UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 89—PART 6

JULY 7, 1943, TO OCTOBER 20, 1943
(PAGES 7313 TO 8608)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON : 1943

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 7, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, Thou hast made all the highways of our hearts to lead to Thy face. Thou hast so formed our being that its deepest cravings are satisfied only in Thee. We confess that in the conceit of our self-sufficiency too often we have turned with our burning thirsts to the broken cisterns of worldly wisdom and of our own sophisticated cleverness. That delusive way has brought us and our generation to tragedy, tyranny, and agony. In all the confusion of our willful blundering we see now that darkness broods upon our path because we have turned our backs to Thee and hidden ourselves from Thy light. Help us this noontide to turn our faces to Thy shining, O Thou Sun of our help and strength.

Not only for our separate lives do we pray, but for the common interests that bind us all together. For our Nation and its leaders, the whole body of our citizens in this time of testing we crave Thy guidance. Forbid that we should miss the way again to just, enduring, and redeeming peace. In all our decisions set our souls on high things. In this dangerous yet glorious day, when we must choose for ourselves and our civilization life or death, the blessings or the curse, grant us the grace in scorn of consequence to set our wills on things worth living for, and, if need be, worth dying for. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, July 6, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORTS UNDER PROGRAM OF FOREIGN WAR RELIEF—AMERICAN RED CROSS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 7, 1943.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a report, prepared by the American Red Cross, of obligations under the appropriations for foreign war relief consolidated and extended by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1942.

This cumulative report, reflecting all refugee and foreign war relief operations from July 1, 1940, through April 30, 1943, supplements reports submitted as of April 30, 1941, and April 30, 1942. It is of necessity an interim report, since the foreign war relief program is still in progress and H. R. 2714 will have the effect of extending the availability of this appropriation until June 30, 1944. A final report must await the conclusion of the foreign war relief program.

There are also transmitted herewith reports from the Treasury Department, the Department of Agriculture, and the War Department, which are serving as purchasing agencies under the program of foreign war relief. It will be noted that the reports of these Departments are prepared on the basis of orders placed with vendors as distinguished from the report of the American Red Cross, which is prepared on the basis of requisitions submitted to those Departments.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

HOUSING IN CONNECTION WITH NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2936) to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. According to the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday, House bill 2936 is to be voted on not later than 12:45 p. m. today. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before a vote is taken, I think we had better have a quorum. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Barkley	Hawkes	Reed
Bone	Hayden	Revercomb
Brewster	Hill	Robertson
Bridges	Holman	Russell
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Buck	Kilgore	Shipstead
Burton	La Follette	Smith
Butler	Langer	Stewart
Byrd	Lucas	Taft
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Tunnell
Connally	McKellar	Tydings
Danaher	Maloney	Vandenberg
Davis	Maybank	Van Nuys
Downey	Mead	Wagner
Ellender	Millikin	Wallgren
Ferguson	Murdock	Walsh
George	Nye	Wheeler
Gerry	O'Daniel	Wherry
Green	O'Mahoney	White
Guffey	Pepper	Wiley
Gurney	Radcliffe	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from

Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been called away on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent because of illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator have a further amendment to offer?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I ask unanimous consent that the votes by which the amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill read the third time be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the votes are reconsidered. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, yesterday I offered an amendment which was agreed to. The Public Works Agency objects to the limitation which provides "that none of the funds authorized herein shall be used to acquire public works already operated by public or private agencies."

When the amendment was offered, I referred to the Puerto Rican case. The Public Works Agency cites a case of a railroad connecting with a naval plant in one of the Western States where they must have the railroad in order to complete the whole railroad project which the Navy desires. The railroad is worth, let us say, $1,000,000, and they are to put in $2,000,000 in order to complete the project. They have asked that in a case of that kind they be authorized to take over the existing work, where they are enlarging it. Even in such cases I do not think the authority should be given except with the consent of those who own the existing public works. Therefore I agreed to an amendment so that the amendment would read:

That none of the funds authorized herein shall be used to acquire public works already operated by public or private agencies, except where funds are allotted for substantial additions or improvements to such public works and with the consent of the owners thereof.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which my amendment was agreed to yesterday be reconsidered in order that I may offer the amendment I have just read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. TAFT. I now offer the revised amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Have the officials of the Federal Works Agency seen the language of the amendment?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, I conferred with Mr. M. H. Elliott, Jr., assistant general counsel of the Federal Works Agency, and agreed with him on this language.

Mr. MALONEY. I hope the amendment will be accepted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to insert at the end of the bill the following:

Provided further, (a) That none of the funds authorized herein shall be used to acquire public works already operated by public or private agencies, except where funds are allotted for substantial additions or improvements to such public works and with the consent of the owners thereof, and

(b) The total amount allocated for contributions to public and private agencies for the maintenance and operation of public works after July 1, 1943, shall not exceed $40,000,000.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the pending bill authorizes the spending of an additional $200,000,000 under the Lanham Act, which was passed originally in 1940. I have before me the program for the spending of this money, and the Senate should have this information before voting upon the spending of this great sum. Last evening we put over until today action upon the bill, because of the large amount involved, and I feel that the Senate should know now the program which has been placed before the committee as to how this money is to be spent.

I wish to call to the Senate's attention some of the items. There are two items for schools, one in the amount of $28,000,000 and another in the amount of $16,000,000. In other words, it is proposed to go into communities and to use Federal funds for the operation of local State schools. Already that subject has been discussed. I am opposed to the exorbitant use of Federal funds in the State schools, or an attempt to dominate the State schools through the use of such funds.

To proceed to other items. In the bill provision is made for expenditures for recreation, whatever that may mean, in local communities. There is one item of $8,922,000, and another item of $7,429,000. I do not know how this vast sum of money is to be used for recreation, but it does seem to me, Mr. President, that we are going very far, that we are becoming very loose in the expenditure of money for such a purpose. On the basis of those two items, if for no other reason, I hope the bill will not be passed, and that it may be returned to the committee for further consideration.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia has opposed the bill on the ground that the program provides a great deal of money. There is one error, however, in his statement. This is not an appropriation bill. It is an authorization bill. So far as the general expenditure is concerned, I think it is justified; that is to say, the Federal Government is building housing in areas which have been extraordinarily expanded by reason of Federal activities and the spending of Federal money.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator would not call an expenditure of some $15,000,000 for recreation a needed expenditure for housing, would he?

Mr. TAFT. It is a very necessary expenditure in connection with camp areas, for instance. All the recreational facilities provided by the U. S. O. for the soldiers in the camps have been built out of this fund. The U. S. O. itself has not built any facilities. The Government has provided all the facilities. The U. S. O. operates them. Also recreation facilities in various industrial areas of the same general nature have been provided.

Mr. President, it seems to me to be a proper activity in an emergency situation where the Federal Government has built vast communities, sometimes far off in the middle of a desert. An ordnance plant, for instance, has been built at a town which perhaps did not have a population of over a thousand when the work started, and probably has 50,000 population today. The same situation exists in many places throughout the South.

The policy of the act was to assist such communities to set themselves on their feet, to see that they were not plague spots, to see that they had proper sanitary facilities, to see that the people who were working in the plants had at least decent living accommodations, and the things which are necessary to make living accommodations decent and pleasant.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like also to point out, if the Senator will permit, that some of the plants, especially powder plants, were built in rural areas in order to get away from large communities because of the hazards involved.

Mr. TAFT. Exactly. The work proposed is necessary to be done. I have heretofore criticized the Federal Works Agency for the way it has operated, and I do not have any tremendous confidence in its economical operation; but, Mr. President, this is an authorization bill. So far as the authorization is concerned, the principle of it is perfectly clear. I believe we should assist communities which we, the Federal Government, have created. But the bill which passed the Senate making appropriation with respect to the present authorization provided only $75,000,000. I have been informed by members of the conference committee that the conferees will cut the amount to $50,000,000. It seems to me that if we approve the principle of

the expenditure we should approve the authorization, and leave the matter to the Appropriations Committee to make the Federal Works Agency justify the particular project and the particular amount they propose to spend.

By the amendment I offered yesterday I have cut the authorization for so-called war services—that is, the operation of the facilities after they are built—to $40,000,000, although the estimate in the figures presented to the committee was $75,000,000. It seems to me that field is one in which we should not expand Federal operations. Federal operations should gradually be cut down, instead of being expanded. The local authorities should more and more be able to take over the cost of operation.

However, so far as construction is concerned, I believe Federal operation is justified, and it seems to me Congress should pass this authorization bill, and should leave to the Appropriations Committee the task of making sure that the particular purposes for which the money is spent are justified.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator has spoken of the vast plants which have been established during wartimes. I desire to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that such plants are usually built under contract with private companies, with Government funds, and that the funds available under the contracts for the building of the plants cannot be used for the construction of housing and other facilities.

Mr. TAFT. No; they cannot. If the plant is built for a private concern, it is built as an industrial plant, and does not include housing, water, or other public facilities. For instance, the Wright aeronautical plant in Cincinnati, which was built in the Mill Creek Valley, today employs approximately 50,000 persons. The Federal Works Agency under this plan built a water line from a point in the Big Miami Valley, about 14 miles away; they drilled wells from which to get cold water for the operation of the plant, and ran the water to the Wright aeronautical plant. The water line was built with funds from Lanham Act appropriations. The company pays for the cost of the water. The project is a self-liquidating one. So far as the Federal Works Agency is concerned, after the war it should undoubtedly dispose of it to the State or to some other operating agency; but funds for the project are not included in the money loaned to the Wright Aeronautical Co. for the construction of its plant.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The building of the Willow Run plant in Washtenaw County is an example of a situation we should bear in mind. Washtenaw County is a rural county. The large Willow Run plant was built in that county. Many persons have moved into the vicinity of the plant. Many of them live in trailer camps. The Federal Government has conducted various housing programs. The section surrounding the plant did not have water; it did not have sewers; it did not have the necessary hospitalization, and so forth. The county has found itself unable to cope with the situation. Health conditions were, and at the present time are, very bad. There is urgent need for greater hospital facilities, additional school facilities, and for running water to be brought from the various cities, even from the city of Detroit.

So I feel that the pending bill, if passed, would take care of the situation now existing in Washtenaw County, which is near Detroit, and is one of the things for which we can well afford to appropriate money, because money thus spent is a justifiable part of the war cost. I think the Defense Plants Corporation has spent a great deal of money in building the foundations for the machines, but has failed to build the foundations required for the people who are actually running the machines. The making of adequate provision for the workingmen and their families, just the same as the building of foundations for the machines used to make the munitions, should be considered as a part of the cost of the war.

I hope the bill will pass, and will provide for the furnishing of facilities to the persons who are manning our war plants which have been built away from metropolitan areas, in order that proper care may be taken of the people who are making the munitions our armed forces require.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The bill is to authorize the appropriation of $200,000,000; and, as I understand, it must yet go to the Appropriations Committee for the actual appropriation of any of the amount which will be authorized under the bill; is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. The Senate Committee on Appropriations put in one of the appropriation bills an item for $75,000,000, contingent on the passage of the pending bill. The appropriation would not otherwise be authorized. The $75,000,000 has been cut by the conference committee to $50,000,000, so that is all that is involved at the present time. That is all that can be obtained until next fall, when application can be made to the Appropriations Committee for an additional grant. However, I think the projects for which additional money may be desired will have to be proved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MALONEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. What is the pending question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the passage of House bill 2936, the bill introduced by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], with regard to defense housing.

Mr. PEPPER. The vote is on the final passage of the bill; is it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct; the vote is on the final passage.

The legislative clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I am advised that if he were present and voting he would vote as I am about to vote. I am therefore free to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained in various Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] are detained on important public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

I am advised that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been called away on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent because of illness in his family.

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 4, as follows:

YEAS—63

Barkley	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bone	Hill	Robertson
Brewster	Holman	Russell
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Brooks	Kilgore	Shipstead
Burton	La Follette	Smith
Byrd	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Caraway	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Danaher	McFarland	Tunnell
Davis	McKellar	Tydings
Downey	Maloney	Vandenberg
Ellender	Maybank	Van Nuys
Ferguson	Mead	Wagner
George	Millikin	Wallgren
Gerry	Murdock	Wheeler
Green	Nye	Wherry
Guffey	O'Daniel	White
Gurney	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Hawkes	Pepper	Willis

NAYS—4

Buck	Reed	Revercomb
Butler		

NOT VOTING—29

Aiken	Chavez	Moore
Andrews	Clark, Idaho	Murray
Austin	Connally	Overton
Bailey	Eastland	Reynolds
Ball	Gillette	Thomas, Idaho
Bankhead	Glass	Tobey
Barbour	Hatch	Truman
Bilbo	Johnson, Calif.	Walsh
Bushfield	Lodge	Wilson
Chandler	McNary	

So the bill H. R. 2936 was passed.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. MALONEY, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. REVERCOMB conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO THE VIRGIN ISLANDS AND PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Social Security Act so as to extend certain titles thereof to the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

LEASE OF SEGREGATED COAL AND ASPHALT DEPOSITS OF THE CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW NATIONS, OKLAHOMA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the leasing of the segregated coal and asphalt depcsits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in Oklahoma (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL EXPLOSIVES ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Explosives Act, as amended, to provide additional safeguards for the protection of explosives and ingredients thereof (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF A DEPARTMENT AND AN AGENCY

Letters from a department and an agency submitting pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending September 30, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service, as follows:

Department of State; and
Smaller War Plants Corporation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Numerous memorials of sundry citizens, workers in the various shops in New York City and vicinity which are under contract with United Shoe Workers of America (Congress of Industrial Organizations) Joint Council 13, remonstrating against attacks on the Office of Price Administration, especially attacks seeking to prevent payment of subsidies and the roll-back of food and commodity prices; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the executive committee of the League of Democratic Women of San Diego, Calif., favoring repeal of the so-called Smith-Connally antistrike bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE:

The petition of Mabelle H. Whitney and other citizens of Winterport, Maine, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Langdon and vicinity, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference petitions of sundry citizens, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, and I request that a tabular analysis of the petitions be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the petitions were received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETITIONS IN SUPPORT OF S. 860

California: Encinitas	1
Connecticut: Hartford	170
District of Columbia: Washington	60
Florida: Miami	34
Illinois:	
Aurora	23
Chicago	1
Freeport	94
Greenville	67
Mt. Vernon	66
Peoria	94
Pinckneyville	40
Polo	180
Salem	23
West Frankfort	1
Total	589
Maryland:	
Overlea	2
Boonsboro	56
Total	58
Massachusetts:	
Middleboro	22
New Bedford	102
Westfield	75
Total	199
Minnesota:	
Blue Earth	75
Faribault	122
Madison	1
Minneapolis	86
St. Paul	1,100
Rochester	18
Thief River Falls	18
Virginia	82
Window	1
Total	1,503
Missouri: Springfield	5
Maine: Lebanon	24
Pennsylvania:	
Willsboro	52
Wellsboro	68
Total	120
New Jersey:	
Bridgeton	2
Newark	47
Washington	7
Westfield	1
Total	57
New York:	
Keeseville	26
Montgomery County	312
Total	338
Oklahoma: Skiatook	29
Pennsylvania: Mercer County	19
South Carolina:	
Easley	24
Hartsville	13
Herth Springs	53
Woodruff	23
Total	113
Tennessee: Memphis	5
Texas: Mercedes	128
Washington:	
Bellingham	44
Tacoma	90
Total	134
Wisconsin: Chetek	36
Grand total	3,422

WAR CONTROL AND REGULATION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference petitions of sundry citizens, praying for the enactment of House bill 2082, relating to war control and regulation of the liquor traffic, and request that a tabular analysis of the petitions be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the petitions were received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETITIONS IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 2082

California	161
Colorado	37
Missouri	173
Oregon	38
Total	409

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 990. A bill for the relief of the Washington, Brandywine and Point Lookout Railroad Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 406).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 533. A bill for the relief of John P. von Rosenberg; with amendments (Rept. No. 407).

PARTIAL REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION AND USE OF PUBLIC LANDS (S. REPT. NO. 404)

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and from the subcommittee of that committee, acting under Senate Resolution 241 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, extended by Senate Resolution 147 of the Seventy-seventh Congress and Senate Resolution 39 of the Seventy-eighth Congress. I ask unanimous consent to file a partial report on the subject of administration and use of the public lands, and I request that it be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES, 1942 (S. REPT. NO. 405)

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report from the Special Committee to Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures in the year 1942, pursuant to Senate Resolution 235, Seventy-seventh Congress, extended by Senate Resolution 5, Seventy-eighth Congress.

Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the statement of the policy of the committee printed on page 3 of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

COMMITTEE POLICY AND PROCEDURE

With the Nation at war in 1942, the committee entered upon its work with a full realization of its obligation to be as saving in the use of money, manpower, and travel facilities as was consistent with the full performance of its duties and functions under the terms and provisions of Senate Resolution 235. Accordingly, the committee established at the outset of its operations a conservative policy with regard to ordering investigations and hearings. In adopting this policy, there was no intention or expectation that any case deserving of the committee's intervention would have other than prompt and vigorous attention; there was, however, a very firm purpose to avoid the work and expense which might be wasted through hasty action upon complaints laid before the committee which were frivolous or made merely for such advantage, through publicity or otherwise, as might inure to the complainants.

In the matter of investigations, the committee felt that no undue delay would be occasioned in meritorious cases and no improper burden would be placed upon complainants, if it were required that all charges filed with the committee be set forth, however informally, with such particularity and detail as would establish prima facie that the committee had jurisdiction and that the complaints had substantial bases in fact. In applying the foregoing rule, the committee did not reject or disregard complaints it considered wanting in definiteness or particularity but, in all such cases, the complainants were promptly advised of the committee's requirements and were given a specified period of time within which to amend or supplement their complaints in conformity therewith.

With regard to hearings, it was the rule of the committee that no hearing would be authorized in any case until after a preliminary investigation had been made and the investigators' report thereon had been considered by the full committee. It may be stated that the committee found it unnecessary to hold hearings in any of the cases filed before it.

Mr. McFARLAND. It will be noted that it was the policy of the committee to require a preliminary investigation of every complaint before a public hearing was held. The committee felt that public hearings are frequently misunderstood and that a preliminary investigation should be conducted and a report made to the committee before a public hearing was ordered. This was done, and it will be noted that no public hearings were held. The committee did not consider any of the facts reported justified a public hearing. The credit for this is due to the candidates themselves.

It will also be noted from the report that no adverse recommendation was made in regard to the seat of any Senator. The credit for this is due to the various Members of the Senate who were elected at the last election.

I should like also to have printed as a part of my remarks part IV, which is the financial statement of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

PART IV. *Financial statement*

Authorized		$30,000
Less expenditures:		
Office salaries	$2,060.41	
Office supplies and expenses	130.69	
Investigators' salaries and expenses of investigations	5,241.52	
Legal salaries and expenses	2,173.38	
		9,606
Unexpended balance		20,394

Mr. McFARLAND. It will be noted the committee expended less than a third of the money authorized. We are happy to report this small expenditure of money. We felt it our duty to save, where possible, at a time when our country is engaged in this war and all resources are needed for its prosecution.

Mr. President, I should like at this time to thank the members of the special committee who served with me, the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. They cooperated wholeheartedly, and the fact that all of our votes and recommendations were unanimous is proof of the nonpartisan manner in which the affairs of the committee were conducted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and printed.

ASSISTANT IN OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF SENATE

Mr. LUCAS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 175), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized to employ an assistant in his office, at the rate of $2,400 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

On July 5, 1943:

S. 1134. A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

On July 6, 1943:

S. 35. A bill to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States; and

S. 1252. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119), relating to water conservation and utilization projects.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1322. A bill permitting aliens, other than enemy aliens, to become tenants in low-rent housing projects maintained under section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. CARAWAY:

S. 1323. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret M. Ross; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1324. A bill for the relief of the Wisconsin Electric Power Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1325. A bill for the relief of Joseph Moret; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1326. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Straka; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. BARKLEY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 74, which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF WAR AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am compelled to attend a conference, and I desire to ask unanimous consent to introduce and to presently consider a joint resolution amending a proviso in the war agencies appropriation bill. In that bill is the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be directly or indirectly used for the payment of the salary or expenses of any person who directs the formulation of any price policy, maximum price, or price ceiling with respect to any article or commodity unless, in the judgment of the Administrator, such persons shall be qualified by experience in business, industry, or commerce; but this limitation shall not apply to the Administrator or Acting Administrator

as the case may be, in considering, adopting, signing, and promulgating price policies, maximum prices, or price ceilings formulated and prepared in compliance herewith.

In the second deficiency bill that language has been amended so as to give until the 16th of August. The Price Administrator tells me that unless he has more time than that it will result in the resignation of practically his entire staff, and he has asked that an amendment be adopted in the form of a joint resolution giving him until the 15th of October. So what I am asking is that the language I have just read be amended by adding the following:

Provided, That this proviso shall not be effective as to salaries and expenses accruing prior to October 15, 1943.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the introduction and present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 74) to amend the National War Agencies Appropriation Act of 1944 was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the proviso in section — of the National War Agencies Appropriation Act of 1944, reading as follows: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be directly or indirectly used for the payment of the salary or expenses of any person who directs the formulation of any price policy, maximum price, or price ceiling with respect to any article or commodity unless, in the judgment of the Administrator, such persons shall be qualified by experience in business, industry, or commerce; but this limitation shall not apply to the Administrator or Acting Administrator, as the case may be, in considering, adopting, signing, and promulgating price policies, maximum prices, or price ceilings formulated and prepared in compliance herewith," is amended by adding thereto the following: "*Provided*, That this proviso shall not be effective as to salaries and expenses accruing prior to October 15, 1943."

The joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VIOLATIONS OF FREE SPEECH AND RIGHTS OF LABOR—PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT NO. 398

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution for which I ask immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 173), as follows:

Resolved, That 5,500 additional copies of part 1 and each subsequent part of Senate Report No. 398, submitted by the Committee on Education and Labor pursuant to Senate Resolution 266 (74th Cong.), as extended by Senate Resolution 98 (78th Cong.), entitled "Violations of Free Speech and Rights of Labor," be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will say, Mr. President, that I have conferred with the majority and minority leaders and with the chairman of the Committee on Printing, and the resolution is satisfactory to them. It simply provides that we may have printed the usual number of these parts of the report which we have been printing previously.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

JEFFERSON DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARKLEY AT UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator BARKLEY at the Jefferson Day celebration, University of Virginia, on July 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATES' RIGHTS OR FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BUTLER

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "States' Rights or Federal Bureaucracy," delivered by him on July 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FIGHT OF AGRICULTURE FOR ECONOMIC EQUALITY—ARTICLE BY SENATOR CLARK OF MISSOURI

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article written by him entitled "The Fight of Agriculture for Economic Equality," published in The Missouri Farmer of June 1, 1943, together with an editorial note entitled "Let's Get the Record Straight," which appear in the Appendix.]

THE FLAG SPEAKS FOR AMERICA—ADDRESS BY THE GOVERNOR OF PENNSYLVANIA

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Flag Speaks for America," delivered by Maj. Gen. Edward Martin, Governor of Pennsylvania, at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa., on Flag Day, Monday, June 14, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA AND RUSSIA — ANSWER TO MAX EASTMAN BY MAX LERNER

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Answering Max Eastman," written by Max Lerner, and published in the Washington Post of July 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHORTAGE OF TEACHERS — ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Teacher Shortage Declared a Peril," written by Benjamin Fine and published in the New York Times of June 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOME FRONT REFORMS AT TOP NEEDED—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by David Lawrence entitled "Home Front Reforms at Top Needed," published in the Washington Star, which appears in the Appendix.]

VICTORIES AT HOME—EDITORIAL FROM THE CINCINNATI ENQUIRER

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Victories at Home," published in the Cincinnati, Ohio, Enquirer of July 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACQUISITION OF CORN BY GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 71.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 71), relating to the acquisition of corn by governmental agencies.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the joint resolution ought to have been considered before now. Before a vote is taken on my motion, I wish to read for the RECORD two telegrams, which I have selected from among 500 or 600 of the same nature. One of the telegrams is from New Hampshire, and the other from South Carolina, so they represent a pretty broad field.

I read first the one from New Hampshire, which is addressed to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]:

EXETER, N. H., *July 6, 1943.*

CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Unless immediate congressional action is taken to provide free movement of corn, sharp curtailment in food production can be expected. Feed manufacturers are unable to buy corn because of low-priced ceilings, and unless this condition is corrected at once thousands of poultrymen and dairymen will be forced to liquidate their stock. We urgently recommend you to do everything possible to have price ceilings removed from corn. Only by removing corn price ceilings will feed manufacturers and other feed processors be able to obtain supplies sufficient to prevent a serious food shortage. We emphasize that immediate congressional action is necessary to avoid chaos.

GENERAL MILLS, INC.

The telegram from South Carolina is of the same nature, but different in wording:

SPARTANSBURG, S. C., *July 5, 1943.*

Hon. ELLISON D. SMITH,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Unless immediate congressional action is taken to provide free movement of corn, a sharp curtailment in food production can be expected. Feed manufacturers are unable to buy corn because of low price ceiling. Unless this condition is corrected at once thousands of poultrymen and dairymen will be forced to liquidate their stock. We urgently recommend you do everything possible to have price ceiling removed from corn. Only by removing corn price ceiling will feed manufacturers and other food processors be able to obtain sufficient supplies to prevent a serious food shortage. We emphasize that immediate congressional action is necessary to avoid chaos.

O. H. GREEN.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 71) relating to the acquisition of corn by governmental agencies, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 5, after the word "agency", it is pro-

posed to strike out "all such" and insert "or by any individual, firm, association, or corporation, and all governmental."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry about the meaning of that amendment. As it was originally introduced, the joint resolution undertook to authorize only Government agencies to buy corn.

Mr. SMITH. When the joint resolution came before the committee, which is assumed to have some little function in drafting legislation of this nature, the committee said, in effect, "We want this provision to permit any man to buy or sell at not to exceed $1.40 a bushel."

Mr. BARKLEY. So the amendment which the committee added to the joint resolution would not limit it to any individual, firm, association, or corporation which is a governmental agency, but any private individual would be authorized to buy and sell corn for any purpose and pay as much as $1.40 a bushel.

Mr. SMITH. Not to exceed $1.40 a bushel.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is what I mean.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the committee considered this question, and I think we are all tired of being dictated to by a handful of people who do not understand the situation. I have evidence of that in the form of the telegrams to which I have referred. It is a question of whether this body will accede to allowing the people to have something to say in the operation of the Government, or whether we will cut them out and put the decision entirely in the hands of a few persons in Washington. I for one am tired of being regimented and rationed concerning things which they do not understand, and I think others feel the same as I do.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. Oh, yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want the Senator to yield in that tone of voice. If he does not wish to yield freely, I do not wish him to yield grudgingly. I should like to ask the Senator for some information. Regardless of what we are all tired of doing, the effect of the joint resolution would be to nullify the ceiling on corn which was put into effect by the Office of Price Administration. Is that not true?

Mr. SMITH. I hope that would be the effect of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would not that be the effect of it?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The joint resolution deals only with corn. I heard the Senator from South Carolina state on the floor the other day the use to which corn is put in South Carolina. [Laughter.] I am not arguing the matter with the Senator, because I realize that nothing which I might say would influence his view; but in order that it may be made clear, if we can pass a joint resolution now or at any other time nullifying the ceiling price on corn, why can we not do it with respect to tobacco, wheat, and other commodities?

Mr. SMITH. Does not the Senator realize that the corn situation is the most critical one before the American people at the present time?

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize that the corn situation is critical.

Mr. SMITH. If tobacco or wheat should fall into the same category, we could consider those commodities individually.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am asking the Senator if we should do it piecemeal. I am not opposing his proposal, although as a rule I am opposed to picking out one commodity and using it as the basis for repealing a law which applies to many commodities. I do not know what the House would do—I have no information on that subject—and I do not know what the President would do because I have no information on that subject either, but if, because of an emergency or a particular condition, we can pick out one commodity and say to the agency which we have set up, "You shall not put a ceiling on it; if you do, we will lift it by legislation," is it not logical to believe that we may be expected to do the same thing with regard to any other commodity with respect to which a critical situation exists, or a strong group asks Congress to nullify the act?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that whenever any commodity gets into the mess that corn is in, I, for one, will either introduce a resolution to relieve it, or I will vote for one introduced by some other Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit a suggestion I think that because of the way in which the committee has reported the bill the language is confusing. In the first place, the committee reported an amendment to add to the joint resolution the language "or by any individual, firm, association, or corporation, and all governmental." The word "and" ought not to be there.

Mr. SMITH. My attention was called to that matter by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. I am perfectly willing to have the word "and" stricken out.

Mr. BARKLEY. As a matter of fact, I do not believe that the amendment in line 8 is really necessary, in view of the language in line 6. The Senator has twice provided authorization to do the same thing.

Mr. SMITH. I hope it will be done four or five times.

Mr. President, on page 1, line 8, after the word "corn", I move to amend the committee amendment by striking out the word "and."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Having received the full modicum of information which I sought from the Senator from South Carolina, I desist.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the question was in keeping with the answer. Neither of them was very brilliant.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator refers to his own answer.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I also refer to the question of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. President, this question seems to be a source of great amusement to the faithful, but I think it is time for us to legislate for the benefit of the people. I have received hundreds of telegrams, as I know other Senators have, showing that the corn situation is simply intolerable. We have delegated all our legislative functions to the other end of the Avenue, and I wonder what we can do. The users of corn have asked me to draft legislation, and I have done so in good faith. I am asking for relief for those who are suffering from the ceiling price which has been placed upon corn. It has been implied that we must not hurt the feelings of those who put the ceiling on corn. Mr. President, they do not know a cornstalk from a fishing pole; and yet they dictate to the people who raise corn. The gentleman who has charge of the program, to whom we foolishly delegated all our rights and interests, actually stated before our committee that he did not have the remotest idea of the far-reaching use of the by-products of corn, and was amazed when told that the lack of corn was likely to interfere with the manufacture of many strategic materials necessary in the prosecution of the war.

I believe the parity price was 85 cents a bushel. The ceiling price was $1.07. It has been estimated that approximately 800,000,000 bushels of corn are in the hands of the farmers. They are feeding it to their stock, and at the present price of livestock they are realizing about $1.37 a bushel for their corn. Therefore the committee thought that $1.40, a 3-cent increase over the $1.37, might be a reasonable price.

Mr. President, I should like to make a speech about this rotten mess, but I forebear. The joint resolution is before the Senate, and the Senate can act appropriately.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to suggest something in the interest of draftsmanship? As I suggested a moment ago, he has the same amendment in two different places, namely, in line 6, and in line 8. It seems to me that it is unnecessary to have it in line 8 because without it the language would read as follows:

> That notwithstanding any other provision of law, or of any regulation, order, or directive, imposing limitations upon the acquisition of corn by any governmental agency, or by any individual, firm, association, or corporation, all governmental agencies which exercise any functions with respect to the buying, selling, storage, or use of corn, all individuals, firms, associations, or corporations are hereby authorized to acquire corn—

And so forth. It seems to me that by having it in once——

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if the Senator will read the first part of the resolution he will see that it provides:

> That notwithstanding any other provision of law, or of any regulation, order, or directive, imposing limitations upon the acquisition of corn by any governmental agency, or by any individual, firm, association, or corporation, and all governmental agencies which exercise any functions with respect to the

buying, selling, storage, or use of corn, and all individuals, firms—

And so forth. That throws it right back on those who have no governmental impositions placed upon them.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator wants the joint resolution to read in that way, I am not going to insist on striking the second amendment out, but I thought by doing so the joint resolution would be simplified.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. It seems to me, Mr. President, in view of the language which precedes, that is the language "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, or of any regulation, order, or directive, imposing limitations upon the acquisition of corn by any governmental agency or by any individual, firm, association, or corporation," that the language should be repeated as it is repeated in the joint resolution.

Mr. SMITH. Of course.

Mr. WHITE. Because otherwise he would give no authority to these individuals to purchase at the price which is named.

Mr. BARKLEY. We could say in lines 6 and 7 "all such governmental agencies, individuals, firms, associations, and corporations are hereby authorized."

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, when the amendments were offered in the committee the first amendment had reference to those upon whom restrictions were placed. Then, it was desired to throw it open to anybody and, therefore, the second amendment. I think it is all right as it is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from South Carolina if he does not want the word "and" in line 6 stricken out?

Mr. SMITH. The word "and" in line 8 has been stricken out; that has already been agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is in the second amendment.

Mr. SMITH. I ask that the committee amendments may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, which the clerk will again read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 5, after the word "agency", it is proposed to strike out "all such" and insert "or by any individual, firm, association, or corporation, and all governmental."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the second committee amendment. The Chair will state that it has been agreed that the word "and" in line 8 should be deleted.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 8, after the word "corn", it is proposed to strike out "all individuals, firms, associations, or corporations."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as previously amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is open to further amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no amendment to offer. I merely wanted to make an observation. I realize the situation that confronts the country in regard to corn. We all have the same report from our constituents with respect to the difficulty of obtaining corn. I do not think anybody has the last word as to the reason for the situation, or as to whether the ceiling placed upon corn by the O. P. A., which, as I recall, is $1.07 a bushel, when parity is practically 85 cents a bushel, has caused it or whether it has not caused it, and I am not going to attempt to go into that. I am told that corn is bringing in certain limited sections of the country as much as $1.37 a bushel.

Mr. SMITH. That is in what is called the black market. I hope the Senator is not advocating that.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not advocating that, but the reason given me why $1.40 ought to be put as the top price under this joint resolution is that corn is bringing as much as $1.37 in certain limited sections of the country in the black market—for that is what it is. I am not saying this in opposition to the joint resolution, but I would deplore Congress itself entering upon the policy of price fixing. We recognize that Congress cannot fix prices on all commodities which are consumed in the United States any more than Congress can fix rates on all the railroads which haul freight. That authority is left to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and this authority was left to the Price Administration, because if we undertook to pass legislation fixing the prices upon all commodities, we would find ourselves in a hopeless swamp from which we could not see our way out, because conditions change so often that it would be utterly impossible for Congress to pass a new law every time we might think a price ought to be changed.

Mr. SMITH. When Congress passes a law it is disregarded.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is entitled to his opinion about that. I do not think that the O. P. A. has disregarded the law which Congress enacted when it fixes the price of a commodity at the top price which Congress authorized them to fix, among three categories, whichever might be the highest. I do not think it could be stated that O. P. A. has violated the law of Congress even in fixing a dollar and seven cents a bushel for corn, although I realize that that ceiling has probably caused many farmers to hold their corn and not sell it, in the hope that some plan would be worked out which would enable them to get a better price. The Commodity Credit Corporation or the O. P. A. issued a statement the other day that those who sold their corn between now and August 10, I believe, would be given whatever adjustment price was fixed at that time, and I happen to know that they are working on a program by which the price of corn will be increased.

Mr. SMITH. I am glad the Senator referred to that official document. It stated clearly, "If you will sell us your corn now at the ceiling price, in the event we raise it a cent or two, we will pay you, but let us have it now." The farmers had sense enough to know that that was not a contract.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course it is not a contract; but I think it was an act of fairness on the part of those in charge of the program to say, "In order to loosen up the market and make corn available, if there should be any increase in the price of corn you will reap the benefit of the increase." That might help to loosen up the market and allow those who cannot now get corn to obtain a supply of the commodity.

All I wish to say is that if this resolution is to pass, as I presume it will through this body at least—I do not know what the other body will do, and I have no information as to the President's attitude—if this resolution is passed through this body alone or through Congress and becomes a law, I hope it will not be taken as a precedent by which the Congress would conclude that it had the right or power or the wisdom to take up every commodity in the United States separately and say what the ceiling price upon it should be. I do not believe we can do that.

Mr. SMITH. Does not the Senator think it would be the duty of Congress to relieve a situation as to any commodity which is vital to the people if it got into the mess this corn business is in?

Mr. BARKLEY. That may be, but what I am insisting upon is that whatever we do with regard to this commodity shall not be taken as an indication of the settled policy of Congress to undertake to deal piecemeal and item by item and article by article with maximum prices.

Mr. SMITH. I hope that whenever the people are suffering, as they are suffering under the corn situation, they can come to Congress and obtain relief. That is what I am trying to do in this instance.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. As I understand, the Chair announced that the amendments had been adopted and the joint resolution was open to further amendment. On page 2, line 2, there is mention of a price not to exceed $1.40 a bushel. Personally I think that the joint resolution should include the words following the word "bushel," "basis Chicago," because I am sure that is what the Senator has been referring to in talking about the price. The price there now is $1.07. The actual basis at which the price should be figured back to other markets has been established by previous regulations. There is a certain difference allowed for freight differential, and it would avoid a

great deal of confusion, utter confusion, if a basis could be established instead of merely saying "$1.40 a bushel." There is nothing to indicate whether $1.40 a bushel is meant on a farm in Nebraska or in Chicago.

Mr. SMITH. There has been a great deal of trouble about the freight matter. In certain sections there is a 10 percent differential, that is, the freight rate is 10 percent higher in the South than it is in the North and parts of the Northwest. Therefore there is confusion worse confounded. My idea was that as the corn is in the hands of the farmers, if a neighbor wanted 100 bushels or 500 bushels, or the manufacturers wanted to have their inventories booked up properly, they could do so, provided they gave not to exceed $1.40 a bushel.

I should not like to have the price based on Chicago, because of the unhappy freight mess we are in. It is nearly as bad as the corn situation. I am a member of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and I know there are about four or five people fixing freight and passenger rates. They pay about as much attention to the Interstate Commerce Commission as certain individuals do to Congress. They fix the rates to suit themselves. I think it is a pretty good idea to leave this provision without basing it on any particular point. Let us just say "not to exceed $1.40 a bushel."

Mr. REED. Has the Senator from South Carolina concluded?

Mr. SMITH. I think I will conclude. I am afraid I might make a speech.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to speak very briefly on the joint resolution. I am sorry the necessity arises for us to take action on this matter. It arises out of the continued policy of the present administration.

In the first place, Mr. President, Secretary of Agriculture Wickard started out definitely on a policy to keep down the price of feed, including corn, so as to encourage a larger production of livestock and a larger feeding of dairy cattle. He was eminently successful. He was so successful that we have more livestock in the country than we can feed. There is talk now about there being too many hogs.

The second mistake comes from the error of the O. P. A. in assuming that the law establishing ceilings fixed a maximum. It did nothing of the kind; it fixed only a minimum. The law provided that a ceiling price below a certain figure should not be established.

Mr. President, the Members of Congress might just as well get this into their minds. The O. P. A. has fixed the corn ceiling on a basis of parity as the maximum price that can be paid, not as the minimum price but as the maximum price, and corn will not move at that price. So the dairy farmers all over the East and the poultry producers all over the East and the West are crying for corn, as are the livestock feeders in my own section.

There are 600,000,000 bushels of corn which somehow or other have to be brought into the market. The O. P. A. made some mistakes, and when they finally decided to take action, they made the mistake of fixing the ceiling price at a minimum, where it could be fixed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. In a moment I shall be happy to yield. I am attempting to outline the situation as it presents itself to me, because I do not like to do what I think we are bound to do.

In addition to what I have stated about livestock feeders, including the poultry and dairy farmers of the East and the Pacific coast, there are industrial users of corn. Along with other Senators from corn-producing States, I discussed this matter with the Commodity Credit Corporation. The senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who is not present today, the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], who is not in the Chamber at the moment, and I went to talk with Mr. Davis about a month ago regarding this very situation and as to what could be done to release the corn now on hand, for which there is a desperate need. The matter is not sectional; there is an industrial need for the corn everywhere. There is a need for it for poultry feeding everywhere. For example, there was more poultry in the country in 1942 than ever before, and in April of this year there was 13 percent more poultry than in April of last year. Poultry will not grow unless they have feed, and it is impossible to obtain enough feed for poultry without corn, either whole or as the major ingredient in poultry feed. The dairy farmers all over the country have to have feed. Yet there are 600,000,000 bushels of corn in the hands of individual owners who are unwilling to sell at the present time.

The Senators from corn-producing States, in conference with Mr. Hutson, were told first what the Commodity Credit Corporation proposed to do; and it has done it. Mr. Hutson and the Senators from the corn-producing States, of which I am one, agreed at the time that any relief which could be afforded by requisitioning all the corn in the elevators and in commercial channels would be only slight relief. It might ease the situation for perhaps a week or two weeks, but not longer than that.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has done all it could. It did requisition approximately 12,000,000 bushels of corn in the elevators and in the commercial channels; that is gone, and we still face the situation which has been confronting us.

I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Several times Congress has passed laws providing for the sale of hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat. Wheat has been used for feed, especially the wheat that was taken over by the Commodity Credit Corporation. I should like to ask how the enactment of the pending joint resolution would affect the price of hard spring wheat, in the judgment of the Senator.

Mr. REED. Whatever answer I might make would be only the expression of a judgment as against unknown factors. I am perfectly willing to make such an expression, if the Senator from North Dakota desires.

Mr. LANGER. I do want an answer, if I can get it.

Mr. REED. Let me suggest first to the Senator from South Carolina that I think the suggestion made by the Senator from Nebraska that he insert in connection with the $1.40 price, or any other price figure, the words "basis Chicago" is a good one, for the reason that Chicago is the great corn market of the United States. Corn is bought and sold in Oregon, in South Carolina, in New York, in Texas, usually "basis Chicago." I do not mean to say that there are no sales of corn made anywhere on some basis other than Chicago, because there are local sales of corn and the movement of corn locally, but in commercial channels everywhere, from New England to California, the basis used is the Chicago basis. I hope the Senator from South Carolina will accept the suggestion offered by the Senator from Nebraska as clarifying the situation.

Now answering the question of the Senator from North Dakota, I desire to go briefly into the relationship of the parity price on wheat and the parity price on corn. The average parity price of wheat today throughout the United States is $1.45, let us say. The parity price of corn is about $1.07 or $1.09, or somewhere in that neighborhood. Yet, beginning a year ago, Congress, through a measure originating in the Senate, authorized the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, to do precisely what is proposed now, that is to say, to take 125,000,000 bushels of wheat and sell it for feed at not less, as I recall, than the parity price of corn. In other words, the Commodity Credit Corporation in that transaction would sustain a loss equivalent to the difference between the parity price of wheat and the parity price of corn. That action was taken a year ago, because the present shortage of feed, due to different reasons, was then foreseen.

Mr. President, I took the floor in this body a year ago to urge that the Senate insist upon its amendment, to which the House conferees were objecting, which would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to do the very thing now proposed to be done. The Senate insisted upon its amendment. The House receded. The Secretary of Agriculture sold the 125,000,000 bushels of wheat. About 3 or 4 months ago, again the question arose in this body, and the Secretary of Agriculture was given additional authority to sell 100,000,000 bushels, in addition to the 125,000,000 bushels which had already been sold. The whole purpose was to relieve the feed situation.

Mr. President, we have now reached a time when we have no more wheat than we need. We cannot sell any more wheat for feed, which is the most valuable agricultural product grown. I

shall come to the point raised by the Senator from North Dakota in a moment.

Mr. LANGER. No, Mr. President, let the Senator continue. I am interested in what he is saying.

Mr. REED. It so happens that I have lived with the grain question all my life. I do not think the passage of the joint resolution will have any effect upon the price of wheat. I come from a wheat-producing State. I wish its passage would have an effect upon the price of wheat. I wish corn would pull wheat up with it. But the O. P. A. has placed a ceiling on flour prices. It fixed a limit on the price the flour miller can pay for wheat. That in turn keeps the wheat price 21 cents below parity, which I think is unjust, unreasonable, outrageous, and anything else anyone may want to call it. That, Mr. President, is the situation. I do not think the proposed action can immediately, at least, have any effect on the price of wheat.

Have I answered the Senator's question?

Mr. LANGER. Practically. Why would it not be just as well to remove the ceiling price from flour and bring wheat up to parity?

Mr. REED. I will say to the Senator from North Dakota that before I leave Washington I am going to register the most vehement protest I know how to register concerning the dumb, incredibly stupid, incompetent policies which are being followed with respect to the production of food and feed. I warn the Senate and I warn the country that unless the incredibly stupid policies which are now being followed with respect to the production of food and feed are corrected, the country will face a desperate need for more food and more feed some time in the first part of 1944.

Mr. LANGER. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Would the Senator, when he begins to raise this fuss, have any objection if I accompany him?

Mr. REED. I shall be very happy to take the Senator from North Dakota along with me. He is one of the best hell-raisers I know of.

Mr. LANGER. As the Senator knows, with respect to wheat, the situation is desperate.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to conclude with this statement: The limitations we have placed upon the O. P. A. with respect to fixing price ceilings are minimum limitations, not maximum. If during the remainder of the war the country expects to have produced enough food and feed to feed the people of the country, the livestock, the poultry, the dairy animals, we must forget the term parity, and fix prices at whatever point and at whatever level is necessary to obtain production. So I shall vote for the joint resolution sponsored by the Senator from South Carolina. I do not like to have the Senate take up a single item and deal with it specifically, but there is nothing else to do in the situation which exists at this time.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, is the joint resolution open to further amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MEAD in the chair). The joint resolution is open to further amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. I send forward an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

That section 381 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section—

"(1) no cotton held by or on behalf of the United States shall be sold at a price less than 23½ cents per pound (determined on the basis of seven-eighths inch Middling cotton free on board at the mills or at the ports, with increases or decreases in such price which properly reflect differences in grade, type, staple, quality, and location); and

"(2) any cotton held by or on behalf of the United States may be sold at a price of 25 cents or more per pound (determined on the same basis and with similar increases or decreases), without regard to the limitations contained in subsection (c) upon the number of bales which may be sold in any calendar month or any calendar year: *Provided*, That no maximum price for cotton shall be established or maintained under authority of any act of Congress or any Executive order or a price below the price specified in this paragraph."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I objected to the consideration of Senate bill 1088, which is now the language of my amendment, when it was called on the calendar on June 15, but in view of the fact that the pending joint resolution is before the Senate, this is the proper time and an appropriate place for the Senate also to consider the amendment I have proposed. The amendment is the language of a bill reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Obviously it would not be fair for me to persist in my objection to the bill so long as we are acting on the pending joint resolution.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I hope the joint resolution will not be cluttered up by amendments. The joint resolution is before the Senate. A disastrous condition exists with respect to corn. When cotton gets into a similar fix I shall introduce a joint resolution with respect to cotton.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the bill, now the language of my amendment, was reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry——

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Of which the distinguished Senator from South Carolina is chairman. I assume it had his approbation and support when it came from the committee. I know of nothing in the record to justify a contrary conclusion.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, that is neither here nor there. The amendment will have a disastrous effect on the pending joint resolution. I desire that the joint resolution shall pertain to the subject with which it deals and with respect to which it was introduced. I was asked by persons interested in the production of corn to introduce the joint resolution, but now, instead of permitting it to be passed as the emergency justifies, various persons are shooting at it from different directions.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the Committee on Agriculture has advised us, as the language of the amendment would indicate—

That no maximum price for cotton shall be established or maintained under authority of any act of Congress or any Executive order or a price below the price specified in this paragraph.

Not only that, Mr. President, but the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry advises that the measure is a highly essential one. The committee says that if we do not adopt the proposed legislation the present system of handling cotton in the United States will be destroyed.

Mr. President, can the Senator from South Carolina sit here in the Senate and——

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I think the language proposed by the Senator from Connecticut should be sent to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask for action on the amendment as offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I introduced the bill just mentioned by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER]. I introduced it at the request of the commissioners, directors, and secretaries of agriculture of the various States. These gentlemen met in Washington some 4 or 5 weeks ago, and considered a great many questions. Among the questions considered by them was the price of cotton. This organization, I may say, is made up of one member from each State of the Union. In some States the man at the head of the agriculture department is called the secretary of agriculture. In other States he is called the director of agriculture. In my State, the State of Oklahoma, the man at the head of the department is called the president of the board of agriculture. Those gentlemen are the ones who made the recommendation upon which I acted in introducing the bill. The bill was referred to the committee, and was reported from it favorably. The bill is now on the calendar, ready for consideration.

However, Mr. President, I am not asking now that the bill introduced by me be added as an amendment to the pending joint resolution. Corn is grown in Oklahoma; therefore my State is interested in the price of corn. In the southern section of my State cotton is the prevailing crop. I am perfectly content to solve the price-of-cotton problem on its merits, and likewise to solve the corn-price problem on its merits. So, at the present time I would oppose the addition of my bill as an amendment to the pending joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

ment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words relative to the joint resolution as it was before the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut was offered. What I say shall be in favor of the joint resolution.

I realize that the situation is serious. I also realize that, under ordinary and normal circumstances, the proposed method is not the proper one to handle such matters. However, as I have said, the situation is serious. I have received letters, telegrams, and telephone calls from many persons, particularly from those familiar with the feed situation, who are vitally interested in this question. They cannot get the corn they require in order to be able to mix the feed for either poultry or other livestock. Under present conditions, I think an expression by the Senate would at least have a beneficial effect in showing the desire of the Senate to have some action taken.

I took up the matter with the Department of Agriculture. I was told there are approximately 825,000,000 bushels of corn in the country, altogether. I then asked how much corn would be required to feed all the livestock in the country. I was told that approximately 400,000,000 bushels of the 825,000,000 bushels would be required. Then it was pointed out that something is always left; in other words, people will not sell out entirely until they know what the next crop will be. I was informed that that amount was estimated to be approximately 150,000,000 bushels. So there is a possibility of having between 250,000,000 and 275,000,000 bushels of corn put on the market, if the price can be made such as to induce those who have it to sell it. In other words, it is believed that from 250,000,000 to 275,000,000 bushels of corn are being held for a higher price. The remainder of the corn is being held by those who have livestock to which to feed it, and to them price is not an inducement.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that under those conditions the placing of a higher price on corn is the only solution of the problem of how to get the corn out of the hands of those who are holding it for a higher price. They can be called speculators, or it may be said that they are increasing the cost of living. The fact of the matter is that various mills I could mention—for instance, the Larro Mill, which I understand is about to shut down, and other large mills—find it absolutely necessary to cease preparing and selling feed in my section of the country and in other sections.

The problem is a most important one because we must have the feed. In my county there are approximately 20,000,000 chickens. In the main those chickens are between 1 day old and 15 weeks old. They must have food. In order to produce the chicken flesh, it is absolutely necessary that corn be available. It may be, as the Senator from Kansas has said, there are too many mouths to feed. Perhaps that is true; I do not know. At any rate, it seems to me the joint resolution proposes an inducement which can be offered to those who have corn to sell. I think the method proposed by the joint resolution is the only remaining one by which it is possible to get the corn on the market because the people know that the corn is worth more when fed to either hogs, cattle, or poultry than it is when sold on the market at the present ceiling price. Therefore, it is necessary to raise that price. I hope the O. P. A. will do so, and I hope it will not be necessary for the joint resolution to go into effect.

However, I think we are justified in making an exception in this case because there are literally millions of mouths that are crying for something to eat. If the corn they must have can be obtained, I think it should be.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is very obvious that the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut is offered solely for the purpose of defeating the corn joint resolution. Once we start amending the resolution now before the Senate, inasmuch as other interests are just as much affected as cotton, we shall have no end of amendments to the joint resolution, so that the ultimate result will be its total defeat.

Insofar as I am concerned, I will not support any amendments to the corn joint resolution. If any are agreed to I will vote against the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from South Carolina.

In the past I have spoken in the Senate in connection with the discussion of the very serious corn situation. Cotton does not stand in the same position as does corn. Neither does sugar; neither does any other basic commodity.

Mr. President, there is no need for me to reiterate what is occurring today as a result of the failure of the refineries and the feeders to obtain corn, the vital commodity needed in order to keep the wheels of industry moving, as well as to keep certain food products of the Nation up to standard. I am not so sure, however, that a price of $1.40, as provided for in the joint resolution, is necessary in order to accomplish the desired result. In fact, I should prefer to see the joint resolution provide for a price of $1.30 or $1.35. I say that for the reason that I do not want to do anything in the way of increasing the price of one basic commodity, and thus permitting those who use that commodity to request a higher price for the produce they sell. That is what might happen, if my figures are correct, with respect to the principal product which comes from corn—hogs. At the present time, the parity price on hogs is $11.90. If corn sold for $1.40 a bushel, as the joint resolution provides, the result would be that farmers who raised hogs would request a price of $14.56 for their hogs, whereas at present the actual price being received is $13.90.

On the basis of $1.30, he would be able to ask for only $13.52, whereas at the present time he is receiving $13.90. If the farmer were forced to pay $1.40 for corn, that would be the only commodity which would result in the farmer asking for a greater price for his product than he is receiving at the present time. All other commodities, such as hogs, cattle, butterfat, milk, and so forth, insofar as a proper ratio is concerned, would be unaffected, regardless of whether the price of corn were $1.30 or $1.40.

I have consistently stated, and I now repeat, that corn can go to $1.30 a bushel without starting the dangerous spiral of inflation which the President, the Congress, and the country have all discussed from time to time. In my opinion, what we are proposing to do would not cause a break in the line so far as the stabilization of prices is concerned.

Mr. President, there is one other matter of vital interest in connection with the joint resolution, and that is with respect to the order which was issued by the Stabilization Director, Mr. Byrnes, and the Food Administrator, Mr. Davis, on April 14, 1943. The Office of War Information stated in its release:

> Abandoning the present "escalator" method of seasonal pricing on corn upon instructions from Stabilization Director James F. Byrnes and Food Administrator Chester Davis, the Office of Price Administration today announced that the September 15, 1943, ceiling price of yellow corn—5 cents per bushel higher than the present maximums—will become effective April 14 and will continue as the top price for the period ending October 31, 1943.

The release further states:

> There will be no further increase in corn price ceilings during the 1943 market season.

That was a definite order which was issued. I do not know how much corn has been sold through commercial channels since April 15, 1943; but if since that time anyone sold corn in good faith on the theory that there would be no change in price during the 1943 market season, as is stated in this release, and Congress now comes along and advances the price, or permits the price to advance through the cancelation of the present Executive orders, in my opinion some adjustment should be made to those farmers. It might be difficult to make any adjustments with the commercial corn farmer who sells here and there to various elevators. The Government recognized this principle recently in the order which was issued, indicating to farmers that if they should sell their corn at the present time, and the price of corn should rise between now and the time when corn is marketed this fall, the Government itself would attempt to make an equitable adjustment at that time.

Mr. President, to me this is rather serious. Perhaps a good many millions of dollars would be involved in the way of an adjustment. It is something which can be worked out in connection with the joint resolution, or at some later time, in the event the joint resolution should become law.

I hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut will be defeated. Senators from the South understand the cotton situation pretty well. I cannot believe that the Senator from Connecticut is very serious about his amendment. When the time

comes when those who are interested in cotton wish to take care of that situation I presume that they will do so. I know that they will be glad to have the assistance of the Senator from Connecticut at that time. I hope that his amendment will be decisively defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the joint resolution to add a new section providing that the price of crude oil shall be increased 20 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. The price of crude oil shall be increased 20 percent.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I think it ought to be said in this connection that it is widely represented in my section of the country that one reason why we are confronted with a gasoline shortage is that there is an insufficient incentive to the producers of oil. It is said that the price ceiling on crude oil fixed by the Office of Price Administration is so low that inadequate production has resulted, and consequently we are suffering from a dearth of oil stocks for the production of oil for heating purposes and gasoline. It is perfectly obvious that the entire eastern area is suffering; and, as things now are the suffering will continue. In view of the fact that the Senate is being asked to take individual action on each of the items which come within the purview of the Emergency Price Control Act, it is no more than right that we should reach all those items with respect to which such situations arise.

I wish the RECORD to show that I have spoken on the subject of whether or not this particular measure should receive consideration. I direct specific attention to what was said at page 7093 and following pages of the RECORD when it was called up on July 3. If we are really determined to take individual items out of the Emergency Price Control Act, a good place to start is with crude oil.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to repeal section 4 (d) of the Emergency Price Control Act of January 30, 1942. In support of that amendment I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Senator from South Carolina and others have stated that their objective is to move corn off the farms and into the marts of trade, irrespective of the Emergency Price Control Act and the Office of Price Administration. It is said that the farmers will not sell corn. It is said that there are 600,000,000 bushels of corn which industry needs, which the public needs, and which we all need. I agree with all those statements with reference to the need, and that the public and industry require the corn. There is no question about it. But, Mr. President, the Congress of the United States has turned over to the Office of Price Administration general control over all commodities. Either we are to support the system under which the entire economy is to be operated, or we are to tear it apart piecemeal. If it is really desired to get corn off the farms, and if there are recalcitrant farmers who will not sell to the trade, even at a reasonable price, then, Mr. President, if we repeal section 4 (d) of the Price Control Act, we shall be removing that limitation. Let me read it:

Nothing in this act shall be construed to require any person to sell any commodity—

All we have to do is to get rid of that prohibition, and we can fix a price and tell farmers that they must sell their corn, and at what price they must sell it. We can move it off the farms. In that way we can achieve all the objectives which the Senator claims for the pending measure, which, if it should become law, would emasculate the general price administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have said enough to have it become perfectly apparent, as the Senator from South Carolina himself has said, that if the amendment which I originally offered, which would have removed cotton from price control, were in fact adopted, it would be disastrous, as the Senator himself said——

Mr. SMITH. No; I did not say that.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator said it would be disastrous to the joint resolution.

Mr. SMITH. It would be disastrous to the joint resolution, and that is what the Senator is driving at. He is hoping for the defeat of the joint resolution.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator is perfectly correct about that matter. I am hoping for the defeat of the joint resolution. I think it is a mistake. I think it should not be acted upon favorably. I have, in my humble way, endeavored to call attention to what I think is a serious fallacy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, let us vote on the joint resolution.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I urge upon the Senator from South Carolina that he accept the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska that the price of $1.40 be established on the Chicago basis.

Mr. SMITH. I have already tried to convince the Senate that $1.37 a bushel is being received by converting the corn into meat. I will not go further into that question. I wish the Senator had been before the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution. The joint resolution was read the third time.

Mr. BURTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Barbour	Hawkes	Revercomb
Barkley	Hayden	Reynolds
Bone	Hill	Robertson
Brewster	Holman	Russell
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Brooks	Kilgore	Shipstead
Buck	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Butler	Lucas	Taft
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tydings
Connally	Maloney	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maybank	Van Nuys
Davis	Mead	Wagner
Downey	Millikin	Wallgren
Ellender	Murdock	Walsh
Ferguson	Nye	Wheeler
George	O'Daniel	Wherry
Gerry	O'Mahoney	White
Green	Pepper	Wiley
Guffey	Radcliffe	Willis
Gurney	Reed	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a letter received by me from Administrator Brown with respect to the price of corn.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 29, 1943.

The Honorable HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am sorry if there has been delay in answering your letter concerning the retarded movement of corn, but as you can realize, the great pressure of work often compels postponement of mail replies.

I realize that there has been an acute shortage of corn in many sections of the country which has inflicted hardships on farmers and industrial operators.

Briefly, the situation is this:

Corn prices are frozen under an Office of Price Administration ceiling. The price to the farmer for corn in the Corn Belt is approximately a dollar a bushel. If, however, the farmer chooses to feed his corn to his pigs instead of selling it, he then figures that his corn is worth considerably more to him. (Figures vary from $1.10 to $1.35.) Farmers have been urged to raise hogs, so the floor price on hogs is $13.75 per hundred pounds. Actually, the selling price is closer to $14.50, and has gone as high as $16.50. Hog production has jumped from about 104,000,000 head as of a year ago, to 120,000,000 as of today. Added to this increased feeding, there was the unfavorable weather conditions in the spring which delayed planting. Farmers are holding on to their corn instead of distributing it. Agriculture, Office of Price Administration, Commodity Credit are all alive to the seriousness of the situation and are working on plans to alleviate it. But it is believed that the feeding demand, and also increased industrial requirements, plus the uncertainty of the 1943

crop, are the causes of the trouble—not the corn ceiling, which was established in line with the President's hold-the-line order.

You may be interested to know some of the figures on the movement of corn this year as compared with last. In April 1942, 29,000,000 bushels of corn were shipped by the farmers to the terminal markets. And nineteen and one-half million bushels were shipped out to meet the requirements of farm and industry. During the same period in 1943, receipts at the warehouses were 26,000,000 bushels, but the shipments out were 24,000,000. The same relative proportion of receipts and shipments held also for May. This, as you will see, clearly indicates that although the supply of corn has somewhat decreased, the demand has risen quite disproportionately. The present corn situation therefore is caused primarily, not by price nor production, but by demand.

From now on it may be necessary to use feed wheat and other feed grains to a greater extent, and also to import larger quantities of Canadian oats and barley in order to supplement our domestic corn supply, and to meet the requirements of farm and industry. The Office of Price Administration has been meeting with the Department of Agriculture and also with Judge Vinson, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, to work out a program that will more completely alleviate this whole situation. It is hoped that some announcement can be made shortly. Meanwhile the War Food Administration has authorized the Commodity Credit Corporation to call in the 1942 farm loans. It is expected that this action will make some corn available to deficit areas, and also permit allocation to the more essential industrial processors.

I trust the above information has made the situation somewhat clearer to you, and that it will serve you in responding to your constituents.

Sincerely yours,

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Administrator.

Mr. BONE obtained the floor.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may we have a vote on the joint resolution?

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I am quite willing to yield for the purpose of a vote being taken, but for no other purpose.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina a question. If the price is raised on corn how much will it increase the cost of feed to all the dairy farmers of the country?

Mr. SMITH. It will not increase it at all, for the simple reason that corn is now being converted into hogs and cattle at $1.37 a bushel.

Mr. TAFT. However, $1.40 will raise it that much?

Mr. SMITH. It is not $1.40, but not to exceed $1.40. There is discretion there; it could be sold at $1.10.

Mr. TAFT. However, it seems to me impossible to raise the price of corn without raising the price of feed. I do not see how it could be possible that that would not be the effect.

Mr. SMITH. It is not to exceed $1.40 a bushel.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I am not yielding the floor for any further discussion. I am quite willing to yield for a vote on the joint resolution, but for no other purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me absolutely impossible that the price of corn could be raised without raising the cost of feed.

Mr. SMITH. I know what the Senator is driving at. The Senate is not fooled a minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington refuses to yield. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution (putting the question).

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 71) was passed.

PROSECUTION OF THE ANACONDA WIRE & CABLE CO. FOR FRAUD

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, the story I am about to tell the Senate constitutes an outstanding example of Punic faith.

A few days ago a Federal court, the United States district court sitting at Fort Wayne, Ind., disposed of one of the most astounding and challenging cases of fraud which has so far been disclosed in this war by investigative agencies of the Government. This was a criminal case in which the defendants were the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., a Delaware corporation engaged in business within the northern district of the State of Indiana, with its plant and factory located at Marion, Ind. This company was engaged in the manufacture of various types of insulated wire and cable, with its principal place of business at Hastings-on-Hudson, N. Y. The other defendants named in the indictment were:

Thor S. Johnson, general manager of all the mills of the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co.

Frank E. Hart, manager of the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., Marion division.

Don R. Carpenter, plant superintendent of the Marion division of the Anaconda Co.

Chalmer C. Bishop, chief inspector and plant engineer with the Marion plant.

Frank Kunkle, assistant chief inspector at the Marion plant.

The indictment against this company and the individual defendants was returned December 21, 1942, by the grand jury. The case was tried, in the manner I shall describe, before the United States district court at Fort Wayne, the presiding judge of which was Thomas W. Slick, district judge. The charges in this indictment are set forth in eight separate counts, charging conspiracy to defraud the Government of the United States.

A brief statement of the nature of the charges against the defendants will be helpful in understanding the technical language employed in the indictments, which I shall cause to be set out at length following this general statement.

When the case came on for trial before Judge Slick on June 10, 1943, the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co. and the five officers and officials of the company appeared before the court, and, instead of demanding a jury trial and seeking vindication at the hands of the jury, elected, with full knowledge of the serious charges against them, to enter a plea known in Federal practice as nolo contendere. This, in effect, is a plea of guilty, and is so regarded by practitioners. In passing judgment on this plea of guilty, the presiding judge frankly stated that it was a plea of guilty as charged. Therefore, it becomes important for Americans who are interested in the conduct of the war to note exactly what sort of a charge rested against the men who entered this plea of guilty.

The complaint in this action charges that the conspiracy of the defendants against the Federal Government began on or about the 1st of November 1940 and continued up to and including the 1st day of October 1942. It will be observed that the fact that we were suddenly plunged into a deadly war did not in any wise induce the defendants to change the criminal practices outlined in the complaint. After Pearl Harbor, and while boys were dying on battlefields, the defendants continued their sordid work of defrauding the Government by furnishing faulty cable by means of practices described in the complaint and before the grand jury. These facts were made known to the court at the time he imposed sentence on the defendants.

In general, the complaint charges that the defendants defrauded the United States by tricks, schemes, and devices to avoid meeting and complying with the specifications for the manufacture of wire and cable as contained in the contracts with the Government and by not testing the wire and cable as was required in the contracts. The complaint charges that the company had been paid $5,000,000 under such fraudulent operations.

The complaint specifically charges that the defendants knew at all times during the existence of the conspiracy that more than 75 percent of the production of wire and cable was to be used in defense of the United States and the prosecution of the war effort; that the defendants knew at all times during the conspiracy that every contract with the United States Government required all wire and cable to meet certain tests specified by the contract; that the defendants well knew at all times during the conspiracy that the majority of all wire and cable produced for the Government would not be of a quality called for in the contracts and would not meet the tests required under the contract; that during the conspiracy all the defendants well knew that the use of such defective wire and cable which would not meet the tests would endanger the lives of men in the military service of the United States and would cause the loss of equipment and territory and would threaten the welfare of the United States in the war because they knew that the cable they were supplying to the Government would be unusable in desert climates, frozen climates, tropical climates, on naval combat vessels, and in coast defense positions. Also that the defendants were making field wire for communications in combat areas by forces of the United States and Allied and associated nations, including the manufacturing of DeGaussing cable for use in naval combat vessels of the United

States and submarine cable and, in general, for the conduct of the war by the United States.

Let me say parenthetically at this time that when I use the term "cable" I am referring to cable over which messages are sent to men in the battle areas, as well as to cable used in electrical work generally.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the batteries on all our warships, including the antiaircraft guns, are fired, controlled, aimed, and ranges set, over this self-same cable, and if the cable is defective, the ship itself is helpless against aircraft attack.

Mr. BONE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. And that the safety and success of the entire land combat forces are frequently dependent on messages sent overland over these self-same cables, which messages must be received promptly in order that the troops may properly coordinate their operations.

Mr. BONE. The Senator is absolutely correct, and I thank him for his contribution to the discussion. The men who did this dreadful thing would be lined up before a firing squad if they were in Germany or Russia. I shall disclose to my colleagues what we did to them in our Federal court.

The complaint charges that the defendants agreed, as part of their conspiracy, that the tests called for in contract specifications would not be complied with; that the defendants further agreed, as a part of their conspiracy, that there would be constructed two gadgets known as "circuit boxes" for use in the preliminary and final test areas for conducting the insulation resistance tests, and that these circuit boxes were designed to make such tests useless in that they would make the cable appear to be conforming to contract specifications when it was defective. By pressing four different buttons a certain number of times the cable which was being inspected would show useful qualities from four to ten times better than it actually had; that such circuit boxes were secreted under desks—desks of company officials—and not available to the sight of Government inspectors, and that such circuit boxes would be used by the conspirators in the application of the insulation resistance tests to all wire and cable manufactured under contracts with the United States.

The complaint charges that the cable to be used on battlefields would be "pretested" on night shifts by the application of fictitious insulation resistance tests and dielectric tests by use of these circuit boxes, and such reels of wire and cable that would pass such tests by the use of the phony circuit boxes would remain in the tanks and pits every day for the period of time such reels of wire and cable would pass such tests by use of the circuit boxes. Process tags would be affixed to wire being delivered, indicating that it was a finished and acceptable product, and these tags were used to deceive Government inspectors, for they were shifted to other wire from time to time.

The complaint charged that all of this sort of phony operation was a continuous procedure and enabled the company to escape complying with the specifications in the Government contract. Employees of the company were required to take pretested reels of wire which were in the test tanks for daily fictitious tests, and scrub this wire with brushes after rinsing the wire with kerosene to remove rust and discolor which might be challenged by Government inspectors.

The defendants tried to keep Government inspectors out of the plant at night during night shifts unless the inspector was accompanied by an official of the company. All such actions were designed to keep Government inspectors from becoming aware of the sinister operations underway. The conspiracy went so far as to apply these deceptive inspection practices to all types of wire and cable being furnished to the Government, and the Federal Government charges that the agreement to do this was a part of the conspiracy. After having been guilty of all of this wretched business in an hour of peril for this Government, and when its sons were dying on battlefields all over the world, this company had the brazen effrontery and monumental gall to submit bills to the Federal Government, and accept payment, for this almost useless cable, the employment of which on a battlefield might conceivably result in the death of vast numbers of boys.

In order to be very certain that there would be no slip-up in this sort of racket, the chief inspector at the Marion plant, defendant Chalmer Bishop, constructed the circuit boxes and installed them in their secret locations under the desks, and these circuit boxes were used to perpetrate this fake and fraud on the Government of the United States.

Following the usual form of indictments, the indictment in this case states that these actions were "against the peace and dignity of the United States of America." The cold, hard, ruthless fact is that the ultimate effect of this terrible business was to visit this corruption and crookedness on the men fighting at the front who are compelled to rely on this cable for their protection.

The record does not disclose whether the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co. has been running newspaper or magazine advertising, boasting of its great and patriotic service to the Government in furnishing cable at a nice profit. It is to be hoped that the country will be spared that master stroke of buffoonery, and that last, ultimate insult to the parents of the boys who might have been compelled to use the phony output of this outfit if their treachery had not been disclosed to public gaze.

A recent story in a newspaper is of more than passing interest. A New York newspaper pointed out that 5 months after the company was exposed for selling this defective and fraudulently tested wire and cable to the Navy it was able to obtain commendatory letters from the Navy Department. In the face of such things, one is almost constrained to believe that we have come to a point where we doff our hats to brazen effrontery and burn our sweetest incense on the unhallowed shrine of pompous humbuggery. According to the writer of the news story, the commendatory letter to this company was written not only after the indictment, but, according to counsel for the indicted company, was written "in view of the indictment." Apparently some Government officials are not able to lift their worshipful lips from the boots of big business long enough to draw a decent breath, for a third Navy letter appears in the picture, it being dated May 8 of this year, and this communication stated that the company was being considered for an E award. The news story I have referred to states that the Army Signal Corps has indicated to all its depots to segregate field wire from the Anaconda Marion plant and use it "for maneuver and training purposes only."

Any normal American trying to present some sort of adequate comment on this sort of business would probably bog down in despair, for certainly the English language is inadequate to describe the things for which this company and the individual defendants were indicted, and pled guilty.

The indictments against the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co. and the individual defendants were brought under sections 83 and 88 of title 18 of the United States Code. These cover activities constituting a defrauding of the United States and presenting false claims to the Government. Conviction carries penalties of up to 10 years in the penitentiary and a fine up to $10,000, or both. At this point in my remarks I offer for the RECORD a copy of the indictment, and I ask that it be set out at full length so that those who care to read this record may know with exactly what offenses the defendants were charged.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The indictment is as follows:

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA, FORT WAYNE DIVISION, DECEMBER TERM, A. D. 1942—THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *v.* ANACONDA WIRE & CABLE CO., A CORPORATION, THOR S. JOHNSON, FRANK E. HART, DON R. CARPENTER, CHALMER C. BISHOP, AND FRANK KUNKLE—FORT WAYNE CRIMINAL, NO. 1039

The grand jurors for the United States of America, duly impaneled and sworn in the district court of the United States for the northern district of Indiana, upon their oaths present:

I. That heretofore, to wit, beginning on or about the 1st day of November 1940 and continuing up to and including the 1st day of October 1942 and prior to the presentment of this indictment, within the northern district of Indiana and within the jurisdiction of this court, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., a corporation, Thor S. Johnson, Frank E. Hart, Don R. Carpenter, Chalmer C. Bishop, and Frank Kunkle, hereinafter called defendants, did unlawfully, willfully, knowingly, and feloniously, combine, conspire, confederate, and agree, acting together and with each other, and with Carl Frederick Westphal, Harold McFarland, Richard W. Crosley, Charles E. Davis, Jr., Robert J. Copsey, Her-

bert C. Witthoft, Horace Louis Wuerth, James E. Guinnup, Wilbur L. Moore, Loomis H. Arnett, John C. Pearson, James A. Ribble, Cecil J. Bash, Leo I. Gorman, Lewis R. Pence, William Sherman Alexander, Emery G. Davis, Wilbur D. Sommers, Edward M. Merchant, Jr., and Charles I. Timmons, herein named and not herein indicted, and hereafter called coconspirators, and with divers other persons and coconspirators to the grand jurors unknown, did enter into a combination, conspiracy, confederation, and agreement to defraud the United States by manufacturing defective wire and cable and selling said defective wire and cable to the United States under contracts with the United States by false and fraudulent representations to Government inspectors of the United States inspecting said wire and cable under said contracts with the United States, and by defrauding the United States by tricks, schemes, and devices to avoid meeting and complying with the specifications for the manufacture of wire and cable as contained in said contracts and by not testing the wire and cable as required of and agreed to by said defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., a corporation, as contained in said contracts with the United States for the manufacture of various types of wire and cable, and by defrauding the United States by presentation to the United States, and various departments, agencies, and officers thereof, false and fraudulent and fictitious claims for approval, allowance, and payment in compensation for defective wire and cable, and by defrauding the United States of and concerning its right to the pecuniary interest of more than $5,000,000, paid to the defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., a corporation, for the manufacture of various types of wire and cable at its plant at Marion, Ind., and by defrauding the United States of and concerning its governmental function of the prosecution of the war by the production of war materials to be used in furtherance of the war effort free from dishonest, corrupt, deliberate, and intentional delivery of defective materials to the United States and allied and associate nations of the United States for use in combat areas and vital defense positions, unfit for use, the said combination, conspiracy, confederation, and agreement to defraud the United States being of a continuing nature and having been incontinuous operation and execution by the defendants and coconspirators from its inception on or about the 1st day of November 1940 up to and including the 1st day of October 1942, in the manner and for the purpose, and by the means, hereinafter set forth.

II. That at all times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., was a corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware engaged in business within the northern district of the State of Indiana at its plant and factory located at Marion, Ind., making and manufacturing various types of insulated wire and cable, and with its principal place of business at Hastings-on-Hudson, N. Y.

That at all times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, Thor S. Johnson, held the position of general manager of all mills of the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co.;

The defendant, Frank E. Hart, held the position of manager of the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., Marion division;

The defendant, Don R. Carpenter, held the position of plant superintendent of the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., Marion division;

The defendant, Chalmer C. Bishop, held the position of chief inspector and of plant engineer of the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., Marion division;

The defendant, Frank Kunkle, held the position of assistant chief inspector and of chief inspector of the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., Marion division.

That at all times hereinafter mentioned, each said individual defendant was charged with the duty and responsibility of the operation and production of the factory and plant of the said defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., and was the duly authorized agent and representative of said defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., for the determination of the methods and manner of the operation and production of said plant at Marion, Ind.

III. That said defendants and coconspirators well knew at all times during the existence of this conspiracy that more than 75 percent of the production of wire and cable by the defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., at Marion, Ind., was for the United States and for use in defense of the United States and the prosecution of the war effort;

That said defendants and coconspirators well knew at all times during the existence of this conspiracy that every contract with the United States required all wire and cable to meet certain tests and standard tests such as insulation resistance tests, dielectric tests, and certain physical tests;

That said defendants and coconspirators well knew at all times during the existence of this conspiracy that in most instances inspectors would be present to witness such aforesaid tests, as representatives of departments and agencies of the United States and affidavits showing such aforesaid tests to have been applied to manufactured wire and cable were required of said defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., in compliance with said contracts;

That said defendants and coconspirators well knew at all times during the existence of this conspiracy that prior to entering into and during the required performance of every said contract with the United States the majority of all wire and cable produced would not be of the quality called for in said contracts and would not meet said tests and standard tests;

That said defendants and coconspirators well knew at all times during the existence of this conspiracy that the use of such defective wire and cable not meeting said tests and standard tests would endanger the lives of men in the military of the United States and would cause the loss of equipment and territory and would threaten the welfare of the United States in the war; that is to say, said defendants and coconspirators well knew that failure of such wire and cable to meet such tests and standard tests would render it unusable in desert climates, frozen climates, tropical climates, naval combat vessels, and coast defense positions; in that said Marion plant was engaged in making field wire for communications in combat areas by forces of the United States and allied and associate nations, and the manufacture of DeGaussing cable for use in naval combat vessels of United States, and submarine mine cable, and various other types of wire and cable for the conduct of the war by the United States.

IV. That it was agreed as a part of this conspiracy that the tests and standard tests called for in the specifications of said contracts with the United States for the manufacture of wire and cable would not be complied with;

That it was further agreed as a part of this conspiracy that there would be constructed two circuit boxes for use in the preliminary and final test areas for conducting the insulation resistance test, which circuit boxes would perform the function of causing the wire and cable tested to appear, by pressing four different buttons, respectively, two times, four times, six times and tenfold better than it actually would be; that such circuit boxes would be secreted under the desks and not available to the sight of Government inspectors; and that such circuit boxes would be used in the application of the insulation resistance test to all wire and cable manufactured under contracts with the United States.

That it was further agreed as a part of this conspiracy that a quantity of the reels of wire and cable manufactured would be pretested on night shifts by the application of fictitious insulation resistance and dielectric tests by use of the said circuit boxes, and such reels of wire and cable that would pass such tests by the use of the circuit boxes would remain in the tanks and pits every day for the period of time such reels of wire and cable would pass such tests by the use of the circuit boxes; that each piece of wire and cable would have affixed to it a process tag which would remain affixed to it throughout each stage of manufacture and until the wire and cable would become a completely finished product; that such pretested reels of wire and cable would be tested every day in the presence of said inspectors would reflect on said tags that the said pieces of wire and cable had passed the insulation resistance and dielectric tests, and on the night shifts such tags showing the tests to have been complied with would be exchanged with the tags on the reels of wire constituting previous production that had not been and would not be submitted to said tests; that such procedure would be a continuous daily procedure and would enable the production of the various types of wire and cable under contracts with the United States without complying with the specifications contained in such contracts.

That it was further agreed as a part of this conspiracy that such pretested reels of wire remaining in the test tanks and test pits for said daily fictitious tests would be on the night shifts scrubbed with brushes after rinsing them with kerosene in order to remove rust and discolor that would indicate and show to said inspectors that such reels of wire and cable were not removed from said tanks and pits and replaced by other reels of wire and cable to be tested; that such reels of wire and cable would be on occasions refinished and would be on occasions rewound on other reels in order to expose that part of said reels of wire and cable that had not been subjected to the rust and discoloration from immersion in water in said tanks and pits, and thereby prevent detection by said inspectors of the fictitious test procedure;

That it was further agreed as a part of this conspiracy that no Government inspectors would be permitted within the confines of the factory and plant property on night shifts and hours when the factory and plant was not in production and operation unless accompanied by an escort, who would be an official holding a position with said defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co.

That it was further agreed as a part of this conspiracy that pieces of wire and cable manufactured for the certain purpose would be used for taking and cutting the samples for the required physical tests contained in the specifications of said contracts, and though it would be represented to said inspectors that such samples were taken from daily production of wire and cable, all such samples would be procured from said specially manufactured pieces of wire and cable.

That it was further agreed as a part of this conspiracy that when the dielectric tests were applied to said wire and cable and a certain voltage was required, as contained in said contract specifications, the voltage actually used in said dielectric tests would not be more than one-half as much as would be reflected on the scales and as represented by each test operator.

That it was further agreed as a part of this conspiracy that barrels of saturating compound would be chosen for the certain purpose of selecting samples therefrom for the

required physical tests contained in the specifications of said contracts, and though it would be represented to said inspectors that said samples were taken from the saturating compound used in the daily production of wire and cable, a different and inferior saturating compound would be used in the daily production of said wire and cable;

That it was further agreed as a part of this conspiracy that inferior material ingredients and parts would be used in the manufacture of all types of wire and cable to the quality of material, ingredients, and parts of the wire and cable required in the specifications contained in said contracts with the United States;

That it was further agreed as a part of this conspiracy that claims, bills, and invoices would be submitted and presented to and payment obtained from the United States, and the departments, agencies, and officers thereof, for the manufacture of said various types of inferior and defective wire and cable as though the wire and cable were of the same quality and would meet the specifications contained in said contracts.

OVERT ACTS

V. In pursuance of this conspiracy and to effect the objects thereof, on or about the 15th day of December 1940 the defendant, Chalmer C. Bishop, constructed the said two circuit boxes and installed them in their secret locations under the desks in the preliminary and final test areas of said plant.

The purposes and objects of this conspiracy, confederation, combination, and agreement have been successfully operated, executed, and carried out, contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

Count II

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

1. That, heretofore, on or about the 1st day of November, 1940, and prior to the presentment of this indictment and continuing up to and including the 1st day of October, 1942, within the northern district of Indiana, and within the jurisdiction of this court, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., a corporation, Thor S. Johnson, Frank E. Hart, Don R. Carpenter, Chalmer C. Bishop, Frank Kunkle, hereinafter called defendants, did unlawfully, willfuly, knowingly and feloniously, combine, conspire, confederate, and agree, acting together and with each other, and with Carl Frederick Westphal, Harold McFarland, Richard W. Crosley, Charles E. Davis, Jr., Robert J. Copsey, Herbert C. Witthoft, Horace Louis Wuerth, James E. Grunnup, Wilbur L. Moore, Loomis H. Arnett, John C. Pearson, James A. Ribble, Cecil J. Bash, Leo I. Gorman, Lewis R. Pence, William Sherman Alexander, Emery G. Davis, Wilbur D. Somers, Edward M. Merchant, Jr., and Charles I. Timmons, herein named and not herein indicted, and hereafter called coconspirators, and with divers other persons and coconspirators to the grand jurors unknown, enter into a combination, conspiracy, confederation, and agreement to defraud the Government of the United States, and the War Department of the United States, and the Finance Officer of the Army of the United States, Public Ledger Building, Independence Square, Philadelphia, Pa., by obtaining the payment and allowance of a false and fraudulent claim, and by aiding the defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., a corporation, to obtain the payment and allowance of a false and fraudulent claim which said officer of the United States then and there had the authority to approve and allow for payment said false and fraudulent claim, the said combination, conspiracy, confederation, and agreement to defraud the Government of the United States, and the Department and officer thereof, being of a continuing nature and having been in continuous operation and execution by the defendants from its inception on or about the 1st day of November, 1940, up to and including the 1st day of October, 1942, and was entered into in a manner and for the purposes as hereinafter set out.

II. Each and every allegation contained in paragraphs II, III, and IV of the first count of this indictment are realleged herein with the same force and effect as though set forth in full herein.

III. That on or about the 1st day of November 1941 the defendant, said Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., entered into a contract with the United States to manufacture a certain quantity of field wire, which contract was designated "Contract No. W2124-SC-71, File No. 652 Phila.-42 OCSO DP-42-242," and which contract required of and the defendant, said Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., agreed to manufacture said field wire in accord with certain specifications and of a quality sufficient to meet said certain tests and standard tests.

That on or about the 20th day of January 1942 the defendant, said Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., in pursuance of and to effect the objects of this conspiracy, through its business office and W. R. Rhoades, its duly authorized agent and representative at its Marion plant, did mail and present for allowance and payment to F. J. Keelty, finance officer of the Army of the United States, Public Ledger Building, Independence Square, Philadelphia, Pa., a false and fraudulent claim in the sum of $12,450.35 for 246.3465 miles of field wire under said contract at the price of $50.54 per mile, which said false and fraudulent claim was designated "Invoice No. 72860," and having printed thereon "Our Order No. NR 12008," and reflecting that said 246.3465 miles of field wire had been "shipped to signal supply officer, New Cumberland, general depot, New Cumberland, Pa."

That said officer of the United States, F. J. Keelty, did then and there have the authority to approve and allow and pay said false and fraudulent claim and the said defendants did then and there defraud the Government of the United States and the War Department of the United States and the finance officer of the Army of the United States aforesaid, and the said defendants did then and there obtain and did aid said defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., to obtain the approval and payment and allowance of said false and fraudulent claim by the said F. J. Keelty, as aforesaid; on the 2d day of February 1942, in this; that the officer of the United States, F. J. Keelty, aforesaid, did on the 2d day of February 1942, approve and allow and pay said false and fraudulent claim by the issuance of check No. 1326865, dated February 2, 1942, in the sum of $12,388.10, drawn on the Treasurer of the United States, in favor of said defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., which said check had contained and included therein the amount of said false and fraudulent claim less one-half of 1 percent discount, and each of said defendants well knew said false and fraudulent claim to be false and fraudulent in this particular, to wit; that the aforesaid 246.3465 miles of field wire was not manufactured in accord with the specifications contained in said contract and was defective wire, and was not made of the quality and type of material set out in the specifications contained in said contract and was not tested and subjected to said tests and standard tests required by the provisions of said contract and did not meet said specifications and tests and standard tests called for in said contract, as the defendants, and each of said defendants well knew in this respect, to wit; that the two aforesaid circuit boxes located in the preliminary and final test areas of the Marion plant aforesaid, were used to make fictitious tests upon the aforesaid 246.3465 miles of field wire and that after said fictitious test process tags denoting the various reels and pieces of said 246.3465 miles of field wire were changed and switched, as aforesaid, during the nights of operation of said Marion plant in the production of said 246.3465 miles of field wire, and said 246.3465 miles of field wire was not tested and not subjected to the tests required and agreed to under said contract as represented by said defendants and coconspirators and by changing said tags on the night shifts and secreting said circuit boxes in hidden places, such failure to test said 246.3465 miles of field wire had not been apprehended by said Government inspectors; and by cutting and taking samples of field wire from specially manufactured pieces and reels of wire, as aforesaid, and representation to said Government inspectors by said defendants and coconspirators that such samples were taken from the pieces and reels of said field wire contained in said 246.3465 miles of field wire for the purpose of making physical tests contained in said contract specifications, the defective materials, ingredients and parts of said 246.3465 miles of field wire had not been apprehended by said Government inspectors, contrary to the form of the statute, in such case made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the United States.

Count III

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

I. That heretofore, on or about the 1st day of November 1940, and prior to the presentment of this indictment and continuing up to and including the 1st day of October 1942, within the northern district of Indiana, and within the jurisdiction of this court, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., a corporation; Thor S. Johnson, Frank E. Hart, Don R. Carpenter, Chalmer C. Bishop, and Frank Kunkle, hereinafter called defendants, did unlawfully, willfully, knowingly, and feloniously combine, conspire, confederate, and agree, acting together and with each other, and with Carl Frederick Westphal, Harold McFarland, Richard W. Crosley, Charles D. Davis, Jr., Robert J. Copsey, Herbert C. Witthoft, Horace Louis Wuerth, James E. Guinnup, Wilbur L. Moore, Loomis H. Arnett, John C. Pearson, James A. Ribble, Cecil J. Bash, Leo I. Gorman, Lewis R. Pence, William Sherman Alexander, Emery G. Davis, Wilbur D. Sommers, Edward M. Merchant, Jr., and Charles I. Timmons, herein named and not herein indicted, and hereafter called coconspirators, and with divers other persons and coconspirators to the grand jurors unknown, enter into a combination, conspiracy, confederation, and agreement to defraud the Government of the United States, and the War Department of the United States, and the finance officer of the Army of the United States, Public Ledger Building, Independence Square, Philadelphia, Pa., by obtaining the payment and allowance of a false and fraudulent claim, and by aiding the defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., a corporation, to obtain the payment and allowance of a false and fraudulent claim, which said officer of the United States then and there had the authority to approve and allow for payment said false and fraudulent claim, the said combination, conspiracy, confederation, and agreement to defraud the Government of the United States, and the said Department and officer thereof, being of a continuing nature and having been in continuous operation and execution by the defendants from its inception on or about the 1st day of November 1940, up to and including the 1st day of October 1942, and was entered into in a manner and for the purpose as hereinafter set out.

II. Each and every allegation contained in paragraphs II, III, and IV of the first count of this indictment are realleged, reaffirmed, and incorporated herein with the same force and effect as though set forth in full herein.

III. That on or about the 1st day of November 1941 the defendant, said Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., entered into a contract with

the United States to manufacture a certain quantity of field wire, which contract was designated "Contract No. W2124–SC–71 File No. 652 Phila.–42 OCSO DP–42–242," and which contract required of and the defendant, the said Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., agreed to manufacture said field wire in accord with certain specifications and of a quality sufficient to meet said certain tests and standard tests.

That on or about the 13th day of February 1942 the defendant, said Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., in pursuance of and to effect the objects of this conspiracy, through its business office and W. R. Rhoades, its duly authorized agent and representative at its Marion plant, did mail and present for allowance and payment to F. J. Keelty, finance officer of the Army of the United States, Public Ledger Building, Independence Square, Philadelphia, Pa., a false and fraudulent claim in the sum of $12,416.57 for 245.6780 miles of field wire under said contract at the price of $50.54 per mile, which said false and fraudulent claim was designated "Invoice No. 74862," and having printed thereon "Our Order No. NR 12008" and reflecting the said 245.6780 miles of field wire had been "shipped to signal supply officer, New Cumberland General Depot, New Cumberland, Pa."

That the said officer of the United States, F. J. Keelty, did then and there have the authority to approve and allow and pay such claim and the said defendants then and there did defraud the Government of the United States and the War Department of the United States and the said finance officer of the Army of the United States, and did obtain and did aid the said defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., to obtain the payment and allowance of said false and fraudulent claim by the said F. J. Keelty, as aforesaid, on the 20th day of February 1942, in this: That the officer of the United States, F. J. Keelty aforesaid, did on the 20th day of February 1942 approve and allow and pay said claim by the issuance of check No. 1347362, dated February 20, 1942, in the sum of $12,354.49 drawn on the Treasurer of the United States in favor of the defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., and said defendants, and each of said defendants, well knew such claim to be false and fraudulent in this particular, to wit: That the aforesaid 245.6780 miles of field wire were not manufactured in accord with the specifications contained in said contract, and was defective wire, and was not made of the quality and type of material set out in the specifications contained in said contract, and was not tested and subjected to said tests and standard tests required by the provisions of said contract, and did not meet said specifications and tests and standard tests called for in said contract, as the defendants well knew in this respect, to wit: That the two aforesaid circuit boxes located in the preliminary and final test areas of the Marion plant, aforesaid, were used to make fictitious tests upon the aforesaid 245.6780 miles of field wire, and that after said fictitious tests, process tags denoting the various reels and pieces of said 245.6780 miles of field wire were changed and switched during the nights of the operation of said Marion plant in the production of said 245.6780 miles of field wire, and said 245.6780 miles of field wire were not tested and subjected to the tests required and agreed to under said contract as represented by said defendants and coconspirators, to said Government inspectors, and by changing said tags during the nights and secreting said circuit boxes in hidden places, such failure to test said 245.6780 miles of field wire had not been apprehended by said Government inspectors, and that by cutting and taking samples of field wire from specially manufactured pieces of wire and cable and representation to said Government inspectors by said defendants and coconspirators that such samples were taken from the pieces and reels of wire contained in said 245.6780 miles of field wire for the purpose of making physical tests contained in said specifications, the defective materials, ingredients, and parts of said 245.6780 miles of field wire had not been apprehended by said Government inspectors, contrary to the form of the statute, in such case made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the United States.

Count IV

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

I. That, heretofore, on or about the 1st day of November 1940, and prior to the presentment of this indictment and continuing up to and including the 1st day of October 1942, within the northern district of Indiana, and within the jurisdiction of this court, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., a corporation; Thor S. Johnson, Frank E. Hart, Don R. Carpenter, Chalmer C. Bishop, Frank Kunkle, hereinafter called defendants, did unlawfully, willfully, knowingly, and feloniously combine, conspire, confederate, and agree, acting together and with each other, and with Carl Frederick Westphal, Harold McFarland, Richard W. Crosley, Charles D. Davis, Jr., Robert J. Copsey, Herbert C. Witthoft, Horace Louis Wuerth, James E. Guinnup, Wilbur L. Moore, Loomis H. Arnett, John C. Pearson, James A. Ribble, Cecil J. Bash, Leo I. Gorman, Lewis R. Pence, William Sherman Alexander, Emery G. Davis, Wilbur D. Sommers, Edward M. Merchant, Jr., and Charles I. Timmons, herein named and not herein indicted, and hereafter called coconspirators, and with divers other persons and coconspirators to the grand jurors unknown, enter into a combination, conspiracy, confederation, and agreement to defraud the Government of the United States, and the War Department of the United States, and the finance officer of the Army of the United States, Public Ledger Building, Independence Square, Philadelphia, Pa., by obtaining the payment and allowance of a false and fraudulent claim, and by aiding the defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., a corporation, to obtain the payment and allowance of a false and fraudulent claim, which said officer of the United States then and there had the authority to approve and allow for payment said false and fraudulent claim, the said combination, conspiracy, confederation, and agreement to defraud the Government of the United States, and the said Department and officer thereof, being of a continuing nature and having been in continuous operation and execution by the defendants from its inception on or about the 1st day of November 1940 up to and including the 1st day of October 1942, and was entered into in a manner and for the purpose as hereinafter set out.

II. Each and every allegation contained in paragraphs II, III, and IV of the first count of this indictment are realleged, reaffirmed, and incorporated herein with the same force and effect as though set forth in full herein.

III. That on or about the 1st day of November 1941, the defendant, said Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., entered into a contract with the United States to manufacture a certain quantity of field wire, which contract was designated "Contract No. 2124–SC–71 File No. 652 Phila.—42 OCSO DP–42–242," and which contract required of and the defendant, said Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., agreed to manufacture said field wire in accord with certain specifications and of a quality sufficient to meet said certain tests and standard tests.

That on or about the 30th day of June 1942, the defendant, said Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., in pursuance of and to effect the objects of this conspiracy, through its business office and W. R. Rhoades, its duly authorized agent and representative at its Marion plant, did mail and present for allowance and payment to F. J. Keelty, finance officer of the Army of the United States, Public Ledger Building, Independence Square, Philadelphia, Pa., a false and fraudulent claim in the sum of $12,287.20 for 243.1183 miles of field wire under said contract at the price of $50.54 per mile, which said false and fraudulent claim was designated "Invoice No. 80848" and having printed thereon "Our Order No. NR 12008," and reflecting the said 243.1183 miles of field wire had been "shipped to Depot Quartermaster, New Cumberland General Depot, New Cumberland, Pa."

That said officer of the United States, F. J. Keelty, did then and there have the authority to approve and allow and pay such claim and the said defendants then and there did defraud the Government of the United States and the War Department of the United States and the said Finance Officer of the Army of the United States, and did obtain and did aid said defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., to obtain the payment and allowance of said false and fraudulent claim by the said F. J. Keelty, finance officer aforesaid, on the 13th day of July 1942, in this; that the officer of the United States, F. J. Keelty, aforesaid, did on the 13th day of July 1942 approve and allow and pay said claim by the issuance of check No. 1998057, dated the 13th day of July 1942, in the sum of $12,225.76 drawn on the Treasurer of the United States in favor of the said defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., which said check had contained and included therein the amount of said false and fraudulent claim, less one-half of 1 percent discount, and said defendants, and each of said defendants, well knew such claim to be false and fraudulent in this particular, to-wit: That the aforesaid 243.1183 miles of field wire was not manufactured in accord with the specifications contained in said contract and was defective wire, and was not made of the quality and type of material set out in the specifications contained in said contract, and was not tested and subjected to said tests and standard tests required by the provisions of said contract, and did not meet said specifications and tests and said standard tests called for in said contract, as the defendants, and each of the defendants, well knew in this respect, to wit: That the two aforesaid circuit boxes located in the preliminary and final test areas of the Marion plant, as aforesaid, were used to make fictitious tests upon the aforesaid 243.1183 miles of field wire and that after said fictitious tests, process tags denoting the various reels and pieces of said 243.1183 miles of field wire were changed and switched as aforesaid during the nights of operation of said Marion plant in the production of said 243.1183 miles of field wire, and that said 243.1183 miles of field wire was not tested and not subjected to the tests required and agreed to under said contract after the shifting and changing of said process tags, and as represented by said defendants and coconspirators to Government inspectors and by changing said tags on the night shifts and secreting said circuit boxes in hidden places, such failure to test said 243.1183 miles of field wire had not been apprehended by said Government inspectors, and that by cutting and taking samples of field wire from specially manufactured pieces of wire and cable and representation to said Government inspectors by said defendants and co-conspirators that such samples were taken from the pieces and reels of wire contained in said 243.1183 miles of field wire for the purpose of making physical tests contained in said specifications, the defective materials, ingredients and parts of said 243.1183 miles of field wire was not apprehended by said Government inspectors contrary to the form of the statute, in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States.

Count V

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

I. That, heretofore, on or about the 1st day of November 1940, and prior to the presentment of this indictment and continuing up to and including the 1st day of October 1942, within the northern district of Indiana and within the jurisdiction of this court, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., a corporation; Thor S. Johnson, Frank E. Hart, Don R. Carpenter, Chalmer C. Bishop, Frank Kunkle, hereinafter called defendants, did unlawfully, willfully, knowingly, and feloniously combine, conspire, confederate, and agree, acting together and with each other, and with Carl Frederick Westphal, Harold McFarland, Richard W. Crosley, Charles D. Davis, Jr., Robert J. Copsey, Herbert C. Witthoft, Horace Louis Wuerth, James E. Guinnup, Wilbur L. Moore, Loomis H. Arnett, John C. Pearson, James A. Ribble, Cecil J. Bash, Leo I. Gorman, Lewis R. Pence, William Sherman Alexander, Emery G. Davis, Wilbur D. Sommers, Edward M. Merchant, Jr., and Charles I. Timmons, herein named and not herein indicted, and hereafter called coconspirators, and with divers other persons and coconspirators to the grand jurors unknown, enter into a combination, conspiracy, confederation, and agreement to defraud the Government of the United States, and the War Department of the United States, and the finance officer of the Army of the United States, Public Ledger Building, Independence Square, Philadelphia, Pa., by obtaining the payment and allowance of a false and fraudulent claim, and by aiding the defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., a corporation, to obtain the payment and allowance of a false and fraudulent claim, which said officer of the United States then and there had the authority to approve and allow for payment said false and fraudulent claim, the said combination, conspiracy, confederation, and agreement to defraud the Government of the United States, and the said Department and officer thereof, being of a continuing nature and having been in continuous operation and execution by the defendants from its inception on or about the 1st day of November 1940 up to and including the 1st day of October 1942, and was entered into in a manner and for the purpose as hereinafter set out.

II. Each and every allegation contained in paragraphs II, III, and IV of the first count of this indictment are realleged, reaffirmed, and incorporated herein with the same force and effect as though set forth in full herein.

III. That on or about the 31st day of January 1942, the defendant, said Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., entered into a contract with the United States to manufacture a certain quantity of field wire, which contract was designated "Contract No. DA-W-2124-SC-213, file No. 5048 Phila.-42," and which contract required of and the defendant, said Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., agreed to manufacture said field wire in accord with certain specifications and of a quality sufficient to meet said certain tests and standard tests.

That on or about the 14th day of March 1942, the defendant, and Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., in pursuance of and to effect the objects of this conspiracy, through its business office and W. R. Rhoades, its duly authorized agent and representative at its Marion plant, did mail and present for allowance and payment to F. J. Keelty, finance officer of the Army of the United States, Public Ledger Building, Independence Square, Philadelphia, Pa., a false and fraudulent claim in the sum of $11,390.88 for 456 miles of field wire under said contract at the price of $24.93 per mile, which said false and fraudulent claim was designated "Invoice No. 76508" and having printed thereon, "Our Order No. NR 12800," and reflecting the said 456 miles of field wire had been "shipped to Amtorg Trading Corporation, care Moore & McCormack Steamship Co., Bourse Building, Philadelphia, Pa."

That said officer of the United States, F. J. Keelty, did then and there have the authority to approve and allow and pay such claim and the said defendants then and there did defraud the Government of the United States and the War Department of the United States and the said finance officer of the Army of the United States, and did obtain and did aid said defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., to obtain the payment and allowance of said false and fraudulent claim by the said F. J. Keelty, finance officer aforesaid, on the 25th day of March 1942, in this; that the officer of the United States, F. J. Keelty aforesaid, did on the 25th day of March 1942, approve and allow and pay said claim by the issuance of check No. 18985, dated March 25, 1942, in the sum of $33,514.15, which said check contained, and had included therein, the amount of said false and fraudulent claim, less one-half of 1 percent discount, drawn on the Treasurer of the United States in favor of the said defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., and said defendants, and each of said defendants, well knew such claim to be false and fraudulent in this particular, to wit, that the aforesaid 456 miles of field wire was not manufactured in accord with the specifications contained in said contract and was defective wire, and was not made of the quality and type of material set out in the specifications contained in said contract, and was not tested and subjected to said tests and standard tests required by the provisions of said contract, and did not meet said specifications and tests and said standard tests called for in said contract, as the defendants, and each of the defendants, well knew in this respect, to wit, that the two aforesaid circuit boxes located in the preliminary and final test areas of the Marion plant, as aforesaid, were used to make fictitious tests upon the aforesaid 456 miles of field wire and that after said fictitious tests, process tags denoting the various reels and pieces of said 456 miles of field wire were changed and switched during the nights of operation of said Marion plant in the production of said 456 miles of field wire, and said 456 miles of field wire was not tested and not subjected to the tests required and agreed to under said contract as represented by said defendants and coconspirators to said Government inspectors and by changing said tags on the night shifts and secreting said circuit boxes in hidden places, such failure to test said 456 miles of field wire had not been apprehended by said Government inspectors; and that by cutting and taking samples of field wire from specially manufactured pieces of wire and cable and representation to said Government inspectors by said defendants and coconspirators that such samples were taken from the pieces and reels of wire contained in said 456 miles of field wire for the purpose of making physical tests contained in said specifications, the defective materials, ingredients, and parts of said 456 miles of field wire had not been apprehended by said Government inspectors, contrary to the form of the statute in such cases made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States.

Count VI

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

I. That heretofore on or about the 1st day of November 1940, and prior to the presentment of this indictment and continuing up to and including the 1st day of October 1942, within the northern district of Indiana, and within the jurisdiction of this court, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., a corporation; Thor S. Johnson, Frank E. Hart, Don R. Carpenter, Chalmer C. Bishop, Frank Kunkle, hereinafter called defendants, did unlawfully, willfully, knowingly, and feloniously, combine, conspire, confederate, and agree, acting together and with each other, and with Carl Frederick Westphal, Harold McFarland, Richard W. Crosley, Charles D. Davis, Jr., Robert J. Copsey, Herbert C. Witthoft, Horace Louis Wuerth, James E. Guinnup, Wilbur L. Moore, Loomis H. Arnett, John C. Pearson, James A. Ribble, Cecil J. Bash, Leo I. Gorman, Lewis R. Pence, William Sherman Alexander, Emery G. Davis, Wilbur D. Sommers, Edward M. Merchant, Jr., and Charles I. Timmons, herein named and not herein indicted, and hereafter called coconspirators, and with divers other persons and coconspirators to the grand jurors unknown, enter into a combination, conspiracy, confederation, and agreement to defraud the Government of the United States, and the War Department of the United States, and the Finance Officer of the Army of the United States, Public Ledger Building, Independence Square, Philadelphia, Pa., by obtaining the payment and allowance of a false and fraudulent claim, and by aiding the defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., a corporation, to obtain the payment and allowance of a false and fraudulent claim, which said officer of the United States then and there had the authority to approve and allow for payment said false and fraudulent claim, the said combination, conspiracy, confederation, and agreement to defraud the Government of the United States, and the said Department and officer thereof, being of a continuing nature and having been in continuous operation and execution by the defendants from its inception on or about the 1st day of November 1940, up to and including the 1st day of October 1942, and was entered into in a manner and for the purpose as hereinafter set out.

II. Each and every allegation contained in paragraphs II, III, and IV of the first count of this indictment are realleged, reaffirmed, and incorporated herein with the same force and effect as though set forth in full herein.

III. That on or about the 31st day of January 1942 the defendant, said Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., entered into a contract with the United States to manufacture a certain quantity of field wire, which contract was designated "Contract No. DA-W-2124-SC-213 File No. 5048 Phila.-42," and which contract required of and the defendant, said Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., agreed to manufacture said field wire in accord with certain specifications and of a quality sufficient to meet said certain tests and standard tests.

That on or about the 15th day of April 1942 the defendant, said Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., in pursuance of and to effect the objects of this conspiracy, through its business office and W. R. Rhoades its duly authorized agent and representative at its Marion plant, did mail and present for allowance and payment to F. J. Keelty, finance officer of the Army of the United States, Public Ledger Building, Independence Square, Philadelphia, Pa., a false and fraudulent claim in the sum of $10,191.84 for 408 miles of field wire under said contract at the price of $24.98 per mile, which said false and fraudulent claim was designated "Invoice No. 77780" and having printed thereon "Our Order No. NR 12800," and reflecting the said 408 miles of field wire had been "shipped to Amtorg Trading Corporation, % Moore & McCormack Steamship Co., Philadelphia, Pa."

That said officer of the United States, F. J. Keelty, did then and there have the authority to approve and allow and pay such claim and the said defendants then and there did defraud the Government of the United States and the War Department of the United States and the said finance officer of the Army of the United States, and did obtain and did aid said defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., to obtain the payment and allowance of said false and fraudulent claim by the said F. J. Keelty, finance officer aforesaid, on the 25th day of April 1942, in this; that the officer of the United States, F. J. Keelty aforesaid, did on the 25th day of April 1942, approve and allow and pay said claim by the issuance of check No. 20555,

dated April 25, 1942, in the sum of $10,749.82, drawn on the Treasurer of the United States in favor of the said defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., which said check contained and had included therein the amount of said false and fraudulent claim, less one-half of 1 percent discount, and said defendants, and each of said defendants, well knew such claim to be false and fraudulent in this particular, to wit; that the aforesaid 408 miles of field wire was not manufactured in accord with the specifications contained in said contract and was defective wire, and was not made of the quality and type of material set out in the specifications contained in said contract, and was not tested and subjected to said tests and standard tests required by the provisions of said contract, and did not meet said specifications and tests and said standard tests called for in said contract, as the defendants, and each of the defendants, well knew in this respect, to wit; that the two aforesaid circuit boxes located in the preliminary and final test areas of the Marion plant, as aforesaid, were used to make fictitious tests upon the aforesaid 408 miles of field wire and that after said fictitious tests, process tags denoting the various reels and pieces of said 408 miles of field wire were changed and switched during the nights of operation of said Marion plant in the production of said 408 miles of field wire, and said 408 miles of field wire was not tested and not subjected to the tests required and agreed to under said contract as represented by said defendants and coconspirators to said Government inspectors, and by changing said tags on the night shifts and secreting said circuit boxes in hidden places, such failure to test said 408 miles of field wire had not been apprehended by said Government inspectors; and that by cutting and taking samples of field wire from specially manufactured pieces of wire and cable and representation to said Government inspectors by said defendants and coconspirators that such samples were taken from the pieces and reels of wire contained in said 408 miles of field wire for the purpose of making physical tests contained in said specifications, the defective materials, ingredients and parts of said 408 miles of field wire had not been apprehended by said Government inspectors, contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the United States.

Count VII

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

I. That, heretofore, on or about the 1st day of November 1940, and prior to the presentment of this indictment and containing up to and including the 1st day of October 1942, within the Northern District of Indiana, and within the jurisdiction of this court, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., a corporation, Thor S. Johnson, Frank E. Hart, Don R. Carpenter, Chalmer C. Bishop, and Frank Kunkle, hereinafter called defendants, did unlawfully, willfully, knowingly, and feloniously combine, conspire, confederate, and agree, acting together and with each other, and with Carl Frederick Westphal, Harold McFarland, Richard W. Crosley, Charles D. Davis, Jr., Robert J. Copsey, Herbert C. Witthoft, Horace Louis Wuerth, James E. Guinnup, Wilbur L. Moore, Loomis H. Arnett, John C. Pearson, James A. Ribble, Cecil J. Bash, Leo I. Gorman, Lewis R. Pence, William Sherman Alexander, Emery G. Davis, Wilbur D. Sommers, Edward M. Merchant, Jr., and Charles I. Timmons, herein named and not herein indicted, and hereafter called coconspirators, and with divers other persons and coconspirators to the grand jurors unknown, enter into a combination, conspiracy, confederation, and agreement to defraud the Government of the United States, and the War Department of the United States, and the finance officer of the Army of the United States, Public Ledger Building, Independence Square, Philadelphia, Pa., by obtaining the payment and allowance of a false and fraudulent claim, and by aiding the defendant Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., a corporation, to obtain the payment and allowance of a false and fraudulent claim, which said officer of the United States then and there had the authority to approve and allow for payment said false and fraudulent claim, the said combination, conspiracy, confederation, and agreement to defraud the Government of the United States, and the said Department, and officer thereof, being of a continuing nature and having been in continuous operation and execution by the defendants from its inception on or about the 1st day of November 1940 up to and including the 1st day of October 1942, and was entered into in a manner and for the purpose as hereinafter set out.

II. Each and every allegation contained in paragraphs II, III and IV of the first count of this indictment are realleged, reaffirmed, and incorporated herein with the same force and effect as though set forth in full herein.

III. That on or about the 16th day of March 1942, the defendant, said Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., entered into a contract with the United States to manufacture a certain quantity of field wire, which contract was designated "contract No. DA-W-2124-SC-379-W-2124-SC-1309, file No. 9004, Philadelphia, 42," and which contract required of and the defendant, said Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., agreed to manufacture said field wire in accord with certain specifications and of a quality sufficient to meet said certain tests and standard tests.

That on or about the 21st day of July 1942, the defendant, said Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., in pursuance of and to effect the objects of this conspiracy, through its business office and W. R. Rhoades, its duly authorized agent and representative at its Marion plant, did mail and present for allowance and payment to F. J. Keelty, finance officer of the Army of the United States, Public Ledger Building, Independence Square, Philadelphia, Pa., a false and fraudulent claim in the sum of $12,368.85 for 244.7229 miles of field wire under said contract at the price of $50.54 per mile, which said false and fraudulent claim was designated "Invoice No. 81983," and having printed thereon, "our order No. NR 13130," and reflecting the said 244.7229 miles of field wire had been "shipped to United States Marine Corps, Depot T O 1100 Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa."

That said officer of the United States, F. J. Keelty, did then and there have the authority to approve and allow and pay such claim and the said defendants then and there did defraud the Government of the United States and the War Department of the United States and the said finance officer of the Army of the United States, and did obtain and did aid said defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., to obtain the payment and allowance of said false and fraudulent claim by the said F. J. Keelty, finance officer aforesaid, on the 5th day of August 1942 in this; that the officer of the United States, F. J. Keelty aforesaid, did on the 5th day of August 1942 approve and allow and pay said claim by the issuance of check No. 2093343, dated August 5, 1942, in the sum of $36,019.85, which said check contained and had therein included the amount of said false and fraudulent claim less one-half of 1 percent discount thereon, drawn on the Treasurer of the United States in favor of the said defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., and said defendants, and each of said defendants, well knew such claim to be false and fraudulent in this particular, to wit, that the aforesaid 244.7229 miles of field wire was not manufactured in accord with the specifications contained in said contract and was defective wire, and was not made of the quality and type of material set out in the specifications contained in said contract, and was not tested and subjected to said tests and standard tests required by the provisions of said contract, and did not meet said specifications and tests and said standard tests called for in said contract, as the defendants, and each of the defendants, well knew in this respect, to wit: that the two aforesaid circuit boxes located in the preliminary and final test areas of the Marion plant, as aforesaid, were used to make fictitious tests upon the aforesaid 244.7229 miles of field wire and that after said fictitious tests, process tags denoting the various reels and pieces of said 244.7229 miles of field wire were changed and switched during the nights of operation of said Marion plant in the production of said 244.7229 miles of field wire, and the said 244.7229 miles of field wire was not tested and not subjected to the tests required and agreed to under said contract as represented by said defendants and coconspirators to said Government inspectors, and by changing said tags on the night shifts and secreting said circuit boxes in hidden places, such failure to test said 244.7229 miles of field wire had not been apprehended by said Government inspectors; and that by cutting and taking samples of field wire from specially manufactured pieces of wire and cable and representation to said Government inspectors by said defendants and coconspirators that such samples were taken from the pieces and reels of wire contained in said 244.7229 miles of field wire for the purpose of making physical tests contained in said specifications, the defective materials, ingredients, and parts of said 244.7229 miles of field wire had not been apprehended by said Government inspectors, contrary to the form of the statute, in such cases made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States.

Count VIII

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

I. That, heretofore, on or about the 1st day of November, 1940, and prior to the presentment of this indictment and continuing up to and including the 1st day of October, 1942, within the Northern District of Indiana, and within the jurisdiction of this court, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., a corporation, Thor S. Johnson, Frank E. Hart, Don R. Carpenter, Chalmer C. Bishop, Frank Kunkle, hereinafter called defendants, did unlawfully, wilfully, knowingly, and feloniously combine, conspire, confederate, and agree, acting together and with each other, and with Carl Frederick Westphal, Harold McFarland, Richard W. Crosley, Charles D. Davis, Jr., Robert J. Copsey, Herbert C. Witthoft, Horace Louis Wuerth, James E. Guinnup, Wilbur L. Moore, Loomis H. Arnett, John C. Pearson, James A. Ribble, Cecil J. Bash, Leo I. Gorman, Lewis R. Pence, William Sherman Alexander, Emery G. Davis, Wilbur D. Sommers, Edward M. Merchant, Jr., and Charles I. Timmons, herein named and not herein indicted, and hereafter called coconspirators, and with divers other persons and coconspirators to the grand jurors unknown, enter into a combination, conspiracy, confederation, and agreement to defraud the Government of the United States, and the War Department of the United States, and the finance officer of the Army of the United States, Public Ledger Building, Independence Square, Philadelphia, Pa., by obtaining the payment and allowance of a false and fraudulent claim, and by aiding the defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., a corporation, to obtain the payment and allowance of a false and fraudulent claim, which said officer of the United States then and there had the authority to approve and allow for payment said false and fraudulent claim, the said combination, conspiracy, confederation, and agreement to defraud the Government of the United States, and the said Department and officer thereof, being of a continuing nature and having been in continuous operation and

execution by the defendants from its inception on or about the 1st day of November, 1940, up to and including the 1st day of October, 1942, and was entered into in a manner and for the purpose as hereinafter set out.

II. Each and every allegation contained in paragraphs II, III, and IV of the first count of this indictment are realleged, reaffirmed, and incorporated herein with the same force and effect as though set forth in full herein.

III. That on or about the 16th day of March 1942 the defendant, said Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., entered into a contract with the United States to manufacture a certain quantity of field wire, which contract was designated "Contract No. DA-W-2124-SC-379-W-2124-SC-1309, File No. 9004 Philadelphia-42," and which contract required of and the defendant, said Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., agreed to manufacture said field wire in accord with certain specifications and of a quality sufficient to meet said certain tests and standard tests.

That on or about the 5th day of August 1942 the defendant, said Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., in pursuance of and to effect the objects of this conspiracy, through its business office and W. R. Rhoades, its duly authorized agent and representative at its Marion plant, did mail and present for allowance and payment to F. J. Keelty, finance officer of the Army of the United States, Public Ledger Building, Independence Square, Philadelphia, Pa., a false and fraudulent claim in the sum $12,322.66 for 243.82 miles of field wire under said contract at the price of $50.54 per mile, which said false and fraudulent claim was designated "Invoice No. 83101" and having printed thereon, "Our Order No. NR 13130," and reflecting the said 243.82 miles of field wire had been shipped to Depot T. O. United States Marine Corps—1100 Harrison, San Francisco, Calif.

That said officer of the United States, F. J. Keelty, did then and there have the authority to approve and allow and pay such claim, and the defendants then and there did defraud the Government of the United States and the War Department of the United States and the said finance officer of the Army of the United States, and did obtain and did aid said defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., to obtain the payment and allowance of said false and fraudulent claim by the said F. J. Keelty, finance officer aforesaid, on the 17th day of August 1942, in that; that the officer of the United States, F. J. Keelty, aforesaid, did on the 17th day of August 1942 approve and allow and pay said claim by the issuance of check No. 2176039, dated August 17, 1942, in the sum of $24,117.47; which said check contained and had therein included the amount of said false and fraudulent claim less one-half of 1 percent discount, drawn on the Treasurer of the United States in favor of the said defendant, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., and said defendants, and each of said defendants, well knew such claim to be false and fraudulent in this particular, to wit, that the aforesaid 243.82 miles of field wire was not manufactured in accord with the specifications contained in said contract and was defective wire, and was not made of the quality and type of material set out in the specifications contained in said contract, and was not tested and subjected to said tests and standard tests required by the provisions of said contract, and did not meet said specifications and tests and said standard tests called for in said contract, as the defendants, and each of the defendants, well knew in this respect, to wit, that the two aforesaid circuit boxes located in the preliminary and final test areas of the Marion plant, as aforesaid, were used to make fictitious tests upon the aforesaid 243.82 miles of field wire, and that after said fictitious tests, process tags denoting the various reels and pieces of said 243.82 miles of field wire were changed and switched during the nights of operation of said Marion plant in the production of said 243.82 miles of field wire, and that said 243.82 miles of field wire was not tested and not subjected to the tests required and agreed to under said contract as represented by said defendants and coconspirators to said Government inspectors, and by changing said tags on the night shifts and secreting said circuit boxes in hidden places, such failure to test said 243.82 miles of field wire had not been apprehended by said Government inspectors; and that by cutting and taking samples of field wire from specially manufactured pieces of wire and cable and representation to said Government inspectors by said defendants and coconspirators that such samples were taken from the pieces and reels of wire contained in said 243.82 miles of field wire for the purpose of making physical tests contained in said specifications, the defective materials, ingredients, and parts of said 243.82 miles of field wire had not been apprehended by said Government inspectors, contrary to the form of the statute in such cases made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the United States.

A true bill:

———— ————,

Foreman.

ALEXANDER M. CAMPBELL,
United States Attorney.
LUTHER M. SWYGERT,
JAMES E. KEATING,
Assistant United States Attorneys.
TOM C. CLARK,
PAT COON,
Special Assistants to the Attorney General.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, after reading this indictment, let it be recalled that the defendants pled guilty to each and every one of these terrible charges.

As I have indicated, the defendants appeared in court and entered a plea of guilty. The Government attorneys had fully expected the company and the defendants to try the case before a jury rather than openly admit the truth of these awful charges. The record discloses that counsel for both the Government and the defendants made lengthy statements before the court, and the court had before it all that had occurred before the grand jury, where a most complete disclosure of these crooked operations had been made through the testimony of those who had been active participants.

A somewhat general statement of the history of this case will be of interest to patriotic Americans, and to the mothers and fathers of all the boys who might have been the victims of this sort of operation had vigilant Government inspectors and investigators not caught the company in the commission of the offenses. Unhappily for our soldiers and sailors, this frightful and deadly fraud might not have been caught except for the consciences of some of the men whose guilty knowledge made them talk, and thus enabled investigators to prepare this airtight case against the defendants.

SUMMARY OF THE ANACONDA CASE

Inspection of war materials for the United States Signal Corps and for the Navy is handled by civilian employees in the plants where the material is being made. These employees work under the direction of uniformed personnel of the Army and Navy, who supervise inspection in various districts for both the Army and the Navy throughout the United States.

During the month of August 1942 Cyrus Shipp was the chief inspector for the United States Signal Corps at the plant of the Paranite Co., located several miles out of Marion, Ind.

A former employee of the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co. plant at Marion, Ind., was working for the Paranite Co. at the time. This employee, Carl Westphal, became friendly with Cyrus Shipp and told him of all the practices in the test procedure on the various types of wire and cable manufactured by the Anaconda Co. in its plant in Marion, Ind. Then Cyrus Shipp wrote his superior, at that time Major Prina in Philadelphia, who transferred Cyrus Shipp to the Anaconda plant in Marion as chief inspector. Thereupon, Cyrus Shipp determined the location of certain secret devices secreted beneath the desks in the inspection areas and satisfied himself that all of the practices related to him by Westphal were in force in the Anaconda plant.

It must be borne in mind that under contracts with the Army and Navy, specifications are a part of each contract. These specifications are designed for the sole purpose of insuring quality in the material being purchased. So every material purchased must meet a certain standard quality or must pass certain tests that will demonstrate its serviceability and usefulness to the Government. Under these contracts the Government does not own testing equipment, for all of the companies contracting with the Government are required, under their contracts, to own and maintain testing equipment. In that respect, each company doing business with the Government will maintain testing laboratories or places for testing production which will be operated by their own company employees. Under virtually all contracts, the inspectors working for the Government do not perform the tests themselves, but simply witness the tests. The Government inspectors would merely view the measuring devices or instruments which reflect the result of the tests, whereas, the test is actually administered to the material by the employees of the company. All of this is true with respect to the manufacture of various types of wire and cable.

The Anaconda Co., at its Marion, Ind., plant, was engaged in the manufacture of approximately 300 different types of cable for the Navy. They are different types in that there will be some different construction, some different stranding, some different insulation or outer covering in accord with the particular use the cable is to be put to. A Navy vessel is electrically operated and controlled. Cable of great flexibility is required in many instances such as the operation of searchlight batteries. Oil-resistant types of cable are required where such cable will be beneath oil constantly. Cable for the operation of water pumps which may be beneath water constantly are required. There are types of cable that must transmit great current such as DeGaussing cable which encircles the inside or outside of the hull of the ship and has the faculty of demagnetizing the steel vessel and thereby preventing the attraction of magnetic mines. There are smaller types

of cable which are used even in the ship's galley for electric cooking. Cable is used in the operation of many different sizes of motors which function to raise or lower lifeboats, to operate ammunition hoists, to operate gun turrets, to operate all radio and detection devices and equipment aboard a vessel. These latter types may be required to have the faculty of preventing outside interference and amplifying sound. All of these types of cable were manufactured for the United States Navy at the Anaconda plant in Marion, Ind.

For the United States Signal Corps the Anaconda Co. made great quantities of field wire, which is a telephone communications wire used in combat areas. The plant made great quantities of assault wire which is a tiny light communications wire. Assault wire is approximately one-eighth as heavy as the standard field wire and may be carried by a soldier with little impediment and is used in actual combat areas. Anaconda made Parkway cable for the Signal Corps. Parkway cable is a type of cable that furnishes power for lighting purposes in airport construction and is generally used beneath the surface for lighting up and defining landing areas. Anaconda was engaged in the manufacture of various types of wire and cable for the United States Coast Guard, for use by the Panama Canal Zone and various other Government agencies such as Civil Aeronautics Authority, Bonneville Dam, and Tennessee Valley Authority. Great quantities of the above types of wire and cable were manufactured under lease-lend and shipped to Russia and Britain. All of these types of wire and cable were inspected by the Signal Corps and Navy inspectors and were required to meet certain standard tests and specifications.

Under these tests and specifications, it is seldom a requirement that a certain type or kind of ingredient be used. There is sometimes a provision that certain kinds of ingredients not be used in that those particular ingredients are known to deteriorate rapidly and to be of inferior quality. Specifications usually set up a test and require that the product manufactured meet that test without regard to particular ingredients of the product. Specifications on nearly all kinds of material manufactured for the Government are the result of long experience by industry. These specifications are usually the outgrowth of manufacture by the particular industry over a long period of years and have been adopted by the industry long prior to manufacturing for the Government. Specifications are not generally designed by Government engineers, but have been designed through long practice by the industry itself.

The only reason for evading and resorting to any practice to avoid tests and specifications on the materials sold the Government is to cheat the Government and sell to the Government inferior, defective material. It is possible that a plant can increase its production greatly by not testing and not requiring that its product meet the specifications, and thereby receive much more money from the Government as the result of its increased production. However, if the product is a quality product, and one that will meet the specifications required under the contract with the Government, and if the company manufacturing the product maintains sufficient testing equipment, the production of the company should not be affected by avoiding tests and specifications.

On August 29, 1942, Cyrus Shipp, having satisfied himself that all of the practices related to him by Carl Westphal were in actual execution in the Anaconda plant, advised Frank Kunkle, who was a defendant and the company employee acting as chief inspector for the company, that no more wire for the Army could be shipped from the plant until all those practices ceased. This particular company employee, Frank Kunkle, admitted to Cyrus Shipp on that Saturday afternoon, August 29, that such practices had been occurring at the plant, and told Cyrus Shipp that he had caught the company cold-handed. At that time there were two carloads of field wire ready to be shipped, packed and stored in freight cars. The manager of the plant, Frank Hart, was advised at his home that Cyrus Shipp would not permit any more wire and cable to be shipped to the Army until practices in the plant ceased, but Frank Hart refused to talk with Shipp at that time, and there followed a series of conferences lasting approximately a week.

Let me say parenthetically that it is interesting to know that American boys had confidence in cables which were so defective that the persons deliberately creating the defects would be brought before a firing squad if they had done this in war zones.

During that week the Navy inspector was notified of the condition, and the superiors of Cyrus Shipp were also notified. In the conferences that occurred, the manager of the plant, Frank Hart, denied any knowledge of the practices, and contended that they did not exist, and explained to the superiors of Shipp that labor organizers were trying to cause them trouble. That explanation was given credence by those men, though it afterward appeared that there was no basis for any such assertion on the part of the manager of the plant, and that it was purely a figment of imagination on the part of the manager to assert that labor organizers were causing trouble. The result of the conferences was that the company and the Navy and Army officials agreed on a complete change of inspection practices to be placed in force immediately. In the meantime, Shipp and Westphal had gone to the field office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Indianapolis and related to the F. B. I. their knowledge of the practices in the plant. The F. B. I. started an investigation, with two men visiting and talking with various employees of the plant in their homes at night and at odd hours when they would not be busy. That investigation by the F. B. I. continued over a period of approximately 6 weeks.

While the investigation was in progress, as a part of the agreement between the company and the inspection officials, it had been agreed that all wire and cable that was on hand and ready for shipment on August 29 would be tested to determine its quality. In reality, that wire and cable had never been tested, and that was known to Cyrus Shipp from his complete knowledge of the practices going on. So, about September 21, 1942, while field wire that had been packed and ready for shipment was being tested, Shipp learned that more of the wire was being regarded as having been tested than was possible to be tested on the equipment being operated. He went to the operators of the machines that were testing the wire—the company contended the wire had already been tested, but agreed to retest it—and talked with them at home, at night. They told Shipp that they had been instructed by the plant superintendent, Don Carpenter, and the acting chief inspector, Frank Kunkle, to run the wire through the machines without testing it, "that there must not be any holes in that wire." Then Shipp went to the manager and told him that the wire was not being tested as they agreed, and insisted that all the wire be run through the machines while he or one of his men was present to observe the holes and defects in the wire. The machines are known as sparking machines, and holes in the wire are indicated on the machine when the wire is passed through a high-voltage coil. Subsequently, Shipp observed a complete test of 325 reels of the wire. Ninety percent had holes in it. Some reels of wire had as many as 300 holes in it.

The initial report of the F. B. I. was made about the middle of November. Subsequently, a grand jury began its investigation at Fort Wayne, Ind., on about December 9, 1942. Approximately 65 witnesses appeared before the grand jury, incuding all officials of the company in the Marion plant and all employees of the company who worked in the inspection areas and laboratories of the company.

Fundamentally, all the tests and requirements of the specifications for the various types of insulated wire and cable are the same. Field wire has a conductor which consists of four fine strands of steel wire and three fine strands of copper wire. The strands are stranded together in stranding machines. Afterwards, the stranded conductor passes through an insulating machine which applies a rubber compound around the conductor. Then a braid is applied over the insulation. Subsequently, a saturating compound which saturates the braid is placed on it. A finishing compound is applied over the saturating compound to obtain the finished product. At each stage of the process of manufacture certain tests are applied to the wire. When the wire comes out of the insulating machines, certain tests are applied to the rubber compound. It is given a tensile strength test, which tests the pounds of pull per square inch. It is also given a set test, a modulus test, and an aging test

which determine its approximate life and serviceability. The braid is tested. The saturating compound is given a penetration test and a melting-point test. The finished product is given certain electrical tests. It should be immersed in water for a period of 12 hours, and a high voltage submitted to it, with the water acting as a ground. If there be holes in it, the wire will not take the voltage. It is given an insulation resistance test whereby the amount of current that escapes through the insulation is measured, and if there be holes or extremely thin places in the insulation the wire will not pass the insulation resistance test. Then the electrical tests are given to the wire by immersion of the entire reels of wire, when they become the finished product, into metal tanks, and the submission of the high voltage and insulation resistance tests. The other physical tests to the compounds are given to samples of the wire as it progresses through the various stages of production. The company kept specially manufactured reels of wire and cable secreted in cabinets adjacent to its physical testing laboratory.

As wire would go through the various stages of production, 20-foot samples would be taken from the secreted wire and all the various tests would be applied to those samples. That was a daily procedure. Though the samples were supposed to be cut from the daily production, actually the samples would be taken from the specially manufactured reels of wire which were known to be good and would pass the tests, and samples from the good wire would be substituted for the samples from the daily production. The tests would be applied to the good wire that would pass the physical tests. So, in reality, none of the wire was ever actually tested, but the tests were applied only to specially manufactured wire that the company and employees knew would meet the tests. Barrels of saturating compounds that would pass the tests were specially prepared, and those barrels were kept adjacent to the saturating pits. It would be represented to the Government inspectors that that saturating compound was being applied to the wire, when in reality a highly inferior, much lower quality compound was actually being used to saturate the wire. The tests would be applied to the barrels of saturating compounds that were specially prepared, and never would be applied to the saturating compound that was actually applied to the wire.

The electrical tests were performed so that the voltage submitted to wire could be reflected on an ammeter, and the insulation resistance test would be reflected on an instrument called a galvanometer. In the event the wire was to receive 10,000 volts, the electrical board was so rigged and so constructed that the ammeter would reflect 10,000 volts, but, in reality, only 5,000 volts would be submitted. That is, on the electrical high-voltage test, never did the wire or cable receive more than one-half the voltage the specifications required that it receive.

That will give my friend the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] some idea of what might happen on a battleship if such wires were used to conduct current to motors activating the turrets and controlling the firing apparatus. Of course, Mr. President, the deliberate production of such inferior wire, used for such purposes, could easily and naturally be construed as giving comfort and aid to the enemy.

The insulation resistance test was the test in which secret devices were used to cause the wire to appear much better than it actually was. Those devices were referred to as button boxes, and they were secreted beneath the galvanometer set in the two electrical-test areas of the plant. They were intricate devices which took much thought and effort to perfect, in that they were made up of what are known in the electrical business as bastard resistors. Bastard resistors are hand wound, and are designed to give a resistance value which would not be an even value such as would be reflected upon standard resistors manufactured by various concerns. Upon the use of one button, the voltage would be decreased, and the resistance value would be decreased to one-half of the standard resistance value and voltage required to be applied under the specifications. Thus, the wire and cable would appear twice as good as it actually was. Upon the use of another button, the voltage and resistance value would be decreased to one-fourth, thus making the wire appear four times as good as it actually was. Similarly, another button decreased voltage and resistance to one-sixth of that required by the specifications, making the wire or cable appear to be six times as good as it actually was. The use of another button would correspondingly decrease the voltage and resistance value to one-tenth of that required by the specifications, and thus made the wire and cable appear 10 times as good as it actually was.

Field wire is a wire that does not stretch from telephone pole to telephone pole, as we customarily see it used for telephone purposes, but is used on the ground and is run through rivers and through bushes and trees and across rocks, and must be of the quality specifications called for, or it will not be serviceable and cannot be used for the uses the Government intends. Field wire was the largest single item of manufacture by the plant. It was made for use in the Sahara Desert, the south Pacific islands, and Alaska.

As previously stated, in general all the tests given to all insulated wire and cable are of similar nature to those enumerated above. Every product that was made by the Anaconda Co. in its Marion plant had the same similar practices enumerated above with reference to compliance with specifications and quality of material. The Anaconda Co. and employees of that plant did not make the tests of the wire and cable that were required of them. The entire system was devised to prevent detection by the Government inspectors and it was successfully done over a 2-year period of time.

The great majority of the witnesses appearing before the grand jury were young men between the ages of 21 and 29. They told of many meetings in the plant where they would be constantly warned not to discuss the test procedures with anybody and never talk with any Government inspector or take a Government inspector to their homes. They told of many instances where various employees would object to the practices and would be transferred to other jobs. The plan was running 100 percent production on contracts directly with the Government and on subcontracts with various Navy shipyards from the middle of the year 1941. Thirty-nine different witnesses described the use of the button boxes and told the grand jury of the tag-changing procedure which enabled the shipment of great quantities of wire and cable with no regard whatsoever to the testing procedure required to be followed.

This tag-changing procedure operated on a simple plan. One piece of a certain type of wire or cable is just the same as the next piece of the same type of wire or cable. When a piece of wire or cable starts through production, it has affixed to it what is known as a process tag. This process tag has a number which designates the number that piece of wire or cable has in relation to the number of the pieces of wire or cable that will be required to fill a designated contract; that is, the process tag will have affixed to it the contract designation, the number of pieces of wire and cable required to fill the particular contract, and, specifically, the particular number this piece of wire has in the fulfillment of the contract. That piece of wire is just like one piece of grain in a bushel basket or one cottonseed in a wagonload of cottonseed. It is indistinguishable from any other piece of wire or cable required to fill the particular contract.

Thus, it is possible for the company to adopt the practice that it did adopt by changing the tags from one piece of wire to another piece of wire, as follows: This process tag will have followed a piece of wire through production until it will have become a finished product, and upon the process tag should be stamped the Government inspector's approval reflecting that such piece of wire had passed all of the various tests. So, the Anaconda Co. adopted the practice of choosing special reels of wire that would pass the electrical tests by the use of these fictitious test-button boxes. It would keep these reels of wire in the test tanks and submit the electrical tests by the use of the button boxes over and over again to the same reels of wire. The Government inspector sitting in a small room watching the ammeter and galvanometer and taking the readings has no opportunity to observe what goes on in the test pits and among the test tanks. The Government inspector has no opportunity to observe the use of the button boxes which apply the fictitious tests. When the so-called tests will have been completed, the Government inspector will stamp the process tags reflecting that the electrical tests have been passed.

Then on night shifts, when there are no Government inspectors in the plant the employees will take the process tags off of the reels of wire and cable and place them on the previous day's production, and the previous day's production will then be shipped out just as if it had been tested, when in truth, the production received no tests whatsoever. Then the tags that were on the previous day's production will be placed upon the reels of wire and cable in the tanks and the same reels of wire and cable in the tanks will be submitted to the tests or fictitious tests on the succeeding day. Thus, as long as a reel of wire may remain in the tanks, each day reels of wire and cable that have never been tested in any manner will be shipped out.

It ought to obtain a patent or copyright on that sabotage system. That type of villainy, the description of which would involve the use of language which would not be proper here, should at least be preserved for posterity in this somber record.

This process was developed by Anaconda and was enabled to be carried out by Anaconda without detection, for the reason that the same reels being left in the tanks would be replenished on night shifts by making pretests and determining what particular reels can be used in the tank to supplement reels that will have failed. A few reels would play out each day. Reels of wire and cable have been known to remain in the tanks for as long as several months. The same reel of wire would be tested day in and day out and the tag would be changed and another reel that had not been tested would be shipped out. On night shifts, it was customary to scrub off the reels of wire and cable in the tanks. Rust would accumulate on the steel reels and it would be necessary to clean them with kerosene rags and brushes in order to prevent the Government inspectors from observing their rusty condition. Also, every day when it was known that certain reels of wire could not pass even the fictitious insulation resistance test on the one-tenth button, the test helpers who were employees of the company and who would be changing the leads on the reels of wire in the tanks would skip over the reels that were bad and indicate that they were making a change to the bad reel, but would be in fact, submitting the test to the same reel over and over again.

Under this system, it was necessary to regulate the daily production in accord with the number of reels in the tanks. That is, the daily production should be equal to the number of process tags that had been approved in order to prevent the piling up of a number of reels of wire or cable in advance and thus prevent detection by an inspector who would observe many reels being produced and not tested. However, on occasions the production has been known to be much more than the tags, and it would be necessary for the company to secrete these reels by placing them in an inconspicuous corner of the building and placing tarpaulins over them.

It was well established that the testing equipment of the company could not possibly test the great amount of production of the company. In that connection there were numerous requests for additional testing equipment by certain foremen in the plant, who stated that it was always refused. After the indictment was returned in the case, the testing capacity was more than doubled in the Marion plant.

Employees related instances of conversation with the superintendent and manager of the plant to the effect that good reels of wire and cable could be made for sample and test purposes and they should be able to make good reels of wire and cable all the time.

The general manager of all Anaconda Wire & Cable Co. plants at numerous meetings with the management of the plant and the foremen of various departments told them that they had to get the wire by the dumb Government inspectors. On occasion he used the phrase "anyone who is not able to get the wire by these jerk Government inspectors ought not to have a job in the plant." He insisted that all production of wire and cable be held to minimum diameters. That is, diameters of the conductor and the insulation and all outer covering for conductors may only be produced at a minimum thickness. When machines are set for production at the minimum figure, testimony indicated the production would necessarily run below the minimum, and would cause much of the wire and cable to have to be scrapped as not meeting specifications. Investigation of the scrap in other wire and cable mills shows that there have been daily scrap piles of wire and cable wherein there were defectives that had to be thrown out. However, a scrap pile at the Marion plant of the Anaconda Co. is unknown and not within the memory of the employees did a scrap pile occur.

Evidence disclosed before the grand jury was later discussed with the court by counsel for the Government. He pointed out that the testimony before the grand jury had shown a continuing practice of defrauding private customers of the Anaconda Co. by the same methods and practice which had been employed in filling Government contracts. The court referred to one of these incidents by naming the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. as a victim. Employees of the company had told the grand jury of these efforts to evade contract obligations to private purchasers over a period of years.

The top men in the organization, Thor S. Johnson and Frank E. Hart, denied to the F. B. I. at all times any knowledge of the practices in the plant until their pleas were entered on June 10. However, the plant superintendent, Don R. Carpenter, the chief inspector of the plant, Chalmer Bishop, and the assistant chief inspector, Frank Kunkle, admitted the practices and their part and direction and supervision of the lesser employees so engaged.

There was no disposition on the part of these lesser employees to hold back any information from the F. B. I. and before the grand jury. All of them seem to have been laboring under great strain with their consciences. I should think so, when they were sending out stuff as deadly as this to boys fighting in the field.

They readily divulged their participation in the use of the boxes, the tag changing, and substituting good samples for the samples of the regular production, and making false reports of tests. They stated as their reasons for their continued fraudulent practices the necessary support of their families and that they had to have a job.

The company from production at its Marion (Ind.) plant has received around $20,000,000 from the Government in the last 2 years.

After the indictment was returned, a search was made for various types of wire and cable that could be identified as having been made at the Marion (Ind.) plant. Around 700 reels of Anaconda wire was located in the warehouse of the United States Marine Corps at San Diego, Calif., which was ready for shipment to combat areas in the Pacific. It was established that 56 reels of this wire were made at the Marion (Ind.) plant. This wire was tested and was found to be utterly defective. We were in possession of certified copies of two complaints from the Moscow office of the Lend-Lease, pointing out numerous specific defects in the Anaconda wire, which was made under a particular contract with the United States Signal Corps, which contract was in the process of fulfillment at the Marion plant. However, the Anaconda Co. sometimes split up its contracts and would manufacture part of a contract at one plant and another part of the same contract at another plant.

After the indictment was returned, the United States Signal Corps ordered that all Anaconda wire be kept within the continental United States and be used only on maneuvers and not in any combat area. We are in possession of a great many pieces of wire that were cut out of the reels of wire that were on hand ready for shipment at the time of the discovery of the practices. These pieces of wire show numerous holes and breaks in the insulation.

It was the statement of numerous employees having particular jobs to do in the production that they did not know how really "lousy" the wire was that the plant was making until they came to test some of it. In other words, an employee working at the saturating finishing machine would not actually know of the condition of each reel of wire that went out for the reason the tag changing, use of the button boxes, and substitution of samples would all be done by particular employees who had specific assignments without regard to the duty and assignments of other employees. There were three 8-hour shifts working in the plant since the early part of 1941. The number of employees has doubled in the last 2 years and it was impossible for each employee to know the condition of the finished product.

On one occasion the inspector for the Signal Corps had an argument with several employees in the physical test laboratory as to the method of conducting their tests. Employees testified that this particular inspector, K. K. Miller,

was becoming suspicious of their testing procedure. Carpenter, the plant's superintendent, and Kunkle, the assistant chief inspector for the plant, testified that they told Frank Hart, the plant manager, that K. K. Miller was becoming suspicious. Thereupon, the defendant, Frank Hart, went to the Signal Corps inspection offices and told the superiors of Miller that Miller was disrupting production in the plant and causing antagonism among his employees by bickering and arguing with them. Thereafter, Inspector Miller was transferred to another plant upon the statement of Frank Hart, the plant manager, though the true reason for the representations of Hart was that Miller might catch up with their fraudulent practices.

The Anaconda plant, as other war-production plants, employed guards and maintained a guard system requiring identification upon admission to the plant at all times. In the event a plant is making any secret productior or is making products over which particular Government inspectors have no authority or control, the plant may exclude inspectors in the particular areas.

However, as a part of the fraudulent practices and program, it was apparent that Government inspectors must be excluded from the plant on night shifts and at odd hours in order to prevent a detection of the tag-changing procedure and the pretesting to obtain selected reels for use in the electrical tests. Therefore the plant superintendent, defendant Carpenter, and assistant chief inspector, defendant Kunkle, went to the plant manager, Frank Hart, and so informed Frank Hart that the Government inspectors would detect their test procedure if allowed to wander about the plant during nights and odd hours. Then defendant Frank Hart issued an order to the guards requiring that no Government inspector be permitted in the plant at night or Saturday afternoon and Sunday unless accompanied by an escort who would be an official or designated employee of the company.

The captain of the guards was instructed that he must call Kunkle in the event the Government inspector desired admittance. Further, if a Government inspector desired admittance to the plant on Sunday, it was necessary that he give 24 hours' notice before being allowed to go in the plant. This procedure was respected and followed by the Government inspectors at all times during the last 9 months of 1941 and until detection of the practices in August 1942.

On June 10, 1943, the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., the corporation; Thor S. Johnson, general manager of all mills of Anaconda Wire & Cable Co.; Frank E. Hart, the manager of the Marion, Ind., plant; Don R. Carpenter, the plant superintendent of the Marion, Ind., plant; Chalmer C. Bishop, chief inspector of the Marion, Ind., plant; and Frank Kunkle, assistant chief inspector of the Marion, Ind., plant, all of the defendants named in the indictment, entered pleas of nolo contendere in the United States district court at Fort Wayne, Ind., before Judge Thomas W. Slick. The court was informed substantially as related above of the practices and fraud against the Government.

The judge finally disposed of this case by being rude enough to impose upon the company a small fine, and he then knew of all the facts, as I have related them to the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator state the amount of the fine?

Mr. BONE. I shall cover this case very thoroughly for those who wish to read about it, as I am sure many will. If any similar cases arise in the future I will insert in the RECORD from time to time a similar description. I will also explain what would happen to a soldier boy who did what one of these men did. That ought to interest Senators.

Each of the defendants speaking through their counsel made a statement.

By the way, Mr. President, they are very able counsel. Corporations like the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co. do not hire inferior attorneys.

The Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., a corporation, stated that it was technically guilty but not morally guilty.

At this point I digress to say that I should like to have some good lawyer in this body explain to me what that means. I practiced law a long time, and I am not sure what is meant by that kind of an expression. I should like to have some able lawyer—there are many of them in this body—tell me what distinction he would make between the two classes of guilt in a case of this kind, in which a company deliberately manufactured wire of an inferior grade for use on a battlefield. The company stated that it was technically guilty but not morally guilty. That plea will take rank as a gem in legal literature.

Thor S. Johnson denied complete knowledge of the practices and urged that there was a great desire to get out production. Frank E. Hart denied complete knowledge of the practices and more or less sought to lay the blame on the defendants Carpenter, Bishop, and Kunkle. The defendants, Carpenter, Bishop, and Kunkle alleged good citizenship and good family line, but stated that the Government's charges were substantially correct.

Judge Thomas W. Slick, at the conclusion of the statements of the parties talked from the bench, approximately 1 hour during which time he asked the Government for its recommendations as to penalties in the case, and the Government recommended maximum fines and imprisonment. Here follow excerpts from the language of the court in assessing penalties:

It is regrettable that there was so much publicity given to this, a criminal case, in the press. * * *

I particularly did not read any of them (newspaper and magazine articles), any of that publicity, because I felt that I probably would preside at the trial, and I did not want to prejudge any of the defendants; and I have not. * * *

These men are not saboteurs, they are not disloyal citizens. They made a mistake, and may regret it now, but not with the intention of aiding our enemies or crippling our war efforts * * *.

If the jury, as they do in State courts, could find the defendants guilty or not guilty, and then in the event they found them guilty, fix the penalty, that would have been a very welcome thing to me. I don't like to assume a responsibility of this character. It is not pleasant. * * *

These defendants are well represented. Counsel weighed, I have no doubt, I know they did, the question as to whether or not they should enter a plea of nolo contendere, a plea of guilty, or plea of not guilty and go to trial.

Much of the argument of counsel addressed to the court might have been a very strong argument to a jury on the question of guilt or innocence, where a jury would have been faced with the question of finding these defendants guilty beyond all reasonable doubt; there might have been some reasonable doubt in the minds of a jury as to some of these defendants, I don't know, but the plea has been entered as to all defendants, and I was particular in asking each defendant if he understood the effect of this plea, and I have no doubt it was thoroughly explained to each defendant, because I know such lawyers and advocates as Mr. McNagny, Mr. Hickam, Mr. Galvin, Mr. Caine, Mr. Rhodes, and Mr. Thomas, would not have permitted their clients to enter this plea without thoroughly explaining to them the effect of it, and the effect of it, as all lawyers know, is a plea of guilty; it is tantamount or equivalent to a plea of guilty for the purposes of this case only, but for the purposes of this case the defendants have pled guilty. * * *

Their pleas are that they are guilty. They could not have been guilty if they had not had knowledge of what was going on. They are not on trial, as counsel very well understand, charged with negligence; they are charged with knowledge. Mr. Johnson could not have been guilty and should not have entered a plea of nolo contendere, which is equivalent to a plea of guilty, which is a plea of guilty in this action, if he had absolutely no knowledge of what was going on. That is just inconceivable. I cannot understand how a man as intelligent as he is, represented by the best counsel he could get in this area, could plead guilty and just say to the court, "I had no knowledge of what was going on." * * *

Johnson was the top-flight man.

I don't want a man who is not guilty to plead guilty in this court for any purpose, and to argue to me that these men were moved by patriotic motives in our war effort in entering their plea of guilty just does not add up.

I yield to no one in my desire to do anything I can, in my feeble way, to aid the war effort, but I don't think there is a lawyer here or person in the courtroom but what would take the same stand; but I certainly would not plead guilty—I don't care who the district attorney was—to something I was absolutely innocent of because I might conceive that my efforts in the war effort were needed. I don't think a man is called upon to enter a plea of guilty because he wants to go ahead and help win this war. I just cannot see that, gentlemen; I just cannot understand it. * * *

To think of a company, well manned, as the Anaconda is, resorting to fraudulent practices, even before we entered the war, and encouraging or at least allowing its employees—Hart, Bishop, Carpenter, and Kunkle, and, as was said, 20 or 30 other lesser employees—to think of a company encouraging or permitting a practice to be built up to deceive its customers, the Pennsylvania Railroad, long before we entered the war, and the Government, long before we entered the war, and then continuing that practice, to me, I confess I just cannot understand it; it

is baffling. I cannot understand men who would do that and who would put their own integrity in the background, who would yield allegiance or obedience to a company that hired them, to deceive the customers, and resort to fraudulent practices. * * *

I don't know; I don't know why those tests were written into these specifications if they did not amount to anything. I don't think that the evidence justifies the conclusion that they were written by some bureaucrat in Washington—some brass hat, as one counsel referred to them; I don't think that is the answer at all. * * *

They were produced, as Mr. Campbell says, from the experience, I take it, of the underwriters and engineers, not from some Office of Price Administration or some other alphabetical agency in Washington. This is the War Department. These men—brass hats, call them, if you like—these men are men who represent the Army and the Navy. * * *

As I said, it seems to me that the system as described involves the Anaconda Co., Mr. McNagny, more than any other defendant in this case. They were not engaged in a charitable operation. They were producing wire for the Army armed forces for a consideration agreed upon in a written contract. That does not detract from their loyalty to the Government and their desire to aid the Government in the war effort, but they were being paid for producing this wire and they contracted to produce wire that would undergo certain tests and arrangements were made for those tests. * * *

That doesn't relieve the defendants of responsibility, even if the inspectors were dumb, as one witness said—"get by these dumb inspectors." * * *

Now, as I said, the action of this company to the public is no doubt revolting. It was to me when I first read the article in the newspaper. But that is not to be considered here. We are not here to endeavor to satisfy the public, but to mete out, as nearly as we can, justice. * * *

If a man commits a crime, the court does not send him to jail or fine him for the purpose of punishing him, but for the purpose of reclaiming him for society, and making a good citizen out of him. If we have accomplished that, we have done what we should do.

I don't think any one of these defendants is of a criminal type. If I thought so, I would have no hesitation in giving him the limit. I don't think that any of these defendants is a criminal at heart. They made a very serious mistake, there is no question about that. That is the first observation I wish to make. They probably have suffered more since this exposure than the average criminal, who is a real criminal at heart, suffers from a term in confinement. We do not need to reform these men.

They had only been at this for years, and yet they did not need reformation.

The second object of punishment is to deter others from doing the same thing. I don't think that the purpose of the court ought to be to whitewash anyone, or extend any maudlin sympathy to anyone who comes in on a plea like this, when he knows the consequences of his act, and realizes what the consequences might be if he were detected to deter others. How far must we go with these defendants to deter others?

That was the weighty question before the judicial mind at this point. Now let us see how Judge Slick settled this question, and if his decision encouraged others to do such things as these fellows were doing.

I am not consciously going to be affected by the hue and cry from the public or the press, or any criticism that may be directed to this court or anyone connected with this proceeding because of the severity or the lack of severity of any punishment. I am not consciously going to be affected by that at all. We must, of course, think of the eternal fitness of things, and the deterrent effect or the lack of deterrent effect if the men who do these things go scot free. * * *

I think the next most culpable man is your client Mr. Hickam, Mr. Johnson, the general manager of all of these plants. He must have known that something was going on in these plants that was wrong; and I am aided in my conclusion there by his plea of guilty. Mr. Johnson said he was guilty by his plea.

Now, you may argue, what was the use for Mr. Johnson to make any other plea? The Anaconda Co. had all of the resources to defend him, and the Anaconda Co. is back of his defense. The Government is on one side, that is true, but the Anaconda Co. is not a weakling, and Mr. Johnson is their general manager. Therefore, my conclusion is that I think your client is the next in culpability. He is high in the councils of this company; he was manager of this company for years, and he must have known what was going on. He may have considered it foolish to make all of these tests, but he must have known that the contract required it, and he violated the contract. * * *

In other words, I take these defendants as they are named in the indictment. I think the worst offenders are at the top. * * *

After the Government's recommendation of maximum fine and imprisonment, the court stated as follows——

Mr. HILL. Was there a specific recommendation for a prison sentence on the part of the Government?

Mr. BONE. Yes. I am coming to that.

I have told you, Mr. Campbell, when your recommendation is on the side of leniency I follow it, because I feel that the district attorney, knowing the case, if he concedes anything to a defendant, the court, of course, should be willing to give the defendant the benefit of that concession. However, I have told you many times that I do not expect to follow the recommendations of the district attorney's office when he comes to the imposition of punishment. * * *

Mr. Campbell, I appreciate your recommendation. I know that you have given this some thought, as you should, no doubt with the anticipation of such an inquiry, but I am wondering whether this court is called upon, and whether the necessities of the case require a prison sentence; I mean, the serving of a prison sentence. I think these men should receive a sentence, but I am not so sure that we are going to gain anything by putting Mr. Johnson and Mr. Hart in jail. * * *

Now, Mr. Galvin read to me yesterday a record of this company, I mean of the business of the company, immediately following this exposure, and there was a considerable interruption of business there, of flow of business, of the production; it was interrupted, disorganized.

Now, should we do that again or should we put it up to Mr. Hart to go back there and produce? In other words, is it necessary, does justice demand, that Mr. Hart be taken out of production and put in jail, and disorganize the industry, or wouldn't we be accomplishing the same thing by putting him on probation and telling him to go back and work tomorrow and continue to produce, say to him, "Mr. Hart, we are going to watch you and see that you do produce," rather than putting him in jail? What good will that do a man like that, who is not criminally minded, who has not a criminal heart; what good is it going to do?

You cannot reform him. I think he is reformed now; I think you have already reformed him. I think this indictment and this exposure has reformed all of these men.

Parenthetically, let me say that if that weird theory of law be correct, all it is necessary to do is to thoroughly publicize the acts of a rape fiend, and that would reform him. He would not have to be put in jail. This court has made some magnificent contributions to law and to the whole system of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence. Now, back to the judge.

Now, the deterrent effect on others is one thing for the court to consider. Have you some answer to that?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, Your Honor.

Mr. Campbell was the Government's attorney.

The COURT. You seem to be anxious to get on your feet.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thought the court was interrogating me. I should like to answer the court's question, if you desire me to answer it.

I should say this, that it is my position that anyone in the status of Johnson or Hart who participated in a fraud of the magnitude and the extent of this, over the period of years that these two men participated in it, according to the evidence in this case, should serve some sentence.

The COURT. Well, now——

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like to say further——

The COURT. You have not answered the question why. Is it because they deserve it or is it because you think they should be reformed, or is it because you think there should be some deterrent effect upon society?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think two things, Your Honor; I think they may deserve it, and I think it would be a deterrency on others who might be thinking as they did think * * *.

The COURT. Let's take Mr. Hart, for instance. Should we send him to jail and take him out of production for a year, or should we give him a year and a day and suspend the sentence and tell him to go back to Marion and go to work under probation and produce? Now, what is the answer, what will do the most good?

Now, I think you will agree with me—we are not picking on Mr. Hart; we just mention his name; Mr. Galvin is right here watching—I think you will agree with me that Mr. Hart is not of the criminal type to start with; he is not a man who would rob a bank or steal an automobile and take it across the State line, or use the mails to defraud. He did, I think, participate, or he admits his guilt in participating, in this avoidance.

Senators, that is a hell of a way to characterize the deliberate production of faulty cable which might cost the lives of thousands of boys if they attempted to use it on a battlefield. The judge refers to this offense as an "avoidance." A nice word for a terrible act.

Now, back to the court.

Now, I am going to fine Mr. Hart a substantial amount; I am going to give him a sentence. The question arises in my mind whether I should send him to jail or back to the Marion plant to go to work in the morning.

How will the ends of justice be any better met than by requiring him to produce? What do you think about that, Mr. Coon?

Mr. COON:—

Mr. Coon is from the Attorney General's office in Washington, D. C.—

Mr. COON. My thought is, Your Honor, that the nature of this offense requires punishment, as we have recommended.

Now, from a deterrent effect, since you ask me, I place my thought upon that ground. The Government is presently engaged in many millions of dollars of contracts. The

Government's contracts require material of a certain quality. This company, these men, along with every other company so engaged, must make that material up to that quality. Of course, the crime occurring at this time, the material that they were making is of importance, but the deterrent effect, I think, Your Honor, is my sole thought about the reason for imprisonment in the case. * * *

The COURT. Well, let's see about the deterrent effect. Take a man in some other part of the country in about such a position as Mr. Hart is in this case. Don't you think the publicity given to this, the infliction of the trial, the indictment, and the assessment of a reasonably heavy fine, would have the practical effect of deterring others from falling into this error, as Mr. Hart did?

Mr. COON. If Your Honor please, by deterrent effect I mean that if anyone else should determine that he can sell the Government inferior material by avoiding tests of specifications in our contract, if these men were imprisoned, as the Government recommends in this instance, then that next man running a plant will be aware that if he adopts that attitude and does to that extent that he would have to go to jail. * * *

The COURT. Of course, I am not responsible for the laws of the United States. I am only here to enforce them when they come before me. Congress in its wisdom has substituted a plan which we call probation, with the old idea of punishing a defendant for a first offense, who is not of the criminal type, who does not need to be removed from society.

Again I pause in the reading to say that this kind of funny business went back over several years. Yet the court refers to punishing them for a "first offense." The court continues:

I have always been a great believer in that system of probation. There isn't any doubt in my mind but what Mr. Kunkle and Mr. Carpenter, perhaps Mr. Bishop, are entitled to the benefit of that law. The only thing I am debating is whether Mr. Hart and Mr. Johnson are.

Mr. Johnson was making $22,000 a year. He is a pretty important man to this company. I don't know why, whether he can be replaced or not without some difficulty, and it would not be a heavy punishment for him to pay a fine. I could even conceive that the company might pay his fine; I don't know about that. It is none of my business. But I think that a fine should be paid by someone, either by him or by the company.

The judge is not going to allow these boys to get off. He is going to chide them in some way. They have finally come to judgment.

Mr. KILGORE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I am wondering whether by any means the fine could be charged in as a part of the operating costs below the fixed fee charged in the manufacture of this cable.

Mr. BONE. I hope the Treasury Department will watch this very oblique operation and ascertain whether these men add these fines to operating overhead and seek credit in that amount in making out their tax returns. It would be only in keeping with the rest of this cockeyed operation.

Mr. KILGORE. Frankly, it would be about the only thing that is not included in the operating charges inserted under the fixed fee.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. While the court was considering the various types of punishment which might be inflicted upon these defendants, does the record show any suggestion that the defendants might be smitten lightly on the wrist by the index finger of the marshal?

Mr. BONE. The delicate judicial stroke on the wrist will come in just a moment.

Mr. KILGORE. Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. BONE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Taking up the matter of punishment—and this question is seriously put—I think I should call the Senator's attention to a peculiar situation. The furnishing of defective steel by the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Co. in this war is paralleled by an actual report from the House of Representatives in the Spanish-American War showing that the Carnegie Steel Co., the ancestor of Carnegie-Illinois, "got away" with the same thing.

Mr. BONE. I recall the case, which arose many years ago. I think it involved defective armor plate.

The court continued:

Now, the only thing I am debating is whether or not he should be sent to jail—

He is now talking about Mr. Johnson—

and I am wondering what good I am going to do society by sending him to jail. The only possibility is that suggested by Mr. Coon, that it might deter some others engaged in similar industry from attempting to evade tests or presenting false claims. I am not very strong in my belief that that would be very much of a deterrent, Mr. Coon. If after all this publicity that has been given to this case any man thinks he can get by and gets caught, he certainly would not deserve very much consideration, because you certainly have—I don't say you—the press—let's blame the press if we have to blame somebody. There has certainly been plenty of publicity given this case.

It may be that I am just a little inclined to lean backward here. I don't want to have it thought that I am influenced in any way by that publicity, by that possible criticism that might come from a show of leniency.

I know how the public feels. You go out on the street, I imagine, and ask the public how they feel about men of this kind, and they say they ought to have the limit. The trouble is, they don't know the facts. They think of our war effort; their emotion is patriotic rather than the administration of mere justice.

Some parent might think of a dead boy on Guadalcanal who might have died because an Anaconda cable did not function. It might make him want to take one of these Anaconda boys in his two strong white hands and do something to him. American fathers and mothers still love their boys very deeply.

The judge continued:

I know this is a serious matter, serious to the Government. The Government has succeeded in every instance in this case. They have indicted the company and the five individuals, and after great work these defendants have all admitted their guilt.

DISCOUNT FOR CASH

I do not know whether that is to be classified as a discount for cash, if the fine is to be paid forthwith. I am sure the lawyers listening to me are going to enjoy this, because it is injecting a great many new ideas into the theories of law we cherish. I continue reading from the judge's remarks:

Ordinarily we give some consideration for that. Some of these defendants might have gone to trial and in a protracted trial, due to the energies of their counsel, they might have raised a doubt in the minds of a jury and been acquitted, at heavy expense.

Now, I am not going over to the side of the defendants, but I am just trying to get over to your department, to you—and you are the only one I am thinking about, as the district attorney—my thought in this matter.

Mr. Coon, you say that the nature of this offense demands a term in prison in your opinion?

Mr. COON. Yes, your honor.

The COURT. Well, that really is punishing the individual, isn't it? It is really punishment rather than a deterrent. I don't quite agree with you that a jail sentence is necessarily attached to a fine to have a deterrent effect, and I am conscious of the fact that you are an advocate in this case, with all due respect to your wonderful personality and your ability, and Mr. Campbell's also, still I can't forget, just like Mr. Galvin, that you are an advocate, and perhaps if you were to exchange places with me you might view it perhaps in just a little different light. * * *

Well, gentlemen, I really mean what I say when I am faced with that point, and I don't know just exactly what I ought to do. I feel that the Government has performed wonderful work here; I feel that the war effort to a great extent depends on men of this kind. I feel that the prosecution of this case will have a deterrent effect on every manufacturer.

That is a sort of judicial slap that will have a deterrent effect on every manufacturer. The court does not make distinctions. The word had better be passed along that this court admonishes that this decision to fine and not imprison will have a deterrent effect on all manufacturers. Let them all be warned:

You don't go too far; you don't want to scare them so that they can't produce. You want them to comply reasonably with the specifications.

That is a new idea.

I think I will assess a fine against the Anaconda Co. of $10,000 and the costs of this proceeding.

I will assess a fine against Mr. Johnson of $10,000. If the Anaconda Co. pays the costs, Mr. Johnson will not be charged with any costs.

I will assess a fine against Mr. Hart of $10,000.

I will fine Mr. Carpenter $500, Mr. Bishop $500, and Mr. Kunkle $100.

I will give Mr. Johnson, in addition to his fine, 2 years; Mr. Hart, 18 months; Mr. Bishop, 1 year and 1 day; Mr. Carpenter, no time; and Mr. Kunkle, no time.

If these gentlemen want suspension of sentence and probation, it will be granted upon the payment of their fines; that is, it is contingent upon the payment of their fines.

Mr. President, I have taken the liberty of quoting the honorable judge who presided over this court at Fort Wayne. His view is that sending these defendants to jail would not be much of a deterrent to others who might be tempted to do likewise. If all courts adopted this theory of administering the law, it would bring undiluted joy to the hearts of prospective criminals who could escape imprisonment by the mere process of

paying a small fine. It will come as rather a rude shock to prosecuting officials all over the country to learn that any form of imprisonment is not a deterrent to crime. It is to be hoped that the Federal judicial district, known as the northern district of Indiana, Fort Wayne division, will not hereafter become a haven for the criminally disposed, although the temptation to migrate to that sanctuary will certainly be very great.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Did the able Senator from Washington state in some other part of his address, which, unfortunately I may have missed, the amount of money which the company gained through the perpetration of this fraud?

Mr. BONE. My recollection is that the Government is trying to recover $5,000,000. According to my recollection the company did $20,000,000 worth of work at the Marion plant.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Has the Government instituted action to recover from the company for the damage suffered?

Mr. BONE. I cannot make a definite statement with regard to that. I think the Government intends to pursue a civil action.

The judge had some misgivings while he was imposing these fines, for he indicated that he knew how the public felt, but that it was his opinion that the public did not know the facts, which is one very excellent reason why they should be given the facts, and that is why they are being set out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The court was of the view that Americans are thinking rather of our war effort, which makes their emotion very patriotic, and that this keeps them from a judicial consideration of the problem wrapped up in the administration of justice. The judge winds up his comment on the action of the defendants by suggesting that they should not be "scared" so that they cannot produce. When one considers what they were "producing," the grim humor of the court is apparent. The court also stated to counsel for the Government that the Government attorneys wanted the defendants to "comply reasonably" with the specifications. When the Government contracts called for certain specified requirements to meet the urgent needs of vital operations, one can only guess what the honorable judge had in his mind when he talked about "reasonable compliance." This is some sort of a new "rule of reason." That sort of reasoning, applied to war material, would produce results which can be easily imagined. It might lose the war for us. The Government wants what it orders, and nothing else. It wants a soldier who will fight and a gun that will throw a shell a certain number of miles. It has a way of compelling compliance with such requirements.

This record would not be complete without a reference to what the Federal Government has succeeded in accomplishing in other cases where some little fellows were involved in injury to Government property. At this point in the RECORD I ask unanimous consent to insert a list of 14 names of men who have been guilty of some form of sabotage. They are all small fry, and what they did was as nothing compared to this willful manipulation of communication wires and electrical cables charged against the Anaconda Co. This list of the charges against the men, and the sentences of imprisonment imposed on them, should be set off against and contrasted with the small fines imposed on this enormously wealthy company and its officials. There are other small fry who have been given sentences for interfering with the war effort by frauds of one kind or another, and they, too, were imprisoned.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Michael N. Etzel, an employee of Martin Aircraft, pleaded guilty to 24 counts of an indictment charging he damaged the cables and tubing of airplanes under construction at Baltimore, Md. He was sentenced to serve 15 years.

Wandell Virgil Skelton was sentenced to a year and a day on each of two counts of an indictment charging him with injuring a roller, valued at $1,000, while employed by the Reynolds Metal Co., at Louisville, Ky. The damage resulted from horseplay on the part of Skelton and others while drinking in the plant on Christmas Eve.

John G. Majus, a ship's carpenter, sawed the steering rod of the steamship *Clamar*, but claimed that he was under the influence of liquor at the time he did the act. He was sentenced at San Francisco, Calif., on March 14, 1942, to serve 3 years in the penitentiary.

Harold B. Crummel threw part of a brick into a machine manufacturing blueprint paper for the United States Army Air Corps. Crummel claimed he was intoxicated at the time. The defendant was sentenced at Grand Rapids, Mich., on March 11, 1942, to serve 8 months in the penitentiary.

Frank J. Russo, on May 20, 1942, at New Haven, Conn., was sentenced to 5 years' imprisonment under an indictment charging injury to national defense premises by inserting a file in the gears of a machine used in the manufacture of machine guns. The reason for his conduct was not determined. It required but 2 hours' work to repair the machine.

Orval Browning and two others were found guilty on June 22, 1942, at Cairo, Ill., the indictment charging that the subjects damaged national defense material by introducing foreign material into the machinery of the Ozark Mineral Co. Each of the defendants was sentenced to a year and a day.

Frederick W. Bilgehouse was sentenced to 3 years' imprisonment at Newark, N. J., on August 19, 1942. He damaged six dies and eight punches used in the manufacture of cables for Navy destroyers, but denied that the damage was intentional.

Leo N. Geller, an employee of the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, damaged three airplanes being manufactured for the United States Navy by roughing the ends of rivets through the use of an improper tool. Geller was sentenced to serve 6 months on October 31, 1942, at San Diego, Calif. Judge Yankwich stated at the time sentence was imposed that he did not believe Geller was essentially a bad man.

Nicholas Buonopane, 23 years old, an employee of the North American Aviation Co., Inc., Inglewood, Calif., cut the wiring on the intercommunication system, severed the wires of the fuel-pressure indicator and also severed the main fuse panel wiring on a B-25-C bomber. He was found guilty of violating title 18, section 82, United States Code, and was sentenced on February 28, 1943, to serve 6 months in the Los Angeles County Jail.

On January 25, 1943, Lewis D'Ambrosia after being found guilty, was sentenced to serve 3 years, the indictment charging the defendant with damaging property being manufactured for the War Department on August 29, 1942, at Chester, Pa. The defendant, a tank washer at the Ford Motor Company, Chester, Pa., damaged an army tank by injecting water into its exhaust pipe. The defendant performed the damage so that "he could go to lunch on time."

Robert W. Schmidt, 20 years of age, an employee of Curtiss-Wright Corporation, St. Louis County, Mo., was sentenced on March 23, 1943, to serve 6 months after having pleaded guilty to an indictment charging four violations of Title 18, section 82, United States Code. The defendant stuck drill bits, which were being used to drill holes, in the wing of an airplane being manufactured for the War Department. The value of the bits was 43 cents each. Juvenile irresponsibility appeared to be the only explanation for the defendant's act.

Oris M. Hardman was sentenced to a year and a day on March 29, 1943, after pleading guilty to an indictment alleging a violation of title 50, section 102, United States Code, in the northern district of West Virginia. Defendant, while under the influence of liquor, destroyed or concealed belts and tools of the Central Machine & Tool Co. which is manufacturing jury struts for Vought-Sikorsky Co. The defendant, a night watchman, did the acts charged because of his dislike for the shop foreman. The defendant's sanity was established prior to sentence.

George Arnold Steele, a 21-year-old welder at the Bethlehem Fairfield Shipyard, did defective welding on ship plates (sling welding) because such welding took less time and increased his earnings. He was found guilty under all three counts of a sabotage indictment at Baltimore, and on April 15, 1943 was sentenced to 18 months. He was adjudged a delinquent child and there was some evidence that he was mentally retarded.

Harvey Lee Thomas, a 21-year-old Navy Department civilian inspector, was charged with violating title 50, section 102, United States Code, in an indictment containing six counts returned at Baltimore, Md. Thomas, following behind company inspectors employed by the Glenn L. Martin Co., "found" conduits bent or broken, attachments loose, etc. It developed that Thomas was responsible for these depredations which had the effect of slowing down production.

Thomas claimed that he found defects in the articles damaged by him and that he accentuated the damage in order to make it more obvious to prevent such material being passed.

Thomas was found guilty after a 3-day trial, and on April 26, 1943, was sentenced to serve 2 years.

John Earnest Johnson and Robert Francis Lapthorn, employees, respectively, in the purchasing departments of prime and sub contractors on cost-plus contracts, were convicted on three counts charging violation of section 338, title 18, United States Code. The indictment charged that these men had collaborated to raise bids on subcontracts and they stood to profit to the extent of $20,000. They were sentenced in Detroit, Mich., on March 1, 1943, to 3½ years imprisonment on each count to run concurrently.

Samuel Byer and Israel Citron, junk dealers, were convicted in Newark, N. J., on May 13, 1943, of a conspiracy to defraud the United States through short-weighing practices in connection with the purchase of scrap metal from the Raritan Arsenal. The defendants paid bribes to Sergeant Lutz who was in charge of sale of salvage and scrap metal at the Raritan Arsenal to short-weigh deliveries to the defendant. The amount of the bribe was $900 and the total extent of the fraud involved was approximately $20,000. Defendant Byer received a sentence of 2 years in the penitentiary and $5,000 fine. Defendant Byer also plead guilty to a substantive count of bribery and was sentenced to a year and a day to run concurrently with the previous sentence. Defendant Citron was sentenced to a year and a day in the penitentiary and fined $7,500.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I content myself by saying that there are some 14 or 16 of them. Fourteen of them are little fellows who were given sentences of imprisonment for doing things of such inconsequential nature, as contrasted to the offenses of the defendants in the Anaconda case, as to bear not even a remote comparison to them.

In crying out against such monstrous perversions of judicial procedure one is tempted, with poor old Lear, to exclaim, "Through tatter'd clothes small vices do appear; robes and furr'd gowns hide all. Plate sin with gold, and the strong lance of justice hurtless breaks; arm it in rags, a pigmy's straw does pierce it."

Let it be understood that the charge against the defendants in the Anaconda case is that they were sordid enough to enrich themslves by endangering the lives of soldiers and sailors and robbing the Government in its hour of peril. In announcing the indictment, Attorney General Biddle had this to say:

This is one of the most reprehensible cases of defrauding the Government and endangering the lives of American soldiers and sailors ever to come to the attention of the Department of Justice. I can conceive of nothing more vicious or treacherous than deliberately supplying our armed forces with defective war material. I am informed that only the alertness of Government inspectors and the promptness with which the War Frauds Unit and the Federal Bureau of Investigation investigated complaints in this case has prevented enormous quantities of wire and cable from being transported to our troops overseas.

The company and its officials were indicted on eight counts. Since they plead guilty to all eight counts, they could have been imprisoned on each count. All of which makes the disposition of the case by the Federal judge all the more astounding.

Upon two occasions I have referred to this peculiar case on the floor of the Senate. As a result a number of people have asked me why the defendants were not indicted for treason. A survey of the decisions of our courts indicates that it is possible that one may be guilty of committing what would otherwise be treasonable acts, although not done with a treasonable intent. It is this element of "intent" to give aid and comfort to the enemy which characterizes the crime of treason. The constitutional provision, section 3 of article III, reads as follows:

Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort. No Person shall be convicted of Treason unless on the Testimony of two Witnesses to the same overt Act, or on Confession in open Court.

The Congress shall have Power to declare the Punishment of Treason, but no Attainder of Treason shall work Corruption of Blood, or Forfeiture except during the Life of the Person attainted.

The Congress of the United States enacted a statute to implement this constitutional provision. The statutory provision reads as follows:

CRIMINAL CODE

SECTION 1. Treason: Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States, levies war against them or adheres to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort within the United States or elsewhere, is guilty of treason.

If anyone reading this description is curious as to what the courts have held to be "giving aid and comfort to the enemy," he might secure a copy of the 1918, 27 Yale Law Journal, pages 331, 343–354, where he will find an interesting discussion.

Because the crime of treason carries a death sentence, the view of the courts has been that unless there is a specific, provable intent to give aid to the enemy, there is no treason. Had the defendants in the Anaconda case been charged with treason, they would have replied to such a complaint by asserting that the Government would have to prove that they had intended to aid and strengthen the enemy. The defendants in this case were gentle souls, and made defective war material for the purpose of making easy money, although the natural consequence of their acts was a willful injury to the United States in the prosecution of the war. The American people, who will pass ultimate moral judgment on the acts described in the indictment against the Anaconda Co., will be the final judges of whether or not the actions of that company and its officials named in the indictment gave aid and comfort to the enemy. If a vital communication cable failed to function on a battlefield, it would be a very brash person who would assert that such a tragedy would not give aid and comfort to the enemy. Certainly it would make the enemy much more comfortable to know that he could shoot our troops to death because they were not getting messages that might have saved their lives. It is probable that thoughtful people who read this record will conclude that it is to the misfortune of the Nation that the constitutional provision leaves no room for constructive treason in that Congress cannot enlarge the constitutional definition of treason.

In considering the moral aspects of this case with its unhappy ending, one thing should never be forgotten by the members of our armed forces and their parents. If an American soldier in a war zone, where battle operations were under way, had manipulated a communication cable, as this company and these defendants did, so that it failed to function, he would be charged with treason and sabotage in the face of the enemy, and he would face a drumhead court martial and later be shot to death by a firing squad of his comrades. I have previously made that assertion on the floor of the Senate in the presence of soldiers. I have also consulted a great many soldiers of high rank, and every one of them agrees with that statement. The cold, hard fact remains that the crime for which an American boy would be shot to death, if committed in a war zone, has, by virtue of the decision of a reputable American court, and a Federal court at that, been considered so trifling an offense that it should be punishable by a pitifully small fine. What invites death for a soldier in a war zone invites a mere slap on the wrist in an American Federal court. The crime is infamous and punishable by death in one place and punishable by a small fine in another. The degree of infamy is not measured by any sort of accepted moral code—this case has made it one of geography. All of the sophistry and specious reasoning in this world will not induce decent people to accept such standards of human conduct.

If the greed of men goes to such lengths that they are willing to endanger the lives of soldiers to enrich themselves, they will find that some day, when this terrible war has come to an end, the people of America will write an iconoclastic thesis against such iniquities in fierce whirlwinds of retribution. The agonizing toll of death and battered and broken bodies calls for swift and ruthless action against men who are so far removed from considerations of decency and patriotism that they carry their souls in their purses and stamp themselves as willing to coin widows' sighs and the tears of Gold Star Mothers into bloodstained profits.

In conclusion, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my statement an editorial from the Southern California Teamster of June 30, 1943, entitled "What Price Death?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT PRICE DEATH?

The decision of Judge Thomas W. Slick in the case of the Anaconda Copper Co. placed the price of a fighting man's death at from $100 to $10,000.

Despite the fact that the company pleaded nolo contendere (no defense), and the overwhelming evidence presented showing that the company not only knew that defective wire and cable was being furnished to both American and allied armies, but that deliberate use was made of devices to fool Government inspectors, a Federal judge handed down suspended sentences and imposed fines ranging from $100 to $10,000 on the grounds that the case "would stop anything of a similar nature."

Estimates of the profit made by Anaconda Wire on the sale of defective wire and cable ran around $5,000,000. Total fines imposed ran around $31,000.

Delving back into copies of the local daily press, we were unable to find editorial comment on this case of outright sabotage. We did come across page 1 items calling for the death of union organizers at sunrise, transfer of workers who have been absent to the battle front, shooting en masse of workers who strike, and so on ad infinitum.

We did locate some small items about steel companies, ammunition firms, optical

companies, and others engaged in the production of war materials who were indicted by the Antitrust Division of the Government, and the indictments quashed in order not to "prevent interruption of the war effort."

We also found quite a story about a union man, who was a welder, being sentenced to 22 months in jail for faulty work.

We now wonder whether the strong decision handed down by Judge Slick was to impress the Nation with the severity of penalty for sabotage or whether it has set a definite price on the death of our fighting men.

If it was to set a price on death, we think it was a high price judged by the standards of some of our big industries; or if it was to impress the Nation and prevent further cases of big business sabotage, we highly doubt whether any other big business is going to risk $31,000 in fines and 1 year suspended sentences for a meager $5,000,000.

Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to Senators who have permitted me to continue and have given such close attention to my remarks.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT AND ATTORNEY, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, and Members of the Senate, we have just listened to an extended and rather vicious charge against the United States court in the northern district of Indiana. After these vicious charges, I should feel remiss did I not for 5 or 10 minutes give to the Members of the Senate somewhat of a picture of the situation in the northern district of Indiana.

According to the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] there are three personalities or agencies of the Government under some suspicion: First, the F. B. I.; second, perhaps the office of United States attorney in the northern district of Indiana; and third, the judge of that court, Judge Thomas Slick. The United States attorney's office happens to be filled by an appointee or nominee of mine, Mr. Alexander Campbell, together with his assistants, Mr. Swygert and Mr. Keating. I consider the United States attorney's office for the northern district of Indiana the outstanding office of that character throughout the country. Alexander Campbell is a fearless, competent, and successful prosecutor. During the last 2 or 3 years many important cases have been sent to the northern district of Indiana for trial, and he has invariably succeeded in winning those cases.

I have no interest in the prosecutions there. I have heard more today from the Senator from Washington than I have ever heard before or known or will know again about the facts in this particular case. I have an inflexible rule to keep my hands off any pending prosecution in the district courts of Indiana or any proposed or prospective indictment. I have done so in this case; but I cannot refrain from paying a tribute to Alexander Campbell, who is one of the greatest prosecutors of those who occupy the office of United States district attorney in the United States of America.

In his closing argument, Mr. Campbell said:

Well, one of the lawyers said something about the Federal Bureau of Investigation, about the Department of Justice. We need no defense in this or any other case. The policy of my office is so clearly and distinctly known to Your Honor that it needs no defense in this court, but I want to say about the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that they are the greatest law-enforcement agency in the world. It was the Federal Bureau of Investigation who, during peacetime—yes, in this very district and in this very court, if you please—drove the gangsters from the district and from the land; they drove the bank robbers out, and there has not been a serious kidnaping since the Federal Bureau of Investigation has developed into the outstanding organization that it now is. To the Federal Bureau of Investigation also has been delegated the responsibility to investigate war frauds, and they are applying to those investigations the same fine technique, the same brilliant determination, that rid the Nation of major crimes after prohibition.

In that simple eulogy of the F. B. I., I wish wholeheartedly to join. Under the magnificent direction of J. Edgar Hoover, to me the F. B. I. is the outstanding, most wholesome, and most effective agency of the Government in the detection, prosecution, and prevention of crime. So much for the F. B. I.

Alexander Campbell, the United States attorney, in his closing plea to the court in the Anaconda case, said this:

The evidence in this case, Your Honor, presents the most grievous fraud in the history of the Nation. I say to Your Honor, in making disposition of this case, by your decision, say to them, and the rest of their kind, if there be any more war frauders, you shall not pass this way again.

Then, when asked for suggestions as to the sentences, Mr. Campbell said:

I have a recommendation. In this case the Government recommends for the defendant, Anaconda Corporation, maximum fine and costs.

Of course, that was all that could be imposed on the corporation.

For the defendant, Johnson, maximum fine and imprisonment.

Which meant 10 years.

For the defendant, Hart, maximum fine and imprisonment.

Ten more years.

For the defendant, Bishop, maximum fine and imprisonment.

For the defendant, Carpenter, fine and sentence.

For the defendant, Kunkle, fine and sentence.

I do not believe the senior Senator from Washington intended to cast any aspersions or raise any doubts as to the ability and integrity of the United States attorney's office in the northern district of Indiana.

Mr. BONE. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Certainly.

Mr. BONE. I had to step out of the Chamber and did not hear all the Senator said, but I am rather curious about what he has just stated. I quoted Mr. Campbell at some length in my statement, and as I recall the record, Mr. Campbell urged imprisonment. I think he did all he could in the case, so far as I can tell from the record. Was it the Senator's view that I had animadverted upon him?

Mr. VAN NUYS. No.

Mr. BONE. I think he did all he could as United States district attorney to put these men in the penitentiary, where they belong.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Judge Slick has been on the Federal bench in the northern district of Indiana for 28 years. He is 74 years of age, beyond the age of retirement. Prior to assuming the bench, he was prosecuting attorney for St. Joseph County, where South Bend is located, and also city attorney for years of the city of South Bend.

While of opposite political faith from me, I have been a friend of Judge Slick for many years. During all these years, from personal acquaintanceship and experience, I know him to be a high standing, efficient jurist, as he was an efficient and able prosecutor and city attorney. No one has ever questioned his integrity or his competency as a practicing attorney and as a distinguished jurist.

I am not defending Judge Slick's judgment in this case, but I am imploring the Members of the Senate and the press to refrain from casting even the shadow of a doubt upon the integrity, honesty, and patriotism of Tom Slick, who is my political opponent.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I rise for just a moment to endorse sincerely and wholeheartedly the statements just made by my colleague the able senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS].

I am not sufficiently versed in the facts surrounding the case involving the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co. which has just been discussed by the Senator from Washington to be able to comment at length on it or to criticize any of the statements made by the Senator, with reference to it. I do know that the administration of Mr. Alexander Campbell as district attorney for the northern district of Indiana has been of a very high order. I also know that the character, the reputation, and the judicial record of the Honorable Thomas W. Slick, judge of the United States District Court of the Northern District of Indiana, are of the very highest order. No man in Indiana is held in higher esteem.

Whatever may have been the reasoning on which he based this judgment, I do insist that it was made upon the basis of integrity, of patriotism, and the highest order of legal attainments which have consistently characterized his record of more than a quarter of a century. I, too, would not want any impression to be gained by any of my colleagues or by any members of the press that there might have been any lack of integrity, of patriotism, or of devotion to our Government in the actions of Mr. Campbell and Judge Slick in this case.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I have no desire to speak a second time on the issues I presented to the Senate. I content myself with saying to my colleagues who are lawyers, and to those who understand legal maxims, that the facts I presented to them today about this mournful case in Indiana come squarely within that very ancient rule of law, Res ipsa loquitur, which in ordinary English means, "The thing speaks for itself."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 8 and 9 to the bill and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which its requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 27 to the bill, and that the House adhered to its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 24, 25, and 26 to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2798) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House still further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 33 and 34 to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 986. An act to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct;

H. R. 997. An act to establish in the Medical Department of the Army a corps to be known as the Pharmacy Corps;

H. R. 1004. An act to relieve newspapers and periodical publications which have voluntarily suspended publication for the duration of the war from payment of second-class application fees upon resumption of publication;

H. R. 1334. An act for the relief of J. Frank Meador;

H. R. 2106. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Sir William Blackstone, the work of the late Paul W. Bartlett, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2481. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2719. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

During Mr. BONE's speech,

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to submit a conference report?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I present the conference report on the second deficiency appropriations bill and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The report will be read.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 28, 29, 30, and 31.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, and 61; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 5 of said amendment strike out the figure "$75,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$50,000,000", and in line 8 strike out "$3,375,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 5 of said amendment strike out the figure "$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$100,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 6 of said amendment, after the word "expended" and before the comma, insert the following: "and to be allocated to the Intracoastal Waterway from the vicinity of Apalachee Bay to Corpus Christi, Texas"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 8, 9, 24, 25, 26, and 27.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3030, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
July 7, 1943.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 8 to the bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

Before the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

"The eighth proviso in the paragraph under the caption 'Office of Price Administration,' contained in the National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1944, shall not take effect until August 16, 1943";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 9 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

"National Youth Administration: For an additional amount for the National Youth Administration in the performance of its functions from July 1, 1943, to the date of enactment of the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1944, and thereafter for the liquidation of such Administration, including not to exceed $2,000 for printing and binding, not to exceed $1,500,000 from the unexpended balance of the appropriations for the National Youth Administration in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1943, to be added to and merged with the funds made available for the liquidation of the National Youth Administration by such Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1944; and of such merged amount not less than $1,487,000 shall be allocated and set apart to be used exclusively for payment of accumulated and accrued leave of employees: *Provided*, That all real and personal property of the National Youth Administration is hereby declared surplus, and all equipment, materials, and supplies shall be assembled, inventoried, and turned over to the Director of Procurement, Treasury Department, under Executive Order 9235, by the Administrator of the National Youth Administration as expeditiously as possible, and all real property shall be disposed of by the Commissioner of Public Buildings in accordance with the act of August 27, 1935 (40 U. S. C. 304 (a) and 304 (b)): *Provided further*, That under commitment to return such property to the United States at borrower's expense, any real or personal property of the National Youth Administration in use on June 30, 1943, by any State or other public vocational education authority may continue to be so used during the period of the present war and for not to exceed 6 months after the termination thereof, without compensation, but in no event beyond the date such property ceases to be used for vocational education purposes: *Provided further*, That during such

period, the Director of Procurement, in the case of personal property, and the Commissioner of Public Buildings, in the case of real property, upon certificate of the United States Commissioner of Education that such property is to be used for vocational education and training, may loan, without compensation, to any State or other public vocational education authority, if applied for within 90 days after the date of enactment of this act, any real or personal property of the National Youth Administration not required by any other Federal agency or otherwise loaned under the authority of this paragraph, if such borrower agrees, in the case of personal property, to pay all expenses incident to obtaining and returning such property."

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 27 to said bill; and

That the House adhere to its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 24, 25, and 26 to said bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8 and 9. Amendment numbered 9 is the War Manpower Commission amendment. It is the amendment which disposes of the National Youth Administration.

A mistake was made made in the amendment by the conference committee, and I ask that it be sent back for correction. The purpose for sending back the amendment is largely to correct a mistake made in it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments numbered 8, 9, 24, 25, 26, and 27; ask a further conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

Mr. President, I wish to explain what those amendments are. Amendment numbered 19 deals with the liquidation of the N. Y. A. Another amendment is that of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] providing for relief to farmers who suffered damage because of recent floods in the States of Iowa, Kansas, and Missouri. The last amendment is the one providing for the establishment of landing areas, on which a great deal of work has been done, but which have not been completed.

The House disagrees with the Senate with respect to its amendments, and I ask the Senate to send them back to conference to see if the conferees cannot work out an agreement.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator be kind enough to explain what provision is made with respect to liquidation of the N. Y. A.? How much money is provided for the purpose, and what disposition is to be made of the equipment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to read the provision. It is as follows:

National Youth Administration: For an additional amount for the National Youth Administration in the performance of its functions from July 1, 1943, to the date of enactment of the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1944, and thereafter for the liquidation of such Administration, including not to exceed $2,000 for printing and binding, not to exceed $1,500,000 from the unexpended balance of the appropriations for the National Youth Administration in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1943, to be addedto and merged with the funds made available for the liquidation of the National Youth Administration by such Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1944; and of such merged amount not less than $1,487,000 shall be allocated and set apart to be used exclusively for payment of accumulated and accrued leave of employees.

It was found that there are a very large number of employees in this activity of the Government who have leave accrued, and of course that is an obligation of the Government which must be taken care of. That is why the additional $1,487,000 was asked.

I proceed to read from the report:

Provided, That all real and personal property of the National Youth Administration is hereby declared surplus——

That has to be done in order to utilize this material.

Provided, That all real and personal property of the National Youth Administration is hereby declared surplus, and all equipment, materials, and supplies shall be assembled, inventoried, and turned over to the Director of Procurement, Treasury Department, under Executive Order 9235 by the Administrator of the National Youth Administration as expeditiously as possible, and all real property shall be disposed of by the Commissioner of Public Buildings in accordance with the act of August 27, 1935 (40 U. S. C. 304 (a) and 304 (b)): *Provided further*, That, under commitment to return such property to the United States at borrower's expense, any real or personal property of the National Youth Administration in use on June 30, 1943, by any State or other public vocational educational authority may continue to be so used during the period of the present war and for not to exceed 6 months after the termination thereof, without compensation, but in no event beyond the date such property ceases to be used for vocational educational purposes: *Provided further*, That during such period the Director of Procurement, in the case of personal property, and the Commissioner of Public Buildings, in the case of real property, upon certificate of the United States Commissioner of Education that such property is to be used for vocational education and training, may loan without compensation to any State or other public vocational educational authority, if applied to within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this act, any real or personal property of the National Youth Administration not required by any other Federal agency or otherwise loaned under the authority of this paragraph if such borrower agrees, in the case of personal property, to pay all expenses incident to obtaining and returning such property.

Mr. President, it will be noted that the words "not required by any other Federal agency" are used. Complaint has been made by some Senators and by at least one Representative, but after the bill passed the House, that the words "not required by any other Federal agency" would permit the property to be acquired by, let us say, the lend-lease organization, and shipped abroad. It was never the purpose of anyone that that should occur; and that part of the provision will have to be worked on.

With that explanation, I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I think the provision from which the Senator last read is a very salutary one. Am I to understand that it carries the power for the Commissioner who, under the provision, is charged with custody of the real estate, to turn over the real estate as well as the personal property to State vocational departments?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; it can be turned over by way of a loan without compensation.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to ask a further question, Mr. President.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. PEPPER. Is any provision anywhere contained in the bill, or is it contemplated that provision might be made separately, whereby the State vocational authorities might obtain additional funds for use in connection with the equipment?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; not at all. All of it would be turned over to the States or the vocational boards of the counties.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator whether there is any question that "public educational vocational authority" would mean the various public schools, whether they be in the cities, the counties, or the townships.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think not. The Senator called attention to that point this morning. I certainly will present it to the conference to see whether that view is the correct one. Of course, the language should mean that. If it does not, I hope we may straighten that out in conference.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I had in mind, that the provision should include the various school districts and school boards, so that there would be no question that if they desired to carry on vocational education they could apply, under the act, and could obtain the property. I know there is such a desire in Michigan.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am quite sure that could be done. However, if there is any question we shall undertake to remove the question in the further conference. That is one of the reasons why I am asking that the bill be sent to a further conference.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt, but I understood the presentation of the conference report would take only a moment. I shall require only about 5 minutes more in order to complete my remarks. Under the circumstances, I wish to complete my remarks, and then the Senate can resume the consideration of the report.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has no right to object. The

Senator from Tennessee has made a motion which is now pending and is not subject to objection.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I desire to continue my remarks, if possible. I will not permit long debate and colloquy in my time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator has been very kind in yielding. The completion of consideration of the conference report will not take more than a minute or two longer.

Mr. BONE. I have been standing and waiting. I desire to complete my remarks. Then the remainder of the afternoon will be available for further consideration of the report or any other matters.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, is the conference report subject to discussion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. PEPPER. Then I should like to make a comment.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I object to further discussion, and ask that I be permitted to complete my remarks. I only need 5 minutes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well; if the Senator desires to hold up a conference report and further reports of conference committees, he will have to take the responsibility for doing so.

Mr. BONE. I am willing to accept it. I shall need only 5 minutes more to complete my remarks. The Senator from Tennessee told me that consideration of the conference report would require only a minute of time. That is why I yielded.

I will take the responsibility, to which the Senator refers, for proceeding now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the colloquy which has ensued appear following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

After the conclusion of Mr. BONE'S speech and the remarks of Mr. VAN NUYS and Mr. WILLIS, which were transposed to that point,

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] that the Senate further insist on its amendments numbered 8, 9, 24, 25, 26, and 27 to House bill 3030, request a further conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Tennessee, I understand that the able Senator is proposing that the N. Y. A. amendment go back to conference?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. PEPPER. If it is a fact, as I belive it to be—because I have consulted the Department of Education of the United States as well as the National Youth Administration—that there is no duplication of the school aid which the N. Y. A. was giving to boys and girls in schools and colleges I ask the consideration of the able Senator to a suggestion. In Florida 1,633 boys and girls were receiving the benefit of N. Y. A. aid with which to go to high school and college. They had an opportunity to do some work while they were attending school or college, which made it possible for them to continue. I am sure that nearly all those boys and girls will have to go home or cease their education unless they can find some opportunities to work. They have been enjoying such opportunities under the N. Y. A.

I think the able Senator has worked out a very salutary arrangement for turning over the N. Y. A. vocational training equipment to the State departments of education. If there has been duplication in vocational activities, it can be eliminated; but I am sure that unless the conferees can make some provision for continuation, under the Commissioner of Education of the United States, for example, of the student-aid activities, boys and girls all over America will be sent home and cut off from an opportunity to help work their way through school.

I wish to ask the able Senator if he will not verify what I say. I went to the telephone from the floor of the Senate after the able Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and I had discussed this matter the other day. I called the office of the Commissioner of Education. I asked whether any other agency was duplicating the student-aid program of the N. Y. A. and was told that the answer was definitely "No."

That information is from the Office of the Commissioner of Education. If the able Senator finds that to be true, I am sure he does not want to cut those boys and girls off from an opportunity to help work their way through school. Will he not investigate and find out if I am correct, and if I am correct, have the N. Y. A. fund which has been used for that purpose transferred to the Office of the Commissioner of Education, so that these worthy boys and girls may continue to help work their way through school?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am advised that that would be legislation on an appropriation bill, and the conferees could not act on it. That is my advice. I will look into the matter. That is all I can say. We must conform to the rules of the Senate so far as making additions to an appropriation bill is concerned.

Mr. PEPPER. Would it not be possible to find out from the N. Y. A. what sum of money has been used, and what amount was set up for this purpose during the coming fiscal year, and put it in the appropriation bill for the Commissioner of Education, for student aid? Then the Commissioner of Education could continue these cases if he should so desire.

Mr. McKELLAR. That would be to continue the N. Y. A. The N. Y. A. was abolished the other day by act of Congress. The only way the Senator could accomplish that purpose would be for him to introduce an independent measure. I am inclined to think that I would favor an independent measure of that kind; but it would have to be an independent measure. I am advised that it could not be done in this bill.

Mr. PEPPER. I would not question the parliamentary wisdom of the able Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not sure.

Mr. PEPPER. It seems to me it could be handled in the same way we are handling the equipment. We are giving the Procurement Office of the Treasury Department the power to allocate the equipment to State departments of education. Why could we not put in an item of appropriation to the Commissioner of Education for student aid, in the same amount which has been going to the N. Y. A.? In that way we would effectively transfer the activity to the Commissioner of Education.

Mr. McKELLAR. That might have been possible on the consideration of the repeal of the N. Y. A.; but, as the Senator will remember, the N. Y. A. was stricken out and ordered to be liquidated.

Mr. PEPPER. May I suggest to the Senator another way in which it might be done?

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no law at all for the N. Y. A. The N. Y. A. was one of the mushroom growths which came into being without a law, merely through an appropriation. Therefore, so I am advised, there would be no law for it.

Mr. PEPPER. What would the Senator think of this suggestion, if I may ask him to consider it: Why not add enough funds to the liquidation fund provided for N. Y. A. to carry on student aid for this fiscal year?

Mr. McKELLAR. That would not be honest legislation.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I should like to say just a word to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and his colleagues associated in this conference.

I happen to be one of those who regret exceedingly that the N. Y. A. activities are to be terminated. I assume that the liquidation is now certain. I am extremely anxious that in the process of liquidation whatever is agreed to shall contain a provision under which either the N. Y. A. or the Procurement Division of the Treasury, or some other appropriate office of the Federal Government, may make available to the States and to the vocational boards of the States, and possibly to other political units within the States, the vast number of machines, machinery, equipment, tools, and appliances heretofore used by the N. Y. A., so that vocational training may be carried on within the States, and the equipment may make full contribution thereto. I hope the Senator and his colleagues will do everything within their power to assure that objective being realized.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, that is the exact purpose of this legislation.

Mr. PEPPER. Is not the Senator afraid that if no additional funds are allocated to the State educational departments they will not have the money with which to operate the equipment for training purposes?

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot advise the Senator on that point. The messages which I have received concerning the matter are to the effect that the various State departments are very anxious to obtain the equipment and are perfectly willing to assume the responsibility for the work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

AUTHORITY TO SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM TO SUBMIT REPORTS ON AVIATION

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program be permitted to file with the Secretary of the Senate and have printed reports during the adjournment of the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

STABILIZATION OF CURRENCIES AND EXCHANGE VALUES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, looking to the post-war period, I do not believe anything is more important in connection with the continuation of our form of government, or more important to the people of the country than the question of how sound and how stable will be our currency and our Treasury at the conclusion of the war and thereafter. Sometime between now and the conclusion of the war—and, indeed, after its conclusion—the nations of the world will be looking to this country to take leadership in stabilizing the currencies of the countries of the world. Only this morning a public official called the attention of the Special Silver Committee of the Senate to the question of stabilization of currencies here and abroad.

With those things in mind, Mr. President, I submit a resolution which I hope may be read and referred to the proper committee.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 174) was read and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of nine Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a comprehensive study of proposals designed to stabilize currencies and their exchange value, including proposals for substituting any type of "credits" for gold in settlement of international balances, for establishment of a system of bimetallism, and any other proposal involving international agreement with a view to facilitating international exchange and promoting international trade. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purpose of this investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES IN EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 33 and 34 to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 2968, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
UNITED STATES,
July 7, 1943.

Resolved, That the House still further insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 33 and 34 to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, one of the Senate amendments provides for confirmation by the Senate of certain officers in various Government agencies. The other day, by a vote of nearly 2 to 1, the Senate voted to sustain that amendment. The House voted on the question today. I am advised that there was some misapprehension on the part of one delegation.

I move that the Senate further insist on its amendments numbered 33 and 34, request a further conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2798) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "$27,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

On page 1 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in line 8 of said amendment, after the word "highways", strike out "on the system of Federal highways, and secondary or feeder roads", and insert the following words: "of States or their subdivisions".

On page 2 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in line 24, strike out the figures, "$20,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof the figures, "$10,000,000".

On page 4 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in line 3, after the word, "section.", add the following: *"Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall apply only during the continuance of the emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, and for a period of one year thereafter."

On page 4 of the Senate engrossed amendment in line 12, after the word, "bridges" insert a "comma" and the following words: "including interstate toll bridges,".

On page 6 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in line 16, after the word "official", strike out all of the remainder of line 16 and all of line 17, and insert a "comma", and add the following: "unless the War Production Board shall certify that the use of critical material for additional highway construction would impede the conduct of the war."

And the Senate agree to the same.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
J. G. SCRUGHAM,
CLYDE M. REED,
WILLIAM LANGER,
C. D. BUCK,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. W. ROBINSON,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
JAMES W. MOTT,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the report be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senate and House conferees have reached a complete agreement upon the road bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, during consideration of this measure on the floor of the Senate I offered an amendment by which the amount of the fund available for the construction of access roads, as reported by the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, was increased by $10,000,000. Provision was made that this should be used for the construction of access roads to sources of raw material, including petroleum. The reference to petroleum

has been stricken out of the bill in conference; but the amount of the appropriation or the sum available carried in the conference report is greater than that which was reported by the committee. I take it, therefore, that a portion, at least, of the additional fund which was provided as the result of the amendment offered by me still remains in the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And it is to be understood, therefore, that this fund will be available in proper cases where proper application is made for the construction of access roads to oil fields?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if I may answer the question, since I responded when the Senator offered the original amendment, let me say that when we took his amendment to conference it was discovered that the amount of money remaining in the Treasury available to this purpose was not as much as $35,000,000. Therefore the amount provided by the amendment had to be reduced. It was compromised at $27,500,000, and there is available for this purpose that much money in the Treasury. So that part of it is clear.

As to specifying the word "petroleum," the House conferees stated that petroleum was undoubtedly a raw material, and they wanted it treated on an equality with all other raw materials, but they did not want it mentioned specifically because that would give it a preference over other raw materials.

So the Senator is correct in assuming, first, that the petroleum deposits, so far as constructing roads to make them accessible are concerned, may receive exactly the same treatment as any other raw material deposits, and the increase in the amount of money makes it possible to do that. There is no part of the money earmarked for that particular purpose, however.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I can understand that, and I think that it was quite proper; but it is clear that the legislative intent is that this fund shall be available for petroleum as well as for timber, minerals, and other sources of raw materials.

Mr. HAYDEN. Exactly so.

Mr. McKELLAR. Just as in the case of any other raw material.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very grateful to the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, because of my interest in South Carolina highways and bridges, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, if there was any appreciable change in that part of the bill which concerned taking over of toll bridges, and with reference to allotments by the Bureau of Public Roads to the various State governments on a matching basis?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, there was not; that provision is still in the bill, and, by agreement between the Federal and State authorities, I hope that a great number of bridges will be made free.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to know from the Senator from Tennessee, what, if anything, was done with the amendment the committee put in the bill attempting to avoid interference by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not the report before me, but it was amended and agreed to. I will state to the Senate that that particular provision was agreed to with the addition that it should not be interfered with unless the War Production Board certified that the material could not be obtained because it was necessary for the prosecution of the war. It left the matter squarely up to him in such a way that he would have to act on it without the question of a doubt.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As the Senator knows, I have been very much interested in section 7 of the bill, an amendment which I offered to it. I should like to know just what changes, if any, were made in that section.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I happen to remember that the provision remains as it was adopted by the Senate except that it will continue in effect only during the period of the emergency and a year thereafter. In other words, it is not to be permanent law.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand. With respect to the amount which was appropriated or made available for it, has there been any change?

Mr. HAYDEN. The amount was cut $10,000,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It was reduced from $20,000,000 to $10,000,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. It was reduced from $20,000,000 to $10,000,000, for the reason that Mr. WHITTINGTON, who is also chairman of the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives, indicated that that sum of money was being provided in another piece of legislation. So he thought the two should conform.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand, there is $18,000,000-plus in an emergency road fund, which is also made available along with the $10,000,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. The unexpended balance remains, and $10,000,000 has been added, making a total of $18,000,000, to be utilized for this purpose. It is not, however, a permanent allocation so far as this legislation is concerned; it applies only to the war period, upon the theory that we are meeting a war emergency.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING CLAIMS BY OYSTER GROWERS

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take up for immediate consideration and action House bill 2614, a measure of considerable importance. Since it is not controversial I think it can be disposed of within a very few minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, before unanimous consent is given, let me ask, What is the bill?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It is a bill providing for an extension of time during which certain oyster growers may file claims in the Court of Claims.

Mr. WHITE. When was the bill placed on the calendar?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. A day or so ago.

Mr. WHITE. Was it on the calendar and was it reached on the last call of the calendar?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No; it was not.

Mr. WHITE. I know nothing about the bill, but I am opposed to the seemingly growing practice of reaching into bills on the calendar in the closing hours of the session and picking them out and bringing them to the notice of the Senate. I shall not take the responsibility of making objection in this case, and it is agreeable to me if the Senate wishes to consider the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Maryland whether he has conferred with the majority leader about taking the bill up at this time.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I have not been able to reach him since he has been tied up in important committee work.

Mr. HILL. I wonder if the Senator from Maryland would not withhold his request for a few moments. I am sure that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] will be on the floor in a few moments. Although I am sure the bill is meritorious, as the Senator from Maryland has suggested, yet if we start this procedure, naturally if I had a bill in which I was interested, I would ask consent that it be considered. I wonder if the Senator will not withhold his request for a few moments. Is he anxious to get away soon, or for some other reason wants to have the bill considered now?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It is a highly important measure and should be taken up today if feasible. I am confident that this bill, reported favorably by a unanimous vote of the Commerce Committee, will meet with no opposition, and, therefore, I have asked for immediate consideration without waiting for the call of the calendar.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, the bill is local in its application.

Mr. BYRD. It affects Virginia and Maryland.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, the bill would increase from 1 year to 2 years the period of time within which certain oyster growers may file claims against the United States in the Court of Claims for a kind of injuries to which I will now refer. The Federal Government in the course of its dredging operations very frequently causes damage to oyster beds. It does not do so intentionally, of course. The fact is, however, that the owners of the oyster beds often suffer serious financial loss as a result of these dredging operations. This fact has been clearly recognized. In 1935 an act was passed which permitted such oyster growers to file their claims in the Court of Claims within 1 year after cessation of the dredging operations which have caused or are alleged to have caused such damages to these oyster beds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2614) to increase by 1 year the period within which certain oyster growers may file claims against the United States in the Court of Claims was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISTRIBUTION OF FERTILIZER OR SEEDS BY AGENCIES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 1396, Calendar No. 402.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1396) making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, one amendment was suggested in the hearings. I now offer that amendment, and when the amendment is adopted, so far as I know, there is no further objection to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That the provisions of this act shall not apply to fertilizer distributed for experimental purposes by the Tennessee Valley Authority."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as I understand, the bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It was.

Mr. HILL. Has the Senator had an opportunity to speak to the majority leader with respect to the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The majority leader has been out of the Chamber during the afternoon.

Mr. HILL. I appreciate that. I wondered whether the Senator has had an opportunity to speak to the majority leader about the bill. The bill has been passed by the House?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill H. R. 1396 was read the third time and passed.

COMPACT ESTABLISHING BOUNDARY BETWEEN IOWA AND NEBRASKA

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 2794, Calendar No. 401.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2794) to approve and consent to the compact entered into by Iowa and Nebraska establishing the boundary between Iowa and Nebraska.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object; as I understand, the bill affects only the States of Iowa and Nebraska?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, both Senators from the State of Iowa and both Senators from the State of Nebraska favor the bill, and it was unanimously reported from the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, Mr. President. I spoke to the majority leader, and he has no objection to the present consideration of the measure.

Mr. HILL. The bill has passed the House, as I understand.

Mr. WHERRY. It has.

Mr. HILL. There was no objection to it in the committee, was there?

Mr. WHERRY. No.

Mr. HILL. And, as I understand, there is no objection on the part of any Senator from the two States involved?

Mr. WHERRY. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill H. R. 2794 was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIMINATION OF PRIVATE SUITS FOR PENALTIES AND DAMAGES ARISING OUT OF FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 1203, Calendar No. 297, a bill dealing with informer suits, in order that it may be made the pending business.

Mr. HILL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HILL. Did the Senator move for the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me the bill is highly controversial. At least I have received many letters in opposition to it. I believe we should not consider it without some notice to those who are interested in it. Consideration of the bill has been objected to on the call of the calendar a number of times, and I do not believe it ought to be taken up at this late date.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio perhaps did not understand my motion. I do not intend to press the measure for action this afternoon. I simply desire to make it the pending business.

Mr. TAFT. Excuse me. I understood the Senator was asking for action on the measure. I withdraw my suggestion.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator, as I understand, does not propose to take up the bill this afternoon?

Mr. VAN NUYS. No; I do not think so, because——

Mr. LANGER. I should like to know.

Mr. VAN NUYS. If there is a lull in proceedings while the Senate, perhaps, may be waiting for a conference report, we may be able to take up the bill and discuss it later today.

Mr. LANGER. I filed a minority report on the bill, and it will take me a half hour or three-quarters of an hour to discuss the measure. Why not ask for its consideration tomorrow?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Let us wait and see how the program develops today before we decide what action to take. Perhaps it is desired that the Senate remain in session for some time today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

WASHINGTON, BRANDYWINE & POINT LOOKOUT RAILROAD CO.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 990, Calendar No. 416.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title of the bill will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 990) for the relief of the Washington, Brandywine & Point Lookout Railroad Co.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the bill is not on the calendar.

Mr. TYDINGS. The bill is on the calendar, but there is no print of it available containing the calendar number. It is a local bill, having to do with a small railroad in Maryland. The Government wants the railroad, and is taking it over. The owners of the railroad had given the Government a mortgage in World War No. 1 of $50,000. They desire to pay off the mortgage. There is some interest in dispute. The owners are willing to pay 3 percent interest on the amount in arrears, so that the Government would receive the $50,000, and 3 percent interest. I have submitted the matter to the Treasury Department, and the Department has no objection. The passage of the bill would avoid litigation. The matter will thus be settled to the complete satisfaction of the Treasury Department.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. By what committee was the bill considered?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Committee on Claims. The bill was reported unanimously from the committee.

Mr. HILL. Has the House passed the bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. It is a Senate bill. Unless the bill is passed the subject matter of the bill might become a matter of litigation. If the bill is passed the Government will be satisfied, and the owners of the railroad will make no money out of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 990) for the relief of the Washington, Brandywine & Point Lookout Railroad Co., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to accept the sum of $50,000 in full settlement and discharge of the indebtedness of the Washington, Brandywine & Point Lookout Railroad Co., a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Maryland, to the United States, including unpaid interest, evidenced by a note dated July 6, 1918, in the principal amount of $50,000 executed by the company pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Control Act, approved March 21, 1918, and to release all evidences of indebtedness and collateral held as security therefor.

A REQUIREMENT FOR PEACE—A SECRETARY OF PEACE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on one occasion the former King of England used the very pertinent words "at long last." At long last, Mr. President, I shall proceed with my remarks. [Laughter.]

There are two powerful forces in the history of mankind—the force of military might and moral force.

We are doing our utmost to apply physical force to the enemy. But are we doing our utmost to apply moral force to achieve the beneficent end we seek, namely, peace?

In the midst of war, human nature remains basic. Psychological influences are present in time of war as in time of peace. We admit this when we speak constantly of our own morale or of the morale of the enemy people.

Many persons believe that the only way to win a war is to apply the utmost of physical energy, and to hate the enemy. Many persons think that peace of an enduring nature can be achieved by continuing to hate and by continuing to hold in subjugation a conquered people for all time.

What is little realized is that peoples who are proud and virile, peoples who are conscious of an injustice done them, will remain sullen and unconquerable. Their minds and energies will be fixed on the best way to achieve revenge. That does not permit reconciliation or rebuilding. It interferes with the resumption of normal trade, and keeps alive the fires of war. It means that armaments must be constantly kept on a large scale. It means tremendous burdens of taxation.

We always maintain two departments of national defense—War and Navy. We should maintain a department of peace.

The chief responsibility of the War and Navy Departments is to maintain at all times the best instruments of war.

The chief responsibility of a department of peace would be to maintain at all times the best instrumentalities of peace.

Let me say, Mr. President, that a few days ago I read a statement by Lloyd George, the substance of which was that if the German Kaiser had known before the last World War that Britain and ultimately the United States would enter that war, he never would have sent his troops into Serbia and Austria. In other words, nothing was definitely known about what the world powers would do. That was the situation before the present war.

When the Japs went into Manchuria, our State Department tried to have some action taken; but there was no understanding between the nations as to the responsibility in such a case. It has been stated on good authority that if at the ime when the Italians went into Ethiopia, the other European nations belonging to the League of Nations had taken a definite stand, probably the result would have been that the present World War would have been nipped in the bud.

Many observers will say that a department of state already has the duty a department of peace would have. But the Department of State has many duties, including that of determining, under the President, the policy of the Government in relation to international problems. That Department conducts negotiations pertaining to the protection of American rights and interests and the promotion of beneficial intercourse between the United States and other countries. It must concern itself with many complicated legal questions in parts of the world where the problems do not relate to the preservation of peace. It also performs certain domestic duties.

Mr. President, if a separate department given over entirely to the work of maintaining peace between all nations were established it might, of course, find itself at variance with other departments of our Government, and that would be a healthy thing, because the interest of maintaining peace might conceivably supersede some national or selfish interest of a commercial nature.

We must begin to think in terms of international brotherhood rather than national selfishness. Some will say that is superficial, theoretical thinking, but I think it is basic. We must begin to examine the roots of discord and learn something about the seeds of international conflict and disunity, and how to antidote the causes—how to pull up the tares of war and plant the wheat of peace.

We must not wait until hostilities are over to start on this vital task. We must begin now, because while we are united with our allies in the common cause of war we see more clearly than we shall see in the future the need of common action and common purpose at all times.

We must begin to exert our moral force even now, because it is now that we must recognize that a third world war can be built on the foundations of hate and discord sown in World War No. 2. We must begin now to prevent a third world war. We must not assume that a simple set of treaty provisions will keep the peace.

Many people think we would have had a better era after the last World War if our forces had marched into Berlin. We have heard that comment often. Yet we forget that Germany was completely disarmed last time, and there were treaty provisions which required that she be kept disarmed. For more than 10 years after the last World War, Germany was in a state of virtual military impotence. It was not until 1933 that, under Hitler, Germany really began to rearm.

We had treaties which provided that Germany should not rearm, but the Allied Nations were too indifferent to the symptoms of war. They were preoccupied with themselves. As for us, we assumed that Britain and France were closer to Germany than we were. We took it for granted they would be alert to their own defense. But evidently everybody's business was nobody's business, and, as a result, today we have become involved in another world war. Hereafter everybody's business cannot be nobody's business. War any place, the seeds of war any place, is the concern of America.

Can we afford to let matters drift again? Should we not have a department of peace which shall fearlessly expose by means of the power of publicity and public opinion the trends toward war?

I desire to emphasize that statement, Mr. President, because, to me, trends toward war unrealized and unexposed, are exceedingly dangerous to peace. It seems almost incredible that Hitler's tactics from 1933 on could have been hidden from the world as long as they were. Our State Department knew about them. However, suppose we had had a department of peace which, by means of publicity and public opinion, would have fearlessly exposed those seeds of war. What would have been the result? The answer is obvious.

Should we not have permanent, active, alert machinery of mediation and conciliation? Should we not make it our business to take an interest in any dispute anywhere which might lead to bloodshed? Some may think the last question is somewhat superficial; but is it? Would the annual cost of a department of peace be as much as one-tenth of the cost of a single battleship? We can certainly set up a department of peace just as logically as we set up a system of insurance for our lives or our property.

We should organize a department of peace now, not only to set in motion a mechanism for dealing with the problems at the peace table, but to show the whole world that we mean to be energetic about peace, that we will not go to sleep again, even after the peace treaties are signed, and we should begin now to educate our people as to the basic reasons why friction between nations occurs.

A very important function of a department of peace would be to prevent the maintenance of any censorship of the press in times of peace. It is because peoples are misled by their own misrulers and are forbidden to learn the truth about their neighbors across interna-

tional boundaries, that the seeds of war hate are sown. An internationally free press is a prerequisite of peace. Since we are committed to the "four freedoms," we can start now through a department of peace to urge upon every nation that there be no censorship in times of peace.

We must go further even during this war. We must begin an examination of the basic reasons why Hitler and Mussolini were able to achieve a dictatorship. We must examine the economic causes of dictatorship, and determine to what extent the acts of other nations bring on economic depression in the countries that have accepted dictatorship as a desperate last resort.

We must today begin to reach the hearts of enemy peoples. We must persuade them of the futility of clinging to their dictators. But what do we hold out for them? Imprisonment? Enslavement? Will not proud men fight to the bitter end rather than surrender or overthrow their rulers if by giving up they become subjugated for life? Must we not really emancipate them from their own dictators and prove to them that we mean to deal fairly, equitably, and in a civilized manner with them when they overthrow their leaders? We must make it clear that we intend to put on trial and to execute the criminal leaders responsible for the outrages against mankind, even if the number runs into hundreds. We must ferret out the instigators of these crimes against humanity. But as for the millions of men, women, and children, whose patriotism was whipped up to untold heights by untruth and misrepresentation—have we only bitterness and permanent hate to offer them?

I am speaking on the subject of psychological warfare. Mr. President, we are not measuring up to the standard which we established in the last war. So far we have no one to measure up to Woodrow Wilson. His words reached into the hearts and souls of Europe, and had a great deal to do with the final let-down of the enemy.

The world cannot be free of war so long as we institutionalize hate and discord. We must instead institutionalize peace and unity. We can do this by the power of example, by the moral force of human beings everywhere who can offer a hand of friendship to conquered peoples and ask them to build with us a new world.

Many tens of thousands of lives—our soldiers and sailors and marines too—will be saved if this war is shortened. It can be shortened not by relaxing our physical force one moment, but by intensifying at the same time our moral force. We must reach the hearts of the German and Italian peoples. We must find in the residue of Christians in Germany and Italy—and there are many of them—the nucleus for reaching the others. We must speak to them constantly over the air, through the press and above all through the pronouncements of our statesmen. We must give an outline of the peace that is to come. Shall it be an outline that has in it no provision for the conquered and a division of material things only for the conquerors?

I am thinking of the hundreds of thousands of lives which may be saved if we approach this problem constructively, recognizing that with all the impacts of war upon the millions of people in Europe, they are reaching out now to see a light which may give them hope that when the war is over there will be a chance for them.

We cannot build a world of peace on the foundations of selfishness and hate. We can build a new world only on the foundations of unselfishness and friendship.

The moral force of this Nation, which is at heart an unselfish nation, has not been as effectively mobilized in this war as in the last war. We are behind in our program of peace. We have expressed in general terms our war aims, but we have not made definite our approach to enemy peoples. It is to win them over—it was done before and it can be done again—that we must direct our major efforts today.

I pay homage and give all credit to our gallant boys on every front—on the land, on the sea, and under the sea. They are doing a tremendous job; but we are failing them in the battle on the psychological front.

Moral force to be effective must be honest. It must not make pledges that are specious on their face. It must bring forth sincerity and genuine faith to make valid our words and our plans. We can shorten the war if we begin now to exert our moral force. And we can prevent world war No. 3 if we begin now to build the true foundations of international friendship. It is so large a responsibility that it needs the time and energy of an entire department of the Government. Let us establish a Department of Peace as a manifestation of our highest purpose for this year and all years.

Mr. President, I may introduce a resolution later on to create a department wholly devoted to the cause of permanent peace. Let us set a standard for all time.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. Not now. I shall be glad to yield later. We already have a Secretary of War, a Secretary of the Navy, a Secretary of Commerce, a Secretary of the Interior, and so forth. Let us have a secretary of peace.

Oh, I know to many that such a statement sounds like another platitude—only a generality. Perhaps it is, but perhaps in it there is a nucleus.

Never has there been in the history of the world a greater hunger for peace than there is right now. I do not believe that any nation has ever been so determined as we are now—so determined to seek the way which will lead to total peace.

I think it is time that we have a Cabinet member having no other purpose than that of the promotion of peace. This would give us a department equal in standing with all other departments.

Think what it would mean to the peoples of the earth if this great Nation created a department of peace. Remember the impact upon this country and upon the world when Woodrow Wilson brought to a tired, suffering humanity the idea of a League of Nations. Remember how the common people in Europe looked upon him? There was in the concept of the League of Nations a picture of what we all hunger for.

A secretary of peace. I crave for my Government the distinction of being the first government on earth to establish a secretary of peace. We all agree that when victory comes it must be followed by such a unity of effort and purpose on the part of the United Nations as to render it impossible that another World War may occur.

All humanity desires to escape the consequences of armed conflict. Of course, there are certain groups in certain nations which would provide an exception. Those groups glorify war. But when this war is over there will be no glory in war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks Senate Resolution 22, which I submitted in the Senate on January 7, 1943, and which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and apparently rests in the cobwebs and pigeonholes of that committee. It would create a liaison committee between the Congress and the Executive. I also ask that at the conclusion of my remarks there be printed a copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 16, submitted on July 2, by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I also ask that at the conclusion of my remarks there be printed Senate Resolution 114, known as the Ball resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the various resolutions may be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibits A, B, and C.)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I stated that I crave for my Government the distinction of being the first government on earth to establish a secretary of peace. The establishment of such a secretariat would go through the world as did Woodrow Wilson's idea for a League of Nations. It brought hope. It brought faith to the downtrodden, crucified people of Europe.

Mr. President, there comes to my mind an incident which occurred in the dining room of the British Parliament in August 1939, when I had lunch with a member of the British Parliament, and at that time met Mr. Winston Churchill and Mr. Lloyd George. On that occasion the member from Manchester to whom I have referred spoke of the condition of the British people. Mind you, Mr. President, that was about a month before Hitler went into Poland. The member of Parliament said to me, "Senator, I hope to God we have at least another year in which to get ready. England has been asleep; Britain has been asleep." Then he said, "And, Senator, you people had something to do with our going to sleep." He said, "When the war was over and 900,000 of Britain's best sons were rotting in the soil of Europe, when our economy was shattered, when our homes

were broken, when the mothers, wives, daughters, and sweethearts waited for loved ones who never returned, Europe was rather dark, mentally, and there appeared in the west, not in the east, a star of hope. We called him Woodrow Wilson. He brought to Europe an ideal. We took that ideal, hook, line, and sinker. Through the succeeding years we were literally sabotaged into believing that simply by grasping at an ideal peace would remain. Two years ago Hitler could have marched down the streets of London and our British public would not have believed their eyes. That is the condition we were in. But now, thank God, we are awake."

Mr. President, that man in a most graphic manner was painting the picture of hungry humanity longingly looking for something to save it from the curse of war. The means to which it had resort did not save it, because humanity did not grasp its import and did not learn to play ball together. There was a lack of cooperation and of collaboration among the groups in Europe.

I repeat, Mr. President, all humanity desires to escape the consequences of armed conflict. Multitudes of thoughtful people, looking thrcugh and beyond the carnage of war, are undertaking to formulate peace plans. The prayers of countless millions ascend unto the Father, praying that a way will be discovered out of the darkness.

In this war we are putting forth the effort of all of us. We call it total war. I say to you that total peace is as worthy an objective. The purpose of this great war is to open the way for the peace which will follow. We know that peace does not come as a natural result of war.

We know that after war comes a peace table. What will follow will depend upon the mental and spiritual stature of the peacemakers. Let us put into actual effect, Blessed are the peacemakers.

We of the United Nations have dedicated our wealth, our energy, our man and woman power, to accomplish victory. Can we not do the same to accomplish peace? The problem of winning through to peace after the war is over, of course, requires planning. But man is fallible. God alone is infallible.

Before Pearl Harbor, this Nation was divided on the issue of intervention. But Pearl Harbor left us no choice. It fused us into one people, dedicated to a great purpose. A miracle took place. The Nation got into action as one man. For what? Certainly we had no desire for national aggrandizement. We wanted no more territory. Our only purpose was to destroy the despoiler, to destroy those who would enslave us.

When the last World War was over, our purpose was noble. Wilson was recognized as the apostle of freedom. Hope was triumphant. The idea that the world could federate for security and peace lodged deeply in the hearts and souls of men.

In the intervening years, we have learned much. The world has shrunk. Nations are neighbors. Our problem now is to create a unity.

If this Government now creates a secretary of peace, it will be a step in the direction that will make for peace. It will ring the tocsin around the world. It will say to all humanity—I do not mean the blind statesmen; I mean the common men and women who are suffering, dying, paying the price—"America is again leading the way." Of course, the mere appointment of such a new Cabinet member would not do the job, but the right man in that place could perform a most important work.

Mr. President, I shall not attempt to lay out a pattern; but I am one of those who feel that war is the result of man's inhumanity to man. War is man-made. It is not God-made. It is man's task to make a third world war impossible. I am one of those who believe we can do the job. I am not going to admit defeat in that task, to say we are imbecilic, that we are limited, that we cannot succeed. I believe His presence will walk with men today as it has always been available to men if they will reach out to Him.

Mr. President, Hitler, in Mein Kampf, set out a blueprint for world domination. He almost succeeded. At the peace table we should draw a blueprint of a plan which would make future wars impossible.

We will have to pattern our justice with the divine. We will have to cast out all ideas of vengeance and hatred. The old concept of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth must have no place at the peace table. Not revenge, but justice, must be our guide. We must see to it that never again will it be possible for war-minded peoples to build a huge war machine.

It is obvious that in the past our foreign policy has failed to keep us out of war. Our Government must begin now to study the problem of how to get cooperation with all like-minded nations in an effort to prevent another world holocaust. I believe the first step to be taken must be that of putting the collective power of the nations with common interests behind a pact outlawing war, thus creating a collective security.

Mr. President, I am about to close. I have said, I believe we must put the collective power of nations of like mind behind a collective security pact. To me, that is the answer. The United States of America and the other nations are not ready for any great supergovernment; but the peoples of the earth are looking for some practical way, and it would seem to me that the United States can lead that way by establishing, for the first time in the history of man, a Secretary of Peace.

EXHIBIT A

Senate Resolution 22

Resolved, That the Chief Executive be invited to join with the Senate in the creation of a Foreign Relations Advisory Council to be constituted of the following: The Secretary of State, the Under Secretary of State, other technicians whom the Secretary of State might designate, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the chairman and the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and such other Senators as the President might from time to time designate.

EXHIBIT B

Senate Concurrent Resolution 16

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That this Congress favors (1) the prosecution of the war to conclusive victory; (2) the participation by the United States in post-war cooperation between sovereign nations to prevent, by any necessary means, the recurrence of military aggression and to establish permanent peace with justice in a free world; (3) the present examination of these aims, so far as consistent with the united war effort, and their ultimate achievement by due constitutional process and with faithful recognition of American responsibilities and American interests.

EXHIBIT C

Senate Resolution 114

Resolved, That the Senate advises that the United States take the initiative in calling meetings of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority—

(1) To assist in coordinating and fully utilizing the military and economic resources of all member nations in the prosecution of the war against the Axis.

(2) To establish temporary administrations for Axis-controlled areas of the world as these are occupied by United Nations forces, until such time as permanent governments can be established.

(3) To administer relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation in territories of member nations needing such aid and in Axis territory occupied by United Nations forces.

(4) To establish procedures and machinery for peaceful settlements of disputes and disagreements between nations.

(5) To provide for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation.

That the Senate further advises that any establishment of such United Nations organization provide machinery for its modification, for the delegation of additional specific and limited functions to such organization, and for admission of other nations to membership, and that member nations should commit themselves to seek no territorial aggrandizement.

FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION IN PRESS AND RADIO

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on May 10 of this year the Supreme Court of the United States handed down an opinion in the case of the National Broadcasting Co. against the United States, which subjects the radio stations of this country to the absolute and arbitrary rule of the Federal Communications Commission. It is my belief that this opinion threatens freedom of speech in the United States unless it is corrected by legislation. Such legislation is pending before the Committee on Interstate Commerce. It was introduced by the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. My belief is that the committee should consider the bill and should report it during the approaching recess.

I suppose there is no other place in the world where the right of free speech is so freely granted as in the United States Senate. Therefore it is all the more our obligation to see that that right is preserved throughout the United States, and it is appropriate that I

should speak here when that right is threatened.

We have been told that one of the great purposes of this war is to spread freedom of expression throughout the world. Whether any such purpose is feasible insofar as it interferes with the governments of other countries may be doubtful, but there can be no doubt that our victory in the war will contribute largely to its establishment elsewhere. However, in urging that ideal upon the world certainly we cannot forget the right of the people of the United States to free speech. That right is far older than the "four freedoms." Article I of the Bill of Rights says:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press * * *.

There is no more fundamental liberty. If freedom of speech is destroyed, then every other freedom can be whittled away without the realization that it is disappearing. Anyone who aims at arbitrary government must first destroy freedom of speech or he will not reach his goal.

There are a number of reasons why we must exert every effort today to protect this right. It is a time of war and distress, when men's minds are confused and diverted to the needs of the moment. Even before the war, we were overwhelmed by a general passion to regulate everything and everybody. Because the war requires that we must all submit to certain Fascist controls, Government regulation has been indefinitely extended, and at least in some instances those who have a passion for running other people's business have availed themselves of the war necessities to acquire power which the war does not justify.

We are governed by an administration which, however much it may be interested in abstract freedom in Europe and Asia, certainly does not seem interested in individual freedom in the United States. It is therefore inevitable that this passion for regulation should extend to the institutions through which free expression reaches the people of the United States. Yet the freedom of these institutions, in particular the press and radio, is essential to freedom of speech for the people. If speech is to be really free, there must be freedom of every possible means of communicating ideas and views and principles and hopes from one citizen to another, from one section of the country to another. It is only by free means of communication that a people can remain free. There is no freedom if these means of communication are owned and operated by the Government. Freedom of speech does not mean that only those in control of the Government shall have the right to speak. The people must have the right and the means to speak to each other. The opposition to those in power must have the same right and means of speaking as the directors of government.

The present administration has shown no concern for freedom of the press at home. The suit brought against the Associated Press under the Sherman Act shows the attitude of the administration that the press and distribution of news shall be subjected to the same kind of rules as the manufacturer or the chain store. Regardless of the legalities of the case, it is clear that the policy which directed the bringing of this suit is part of the general passion for Government control, and those who brought it show a reckless disregard for freedom of the press. Those who drafted the Sherman Act surely had no thought that it could ever be used for such a purpose. No doubt today the Associated Press could secure the dismissal of the suit, if they were willing to run their business as the Department of Justice or some other New Deal agency thinks that the distribution of news should be run.

The Senate only this week had to step in to prohibit the wide distribution of Government propaganda within the United States by the Office of War Information. There is no freedom of speech if the Government, by the use of its vast funds and the means that are open to it, floods the country with propaganda and blankets the voices which speak in opposition. When Mr. Elmer Davis requisitions all four networks to hear his weekly outpourings and everyone must listen or turn off the radio, it is an infringement upon freedom of speech.

We have seen on the part of the Government a complete suppression of a great deal of news relating directly to the war, far more complete than seems to be necessary for any legitimate war purpose. There has been imposed on the newspapers a voluntary censorship of many facts the knowledge of which will do the enemy no good. Naturally, when news is suppressed, all comment on such news is automatically destroyed. The people were not told the whole truth about Pearl Harbor until a year after that inexcusable disaster, and the news relating to the bombing of Tokyo went even further in almost deliberate misrepresentation. In two very recent instances the administration sought to achieve complete secrecy in relation to international conferences of far-reaching application—the Refugee Conference held in Bermuda, and the International Food Conference at Hot Springs.

The Office of Censorship has been less criticized than the O. W. I., but here also it seems that suppression of facts has amounted to a denial of freedom of speech. There has been much complaint from British and other foreign correspondents over the censorship of their dispatches. In the case of Alex Faulkner, correspondent of the London Telegraph, it was agreed by Mr. Byron Price that in one instance at least his dispatch had been heavily overcensored. Don Iddom, correspondent of the London Daily Mail and Sunday Dispatch, said in a report to the British press:

> The American censorship of outgoing press messages is preventing the British people from getting a complete picture of America at war. What we have been sending is the truth, but not the whole truth. * * * Officialdom is partly gagging us.

Quoting the head of a British news agency, who has recently completed a tour of the United States, he said: "The British censorship at its worst is better than the American censorship at its best," and added:

> Our censorship of dispatches and articles going out of Britain is much more lenient, much more tolerant, much more in democratic tradition.
>
> Now what is the reason for this bad and stifling American censorship? I suggest that it is because it is trying to do too big a job. Instead of trying to carry out its function of preventing information that might be of military value reaching the enemy it has taken on itself the task of deciding what the British public should know about America and what they should not know about America.
>
> One day there might be a major schism in Anglo-American policy and the people in Britain will say and rightly: "But we had no idea American opinion took this view. This is absolutely new to us. There were never any indications of such a trend."

From the time that the President traveled publicly all over the United States without a word appearing in the newspapers, the people have lost confidence in the accuracy or completeness of any news. Such a condition is not freedom of the press.

And yet while all these policies indicate that the administration has no real interest in freedom of the press in this country, the ingrained insistence of our people upon that freedom has prevented any great progress toward actual suppression of the freedom of newspapers and magazines. Publications still represent every shade of opinion among the people, and anyone wtih a real message can find a newspaper or magazine to print it. There is as yet no Federal agency in control of the press, and there is as yet no Federal bureau which licenses the press.

But what is true of the newspapers is no longer true of the radio, and the radio is an even more important instrument of free speech than the newspaper. In the broadcasting case the Federal Communications Commission undertook to issue regulations assuming complete control of all the relations between the local broadcasting stations and the networks and breaking down the network system which has grown up in recent years. The Commission did this under the Communications Act of 1934, not by direct regulations of chain broadcasting but by using its power to refuse licenses to local stations. These regulations provided that no license should be granted to any station having a contract with a network which provides that it shall only broadcast the programs of that network, or a contract which provides that other stations within the area cannot use the network's programs. Licenses are to be denied to any station having a contract with a network for more than 2 years, or giving the network options on more than a very limited period of time. The Commission will refuse licenses to any local station which does not retain the complete right to reject any program in its own discretion, or which agrees that it will not undercut its network rates for national advertisers who come to it directly.

It seems obvious that if licenses can be denied for violations of regulations of this kind, they can be denied for almost any method of conducting the local radio

business of which the Commission does not approve. If these regulations are valid, then local stations are subject to almost any rules which the Federal Communications Commission sees fit to make. The Court held that these regulations were valid, and the majority decision of Mr. Justice Frankfurter is broad enough to justify any regulation which is not completely arbitrary.

The Communications Act was undoubtedly passed because of the confusion which would exist in broadcasting without some regulations. Unlike the situation of the newspapers, it was essential that stations be confined to specific wavelengths and powers, so that they might not conflict with each other. There is nothing in the Communications Act, as I read it, which shows any intention of Congress to go beyond that simple purpose in conferring power to regulate. The Court relies on that section of the act which authorizes the Commission "from time to time, as public convenience, interest, or necessity requires," to make various types of regulation. I believe this language refers merely to qualifications of the stations to serve the public, but the breadth of Mr. Justice Frankfurter's decision is evident from his use of the following language:

> We are asked to regard the Commission as a kind of traffic officer, policing the wavelengths to prevent stations from interfering with each other. But the act does not restrict the Commission merely to supervision of the traffic. It puts upon the Commission the burden of determining the composition of that traffic.

I repeat the language of the majority opinion:

> It puts upon the Commission the burden of determining the composition of that traffic.

In other words, it is declared that control of what reaches the American people over the air has passed from the American public into the hands of an all-powerful Commission, whose edicts are final and conclusive, and which exercises powers as complete as those existing in many foreign countries.

Mr. Justice Murphy and Mr. Justice Roberts dissented, but they take the same view of the scope of the Frankfurter opinion, for Mr. Justice Murphy says:

> By means of these regulations and the enforcement program, the Commission would not only extend its authority over business activities which represent interests and investments of a very substantial character, which have not been put under its jurisdiction by the act, but would greatly enlarge its control over an institution that has now become a rival of the press and pulpit as a purveyor of news and entertainment and a medium of public discussion. To assume a function and responsibility of such wide reach and importance in the life of the Nation, as a mere incident of its duty to pass on individual applications for permission to operate a radio station and use a specific wavelength, is an assumption of authority to which I am not willing to lend my assent. * * * We exceed our competence when we gratuitously bestow an agency power which the Congress has not granted.

The majority opinion rests its case on the authority given the Commission to do certain things "as public convenience, interest, or necessity requires." I agree that these words are broad. Congress has been properly criticized for passing statutes like this statute and the National Labor Relations Act and the Securities Act, conferring power on administrative agencies in loose language with no definite meaning. Congress has been too prone to give to these agencies the right to make rules and regulations without defining clearly enough the limitations on the delegation of what is actually law-making power. And yet I believe this decision goes far beyond any intent of Congress which can be read into the act by the average layman having some knowledge of its history.

Mr. President, the apparent intent of the new regulations, as stated by the Commission, is to free the local broadcasting stations from network control and permit them to do as they please. But this is not the real effect. It may be that they will be less subject to influence by the networks, but the direct effect of the regulations is to prevent them from making the contracts which they may desire to make. Such freedom as they acquire is only acquired by the adoption of a principle under which in the future they may be made to do exactly as the Government pleases. There is practically no limit to the manner in which their business may hereafter be regulated by the Federal Communications Commission. There will remain to them no freedom of expression. The present regulations cover every phase of the manner in which these stations may make contracts with the networks, they extend to certain phases of their charges for advertising, and presumably may be extended to the entire manner in which advertising charges are made, and the amount of such charges. From the language of the Frankfurter opinion the Commission may determine "the composition of the traffic over the air." This apparently means that the Government can prescribe the amount of time to be devoted to every kind of program, and perhaps even specify the programs themselves. If the character of the programs and the right to advertise may be restricted and limited, then these local broadcasting stations cannot long survive under private control.

As for the network system, the effect of the decision is ultimately destructive. Many persons have regarded the networks as somewhat monopolistic, but, on the whole, I believe the people approve the job they have done. The destruction of that system would be itself a serious limitation of freedom of expression throughout the United States. It is the network which makes it possible for the whole people of the United States to listen to the Philharmonic Symphony under Bruno Walter on a Sunday afternoon. It has made it possible for all our people to listen to the N. B. C. Symphony under Toscanini, a delight once reserved to a few people in very large cities. It has opened the doors of the Metropolitan Opera to the whole American people rather than to the few who could afford to buy a seat in New York. It has opened avenues for personal discussion and debate for such institutions as the Town Meeting of the Air, the American Forum, the Chicago Round Table, and other organizations for discussing important public questions. It has made it possible for public officials and Members of Congress to reach millions of citizens. When the President of the United States wishes to, he can speak directly to the whole American people sitting in their homes. It requires organization to develop such facilities. In contrast to other countries where the radio is controlled by the Government, these networks have been developed by private capital, individual ability, and freedom to keep a proper balance between the artistic, theatrical, humorous, and political outpourings of the Nation. No other country produces programs of equal quality and quantity.

The protection of the network system has been commercial advertising. By this means it has been possible for the broadcasters to send over the air programs that represent millions of dollars of expenditure. But if that expenditure is to be justified, the advertiser must be guaranteed an audience sufficiently large to make the expenditures worth while. The Texas Oil Co., for instance, finances the broadcasting of the Metropolitan Opera Co. every Saturday afternoon during the season. The program involves a huge expenditure for a very few minutes of advertising. The advertiser can only afford to underwrite such a huge enterprise—opera available to perhaps 200,000,000 people—because he knows that a large number of those people will hear his name and have some sense of gratitude to him for that service.

But the regulations which have been upheld prevent any network from guaranteeing to an advertiser any of the affiliated stations; in fact, they destroy the whole system of affiliated systems. A majority of a seven-man board has decided that the present network system is entirely wrong, and, without consultation with Congress, has undertaken a compulsory restriction which may well destroy these systems.

Mr. President, I may say that the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] was one of the authors of the Communications Act of 1934. I think he agrees with me that when the act was written Congress did not have the slightest intention of granting any such power to the Radio Commission.

Mr. President, the radio is a means of communication, a facility of free speech, of equal importance today with the press. From its very nature, it must be regulated in a manner which is not necessary in the case of the press. But that regulation should be limited to the essential rules necessary to prevent confusion in the air, decent expression, and the affording of facilities to all points of view. If Congress feels that rules to prevent monopoly in the network field should be added, they should be made by Congress, and not by a subordinate agency of the Government.

In my opinion the Congress should proceed at once to amend the Federal Communications Act to define precisely the limitations of authority to be conferred on the Federal Communications

Commission. The senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and the senior Senator fron. Montana [Mr. WHEELER] have introduced a bill to carry out this purpose. They are experts on the question, and are familiar with the intent of the former act. I hope that hearings may be held immediately upon the proposed bill, and that Congress may consider it immediately upon its return from the recess. In the meantime, the regulations should be suspended until the whole problem can be considered by Congress. Only in that way can we defend ourselves against the most serious infringement on the right of freedom of speech in the United States which has occurred since the Bill of Rights was adopted.

AMERICA MUST WORK AS SHE HAS NEVER WORKED BEFORE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this morning's press carries a statement of Mr. Donald M. Nelson, the Chairman of the War Production Board. Mr. Nelson states that the country failed to produce more war goods in May than were produced in April, and that this constitutes a slackening of pace which he terms "a very serious matter."

The comparative poor showing, Mr. Nelson explained—

places upon the remaining months of the year additional strain in a period when production difficulties will multiply because the industrial machine is operating so close to capacity.

The statement of Mr. Nelson should arouse us. It should challenge every American. It should pull each of us up sharp, like a lasso, and should cause us to search ourselves as to whether we are making our best possible contribution to the war effort.

Each day as we glance at our newspaper we read of America's airmen dropping bombs in Germany, Italy, and other parts of Axis-occupied Europe, on the Jap strongholds in the Aleutians, in China, and in the Southwest Pacific. Each day we read fresh news of the advance of our troops in the island warfare of the South Pacific and of urgent preparations for early and major offensive actions against the citadels of the Axis on the European Continent. Each day new achievements add luster to the record of our fighting forces. Guadalcanal, Midway, Tunisia, Buna, and Rendova have already taken their places in American history with Bunker Hill, Saratoga, Yorktown, Bull Run, Gettysburg, the Somme, and the Meuse-Argonne. And still each day finds more of our troops being rushed into active theaters of operation to provide the strength necessary to sustain the offensive actions which have already begun. Each day our merchant-marine crews and our Navy are moving more supplies and more men to the battle front. As we read the war news, our hearts fill with pride at the change which has taken place since the dark days which followed Pearl Harbor.

And yet, even as the momentum of impact against the enemy is accelerating everywhere, Mr. Nelson's statement sounds an ominous warning against the optimism which prevails throughout America today. Of course, our soldiers and marines and our sailors in the Army, in the Navy, and with the merchant marine will carry on to victory. They will carry on even though the path be long and tortuous and drenched with the lifeblood of gallant American youth. We are a peace-loving people, a peace-thinking people, but we have developed in the short space of 18 months the finest Army, Navy, and Air Force that have ever carried the flag of freedom into combat. With the support of America, our armed services will perform their share of the common task. However, we must face the picture of total war yet to come. We must not let wishful thinking lead us to believe that victory is within our immediate grasp.

General Marshall told the conference of Governors at Columbus, Ohio, on June 21, that—

Tunisia gave us an invaluable pattern for the future but the tasks will be increasingly difficult, usually with the great hazard of an over-water approach and a heavy battle to be maintained beyond the beaches. The way will be far from easy, the losses heavy, but the victory certain.

He also expressed a word of caution against hasty conclusions or impromptu conceptions regarding the utilization of air power or any special weapon in the conduct of this war, stating—

Your adversary may be hammered to his knees by bombing but he will recover unless the knockout blow is delivered by the ground Army with infantry and artillery as important as tank, and antiaircraft and engineers and signal troops vital to the whole.

With respect to victory, he added—

There can be but one result unless the enemy succeeds in creating internal friction among the Allies, division of one against the other and misrepresentation leading to public loss of confidence in our war effort.

General Marshall felt it necessary to solicit the support of the Governors to check the sudden waves of optimism which lead the public to feel that we have made our great effort and that the end is in sight. He said:

This is far from the case. We are just getting well started. The great battles lie ahead. We have yet to be proved in the agony of enduring heavy casualties as well as the reverses which are inevitable in war. The failure today to surge forward with every ounce of power and effort we possess would be to write a tragic page for history. The temptation to ease up after initial and relatively minor successes seems difficult to resist. Axis nations probably count on this as a weak element of allied psychology.

He concluded with a final note of warning that "there must be no let-up in our preparations."

What do we find? Mr. Nelson's statement, the failure to reach our production goals in May, the slackening of the pace, as Mr. Nelson expressed it, tell of an attitude of complacency that victory is assured, that victory is just around the corner. While our soldiers move forward against strong and determined foes, crisis after crisis is announced as developing on the home front. Often the so-called crises are the results of wrangling between selfish groups that are fearful that one group may get more than some other group. Sometimes the crisis is the result of some petty wrangling within the Government. Constant criticism of Government, usually bitter and destructive, fills the newspapers and forms the headlines. Let us save the hate which is within us to use against the enemy. Let us have tolerance at home for each other and for the sincerity of each other's contribution to the war effort. Never in our history was it so necessary for our Government officials to be inspired to constructive action by constructive criticism. We must not let our leaders be forced into defensive positions and negative action through destructive criticism which tears down the accomplishments of the last year and a half.

On many sides I have heard charges of extravagance and waste against the armed services—charges which imply deliberate negligence and widespread inefficiency. Perhaps some of these charges are true; but more than likely they apply to a small proportion of an effort which is so huge as to stagger human imagination. I would not stop criticism. I would not discontinue full investigations of every phase of the war effort. I would stop public criticism based on generalities which tears down faith and confidence in our leaders and provides nothing to take their place. I would not apply mistakes and errors which are inevitable in a task of such magnitude to the task as a whole. I would always measure criticism and errors against the accomplishments of America in the war to date.

These are the accomplishments which have provided us with the greatest Navy in the world, carrying the war to the enemy on the seven seas, and providing protection to troop and cargo convoys proceeding to every battle front. These are the accomplishments which have provided us with the largest air force in the world, which is carrying the war to the very home of the enemy with an almost unbelievable ratio of victories to defeats. These are the accomplishments which have transported overseas hundreds of thousands of soldiers with a loss of life in transit of less than 200. These are the accomplishments which have provided this fine body of well-trained fighting men with adequate food and clothing and with superior weapons of war. These are the accomplishments which have transported to north Africa alone as great a tonnage of military supplies as was shipped from the United States to the American Expeditionary Force in France during the last war. These are the accomplishments which are building up the reserves in men and materials required for an offensive of ever-increasing vigor.

Our production of war munitions, according to the figures of the War Production Board, aggregated $4,950,000,000 in May. This volume proved our right to the title which we proudly claim of being the arsenal of democracy. Yet even this output, as magnificent an achievement of industry and labor as it represents, is still insufficient to provide the materials

of all-out war for ourselves and our allies and not what it should have been. Monthly rates of production must be increased, manpower problems must be solved, management and labor must reconcile their differences. America must go to work each day with but one thought in mind, and that thought to produce for war whatever the sacrifice.

We hear much about post-war planning, post-war planning by the Government, post-war planning by management, post-war planning by financial interests, post-war planning by labor. I believe in post-war planning. If we are to have an enduring peace worthy of the sacrifices of this war there must be planning and action as well. But there must not be post-war planning for production or for business or for personal profit or for selfish gain that will in any way interfere with or lessen our war effort, or our war production. We hear of management which is devoting its best engineering and production talent to the development of new and better products to be ready for the competition of business when the war is ended. In this rush to plan for business or for production for the days of peace there is an inherent danger—the danger of slackening our effort to bring about that peace. We must not devote energies and talents to such planning when these energies and talents are needed to drive our war effort to a maximum efficiency.

America must shed its shining and comfortable cloak of complacency and overconfidence, and don for the duration of the war the working clothes which are more befitting the Arsenal of Democracy. It will not be enough to win this war. We must win it in the shortest possible time with the least possible loss in human life. Every month, every week, every day, every hour that the war continues will mean death for our American boys. America must seek and find in its war effort that solidarity of purpose and unity of spirit which comes to a determined nation. America must work as America has never worked before. Today, with our fighting forces taking the offensive on every battle front, America must concentrate its heart and soul to their support and to the one great objective—complete victory.

INSPECTION OF NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE BY COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an additional amendment, Senate Resolution 156, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 156) authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs to inspect naval establishments in the Western Hemisphere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I understand—and I believe I am right about it, but if I am wrong I hope the Senator will correct me—that the pending resolution would create a committee for the purpose of inspecting naval bases, and so forth, which would be a committee comparable to one of the same general character which has already been set up by the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator from Maine that this is the first time during the course of the war that the Naval Affairs Committee has requested that any committee be appointed to make any inspection or examination of naval bases, and that the resolution was reported by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] as chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. The Senator from Massachusetts is present in the chamber and can give the Senator from Maine any further information he may desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution submitted by Mr. WALSH on June 4, which had been originally reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment on page 1, line 11, after the words "not more than", to strike out "$8" and insert "$10", and subsequently reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with an additional amendment, on page 1, line 11, after the word "allowance", to insert "provided by law" and strike out the following language as proposed to be amended by the Committee on Naval Affairs: "of not more than $10 for such time as they may spend away from their official residences, or Washington, D. C.", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof duly appointed by the chairman of the committee, is hereby authorized to visit, for the purposes of inspection, during the present Congress, any part of the Naval Establishment in the Western Hemisphere, the expenses incurred in pursuance thereof not to exceed $4,000, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate. The members of such committee or subcommittee shall be paid the actual expenses of transportation incurred by them for travel performed under the provisions of this resolution and a per diem allowance provided by law while performing travel authorized by this resolution.

The amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 156) as amended was agreed to.

PREVENTION OF EXCESSIVE FEES FOR NEGOTIATION OF WAR CONTRACTS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, a few days ago there was a call of the calendar, and when Calendar No. 259, House bill 1900, was reached, it was passed over at the request of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]. At that time the purpose of the bill was explained in detail. The Senator from South Dakota is now content that the bill should be enacted into law. He has withdrawn his objection, and has consented to my request that the bill be taken up for immediate consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1900) to prevent the payment of excessive fees or compensation in connection with the negotiation of war contracts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, on page 3 of the bill, I ask unanimous consent to amend by transposing the word "by" where it appears in line 14 before the words "all persons", to line 13, after the word "sales."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 1900) was read the third time and passed.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 279, Senate bill 883.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 883) providing for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 883), which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment of the committee was, on page 2, line 22, after the word "Senate" and the period, to strike out "He shall be charged with the supervision and coordination." and insert "He shall make studies and recommendations with a view to coordination."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was on page 3, line 6, after the word "make", to strike out "a" and insert "an annual"; and on the same page in line 8, after the word "Representatives" and the comma, to strike out "each 6 months."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, has final action been taken upon the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is about to be.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say to the able Senator from Wisconsin that the chairman of the Senate Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], had desired to be present when this bill was taken up for consideration. Out of deference to him and the splendid work which he has done in the field of small business—and, so far as I know, he will be present tomorrow—I wonder if the Senator from Wisconsin would be agreeable to the bill going over?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, my information is that the Senator from Montana has left Washington and will not be here again until after the summer recess.

Mr. PEPPER. Would the Senator from Wisconsin be agreeable to the bill going over until tomorrow?

Mr. WILEY. Yes, if the Senator feels that that would bring about the result which he desires. I might state that the bill was unanimously reported from the Committee on Commerce. It has the approval of Mr. Jesse Jones. The minority leader [Mr. MCNARY] personally took an interest in the bill. I know of no objection to it. I am sure the Senator from Montana, and all persons who know anything about the measure, are completely in favor of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. (a) The Congress hereby finds that (1) the existence of American small business as an integral part of the American economic system is essential for the preservation of the system of free competitive enterprise in the Nation, (2) that the continued existence of American small business as a potent factor in the American economy is now challenged and threatened with extinction, and (3) that destruction of American small business burdens and obstructs the free flow of goods in commerce and interferes with the orderly and fair marketing of goods in commerce.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act, through the exercise by Congress of its power to regulate commerce between the several States and to create executive offices, to preserve American small business as an integral and essential part of the American economic system, and to preserve the system of free private competitive enterprise in the Nation.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR SMALL BUSINESS

SEC. 2. There shall be in the Department of Commerce an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business. It shall be the province and duty of said Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business to foster, promote, and develop the conduct of commerce, manufacturing, transportation, distribution, and other business facilities and activities in the United States by small business with the end in view of the preservation of small business as an integral component part of the American system of free private competitive enterprise of the Nation. He shall be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. He shall make studies and recommendations with a view to coordination of governmental activities dealing with the small business and small-business problems, and such other duties as shall be assigned to him by the Secretary of Commerce and as may be required by law. There shall be detailed to his office such number of employees of the Department of Commerce as may be authorized by the Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary of Commerce shall make an annual report to the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, of the operation of the office of the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business including such other information and such comments and recommendations with respect to American small business and small-business problems as he may deem appropriate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Donal F. McGonigal, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 8 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul;

John S. Service, of Ohio, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul;

William C. Burdett, of Tennessee, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to New Zealand;

Loy W. Henderson, of Colorado, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Iraq; and

Ray Atherton, of Illinois, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Canada; also to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Denmark and as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near the Government of Luxemburg now established in Canada.

By Mr. MCCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Armond W. Scott, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia (he is now serving in this post under an appointment which expires July 14, 1943); and

Thomas D. Quinn, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, vice Hobart Newman, whose term expires August 21, 1943.

By Mr. WALLGREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Raymond D. Johnsos, from the State of Illinois, to be principal manpower field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, in the Chicago regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably five nominations in the Foreign Service, and I ask unanimous consent that they be acted on at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to immediate consideration? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nominations.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS—WILLIAM J. STOREN

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably the nomination of William J. Storen to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 16. This is a reappointment, Mr. Storen is now in office, and I should like to have the nomination acted on at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William J. Storen to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION—RAYMOND D. JOHNSOS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, there was reported favorably today from the Committee on Military Affairs the nomination of Raymond D. Johnsos of the State of Illinois to be principal manpower field supervisor of the Chicago regional office. The nomination is not on the calendar, and I am wondering if I can obtain unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Raymond D. Johnsos to be principal manpower field supervisor of the Chicago regional office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, July 8, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received July 7 (legislative day of March 24), 1943:

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

William J. Storen, of Charleston, S. C., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 16, with headquarters at Charleston, S. C. (reappointment).

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. (temporary) Homer G. Hutchinson, Jr., to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 15th day of April 1940, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Maj. (temporary) Ross S. Mickey to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of June 1940, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Hal R. Kolp, a naval aviator of the Marine Corps Reserve, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from the 10th day of February 1941.

Fred E. Haynes, Jr., a citizen of Texas, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 22d day of August 1942.

William H. McDonough, a citizen of California, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 23d day of February 1943.

Louis C. Vandertill, a citizen of Michigan, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 24th day of March 1943.

Kenneth A. Gordon, Jr., a citizen of California, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of May 1943.

Platoon Sgt. Joseph D. Baugh, a meritorious noncommissioned officer, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 5th day of May 1943.

Charles A. Irvine, a citizen of Missouri, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 5th day of May 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 7 (legislative day of May 24), 1943.

FOREIGN SERVICE

Ray Atherton to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada; also to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Denmark and as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Luxembourg now established in Canada.

William C. Burdett to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand.

Loy W. Henderson to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iraq.

Donal M. McGonigal to be a consul of the United States of America.

John S. Service to be a consul of the United States of America.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

William J. Storen, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 16, with headquarters at Charleston, S. C.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Ernest L. Marbury, of Alabama, to be deputy regional manpower director, at $6,500 per annum, in the Alabama State office.

George C. Chesney, District of Columbia, to be head industrial consultant in the Bureau of Manpower Utilization, at $6,500 per annum, in the Washington office.

George C. Estill, of Florida, to be regional chief of manpower utilization, at $6,500 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office.

Raymond D. Johnsos, of Illinois, to be principal manpower field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, in the Chicago regional office.

William O. Weyforth, of Maryland, to be senior labor economist, at $4,600 per annum, in the Maryland State office.

Harold S. Woodley, of Michigan, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Battle Creek area office.

Charles M. Hay, of Missouri, to be general counsel in the office of the executive director, at $8,000 per annum, in the Washington office.

Richard J. Cullen, of New York, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in the New York regional office.

Elmer K. Delp, of New York, to be assistant regional chief of training, at $5,600 per annum, in the New York regional office.

Huxley Madeheim, of New York, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in the New York regional office.

Glenn L. Bobbitt, of North Carolina, to be area chief of training, at $4,600 per annum, in the Raleigh area office.

Leo H. Carney, of Pennsylvania, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Erie area office.

Frederic S. Martin, of Rhode Island, to be regional personnel officer, at $4,600 per annum, in the Boston regional office.

Henry L. Badoux, of Tennessee, to be assistant regional chief of manpower utilization, at $5,600 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office.

Julian Capers, Jr., of Texas, to be senior information specialist, at $4,600 per annum, in the Dallas regional office.

William D. Gallier, of Texas, to be principal manpower field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, in the Dallas regional office.

Richard B. Johnson, of Texas, to be housing and transportation specialist, at $4,600 per annum, in the Dallas regional office.

Arthur A. Smith, of Texas, to be principal manpower field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, in the Dallas regional office.

Everett R. Speer, of Texas, to be assistant regional chief of placement, at $5,600 per annum, in the Dallas regional office.

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier generals

William Edward Raab Covell
Albert Jesse Browning

POSTMASTERS

IDAHO

Ferguson Hanmer, Salmon.

LOUISIANA

Vada S. Clements, Ida.

NEW YORK

Leonard J. McHugh, Depew.
Aaron Feldherr, Greenfield Park.
Elloy R. Ganey, Jamestown.
Charles F. Schreier, Sag Harbor.
Edward P. Sullivan, Sunmount.
John T. Clark, Tuxedo Park.
Mary P. Carroll, Valley Falls.
Theresa Jaeger, West Nyack.

OREGON

Gwendolyn H. Stemmerman, Powers.
Gerald E. Wright, Wauna.

RHODE ISLAND

Walter B. Kingsley, Allenton.
Raymond L. Battey, Greenville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 7, 1943

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, as we bow at the altar of prayer we thank Thee that a new day shows us the stepping stones to higher and better things. Our hearts are heavy as we realize that war is still darkening the sky and increasing the sorrows of humanity. Oh, show us the way that leads to the ranges of wise attainment which Thou dost reveal in loving and merciful condescension.

Oh, touch every lover of liberty and every dreamer of fine ideals of free institutions. Over all our country, open sightless eyes to a world dazzling in the shade, that they may see it beckoning them to a splendid vision and grand endeavor. Ours is a life's work, a life's task, and a life's mission. Dear Lord, forbid that we should ever cheapen our calling or lower the virtues of democratic procedure. Gladly cooperating with the divine purpose, give us a deepening sense of powers unemployed, of possibilities unachieved, and ideals unfulfilled. Every earnest effort to do our whole duty is nearer the goal of victory and barriers overcome. Do Thou increase the revelation of Thyself and blend our labors into the aspirations of a true democracy; and Thine shall be the praise. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 986. An act to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct; and

H. R. 2106. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Sir William Blackstone, the work of the late Paul W. Bartlett, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2076. An act to authorize the deportation of aliens to countries allied with the United States; and

H. R. 2703. An act to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 235. An act for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey;

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson; and

H. R. 1784. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business of Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING MEETING OF HOUSE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House this morning.

The SPEAKER. The House is going to be voting on various conference reports this morning.

Mr. BLOOM. I withdraw the request.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes today at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

CRISIS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, 6,000 babies were listed as born to soldier fathers in the month of May. The Army estimates that 300,000 babies will be born to service fathers during the war period.

There are many inconsistencies emanating from the Office of Price Administration, many problems that still remain unsolved. A tragic call for help appears in the United States News of this week in the form of a letter to the editor from one of the fathers of tomorrow's citizens whose wife is having her second child. He writes that the papers record a record "baby crop" this year. They report that some baby carriages will be made, but no diapers. What do the New Dealers expect us to do with our babies without diapers and pins with which to fasten same?

We can do without a lot of things, but how can a baby do without diapers? Is there anybody in Washington who is interested in baby problems? If so, to whom should I address complaint?

Mr. Speaker, that is a call of desperation; I bring it to your attention as another major problem which still remains unsolved by the W. P. B.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

CRITICAL STRATEGIC MATERIAL—THE B. E. W.-R. F. C. DISPUTE

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the problem of obtaining critical strategic materials is a problem of vital importance to the millions of our fellow Americans who will constitute our overseas fighting fronts.

The Vice President of the United States and the Secretary of Commerce have both charged that this problem has been handled improperly and, to quote the Vice President, "to the detriment of the war effort."

The situation demands clarification and constructive action. Yet that action was blocked yesterday by a vote of 6 to 5 in the Rules Committee, all six Democratic members voting against action.

It is difficult to understand how six leading Democratic Members of this House could bring themselves to vote as a unit squarely in opposition to the ascertainment of the facts, squarely in opposition to expediting the war effort.

The situation is not a new one. There has been friction and criticism for well over a year. Secretary Jones has asked that the situation be dealt with now. His own friends in this House deny his request. Sooner or later the situation must be dealt with in fairness to the armed forces. The people of the country will demand it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two particulars: One to include an editorial, and the other to include two speeches.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE SYNTHETIC DIAPER CRISIS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Member from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON]—and I do not know what the revision of her remarks will show—always gives the House some constructive thought, but sometimes she overlooks some of the basic facts on which her argument is based. She just asked the House, "What will our babies do without diapers?" The enemy can be defeated, the battle on the home front won, without becoming frightened over a newspaper article telling us there will be a shortage of diapers. The babies of our soldiers, of our civilians, will not be without diapers.

The lady is unduly alarmed. American ingenuity and resourcefulness, the courage and the determination of the American mothers will today, as always, in spite of the New Deal—yes, notwithstanding the most strenuous efforts of Hopkins and WALLACE—solve the problem as it arises and the babies, every little girl and boy, God bless them, will feel the comfort, have the service of a soft, adequate diaper, well secured by a loving mother, grandmother, or grandfather.

Some of us in our earlier days were blessed by the fact that everything desired was not immediately at hand. Let me venture the suggestion that many a distinguished Member of this House, yes, perhaps of the other body, was in her or his infancy cradled in a diaper that first saw service as part of a flour sack, a salt bag, perhaps as a former petticoat or shirt. At the risk of being wrong, let me venture the guess that there are enough old shirts, petticoats, and other used garments soft in texture

but strong and reliable in fabric which, if the worst comes, will serve the purpose.

I am in favor of doing everything possible for the soldiers, for the soldier-fathers, for the mothers of the soldiers' babies—in fact, for all mothers, and I understand that some 6,000 soldiers' babies were born——

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. In the month of May in 21 States——

Mr. HOFFMAN. In the month of May. But she overlooks the fact that she advocated the inclusion of the service of the WAVES, the WAC's, the SPARS, and perhaps thousands of other women going into foreign service, so there will not be as many babies—or so it would appear—so there will probably not be as great a need for the diapers to which the lady has called attention.

Another thing she forgets and that is this, that before the present generation was born there were millions of babies born throughout the world who never were pricked by a diaper pin. I know something about what it is to wash diapers, to pin them on babies; I have done that and it was a pleasure, one that I would like to have again if age and circumstances did not prohibit.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has perhaps misunderstood me. This is the first time I have ever known him inclined to be reactionary.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, I am not reactionary. No one who has ever washed diapers is a reactionary; he is a progressive. There is something about the practice that makes you seek progressive methods. The Member from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] is always alert, but on this occasion I do not think she has cause for worry.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(Mr. LEMKE and Mr. POWERS asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from today's New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE PUBLIC POWER PROGRAM

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include some tables on agricultural appropriations for 1942, 1943, and 1944, appropriations that are available to the Department of Agriculture. These will be good reference material for all the Members.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order; I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the second deficiency bill (H. R. 3030) to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT ON SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 28, 29, 30, and 31.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, and 61; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 5 of said amendment strike out the figure "$75,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$50,000,000" and in line 8 strike out "$3,375,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 5 of said amendment strike out the figure "$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$100,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 6 of said amendment, after the word "expended" and before the comma, insert the following: "and to be allocated to the Intracoastal Waterway from the vicinity of Apalachee Bay to Corpus Christi, Texas"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 8, 9, 24, 25, 26, and 27.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

LEGISLATIVE

No. 1: Appropriates $20,000 to enable the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures to carry out duties imposed by section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941, and section 204 of the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act, 1944, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 5, relating to the Government Printing Office: Appropriates $17,000,000 for working capital and congressional printing and binding, fiscal year 1944; increases the amount available for printing, binding, and distribution of the Federal Register to $430,000, fiscal year 1943; and strikes out the proposed payment to messengers on night duty, totaling $2,400, to be paid from the appropriation for printing and binding for Congress for the fiscal year 1943.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Nos. 6 and 7: Appropriates $29,500 for salaries and expenses, National Resources Planning Board, as proposed by the House, instead of $42,500, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that not more than $37,000 shall be available for salaries (other than to pay annual leave), as proposed by the House, instead of $50,000, as proposed by the Senate.

INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

No. 10: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate appropriating $65,000 for salaries and expenses, Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, fiscal year 1944.

Nos. 11, 12, 13, and 14: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate providing $20,000,000 for war-area child-care payments to States, local public authorities, and other agencies, and $450,000 for salaries and expenses, necessary to carry out the war-area child-care program proposed to be administered by the Federal Security Agency; and eliminates the provision of the Senate making such appropriations dependent upon the enactment of the bill (S. 1130) to provide for care of children of mothers employed in war areas in the United States, and for other purposes.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

No. 15: Appropriates $50,000,000 for war public works (community facilities), instead

of $75,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; of which $2,250,000 is made available for administrative expenses, instead of $3,375,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 16: Appropriates $12,000,000 for use by the Public Roads Administration in connection with the Inter-American Highway, as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

Nos. 17, 18, and 19: Appropriates $100,000,000 for war housing, instead of $150,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that not exceeding $7,000,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation under "Emergency fund for the President, defense housing," contained in the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, shall be continued available until June 30, 1944, as proposed by the Senate.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Nos. 20, 21, 22, and 23: Appropriates $68,000 as an additional amount for support of indigent insane of the District of Columbia in St. Elizabeths Hospital, fiscal year 1943; provides $2,916.86 for the payment of final judgments; and provides for the division of expenses in connection with such items; all as proposed by the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Nos. 28, 29, 30, and 31: Strikes out the proposals of the Senate to appropriate $1,100,000 for the Bituminous Coal Division, and $25,000 for the Patrick Henry National Monument, under the National Park Service.

NAVY DEPARTMENT

Nos. 32 and 33: Inserts additional funds for the payment of claims for damages by collision with naval vessels, contained in Senate Document 82, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 34 and 35: Provides additional funds under the Coast Guard for the payment of claims for damages, operation of vessels, contained in Senate Document 81, as proposed by the Senate.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

No. 36: Appropriates $800,000, fiscal year 1944, to the Bureau of Accounts, for salaries and expenses, deposit of withheld taxes, as proposed by the Senate.

WAR DEPARTMENT

Nos. 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, and 44: Appropriates $7,095,000 for rivers and harbors work, as proposed by the Senate, amended to require allocation of the funds to the intracoastal waterway from the vicinity of Apalachee Bay to Corpus Christi, Tex.; provides $4,385,000 for the prosecution of a dam and reservoir project on Mosquito Creek, Ohio, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates $10,000,000 for flood control, general (emergency fund), as proposed by the Senate. Appropriates $80,820 for maintenance and operation of the United States Soldiers' Home, 1944, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that appropriations for the Military Establishment and for civil functions, fiscal year 1944, shall be available for carrying into effect the act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to, or loss or destruction of property, and so forth, approved July 3, 1943, as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—JUDGMENTS AND AUTHORIZED CLAIMS

Nos. 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, and 60: Appropriates funds for the payment of judgments and authorized claims as submitted to the Senate in sundry Senate documents, all as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

No. 61: Provides that all appropriations and authority, with respect to appropriations for the fiscal year 1944, shall be available from and including July 1, 1943, as proposed by the Senate.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendments are reported in disagreement:

No. 8, relating to the preparation and distribution to the public of the United States Government Manual under the Office of War Information.

No. 9, relating to the transfer of equipment, tools, and machinery heretofore used by the National Youth Administration to States or State boards for vocational education.

Nos. 24, 25, and 26, relating to aid and the temporary rehabilitation of farmers, in areas flooded in 1943.

No. 27, relating to appropriations for development of airports started by the Work Projects Administration, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, Department of Commerce.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW.
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I shall take 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill went to the Senate carrying about $36,000,000. The Senate added about $300,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. TABER. It went to the Senate with about $36,000,000 and they multiplied it by 10.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; the Senate added about $300,000,000. It is only necessary to discuss a few items.

One item that attracted some attention, a very appealing one, was that for child care in war areas. The Senate inserted $20,000,000, but the bill authorizing such payments, although it had passed the Senate, has not been considered in the House. Under the circumstances the House could not yield and the item went out of the bill.

A second item which has attracted deserved attention is the item for war housing. In many of the congested centers about our war industry plants the housing condition is bad and in some locations is critical. It is charged, perhaps with some color of accuracy, that in some such centers disturbances which have arisen, notably in the Detroit area, were due to deficiencies in housing available for workmen employed in the war production plants.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I happen to be a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which committee has made a very extensive investigation of the housing situation in this country, also an investigation of the use of funds which have been appropriated for this purpose heretofore. I was very strenuously opposed to the authorization of this appropriation. I was assured that that bill was only an authorization not an appropriation, and that I would be given ample opportunity to express my grievances and give the information I have to the Appropriations Committee of the House and therefore to fight this appropriation in that committee. This appropriation has never been before the Committee on Appropriations of the House, yet my distinguished chairman assured me I would be given a chance to be heard on it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman has stated the situation fairly. This appropriation is in response to an authorization for $300,000,000 just passed both Houses. The Senate inserted an appropriation for half the authorized amount, $150,000,000. The House conferees after due consideration reduced that to $100,000,000, one-third of the new authorization.

Mr. WILSON. When the gentleman says "the House," does he mean the House Committee on Appropriations or the conferees?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The managers on the part of the House, the conference committee, included the chairmen of all subcommittees. The situation was imperative, it had to be taken care of at once. Notwithstanding the need, we provided only one-third of what the gentleman's committee authorized.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. It will be recalled that the gentleman from Indiana, by an amendment which he offered when the measure was pending here in the House, indicated that in his judgment $200,000,000 would be necessary for this purpose. I am wondering why he has changed his mind and thinks that even $100,000,000 will not be necessary now.

Mr. WILSON. If the gentleman from Texas will permit me to give this answer to his question, I would like to do so.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WILSON. The gentleman from Texas said that was only an authorization, that it was customary to ask for authorizations far in excess of the amount to be appropriated. When I asked for an authorization of $200,000,000 I had no intention whatsoever of asking for an appropriation of $200,000,000 or not even $100,000,000. We have more than 45,000 housing units in the country today empty.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say that the Navy Department alone gave the committee the evidence with reference to its need for 175,000 units. Certainly there cannot be any quibbling with reference to one-third of the authorized appropriation now being needed.

Mr. WILSON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I hope the gentleman will permit me to proceed.

Mr. WILSON. I am going to have to object to this. I will demand a record vote.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman has made his position very clear. He

proposed an amendment to appropriate for this purpose $200,000,000.

Mr. WILSON. That is not correct. I did not propose an amendment to appropriate anything. It was only an authorization.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Whenever a committee authorizes an appropriation it does so for the express purpose of securing appropriations and it is presumed that the committee having charge of the appropriation will proceed to give appropriate consideration to the authorization that the committee recommends. An authorization can have no other purpose.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to ask the gentleman two questions. In the first place, am I correct in assuming there is not anything in this bill about crop insurance? I was told there was.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The item on crop insurance is brought back in disagreement. It will be taken up later.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It is one of the amendments in disagreement?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. It will be taken up for consideration as soon as the conference report is disposed of.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I ask the gentleman about this child-care proposition which seems to me to be one of our greatest problems? I can understand why we cannot appropriate money pursuant to an act that has not been passed, but may I ask the gentleman what the outlook is on that problem?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Speaking for myself I may say that our attitude on it would have been at least sympathetic had there been authority for its consideration.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to the gentleman from California that that situation is taken care of under title II of the so-called Lanham Act, which provides for these community facilities, including child care, and so forth, and this bill authorizes an appropriation of $50,000,000 for these various purposes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Which can be used for that purpose?

Mr. LANHAM. Part of it; yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. An appropriation for the Guffey Coal Act was precluded when the Committee on Rules declined to favor a resolution to consider a bill to continue the life of the Commission beyond August 24.

We provided for completion of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway from Florida to Texas. We provided the remaining amount of some $7,000,000 to complete the project.

We also provided $4,385,000 for the Youngstown flood project, where in a recent flood the river came within a half inch of putting out of commission three of the largest and most important steel plants in the Nation.

We provided $10,000,000 for repair of levees under the jurisdiction of the War Department and $80,000 to readjust salaries in the State Soldiers Home.

Before I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, as I said before, this appropriation has never been before the Appropriations Committee of the House. We have never had a chance to be heard. There are several Members of the House who are opposed to this appropriation. The National Housing Administration has never shown a committee of the House of Representatives, the Rules Committee, or the Appropriations Committee, where one single dollar is needed.

We have today between 45,000 and 60,000 empty housing units built from the Lanham Act funds. We have today 45,000 or 50,000 units that will never have anyone living in them and if we build 300,000 more we will have at least 100,000 units in which there will never be anyone living. I have made an investigation of this myself, I have the evidence, and I know what I am talking about. If anyone can show me how building empty houses is going to win this war I will support this appropriation.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I have not the time to yield.

Mr. Speaker, this housing agency has between $30,000,000 and $40,000,000 in funds now with which to build houses. They do not need an additional appropriation at this time. Therefore I think that $50,000,000 would be adequate. I have always thought that $50,000,000 would be adequate to carry them over and do the job that is essential to the war effort.

I only had 20 minutes out of the entire time allowed in the consideration of the bill authorizing the pending appropriation. The proponents of the measure had 1 hour and 40 minutes. I had less than half enough time to present my case to the committee. Here I am and here we are today, Members of the House, put in the position of appropriating money for something few know anything about. You have not had a chance to hear anyone on the issue, you have heard only from a few people who have been advocating this appropriation. The opposition have had no chance whatever to present their case.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this conference report will be voted down and that the conferees will be instructed to amend this particular section to $50,000,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, may I say in reply to the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana that the evidence before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds shows that the family units are 91-percent occupied, and with reference to all the units, both family units and the units for single workers, they are 84-percent occupied. Of course, vacancies arise with reference to these single workers because many of them are taken out of their employment and put into our military services. These vacancies do occur. They are temporary by reason of the fact that others come along to replace these men when they are taken into the service. But it is a fine record under all the circumstances to have 91 percent of the family units occupied and an over-all picture of 84 percent of them occupied.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the statement of my distinguished chairman. We have held a number of hearings in our committee on this piece of legislation. The records will show that, as he stated, 84 percent of these buildings are occupied.

I regret exceedingly that my distinguished friend and colleague from Indiana has taken the position he has. You recall that several days ago we debated this matter for 2 hours on the floor of the House, 1 hour assigned to the other side and 1 hour to our side. The gentleman from Indiana had 20 minutes of the 1 hour allotted to our side and the rest of us had 5 and 10 minutes apiece. This House then, by a majority vote, sustained the recommendation of the committee and against the recommendation of the gentleman from Indiana.

It is to be regretted that when we had our committee meeting yesterday our distinguished friend from Indiana, probably because of official business, was unable to attend, because at that committee meeting we ironed out a number of the objections that were brought up on the floor.

I sincerely trust that the House will this morning go along with the recommendation of the conferees and stand by their previous action, notwithstanding the objections of the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I have noticed for the first time that this appropriation contains a certain amount of money for the completion of a dam known as the Mosquito Creek Dam in the Mahoning River, in the vicinity of Youngstown, Ohio. A good many of the people from Pittsburgh and western Pennsylvania have felt that this dam, although it purports to be a flood-control project, is really in aid of a canal which they have been trying for some time to build from Youngstown to the Ohio River.

I, together with some of my colleagues on both sides of the House from Pennsylvania, have taken this matter up with various departments of the Federal Government. They assure us that this is really a bona fide dam. I am taking this time to say that if there is any attempt on the part of the people behind this project to use it in aid of this canal, which we feel to be unfair and uneconomic, we are being deceived at the present time, and will resist any further building which will be in aid of the canal.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1938 this House authorized the construction of this dam. Two years ago, in 1941, the heads of a steel plant appeared before a Senate committee and testified that they were losing 4,000 tons of steel a month, 3 plants losing 12,000 tons a month, or 84,000 tons of steel a year. In the summertime this loss is due to low water, and in the wintertime they are losing this steel through high water.

We have a War Production Board down here which requires us to get priorities if we want to get a coffee grinder, but there are 84,000 tons of steel being lost for the want of a dam.

This dam should have been constructed long ago, at a cost of only $4,000,000. This dam is to keep the steel plants going, to furnish the material and make everything that is necessary in winning the war. Even the railroad has admitted that this dam is no part of a canal. I do not think the gentleman from Pennsylvania was ever in the town of Youngstown, Ohio, yet he stands here and tells us something about what is going on down there, without knowing what is going on.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. As a matter of fact, I happen to have visited quite frequently the city which the gentleman has represented so well. The railroad companies are very much opposed to this particular dam, and only because they believe it is physically in aid of this canal. If it were a legitimate flood-control project and necessary to the gentleman's district, I would be the last person to oppose it. The only reason I am making this statement is that I want it to be made sure that we shall resist any attempt to use this dam in aid of this canal. which we feel to be unjust to the western Pennsylvania district.

Mr. KIRWAN. Senator GUFFEY had opposed this project, but when he found out that it was no part of a canal, he withdrew his objection. This is not only for my district, it is of aid to the Nation in the production of steel.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the housing item, together with the item for community facilities, has been reduced to $150,000,000 in all. That it, $50,000,000 for facilities and $100,000,000 for housing.

There were no hearings anywhere indicating just what they wanted to do with the money. We are going a long way letting bureaucrats have $150,000,000 without any hearings whatever to justify it. The only reason that anyone has for signing the conference report and going along with it is that probably they cannot do a great deal more than they need when they had a budget estimate for $300,000,000 on one, item, and, as I remember it, $150,000,000 on another, making a total of $450,000,000, and they are only getting $150,000,000.

I just want to serve notice on this housing outfit that they cannot come in here and get me to sign another conference report without telling us what they are going to do with the money in detail. There is absolutely no justification in the record for the appropriation of a dollar. We are taking it on faith, making a cut on the basis of what they asked for originally by dividing it by 3. I do not like that way of doing business and I want these people to know that they will never get me to go along again without calling attention to it on the floor and fighting it and without giving us the detail and telling us what they want the money for.

There are several things in here that are quite liberal. On the other hand, they are what we had to yield to in connection with getting an agreement out of the Senate. When the Senate makes a business of increasing by tenfold what we send over to them, we always know there is considerable "velvet" in it. Those are the times that we have to watch and cut down just as much as we can. There are a great many amendments in disagreement that will require discussion later on, but for the time being I will not add anything further.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TABER. Yes, I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Did your committee strike out the proposed item of $20,000,000 as an appropriation under Senate 1130?

Mr. TABER. We did, because we had no authorization to carry any such thing. If we had wanted to, we could not put it in the conference report without making the conference report subject to a point of order, and we thought that no such thing as that should be considered without our first having legislative authority and hearing in detail as to what should be done.

Mr. McGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. If I understand the gentleman correctly, the $20,000,000 is dependent upon the passage of S. 1130, then?

Mr. TABER. Oh, I do not know anything about that. It is not in this bill and it is not dependent on anything now except the passage of the bill and future hearings before the Appropriations Commitee as to need.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. May I bring to the attention of the gentleman from New York that the service contemplated by the proposed appropriation is carried out through the appropriation to which the gentleman referred, under the so-called Lanham Act, with reference to community facilities?

Mr. TABER. But it is being carried out in a very extravagant manner under the direction of a woman by the name of Florence Kerr, who is moving people all around in it at enormously high salaries. I call especial attention to one case in New Orleans where they had a set-up that satisfied the locality and took care of everything for $130,000. They only had one supervisor at $350 a month. She moves in and boosts the cost to over $500,000 and puts in seven or eight supervisors with one at the head at $500 a month. That kind of business is something that requires considerable brakes.

Mr. LANHAM. They are asking for a great deal more than has been used by the Federal Works Agency for that purpose.

Mr. TABER. That may be.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to ask a question. With reference to this proposal of the Senate for this child-care program, do I not recall that at one time the gentleman from Missouri reported that in another bill provision was being made for the child-care program, for the children of mothers engaged in war industries?

Mr. LANHAM. If the gentleman will permit me to answer that, that is provided for under title II of the so-called Lanham Act. Care is being taken of the children of the war mothers.

Mr. CASE. And is the gentleman satisfied that adequate care is being provided under that item?

Mr. LANHAM. I think insofar as it can be done at this time it is being done, and much less money has been spent for that purpose than is contemplated under this Senate proposal.

Mr. CASE. Then the action of the conferees on this bill is satisfactory at this time to the gentleman on this point?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 306; nays 30, not voting 94, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

YEAS—306

Abernethy	Angell	Bell
Allen, La.	Arends	Bennett, Mo.
Andersen, H. Carl	Arnold	Bishop
	Auchincloss	Blackney
Anderson, Calif.	Baldwin, N. Y.	Bloom
Anderson, N. Mex.	Bates, Ky.	Bolton
	Bates, Mass.	Bonner
Andresen, August H.	Beall	Boren
	Beckworth	Bradley, Pa.

Brown, Ga.	Hinshaw	Peterson, Fla.
Brown, Ohio	Hobbs	Peterson, Ga.
Bryson	Hoch	Pfeifer
Bulwinkle	Hoeven	Philbin
Burchill, N. Y.	Holmes, Mass.	Pittenger
Burdick	Holmes, Wash.	Ploeser
Burgin	Hope	Poulson
Butler	Horan	Powers
Byrne	Howell	Price
Camp	Hull	Priest
Canfield	Jackson	Rabaut
Cannon, Fla.	Jarman	Ramspeck
Cannon, Mo.	Jeffrey	Randolph
Carson, Ohio	Jenkins	Rankin
Carter	Jennings	Reece, Tenn.
Case	Jensen	Reed, Ill.
Celler	Johnson,	Reed, N. Y.
Chapman	Calvin D.	Rees, Kans.
Chiperfield	Johnson, Ind.	Richards
Church	Johnson,	Rivers
Clark	J. Leroy	Robertson
Clason	Johnson,	Robinson, Utah
Coffee	Luther A.	Robsion, Ky.
Cole, Mo.	Johnson,	Rockwell
Cole, N. Y.	Lyndon B.	Rodgers, Pa.
Colmer	Johnson, Okla.	Rogers, Calif.
Cooley	Jonkman	Rogers, Mass.
Cooper	Judd	Rohrbough
Courtney	Kean	Rolph
Cravens	Kearney	Rowan
Creal	Kee	Satterfield
Crosser	Kelley	Sauthoff
Cullen	Kennedy	Scanlon
Cunningham	Keogh	Schiffler
Curtis	Kern	Schuetz
D'Alesandro	Kinzer	Schwabe
Davis	Kirwan	Scott
Day	Kleberg	Shafer
Dewey	Klein	Sheppard
Dickstein	Knutson	Short
Dilweg	Kunkel	Sikes
Dingell	Lambertson	Simpson, Ill.
Dirksen	Landis	Simpson, Pa.
Disney	Lane	Smith, Maine
Dondero	Lanham	Smith, Va.
Eaton	Lea	Smith, Wis.
Eberharter	LeCompte	Snyder
Elliott	LeFevre	Somers, N. Y.
Ellison, Md.	Lemke	Sparkman
Ellsworth	Lesinski	Spence
Elston, Ohio	Luce	Springer
Engel	Ludlow	Stanley
Feighan	Lynch	Starnes, Ala.
Fenton	McGehee	Steagall
Fernandez	McGregor	Stearns, N. H.
Fish	McKenzie	Stefan
Flannagan	McLean	Stewart
Fogarty	McMillan	Stockman
Folger	McMurray	Sullivan
Forand	Maas	Sumners, Tex.
Fulbright	Madden	Sundstrom
Furlong	Mahon	Taber
Gale	Manasco	Talbot
Gamble	Mansfield,	Talle
Gathings	Mont.	Taylor
Gavagan	Marcantonio	Thomas, N. J.
Gavin	Martin, Iowa	Thomas, Tex.
Gearhart	Martin, Mass.	Thomason
Gerlach	Mason	Tibbott
Gibson	May	Towe
Gillette	Merritt	Voorhis, Calif.
Goodwin	Merrow	Wadsworth
Gossett	Michener	Walter
Graham	Miller, Conn.	Ward
Granger	Miller, Mo.	Wasielewski
Grant, Ala.	Miller, Nebr.	Weichel, Ohio
Grant, Ind.	Miller, Pa.	Weiss
Gregory	Mills	Welch
Griffiths	Monkiewicz	Wene
Gross	Morrison, La.	West
Gwynne	Mruk	Wheat
Hagen	Mundt	Whelchel, Ga.
Hall,	Murdock	White
Leonard W.	Murphy	Whittington
Halleck	Murray, Tenn.	Wickersham
Hancock	Myers	Wigglesworth
Hare	Newsome	Willey
Harless, Ariz.	Norrell	Winstead
Harness, Ind.	O'Brien, Mich.	Wolcott
Hart	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Hartley	O'Neal	Wolverton, N. J.
Hays	O'Toole	Woodruff, Mich.
Heffernan	Outland	Woodrum, Va.
Hendricks	Pace	Worley
Herter	Patman	Wright
Hess	Patton	Zimmerman

NAYS—30

Barrett	Clevenger	Hoffman
Bender	Compton	Johnson,
Brehm	Crawford	Anton J.
Buffett	Dworshak	Jones
Busbey	Ellis	LaFollette
Carlson, Kans.	Fellows	Lewis
Chenoweth	Heidinger	McCowen
McWilliams	Smith, Ohio	Wilson
Ramey	Vincent, Ky.	Winter
Rizly	Vorys, Ohio	
Rowe	Vursell	

NOT VOTING—94

Allen, Ill.	Fulmer	Morrison, N. C.
Andrews	Gallagher	Mott
Baldwin, Md.	Gifford	Murray, Wis.
Barden	Gilchrist	Norman
Barry	Gillie	Norton
Bennett, Mich.	Gordon	O'Brien, Ill.
Bland	Gore	O'Connor
Boykin	Gorski	O'Hara
Bradley, Mich.	Green	O'Konski
Brooks	Hale	O'Leary
Buckley	Hall,	Phillips
Burch, Va.	Edwin Arthur	Plumley
Capozzoli	Harris, Ark.	Poage
Cochran	Harris, Va.	Pracht
Costello	Hébert	Russell
Cox	Hill	Sabath
Culkin	Holifield	Sadowski
Curley	Izac	Sasscer
Dawson	Johnson, Ward	Sheridan
Delaney	Keefe	Slaughter
Dies	Kefauver	Smith, W. Va.
Ditter	Kilburn	Stevenson
Domengeaux	Kilday	Sumner, Ill.
Doughton	King	Tarver
Douglas	Larcade	Tolan
Drewry	McCord	Treadway
Durham	McCormack	Troutman
Elmer	McGranery	Van Zandt
Fay	Magnuson	Vinson, Ga.
Fisher	Maloney	Weaver
Fitzpatrick	Mansfield, Tex.	Whitten
Ford	Monroney	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Ward Johnson.
Mr. Doughton with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Hill.
Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Gallagher.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Elmer.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Norman.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Gordon with Mr. Gillie.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Hale.
Mr. Fay with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Troutman.
Mr. Tarver with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Pracht.
Mr. Curley with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Gorski with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Harris of Virginia with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Tolan with Mr. Gilchrist.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 8: On page 4, line 13, insert:

"OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

"OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

"The second paragraph under the caption 'Office of War Information,' contained in the National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1944, shall not prevent the preparation and distribution to the public of the United States Government Manual."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

"Before the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following paragraph:

" 'OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

" 'The eighth proviso in the paragraph under the caption Office of Price Administration, contained in the National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1944, shall not take effect until August 16, 1943.' "

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there are two items contained in this amendment. One relates to the continuation of the United States Government Manual under the Office of War Information, which would have to be discontinued under an amendment inserted in the war agencies appropriation bill.

The second provision relates to the inhibition under the Office of Price Administration which was adopted as a part of the war agencies appropriation bill, prohibiting the employment of employees without business experience. Under that bill the provision becomes effective immediately and obviously allows them no time for adjustment. The pending amendment gives them 45 days in which to make provision.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 9: Page 4, line 20, insert:

"WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

"National Youth Administration: Upon the application within 60 days of any State or State board of vocational education, or county or county board of education, any building, accessory, equipment, tools or machinery of any type heretofore in use by the National Youth Administration, and located in such State and county, shall be transferred by the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department to any such applicant without compensation."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by such amendment, insert the following:

"WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

"National Youth Administration: For an additional amount for the National Youth Administration in the performance of its functions from July 1, 1943, to the date of enactment of the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1944, and thereafter for the liquidation of such administration, including not to exceed $2,000 for printing and binding, not to exceed $1,500,000 from the

unexpended balance of the appropriations for the National Youth Administration in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1943, to be added to and merged with the funds made available for the liquidation of the National Youth Administration by such Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1944; and of such merged amount not less than $1,487,000 shall be allocated and set apart to be used exclusively for payment of accumulated and accrued leave of employees: *Provided*, That all real and personal property of the National Youth Administration is hereby declared surplus, and all equipment, materials, and supplies shall be assembled, inventoried, and turned over to the Director of Procurement, Treasury Department, under Executive Order 9235 by the Administrator of the National Youth Administration as expeditiously as possible, and all real property shall be disposed of by the Commissioner of Public Buildings in accordance with the act of August 27, 1935 (40 U. S. C., 304 (a) and 304 (b)): *Provided further*, That under commitment to return such property to the United States at borrower's expense, any real or personal property of the National Youth Administration in use on June 30, 1943, by any State or other public vocational education authority may continue to be so used during the period of the present war and for not to exceed 6 months after the termination thereof, without compensation, but in no event beyond the date such property ceases to be used for vocational education purposes: *Provided further*, That during such period the Director of Procurement, in the case of personal property, and the Commissioner of Public Buildings, in the case of real property, upon certificate of the United States Commissioner of Education that such property is to be used for vocational education and training, may loan, without compensation, to any State or other public vocational education authority, if applied for within 90 days after the date of enactment of this act, any real or personal property of the National Youth Administration not required by any other Federal agency or otherwise loaned under the authority of this paragraph, if such borrower agrees, in the case of personal property, to pay all expenses incident to obtaining and returning such property."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask to be notified when I have consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. For what purpose?

Mr. HOBBS. I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the committee.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield to the gentleman to offer an amendment.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the gentleman has yielded to me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama makes the point of order that the gentleman from Missouri yielded to the gentleman from Alabama, but when the gentleman from Missouri heard for what purpose the gentleman from Alabama desired recognition he refused to yield.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri asked me for what purpose I desired recognition and I stated for the purpose of offering an amendment to the committee amendment, and he yielded to me after that.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if I so stated it was through inadvertence as my purpose in preferring the unusual question as to the purpose for which the gentleman desired recognition was obviously to decline recognition for an amendment. Members in charge of bills are charged with the responsibility of protecting such bills from amendment. I could not yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama to offer an amendment, because I am not authorized to yield, for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has voted to liquidate the National Youth Administration. That organization now has under its control $55,000,000 worth of property in 1,700 different locations throughout the United States. The purpose of this amendment is to provide for the orderly and economical conservation and disposition of that property.

Speaking generally, the plan adopted under the legislation in disagreement between the two Houses and the plan determined upon by the conferees was to loan rather than grant, gratuitously, any of this property at this time to the public institution which were using it on June 30, to remain under their control for a period ending 6 months after the termination of the war or until it ceased to be used for vocational education. In other words, it is turned over to the schools now using it solely and exclusively for the purposes of vocational education and when it ceases to be so used it is to be returned at the expense of the borrowing agency.

Such of the property as is not being used on June 30, by public vocational educational institutions for that purpose is to be available to Government agencies, especially the Army and the Navy, who are to pay for it out of funds at their disposition. Other property which the Government agencies do not want and which is turned back by the educational institutions having it at this time can be loaned for the purpose of public vocational education and training to public vocational education authorities.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the conditions that have been described in this debate, and the pertinent questions that have been asked, show clearly the need of an appropriation of some money to enable the schools to avail themselves of the opportunity the pending amendment seeks to give them.

But also the need of teachers to take the places of those who have gone from their classrooms into the fighting forces or into war industries is perfectly apparent to all who know anything of the teacher shortage. Unless we are indifferent to the sad plight of our schools and colleges we must provide for the continuation of the educational program of the National Youth Administration, both to aid in the solution of the problem of furnishing qualified teachers and the direct aid to the financially suffering schools and colleges whose enrollments have been cut so drastically by the war.

With these thoughts in mind, I sought to offer the amendment I shall read in concluding these remarks. You know how I was prevented from offering this amendment and was deprived of the chance even to have it read.

In order that you may know what it was, I now read it for your information and consideration.

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS: After the Committee or House conferees' amendment, insert:

"Such unexpended balance, after the funds made available hereinabove shall have been deducted, the remainder shall be transferred and credited to the United States Office of Education for the continuation during the fiscal year 1943 of the war training and educational program in schools and colleges by virtue of the cooperation of National Youth Administration, plus such additional amount as may be necessary to increase such remainder to the sum of $6,000,000, which additional amount is hereby appropriated and made available for such purpose."

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I promised to yield to the gentleman from Michigan to permit him to submit a request.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and the other special orders heretofore granted I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ENGEL and Mr. MURDOCK rose.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield first to the gentleman from Michigan, a member of the committee.

Mr. ENGEL. As I understand it, this amendment does not postpone the date of liquidation as set in the bill passed some days ago, January 1, 1944.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. ENGEL. National Youth Administration must be liquidated by January 1, 1944.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes in order to answer the questions of the Members on their feet.

Mr. ENGEL. This million and a half additional is to pay for leaves and meet the pay roll from July 1 to the date of dispersal; is that right?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is correct. There is due in accrued leave and for operation from July 1 up to the date of the enactment of the regular annual bill in round figures about $2,000,000. To meet these fixed obligations we earmarked a million and

a half of this fund as the gentleman has indicated.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. Then the personal property which has been loaned to schools remains there for the duration of 6 months and they have the first priority.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Property in use on June 30 last by a public vocational school can continue to be loaned to that school for use for vocational-education purposes during the war and for not more than 6 months afterward. Government agencies have prior consideration for the rest of the property and after them public vocational-education authorities can be loaned this property for vocational education and training.

Mr. ENGEL. Then the war agencies have next priority; is that right?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; they have priority to buy.

Mr. ENGEL. The vocational schools have priority as far as leasing the property is concerned until 6 months after the termination of the war.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Provided it is to be used for vocational education.

Mr. ENGEL. The personal property is to be disposed of by the Procurement Division of the Treasury and the real property by the Public Buildings and Grounds Division; is that right?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], a member of the committee.

Mr. RABAUT. The understanding I had when we were in committee yesterday was that these facilities would remain in the schools in which they are now located if they were used for vocational training. Under the language that has been suggested here, however, these facilities are only permitted to remain in the public schools. There are some private schools that have these facilities; there are some institutions, such as colleges, that have these facilities. I do not think it was the intention to deny such institutions in the language proposed yesterday in the committee.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. Replying to the gentleman from Michigan who is interested in some of these schools, I think it was the belief of the committee that under this language the public authorities would designate such schools as needed this equipment and should be operated, even private schools. And they would be entitled to the use of this property provided they carried on the program as it had been carried on prior to this time. In other words, it does not mean that the public agency could not have a designee, a private agency, who could operate it by authority from that public agency. The wisdom of allowing a law to be passed under which Government property would be turned over to some private individual or group, is doubtful in my opinion. It should go through some governmental agency of the State, county, or the city.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I shall take 3 additional minutes to reply to the gentleman's questions.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, is it the chairman's understanding of this bill that this property that is in private institutions now is to be taken out immediately whether they are using it or not?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I have consulted the clerk to the committee and I am advised that we adopted the provision in the Senate amendment which limits it to public institutions.

Mr. RABAUT. Would private institutions be permitted to use it, or will it be taken away from them? If it is, the bill is discriminatory.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am advised that the Senate language limits it to public institutions.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. A part of my question has been answered. I am anxious that this N. Y. A. material be made available to our public schools to the greatest possible extent for war training. Do I understand now that this equipment is loaned to public institutions and no rental charges are made?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no rental charge. The only requirement is that they return it at their own expense at the conclusion of the period for which it is loaned.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman tell me what becomes of the facilities that are not in schools but have been operated wholly by the National Youth Administration? Can they be turned over to the public-school bodies?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It goes to such Government agencies as request it, notably the Army and Navy which must pay for it out of the funds allotted to them. If Government agencies do not want it the public institutions can request a loan of it for vocational education and training and if no one wants it, it can be sold as surplus.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Why should not public schools in a case like that be allowed to take over these facilities?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The purpose of this is to leave it in the public schools where it is retained without cost or charge as long as it is used for vocational education up until 6 months after the war when final disposition can be made of it.

Mr. RAMSPECK. If I may say to the chairman, I have in my district a very large facility of the National Youth Administration being used to train war workers for a bomber plant. It is going to be shut down. Why cannot the county schools take it over and operate it?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They have absolute authority to loan it to carry on that work as long as it is used for vocational education, if not needed by some Federal agency.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Provided the county board of that county asks for the transfer?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; certainly.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I shall take 5 additional minutes.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. In view of the confusion we have had, I think it comes about by a lot of Members asking questions that no one can hear because they are not by the microphone. I suggest if anyone wants to ask a question of someone else that they go to the microphone where they can be heard.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The point is well taken, and I concur in the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have the same problem in my district that the gentleman from Georgia who has just interrogated the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The situation is that this N. Y. A. facility has been operated by the N. Y. A. making goods for war purposes for the Army and Navy, doing it in property owned by the school board. The school board has furnished the property. Now, that is closed down. It is not clear to me, and I do not think it is clear to the gentleman from Georgia, that the language of the conference report is clear enough to take care of that situation so the property may be retained there. My suggestion to the chairman is this: Can we not have that language a little bit more specific so there will be no question about it?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The language specifically applies to precisely that situation. If there is no requisition from the Army or Navy, it can and will be loaned for that purpose upon request of the school.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Will the gentleman tell us just how it does so, so that there may be no misunderstanding about that? Will he do that in his extension of remarks?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the educational board makes application for it, it will be loaned if it is to be used for vocational education purposes.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire with regard to the dis-

mantling of some of the facilities already in existence. I am informed that some well-regulated and productive institutions have already been taken down and the machinery has been stored. I am also told by the superintendent of schools of the city of Detroit that they are reluctant to have to apply to the State board or to anyone else, and he insists that they should have the right to take over existing facilities and to make their application direct and that they should be protected in this regard.

Mr. TABER. They would be allowed to under this language.

Mr. DINGELL. Well, I will accept that, but I would like to have the Chairman make that specific so there will be no misunderstanding.

May I say with regard to the general use of this machinery, that there are many institutions, not necessarily public schools, but private schools and other schools under N. Y. A. that have been teaching and doing a very creditable piece of work. They should not now be disturbed. All these should have the same privilege until 6 months after the war. I do not think there should be any partiality shown because it is an emergent question and it requires the training of the greatest possible number, particularly in such localities as the city of Detroit. I would like to have some assurance from the Chairman that private and public schools and such institutions as have been training the youth for war work will have the privilege of using this machinery and that meantime the N. Y. A. discontinue dismantling these plants until full and final disposition is made.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I understand the gentleman's interest in the dismantling of these plants, but Congress has spoken, Congress has ordered N. Y. A. liquidated, the Congress has determined that these plants, regardless of the work they are doing or how essential or how valuable they are, shall be discontinued, and we have no alternative but to follow the direction of the Congress.

As to this surplus material, some of the machinery and equipment is exceedingly valuable and in great demand. The Army and Navy are crying for it right now. Under the pending amendment, after public educational institutions now using this equipment have been cared for, the remaining surplus material is subject to disposition to Government agencies and the Government agencies, such as the Army and Navy, have priority.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman advise the House whether or not any provision has been made whereby after the Army and the Navy have exercised their priority in the selection of such machinery as they may need, either a private school or a public school has the right to buy this machinery and use it where it now is?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Under the language of the Senate amendment and under the revision adopted in conference, after the public schools which now have this equipment have been provided for and the agencies of the Government have exercised their priority, then the remaining surplus can be loaned to any public institution provided it uses the equipment for vocational education.

Mr. DONDERO. Could they buy it in order that they would own that machinery, and leave it there?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in order to yield for a question, I shall take 3 additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for an observation?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, a member of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the chairman of the committee to yield that I might be able to make a brief but, I trust, appropriate observation with reference to the "funeral arrangements" that the committee has made concerning the remains of the late National Youth Administration.

The spectacle that we have witnessed for the past several minutes of many Members standing on the floor of this House demanding to know what is going to happen to their particular N. Y. A. projects is exactly what I anticipated would happen. I predict there is going to be still more confusion and embarrassment when Members return home, especially to Members who voted to kill the N. Y. A. on the theory that it was not contributing anything to the war effort. I am gratified, of course, to learn that some Members who were bitter in their criticism and denunciation of that organization have finally discovered that they have, or had, one or more projects in their own districts that were vitally important to the war effort. Frankly, their complaints now about closing down their projects come mighty late.

It is also interesting and very significant to see that many of the inquiries, complaints, and criticisms against the deficiency committee as to the manner in which the N. Y. A. is to be liquidated, come from those who apparently did not know that they had an N. Y. A. project a few days ago, or else from those who insisted that it was rendering no appreciable benefit in training young people for the vital war industries.

When you return to your districts within a few days there is going to be a sign on the doors of most of those splendid, well-equipped N. Y. A. shops, 1,500 in all, "Closed for the duration." Regardless of the language of this amendment, there is nothing that the committee can now do except to liquidate that organization.

I am glad, Mr. Speaker, the RECORD will show that I opposed to the end the closing of these N. Y. A. shops that have carried on such an outstanding, constructive, and worth-while training program for the young men and young women of America.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. In reading over the language of the proposed amendment, I notice it carries the words "any other Federal agency." It would occur to me that a fair interpretation of that might be that any Federal agency would have priority over any State or county agency. I refer particularly to the language toward the conclusion of the amendment which reads, in part:

> Any real or personal property of the National Youth Administration not required by any other Federal agency or otherwise loaned under the authority of this paragraph.

Would that not mean in effect that the United States Office of Education would have a priority over any State educational set-up?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. After the public educational institutions which now have the material have been provided with what they require, the Federal agencies then have priority as the gentleman has indicated, and they can secure this material on application if they pay for it. Upon payment it is theirs and they may use it for their own purposes.

Mr. CASE. The part of the amendment to which I have referred deals with the loaning of this property and the returning of it, if the borrower agrees to pay the expenses.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The loaning is exclusively for vocational educational purposes, but when no longer required for that purpose any Federal agency in the exercise of its right of priority can buy it and use it as it deems best.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, when the committee considered this matter the intention was very clear as to what was to be done. Certainly the language is meant to carry out these ideas. The intention of the conferees was simply this. Since the liquidation of N. Y. A. had been ordered, we did not wish that there be a complete waste and disuse of the material, with which they have worked, consequently we attempted to draft an amendment which would carry that desire into effect. Under the law, the Army, Navy, and Government departments have first call on surplus property. This right remains under this amendment. We did not touch that. But in the event that it is not called for by these Government agencies, the intention of the conferees was to make it possible for those schools to be operated, should any public agency want them to be operated, by making application to the proper authorities. Any material which was needed by the public authorities could be turned over to a public

agency, school district, city district, or any other public agency, and the property would be turned over to it by way of a loan until 6 months after the war ends. That was the intention.

It was further intended that where these schools were being operated by some private group, since this is the Federal Government's property it would be turned over upon application to the State or some subdistricts, and they in turn could designate some private agency to go ahead about as they had before.

The whole proposition meant to be covered by this amendment is the full utilization of the existing N. Y. A. school facilities by application on the part of a public body and also by designation by that body to some private institution where they had been operating that way in the past. That is my understanding of the intent of this amendment and I believe the amendment carries that into effect.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I, along with many other Members of this House, voted in favor of the continuation of the National Youth Administration because I felt that every single facility we had for use in the war-training program would be necessary and should be used. It seems to me that this discussion today indicates that that is true, and that these facilities are going to be made available to these various school agencies.

I should like to ask the chairman this question, if I may. We have been talking about making these facilities available to the various schools and agencies in order to use them for war training. The question that is bothering me is: Where are these schools going to get the funds necessary to employ the personnel for the operation of these training facilities? Has the committee provided additional funds to take care of that?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The proposition here is to dispose of surplus material. We have nothing to do with the operation.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. The War Department and the Navy Department have training schools in which they are furnishing instructors for persons in the Army and the Navy. They could use this material. The Office of Education has $90,000,000 to be used in training men for industry, and they have instructors.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But the $90,000,000 is a reduction of the amount budgeted. No one is more anxious than I am to see this amendment adopted making possible the transfer of this equipment to the educational agencies. I think our war effort demands that it be used to the fullest. But I fear that with the reduced appropriations for vocational education we may be doing a futile thing. We are certainly imposing an added responsibility upon our educational agencies in that we are asking them to take over some of the training work formerly done by N. Y. A. The schools will do that job to the best of their ability, but we should have voted increased appropriations to make that possible.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under the terms of this motion "the property shall be turned over to any other Federal agency," the National Youth Administration having been created by Executive order, could not the President create another agency by Executive order and use the funds he now has on hand and have this property turned over to that agency, under that term "any other Federal agency"?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no provision under which this could be used for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman in addition to yielding me 1 minute also yield for the purpose of offering an amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman defer that for the present?

Mr. HOBBS. Very well.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the question of the bill, S. 35, the silver bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, as I read the latter part of this motion made by the gentleman from Missouri it will not take care of such situations as the one in which I am interested, where the N. Y. A. is operating a training center on property owned by one of the counties in my district, in buildings owned by that county. There is no provision made in this motion to let that county continue to operate that training center.

Right near the city of Atlanta we have a bomber-assembly plant which will employ 29,000 people. It is just getting ready to go into production. They need to train many workers there. It seems to me it does not make sense to pass a motion of this sort, which will not give that county an opportunity to take its own funds and operate this machinery for the purpose of training people in that community to work in a war plant. Therefore I am not going to support the motion unless it is amended. I hope the House will vote it down so that it can go back to conference and they can write it so that it will be workable.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] is mistaken in his interpretation of this amendment. I know it is the intention of this committee, and the chief clerk, who has been with the committee many years and who is conceded to be an expert, advises that the language is broad enough to include such a situation as the gentleman describes. Certainly it is the avowed intention of the committee that it shall. I might say that I have a similar situation in my own district, where there is a modern up-to-date N. Y. A. shop that has been training approximately 200 young men and women for work in war industries. I raised this same question at the time the committee was trying to agree on the language and was assured then that the language is sufficiently broad to include a project of this kind.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. If I understand the language, the property must be first offered to other agencies of the Government before the county authorities have any chance to take it over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct, on the theory that the armed forces, if they need these facilities, must have first call. I believe that is the intention of the membership of this House to use these facilities for the war effort if it is possible to do so. Then if no war agency wants it, let the city, town, or county public-school system take it over and operate it if it can find a way to pay the trained personnel to do so. Of course, such an arrangement may not be satisfactory in many instances, but it seems to be the best arrangement that can be made under the present circumstances.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE], chairman of the subcommittee which originally had charge of this legislation.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I shall direct my remarks primarily to the inquiry of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], because I am interested in projects or proposals similar to the one he has referred to and have reached a conclusion somewhat different to that expressed by him. The amendment provides that

all property of the National Youth Administration is declared surplus by this act and that all equipment, materials and supplies shall be inventoried and turned over to the Director of Procurement in the Treasury Department to be disposed of according to the act of August 27, 1935; it provides further that, under certain conditions, all such property may be loaned to a State or other vocational educational authority to be used for educational purposes within the State and county where located during the remainder of the war and 6 months thereafter, provided that application is made by a State or other vocational educational authority within 90 days after the passage of this bill, provided such property is not required by any other Federal agency, such as the War Department or the Navy Department, both of which have been and are still engaged in giving young men and women training similar to or corresponding to that formerly given by the National Youth Administration and the United States Office of Education.

My understanding is, therefore, that the Army and Navy shall first be entitled to these properties, as provided under existing law, and after that the United States Office of Education may be entitled to such properties if it can be used in its vocational educational program. Therefore, a State, or State vocational educational board, or a county vocational educational board will have a right, through the United States Office of Education, to make a requisition for these properties and will be entitled to same in case a requisition is not first made by the War Department or the Navy Department.

I am sure the gentleman from Georgia has in his county and his State a vocational educational board, either of which may be classed as "another governmental agency" and would be entitled to this material, equipment, and so forth, for use in their vocational schools. This is my interpretation of the amendment.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. The Lanham Act does not provide any money for vocational training, and that is where they get the money from.

Mr. HARE. Oh, no; I think my colleague is mistaken, for we passed a bill only a few days ago carrying an appropriation of $90,000,000 in the way of grants to the States for use in the vocational-education program of defense workers. Under the proposed amendment the United States Office of Education, a State or county vocational education board may file application for the buildings, equipment, materials, and so forth, of the N. Y. A. and use it during this emergency and 6 months thereafter without compensation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] 4 minutes.

Mr. TABER Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I can clear this situation up or not, but I intend to try.

The authority given here to turn things over to other Federal agencies has to be construed as limited to those agencies that would have funds available to pay for the stuff. Nothing can be turned over to any agency that does not have the money to pay for the stuff, and they have to get the money by securing an appropriation. The only agencies that would have the money would be the Army and the Navy. That is the situation exactly as it stands.

The committee wants to make available to any State vocational school or any local school in a school district, whatever it might be called, the material and machinery that the N. Y. A. has so that it could be put to use.

Frankly, should the Army and the Navy need it for factories that they are directly or indirectly operating, that is what it ought to be used for. There are a lot of factories that could use this material to very good advantage. Frankly, I am not sure but what we would be better off if the stuff was sold to the factories, but there seems to be a very considerable sentiment that the vocational schools, where they are in need of this machinery, might have the opportunity to use it, and that is what we provided.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. In just a moment. It is absolutely impossible to allocate any of the President's funds for such a function as the N. Y. A. under the limitations that have been set up; it is absolutely impossible for the Department of Education to go ahead and do anything of this kind for the funds that have been appropriated to them are for allocation to the State schools and the State commissioner of education could not go ahead with funds that have been allocated to him.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Of course, we all know that if the Army and the Navy really need this material and want it they can get it anyway.

Mr. TABER. They will get it, if they want to make use of it, and they ought to.

I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that the title to the buildings and the equipment that is a part of the buildings generally is in the local community, in many instances, where it has been used for vocational education, where they have used both the buildings and the machinery?

Mr. TABER. Well, that is true to a very large extent.

Of course, the N. Y. A. activities were so far beyond anything that many of us imagined, such as conducting model dairy farms with bureaucratic cattle and all that sort of thing, that it is almost impossible to conceive of the activities and the extent of the activities in which they were engaged. The thing ought to be liquidated and sold immediately.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Is it not a fair construction that the priorities that the Federal agencies will have is limited to purchases, and that the availability of the property to the States and local communities is limited to borrowing for the duration of the war, and that the property neither sold nor loaned will remain in the custody of Treasury Procurement, if personal property, and of the Public Buildings Commissioner if real property?

Mr. TABER. That is correct, except that the property neither sold to other Government agencies or loaned, will under the rules, be sold to the public.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAMSPECK) there were—ayes 147, noes 37.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 24: On page 13, line 6, insert "Department of Agriculture."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be passed over until after we dispose of No. 26, inasmuch as they relate to the same subject matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 25: Page 13, line 7, insert:

"FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

"Administrative and operating expenses: For an additional amount for operating and administrative expenses under the Federal Crop Insurance Act, approved February 16, 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1501–1518; 55 Stat. 255–256), fiscal year 1944, $4,318,748, and the proviso contained under this caption in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, is hereby repealed."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adhere to its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House adhere to its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 25.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COOLEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 25 and concur in the same.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall not make exactly the same speech that I have

made on at least five occasions with reference to this crop-insurance program, but I do want to advise the House of the position taken by the farm leaders of America: First, Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, advises us to "retain the crop-insurance program for wheat and cotton until further trial of this program can be made." He says further, "I think it will succeed."

Mr. James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, says this:

> Our established crop-insurance program should be retained. We are just really getting started.

Mr. Robert Handschin, regional secretary of the National Farmers Union, says this:

> The feed and food supply of our Nation for 1944 can be irreparably damaged if crop insurance is denied on winter wheat to be planted soon and Congress should recess until after Labor Day.

Mr. Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange—and I believe everybody will admit that the National Grange is a very conservative farm organization and that Mr. Albert Goss is a very able man and is very familiar with the problems of agriculture. He says this:

> The need for a workable plan of crop insurance has long been apparent. We believe the plan should be continued and this program gradually broadened as experience justifies.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And may I add this, that as I understand it today, the Government is helping to carry the crops of those farmers who plant crops essential to the war effort, such as hemp, soybeans, and other oil-yielding crops.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I should like also to call attention to the fact that the Senate of the United States has insisted upon continuing this crop-insurance program. The Senate has had several record votes on it and on each occasion has gone on record as favoring a continuance of the program. It seems to me that when all of the farm leaders—and Mr. Edward O'Neal has been championed on many occasions by the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Missouri—insist on this program, that in this emergency we should not hesitate to renew the program which was certainly initiated and devised in the interest of the farmers. If we fail to renew the program, how can we return to our districts and look our constituents in the face and explain to them why we wrecked the program which was inaugurated just a year or so ago in their behalf?

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOBBS. Does not the gentleman believe it highly significant that a dole is included in this bill, something against which some of us have been inveighing for a long time?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; I think it is very significant.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the crop-insurance program, while it may not have worked as well in the short period of time in which it has been in operation as some people had hoped it would, that it does go a great way in helping solve the agricultural problem.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HARE. We are now considering $15,000,000 for relief for agriculture. If these farmers had been encouraged and permitted to take insurance, this appropriation would not be necessary. The amount that we are losing on insurance today is not half of $15,000,000. If we continue the policy of giving relief to farmers whose crops are destroyed by flood, by rain, by hurricane, and so forth, it will cost us not $15,000,000 but from twenty to fifty millions.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman. He is entirely correct. Do the Members of this House whose constituents have entered into these insurance agreements realize what the situation is? What will the gentleman from Missouri say to his farmers? Or gentlemen from the great State of Nebraska have to say to the 67,000 Nebraska wheat farmers who have contracts with this Corporation? Or the gentlemen from the State of Kansas, where 42,000 wheat farmers have made similar contracts? Or gentlemen from the State of Ohio, where 40,000 farmers have insurance contracts?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 3 additional minutes?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true, too, that the contracts that are now out were written on a 3-year basis and those farmers took them with the understanding there was protection for 3 years?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct; and although the contract contained an escape clause, everyone knows that the farmers signed those contracts in good faith, believing that the Government would carry out its part of the contract and continue this Corporation for at least 3 years.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I wonder if the gentleman will tell us where we will get the money to pay all these losses?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; I can tell the gentleman that. In this program the wheat farmers of the country have themselves contributed $35,000,000 to a total loss of $55,000,000 which otherwise would have been provided perhaps in relief funds.

Mr. GAVIN. The American taxpayer has got to get relief somewhere. We should stop some of these losses.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. To the gentleman who just spoke about relief for the taxpayers, will he listen?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes, I will be glad to.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. We have been paying over a 10-year period $65,000,000 for relief to agriculture. That has come out of the pockets of the taxpayers.

Mr. GAVIN. A great many of them in my State, 11,000,000 people, too.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. If you are concerned with getting away from the problem of public taxation, why do you not let us work out a program here, and give us time, so that the farmers can carry this relief and relieve your taxpayers of that burden? If you want to do that you ought to come and join us.

Mr. GAVIN. Why do you not work out a program where we will break even instead of having these losses?

Mr. COOLEY. It would be absolutely unreasonable to expect any set of administrators to devise an actuarially sound program in the short period of time that this Corporation has operated.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, for 5 successive years we have tried this experiment and each year the losses to the Government have been astronomical. Every year they have said, "Give us 1 more year and we will make it self-sustaining." Each time we have given them 1 more year and each year the losses mount.

Let me give you a little personal experience. The first year crop insurance was introduced I insured my own wheat because I thought I ought to have some personal acquaintance with all services provided for agriculture. At the end of the season I found I had lost money by insuring. In my district, which is a wheat district, and in which every farmer who cultivates his land includes wheat in his rotation, a large number insured and they all lost money. Here is the distinction. On land on which you are going to make a crop 4 years out of 5 insurance involves a loss but in the marginal areas where you are sure of losing the crop 2 years out of 3, it is a profitable investment because you can go ahead and plant and you know you are going to collect either from the Government or the crop. Usually it is the Government that pays. That means that in the marginal areas the farmers who insure are betting on a sure thing. In my congressional district where many farmers took insurance the first year I have not had a single request for continuance of insurance or a single letter about insurance for 3 years.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I have not had a farmer in 13 counties write me and ask me for this since the agitation has been on.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman's district is partly in the Missouri River Valley. Crops have been utterly destroyed there. The wheat crops are gone. If there ever was a time when crop insurance was justified, it is under the conditions that obtain in your very congressional district, or a part of your district this year, and if we are ever going to help these farmers in times of distress, when we have insect infestation, when we have drought, when we have floods such as we had this year, crop insurance is the program, if you will give it a sufficient time to be worked out. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that no life-insurance company was ever able to get on a paying basis except after a long period of time and the expenditure of a lot of money. Why do you not give the farmers of America a chance to carry their own relief?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will take 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Missouri, for whom I have a deep personal affection, seems in this instance to know more about our farmers than they know themselves. In those areas the land is good and where we lose a crop 1 year out of 5 it does not pay to insure. If it paid the farmers to insure they would insure, but whereas a very large number insured when crop insurance was first initiated, the number has steadily declined. That is conclusive proof of the attitude of the farmers themselves.

And there is not a single taxpayer in the State in the gentleman's district or out of it that favors paying these enormous losses every year.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think the gentleman from Missouri has touched the sore spot on all of this insurance. In the areas where it is customary to have crop failures about 4 out of every 5 years, they need the insurance, and there is also where the yield is small when they do have a crop, but the premiums in those areas are so high that it takes about half of the average yield to pay the premium and to cover the cost of the insurance. In the other areas—like the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN]—where you had a flood this year, you may not have another destruction of crops there in 30 years.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In conclusion, this matter has been before the House repeatedly. Every time it has been before the House it has been voted down. It has been voted down on standing votes, on teller votes, and on yea-and-nay votes. It has been voted down because it is an unconscionable charge against the Treasury. The taxpayers are opposed to it because they object to being saddled with this recurring deficit every year, and because the farmers themselves do not use it, because it does not pay on good land.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will not yield upon this amendment. The House has taken this position many times. The Senate itself yielded on this item by a very substantial majority when the agriculture appropriation bill was under consideration.

There is a large expense to this program and it is being availed of by fewer and fewer of the wheat farmers where it has been tried year after year. What is the use of going on with something that does not develop into a useful activity for the people?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the lack of information and erroneous information which the chairman of the Appropriations Committee made manifest in his statement, and which the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] aided in spreading, I must call your attention to a primary fact upon which the crop-insurance program stands, and has operated from the beginning.

Crop insurance does not insure dollar for dollar. It does not insure crop for crop. It insures 75 percent of the average crop over a period of years, actuarially established. Many farmers cannot get crop insurance because they do not have sufficiently adequate records to show over a period of 5 years what the crops have been. Therefore it is utterly impossible for any farmer who has had a crop failure "2 out of 3 years" to get any insurance at all. He could not afford to pay the premium for so little insurance—75 percent of his average annual crop on a 5-year basis. No such insurance policy has been written. The crop-insurance program is for the purpose of aiding those who wish to establish at their own expense, without cost to the Government over a 10-year period and beyond, a stable economy for agriculture by guaranteeing up to 75 percent of their average annual crops for 5 years, when and if they should have one crop failure.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be delighted to yield for a question.

Mr. GAVIN. If the gentleman had a business that was losing $44,000,000 a year, would he continue it?

Mr. HOBBS. I certainly would if I could afford it, and was sure it would pan out within a reasonable time. You may laugh if you please, but that shows to my mind the temper of this House. They are running a steam roller over everybody who is in disagreement with the Committee on Appropriations. Every time the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] laughs—and he is one of the finest Members of this House—he wants everybody else to duck and hide and not come out of their storm cellars until he has worked his will.

I say that a business like crop insurance if it had sustained a loss of $44,000,000 a year, and that supposition is according to your estimate which is not true, ought to be continued at least during the 10-year test period to show that it will come out of its doldrums just as life insurance and every other kind of insurance did. But the $44,000,000 the gentleman from Pennsylvania talks about is not the loss per year, but for the first 4 years. That shows how little the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] knows about the business record of crop insurance.

I call your attention to the fact that what I prophesied the other day in my argument for crop-insurance continuation is happening right under our noses. The very next amendment following this one, on page 13, is a provision to give free gratis and for nothing to the flood sufferers out yonder on the Mississippi and Missouri and other rivers $15,000,000. In other words, we will not allow the constituents of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to insure themselves against loss—we give them this money, a $15,000,000 dole. When such gratuities are thus advocated, and this one has been approved by the Senate, why should farmers buy insurance against crop failure or destruction? Why should farmers pay premiums for that which Congress may give them for nothing? There is this dole handed out here in the very next amendment, and the gentleman from Missouri says the farmers of Missouri do not want crop insurance. Do they expect a dole? They, and all others, may well do so if we kill crop insurance.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will yield, I want to correct one erroneous impression. We have not lost $44,000,000 a year.

Mr. HOBBS. Certainly not. That has been the total cost of both losses and operations for the whole 4 years.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, this is a compromise amendment reducing the amount from $7,000,000 to $4,000,000.

Perhaps I can consume my time best by explaining this matter to some of you who seem to misunderstand completely the insurance program. The gentleman from Missouri said the insurance is now being used only on the marginal farms which have never produced a crop. That cannot possibly be true because no marginal farmer can pay the premiums.

This insurance on crops is issued exactly like the insurance on your life, on experience. Two farms in the same neighborhood have different rates. They get your production for the last 10 to 20 years as the figures are available, and your premium is fixed on the basis of the experience of that farm. No marginal farm which has suffered repeated crop failures can afford to pay the premiums. If you have made good crops in

the years past, you have a low premium. If you have had poor crops you have a high premium. The program itself denies the statement made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

If you are in a few moments, under the next amendment, going to give to the constituency of the gentleman from Missouri $15,000,000, as a pure hand-out, after the Farm Security Administration has already been there and given millions to the farmers in the form of grants, after you last week voted $10,000,000 for the same group to rebuild their roads and their dikes—if we can spend that much money for those unfortunate farmers—what is wrong with appropriating approximately 25 percent of that amount in order that the other farmers of this Nation may have the opportunity to insure themselves against these hazards? Shall the Congress adopt a policy today, "No, we are not going to permit the farmers to pay premiums to insure themselves, but we are going to wait until a disaster comes and then appropriate millions and millions as a gift"? I beg you not to put yourselves and not to put this Congress in the position of adopting any such policy at this time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there ought to be a time somewhere down the line when we finally settle an issue.

Now, let us trace the history of this thing for a few minutes. This House has deliberately debated and considered and voted against crop insurance, not once, not twice, but a number of times—five times, I am told. The matter was considered by the Agriculture Committee. It was brought into the House by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]. It was voted out of the bill after debate, after heated debate; it was reinserted by the Senate; it was brought back here any number of times and considered by this House, and those gentlemen who have spoken about it today have stated their case, and time after time this House has voted overwhelmingly against it. The last vote taken on it in the agricultural bill, a very unusual procedure, was to adhere to our disagreement to it, which meant that if the Senate did not recede the bill would be killed; and the Senate receded. Notwithstanding that fact, and notwithstanding the repeated disapproval expressed by this House, they reinsert it in this deficiency bill, and here it is back again today.

Now, I do not know too much about crop insurance. I do know that the evidence has shown us everytime we have had it under consideration that it has been a colossal loss, and that it threatens to be even a larger loss to the Public Treasury; that it has not demonstrated it is any real help to the farmers, but many, many leaders of farm organizations have spoken against it.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield to correct a misstatement?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I will say the losses have increased in the wheat program every year it has been tried, and that was the evidence before your committee.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The losses have increased?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. No. The cost of this program has increased from year to year.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think last year the loss was about $45,000,000.

Mr. COOLEY. Oh, no. The loss over the entire program has only been $44,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I base my appeal to this House on this fact: We have passed on this time and time again, and the House has settled the issue, and I do not believe we should reopen it now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, let us break this problem down a little bit and see what it is like. There will be no controversy about the figures, because here is a 1,800-page record before me, which is the record of the Crop Insurance Corporation itself.

In 1939 on wheat alone the farmers paid in three and four-tenths million in premiums. The Government paid in four and one-half million, in the form of expenses, making a total of just a little short of eight million. That is the contribution of the farmer and the Government—$8,000,000. And how much did the farmer get? He got five and six-tenths million out of eight million that was contributed.

In 1940 the farmer paid in a little over nine million in premiums. The Government paid in five and three-fourths million in expenses, making a total of $14,800,000. How much did the farmer get? It cost us $14,800,000 to give the farmer about $13,800,000.

In 1941 the farmer paid in in premiums $7,000,000. The Government put in five and one-fifth million in expenses, making a total of twelve and two-tenths million dollars. How much did the farmer get? He got $14,000,000 in indemnities, but it cost us twelve and two-tenths million to give it to him.

In 1942 the farmer paid in eight and four-tenths million in premiums. The Government paid seven and nine-tenths million in expenses, making a total of $16,300,000 that the farmer and the Government made in premiums, contributions, and administrative expenses. How much did the farmer get? A little over $12,000,000. It cost us $16,300,000 to give the farmers only $12,000,000.

Now, here is about the way it works out: There is no controversy about the figures. These are the record figures. Let us assume that you are going to give every farmer $2.12. Then you say, "Now, Mr. Farmer, before we do so we are going to take a premium from you and then we are going to add some expenses, so that in order to give you $1.12 of the $2.12 it is going to cost us $1 to give it to you." It cost $1.12 either from the farmer or out of the Federal Treasury for every dollar that the farmer got. Is there any rhyme or reason or sense to that? For every dollar returned to the farmer, we collected 62 cents in premiums from him and added 50 cents in administrative expenses. Thus, it cost $1.12 in premiums or expenses for each $1 received by the farmer.

It is now stated that in another section of this bill provision is made for a dole. Let me ask those gentlemen who have raised that question, When there are only 970,000 cotton-insurance contracts, what are you going to do with the other eight and one-half million cotton farmers who did not take out any insurance?

What about them? Does that dispose of this dole question? It does not. When you talk about wheat, when you talk about the wheat farmer, about 450,000 or 500,000 of those who were disposed to take out crop insurance, do you think they are going to escape the dole if this is going to be put on a dole basis? What of the other thousands of wheat farmers who have not participated in the program?

When we are talking about this flood matter, we are dealing with a wholly emergent situation that arises once in a long time, and yet they want to hold that up by way of an emergency as against a permanent program that has resulted in a loss of $41,000,000 in four years on one commodity alone and a loss of $1,550,000 on cotton for the first year it was insured.

The gentleman from North Carolina referred to Mr. Handschin, the legislative representative of the Farmers' Union, and who appeared for more than an hour before our committee. He is for crop insurance; he is for extending the plan; he favors extending it to corn; he is for extending it to a great many other commodities, so that the losses might be infinitely greater to the taxpayers of this country every year on the basis of present operations. He is the same Mr. Handschin who, when he testified before the committee, said that he believed in an unchallenged Federal control of all agriculture. Yes; he is for crop insurance; he is for something more; he is for complete domination of every farmer in the land by the Federal Government and for extension of the whole control program. So, when they cite this gentleman as a witness, let us take him as a witness in his full capacity, his full record on every phase of the agricultural program.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman also advise the House, in his discussion, concerning the viewpoint of Albert S. Goss, who said that he was in favor of crop insurance and of extending this program as experience justifies?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I will answer the gentleman.

Mr. PACE. And also Mr. Edward O'Neal, of the Farm Bureau Federation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. Mr. Goss has never spoken to me about the crop insurance. I have seen Mr. O'Neal on some occasions, and he has never stated to me personally or over the telephone, or in any other manner that I modify my position on crop insurance, and yet he knows that I have been rather active in the liquidation of this agency that has lost money ever since it started operating.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the House has voted this down repeatedly, and the Senate finally receded, and it was taken out of the agricultural appropriation bill. It is back now, because Members of the other body who are interested in this matter have hooked it onto the deficiency appropriation bill. Since the Senate has already receded on this item, why should it not recede again if it expects to pursue a logical and consistent course?

The House should vote down the preferential motion of the gentleman from North Carolina and should stand by the motion of the gentleman from Missouri to adhere to our position and not recede from the position we have consistently taken by an overwhelming majority at least four times in this body.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PACE) there were—ayes 52, noes 123.

So the motion was not agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 26: Page 13, line 15, insert "That in order to aid in the temporary rehabilitation of farmers whose buildings, crops, livestock, machinery, and equipment were destroyed or damaged, in whole or in part, by floods in 1943, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to utilize the facilities of any existing agency or bureau to provide relief to any such farmer, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, for the purpose of aiding such farmer to replace or repair any property so destroyed of damaged, and to obtain the necessary seed, livestock, and equipment to enable him to continue farming operations, and for that purpose there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $15,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, is amendment 25 or 26 up now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is advised that the House is now considering amendment 26.

Mr. TABER. And the motion before the House is that the House insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion is that the House adhere to its disagreement to amendment No. 26.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, no man in this body has rendered more effective service in behalf of flood damages and flood sufferers than the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Is the gentleman in favor of the motion or opposed to the motion?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am in favor of the motion, but I want to make a statement with the gentleman's permission in support of the motion he has made. I should like to repeat, Mr. Speaker, that I know of the profound interest of my devoted friend, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in behalf of flood damage and flood sufferers of his and other districts. He is to be commended upon the motion he has made. I trust that neither the Senate amendment or any similar substitute will be brought back to the House.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment of the Senate is wholly unnecessary and would establish an unwise precedent. It would provide for doles for the first time for flood or other similar sufferers. Heretofore Congress has provided in cases of flood or drought loans, but Congress has provided for security on crops or livestock or equipment, and now in the war as in peace the Farm Security Administration under the supervision of the War Food Administration is authorized to make loans to flood sufferers to buy livestock and is authorized to make grants. The Senate amendment was certainly not carefully considered. The language is unusual in an appropriation bill. It concludes as follows, and I quote from the Senate amendment:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $15,000,000.

Congress has heretofore made provision for earthquake sufferers. They provided, however, that the loans should be secured. In 1933 Congress passed a bill for the relief of earthquake sufferers in California.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I shall be glad to yield as soon as I finish my statement.

In 1934 Congress made provision for disaster loans for flood and other sufferers, but security was required. Disaster loans were authorized and provided for flood damages and rehabilitation in 1935 and in 1936, but security was required. There are now loans available to flood sufferers, but they require security. All disaster loans, all feed and seed loans, all livestock loans provide for security. The Senate amendment requires no security. The Disaster Loan Corporation is now authorized to make loans for damages or destruction by earthquake, cyclones, tornado, or floods, but security is required. The Farm Security Administration is authorized to make grants and to make loans to farmers whose property has been destroyed or damaged and to aid farmers to obtain livestock and equipment. The floods came late. The Farm Security Administration is authorized to make grants. It was urged in behalf of the continuance of the Farm Security Administration that during the war it was essential to make loans to farmers suffering from floods or droughts. The Farm Credit Administration also makes feed and seed loans, but the crop is given as security. The Senate amendment does not provide for either loans or security. I quote, "To provide relief." Relief is a dole. Loans and, in proper cases, grants are now authorized by the Farm Security Administration. There is no occasion for the Senate amendment. No such provision has ever been made for flood or drought sufferers. The amendment is unnecessary and unsound.

Secondly, it would establish a precedent that would destroy the principle of disaster loans for flood sufferers and cyclone sufferers and drought sufferers that have heretofore been made, and are now authorized. It would discriminate against those who suffered from the floods in 1942, 1937, and other years. This amendment is restricted to the flood sufferers of 1943. Unless we mean to provide for a direct dole, which Congress has never provided for any sufferer, we should not agree to the Senate amendment. Congress has provided money to the Army to feed flood sufferers in years past, but doles or direct-relief appropriations without security have never been made.

We have provided money for the W. P. A. to create employment; we have made seed loans, we have authorized disaster relief loans for people in cities and towns and for people in the country, but security has always been required. We have authorized earthquake loans, but security was required. This is the first time that a straight loan without requiring security has been proposed.

The American Red Cross has provided food and shelter. It provides relief. The Red Cross has spent $96,000 in Indiana to date to buy seed to aid flood sufferers; they have spent $205,000 in Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Kansas; and in Missouri and Illinois the Red Cross has spent $219,000 to date in the 1943 floods. Heretofore the relief program has been carried on by the Red Cross as they have done in the floods of 1943. They go in and feed people where they are hungry and have no food, to give them clothes where they have lost their clothes, but so far the Federal Government has always declined to provide direct relief or doles to flood sufferers.

I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I agree with what the gentleman said; I am opposed to the dole.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The question is: What are the Indiana farmers going to do along the Wabash River where year after year the river has been overflowing and destroying thousands of acres of crops?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Those farmers have probably, if they can qualify, already gone to the Farm Security Administration; they have got their loans, they have given security on their property, their horses, their cattle, or their tractors. Under the provisions of this Senate amendment the farmer who now comes along without security and asks for a loan or grant will get it and there will be a discrimination among the flood farmers of 1943 and, also, among the farmers of the 1943 flood and previous flood sufferers. There is a discrimination against people who live in the country and in the towns, because disaster loans are applicable to town and country alike.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Flood Control by the very nature of the studies his committee has made is familiar with the situation along the Wabash River. What we want to do is to get at the source and stop the floods that cause this damage.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Then the thing to do is to support the bill I propose to bring before the Congress, later in the session.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does the gentleman have any such flood-control work in that area in that bill?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As I stated in response to the gentleman's question, when the matter was up for consideration before, that we put $10,000,000 in the pending bill for rescue and repair work on the Wabash and other rivers of the United States, which I call emergency legislation. I stand for comprehensive flood-control works along all rivers, including the Wabash, where the cost of the improvements is less than the benefits. I propose to submit a comprehensive flood bill for works along all rivers during the present Congress.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. But when are we going to get real and effective assistance? I recall, when the question was up before in connection with the sum the gentleman mentions, that it was made clear at that time that those particular funds would be available only on existing projects. As the gentleman states it, the funds would apply only to rescue and repair work.

Our problem, however, is to undertake comprehensive new projects which will afford real and lasting protection within the Wabash Valley. How soon, therefore, may we expect to authorize this new work which very recent unfortunate experience has proved to be essential?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I trust before the session is over, but certainly during the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman should be commended on his position, and I would like to ask this question: If the entire $15,000,000 is appropriated and spent it would not provide any protection against future flood damage, would it?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Not at all and there would be a discrimination among the flood sufferers themselves and the Senate amendment would make no provision for the people who live in towns. Let us treat them all alike. Let us treat all flood sufferers of all years alike. We can do that under existing legislation.

I extend my remarks to reply to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and to say that Congress has just appropriated $80,000,000 for rehabilitation loans and grants for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1943, to the Farm Security Administration. Provision is made for loans to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged, in whole or in part, by floods in 1943, to enable such farmers to obtain seed, livestock, and equipment, but security is required. The livestock, the crops, and the equipment are given as security. One of the reasons urged for a continuance of rehabilitation loans to the Farm Security Administration now under the supervision of the War Food Administration was to provide for sufferers from floods, cyclones, and droughts. Grants are authorized. I am advised that grants to the amount of $2,000,000 were extended to flood sufferers in 1942. I am advised that grants to the amount of $13,000,000 were extended to flood sufferers in 1941. The $80,000,000 for rehabilitation loans, including grants, was available on July 1, 1943. Loans have already been offered to farmers out of the funds appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943. There is substantially $80,000,000 available for loans and grants. Just 7 days of the fiscal year have passed. If it should develop that additional funds are required for either rehabilitation loans or grants by the Farm Security Administration, there will be other deficiency bills and there will be ample time for supplemental appropriations.

For floods, droughts, and cyclones, under the American system, the Red Cross provides direct relief. They move in as soon as the disaster occurs. They feed those who are hungry. They provide clothes and shelter. They provide seed. The Farm Credit Administration makes feed and seed loans, but they take the security of the crops. The Farm Security Administration makes grants when the floods come late and the winter crops are destroyed so that farm sufferers can be tided over and they can make the crop the next year. That crop will be security for the loans with which to make the crop.

No man could be more sympathetic with flood sufferers than I. No showing has been made that existing appropriations are not sufficient for the flood sufferers of 1943. The fiscal year has just begun.

As I have pointed out, the Senate amendment is for $15,000,000 and I quote the language of the amendment: "To provide for relief." It applies to rehabilitating the buildings, the crops, the livestock, the machinery, and the equipment damaged or destroyed in 1943. As I have stated, disaster loans require security. The acts providing for the loans stipulate security. The Senate amendment eliminates the word "loan." It contains only the word "relief." Relief and doles are synonymous. During the balmiest days of the Work Projects Administration, Congress never provided for direct relief. It never provided for doles. It provided for work for the unemployed. If the floods destroyed the crops the W. P. A. provided for employment for farmers, but the Senate amendment is a departure from any and all legislation in any and all floods, droughts, or other disasters prior to the year 1943.

Any substitute for the Senate amendment that provides for loans, or in exceptional cases grants, in such manner and terms and conduct as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe would be just as objectionable. By eliminating the provisions that have obtained in all previous legislation for disaster loans or for rehabilitation that require security the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to make the loans without security. The fact that the provision that obtains in all other legislation requiring security is eliminated in any amendment that may be offered as a substitute for the Senate amendment would show that it was the purpose of Congress to provide direct relief or the dole. Such is contrary to the American system and to the policy of the United States.

If it be said that the $15,000,000 proposed is to be administered by the Farm Security Administration, I answer that it will not be administered as other rehabilitation funds are administered. Security is not provided for, but the amendment is careful to provide that not to exceed a million and a half dollars may be spent for administrative expenses.

If additional funds for the flood sufferers, either as loans or grants, are required, the proper way would be to increase the appropriation available for rehabilitation loans to the Farm Security Administration under the supervision of the War Food Administration so that adequate loans and grants would be made to the flood sufferers of 1943. If an amendment for either grants or loans without security is offered as a substitute for the Senate amendment, it would undermine the Farm Security Administration and its rehabilitation program. If we are to have special legislation for every flood, there is no occasion for the continuance of the rehabilitation loans of the Farm Security Administration or for feed and seed loans by the Farm

Credit Administration. It is the duty of the citizens to support the Government and not the duty of the Government to support the citizens. It is the responsibility of the Government to provide work or loans for those who suffer from flood and other disasters to enable such sufferers to help themselves.

I should like to say that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee is to be commended for including in the pending bill $10,000,000 authorized by the House and the Senate to provide for emergency repair and restoration of all flood-control works damaged or destroyed by floods in 1943. The provision is applicable to all flood-control works damaged or destroyed in any State in the Union by floods in 1943, whether such works were constructed by the Government or by the local interests.

I know of no more satisfactory public works than flood-control improvements where the benefits exceed the costs of the works. For the next fiscal year no appropriations are being made for national flood-control works. They have been suspended for the duration. If floods continue, emergencies must be provided for. Works are being constructed to protect munitions plants. It may be necessary to construct works to protect the farms and the bread baskets of the Nation. Food is as essential as guns to win the war.

It may be said that there is no occasion for my argument inasmuch as I am in accord with the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 26. I am not speaking against a windmill. I am speaking against amendment No. 26. I am familiar with it. It is a combination of disaster, feed and seed, and Farm Security rehabilitation relief. Its purpose, and I quote from the amendment, is—

to aid in the temporary rehabilitation of farmers whose buildings, crops, livestock, machinery, and equipment were destroyed or damaged.

Disaster loans have to do with the repair of buildings, rehabilitation loans with seed, livestock, and equipment. If it be argued that the Senate amendment is nothing more nor less than a Farm Security authorization or increase in the Farm Security appropriation, I reply that any such statement is without foundation. Farm Security does not make loans for the repair and rehabilitation of buildings. I agree that the Senate amendment gives no definite yardstick. That is the trouble. I recall that the amendment was first presented in the Senate to the emergency flood-control authorization for 1943 when the distinguished Senator from Oregon, the minority leader [Mr. MCNARY], protested that it went beyond any previous legislation. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] withdrew the amendment.

I am speaking because the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has made the motion to further insist. I want to strengthen and support his position. I want to prevent a motion to recede and concur with an amendment such as the gentleman from Missouri evidently has in mind when he says that his amendment is intended to provide additional funds for the Farm Security Administration. The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee cannot expect more for the flood sufferers in 1943 than Congress has accorded to the flood sufferers in other years. If an amendment is offered in lieu of the Senate amendment to provide relief by loans, or in exceptional cases by grants, without requiring security, even though the purpose is to enable farmers whose property was damaged or destroyed by floods in 1943 to obtain seed, livestock, or equipment, such a substitute or amendment should not be adopted for it is not in accordance with existing law for rehabilitation loans or grants by the Farm Security Administration, and hence is not an increase in the authorizations.

The fiscal year has just begun. Heretofore I know that the Farm Security Administration has said, when appeals have been made for help for flood sufferers, that there should be an additional appropriation. I know that it is said that $20,000,000 is available for administration and grants as against $50,000,000 in 1941, but $13,000,000, or approximately one-fourth, was used for grants in 1941. On the same basis at least $5,000,000 of the $20,000,000 should be available for grants in the next fiscal year. But, fortunately, as I have stated, the fiscal year has just begun and there is a total of $80,000,000 available for rehabilitation loans, grants, and administration.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] evidently is not familiar with the Senate amendment because he speaks of language that is not in the Senate amendment. He speaks of additional loans for the Farm Security Administration. There is no occasion for any new language or any new authority. If it be shown that the appropriations for Farm Security Administration are inadequate for loans and grants, that appropriation should be increased and the fund should be handled just as other rehabilitation loans and grants have been handled in other floods during the present administration.

Any loans without a definite requirement of security, as is the case with disaster and rehabilitation loans, is nothing more or less than a dole. It is straight relief. The Senate amendment No. 26 is utterly untenable and unsound. The substitute that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], as indicated by his argument, has in mind is equally unsound. It is a departure. It is the first time that straight relief or straight dole has been proposed by any chairman of any Appropriations Committee in the history of the House of Representatives.

The Committee on Flood Control, in the acts of 1936, 1938, and 1941, has authorized flood-control projects in the principal river basins of the United States. I recall that in the act of 1936 some 18 or 20 projects were authorized along the Wabash River in Indiana. I do not know why they have not all been constructed. The local interests are required to furnish the rights-of-way for the levees. The projects were recommended, before Congress approved them, by the Chief of Engineers. I believe that I am warranted in saying that the Committee on Flood Control has heretofore approved all projects along the Wabash River, including local protective works and reservoirs along the tributaries on which favorable recommendations have been made by the Chief of Engineers. If any projects have been favorably reported since the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, they will be included in the next flood-control bill, which I trust the committee will be able to report during the present session, certainly during the present Congress.

I should like to say in this connection that Congress has authorized for general flood control about $930,000,000. Five hundred and twenty-six million dollars have been appropriated. For the duration, flood-control appropriations are not being made. The appropriations to date, plus those required to complete projects already under construction, aggregate $770,000,000. We have an apparent backlog of $160,000,000 in authorized flood-control projects for construction following the war. This backlog is insufficient. I can assure the gentleman from Indiana, as well as other Members of the House, that the Committee on Flood Control is planning an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects, including levees, flood walls, and reservoirs, where favorable recommendations have been submitted by the Chief of Engineers. These projects will be available for construction following the war. No appropriations have been made for flood control for the next fiscal year, as I have stated. If floods continue, emergency appropriations may be necessary to provide for the production of food, just as emergency appropriations have been necessary to protect munitions plants. I advocate public works to provide for unemployment. The need following the war will be great. I know of no more satisfactory public works than sound flood-control improvements.

I trust that the House conferees will continue to insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 26, and that no motion will be submitted to recede from the disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with a substitute unless that substitute is in accordance with existing law and unless that substitute provides the same relief for the flood sufferers of 1943 that has been provided for the flood sufferers of previous years during the present administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Mississippi who is fostering some of the most beneficial legislation that has been submitted to the Congress is in this instance charging a windmill.

In the first place the committee has moved to adhere to the last motion that can be made, and any criticism of the amendment is superfluous and beside the

point. In the second place, he does not seem to have read the amendment very carefully because the amendment provides not for relief, not for a dole; it provides for none of the things he condemns so enthusiastically.

It provides only for bringing back this devastated area into production. Some of these areas on the Wabash River, on the Ohio, Mississippi, and Missouri Rivers, and their tributaries, including the richest land in the Nation, the breadbasket of America, have been covered with water, preventing the planting of crops, or crops already planted have been destroyed. There is still time for emergency crops this year, but these farmers, with everything swept away—buildings, machinery, stock, and fences—cannot get into production this season without some cooperation.

The second error into which the gentleman falls is that he attempts to differentiate between this and Farm Security. He says Farm Security provides for this. Why, certainly, and that is the purpose of this amendment. The amendment provides for administration by the Secretary of Agriculture through an existing agency and that agency is Farm Security. But while Farm Security has for the current year about $136,000,000, it has for the coming year—the year for which this money is provided, the year for which we are now appropriating—only $80,000,000. With much reduced funds and heavily increased needs this $15,000,000 is necessary to take care of the situation in the manner to which the gentleman refers. The purpose of this amendment is to supplement the amount which Farm Security might spend for this purpose. The gentleman says Farm Security serves the need, but how can Farm Security serve the need with half the amount it had last year and with triple the need of last year?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Would not the proper way be to increase the appropriation to the Farm Security Administration? I call the gentleman's attention to the fact, and I speak advisedly, the word "loan" is not mentioned in Senate amendment 26. There is nothing but relief mentioned in the Senate amendment from which I quote: "To provide relief." I knew whereof I spoke.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This provides for the very purpose the gentleman urges. The word "loan" is carried in the committee amendment which I was precluded from offering by the gentleman's opposition. The gentleman says this work ought to be done by Farm Security, but how can Farm Security do it without funds? He says we have the right agency, but he does not want to let them have money to operate. The only purpose of this amendment is to give the Farm Security Administration funds to encourage production of food in these flood-devastated areas.

Mr. NORRELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. May I say that I am very much interested in this provision in the bill. I do not think we are doing anything new or unusual. We are appropriating millions of dollars for other things.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is right. We are merely providing funds for continuing the program. The gentleman from Mississippi used 5 minutes in heated argument against the very thing he urges.

Mr. NORRELL. I want to compliment the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman brings in a supplemental appropriation for the Farm Security Administration under the War Production Board, I shall not have a word to say if it be shown that the $80,000,000 appropriated, as the gentleman says, is insufficient, although the fiscal year has just begun.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are in the last day of the session. We are trying to adjourn tonight, if possible, and, if not, we expect to recess tomorrow night. If the money is to be provided it must be provided here and now. This is the last opportunity. Here the gentleman is quibbling about the method. At this late hour there is no other method. Floods do not wait. Here is a chance to give the Farm Security Administration $15,000,000 when they ought to have $45,000,000, and resume the production of desperately needed food both this year and next.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Clerk recur to Senate amendment numbered 24 which we passed over. We would like to dispose of that at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report Senate amendment numbered 24.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: Page 13, line 6, insert "Department of Agriculture."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adhere to its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 24.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 14, line 3, insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

"OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

"Development of civil landing areas: For completion of landing area construction previously undertaken by the Work Projects Administration at public airports, including all necessary engineering and administrative expenses in the field, $8,832,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be construed as precluding the use of other appropriations available for any of the purposes for which this appropriation is made: *Provided further*, That any or all of the foregoing appropriation of $8,832,000 may be transferred to any other Federal agency organized to undertake the work herein provided for either by contract or by force account, and such agency is authorized to proceed with such work."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 27.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion. I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Preferential motion offered by Mr. STEFAN: Mr. STEFAN moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment numbered 27.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the preferential motion which I offer at this time is for the purpose of saving airports which are 50 to 90 percent completed and which may represent a tremendous loss to our taxpayers if they are not completed. I find myself in a very unusual situation in offering this motion. I had originally intended to offer a motion to recede and concur with the Senate amendment with an amendment. However, I learned that if I had offered such a motion I would not be allowed to speak on the subject, and the motion would have been voted upon without the possibility of explaining the motion or the amendment. Had I offered such a motion it probably would have precluded anyone else favoring the completion of these airports from talking. The opposition would probably have all of the time to speak because the opposition has control of the time. So the motion before the House now is to recede and concur with the Senate amendment No. 27, which has as its purpose the appropriation of $832,000,000 for the completion of certain airports. I believe that approximately $8,000,000 would be needed to complete the original 28 or more airports in the original C. A. A. list. But members of the committee indicate to me that the other body has put in some items which the C. A. A. did not originally contemplate, and it has been suggested to me that perhaps we would be more successful in completing these meritorious projects if the amount was reduced. Therefore, I had planned to offer a preferential motion to recede and concur with the Senate amendment with an amendment, but, fearing that we would be cut off from debating the amendment and precluded from speaking on the subject, I merely offer a motion to recede and concur, with the hope that we can offer amendments later in order to save a situation which is so important to national defense and for the continuance of our aviation program.

The membership of this House knows of my interest in economy. I am sure I have demonstrated time and again my opposition to waste and extravagance. I am sure that the membership knows of my continued efforts to eliminate non-

essential expenditures. But here is an item where appropriations will save a gigantic investment of money in which the States, municipalities, and the Federal Government are interested.

I hope the membership of the House will pardon some repetitions regarding airports. I have spoken on the subject here so often that I fear that I may not get the undivided attention of the membership. However, there may be a number of Members here who have not heard my previous explanations, so I again tell you briefly what is involved in this bill.

When the W. P. A. started building airports, that Agency went into every State in the Union and urged communities to become interested in these projects. Many were started and many were completed. Many are now being used by the armed forces and have become a valuable part of our defense program. About 267 of these W. P. A. airport projects were in the so-called approved or completed and partially completed stage when W. P. A. liquidated. I believe about 103 of them were completed and are being operated. The Army and Navy took over about 71 of them and are operating them and it is assumed will complete them where necessary with Army or Navy funds. Only recently the Congress voted unanimously the reappropriation of $99,000,000 to complete about 65 of them. This left about 28 of the original 267 airports without designation. These are the 28 airports involved in the bill under debate. Most of these 28 airports, including 1 in my congressional district—Fremont, Nebr.—are 50 to 90 percent completed. Others are scattered over many other States. I shall include a breakdown of them in the extension of my remarks for the information of the membership. These 28 airports represent a huge municipal, State, and Federal investment. I want to save that investment with this motion. It is from the basis of economy that I ask your support. Here are about 28 of those original 267 airports in which the municipalities, the States, and the Federal Government have many millions of dollars invested. In many cases as in the case of Fremont, Nebr., the work is almost 90 percent completed and it will require but $225,000 to complete. Many of you here today have airports in your districts in a similar condition. In many cases the runways have been graded; material is on the ground and if they are not completed now they will really represent waste. The municipalities in many cases have depended upon the agreements of the W. P. A. which made promises of funds to complete these projects. In many cases the W. P. A. had already allocated funds to complete them. But when W. P. A. liquidated, these funds, which had been earmarked especially to complete these airports, went back into the Federal Treasury and the airports were left high and dry with wind and erosion daily damaging the investments the taxpayers have in these projects.

I ask the membership of this House to consider the citizens and officials of these municipalities. The Federal officials in many cases went from community to community urging these officials to build airports on the basis that they were badly needed for national defense. Our patriotic city officials and our patriotic citizens answered the call. They held bond elections and went into debt to buy land. The State aeronautic commissions helped with State funds and the W. P. A. expended millions of Federal funds and airports were actually started and, as in this case, practically completed. I hope you will realize that this motion is in no way a pork-barrel proposition, but an effort to save a gigantic investment made by our taxpayers.

The C. A. A. recognized this fact. It recognized it because it made many resurveys and recommended to the Bureau of the Budget that it be allowed a little over $8,000,000 to complete these 28 airports. So the request here is not only my own request but it comes directly to you from the C. A. A. It also comes to you with a unanimous vote of the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. But the House committee asks you to eliminate the entire item, which would leave these airports deserted and a great investment lost to our taxpayers. Because the C. A. A. deems it important that these airports be completed immediately, I feel that we should complete them. It will be argued that the Army has not designated these airports as of military necessity and that the W. P. A. contract gives the responsibility to the localities to complete them. My argument is that the C. A. A. says they are needed and should be completed. The W. P. A. had allocated the money for them, but the money is in our Treasury because the W. P. A., when liquidating, returned the money to the Treasury. There is no record that the Army and Navy say these airports are not needed. I predict that while we are talking on the subject some of them may be taken up by our armed forces, and certainly, if the war continues, they will be needed.

My colleague the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has one of these airports in his district. He has been working on that project diligently for a long time. He has done everything that could be done. I hope the chairman will give him a few moments to tell the story of that airport. I hope other Members who have these unfinished airports in their districts will ask for some time so that the House can have the full picture. I plead with the House to go along with us on this very important aviation program.

Twenty-eight airports under old W. P. A. program, which are 50 to 90 percent completed. C. A. A. has asked the Budget for $8,000,000 to complete these airports. Budget will hold hearings on this request shortly.

California: Merced.
Colorado: Pueblo.
Connecticut: Danbury.
Georgia: Atlanta, municipal.
Idaho: Idaho Falls.
Indiana: Bloomington.
Iowa: Des Moines, Iowa City.
Kansas: Pittsburg.
Maine: Dexter, Eastport.
Michigan: Menominee.
Minnesota: Eveleth, Hibbing, International Falls.
Nebraska: Beatrice, Fremont.
New Mexico: Raton.
North Carolina: Burlington, Rockingham, Wilson.
North Dakota: Valley City.
South Dakota: Spearfish.
Texas: Henderson, Rusk County.
West Virginia: Clarksburg, Wheeling.
Wisconsin: Eau Claire, Oshkosh, Siren—Burnett County.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I notice the Senate amendment provides $8,832,000. The gentleman has suggested that had it been possible he would have offered an amendment. Would he have changed that amount and placed any restriction on the amendment?

Mr. STEFAN. I would have cut it down to around $4,000,000 to save at least some of these airports and some of this investment.

Mr. CASE. Under the $4,000,000 fund or whatever it was the gentleman had in mind——

Mr. STEFAN. The amount that some Members suggested was $3,990,000. But that would not complete the projects under discussion.

Mr. CASE. If the amount were changed to that $4,000,000 figure, would it permit the completion of the airports on which W. P. A. contracts had been entered into?

Mr. STEFAN. I believe that $4,000,000 would at least save most of them and make them usable.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If $4,000,000 is all that is necessary, what is going to happen to the other almost $5,000,000 that is carried in the bill?

Mr. STEFAN. In my opinion, that amount could have been used for concreting and cementing runways. With the $4,000,000 we could barely hold the investment together and at least put these airports to some use.

Mr. SPARKMAN. What does the gentleman mean by saying "complete"? Does it include the paving of runways and the grading of space for administration buildings?

Mr. STEFAN. By "complete" I would mean paved runways and D. L. A. as contained on C. A. A. specifications.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I hope very much that the House will agree to this

proposed appropriation and complete most of these 28 airports in which we have invested many millions of local funds. It is not right to these communities which have given locations and some of which have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to build these airports, for the Government to abandon these airports and not complete them. As was said by the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, to leave these projects uncompleted would mean the loss of many more millions of dollars than it is estimated it would take to complete them. That ought not to be done. It is indefensible.

In my own district at Wilson, N. C., I noticed a report of the W. P. A. And it appears that only $7,000 has been spent by the Federal Government, and $326 by the local sponsors. As a matter of fact, the town of Wilson issued bonds in the amount of $100,000 and has spent $58,000 of that sum. The Federal Government has spent over $100,000. There is $158,000 that is practically sure to be lost unless $50,000 or $100,000 more can be spent in order to complete this project. That is the story on almost all the 28 projects here that have been left out of the completion program. The communities where the airports are located were induced to put up hundreds of thousands and even millions of dollars to acquire valuable property and start construction of these projects, and it is an outrage for the Government now to abandon them. They will ultimately be needed, if not now, and will be of inestimable value for 100 years to come.

I hope the House will agree to the motion offered by the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska. He knows more about these airports and about civil aeronautics and has the matter closer to his heart than any other Member of the House, and we should listen to his splendid information and follow his sound sensible advice. It would be a great injustice to these communities not to continue these projects and complete them. It would be unwise from every point of view.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I can understand the interest of those who have airports in their districts, in wanting this motion not to prevail. It so happens that W. P. A. did many things beside build airports. They constructed many other things. I doubt if there is a man in this Chamber who has not some project that needs more work done by W. P. A. or by someone in order to complete it. I know that I have and I know that others have. It is human nature to want those things to be done, but I fail to see why you pick out a few projects, such as airports, and say, "We want those finished because of their importance," because there are many, many other projects which W. P. A. was undertaking that were also worth while.

Now, let us go back to what W. P. A. was organized for. It was said on this floor many many times in years gone by that W. P. A. was not doing this work just to furnish something nice to the communities. W. P. A. went to work to furnish employment to unemployed people. That was the whole purpose of W. P. A., to give people jobs; not to give cities and communities and States nice presents from the Federal Government. They have received millions of dollars worth of benefits while they were giving employment. But now that that is over, there is no W. P. A. to provide this employment and it is hardly compatible with the idea of W. P. A. to come back and say, "Now, you gave us so much you must go ahead and give us the rest of it."

Now, on these projects, the only possible excuse in my opinion, for going ahead would be that they would be of some importance to the war effort. The Army has taken the projects that W. P. A. was working on and has designated those that were of military importance, and those are being finished. Those that are before us today have not been so designated, so they stand as work done by the W. P. A. or others that may be worth while to the communities but are not of military value. I think the amounts mentioned here are so small that any State or city which has an airport partly finished, if it has the ingenuity and if it has the interest, can go out and raise that money and not expect the Federal Government to do it. I think it is time for the people in the States and in the cities not to look to the Federal Government for everything. The Federal Government, in the interest of relieving unemployment, has furnished tremendous value in property and in improvements to the States and the cities. This airport program is a great asset to those communities and they should undertake the completion of them themselves.

So, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, these were not designed as a gift to the States. They are not needed for military purposes because they have not been so designated, and it is unfair on the part of the cities and the States to come in here and say, "Now, because you spent millions in my district you must go ahead and spend millions more."

I trust that the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] will be agreed to, and I also hope that those communities will be a little more enterprising and do the job themselves, and not call on Uncle Sam to take over the burden.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I must disagree with my distinguished colleague from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], whose good judgment in most instances I would rely on to the *n*th degree.

I know that if this country is wise, as it has been partially wise in the past, it will arrange for a great airport expansion program in all of the States of the Union. We should have, perhaps, 20,000 airports of varying sizes in this Nation. It is sound thinking and acting for Congress to develop its airport program. Each step we take in that direction is desirable.

I draw your attention to the fact that Florida had the foresight, prior to the declaration of war, to build a system of airports over a period of several years, and Florida today is outstanding as a State which was able to take care of the impact of war from the standpoint of aviation facilities for the Army and Navy. A visit to Florida airports, teeming with activity, will prove the strength of that statement. Civil Aeronautics Administration officials will tell you that Florida was in a preferable condition because of the work done under W. P. A. funds in the construction of airports. Of course local political subdivisions carried their full share of costs in the items of lands, and so forth.

I know airports that fall in the category of those mentioned today during debate. I have none of these projects in my own congressional district, but Clarksburg and Wheeling, W. Va., are in the list to be finished if the motion of the gentleman from Nebraska carries and we agree to the Senate view. A splendid airport at Morgantown, W. Va., in my district, builded with W. P. A. funds and local cooperation and supervised by the C. A. A. has been the means within the last month of saving in equipment to the Army Air Forces an amount of some several hundred thousand dollars. In what way? Three planes of the Army Air Forces, flying with small gasoline loads, under bad weather conditions, found it possible to come in and land. When further desirable development to this airport takes place it will mean that aircraft will find even more adequate facilities for safety and operation.

Of course, the Airport Approval Board, composed of the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Commerce, has not had occasion to say that these uncompleted airport projects, which we consider today, must be finished and are necessary in order to win the war; but the Civil Aeronautics Administration, through the Director of Airports, Mr. C. B. Donaldson, and the chief airport engineer, Mr. Phillips Moore, will explain to you that these projects, of which the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] speaks, are vital to a continuance of a good civil-aviation program in this country and that these projects will be valuable in the prosecution of the war.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Is not that the reason that C. A. A. asked for the completion of them, because they are needed, and there are 28 of them that are needed to round out the program which the C. A. A. went to the municipalities and urged the communities to bond themselves to build?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is absolutely right. Military planes are flying in the vicinity of these airports and they are needed now. I can tell you that in the territory of one of these uncompleted airports today military

craft are flying over at the rate of about 200 every 24 hours; before the war military planes were perhaps operating 18 or 20 craft in the same period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of this House to act wisely and agree with the position taken by the gentleman from Nebraska. Each airport completed or further developed is a link in the vital chain of sound national planning for peace and for the purposes of defense if war occurs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER].

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I hope this preferential motion of the gentleman from Nebraska prevails. It is one of the most important motions that has been before this body at this session. I am for the development of the airports of this country. We are far behind with the type of program that ought to be carried on. I will not here repeat the statements made by the gentleman from Nebraska and the gentleman from West Virginia, but those statements are fully true and correct.

In the district I represent, to be concrete with you, there is an uncompleted airport at Hibbing, Minn., and an uncompleted airport at Eveleth, Minn. Both of these airports are in the heart of the iron-ore industry. They ought to be finished. We do not know the day nor the month when the planes, for military purposes, may find it necessary to safeguard this section where now 80 percent of the iron ore in the United States comes from to be used in the manufacture of iron products.

At International Falls there is a third airport in my district that is uncompleted. It is on the Canadian border and if the enemy ever comes over that northern route, International Falls is on the line of travel.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you in the interest of national defense, in the interest of the Army, in the interest of the American people, that these airports ought to be finished so they can be utilized if the hour of emergency comes. These are just three instances.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Of course, the gentleman knows that if the Army or the Navy wants to complete any airport they have a right to do so.

Mr. PITTENGER. Yes, I realize that. They have already recommended the completion of some airports. I do not think they have had time to give consideration to what the development of airports in this country means, not only to the Army and the Navy, but to the American people in connection with the program of air transportation.

Mr. Speaker, there has been discussion this afternoon indicating that some Members have felt that the different communities should complete these airports. The short and practical answer to that is that these communities do not have the funds sufficient to do so. There have also been some remarks indicating that these were W. P. A. projects, and, if we complete them, it will set a precedent to complete numerous other W. P. A. projects that have nothing to do with the airport development. I do not approach this question from that standpoint.

It is my contention that we are way behind with airport development in the United States, and as I understand it, the major portion of this $8,000,000 Senate item is to be used to complete the uncompleted W. P. A. airports. Every one of those airports were started because of their value to the country in the field of civil aeronautics, and, as I have indicated, airports in my territory have a value in our war effort.

It strikes me as nonessential to vote $71,000,000,000, as we recently did, for the War Department, and then to quibble over an $8,000,000 item in one of the most vital factors that effects America, namely, the development of aviation in this country.

It is true that the War Department has authorized to develop airports where it considers there is an emergency, and where it considers such development immediately necessary. I have had no control whatever over that program, and I know that the War Department has agreed to proceed with the completion of certain uncompleted W. P. A. airports. I feel satisfied that when they start to investigate they will come to the conclusion that the airports to which I have referred in this speech should be included in the War Department program.

But I want to approach this item of $8,000,000 from another standpoint.

I have said on many occasions that while we are spending billions of dollars in a war for destruction of our enemy, we should not overlook our domestic problems, and that this includes the problem of transportation and other factors.

I think we can well afford to spend $8,000,000 on airports, every one of which is now, or will shortly be, of vital importance in solving the transportation problems of America.

As I view it, the possibilities in the future of civil aeronautics is unlimited, and we do not realize the great field of the future in this line of transportation. Not only will the airplane industry furnish passenger transportation, but it will make possible the transportation of freight, and I predict that the greatest development of the future will come with the development of this mode of transportation.

Compared with the program for civil aeronautics, and the development of air fields in the future, this item of $8,000,000 for completion and development of a few air fields located in various parts of the United States becomes rather insignificant.

I think it a mistake for Congress to adjourn at this time without making this appropriation. So far as I am concerned I feel that we have neglected this great development of the airplane, and that Congress should have a special committee on civil aeronautics, or it should assign to one of its existing committees, the job of planning now for the development of airfields in every State in this country, so that the transportation, which is sure to be developed along these lines, will have this adequate equipment at its service when the post-war development period begins.

I urge the adoption of this motion of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

As the aviation industry makes progress they are going to need emergency landing fields. The remarks of my distinguished colleague from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] are timely and proper, and set forth in a most commanding way the need for this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, it must be remembered that there are W. P. A. projects and W. P. A. projects. It is true that in the beginning the W. P. A. work was mainly for the purpose of providing employment to those who needed work, but toward the last a lot of that work was being done with an eye on the war effort, and the people of the various communities were appealed to on that score; their patriotism was appealed to with an eye toward the war effort, and with that in mind embarked on the construction of these airports, and expended large sums of money moved by patriotism.

I would like to read, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, an excerpt from a letter I have received from J. A. Kastler, of Raton, N. Mex., former mayor of that municipality, concerning an airport in my own State, which I understand is 91 percent completed. Mr. Kastler states:

> The city of Raton backed this venture in actual cash, having purchased 1,300 acres of land for $13,000, and having contributed some $15,000 additional in other improvements, and, besides, have had expenses regularly in maintaining the port as a designated landing field.

Though not completed, it is being utilized today in the war program. I quote also from a letter I have received from Arthur Johnson, vice president and cashier of the Raton First National Bank. He states:

> As you, of course, know, the airport is being used quite extensively for training in conjunction with Peterson Field at Colorado Springs. With some additional work I feel sure that this airport will measure up with the majority of airports in the country.

Mr. Speaker, what I have had to say with reference to the airport at Raton, which, as I say, is 91 percent completed, no doubt applies to other similar airports, and I think that the Congress at

this time ought to do something to evidence its good faith to the people who have loyally supported this program and who have worked and expended funds to provide sites for the construction of these airports to aid the war program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska. I feel that these airports should be completed at the earliest possible date.

One of these airports is located at Pueblo, Colo., which is in my district. This is the municipal airport and is now being used. However, certain work remains to be done before all of the improvements contemplated are completed.

To date the Government has spent $317,819 on this airport. The city of Pueblo has contributed $57,654, making a total expenditure of $375,473. Under the C. A. A. estimate the sum of $70,000 has been allocated to complete the project that was under construction when work stopped. If this amendment is adopted this amount will be available to install contact lights and pave taxi ways and aprons, in addition to other improvements.

Pueblo is rapidly becoming one of the air centers of the West. The Army has an air base located at this point. An instrument training program for pilots is being conducted under the supervision of the Pueblo Junior College. The Continental Air Lines have Pueblo as a stop on their Denver to El Paso route, and also on the Denver to Wichita route.

I mention these facts to indicate the importance of this airport. The flying weather in Colorado is considered most favorable by the Army. Very few days are lost because of bad weather. Large air bases are located at Lowry and Buckley Fields in Denver, another at Peterson Field in Colorado Springs and one at La Junta. I submit that it is highly desirable to complete this municipal airport at Pueblo so that it may be available for the use of the Army flyers in case of emergency.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this amendment will be adopted. I consider the completion of these airports at this time as most essential to our war effort.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of sound business and economy we should support the motion of my Nebraska colleague. I will illustrate what is involved by telling the House about the airport in which I am interested.

The city of Beatrice, Nebr., had an airport of 160 acres where they were training about 50 flyers for the Army and Navy through C. A. A. program.

They have several plants there doing important war work. That airport was constantly used in our war program. Airplane parts and other war products were being shipped in and out of that port. Then the Federal Government through the W. P. A. came along and sold that community on the idea of voting bonds and enlarging their airport. They voted bonds and spent about $80,000 of the city's money. The airport was enlarged and it enveloped the existing airport they had so it could not be used any more; it is gone. The Federal Government promised them in effect that they would finish it. The Federal Government sent its agents into that community and urged a bond issue to build a larger airport for the benefit of the aviation program of the entire United States. The W. P. A. spent over $73,000 in addition to the sponsor's funds on that airport. A statement of the work and expenditures already made by the W. P. A. alone on the airport is as follows:

BEATRICE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT, BEATRICE, NEBR.

First stage of development: Grading, drainage, pavement, and incidentals for the construction of two runways, taxiway, and apron in accordance with plans approved by the Civil Aeronautics Administration to meet requirement for a class 3 airport.

WORK ACCOMPLISHED

Items of work performed or to be performed as of February 1, 1943, by Work Projects Administration and sponsor, the city of Beatrice, Nebr.

Item No.	Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit price	Amount	Percent complete
1	Clearing and grubbing	260	Acre	$3.10	$806.00	72
2	Removal of old fence	160	Rod	.35	56.00	50
3	Grading runways landing strips	4,800	Cubic yard	.39	1,872.00	3
4	Grading apron, taxiway	43,890	Cubic yard	.39	17,117.10	80
5	Field grading	8,000	Cubic yard	.39	3,120.00	6
6	12-inch subbase treatment		Cubic yard	.75		0
7	Fine sand for subbase		Cubic yard	.55		0
8	3-inch underground ducts		Linear foot	1.00		0
9	Furnishing seed	1,238	Pound	.33	408.54	100
10	Preparation and seeding field		Acre	3.25		0
11	Fencing field		Rod	1.57		0
12	Storm-sewer excavation	9,436	Cubic yard	1.00	9,436.00	100
13	Storm sewer backfill, rolled	4,664	Cubic yard	.185	862.84	100
14	Storm-sewer backfill, tamped	2,614	Cubic yards	.895	2,339.53	100
15	18-inch concrete pipe in place	1,806	Linear feet	1.80	3,250.80	100
16	24-inch concrete pipe in place	2,056	Linear feet	2.75	5,654.00	100
17	30-inch concrete pipe in place	608	Linear feet	3.70	2,249.60	100
18	36-inch concrete pipe in place	1,228	Linear feet	4.60	5,851.20	100
19	42-inch concrete pipe in place	656	Linear feet	6.35	4,165.60	100
20	48-inch concrete pipe in place	980	Linear feet	7.85	7,693.00	100
21	Storm-sewer inlets	11	Each	63.00	693.00	100
22	Pipe headwalls	3	Each	32.60	97.80	100
23	6½-inch concrete pavement, runways		Square yards	2.12		0
24	6½-inch concrete pavement, apron, taxiway		Square yards	2.12		0
25	60- by 80-foot frame hangar, utilities	1	Each	7,500.00	7,500.00	100
	Grand total of work accomplished				73,172.91	

Mr. Speaker, unless we reject the report of the conferees, this great investment, at least a great part of it, is forever lost. Is there any economy in that? It means that the Federal Government has broken faith with this community; it means that this community that had an airport, no longer has one at all. My colleague [Mr. STEFAN] has worked long and hard on this program. His airport at Fremont, Nebr., ought to be completed. His motion should be approved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a table of expenditures.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I favor the preferential motion of the gentleman from Nebraska. The total appropriation to complete 28 important airports is $8,830,000. One of these airports is in my district, known as the Wheeling-Ohio County Airport. It will require less than $100,000 to finish this project and to put this airport in first-class shape for all civil and military purposes. The city of Wheeling and Ohio County have each spent a very considerable sum of money. In addition the W. P. A. has done quite a lot of work. Supplementing all of that, the public-spirited citizens of the city of Wheeling and Ohio County have devoted their time, efforts, and money to completing this important work. Several planes in distress have landed on this airport. It was with difficulty that they were again able to take off. Bethany College, within a few miles of this airport, has a large class of naval air trainees. I cannot conceive of any airport in or near our section of the country that is of greater civil and military importance. It is in direct line of east and west transportation. Its value to the community, as well as to the country, will be permanent. It is well located above the fog, easily accessible to the city of Wheeling and to nearby territory in the States of West Virginia, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

For 15 years the people of Ohio County have been air conscious. They have been attempting to develop an airport. In fact, they are among the pioneers. Many of our citizens use air transportation constantly. We are in an energetic defense plant area.

I strongly urge that this appropriation be given support by the membership of the House and that we be permitted to finish this airport, with the small sum that will be made available by this ap-

propriation, at the earliest possible date. It is sound, practical, and worthy of the support of the entire House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER].

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to go further into the discussion of whether these airports should be completed insofar as the Federal Government is concerned. I cannot agree with the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky at all.

In my district the Federal Government through W. P. A. came to the city of Pittsburg, Kans., and interested them in expanding the municipal airport. The city undertook an obligation of $600,000. Today they have expended about half of that. The port is about 52 percent completed. They are training Army pilots at that port right this minute and yet the Army has not designated that port as one necessary for miltiary purposes and it cannot be completed by the city of Pittsburg without Federal assistance. The city of Pittsburg has voted a $150,000 bond issue. The runways at this airport have been graded and developed, and if they are not finished the money that has been expended in partially completing the airport will be at least a 50-percent loss, because the city of Pittsburg is not financially able to undertake an obligation of that amount without Federal assistance. This airport is also being used by Army bombers training at various ports in this area, using it as an emergency field, and for this purpose it certainly is necessary as a war-training project.

I hope that by some manner or means we can prevail upon the conferees to go back to conference and agree on an amount which will permit the completion of these vitally needed airports, and I hope the motion of the gentleman from Nebraska will prevail.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I favor the preferential motion of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. Speaker, included in this list of airports is one port with which I am particularly familiar—the one at Iowa City, Iowa. A few years ago it was designated as a bomber landing field by the War Department. The War Department thereby induced that community to expand and put in hard-surfaced runways. They got the job 80 percent completed. They have a very extensive pilot-training program in existence at that port now, yet in spite of the fact that the project is 80 percent completed, they find themselves there now unable to use the airport to its fullest possibilities and to its real need.

We need $120,000, approximately, to complete this project. I disagree with the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] to the effect that this city could easily raise the money, for it is a city of only 17,000 people. They have pioneered airport development all through the years. I lived there through the entire program of airport development by the Chamber of Commerce, and the city government, and I know that the city of Iowa City cannot raise $120,000 as easily as the gentleman from Kentucky indicates. I know the history of the project thoroughly, and I know it is important. It is designated as a bomber landing field by the War Department, and they need these Mid-West airports to supplement the entire network of airports. My prediction is they will need them more and more as the years go by.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion made by the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has repeatedly gone on record and demonstrated oftentimes its willingness to support a well-rounded program of civil aeronautics and the proper development of airways throughout the country. As you all know, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has now under consideration amendments to the Civil Aeronautics Act.

That bill provides for subsidies, and it provides for the expenditure of vast sums of money for the development of aviation. It seems to me that we cannot at this time afford to curtail our program of development of airports. The war has shown us definitely that if it had not been for our civilian aeronautics program in the past, why we would have been stymied, we could not have moved, and it would be just criminal if we at this time curtailed the program of development of our airports in connection with civilian aeronautics. I think this very definitely ties in with our war program.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADOWSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman from Michigan is correct in his observation. I desire to add also that these W. P. A. airports became the backlog of the training program for civilian pilots, and out of which came the fliers who were the backbone of the Army air forces as we began this war. We need more and more airports. It is too bad we did not possess several thousand in addition to what we did have on December 7, 1941.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] when he spoke of economy. I am in favor of the House at this time reaching some compromise in order to make funds available for the completion of the airports involved in this amendment. I take that position primarily because I believe economy is the main objective in seeking completion of these ports so that the sums already invested will not be lost.

A great deal of money has been spent on these projects. The one in which I am interested in my State, Idaho Falls, was not started as a W. P. A. project. At the present time $355,000 has been expended upon the development of this airport. The C. A. A. in the first emergency landing field program allocated about $50,000 to improve that airport, which is strategically located in the intermountain area embracing Ogden and Salt Lake City, Utah, Boise, Pocatello, and Mountain Home, Idaho, where there is extensive aviation development.

I received a letter recently from Mr. E. W. Fanning, mayor of Idaho Falls, in which he refers to this airport, as follows:

> I might say that I have just returned from a trip to Seattle, Wash., where I conferred with Mr. Paul Morris, and Mr. Lane Wilcox, director of airports, for the Civil Aeronautics Administration in regard to the completion of our airport. While there I found that these gentlemen had at various times recommended the completion to Washington, D. C., but they had been informed that it would be impossible for Civil Aeronautics Administration to do anything unless requested to do so by either the Army or the Navy. They did state, however, that they had included the amount necessary to complete this airport in their budget request. * * *
>
> We have a very definite commitment from the United States Government that if we would purchase the land, the Government would do the necessary construction work, and we feel that there is a moral obligation which should be taken into consideration, inasmuch as the city of Idaho Falls spent $70,000 for land alone for this project.

I submit that that is not a boondoggling project or that it merely involves the completion of a W. P. A. project. This airport requires only a moderate sum to develop it into a class 4 field so that it may be used to the fullest extent by the 4-motored bombers which are constantly flying throughout that intermountain area. I believe the war program will be beneficially affected by making available a few millions to complete this group of 28 airports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. The State of Wisconsin has three of these uncompleted airports started under Government encouragement and to some extent with Government funds. One of these is at Oshkosh, in the district of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], who recently dwelt at considerable length upon the completion of these projects before the House. Another one is located at Siren, and the third is located at Eau Claire.

The city of Eau Claire has gone to large expense in securing land in order that this project might be started. In

proceeding to do so it had the support and assurances of the Federal Government. The airport has not been completed. The city has other responsibilities incident to the location of a large munitions plant there which require all the funds it can raise for its own purposes at this time. Unless this amendment shall be adopted and the preferential motion agreed to, there is no possibility of early completion of that airport.

I hope the preferential motion will be adopted by a large majority and that this bill may be approved and the 28 airports completed. That should be done, in justice to the communities in which they are situated. Furthermore, their completion will serve to improve the airport facilities of the entire Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I am interested in this program, but I think the work essential at this time can be done with half the money proposed, leaving the paving to be done at a later date. Furthermore, no project should be prosecuted at this time which is not important to the war effort. I hope we can vote an amendment along that line.

My experience is similar to that which has been recounted by the other Members. I refer particlarly to the Lawrence County airport where the county spent a great deal of money with the understanding that runways would be extended by the Federal Government. In fact, the Civil Aeronautics Authority made an allotment at one time of $100,000 and the W. P. A. an allotment of $130,000 to complete the extension of the runways and pave them. The county went ahead and purchased the land but the project has been held up. The county in this instance has put a great deal of money in hangars, repair shops, and so forth, and has one of the largest investments of any local community in an airport that I know anything about. The county has done more than it was asked to do. It is commonly believed that extension of the runways would be very valuable to the war effort.

A large class, several hundred cadets, use the field for training purposes now, but the runways should be lengthened to make an emergency landing possible for the flying fortresses that are based at a field 50 miles away and a glider base even nearer. I should want this project considered solely on its value to the war effort if money is made available to replace the lost W. P. A. labor.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to ask for a division of the question and then to offer a further preferential motion which will reduce the amount from the $8,300,000 in the Senate amendment to $4,000,000, which will take care of all of these airports for the work necessary to conserve what has been done. This preferential motion which I shall offer is in line with the suggestion or the statement made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], when he made his remarks, that he would have offered that motion could he have offered it at that time.

It seems to me that is the real intent and that is the meritorious thing to do and that such a motion should be offered. So I shall ask for a division of the question and then offer a further preferential motion.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I am advised by the C. A. A. that if the amount is cut down what they propose to do is to preserve and protect the investment and the work that has already been done and perhaps not attempt at this time to proceed with certain of the concrete paving, and so forth, if they can put these ports in usable condition without that. That is the reason they can get along with the lesser amount.

Mr. CASE. Yes; and the $4,000,000 will be spread over all the airports and they can do the work that is essential for the time being.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion because I think, in time of war, regardless of other considerations, the airport program should be tied into the war effort. I am just as much interested in developing airports in my district as is any other Member of the House, but I think the whole consideration should be, Is it necessary to win the war? If the Army does not approve of the projects carried in this amendment, then I am certainly opposed to the preferential motion which would make possible this expenditure.

May I ask the chairman whether the airports that would be continued if the preferential motion were sustained are in the comprehensive plan of the Army?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; they are not. They have not been approved by the board in charge of the program.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman. I therefore oppose this preferential motion.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. I think the correct statement is that the Army board picked out certain airports on which it considered emergency work to be necessary. It has not disapproved these other airports; it simply has not reached them yet.

Mr. JONES. Turning it the other way around, it has not approved these airports. As to whatever is needed in the Army's program, there is money available from other appropriations.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Funds are already provided for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, if I were not convinced that the completion and placing in a usable condition of the airports we have under consideration were not tied into the war effort, I would be opposed to the preferential motion, but having in mind one of these airports—one, so I am informed, similar to the others on the approved list—I know just how necessary it is right at this moment in the war work we are endeavoring to carry on in California to immediately resume and to complete as quickly as we can this construction responsibility.

All over the State I represent are to be found in great numbers Government training fields, Government combat fields, and civilian fields galore. The civilian fields and the Government fields now available are crowded to the point where it is dangerous to use them. Additional facilities must be developed at the earliest possible moment. No legislation offers greater promise of early relief from air congestion than the measure under consideration. By the pursuit of this method we can bring into use in the winning of the war 26 half-completed airports, scattered, as they are, all over the various parts of the United States. I hope that the preferential motion is agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I shall consume 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, however desirable these other airports may be following the war, they are not needed now for the prosecution of the war, and that is the only consideration on which they could be included in this bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not true that there are three airports in this amendment that have never been approved by the War Department, and that no work has ever been done on any one of the three by the W. P. A.?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true. There are airports here which have not been adopted by the W. P. A. For example, we have a request here for an appropriation of $832,000 for an airport, and on which the Work Projects Administration has never spent a penny.

Mr. TABER. There is practically $2,000,000 in this bill for those three airports.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. With which neither the War or Navy Departments nor the W. P. A. have ever had any connection or in which they have expressed any interest or for which they have indicated there was any need.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think we remember that this House year after year believed in the feasibility of a highway to Alaska, yet the War Department repeatedly until September 1941 said such a road would have no military value; so we cannot always point to the War Department as a criterion of just what is best in these matters, can we?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. At the time to which my friend the gentleman from West Virginia refers the road was without military value. It was not until and under circumstances which could not at that time be foreseen, and which have materially changed the entire situation, that the project or the road assumed any military value.

In this case, insofar as these airports are concerned, we have an accurate and available method of determining military value. The Board, consisting of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Commerce, not only has authority to order construction at any time, but it has the funds, amounting to about $90,000,000 at this time, from which it may draw at will for construction of airports deemed essential to military operations. It has both the authority and the funds to build or to complete or supplement any needed airport. If there were the slightest need, if there were at any time the slightest evidence of any military value to be served by the completion of any of these airports, all that would be necessary would be for this Board to approve them and they could be completed promptly without notice or application to Congress or to any other authority, out of funds already at their command.

Granted that W. P. A. has had something to do with initiating some of these airports, may I call attention to a stipulation in the contract entered into by the sponsors of these airports at the time they were started.

I shall read just two excerpts from the signed agreement which the sponsors of each of these airports signed when they first filed their applications for construction of these facilities.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I shall take 3 additional minutes.

Here is the first provision of the contract:

It is agreed that the Work Projects Administration is under no obligation to initiate operations under the project authorization, if approved, nor to complete the project, or any portion thereof, if placed in operation.

The first thing the sponsors agreed to and to which they affixed their respective signatures was this specific, definite, unequivocal agreement.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. In spite of that very fine writing in W. P. A. 301, the W. P. A. allocated funds to those municipalities with an agreement that that money would be spent there. The municipalities had no idea W. P. A. was going to liquidate. They went to work and started buying land because W. P. A. allocated the money to build the airport there. They not only obligated themselves and went into debt, they put a tremendous amount of other money—municipal money and State money which was given them by the State aeronautics commissions—into these airports. Then W. P. A. liquidated and left these airports high and dry.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Did the gentleman approve that liquidation?

Mr. STEFAN. I did, with the exception of carrying out the obligations it had made with the municipalities. I am interested in saving the investment we have made, the investment of Federal funds, of State funds, and of municipal funds. I am interested in economy. If you wipe this out you are going to wipe out this investment. I have visited many of these airports myself. They are 50 to 90 percent complete. The State aeronautics commissions have approved them.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman approves liquidating W. P. A. Every one of these projects in which W. P. A. was interested or which it initiated were stopped by the liquidation. They approved liquidation with a full realization on these contracts, because it was stressed at the time the President stopped W. P. A. operations.

First, there was this agreement and understanding, this contract, that in event of discontinuance, no obligation devolved upon W. P. A. to complete the airports. Second, there was the further agreement, and may I especially call attention to this last proviso in the contract which all applicants signed at the time W. P. A. undertook construction.

Further, in consideration of the expenditure of Federal funds on the project—

I would like to have the attention of the Members, because Members should hear this provision which is in every contract under which these projects were constructed:

Further, in consideration of the expenditure of Federal funds on the project, it is agreed if the proposed work is undertaken and operations are discontinued—

That is the situation here—

by the Work Projects Administration, the sponsor will take such steps as may be necessary to complete a useful economic unit of the work.

All sponsors, when they made this application and when they entered into this contract, agreed that if anything interfered with completion by the Federal Government—interfered with W. P. A. completing it—the sponsor should then complete a useful, economic unit of the work.

Now, in the face of that agreement and in violation of that contract, sponsors of these projects are asking for the expenditure of these substantial sums of money on projects for which there is no military need, which have no military value, but with all of which they have agreed, under the circumstances, to complete themselves.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That condition has existed in every contract ever since the E. R. A. days of 1933. Communities and municipalities are obligated.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I will take one additional half minute in which to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. All of the communities are obligated under that agreement to complete those projects where there is economic value in so doing. If there is no military value in completing these projects they should not be completed.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There were thousands of projects, highways, schools, roads, water systems, and so forth, that were discontinued at the same time. There is no distinction or difference. The sponsor whom the gentleman represents agreed if the W. P. A. did not finish the project they would finish it. It now devolves upon them to carry out their contract.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. All of which would be good for post-war planning.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman has touched on one of the important considerations. After the war we will need projects of this character to take care of unemployment and all projects which are without military value should be deferred until the demobilization of the war industries.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division of the question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota demands a division of the question.

The question is, Will the House recede?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASE) there were ayes 48 and noes 77.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I hope the gentleman will not insist on a roll call at this time. We are very greatly pressed for time. There is no question about the feeling of the House. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would withdraw his point of order.

Mr. BURDICK. Time is no more valuable than the 2 minutes you said you did not have when you had it, when the debate was on.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 149, nays 198, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

YEAS—149

Abernethy	Buckley	Cullen
Andersen, H. Carl	Burch, Va.	Cunningham
Anderson, N. Mex.	Burchill, N. Y.	Curtis
Andresen, August H.	Burdick	Dickstein
Angell	Burgin	Dilweg
Barrett	Byrne	Durham
Beall	Cannon, Fla.	Dworshak
Beckworth	Carlson, Kans.	Eberharter
Bennett, Mo.	Carson, Ohio	Ellis
Bonner	Case	Ellison, Md.
Bradley, Pa.	Chenoweth	Ellsworth
Brooks	Clark	Fellows
	Cole, Mo.	Fernandez
	Cooley	Flannagan
	Cravens	Folger

Gale	Lesinski	Richards
Gathings	Luce	Rizley
Gavagan	Lynch	Rohrbough
Gearhart	McGehee	Rolph
Gossett	McGregor	Rowan
Grant, Ind.	McKenzie	Sadowski
Gwynne	McMurray	Sauthoff
Hagen	Maas	Scanlon
Hare	Madden	Schiffler
Harless, Ariz.	Manasco	Schuetz
Harness, Ind.	Mansfield,	Short
Harris, Va.	Mont.	Sikes
Hart	Marcantonio	Smith, Maine
Heffernan	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Va.
Hendricks	Miller, Mo.	Smith, Wis.
Hinshaw	Miller, Nebr.	Sparkman
Hoeven	Miller, Pa.	Stanley
Holmes, Wash.	Monkiewicz	Stefan
Hope	Morrison, La.	Stockman
Horan	Mruk	Sullivan
Howell	Mundt	Talle
Hull	Murdock	Tibbott
Jensen	Myers	Vincent, Ky.
Johnson, Ind.	O'Brien, Mich.	Vorys, Ohio
Judd	O'Toole	Vursell
Kerr	Patton	Wasielewski
Kleberg	Peterson, Fla.	Weichel, Ohio
Klein	Pittenger	Weiss
Kunkel	Ploeser	Welch
LaFollette	Poulson	Wene
Lambertson	Price	White
Landis	Ramspeck	Winstead
Lanham	Randolph	Winter
Lea	Rankin	Wolcott
LeCompte	Reed, Ill.	Wright
Lemke	Rees, Kans.	Zimmerman

NAYS—198

Allen, Ill.	Gibson	Newsome
Allen, La.	Gillette	Norrell
Anderson, Calif.	Goodwin	O'Brien, N. Y.
Arends	Graham	O'Neal
Arnold	Granger	Outland
Auchincloss	Grant, Ala.	Pace
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gregory	Patman
Bates, Ky.	Griffiths	Peterson, Ga.
Bates, Mass.	Gross	Philbin
Bell	Hall,	Powers
Bender	Leonard W.	Pracht
Bishop	Halleck	Priest
Blackney	Hancock	Rabaut
Bloom	Harris, Ark.	Ramey
Bolton	Hartley	Reece, Tenn.
Boren	Hays	Reed, N. Y.
Brehm	Heidinger	Robertson
Brown, Ga.	Herter	Robinson, Utah
Brown, Ohio	Hess	Robsion, Ky.
Bryson	Hobbs	Rockwell
Buffett	Hoch	Rodgers, Pa.
Bulwinkle	Hoffman	Rogers, Calif.
Busbey	Holmes, Mass.	Rogers, Mass.
Butler	Jackson	Rowe
Camp	Jarman	Sabath
Canfield	Jeffrey	Sasscer
Cannon, Mo.	Jenkins	Satterfield
Celler	Jennings	Schwabe
Chapman	Johnson,	Scott
Chiperfield	Anton J.	Shafer
Church	Johnson,	Sheppard
Clason	Calvin D.	Simpson, Ill.
Clevenger	Johnson,	Simpson, Pa.
Coffee	J. Leroy	Slaughter
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson,	Smith, Ohio
Colmer	Luther A.	Snyder
Compton	Johnson,	Somers, N. Y.
Cooper	Lyndon B.	Spence
Costello	Jones	Springer
Courtney	Jonkman	Starnes, Ala.
Cox	Kean	Steagall
Crawford	Kearney	Stearns, N. H.
Creal	Kee	Sumner, Ill.
Crosser	Kelley	Sumners, Tex.
D'Alesandro	Kennedy	Sundstrom
Davis	Kinzer	Taber
Day	Kirwan	Talbot
Dewey	Knutson	Thomas, N. J.
Dingell	Lane	Thomas, Tex.
Dirksen	LeFevre	Thomason
Disney	Lewis	Towe
Domengeaux	McCowen	Voorhis, Calif.
Dondero	McGranery	Wadsworth
Doughton	McLean	Walter
Elliott	McMillan	Ward
Elston, Ohio	McWilliams	Wheat
Engel	Mahon	Whelchel, Ga.
Feighan	Martin, Mass.	Whitten
Fenton	Mason	Whittington
Fish	May	Wickersham
Fisher	Merritt	Wigglesworth
Fogarty	Merrow	Willey
Forand	Michener	Wilson
Fulbright	Miller, Conn.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Furlong	Mills	Wolverton, N. J.
Gamble	Monroney	Woodruff, Mich.
Gavin	Murphy	Woodrum, Va.
Gerlach	Murray, Tenn.	Worley

NOT VOTING—83

Andrews	Gillie	Mott
Baldwin, Md.	Gordon	Murray, Wis.
Barden	Gore	Norman
Barry	Gorski	Norton
Bennett, Mich.	Green	O'Brien, Ill.
Bland	Hale	O'Connor
Boykin	Hall,	O'Hara
Bradley, Mich.	Edwin Arthur	O'Konski
Capozzoli	Hébert	O'Leary
Carter	Hill	Pfeifer
Cochran	Holifield	Phillips
Culkin	Izac	Plumley
Curley	Johnson, Okla.	Poage
Dawson	Johnson, Ward	Rivers
Delaney	Keefe	Russell
Dies	Kefauver	Sheridan
Ditter	Keogh	Smith, W. Va.
Douglas	Kilburn	Stevenson
Drewry	Kilday	Stewart
Eaton	King	Tarver
Elmer	Larcade	Taylor
Fay	Ludlow	Tolan
Fitzpatrick	McCord	Treadway
Ford	McCormack	Troutman
Fulmer	Magnuson	Van Zandt
Gallagher	Maloney	Vinson, Ga.
Gifford	Mansfield, Tex.	Weaver
Gilchrist	Morrison, N. C.	West

So the motion to recede was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

General pairs:

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Ward Johnson.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Hill.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Norman.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Gordon with Mr. Gillie.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Hale.
Mr. Fay with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Troutman.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Tarver with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Gorski with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. King with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Gilchrist.
Mr. Ford with Mr. Elmer.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Tolan with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to further insist on the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the various votes will be reconsidered and that motion laid on the table.

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution relating to the acquisition of corn by governmental agencies, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2936. An act to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes", approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MALONEY, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. REVERCOMB to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 33 and 34 to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 33: Page 43, line 13, insert: "SEC. 203. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay the salary of any person at the rate of $4,500 per annum or more unless such person shall have been appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 33.

Mr. EBERHARTER and Mr. TABER rose.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a member of the committee.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. TABER. To offer a preferential motion, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will have both motions read and see which is more preferential.

The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EBERHARTER moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 33 to H. R. 2968.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recede and concur with an amendment as follows: "In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate insert the following:

"'No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay the salary of any person at the rate of $5,500 per annum or more, appointed after June 30, 1943, unless such person shall have been appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That those appointed between June 30, 1943, and November 1, 1943, may hold office till the latter date unless sooner than that the Senate shall have refused to give its advice and consent as to any such appointee.'"

The SPEAKER. The Chair is compelled to hold that the motion to recede and concur, at this stage, takes precedence over a motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] demands a division of the question.

The question is: Will the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate?

The question was taken; and on division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 98, noes 73.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be quite a bit of confusion as to what this vote will decide. I ask the Chair to please state what the parliamentary situation is at the present time.

The SPEAKER. The only question involved is whether or not the House will recede from the disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE. Is it not a further fact that if the House accepts the motion to recede then the motion of the gentleman from New York to concur with an amendment will take precedence over the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EBERHARTER]?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Tellers were ordered.

The House again divided; and on the vote by tellers, there were—ayes 120, noes 79.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 170, nays 176, answering "present" none, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

YEAS—170

Allen, Ill.	Gearhart	Mundt
Allen, La.	Gillette	Murray, Tenn.
Andersen, H. Carl	Goodwin	Norrell
Anderson, Calif.	Graham	O'Brien, N. Y.
Andresen, August H.	Grant, Ind.	Pace
Angell	Griffiths	Peterson, Ga.
Arends	Gross	Philbin
Arnold	Hagen	Ploeser
Auchincloss	Hall, Leonard W.	Poulson
Barrett	Halleck	Powers
Beall	Hancock	Pracht
Bell	Harness, Ind.	Ramey
Bender	Harris, Va.	Rankin
Bishop	Heidinger	Reece, Tenn.
Blackney	Herter	Reed, Ill.
Bolton	Hess	Reed, N. Y.
Boren	Hinshaw	Rees, Kans.
Brehm	Hoeven	Rizley
Brooks	Holmes, Mass.	Robsion, Ky.
Brown, Ohio	Holmes, Wash.	Rockwell
Buffett	Hope	Rogers, Mass.
Busbey	Horan	Rohrbough
Butler	Howell	Rolph
Carlson, Kans.	Jenkins	Rowe
Carson, Ohio	Jennings	Satterfield
Carter	Jensen	Schiffler
Chenoweth	Johnson, Anton J	Schwabe
Chiperfield	Johnson, Ind.	Scott
Church	Johnson, J. Leroy	Short
Clason	Jones	Simpson, Ill.
Clevenger	Jonkman	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, Mo.	Kearney	Smith, Ohio
Cole, N. Y.	Kinzer	Smith, Wis.
Compton	Knutson	Springer
Courtney	Lambertson	Stanley
Cox	Landis	Stearns, N. H.
Crawford	LeCompte	Stefan
Cunningham	LeFevre	Stewart
Curtis	Lemke	Stockman
Davis	Lewis	Sumner, Ill.
Day	McCowen	Taber
Dewey	McGehee	Talbot
Dirksen	McGregor	Talle
Disney	McKenzie	Tibbott
Dondero	McLean	Vincent, Ky.
Dworshak	McWilliams	Vorys, Ohio
Ellis	Maas	Vursell
Ellsworth	Manasco	Weichel, Ohio
Elston, Ohio	Martin, Mass.	Wheat
Engel	Merrow	Wigglesworth
Fellows	Michener	Wilson
Fenton	Miller, Nebr.	Winter
Fish	Miller, Pa.	Wolcott
Fisher	Monkiewicz	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gamble	Morrison, La.	Wolverton, N. J.
Gathings	Mruk	Woodruff, Mich.
Gavin		Worley

NAYS—176

Abernethy	Cullen	Hobbs
Anderson, N. Mex.	D'Alesandro	Hoch
Baldwin, N. Y.	Dickstein	Hoffman
Bates, Ky.	Dilweg	Hull
Bates, Mass.	Dingell	Jackson
Beckworth	Domengeaux	Jarman
Bennett, Mo	Doughton	Jeffrey
Bloom	Durham	Johnson, Calvin D.
Bonner	Eaton	Johnson, Luther A.
Bradley, Pa.	Eberharter	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Brown, Ga.	Elliott	Johnson, Okla.
Bryson	Ellison, Md.	Judd
Buckley	Feighan	Kean
Bulwinkle	Fernandez	Kee
Burchill, N. Y.	Flannagan	Kelley
Burdick	Fogarty	Kennedy
Burgin	Folger	Kerr
Byrne	Forand	Kirwan
Camp	Fulbright	Kleberg
Canfield	Furlong	Klein
Cannon, Fla.	Gale	Kunkel
Cannon, Mo.	Gavagan	LaFollette
Case	Gerlach	Lane
Celler	Gibson	Lanham
Chapman	Grant, Ala.	Lesinski
Clark	Gregory	Luce
Coffee	Gwynne	Ludlow
Colmer	Hare	Lynch
Cooley	Harless, Ariz.	McGranery
Cooper	Harris, Ark.	McMillan
Costello	Hart	McMurray
Cravens	Hartley	Madden
Creal	Hays	Mahon
Crosser	Heffernan	Mansfield, Mont.
	Hendricks	Marcantonio
		Mason
		May
		Merritt
		Miller, Conn.
		Miller, Mo.
		Mills
		Monroney
		Murdock
		Murphy
		Myers
		Newsome
		O'Brien, Mich
		O'Neal
		O'Toole
		Outland
		Patman
		Patton
		Peterson, Fla.
		Pittenger
		Price
		Priest
		Rabaut
		Ramspeck
		Randolph
		Richards
		Robertson
		Robinson, Utah
		Rogers, Calif.
		Rowan
		Sabath
		Sadowski
		Sasscer
		Sauthoff
		Scanlon
		Schuetz
		Shafer
		Sheppard
		Sikes
		Slaughter
		Smith, Maine
		Smith, Va.
		Snyder
		Somers, N. Y
		Sparkman
		Spence
		Starnes, Ala.
		Steagall
		Sullivan
		Sumners, Tex.
		Sundstrom
		Thomas, N. J.
		Thomas, Tex.
		Thomason
		Towe
		Voorhis, Calif.
		Wadsworth
		Walter
		Ward
		Wasielewski
		Weiss
		Welch
		Wene
		West
		Whelchel, Ga.
		Whitten
		Whittington
		Wickersham
		Willey
		Winstead
		Woodrum, Va.
		Wright
		Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—84

Andrews	Gore	Murray, Wis.
Baldwin, Md.	Gorski	Norman
Barden	Gossett	Norton
Barry	Granger	O'Brien, Ill.
Bennett, Mich.	Green	O'Connor
Bland	Hale	O'Hara
Boykin	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Konski
Bradley, Mich.	Hébert	O'Leary
Burch, Va.	Hill	Pfeifer
Cabozzoli	Holifield	Phillips
Cochran	Izac	Plumley
Culkin	Johnson, Ward	Poage
Curley	Keefe	Rivers
Dawson	Kefauver	Rodgers, Pa.
Delaney	Keogh	Russell
Dies	Kilburn	Sheridan
Ditter	Kilday	Smith, W. Va.
Douglas	King	Stevenson
Drewry	Larcade	Tarver
Elmer	Lea	Taylor
Fay	McCord	Tolan
Fitzpatrick	McCormack	Treadway
Ford	Magnuson	Troutman
Fulmer	Maloney	Van Zandt
Gallagher	Mansfield, Tex.	Vinson, Ga.
Gifford	Martin, Iowa	Weaver
Gilchrist	Morrison, N. C	White
Gillie	Mott	
Gordon		

So the motion to recede was not agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

General pairs:

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Hale.

Mr. Fay with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Ward Johnson.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Norman.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Hill.

Mr. Bland with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Phillips.

Mr. Tarver with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Troutman.

Mr. McCormack with Mr. Ditter.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Gorski with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Curley with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Maloney with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Larcade with Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Martin of Iowa.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Ford with Mr. Elmer.

Mr. Izac with Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. Murray.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Gilchrist.

Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Gordon with Mr. Gillie.

Mr. Weaver with Mr. Taylor.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. As I understand the situation, the motion made by me contained two parts, the motion to recede and concur; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] asked for a division of that question and the House just declared itself not to recede. The question, as I understand it, now before the House is whether it desires to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The House cannot concur until it has receded, which it has just refused to do.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I beg the Speaker's pardon. I thought the vote was that the House should recede.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 34: Page 43, line 18, strike out "203" and insert "204."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to amendment No. 34.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which the various amendments were disposed of was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—AMERICAN RED CROSS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 7, 1943.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a report, prepared by the American Red Cross, of obligations under the appropriations for foreign war relief, consolidated and extended by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1942.

This cumulative report, reflecting all refugee and foreign war relief operations from July 1, 1940, through April 30, 1943, supplements reports submitted as of April 30, 1941, and April 30, 1942. It is of necessity an interim report, since the foreign war relief program is still in progress and H. R. 2714 will have the effect of extending the availability of this appropriation until June 30, 1944. A final report must await the conclusion of the foreign war relief program.

There are also transmitted herewith reports from the Treasury Department, the Department of Agriculture, and the War Department, which are serving as purchasing agencies under the program of foreign war relief. It will be noted that the reports of these Departments are prepared on the basis of orders placed with vendors as distinguished from the report of the American Red Cross, which is prepared on the basis of requisitions submitted to those Departments.

Respectfully,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke today have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a communication from the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], chairman of the Special Committee Investigating Employees of Alleged Subversive Activities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper item from a newspaper in Worcester, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CONSTRUCTION OF RURAL POST ROADS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah submitted the following conference report and statement:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2798) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "$27,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

On page 1 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in line 8 of said amendment, after the word "highways", strike out "on the system of Federal highways, and secondary or feeder roads", and insert the following words: "of States or their subdivisions".

On page 2 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in line 24, strike out the figures, "$20,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof the figures, "$10,000,000".

On page 4 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in line 3, after the word, "section.", add the following: "*Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall apply only during the continuance of the emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, and for a period of one year thereafter."

On page 4 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in line 12, after the word, "bridges" insert a "comma" and the following words: "including interstate toll bridges,".

On page 6 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in line 16, after the word "official", strike out all of the remainder of line 16 and all of line 17, and insert a "comma", and add the following: "unless the War Production Board shall certify that the use of critical material for additional highway construction would impede the conduct of the war."

And the Senate agree to the same.

J. W. ROBINSON,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
JAMES W. MOTT,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
J. G. SCRUGHAM,
CLYDE M. REED,
WILLIAM LANGER,
C. D. BUCK,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2798) amending the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes", approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 1: In the bill, as passed by the House, $25,000,000 was set as a limitation on the expenditure of access road funds for access roads to raw materials. The Senate amended the bill to provide for a limitation of $35,000,000. The conferees on the part of the House deemed this amount excessive in proportion to the unexpended balance of the general access road fund and compromised on a limitation of $27,500,000, since $233,000,000 of the $260,000,000 access road fund has already been allocated to certified projects. Senate amendment No. 1 also provided for the express inclusion within the meaning of "raw materials" in section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, approved November 19, 1941, as amended, of petroleum, by inserting, after the words "raw materials", wherever they occur in section 6 of the Defense Highway Act, the words "including petroleum". The managers on the part of the House regarded this amendment as redundant, taking the position that "pe-

troleum" is clearly within the meaning of "raw materials".

No. 2: The managers on the part of the House recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 2, with the following changes agreed to by the managers on the part of the House and the Senate:

On page 1 of the Senate engrossed amendments, amendment No. 2, after the words "repair of roads and highways", strike out "on the system of Federal highways, and secondary or feeder roads", and insert in lieu thereof "of States or their subdivisions". This amendment, with the change recommended by the Conferees, would allow the Commissioner of Public Roads to reimburse the several States for the necessary rehabilitation or repair of roads and highways within the various States which were substantially damaged not only by the Army or the Navy, as provided in existing law, but also by other agencies, persons, or contractors in performance of a contract or work in connection with the prosecution of the war. Since most of the damage to roads occurring as a result of excessive and abusive use in connection with the prosecution of the war is not done by the "Army or Navy or both" but is nonetheless essential in the prosecution of the war, your managers regard this amendment as important and as one that should be adopted.

The change in this section of Senate amendment No. 2 was recommended by your managers to make certain that where such damage occurred it would be reimbursable in all justifiable cases without possible controversy as to whether the damaged road was within the meaning of "secondary" or "feeder" road definitions.

The managers on the part of the House recommend that the House recede from its disagreement on that part of Senate engrossed amendment No. 2, entitled "sec. 7" and agree to the same with amendments striking the figure "$20,000,000" and inserting "$10,000,000" and inserting an additional proviso at the end of said section 7, reading as follows: *"Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall apply only during the continuance of the emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, and for a period of one year thereafter." In view of the extensive damage done to the road systems of those States in the area affected by the recent floods, it is regarded by your managers to be necessary to the expeditious repair of this damage that this section be included in the bill and agreed to by the House. Since authorization for taking care of flood damage has been recommended by the House Committee on Flood Control, it was deemed advisable to limit the amount authorized to be expended in this section to $10,000,000, and to limit the time for its expenditure to coincide with the period of the present emergency.

The managers on the part of the House recommend that the House agree to section 8 of Senate amendment No. 2, beginning on page 4 of the Senate engrossed amendments, with the amendment agreed to by the conferees which would insert, after the words "toll bridges", on line 12 of page 4, the words "including interstate toll bridges,". This section would extend the time limits in the act entitled "An act to aid the several States in making, or for having made, certain toll bridges on the system of Federal-aid highways free bridges, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1937, as amended, to allow the Federal Government to participate in the acquisition of toll bridges by the States at any time prior to January 1, 1945, and would make certain other changes in the present provisions for such acquisitions. The proposed amendment would strike out the act of August 14 as amended and insert an entirely new provision, which is self-explanatory.

Section 9 of Senate engrossed amendment No. 2, found on page 6 of the Senate engrossed amendments, was found to be wholly objectionable by all the managers on the part of the House. In order to resolve the differences between the House and Senate conferees, your managers have agreed to recommend the adoption of said section 9 amended to read as follows: "No part of any appropriation authorized in this Act shall be impounded or withheld from obligation or expenditure by any agency or official unless the War Production Board shall certify that the use of critical material for additional highway construction would impede the conduct of the war."

J. W. ROBINSON,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
JAMES W. MOTT,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I call up a conference report on the bill (H. R. 2798) entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes,' approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that the conferees have inserted a section 9 in this report which provides that no part of any appropriation authorized in this act shall be impounded or withheld from obligation or expenditure by anyone unless the War Production Board shall certify the use of critical materials for additional highway construction would impede the conduct of the war, and I ask the gentleman from Utah if that was included within the provisions of the House and Senate bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That was agreed to by the conferees on both sides.

Mr. TABER. That it was not in either bill?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No; it was not in either bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, do I understand the gentleman's request to be simply to call up the conference report now?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. I will not object to that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read the conference report.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the conference report is not within the range of the conference in that section 9 of the bill as proposed in the conference report is not an item that was in the bill as it passed the House or the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Utah desire to be heard?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, section 9 was not in the House bill but was an amendment placed in the Senate bill, and it was before the conference committee for consideration as amended by the Senate, and in conference the conferees changed section 9 to read as it now appears in the conference report.

Mr. TABER. Has the gentleman read the provision the Senate inserted in the bill as it passed the Senate?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. As the bill passed the Senate, section 9 read as follows:

No part of any appropriation authorized in this act shall be impounded or withheld from obligation or expenditure by any agency or official other than the Commissioner of Public Roads.

In the conference report we amended section 9 to read as follows:

No part of any appropriation authorized in this act shall be impounded or withheld from obligation or expenditure by any agency or official unless the War Production Board shall certify that the use of the critical material for additional highway construction would impede the conduct of the war.

It is clearly an amendment of the Senate provision.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard briefly on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to supplement the statement of the gentleman from Utah on the point of order. I believe the agreement between the Senate and the House conferees is simply an enlargement or an extension of the language in the prohibition adopted by the Senate at the time of the final passage of the bill in that body.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The amendment was in the Senate bill and that is section 9. The language the conferees bring back to you is simply an amendment of section 9 by the conferees and was unanimously agreed upon by the conferees.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, if I might suggest, it is an enlargement of the language and goes beyond the range of the differences.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is clearly a limitation of the language of the Senate amendment and was intended to be a limitation. We say so frankly. The House conferees refused to agree to the language of the Senate. The language substituted by the conferees is intended in my opinion as a limitation of the language used in the bill and does not go so far as the language that was in the bill as amended by the Senate.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, permit me to call attention to the fact that the language of the Senate very broadly provided:

No appropriation authorized in this act shall be impounded or withheld from obligation or expenditure by any agency other than the Commissioner of Public Roads.

The language agreed upon by the conferees is merely restrictive of that and is purely within the purview of the language which was before the conference and is a limitation upon the action agreed upon by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Section 9 of the Senate amendment reads as follows:

No part of any appropriation authorized in this act shall be impounded or withheld from obligation or expenditure by any agency or official other than the Commissioner of Public Roads.

Section 9 is purely a limitation and it is a limitation on everyone except the Commissioner of Public Roads.

The language agreed upon in conference is more restrictive than the language of the original section 9 in the opinion of the Chair because it strikes out the words "other than the Commissioner of Public Roads" and inserts "unless the War Production Board shall certify that the use of critical material for additional highway construction would impede the conduct of the war."

It seems to the Chair, section 9 dealing with limitations, that this is simply a further restriction and limitation and the Chair would be compelled to overrule the point of order raised by the gentleman from New York.

The point of order is overruled.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER), there were—ayes 147, noes 10.

So the conference report was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MORE ADEQUATE AND UNIFORM ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS IN VETERANS' LAWS PERTAINING TO COMPENSATION, PENSION, AND RETIREMENT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2703) to provide for adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, line 8, after "person", insert "not a citizen of the United States."

Page 7, line 13, strike out "That for" and insert "For."

Page 7, line 15, strike out "for 90 days or more."

Page 7, line 18, after "enrollment", insert ", or where clear and unmistakable evidence demonstrates that the injury or disease existed prior to acceptance and enrollment and was not aggravated by such active military or naval service."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not expect to object, but I know the House would like to have a description of the amendments. There has been no objection to some of the amendments, but one is not what it should be. As it is indicated that the House may recess shortly, we feel it is best to accept what we can secure from the other body. Will the gentleman explain the amendments to the House? I should like to state to the House how harmoniously the entire membership of the committee have worked to secure legislation this year for the veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the first amendment on page 4 inserts the words "not a citizen of the United States" in line 8, which, in my opinion, should have been included in the House bill. I have no objection to that provision at all because it throws around the measure a protection that I rather think is essential.

The next amendment is on page 7, line 13, where the words "that for" are stricken and the word "for" inserted. That is in line 13.

The amendment in line 15 on page 7 strikes out the words "for 90 days or more." That is, every person employed in the active military and naval service for 90 days or more, and so forth. The "90 days" were stricken out.

The only amendment about which there is very much controversy in the minds of members of the committee is the last one on page 7, beginning in line 18, after the word "enrollment" insert the words "or where clear and unmistakable evidence demonstrates that the injury or disease existed prior to acceptance and enrollment and was not aggravated by such active military or naval service."

With that amendment the provision reads as follows:

For the purposes of paragraph 1 (a) hereof every person employed in the active military or naval service shall be taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service except as to defects, infirmities, or disorders noted at time of the examination, acceptance, and enrollment, or where clear and unmistakable evidence demonstrates that the injury or disease existed prior to acceptance and enrollment and was not aggravated by such active or military or naval service.

Up to the present time a great many men have been turned out of the service after they had served for a long period of time, some of them probably as much as 2 or 3 years, on the theory that they were disabled before they were ever taken into the service. We provided this 90 days' limit in the House bill in order that a man should not be kept in service more than 90 days and then be discharged for an alleged disability presumed to have existed before he was taken into the service without giving him proper hospitalization and compensation where it is deserved.

This amendment strikes out the 90 days' provision and adds the provision which takes the burden from the veteran and places it on the Administration to prove by clear and unmistakable evidence that the injury or disease existed prior to acceptance and enrollment and was not aggravated by such active military or naval service. The only question with some of the members of the committee was they feared that this provision is not strong enough because every time we have been called upon to change veterans' legislation, or almost every time, it has been because of a refusal on the part of the Veterans' Administration to carry out the will of the Congress.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Does not the distinguished chairman of the committee feel that the very fact these men have been accepted into the armed forces should be prima facie evidence that the veteran was in good health?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. This amendment puts the burden of proof on the Administration to show the contrary. We want to serve notice now that we are going to expect the Veterans' Administration to carry out the will of Congress in that respect and not to as they did in the early 20's, construe everything so strongly against the veteran that it will force us to come back here and amend the law in order to make them do what we are trying to direct them to do here.

Mr. SHORT. The poor disabled veteran should not be made the goat.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Missouri that he is not going to be made the goat. If the Veterans' Administration does not carry out the will of Congress by proper administration of this law as it applies to these disabled veterans, we are going to see that they do it or so strengthen the law that they cannot get around it.

Mr. SHORT. I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] who has always been one of the very best friends the servicemen of this country have had.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Missouri. I can say the same thing for him.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There are many veterans in the present World War that are having great difficulty in establishing service connection. The House unanimously passed the House provision which we felt was airtight. The entire membership of the World War No. 1 veterans' committee has worked hard to secure this provision. If the Veterans' Administration does not live up to what we feel is right, I hope the House will immediately take steps to change it. I hope the Members will report to the veterans' committee any and all cases they feel to be unfairly rated.

It is only because the House is likely to recess very quickly that this change is accepted. Is that not true?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, but I may say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that the Senate provision has one advantage over the House provision in that it does not require a veteran to serve 90 days In other words, it eliminates that 90-day limitation, which might have been a two-edged sword.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DEWEY. I wonder if this bill has the retroactive feature in it that we discussed when it was originally on the floor, when the gentleman opposed it. If the bill is passed now, will it be retroactive to affect those men who have been taken from the service on the basis that they have preservice disability?

Mr. RANKIN. That is my understanding and that is the understanding of the committee, that it will apply to all the men who have been discharged from the Army, the Navy, or the Marine Corps during this war.

Mr. DEWEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Does the gentleman feel that the legislation as it is now presented will take care of overcoming the allegations in the discharges which the War Department and the Navy Department give these men in which it is stated that the discharge is for physical disability existing prior to service?

Mr. RANKIN. This places on the Veterans' Administration the duty to go into the proposition and to prove that it was a preservice disability. It places the burden of proof on the Veterans' Administration to show by unmistakable evidence that the injury or disease existed prior to acceptance and enrollment and was not aggravated by such active military or naval service.

Mr. CASE. What I am afraid of is that the Veterans' Administration will say that, where the discharge on the face of it states that it is for physical disability existing prior to service, that is proof.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but they cannot say that is proof in the face of this bill. It is a question of fact, and they cannot substitute that statement for proof in the face of this law.

Mr. CASE. The reason I am raising the question is that General Magee, in his testimony before the War Department Appropriations Subcommittee, went into this question at some length. We discussed it pro and con for some time. He contended that it was incumbent upon them under their regulations to state that this disability existed prior to service. It was the contention of many members of the committee that that statement on the discharge would be used as prima facie evidence by the Veterans' Administration to show that the disability existed prior to service.

Mr. RANKIN. That is exactly what we are serving notice about now. It not only is not conclusive proof but it is not prima facie proof. We expect every one of these cases to be examined and to stand each one on its own bottom.

Mr. CASE. I am very glad to have the chairman make that very definite and clear. I think it should be recognized as part of the legislative interpretation of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I have heard the statement of the chairman of this committee who, I think, understands this legislation as well as, if not better, than any other Member of this House. I am sure we all appreciate the fine, unselfish service the gentleman has rendered the veterans of the World War. I am wondering, however, if the gentleman feels that the legislation as now proposed with the Senate amendments is preferable to the bill as originally passed by the House. I think I state the position of every Member here that we do not want to be a party to anything that might do an injustice to any member of the armed forces. This is a very serious and important matter of legislation that will affect these boys for years to come.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] that we prefer the House bill, but the Senate made these changes. Some of them, as I have said, are improvements. This last amendment may have more salutary effect than some Members at first thought it would, but we are likely not to get any legislation at all at this time unless we agree to these amendments here today. For that reason, we have agreed to accept the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that I would rather not have any legislation at all at this time and wait until later to get the law exactly as Members want it than have a measure that is unsatisfactory.

Mr. RANKIN. We have had this matter up with the veterans' organizations today. We have all agreed that with these statements as to the attitude of Congress and as to the intention of Congress it is best to let this bill go through as amended in the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman. With that statement I am willing to go along with the bill as it is now.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it the gentleman's intention to pursue this matter in the next session to try to get all the House provisions into law?

Mr. RANKIN. If the administration carries out the intention of the law as the Senate Members think it will, and if the law works as it should, it will not be necessary to change the law; but we are going to keep an eye on it and unless the intention of Congress is carried out we will of course move to strengthen the law.

Mr. KENNEDY. I want to congratulate the gentleman for being so diligent. I know that the best interests of the veterans are protected in the gentleman's hands.

Mr. RANKIN. And I would say the same thing about the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. The veterans never had a better friend than he has been at all times, and they know it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think this bill will serve notice to the doctors examining and taking men into service, that they must make sure that the men are physically sound and will be much fairer to the men going into the service.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; and when a man breaks down and becomes mentally infirm, the signing of a waiver is not going to have any effect. In other words, we are going to have the man examined, have his case gone into thoroughly and see that he is given justice.

Mr. ANGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. That is the point I wanted to bring up. When we had this bill up before I placed in the RECORD some correspondence between myself and the Secretary of War in which it appeared that there is a regulation in the Department at the present time which requires veterans being discharged for disability to sign a waiver that they had suffered these disabilities before they were inducted into the service. I wanted to ask the gentleman if it is his opinion that with this legislation that practice in the War Department will be done away with?

Mr. RANKIN. Those waivers will not have any effect if this legislation is passed, except that it may be used as evidence, but not conclusive evidence.

Mr. ANGELL. Those veterans being discharged frequently are not mentally competent.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly.

Mr. ANGELL. They are suffering great disability and they are under the strain from service in foreign lands and it is unjust to require them to sign such a statement that they suffered the disabilities before they were inducted into service. I am willing to go along with the gentleman if it is his opinion and that of his very efficient committee that this will be satisfactory to the veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. I think this measure will take care of cases of that kind.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. We all appreciate the fine service that the gentleman gives to the veterans of the United States. Does this bill apply to the veterans of all wars?

Mr. RANKIN. This provision applies to the veterans of this war.

Mr. JENSEN. Just the veterans of this war?

Mr. RANKIN. Just the veterans of this war.

Mr. JENSEN. There are many veterans of past wars.

Mr. RANKIN. They are already taken care of.

Mr. JENSEN. Are the veterans of World War No. 1 taken care of in about the same manner?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. It seems we are having a great deal of trouble trying to get the benefit of that legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, you may have considerable trouble proving service connection after 24 years.

Mr. JENSEN. Did the Senate take out that 90-day clause?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. They do not have to serve 90 days, but with this other provision some think it is an improvement.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I feel sure that the removal of that fixed 90-day clause is a good thing, because you cannot expect a doctor always to be able, when he examines a patient, to be sure whether or not he has any disease. For example, there are some allergic diseases that are not present for many months of the year. Even though a man has had it every year during a certain season, there are other times when it will not be present and cannot be detected. There are other conditions, like duodenal ulcer, which may recur periodically in the spring or the fall. A man may have a spell every spring, or he may go 5 years without one under normal living. Then if it comes on when he is in the service and he does not admit that he has had it before, it is impossible for the doctor to tell. I have had patients come to me and say, "I am going into the service. You treated me for duodenal ulcer. Don't you tell the Army doctors about it if they call up and ask." I cannot tell them because it is a privileged communication. There are many fellows who would take advantage of the 90-day clause; they would deliberately get into the Army, sometime after 90 days reveal their symptoms, and then they will be discharged on account of physical disability and will be able to get a pension.

The bill as amended is much better than it was, but there is still one word in the bill that makes it almost impossible to administer from a medical standpoint.

Mr. RANKIN. Before the gentleman gets away from that 90-day clause, let me say that with that provision in the bill some felt there might be a tendency on the part of the medical authorities not to be in a hurry to examine a man until he had been in there for 75, 80, or even 89 days. So with that provision eliminated it will probably facilitate the examination of these men and the passing upon their cases.

Mr. JUDD. I think it is much better as it is except for one word, and I admit I do not know how to correct it. That word "aggravate" is administratively impossible. How can a doctor prove that a thing has not been aggravated by the man's service, or how many veterans will ever admit that it was not aggravated? "Aggravate" is a matter of degree, and usually impossible to measure.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand.

Mr. JUDD. I do not know how any doctor is going to be able to prove one way or the other.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman that that word "aggravate" is now sanctified by time and usage. It has been in the veterans' law ever since the last World War. If a man went into the service in the last war with a disability and that disability was aggravated by his service his disability was held to be service-connected. For instance, we will take a case in the present war. A man comes in with a nervous tendency that is not pronounced enough to cause the Army to reject him, or the Navy to reject him, but he goes through Pearl Harbor or he is on a vessel that is bombed and men are killed all around him and the ship is blown to pieces, it might aggravate that disability without touching him. It might aggravate his condition to such an extent that he would be a total nervous wreck. Then he should be entitled to hospital care and such other benefits as are provided for service-connected disabilities.

Mr. JUDD. I think the gentleman is right in agreeing to make this bill provide the burden of proof shall be upon the Government to show that the condition did exist previous to entry into service, rather than having the burden of proof on the veteran to show that it did not exist before he entered the service. That is the fair thing to do, just like in baseball where a tie is decided in favor of the runner. There ought to be a presumption in favor of the veteran in this case as well.

But, with the word aggravated in there it is going to be almost impossible ever to keep some from getting pensions that ought not to get them.

Mr. RANKIN. So far as the word aggravated is concerned, as a practicable proposition, it is not subject to a doctors technical diagnosis or doctors medical terminology, as used by an experienced physician such as the gentleman from Minnesota would give it in writing up his report on a special case involving a technical diagnosis.

Mr. JUDD. I understand.

Mr. RANKIN. It is to be taken in connection with all the facts and circumstances of the case and has had a practical application in its use.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. As the gentleman from Mississippi has indicated, the word aggravated has a well-defined meaning in law.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. ANGELL. Not only with respect to veterans, but in cases involving negligence, such as inactions where because of negligence there has been an aggravation of a preexisting condition, and the injured party is entitled to recover. That has been the law for a long time; it is not new in veterans legislation; it is not new to the law.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am glad to hear the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, who is a real friend to the veterans, make the analysis of the bill which is applicable to quite a number of cases that I have had arise in my district. I have had many persons file claims who have had a very hard time, but with the burden of proof shifted to the Government, it will eliminate many such cases. I am therefore very grateful to the chairman of the committee for making provision that the burden of proof is shifted to the administration.

Mr. RANKIN. I think the gentleman from Ohio. We found some men who were suffering from service aggravated disabilities and who had been discharged and sent home, and in some instances sent to the county jail or who had been turned back to their parents and families without the benefit of hospitalization. That is wrong. I called to the attention of the House here to a case arising in Idaho of a young man who had been returned home, who had been in the service several years and was at Pearl Harbor during the attack. A year later, when he failed to recover from the shock he suffered at Pearl Harbor he was discharged on the theory that his disability had existed prior to his entry into the service and they said nothing about it being aggravated.

I want to say to the gentleman from Ohio, however, when I called that case to the attention of the Congress and to the administration on the floor of the House, they went back and reopened the case and he was given the proper rating and relief.

Mr. McGREGOR. May I say on behalf of the veterans of the Seventeenth District of Ohio that we thank him for his interest.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman upon the fine statement made and for this proposed legislation, which should be passed without a dissenting vote.

I want to add that to the statement made that there are many boys who have returned from the service who have been placed in county jails because there was no other place to care for them. I have known of a number of instances where boys have also been placed in poorhouses. Our jails and almshouses are no place in which to place our veterans. We must properly care for them.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. In some cases these veterans have been confined in our jails and poorhouses for long periods of time—not because they have violated our laws—but simply because there was no other place in which they could be cared for. We owe a signal duty to these disabled veterans, and in this we must not fail.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. We must provide for the proper care of our veterans. A grateful Nation must care for her veterans. I know the great service my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has rendered for our veterans. I wish to compliment him upon that outstanding service for our veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] and to the Congress, and to the country, that so far as I am concerned, so long as I am chairman of this committee, no veteran who has honorably served his country in this war, and been disabled, or had a disability aggravated as a result, is going to be turned out and forced to beg his bread from door to door or to sell pencils or seek the shelter of a jail or a poorhouse or sent back home without proper treatment, if I can help it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the purpose of the amendment appearing on page 4 of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. That is a limitation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman explain the meaning of the provision contained on page 4 of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. That amendment was placed in the bill by Senator CLARK of Missouri. It states:

When any person not a citizen of the United States, entitled to compensation, pension, or other gratuity under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, is located in the territory of or under military control of an enemy of the United States or of any of its allies, any award of such benefits in favor of such person shall be terminated forthwith and such person shall not be entitled to any such benefits except upon the filing of a new claim accompanied by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs showing that the claimant was not guilty of any of the offenses enumerated in section 4 of this act.

Mr. SABATH. May I ask this question? We have many aliens in our service who volunteered. Some have been captured and are now held by our enemies, some have been killed. Would those who are held by our enemies be precluded from the benefits of this act?

Mr. RANKIN. They would be precluded during the time they were held in enemy territory. The language reads:

Provided, That no compensation, pension, or other gratuity shall be paid for any period prior to the date of such new claim: *Provided further*, That while such person is located in a territory of or under military control of an enemy of the United States or any of its allies any part of the benefits to which such person would otherwise be entitled may, in the discretion of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, be apportioned and paid to the dependents of such persons who are in the United States or in a place not occupied or controlled by such enemy, except that the amount so apportioned and paid shall not exceed the amount to which each dependent is entitled if such person were dead.

The Senate added an amendment which adds after the word "person" the words "not a citizen of the United States." If they are citizens of the United States, no matter if they are naturalized citizens, then this amendment would not apply.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Does this mean that we are to have two classes of servicemen, those who are citizens and those who are not citizens? That one group of our citizens will have the advantage of certain benefits and the other group be denied certain benefits?

Mr. RANKIN. It means that the man who is not a citizen who falls in the hands of the enemy in enemy country is treated differently; they draw a distinction between him and the man who is a citizen of the United States.

Mr. SADOWSKI. It seems to me that is grossly unfair. I shall oppose that.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not think so. It only applies to the ones who have committed some of the offenses enumerated in section 4 of this act.

Mr. SADOWSKI. It seems to me that a man who fights for the United States, whether he has citizenship or does not have citizenship, if he fights for the country, is entitled to the same benefits as the man who has citizenship. I would be in opposition to that Senate amendment.

Mr. SABATH. May I make this observation: Many of these men who have enrolled or who have been drafted into our service are still citizens of countries with whom we are at war, and whenever they are apprehended they are treated as traitors, not merely as American soldiers but as traitors to their own country; consequently, they are dealt with more harshly and frequently they are subjected to the death penalty. Why should we discriminate against them when they assume the responsibility they do in the interest of helping our country where they have resided for a few years, helping her win the war?

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois that both these gentlemen voted for this bill when it passed the House with that provision in it, and this limitation narrowing it down to men who are not citizens of the United States who fall in the hands of the enemy was placed in the bill by the Senate. So far as I can see, that is not a very serious discrimination against anyone.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Why discriminate willfully against people who volunteer their services?

Mr. RANKIN. This applies only to the ones who are guilty of some one of the offenses enumerated in section 4 of this act, which reads as follows:

SEC. 4. Any person shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be guilty of mutiny, treason, sabotage, or rendering assistance to an enemy of the United States or of its allies shall forfeit all accrued or future benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration pertaining to gratuities for veterans and their dependents: *Provided, however*, That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, in his discretion, may apportion and pay any part of such benefits to the dependents of such person not exceeding the amount to which each dependent would be entitled if such person were dead.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that answers the question.

I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLORENCE B. HUTCHINSON

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1463) for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1463) for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the figures "$116" insert "$416"; and the Senate agree to the same.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
W. A. PITTENGER,
Managers on the part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JAMES M. TUNNELL,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1463) for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report.

The bill as passed the House appropriated to Florence B. Hutchinson the sum of $1,000, for personal injuries, medical and other expenses sustained by her when she fell getting out of an elevator on March 1, 1941, in the Champlain Apartment Building, Washington, D. C., leased by the Public Buildings Administration of the Federal Works Agency, the space therein having been assigned to and being occupied by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The Senate reduced the amount appropriated from $1,000 to $116 and, at the conference, a compromise of $416 was agreed upon.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
W. A. PITTENGER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the action of the conferees?

Mr. McGEHEE. Yes. The bill passed the House carrying $1,000 for the relief of this claimant. The Senate cut it down to $116 and actual medical expenses. The conferees agreed to $300 for damages for personal injuries and suffering.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is all that is involved?

Mr. McGEHEE. That is all.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GUARDIAN OF LEONARD L. GAY

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1784) for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1784) for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
NAT PATTON,
W. A. PITTENGER,
Managers on the part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JAMES M. TUNNELL,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1784) for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report:

The bill as passed the House appropriated to the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay the sum of $3,500 for personal injuries sustained by an exploding cartridge during United States Army maneuvers in Louisiana on January 16, 1942.

The Senate reduced the amount appropriated from $3,500 to $2,500, and at the conference it was agreed that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and that the amendment of the Senate be concurred in by the House.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
NAT PATTON,
W. A. PITTENGER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREST W. DICKEY

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 235) for the relief of Forest W. Dickey, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEHEE]?

The was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 235) for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same, with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "$5,000" insert "$6,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
NAT PATTON,
W. A. PITTENGER,
Managers on the part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JAMES M. TUNNELL,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 235) for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report.

The bill as passed the House appropriated to Forrest W. Dickey the sum of $7,500, for personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses, sustained when shot without provocation by an armed soldier of the United States Army at Barstow, Calif., on January 27, 1942.

The Senate reduced the amount appropriated from $7,500 to $5,000 and, at the conference, a compromise of $6,000 was agreed upon.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
NAT PATTON,
W. A. PITTENGER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Frank Waldrop appearing in the Times-Herald of July 7, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEHEE]?

There was no objection.

DEPORTATION OF ALIENS TO COUNTRIES ALLIED WITH THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2076) to authorize the deportation of aliens to countries allied with the United States, with Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 9, strike out all after "exile", down to and including "territory" in line 13 and insert "then, to a country or any political or territorial subdivision thereof which is proximate to the country of which the alien is a citizen or subject, or, with the consent of the country of which the alien is a citizen or subject, to any other country."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this Senate amendment simply permits these Chinese sailors to land in some other country besides England, is that right?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is correct. This bill was passed by the House unanimously on March 23; it passed the Senate but it was recalled by Senator LA FOLLETTE because of an objection made by the Chinese Government. The Chinese and British Governments have agreed upon the amendment and the text of the amendment and an agreement has been entered into between these two countries with reference to the treatment of these Chinese. They will be treated better. These Chinese who are now held in detention may go back to the Allied Nations, some of them to England, most of them to India, where they will join the armed forces of the Allies.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There is a complete agreement on this?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes, there is a complete agreement between the Chinese Government and the English Government, and so forth.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] who is interested in this matter is in the hospital and he has asked me to say that he thinks the Senate amendment is all right and agreeable and that it ought to be adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2936) to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An

act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," the national-defense housing bill, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, after "$500,000,000", insert ": *Provided*, That none of such funds shall be used for loans, grants, or contributions for the operation of day care or extended school services for children of mothers employed in war areas if and when the War-Area Child-Care Act of 1943 (S. 1130, 78th Cong., 1st sess.) becomes law: *Provided further*, That no grant, loan, or contribution for the maintenance or operation of public schools in any State shall be made without prior consultation with the State department of education and the United States Office of Education."

Page 1, line 7, after "$500,000,000" insert ": *Provided further*, (a) That none of the funds authorized herein shall be used to acquire public works already operated by public or private agencies, except where funds are allotted for substantial additions or improvements to such public works and with the consent of the owners thereof; and

"(b) The total amount allocated for contributions to public and private agencies for the maintenance and operation of public works after July 1, 1943, shall not exceed $40,000,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the amendments?

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, these are amendments which the Senate placed upon a bill passed by the House with reference to the so-called community facilities in these congested housing areas where we have been building access roads to plants and carrying on certain hospitalization, sewerage, and water extensions, and aid to schools.

The Senate in one of the amendments placed a restriction that any such necessary construction as there may be in additions to existing schools to take care of the children of these war workers who have been brought into the communities, and any other matters which affect the schools under the act, shall require consultation not only with the local school people but with the State superintendents of education and with the Office of Education in Washington.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It does not require that consent shall be given, merely that they will be consulted?

Mr. LANHAM. Merely that there shall be consultation with them. We think it is reasonable to assume, in view of the fact that what is done under this act is by reason of the burden that is placed upon these communities by the war workers who have been brought in and who have children going to these schools, that these consulted authorities would naturally approve the applications because there will be need for such services shown by them.

Another amendment is to the effect that none of the money can be used to buy an existing facility unless there is to be some necessary addition to it, and also with the consent of the owner. For instance, there might be a little hospital in one of these congested areas which could be purchased and added to more economically than by constructing an altogether new one.

Then there is a proposal that not more than one-fifth of the money authorized to be appropriated may be used for services, the remainder to be used for construction of the various kinds enumerated in the act.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. May I ask if there is in this bill real protection against Federal control of schools?

Mr. LANHAM. Absolutely. As a matter of fact, this law itself by terms very specifically provides already that no Federal agency can have anything to do with the operation or the curriculum or the administration of any of these schools.

Mrs. BOLTON. I wanted that to be very clear.

Mr. LANHAM. That is in the law.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Most of these schools that are being constructed in the war areas are temporary in nature?

Mr. LANHAM. They are.

Mr. DONDERO. They will not become part of the State school system when this war is over unless they have been built as additions to existing structures?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct, and unless the State authorities desire to keep them.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. Under this law, the Federal Government does not thrust itself into the school systems of our States?

Mr. LANHAM. It does not. As a matter of fact, we on the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds were so adamant in our views in that regard that we wrote into the law the most stringent provision for which we had words to give expression to our sentiments in the English language.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understood the gentleman to say that these buildings shall not be acquired by public bodies within the State unless certain additions are to be made.

Mr. LANHAM. No; that, of course, was an erroneous understanding. The gentleman from Michigan inquired whether or not if an addition had been made to a school the State authorities or the school authorities could acquire it afterward. If an entire school building of a temporary nature were constructed, or a building of any other nature, it could be acquired by the local authorities.

Mr. HINSHAW. Acquired by the local authorities, not by the Federal Government?

Mr. LANHAM. This is a law that pertains only to the duration of the war. It is our purpose with reference to the housing and also these facilities to dispose of them when the war is over. The law so provides. For instance, if a city has had an addition made to its water service or to its sewerage system for the accommodation of these projects, the most reasonable disposition of such properties would be to the city concerned.

Mr. HINSHAW. The reason I ask the question is that under some previous law—whether the gentleman's committee was the fountainhead of that law or not I do not recall—in the construction of additional school facilities in the city of Burbank, Calif., it became necessary for the Federal Government to take a lease upon public land—that is, the school land—in order to make the construction. The Federal Government would not do the construction without also having control over the ground. I want to know whether this money can be spent on public ground without taking that ground over, or whether the Government has to take over control of the ground for some period, such as 99 years.

Mr. LANHAM. No; sometimes it is more advantageous for the Government, naturally, to lease land than it is to purchase the land, and it is more economical, but it is the intention for all of this property to be disposed of when the war is over. We have no purpose in the world of invading the jurisdiction of the States or the operation of their various State facilities.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman does not quite understand my question, I think. I mean, if this money is to be spent, we will say on an addition to a local school, does that require that the school board or the school district make a lease of the public land to the Government, which the Government can then use for the construction of the building?

Mr. LANHAM. I do not know just what all the administrative minutiae may be in getting a necessary addition made to a school, but there is certainly no effort on the part of the Federal Government to interfere with or to take over State property.

Mr. HINSHAW. It is a very important matter.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think I understand the purport of the question of the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman from Massachusetts has been out to California and knows the situation.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Where there are at the present time school facilities and where there is an influx of war workers, there is nothing in the law to prevent the Federal Works Administration from placing an addition on the present school facilities without acquiring land, as far as I know, and I think I am correct, because the municipality or the county already owns that land. It is simply a question of building

an addition to accommodate the other children.

Mr. LANHAM. If the gentleman from California means that that addition becomes a part of their school system, it does.

Mr. HINSHAW. Then do they have to undertake any obligation to repay money on a loan?

Mr. LANHAM. Not necessarily, because the law provides for grants or loans or both.

Mr. HINSHAW. The reason I asked that question is, as the gentleman doubtless knows, that it would take a vote of the people in a particular school district to authorize a school board to accept a loan or to make a loan.

Mr. LANHAM. Of course, I cannot give the gentleman all the details of the administrtaive action in each particular place in the country. I would not know that. States have different provisions. However, unless this bill is passed, the work will be stopped on schools, on care for children of war workers, on hospitalization, on extension of water and sewerage systems, and on access roads to these plants which are vitally necessary for the operation of the plants.

I cannot tell just what the situation may be at Burbank, Calif., but if the gentleman from California will inquire of the administrative authorities what that situation is, they can give it to him in detail.

Mr. DONDERO. Further reserving the right to object, I think it ought to be said to the House that when this bill left the House and went to the Senate it did not include the amendment which provided that the Federal Works Agency's representatives were compelled even to consult with the State authority. That amendment has been placed in the bill by the Senate. I think it strengthens the bill and safeguards to the States some voice in the question of whether or not a school shall or shall not be built.

Mr. LANHAM. That is the amendment that was offered in the Senate by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

Mr. BOREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. BOREN. How much is the total amount of money involved in this conference report?

Mr. LANHAM. This is not a conference report. This is simply the conclusion of legislation upon this bill from the standpoint of the authorization. In the deficiency bill today an appropriation of $50,000,000 was made, contingent upon the enactment of this measure.

Mr. BOREN. This $50,000,000 is to be used to build sewer systems or any other facilities that might be necessary?

Mr. LANHAM. That is right—all of those mentioned in title II of the act.

Mr. BOREN. No such system was ever used until the defense efforts came into the country. When an oil field was opened up and thousands of people went into the area and school children were congregated without schools and sewer systems and so forth, for 150 years historically we have got along without this sort of a Government subsidy. Now the Government is assuming in this bill to pay for those necessary facilities which in a normal time would be left as a burden on the locality.

Mr. LANHAM. I fear the gentleman from Oklahoma does not understand the purposes of this act and the purpose of this part of it. No subsidy is involved. We have gone into these various congested areas of defense where these war plants of different kinds are situated and in-migrant workers have been taken in to serve those plants. To the extent that housing is not available and to the extent that private capital cannot build the necessary housing, then we have constructed, publicly, these housing projects. The people who are going to live in them have to be serviced. The only purpose of this is that when these families come in, with the mothers working in war plants, they have these children that must go to school and it places a burden upon the community which we are trying to take care of simply from the standpoint of the war effort.

Mr. BOREN. How much of the $50,000,000 will go to education?

Mr. LANHAM. I cannot tell the gentleman exactly how much of it will go to education, because the $50,000,000 appropriated today is but a part of the authorization and not the full amount. In the last year, I do not have the figures before me, but I think it was approximately $11,000,000.

Mr. BOREN. The authorization is for $500,000,000?

Mr. LANHAM. No; it is for $200,000,000.

Mr. BOREN. How much of the authorization is designed for educational purposes?

Mr. LANHAM. I do not have the figures with me and I cannot tell the gentleman definitely, but I think it will be perhaps fifteen or sixteen million dollars.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to my colleague on the committee.

Mr. WILSON. I believe it would help to clear up the situation to state that in most cases the Federal Works Agency has merely matched money that the local corporations put up, and paid that part of the cost of building these necessary additions in proportion to the amount that their situation has been aggravated by the influx of war workers. That has been my experience in getting funds for this purpose.

To answer further the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], if it is an addition to a school and the project is to be built on existing school grounds, the local corporation furnishes that ground as a part of their contribution in taking care of this influx and will also match this Federal Works Agency grant to a certain extent, especially if the construction has future need and is of a permanent type. If it is temporary and the influx is purely temporary, then it is likely that they will stand the whole cost. They will select their own site and therefore it will be disposed of in some way or other after the emergency.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank my colleague.

May I say further in answer to the question asked by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], that I now have the figures for last year. Last year there was $11,506,269 that went for the schools.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman of course knows of my very keen interest in the housing situation in Detroit. That, to a great extent, affects the entire school system there because of this great influx of workers from all over the country. I should like the assurance of the gentleman, as I understand some of his committee are about to make a reasonable tour of the country, that if and when they are in Detroit they will make a careful analysis of our emergency needs, that they may consult with the local housing authority and with the good mayor of my city in order that we may work out some reasonable plan under which the necessary facilities may be furnished.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that it is contemplated that a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will make a visit to that area and will be very glad to have the consultation to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it not a fact that aside from all considerations, these facilities are absolutely vital to the war effort, and without them we cannot expect these people to work?

Mr. LANHAM. Oh, absolutely. Without these facilities you could not get these in-migrant workers to go to work in these plants.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact, as the gentleman from New York said, that these facilities are absolutely necessary?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct.

Mr. SABATH. And that the small communities will be tremendously benefited; those communities where these great plants have been built; far removed from the large centers, and that all of this will be of tremendous benefit to all sections where those plants have been erected at great cost? But it requires that they are necessary, and I presume that it will have to be done.

Mr. LANHAM. It would be an unjustifiable burden upon the communities not to help them out with reference to these necessary expenditures for the war effort.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. Is it not a fact that communities are seeking these projects and asking that they be located, that they were looking for these projects because they considered they were not going to be a burden, but considered they would be an asset if the projects were located

in their community. Is it not a further fact that the projects are looked upon as a financial benefit to the communities where they are located; and is it not a further fact that there are plenty of communities throughout the entire Nation that would be glad to have such projects located within their own communities?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me to answer the question?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. Let me say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that in one community in Indiana with a population of about 450 people, they put up a large powder plant and there have been built something like 2,000 houses for the use of people working for the Government. These people were brought there when there was nothing but temporary shelter in that community; the school population has increased three or four times what it was previous to the location of this project, and this little rural village had absolutely no capacity to bond itself to build a school building, to build sewer systems or water facilities, and these people were left almost stranded; the local community could not house them, and it was necesary to have housing, and, therefore, they had to build these facilities to give them any kind of shelter. The local community could not build them; it could not do so if it wanted to, because it did not have the bonding capacity.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. May I say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that I happen to live in an area not far from Detroit where the Government built a Navy ordnance plant and a tank plant. The tank plant was built in the middle of a corn field where there was a little community of 200 or 300 people, which was faced with the problem of taking care of several thousand workers plus their children.

Mr. BOREN. Did Detroit not want this plant?

Mr. DONDERO. This was outside of Detroit in a rural community, where they could not possibly take care of these workers.

Mr. BOREN. Did the local community not want it?

Mr. DONDERO. The plant was put up there without taking it up with them; they had nothing to say about it; it was located there by the Federal Government, and it was necessary to provide facilities for the workers in the plant.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, it is an amazing thing to me that the Government, with all of the facilities that are available throughout the length and breadth of this land, with all the places that could be utilized, has to pick out some of these places to locate its plants where they are a burden on the people where they are located.

Mr. LANHAM. As a matter of fact, that is something about which the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds would have no jurisdiction whatever, but there is no doubt in the least about the need for these facilities.

Mr. BOREN. But the Congress can decide whether or not we are going to subsidize the building of these facilities; at least, it can lay down a yardstick that will cause them to hesitate to follow such a course in the future.

Mr. DONDERO. May I say to my good friend from Oklahoma that I am in sympathy with the viewpoint taken by him, in general, and the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] knows that I have exerted every effort to safeguard the rights of the States and the local communities against any such subsidies.

Mr. LANHAM. I can assure my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan, that he and I are in accord in that respect.

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. May I say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that it does not make any difference whether these small communities wanted these projects located there or not. Some of them may think a benefit would result, but if they will look back to the last World War, they can see the ghost towns that were left when the war closed.

Mr. LANHAM. That is right; there will be no ghost towns under this legislation because we provide for the disposition of the property when the war is over.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BISHOP].

Mr. BISHOP. This fund, as I understand it, is to be used to provide water works and sewerage for the additional housing in those centers of great war industry activity where it is so badly needed because of the emergency conditions.

Mr. LANHAM. And it is not done for their own citizens; it is done because the Federal Government puts the burden on them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to Senate amendments numbered 1 and 2 to the bill H. R. 2936, to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The question is: Will the House suspend the rules and agree to the Senate amendments?

The question was taken and in the opinion of the Chair two-thirds having voted in the affirmative the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2614. An act to increase by 1 year the period within which certain oyster growers may file claims against the United States in the Court of Claims; and

H. R. 2794. An act to approve and consent to the compact entered into by Iowa and Nebraska establishing the boundary between Iowa and Nebraska.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1396. An act making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3030) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8 and 9 to said bill; that the Senate further insists upon its amendments numbered 8, 9, 24, 25, 26, and 27, requests a further conference with the House thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2968) entitled "An act making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate still further insists on its amendments numbered 33 and 34 to said bill; asks a still further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2798) entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for

other purposes,' approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes."

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up H. R. 281.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Public Lands, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, or subcommittees, is authorized and directed to make a study of the problems in connection with the public lands of the United States; including, but not limited to, (1) an investigation of the tax problems connected with the acquisition of such lands and burden upon local units by reason of use of large tracts of public lands for public use, the effect upon grazing areas and other incidental problems; the study of a homestead program and a study of the use of such program to assist in the rehabilitation of men discharged from the armed forces of the United States.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigations and studies, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For purposes of carrying out the provisions of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, by subpena or otherwise, to take such testimony, and to have such printing and binding done, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes and will later yield time to the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Is there an amendment to be offered to the resolution?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. That is important. What will the amendment contain?

Mr. SABATH. The amendment provides that the hearings and investigation shall be limited to the District of Columbia. I intend to offer that amendment at the proper time.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution was unanimously asked for by the Committee on the Public Lands. During the last 2 years the Government has been obliged to take over a large acreage of land throughout the country. In many instances it was necessary. It is believed by some and by that committee that many counties and sections have suffered because that land has been taken off the tax rolls of the county or State. The committee believes they should investigate and ascertain whether the Government should reimburse the various counties or States covering the losses they have sustained because of the taking of this land by the Federal Government. I presume a majority of the Members from those sections are in favor of this resolution, but even others feel that no injustice should be done to anyone under this administration. In view of that the Committee on Rules authorized me to report the resolution and offer an amendment which would restrict the committee to making investigations and holding hearings in the District of Columbia. I am informed by the proponents of this resolution, however, that it will be impossible for them to proceed and make the investigation that should be made if they are so restricted; consequently I shall leave it to the House and I hope the Membership will use good judgment in voting on that amendment as to whether they shall say by adopting it that this committee shall be the first to be so restricted.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Will the House have an opportunity to vote down such an amendment?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman should know by this time that I never deprive the Membership of the House of an opportunity to express itself in voting on any proposition.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SABATH. That is true; notwithstanding the shortcomings of some of the Members I still have confidence in the vast majority of the Members of the House.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I wanted the matter to be clear to the Members.

Mr. SABATH. With this short explanation, realizing the desire of the Members to take a little recess shortly I conclude my remarks and yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York. I hope it will not be used.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in view of our military operations in the Far East and the large number of young Americans deployed in that area, suppression of the opium traffic has become a matter of vital importance to us, and if you will bear with me a short time, I shall give you a brief history of opium smoking there, its present status, and what should be done about it as a postwar problem.

A great Chinese leader who was being prevailed upon to legalize opium smoking in China said, "Nothing can induce me to obtain a revenue from the vice of my people." Ever since then the Chinese policy has been to suppress opium abuse. Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek inaugurated a 6-year plan to throw off the bonds of opium. This plan was going forward with such success that the Chinese strength frightened the Japanese. They saw the Chinese giant throwing off the opium shackles and attacked before China was completely cured. The specter of a strong opium-free China had as much to do with the Japanese attack on that country as any one factor. Today in unoccupied China opium smoking has been reduced to an extent which has astonished international opium experts who have observed that country for many years. China regards opium suppression as more important than it regarded extraterritorial privileges which were abolished by the United States and the British a short time ago.

After having taken the initiative of calling the Shanghai Commission in 1909, our Government exercised its influence to convene the Conference of 1912 at The Hague. This resulted in the adoption of an international instrument embodying certain principles on opium smoking. This convention, which was incorporated in the Versailles Treaty, came into force after the First World War and carried with it a provision that the contracting powers should gradually and effectively suppress the smoking of opium. However, the situation in the Far East grew worse.

The conference called in 1924 at Geneva on smoking opium accomplished nothing. Even the most enthusiatic defenders of this instrument could not deny that it was nothing more than an outline of principles which might lead at some time in the future to an improvement in the situation.

Conditions grew steadily worse, and in 1931 an opium-smoking conference met at Bangkok which did not fulfill even a fraction of the hopes and expectations we had nourished in this respect. No definite time limit was set within which opium smoking should be suppressed in the Far East, and the agreement of 1931 can only be considered as an attempt to improve some administrative arrangements of the smoking opium monopolies then maintained by the British, Dutch, French, Portuguese, Siamese, Iranian, and Japanese Governments, these arrangements being merely of a secondary character. Conference on the manufacture of drugs have given satisfaction to all governments concerned, and the problem of smoking opium should reach the same level of development which the control of dangerous drugs has already reached.

Article 6 of the International Opium Convention of 1912, signed at The Hague, provides that the "Contracting powers shall take measures for the gradual and efficacious suppression of the manufacture, the internal traffic in, and the use of prepared opium insofar as the different conditions peculiar to each nation shall allow of this, unless existing measures have already regulated the matter."

The United States fulfilled its obligations. It would not allow smoking opium in the Philippine Islands, although a plan was proposed to this Congress to allow a smoking opium monopoly to sell opium to the Filipinos for a period of 3 years. Think of what would have happened to our prestige had Congress not turned down this proposal. How much might this have affected the course of war in the Pacific? How much sooner would the Japanese have been able to conquer territories, and would Australia and New Zealand have been saved had we adopted

the same opium policy as some of the other powers?

While these government smoking opium monopolies which sell opium to all comers are supposed to control, the situation has become decidedly worse, and it is not to be wondered at that the natives of Burma and Java were not enthusiastic in their assistance to defend their territories from Japanese aggression. These people always resented the fact that opium was being sold to them. Opium smoking is legal in British Malaya, the Netherland Indies, the unfederated Malay States, Sarawak, Brunei, Burma, Ceylon, India, British North Borneo, Hong Kong, Thailand, French Indochina, Iran, and in all territories under Japanese domination. These countries have maintained that they have fulfilled their obligations under the 1912 convention, and that they cannot abolish monopolies unless smuggling of opium into their territories ceases, and as long as opium production continues in China on a large scale they believe that the system of selling prepared opium is preferable to suppression. If you can follow that line of reasoning why not set up infection centers when you get a smallpox epidemic? By the same illogical reasoning all prostitutes should be licensed by the government. The legal sale of poison to a population is morally indefensible. The true reason for maintaining these monopolies is revenue.

At the Bangkok Conference in 1931 our representative stated that "while we are prepared to lend all practical aid to measures directed toward suppression of this destructive vice, the Government of the United States is not prepared to follow a line similar and concurrent with that followed by other governments so long as those other governments elect to retain the monopoly system and are not willing to attempt complete suppression."

Canada has always agreed with us on this policy. Our neighbor along with ourselves has always been on the receiving end of smuggled smoking opium manufactured in those Far Eastern government monopolies. The opium is purchased by the smuggler across the counter in the Far East and then is smuggled into the United States and Canada.

At the Bangkok Conference our representative also said, "The Government of the United States most strongly urges frank recognition of the fact that there is but one real method by which to suppress the evil of opium smoking in the Far East or anywhere else and that this method is complete statutory prohibition of the importation, manufacture, sale, possession or use of prepared opium, coupled with active enforcement." The Chinese Government has always supported the United States Government in this policy, and has bitterly complained about the sale of opium to its citizens by foreign governments.

The Netherlands Government has always maintained that it could better control the situation by selling prepared opium under strict rules. However, the smuggler got the upper hand in the Netherlands Indies before the Japanese moved in. Now the Japanese operate these monopolies. The scorched-earth policy in the Far East did not apply to the opium smoking monopolies. The Japanese took over these going concerns without 1 day's loss of business. The Japanese are now maintaining these monopolies and are deriving enormous revenue therefrom, although broadcasting that from now on this terrible vice will not be the curse of the Far East. Of course, we know that this is Japanese propaganda to offset our facts about the diabolical methods used by the Japanese in poisoning and weakening the Chinese with opium and softening them up for conquest. The two-faced Japanese state that they had already suppressed smoking opium in certain territories. Like the two-faced god Janus they say that the tax on smoking opium in Burma had been considerably reduced so that the coolie would not have to spend all of his money for smoking opium.

At conferences and meetings of the Opium Advisory Committee of the League of Nations, the British Government has maintained the position that if effective measures are taken by China to suppress the growth of the opium poppy and have reached such a stage as to remove the danger of opium smuggling from China into British territories, such as Hong Kong and Burma, they would initiate the necessary measures to enable the complete prohibition of opium.

The French Government has also stated that it would undertake to abolish completely the use of prepared opium following the British Government's proposal.

The Government of Thailand also stated that it could not abolish the sale of smoking opium from government shops as long as an uncontrollable illicit traffic originating from neighboring states existed.

A commission of inquiry into the control of smoking opium by the League of Nations stated that the opium going into the illicit traffic in the Far Eastern territories was not solely of Chinese origin but consisted mainly of opium produced in Persia, Turkey, the Shan States and India. Therefore, China was not alone responsible. The Six-Year Plan which China inaugurated in 1935 for gradual suppression made such successful progress that by the end of 1940 it can be said that the goal of suppression had almost been reached.

To give you an idea of the number of smokers in some of these territories, the Netherlands Indies had in 1940 77,000 registered smokers, half of whom were Chinese and the other half Javanese; Burma had 45,000 smokers, only 13,000 of whom were Chinese; and the rest were Burmese.

Some time in 1940 the Chinese government issued instructions to Chinese foreign representatives to endeavor to stamp out opium smoking among overseas Chinese in their respective jurisdictions, but they got little help.

Some of the worst smoking opium conditions are found in the Portuguese Government monopoly at Macao, an island near Hong Kong, where about a million transient smokers annually purchase opium from the Portuguese Government monopoly.

The opium situation in India should not be overlooked. There are some 6,000 government shops in India which sell opium. The revenue yielded is great. As much as 500 tons of smoking opium, or twice the medical needs of the world, are eaten or smoked in India. An Indian scientist points out that these opium smokers are not healthy; they have nothing to look forward to in life but to work hard and buy opium with the fruits of their toils. I could go on for hours elaborating on this sort of picture but shall reserve this for further discussion.

I just want to point out that the defense given by all these countries that as long as smuggling continues they could not abolish government monopolies is utterly destroyed by the situation which existed in Hong Kong before the Japanese conquered that territory. Rationed government smokers numbered 5,557 in 1939 whereas according to the Hong Kong police authorities illicit smokers numbered 90,000. Is not this eloquent evidence that the smoking opium monopoly can be closed? The solution there should have been not to sell government opium but to proceed against the smuggler. When the government sells opium to 5,000 and the smuggler sells to 90,000, the defense for maintaining government monopolies has collapsed.

In French Indo-China a few years ago the Government increased the price of smoking opium to the inhabitants because smuggling, it stated, had been reduced to such an extent that the government was no longer in competition with the smuggler. Formerly, the French Government had stated that it would close government shops when smuggling ceased. Instead of doing so it raised the price of opium.

Iran is one of the large opium-producing countries. It formerly produced much of the smoking opium used by Japan in territories under her control. Iran is also the source of much medicinal opium. Iran has unfortunately legalized the sale of opium. However, in issuing a license to its subjects to purchase opium, the government permits contain the following 12 admonitions:

1. Don't be fooled by this home-wrecking drug.
2. Escape from the claws of this ghoul.
3. Addiction to opium leads to ruin.
4. Why set fire to your own possessions?
5. Opium brings misfortune.
6. It is easier than you think to give up opium.
7. Opium is your enemy and your family's enemy.
8. You can easily give up opium.
9. You have learned how harmful opium is. Make an effort to give it up.
10. Gradual lessening of the amount consumed is the easiest way to give up opium.
11. Have pity on your wife and children.
12. Save yourself from ruin and your family from misfortune.

The Iranian Government also gives the following warning to the licensed users:

You know that by using opium daily you are turning in to your government's treasury an appreciable amount of your income. However, since your government, which is your well-wisher, is ready for your own good and for the sake of society to forego this revenue, it behooves you to further this purpose of your government by giving up the use of opium, thus doing your share to save yourself and serve the public good.

As a result of using opium you make yourself miserable, your family financially insecure, your country weak. Make an effort and give it up.

If you are not interested in your own good, at least try to serve humanity and your country by making an effort to discontinue its use.

If you will reduce your daily ration of opium gradually, by imperceptible degrees, you will succeed in giving it up without even feeling it.

Never use opium in the presence of others, and thus avoid setting fire and bringing ruin to other people's homes and lives.

Then why legalize its sale? The Iranian Government cannot rely on the defense that as long as the smuggler operates, they must sell to control its use.

Organized labor throughout the world declared itself with respect to this problem by the following resolution adopted by the International Labor Conference at its session in June 1936:

The twentieth session of the International Labor Conference:

Taking note of the report entitled "Opium and Labor," submitted by the International Labor Office;

Considering that it cannot remain indifferent to the conclusions of this report, in which it is stated that opium smoking is injurious to the workers, impedes their social and economic development, impairs their health and decreases their efficiency and, when it is practiced continuously, shatters the health and increases the death rate of the smokers, and tends to reduce the rate of economic and social progress in the districts affected;

Believing that these effects are due both to unsatisfactory conditions of labor and to the official authorization of the sale of opium to workers:

Requests the governing body to recommend the governments in whose territory the sale of opium for smoking is authorized to improve conditions of labor by the following methods:

1. Reduction of hours of work in occupations where long hours are worked;

2. Guaranty of an adequate living wage and improvements of conditions of labor in arduous occupations, which are generally the worst paid;

3. Establishment of facilities for medical treatment;

4. Establishment and organization of collective spare time activities;

Also requests the governing body to bring to the notice of the competent bodies and of the governments the following suggestions, with a view to drawing up rules which would complete the measures mentioned above in countries in which the sale of opium for smoking is authorized;

1. The limitation of the sale of opium, either raw or the prepared form, to registered smokers;

2. The registration of all workers addicted to opium smoking;

(a) The establishment of registers for the registration of workers who smoke opium, such registers to remain open for a period of 12 months, after which they should be closed and no further smokers registered;

(b) The granting of licenses for registered workers authorized to smoke opium, so as to allow of the identification of the license holder and the purchase by him of the quantity of opium mentioned in the license;

(c) Notification to all registered smokers that the sale of opium will be discontinued at the end of 5 years;

3. Reduction of the quantity of opium sold to licensed smokers by one-fifth each year;

4. Establishment by the government of curative centers where workers accustomed to smoke opium may obtain treatment to cure them of the habit;

5. Drawing up and application of such laws and regulations, and adoption of such measures as are considered necessary to prevent licensed smokers from substituting for the use of opium that of opium derivatives, cocaine or any other drug covered by the existing conventions;

6. Drawing up and application of such additional laws and regulations as governments may consider necessary to bring about the cessation of the licensed use of opium for smoking within 5 years;

7. Application of measures to prevent workers who smoke opium from obtaining and smoking smuggled opium.

This interest by organized labor should have a powerful influence in having smoking opium completely abolished when we and our allies reconquer far eastern territories.

Just before the outbreak of the war the League of Nations had three preliminary conferences to determine the best method of limiting the production of opium to world medical needs. One of the greatest stumbling blocks encountered was the difficulty of obtaining a total opium production figure because of this so-called legitimate sale of opium by governments having territories in the Far East. For instance, some years government smoking opium needs would total 50 units, and might go up as high as 80 units in another year. Therefore, it would not be possible to arrive at a world consumption figure for both medicinal opium and government monopoly opium for smoking and eating when the consumption for smoking and eating might vary as much as 50 percent because of the sale by government monopolies, which is not a fixed item like the world consumption for medical needs.

It would be impossible to arrive at proper limitation of opium production in the post-war world unless this problem of government sale of smoking opium is settled now.

We have often heard humorists say that we have never lost a war nor won a conference. That was exploded in 1931 at the League of Nations in Geneva when the United States won the greatest and most far-reaching victory in the history of the narcotic problem when it obtained nearly all of its proposals to limit the manufacture of narcotic drugs to the medical needs of the world. The result of this convention has been an enormous drop in addiction throughout the world. No small part of this credit belongs to our United States Commissioner of Narcotics, Hon. Harry J. Anslinger, who, with the aid of Canada, China, and several of our South American neighbors, resolutely battled the European narcotic manufacturing cartel for 3 months to obtain concessions in an international treaty never before accomplished in any of our treaties. I have examined the records of this history-making conference and find that our American delegates set up machinery which is still still in operation despite the war. One result of this convention is that cocaine addiction has practically disappeared throughout the world. That is is why I am appealing for a settlement of the smoking opium problem now.

Commissioner Anslinger for at least 10 years attended the League of Nations meetings having to do with the opium problem, and each year he appealed to the several nations to put an end to their sale of smoking opium, not only to free opium slaves but to arrive at limitation of production.

I have no desire nor intention to criticize any of our allies and I do not want anything I have said here construed in that light. I am looking at the problem objectively only. It would be a far-reaching step if we obtained a declaration from our allies now instead of waiting for the post-war world when the smoking opium problem as in the past, might be difficult, if not impossible of solution. Governments should abandon the principle of the sale of poison opium to their people. This problem has highly political, social, and economic ramifications.

The legalized sale of opium must be abolished under the "four freedoms." There must be freedom from exploitation by governments. Can a man have freedom from want if his government takes the fruits of labor in exchange for opium? Government sale of opium to its nationals is in effect a license to cut off one-third of a man's life. This was proved by Mr. Lyall, president of the opium board of the League of Nations. The poor coolie laborer works all day, gets about 50 cents, and gives 45 cents to the government for opium. His family is impoverished. He goes into a government-licensed den and either buys opium or smokes a government pipe which has been used a hundred times that day. We can he thankful we never sold opium to the Filipinos. That is one reason they rallied around our flag.

We have a problem to face right at this moment, that is the danger of contamination of our American troops who reconquer these territories. These boys must be guarded against the danger of becoming opium-smoking addicts in any of these territories which they reconquer where opium-smoking monopolies exist; otherwise we shall have many of them returning as opium users. There is only one thing to do when we reconquer these territories, and that is to close immediately these government opium shops and not allow them to reopen—certainly not during the time we are in occupation. I hope that our Army and Navy authorities will bear this in mind and will take drastic measures to close these shops because the danger of addiction always follows where opium is accessible.

This is one of the problems for post-war settlement which could be settled now by these few simple words on the part of the United Nations, "When terri-

tories belonging to any member of the United Nations are reconquered, government opium shops will be closed and will remain permanently closed." Let us have an agreement now.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] such time as he may desire.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects: First, the supply of natural gas; and, second, the opinion of a citizen of Florida on the Florida Barge Canal.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include some extracts from a publication of the Disabled American Veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH].

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted at a mass meeting in San Francisco on June 17, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON].

(Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two places in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER.]

(Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAY] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address, and that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in one to include a speech made by him before a Republican rally in Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS.]

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter which the President addressed to the Rivers and Harbors committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was granted permission by the House to extend my own remarks and to include an address of the Librarian of Congress. I am informed that the address exceeds the usual amount and will cost $108. I ask unanimous consent that this address may be printed, notwithstanding the estimate of the Public Printer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JULY 7, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

Very sincerely yours,
JAMES WOLFENDEN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 715a, United States Code, the Chair appoints as a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. BREHM, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a highly important bill or it would not have been brought in here at the eleventh hour. The Committee on Public Lands has been working on this bill for a very long while. I rather suspect there are 40 or 50 Members of the House who would be interested in their districts by the passage of legislation of this kind. In my district, like other districts, the Government has acquired vast tracts of land to build Army camps. Camp Shanks, within 25 miles of New York City, is located in Rockland County, in my new district, and is equipped to handle 40,000 soldiers. The Government has taken over almost a whole township; it has taken it out of taxation. Interest is required to be paid on the bonds issued by the town and school district. These townships have no money to pay the interest with if the Government does not contribute its share. This raises a very serious question in reference to establishing a definite policy. What should be the right and fair policy for the Government? Should the Government pay these taxes in the school districts and townships where it has acquired a large quantity of valuable land and taken it out of taxation? I want a committee to be formed to study the entire problem and to report back a definite policy. That is why I am supporting this bill. I do not propose to say to the committee what it shall do or what it shall not do. It has the interest of the Government at heart, and it has the interest of the people and taxpayers at heart. The Government should do the right thing, and the Congress, I am sure, will support any policy that is just and fair to the Government and to the people in the districts affected. It certainly is not fair to destroy a whole township or a whole county, which has been done in many States of the Union.

I am not pleading for my own district alone; I am pleading for a square deal for the American people whose property has been taken away from them because of the war, or on account of some emergency or necessity, and that property has been withdrawn from taxation. Therefore, as a member of the Committee on Rules, I insisted that this resolution be reported and a committee be empowered to study this serious and complicated problem. Of course, we have confidence in the committee and know that it will study the problem intelligently.

There are members on the Rules Committee, like my distinguished chairman, who for one reason or other—I do not want to say, of course, that he is wrong, but he is going to offer an amendment to restrict this committee in their labor, in their work, and keep them right here in Washington in the warm weather during August and make them stay here all the time during the recess to study the problem, whereas they, of course, ought to be going out throughout the country and into the different States of the Union, not alone in New York but even in the State of Illinois and possibly in Chicago, finding out the facts, and upon those facts recommending a definite policy to the House of Representatives.

I have confidence in any committee of the House that already exists, both Democrats and Republicans, and believe that the Committee on the Public Lands is composed of able, conscientious, and intelligent members.

I take this opportunity to say that if the Republicans had been in power instead of the New Deal and a controversy had arisen between a Cabinet officer and the Vice President, and they had started calling each other names and had entered into charges and countercharges and criminations and recriminations, denouncing each other as squandering the people's money, and being thoroughly incompetent and dishonest, and impeding the war effort, there would be an investigation. There would be an investigation not only by the Congress but by the Department of Justice, and the Republicans would not have tried to prevent it. But here we are about to adjourn, and the Rules Committee that reported out the pending resolution yesterday refused by a vote of 6 to 5 to permit an investigation of that controversy on the home front, although the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Jesse Jones, came before the committee and asked for such an investigation. This same Committee on Rules, a very distinguished committee, by the way, refused by a strict party vote to permit an investigation of these charges and countercharges of gross squandering of the people's money and of utter inefficiency and incompetency that seriously hampered our war efforts. There were a few words passed between these two distinguished gentleman that I prefer not to use in a public assembly of this kind, because I would not want to be called to order by the Speaker of the House or have my words taken down by some Member. From what each of these two eminent statesmen said of each other I infer there was a slight misunderstanding over each other's veracity.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has heard a great deal in the last few years about the good-neighbor policy and about unity and tolerance. Would the gentleman give us his idea as to how much this good-neighbor policy here at home is promoted when the Vice President comes back and hits his nearest neighbor, Jesse Jones, and calls him this, that, and the other?

Mr. FISH. There is only one thing left to do and that is to engage in a good old-fashioned battle royal. We might stage it in the House of Representatives. If they had been Republicans, there would have been investigations and impeachment proceedings in the House against both of them until we found out the facts and the truth of the charges and countercharges in the interest of the American public, who are entitled to the facts. But the Wigglesworth resolution was voted down in spite of the fact that Mr. Jesse Jones asked for it, by a strict party vote, by the same distinguished committee that reported this resolution. I do not understand how the fair-minded Democratic members of the Rules Committee could be a party to putting the snuffer on such an investigation.

At the same time they refused an investigation of the Elk Hills oil situation out in California, which was included in one of the bills from the Committee on the Public Lands. If the Republicans were in power, that situation would have been investigated by half a dozen committees and all the facts presented to the public. I do not know; possibly the Republicans are to blame for not getting on their hind feet and insisting upon these investigations for the good of the country. It may be we are too easy and too good-natured not to insist on them. The responsibility rests squarely with the Democratic majority for voting down any investigation of these serious charges.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Might it not be that we have become accustomed to that way of doing to which the gentleman just referred, there has been so much waste, so much extravagance, so much corruption, so much quarreling among them?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman means we have possibly become immune to these charges of squandering the people's money and of incompetency among the New Deal bureaucrats.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. FISH. Possibly that is the answer.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. CLARK. The gentleman has told us what his party would do if it were in power under present conditions. I presume he speaks in part from the expierence his party has heretofore had in dealing with some subjects of that kind in its last administration.

Mr. FISH. Yes; and we investigated them and sent some of them away. We did not cover them up. We did not seek to hush up any scandals. We voted for an investigation and to bring the facts out into the open. That is all we are asking for now, a fair and impartial investigation, which the Democrats on the Rules Committee voted down.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Just to get back to the original proposition of the Government's taking over large tracts of land and taking them from the tax rolls, that is a very serious question, particularly in the Northwest, because there are counties up there where the Government has gone in and bought forest land until there is not enough taxable property left even to support the sheriffs and the judiciary systems of those counties.

Mr. FISH. Yes; and the school districts and the schools, to keep the children in the schools. There is no money left, they are virtually bankrupt. This is a serious resolution. It involves a great national policy. I hope the amendment to be offered by my distinguished chairman will not prevail.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. Following up a little further the suggestion made by my colleague from New York [Mr. REED], in some of these Northwestern States, particularly in my own, more than 50 percent of the land is owned by the Federal Government and other public agencies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

This bill is not confined to the State of Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. That is true.

Mr. FISH. It takes in almost every State in the Union. It is not offered along partisan lines. It involves many of the Southern States as well. I hope when the amendment is offered to confine the committee to remain in Washington; if you want a real investigation, if you want the facts, then vote down the amendment and give this committee a chance to go out and get the facts.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman mentioned Elk Hills. I am sorry the Rules Committee did not see fit to go along on this investigation of the Elk Hills oil deposit. That happens to be in my district. The present bill involves increasing the size of that area. It involves million of dollars worth of highly developed oil lands. It takes many, many millions off the tax rolls.

Mr. FISH. Is it not a fact that the Secretary of the Navy has already admitted his mistake; it was just another raw new deal?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will say to the gentleman that the contract that exists is altogether different than the bill pending before the Public Lands Committee, creating additional size of the field.

Mr. FISH. Why were we not permitted an investigation, then, when we asked for it?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I asked for an investigation because I thought it went back to the Teapot Dome scandal.

Mr. FISH. Well, we did not cover up anything at that time and why should we attempt to do so now? Why not bring those facts out and let the public know about it? That is what we are complaining about.

Mr. ELLIOTT. There is no one who wants to bring it out any more than I do.

Mr. FISH. All right. Go after your Democratic members on the Rules Committee and let us get some action as soon as we convene after the recess.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this resolution, but since the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules has announced that he pro-

poses to submit an amendment that the hearings be held only in Washington, I am opposed to that amendment.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I stated that I had been instructed by the committee to offer such an amendment, and it was the only way I could obtain favorable action from the committee, by agreeing to offer an amendment, and I stated that I was going to carry out the wishes of the committee and offer the amendment. Do I make myself plain?

Mr. BARRETT. I understand the gentleman is merely carrying out the instructions of the Rules Committee.

Now, I am particularly interested in one phase of the investigation proposed under this resolution. That is the creation of the Jackson Hole National Monument and the hearings pursuant to my bill to abolish that monument. It is located in my State. It comprise 221,610 acres. It takes in nearly half of the taxable property in Teton County, Wyo. Now, briefly this is the history of this matter. About 10 years ago the Park Service proposed legislation in Congress to add this 221,000 acres to Teton National Park. The bill was submitted but failed to pass. It has been submitted to Congress on different occasions. The Congress each time has failed to pass it. On March 15 last the President, by Executive Order, created the Jackson Hole National Monument, and thereby added this 221,000 acres to Teton National Park. Accordingly he accomplished by indirection the very thing that Congress refused to do directly.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. What authority of law was there for creating this national monument.

Mr. BARRETT. The action was taken under what is known as the Antiquities Act. It was an act of Congress of 1906 and authorized the President by Executive order to create monuments to preserve historic objects or objects of scientific interest. It provided by its terms that only the smallest amount of acreage necessary should be set over in order to protect the object to be preserved.

Mr. CURTIS. Has that ever been construed to include over 200,000 acres of land?

Mr. BARRETT. No. I will say it has not been construed by the courts either way, but any reasonable person reading the act will be able to ascertain that certainly the Congress did not intend to include 221,000 acres in a monument.

I might say further that at the time it was considered in Congress, the debates disclosed that they intended they would take in only a matter of a few hundred acres in each case.

Mr. CURTIS. To preserve spots of specific historical interest and value?

Mr. BARRETT. That is right.

Mr. HORAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Are there any such objects of scientific interest in the Jackson Hole district?

Mr. BARRETT. I may say that we have had extended hearings in Washington on this matter. Several witnesses came down from Wyoming at considerable expense to testify at the hearings on my bill to abolish this monument. They testified that there were no such objects in the entire 221,000 acres. But now the Public Lands Committee wants to send a subcommittee out there and investigate and look over the land to see for themselves just exactly as to that fact.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to my colleague from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am curious to know why the committee wants to go into the question of investigation of the problem of rehabilitation of men discharged from the armed forces. That seems rather farfetched from the main purpose of the resolution. I think that might better be left to the committee handling veterans' legislation.

Mr. BARRETT. The chairman of my committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] can answer that question better than I, but what they propose is that they will investigate the feasibility of permitting the returning soldiers to file on some of these vast bodies of land purchased by the Government during the past few years and establish homes on it and farm it and get it back on to the tax rolls. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], the distinguished chairman of my committee.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The purpose of the committee was to study the over-all problem with reference to public lands. There is no one agency in the Federal Government today that knows exactly how much land the Government owns. That is one thing. There has been testimony before the committee, but no single agency has that information. The nearest to it was the Federal Real Estate Board.

Almost 20,000,000 acres of land has been taken off the tax books within the last 2 years. We hope to make a complete study, to have more complete information for the Congress showing exactly how much park land, how much forest land, and how much other lands are owned by the Government. We ought to find out how many acres would be available to be used for rehabilitation or could be put up for homesteads.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to say further that in this area involved in the Jackson Hole National Monument there are ranchers running about 14,000 head of cattle. Unless this monument is abolished those men will have to go out of business. Teton County will not be able to carry on because nearly half of the tax money comes from people living in this particular area. There are about six schools in that area, and they will not be able to carry on. The people of Wyoming and Teton County in particular are opposed to this monument. They feel that this is a matter that should have been left to the Congress where they would have had an opportunity to be heard. They feel that this Congress ought to assert itself and to show, in no uncertain terms, its disapproval of the action of the Executive in overriding the will of the Congress and attempting to do by a directive the very thing that Congress has refused to sanction by legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I raise this question because I am not sure that the gentleman has stated exactly what the bill intends to do. As I understood the gentleman, he said that some of the lands would become available for homesteads. They cannot be homesteaded because they are not on an ordinary homestead basis; this refers to the public lands.

Mr. BARRETT. The gentleman is correct but no doubt considerable lands could be opened in all the public land States.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. There are great areas in his State and in my own State where they would not be proper for homestead.

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct.

I might say to the gentleman that the purpose of the bill is to authorize an investigation to be made to determine the particular areas that might be homesteaded.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take any more time because I realize everybody is very anxious to get through. I think this resolution should be passed but that the amendment that may be offered by the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee ought to be voted down, and I think the Public Lands Committee ought to have an opportunity to go out and look over the area themselves and determine the true character of the lands set aside by this monument.

'Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman yields back 1 minute.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I favor this resolution. There is a real problem in connection with the lands that the Government has taken over. In fact, the Government has taken over millions upon millions of acres for which it has no use. These millions of acres have been taken from the counties' tax rolls. In some cases the Government owns practically the entire county, but it refuses to pay taxes.

Therefore an investigation to have the Government pay taxes is proper and urgent. I feel that when the Government is compelled to pay taxes the bureaucracy will not be so greedy in grabbing lands that they cannot use and do not need. I am sure in some cases they will be willing to return some of the lands to the

people to whom it belongs, and from whom it was taken.

There seems to have been a craze on the part of every governmental department to grab some land or something and call it the public domain. Mr. Speaker, this has not been the policy under which this Nation has grown and become the greatest Nation on the face of the earth.

In my State under the submarginal land-purchase program the Government took over about one-half of a county and thus removed these lands from the tax rolls of the county. This has made it virtually impossible for the county government to continue. I am sure if these lands are taxed properly that then there will be no more grabbing.

I am very sorry, however, that the Rules Committee excluded an investigation of the Elk Hills Reservation. From the evidence we have been listening to in the Public Lands Committee I am sure we all are satisfied that there is something wrong. We feel that the Navy Department and other departments were not as alert as they should have been. While there has been no positive evidence of fraud or scandal, nevertheless, the contract entered into by the Navy Department giving to one oil company a monopoly for virtually nothing must be viewed with suspicion.

I am not one who will make accusations without a foundation but I will state that the whole transaction does not look good. I think the Department of Justice is to be congratulated for having protected the public interest by pointing out that the contract, to say the least, is illegal. There is further suspicion because about the time this contract was signed we were asked to add another mile all around the Elk Hills Reservation to the reservation. This in order to cancel out other oil companies all in favor of one oil company.

It is clear to everybody that the Government that has so readily grabbed millions of acres of farm lands could have taken these oil lands and gotten immediate possession and there was no need of entering into the kind of contract it entered into.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following any special orders heretofore entered and at the close of the business on the Speaker's desk, I may be permitted to address the House today for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE], one-time candidate for President on the national ticket, criticizes the minority because we have not investigated this Elk Hills oil deal. I wish he would explain to the House how we can get the votes to do so. That matter was up to the Committee on Rules as I understand it, and I understand that the Republican Members of the committee voted in favor of the investigation.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have not time.

Mr. Speaker, before we go home—if we do go home—and it seems to me we should not go home until we find out and are able to tell the people whether Mr. WALLACE, the Vice President, and Chairman of the B. E. W., is right when he says in substance that Mr. Jones has been holding back war production and when he says in answer to Mr. Jones' statement that his is not true, that Jones is a liar and then Jones says that WALLACE is a liar—well, now, maybe the people are not interested in knowing which one or whether both of them are liars, or each is telling the truth, but surely, certainly, the people are interested in knowing whether the Vice President of the United States is holding up war production, whether the Chairman of the R. F. C. and the Secretary of Commerce is holding up war production. Perhaps neither is at fault. The people of this country are interested in knowing whether Jesse Jones, head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, has been holding up war production.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No, I cannot. If either one of these gentlemen is doing half of what the other says he is doing he should be kicked out of his official job.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does not the gentleman think it will be a good plan for the Congress to go home and allow the war agencies to quarrel among themselves?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Listen! Listen to what the gentleman says! That when the Vice President of the United States calls the Secretary of Commerce a liar and the charge is hurled back and when each charges the other with holding up the war program, does the gentleman mean that we go home and let them fight? My God! Have we not war enough across the seas without letting these two—one the Vice President, the other a member of the President's Cabinet—carry on a war here at home? The war they have started leads to disunity, decreased production, lack of confidence. It is up to the President to keep order in his official family. When mother's spankings did not bring me to time, father's did; and if the President cannot or will not end the fuss Congress can and should. It certainly must discourage the boys and men fighting overseas. Read what I put into the RECORD yesterday from a soldier down in New Guinea who said he was grateful because he was in New Guinea where he only had to fight the Japs. Waste piled on waste and the administration's spokesman of unity and good-neighbor policy for all the world, returning from his trip to South America where he preached unity as an example of his philosophy of good will, turning to swat his chief's Cabinet member.

No, we should stay right here and straighten out at least some of our domestic troubles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MCMURRAY].

Mr. MCMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Capt. John Schmidt to Clarence Streit.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under previous unanimous-consent request I was granted leave to extend my remarks on the subject of aviation. I now have a letter from the Public Printer stating that it will take three and two-fifths pages and cost $153. I ask unanimous consent that it may be placed in the RECORD notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered this afternoon by Rev. Father O'Toole in regard to the Chinese situation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a news release by the Department of the Interior, commenting on the resignation of John C. Page as Commissioner of Reclamation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes today after the

other special orders have been disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement he made over the radio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

THE IMPENDING FOOD SHORTAGE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, early in the year I called the attention of the House to the probability of a food shortage. Farm leaders as well as individual farmers at that time were beginning to realize that food production for 1943 would likely be much less than production of 1942 regardless of what certain department heads claimed.

The man on the farm knew that with his boy going or gone to the armed forces and his hired help diverted to war industries by high wages, and regardless of his own patriotism, and his own desire to feed the Nation and the world, that it would be physically impossible for him to supply the food requirements.

Planting time came along and he found himself handicapped in many ways. Many farmers resorted to putting lights on their tractors and operating them as much as 18 hours a day. Oftentimes it was the wife or daughters who operated the tractor while the farmer took his meals. A desperate effort was made to plant sufficient acreage. Then along came about 6 weeks of wet weather over a great portion of the country, and on June 1, the Secretary of Agriculture issued a statement to the effect that 15,000,000 acres of corn remained to be planted. Floods covered millions of acres of fertile soil in our Middle West. It then became apparent to and was admitted by those in governmental authority that there was going to be a very decided decline in production.

It was then that those in authority began admitting what farmers and farm leaders had claimed several months before. The planting season ended about the middle of June and then the country began to realize that we would have to depend on what we were going to get from the acreage planted. It was then that Chester Davis, who knew the situation better than any other man in the Government, declared that it was necessary that we save every scrap of food possible. Several months before I had declared "war on waste" and tried to get the country to become waste conscious. I took this stand after observing terrific waste in restaurants and having a great many complaints coming to my office dealing with waste in Army camps.

I suggested the phrase of "lick your platter clean" which was given wide publicity and to my complete amazement swept the country. Immediately, I received a flood of letters from every section of the country, even from far-away Alaska and ships at sea, commending me for my action, calling attention to waste, and promising cooperation. Thereupon, I had several thousand stickers made bearing my slogan, "Save food; lick your platter clean, it's the patriotic thing to do."

Immediately there was a great demand for them and today they are appearing in about 24 States.

From the letters I am receiving from restaurant operators in various parts of the country I have reason to believe that millions of dollars worth of food is being saved. It was only when our staple commodities, such as potatoes and beef, began to disappear from the table that I realized to what extent the people of the country were beginning to take seriously the things that I had been saying.

While the public is now cooperating splendidly and while we have had assurances from the War Department that they would cooperate, complaints continue to come concerning waste in Army camps. Just this morning I received a letter calling my attention to waste in an Army camp where the writer said he knew of a whole side of beef being wasted. He called my attention to a medical center where food waste was equally as bad and to a southern Army camp where the waste was termed as being "sinful."

Now, I understand very well that there is a certain amount of waste where a great many men are being served, but certainly no one can justify such wholesale waste as this.

Certain Congressmen who have visited Army camps recently and have eaten in the officers' mess halls have been shocked by the waste they observed, they have told me.

I believe that with the effort the farmers of the country are putting forth we are going to have sufficient food produced this year, if we have sense enough to use it intelligently, but these kind of things are most discouraging to the producers, who have never had sufficient themselves to waste. As a matter of fact, the farmers of this country have never had a break.

True it is, some have gotten along right well, having accumulated acres and sufficient of this world's goods to finally retire and spend their remaining years in a home in town, but we must remember that generally it was made possible by an increase in land values or due to the fact that he raised a large family and that he and his wife and family worked hard for long hours for many years and got where they did by pooling their interests.

The farmer has never had preferential treatment at the hands of the Government. He has never refused to produce or to market his products, regardless of recent headlines saying that the farmers were on a strike and because of the strike there was a shortage of beef. The shortage of beef I will discuss later, but these things are antagonizing the farmer and sooner or later, and probably sooner than most of us think, he is going to assert himself in no uncertain terms. After all, I believe that we are very close to a time when he is going to get recognition, and it is going to be brought about by a hungry people who will not lay the blame on him but on the few responsible men in governmental authority.

Because he has gone ahead for centuries and produced without complaining and without striking, it cannot be said that the man with the hoe will continue to take it on the chin.

Let me read you a few lines from the pen of Edwin Markham, under the title of "The Man With the Hoe":

Bowed by the weight of centuries he leans
Upon his hoe and gazes on the ground,
The emptiness of ages in his face,
And on his back the burden of the world.
Who made him dead to rapture and despair,
A thing that grieves not and that never hopes,
Stolid and stunned, a brother to the ox?
Who loosened and let down this brutal jaw?
Whose was the hand that slanted back this brow?
Whose breath blew out the light within this brain?
O masters, lords and rulers in all lands,
How will the Future reckon with this Man?
How answer his brute question in that hour
When whirlwinds of rebellion shake the world?
How will it be with kingdoms and with kings—
With those who shaped him to the thing he is—
When this dumb Terror shall reply to God,
After the silence of the centuries.

The farmer must gamble with the risks of destruction or impairment of his crops by floods, drought, insects and pests of all kinds, blight, and possible lack of sufficient labor for harvesting, plus rising costs of labor, machinery, repairs, feeds, and fertilizer.

Possibly because of the mistaken notion that our food supply was inexhaustible, agriculture was seriously crippled by the drafting of experienced and expert farm help. Instead of new and additional machinery being made available to farmers to compensate in some measure for the reduction in farm help, the supply of new farm machines, and of repairs for old machines, was cut off. Also, the available supplies of fertilizer were drastically reduced because of impractical restrictions. And then, when farm labor had been made scarce and its cost was steadily rising due to that scarcity and to high industrial wages, when cost of production of food was being increased by worn-out and inefficient machinery, when normal production was being retarded by the lack of fertilizer; after all of this, a bungling bureaucracy, either wholly ignorant of the trend of affairs or else without regard for results, placed maximum prices or price ceilings upon farm products. And recently, climaxing all of its previous blunders, this bureaucracy has now further reduced income to farmers by lowering prices upon some foods, accompanying the roll-back

in prices by assurances of subsidies, which are unsound, uneconomic, and impractical, and which may or may not be made available.

The result is that a great shortage of food for next winter and subsequent months is now inevitable and it is too late to do much about it for this year. If there is to be improvement for 1944 there must be drastic changes in policy so that agriculture can be unfettered.

Ignorance cannot be pleaded as an excuse. Farm organizations and others for over a year and a half have urged policies which, if they had been adopted, would have prevented the imminent crisis. But the advice of experienced men was rejected.

When the supply of goods is limited and purchasing power is available, prices of articles will ultimately be fixed by the law of supply and demand. The ineffectiveness of price ceilings, which is being demonstrated in this country now, is but a repetition of what has happened in other countries throughout the centuries. More drastic laws, increased severity of penalties, even deaths, have not prevented black markets.

But generally it is not the farmer who, under black markets, receives the benefit of the higher prices.

If adequate food production is to be assured, price ceilings on farm products must be removed permanently to encourage farmers to assume the risks and work the exorbitantly long hours which will be required.

For war production the manufacturer is assured of his cost of production, plus a profit. Likewise, labor has been receiving repeated increases in pay with time and a half or more for overtime. The proposed system of roll-backs is equivalent to another increase of wages to labor.

It is high time that agriculture be given economic justice and a free hand to do what can be done to produce food so much needed by our city consumers, armed forces, and allies.

Price ceilings as a remedy for inflation have been tried hundreds of times during the past 2,000 years. Not once, so far as I can learn, have they succeeded over an extended period. On the contrary, they have resulted in creating food shortages, black markets, and, finally, the very inflation they were supposed to prevent.

We have the serious problem of an excess income of some $20,000,000,000, all seeking something to buy. It is impossible to dam this rapidly increasing surplus income by price ceilings. It is increasing at the rate of a billion and a half to two billion dollars per month, and history proves that it cannot be dammed.

Whenever rising production costs bump into price ceilings, production is strangled. These production costs vary greatly in different sections of the country, and local markets have normally adjusted themselves to these different costs. With inflexible ceilings, the high production cost areas are put out of business.

To overcome this difficulty we began the use of subsidies. Nevertheless, no system of subsidies has ever been devised which is effective enough to reach only these high cost areas. Any subsidy system which is effective in maintaining production must be flexible enough to keep the high cost producer in the field. Under such a plan the low cost producer would receive an unwarranted profit.

As a matter of fact, subsidies, as now employed, do not reach many of the small producers at all, so they are the direct victims of the roll-back. Neither are they sufficient to aid many of the high cost producers. It follows, therefore, that the ceilings are cutting off production just as they have always done whenever tried.

If this Nation is unwilling to pay the cost of its food bill during these years of record income largely based on Government outgo, how can we ever expect our price structure to become balanced? In launching upon a subsidy program in our efforts to hold down the cost of living, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that there is only one basis upon which any government can endure, and that is that the people must support the Government. Any attempt to reverse this principle, asking the Government to support the people, cannot fail to have disastrous results.

Why should we cut the price of coffee 3 cents per pound, butter 5 cents per pound, and meat 2 cents per pound to everybody, including the wealthy and those whose incomes have increased more than the cost of living, in order to aid the few with fixed or low incomes? If subsidies are necessary for the relief of, say, 10 percent of our population, it is an enormous waste to subsidize the other 90 percent who do not need it. A far better scheme would be to use the stamp plan which was employed during the late 30's. Thus the subsidy would go to only those who need it, and it would not be necessary to place ceilings which fast curtail our already diminishing food supply.

England has been cited as an example for us to follow in the matter of price ceilings and subsidies. However, the English economy is almost the reverse of our own. England is an industrial nation, with only 7 percent of her population engaged in agriculture. Her interest lies in maintaining a low level of food prices and the 93 percent of her people can well afford to subsidize the other 7 percent to keep food prices at the desired level.

In England the consumer pays 60 percent of his income for food, as contrasted with 22 percent in America, believed to be the lowest in the world.

England pays a subsidy, but in effect the United States pays it for her. During the 2 years ending March 1, we exported to England under lend-lease $1,449,064,000 in foodstuffs. She sold this food to her people and out of the proceeds paid subsidies estimated at approximately $730,000,000, with a tidy balance left over. Thus, England did not increase her inflationary gap by borrowing the subsidy money from banks.

The English figures do not tell the whole story. In her food index she uses only 14 items, largely those received from America, which are under complete control. She does not include such homegrown products as fresh fruit, fresh vegetables, or any canned goods. The prices on these items have risen sharply. They have had to go up in order to maintain production, but this increase does not show in the food index which England exhibits as proof that food prices have not been allowed to advance.

It should be noted that England is having a serious time with "black markets." She has had to increase the penalty for the sale of food above ceiling prices to 14 years in prison plus $20,000 fine, yet with these severe penalties prosecutions have increased 320 percent in the last 2 years and the Ministry of Food has recently reported that "black markets" are endangering the successful prosecution of the war.

I therefore feel that it is not wise to try to follow in England's footsteps.

For months, beginning even before Pearl Harbor, a chain of events has brought discouragement, distrust, discontent, and resentment to farmers.

Beginning with so-called daylight saving and continuing through the drafting of essential and experienced farm boys and hired men; the restriction on farm machinery and supplies; the rationing of gasoline and footwear; the requiring of multitudinous forms, reports, and applications; the repeated trips, and accompanying annoyances, to offices of O. D. T. and O. P. A. and other agencies; the charges of profiteering; the criticisms of the press, which though not unfriendly has used misleading information supplied by Government bureaus.

For instance, the recent headlines saying that the meat shortage was created by farmers who were "striking" and refusing to sell their fat cattle. The fact is, fat cattle are burdensome back in the country but cannot be moved to market because of O. P. A. regulations. The same applies to millions of bushels of corn tied up in elevators and granaries throughout the country when it is sorely needed in channels of trade and for feed purposes.

Other things bothersome to the farmer included the shortage of feeds due to unwise price ceilings; the deprivation of markets and loss of income due to unwarranted price fixing; the interference in normal methods of transportation to markets; the steadily rising costs of everything farmers buy, due to high wages to industrial workers; the roll-back of food prices to meet the demands of organized labor; and the hostility shown by government and organized labor to agriculture, through all of these there has been a procedure which has baffled and discouraged farmers.

For, after all, greatly increased production of farm commodities would be our best guaranty against inflation.

In closing it should be stated that there is one outstanding fact that speaks volumes for both the intelligence and loyalty of the American farmer, which is that notwithstanding the widespread resentment of farmers resulting from price ceilings and other Federal domestic policies, the vast majority of farmers

are loyally supporting the President's war policies. This is as it should be, for with this war lost, everything worth living for is lost.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope those in authority will change their program and accept advice from those who understand the farm problem and are interested in our food supply, lest we go hungry.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the present military trends of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]?

There was no objection.

THE LATE RUDOLPH FORSTER

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, last night there died in the city of Washington one of the great servants of the Federal Government, one of the men who faithfully served this Nation. I am speaking of Mr. Rudolph Forster, executive clerk at the White House.

Mr. Forster was in the State Department, but on the 7th day of March 1897 he was called to the White House. Under President McKinley, under President Theodore Roosevelt, under President Taft, under President Woodrow Wilson, under President Harding, President Coolidge, President Hoover, and President Franklin D. Roosevelt he served.

He was a fine man. Those of us who knew him loved him for his simplicity, his character, his honor. I say that the service he rendered to the Government of the United States has been worth while.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I want to join with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] in paying tribute to one of the sweetest and gentlest souls I have ever known. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] and myself, as well as other Members of this body, had the pleasure of associating with Mr. Forster and of knowing him intimately. We all loved him, we all recognized him as being a man of great wisdom, a man of great patriotism, a man who loved his fellow men. When he left us, one of the gentlest souls that I have ever known departed.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Forster served 48 years in the White House under eight Presidents. He had the confidence of all eight of those Presidents. He loved every one of them and he expressed his great admiration for every one of them. At all times he was loyal to the man he served.

That is a record of achievement that has seldom been equaled and probably never surpassed in the history of this Republic. Mr. Forster was one of the most lovable characters I have ever known.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Forster was the personification of honor and loyalty and patriotism. He gave his all to whatever task he undertook. Everybody loved him, as has been stated before. I know that the Members who used to telephone to the White House regarding information about the signing of bills never ceased and never will cease to be grateful for the information that he gave every Member the minute that it was honorable for him to do so. You cannot replace Mr. Rudolph Forster.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from North Carolina, the gentleman from Georgia, and others in the statement that Mr. Forster was one of the finest, noblest characters I have ever had the pleasure of meeting. I have known him for nearly 37 years, and I never had the pleasure of meeting a finer man than he.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made by the president of the Indiana Bar Association. I have an estimate from the Public Printer on this, and he states that it will cost $135. I ask unanimous consent that this may be printed notwithstanding the estimate of the Public Printer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITE. In the event that amendments are offered to the resolution, will there be an opportunity to discuss the amendment?

Mr. SABATH. It will not be necessary.

The SPEAKER. If anyone offers an amendment, he may speak an hour, if he so desires.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of time on this side.

Mr. Speaker, had it not been that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] stated that the resolutions to which he referred, namely, the Wigglesworth resolution to investigate the Wallace-Jones controversy and the Peterson public lands, Elk Hills oil investigating resolution, were defeated by a strictly party majority vote, I would not take the floor at this time. I feel that the two resolutions were defeated because it was believed to be for the best interest of the country that they should not be acted upon at this time. It was not only my opinion but that of a majority of the members of the Committee on Rules that these two outstanding gentlemen—the Vice President, Mr. WALLACE, who is also serving as Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare, and Mr. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, who is also serving as Administrator of several other agencies—their duties calling for the discharge of tremendous responsibilities, will find time to themselves adjust their differences.

I do not know what evidence or basis the Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare had in making the charges that Mr. Jones has delayed war activities. Only a few days ago Mr. Jones appeared before the Committee on Rules to testify in connection with the resolution of Representative COFFEE providing for the investigation of the conditions and circumstances surrounding the $85,000,000 loan by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Shipshaw aluminum plant project in Canada. Mr. Jones stated that the loans were made to increase the output of much-needed aluminum and in the negotiation the interest of our country were safeguarded. In view of his testimony, not only the majority, but the minority members of the committee, felt that further investigations should be held in abeyance, and this influenced, as the gentleman from New York should know and does know, the action on the two resolutions of which he complains. Frequently, charges are made, exaggerated by the press, and, invariably, when all the facts are brought to light, it is found that the charges are far-fetched.

I have read the statement issued by the Vice President that Mr. Jones has delayed the acquisition and supplying of extremely needed critical materials; but being familiar with the extended investigations invariably made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation before loans are approved, I feel that the same practice was followed in the matter of which the Vice President complains. Up to now, I have not had the time or opportunity to read Mr. Jones' press release; but I am sure it does not contain any accusation that warranted the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] in using the word "liar." I hope the dispute is largely a question of jurisdiction, and no doubt in due time any differences will be amicably explained and adjusted. Of course, as I have stated, the gentlemen from Michigan and New York are given to exaggeration, to using unwarranted language, and, in this instance, have sought to create a mountain out of a molehill. That is nothing new—it is their continuing policy to say things to create discord and obtain publicity. If I am satisfied after giving this matter

further study, that it requires action on the part of the Committee on Rules, it shall be forthcoming. However, I feel confident that it will not be necessary for our committee to act.

Reverting to the charges against the administration in acquiring unnecessarily large tracts of land, all I wish to say is, if that has been done, it was done under the Republican Secretary of War and the Republican Secretary of the Navy, and the President should not be criticized for their action, it being humanly impossible for him to watch all that is being done. I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that the owners whose properties have been taken over for war purposes will be treated fairly and justly. However, it has been my observation that most of the property owners do not desire just and fair terms but seek to obtain the highest possible prices from the Government, far in excess of actual values.

Mr. Speaker, the complaint that we have not given authority to the Committee on Public Lands to investigate the oil lease negotiated by the Secretary of the Navy is due to the fact that the Secretary has admitted a mistake has been made by awarding an illegal contract, which will be canceled. However, as I have stated heretofore, I am informed that the Standard Oil Co. is still in possession, and, if that is so, I am satisfied that the Department of Justice will take proper steps to nullify the lease. In the event such action is not taken, I shall grant the gentlemen urging the investigation a right to be heard on their request for a congressional investigation.

The proposed resolution before us authorizes a study and investigation to determine what, if any, losses have been sustained by counties in being deprived of revenue on taxes paid on these lands; and I hope the Committee on Public Lands will make a thorough study of the question. However, in this connection permit me to call attention to the fact that not only certain counties have suffered and are being deprived of taxes on lands taken over by the Government, but many cities have suffered to a still greater degree. I know in my own city of Chicago many large pieces of property have been taken over by the Government and out of the taxing power of the city, resulting in the loss of taxes. But I have not asked that that situation be also studied, feeling that some principle or arrangement will be worked out and adopted that will apply to the cities.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated in my opening remarks, I have been instructed by the Committee on Rules to offer an amendment to the resolution that would restrain the Committee on Public Lands from holding hearings outside of Washington, D. C. However, it has been stated that such restriction would be discrimination and deprive the committee of the right accorded to other committees. I move to strike out on page 2, line 9, after the word "times" the following words, "and places within the United States" and insert in lieu thereof, the words "in the District of Columbia." This amendment, as I have stated, would preclude and restrain the committee from visiting and examining many properties. It is my opinion they have a right and it is necessary for them to visit scenes affected in their study of the question.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SABATH: On page 2, line 10, after the word "times", strike out "and places within the United States" and insert in lieu thereof "in the District of Columbia."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. MAAS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 243.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Roads, as a whole or by subcommittees, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the construction and maintenance of highways, roads, streets, and bridges over which the Government or any agency thereof exercises or may exercise any jurisdiction or direction, directly or indirectly, as a part of the war effort or otherwise, including the allocation of materials, equipment, and manpower for the construction or maintenance thereof, and practices incidental thereto whether private or governmental which affect or may affect the use, construction, and maintenance of such highways, roads, streets, and bridges.

The committee shall report from time to time to the House the results of its investigations and studies, and in its reports the committee may recommend such legislation as may be deemed pertinent.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, to take such testimony, to have such printing and binding done, and to make such expenditures as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman. Oaths or affirmations may be administered by the chairman or any member of the committee designated by him.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I shall not detain the House for more than a minute or two. This resolution was requested by a unanimous vote of the Committee on Roads and was reported by a unanimous vote by the Committee on Rules. It provides that the Committee on Roads shall have jurisdiction to investigate and examine into road construction and the roads program in the United States. I know that nearly all of you gentlemen from the West and the South as well as from the East are interested in roads. I believe this investigation will be helpful and beneficial to the country, and consequently should receive the unanimous approval of the House.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour and the good nature of the House, I do not believe we should delay any longer in the consideration of this resolution. I join with my distinguished chairman in urging the passage of the resolution, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A PROPOSAL FOR A CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF SACRIFICE

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and include therein the text of a brief bill I propose to introduce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, today I shall introduce a bill to provide for a Congressional Medal of Sacrifice. A veteran of the First World War, Capt. W. A. Ross, United States Army, retired, has called my attention to the fact that while we have various medals of honor and various awards for members of our armed forces, provision has never been made for a suitable recognition to the Gold Star Mothers. My bill proposes to award them a medal of appropriate design, including a gold star.

There is a provision for an annual Gold Star Mothers' Day and after World War No. 1, a pilgrimage to the battlefields of Europe was provided at Government expense. Provision has been made for monetary awards to dependent relatives, including mothers. I have not been able to find, however, any provision to award to the Gold Star Mothers an official emblem recognizing the great sacrifice they have made on the altar of the country.

How greatly such a medal would be treasured by the Gold Star Mothers came to me sometime ago, as I read this poignant paragraph in the column of Henry McLemore in the Washington Evening Star. I quote:

Mothers write: "Word of my boy's death came today. In the paper I read of decorations being given those who are alive. My boy gets nothing. Is there nothing that goes to those who die for their country, unseen and unsung?"

And at this point, I think it is appropriate to insert the letter from Abraham Lincoln to Mrs. Bixby, which will probably remain forever, as the finest statement of a nation's gratitude and inability adequately to express it. I quote:

LETTER TO MRS. BIXBY, OF BOSTON, MASS.

EXECUTIVE MANSION.
November 21, 1864.

DEAR MADAM: I have been shown in the files of the War Department a statement of

the adjutant general of Massachusetts that you are the mother of five sons who have died gloriously on the field of battle. I feel how weak and fruitless must be any words of mine which should attempt to beguile you from the grief of a loss so overwhelming. But I cannot refrain from tendering to you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the Republic they died to save. I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

Yours very sincerely and respectfully,
ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

(John G. Nicolay and John Hay, Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln.)

The bill which I am introducing today, Mr. Speaker, is brief, and I insert it at this point. As will be seen, provision is made for congressional representation in the selection of a suitable design, for certification of persons entitled to receive the awards and for presentation by the President in the name of the Congress. The text follows:

A bill to provide for a Congressional Medal of Sacrifice

1. *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to present in the name of the Congress, a Congressional Medal of Sacrifice, to the mother of any person who, while serving in the armed forces of the United States, or in the American Merchant Marine in hostile waters, loses his life in line of duty during time of war, as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 2. A design for the Congressional Medal of Sacrifice shall be selected by a committee of seven persons, two of whom shall be named by the President of the Senate, two by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and one each by the War Department, the Navy Department, and the War Shipping Administration. The design shall include a gold star, and may include an appropriate ribbon or other device for additional gold stars if more than one of a mother's children die in line of duty as provided in section 1.

SEC. 3. The administrative heads of the respective services concerned shall provide for certification to the President of the names of persons entitled to receive the Congressional Medal of Sacrifice; and thereupon the President shall present the medals at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement on Gold Star Mothers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

LESLIE M. RAPP

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 288) from the Committee on Accounts, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective July 1, 1943, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, additional compensation to Leslie M. Rapp, minority clerk of the Ways and Means Committee, at the rate of $900 per annum so long as the position is held by him.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJORITY AND MINORITY EMPLOYEES

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 295) from the Committee on Accounts, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That until otherwise provided by law there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives compensation at the rate of $2,000 per annum for the employment of a clerk in charge of printing for the majority caucus room and compensation at the rate of $2,000 per annum for the employment of a clerk in charge of printing for the minority caucus room, such appointments to be designated by the majority leader and minority leader, respectively.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 296) from the Committee on Accounts, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Public Lands, not to exceed $10,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee, signed by the chairman, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ACTIVITIES OF THE FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 290) from the Committee on Accounts, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the committee of investigation authorized by House Resolution 119, not exceeding $10,000, in addition to amounts heretofore made available, including expenditures for the employment of experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would like to inquire if the Speaker can inform the House as to what we may expect for the balance of the day and perhaps tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it will be impossible for us to close up all the business today. There will be no request to meet early tomorrow because when we adjourn today we will come in at 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The Chair will state there will be no further business transacted in the House this evening except to agree to the conference asked by the Senate on the two appropriation bills. We will await that.

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. PETERSON of Florida submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 647) to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, and for other purposes, for printing in the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Nation's Business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a reported program of the United Labor Committee Executive Board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE APPROACHING POLITICAL CAMPAIGN

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the approaching political contest in the United States is destined to be the most momentous within the memory of living man, probably more deeply and lastingly affecting the lives of our citizens, our system of economy and the structure of the Republic itself, than any election held in the history of the Nation.

Thoughtful citizens are convinced that the approaching political contest will determine whether this Nation shall endure as a free and sovereign nation; whether a republican form of government will be maintained; whether the Congress and the judiciary will operate as equal and separate branches of our Government, and whether free enterprise and individual liberty are to be reestablished and perpetuated.

The war in which this Nation finds itself engaged throughout the world cannot be an issue in the ensuing campaign. The American people as a

whole are performing every military task and meeting every call upon them that conceivably could be made in behalf of victory. On that there is no division.

But the American people will not be diverted from the issues in the next campaign; they are crystal clear. Already, though the election is many months removed, people everywhere in the United States who love their country's traditions and institutions, are united in studying the life record and the character of men of sound faith and high repute, seeking to find the man best fitted to serve our people in the Presidency.

Having known him intimately for many years, I have come to believe that Earl Warren abundantly possess every attribute of purpose and courage, mind and heart, industry, character and old fashioned Americanism that our next President must possess if the United States is to endure as we have known it.

Earl Warren is not a candidate for President. He is quoted by Gould Lincoln, in the Washington Star of June 22, 1943, as stating: "I am not a candidate for any other office than I already have." Regardless, the men and women of America are discussing his availability with increasing enthusiasm.

Governor Warren served in the United States Army during World War No. 1. It is strange no member of our armed forces during the First World War has attained the Presidency. It would seem that by thus belatedly, fittingly honoring the veterans of World War No. 1 we can give evidence of the sincerity of our promises to the eterans of this war. And who could doubt that a soldier prefers to have a soldier for his Commander in Chief?

While Earl Warren was a soldier durin the last World War, he is a lawyer and not a professional military man, but he had opportunity to learn enough about the military art during his service in the Army to know that the strategy of land, sea, and air warfare must be determined by competent military leaders of those arms who have made the exacting business of war their life work.

Earl Warren was born at Los Angeles, Calif., March 19, 1891. He graduated from the University of California, bachelor of laws, 1912, and from the School of Jurisprudence, University of California, doctor of laws, 1914, in which year he was admitted to the California State Bar. He married Nina E. Meyers October 14, 1925, and the union has been blessed with a large family—James C., Virginia, Earl, Dorothy, Nina Elizabeth, and Robert. Mrs. Warren, a charming lady, graces their home and has helped her husband's career by centering her activities in properly raising her family and maintaining a happy home. She is everything that a mother and a wife should be and has made the Governor's mansion at Sacramento a place of culture and charm.

Governor Warren has occupied the Governor's chair at Sacramento but a short time, but he has had vast experience in the affairs of his State. He had previously been district attorney of Alameda County and more recenty attorney general of California. He has had a distinguished career as a member of the State bar of California, engaging in the practice of law in Oakland.

Governor Warren long has been active in the affairs of the Republican Party in California and in the Nation, being chairman of the Republican State Central Committee of California, 1934 to 1936, and Republican national committeeman for California.

Perhaps the principal reason for this unprecedented victory as Governor was that in a long public career, since 1919, the people of California have become acquainted with the character of Earl Warren; they know that he does not make promises that he cannot fulfill; and they know that when he makes a public pledge it will be fulfilled precisely as stated by him.

He has kept his pledges to the people of California. He has brought order out of chaos, has reestablished sound government and a sound fiscal policy. In the forefront of the war effort, California is ready and alert and delivering for the Nation under the leadership of a sound American Governor.

After meeting the leaders of Governor Warren's administration, Raymond Moley wrote of them:

> They are a personable bunch—clean, vigorous, free of the musty aroma of long years in politics and fortunately free, also, of the saccharin intensity of professional reform. They are just good men who want to do a good job in a State which has never been particularly party-bound.

In the days before us, American men and women of sound faith of both major parties might well study the personal and public record of Earl Warren, and particularly consider the amazing alacrity with which he has brought order out of chaos in the vital State of California.

No one who knows Governor Warren doubts his capacity to render a similar service in like precise and expeditious manner for the Nation.

CEILING PRICE ON CORN

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time to inquire of some Member of the House, perhaps of the Speaker, what disposition has been made of the bill that has just come over from the Senate, increasing the price of corn to $1.40, placing a ceiling of $1.40 on corn?

The SPEAKER. It has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. FISH. The Speaker has answered that it has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture. Members of the Committee on Agriculture are present in the House, and I would like to inquire whether that committee proposes to meet before midnight tonight or tomorrow morning and report back that bill or some amendment to it. Time is of the essence. I would much prefer a ceiling of $1.25 than $1.40 on corn, because I believe if we pass a bill with a ceiling of $1.25 at Chicago that corn will begin moving to the Eastern States before our farmers, our poultrymen, our dairymen, and our industries are liquidated. I hope the Committee on Agriculture will not dodge this issue but will meet it squarely and report a bill for action by the House before we recess.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

NATIONAL WAR AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for the war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, still further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments numbered 33 and 34, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3030), the second deficiency appropriation bill, 1943, insist on House amendments to Senate amendments numbered 8 and 9; that the House recede from its adherence to its disagreement to Senate amendments Nos. 24, 25, and 26, and still further insist on its disagreement to such Senate amendments; that the House still further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 27.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I witnessed on last Saturday afternoon the most pitiful spectacle of my entire life. I saw the last round of the first real test of bureaucracy against democracy. I saw the Congress fold up and accept without a struggle a knock-out punch from one of our many bureaus.

I refer to the retreat taken in the Watson, Dodd, and Lovett amendment. I want to review very briefly the progress of this subject: Dealing first with Robert Morss Lovett, secretary of the Virgin Islands, who draws from the taxpayers of America the sum of $5,800 per

annum. This body recalls that on February 1, 1943, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable MARTIN DIES, chairman of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, cited before this body the said Lovett for his long record of Communist affiliations. On April 16, 1943, the said Lovett was given a hearing before a subcommittee of the said special committee, during which hearing the said Lovett defended the Communist Party while still drawing the said sum of $5,800 from the labor of loyal American citizens. On April 21, 1943, the Kerr committee, which had been created by the House as a trial committee on the pretext that these parties should not be convicted without trial, filed a report based upon hearings given Mr. Lovett and evidence submitted by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in which report he was held and declared to be unfit for Government employment. His fitness was defended by the Honorable Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, which, frankly, is not at all surprising to me or any other well-informed person. On May 14, 1943, the Kerr committee cited Lovett as unfit for Government employment.

William E. Dodd, Jr., was on December 1, 1941, employed as editorial assistant at $2,600 per annum by the Federal Communications Commission, and on November 19, 1942, the Federal Communications Commission requested Mr. Dodd's local draft board's permission to send him to London to organize news intelligence service in north Africa. An increase of $600 was requested by the Federal Communications Commission for Mr. Dodd. It is inconceivable that the Federal Communications Commission, with its knowledge of Dodd's political philosophy, would think of putting him in such an important position when the very lives of our fighting forces were at stake, but fortunately the State Department refused Mr. Dodd a visa, which refusal was based on information furnished by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities and the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and in the face of these facts the brass of the Federal Communications Commission was strong enough that the said Dodd was retained with the Commission at a salary of $3,200 per annum.

On February 1, 1943, the said Dodd was cited in a speech by Hon. MARTIN DIES before the House of Representatives for his many activities on behalf of Communist front organizations. On April 5, 1943, the said Dodd was given a hearing before a subcommittee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, during which he admitted affiliation with a long line of Communist front organizations, and that he had entertained the outstanding foe of American Democracy, Harry Bridges, at a cocktail party while the said Bridges was in the city of Washington, D. C. On April 21, 1943, the Kerr committee aforesaid reported to the House, based upon hearings with Mr. Dodd and evidence submitted by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, that the said Dodd was unfit to hold a Government position. In the face of these many unanswerable facts definitely establishing the unfriendliness of the said Dodd to our form of Government and of his unquestioned relations to the Communist Party, the said Federal Communications Commission voted, 4 to 3, to retain the said Dodd in the service of the said Commission, and while the youth of this Nation are fighting for the very life of the Democracy the said Dodd is given opportunity to destroy. On May 14, 1943, the Kerr committee cited Dodd as unfit for Government employment.

Goodwin B. Watson has been employed as chief broadcast analyst at $6,500 per annum since November 18, 1941, having before said time been on a salary of $5,600. On November 18, 1941, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable MARTIN DIES wrote to Mr. James Lawrence Fly, who is Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, calling his attention to Watson's long record of communistic views and his numerous affiliations with Communist front organizations. It would seem, though, that to Chairman Fly his many communistic activities made the said Watson worth more to the Commission, as he raised his salary $900 that day, and on November 19 the said Fly wrote the said DIES defending the said Watson as fully qualified for his position—this with a full knowledge of his communistic philosophy. In January 1942 the House of Representatives approved a proposal to allow no portion of the appropriations of the Federal Communications Commission to be used to pay the salary of Goodwin Watson, removing the said stipulation on June 22, 1942. On February 1, 1943, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable MARTIN DIES, again cites the Communist views and affiliations of Watson, and on April 1, 1943, Watson is given a hearing before a subcommittee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. On April 21, 1943, report of the Kerr committee, based upon hearings with Mr. Watson and evidence submitted by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, held the said Watson to be unfit for Government employment; and, on April 29, 1943, with a full knowledge of all of these facts, the Federal Communications Commission voted 4 to 3 to retain the said Watson in the service of said Commission. On May 14, 1943, the Kerr committee cited the said Watson as unfit for Government employment in its report to the House.

On May 18, 1943, on a record vote an amendment which, in effect, dropped these 3 parties from the Federal pay rolls carried in the House by 318 to 62. The Senate failed to concur with the House on this amendment and many conferences were held between the conferees of the House and Senate on this subject, and finally on the 30th day of June 1943 the matter came back to the House and a motion was made that the House recede and concur in the Senate action rejecting said amendment, at which time a record vote showed 301 in favor of standing by our original provision denying salary payment to these 3 parties and 71 voted to recede and concur with the Senate. On Saturday, July 3, 1943, the same week, the matter came back to the House from the conferees and a conference report was offered wherein the conferees from the Senate and the House had agreed to a compromise which at its best could not offer more than to relieve the Federal Government of these 3 individuals who have been found to be subversive and who have practically plead guilty to said charge by November 15, 1943.

Here is where the shame falls on this House. A measure of the vast importance and far-reaching effect of this measure which had been debated back and forth so many times was placed for a vote before this body and actually became law, in effect, cramming these 3 individuals down the throats of millions of loyal taxpayers by a vote of possibly 8 or 10 individuals. In other words, the question was put and those in favor of agreeing to the conference report were asked to signify by saying "aye," and those opposed "no." Probably a half dozen, or possible 10, answered in the affirmative, and possibly 2 or 3 in the negative. Then the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] asked for the yeas and nays, and the Speaker asked all to stand that were in favor of taking the vote on this all-important measure by yeas and nays, or on a record vote, or speaking in plain language, in a manner whereby the American people could see how each Member voted, and 28 rose to their feet, which, of course, was not a sufficient number to demand the yeas and nays. At this point the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] objected to the vote on the ground that there was no quorum present, and, after counting, the Speaker answered there were 284 Members present, which, of course, constituted a quorum. In other words, there were 256 on the floor drawing salaries from the American taxpayers who did not rise to their feet, when by so doing their constituents and the boys who are fighting on foreign battlefields today could have seen how they voted.

You Republican brethren who have been trying to tell the American people how you are going to rid this country of the many things that you say the New Deal has produced, including subversives, certainly were a bewildered looking bunch. We boys on our side who were determined that those three individuals should cease drawing the taxpayers money while they practiced their communistic ideas had hoped for some help from you, and as I stood among the few who rose on our side, I gazed across to my right assuming that I would see the personnel of the Republican side instead of a mere handful, standing shoulder to shoulder pushing forward for the preservation of democracy. You were all squatted so low in your seats until I started to look under them for you. I was told by some of your number that you were going to throw it in Roosevelt's

lap, and to this I want to say that you did not throw it in Roosevelt's lap, but into the very heart and vitals of American democracy.

This body committed a mammoth sin against the American people on Saturday afternoon, or either an unpardonable sin on the Messrs. Watson, Dodd, and Lovett in their other votes. We voted them subversive, and leaving off the fact that they virtually pleaded guilty to these charges, they stood convicted of such charges by the ballot of the membership of this House. In other words we have fallen into the pitiful and defenseless position of finding 3 men subversive to our Government in the midst of a bloody, desperate, and undetermined war, after we have taken the sons of mothers, the husbands of wives, the fathers of children and the love of sweethearts and sent them forth to battle fronts throughout the world to die the horrible deaths that the combat of war bring, and yet on the afternoon of July 3, 1943, this body voted, refusing to make a record vote, to maintain these parties who by their own verdict are subversive to our form of government in active service in as important positions as they are now serving. The nature of their employment enables them to know diplomatic, political, and military secrets of enormous importance; this especially applies to Watson and Dodd. I hope that every Member of this body will bear in mind that the word "subvert" means to overturn, overthrow, ruin utterly, to undermine the morals, allegiance, or faith of, to corrupt. In the face of a verdict rendered twice by this House by a more than 3 to 1 vote have we found these parties guilty, but yet we left them on, and to my sorrow and humiliation there were only 28 Members of the body that signified their willingness for their people to know how they voted on this question. I am happy that I was one of the 28 and I am asking the American people to inquire of their Congressman whether or not he was one of the 28.

I love the membership of this House, and this institution has received much criticism that it did not deserve, but on this question the Americna people should bitterly condemn this House for its weakness in dealing with a question so vital to the life and future of our democracy. I hope that every American citizen reads these remarks, but I am especially calling on the families of the armed forces, the membership of the American Legion, and the soldiers when they return home to read every word of what I have said on the floor of the House today.

I want the American public to bear in mind that this same House has voted hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Dies committee, which money came from the sweat and toil of the American taxpayer, and the same parties who voted these funds deliberately refused to preserve the benefits derived from its expenditure for the safety of American democracy. I do not want to be misunderstood, I am not critical of the Dies committee, I think that the American public owes a debt of gratitude and commendation to this committee, its chairman, the gentleman from Texas the Honorable MARTIN DIES, and the services it has rendered that they will never be able to pay. I am critical, however, of the membership of this House who vote the funds and refuse to accept the fruits its expenditures produce.

I want to remind the Members of this House and the American public that the greatest danger that this democracy faces today is the filthy hand of communism that is active in our midst today. Our boys are fighting with their lives, giving their blood to win against our visible enemies, and they are going to win, but unless this Congress changes its attitude and goes to acting with courage we are going to lose the battle at home while they are winning the one abroad. My colleagues, you know what was in your bosom on Saturday afternoon, I do not have to tell you, and I do not want you to answer to me, but answer to your own conscience what you think the result of this war would be if the soldiers whom you sent to the battle fronts met the enemy with no more courage than you met your duty on Saturday afternoon.

It might be well for you to consider the matter in this light. You very often find yourself pitying the soldiers who are being taken prisoners, but let me ask you if it ever occurred to you that when you sat passively and refused to fight like you did on last Saturday, that you are being taken prisoner day by day by the filthy forces of communism, and worse than this, are permitting the thousands of people who pay your salaries to likewise be taken prisoner. As your friend, comrade, and colleague, let me ask you to not pass judgment on this statement, but if you are living 10 years from today, I ask you to read this statement and then answer whether or not you think that I have told you the truth.

I do not believe there is a Member of this House who is not aware of the fact that the Communist organizations of this country have for many years been gradually boring into the bone and sinew of our democracy, and especially that their activities have been doubled many times since the emergency of war has built a shadow for them to work under. You know as well as I that the mischief that these labor racketeers have committed in sabotaging our war effort, has been fomented and sponsored by the Communist organizations, and you further know that these same organizations are responsible for the race riots that have been prevalent throughout the country. These are facts that anyone unprejudicial in seeking truth realistically will have to admit. Nothing could be more cruel than for these un-American slickers to go around and prey on the poor American Negro, who in the past has, and in the future will, if let alone by this foreign element sponsoring communism, be much better citizens than the ones of whom I speak. They care nothing for the welfare of the Negro; they have one purpose, one thought, and one aim, and that is to destroy the peace, tranquility, and unity of the God-fearing law-abiding, patriotic American citizens until they can create enough chaos and confusion to strike a death blow and take over this country. Let me tell you that when my children and your children have to take on the damnable yoke of communism, the records of this Congress will disclose when you and I are gone that their progress toward control of this Government was fought every step of the way by me. You may surrender and accept in the future like you have in the past their progress in silence, and you may now condemn me for my stand, but the day will come when you will thank me for every word I have spoken here today.

On Saturday it was amazing to me to listen to the few remarks that preceded what I would call "the grunt vote" that was taken. Not a man offered a reason for the House's retreat to cover. Instead, excuses were offered, as a naughty schoolboy always does when he knows that he is fixing to commit a wrong. Some made the statement that in legislating, compromise was a necessary element. In policy making I concede this is right. But, pray, tell me, in the light of the rightousness of a just God, where you justify a compromise with a person who is subversive, and whom you have determined to be subversive by your own vote, when the boys that you have wrung from their mothers' breasts and sent to foreign battle fronts are dying to save the democracy that the subject matter of your compromise is destroying from the inside. Could you close your eyes and visualize your son, any American mother's son, in the throes of death on a foreign battlefield or sinking for his last time in the briny deep thousands of miles from a waiting mother and you in the Halls of Congress compromising with an enemy who is here to destroy what that precious life was forfeited for? Could you meet that mother who bore that son in pain and brush the tears from her wrinkled face and tell her that you had silently compromised with the enemy her son died to defeat? I sometimes wonder how deep the horrors of war rest on some people's bosom, what price they put on blood, or where they find the glory in death.

Some said the Senate stated they could not concur because they had not had time to investigate the matter. To this I inquire since when has one body of the Congress got to where it cannot take the word of the other body on matters of this nature. Furthermore, over this period of near 2 months that we have been pitching this matter back and forth, would it not have been much easier and less expensive to the American taxpayer for the Senate to have sent a committee over to look at the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation if they were not willing to accept at face value the report of the two investigating committees of the House. Some few people may swallow this explanation, but the great masses of the American people are too enlightened and will never accept it. There is not, nor can there be, an excuse for maintaining on the Federal pay rolls subversives in a time of war. If it is right for them to stay there 5 months, if they cannot do any harm to our war effort in 5 months, then they can never do any harm. These three men should be put off the pay rolls and put off now, or

should have been vindicated instead of convicted by this body, and it is high time that the American people demand that the membership of this House display some courage in the performance of the duties they are sworn to perform.

It is quite interesting to note that Chairman Fly, since the gentle retreat of the House last Saturday, is seeking new fields to conquer. I notice from the press that he is now attacking the Army and Navy. This shows you to what extent a bureaucrat will go when he gets you on the run. If this House had stood up and let Fly know that we would not tolerate the use of communistic idealists in that service, with probably some more Pearl Harbors to result, it would probably have clipped his wings to where he would at least respect the Army and Navy that are fighting to protect his home today. I have said in the past and will say again that every public official who fails to act with decision, determination, and courage, will see the fruit of his sins quickly. This Congress has got to put the Communists of this country on notice that their activities will not be tolerated further. It was amusing to me recently when the announcement came out of the dissolution of the Third International. I remarked immediately that this announcement was made for the sole purpose of throwing the American people off guard, which has been well proven.

I want to ask in sincerity, unprompted by prejudice or an exaggerated mental state brought about by interest or excitement, why it is that no Communist ever suffers defeat when drawing an issue with this Government. Earl Browder won, Harry Bridges has won through the years, and I hope that someone can give me a real answer to this question.

No wonder our people have suffered from the many injustices that have been imposed upon them by the strictest regimentation by the Office of Price Administration. Just to mention a few instances, one Carl Borden was head of the rent section of the Office of Price Administration whose record as far as public life is concerned shows that he was secretary of a certain League of Industrial Democracy in Chicago, an organization working for "a social order based on production for use and not for profit." He worked in Soviet Russia for several years and this same party is today head of the Office of Price Administration in Hawaii at $8,000 per year of the taxpayers' money of the United States of America.

I want to remind the people of the United States further that another Office of Price Administration employee by the name of Doxey Alfonso Wilkerson, a Negro Communist, has had much to do with the hardships and inconsistencies visited on them by the O. P. A. Why does this Government persist in having its policies set up by Communists while we tell the mothers and fathers and taxpayers of America that we are taking their sons and their money to preserve democracy. The records will disclose that the said Wilkerson came from the Federal Security Agency and that J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has on more than one occasion advised the departments for whom this Negro was working of his communistic activities and of his membership in the Communist Party of the State of New York. Yet, in the face of this, on December 9, 1942, the Assistant Administrator ruled that they found nothing to show the said Wilkerson engaged in activities which might probably be characterized as subversive or disloyal to our Government in which the said Administrator stated: "Therefore, he has been exonerated, and we are filing the report without further action," referring to the report of J. Edgar Hoover. Only recently Wilkerson has been defended by others as being clear of any communistic activities or affiliations and, in the face of this Wilkerson resigned from the Office of Price Administration to accept employment with the Communist Party to devote his full time to lecturing for said party and organizing for the said Communist Party.

I call on the American people to use their status as citizens and the final governing body of this great Commonwealth to stamp out every taint of communism from the portals of this great Government. This country was established as a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and I ask that God in all His wisdom may provide that again we return to these sacred principles.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I think the House generally approves the views the gentleman is expressing in connection with these three men. However, I think it might be well for the gentleman to have as a part of his presentation the fact that many of these individuals continue to tell the Government that they are not members of the Communist Party, but the facts later prove that they are. A leading example is that of Dr. Wilkerson, who claimed that he was not a member of the Communist Party, who nevertheless when he resigned his Government position went into the Communist Party as an organizer.

Mr. GIBSON. I thank my friend, the gentleman from West Virginia, and a little later I will discuss that very question.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to agree with the remarks of the gentleman in connection with the individuals he has mentioned. But does he not feel that there is also a responsibility on the part of the agencies or those who are responsible for them, for allowing them to remain in these positions after this matter has been called to their attention?

Mr. GIBSON. The gentleman is clearly right, and it is a shame on our democracy that these agencies have made it necessary for this Congress to have to take the action it has taken and to make it necessary for me to make the remarks that I am making at this time.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In connection with the observations of the gentleman from Illinois, it is true that in connection with Dr. Wilkerson he was on two occasions given a clean bill of health after the Federal Bureau of Investigation had said to the heads of one of these agencies that he was guilty of subversive activities, and the agency, after they had that information, said that Dr. Wilkerson was all right with them.

Mr. GIBSON. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for bringing that matter to the attention of the House. I want to say that some of the newspapers charged that party as being from Georgia which I want to deny.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an amendment that I sought to offer today to the second deficiency bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement from the Legislative Reference Service of the Congressional Library.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects: One, a compilation of the benefits available to disabled United States servicemen in Illinois; second, an article from the Washington Post setting forth the fact that the lake levels in Lake Michigan are now 2½ feet above normal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 15 minutes.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a document entitled "Government Corporations—The No-Man's Land of Federal Finance." This is a publication of the Citizens' National Committee, and it constitutes an amazing and illuminating exposé of the dangerous and confused condition which has grown up under the secrecy of bureaucratic operations in the present administration. This document sets forth in detail the names, the uses, and the amounts of public funds involved in

these innumerable governmental corporations which have been woven into a web which threatens to entangle and strangle free industry and free enterprise in the United States. These corporations under their charters are authorized to engage in every line of business, regardless of the destructive effect on private business which this competition would impose.

As this study so well sets forth, the employment of the device of Government corporations has increased to such a tremendous—I might say to such a phenomenal—extent during the last decade, that today these corporations rival in importance and scope of operations the long-established and basic departments of the Government itself.

This study points out that the corporate form was very sparingly used by the Government prior to 1913. At that time it was the general policy of the Government to liquidate such corporate entities as soon as they had served their purpose. It is a singular, and perhaps a sinister fact that this policy seems to have been abandoned. The proponents of the use of this government device are prone to cite the flexibility and speed of action, together with the absence of control which Government corporations can achieve, as the justification for their creation and use.

It is an amazing fact, as disclosed by the Citizens' National Committee, that in the last 10 years Government corporations have increased their assets 500 percent.

We find that in the case of some of these governmental corporations there is no limit to their authority to issue obligations. In this field, the newest and most significant proposal is the creation of what has been styled a super, hybrid, quasi-governmental corporation to execute post-war plans, another rat hole, and a much bigger one, down which can be poured billions upon billions of the American taxpayers' money by irresponsible and power-mad bureaucrats without consent of the taxpayers themselves.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I yield to my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. JONKMAN. On June 10 last the State Department released a press notice concerning the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration that purports to be a union of the nations for the purpose of general rehabilitation and relief.

We were told this morning by Dean Acheson of the State Department that under that agreement each nation pledges all of the resources at its command and that it was understood by the State Department that the administration could make the commitments for the United States for this Relief Administration body and that afterward the Congress could disapprove or approve or ratify that action as they saw fit, and decide whether they would make the necessary appropriations to implement the agreement. Does not the gentleman think that is one of those superhybrid corporations in which our substance would be wasted?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I have just stated that this was probably the most significant proposal that has been advanced by the administration in connection with setting up these different governmental corporations. I think every Member of the House must have known for a long, long time that the Executive—and I refer to Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt, the President of the United States—has been constantly encroaching upon the prerogatives of both the judicial and the legislative branches of the Government. I might remind those present that it was not so long ago when the President, impatient with the restrictions placed upon him by the then Supreme Court of the United States, asked Congress to add five new members to that Court which would give him a majority and enable him to exercise some measure of control over the deliberations of that body. I thank God that Congress had the courage to withstand the importunities and the pressures that were brought to bear upon Members of the House and Senate to force the acceptance of that proposal. Let me say further that from the things the President has said and done from time to time, it appears that he has overlooked no opportunity to criticize and belittle the Congress. Does he have in mind destroying the confidence of the people in their legislative branch of the Government? It would seem so, Mr. Speaker. If he could subjugate and destroy the usefulness of the Congress he would find himself in as autocratic a position as even Mr. Hitler himself.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and Mr. DISNEY rose.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield first to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman probably read the information that was released to the press, but of which the press carried very little. Article 1 states:

> There is hereby established the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.
>
> 1. The Administration shall have power to acquire, hold, and convey property, to enter into contracts, and undertake obligations, to designate or create agencies and to review the activities of the agencies so created, to manage undertakings, and in general to perform any legal acts appropriate to its object and purposes.

Can there be anything more far-reaching than that?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I think not. I assume the lady read from an Executive order. May I say that I doubt very much whether the Chief Executive would find himself in the postion he has assumed had it not been for the change in the Supreme Court that has taken place since the gentleman in the White House assumed his responsibilities. He has appointed more than a majority of that Court. I assume he exercised great care in the selection of his nominees and that every one of them was selected because he saw eye to eye with the appointing power. Does this account for the continuous seizure of power by the Executive? It would seem so, Mr. Speaker. It must be the knowledge that he has a friendly court of last resort to which he can appeal if the Congress would thwart the Presidential imperious will. Somehow I still have confidence in the Supreme Court of this land and that it will rise to its full responsibility and rebuke those who would destroy constitutional government in this great land of ours.

I do not know what the other Members of the Congress think about this developing situation; I do not know how many will be complacent enough to sit in their seats speechless and permit the man in the White House to assume all the duties, the functions, the responsibilities, and the prerogatives of all three branches of our tripartite system of government, but I want to assure the Members of this House here and now that I do not propose to keep silent under the circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to go to the country with the things that are going on and I shall do my bit to enlighten the people of this country where we are being led and what we are being led into by an administration that thinks it is wise enough, powerful enough and rich enough to bring the "four freedoms" to all the people of the world. He should stop, look, and listen to the conditions existing in this country and take cognizance of the fact that before he attempts, at our expense, to bring the "four freedoms" to the peoples of all the world, we should first establish them here. This has not as yet been done.

Mr. Speaker, referring again to governmental corporations, it gives us something to ponder about when we learn that as of January 31, 1943 the Government proprietary interest in corporations or agencies amounted to $11,671,000,000 for only those corporations reported by the Treasury Department.

Many governmental corporations are authorized to grant loans. This granting of loans has, in turn, necessitated the creation of extensive machinery for management, control, and the disposal of collateral—in other words, getting the money to loan.

A Treasury Department report dated June 30, 1939, showed 14 Government corporations or agencies with a net profit, and 18 such corporations or agencies with a net loss. The net loss was $1,654,000,000.

Partial list of these governmental corporations and agencies shows a total of 109,519 employees with a monthly payroll of $19,025,787.

Thirty-two of these governmental corporations and agencies render no accounts to the General Accounting Office whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, this pamphlet on governmental corporations shows that never in the history of the United States have such enormous resources and sweeping powers, and such vast operations been conducted under such a complete cloak of secrecy. Although in the last few years we have had a flood of Government publications, with thousands of

people working to pour out alleged information upon the American public, yet the fact is that the concealment of vital facts concerning the growth of these governmental corporations is shocking. Their constant increase is dangerous in a nation of free enterprise.

A great deal has been said about invisible government in the United States, but, as pointed out in this illuminating pamphlet, here is an aspect of Government which, heretofore, has been invisible, but which is vastly more potent than most of the phantoms usually so described.

These governmental corporations are designed to escape the restrictions usually placed by the Congress upon governmental activities. They are so set up as to be able to have the benefits of Government resources, public authority, and official power, without the controls which free government has placed—and very properly—upon the grant and the exercise of official authority.

It is the more alarming when we learn that this record is itself incomplete. The Citizens' National Committee officials state that, so far as is known, there is no one in the Government of the United States, and no office, which actually knows the scope, ramifications, powers, and controls of these various agencies. Some of them are operated in complete secrecy.

Mr. Speaker, this effort by the Citizens' National Committee to let a little light into a very dark place is highly commendable, but it discloses an unpleasant situation which would take the power of the Congress, a long and careful investigation, an intense determination, and a good many thousands of dollars, to make the record complete. Enough is revealed in this pamphlet, however, to show the need for earnest and immediate consideration of this problem by the Congress.

After the recess, Mr. Speaker, I intend to have something more to say on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a release concerning the war power produced at Boulder Dam in the States of Colorado and Arizona.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD concerning the relations between the Congress and the Executive departments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article on the price of crude petroleum by Andrew M. Rowley.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in connection with the second deficiency appropriation bill and to include a table of proposed airports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order previously agreed to, the gentleman from Massachusets [Mr. BATES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the closing hours of the Congress I believe it is well for the Members to become better acquainted before they go home with the real critical situation confronting this country insofar as our petroleum requirements are concerned and petroleum that is available for transportation to the various sections of the country. I have just served on a special subcommittee of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House investigating the petroleum situation of the country and the effect it was having along the eastern seaboard and also as it may possibly affect the military requirements of the Nation.

That committee, composed of four members of the House Naval Affairs Committee, visited several of the oil States, namely Illinois, Arkansas, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, in order to get first-hand information in regard to the petroleum situation out in the field from the men who are operating and producing that precious material every day of the year.

The history of the oil shortage in the country is well known to everyone. It started with the devastating attack by the submarines only a year ago and continues up to the present time to the point that all the people and all the economy of the entire eastern seaboard have been seriously affected ever since the early part of 1942. The nominal peacetime requirements of the eastern seaboard, comprising the 17 States from Florida to the Canadian line, were about 1,500,000 barrels a day. That does not take into consideration at all the military requirements that we now have to assume in order that the forces abroad as well as the shore establishments here in our country may be well taken care of.

The deadly effect the enemy submarine was having on our tank ships was reflected in the low point reached in petroleum deliveries in May 1942 of a little over 1,000,000 barrels of oil daily.

During the early summer and fall of 1942 the amount of petroleum products brought to the eastern seaboard averaged about 1,150,000 barrels a day, or 350,000 barrels a day less than our peacetime requirements. That was due to the fact that the tank ship was practically eliminated as a means of transportation for the petroleum products from the Gulf Coast States to the eastern seaboard. Those that were not sunk were transferred to the military and naval service in order to bring these oil products to the far-flung battlefields and also to meet the oil requirements of the fighting fleet and its auxiliaries.

These tank ships previously brought in 95 percent of all the petroleum products transported to the eastern seaboard from the oil-producing States of the Union. With the practical elimination of the tank ships, or a large number of them, through destruction by German submarines and the withdrawal of others from peacetime requirements that were later placed in the military service, those tank ships were no longer available to carry the petroleum products to the eastern seaboard. This resulted in a complete revolution of the transportation of petroleum products as theretofore carried. Instead, railroad tank cars, which previously brought in less than 5 percent of all the petroleum products to the eastern seaboard, were pressed into service, and now over 70,000 of these tank cars today are bringing in approximately 65 percent of all the petroleum products transported to the eastern seaboard. The total being brought in by all means of transportation is approximately 1,400,000 barrels a day at the present time—900,000 barrels by tank car, the balance by pipe lines, barges, and other means. This is still 100,000 barrels a day less than our peacetime requirements. Out of this 1,400,000 barrels delivered per day, we must take care of the ever-increasing military demands, which is reaching tremendous proportions. It is no wonder, therefore, that the entire eastern seaboard has been facing a critical shortage of fuel oil and gasoline that has brought about great hardship and suffering to our people.

Mr. ROLPH. What was the reason that the cars did not bring it in—a difference in freight rates?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Simply because it was thought in the early days of the great crisis the tank cars were not available in great numbers.

As a result of the splendid work of the Office of Defense Transportation, headed by Mr. Joseph Eastman, its chairman, I think a very wonderful job has been done in providing the very necessary tank cars and which saved the economic life of our part of the country from serious consequences and stopping a great many of our people from freezing to death during the past cold winter period. As it was much suffering took place when people found themselves without sufficient oil to keep warm.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In the early days when the tankers were first loaned to England, when I took up with Mr. Ickes the use of tank cars that office rather laughed at their use. I had

secured figures from Mr. Pelley, of the railroads, but even his figures were low and more tank cars have been used than he anticipated. They have done a fine job, but not enough.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Prior to the war the petroleum industry always made it a practice to have our storage tanks filled at the beginning of every winter in order that we would be properly taken care of during the winter months in the event any dislocation of our transportation system occurred during that period. As a result of the tremendous shortage of supplies coming into the eastern seaboard for civilian and military consumption during the past year, those stocks have dwindled to a point where they are at the very lowest level they have been for years. Now, we are facing another critical winter in the northeast section of the country and along the entire Atlantic seaboard with our stocks at a very low level.

The amounts of gasoline and fuel oil that will be brought in during the succeeding months will be nowhere near enough to meet all of our normal requirements, both military and civilian. This will mean the continuing on of the very strict rationing program of which you Members of Congress are well aware because the restriction applies to the District of Columbia as well as it does the entire Atlantic seaboard.

There is only one solution to this problem, in my opinion. It may well be divided into two questions. First, we must develop new production. Secondly, when production increases, then another, a third big pipe line must be built from the oil fields to the East. We find that last year, for the first time in many years, the consumption of petroleum products in this country was double the amount of new discoveries. In other words, our reserves throughout the country are beginning to dwindle. Unless something is done to stimulate production, to find new fields, to develop new explorations, to provide an incentive for the so-called wildcatter and independent who prior to this day discovered over 75 percent of the new wells discovered in this country, we are going to face a petroleum famine in this great Nation. Not this year or next, but the years roll along pretty fast and it will not be long before we will start to feel the effect of an oil shortage.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. I am tremendously interested in the gentleman's statement, and want to compliment and commend him and the committee on the very exhaustive research they have made in this connection. May I ask the gentleman if it is his recommendation that the price of crude oil be increased?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is the main point of my appearing here today on the floor of the House. In the meetings we had in the several States of the Union we had representatives of the State regulatory bodies appear before us, we had the outstanding geologists, we had independents, we had wildcatters, we had representatives of the major companies, we had the brains of the industry; and the one plea to our committee was that when we got back to Washington we should make a special plea for an increase in the price of crude oil, because that in itself will be the only and the real incentive toward the development of new reserves and the production of more petroleum products that can be transported to the various parts of the country.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. I have been struggling with this petroleum problem to get a decent price for crude oil for some time. I wonder what suggestion the gentleman has toward getting a price where the producers of oil can produce at cost instead of at a loss?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. We were told, and the facts bear it out, that the same price is paid today for crude that was paid in 1937. The index figure of the oil industry today is about 55 percent of what it was in 1937. The producer down through these years has had to pay all the cost of increased wages, increased cost of material, and increased costs all along the line. Yet the price that he is paid for crude oil today is the same as he was paid in 1937.

Mr. DISNEY. The cost of production has gone up about 55 percent per barrel more than in 1937, but this stupid, dumb O. P. A. cannot be taught to understand that. They look at you blank and say substantially, "So what?" Nothing is accomplished. All of these facts that the gentleman has recited have been given to the O. P. A., with no results. Mr. Ickes has recommended at 35-cent increase, and nothing is done.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is the point that brings me to the floor of the House today, representing as I do a constituency which might well be called consumers. I believe I represent the point of view of all the representatives of the eastern seaboard States. We are in favor of Mr. Ickes' recommendation that he made back in April of this year to O. P. A. for a 35-cent per barrel increase for crude. That is the average price. It does not mean they will all be paid 35 cents. Some will be paid more and some will be paid less, but the average is 35 cents.

Furthermore, we are informed by the refiners that an increase of 10 cents per barrel on crude oil will only mean one-quarter of a cent a gallon increase in gasoline or fuel oil. Furthermore, the 35 cents that has been recommended by Mr. Ickes to the Office of Price Administration will mean less than 1 cent a gallon to the consumer along the entire Atlantic seaboard. To us it seems absurd and ridiculous that the Office of Price Administration or Prentiss Brown will leave this situation go by unchallenged and imperil this Nation because of a lack of petroleum products that we need to keep our economy alive, to feed our military machine and to keep our people from freezing.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has made a very exhaustive and fine report. Is it not true that if Mr. Ickes or some one person were given complete charge of prices and everything else, we would have a much better situation?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I believe there is altogether too much division of authority. I believe the same kind of a job that Bill Jeffers is doing in the rubber program can well be done on this fuel and gasoline situation if a competent man or board is selected for the task. Something has to be done and done quickly and the full responsibility is clearly on the Office of Price Administration. Unless they approve the 35 cents that has been recommended by Mr. Ickes, there is certainly going to be an oil shortage, and there will be great distress throughout the country. The military requirements must be met. The economy of this country of ours which is geared to the petroleum industry, will be placed in great jeopardy unless early and speedy action is taken.

Mr. DISNEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. DISNEY. I am glad to see the gentleman realize from actual experience and the taking of testimony that an increase in the price of crude does not affect the cost of refined products, except fractionally. It is a relatively unimportant matter. Usually folks back in this direction have the impression that a hike in the cost of crude results in enlarged prices for refined products, but, as I said, it is only fractional.

In line with what the gentleman said, let me read from a report made by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of this House, just printed yesterday, which bears out the gentleman in what he says. I want one quotation to go in the RECORD at this point, if the gentleman will permit. The committee says, in part:

> New discoveries have been declining since 1939. We use 1,400,000,000 barrels of oil a year, yet discoveries since 1939 have been at the rate of only about half of the consumption rate.

Think of it. Half the consumption rate in new discoveries.

> This is a forcible announcement of the production decline.

They are not going to produce oil at a loss. That is what they are trying to do, and we are running into an oil shortage, as the gentleman says, as the result of this stupidity by the O. P. A. Unless the O. P. A. performs a little differently, this Congress when it comes back will come back with the determination to set up O. P. A. in a manner that it can reflect a sensible conclusion on a subject on which it has had complete information.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. In line with what the gentleman from Oklahoma

[Mr. DISNEY] just said, as a member of the committee that prepared this report, I would like to have the RECORD show at this point that we recommended that the whole question of petroleum, with reference to production, prices, and supply be transferred to the Petroleum Administrator for War, Mr. Ickes. That is the recommendation in this report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman from Oklahoma referred to the dumbness of O. P. A. Nobody could be that dumb. The O. P. A. is just as near right on oil as it is on corn, on meat, and on farm products, and on everything else. America is going to have to destroy O. P. A. or O. P. A. will destroy America.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman will recall that in answer to a question I asked Mr. Donald Nelson, he said that he had authority vested in him by the President to adjust the matter and bring about more equitable distribution of oil and gasoline. That is in the record of those hearings.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I may also say with regard to the statement of the gentleman from Oklahoma that last year we had about 3,000 wildcat drillings; that is to say, the men who go out like the men who look for gold with a little pickax on their shoulders to find the precious materials. The wildcatters in the petroleum industry are exactly the same kind of men. They are the men who go out into the wilderness hopeful that they will find something under the soil that will bring them wealth. That is the incentive, that is the urge, to get something that will bring them wealth; that is the same thing that brings out the development of oil that results in the discovery of gold, but because of excessive cost they are unable to continue.

In 1943 Mr. Ickes says he hopes that there will be drilled at least 4,500 wildcat wells in this country, but during the first 5 months of 1943 only 1,235 had been drilled.

On that estimate for this year, based on the drillings for the first 5 months, there will only be 2,964 as against the 4,500 that Mr. Ickes hopes will be drilled, simply because the wildcatters and the independents are going from the oil business into stock raising, into cotton raising, into cattle raising, and into farming. The wildcatter is giving up the oil business and leaving the oil industry because the incentive and the urge to earn and the urge to find wealth from the discovery of oil is being taken away from him through the many obstacles that are being placed in his way.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. Following the suggestion of the gentleman, the number of completions of wells is growing less instead of more, so that Mr. Ickes' hopes that 4,500 wells will be drilled will not be fulfilled this year because the acceleration in the drilling curve of the number of wells and their completion is downward because of this nonsensical attitude of the O. P. A. about price. There is no other reason on earth for it.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Oklahoma is exactly right.

Mr. DISNEY. The number of wells drilled is going to decrease rather than increase.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Oklahoma has put his finger on the exact situation. You can get results immediately as was shown in California when the incentive was given by increasing the price of crude oil, when a tremendous increase in the amount of crude oil that was brought to the surface and is now available for civilians and for the military requirements.

And along with the increase in price there must also be an easing off of critical materials; there must be more and better spacing allowed instead of the acreage being restricted to one well to every 40 acres; there must be a reduction in this requirement where it is clear that no destruction of efficiency in operation of the present wells will take place. Many complaints have been entered to our committee because of this spacing regulation, which is altogether too rigid. Members of the State regulatory bodies complained very bitterly about these restrictions, which they claim is preventing much more oil being produced.

There also must be better cooperation between the representatives of the Federal Government and the members of the local regulatory bodies. It seems from the evidence presented to our committee there is a lack of cooperation and understanding between the Federal Government and the local officials in matters of great importance to the petroleum industry.

The Selective Service should recognize the petroleum industry as one of the most essential in supporting the war effort. Many complaints were made that local boards gave altogether too little attention to the needs of retaining the skilled men in the oil fields. Great numbers of these skilled men were inducted into the armed service, it was claimed.

It must be kept in mind, and clearly understood, that the economy of this country is closely geared to the petroleum industry. Our homes require fuel oil in order that our people can be kept warm. Our industries and business enterprises require millions of barrels of gasoline each year to operate their trucks and automobiles. Our farmers need tremendous amounts to operate farm machinery. Our people have a right to expect that everything be done to relax the present restrictions on the use of gasoline, so they may have the benefit of the use of their automobiles. They, of course, and first of all, want to see our military requirements met, but they do feel that everything is not being done to solve this great problem, and I am thoroughly in agreement with their point of view. Oil, in its many forms, is one of the most precious of our critical supplies. Everything should be done to encourage its production. Then will come, and I feel quickly, a widespread demand for another large-diameter pipe line from the oil fields to the eastern seaboard. The present program of tank cars, barges, pipe lines, including the 24-inch and the 20-inch, will fall far short of meeting our military needs and civilian requirements of the eastern seaboard. Let us have action. The situation demands it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the legislative program is concluded, if it is, and if I have the opportunity, that I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on this same subject. And in this connection, I want to compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts for the very splendid presentation he has made of this matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

REPRESENTATION IN OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, for years Pacific Coast States have been calling attention to the fact that in Federal Government appointments our section is woefully forgotten. North, south and east, yes; but practically none from the west. No one from our section is in the Cabinet or on the Supreme Court. The identical situation applies to almost every department and bureau in Washington.

Let me cite one case. In yesterday's mail I received a copy of letter written by the Pacific States Butter, Eggs, Cheese, and Poultry Association addressed to the regional director of the Wage and Hour Division in San Francisco. The communication reads in part:

I have just received a copy of release R-1984 from your Administrator, Mr. L. Metcalf Walling. This release sets up a general industry committee of 21 to deal with meat, poultry, and dairy products, and it calls a meeting in New York for July 13 to investigate conditions in the industry and

recommend to the administrator minimum wage rates for all the employees, etc. This release also states, "Such representatives have been chosen with due regard to the geographical regions in which such industry is carried on."

As there is not a single representative for the Pacific Coast States and none for the industry from the entire territory west of the Rocky Mountains it would appear that your Mr. Walling is of the illusion that there is no poultry, dairy, or meat industry west of the Rockies. In fact, I note only one industry representative west of the Missouri River, which is the larger half of the United States and has more than 6,500,000 head of milk cows, this being approximately 28 percent of the total United States milk cow population.

So far as I am aware, no one out here has ever been asked to recommend appointees for these committees who would be in position or who might have any knowledge whatsoever of the dairy and poultry industries here and so far as I am aware even your own regional office has not been consulted on it. The absence of any appointees seems to confirm that. Of course, if the matters to be dealt with were exclusive to eastern territory, then it would be different, but these are obviously standing committees, and the text of the release indicates consideration of national problems as a whole.

Mr. SPEAKER. Our section should be represented on the meat committee and every other Federal activity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

UNITED STATES ACADEMY OF FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H. R. 3167, a bill to create a foreign-service academy, or what might be called a West Point of diplomacy.

In introducing a bill to create a United States Academy of Foreign Service, I am proceeding on the premise that knowledge is power. The more information that we have as individuals, the better we serve, and the more we attain. The more information we have as a Nation, the better we serve ourselves, and the world and the better we protect ourselves from those forces that would destroy us. I have spent many months working on the plans for the creation of such an academy. I am indebted to a number of my colleagues, foreign-service officers, educators, and newspaper men and women for their helpful suggestions.

For many years, we have had a Military Academy and a Naval Academy. Why not have a West Point of diplomacy? Why not have an academy to train our young people in peaceful commerce, greater understanding, and in the art of getting along with the nations of our one world?

We are now fighting a war of great magnitude. American taxpayers' dollars are being spent in every part of the world, but, what is more, American boys are fighting on every body of water, on every continent, and on countless islands of the sea. American blood is being spilled around the world; the graves of America's brave dot the entire globe. We cannot turn back. There are many things that are necessary in our national life, or these dead will have died in vain. In my opinion, one of those things is that we must have a foreign service better than any other foreign service in the entire world. At this point, let me say that I am not criticizing our present diplomatic and our consular service. I am not criticizing what has been done. America is going to have to live in the future, and we shall need a larger and better force than ever before in our history.

I wish to take up some of the provisions of my bill and explain them.

Section 1 provides that in order to promote peace, greater understanding and good will throughout the world, there shall be created an academy to be known as the United States Academy of Foreign Service.

In section 2 I provide that the management of the academy shall be vested in a board of trustees composed of three Representatives, three Senators, and the Secretary of State. The trustees shall control the academy, the Congress controls the trustees, the people control the Congress.

In section 3 I have provided for the selection of the faculty. Considerable discussion has been had on how the president and the faculty of such an academy should be appointed. It should not be political. Why not call on the educators of the country to help set up this academy? Therefore, I have provided that the Governor of each of our 48 States shall submit the name of one educator to the Secretary of State; that the Secretary of State shall select from these 48 educators 12 who shall serve on the committee on faculty to select the president and the members of the faculty of the academy, and to sponsor them for a period of 2 years. This section also provides that not more than 1 of the committee of 12 selected by the Secretary of State shall be from any one Federal Reserve district. The purpose of this is to have this committee reflect the educational leadership throughout the entire Nation.

In section 4 I have provided that the course of study at this West Point of diplomacy shall extend over a period of 6 years, 4 years to be scholastic training within the academy and 2 years of apprentice training in this country in American manufacturing, transportation, agriculture, marketing, finance, and other business. In this section I provide that the course of study shall include, but shall not be limited to, the study of government, political and governmental theory, comparative religion, history, literature, science, composition, mathematics, economics, geography, foreign languages, agriculture, finance, international law, business and trade practices, and military and naval observation. Provision is made that students may be assigned to our military or naval academies temporarily for instruction in military observation. America must know what is going on in the world. We cannot continue to be suckers and survive as a first-class nation.

Section 5 provides a method for the appointment of students to the Academy of Foreign Service. This is patterned after the method of selecting cadets and midshipmen. The purpose of this is to have a geographical spread to the student body. The academy and its graduates will then reflect America as it is, no more, no less. The periodic return of these graduates to the various sections of the 48 States will give to their relatives, neighbors, and friends the benefit of their observation in foreign lands.

Later on, I provide that these graduates after they are in the foreign service must spend at least 1 year out of 5 in this country. We do not want our foreign service to lose sight of the fact that America is their country. We do not want them to get out of tune with America, America's problems, America's ideals, and America's hopes. They will assist America in taking her part in the world of tomorrow, but at the same time they will preserve, protect, and defend the sovereignty of the United States. These young men and women who will go to this academy will represent the great heart of America. Their course of study, as stated, will include 2 years' apprenticeship in this country. These provisions, plus the rule that they must spend at least 1 year out of 5 in this country, all are for the purpose of keeping them American. America is part of the world. We cannot retract from it. At the same time, we cannot solve all the problems that will arise in the future, because we do not know what they will be. We cannot now design all the necessary international machinery that will make us foolproof for peace throughout all time. but we do know that knowledge is still power. We do know that we have a better Navy because of Annapolis. We do know that we have a better Army because of West Point. By the same premise, we will have better results remaining at peace by providing for a trained foreign service.

Section 5 also sets forth the requirements for admission. It is limited to native-born citizens of the United States, men and women who have reached their eighteenth birthday and have not passed their twenty-second birthday, and who have had at least 2 years of college or university education. In addition to this, the academy shall require an entrance examination, but this entrance examination is an aptitude test to ascertain one's intellectual capacities, not their attainments, and to ascertain their aptitude for the foreign service. That will be the general requirements for admission.

I have made special provision to admit members of our armed forces into this Academy for 3 years following the war, and have provided that any individual who has served in the armed forces of the United States in World War No. 2 outside of the continental United States for a period of at least 6 months may enter the academy, if appointed, upon passing the entrance examination only. I would like to state why this provision is made. Within our armed forces we have many well-trained and high-type individuals who will have done an expert job in observing in various parts of the world. They are now seeing day to day what you and I read about. Their knowledge of the world and world problems

is valuable to the United States. These soldiers will have a better knowledge of the geography, economics, and the customs and habits of the people of the world than those of us at home. They know America's weakness and they know America's strength. They know the weakness and the strength of other nations. They would make good Foreign Service officers. What group other than the veterans of World War No. 2 could better help form and carry out the foreign program of the United States? I have made this provision not for the purpose of helping soldiers and sailors and marines, because such a small percentage will ever be given the opportunity to attend this academy, but this provision is made to help the United States. It provides for the peacetime service of the men and women who carry the scars of battle. I am not unmindful of the fact that in the Constitutional Convention we had a predominance of men who fought in the Revolution.

Section 6 of the bill provides that the board of trustees may require a student entering the academy to submit a statement to the president of the Academy reciting that he will serve the Government of the United States where assigned for a definite period.

In section 7, it is provided that the graduates of the Academy of Foreign Service shall be appointed Foreign Service officers without the examination provided for in the act of May 24, 1924, and that they shall have preference over all other applicants. In that same section, I make provision for the using of the graduates of this academy in other governmental work besides that of the diplomatic and consular service. This section provides that these graduates shall be available for assignment, first, to the State Department and the foreign service. Second, that they may be assigned to the Department of Commerce for service in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and other related duties. I believe that, if America proceeds in the right direction, we can build up a great foreign trade in the post-war days. I think that American genius and daring under our system of private enterprise can compete with any other system in the whole world. America has never seriously set herself to the task of selling her products abroad. I firmly believe that American boys will return when the war is over with very definite ideas on what they can make and sell in foreign lands. Many of those boys will go into business. The Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce should have a trained force to help American businessmen sell their products abroad, thereby providing employment at home and for a greater use for the products of our factories and our farms. At the same time, we will raise the standard of living in the countries where our products are sold and we will encourage friendly relations toward our country.

In the third place, I have provided that the graduates of this academy shall be available for assignment to the Department of Agriculture in connection with the Office of Foreign Agriculture Relations and other service relating to the production, distributing, and marketing of agricultural products. The world has never had a surplus of food. Rather than a program of destruction and restriction, why not let the Government of the United States lead out with a program to send the products of our farms around the world? There are many problems involved in such an undertaking, but the least we can do is to provide the best-trained individuals possible for this job.

Last, I have provided that the graduates of this academy may be assigned to the Department of the Treasury of the United States for service in connection with international finances and currency, tariffs, debt adjustments, and related activities. Each one of these enumerated functions constitutes a difficult problem. Maybe we cannot get all the answers now, but we do know that education combined with practical experience, as we propose here, will come nearer getting us the answer than blind experimentation. I believe that, if such an academy is established and trains hundreds of capable people for this great job of getting along in the world, of making friends and perpetuating our economy built on the principles of abundance and private enterprise, we will be much closer to world peace.

A mother of two boys who are now fighting abroad talked to me about the military progress that Japan made in the early part of the war and the treachery that was played by Japan upon the United States. She said to me, "Didn't anybody know?" I think the answer is that perhaps some people knew, but not enough knew all the facts. With a trained force as this bill provides, with countless eyes and ears seeing and listening around the world, America will be better advised. A graduate of this academy will be an educated person, trained in the arts of diplomacy, plus a technical expert, plus a practical business individual, plus a shrewd military observer. It will help keep Uncle Sam out of trouble, but, what is more, if trouble comes, we will have in this force a vast storehouse of knowledge concerning the fundamental economy, civil and military, of every country and every part of the world. I believe we should have a West Point of Diplomacy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an outline of the War Institute as conducted by National University.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House previously agreed to, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend the remarks I am about to make, also to extend my remarks and include therein a release from the State Department of June 10.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE FIFTH FREEDOM

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have offered the following concurrent resolution today:

> That it is the sense of the Congress that, in addition to the four freedoms as the principles for which we are fighting the present war, there is a necessary fifth freedom for which we are fighting known as freedom of individual enterprise and initiative.

If we are to maintain our present standard of leadership among the nations of the world, we must add to the "four freedoms" which complement the Atlantic Charter a fifth freedom—freedom of individual enterprise and initiative—for it is through the spirit of individual enterprise and initiative of the American people that America has become great.

This spirit has been emphasized since the very beginning of the Republic, when both our pioneer men and women dared to do and die to conquer the wilderness and build a mighty Nation. It was further exemplified by the founding fathers in writing the Declaration of Independence and has ever guided our people in the many trying epochs which have marked America's progress.

It is this fifth freedom, which we have always enjoyed, that has made possible our great productive effort and accomplishment since Pearl Harbor and without the exercise of which we could not hope to look forward to victory. This fifth freedom has bred our leaders of industry, has developed the most resourceful and inventive artisans and mechanics in the world.

Should this fifth freedom be suppressed in the post-war world, our industrial leadership would vanish and we should be reduced to the level of the totalitarian countries, which offer no inducement or promise to the individual, who would merely become servants of the state. Indeed, without the fifth freedom, freedom from want and freedom from fear would be wholly impossible of attainment.

No future of abundance would be possible for the American people under a system which would deny opportunity for private enterprise. Instead, we should be reduced to a mere subsistence level without the comforts and luxuries to which our people have become accustomed and which should be the heritage we pass along to our children.

Today our boys are fighting and dying on the far-flung fighting fronts of the world, not only to preserve freedoms enunciated by the President, but to insure that those who survive will return to a land—their land—where the American way of life as guaranteed in the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights will continue to exist.

UNIFORMITY OF FREIGHT RATES DESIRED

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide uniform rates for the transportation of property by railroad throughout the United States.

It cannot be denied that there exists a disparity in rates for the transportation of property by railroad between territories in this country. I am proposing this legislation at this time to again give notice that the existing discriminations should be eliminated and a uniform rate established.

The Transportation Act of 1940 contained an amendment directing the Commission to institute an investigation in reference to our freight-rate discrimination and to enter such orders as may be appropriate for the removal of any unlawfulness which may be found to exist. The Commission had already instructed a formal investigation of the class-rate structure of common carriers by railroad anticipating this direction by the Congress. This investigation has been under way now for 3 years. The testimony closed on April 1, and all parties were given until June 30 to file the briefs. This deals with rail rates, which is Docket No. 28300, and classification, which is Docket No. 28310. It is obvious that following the arguments before the Commission that it will take some time for the Commission to determine what its decision will be.

I realize this is a stupendous task and a most important one for the entire Nation. A final decision should not be postponed indefinitely, and an order should be made within a reasonable time.

It is the position of some members of the Commission that the problem of classification must be solved, before we can have any uniform rate structure. We have already in existence classifications of property for transportation by rail and I am proposing in this bill that all property not so classified will be determined for the purpose of transportation by rail as "commodities," and uniform rates to be applied accordingly.

The Congress should define a policy regarding freight-rate levels to establish uniform freight rates throughout the country. The Commission's investigation is to ascertain whether existing rates violate existing law.

Mr. Speaker, the question of freight-rate discrimination is not a new one. Much interest has been manifested for years in an effort to equalize our rate structures and it is inevitable that the time will come when one section will not be favored over another. It is only fair, just, and right that we have the same opportunities in every section of this country for development.

There has been much misundertanding and confusion about this tremendous problem. I would like to try to clear up in my humble way some of the confusion and misunderstanding that exists in the different sections of the country. Also, to endeavor to give you the true picture as best I can, showing the disparity and inequalities that exist between rate territories.

Some believe, for example, that the freight rates on a certain article from a given point in the southwest territory to a given point in the northern territory is higher than it is from the same point in the northern territory to the same point in the southwest territory. This opinion is erroneous. It costs the same amount to send a classified article from El Dorado, Ark., to New York City as it does to send the same article from New York City to El Dorado, Ark.

The inequality exists by different rate structures in designated zones or territories. Our freight-rate structure in the United States is developed on a regional basis. There are three general territories. The North, the South, and the West, within each of which there is a separate and distinct rate structure with higher rates in the South and West than in the North.

The regional freight-rate structure may be explained in part by the historical development of the railroads. The railroads developed as short feeder lines to move the products from the interior to the water terminals. They were necessarily localized and grew up in each territory independent of other territories. As commerce developed between the territories and bridges were constructed over the rivers, they developed a system of inter-territorial freight rates. The rates in most cases between the territories were constituted by adding the rates to the borders and the local rates beyond, but in recent years these rates have been constituted on a somewhat lower basis, which reflects within the border territories.

The result is that rates from the South, Southwest, and West to the North are higher than they are in the North and lower from the North than within the South or West.

In a discussion of freight rates it is necessary to distinguish between class rates and commodity rates.

Class rates usually apply to high-grade commodities, such as manufactured articles, and move on a mileage scale which is substantially higher in the South and West than in the North. The commodity rates which move the bulky raw materials, such as coal and iron ore, are on so many different bases it is impossible to generalize concerning them other than to state that on a limited number of commodities there are substantial regional differences in levels with higher rates in the South and West than in northern territory.

For illustration, if you use the average first-class rate in the North as 100, the average relation of the southern rate is 139 and the West which is divided into a number of subterritories with class-rate levels ranging from 128 to 184. To move an article rated first class within the North 100 miles, we might say that the first-class rate was $1 while in the South the same article moved the same distance would cost $1.39 and in the West from $1.28 to $1.84. For instance, if a manufactured commodity moved from Nashville, Tenn., to Terre Haute, Ind., a distance of 200 miles of which 100 miles was in each territory, you would add the charges of $1 and $1.39 to obtain the interterritorial rate. This created an interterritorial problem, for the Nashville shipper pays $2.39 to move his product to Terre Haute while a competitor in the North at Columbus, Ohio, would pay only $2 for a similar distance of 200 miles to Terre Haute.

An identical problem exists when a Nashville producer ships to Spartanburg, S. C., a distance of 200 miles. The Nashville shipper would pay $2.78 while the Columbus shipper would pay only $2.39 for a similar distance of 200 miles to Spartanburg.

Of course, this is a very crude illustration and does not represent the actual mileage or actual rates, but it demonstrates the interterritorial rate problem. This is particularly true of the class-rate structure which applies to high-grade commodities such as manufactured articles. The southern and western territories are at a rate disadvantage on shipments of most manufactured commodities moving on class rates in competition with the northern manufacturers in their respective territories.

Some concrete examples might be helpful. Pottery is manufactured at Zanesville, Ohio, and Memphis, Tenn. It moves in carload lots of 24,000 pounds in each territory. Zanesville is 429 miles from Peoria, Ill., and Memphis is 443 miles from Peoria. The freight charges on a car of pottery from Zanesville to Peoria are only $96, while the charges from Memphis to Peoria are $129.60. The Memphis shipper has a disadvantage of $33.60 per car for substantially the same distance in competition with the Zanesville manufacturer to a point in the North. The southern manufacturer has a similar disadvantage when competing with the northern manufacturer in southern territory. For example, the freight charges on a car of refrigerators from Philadelphia to Raleigh, N. C., a distance of 410 miles, is $116, while it costs an Atlanta, Ga., manufacturer $146 to move a car of refrigerators to Raleigh, N. C., a distance of 421 miles. This illustrates that the southern manufacturer is at a rate disadvantage in competition with the northern manufacturer both in the South and in the North. The northern territory has an even greater advantage over the manufacturers in the West and Southwest. Pittsburgh, Pa., is 640 miles from Cairo, Ill., while Fort Worth, Tex., is only 630 miles from Cairo, Ill., yet it costs $176.40 to move a carload of refrigerators from Fort Worth to Cairo and it only costs $140.40 to move a carload of refrigerators from Pittsburgh to Cairo.

These are typical illustrations of the class-rate structure that moves many manufactured articles. It should not be overlooked, however, that the South has some lower freight rates than the North on low-grade commodities and even on manufactured or semimanufactured articles, but the general rate structure follows the historical pattern of higher rates in the South, Southwest, and

West than in the East, which is reflected in the interterritorial levels.

There has been some recent comment by Mr. Robert S. Henry, of the Association of American Railroads, and by Mr. J. B. Hill, of the Louisville-Nashville Railroad, in reply to an article by Governor Jones, of Louisiana, relative to the interterritorial freight rates which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post recently. These railroad representatives have stated that the southern carriers have established low rates to competitive markets in the North. It is true that the southern railroads have granted a number of comparable rates to southern manufacturers, but this has not been done in all instances. Moreover, while as low rates sometimes apply, higher minimum rates for a carload shipment from the South sometimes negatives completely the low rate. For example, the shoe manufacturers at Nashville, Tenn., have slightly lower carload-rate levels and about the same less-than-carload rates to Toledo, Ohio, a distance of 485 miles, as have shoe manufacturers located in Endicott, N. Y., which is 477 miles from Toledo. The carload rate of 99 cents per hundred pounds from Endicott applies on minimum shipments of 15,000 pounds, whereas the carload rate of 87 cents from Nashville applies on 24,000 pounds as a minimum. As a result of the higher minimum weight required of southern shippers of shoes the total charges for 15,000 pounds would be assessed at the less-than-carload rate, which is 24 cents higher than the carload rate. This would make the total charges on 15,000 pounds of shoes from Nashville $166.50 as compared with total charges of $148.50 for the same quantity shipment of shoes from Endicott, N. Y. All such factors must be taken into consideration, together with the fact that the southern manufacturer must negotiate for lower rates, and usually it is not obtained until the industry is actually established. The uncertainty in obtaining a lowered rate in the South naturally hinders the establishment of new industries.

This situation has been under constant attack for over 70 years, and in recent years has received much attention from those concerned with the national welfare, but Congress has not laid down any definite policy. It has left the matter to the Interstate Commerce Commission which has generally assumed a judicial attitude by considering matters only when complaint is made or filed.

It has been contended that costs, operating conditions, and differences in traffic have justified higher rates in the South, Southwest, and West than in the North. The further contention is made that the industrial development of the South and West has been affected by freight rate differences only to a limited extent, and if the rates were adjusted some northern manufacturers would presumably lose rate advantages of long standing which would have an adverse effect on their business. Of course, the regional differences in class rates have affected the industrial development of the country, and the point that some manufacturers in the Northeast would lose advantages has no merit. The mere fact that some shippers or localities would lose rate advantages should be no bar to revision of the existing rate structure. The rate structure should not be manipulated to favor the location of industries in any particular region, nor should it place obstacles in the way of locating industries where production costs are lowest or where for other reasons it is advantageous to locate an industry.

A number of studies made by the Bureau of Statistics of the Interstate Commerce Commission since 1930 show that railroad freight costs were slightly lower in the southern region than in the eastern district, but higher in the West. A comparatively recent case, *State of Alabama* v. *N. Y. C. R. R. Co.* (1939, 235 I. C. C. 225), indicates that the Commission questions the assumption that railroad costs are higher in the Southern than in Eastern territory.

An analysis of the average carload costs shows that the costs in the South are approximately 4 percent below eastern costs and western costs are approximately 6 percent above eastern costs.

There has been some hesitancy about accepting these cost studies because of the difficulty of reconciling the figures with the rather poor financial showing which has been made by the southern and western roads. An analysis shows that since 1936 the southern roads have shown a greater rate of return on their investments than the eastern roads in each year except 1940, and that had it not been for the relatively large passenger deficits in the South, the southern roads would have made an even better financial showing.

This is the general picture of the freight rate situation, which my bill is intended to correct. It is the responsibility of this Congress to determine the policy on these important matters. It is only by such definite determination and by the establishment of definite policies that we can hope that those in charge of the administration of these policies can discharge their full responsibility. We have reached the stage in the development of this country where national problems must inevitably be approached on a uniform basis, giving equal opportunity throughout the Nation for our continued progress and development. The Constitution of the United States of America provides: "That Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

I hope and trust that the policy of this legislation I am proposing will be adopted by this Congress and that for the best interest of the people we can establish equal opportunities for development by the establishment of uniformity of rates and thereby build a greater America for all of our people.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I presume the bill which the gentleman has introduced will be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of which both he and I are members, and I hope that that committee will be able to give consideration to that bill at a very early date because it is a matter of great concern to the people of the South.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland (at the request of Mr. D'ALESANDRO), indefinitely, on account of ptomain poison.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1286. An act to provide relief to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged by floods in 1943, to the Committtee on Agriculture.

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution relating to the acquisition of corn by governmental agencies and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 986. An act to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct;

H. R. 997. An act to establish in the Medical Department of the Army a corps to be known as the Pharmacy Corps;

H. R. 1004. An act to relieve newspapers and periodical publications which have voluntarily suspended publication for the duration of the war from payment of second-class application fees upon resumption of publication;

H. R. 1334. An act for the relief of J. Frank Meador;

H. R. 2106. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Sir William Blackstone, the work of the late Paul W. Bartlett, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2481. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2719. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1316. An act to provide for clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 986. An act to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct;

H. R. 997. An act to establish in the Medical Department of the Army a corps to be known as the Pharmacy Corps;

H. R. 1004. An act to relieve newspapers and periodical publications which have voluntarily suspended publication for the duration of the war from payment of second-class application fees upon resumption of publication;

H. R. 1334. An act for the relief of J. Frank Meador;

H. R. 2106. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Sir William Blackstone, the work of the late Paul W. Bartlett, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2481. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2719. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 8, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

558. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the leasing of the segregated coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

559. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to extend certain titles thereof to the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

560. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an estimate, with justification attached, of the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the General Accounting Office during the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

561. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, requesting consideration as to changes in S. 1250, Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

562. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the sale, exchange, or other disposition of certain securities held by the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'TOOLE: Committee on the Library. Senate Joint Resolution 47. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out under the general direction of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation; with amendment (Rept. No. 676). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 678. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 679. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 288. Resolution to provide for additional compensation for Leslie M. Rapp, minority clerk of the Ways and Means Committee of the House; without amendment (Rept. No. 680). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 295. Resolution providing for the employment of a clerk in charge of printing for the majority caucus room and clerk in charge of printing for the minority caucus room; without amendment (Rept. No. 681). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 296. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 281 by the Committee on the Public Lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 682). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 290. Resolution to provide for the expense of continuing the investigation authorized by House Resolution 119 by the Select Committee to Investigate Farm Security Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 683). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 3160. A bill to provide for the payment of the 6 months' death gratuity to certain dependent parents of deceased members of the land forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3161. A bill to provide for payments to counties to reimburse them for loss of tax receipts on account of certain land acquired for use by the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 3162. A bill to provide for the coinage of gold to pay for gold purchased by the United States; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

H. R. 3163. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that the Federal contribution to the States shall be in lieu of requiring repayment from recipients of old-age assistance and to prevent requiring liens for repayment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 3164. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y., and for other purposes," approved June 14, 1933; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3165. A bill to remove restrictions on Indian property now held in trust by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 3166. A bill providing for taxation by the States, Territories, and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 3167. A bill to create a United States Academy of Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 3168. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the attorney general of the State of California to bring suit in the Court of Claims on behalf of the Indians of California," approved May 18, 1928; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 3169. A bill providing for the issuance of recovery bonds to stimulate orderly reconversion to peacetime production after the termination of the present war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 3170. A bill to provide for a Congressional Medal of Sacrifice; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 3171. A bill to authorize the submission to Congress of a comprehensive plan for the prevention of the pollution of the waters of Lake Michigan; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 3172. A bill to amend the Intertate Commerce Act to provide uniform rates for railroad freight, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that in addition to the "four freedoms" there is a fifth freedom of individual enterprise and initiative; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. Res. 293. Resolution providing for employment of four additional laborers, office of the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 294. Resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "Chronological List of Major International Events Prior to the American Declaration of War Against the Axis With Ostensible Reasons Advanced for the Occurrence of the Event," as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 3173. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Lorraine Novak, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3174. A bill for the relief of Chatham M. Towers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. R. 3175. A bill for the relief of Edward A. Hohman, Julia Hohman, and Mary Haberman; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1967. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of Adella S. Brown and 70 other citizens of Amsterdam, N. Y., protesting against the wastage of sugar and grains in the manufacture of beer, wines, and distilled liquors, and asking that legislation be voted for to prevent this waste; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1968. Also, petition of Mary S. Clough and 50 other citizens of Schenectady County, N. Y., appealing for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1969. By Mr. DIRKSEN: Petition of sundry citizens of Illinois, favoring passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1970. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of sundry citizens of Monroe County, Ohio, supporting House bill 2032, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1971. By Mr. NORRELL: Petition of Mrs. C. C. Smith, of Monticello, Ark., and others, petitioning Congress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1972. Also, petition of Mrs. C. W. Porter, of Monticello, Ark., and others, petitioning Congress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1973. By Mr. HAYS: Petition of H. N. Bleier, of Paragould, Ark., and others, petitioning Congress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1974. Also, petition of Mrs. R. S. Johnson, of Paragould, Ark., and others petitioning Congress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1975. Also, petition of Marion Satterfield, of Brinkley, Ark., and others, petitioning Congress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1976. Also, petition of Ben E. DeVall and Brinkley, Ark., and others, petitioning the gress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1977. Also, petition of A. R. Ford, of Paragould, Ark., and others, petitioning Congress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1978. Also, petition of H. C. Seefeldt, of Brinkley, Ark., and others, petitioning the Congress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1979. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of C. F. Schenk and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1980. Also, petition of H. E. Schoenfeld and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1981. Also, petition of Peter Saguti and 87 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1982. Also, petition of Henry Mather and 17 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1983. Also, petition of Sam Levy and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2802, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1984. Also, petition of the Jefferson Hotel Co., signed by 100 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1985. Also, petition of James L. Gartland and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1986. Also, petition of Frank Klingel and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1987. Also, petition of Ed. Johanning and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1988. Also, petition of William Smith and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1989. Also, petition of Harry Ladenberger and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1990. Also, petition of the Dome in St. Louis and signed by 19 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1991. Also, petition of William E. King and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1992. Also, petition of Jesse J. LeMoine and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1993. Also, petition of John J. Shetterly and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1994. Also, petition of H. E. Bullock and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1995. Also, petition of Walter H. Judge and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1996. Also, petition of Robert Kopff and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1997. Also, petition of Charles J. Schweitzer and 16 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1998. Also, petition of W. B. Ossek and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1999. Also, petition of the Krebs Buffet, and signed by 28 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2000. Also, petition of Frank Jukubiak and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2001. Also, petition of Walter Burke and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2002. Also, petition of J. Comerio and 38 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2003. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. John B. Woodward and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2004. Also, petition of the board of education employees, shops division, and signed by 58 St. Louis citizens protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2005. Also, petition of W. W. Huff and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2006. Also, petition of O. L. Blow and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2007. Also, petition of Adolph C. Beyer and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2008. Also, petition of George W. Fitzgerald and 16 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2009. Also, petition of Elbert A. Klump and 13 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2010. Also, petition of Ella Cook and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2011. Also, petition of J. M. McLaughlin, Jr., and 14 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2012. Also, petition of John Dodd and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2013. Also, petition of the Polish Home Association of St. Louis and signed by 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2014. Also, petition of Charles F. Gray and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2015. Also, petition of Harry J. Kargus and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2016. Also, petition of H. Balbenbush and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2017. Also, petition of Frank Klotzer and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2018. Also, petition of Oscar D. Hartman and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2019. Also, petition of Fred R. Lesch and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2020. By Mr. BUCKLEY: Petition of Peter J. Finnerty and others, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation, particularly House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2021. By Mr. HAGEN: Petition of Mrs. Martin Aas and 28 other residents of Thief River Falls, Minn., supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2022. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of the United Spanish War Veterans, Department of West Virginia, Clarksburg, W. Va., opposing all proposals to consolidate veterans pensions, disability, retirement, hospitalization, and vocational rehabilitation benefits with civilian benefits as administered under social security laws; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2023. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of Mearie A. Vullien and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2024. Also, petition of John Kehoe and nine other residents of Spokane for redress of grievance for provisions of the Office of Price Administration Rent Control Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2025. Also, petition of C. T. Buckland and 10 other residents of Millwood, Wash., for redress of grievance for provisions of the Office of Price Administration Rent Control Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2026. Also, petition of A. W. Mollehnaher and three other residents of Spokane for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2027. Also, petition of Mrs. R. Greenwood and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2028. Also, petition of B. S. Coad and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2029. Also, petition of Robert L. Weniger and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2030. Also, petition of Ivan H. Abraham and six other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2031. Also, petition of Emma Herndon and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2032. Also, petition of A. B. Bannett and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency

2033. Also, petition of John S. Athey and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2034. Also, petition of Julia Talbot and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2035. Also, petition of Nellie Richter and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2036. Also, petition of Edna K. W. Nelson and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2037. Also, petition of F. W. Richardson and two other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2038. Also, petition of Mrs. J. D. Zimmerman and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2039. Also, petition of Mrs. L. K. Loffler and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2040. Also, petition of E. A. Cornelius and seven other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2041. Also, petition of Alice R. Hart and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2042. Also, petition of Florilla Hopper and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2043. Also, petition of Alta Firth and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2044. Also, petition of Mrs. R. J. Hanlose and seven other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2045. Also, petition of Mrs. C. Fred Smith and eight other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2046. Also, petition of Lilliam Burns and seven other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2047. Also, petition of Isabell McGilvery and six other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2048. Also, petition of Claire Cannell and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2049. Also, petition of Mary A. Martin and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2050. Also, petition of H. G. Phair and seven other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2051. Also, petition of Charles M. Barket and eight other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2052. Also, petition of W. E. Arnett and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2053. Also, petition of Thomas W. Bailey and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2054. Also, petition of Jane Schultz and 10 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2055. Also, petition of A. L. Pratt and 10 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2056. Also, petition of Helen Hupp and 10 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2057. Also, petition of E. H. Davidson and 11 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2058. Also, petition of Scott C. Sharp and 11 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2059. Also, petition of William Reilly and 12 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2060. Also, petition of Elizabeth Hicks and 11 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2061. Also, petition of F. Croneath and 12 other residents of Spokane and Millwood, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2062. Also, petition of Maurice J. McHugh and 12 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2063. Also, petition of F. W. Mauser and 12 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2064. Also, petition of Hattie Krups and six other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2065. Also, petition of Fred W. Curtis and seven other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2066. Also, petition of Bertha E. Nagel and five other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2067. Also, petition of Howard P. Ball and 14 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2068. Also, petition of Grace Boettgo and eight other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2069. Also, petition of Tena Madsen and five other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under the provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2070. Also, petition of Mary M. Seeley and six other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2071. Also, petition of A. S. MacDonald and 20 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2072. Also, petition of Mary Mitchell Joy and 12 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2073. Also, petition of Mary C. Hale and seven other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2074. Also, petition of Edward T. Russell and seven other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2075. Also, petition of Raymond L. Haines and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2076. Also, petition of Hermione McPhee and eight other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2077. Also, petition of M. W. Wright and seven other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2078. Also, petition of J. S. Lewis and 10 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2079. Also, petition of Rose M. Maher and seven other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 8, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who makest Thyself known and heard not in the whirlwind nor in the earthquake, but in the still small voice, we would hush our thoughts to silence as we bow our spirit at this altar of prayer. Before we speak to one another about the Nation's life we would open our hearts to Thee from whom no secrets are hid. From the tumult of an angry world we seek the sanctuary of Thy presence, not that we may escape the world but that we may turn to the perplexing maze of its tragic problems with strong spirits and quiet minds. In a shaken world we seek stability. In an anguished world we need inner peace. In a fearful world we want confidence and courage. In a world of rising and falling systems we crave a vision of Thine eternal kingdom which has no frontiers.

Grant us the wisdom and the vision here to fashion laws that may be the expression of the fairer ideals of freedom and brotherhood which are now seeking their incarnation in a new age which has struck the tents of a past content. May those who here serve the public weal be wise interpreters of Thy eternal law, the brave spokesmen of Thy will and of Thy truth which sets men free from ancient wrong. So send us forth, to serve the present age sure that, though the earth were removed and the mountains cast into the midst of the sea, the Lord of hosts is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge, our help in ages past, our hope for years to come. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, July 7, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on July 7, 1943, the President had approved and signed the following act (S. 1109) to increase by $300,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House still further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 33 and 34 to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; agreed to a further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 8 and 9 to the bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its adherence to its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 24, 25, and 26 to the bill; that the House insisted upon his disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 24, 25, and 26 to the bill; that the House further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 27 to the bill; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The massage further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2076) to authorize the deportation of aliens to countries allied with the United States.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2703. An act to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2936. An act to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled, "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the reports of committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 235. An act for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey;

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson; and

H. R. 1784. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1316) to provide for clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

FELICITATIONS OF SENATE OF CHILE ON AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a cablegram from the President and Secretary of the Senate of Chile, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and a translation of the cablegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Translation]

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.:

I have the honor to communicate to you that the Senate of Chile in yesterday's session unanimously agreed to express to the Senate of the United States its sentiments of profound solidarity with the great sister Republic on the occasion of the festivities at the anniversary of its independence, hoping for the triumph of the democratic ideals for which it has ever stood and which today it is heroically defending on the field of battle.

FLORENCIO DURAN BERNALES,
Presidente.
FERNANDO ALTAMIRANO,
Secretario Accidental.

FELICITATIONS OF SENATE OF CUBA ON AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a cablegram from the President of the Senate of the Republic of Cuba, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and a translated copy of the cablegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HABANA.

HENRY WALLACE,
Vice President of the Republic and Ex-officio President of the Senate of of the United States,
Washington:

On this glorious anniversary of the independence of the great North American democracy, I interpret the highest sentiments of the Senate of the Republic of Cuba, expressing to the High Chamber of the United States and to you, who worthily preside over it, the assurance of our solidarity, and confidence in the imperishable triumph of the highest democratic ideals which unite our peoples in this era of universal liberation.

Accept the assurance of my deepest personal esteem.

GUILLERMO ALONSO PUJOL,
President of the Senate of the Republic of Cuba.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Claims:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State to the end that legislation may be enacted appropriating the sum of $141,037.61 for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who have sustained losses by reason of war conditions which have been prevailing in all parts of the world during the past 5 years.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 8, 1943.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF A FEDERAL AGENCY

A letter from the executive director of the Board of Economic Warfare, submitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of personnel requirements for that Board for the quarter ending September 30, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on files of the Departments of War, Navy (6), and Agriculture; United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Federal Works Agency, and Executive Office of the President (Office for Emergency Management, Office of War Information, Administrative Branch, and Operating Services Division) which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF INDIANA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of Indiana, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America limiting the term of office of a President of the United States to not more than two consecutive terms

SECTION I. Be it resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, the House of Representatives concurring, that the General Assembly of the State of Indiana does hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America limiting the tenure of office of a President of the United States to not more than two consecutive terms.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution properly authenticated be sent forthwith to the presiding officer of each House of the National Congress and to each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Indiana.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—LETTER AND PETITION

Mr. CAPPER presented a letter from Mrs. Lillie Manney, of Seattle, Wash., together with a petition signed by sundry citizens of that city, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and the letter and petition (without all the signatures attached) ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 23, 1943.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed please find petition requesting the passage of S. 860. The majority of signers have loved ones, others have friends serving in the Army. Please, please do all you possibly can to have this bill passed and enforced. It is so vital—so needed.

I do not have access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Senator Jones, years ago, sent it to me and now I miss it. Could the petition be recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

When sabotage can do such deadly work, why, oh why, is the sale of alcoholic beverages permitted? Especially to those who need to be at their very best? Will we have to have another Pearl Harbor catastrophe?

Hoping and trusting you will do all you humanly can, I am

Respectfully,

(MRS.) LILLIE MANNEY.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

Inasmuch as the last Congress did nothing in response to the earnest plea of mothers, fathers and well-wishers of the members of our armed forces that places dispensing alcoholic beverages be forbidden to operate in the immediate vicinity of the camps;

We earnestly beseech this Congress to take the responsibility upon itself of dealing with these conditions realistically and giving to our Army that bit of protection which proved so effective in 1917 by passing S. 860.

(MRS.) LILLIE A. J. MANNEY,
(MRS.) EFFIE GRABBELL.
(MRS.) BERTHA JOHNSON.
(MRS.) THEO. D. CALLAHAN.

(And other citizens, all of Seattle, Wash.).

RESOLUTION OF DEPARTMENT OF ILLINOIS, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES—PROPOSED PEACE PLANS

Mr. NYE presented a resolution adopted by the annual encampment, Department of Illinois, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the United States is engaged in a horrible global war to preserve our national independence declared in 1776, to maintain our free economic system and our traditional American way of life; and

Whereas the proponents of world government in the United States, instead of directing their attention and energies to the winning of the war, continue to use the war in a mad drive for a commitment of our Government to a post-war new world order; and

Whereas the proponents of world government agree that if their scheme becomes a reality, the United States must surrender her sovereignty, must surrender her control of her defense forces, must surrender her right to enact tariff laws, must surrender her right to coin money and regulate the value thereof, must surrender her high living standards and accept for her citizens a lower standard of living and a greater tax burden; and

Whereas if we become a part of world government by thus surrendering our sovereignty, we would be returning to the same condition of servitude in which we were prior to 1776 and the galling chains our Revolutionary forebears broke would again be forged around us; and

Whereas our founding fathers, whom the world has praised for their patriotism and wisdom, believed and hoped that the admirable system which they founded and bequeathed to us would serve us and endure for all time, but the proponents of world government maintain that the work of our

founding fathers was but folly; that our constitutional and representative form of government is a failure; and that the glories of the Republic of the United States have faded and have come to an end: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Department of Illinois, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in annual encampment assembled, this 24th day of June 1943 in Chicago, Ill., That we denounce the proponents of world government for their weakening of the war effort of our people and their breeding of disunity and confusion in attempting to use the war to bring about a surrender of our Republic to a new, supreme, sovereign, world government, that we call upon all persons interested in writing a lasting peace to postpone discussion of peace plans until after our fighting men have returned from the battle fronts of the world and can participate in discussions and decisions on plans and terms of the peace which they won, and that we request the officers of the Government of the United States to formulate plans for peace which will not imperil our American sovereignty, our American rights, our American independence, our American standard of living, and our American tradition, and without the commitment of our Government except as directed by the vote of our people.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation three lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GUFFEY:

S. 1327. A bill to amend the Federal Explosives Act, as amended, to provide additional safeguards for the protection of explosives and ingredients thereof; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 1328 (by request). A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to extend certain titles thereof to the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; and

S. 1329 (by request). A bill to regulate the furnishing of artificial limbs or other appliances to retired officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, and to certain civilian employees of the military and naval forces of the Regular Establishment (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WALLGREN:

S. 1330. A bill to further the conservation and proper use of the forest resources of the Nation and to effectuate the recommendation of the Joint Congressional Committee on Forestry submitted to the Congress pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 31 (52 Stat. 1452), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE (for Mr. AIKEN):

S. 1331. A bill to assist in the effective prosecution of the war, to improve the health, efficiency, and morale of the civilian population and the armed forces, to provide for a more equitable distribution of food supplies through a food-allotment plan, to prohibit the payment of subsidies for the production, processing, distribution, or other handling of agricultural commodities except as specifically authorized by the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. TUNNELL:

S. 1332. A bill to make unlawful certain practices relating to the making of records for radio transcription, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 1333 A bill to amend section 3 (d) of the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1334. A bill for the relief of J. C. and Vassie Lee Davidson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 1335. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1336. A bill to authorize the transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GUFFEY:

S. 1337. A bill for the purpose of conserving the coal resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. J. Res. 75. Joint resolution to provide a simple, effective, and uniform method of evaluating the charges for freight transportation on Government purchases or bids; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

HISTORICAL RECORD OF AMERICA'S FIGHTING CONGRESS (S. DOC. NO 94)

Mr. BRIDGES submitted a resolution (S. Res. 176), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the historical record of America's Fighting Congress, by William P. Kennedy, Lit. D., as it appears in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of June 18 and July 1, 1943, be printed as a Senate document, including the insertions in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 15.

PUERTO RICAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, there is pending in the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs the Puerto Rican independence bill, which has not as yet been reported but upon which hearings have been held. The bill has been pretty well perfected. There is a campaign on in Puerto Rico to obtain adherents to the purposes of the bill. I am in possession of a telegram which reads as follows:

SAN JUAN, P. R., *July 8, 1943.*

Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Over 1,000 students at university assembly unanimously approved to give full support to your bill for independence.

JOSE A. BENITEZ.
ANGEL CRUZ.
EDUARDO FLORES.
CARLOS CARRERA BENITEZ.

UNVEILING IN THE CAPITOL OF PORTRAIT OF ARTHUR PUE GORMAN

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, on Tuesday, July 6, at 3 p. m., when a portrait of Arthur Pue Gorman, a distinguished and honored son of Maryland, was unveiled, a notable addition was made to the collection of portraits hanging in the corridors of the United States Capitol of former Members of the United States Senate. An account of the exercises was published in the Baltimore Sun on July 7 in an article written by Col. George Combs, well-known and able correspondent of the Baltimore Sun.

Mr. President, I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATE ARTHUR PUE GORMAN'S PORTRAIT GIVEN TO SENATE—FAMOUS MARYLAND STATESMAN ROSE FROM PAGE BOY TO NATIONAL FIGURE IN DEMOCRATIC PARTY

WASHINGTON, July 6.—A portrait of Arthur Pue Gorman, who rose from page boy to United States Senator from Maryland and a national leader of the Democratic Party, was unveiled today in the Capitol.

The portrait was presented on behalf of the family by Arthur Gorman Lambert, of Chevy Chase, Md., a grandson of the late Senator, and was accepted by Senate Majority Leader BARKLEY, of Kentucky.

The ceremonies, attended by members of the family and Maryland political leaders, were held in a corridor leading from the Senate floor to the rotunda and House of Representatives. The portrait is hung at the Senate end of the corridor, facing the main entrance to the Senate floor.

Senator Gorman was described by Senator BARKLEY as "one of the outstanding statesmen of his time," as a man "who brought honor to the State of Maryland and to the United States," and by Senator RADCLIFFE (Democrat, Maryland) as one of the most influential citizens of Maryland in the last 100 years.

Others who spoke included Senator GEORGE (Democrat, Georgia), Representative SASSCER (Democrat, Maryland), Mayor Theodore McKeldin, of Baltimore, and Galen L. Tait, chairman of the Maryland Republican State campaign committee.

After the ceremonies a small reception was given by Mrs. Wilton J. Lambert, of Washington, a daughter of Senator Gorman.

Senator Gorman was born in Woodstock, Md., on March 11, 1839, and died in Washington on June 4, 1906. During his long and active career he served as Capitol page, Senate postmaster, United States Senator, and Democratic leader of the Senate.

He served in the Senate from 1881 to 1899, again from 1903 to the time of his death. In Maryland he was onetime collector of internal revenue, a member of the Maryland State House of Delegates, serving as speaker for one session, and State senator. Appointed a director of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal Co. in 1869, he became president of the company in 1872.

In 1884 he was chairman of the Democratic national campaign committee, a post he filled so well, Senator RADCLIFFE said, that he thereafter became nationally recognized as one of the great political figures of America.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], one of the speakers at the exercises, emphasized the close friendship between his own father, the late Champ Clark, and Senator Gorman. An interesting series of reminiscences was given by Mr. Clifford Berryman, the brilliant and famous

cartoonist, who was an intimate associate of Senator Gorman.

Mr. President, Senator Arthur P. Gorman's rare qualities of leadership were evidenced in State and in national affairs, especially in the United States Senate. Early in life he became the leader of the Democratic Party in Maryland, and his leadership continued uninterrupted in spite, at times, of spirited opposition until his death in 1906.

In 1881 the Democratic Party, in control of Maryland Legislature, elected Senator Gorman to membership in the United States Senate, where he served continuously for 18 years. His remarkable ability soon became apparent to the Members of the Senate. As the Presidential campaign of 1884 drew near, it became apparent that the Democrats had a good fighting chance to elect to the Presidential office the first member of their party since the period immediately preceding the War between the States. The selection of the chairman of the campaign committee was to the Democrats a matter of paramount importance. Arthur P. Gorman, although young in years and little more than a freshman in the United States Senate, was selected for that important post.

The Presidential campaign of 1884 was one of the hardest fought in the history of this country. The result was that Grover Cleveland was elected to the Presidency. Senator Gorman's astute management of that campaign has always been regarded as one of the chief factors in bringing about the success of the Democratic Party in that election.

Senator Gorman continued to grow steadily in influence in the Senate. He became in time chairman of the Democratic steering committee, where his effective leadership was generally recognized in those turbulent days. His leadership was soon put to the severest test. Shortly after Benjamin Harrison was elected President of the United States, the so-called Force bill came before the Senate for consideration and action.

This bill would have given the Federal Government control over elections in the States, with power to use military force to exercise such control. The opposition to the bill was most vigorous, especially from the Southern States, where the bill was vehemently criticized. Although the Senate was Republican and the so-called force bill was regarded as a party measure, the bill was eventually defeated in the Senate. It is generally conceded that this was very largely the result of the astute leadership of Senator Gorman.

The reaction of this victory was extraordinary. For instance, Senator Gorman was presented with a silver service by the State of Maryland for his successful fight against the force bill. There was no precedent for such an honor in Maryland. The people in the Southern States showered praise upon him. Many students of history regard the victory of Senator Gorman in the defeat of the force bill as one of the greatest accomplishments in the annals of parliamentary government in the United States.

The Republican Party acquired control of the Maryland Legislature in 1889, electing a successor to Senator Gorman. However, when the Democrats regained control in 1903, Senator Gorman was reelected to the United States Senate, where he remained until his death on June 4, 1906.

Senator Gorman's record from the time he was a page in the Senate until his death as the leader of his party in that body is one of remarkable and brilliant achievement. Senator Gorman had a distinguished appearance and a rare charm of manner. He was a true and stanch friend, and deservedly enjoyed the confidence of many people, irrespective of party affiliation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it is a matter of regret to me that when the unveiling of the portrait of Arthur P. Gorman took place in the Senate corridor a few days ago I could not be present because I was engaged in the debate on the subsidy roll-back at the time the exercises were being held. As one of the present representatives of Maryland in the Senate, I would have liked to indicate, by my presence at least, that I was in thorough accord with the honor being bestowed on this distinguished son of Maryland, who was the leader in this body for many years. I make this statement so that it will not be thought that my absence was other than unavoidable.

REVENGE IN POLITICS—QUOTATION FROM HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the following:

Hon. James A. Farley, in his book, Behind the Ballots, page 375, said:

Another good thing to remember is that nothing is ever gained by trying to seek revenge in politics. The public has no interest in the individual who wants to get back at another person because he thinks he has been ill-treated or betrayed. The man who starts out to destroy another man for revenge usually winds up by destroying himself.

THE FOOD PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY HERBERT HOOVER

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the food program delivered by former President Herbert Hoover before the American Farm Bureau Federation in New York City on June 8, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

BOND RALLY ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. JAMES A. ULIO

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Maj. Gen. James A. Ulio, The Adjutant General of the United States Army, on the occasion of a bond rally at Somerset, Pa., July 5, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE STRATEGY OF TRUTH—ADDRESS BY LIAM O'CONNOR

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "What the Office of War Information Sets Out To Do for Us," delivered by Liam O'Connor, Special Assistant to the Director of Domestic Operations, Office of War Information, at the annual convention of the Catholic Press Association, Toledo, Ohio, May 20, 1943, and published under the heading "The strategy of truth" in the magazine Commonweal, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY J. CLIFFORD McMANAMY AT UNVEILING OF PLAQUE TO INDUCTEES FROM HARRISON COUNTY, W. VA.

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an Independence Day address on the occasion of the unveiling of a plaque in honor of the men from Harrison County, W. Va., inducted into the armed services, delivered at Clarksburg, W. Va., by J. Clifford McManamy, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROTEST AGAINST RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the March on Washington group, printed in the Washington Star of July 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

OPPORTUNITY FOR PEACEFUL COOPERATION AMONG ALL RACES—EDITORIAL FROM PITTSBURGH COURIER

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial relative to the need for peaceful cooperation among all races, printed in the Pittsburgh Courier for July 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT—ARTICLE FROM THE YORK (PA.) GAZETTE AND DAILY

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Facts and Fancy Column of the Gazette and Daily, of York, Pa., of the issue of June 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

A REDECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Redeclaration of Independence adopted by the National Economic Council, Inc., at Chicago, Ill., which appears in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN POLICY FOR POST-WAR UNITED STATES—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Foreign Policy for Post-War United States," published in the Washington Times-Herald of June 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING IN CONNECTION WITH THE SALE OF UNITED STATES BONDS

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a consummation of public opinion in the State of Missouri on aid in the stabilization program and war effort by paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States bonds, which appears in the Appendix.]

ELIMINATION OF PRIVATE SUITS FOR PENALTIES AND DAMAGES ARISING OUT OF FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending business is the consideration of House bill 1203, reported by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS].

The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States.

Mr. VAN NUYS obtained the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I inquire what is the parliamentary situation? Is the bill before the Senate, or is there pending a request for its consideration?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill was taken up on motion yesterday, and is the unfinished business.

Mr. WHITE. I know there is some opposition to this bill, and if it is to be considered now I feel under obligation to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is the unfinished business; all we have before the Senate is this bill. However, it is immaterial to me.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield for the purpose of calling a quorum?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following senators answered to their names:

Barkley	Hayden	Reynolds
Brewster	Hill	Robertson
Bridges	Holman	Scrugham
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	Kilgore	Smith
Burton	La Follette	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Truman
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Tunnell
Connally	McKellar	Tydings
Danaher	Maloney	Vandenberg
Davis	Maybank	Van Nuys
Downey	Mead	Wagner
Ellender	Millikin	Wallgren
Ferguson	Murdock	Walsh
George	Nye	Wherry
Gerry	O'Daniel	White
Green	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Guffey	Pepper	Willis
Gurney	Reed	
Hawkes	Revercomb	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on important public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been called away on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent because of illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—INSTRUCTION TO SENATE CONFEREES

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a motion that the Senate instruct its conferees on House Joint Resolution 147, which provides for continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before consent is granted—and I hope it will be granted—I wish to state that if it shall be granted and the motion shall be made, I shall insist and demand that there be a yea-and-nay vote, so that every Senator, regardless of how he voted heretofore, may go on record in regard to the motion. I hope Senators will understand that we will have a yea-and-nay vote, so that they may express their opinions about the matter on the motion which the Senator will make if consent shall be granted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request?

The Chair hears none.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, the conferees on House Joint Resolution 147 have been in conference since yesterday morning, and have had no appreciable success. The House conferees are unanimous, I think it proper for me to say, in disagreeing to Senate amendment numbered 3. We see no chance of an agreement in the conference on that amendment. So I move that the Senate instruct its conferees to recede on amendment numbered 3, which is known here as the Danaher-Tydings amendment. There is no further disagreement in the conference at the present time.

I think I should offer a further word of explanation. There is a feeling—and I hope I do not trespass on any confidence which may surround a conference—that were the so-called Danaher-Tydings amendment adopted the joint resolution would face a certain veto. I incline toward that view. I think it is the view of a great majority of the Senate conferees, and I think it is the unanimous view of the House conferees.

The Senate conferees made every effort to bring about the acceptance of the views expressed by the Senate. Failing in that, the Senate conferees, through my able colleague [Mr. DANAHER], presented what was intended to be a compromise amendment. It was rejected unanimously by the House conferees.

Mr. President, we have reached a stalemate. I see absolutely no chance for agreement in the conference. The proposal I make is an unusual procedure. The conference committee meets again at 2:30 today. If the motion I make is agreed to, it is my opinion, and I think it is shared by all the conferees, that we can dispose of this matter this afternoon.

I have made my motion, Mr. President.

Mr. BARKLEY. On the motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I feel that the Senate is entitled to complete advices in the particulars referred to by my distinguished colleague. We have had occasion after occasion during the past many weeks, indeed during the past several sessions, when a feeling pervaded a very great many Members of the Senate that conferees were attempting to write legislation. The Senate conferees were confronted with a situation in which most assuredly they wished to avoid any such imputation as to them. At the same time the views of the Senate as to policy, as reflected by the vote on Tuesday, have been projected constantly in the conference. Of the five Senate conferees four voted against the amendment, which, as section 5 or amendment 3, is now in disagreement. Nonetheless, Mr. President, they honorably and ably have represented the views of the Senate, and I think their colleagues in the Senate ought to hear that statement from me, for I was one who voted for the amendment when it was before the Senate the other day.

When, however, an impasse obviously had developed in an effort to achieve a compromise which would reflect the views of the Senate as to matters of policy, and at the same time make possible the continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation, I drafted and submitted, and the conferees considered word by word, the language of a proposed substitute, a copy of which I send to the desk and ask that the clerk read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that (1) whenever a maximum price or prices shall have been established for any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, including livestock, under authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or of the act entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes," approved October 2, 1942, as amended, no subsidy or other payments shall be made hereafter, either directly or indirectly, to a producer, processor, manufacturer, or any other person engaged in the production, marketing, distribution, or handling of any such commodity for the purpose of compensating any such producer, processor, manufacturer, or other person in whole or in part for any reduction or roll-back hereafter ordered with respect to any maximum prices

so established; and (2) despite the declaration in clause (1), in the exercise of complete good faith, commitments heretofore made and relied upon in connection with a reduction or roll-back program should be honored by any governmental agency, including Government-owned corporations.

(b) The definition of the term "person" in section 302 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 shall apply to the term "person" as used in this section.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, that particular proposed substitute was formally moved, and the Senate conferees by a vote of 3 to 2 accepted the proposal, and it was put up to the House conferees. They, however, adamant in their objection, as my colleague has stated, unanimously refused to accept the substitute. In that impasse the Senate conferees have decided to submit the entire situation to the Senate, to advise the Senate of the facts, to report the disagreement in the particulars referred to, and to ask further instructions of this body.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Connecticut yield so I may ask a question of his colleague?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Did the House offer anything in place of amendment numbered 3?

Mr. MALONEY. No; the House insists upon the joint resolution which it passed.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I did not enter the Chamber in time to hear the full explanation of the senior Senator from Connecticut. I ask the Senator what the present status is? Is the status such that the Tydings amendment has been refused by the House conferees?

Mr. DANAHER. It has.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. And we now come back to the original Commodity Credit Corporation measure?

Mr. DANAHER. Not entirely so. The House conferees have agreed to Senate amendments 1, 2, and 4. The conferees are in disagreement, however, as to Senate amendment numbered 3. No. 3 is the so-called Tydings amendment.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I wish to say that I voted against the Tydings amendment, not because I was in favor of prohibiting subsidies, but because I was afraid that if it were adopted the President would veto the measure, and then it would be back in the Congress without any protection being afforded the Commodity Credit Corporation, which I think ought to be saved. In my opinion the measure as passed by the Senate was in its essentials about the same as the measure the President vetoed.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I shall briefly conclude. I wish simply to acquaint the Senate with all the factors involved, and to pay my own public tribute to the action of the conferees who have represented the views of the Senate with all the force and fervor at their command.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, has the Senator from Connecticut concluded?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say a word in confirmation of what two Senators from Connecticut have said. We all know that the only way to continue the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation is now to enact legislation which will do so. We know that failure on the part of Congress to legislate means the death of the Commodity Credit Corporation. In my judgment, after 2 days of continuous session with the conferees, the only way to obtain legislation is to adopt the motion of the Senator from Connecticut. It is the feeling of the House conferees that Congress having passed a measure last week which was vetoed, and the House, after consultation with all parties and interests, having voted for a simple measure which would extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the adoption of the Danaher-Tydings amendment would put back into the proposed legislation practically the same provision which the President vetoed, and that it would receive a similar veto. In that event we would be in chaos again, and the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation would expire. Therefore, it seems to me the only way to preserve the life of this valuable agency is to vote for the motion of the senior Senator from Connecticut. Congress will be in session again, assuming that it takes a recess at all, about the middle of September. No doubt the whole question will arise again. After the recess, Congress will be in a frame of mind to act more deliberately, and will have more time to act with greater deliberation.

Under those circumstances, I hope the motion of the Senator from Connecticut will be agreed to.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I am not very familiar with the joint resolution except for the amendment of the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Connecticut. What I have risen to remark is that I do not think it is becoming to those who should have the interests of the people at heart to hesitate to pass laws for fear of a veto. Our duty is plain. If the President wants to assume the responsibility of throwing out the Commodity Credit Corporation in order to get the opportunity to have subsidies and roll-backs, and if Congress submits, that is all right; but let the responsibility rest where it belongs. I do not want to be in a body that is afraid there will be a veto. Congress is here to do its duty. If the amendment is proper, if Congress believes it is proper, and if the measure containing the amendment is vetoed, it is our duty to pass the measure over the veto. If Congress would prefer to listen to one man, rather than to the people, let Congress do that.

I simply want to protest against the original veto. I know the President has the power to veto a bill, but the Congress has the power to pass a bill over his veto.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to say that I am as much opposed to the roll-back type of subsidy as is any other Member of the Senate. However, I repeat what I said when the joint resolution was pending in the Senate a day or two ago. We lost the fight against roll-back subsidies when the President vetoed the bill containing the Gillette-Aiken amendment and the House of Representatives could not muster a two-thirds vote to pass the bill over the President's veto. It seems to me it would be futile to carry the fight any further. If the Congress were to carry it further, it would jeopardize the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation and would jeopardize the subsidies which have been pledged to the farmers for increased production, and Congress would strike down other important activities of this great instrumentality in the field of Government and agriculture.

So, Mr. President, I hope the motion made by the Senator from Connecticut will prevail. In expressing that hope, I desire to say that I think the conferees on the part of the Senate have made a valiant fight, but they have been confronted with circumstances of such a character that they could not overcome the position of the House.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I only wish to say that the conferees have reached a complete disagreement. If the Senate decides that the conferees should disagree, that is substantially what they did in the report on the Commodity Credit Corporation measure presented to the Senate the other day, and that would end the Commodity Credit Corporation, I think that is the question.

If the Senate wants further efforts to be made in the conference, I think the Senate should choose as its members of the conference committee, Senators who are enthusiastically in favor of the Senate's position; because under such circumstances the House conferees conceivably might be more inclined to recede.

The Senate conferees have not receded; they have insisted on the Senate language, or something very close to it.

All I wish to say is that I think the Senate conferees have done the best they could. A complete disagreement is not impossible of solution, if the Senate wishes to insist on its position.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I object to the statement made by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. Up to now the Congress has by a majority adopted a certain policy which it believes is for the best interests of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the people. If the measure is vetoed, and if Congress cannot pass the measure over the veto, the responsibility does not rest on Congress. To intimate that Congress is about to jeopardize the existence of the Commodity Credit Corporation is not a proper statement. The Congress is not jeopardizing it. I insist that the matter be kept clear. If Congress cannot pass the measure over the President's veto, let the responsibility be where it belongs. Every Member of the Senate knows that the other veto was not for the purpose of helping the Commodity Credit Corporation; it was, so to speak, a deliberate piece of legislation, in effect, saying, "I will veto the bill and I will kill the Commodity Credit Corporation, but I will save the right to have subsidies and roll-backs."

Let us look at the matter in the proper way. Are we responsible? Who killed the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Congress did not. I have previously refrained from bringing this matter before the Senate, but I desire to go on record as doing my duty, and not being afraid of a veto. Let us be men, if we are. If not, just say, "Send us a bill, and we 'rubber stamps' will fix it."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement in explanation of the position I am about to take on this matter. I shall support the motion made by the senior Senator from Connecticut. I shall do so in the belief that it is necessary in the present circumstances if we are to avoid the disastrous results which are certain to follow a complete deadlock between the legislative and executive branches of government. Whatever may be the disagreements of those of us who are charged with responsibility, our primary duty is to see that the Government shall function.

Like the Senator from Wisconsin, I have been opposed to the so-called roll-back subsidies, because, as I have frequently stated, it is my judgment that if continued they will result in seriously impeding the production of necessary food in the United States.

However, the Constitution gives the President the right to veto legislation passed by Congress. It provides that if the Congress cannot muster a two-thirds vote to override the veto, the views of the President shall prevail.

The views of the majority of Congress in this issue are plain, but it was demonstrated by the vote which was taken in the House last week that the two-thirds vote necessary to override the President's policy is not available in the House. The votes which have been had in this body on this measure indicate that a two-thirds vote to that end cannot be marshaled here. Therefore, we are confronted by a perfectly plain problem of fact, rather than of theory. Shall we, by rigid adherence to our views, prevent the Government from functioning though we know that under the Constitution, we cannot make those views prevail against the President's veto?

It is of the utmost importance to the country, to the farmers and the ranchers, that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be maintained. The House of Representatives, the same body which refused to override the President's veto, has indicated by an overwhelming vote that it wants the Commodity Credit Corporation to be maintained in the manner set forth in the joint resolution. Certain amendments which were proposed in the Senate have been, as I understand the report made to us, accepted by the House conferees. For the Senate, therefore, to undertake to repeat the action already taken by it and vetoed in a constitutional manner by the President, would be, it seems to me, for the Senate to assume the responsibility for the destruction of the Commodity Credit Corporation and all the very valuable work it is doing.

For my part, I cannot feel free to do that. On the other hand, I know, from my conversations with the officials who are charged with the administration of the Price Control Act, with the administration of the production of food, with the administration of the stabilization order, that an attempt, if I interpret their statements to me correctly, will be made so to administer this matter as to meet the essential principles which have been discussed upon the floor of the Senate. As the majority leader has stated, Congress will be in session again within a few months, if it takes a recess in the near future. The policy of Congress has been made perfectly clear, and I am sure that administrative officials recognizing what the mind of Congress is, will in good faith endeavor to adjust their policies and programs to that judgment.

Because the original measure was passed in the Senate and the House by an overwhelming vote there can be no doubt in the mind of anyone that it is the belief of Congress that the so-called consumer subsidy program is itself inflationary, fraught with danger to our economy, and that the roll-back program threatens production. I think the realistic point of view is to believe that those charged with the responsibility for administering the program, knowing the attitude of Congress, will be guided by it, and undertake only those subsidy programs which are absolutely necessary in the circumstances.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. The remarks of the Senator from Wyoming would lead one to believe that he personally has some assurance that there will be no further extension of the roll-back subsidy program. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did not mean to give the impression that I have any assurance, but I do have hope. I know that Marvin Jones, a former Representative in Congress, and formerly chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, who is now the War Food Administrator, is a man of practical mind, who understands agricultural problems. I do not believe that Mr. Jones will be motivated by any theoretical notions with respect to what ought to be or ought not to be, and that in his endeavor to meet the problem of production he will approach it from the point of view of practical realism which has always characterized him. My discussions with Justice Byrnes lead me to the conclusion that his approach will also be realistic. Let me say to the Senator that I am living in the hope that the representations which he has made, and which I have made, and which other spokesmen for agriculture have made, are having their effect. Time will tell.

Mr. BUTLER. I gather from what the Senator has had to say that he gives the inference that if we should agree to the House proposal the administration of the roll-back program would not extend the field; that is to say, the roll-back would continue on the commodities as to which it has already been put into effect, principally on butter and meat. All of us know that the total amount involved in those two programs represents a saving, in the case of butter, of perhaps 60 cents per capita for the entire population, and admitting that it would succeed in its purpose, it would result in a saving of approximately $2.50 per capita on meat I should like to ask the Senator if he thinks the total amount involved is sufficient to warrant the opposition of the administration to the joint resolution, including the Danaher amendment? In addition to what appears on the surface, there must be some other real purpose in insisting that the administration have its way in this matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My answer to the Senator is that I believe that the roll-back program which was announced with respect to meat will not be effective, and cannot be effective, either with respect to the consumers or the producers. Furthermore, I know that that program was not effective, so far as the processors and packers were concerned. I know, as every other person who is familiar with the livestock industry knows, that the program has resulted in a diminution of the supply of meat for the consumers in the face of a large livestock population. It was altogether unnecessary.

I know that the O. P. A., in following this program, was not guided by the advice of the industry, but I think the results of the program are already apparent, and I feel that the representations which the Senator from Nebraska has made, and which others have made, will have their effect.

But, regardless of that, I cannot take the responsibility for spreading the disaster and making it include other agricultural products which are not now involved. In my judgment, the best course I can take is to support the motion of the senior Senator from Connecticut. It seems to me clear that we shall be placing the responsibility squarely upon the Executive. We shall not be assuming the responsibility for roll-backs ourselves—our record is clear—and shall be maintaining the effective operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the whole field of agricultural commodities in which it now works.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I think the Senator stated a moment ago that he was convinced that the practice of roll-back subsidies was a definite threat toward inflation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe that the practice of consumer subsidies is a definite threat of inflation and that roll-backs threaten production.

Mr. WILLIS. Does the Senator believe that if they are carried out according to the program which has already been started, they may ultimately wreck our economy?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would not go so far as to make that statement, because I think the economy of America is very elastic and very sound. I think it can withstand a great deal, even the subsidy program.

In dealing with this very complex problem we must not forget that the Government of the United States, by reason of the war, has become the principal purchaser of agricultural commodities. So

if the prices of agricultural commodities rise in the market, the Government, in making its purchases of meat for the armed forces, and in making its purchases of other agricultural commodities which go into feeding the Army and Navy, will be paying increased prices. It is true, on the other hand, that if the Government pays a subsidy to hold market prices down, a portion of that subsidy will be offset by the saving which the Government makes in the prices it pays for foodstuffs. So the question is not at all simple. It is very complex, like many other problems which have arisen from the fact that we are fighting a total war.

Mr. WILLIS. If the Senator will further yield, I should like to pose the question in a different way.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIS. As I understand, the Senator feels that the practice of roll-back subsidies is a menace to our economic structure, by reason of the danger of inflation which it brings. Does the Senator believe that that danger is greater than the danger of suspending the Commodity Credit Corporation for a period of 60 days?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think that the danger of suspending the Commodity Credit Corporation for 60 days is infinitely greater than the course which I am advocating. Yesterday in this body, without any substantial disagreement, we voted $200,000,000 to expand one phase of national housing. We did so although we knew we were authorizing the expenditure of Federal funds out of the deficit for carrying out programs which hitherto have always been recognized as absolutely local in their aspect. I could stand here for half an hour reciting the various subsidies paid out of Federal funds for State and local operations, for agriculture, for industry, for oil, for coal, and for a score of other objectives, all of which have been authorized by the Senate and the House without dissent.

The threat to our economy from Federal expenditures and subsidies is already here whatever we do about this measure. The defeat of C. C. C. subsidies will not change the situation.

Mr. WILLIS. I wish the Senator from Wyoming would state for the benefit of the Senate the functions which the Commodity Credit Corporation performs which could not be performed by some other agencies of the Government, such as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or the Lend-Lease Administration, pending the renewal of the Commodity Credit Corporation after we return from the recess, if we should find in the meantime that the people of the country desire us to take that step.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the destruction of one agency in the hope that another agency will take on its work seems to me to be a rather futile and dangerous method to follow.

Mr. WILLIS. It is about as futile and dangerous as it would be to trust to the administration to discontinue the practice of roll-back subsidies.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. All because, as I said in my preliminary statement, the Constitution gives the President that power; and when he constitutionally exercises his veto I do not know why we should take the responsibility of asking him to veto the same proposal two or three times.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Indiana suggested that in some way authorizing the continuation of roll-back subsidies would produce inflation. To some extent I agree with that view, but the danger of inflation is just as great from ordinary subsidies as from roll-back subsidies.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TAFT. So far as I can see, the administration will never try another roll-back subsidy. Hereafter its subsidies will be in an effort to hold prices where they are. It is those subsidies which are likely to bring about inflation. The roll-back subsidy is no more inflationary than any other kind of subsidy. In fact, it is rather less so.

In the Danaher-Tydings amendment, about which we have been fighting, there is no prohibition of other subsidies. It is only a future prohibition of roll-back subsidies. So it does not affect particularly the general question of inflation which might be produced by subsidies.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. In view of the remarks of the Senator from Ohio, I wish to state that, in my opinion, the roll-back subsidies are doubly inflationary for this reason: They take the taxpayer's money and increase the public debt in order to reduce the price of food to the consumer. That gives the consumer money with which to buy other things, or to go into the black market, or to spend more money in other ways. We spend the taxpayer's money and give it to some other person who has an opportunity to spend it again. That is what brings about inflation. I think that the roll-back subsidies are doubly inflationary.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator may be correct about that; but we cannot avoid knowledge of the fact that the chief antidote to inflation is heavier taxes. It is within the power of Congress to adopt a new tax program which will squarely meet the danger which arises from increases in the purchasing power of the people of the United States.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The greatest danger of inflation, and the greatest inducement to it is in the fact that our people have been led to believe that war is good business, that we are all going to be rich, and that we will be very well taken care of for the rest of our lives after the war is over. That has been the propaganda, and many persons believe it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to take the floor for a short discussion on this matter.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may propound another question to the Senator from Wyoming? I do not think it will take long for the Senator to answer it.

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from Wyoming apparently advances his argument on the basis that the objective of the roll-back program is the benefit of the consumer. It is certainly for nobody else's benefit. It is for the benefit of the consumer.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did not quite understand the Senator's question.

Mr. BUTLER. The main objective of a roll-back program is to bring relief to the consumer.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, Mr. President; that is not my understanding.

Mr. BUTLER. In the form of lower prices.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. The purpose of the roll-back is to prevent the cost of living from rising so that the administration may continue its effort to hold back the demands for increased wages.

Mr. BUTLER. In the final analysis that would be for the benefit of the consumer. If that is the main objective, why could we not bring aid to the consumer, if the United States Treasury can afford the roll-back, by a repeal of the excise law, which puts a high tax on such commodities as tobacco and liquor? The result would be a much larger financial relief to the people as a whole than the relief which they are supposed to receive through the roll-back program on food.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas has the floor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the subject as briefly as I can and cover some points which I think should be covered.

I agree with the Senator from Wyoming, that Mr. Marvin Jones, the new War Food Administrator, is a very practical gentleman. I am very fond of Mr. Jones. I think he is able, and as fine and amiable a gentleman as any who ever answered "Yes" when his name was called on the roll. But I do not have much hope, so far as Mr. Jones is concerned, that we shall have the same courageous approach to these important questions that we had, and would have continued to have, had Mr. Chester Davis remained on the job.

Mr. President, for a moment I wish to take issue with the Senator from Ohio. I am sure that so keen a mind and so capable a student of monetary and economic questions as the Senator from Ohio, must make a distinction in his own mind between inflation which arises from some doubt concerning the stability of the currency of the country, and inflation which results from a spiral of rising prices, which also is inflationary so far as the price structure is concerned, but which does not go to the same dangerous extent as do other forms of inflation.

Assuming the Senator from Ohio would agree with me in that statement, I am sure that he did not mean to say that a subsidy which would increase production would lead to inflation. I think it is agreed, by all economists, that

so far as the spiral of prices is concerned, increased production is the best way to control the rising price spiral.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I did not say anything about a subsidy for production. I was not referring to that. I was referring to two kinds of consumer subsidies; one, a subsidy which is based on a roll-back, and the other, a subsidy which is based on holding the price where it is when prices generally are going up. So far as the effect on the consumer is concerned, it is the same whether one form of subsidy be adopted or the other. I say that the real danger of inflation in the future from subsidies will result from consumer subsidies which are not aimed at roll-backs, but aimed at holding prices where they are.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I agree with the Senator from Ohio in that statement, but he certainly left a different impression on me in the statement which he made.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I want to say that I am very glad the Senator from Ohio made his last statement, because he led me to believe what the Senator from Kansas has suggested he was led to believe.

I want to emphasize that the Senator from Kansas raises a very important point when he says that increased production is an antidote to inflation. Inflation may come because there is not sufficient production of goods to balance purchasing power.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this is as good a time as any to point out that this country has never had from the responsible voices of Government a proper distinction made as between these two kinds of so-called inflation. However inconvenient a rising price tendency is, it never threatens the governmental structure. Rising prices do an injustice to people with fixed incomes, but so long as other things move up with increased prices, there is no great disturbance in the relationship. Inflation which becomes dangerous to the Government is that form which threatens the purchasing power of its currency and destroys the belief of the people in the soundness of its securities.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to make a brief statement when the Senator from Kansas concludes.

Mr. REED. I shall not make a long statement. I want to clear up these points. I think the President of the United States and those who speak with authority ought to make it clear to the people of the country that there is a great and important difference between inflation such as the case of the French assignats in the days of the French Revolution; the depreciation of our own continental currency in the Revolution because of lack of faith in the Government; the fate of the bonds and currency of the Confederate government during the Civil War; and an era of rising prices. One form of inflation threatens the stability of the Government itself. The other form may be, and is, an inconvenience but not a threat to the existence of stable government. In the beginning of the Civil War, when there was high hope that the Confederate government might be established, their currency circulated and their bonds sold nearly at par. As time went on that changed, and that was due to a loss of faith in the government itself, which does not appear in this situation.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to make a brief observation about the conference. I accept the statements which have been made about the good faith of the conferees; no one could question or should question that, and yet I think it is unfortunate—I do not mean only in this case, but I mean in every case of disagreeing votes between the two Houses—when the conference committee is not made up of a majority, at least, of Members who voted with the prevailing side. What we have heard this morning from the Senator from Wyoming, the Senator from Kentucky, and the Senator from Connecticut is merely a reiteration of their opposition to the position which the Senator took after repeated yea-and-nay votes.

My understanding is that if the House conferees are willing to go back to the House and have a yea-and-nay vote upon the acceptance of the Danaher-Tydings amendment, there is a fair chance it might be accepted. The conferees have not done that. Why should the Senate and the Senate alone be asked to recede? Why should we surrender our position without a struggle? Why should we give up our own view and our own opinion without asking the House conferees to do an equal service in ascertaining by a yea-and-nay vote the actual sentiment of that body?

So, Mr. President, I want it distinctly understood that, notwithstanding the growing unity, perhaps, on the other side of the aisle, I am not ready as yet to recede from the position of the Senate. I think certainly we ought to maintain our own self-respect. I recognize the right of the President, under the Constitution, to veto the bill if he chooses; that is his business, not mine; but, while I am here, I shall maintain my own dignity as a Senator. I urge the Senate to reject the motion of the Senator from Connecticut and for the present at least maintain its position. I think if we give any instructions at all we might give the Senate conferees instructions to go back to conference and maintain the modified Danaher-Tydings amendment as it was read from the desk this morning. That is the minimum we ought to be asked to do, and it is the maximum we ought to do.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish again to make my position clear. This is an altogether novel proceeding, and it is one that puts everyone who voted for the prevailing view of the Senate in a most ridiculous position. It is equivalent to a vote to recede from your own vote after you voted on the question, and after a motion was made in the Senate to reconsider that vote. If the conferees had brought in a conference report receding from the Senate amendments and accepting the House text, that would have been entirely logical, and many of us who have very strong convictions about this matter might have been willing to have gone along with it rather than disrupt the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, but it is little better than asininity itself to talk about preserving the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation has already expired; it expired on July 1; this is the 8th day of July, and if we can revive it now we can revive it in September, and we can take care of its functions in September.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator has criticized the conferees or at least one member of the conference committee, perhaps, for making the motion to recede when the conference committee would not be willing to do so; but the conference committee have been in a very embarrassing position. Unfortunately, the five members of the committee were, in effect, opposed to the Senate position, except the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], who had voted for the Danaher-Tydings amendment, but who otherwise voted previously against the general principle.

I feel very strongly that I should not recommend that the Senate recede, inasmuch as I had been appointed a conferee to represent the Senate. I myself intend to vote to recede, but I think the Senator is wrong in saying that we did anything foolish, in effect, in coming back and saying, "We have done the best we could, and we want you to decide this question."

Mr. GEORGE. I did not say that the Senator had done anything "foolish." I say that he is asking me to do something foolish.

Mr. TAFT. No.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes; the Senator has. I have voted one way on this question, and there is no conference agreement which I might support.

Mr. TAFT. There is a conference disagreement.

Mr. GEORGE. But I am asked to recede and take back my vote because there has been no agreement of the conferees. It is a wholly new procedure. I am not reflecting on the conferees, but it is putting in a ridiculous position those of us who voted in the affirmative on the joint resolution which was passed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a moment further.

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. We have repeatedly had conference reports from the Appropriations Committee, and time after time the conferees on such bills have come back and said, "We cannot agree; we should like the Senate to decide the question or pass on the question again." We have done it a dozen times in the last 10 days. That is all the conference committee is doing in this instance.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no, that is not what the conference committee is doing.

Mr. TAFT. We reported a disagreement.

Mr. GEORGE. I intend to make my own position clear. That is not what the conferees are doing. Time after time the Committee on Appropriations has come back to the Senate and said, "We could not agree. We move that the Senate insist on its amendments and ask for further conference." Conferees can come in and say, "We move that the Senate insist," or they can come back and make a report, saying, "We have receded," and I think I might vote with the conferees on such a report. But they are not doing that.

Mr. TAFT. I remember the Senator from Nevada coming in and reporting a disagreement and recommending that the Senate yield. He did that only this week.

Mr. GEORGE. He made a motion that the Senate yield on a vote. He had a report which we were asked to adopt.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator from Georgia that if the conferees could have agreed on a complete report, in which the Senate conferees yielded and the House eliminated amendment numbered 3, it would have been a simpler matter, but the Senate conferees could not agree to do that. A majority of the Senate conferees were unwilling to yield. The Senate conferees cannot bring in that sort of report, on which the Senator could vote, as a final disposition of the conference.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], recognizing that the procedure is not regular, asked unanimous consent that he might make a motion to do what he is seeking to do. The effect is the same as if a complete conference report had been brought in, in which the Senate conferees yielded. It seems to me that the result is the same and it seems to me also the only way the Senate can at this juncture express itself again on the subject.

I am sorry it has been impossible to get a complete agreement. We worked for 2 days attempting to get one, but we have not been able to do it, and we cannot do it on the basis of the Senator's suggestion that he would vote for a conference report which eliminated the Senate amendment. We have not been able to arrive at that point, and there is no chance of arriving at that point. That is why we are asking that the Senate take the action proposed.

Mr. GEORGE. The course of the Senate conferees is perfectly clear. The Senate conferees could have returned and reported a disagreement, and it would have been up to the Senate to ask for further conference, and the appointment of other conferees, if necessary, if the present members of the conference on the part of the Senate did not wish to continue their work. That would be perfectly regular. The proceeding now before us is wholly novel, not only novel, but it puts any Senator who, in good faith, voted for what the Senate finally did on the joint resolution in a most awkward position. It does not embarrass those who voted against what the Senate did, because they are simply following a course which permits them to remain consistent. It does not embarrass the House, because the Senate conferees have not induced the House conferees to take the matter back to the House for a vote.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator will yield, there is no possible way by which we can make them take it back. They simply refused to agree. I left the conference with the understanding that there was a complete disagreement, and that we were through, so far as I was concerned.

Mr. GEORGE. That is not what you have reported.

Mr. TAFT. I have reported nothing. We have not reported anything.

Mr. GEORGE. That is not what has been reported to us.

Mr. MALONEY. Will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Perhaps I should make the record clear. The motion I made was on my own responsibility as a Senator. I explained that it was a novel procedure. I said I thought it was the only way out, and I say now that I think we will be here all summer unless we adopt this motion.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it is easy for conferees, when they cannot agree, to return to the body which appointed them and report a disagreement, and leave the matter in the hands of that body. When that is done, then it is competent to move for further conference, or for insistence upon what the body has done, and it would be competent to move, of course, to recede from an action taken. But that is not what is happening here. While we voted one way a few days ago, we are asked now to vote to take back what we did, relieve the conference of the responsibility, and relieve the House of the responsibility of facing this issue before the country.

I myself do not care to be put in such an awkward position, and, so far as I am concerned, I shall vote against the pending motion. If the conferees returned and said, "It is impossible to reach an agreement, and we report that we have receded from certain amendments," there would be a different question. If they return and report that it is impossible to reach an agreement, and that "We are in disagreement, and we ask to be discharged or further instructed," that is a different matter. Then we may vote upon the question as a new proposition. But we are asked to vote on the same question on which we have already voted, and any man who has any respect for his intellectual and moral integrity cannot change his vote on any such basis as that.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I simply cannot understand the argument of the Senator from Georgia. The situation is exactly the same, in substance, as if we reported a disagreement. We report to the Senate that it is absolutely impossible to induce the House to accept the Senate amendment. We tell the Senate that, and it is true; there is no question about it; that fact has developed.

Mr. GEORGE. Then what do you ask us to vote on?

Mr. TAFT. That fact has developed since the Senate adopted the amendment. Since then we find that the House refuses to accept it; they send it to conference; the conferees on the part of the House absolutely refuse to accept it; and that is the condition. That changes the position of those who voted for or against it, and it is exactly the same condition which might change their position if there were a majority report of disagreement or recommendation that the Senate recede.

The position of those who voted against the amendment is not changed by any recommendation of our committee. It is changed by the condition which has arisen, that the House has let us know that they will not accept the Senate amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Why not report a disagreement?

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. A formal disagreement has to be reported to both Houses; it cannot be reported to one House alone, but must be reported to both Houses. We have no control over the House conferees. They not only have refused to accept the Senate amendment, which, of course, they had a perfect right to do, but they have declined to take the amendment back to the House for a separate vote, and declined to take back to the House a complete formal disagreement. With that situation facing the Senate, we feel that what is suggested is the only practical way by which this impasse can be resolved, appreciating all that the Senator from Georgia says about the technical situation.

Mr. GEORGE. It is more than technical. I am asked to vote on the same motion on which I voted before in the Senate itself. I am not asked to vote on a disagreement; I am not asked to vote to recede; I am merely asked on a simple motion to vote contrary to the way I voted before.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. REED. Let me observe that I have a little stronger feeling than that entertained by the Senator from Georgia entertains. I have a feeling that I am asked to vote for a Commodity Credit Corporation measure regardless of what the Senate might desire in the way of a chance to add to or detract from the measure by amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think there can be the slightest controversy. If conferees disagree, it is the duty of both sets of conferees to take the disagreement back to their respective bodies. I do not see why the House would refuse to do its duty, and I do not believe that the House conferees would refuse to do their duty. If so, it is perfectly compe-

tent in the House to move their discharge. Conferees cannot refuse either to report back or to ask for further time or to report a disagreement. They simply have not that power. A motion to discharge conferees is always in order.

We are not asked to vote on a conference report; we are asked to vote on a motion. It happens that the Senator from Connecticut, for whom I have great respect, made the motion. Any other Senator might have made the motion in this body, and backed it up with a statement of all the Senate conferees that the conferees were not able to agree. That may be true as a matter of fact; I am not controverting that. But here is an issue which has been twice put fairly to the Senate, and now the conferees have not returned with a report of disagreement, but a Member of the Senate, who also happens to be a Senate conferee, has asked those of us who have different views on the matter to change our attitude and vote the other way. That is an awkward position in which to place any Senator. The practical result may be the same as if a report had been made, as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] seems to think. I do not see how the House conferees can refuse to take this issue to the floor of the House. I have my own conviction that it is not desired to have the House go on record on this question.

Mr. President, I have already said that we can deal with the Commodity Credit Corporation when we return after the recess. The life of the Corporation has already expired. The President has not vetoed the joint resolution now under consideration. The President did veto a measure which might have had the same general effect. Then the House, desiring to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation, passed a joint resolution extending its life. The joint resolution came to the Senate, and the Senate amended it. But the President has not vetoed the joint resolution. If the President feels he should veto it, even after we shall have recessed and gone home, he is within his right to veto it. I shall not criticize the President for vetoing or approving a measure, because in that respect he has his constitutional function to perform, and he has the right to act one way or the other with respect to a measure. But he has not vetoed this particular joint resolution.

Mr. President, is a majority of the Senate, is a majority of the House, to be forced to do what it does not desire to do, simply because the President has vetoed another measure? If so, we are traveling a long way away from the road which should be traveled by a legislative body, a body representative of the people. If we do so the American people will certainly ask who makes our policies. They will certainly ask in 1944 who dictates the policies of the Government. Are they dictated by Members of Congress who represent the people, who come here by the vote of the people? Or are they dictated outside this body?

The Administrator of O. P. A., Mr. Brown, for whom I have personal affection, stood on the floor of the Senate and declared that the price-control measure did not authorize subsidies, except as the Administrator would come back to Congress and ask for the money for the purposes of paying subsidies. We were assured, not only with respect to subsidies but with respect to two or three other highly controverted issues in the price-control measure, that it had no such meaning, as some of us who raised the question feared it had. Yet we have seen followed those policies which we feared would be followed, and which we were assured would not be put into effect.

The important question is, Who has the right to make the laws? Who makes governmental policies? Are commissars sitting in the office of every policy-making official of this Government? You and I cannot excuse ourselves. We will go back to the people and they will say, "We sent you to Washington to represent us. We did not send Byrnes, or Brown, or Vinson, or Jones, to represent us. We sent you to Washington to represent us." And you and I will have to answer to the people.

Mr. President, is Congress to be bypassed all the time, or is it to face the issue and deal with it directly? I wish to see the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation extended, and it is within our power to extend it. If it came to that issue, I would go a long way in yielding my judgment, and permit the life of the Corporation to be extended. But I cannot understand how our conferees, with all respect to them, can come back to the Senate without a report of disagreement. True, they say, they cannot reach an agreement, but they come to us without a report of disagreement, or without a report in which they say they have receded and taken the responsibility because an agreement was not possible. They simply come to us now and ask those of us who previously voted one way now to vote the other way.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I was opposed to the Senate's vote on the amendment. I voted against the amendment. I am sorry I was appointed a conferee. When the conference committee met, it developed that four of the conferees on the part of the Senate had been hostile to the amendment. We had the moral responsibility, however, of defending the Senate's position, although we did not believe in it. We did not think we had a right to yield the Senate's position, and we have come back to the Senate to tell Senators that we could not agree; that we did not want to yield with respect to the position taken by the Senate. We return to our colleagues and say, "Tell us what to do now." The effect is identically the same as if we had reached an official and a formal disagreement, except that the conferees would first have had to repudiate the Senate's position, and I refused to do that.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am not critical of my good friend the senior Senator from Connecticut. I have great respect and love for him. But he must see that he creates a position which places those of us who have voted for the prevailing view of the Senate in a most awkward position. We are simply asked to change our vote.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator does not find himself in any more difficult position than that in which the Senate's agents found themselves in conference.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not mean any offense, but when any Senator is appointed a conferee he has the right to excuse himself from the appointment. When he rises in his place and says, "I did not support the bill," or "I did not support this particular important provision in it, and I ask to be excused from serving as a conferee," the Senate will always accede to his request. As chairman of the Finance Committee, I have been responsible for naming Senators as conferees, because I wanted some Senators to serve who voted for the view which prevailed, though I myself voted the other way.

I did it on the last tax bill. I requested the appointment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] as a member of the conference committee because his vote had been different from the vote I had cast. I felt that the view the Senate had approved had the right to be represented.

I am not criticizing the conferees for serving, and I am not saying that they have not served well; but I am pointing out that a Senator cannot be compelled to serve on a conference committee if he has a view contrary to that which the Senate has taken.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Of course, I understand that a Senator appointed to a conference committee has a right to resign. If the motion I have made is rejected I shall resign; and I hope I am not presumptuous in suggesting that others of the conferees on the part of the Senate may take the same course.

Mr. President, I have endeavored to be realistic about this matter. I am perfectly willing to stay here all summer. There is no place to which I need to go. However, I do know that Members of the House and the Senate have made plans. Some of them are semiofficial at least. I think it is important that there be a recess. I think it is best for the country and the Congress that there be a recess. Mr. President, we are confronted with a most unusual situation, and we had best be realistic about it. If the conference report goes back to both bodies as in disagreement, I have a feeling, and my feeling is shared by other members of the conference committee, that the House might accept the Senate amendment. I am certain in my own mind that that would result in a veto by the President. I should personally be greatly surprised if the President did not veto such a measure.

That means that if my motion fails the Congress had best stay here now or be prepared to return here in the course of another week or two. I should like

to add—and I have no personal concern in this matter—that the Members of the Senate might well make their plans accordingly if the motion is rejected.

The motion was made in good faith. It was made in the feeling that it was about the same as reporting officially a disagreement. I myself cannot see the difference, except there seems to be a sincere feeling that the conferees on the part of the Senate might have subordinated their views, might have sacrificed and submerged the feelings they had, and might themselves have yielded without coming back to the body appointing them for further opinion, suggestion, and instruction.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, in a moment I shall yield the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I desire to ask the Senator from Connecticut a question, if the Senator from Georgia will permit me to do so.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. I shall yield the floor with this statement, Mr. President: There is a direct, simple way to bring this issue to the Senate, and that is to do so in such a way that Members of the Senate can then reexamine their votes and can say whether the disagreement reported, or the agreement reported which is contrary to what the Senate ordered, is one on the basis of which, with the proper explanatory statements which have been made, the Senate can arrive at its new judgment. We are not now asked to express the new judgment. We are simply asked to fold our hands and say "Well, we must have been wrong, because our conferees have not been able to reach an agreement, although they themselves have made no formal report to us."

Mr. President, that is all I have to say.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not wish to discuss the merits of a roll-back subsidy either one way or the other. That matter has been fully discussed. It is in the mind of each Member of the Senate now in the Chamber. His mind is already made up on that matter, and perhaps on the pending motion.

I do not wish to cast any reflection upon the conferees. I am willing to accept the first face value of their statements that they have done their best to win the House over to the Senate's position. However, I do say that I believe that of the four of them, all of whom were on the losing side of the matter in the Senate, at least two should have refused to serve, so that at least a majority of the Senate conferees would have been made up of those who supported the Senate's opinion. I say that without reflecting on the Senators who have served on the conference committee, but I say it because the practice which has been followed is a bad one. It creates, particularly when a situation such as the present one exists, an uncertainty as to whether the motion now pending should be adopted or rejected, as differentiated from a similar motion on a report made by conferees, a majority of whom had originally supported the position taken by the Senate.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. In view of the explanation which has been made, I think that statement is perfectly ridiculous. What happened? We took exactly the same position as that which would have been taken by conferees who had been in favor of the measure.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not doubt that.

Mr. MALONEY. I served notice on the conference that if we had to stay there until next October, I would not on my own responsibility, as an individual member of the conference, repudiate the Senate's position. Conferees who had been in favor of the measure could not have taken a stronger stand than that, and that position was supported by the majority of the Senate conferees.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I accept the Senator's statement, and I cast no reflection upon him. However, I say it is a bad policy to have all the conferees on the part of the Senate made up of Senators who had been on the losing side in the Senate.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall not talk long. I hope the Senator will permit me to conclude.

Mr. REED. I desire to ask the Senator to yield before he concludes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well; I yield.

Mr. REED. Before the Senator from Maryland sits down I hope that he, with his very brilliant mind, will comment on the extraordinary statement made by the Senator from Connecticut that he was fearful that if the Senate conferees insisted that the House conferees take the matter back to the House for a vote the Senate's position would be adopted by the House.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I did not say any such thing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I decline to yield further, because I do not want to occupy the floor for more than 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend for a moment. The Senate will be in order. The galleries will be in order.

The Senator from Maryland declines to yield to any other Senator until he concludes his statement.

Mr. TYDINGS. So, Mr. President, we have already developed several unique situations in senatorial procedure.

The first situation is that on the most controversial issue of the whole session, with the possible exception of one other, the Senate agreed to a conference, and four of the conferees on the part of the Senate had been on the losing side in the Senate. I say the Senate rules should not permit that to be done. That is the first unique situation.

The second unique situation is that a report is not brought from the conference to the Senate for adoption or rejection, or a report that the conferees on the part of the Senate and the conferees on the part of the House cannot agree. It is my conviction that the reason why that was not done was that the conferees did not want to let the matter go to the House of Representatives in any fashion; because if the matter were to go to the floor of the House, in view of the first position of the House and the position of the House in voting to override the President's veto, it is not unlikely that a majority of the House, as well as a majority of the Senate, would like to have a chance to vote on the controversial amendment. That is the third unique situation.

Putting all those together, the fourth unique situation which logically flows from the three preceding circumstances is that in effect the legislative will is denied a chance to express itself according to the rules of legislative procedure. I do not mean to say that there is any irregularity. I do not question the work of the Senate conferees; I am not reflecting on any Senator; but I say that the net effect is that the legislative body is denied the right to exercise its sovereign will under our Constitution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I had announced that I would not yield; but I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I ask the Senator to yield only in connection with one statement. The House had the Senate amendment before it. A motion to adopt it was in order. Instead of that, the House, after considerable discussion, refused to accept the amendment. So the legislative will has been carried out in the House. That is the position of the House conferees. They say, "We voted once, and we are not going to vote again." We cannot make the House conferees take it back to the House.

Mr. TYDINGS. They made the Senate conferees take it back to the Senate; and certainly they are no more powerful than we are.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the difference is——

Mr. TYDINGS. Does not the Senator from Ohio agree with that statement?

Mr. TAFT. No; they did not make us take it back to the Senate. So far as I know, the conferees simply disagreed. However, we would have been quite willing to take it back to the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not doubt that.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me perfectly reasonable to ask the Senate to advise us what we should do under the new circumstances.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not wish to debate the pros and cons of the subsidy question. I have stated exactly what is in my mind with regard to the procedure. I think the question

ought to be developed at least to that extent.

Every Senator has full knowledge of what the background is. I wish only one thing further, and that is the opportunity to register my opposition on the question of subsidy or no subsidy. I shall have that opportunity by voting against the motion of the Senator from Connecticut to instruct the conferees to recede. If Senators wish to change their position, that is their right. We all know what is involved. I think the whole procedure is most unique, and speaks for itself more eloquently than anyone could speak for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] that the Senate conferees be instructed to recede from Senate amendment numbered 3. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that if he were present and voting he would vote as I am about to vote. I am therefore free to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUTLER. Does a vote on the motion made by the Senator from Connecticut in effect amount to a vote on a conference report?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. Will the Senator state the inquiry?

Mr. BUTLER. Is the vote the same as though we were voting on a conference report?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator wish to know on what the Senate is voting?

Mr. BUTLER. Does it amount to the same thing as voting on a conference report?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] that the Senate conferees be instructed to recede from Senate amendment No. 3.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on official business. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who would vote "nay," is paired on this question with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who would vote "nay," is paired on this question with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] who would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], who would vote "nay," is paired on this question with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been called away on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent because of illness in his family.

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—34

Barkley	La Follette	Taft
Brewster	Langer	Thomas, Utah.
Burton	Lucas	Truman
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Davis	Maloney	Vandenberg
Downey	Mead	Van Nuys
Ellender	Murdock	Wagner
Green	Nye	Wallgren
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Hayden	Pepper	White
Hill	Revercomb	
Kilgore	Shipstead	

NAYS—33

Bridges	Gerry	Reed
Brooks	Gurney	Reynolds
Buck	Hawkes	Robertson
Butler	Holman	Scrugham
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Capper	McCarran	Stewart
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McKellar	Tydings
Danaher	Maybank	Wherry
Ferguson	Millikin	Wiley
George	O'Daniel	Willis

NOT VOTING—29

Aiken	Bilbo	Gillette
Andrews	Bone	Glass
Austin	Bushfield	Hatch
Bailey	Chandler	Johnson, Calif.
Ball	Chavez	Lodge
Bankhead	Clark, Idaho	McNary
Barbour	Eastland	Moore
Murray	Russell	Wheeler
Overton	Thomas, Idaho	Wilson
Radcliffe	Tobey	

So Mr. MALONEY's motion was agreed to, that the Senate conferees be instructed to recede from Senate amendment numbered 3, which is as follows:

SEC. 5. Whenever a maximum price or prices shall have been established for any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, including livestock, under authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, or of the act entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes," approved October 2, 1942, no subsidy or other payments shall be made either directly or indirectly to a producer, processor, manufacturer, or any other person engaged in the production, marketing, distribution, or handling of any such commodity for the purpose of compensating any such producer, processor, manufacturer, or other person in whole or in part for any reduction or roll-back of maximum prices so established as may have been or may hereafter be ordered, from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated to the Commodity Credit Corporation or from any funds authorized to be borrowed by such Corporation, or any other governmental agency, including Government-owned corporations, unless the Congress, by appropriation or otherwise, shall have authorized the use of such funds for such purpose. The definition of the term "person" in section 302 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, shall apply to the term "person" as used herein.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I move that the vote just taken be reconsidered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the motion be laid on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement regarding a vital and basic matter pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It will take me only a few moments.

On July 6 I submitted Senate Resolution 170, which was referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and which states the following in a single sentence:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations is instructed to investigate the draft agreement for a United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration published by the State Department on June 11, 1943, and to report to the Senate whether in its judgment this draft agreement partakes of the nature of a treaty, and should be submitted to the Senate for ratification.

Mr. President, when the Foreign Relations Committee met on yesterday morning there was an immediate unanimous agreement, without regard to political parties, that the subject matter of this resolution must be promptly explored, not presently in respect to the merits of the arrangements which are contemplated for United Nations relief and rehabilitation, but in respect to the procedure involved in the creation of this tremendous instrumentality.

Mr. President, as a result of the action of the Foreign Relations Committee a subcommittee was immediately appointed to confer with the State Department upon this subject, with the distinguished Senator from Texas, who is chairman of the full committee, as chairman of the subcommittee. The interest was so general and so intense that a conference was immediately arranged for yesterday afternoon at 2:30, when the subcommittee met with the distinguished Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, and the able Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, who freely and fully provided us with all available information.

As a result of the conference the entire subject matter of the resolution—involving, as it does, the whole question of constitutional authority in respect to war settlements and post-war plans—is under mutual consideration by the Department and the Senate committee. But I do not want the Senate to separate for the recess without making the subject matter clear in the RECORD so that there may be no mistake about the point at issue, and so that the importance of the point in the life of the Nation may not be overlooked.

Mr. President, I repeat that this discussion does not involve the merits of the draft agreement for United Nations relief and rehabilitation administration. That can be weighed later on its merits.

Obviously there is need for some such action; that is conceded. Obviously advanced planning is the only course of prudence; that is conceded. I commend the State Department for proceeding with concrete studies in this direction. This draft agreement, as a matter of fact, may be the appropriate nucleus for ultimate action. The only question here raised, Mr. President, is the question of procedure and jurisdiction, yet nothing could be more important as we prepare to face these transcendental questions involved in the liquidation of the war.

To what extent is it safe, to what extent is it wise, to what extent is it constitutional for executive authority to proceed independent of Congress with respect to the great decisions now impending, in respect to the determination of the problems growing out of this war? That is at the base of this inquiry.

Mr. President, I do not raise the question in a spirit of controversy; I raise it in a spirit of constructive exploration. That was the attitude of the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee yesterday—a searching for a formula which will invite ultimate unity for sound purposes. If I err at any point in my statement I hope I may be corrected by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who is a member of the subcommittee with me and who is familiar with the subject matter which I discuss.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that now is the time, on the threshold of many such international settlements and determinations, to find out precisely what pattern of things to come we shall follow. The best objectives may be defeated by the wrong approach; the finest aims may be dissipated by failure to pursue them appropriately. We know that from our own history. Bluntly, Mr. President, this episode poses the question as to the extent to which the Congress is to be a constitutional partner in the plans and the decisions which shall liquidate this war; to what extent, on the other hand, the President and his executive administration shall settle these war and post-war problems to suit their own discretion and their own purposes.

I repeat that I do not want to discuss the merits of this particular plan. I want to refer only to the procedure, and I refer to the contents of this draft agreement only to indicate the almost illimitable extent of the moral commitments which can live within the four corners of this draft agreement, as we view it.

I ask, Mr. President, that the full text of the draft agreement be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The full text of the agreement is as follows:

The governments or authorities whose duly authorized representatives have subscribed hereto,

Being United Nations or being associated with the United Nations in this war,

Being determined that immediately upon the liberation of any area by the armed forces of the United Nations the population thereof shall receive aid and relief from their sufferings; food, clothing, and shelter; aid in the prevention of pestilence and in the recovery of the health of the people; and that preparation and arrangements shall be made for the return of prisoners and exiles to their homes, for the resumption of agricultural and industrial production and the restoration of essential services, to the end that peoples once freed may be preserved and restored to health and strength for the tasks and opportunities of building anew,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

There is hereby established the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

1. The Administration shall have power to acquire, hold, and convey property; to enter into contracts and undertake obligations; to designate or create agencies and to review the activities of agencies so created; to manage undertakings and in general to perform any legal act appropriate to its objects and purposes.

2. Subject to the provisions of article VII, the purposes and functions of the Administration shall be as follows:

(a) To plan, coordinate, administer, or arrange for the administration of measures for the relief of victims of war in any area under the control of any of the United Nations through the provision of food, fuel, clothing, and other basic necessities, housing facilities, medical and other essential services; and to facilitate in areas receiving relief the production and transportation of these articles and the furnishing of these services so far as necessary to the adequate provision of relief. The form of activities of the Administration within the territory of a member government wherein that government exercises administrative authority and the responsibility to be assumed by the member government for carrying out measures planned by the Administration therein shall be determined after consultation with and with the consent of the member government.

(b) To formulate and recommend measures for individual or joint action by any or all of the member governments for the coordination of purchasing, the use of ships and other procurement activities in the period following the cessation of hostilities, with a view to integrating the plans and activities of the Administration with the total movement of supplies, and for the purpose of achieving an equitable distribution of available supplies. The Administration may administer such coordination measures as the member governments authorize.

(c) To formulate and recommend for individual or joint action by any or all of the member governments measures with respect to such related matters, arising out of its experience in planning and performing the work of relief and rehabilitation, as may be proposed by any of the member governments and approved by unanimous vote of the central committee.

ARTICLE II

Membership

The members of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall be the governments or authorities signatory hereto and such other governments or authorities as may upon application for membership be admitted thereto by action by the council, or between sessions of the council, by the central committee.

Wherever the term "member government" is used in this agreement it shall be construed to embrace such authorities as shall have signed the agreement or shall subsequently become members of the Administration.

ARTICLE III

The council

1. Each member government shall name one representative, and such alternates as may be necessary, upon the council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, which shall be the policy-making body of the Administration. The council shall, for each of its sessions, select one of its members to preside at the session.

2. The council shall be convened in normal session not less than twice a year by the central committee. It may be convened in special session whenever the central committee shall deem necessary, and shall be convened within 30 days after request therefor by a majority of the members of the council.

3. The central committee of the council shall consist of the representatives of China, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America, with the Director General presiding. Between sessions of the council it shall exercise all the powers and functions thereof. It shall invite the participation of the representatives of any member government at those of its meetings at which action of special interest to such government is discussed. It shall invite the participation of the representative serving as chairman of the committee on supplies of the council at those of its meetings at which policies affecting the provision of supplies are discussed.

4. The committee on supplies of the council shall consist of the members of the council, or their alternates, representing those member governments likely to be principal supplies of materials for relief and rehabilitation. The members shall be appointed by the central committee, with the approval of the council if it be in session and otherwise subject to its ratification. The committee on supplies shall consider, formulate, and recommend to the central committee and the council policies designed to assure the provision of required supplies. The central committee shall from time to time meet with the committee on supplies to review policy matters affecting supplies.

5. The committee of the council for Europe shall consist of all the members of the council, or their alternates, representing member governments of territories within the European area, and such other members of the council, representing other govern-

ments directly concerned with the problems of relief and rehabilitation in the European area, as shall be appointed by the central committee, with the approval of the council if it be in session, and otherwise subject to its ratification. The committee of the council for the Far East shall consist of all the members of the council, or their alternates, representing member governments of territories within the far eastern area, and such other members of the council representing other governments directly concerned with the problems of relief and rehabilitation in the far eastern area as shall be appointed by the central committee, with the approval of the council if it be in session, and otherwise subject to the council's ratification. The regional committees shall normally meet within their respective areas. They shall consider and recommend to the council and the central committee policies with respect to relief and rehabilitation within their respective areas. The committee of the council for Europe shall replace the interallied committee on European post-war relief established in London on September 24, 1941, and the records of the latter shall be made available to the committee for Europe.

6. The council shall establish such other standing regional committees as it shall consider desirable, the functions of such committees and the method of appointing their members being identical to that provided in paragraph 5 of this article with respect to the committees of the council for Europe and for the Far East. The council shall also establish such other standing committees as it considers desirable to advise it and, in intervals between sessions of the council, to advise the central committee. For such technical standing committees as may be established, in respect of particular problems such as nutrition, health, agriculture, transport, repatriation, and finance, the members may be members of the council or alternates nominated by them because of special competence in their respective fields of work. The members shall be appointed by the central committee, with the approval of the council if it be in session and otherwise subject to its ratification. Should a regional committee so desire, subcommittees of the technical standing committees shall be established by the technical committees in consultation with the regional committees, to advise the regional committees.

7. The travel and other expenses of members of the council and of members of its committees shall be borne by the governments which they represent.

8. All reports and recommendations of committees of the council shall be transmitted to the Director General for distribution to the council and the central committee by the secretariat of the council established under the provisions of article IV, paragraph 4.

ARTICLE IV

The Director General

1. The executive authority of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall be in the Director General, who shall be appointed by the council on the nomination by unanimous vote of the central committee. The Director General may be removed by unanimous vote of the central committee.

2. The Director General shall have full power and authority for carrying out relief operations contemplated by article I, paragraph 2 (a), within the limits of available resources and the broad policies determined by the council or its central committee. Immediately upon taking office he shall in conjunction with the military and other appropriate authorities of the United Nations prepare plans for the emergency relief of the civilian population in any area occupied by the armed forces of any of the United Nations, arrange for the procurement and assembly of the necessary supplies and create or select the emergency organizations required for this purpose. In arranging for the procurement, transportation, and distribution of supplies and services, he and his representatives shall consult and collaborate with the appropriate authorities of the United Nations and shall, wherever practicable, use the facilities made available by such authorities. Foreign voluntary relief agencies may not engage in activity in any area receiving relief from the Administration without the consent and unless subject to the regulation of the Director General. The powers and duties of the Director General are subject to the limitations of article VII.

3. The Director General shall also be responsible for the organization and direction of the functions contemplated by article I, paragraphs 2 (b) and 2 (c).

4. The Director General shall appoint such Deputy Directors General, officers, expert personnel, and staff at his headquarters and elsewhere, including field missions, as he shall find necessary, and he may delegate to them such of his powers as he may deem appropriate. The Director General, or upon his authorization the Deputy Directors General, shall supply such secretariat and other staff and facilities as shall be required by the council and its committees, including the regional committees and subcommittees. Such Deputy Directors General, as shall be assigned special functions within a region, shall attend meetings of the regional standing committee whenever possible and shall keep it advised on the progress of the relief and rehabilitation program within the region.

5. The Director General shall make periodic reports to the central committee and to the council covering the progress of the Administration's activities. The reports shall be made public except for such portions as the central committee may consider it necessary, in the interest of the United Nations, to keep confidential. The Director General shall also arrange to have prepared periodic reports covering the activities of the Administration within each region and he shall transmit such reports with his comments thereon to the council, the central committee, and the respective regional committees.

ARTICLE V

Supplies and resources

1. Each member government pledges its full support to the Administration, within the limits of its available resources and subject to the requirements of its constitutional procedure, through contributions of funds, materials, equipment, supplies, and services, for use in its own, adjacent, or other areas in need, in order to accomplish the purposes of article I, paragraph 2 (a). All such contributions received by the Administration shall be accounted for.

2. The supplies and resources made available by the member governments shall be kept in review in relation to prospective requirements by the Director General, who shall initiate action with the member governments with a view to assuring such additional supplies and resources as may be required.

3. All purchases by any of the member governments, made outside their own territories during the war for relief or rehabilitation purposes, shall be made only after consultation with the Director General, and shall, so far as practicable, be carried out through the appropriate United Nations' agency.

ARTICLE VI

Administrative expenses

The Director General shall submit to the council an annual budget, and from time to time such supplementary budgets as may be required, covering the necessary administrative expenses of the Administration. Upon approval of a budget by the council the total amount approved shall be allocated to the member governments in proportions to be determined by the council. Each member government pledges itself, subject to the requirements of its constitutional procedure, to contribute to the Administration promptly its share of the administrative expenses so determined.

ARTICLE VII

Notwithstanding any other provision herein contained, while hostilities or other military necessities exist in any area, the Administration and its Director General shall not undertake activities therein without the consent of the military command of that area, and unless subject to such control as the command may find necessary. The determination that such hostilities or military necessities exist in any area shall be made by its military commander.

ARTICLE VIII

Amendment

The provisions of this agreement may be amended by unanimous vote of the central committee and two-thirds vote of the council.

ARTICLE IX

Entry into force

This agreement shall enter into force with respect to each signatory on the date when the agreement is signed by that signatory, unless otherwise specified by such signatory.

Mr. VANDENBERG. For the purpose of this brief comment, I merely point to the fact that the draft agreement contemplates the treatment of almost the total subject, not only of relief, but also of rehabilitation, not only in the war world, not only in respect to those areas which may fall to our responsibility as a result of our serial victories in the war, but also, quoting the language it covers:

The period following the cessation of hostilities.

It sets up for this purpose a complete international machine which is partially reminiscent of the League of Nations itself in respect to its creation of a general body representing all the signatory powers and then a superbody representing only the four major powers, namely, China, Russia, Britain, and the United States, and binding the latter to operate by unanimous consent.

Mr. President, I leave the document to speak for itself, but in article V it finally reads as follows:

Each member government pledges its full support to the administration, within the limits of its available resources and subject to the requirements of its constitutional procedure, through contributions of funds, materials, equipment, supplies, and service for use in its own, adjacent, or other areas in need, in order to accomplish the purposes of article I.

And those purposes are the all-out purposes to which I have previously referred.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this is a moral commitment, if nothing more, of all the available resources of the United States to whatever plan may evolve from the administrative agency, world-wide in its scope and in the dedication which is created by this document. I think it is a moral commitment from which we could never recede when ultimate appropriations are sought from

a Congress which was never consulted in respect to the commitments. I do not believe that is the democratic, the constitutional way.

Mr. President, I said I wanted to discuss only the question of procedure, because that is the thing involved in the present episode. I wrote to the distinguished Secretary of State on June 22 and asked him whether it was contemplated that this draft agreement would be submitted to the Senate for ratification. I read one sentence from the Secretary's letter of July 6 in reply:

> It has been decided, after consultation with the majority and minority leaders of both Houses of Congress, that United States' participation in the establishment of this United Nations administration should be through an executive agreement.

That is the point at issue, Mr. President. The point at issue is whether a commitment of this incalculable magnitude in respect not only to policy but to resources is merely an executive agreement which can totally bypass the Congress of the United States except at that "long last" moment when finally an appropriation is to be sought from Congress to implement the pledges and promises which have been made in the name of the total resources of the United States, by the President and his executive associates.

Under the draft agreement and under the Secretary's letter there is no point at which this plan, I repeat, of illimitable consequences, reaches the Congress for any consultation or action except at "long last" when everything has been done, the machinery created, the commitments made, our share of the cost assessed to us, and we are finally given the unavoidable privilege in Congress of finally making the appropriation. We pay the bills—that is, the people do—but we have nothing to say about what the bills shall be. I respectfully submit that government by executive decree could not aspire to much greater totalitarian authority.

Mr. President, I submit that if any agreements or commitments in international relationships could ever rise to the dignity and importance of a treaty as contemplated by the Constitution of the United States, here is exhibit A. I totally disagree with the conception that commitments of this nature can be made without ratification by the Senate of the United States.

In presenting the matter now I am hoping—and I know the distinguished and unanimous Senators who were sitting in yesterday's conference are of the same mind—that we may find common ground between Congress, the State Department, and the office of the President upon which we can proceed with least possible friction in the development of the answers to the utterly terrific problems which one after another will confront us in the liquidation of the war.

I do not believe that we can hope to arrive at that concert of interest and action if the State Department and the President are to proceed in the fashion indicated in this initial exhibit.

Therefore, Mr. President, I wanted the RECORD to show precisely what had happened, I wanted the RECORD to carry the text of this draft agreement. It is the preliminary text, it is subject to change by consultation with other nations. The final text will probably not be available for 60 days at the earliest.

The State Department representatives, including the very distinguished Secretary of State Mr. Hull, than whom no finer public servant has appeared in the public life of this Nation in my time, listened to us respectfully yesterday, and have agreed to consider the whole matter anew. By the whole matter I mean not only the text of this draft, but also the general subject of the better constitutional relationships which must be established in the pursuit of the settlement of our war problems, if the virtue of the settlements is not to be lost in the quarrel over the method of making the settlements.

It is for the reasons I have given, Mr. President, that I have made this statement, not in a spirit of controversy, but in a spirit of hope that this very frank disclosure, this very frank discussion of what I believe is a substantial error in the attitude of the State Department and the President in this initial venture, may lead to those contacts between us which may find a better and a happier way in which to solve the remaining problems which will pile in upon us as we liquidate the war and justify our conclusive victory.

Mr. GREEN. The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], in his remarks about what happened yesterday at a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations and, after the meeting, of the subcommittee appointed by the committee to confer with the Secretary of State, asked that I note what he said, and that I draw his attention to any unintentional misstatement he might make. I am glad to say that I listened attentively, and he has given a correct statement of what occurred at the two meetings.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator very much, indeed.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I rise merely for the purpose of reading a very short newspaper article, and calling it to the attention of the Senate and House members of the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures. I read from the Washington Times-Herald of this morning:

> TALE OF A DIRTY SHIRT—CLOTHING ROTS AS NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION LAUNDRY IS "WASHED OUT" BY CONGRESS
>
> BIRMINGHAM, ALA., July 7.—An $80,000 laundry operated by the National Youth Administration at nearby Slossfield lay idle today with 15,000 pounds of soiled and "wet-wash" laundry rotting in its bins.
>
> W. McKay Wright, area manager of National Youth Administration, said no funds were provided to finish the cleaning when the Federal agency was liquidated by Congress, effective last Saturday.
>
> "I'm not even allowed to hire somebody to come in and do the work or to permit any other agency to do it," Wright said.
>
> The laundry, which several weeks ago received 20,000 pounds of new equipment, handled work for all National Youth Administration projects in the Birmingham area and for a maternity hospital and two clinics of the local health department.

Mr. President, we see that this great industrial planning institution has been conducting an $80,000 laundry in Birmingham, Ala., for employees in that district, and, in addition, two clinics and a maternity hospital. The article does not state whether it is a State or a National hospital, and I do not know which it is, but I do not believe it is a part of the National Youth Administration. I never before heard of a maternity hospital being conducted by the National Youth Administration.

Mr. President, this shows the remarkable situation into which the National Youth Administration has fallen since its usefulness was over. I intended to offer a resolution for an investigation of this matter. This laundry is not the only property owned by the N. Y. A. It has a dairy farm in Georgia, and another at Manassas, Va. Those activities certainly do not concern the training of industrial employees. However that may be, I had intended to offer a resolution, but the property has been declared surplus property by a bill which has been passed, and it will be put into the hands of the Procurement Division of the Treasury. In order to ascertain something about expenditures such as this remarkable one to which I have called attention, I did think of offering a resolution to have the matter especially investigated. Instead of that, however, I wish to call to the attention of the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] the law under which the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures was created, and to invite him to look into these remarkable expenditures by the N. Y. A., only three of which have been disclosed up to this time.

I want the committee to take steps at once to make an investigation and report to the Congress how it happened that money which was appropriated for training young persons for industry, in compliance with requests made by department officials, on the basis of estimates submitted by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, could have been spent for building laundries and for buying dairies and cattle, and operating dairy farms.

I call the attention of the Senator from Virginia to this matter and ask that immediate steps be taken, if they have not already been taken, to save this property, or what remains of it, for the United States.

I call special attention, Mr. President, to the title relating to nonessential Federal expenditures, being title VI of the Revenue Act of 1941, which was approved on September 20, 1941.

PREPARATION OF ESTIMATES FOR APPROPRIATIONS AND PLANS FOR TAXATION

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, before the Congress moves into its summer recess, I should like to make a few observations, based upon the confusion and turmoil which have attended the last final weeks of our labor, and upon the various prob-

lems which have confronted the Congress throughout the session.

The two most important and time-consuming functions which the Congress must perform center around the serious and difficult problems of taxation and appropriations. These are matters which command the interest and attention of every American citizen, for they bring direct repercussions and impose definite responsibilities on almost every American citizen.

We are all aware, Mr. President, of the delay and confusion which have attended the enactment of tax legislation in recent years. We are all aware that in a number of instances the people of America did not know the proportions of the tax bill which they would be called upon to meet until the due date for that obligation was virtually at hand. These protracted delays only served to confuse and irritate the people, and to bring about a hurried and perhaps ill-planned action on the part of the Congress. The conditions which have attended the program of taxation are not wholly the fault of the Congress. The fact remains that more often than not the Treasury Department has failed to submit its estimates of required revenue and its recommendations as to how that revenue was to be raised until the deadline for congressional action was virtually upon us.

What has been said with respect to taxation can be applied equally as well to the matter of appropriations. The Congress can do little about this matter until the estimates of the various departments and agencies are placed in its hands for consideration. But here again, the estimates are very often not presented at a sufficiently early date to permit the Congress to conduct the hearings and investigations necessary to establish the need for and the validity of the requests made.

Even now we are witnessing the unhappy spectacle of appropriation bills lying uncompleted more than a week after the legal deadline for such appropriations has expired. This situation has brought untold confusion and uncertainty to vast numbers of our people, and has impeded, in some cases, the operation of a considerable number of Government programs and agencies. Conditions such as these contribute nothing to the prestige of the Congress, and they contribute little to the efficiency of the Government or to the confidence of the people.

Mr. President, these appalling conditions must be corrected, and the time to prepare for such a correction is now. Surely the monetary needs of our war program are reasonably clear by now. Surely it is not impossible for the Treasury Department to draw up its revenue estimates and its recommendations as to the type and nature of the taxes which it deems necessary to raise the needed revenues. Moreover, the organization of the Government for war should be sufficiently well planned at this late hour to permit of the drafting of budgetary estimates and requirements, without undue delay or inaccuracy.

Mr. President, if the Congress is to give these respective matters the study and attention which they merit, if the Congress is to hold the necessary hearings and receive the benefit of the reaction of the American people to these particular programs, the basic information pertaining to taxation and appropriations must be in our hands at an earlier date than has heretofore been the case. For this reason I recommend that the Congress serve notice on the Treasury Department and on the Bureau of the Budget to begin immediately to prepare their estimates on these respective matters, so that they might be presented to the Congress immediately upon the termination of the present recess. Indeed, should the work of these agencies be completed before that time, the Congress could well be called together at an earlier date, in order to give proper consideration to the subjects.

Mr. President, I am confident that if my recommendations are carried out, the Congress will be able to perform these two necessary and vital functions in a more efficient and economical manner, and thus assure the more effective operation of the Government, and the more willing and effective participation of the American people in supporting and sustaining the programs in question.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 to the bill and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ELIMINATION OF PRIVATE SUITS FOR PENALTIES AND DAMAGES ARISING OUT OF FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, the bill under consideration passed the House last March, came to the Senate, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary on April 2, and was reported favorably on June 8. The bill was explained once before by me on the floor of the Senate, and I think Members of the Senate are more or less familiar with its purpose and objective. Very briefly, its purpose is to amend a statute enacted in 1863 during the progress of the Civil War. The section of that war statute proposed to be amended applies to what are known as informer suits, which in substance means that any individual may on behalf of himself and the United States bring a suit for damages growing out of alleged frauds in connection with war contracts. The statute further provides that the so-called informer may receive half of the amount recovered.

There is no doubt that during the Civil War the statute served a certain useful purpose. It was enacted as an incentive or reward for informers with respect to fraudulent contracts and false claims filed by individuals or corporations against the Government. The statute has seldom been invoked in late years. But there has been a mushroom growth of such suits within the last 12 months. There are now 28 such suits pending, the total demands of which exceed $100,000,000. One such suit was filed only yesterday in Chicago for $35,000,000 against ex-Vice President Dawes. The one who filed the suit alleged that fraudulent claims were made in connection with loans extended to the Dawes bank by the R. F. C., a transaction with which we are all familiar. The suit is brought by a minor employee of the Dawes bank, who refuses to inform the Government of any of the facts concerning which he claims to have information, and refuses to appear before a United States grand jury and testify to the facts. He is shooting for seventeen and one-half million dollars under this infamous informer's statute.

Mr. President, I have gone into these matters in detail once before on the floor of the Senate. I understand that the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] desires to speak for 20 or 30 minutes in opposition to the bill, and so I shall now yield to him, after which I shall be glad to endeavor to answer any questions Senators may desire to ask.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, it is true, as the distinguished Senator from Indiana said, that I did say I would talk only a short time. However, this morning I received a letter from a former Governor of the State of Kansas. As a result, I feel that of necessity I must change my plans, and must talk at greater length.

I desire to make it perfectly clear that I do not want to have anything I shall say considered by anyone as a reflection upon the Assistant Attorney General of the United States in charge of war-fraud prosecutions, Tom Clark. Likewise, I want all Members of the Senate to know that I have for the chairman of the great Committee on the Judiciary, the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana, FREDERICK VAN NUYS, only the very warmest and deepest affection.

It so happens that in this particular instance, I simply cannot agree with the majority report of the Judiciary Committee. In fact, Mr. President, I am very sorry, indeed, that the bill has come up at all at this particular time, at a time when the Senate is about to take a recess, and when, for example, yesterday there was delivered on this floor one of the greatest speeches—I refer to the speech delivered by the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE]—in connection with the administration of justice that I have heard since I have been

a Member of the Senate, and yet, during the majority of the time when the Senator from Washington was speaking, only 11 Senators were on the floor of the Senate.

Because of the very great importance of this matter, I wish very much that it could have been put over until September.

I desire to say to you, Mr. President, and to the Senate that in my judgment the pending bill is the most important bill that has come out of the Committee on the Judiciary during all the time I have been a member of that committee. We have had only one more important bill, and that was the "Gestapo bill."

That bill is still slumbering in the committee, and I hope it never gets out. However, considering all the bills that have been reported by the committee, the pending bill supersedes in real interest, so far as the people of the country are concerned, any other bill reported by the committee during the 3 years I have been a member of it.

Mr. President, it is my judgment that the votes of the Senate and the House of Representatives upon this measure will determine whether billions of dollars may ever be recovered from war contracts in connection with which there has been fraud. When I say "billions of dollars" I mean just that. The pending bill is more important to the American people than was the Teapot Dome. In my judgment, it is twice as important as that matter was. Certainly this matter is more important than the Elk Hills oil contract, in the exposé of which I had a part a short time ago.

Mr. President, I repeat that I believe the pending bill is one of the most important, if not the most important, of all the measures that have come out of the Committee on the Judiciary during the 3 years I have been a member of the committee. Let me call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the bill is improperly called a bill relating to informer suits. In reality, the bill proposes changes in a recovery act enacted 80 years ago, in the administration of Abraham Lincoln. For 80 years the act has been on the statute books, Mr. President. Now, for the first time, we are asked to change it.

During the Civil War, while Abraham Lincoln was President, he found that the United States Government was being defrauded in war contracts. Where good muskets were contracted for and paid for by the Government, President Lincoln found old muskets delivered. Where good, young horses were bargained for, old, spavined critters were supplied. Where good war material was paid for by the Government in Abraham Lincoln's time, poor material was being supplied. All those war frauds were committed in the Civil War, when the very life of our Nation was at stake, and were committed by persons who were willing to make money out of the blood and sufferings of our soldiers.

It was to remedy that situation that Abraham Lincoln induced a distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, former Senator Cowan, to introduce a measure which became the law which today is sought to be changed and practically repealed. I desire to call attention to what was said in 1863 by the then Senator from Pennsylvania in charge of the bill, in introducing it. Let me say parenthetically that he might just as well have been speaking today. I shall call the Senate's attention to what he said 80 years ago at the time when he introduced the bill which became the act which now is sought to be amended. In fact, in my judgment, the attempt being made is not merely to amend the act but to emasculate it to such an extent as to amount to its practical repeal.

When he introduced the bill the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator Cowan, said this:

> This bill has been prepared at the urgent solicitation of the officers who are connected with the administration of the War Department and the Treasury Department. The country, as we know has been full of complaints respecting the frauds and corruptions practiced in obtaining pay from the Government during the present war; and it is said, and earnestly urged upon our attention, that further legislation is pressingly necessary to prevent this great evil * * *. (The CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 37th Cong., 3d sess., December 1, 1862–March 9, 1863, at p. 952). That the honorable Senator from Michigan was guilty of no overstatement is apparent from the histories of the times.

I suggest that when the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] made his report a few days ago and said that our money was being squandered by millions of dollars, he might just as well have been reiterating what was said 80 years ago by Senator Cowan of Pennsylvania.

> The Government was cheated without conscience in its purchases of military supplies. A committee of the War Department in 1862 exposed frauds of $17,000,000 in contracts amounting to $50,000,000. The Michigan Legislature formally charged that "traitors in the disguise of patriots have plundered our Treasury," and James Russell Lowell, agreeing, asserted, "Men have striven to make the blood of our martyrs the seed of wealth." The term, "shoddy aristocracy," came to signify those who reaped fortunes out of Government contracts, particularly from supplying the soldiers with inferior clothing.

I wish to quote from Hockett's Political and Social Growth of the American People, page 759:

> Necessity, haste, and carelessness can explain the acceptance of a great many of these contracts and a very great deal of inferior goods. But a large amount of blame must go to a horde of Government-paid officials who, either through criminal negligence or criminal collusion, permitted or encouraged this robbing of the Government Treasury and cruelty to the American soldier. * * * Accused inspectors passed the blame on to those letting the contracts, the latter blamed the contractors, and the contractors in turn contended that they furnished goods according to specification.

Exactly as was described yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] in connection with certain Government contracts.

Continuing the quotation from Hockett:

> Such wide publicity was gained by this complicity of public officials in the early contracting business that one of the very first acts of the extra session of Congress in 1861 was to institute an investigation of the existing practices and conditions. * * * The committee discovered an astounding amount of illegal and fraudulent activities, in some instances calling into question the honor or good judgment of men high in political and military councils of the country. (1 Shannon, Organization and Administration of the Union Army, 56–58.)

He might well have been referring to the Truman committee. The investigating committee was appointed in 1861, and after investigating for a little over a year, made its report, just as the Truman committee is making its reports now.

Senators will be interested in knowing exactly what was said by Senators who urged this measure when it was first introduced, and succeeded in having it passed. Senator Cowan, of Pennsylnia said, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE of February 14, 1863, at page 954:

> I am not so certain that there are now in the statute-book laws ample to provide for the complete punishment and prevention of these frauds, but nobody does it.

He is making the very same argument which is made by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] in reporting the pending measure. The distinguished Senator said the other day when he reported the bill that we now have the F. B. I. and many other organizations to help detect frauds. He stated that we did not have such organizations in the Civil War. Yet, Mr. President, this is what Senator Cowan said in 1863, on the 14th of February:

> I am not so certain that there are now in the statute-book laws ample to provide for the complete punishment and prevention of these frauds, but nobody does it. We appoint a committee to investigate a certain subject; that committee makes a report which astounds everybody in any other country but this; and the guilty men go abroad, and they perform their customary and their usual avocations; they are received among their friends just as before; perhaps their character is somewhat heightened by the adroitness they have manifested in their diabolical schemes for the purpose of procuring money from a distracted, and what will be in a short time an impoverished country.

Is not that exactly what was stated by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] yesterday? Did not those guilty men go scot free? Did they not go abroad, performing their customary and usual avocations? In fact, the judge who sentenced them said he was going to let them go so that next morning they could perform their usual work in production.

Senator Cowan continued:

> I have no doubt that if the officers of the Government would do their duty when a man is caught procuring money by these pretenses, and false and forged claims in any of the thousand modes by which it may be done, he could be punished. He could be now, if the proper officers were on his trail and if the proper precautions were taken to enforce the laws we now have.
>
> Indeed, it is not now so much for the want of law that this mischief prevails everywhere, as it is from a seeming utter unwillingness on the part of those in authority to vindicate the laws that already exist by subjecting to punishment those who are guilty.

So I submit that the distinguished Senator from Indiana, in making his report, begged the question when he stated that we have the F. B. I. and many other agencies to detect frauds. I submit that no one does it.

Those far-seeing Senators realized that the most potent weapon to deter these plunderers of our National Treasury, was to make such cheating and defrauding unprofitable. Senator Howard, in urging passage of that bill, said—Congressional Globe, February 14, 1863, page 955:

Mr. President, it is desirable to enact some law which shall remove the stigma which rests upon the country and the Government in reference to the frauds, corruptions, and peculations which have disgraced our service during the whole of this war. It is one of the crying evils of the period, if report is in any degree to be credited, that our Treasury is plundered from day to day by bands of conspirators, who are knotted together in this city, and other large cities, for the purpose of defrauding and plundering our Government.

That was said in 1863 by Senator Howard. It was said upon this floor substantially by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] only a few days ago.

Senator Howard continued:

I believe that in matters of this kind a grand jury is little better than useless, that instead of being a protection to the Government, who is the real sufferer in all cases, they are but a protection to the knave and the rogue. I desire to see some provision adopted which shall bring these gentry to speedy and exemplary justice, and I think this bill will do it.

This is the bill, Mr. President, before us today, at a time when we are spending as many billions of dollars as we spent millions of dollars in the Civil War, when the majority opinion is emasculating it and in practical effect is rendering it almost worthless.

Senator Wilson, of Massachusetts, speaking on February 14, 1863, as appears at page 956 of the Congressional Globe, said—and what he said might just as well have been said here a few days ago by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]:

Mr. President, these halls have rung with denunciations of the frauds of contractors upon the Government of the United States. Investigating committees in both Houses of Congress have reported the grossest frauds upon the Government. * * * This bill is reported for the purpose of ferreting out and punishing these enormous frauds upon our Government; and, for one, my sympathies are with the Government, and not with the men who are committing these frauds.

I say, Mr. President, that that is the dilemma which is facing the Members of this body today. I say that if they are in favor of the majority report they should take cognizance of the language of Senator Howard, who, in 1863, said:

This bill is reported for the purpose of ferreting out and punishing these enormous frauds upon our Government, and, for one, my sympathies are with the Government, and not with the men who are committing these frauds.

The House has passed House bill 1203, which is proposed to be amended by Senate bill 920, to the effect that our courts shall be deprived of jurisdiction even to hear and determine such cases, even though a palpable fraud is committed upon our Government—the people of America. These proposed bills seek to emasculate the inalienable rights of the citizen to check upon his appointed administrative officer in order to insure that his own Government is protected. Is that what the people of America expect of us?

I do not wish the citizens who, with vivid interest, are watching our proceedings here to sink down in despair under the idea that their own Congress is out to destroy the most formidable weapon in the hands of the Government, to be used in retrieving the character of the Nation from the stigma which these fraud practices have inflicted upon our Nation.

Revised Statutes 3490 to 3494 have been on our books for 80 years, and have received the sanction of our courts.

Mr. President, I particularly ask the Senators to note this:

In *United States* v. *Griswold*, 24 Federal 361, affirmed in 30 Federal 762, the Court said this law—

was intended to protect the Treasury—

This is the Court speaking—

against the hungry and unscrupulous host that encompasses it on every side and should be construed accordingly.

The citizens plaintiffs and Government's recovery was sustained.

And I might add that all that was done before the Judiciary Committee was superficial. No hearing was held before any subcommittee.

Mr. President, it is said that there are 28 lawsuits pending. I challenge any member of the Judiciary Committee to give us a list of them. Not one of the men involved in the 28 lawsuits appeared except Mr. Coates, whom I myself got to appear before the Senate committee.

Mr. President, if this report is accepted by the Senate, 22 cases will be adjudicated without a single one of the lawyers or the plaintiffs who brought the cases ever being before either the subcommittee or the Judiciary Committee as a whole, or before any other committee of Congress. That is the record. I know, because I attended every meeting of the committee.

I repeat, superficially, it is possible to abandon qui tam or so-called informer action in favor of enforcement solely through governmental officers, as H. R. 1203 proposed to do. As a consequence, however, the field may be opened to suppression of official action when frauds against the Government implicate favored individuals.

Mr. President, suppose Harry Daugherty were the present Attorney General of the United States. Would you trust him? Yet the proposed amendments would put him in complete control. The qui tam action, which is as old as the common law itself, provides a safeguard which has heretofore in some measure prevented any such situation. Provision for informers is still in force in the revenue, customs, and other laws. A list of these is given in note 4 of the decision of the Supreme Court in the case quoted above. Why is the qui tam action to be repealed solely in the case of contract frauds, particularly at a time when the opportunity for such frauds is greater than ever in our history?

In recent years the art of fraud has been refined. It is now practiced through the medium of the international cartel agreement. The pen is mightier than the sword. How true. Let me read what the economic advisers to the Department of Justice have to say about a typical case. I now read from chapter XX of Germany's Master Plan, by Borkin and Welsh:

The 1921 agreement divided the world market * * * the United States to be exclusive territory of Bausch & Lomb, reserving the rest of the world to Zeiss. * * *

These conspirators dealt in military optical instruments, items vitally needed for our war effort, such as periscopes, range finders, altimeters, and other firing mechanisms—and they charged any price they saw fit. They had a monopoly, the purchasers, including the United States Government, were at their mercy. I denounce these contracts as a palpable fraud.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the passage of this bill. I have filed minority views with the Judiciary Committee.

(At this point Mr. LANGER yielded for the presentation of a conference report and other matters, which appear elsewhere in the RECORD, under the appropriate headings.)

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President——

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement to expedite the business of this body.

House bill 1203 has been before the Judiciary Committee since April 2. We have held repeated hearings before the full committee. Mr. Tom Clark, who is in charge of prosecutions of war frauds, has appeared before us frequently and has pleaded for the enactment of the bill to stop racketeers, who are springing up like mushrooms all over the United States, from taking advantage of this antiquated statute.

The committee has conformed to the desires of the Senator from North Dakota over and over and over again. We have incorporated every amendment which he has asked. He is filibustering today to defeat the bill. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to lay aside the bill and let it go over until after the recess. Let the responsibility and blood be on the hands and head of the Senator from North Dakota in protecting racketeers and profiteers all over the United States.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I resent the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Indiana. More than half an hour ago I told the Senate why I am making this talk. Last night I received a letter from a former Governor of Kansas. Is he a racketeer? Is he a

crook? Let me read to the Senate the letter which I received from former Governor Ratner. I do not know this ex-Governor. I have never met him. He is a Democrat. And then you judge who is protecting racketeers and crooks. He states:

DEAR SENATOR: I will appreciate very much your considering my views relative to H. R. 1203 which, as you know, is the repeal of the informer statute.

Shortly after finishing my second term as Governor of Kansas last January and resuming the practice of law, I became one of the attorneys in an informer suit against the contractors who built the Sunflower Ordnance Plant at Eudora, Kans. This case was based upon the evidence and information secured by the plaintiff and his attorneys. No prosecution or suit had been started by the Government.

Who is protecting the racketeers? We appropriated more than $100,000,000 for the Department of Justice, and now this leading Democrat says that no suit has been started by the Government or anyone else on a matter involving millions of loot.

After we filed suit, and as a result of information we supplied Senator TRUMAN'S committee, and at our request, witnesses were questioned in Kansas City recently by that committee. After this investigation, Senator TRUMAN was quoted in the newspapers as saying that it appeared that many millions of dollars had been wasted in the construction of this plant and that the investigation would continue.

H. R. 1203 is a bill which is most vicious in that its actual though not ostensible purpose is to throw a cloak of protection about unscrupulous persons who have mulcted the Federal Government of millions of dollars and who are now threatened with a just judgment under an "informer" suit pending.

The former Governor continues:

No one could reasonably object to the repeal of the present law if, in fact, "the reasons which caused its enactment no longer exist." However, the bill in question goes much farther and is calculated to do away with the above-entitled action which is now pending and others of a similar nature.

I repeat, Mr. President, that never will I willingly consent, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, to sit by and see the people of America robbed. I have represented the common people here and I will continue to do so. I regret that the distinguished chairman of our Judiciary Committee apparently chooses to make an issue of it, but I owe my first allegiance to the people of this country and from it I shall not swerve regardless of consequences.

Continuing with the letter from the former Governor of Kansas:

On page 3 of the bill, lines 16 and 17 are stricken for the purpose of eliminating outright repeal and retaining the "informer" statute on the books, subject to restrictions which would destroy its force and effect.

Under the present law, there is no restraint upon any district attorney who is doing his duty and who desires to proceed against wrongdoers.

Section 2 of the bill, commencing on line 18, page 3, will terminate all pending litigation by changing present procedure.

Why, Mr. President, racketeers have been mentioned. I hold in my hand a copy of the civil complaint filed only 4 or 5 days ago against former Vice President Charles G. Dawes. I will say to the Senate that it asks for a judgment of $35,331,462.02. I invite the attention of the Senate to the following significant paragraph:

Paragraph 8. The said unlawful acts were committed by the defendants hereinbefore mentioned during the period from the year 1932 to and including the year 1943.

Mr. President, in 1932, 1934, 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, 1940, 1941 and 1942 this matter with which the distinguished Senator from Indiana says we are all familiar, was continuing, and no one brought suit, although appropriations of over $100,000,000 a year were made for the office of the Attorney General of the United States. I ask unanimous consent to print the complaint as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the complaint was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ON THE RELATION OF RAYMOND J. NITKEY, AND RAYMOND J. NITKEY IN HIS OWN BEHALF, PLAINTIFFS, V. CHARLES G. DAWES, OSCAR NELSON, PHILLIP R. CLARKE, WILLIAM R. DAWES, GEORGE B. DRYDEN, JAMES S. KEMPER, ROBERT H. MORSE, JOHN W. O'LEARY, AND RAWLEIGH WARNER, DEFENDANTS

Now come the United States of America, on the relation of Raymond J. Nitkey, and Raymond J. Nitkey, in his own behalf, plaintiffs, by Harry G. Fins, their attorney, and complain of the above-mentioned defendants, alleging as follows:

1. This qui tam civil action is prosecuted under sections 231 to 234, inclusive, of title 31 of the United States Code, a copy of which statute is herewith attached as exhibit A, and made a part hereof.

2. Raymond J. Nitkey was born in the United States of America and is and has been since his birth a citizen of the United States of America, and is a resident of the city of Chicago, county of Cook, and State of Illinois.

3. All of the defendants hereinabove mentioned are residents of and are found within the jurisdictional limits of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division.

4. None of the defendants hereinabove mentioned is in the military or naval forces of the United States, nor in the militia called into or actually employed in the service of the United States of America.

5. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is a Corporation which was organized by the Congress of the United States of America, and all of the property of said Corporation is wholly owned by the United States of America and the officers and employees of said Corporation are officers and employees of the United States of America, and said Corporation is an agency and instrumentality of the United States of America.

6. The above-named defendants agreed, confederated, combined, and conspired with each other to cause to present for payment to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, claims upon or against the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, knowing such claims to be fraudulent, and pursuant to such conspiracy, did make and cause to be made and did present, or caused to be presented, for payment or approval, to the officers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation claims upon or against the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, knowing such claims to be false, fictitious, and fraudulent, and pursuant thereto, for the purpose of obtaining or aiding to obtain the payment and approval of such claims, made, used or caused to be made or used false bills, receipts, vouchers, rules, accounts, claims, certificates or affidavits, knowing the same to contain fraudulent and fictitious statements and entries.

7. The above-named defendants entered into an agreement, combination, confederation or conspiracy with each other to defraud the Government of the United States by obtaining or aiding to obtain the payment or allowance of false and fraudulent claims against the Government of the United States and with intent to defraud the Government of the United States and with the intent to willfully conceal the money or other property so obtained.

8. The said unlawful acts were committed by the defendants hereinbefore mentioned during the period from the year of 1932 to and including the year 1943, and were discovered by the plaintiffs herein during the month of June 1943.

In June 1932 and for a long time prior thereto, the defendant Charles G. Dawes was chairman of the board of the Central Republic Bank & Trust Co., an Illinois banking corporation, and was also president of the said Reconstruction Finance Corporation, an agency and instrumentality of the Government of the United States of America. During the time that the said defendant Charles G. Dawes occupied the above-mentioned dual positions, the said defendant Charles G. Dawes and the other defendants hereinabove mentioned, individually and as officers and directors of the Central Republic Bank & Trust Co., agreed, confederated, combined, and conspired with each other to make application for a purported loan of money from the United States Government through its agency, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, in the sum of $95,000,000 on behalf of the said Central Republic Bank & Trust Co. One of the prerequisites for obtaining such a loan from the said Reconstruction Finance Corporation, among other things, was the transfer of good and valid collateral security to the said Reconstruction Finance Corporation by the person applying for said loan and that the applicant be solvent at the time of application for said loan of money.

The said defendants and each of them well knew or should have known that the said Central Republic Bank & Trust Co. was insolvent in the amount of $17,000,000 to $21,000,000 on October 5, 1932, and for several months prior thereto, and that the failure of said Central Republic Bank & Trust Co. was imminent, and that the collateral security of said Central Republic Bank & Trust Co. to be offered to the Reconstruction Finance Co. as security for said purported loan was of insufficient value. The said defendants, and each of them, well knowing of the insolvency of the said Central Republic Bank & Trust Co. and of the insufficiency of the collateral, did thereupon agree, confederate, and combine and conspire to obtain a purported loan of money from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and, upon receipt of said moneys, to transfer same to a purportedly new banking corporation to be formed by said defendants immediately after said purported loan was obtained, sufficient to cover only the time and demand deposit liabilities of the Central Republic Bank & Trust Co., and no other liabilities of the said Central Republic Bank & Trust Co., contrary to and in violation of the Banking Act of Illinois.

Thereafter, and in pursuance of and in execution of said agreement, confederation, combination, and conspiracy, and shortly after the said defendant, Charles G. Dawes, resigned as President of the said Reconstruction Finance Corporation and while holding the position of chairman of the board of the said Central Republic Bank & Trust Co., the said defendants, and each of them, did submit a false and fraudulent statement of the assets and liabilities of the said Central Republic Bank & Trust Co. to the said Reconstruction Finance Corporation, purporting to show that the said Central Republic Bank & Trust Co. was solvent and did offer to transfer certain collateral as security for said pur-

ported loan of $95,000,000, well knowing that the said Central Republic Bank & Trust Co. was insolvent and that said collateral was grossly insufficient as security for said purported loan.

Thereupon, and in furtherance of the aforesaid agreement, combination, confederacy, and conspiracy of the said defendants, and each of them, caused to and did, organize a new banking corporation under the name of City National Bank & Trust Co. and said defendants became its officers and directors and did, on or about October 6, 1932, transfer only the time- and demand-deposit liabilities of the Central Republic Bank & Trust Co. to the said City National Bank & Trust Co., together with sufficient moneys from said purported loan of $95,000,000 to the said City National Bank & Trust Co. to cover said deposit liabilities.

In pursuance of said agreement, combination, confederation, and conspiracy, the said defendants, and each of them, fraudulently arranged with the said defendant, Oscar Nelson, then auditor of public accounts of the State of Illinois, to approve said transaction in contravention of the mandatory provisions of section 12 of chapter 16½ of the Illinois Revised Statutes which require, among other things, that no sale of the assets of one banking corporation may be made to another banking corporation unless the purchasing bank assumes in writing all of the liabilities of said selling bank as shown by its records, except its liability to its stockholders as such. Said transaction was thereupon permitted to be consummated by the said defendant, Oscar Nelson, the then auditor of public accounts of the State of Illinois, without his written consent, contrary to the provisions of the banking laws of the State of Illinois.

The willful and fraudulent transfer of said moneys derived from said $95,000,000 and the transfer of only part of the liabilities of the Central Republic Bank & Trust Co. to the said City National Bank & Trust Co. as aforesaid, and the acquiescence and approval of the same by the said auditor of public accounts, and the intentional fraud of the defendants not to have the City National Bank & Trust Co. assume in writing all of the liabilities of the Central Republic Bank & Trust Co., including its liabilities on its said loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, were all integral parts of the conspiracy of the defendants to defraud the United States of America and did result in great pecuniary loss to the United States of America.

The said defendants, and each of them, have knowingly and actively continued to defraud the United States of America by continuously, from 1932 to and including 1943, issuing several times during each of said years, false and fraudulent certified statements to the Comptroller of the Currency for the National Banks of the United States, of the assets and liabilities of the said City National Bank & Trust Co., and said defendants have concealed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the United States Government the fact that the City National Bank & Trust Co. is obligated and liable to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the balance of the $95,000,000 which the Central Republic Bank & Trust Co. owes to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the United States of America. Said defendants, and each of them, have committed an unlawful act, contrary to section 231 of title 31 of the United States Code, each and every time they and each of them issued said false and fraudulent certified statement.

9. The various claims so made against the Reconstruction Finance Corporation pursuant to the said agreement, confederation, and conspiracy between the said defendants hereinabove mentioned were false, fraudulent, and fictitious, and up to January 1, 1942, the United States of America has been damaged by the payment of said false, fraudulent, and fictitious claims in the sum of $35,331,464.92, and will continue to be damaged in additional large sums, the exact amount of which is unknown and is at the present time undeterminable by the plaintiffs.

10. By virtue of the statute in such cases made and provided, the defendants, and each of them, became jointly and severally liable to forfeit and pay to the United States of America the sum of $2,000 for each of the acts and transactions hereinbefore mentioned, and, in addition thereto, the defendants, and each of them, are liable for double the amount of damages sustained by the United States of America by reason of the doing or committing of the said act, and legal costs incurred.

Wherefore, plaintiffs pray judgment that each and every one of the defendants hereinbefore mentioned shall forfeit and pay to the United States of America the sum of $2,000 for each of the acts and transactions that have been committed by them under the said agreement, confederacy, and conspiracy between the defendants, and in addition thereto double the amount of damages which shall be found that the United States of America has sustained and suffered by reason of said combination, confederation, and conspiracy, as aforesaid, together with interest thereon at the legal rate, and for all costs of this action, in accordance with the statute in such cases made and provided, and for such other relief as this honorable court shall deem meet.

Plaintiffs hereby demand that the above entitled cause be tried by a jury, as guaranteed by the Seventh Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America.

EXHIBIT A.—SECTIONS 231 TO 234, INCLUSIVE, OF TITLE 31 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 231. Any person not in the military or naval forces of the United States, or in the militia called into or actually employed in the service of the United States, who shall make or cause to be made, or present or cause to be presented, for payment or approval, to or by any person or officer in the civil, military, or naval service of the United States, any claim upon or against the Government of the United States, or any department or officer thereof, knowing such claims to be false, fictitious, or fraudulent, or who, for the purpose of obtaining or aiding to obtain the payment or approval of such claims, makes, uses, or causes to be made or used, any false bill, receipt, voucher, roll, account, claim, certificate, affidavit, or deposition, knowing the same to contain any fraudulent or fictitious statement or entry, or who enters into any agreement, combination, or conspiracy to defraud the Government of the United States, or any department, or officer thereof, by obtaining or aiding to obtain the payment or allowance of any false or fraudulent claim, or who, having charge, possession, custody, or control of any money or other public property used or to be used in the military or naval service, who, with intent to defraud the United States or willfully to conceal such money or other property, delivers or causes to be delivered to any other person having authority to receive the same, any amount of such money or other property less than that for which he received a certificate or took a receipt, and every person authorized to make or deliver any certificate, voucher, receipt, or other paper certifying the receipt of arms, ammunition, provisions, clothing, or other property so used or to be used, who makes or delivers the same to any other person without a full knowledge of the truth of the facts stated therein, and with intent to defraud the United States, and every person who knowingly purchases or receives in pledge for any obligation or indebtedness from any soldier, officer, sailor, or other person called into or employed in the military or naval service any arms, equipments, ammunition, clothes, military stores, or other public property, such soldier, sailor, officer, or other person not having the lawful right to pledge or sell the same, shall forfeit and pay to the United States the sum of $2,000, and, in addition, double the amount of damages which the United States may have sustained by reason of the doing or committing of such act, together with the costs of suit; and such forfeiture and damages shall be sued for in the same suit. (R. S. secs. 3490, 5438.)

SEC. 232. The several district courts of the United States, the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, the several district courts of the Territories of the United States, within whose jurisdictional limits the person doing or committing such act shall be found, shall, wheresoever such act may have been done or committed, have full power and jurisdiction to hear, try, and determine such suit. Such suit may be brought and carried on by any person, as well for himself as for the United States; the same shall be at the sole cost and charge of such person, and shall be in the name of the United States, but shall not be withdrawn or discontinued without the consent, in writing, of the judge of the court and the district attorney, first filed in the case, setting forth their reasons for such consent. (R. S. sec. 3491.)

SEC. 233. It shall be the duty of the several district attorneys of the United States for the respective districts, for the District of Columbia, and for the several Territories, to be diligent in inquiring into any violation of the provisions of section 231 of this title by persons liable to such suit, and found within their respective districts or Territories, and to cause them to be proceeded against in due form of law for the recovery of such forfeiture and damages. And such person may be arrested and held to bail in such sum as the district judge may order, not exceeding the sum of $2,000, and twice the amount of the damages sworn to in the affidavit of the person bringing the suit. (R. S. sec. 3492.)

SEC. 234. The person bringing said suit and prosecuting it to final judgment shall be entitled to receive one-half of the amount of such forfeiture, as well as one-half the amount of the damages he shall recover and collect; and the other half thereof shall belong to and be paid over to the United States; and such person shall be entitled to receive to his own use all costs the court may award against the defendant, to be allowed and taxed according to any provision of law or rule of court in force, or that shall be in force in suits between private parties in said court; *Provided*, That such person shall be liable for all costs incurred by himself in the case, and shall have no claim therefor on the United States. (R. S. sec. 3493.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, continuing reading from the letter from the former Governor of Kansas, on page 2 thereof we find he said:

Why should not a bill of this nature operate prospectively only? Why should the merits of a lawsuit now pending be determined by a Congress, many Members of which have not heard the evidence? Why should such bill be passed to dismiss a lawsuit or lawsuits when the only Members of Congress who have heard a part of the evidence (the Truman committee) favor the objectives of such suit?

Section 3 accords to all "informers" who filed their suits prior to June 15, 1942, the privilege of prosecuting their actions to finality. Why was the date June 15, 1942, arbitrarily inserted in the bill? Why not June 15, 1943? The first date would do away with the various suits and possible suits against profiteering contractors in connection with defense plants.

I can see no single important reason why the present law be changed and certainly no reason why such a bill should affecting pending suits. There are many cogent reasons why such a bill should not be passed and thereby destroy the effect of pending litigation.

Some of the reasons we have pointed out; others will occur to you.

Your vote against this bill will be a blow for liberty.

Mr. President, I wish to read further from the letter of the former Governor of Kansas, Mr. Ratner.

(At this point Mr. LANGER yielded to Mr. BARKLEY, at whose request the calendar was called, and other business transacted, which appears elsewhere in the RECORD under the appropriate headings.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TRUMAN in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. LANGER. What is the present situation regarding House bill 1203?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment to the bill is before the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may make a suggestion?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I say for the benefit of the Senator from North Dakota that it is not expected that a vote will be had today on the pending business. It will go over and will be the unfinished business when the Senate resumes its session following the recess. I say that because the Senator may not wish to exhaust his ammunition now, when there is no game in sight. He may prefer to wait until the game is available, after the Senate recess. He may govern himself accordingly.

I should like to ask that we have an executive session while we are waiting for one or two messages from the House.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. I am reminded that the Senator from Kansas also desires to make a few more or less necessary—or unnecessary—remarks. [Laughter.] I will attempt to accommodate him.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to take a very few moments. I regret that the consideration of House bill 1203 could not have been concluded, once we had started it.

Very briefly, let me say that there are some very important cases pending, some of which were taken care of by amendments. One of them was the Coates case, in Kansas City, Mo. Then there was a case which the Times-Herald of Washington designated as the Hague case, in New Jersey. I do not know whether Mr. Frank Hague is connected with it or not. Nevertheless, the fact remains that there were war frauds there involving P. W. A. contracts in 1935. A group of men were indicted. Some of the indictments were dismissed. Those who pleaded nolo contendere were fined $18,800.

Thereafter, 6 days before the statute of limitations expired, a private taxpayer brought suit for a quarter of a million dollars. That suit is pending. There have been various hearings and motions.

The significant thing is that on the 19th of May last, after the statute had run, the Federal Government itself, through the United States district attorney, sued the same defendants for $1,200,000.

Mr. President, let me say, as a member of the committee, that while sometimes I have not agreed with the chairman, I have always found him to be most kind. I did not agree with him with regard to the Gestapo bill. I was the only member of the committee who disagreed at the time when it first came up, and I feel I was right.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Dread Gestapo Bill May Be Instrument of Terror," published in the New York Journal-American of April 7, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DREAD GESTAPO BILL MAY BE INSTRUMENT OF TERROR

The Department of Justice, which was recently criticized by the Supreme Court for the abuse of its powers, has drawn up a bill to give itself more powers to abuse.

The House of Representatives, which has been posing before the public as a legislative body which has regained its freedom from Executive domination, belied its claims by slavishly passing the bill.

The House invited the contempt of the Nation by hurriedly and unexpectedly passing the bill, at a time when the attendance of Congress was incomplete, and many of the intelligent and patriotic opponents of the oppressive bill were absent.

The Members present who voted for the bill knew full well that they were incurring and deserved to incur the contempt and antagonism of the Nation, so they voted for the bill secretly, and did not allow their names to be recorded.

Not a very inspiring exhibition of independence or of legislative honor or decency.

The bill, properly called the Gestapo bill, can still be rejected by the Senate, if the Senate by any chance should happen to possess more independence and more patriotism and more loyalty to the public than the House.

An amendment sponsored by Representative HAMILTON FISH, of New York, was attached to the Gestapo bill in the hope of guarding freedom of speech and of the press.

Perhaps the Fish amendment will do so—perhaps it will not; but why should any bill be passed requiring such an amendment, in view of the constitutional injunction that Congress shall make no law abridging either of those rights?

Was it the purpose of the Department of Justice in advocating this bill to obtain a statute nullifying that part of the Constitution?

Yet inasmuch as the rest of the amended bill applied to the entire citizenry of the country as well as to hostile aliens, it should be scrutinized most carefully in the Senate to discern how else the lives and liberties of the people may be jeopardized by its unprecedentedly drastic provisions.

For the bill contains a great number of phrases which may prove to be fangs—especially under a Department of Justice which already uses its powers not for justice but for injustice, and is criticized therefor by the Supreme Court of the United States.

In the latter part of March, George Rothwell Brown pointed out the manifest dangers of the pernicious Gestapo bill in his Washington column, The Political Parade.

Describing the bill as having been sent to the Capitol by Attorney General Biddle "to be rubber-stamped," Mr. Brown said:

"This measure is designed to give to the Government powers to cope with saboteurs and traitors and to deal with such cases as those of the German spies who landed on Long Island and Florida and were tried by military courts.

"Nobody objects to such a purpose.

"But the bill contains language so loosely drawn that there is reasonable ground for belief that it could be used for the persecution of innocent American citizens."

Since that was written, notice has been taken of the fact that the bill would turn this free country into a nation of snoopers, with one household spying on another, and with citizens in danger of terrible penalties on the mere suspicion of failing to act as informers.

Mr. Brown likewise brought to light that Members of Congress—among them the Rules Committee of the House and Representative SUMNERS, chairman of the Judiciary Committee—who feared the effects of the bill, had been assured by the Department of Justice that its powers would not be abused.

But what assurance is that coming from a department which already abuses the powers it possesses?

Similar assurances, Mr. Brown recalled, were given that the recently enacted Stabilization Act would not be invoked to impose the $25,000 limitation of salaries, yet it was so used, and Congress has had to pass still another measure as a corrective.

This proposed new law is of such a nature throughout as to cause suspicion that some motive besides the national defense is involved.

The pending bill excites amazement by the punishment it stipulates—corporation or group fines up to $5,000,000, which could possibly be invoked against perfectly patriotic organizations for purely political reasons—and personal penalties, from death sentences down, for what may be only a crackpot manifestation.

These powers and penalties are peculiarly dangerous considering the conspicuous fact that savage decrees and punitive political action have been entirely typical of the New Deal.

The so-called Utilities Reorganization Act was distinguished by its death-sentence clause.

Persons receiving voluminous governmental questionnaires, many of them so complicated as to be incomprehensible, read thereon the Government's threat of 10 years in prison, or a $10,000 fine, for returning false information.

And now comes this fantastic bill along, embroidered with the bodesome words "death" and "imprisonment for life."

What young Draco is devising these things for the New Deal?

Is government by terror to be imported here from Nazi Germany and Communist Russia?

Mr. LANGER. That measure was stopped. It is still pending in the committee, and very likely will come up after we meet.

Finally, Mr. President, let me say that the letter from the former Governor of Kansas with regard to the case involving millions of dollars came to me only this morning. Because of that fact, I spoke for a longer time than I had intended to speak.

The distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] can be certain of one thing, and that is that I will stay here tonight, if he wishes, to expedite the consideration of the bill. If he wishes to go ahead with it, I am perfectly willing to go ahead. I will not

raise the point of order about a quorum not being present. I am anxious to dispose of it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, the bill will be the unfinished business when the Senate next convenes.

Mr. LANGER. That is my understanding.

Mr. WHERRY. I have been furnished by Governor Ratner with the same information which the Senator has. He urges us to give this matter our utmost consideration. When the bill is next considered, I wish to be heard.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an address which I delivered at the Roosevelt Hotel on the 21st of June last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Six weeks ago on the Senate floor I called upon the American people to protect their political interests by taking noupartisan action. The response to that appeal has been outstanding. From State after State responsible citizens from the farm, from the small business places, from the laboring men, have joined in the demand for government which will place the welfare of America above that of any other country.

If today I could sit down with you, my friends and we could look into each other's eyes, I know that the truth I would see there would reveal to a great extent the suffering, the misery, the fears that are within you.

No one can do more for the average man or woman than they can do for themselves but you are entitled to have the truth about the war, the truth about economic conditions, the truth about what the future holds in store for your children, the truth about whether in your old age you will be free from suffering and want.

Frankly, we no longer have the two-party political system in this country. One has but to scan the votes in this body to realize that the Republican Party and the Democratic Party as such on economic grounds have long since ceased to exist and that the places of these two parties have been taken by the conservatives on the one hand and the liberals on the other. Never in the history of America have the conservatives had the bit in their teeth more savagely or cruelty, as witnessed by what has taken place within these last few months.

Within these weeks, although the Democratic platform of 1940 declared that future issues of State and county and Federal bonds should not be exempt from taxation, we find by an overwhelming majority the Senate refusing to pass legislation which would tax these issues in the future, but during the debate acquired the knowledge that there are $18,000,000,000 worth of tax-exempt bonds now in existence upon which no taxes are being paid. That roughly is one-quarter of all the wealth of the United States. A farmer pays taxes on his cow and calf. The laboring man, on his small amount of furniture he may have in his house, but the man who, the record shows, has an income of over $1,000,000 a year on tax-exempt securities, pays nothing.

More ironical yet was the decision of the Congress which the President permitted to become a law without his signature, cruelly discriminating between the soldier of the Army and the wealthy man. If at the beginning of the war two brothers were each having an annual income of $67,200, the boy that was drafted or enlisted in the Army was reduced to $50 a month, or $600 a year, but the proposal to limit the income of his brother to $67,200 a year or $25,000 net was indignantly rejected, although both the Democratic and Republican Parties in their platforms in 1924 had specifically promised after the World War No. 1 that in the event of another war wealth should be drafted the same as human life.

No better illustration of the callous indifference to the poor can be cited than the use tax on automobiles. A millionaire may own a $10,000 Rolls-Royce and be secure in the knowledge that he doesn't pay any higher use tax than the hired man working on a farm who buys a $15 jitney so that he can ride to town on Sunday. The tax on both is alike, $5 apiece, and when an effort was made to prevent that tax from going into effect it was defeated on the Senate floor by a vote of 35 to 22.

Daily we read in the newspapers and magazines that we are living in the finest country in the world and suggestions are frequently made that if one doesn't like this country that he should immigrate to Ireland or Russia or some other country. The boys that are running this country don't like criticism. They resent the truth. The truth of the matter is that the Federal report shows that we have 11,000,000 families that have less than $350 a year for food, or 35 cents a meal for the entire family; that 91 girls out of every 100 prostitutes are the daughters of tenant farmers and sharecroppers and coal miners; and that 695,000 boys were so ignorant and had such lack of education that they could not and were not inducted into the Army; that 3,200,000 people in this country have syphilis and gonorrhea, and that 1,200,000 war workers are suffering from venereal diseases. What a tragedy for those who wrap the American flag about them and loudly proclaim their patriotism, and what a contrast to those 3,000 who today are receiving salaries in excess of $75,000 a year, some of them over one-half million dollars a year and leading organized fights against paying their share of taxes, while the fathers are unable to educate their children, and whose wives and daughters often become prostitutes because they haven't got enough to eat and wear.

The men who control the newspapers and the radio, the men who contribute millions of dollars to corrupting the elections every 4 years—$35,000,000 being spent for the Democratic and Republican last Presidential election alone—dread the power of the farmer, the laboring man, the small businessman. They fear that they will unite and vote together. They spent $35,000,000 in the last election to keep them divided because by keeping them divided they could raise the price of the foodstuffs and farm machinery and those things that they knew these people must have, so they could get their $35,000,000 back again and the election would cost them nothing.

We have seen the National Democratic Convention nominating a Republican and the Republicans nominating a Tammany Democrat, for President. The monopolistic interests work and plan together to nominate two men neither of whom is for the common man's interest, and then at election time the monied crowd say to the people: "You have a free election. Take your choice of either one of these two, both of whom are our men." As far as foreign policy was concerned, in the last election what choice was there for a man who did not wish to become involved in the war between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie?

The time has come in America to nominate men for President and Vice President who will actually live up to the planks of the campaign platform. Honest men who will not say after election as did one of the candidates 3 years ago, that what he said in his campaign speeches was just "campaign oratory." We must build a political organization from the bottom up and not from the top down and to build it from the bottom up we must have an organization in every precinct in America. Men and women who will meet on the same day at the same hour, will elect a permanent precinct captain, organize to get out the vote of the people on election day, and by secret ballot elect delegates who will go to a county convention a week later where again all those present will pledge themselves to back a ticket chosen by delegates selected who will meet at a State convention and shortly after that, at a national convention.

With the delegates selected by secret ballot, with all those attending these meetings pledging themselves to support the ticket no matter whether it runs on the Republican, Democratic, Socialist, or Independent column, we can get those who believe in winning the war quickly, in guaranteeing every man who wants to work the right to work, in giving the returned soldiers jobs when they come back, who believe in decent pensions for the aged folks, who believe in laws to prevent discrimination because of race, color, creed, or sex, and who believe in money reform, to fight together politically instead of fighting each other.

Nearly 10 years ago a million people signed a petition to Congress to have an old-age pension. They were told that the Government could not afford it, and thousands upon thousands of old people have died in hunger and want. But, although they told us then that the money was not available, they have spent billions since for numerous other purposes, which I needn't mention here. Farmers are entitled to the cost of production, plus a reasonable profit, and every farm woman entitled to have the Rural Electrification Administration extend electricity to her home to relieve her and her husband of hard work.

My friends, patriotic men and women will well remember how our soldier boys got back from the last war unable to get work, denied a bonus, and they finally had to march on the Capitol here in Washington, where they were met by the Army that fired upon their own comrades. I warn America that unless constructive steps are taken that as soon as the war is over and millions are out of work we will see a repetition of that disgraceful occurrence. There is only one way to prevent it, and that is by the political organization of the farmer, the miner, the factory worker, the small businessman, the laboring man, into one compact political organization. If every one of you will do your part in organizing your precinct politically and at the given time select delegates by secret ballot, who in turn will meet in the county convention and elect delegates by secret ballot again, who will meet in a State convention where they will select delegates to a national convention by secret ballot once more, then no politician, however powerful, will be able to control that convention and that convention representing the people of this country can determine whether they wish to support liberal candidates on the Democratic ticket, the Republican ticket, or the Socialist ticket, or whether they wish to run a ticket of their own. I call upon everyone who believes as I do, that destitute aged people are entitled to pensions, that a poor woman giving birth to a baby is entitled to hospitalization, that the blind and the crippled should be taken care of properly and decently, and in the three principles I have before-named, to sign and mail to me, Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Washington, D. C., the following pledge:

"I do hereby promise at a date to be selected by the national committee to call together at my home on the day specified,

patriotic men and women who, regardless of race, color, and creed, will pledge themselves to fight the battle of the people.

"Name_____
"Address _____"

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House Joint Resolution 147.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHERRY in the chair). The report will be read.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 3.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 4, and agree to the same.

ROBERT F. WAGNER,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
FRANCIS MALONEY,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
JOHN A. DANAHER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

HENRY B. STEAGALL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. WAGNER. I move that the report be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER NATIONAL MONUMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WALLGREN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 647) to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 3, and agree to the same.

CARL A. HATCH,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
MON C. WALLGREN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. HARDIN PETERSON,
J. W. ROBINSON,
COMPTON I. WHITE,
K. M. LECOMPTE,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN (for Mr. McKELLAR) submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 25 and 27.

Amendment numbered 8: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House, insert the following:

"WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

"National Youth Administration: For an additional amount for the National Youth Administration in the performance of its functions from July 1, 1943, to the date of enactment of the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1944, and thereafter for the liquidation of such Administration, including not to exceed $2,000 for printing and binding, not to exceed $1,500,000 from the unexpended balance of the appropriations for the National Youth Administration in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1943, to be added to and merged with the funds made available for the liquidation of the National Youth Administration by such Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1944; and of such merged amount not less than $1,487,000 shall be allocated and set apart to be used exclusively for payment of accumulated and accrued leave of employees: *Provided,* That all real and personal property of the National Youth Administration is hereby declared surplus, and all equipment, materials, and supplies shall be assembled, inventoried, and turned over to the Director of Procurement, Treasury Department, under Executive Order 9235 by the Administrator of the National Youth Administration as expeditiously as possible, and all real property shall be disposed of by the Commissioner of Public Buildings in accordance with the Act of August 27, 1935 (40 U. S. C. 304 (a) and 304 (b)): *Provided further,* That, under commitment to return such property to the United States at borrower's expense, any real or personal property of the National Youth Administration in use on June 30, 1943, by any non-Federal vocational education authority within any State may continue to be so used during the period of the present war and for not to exceed 6 months after the termination thereof, without compensation, but in no event beyond the date such property ceases to be used for vocational education purposes: *Provided further,* That during such period, the Director of Procurement, in the case of personal property, and the Commissioner of Public Buildings, in the case of real property, upon certificate of the United States Commissioner of Education that such property is to be used for vocational education and training, may loan, without compensation, to any such existing non-Federal vocational education authority, if applied for within ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act, any real or personal property of the National Youth Administration not required by any other Federal Agency (excepting the Lend-Lease Administration) or otherwise loaned under the authority of this paragraph, if such borrower agrees, in the case of personal property, to pay all expenses incident to obtaining and returning such property"; and the House agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 24 and 26.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARTER GLASS,
CARL HAYDEN,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate agree to the report.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish the Senator would not do that until we get the conference report through.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I want a vote on the conference report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Barkley	Hayden	Reynolds
Bone	Hill	Robertson
Brewster	Holman	Scrugham
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Brooks	Kilgore	Smith
Buck	La Follette	Stewart
Burton	Langer	Taft
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McClellan	Truman
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tydings
Connally	Maloney	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maybank	Van Nuys
Davis	Mead	Wagner
Downey	Millikin	Wallgren
Ellender	Murdock	Walsh
Ferguson	Nye	Wheeler
George	O'Daniel	Wherry
Gerry	O'Mahoney	White
Green	Pepper	Wiley
Guffey	Radcliffe	Willis
Gurney	Reed	
Hawkes	Revercomb	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the report be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the motion is to agree to a conference report which asks the Senate to recede on one item which was passed by this body. It affects quite a number of States. It has to do with the completion of some 28 airports. The amount involved is about $8,000,000. We have sat here week after week, particularly in the last few days,

and appropriated immense sums of money for different undertakings throughout the country. The airports in question have been approved by the Civil Aeronautics Authority. They are needed in this country. They are not completed, and in many instances a very small sum of money is necessary for their completion.

I wish to call this matter to the attention of the Senate because I hope that another effort will be made by the Senate conferees in conference with the House conferees to induce them to agree to our position, and not to take from the bill the approved airports which are needed at this time.

For that reason, Mr. President, I shall oppose the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to go on record as confirming what the Senator from West Virginia has said with respect to completion of the airports. The provision in question affects my State. It concerns one airfield at Fremont, Nebr., with which the Senator from Nevada is well acquainted, for statistics with respect to it were presented to the committee. It also concerns one airfield at Beatrice. The airfield at Fremont includes 225 acres of ground. The land has been provided by the city of Fremont. The airport is, I should say, practically completed, having a completed administration building, a drainage system, and level field and runways ready for hard-surface materials. The field is proposed to be used for overflow air traffic from Omaha. It has runways which, if the necessity arises, can be extended on the land which has already been acquired.

Mr. President, we are very anxious to have that airfield developed, if it possibly can be done. I can say practically the same thing with respect to the airfield at Beatrice. It also represents large Federal and municipal investments. The citizens of Beatrice voted $60,000 for the purchase of land and went ahead with their plans. The city has expended at least $70,000 in fulfilling its part of the contract. It is distinctly unfair to these cities and their citizens, and incidentally unwise, for the Federal Government now to turn its back on such developments.

Mr. President, I do not want to hold up the measure under consideration—the Senator knows my position with respect to that matter—but if there is any way in the world by which additional funds can be provided for the completion of these airports which are already started I certainly should like to have the conferees give their utmost consideration to this request.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. As one of the conferees, I wish to state that the Senate conferees loyally and faithfully did their very best to retain this amendment. We met with one objection on principle so far as the House conferees were concerned. They said the W. P. A. was being abolished; that it was interested in a great many things which are desirable, and had instituted the building of sewer systems in one place, or a hospital in another, or a schoolhouse in another. The House conferees then asked how distinction could be made between the various beneficial works which have been begun or were being done by the W. P. A., and an exception made of merely the airports in question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I contend that that is not a question which is at all involved in respect to the consideration of the report. The question is not whether the projects mentioned by the Senator are beneficial or not. I am taking the same position now that I took yesterday in respect to the bill to provide $200,000,000 to complete a number of facilities, schools, and so forth, which had been begun. The facilities provided for in that bill are in the same category as those under consideration in connection with the conference report.

Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senate conferees have done. It seems to me, however, that the Senate conferees should go back with instructions to state that the issue is not as to whether the W. P. A. has instituted projects which are good or projects which are not good for the country. The airfields in question have already been begun. The towns have pledged their credit and issued bonds to develop these projects. They are worth while and necessary. I speak for all the 28 towns in the 17 States involved. I think the airports should be completed. The Federal Government has a very definite duty and responsibility in this respect. Therefore, I believe the report should not be agreed to until the conferees have tried once more to see if they cannot induce the House conferees to agree to this proposal.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me repeat the situation. A record vote was had in the House on this proposal. The vote was 198 to 145. The House conferees insisted that it would embarrass the membership of the House to pick out a particular group of airports and not include them all. They objected to singling out certain airports that the W. P. A. was improving. They insisted further that so far as the war was concerned—and I am repeating the arguments made to us, and not using them as my own arguments, as the Senator will understand—they insisted that so far as any military necessity was concerned, ample money has been made available to the War Department in the case of any of these airports to finish it, if it deems proper, and as may be needed for the war. The only reason the airports have not been finished is that the War Department has not as yet found it necessary to do so. Any one of them, however, that is needed for any war purpose, can be completed at Federal expense immediately.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield further for a moment?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. My understanding is, however, that unless these fields are completed under the auspices of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the War Department will not proceed to build any other fields. Is not that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; that was not indicated to us.

Mr. WHERRY. I have been informed that the appropriation for these fields must come out of the pending appropriation bill, or the chances are the fields will not be completed.

Mr. HAYDEN. One other argument was made, to the effect that in the contracts made with the municipalities with respect to these airports it is provided that in the event the United States does not finish an airport the municipality shall do so.

Mr. WHERRY. In answer to that statement let me say that it is impossible for Fremont, Nebr., to finish its airport. The town procured the land and pledged an issue of bonds for the purpose, but it needs help, and it has depended in good faith on the provision contained in the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Nebraska is in no different situation in his State than I am in in my own State. Two airports are provided for in my State, one at Nogales, and one at Willcox. So we are in exactly the same situation. I thought it fair to state to the Senator the arguments we had to meet, and the absolutely inflexible determination on the part of all the House conferees that they could not yield and could not recommend to the House to yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In view of the fact that some of the airports are more than 90 percent completed, but are not now usable, and that the money heretofore spent on them will have been wasted to a large extent if they are not completed, it seems to me that a statement of the factual situation should certainly overcome the arguments advanced by the House conferees which have been detailed here by the Senator from Arizona. I wish another trial were made to see if the House conferees cannot be convinced that the work should be completed. It would not require a large sum of money compared with the amount we have been appropriating recently.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it is not a question of the Senator convincing me. It is a question of convincing the majority of the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think it is fair to every Member of the Senate, and especially to those whose States are interested in the airports in question, to say that the senior Senator from Nevada has been seriously endeavoring to get an agreement with respect to the appropriation of the money for the completion of these all-important airports. They are important. They

are going to be more and more important as time goes on. In time the community which does not have an airport will be very seriously handicapped.

Many of the landing areas involved have been constructed almost to completion. Others are not quite so far along. But all of them have been deemed essential, and are now deemed to be essential. They will not be constructed by the Army or the Navy. The money is not available for their construction in any appropriation bill that has been passed by the Senate up to this time. Let me be frank with Senators in respect to this matter. In the bill providing for the Civil Aeronautics Administration, out of a total appropriation of $199,000,000, $99,000,000 was appropriated for the year 1944. However, those funds will not be applied to any of the fields to which I refer, because they do not come under that program at all. They come under the program for Army and Navy fields.

Are these fields necessary? Are they essential? Are they necessary at the present time? It is my position and my contention that they are necessary because at the present time they serve the purpose of landing places, emergency landing fields, and storage fields for excess equipment as it comes off the assembly lines.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I am glad to hear the statement made by the Senator from Nevada. I am really at a loss to know why airports for all the States of the Union were not provided for in the measure. As I understand the situation, the measure provides for airports in 26 States. I really think the matter should go back to conference and should secure the approval of the House; but I did want to make clear my position that in my State there are several towns which have made application to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, but evidently the airports for which they have made requests have not received the same approval that has been given for the airports included under the program. I should like to know just how the airports in the 26 States were selected, to the exclusion of airports in other States.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is my understanding, although I have no particular authority for saying so, that the airports were selected because they were regarded by the Civil Aeronautics Administration as being susceptible of completion at the least expense. I could be in error about that, but I think what I have said is correct.

Mr. President, let me state further that no one is more anxious than I to put through the item and to have congressional approbation of it; but the item was taken over to the House, and a vote was had on it. The item was lost by 20 votes, or thereabouts. I am advised, although I am not one of the conferees, and therefore I cannot speak from my own knowledge, that the House conferees now take the attitude that when the next deficiency appropriation bill comes along they will look with greater favor upon this item. I do not want to lose the item altogether. I want eventually to get the item through, so that the airports may be completed.

If the Senate desires to have my individual judgment on the matter, and perhaps I am more interested in it than is any other Member of the Senate, because I have fostered the item all the way through, my individual judgment is that the conference report should be accepted today, and the next time a deficiency bill comes along the Senate will find this item being urged by the Senator from Nevada. That is all I care to say. I submit the matter for a vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada that the conference report be agreed to.

The report was agreed to.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3030, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
UNITED STATES,
July 8, 1943.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 to the bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and concur therein; and

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"In order to provide assistance to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged, in whole or in part, by floods in 1943, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to utilize the facilities of any existing agency or bureau to provide assistance to any such farmer by loans, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, for the purpose of aiding such farmer to continue farming operations in order to produce for the war effort, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding, travel, and other miscellaneous and incidental expenses, fiscal year 1944, $15,000,000: *Provided*, That not more than 10 percent of the foregoing amount shall be used for administrative expenses.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Nevada whether what the Senate has just done completes consideration of the second deficiency bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, House bill 3030. That is the second deficiency bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. No further action on the part of either House is required, as I understand the matter; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. No further action is required so far as I know.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER SENATOR SPENCER OF ARKANSAS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, there has come to my attention an article entitled "A Man of Few Words, an Able Senator," which appeared last January in the Eagle Democrat, of Warren, Ark. The article referred to former Senator Lloyd Spencer, of Arkansas, who retired from the Senate last January without seeking reelection.

As stated in the article, former Senator Spencer was a man of few words. However, he was a man of influence in the Senate. Having come up the hard way, he understood the problems of the people. His experience as a banker gave him an understanding of the financial affairs of our Nation. His counsel and advice were valuable on matters which were considered by the committees of which he was a member.

The people of Arkansas are to be congratulated that it was his desire to return to his former work and take his place in the affairs of his State. He will prove, as in the past, a valuable man in private life. I understand he has since joined the United States Navy, there to serve his country. Both he and Mrs. Spencer have the best wishes of a host of friends made while they were in Washington. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, the article to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MAN OF FEW WORDS, AN ABLE SENATOR

"Our form of government, a liberal democracy, is a great blessing and a great luxury as well," is the sober opinion of Lloyd Spencer, president of the First National Bank in Hope, Ark., who has just retired after 21 months as United States Senator from Arkansas. The public record and experience of this Arkansan, who arose from obscurity to prominence without political pull or influence, should interest the thoughtful citizen. A man of few words, profound thought, and without previous political background, he made an able Senator.

In a recent article in Finance, commenting upon his congressional experience, the ex-Senator wisely stated: "In my opinion, Congress must recapture and reserve to itself many powers which under the stress of the times have been surrendered. I believe Congress is in a mood to do this and will if backed by public sentiment. Unless it is done, we are going to see a great change in our country—a change which will certainly not be for the good of our country." What manner of man is this political initiate who says these things to his fellow citizens?

His personality and ability so impressed his associates that within 12 days after taking his seat the Vice President called upon him to preside over a session of the Senate. Of him one of the most outstanding veterans stated that for the length of time he had served, Spencer has made the best impression of any man who had been there since he had been in the Senate. This would seem to be sufficient to prove Gov. Homer M. Adkins acted in the best interests of the people of Arkansas when he named his intimate friend for the interim period.

Within a quarter of a century, and by dint of his own efforts, Lloyd Spencer has advanced from an humble position to a definite place of achievement in the business, bank-

ing, and political circles of his native State. Although a young man, some years ago he was elected president of the Arkansas Bankers Association. The basis of a healthy economy is sound finance. Spencer knows you cannot separate government from business nor business from government. It is folly for the citizen to think otherwise.

When he entered the Senate, he came directly from the atmosphere of everyday living. Under our system of government he knew it was the responsibility of Congress to legislate for man's behavior and general welfare.

Did he accomplish anything for his constituency? He played a leading part in defeating the move to reduce the number of seven Congressmen from this State. He helped to stifle the political chicanery aimed to deprive the Southern States of the poll-tax privilege. His acumen and aggressiveness were felt in the location of various defense industries in this State. For his home town, he secured the Southwestern Proving Ground, one of the largest war industries established here.

He served in the historical session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, the longest in American history. It authorized or appropriated $200,000,000,000—a sum larger than the total expenses of government from the Declaration of Independence to the opening of that session. Although a freshman, shortly after his admission, he was chosen for a place on the powerful Banking and Currency Committee, succeeding Senator Byrnes appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States and now the economic stabilizer of the Nation. While in the most august parliamentary body in the world, as a humble servant of the people, he found time to answer as many as 60 telegrams a day and over a thousand letters a week. For the time at his command, he did a great job for his homefolks.

Without future political aspirations, Lloyd Spencer is back on his job at home. He has the satisfaction of a successful career. He is a valuable citizen in the ranks. From his experience he believes "businessmen should take a more active interest in government." "For after all," he says, "government is becoming more a part of everyone's life. It threatens to take over business to a very large extent both during and after the war, yet businessmen neglect politics and government."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article entitled "The Low-down After a Close-up," by former Senator Spencer, published in the Finance magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Finance of December 1942]

THE LOW-DOWN AFTER A CLOSE-UP—SENATOR LLOYD SPENCER, OF ARKANSAS, RECORDS HIS VIEWS ON THE TREND OF LEGISLATION AS HE PREPARES TO RETURN TO THE FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF HOPE

As the term for which Governor Adkins, of Arkansas, appointed me to the United States Senate draws to a close, I have mixed feelings of regret and pleasure—regret that I shall soon be leaving a group of men for whom I have great admiration—pleasure at the anticipation of returning to a small-town bank and settling back into the life of the community which I love.

The Seventy-seventh Congress has been historical. It sat in continuous session 715 days, which is longer than any in American history; it declared war; it authorized or appropriated more than $200,000,000,000—a sum larger than the total expense of Government for the period from the day the Declaration of Independence was signed to the day the Seventy-seventh Congress convened—and it delegated unprecedented powers to the President.

When I was appointed Senator almost 2 years ago, some of my friends voiced the fear that "the political bee would sting me" and that I would not want to come back to the more simple and unexciting life of a country banker and farmer. Such has not been the case. I have come to realize, however, how great a service a man can render in the Senate if he will work as hard and as conscientiouly there as he must do to make a success in private life.

A Senator's life, however, is anything but a life of ease and a bed or roses. In a former article in Finance I mentioned something of the multitudinous duties and responsibilities, and these are constantly increasing. Regardless of how much effort is put forth, it is a fortunate Senator who can please half of the people. In my own case, I came here with the determination of voting according to my own judgment, after obtaining all available information, and "letting the chips fall where they may." This I have done, and I am convinced that this is the only policy which would make life as a Senator worth while.

The time I have spent here has been most pleasant and educational. I have met and become friends with many men—some being, in my opinion, among the most capable men in this country—men upon whose judgment the fate of this Nation rests. I shall always cherish these friendships and close associations. I feel that my outlook on life has been greatly broadened and that I will get vastly more out of life henceforth than would have been the case had I not had this opportunity.

There are many things which I have learned, however, which have not brought pleasure. After a close-up view of government I can see many things which must be changed and corrected if our country is to continue to prosper. Waste in a democratic form of government is no doubt inevitable, but I am astounded at the extent of this waste and extravagance in some departments. In time of war, of course, we must expect this, and probably should not be too greatly disturbed by it. Even so, I am convinced that there is entirely too much disregard for expense. Certainly, the nonwar activities cannot excuse their mistakes and extravagances on the grounds of our being at war. I do not want to leave the impression that all Government departments are inefficient, for such is not the case. Some are well managed and efficient—too many are not.

With an operation as large as that of the United States Government, the board of directors (the Congress) must of necessity create agencies to administer laws which are enacted. There is where the trouble begins. In too many cases the intent of Congress is not carried out in the admi· istration. Rules and regulations which are a burden to business and an annoyance to the public are issued by those in charge of the administration of the laws. Naturally, the public puts the blame on Congress. Newspaper and radio commentators criticize, and the result is that Congress becomes more and more unpopular, suffering from the mistakes and results of regulations made by those theoretical gentlemen in the departments.

In my opinion the executive branch of the Government has assumed too great a weight in relation to the legislative and judicial branches. Conditions during the past few years are responsible for this. First was the depression and critical financial condition of the early thirties. Then the war. These have caused Congress to give powers to the Executive which it would never have done in normal times.

Rather than criticize Congress for everything that happens it would be much better for businessmen to endeavor to elect the best men possible and back them with their advice and confidence. The only thing standing between the people and dictatorship or communism is the Congress. Destroy it and you have destroyed our form of government. I do not mean that individual Members of Congress should not be criticized. On the contrary, I think they should be held fully accountable for their votes and their policies, and should be replaced when they do not demonstrate their worth. But to criticize and damn the Congress as a whole is foolhardy and is a blow at a democratic form of government.

Some of the most capable, sincere, and sound men I have ever known are Members of the Senate and House of Representatives. These men work long hours under great strain and carry heavy responsibilities. They would welcome sound, sincere advice from those of their constituents in whose judgment and motives they have confidence. Businessmen should make it a point to become well acquainted with their Senators and Congressmen and endeavor to help rather than hinder them. Too many businessmen have a feeling that they want nothing to do with politics. You had better take a great interest in the affairs of your Government if you desire to survive during the critical period ahead.

In my opinion Congress must recapture and reserve to itself many powers which, under the stress of the times, have been surrendered. I believe Congress is in a mood to do this and will if backed by public sentiment. Unless this is done we are going to see a great change in our country—a change which, in my opinion, will certainly not be for the good of the country.

I am very much concerned by the tendency to "legislate" by regulations rather than by properly enacted laws. An illustration of this is the recent edict limiting salaries to $25,000 net. If this is constitutional, then by the same token the limitation could be made $15,000 or $5,000 or $500 as might be considered proper by those in authority. This should alarm every true American, regardless of the amount of his earnings, as it is a blow at individual initiative and our system of free enterprise.

I do not believe that abnormal profits should be allowed to accrue to anyone as a result of war. I believe in the equality of sacrifice and in the contribution to the war effort on the basis of ability to pay. The machinery for the achievement of this should be our system of taxation and not a regulation or a directive. In my opinion, the salary limitation order is not constitutional and is in direct conflict with the intention of Congress. I believe Congress should, and very probably will, put a stop to this sort of thing.

I fear that there is an element in this country which is deliberately endeavoring to destroy the faith of the people in Congress so that they may become powerful and remain in authority indefinitely. I do not believe the President holds this theory. I believe he is more conservative than most people think. Some of his advisers, however, have indicated by statements and actions that they expect to reform our country, if not the entire world.

Our debt continues to mount at an unbelievable rate. Of course, in war there is no chance to practice economy. We must win and must spend what it takes to do this. We could, however, economize in nonwar fields, and this is not being done. For the next year the Budget is likely to be $100,000,000,000—$80,000,000,000 for war and $20,000,000,000 for nonwar expense. With the new tax law—the highest we have ever known—estimated to produce about $25,000,000,000, we can see that our normal expenditures are entirely too high. There must be a drastic reduction if we are to balance our normal

Budget, and it must be balanced if we are to survive. My only solution of this problem is for the people to be brought to the realization of the necessity. This could be done by businessmen if they would spend the necessary time in discussing the matter with as many people as possible. Eventually the will of the people is carried out by all legislative bodies.

There are two facts which give me hope. First is that a majority of the Members of the United States Senate are men of high character, capable and with a sincere desire to do what is best for our country and to carry out the will of the majority of those whom they represent. Secondly, I have a feeling that the people, as a whole, are becoming more concerned with public matters, and I have great faith in the composite intelligence and sound thinking of the citizenship of this Nation.

In any event, I feel certain that things are happening so rapidly that none of us realize the great change which is taking place. An important chapter in our history is being written. Neither our business nor our social way of life will ever be the same as we have heretofore considered "normal." Great readjustments are being made. What the future holds no one knows.

Whatever happens I am fully convinced that the United States will continue to be the best country of all in which to live because during the past 150 years we have been trained to think for ourselves and are a Nation of sound-thinking people who still believe in a government of the people, by the people, for the people.

THE BEEF SHORTAGE—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a very interesting article published in the New York Times for July 8, 1943, under the caption "Lack of beef baffles meat board while record herds roam ranges—Chicago meeting fails to solve the problem created by profit motive in conflict with hold-the-line price ceilings."

The article is too lengthy to justify any comment from me at this time, other than to say that it points out that there are now on the ranges an estimated 78,000,000 head of cattle, the largest number in the country's history, but beef slaughtering at the present time is 39 percent under the slaughtering had at the same period last year. The article states that one important reason for the present situation, as seen in Chicago, where the meeting which is the subject of the article was held, appears to be the desire for higher prices on the part of the cattle producers, and a second reason is the great number of complicated regulations which are keeping beef from the markets, with the result that the black market in the country is providing 20 percent of the beef on the market, and some very mournful aspects present themselves.

Mr. President, it seems to me that unless we find a solution for this sort of complication, and iron it out, we shall face a serious problem very soon. There is no sense in this sort of a situation. As between private operators, the factories, and those who are otherwise interested in the matter, some solution must be found, and must be found very quickly, if we are to avoid serious consequences.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LACK OF BEEF BAFFLES MEAT BOARD WHILE RECORD HERDS ROAM RANGES—CHICAGO MEETING FAILS TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM CREATED BY PROFIT MOTIVE IN CONFLICT WITH HOLD-THE-LINE PRICE CEILINGS

CHICAGO, July 7.—The War Meat Board, meeting today with its industry advisory committee, came up with no quick solution to the most acute phase of the Nation-wide food problem—how to loosen a flow of cattle from the farms and ranges to the country's legitimate slaughterhouses.

The meat experts took under advisement several plans aimed at doctoring the intricate price mechanism that has grown up in the marketing of cattle and all the by-products of their processing, but conclusions likely will await further recommendations to and word from Washington. The immediate problem is to find additional incentive for cattle sales which can operate within President Roosevelt's hold-the-line order on inflation.

Even while the planners were meeting, regional authorities were smashing hard at the black market which, they concede, is spreading alarmingly in this section amidst the present confusion. They asserted that they had crushed the country's largest black market in veal by closing a wildcat slaughtering operation in Wisconsin.

Many of the calves were hauled great distances, War Food Administration officials said, and some that were too young or too weak from illness to survive and died on the way were thrown in with live ones and all processed together, often under the most highly unsanitary conditions.

Smashing of this part of the veal black market was in addition to a drive in which the Food Distribution Administration revoked slaughter permits of 22 small slaughterers and butchers in Illinois and Wisconsin for operating in violation of Federal regulations. Most of the revocations were based upon alleged falsification of 1941 killings, upon which the permits were issued. A general recheck of these licenses to small slaughterers is under way in this section, in a drive against the black market.

SHORTAGE AMID PLENTY

Meanwhile, the paradox continued of a land running over with livestock and a growing shortage of beef not only for the civilian population but for the armed forces as well.

There are today on the ranges and farms an estimated 78,000,000 head of cattle and 75,000,000 hogs, the largest number in the country's history. Government authorities figure that these totals will be raised to 82,000,000 and 87,000,000, respectively, by January.

Quite an argument has developed among livestock men as to how many of the cattle are beef and how many dairy, but the fact remains that the country has available for slaughter more than enough animals, beef and pork, to take care of all the needs of the armed forces, the civilian population, and lend-lease aid to our allies for many months to come.

The problem of pork seems on its way to solution, largely through the operation of natural forces. Pork produced at the federally inspected packing plants, according to the War Meat Board, was 40 percent in excess of the amount for the corresponding period in 1942, but beef production at the same slaughtering houses last week was 39 percent under the same period last year.

FACTORS STRAINING DISTRIBUTION

Between a steer grazing peacefully on the Texas range and a sirloin steak on a platter hundreds of miles away are myriad processes which had been drawn together into an automatically working system before the war. That system is now under terrific strain, what with wartime exactions upon transportation and manpower and the Army's and Navy's take of meat.

But there are other factors, among them the desire of the producer for a higher price, a greater profit. The animal is now worth 13.50 to 16.50 cents a pound on the Chicago market. Furthermore, where the steer is today, the grass is green and tender, due to a late spring and plentiful rain. His owner does not have to worry about the grain shortage. But let a searing drought descend upon the cattle country for 10 days or 2 weeks drying up the stock water and parching the grass, and the story might change very quickly. Our beefer might entrain hurriedly for Chicago or Kansas City.

The next thing keeping the animal happy and alive out there on the range is the lack of enthusiasm among the packers to do anything drastic to get him into their hands. While the cattlemen are holding for higher prices, the packers complain that they are limited from above by the ceiling on wholesale meat prices and many contend that, as a result, every steer they slaughter is a losing proposition.

So the chances of the steer for not showing up soon as a juicy sirloin on a New York platter are fairly good. They will remain so, meat experts contend, unless or until the price relationship is allowed to adjust itself in a manner to produce the incentive to get him into the channels of trade, or unless more direct governmental action is taken to get him there.

SALES IN BLACK MARKET

Even after the animal is on his way, he may be a long way from New York. He may be diverted to the black market, and while through that process parts of him might get to the East, they will not get to those persons who insist upon legitimate trade. Just the other day reports reached Chicago of 200 carloads of Texas cattle going into Louisiana, into an area that has not a single federally inspected slaughterhouse.

Authorities look with increasing alarm on the number of cattle bought out of the Chicago stockyards on the hoof; the increase in these sales is well more than 50 percent. Most of the cattle so withdrawn went to the East, packing representatives said, largely to sections where the only reason for shipping live cattle in the past was for the kosher trade.

"There is simply no demand like that for kosher meat," one packing authority said.

Twenty percent of the beef now moving is said by meat board officials to be going through the black market.

There are still other things that might happen to our steer between Texas and New York. At least 45 percent of steer and heifer beef must be set aside, under Government orders, for the armed services. Under current circumstances that is not enough to supply the need, so some packers are setting aside as high as 70 percent of the more choice cuts.

Also, the Army or Navy may make a sudden requisition for additional beef to make up for sinking of cargoes by U-boats, or to rush supplies to some point whose needs must be met at once. A short time back the Army suddenly called for 14,000,000 pounds in addition to the set quota.

BOSTON AREA CUT OFF 2 WEEKS

One result of this was that not a single pound of beef was shipped from Chicago to

the Boston, Mass., area for a period of 2 weeks.

Endless Government regulations further complicate the natural flow of meat. There is, too, the additional complication of shortage of manpower, now becoming serious in the packing industry. The American Meat Institute estimates that because of one or more of the obstacles cited above, more than 100 companies, some of them very substantial, have had to discontinue or sharply curtail beef operations since October 1.

But the overburdening reason why the cattle population is continuing so large and the beef supply so low is the fact that the beefers are not moving to market, nothing like to the extent of the facilities available. And the one great reason for this, as seen here, is the desire for higher prices on the part of the cattle producer.

As to hogs, the situation is the reverse. Due to a break downward in price, indicating that the boom-price days may be drawing to a close, and also due to a lack of corn in many "deficit" areas, hogs are now flowing to the packers in a constant, grunting stream. Sufficient pork for all needs, therefore, is freely predicted by the meat experts. As one of them put it today, "There'll be plenty of hog and hominy if we can get the hominy."

PROMOTION OF SUSTAINED-YIELD FOREST MANAGEMENT

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to Calendar No. 368, Senate bill 250. The bill is one introduced by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. The junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] objected to consideration of the bill when it was reached during the call of the calendar a few days ago. The Senator from West Virginia has now withdrawn his objection. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Utah in the chair). The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 250) to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under the circumstances I will not object to present consideration of the bill, because it was reached during the call of the calendar had the other day, and objection was made at that time. However, I hope Senators will not ask to have special bills on the calendar taken up until the Senate has completed action on the appropriation bills and the other business it must transact today in order to be able to agree to a motion to take a recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 250), which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That in order to promote the stability of forest industries, of employment, of communities, and of taxable forest wealth, through continuous supplies of timber; in order to provide for a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and in order to secure the benefits of forests in maintenance of water supply, regulation of stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior are severally authorized to establish by formal declaration, when in their respective judgments such action would be in the public interest, cooperative sustained-yield units which shall consist of federally owned or administered forest land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary establishing the unit and, in addition thereto, land which reasonably may be expected to be made the subject of one or more of the cooperative agreements with private landowners authorized by section 2 of this act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to forest land under his jurisdiction, and the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to forest land under his jurisdiction, are severally authorized, for the purposes specified in section 1 of this act, to enter into cooperative agreements with private owners of forest land within a cooperative sustained-yield unit, established pursuant to section 1 of this act, providing for the coordinated management of such private forest land and of federally owned or administered forest lands within the sustained-yield unit involved.

Each cooperative agreement may give the cooperating private landowner the privilege of purchasing without competitive bidding at prices not less than their appraised value, subject to periodic readjustments of stumpage rates and to such other conditions and requirements as the Secretary may prescribe, timber and other forest products from federally owned or administered forest land within the unit, in accordance with the provisions of sustained-yield management plans formulated or approved by the Secretary for the unit; shall limit the time, rate, and method of cutting or otherwise harvesting timber and other forest products from the land of the cooperating private landowner, due consideration being given to the character and condition of the timber, to the relation of the proposed cutting to the sustained-yield plan for the unit, and to the productive capacity of the land; shall prescribe the terms and conditions upon which the cooperating private landowner may sell to any person timber and other forest products from his land, compliance by the purchaser with such conditions to be required by the contract of sale; shall contain such provisions as the Secretary deems necessary to protect the reasonable interest of other owners of forest land within the unit; and shall contain such other provisions as the Secretary believes necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Each cooperative agreement shall be placed on record in the county or counties in which the lands of the cooperating private landowner covered thereby are located, and the costs incident to such recordation may be paid out of any funds available for the protection or management of federally owned or administered forest land within the unit. When thus recorded, the agreement shall be binding upon the heirs, successors, and assigns of the owner of such land, and upon purchasers of timber or other forest products from such land, throughout the life of such cooperative agreement.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior are further severally authorized, whenever in their respective judgments the maintenance of a stable community or communities is primarily dependent upon the sale of timber or other forest products from federally owned or administered forest land and such maintenance cannot effectively be secured by following the usual procedure in selling such timber or other forest products, to establish by formal declaration for the purpose of maintaining the stability of such community or communities a sustained-yield unit consisting of forest land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary establishing such unit, to determine and define the boundaries of the community or communities for whose benefit such unit is created, and to sell, subject to such conditions and requirements as the Secretary believes necessary, federally owned or administered timber and other forest products from such unit without competitive bidding at prices not less than their appraised values, to responsible purchasers within such community or communities.

SEC. 4. Each of the said Secretaries is further authorized in his discretion to enter into cooperative agreements with the other Secretary, or with any Federal agency having jurisdiction over federally owned or administered forest land, or with any State or local agency having jurisdiction over publicly owned or administered forest land, providing for the inclusion of such land in any coordinated plan of management otherwise authorized by the provisions of this act when by such a cooperative agreement he may be aided in accomplishing the purposes of this act; but no federally or publicly owned or administered forest land not under the jurisdiction of the Secretary establishing the sustained-yield unit concerned shall be included in any such plan except in pursuance of a cooperative agreement made under this section.

SEC. 5. Before any sustained-yield unit authorized by section 1 or section 3 of this act shall be established, and before any cooperative agreement authorized by section 2 or section 4 of this act shall be entered into, advance notice thereof shall be given by publication in one or more newspapers of general circulation in the vicinity of the place where the timber is located, and the costs incident to such publication may be paid out of any funds available for the protection or management of the federally owned or administered forest land involved. This notice shall state: (1) the location of the proposed unit; (2) the name of each proposed cooperator; (3) the duration of the proposed cooperative agreement or agreements; (4) the location and estimated quantity of timber on the land of each proposed cooperator and on the Federal land involved; (5) the expected rate of cutting of such timber; and (6) the time and place of a public hearing to be held not less than 30 days after the first publication of said notice for the presentation of the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed action to the community or communities affected.

Before any sale agreement made without competition and involving more than $500 in stumpage value of federally owned or administered timber shall be entered into under this act, advance notice thereof shall be given by publication in one or more newspapers of general circulation in the vicinity of the place where the timber is located, and the costs incident to such publication may be paid out of any funds available for the protection or management of federally owned or administered forest land within the unit concerned. This notice shall state: (1) the quantity and appraised value of the timber; (2) the time and place of a public hearing to be held not less than 30 days after the first publication of said notice if requested by the State or county where the timber is located or by any other person deemed to have a reasonable interest in the proposed sale or in its terms; and (3) the place where any request for a public hearing shall be made. Such requests need be considered

only if received at the place designated in the notice not later than 15 days after the first publication of such notice. If a request for a hearing is received within the time designated, notice of the holding of the hearing shall be given not less than 10 days before the time set for such hearing, in the same manner as provided for the original notice.

The determination made by the Secretary having jurisdiction upon the proposals considered at any such hearing, which determination may include the modification of the terms of such proposals without further hearing thereon, together with the minutes or other record of the hearing, shall be available for public inspection during the life of any coordinated plan of management or agreement entered into in consequence of such determination.

SEC. 6. In addition to any other remedy available under existing law, upon failure of any private owner of forest land which is subject to a cooperative agreement entered into pursuant to this act to comply with the terms of such agreement, or upon failure of any purchaser of timber or other forest products from such land to comply with the terms and conditions required by such agreement to be included in the contract of sale, the Attorney General, at the request of the Secretary concerned, is authorized to institute against such owner or such purchaser a proceeding in equity in the proper district court of the United States, to require compliance with the terms and conditions of said cooperative agreement; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon said district courts to hear and determine such proceedings, to order compliance with the terms and conditions of cooperative agreements entered into pursuant to this act, and to make such temporary and final orders as shall be deemed just in the premises. As used in this section the term "owner" shall include the heirs, successors, and assigns of the landowner entering into the cooperative agreements.

SEC. 7. Whenever used in this act, the term "federally owned or administered forest land" shall be construed to mean forest land in which, or in the natural resources of which, the United States has a legal or equitable interest of any character sufficient to entitle the United States to control the management or disposition of the timber or other forest products thereon, except land heretofore or hereafter reserved or withdrawn for purposes which are inconsistent with the exercise of the authority conferred by this act; and shall include trust or restricted Indian land, whether tribal or allotted, except that the timber and other forest products on such land shall not be sold without the consent of the Indians concerned.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior may severally prescribe such rules and regulations as may be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act. Each Secretary may delegate any of his powers and duties under this act to other officers or employees of his department.

SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to abrogate or curtail any authority conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior by any act relating to management of federally owned or administered forest lands, and nothing contained in any such acts shall be construed to limit or restrict any authority conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior by this act.

SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this act such sums as the Congress may from time to time deem necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. There has been received today a group of 17 or 18 postmaster nominations. I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nominations may be read by the Clerk and that the Senate may consider them and dispose of them, because we are likely to adjourn tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, what are the nominations?

Mr. HAYDEN. They are the nominations of sundry postmasters which have been submitted to the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Have they been considered by the committee and presented to the Senators from the various States?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator and to the Senate that before we conclude today's business we shall have an executive session, at which time all such matters can be considered. Unless there is some particular reason why the nominations should be considered at this time, I must object.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], I withdraw the request.

LIBERALIZATION OF FAMILY ALLOWANCES FOR SERVICEMEN'S DEPENDENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 394, Senate bill 1279.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is the Senator from Colorado asking unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1279, Calendar No. 394.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I understand, this is a bill which involves several modifications or amendments of the present law. The bill required a committee report of 10 pages for explanation. If the Senator wishes to move that the Senate proceed to consider the bill, I shall have nothing to say; but under the circumstances I must object. The bill would cost about $400,000,000 a year. I object to taking it up by unanimous consent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will withhold his objection while I make a brief explanation of the bill.

It is true that there are many pages of explanation in the report, but it is also true that all branches of the military service are agreed upon the language of the bill. The bill is necessary to enable the various branches of the military service to carry out the law, in which certain defects have been found.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if the bill is taken up on motion, I think I shall vote for it; but the bill calls for nearly $400,000,000 of extra expense. Only a few Senators are present. I cannot consent to a unanimous-consent request for the consideration of a bill of this size; but I am perfectly agreable to a motion to take it up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1279, Calendar No. 394.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, when a similar request was made previously, I objected to consideration of the bill; but after conference with various Members of the Senate about the situation and about the legislation, I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have a word of explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be very glad to explain the bill, and shall try to answer any questions pertaining to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. We should first have an explanation of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall make a full explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada requests an explanation of the bill by the Senator from Colorado before the question is put.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Before the question is put?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That was the Senator's request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the bill provides for changes in allowances to families of men who are in the military service. To show the interest on the part of Congress in the question, I may say that about 20 bills have been introduced by Members of the Senate and Members of the House on different phases of family allowances.

The bill would make four major changes in present law. First, it provides that an initial first payment be made to dependents without delay, simply upon the statement of the enlisted man. Subsequent payments, however, are to be carefully checked, as under present law.

Second, the benefits under this measure would be made available to enlisted

men in the first three enlisted grades, if they chose to accept its benefits in lieu of present cash payments for quarters.

Third, allowances would be substantially increased to parents if such allowances were their chief support, rather than the substantial support required in present law.

Fourth, allowances would be substantially increased to the children of enlisted men.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I now know what the bill is, and I have no objection, so far as I personally am concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments in section 7, on page 7, line 16, after the word "support", to strike out the comma and the words "and an additional $11 for each brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, but not to exceed $83 in the aggregate" and insert "; $68 if such enlisted man has one parent and one brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, but not to exceed $90 in the aggregate"; and in section 7a, on page 9, line 16, after the figures "101" and the colon, to insert *"Provided further,* That the Secretary of the department concerned is authorized to make the election on behalf of the enlisted man in any case in which he deems it desirable and finds it impracticable for the enlisted man to so elect, however, such an election made on behalf of the enlisted man shall not preclude an election at a later date by the enlisted man: *Provided further",* so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 101 of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 381; 37 U. S. C., Supp. 201), is amended by striking out in the first and second lines the words "of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grades."

SEC. 2. That section 102 of such act is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the words "except as to the initial family allowance provided by section 107 (a) hereof."

SEC. 3. That section 103 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 103. The dependents of any such enlisted man to whom a family allowance is payable under the provisions of this title shall be divided into three classes to be known as 'class A,' 'class B,' and 'class B–1' dependents. The class A dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the wife, the child, or the former wife divorced of any such enlisted man. The class B dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the parent, grandchild, brother, or sister of such enlisted man and who is found by the Secretary of the Department concerned to be dependent upon such enlisted man for a substantial portion of his support. The class B–1 dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the parent, brother, or sister of such enlisted man and who is found by the Secretary of the Department concerned to be dependent upon such enlisted man for the chief portion of his support."

SEC. 4. That section 104 of such act is amended by inserting after the words "class B" in the sixth and thirteenth lines, respectively, thereof the words "or class B–1."

SEC. 5. That section 105 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 105. The amount of the monthly family allowance, consisting of the reduction in, or charge to, the pay of the enlisted man and the Government's contribution, payable to the dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man shall be—

"To class A dependent or dependents: A wife but no child, $50; a wife and one child, $68 (with an additional $11 for each additional child, the total amount payable on account of two or more children to be equally divided among the children); a child but no wife, $42 (with an additional $11 for each additional child, the total amount payable on account of two or more children to be equally divided among the children); a wife divorced, $42 (in no event more than the amount of alimony decreed and still payable).

"To class B dependent or dependents (where there is no class B–1 dependent): Where there is no class A dependent, $37 (payable to only one designated dependent); where there is a class A dependent, $20 (payable to only one designated dependent).

"To class B–1 dependent or dependents: One parent but no brother or sister, $50; two parents but no brother or sister, $63 (the total amount payable on account of two parents to be equally divided between them); one parent and one brother or sister, $68 (with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister but not to exceed two); two parents and one brother or sister, $79 (with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister but not to exceed two); a brother or sister but no parent, $42 (with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister but not to exceed two. The total amount payable on account of two or more brothers and sisters to be equally divided among them)."

SEC. 6. (a) That section 106 (a) of such act is amended by striking out in the sixth and seventh lines thereof the words "both class A and class B" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "more than one class of".

(b) That section 106 (b) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) In any case in which the payment of the monthly family allowances involves two or more dependents, the total amount may be apportioned and paid for the benefit of such dependents as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the department concerned."

(c) That section 106 (c) of such act is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, in any case in which a family allowance is granted under this title—

"(1) to a wife or a child living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order or decree or a written agreement, the amount of the family allowance payable to such wife or child shall not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or decree or in the written agreement as the amount to be paid to such wife or child, except that in the case of a wife or child living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order or decree or a written agreement, and such order, decree, or agreement is silent as to the amount to be paid to such wife or child, no family allowance shall be payable unless application is made by the enlisted man or unless the Secretary of the department concerned finds that it is impracticable for the enlisted man to make such application, in which case the full allowance prescribed by this title shall be paid; and except that in the case of an application filed for an allowance for a child living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order or decree or written agreement which fixes the amount to be paid for such child's support at a lesser amount than is provided for such child by this title, the Secretary of the department concerned may authorize payment of the allowance in any amount greater than that fixed by such court order, decree, or written agreement, but not in excess of the amount prescribed by this title; or

"(2) to a former wife divorced, the amount of the family allowance payable to such former wife divorced shall not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or decree as the amount to be paid to such former wife divorced."

SEC. 7. (a) That section 107 of such act is amended by striking out all before the first proviso, including the word *"Provided",* and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 107. (a) An initial family allowance shall be paid for the month in which an enlisted man enters a pay status in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after October 1, 1943, in the amounts and to the dependents hereinafter set forth.

"Such initial family allowance shall be paid to the designated dependent only when a written application therefor is filed by such enlisted man within 15 days after the date of his entry into active service in a pay status and shall be paid as soon as practicable after the filing of such application.

"If paid, such initial family allowance shall be in lieu of the regular monthly family allowance for the month of the enlisted man's entry into active service in a pay status.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of this title, the full amount of such initial family allowance shall be paid by the Government, and no reduction in or charge to the pay of the enlisted man shall be made for such payment.

"The amount of the initial family allowance payable to the dependent or dependents shall be—

"(1) $50, if such enlisted man has a wife but no child;

"(2) $68, if such enlisted man has a wife and one child, and an additional $11 for each additional child;

"(3) $42, if such enlisted man has no wife but has one child, and an additional $11 for each additional child;

"(4) $50, if such enlisted man has one parent dependent upon him for chief support; $68 if such enlisted man has one parent and one brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, but not to exceed $90 in the aggregate;

"(5) $68, if such enlisted man has two parents dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, but not to exceed $101 in the aggregate;

"(6) $42, if such enlisted man has no parent but has a brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, but not to exceed $64 in the aggregate. Payment of the initial family allowance may be made to one payee for each class of dependents, as defined in section 103, for whom an allowance is requested.

"(b) The monthly family allowance provided for by this title shall be paid for the period beginning with the first day of the month in which application therefor is filed, or the first day of the month in which the dependent or dependents first become entitled thereto, whichever is later, subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, and shall be terminated or reduced, as may be required, on the last day of the month in which the disbursing officer paying the allowance receives notice of a change in status of the enlisted man or a dependent which terminated or limited the right of his dependent or dependents to receive such allowance: *Provided*, That the period of entitlement to family allowances shall be as hereinbefore prescribed for payment, except that in the case of a change in status of a dependent, the period of entitlement shall cease with the last day of the month in which such change occurs: *Provided further*,".

SEC. 7a. That section 108 of such act is amended by inserting in the first line thereof after "SEC. 108", the subparagraph designation "(a)", and adding at the end of the section a new subsection to read as follows:

"(b) An enlisted man receiving a monetary allowance in lieu of quarters for dependents, or who, being entitled thereto and having made application therefor on or before the date of approval of this act, may, at his option, receive or continue to receive such monetary allowance, or elect to receive in lieu thereof, the benefits of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended: *Provided*, That an enlisted man's election shall be irrevocable during the period of entitlement to such allowance as set out in section 101: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Department concerned is authorized to make the election on behalf of the enlisted man in any case in which he deems it desirable and finds it impracticable for the enlisted man to so elect, however, such an election made on behalf of the enlisted man shall not preclude an election at a later date by the enlisted man: *Provided further*, That in the case of any enlisted man whose dependents are receiving family allowances and occupying public quarters, a deduction from or charge to his pay shall be made at the rate of $1.25 per day."

SEC. 8. That section 110 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 110. (a) Entitlement to and payment of any family allowance authorized under provisions of this title to the dependent or dependents of any enlisted man shall not be contingent upon pay accruing to such enlisted man or upon the monthly pay of such man being reduced by or charged with any amount."

SEC. 9. That section 119 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 119. Any person who shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, contract for, charge, or receive or shall attempt to solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee or compensation for assisting in any manner an enlisted man or dependent in obtaining a family allowance payable under this title, shall, upon conviction thereof, be guilty of a misdemeanor and for each and every offense shall be punishable by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $1,000 or by imprisonment at hard labor for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

SEC. 10. That section 120 (c) (4) of such act is amended by striking out the words "under oath" in the fourth line thereof.

SEC. 11. That Section 120 (i) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) The terms 'man' and 'enlisted man' mean any enlisted individual of the first to seventh grades, both inclusive, in any of the services mentioned in section 101 of this act and include members of the band of the United States Marine Corps, but do not include the leader and second leader of the band of the United States Marine Corps, the Philippine Army, the Philippine Scouts, the insular force of the Navy, the Samoan Native Guard or band of the Navy, or the Samoan reserve force of the Marine Corps."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I presume that a bill of such importance should be further explained. I do not like to run the risk of having the bill defeated.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest that the Senator ask unanimous consent to have the report on the bill printed in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the report of the Committee on Military Affairs on Senate bill 1279.

There being no objection, the report (No. 383) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon and recommend that it do pass with amendments.

The subject of family allowances has been under study by the subcommittee of the Senate Military Affairs Committee for several weeks. The pioneer bill having for its purpose an over-all increase in family allowances was the one introduced by Senator LODGE on May 24 (S. 1131) to provide for an increase of 15 percent in the Government's contribution to the dependents of enlisted men.

The subcommittee held a hearing in connection with S. 1131 on June 28, at which time Gen. M. G. White and several other officers, both of the War Department and the Navy Department, were present. General White submitted the draft of a new bill which had been agreed upon by the Interdepartmental Pay Board, which draft subsequently was submitted to the Senate by Senator LODGE as an amendment intended to be proposed by him to his bill, S. 1131, and also was introduced by Senator REYNOLDS as S. 1279, the bill which the committee accepted, with certain perfecting amendments, and now report favorably to the Senate.

Certain other aspects of the whole problem, and other proposals regarding increases, were before the committee in the following bills: S. 723, a bill by Senator LANGER relating to wives living separate and apart from enlisted men at the time they entered the military or naval service; S. 918, a bill by Senator DAVIS relating to the date of the beginning of the period for which allowances are paid; S. 976, a bill by Senator DAVIS to increase the amount of the family allowances payable to dependent parents of enlisted men; and S. 1245, a bill by Senator WAGNER to increase the allowances to wives and children.

No formal reports regarding family allowances have been received from the Departments, and the relationship of S. 1279 to the program of the President could not be ascertained in time to incorporate in this report to the Senate. Representatives of the War and Navy Departments testified in behalf of the measure, however, and your committee believe that S. 1279 is an especially timely, just, and equitable bill.

AMENDMENTS

The amendments recommended by the committee and concurred in by the War and Navy Departments are as follows:

The first amendment corrects an error in the family allowance payable to a class B–1 parent and one brother or sister. The second amendment inserts the initial family allowance payable when the enlisted man has one parent and one brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support and increases the aggregate from $83 to $90. The third amendment authorizes the Secretary of the Department concerned to make the election on the part of enlisted men, who are prisoners or in a missing status, as to whether they will continue to receive a monetary allowance in lieu of quarters for dependents or the benefits of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended.

Page 3, line 23, strike out "$58" and insert "$68."

Page 7, line 13, strike out all following the word "support" and insert a semicolon and the words "$68 if such enlisted man has one parent and one brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, but not to exceed $90 in the aggregate."

Page 9, line 8, insert after "101:" the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Department concerned is authorized to make the election on behalf of the enlisted man in any case in which he deems it desirable and finds it impracticable for the enlisted man to so elect, however, such an election made on behalf of the enlisted man shall not preclude an election at a later date by the enlisted man."

Section 1 of the bill amends section 101 of the act. Under the present law family allowances are payable only to the dependents of enlisted men in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh pay grades. The amendment extends the benefits of the act to the dependents of men in the first, second, and third pay grades as well. The reasons underlying this extension are fully set forth in the comments under section 7 (a), below.

Section 2 of the bill amends section 102 of the act. Section 7 of the bill proposes an amendment to the present section 107, by inserting a new section 107 (a). This authorizes an initial family allowance payment the full amount of which is to be borne by the Government. If such an initial family allowance payment is to be made, the present section 102 which provides that the family allowance consists of the Government contribution and the reduction in or charge to the pay of the enlisted man must be amended as set forth. The reasons underlying the initial family allowance payment are fully set forth in the comments under section 7, below.

Section 3 of the bill amends section 103 of the act. This amendment is necessary in order to effectuate the changes in regard to class B dependents, discussed fully under section 5 below. A new class B–1 is created consisting of parents, brothers, and sisters dependent upon the enlisted man for their chief support and not merely for a substantial portion of their support.

Section 4 of the bill amends section 104 of the act. This is necessary in order to bring the new class of dependents, class B–1, within the provisions of the act.

Section 5 of the bill amends section 104 of the act. Section 105 involves certain changes in the rate structure. Instead of setting forth the Government contribution

to the various types of class A and class B dependents, respectively, as does the present section, the total family allowance payable to such dependent is stated. This has definite advantages: (1) The exact amount which any dependent will receive is easily ascertainable; (2) such amount will not be reduced by the addition of other dependents. While under the present law the Government contribution to class A dependents is fixed, the man's contribution may be divided among them. For example, a wife receives $50 per month ($28 from the Government and $22 from the man). If, however, there is a child, the wife receives $43.40 ($28 from the Government and $15.40 from the man), while the child receives $18.60 ($12 from the Government and $6.60 from the man). The man's contribution ($22 if he has class A or class B or B–1 dependents and $27 if he has class A and class B or B–1 dependents remains as at present. The Government contribution is the difference between the man's contribution and the family allowance.

The committee does not believe that there should be a general over-all increase in the rates now payable under this act. This belief is based upon the following facts: Very few cases have come to the attention of those administering the act which would indicate that, as a general proposition, the present benefits are inadequate. In the process of the enactment of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of June 23, 1942, careful consideration was given to the determination of the amounts of family allowances. Based upon those of the last war they were liberally increased by approximately 15 to 30 percent to cover the rise in the cost of living. It was observed and noted that they compared favorably with existing pensions. Furthermore, the hearings on the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 prove conclusively that, in fixing the rates of allowances for dependents, one consideration was given to the material increases in the basic pay for all enlisted personnel provided by the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942. This increase in the lowest grade amounts to 66⅔ percent over that in the last war.

It was not and should not be the purpose of the act to provide benefits for dependents which will enable them to meet maintenance living levels in all cases. Flat rates must be predicated on average living costs. No war can be conducted without some hardships and inequities. The present allowances in the case of many dependents are equal to, if not above, the amounts which the Government can properly be expected to pay to dependents. In other categories these allowances are, it is believed, inadequate. An overall increase in the allowances would aggravate these inequities and would seriously affect the wage scale in many communities. The fact that certain classes of dependents need an increase should not be used to bulwark a general increase.

Since no general increase in the rate structure is provided, the enlisted man's contribution is not increased. This remains $22 if he has class A or class B or B–1 dependents, $27 if he has class A and class B or B–1 dependents. It has already been pointed out that there should be no general increase in the amounts of the family allowance benefits. An increase in the man's contribution would of necessity result in such an increase. The enlisted man may, and in many cases where he has major family responsibilities, does, augment the family allowance by voluntary remittances.

A comparison of the allowances now paid to dependents under the present act and those which would be payable under the bill follows:

Dependent	Present	Proposed
Wife	$50	$50
Wife and 1 child	62	68
Additional children (each)	10	11
Former wife divorced [1]	42	42
1 parent (dependent for chief support): [2]		
Where there is no class A dependent	37	50
Where there is class A dependent	20	50
1 parent (dependent for substantial support):		
Where there is no class A dependent	37	37
Where there is class A dependent	20	37
2 parents (dependent for chief support):		
Where there is no class A dependent	47	68
Where there is class A dependent	30	68
2 parents (dependent for substantial support):		
Where there is no class A dependent	47	37
Where there is class A dependent	30	37
1 parent and 1 brother or sister (dependent for chief support):		
Where there is no class A dependent	42	68
Where there is class A dependent	25	68
1 parent and 1 brother or sister (dependent for substantial support):		
Where there is no class A dependent	42	37
Where there is class A dependent	25	37
Additional brothers or sisters (each):		
Dependent for chief support	5	11
Dependent for substantial support	5	0

[1] It will be noted that in the case of the former wife divorced the allowance in no case is to exceed the amount of alimony awarded. This remains the same under the bill.

[2] The bill provides that allowances can be claimed for either class B–1 or class B dependents but may not be paid to both groups.

The committee recommend no general increase in the family allowance for a wife without a child. The present allowance of $50 ($28 from the Government and $22 from the man) continues. It is recommended, however, that the wife get $50 irrespective of the existence of other dependents. In some cases under the present act the allowance to the wife is less than $50 because there are other class A dependents among whom the man's contribution must be apportioned. Thus, if there is a former wife divorced in whose favor there exists an alimony decree of $42 a month or more, the wife receives an allowance of $40.83. Under the new rate schedule the wife would receive $50 in all cases. Too generous allowances for wives without children might serve to deter many, who are able, from direct participation in the war effort. Many wives make desired readjustments in regard to living arrangements.

Where an enlisted man has a wife and child, the committee recommend that the Government contribution be increased from $40 to $46; and from $10 to $11 for each additional child. The family allowance for a wife with one child would be raised from $62 to $68, or 9.7 percent; for a wife with two children from $72 to $79, or 9.7 percent; for a wife with three children from $82 to $90, or 9.8 percent. An increase in the benefits for children with their mothers, consistent with the advance in the cost of living since the enactment of the act, is justified. It must also be noted that the present rates discounted in advance some of the increase in the cost of living anticipated at the time of the original enactment. The wife with a child or children deserves special consideration. In many cases the responsibilities of maternal care prevent mothers from gainful employment which could be used to augment family allowance benefits.

The present law provides that a child where there is no wife shall receive $42 per month ($20 from the Government and $22 from the man), that where there are two children but no wife $52 ($30 from the Government and $22 from the man); and $10 additional from the Government for each additional child. The committee believe that the allowance for a child where there is no wife is sufficient. It compares favorably with the allowance of $50 for a wife who is an adult. However, this allowance of $42 will, under the bill, be paid irrespective of whether or not there are other class A dependents. Under the present law if the father remarries and the child continues to live separate and apart, instead of $42 the child receives $18.60 per month ($12 from the Government and twenty forty-eighths of the man's contribution). An increase from $10 to $11 is proposed for each additional child. This increase is the same as that recommended for children living with their mother.

The committee do not recommend that the provision of the present act—that the Government contributes $20 to such wife irrespective of the amounts payable to other class A dependents—be changed. There has been no indication that any broadening of this provision is necessary or justified. The divorced wife with an alimony decree of $42 or more per month will, however, under the bill, receive an allowance of $42 even though there is another wife. At the present time such divorced wife receives $29.17 ($20 from the Government and $9.17 from the man), the rest of the man's contribution going to his present wife.

By far the greatest number of cases in which hardship has arisen among dependents as a result of alleged inadequacy of the prescribed rate of allowances arise in regard to parents who are dependent upon a son in the service for their chief support. "Chief support" has been construed to mean over 50 percent of the dependent's income. In the majority of cases in which allowances are now being paid to class B dependents, such allowances are too generous. Under the present law a dependent mother or father receives $37 per month ($22 from the son and $15 from the Government) provided the son has no class A dependents; $20 per month ($5 from the son and $15 from the Government) if the son has class A dependents. If the son has two parents, the Government contribution is $25. For each brother, sister, or grandchild the Government adds $5. But in no case is the Government contribution for class B dependents to exceed $50.

Under the present law class B dependents must be dependent upon the enlisted man for a substantial portion of their support. The application of the test of "substantial support" results in inequity; some allowances to parents are more than adequate, while others are inadequate. For example, a son contributes $10 per month to his mother prior to his entry into the service, she having other income of $50 per month. This $10 contribution is considered a "substantial portion" of her total income and, in most cases, a "substantial portion" of her support. She is therefore entitled to either $37 or $20 dependent upon whether her son has class A dependents. Contrast this case with the one where the son has prior to his entry into the service contributed $60 to a mother with no income. This mother, too, is entitled to $37 or $20, as the case may be.

The number of class B dependents dependent upon the enlisted man for less than 50 percent of their actual support is much greater than the number dependent for more than 50 percent of their support. In the

majority of cases where the parents are dependent for less than 50 percent of their income on the son in the service, the present Government contribution to such allowance exceeds the actual contributions to the parents made prior to the man's entry into the service. It is estimated that approximately 80 percent of the class B dependents now receiving family allowances because they are dependent upon the enlisted man for a "substantial portion" of their support are not dependent for over 50 percent of their income and, therefore, are not dependent for "chief support."

The inequities already outlined are further accentuated by the fact that the amount of the current Government contribution is too often fixed according to the number of dependents whom the enlisted man lists as such in his application. These inequities cannot be corrected by purely administrative action.

The committee recommend much more reasonable support for those class B dependents who are actually dependent upon the enlisted man for chief support, and, at the same time, a reduction in the Government contribution to such dependents as are not dependent upon the enlisted man for chief support, but for substantial support. Two classes of collateral dependents are thus recommended: Class B, consisting of those dependent for less than chief support upon the enlisted man, to whom will be paid a single Government contribution of $15 per month irrespective of the size of the group; class B–1, consisting of those dependent upon the enlisted man for chief support to whom will be paid allowances on the same scale as those payable to class A dependents. The committee recommend that the allowances to class B–1 dependents be fixed in the amount and that they do not vary if the man has or acquires class A dependents. It is believed that a parent dependent upon a son for chief support should receive the same treatment as a wife. Thus one parent would receive $50 (if the man has no class A dependents, $22 from him and $28 from the Government; if he has class A dependents, $5 from the man and $45 from the Government). A second parent would receive the allowances to the same extent as does a child. Thus two parents would receive $68 (if the man has no class A dependents, $22 from him and $46 from the Government; if he has class A dependents, $5 from the man and $63 from the Government). Brothers and sisters (not to exceed three) would be given the same treatment as children, $18 for the first child if there is one parent, and $11 for each additional child not to exceed two.

Allowances to class B–1 dependents are not mandatory, but will be granted only upon the application of the enlisted man except in those cases where the secretary of the department concerned finds it impracticable for such enlisted man to request the payment of such allowance.

Section 6 (a) of the bill amends section 106 of the act. This is necessary to put into effect the changes in regard to class B dependents.

Section 6 (b) of the bill amends section 106 (b) of the act. Section 106 (b) of the present act setting forth the rules for the apportionment of the enlisted man's contribution where there are class A or class B dependents or class A and class B dependents, is not necessary in view of the changes in section 105. Hardship has arisen where there have been dependents of one class with one or more payees. It is desirable, however, to vest in the secretary of the department concerned authority to apportion payments among members of a class.

Section 6 (c) of the bill amends section 106 (c) of the act. This section undertakes to deal alike with three distinct classes of dependents, namely: (1) A wife living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order or written agreement; (2) a child living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order or written agreement; and (3) a former wife divorced. In the administration of the act it has developed that separate provision should be made for the different classes if the apparent intent of the Congress is to be carried out and equitable provision made for the allowances for such classes.

Administration of the act indicates that the present provisions are too restrictive in many cases and result in hardships and inequities obviously not intended by the Congress. For example, a child living separate and apart from the father under a court order which makes no provision for the child receives the full allowance, but if the court order fixes an amount to be paid for the child's support, the allowance is limited thereby.

The proposed subsection permits a father in the service to make application for allowance for a child in the many cases where, although there is no mention of the child in a court order or separation agreement, he was actually contributing to the child's support directly or indirectly prior to entry into the service, or where, because of changed conditions brought about by the war, he may wish to so contribute. The amendment, by giving authority to the Secretary of the department concerned to act where it is impracticable for the father to do so, enables the services to pay allowances in many worthy hardship cases.

The provision permitting payment of the full amount of allowance prescribed by the act in cases where a court order or written agreement fixes a lesser amount, puts this section on a realistic basis, and removes the present inequity between the child now coming within the restriction and other children provided for by the act. It should not be presumed, as is required under the present law, that a father, in the event that he was able, would not provide, or had not provided, for his child better than was required by an order or agreement.

The separation of the classes is completed by treating the case of the former wife divorced, separately. There has been no indication that any broadening of this provision is necessary or desirable.

Section 7 of the bill amends section 107 of the act. Perhaps the greatest dissatisfaction with the administration of the present act involves the time which elapses between the entry of the enlisted man into active service in a pay status and the date of the first payment of the family allowance to his dependents. The need for the benefits is often far greater at this time than later. Under the act and the present joint regulations entitlement does not arise until the month following that in which application is filed, and payment will be made at the first of the next month. Thus, if application is filed June 15, 1943, entitlement is for July, and payment will be made August 1, 1943.

The situation already outlined cannot be remedied without legislation. Section 101 of the act creates some doubt as to whether the law permits family allowances to be paid for any period prior to the entry upon active service in a pay status of an enlisted man, notwithstanding section 107 of the act, which permits the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to "fix the date of commencement * * * of any family allowance on any dates not more than 1 month before or 1 month after the dates above prescribed."

This new subsection provides for an initial family allowance to be paid as soon as practicable after the man enters active service in a pay status. To accomplish this and to permit the services to use the administrative machinery now in existence, the changes in section 107 are essential. Such changes will permit payment by any disbursing officer who may be designated by the Secretary of the department concerned; payments to be based entirely upon written application by the man certifying that he has the named dependents. Some payments, particularly to class B–1 dependents will not be continued because the facts do not justify a finding of chief support. It is not practicable, however, to recover these payments.

The initial family allowance proposed by this subsection will be in lieu of any regular monthly family allowance for the month of the enlisted man's entry into active service in a pay status. The full amount of this initial allowance will be paid by the Government, and no reduction in a charge to the pay of the enlisted man will be made for such payment. In many cases the enlisted man will not have a sufficient amount in his account to stand the regular deduction, and he should not begin service "in the red."

The amounts of the initial family allowance payment are set forth in the section and are the same as those prescribed in section 105 for the regular allowance. It is to be noted, however, that the initial family allowance is payable only to class A and class B–1 dependents (not to class B dependents) and that written application therefor must be filed by the man within 15 days after his entry into active service in a pay status.

Such payments may normally be expected to reach the dependents not later than 15 days after the man enters active service in a pay status. The payment may be made to one payee for each class of dependents for whom such allowance is requested, i. e., to one payee for class A dependents and to one payee for class B–1 dependents.

Section 7 of the bill further amends section 107 of the act. Section 107 of the present act provides for termination of payment of a family allowance upon notice to the disbursing officer of a change in status of an enlisted man, his death, or discharge from the service. It is silent on changes in the status of the dependent, such as death, marriage, etc. Furthermore, while the present section recognizes that payments will be made after a change in status, death, or discharge, it does not clearly set forth the right of the dependent to retain the payments made after the event which terminated the allowance. As a result of the omission of specific language dealing with the period of entitlement and the change in status of the dependent, many inequities exist. Some beneficiaries return checks, others request information as to their entitlement, and a majority proceed to utilize the proceeds for their support. The laws should be specific on the period of entitlement, which in turn will determine the right of every beneficiary of each payment.

Section 7 (a) of the bill amends section 108 of the act. The denial to dependents of enlisted men in the first three pay grades and the Limited Service Marine Corps Reserve of the benefits of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 bears directly on the morale of such men. Enlisted men in the fourth and lower pay grades often decline promotion to the third or higher pay grades because the total payment on promotion may be less than the combined total of payments to the man and his dependents in receipt of family allowances. This is not sound in principle.

The currently authorized monetary allowance in lieu of quarters for an enlisted man in the first three pay grades with dependents, is paid to the man himself although this allowance is for the benefit of his dependents. This monetary allowance varies from the minimum rate of $37.50 per month, which is for domestic application, up to a maximum of $60 per month, depending on the duty station of the enlisted man. Dependents of enlisted men must reside within the United States as regulations prohibit such dependents from accompanying men on whom they are dependent to foreign stations. This

means that enlisted men in the first three pay grades may receive different amounts for their dependents, although all dependents live in this country. This discrimination cannot be justified.

The administrative effort to stop the payment of family allowances promptly upon promotion of a man from the fourth pay grade is often ineffectual and costly. Under conditions of global war, it is frequently impossible to stop the payment of family allowances concurrent with the month of promotion. However, upon promotion of the man from the fourth pay grade, deduction in the man's pay ceases; yet the payment of the full family allowance continues through the month in which the disbursing officer paying the family allowance receives notice of promotion under section 107 of the act. This results in unavoidable overpayments which in many cases may continue for several months. This subsection largely eliminates this situation.

If the benefits of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 are extended to all men in the first three pay grades now receiving monetary allowance in lieu of quarters, some men will suffer a loss. An enlisted man with a wife receives a monetary allowance of $37.50 per month at the domestic rate; the Government contribution to the family allowance for such wife is $28 per month. For this reason the bill provides that the enlisted man may elect once, but only once, as to whether he prefers the benefits of the basic act. This right of election, however, exists only in favor of those enlisted men in the first three pay grades who are receiving a monetary allowance in lieu of quarters for dependents, or who are entitled thereto and have filed application therefor at the date of approval of this act. It does not exist in regard to men promoted after approval of this act. The right of election by the man is preserved, if in absence of an election by him, one has been made by the secretary of the department concerned.

In the case of an enlisted man whose dependents are receiving family allowances and occupying public quarters, a deduction from or charge to his pay shall be made at the rate of $1.25 per day.

Section 8 of the bill amends section 110 (a) of the act. This is necessary to resolve all doubt as to whether or not the requirement of a reduction in the pay of the enlisted man "for any month for which a monthly family allowance is paid (sec. 106a) conflicts with or contradicts the provision of section 110 (a) providing that payment" shall continue to be paid irrespective of the pay accruing to such enlisted man. The amendment eliminates this ambiguity.

Section 9 of the bill amends section 119 of the act. The present section prohibits an agent or attorney being paid any "part of the account paid pursuant to the provisions of this title." Obviously any amount paid from any other source is not within the prohibition of the statute. The change attempts to create an effective sanction in this situation. The proposed amendment, however, does not prohibit a bank, for example, from making a charge for the transfer of an amount already paid as family allowance.

Section 10 of the bill amends section 120 (c) (4) of the act. Some inequities now arise in cases in which an enlisted man has acknowledged the paternity of an illegitimate child and has actually supported such child or has expressed a desire to support the child, but has not done so under oath. In such cases the child should be entitled to a family allowance. The deletion of the words "under oath" will accomplish this desired result, but yet will still require acknowledgment in writing or a court order before an allowance may be paid for the benefit of an illegitimate child.

Section 11 of the bill amends section 120 (i) of the act. This permits payment of the family allowance to the dependents of members of the Limited Service Marine Corps Reserve. These enlisted men, irrespective of grade, receive the allowances of men in the first three pay grades. The authorized strength of this class of Reserves is 6,000, and the present actual strength is 4,771. This also permits payment of family allowances to dependents of musicians of the band of the United States Marine Corps. The inclusion of dependents of the first three pay grades eliminates the reasons for the exclusion of this personnel from the benefits of the act.

Estimate of additional cost of the bill to the Government

1. Initial allowance:	
Army, 1,000,000, at $60	$60,000,000
Navy, 600,000, at $60	36,000,000
Marine Corps, 120,000, at $60	7,200,000
Coast Guard, 15,000, at $60	900,000
Total	104,100,000
2. Additional Government contribution on current allowances in 1944:	
Army, 1,000,000, at $7 per month	84,000,000
Navy, 150,000, at $7 per month	12,600,000
Marine Corps, 31,000, at $7 per month	2,604,000
Coast Guard, 20,000, at $7 per month	1,680,000
Total	100,884,000
3. Additional Government contribution on new allowances in 1944:	
Army, 1,250,000, at $7 per month	105,000,000
Navy, 850,000, at $7 per month	71,400,000
Marine Corps, 120,000, at $7 per month	10,080,000
Coast Guard, 38,000, at $7 per month	3,192,000
Total	189,672,000
Total estimated cost [1]	394,656,000

[1] The total estimated cost to the Government will be partially offset by a reduction in the payment of the monetary allowance in lieu of quarters for dependents of enlisted men in the first 3 pay grades.

Mr. BURTON. Do I correctly understand that the report contains an estimate of the additional cost involved?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. It contains a full description of the bill. It describes everything the bill will do and sets forth the total cost the bill will entail.

Mr. BURTON. Am I correct in my understanding that the cost will approximate $400,000,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It will be approximately $395,000,000 annually.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the only unfinished business which now awaits the Senate consists of conference reports on several appropriation bills, involving action of the House on the so-called McKellar amendments, both of which involve the question of senatorial confirmation of employees drawing annual salaries of more than $4,500. As soon as those two reports come to the Senate, we hope to finish action on them. That will complete the work on all appropriation bills.

It is desired to have the Senate take up a few bills which have been reported and placed on the calendar since the last call of the calendar.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 400, at which point the call was concluded when the calendar was last considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar, beginning with No. 400.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1272) to amend section 813 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended, for the purpose of making the provisions of such section prohibiting political contributions apply equally to labor organizations and management organizations, was announced as first in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over for a few moments so that I may have an opportunity to examine it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

DESIGNATION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC LIBRARY AS DEPOSITORY FOR GOVERNMENTAL PUBLICATIONS

The bill (S. 1224) to designate the Public Library of the District of Columbia a public depository for governmental publications, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Public Library of the District of Columbia is hereby constituted a designated depository of governmental publications, and the Superintendent of Documents shall supply to such library one copy of each such publication, in the same form as supplied to other designated depositories.

BURIALS IN SCOTTISH RITE TEMPLE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 2828) to permit certain burials in the Scottish Rite Temple in the District of Columbia, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BLACK-OUTS

The bill (H. R. 2988) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other

purposes," approved December 26, 1941, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAILING OF NOTICES TO OWNERS OF TAX-EXEMPT DISTRICT PROPERTY

The bill (S. 789) to provide for the mailing of annual notices to owners of tax-exempt properties in the District of Columbia, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] for an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator from Nevada is out of the Chamber temporarily.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over temporarily until the Senator from Nevada returns.

Mr. WHITE subsequently said: Mr. President, at my request Calendar No. 406, Senate bill 789, was passed over. I ask that the Senate recur to that bill in order that the Senator from Nevada may make an explanation, if he cares to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 789) to provide for the mailing of annual notices to owners of tax-exempt properties in the District of Columbia.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, during the last Congress a law was enacted deciding what property in the District of Columbia would be exempt from taxation. A number of pieces of property were included specifically. The law provided, among other things, that each year the owner of the exempt property should file a statement setting forth that the property continued to be used for the purposes by reason of which it was originally exempted from taxation. The pending bill provides that a notice shall be sent, a post card, perhaps, by the taxing officers of the District to those who own such property requiring that they send in their declaration.

Mr. WHITE. When the bill was called I missed the fact that it related to tax-exempt property. I thought it related to taxable property, and that the notices referred to were tax notices. I have no objection to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of Public Law 846, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 24, 1942, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the section and inserting a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That such rules and regulations shall include provision for mailing annually, on or before February 1 of each year, to each of the institutions, organizations, corporations, or associations required by section 3 of this act to file annual reports, notice of its contingent tax liability under this act, together with a copy of any standard form for such reports which shall have been prescribed by the Commissioners under authority of this section."

USE OF BUTTER AT ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 37) relating to the provision of butter for the patients of St. Elizabeths Hospital, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

COLLECTION AND ASSESSMENT OF TAXES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 881) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collection of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 12. On or before August 1, 1943, and on or before the 1st day of August of each subsequent year, the assessor of the District of Columbia shall mail to the record owner of each lot or parcel of land upon which a regular assessment has been levied by the District of Columbia as of July 1 of the same year, a notice of the amount of such assessment, and of the manner in which the amount of such assessment is payable according to law; and such notice shall also include notice of any previous assessments, or portions thereof, levied by the District of Columbia against such lot or parcel of land, which on July 1 of the year in which such notice is sent remained unpaid, and of any fines or penalties accrued or levied by reason of such delinquency: *Provided*, That if the address of the owner be unknown, such notice shall be mailed to his tenant or agent; and if there be more than one record owner of any lot or parcel, notice mailed to one of the owners shall be deemed compliance with this section: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shal affect in any way the provisions of section 3 of this act."

COMPENSATION OF RECORDER OF DEEDS AND SUPERINTENDENT OF NATIONAL TRAINING SCHOOL FOR GIRLS

The bill (S. 1223) to fix the compensation of the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia and the superintendent of the National Training School for Girls was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the date of approval of this act the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia, appointed in accordance with section 548 of the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1275), shall be paid a salary at the rate of $8,000 per annum.

SEC. 2. From and after the date of approval of this act, and notwithstanding any provisions of the act of July 9, 1888 (25 Stat. ch. 595), or any provisions of the act of March 16, 1926 (44 Stat. ch. 58), or any provisions of any other act heretofore approved, the superintendent of the National Training School for Girls shall be paid a salary at the rate of $3,600 per annum.

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF CONGRESS AS TO NECESSITY FOR ADEQUATE AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 12) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) The production of adequate supplies of food, feed, and fiber is as essential to the successful prosecution of the war as the production and manufacture of actual munitions of war;

(2) Farmers are handicapped in obtaining farm equipment, materials, manpower, and supplies that are needed in order to produce enough food, feed, and fiber to meet the requirements of the war food-production program; and

(3) The authorities responsible for the allocation of critical material, manpower, and supplies in giving consideration to the needs of farmers and of the persons who supply farmers with equipment, materials, and supplies must consider the needs of farmers to be of equal importance to the needs of war industries.

It is further the sense of the Congress that the Congress should, and it hereby does, commend the farmers of the United States for the manner in which they have shown their patriotism in response to the many demands that have been made upon them to aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

TOLLS ON GOVERNMENT TRAFFIC OVER GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2912) to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That tolls may be charged for the passage or transit over the Golden Gate Bridge of Government traffic, but such tolls shall not be in excess of the tolls charged for the passage or transit of other traffic over such bridge: *Provided, however*, That civilian employees of the Army and Navy traveling on Government business under proper military authority, and traffic of the War Department, Navy Department, Coast Guard, Maritime Commission, and War Shipping Administration and traffic of or in connection with the Lend-Lease Administration, and all military and naval personnel and their dependents, shall have the use of the bridge and roads in connection therewith free of charge.

SEC. 2. The provisions of the permit from the War Department relative to such Golden Gate Bridge are modified to the extent required to conform to the provisions of this act and, except as so modified, the terms of such permit shall continue in effect.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk. It is an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 15, after the word "Administration", it is proposed to insert "and all employees of the Post Office Department acting in the performance of their duties as such employees, together with the conveyances being used by them in the performance of such duties."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

TRANSPORTATION FOR EMPLOYEES OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The bill (S. 964) to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That during the present war and not exceeding 6 months after the termination of the war, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, whenever he finds such action to be necessary for the efficient conduct of the affairs of his Administration, and under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized to utilize automotive equipment of the Veterans' Administration to transport its employees between field stations and nearest adequate public transportation at such reasonable rates of fare for the service furnished as he may establish. All moneys collected as fares from such employees shall be accounted for and shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts. The authority herein granted the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall be exercised with respect to any station only after determination by the Office of Defense Transportation that existing private and other facilities are not and cannot be rendered adequate by other means, and that its exercise will result in the most efficient method of supplying transportation to the personnel concerned and a utilization of transportation facilities consistent with the plans, policies, and purposes of the Office of Defense Transportation.

JOHN P. VON ROSENBERG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 533) for the relief of John P. von Rosenberg, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$8,972.64" and insert "$3,772.64."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 7, after the words "United States", to strike out "on account of personal injuries and expenses incident thereto and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 10, after the word "and", to strike out "expenses incident thereto", and insert "on account of all property damages, medical, funeral, and other expenses incurred by the said John P. von Rosenberg and wife."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the calendar.

PERKINS GINS, FORMERLY PERKINS OIL CO.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 36, Senate bill 439, for the relief of Perkins Gins, formerly Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the statutes of limitation, so far as they bar the cotton-linter claim of Perkins Gins, a corporation of Memphis, Tenn., formerly the claim of Perkins Oil Co., also a corporation of Memphis, Tenn., arising out of purchase contract No. 3418, entered into by the said Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn., predecessor of said Perkins Gins, of Memphis, Tenn., on September 16, 1918, with the United States of America be, and the same are hereby, waived and revoked.

SEC. 2. That the said claimant is hereby authorized to file within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act its said claim and have the same adjudicated by the Court of Claims of the United States.

PRESENTATION OF MEDAL TO J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 319, Senate bill 357.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is the bill?

Mr. MEAD. It is a bill providing for the presentation of a medal to J. Edgar Hoover.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 357) to authorize the presentation of a medal of honor to J. Edgar Hoover.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the President is authorized to present, in the name of Congress, an appropriate medal to J. Edgar Hoover, in recognition of his untiring devotion to duty in peace as in war, and of the splendid cooperation he has achieved with the law-enforcement agencies in our States, counties, and municipalities whose representatives in turn have so loyally aided the agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the common cause of enforcement of law and the accomplishment of justice, to the mutual advantage of all citizens, everywhere throughout the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the presentation of an appropriate medal to J. Edgar Hoover."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House adhered to its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 33 and 34 to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

TAXATION OF PROPERTY ACQUIRED FOR MILITARY PURPOSES

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I request that the Senate consider Order of Business No. 266, Senate bill 249. I have been advised that the junior Senator from West Virginia has withdrawn his objection to the passage of this bill, and I ask that it be now considered.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I am afraid the Senator from Oregon has made a mistake. I did not object to the bill. That is not a bill to which objection was made by me, and I am not informed of any objection to the bill.

Mr. HOLMAN. I do not know what Senator objected. May I ask unanimous consent that the bill be now considered? There was some misunderstanding about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 249) providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator a question. This seems to be a bill to permit the taxation of property acquired by the Government for military purposes. How does it happen that the bill was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. HOLMAN. I assure the Senator I do not know. I was under the impression that the Senator from West Virginia had objected to the bill on a previous occasion and also to Senate bill 250, calendar No. 368. I understood that he had withdrawn his objection to both of them. He now informs me that he did not object to Senate bill 249. I do not know what Senator objected. I should not want to bring the matter up in the absence of a Senator who had previously made objection. Is there a record of who objected to it?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think Senate bill 249 ought to go over. I myself should like to look into it because it involves matters relating to the taxation by States of property acquired by the Government for military purposes.

Mr. HOLMAN. Very well, I withdraw my request.

POLAND IN THE WAR

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the tragic death a few days ago of General Sikorski, which was lamented all over the world, both because of his splendid statemanship and on account of the great cause he represented, has prompted me to bring to the attention of the Senate the contribution made by the people of Poland to the cause of freedom.

On July 4, our Independence Day, their President Wladyslaw Raczkiewicz telegraphed greetings and good wishes to the President of the United States, and he expressed the conviction that the hour of deliverance is approaching for the nations of Europe who are struggling against the Nazi invader. In forecasting victory for the United Nations he predicted the beginning of a new era of solidarity between the United States and the freedom-loving nations of Europe.

This message from the people of Poland to the people of America was especially significant because of the debt of gratitude we owe for the invaluable assistance rendered the cause of the colonists by Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko and other great Polish patriots who are honored and revered in the United States as well as in their native land.

The founding of our Republic witnessed the beginning of a period of partial eclipse for the people of Poland, because at about that time Poland lost her independent status as a sovereign nation, after a glorious history of achievement dating back 10 centuries rich in tradition and Christian culture.

The partition of Poland began in 1795, and continued uninterruptedly until the close of the last war, when once again she assumed her rightful place among the nations of the world as the Republic of Poland. During all the years of her partition, under the dominance of foreign rule, Poland retained her unity as a nation, ever hopeful for the day of liberty, and her people nurtured the Polish culture of eleven hundred years, the noble heritage left to them by their forebears. Poland as a nation has been eternally devoted to the principles of freedom, and has always fought in defense of Christian ideals. The freedom of the individual to his rights as a citizen was guaranteed in Poland as early as the year 1430, by a charter which corresponds to the "habeas corpus" rights as proclaimed in England in 1679.

Cracow was the royal capital of Poland where King Casimir in 1464 founded Cracow University, the second oldest seat of learning in central Europe. This institution has given to the world outstanding scientists, scholars, and statemen, the most illustrious of whom is the sixteenth century astronomer Nicolau Copernicus whose revelations about the world in which we live astounded his contemporaries and blazed the trail of modern scientific inquiry.

Although Poland was dismembered in 1795 and ceased to exist as an independent state, she never lost hope. The spirit of the Polish people was eloquently expressed early in this century by Poland's great musician and patriot in these words:

> The vision of a strong and independent Poland has been the lodestar of my existence. Its realization is still the aim of my life.

That aim was realized when M. Paderewski became the first Prime Minister of the reborn Poland in 1919.

At the conclusion of the last war, the Polish state was reestablished as an independent nation. The 150 years of subjection and foreign rule, added to the devastation of the war, found the new republic in a pitiable condition. Education and cultural devolopment had been suppressed; the once prosperous country had been reduced to poverty; its industries and communications had remained undeveloped and its whole economy had been seriously handicapped. Nevertheless, the brave people of Poland struggled to their feet and set about the colossal task of restoring their country to its former high place of security.

Great strides were made in agriculture, national health and welfare, education and cultural pursuits. In a few short years the industry and vision of her people had established Gdynia as the biggest seaport on the Baltic, and her ships again plowed the seven seas in commerce with the world. Her government was placed upon a firm basis, after the adoption of a democratic constitution and a two-chamber legislature, elected by universal suffrage, with executive power vested in the hands of a president. Under the provisions of their constitution the president has the power, should his term of office expire during emergency when regular elections cannot be held, to nominate his successor by decree. It is by making use of this power that President Ignacy Moscicki nominated the present president of the Polish republic, Wladyslaw Raczkiewicz. He, in turn, asked the late lamented General Wladyslaw Sikorski, the commander in chief of the Polish armed forces, to form a new government, with himself as prime minister. This assures full constitutional legality to the Polish Government at present enjoying British hospitality in London and which has been recognized by all the countries of the world, except the Axis.

The infant republic of 20 years, with visions of continued growth and improvement in a world at peace, viewed with apprehension the prospect of once again being embroiled in armed conflict which was threatened by the predatory aspects of Hitler's preliminary moves in 1938 and 1939. Poland was still at peace and the temptation was great to remain at peace. The memories of the horrors and devastation of 1914 to 1920 were still fresh in the minds of her people.

When Britain and Poland entered into a mutual assistance treaty early in 1939 there were many who belittled its importance. Britain, they said, was too far removed geographically from Poland to be of any aid, while Poland was said to be incapable of rendering any substantial assistance to Britain. In the light of subsequent events, that treaty and the honoring of its pledges played an important role in the shaping of the destiny of the world.

In the issues of the Sudetenland and Austria, Hitler had met with no military resistance. Enticing promises were likewise made to Poland. They were naturally attractive to this young republic. But Poland refused to compromise with Hitler. She decided that the price of peace, common cause with the Nazi aggressor, was too great a price to pay. She reckoned the blood and carnage which would result when the powerful Nazi Army, poised along the thousand miles of her western frontier, was given the order to march—she made every effort to avoid what Hitler would call a provocation. At the counsel of Britain and France, Poland refrained from mobilizing her forces lest that act be the spark to cause the explosion. But the Hitler strategy of the surprise attack would not be prevented. On that fateful morning of September 1, 1939, after having tricked and deceived Poland until the last moment, as the Japs were to copy later, Hitler, without any warning, gave orders to march into Poland.

This was the first full-dress exhibition of the Nazi war machine. Attacking along the ground and in the air, from the north, south, and west, against a numerically inferior and unprepared defender, they swept the Poles eastward across their own territory. The fury of the onslaught was all that Poland had anticipated and everyone knew that she could not avoid disaster. For 3 days Poland courageously fought the Reich alone. On September 3, Britain and France declared war. It was a day of rejoicing for the Poles, although Nazi bombs were raining on Polish towns and villages, for they knew then their sacrifice had not been in vain.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. Another day of rejoicing is sure to come to the Poles, when the Republic of Poland is reestablished, and the people again take control of their government.

I know that the people of Polish origin throughout the State of Pennsylvania are among the finest citizens of the State, sturdy, hard-working, God-fearing, home-loving people. They have a saying which I desire to repeat, "Poland shall never perish."

Mr. MEAD. I thank the Senator for his contribution, and I wish to say to him that not only because of what the Poles have done in the present war, but because of what they accomplished in the past, we desire to lend every effort toward the prompt realization of the hope which the Senator has expressed.

Mr. DAVIS. It can be truthfully said that Christian civilization was saved by the Poles for the people of the world.

Mr. MEAD. On many occasions they took up arms for Christian civilization.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In my opinion, the Senator from New York is making a valuable contribution to the cause of future Poland. In my State, especially in the city of Chicago, persons of Polish extraction are numbered by the thousands. They are among the finest and most outstanding citizens we have. They take an active part in the religious, social, political, and economic life of the city, and I do not hesitate to state, as the senior Senator from Illinois, that I am happy that we have so many Polish people in Illinois. They are taking an outstanding part in the advancement of democratic life in this Republic.

Mr. MEAD. I appreciate the comment of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Illinois, and I can say to him that the statement which he has made with reference to the patriotism of the people of Polish origin in his State could be repeated with the same high degree of accuracy by myself, and by other Senators in whose States there are Polish populations.

Poland was cut off from her friends and surrounded by enemies. The Polish Army, well trained and brave but lacking in adequate air protection and mecha-

nized equipment, fought desperately. The heroic defense of Warsaw, a city without fortifications and with only a small garrison of regulars, was an epic that has seldom been equaled in the annals of warfare.

The armed resistance lasted 35 days. That was a long time. From September 1 until October 5 Poland resisted Hitler's armies, giving France and Britain time to mobilize their forces. The Nazis suffered heavy losses in men and equipment because of the heroic defense of Poland. They could not contemplate another major offensive in 1939, especially with winter approaching. France and Britain were spared the most dangerous alternative of all—an invasion in 1939, and the war against the Nazis was not lost in 1939—when it might have been. The resolute Poles never signed an armistice with the conqueror.

Poland once again was laid waste, her casualties, both military and civil, were heavy, her Army was crushed and her Government forced to leave the country.

The courage of the Poles in resisting the Nazi war machine for 35 days can be better appreciated when we recall that France, in 1940, capitulated after 37 days and signed an armistice, although she had had 8 months to prepare, with the added help of Britain, Belgium, Holland, and Poland.

The military invasion of Poland was merely a faint tracing of the blueprint Hitler had designed for Poland. Complete destruction of Polish culture is the ultimate aim of the Nazis. Hitler's first step was to deprive the Poles of all education, reduce them to illiteracy, deprive them of all national tradition, and of their own language, and relegate them to the status of serfs. To attain this goal the Nazis have destroyed the schools and universities. They have taken over the radio; they have pillaged the libraries, burned Polish books, publishing houses, newspapers, and periodicals.

They have either shot, or interned in concentration camps, all Polish men of letters and scientific workers. Eminent scholars have died of maltreatment and brutality. The penalty for listening to foreign radio broadcasts is imprisonment or death. Effort is being made to suppress Polish painting, music, drama, sculpture, and architecture, all of which has contributed so much to the world. The invader has ruthlessly destroyed priceless works of art, tapestries and paintings, and historic monuments and buildings. State records, archives, and relics have been plundered. The Hitler occupation of Poland is one of the most sordid episodes in history. Human life has been destroyed in mass executions and by unheard-of cruelties in the concentration camps. Christians and Jews were denied the right to practice their religions and have been subjected to the most shameful persecutions in the annals of man. Everything most precious as the heritage of a proud and sensitive people has been confiscated, destroyed, and desecrated. An attempt has been made to destroy the soul and degrade the mind of the nation.

The superb heroism of the Polish people in the face of this onslaught was acclaimed in the moving words of the late Cardinal Hinsley in a broadcast to the Polish Nation by His Eminence on Easter Sunday 1940:

> You, through all history, will have the glory of a brave resistance against overwhelming odds, and of heroic suffering heroically borne. The like brutality and the like cruelty of exterminating hate the world has never seen before. * * * Poland will rise again: "Fear not those who are not able to kill the soul."

On July 5, 1941, President Roosevelt gave voice to the sentiments of our own people when he said:

> During the last 2 years the heroic and determined manner in which the Polish people have struggled and sacrificed in the face of tremendous hardships and deprivation has been an inspiration not only to the people of the United States but to liberty-loving people everywhere.

The soul of Poland still lives. Her long-suffering people have never submitted to the Nazi yoke. In vain has Hitler searched for a Quisling or a Laval.

The remnants of her shattered Army rallied round General Sikorski, who marshalled a considerable force in France in 1940. They are now garrisoned in Britain guarding a sector of the coast line. Another unit has served with valor in the north African campaign, at Tobruk and Gazala. The members of the Polish Air Force joined the ranks of the R. A. F., and they rendered invaluable assistance in the defense of the British Isles and in the Battle of the Atlantic. Today they are flying bombers and fighters over Europe. The slogan of this new Polish Army is the slogan of the old Polish patriots, "For your freedom and for ours."

Hitler has not been able to accomplish since 1939 what partition could not accomplish in over 150 years. The spirit and unity of the Polish Nation remains unbroken. These proud peoples, upward of 35,000,000 souls, await the day when they can rise from the earth and join hands with the invasion forces of the United Nations and drive the conqueror from Poland. With the dawn of that day, the world will learn of the continued warfare the Polish people have courageously waged from within, of the sabotage to Nazi supplies moving east across Poland, of the secret radios and under-cover newspapers by which the spirit and courage of her people were kept alive, of her dauntless leaders who carried on the underground movement of resistance to the Nazis. The greatness of a nation is the spirit of its people, and the Polish spirit is unquenchable.

The "four freedoms" mean much to Poland. She has tasted of those freedoms and now feels their loss. As members of the United Nations, the United States and the Republic of Poland have pledged mutual assistance to the end that these freedoms become the heritage of the peoples of the earth.

With the restoration of these freedoms will come the peace that Poland knew before September 1, 1939. New historic monuments will replace the old, her Government will be reestablished; her ships will once more fly the flag of Poland upon the seven seas. In the light of these spiritual ideals we repeat, with M. Paderewski, the prayer he uttered in 1939 when Poland lay again prostrate, "Poland is immortal * * * we shall deliver her from captivity."

Mr. President, in connection with my statement on the contribution to freedom made by Poland, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "The Gibraltar Tragedy" published in the New York Herald Tribune of July 6, 1943. The editorial gives an account of the great loss the world suffered when General Sikorski and his party succumbed in a plane accident.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GIBRALTAR TRAGEDY

It is a peculiarly tragic accident which has cost the life of Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski. The plane which plummeted suddenly into Gibraltar Harbor not only carried with it the Polish Prime Minister and commander in chief; it took his only daughter as well, together with the chief of the Polish general staff, the chief of its operations section, and other valued officers. One of these was Col. Victor Cazalet, a British soldier and former Member of Parliament, who was well and widely known in the United States as one of the keener minds among the younger British Conservatives. There will be many to feel these losses in a personal sense. But to the loss of General Sikorski there also attaches an international importance which will be grievously felt not only by his own country but by all the United Nations.

He had been called to a singularly difficult role, which he had discharged with firmness and statesmanlike ability. Between the Nazi tyranny under which his country lay prostrate, the overriding power of Soviet Russia, the uncertainties of Allied policy, and the intransigeance and divisions of many of his own countrymen it was not easy to find the wise and workable course; and probably few other Polish leaders could have held so successfully to the essentials of Poland's problem. General Sikorski divided them clearly, and the Polish-Soviet treaty, which he secured on July 30, 1941, not 6 weeks after the Nazi invasion of Russia had transformed the whole face of the war, was an act of statesmanship for which all members of the anti-Hitler coalition have reason to be grateful.

He grasped the absolute necessity of an understanding with Russia at the very beginning; he understood it at the end, and in his last published interview, in Cairo on Friday, he expressed a desire to reopen Soviet-Polish relations. He was never, however, subservient to the Kremlin; he knew how to maintain Poland's position and dignity on the one hand, while combating with the other the more extreme Polish views which might have operated so disastrously both for Poland and for the United Nations' alliance. Mistakes were made, and it unfortunately proved impossible to prevent the deterioration of Polish-Soviet relations, ending in Moscow's preemptory break. But General Sikorski was on the side of moderation and wisdom. In a critical time he will be very difficult to replace; but the best tribute which Poland could now pay him would be to maintain the policies for which he stood.

In this large effort Colonel Cazalet played a useful role with unflagging zest. There can be few other Englishmen of our time who have touched so many nations and so many individual citizens upon terms of understanding and friendship. What he did for Poland he literally did around the world. Here in America his friends were countless. They included every type of human being,

from governmental dignitaries to figures of the literary and artistic world. Doubtless his official reports to his own government were of constant value; but it was as an understanding observer and appreciative visitor that Americans held him in affection and will remember him. To that post-war world, which must lean heavily upon men of good will if peace and justice are to prevail, Victor Cazalet is a heavy loss.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES IN EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I present the conference report on the bill making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 33 and 34 to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARTER GLASS,
CARL HAYDEN,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 2968, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
UNITED STATES,
July 8, 1943.

Resolved, That the House adhere to its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 33 and 34 to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the only matters in controversy are amendments numbered 33 and 34. The two amendments relate to confirmation by the Senate of certain appointments made in the various war agencies. The House has just voted on that question, and voted it down.

I therefore move that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 33 and 34. I do so with great reluctance, because I think the appointees in question should be confirmed by the Senate. Be that as it may, we are arriving at the time when a recess shall be taken, and I therefore move that the Senate recede from the two amendments, so as to complete action on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

LOANS TO FARMERS FOR CROP PRODUCTION AND HARVESTING

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 340, Senate bill 715.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator please make a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. SMITH. The bill provides for an increase in the amount of feed loans to farmers. It is the purpose to increase the amount of money which farmers may borrow from $400 as provided under existing law, to $1,000. This becomes necessary because of the conditions which face the farmers of America today, first, because of increased operational cost and, secondly, because they need additional amounts of money for the purchase of livestock and other farm equipment which they are not allowed to obtain under the existing law.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TRUMAN in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 715) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1937, and for other purposes," approved January 29, 1937.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 3, in line 9, to strike out the colon after the word "amount", to insert a period, and to strike out the word "*Provided*", and all of lines 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17; in other words, to strike out the two provisos.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I accept the amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina please make an explanation of the bill?

Mr. SMITH. No explanation is needed. The bill deals with a law which is already on the statute books. It would simply increase the amount of money which farmers may borrow.

Mr. MALONEY. I think the Members of the Senate might like to know how much it is proposed to increase the amount.

Mr. SMITH. Under the direction of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, loans to farmers may be increased from $400 to $1,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1937, and for other purposes," approved January 29, 1937, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration (hereinafter in this act referred to as the 'Governor'), is hereby authorized to make loans to farmers in the United States (including Hawaii and Puerto Rico) for fallowing, for planting, for cultivation, for production of crops, for harvesting of crops, for labor, supplies, or other expenses (including equipment) necessary to such production or harvesting, for feed for livestock or poultry, for the purchase of livestock or poultry (including necessary equipment), or for any of such purposes. Such loans shall be made and collected through the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section of the Farm Credit Administration upon such terms and conditions, and subject to such regulations, as the Governor may prescribe.

"SEC. 2. (a) The purpose of this act shall be to make credit available to farmers whose credit requirements, in the opinion of the Governor, acting through the field representatives of the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section of the Farm Credit Administration, cannot be readily and adequately served by private capital at the banking rates prevailing in their communities, and preference shall be given to the applications of farmers who are producing essential crops or livestock or poultry products.

"(b) There shall be required as security for any such loan a first lien, or an agreement to give a first lien, upon all crops of which the production or harvesting, or both, is to be financed, in whole or in part, with the proceeds of such loan; or, in case of any loan for the purchase of or the production of feed for livestock or poultry, a first lien upon the livestock or poultry to be purchased or fed: *Provided,* That whenever local conditions or an emergency justify it, the Governor may accept as security for any such loan a note unsecured by a lien.

"(c) No loan made under the provisions of this act to any borrower shall exceed $1,000, nor shall a loan be so made in any calendar year, which, together with the unpaid principal of prior loans so made to such borrower in that year, shall exceed $1,000 in amount.

"(d) Each loan shall bear interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum.

"SEC. 3. The proceeds of each loan made by the Governor under the provisions of this act shall be impressed with a trust for the purposes for which loans may be made under this act, and may be used only for the purposes stated in the application therefor, and such trust shall continue, and the proceeds shall be free from garnishment, attachment, or the levy of an execution, until such proceeds have been used by the borrower for such purposes.

"SEC. 4. (a) Fees for recording, filing, registration, and examination of records (including certificates) shall not exceed 75 cents per loan, and may be paid from the proceeds of the loan.

"(b) No fees for releasing liens given to secure loans made pursuant to this act, nor any other fee not specified herein, shall be paid from the funds herein authorized to be appropriated.

"SEC. 5. (a) The Governor is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to employ and fix the compensation of such agents, officers, and employees as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That during the present war and for 6 months after the termination thereof, the Governor shall have power, without regard to the provisions of other laws applicable to the employment and compensation of agents, officers, and employees of the United States, to employ and fix the compensation and duties of such agents, officers, and employees as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act; but the compensation of such agents, officers, and employees shall correspond, so far as the Governor deems practicable, to the rates established by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

"(b) The Governor, and the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section of the Farm Credit Administration with the approval of the Governor, shall have power to make such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and of prior crop-production, seed, or feed-loan acts of the same general character.

"SEC. 6. (a) Except with the written permission of the Governor or his duly authorized representative, it shall be unlawful for any borrower to willfully use the proceeds of any loan for any purpose other than those specified in this act.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any person to make any material false representation for the purpose of obtaining, or assisting another to obtain, a loan under the provisions of this act; or willfully to dispose of, or assist in disposing of, except for the account of the Governor, any crops or other property upon which there exists a lien securing a loan made under the provisions of this act.

"(c) It shall be unlawful for any person to charge or accept a fee in excess of $1 for preparing or assisting in the preparation of any papers of an applicant for a loan under the provisions of this act.

"(d) Any person violating any provision of this section of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or both.

"SEC. 7. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $75,000,000 for the purpose of enabling the Governor to carry out the provisions of this act.

"(b) The moneys appropriated in pursuance of subsection (a) of this section, and all collections of principal and interest of loans made under this act, may be used by the Governor for making loans under this act, and for all necessary administration expenses incurred in connection with the making and collection of such loans.

"(c) Expenditures for printing and binding necessary in carrying out the provisions of this act may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes."

SEC. 2. The title of such act of January 29, 1937, is hereby amended to read as follows: "An act to provide for loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting, and for other purposes."

DEATH OF RUDOLPH FORSTER

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am sure all Senators and all others who knew him have heard with the deepest sorrow of the death of Mr. Rudolph Forster, one of the Executive secretaries at the White House. Mr. Forster had been connected with the White House for nearly half a century. He served in various capacities under eight Presidents of the United States. I have known him for 30 years of that time. I have always found him not only to be a man of efficiency and of singular devotion to his duties, but a man of the highest character, of the completest integrity, and of unselfish devotion to his responsibilities as an employee, and an important employee, of the Government of the United States. Although I have never adhered to the belief that any man is ever altogether indispensable, yet it will be hard to replace Mr. Forster, for his experience, his quiet dignity, and his unassuming modesty have contributed to the universal popularity and high regard in which he was held by everyone who had known him during all these years. I express my profound sorrow over his death. I am sure that in doing so I reflect the feelings not only of the Senate but of the House of Representatives and of all others in both public and private life who knew and who came in contact with Rudolph Forster.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to endorse the beautiful remarks which have just been made about Rudolph Forster by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I learned to know Rudolph Forster when I first came to Washington in 1911, more than 32 years ago, as a Member of the House. At that time he was the secretary of President Taft. As the Senator from Kentucky has so well and so eloquently said, he was a fine man; indeed he was one of the finest I ever knew—quiet, courteous, and efficient always, and as honest and as straight as any man could be.

I sincerely mourn his loss. It will be a source of great regret to visit the White House and find that Rudolph Forster is not there. He was always in good humor; he was always willing to serve. It never made any difference to Rudolph Forster whether one was on one side of the political house or the other. He was a grand man. I have risen merely to add in this way to what has been so generously said of him by my colleague, the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I never knew Mr. Forster intimately, but I had known him somewhat for more than 40 years. In the 26 years in which I have served in Congress I have had many occasions to go to the White House, perhaps more so in past years than in recent ones. One could never come within the presence of Mr. Forster without appreciating that he was in contact with a quiet, efficient, fine-minded man, a public servant with the highest ideals of public service. I join with the two Senators who have preceded me in expressing my profound regret at his passing. I saw him the day before he passed away. He was then as gracious and as kindly as always.

It is a misfortune to the executive branch of our Government, it is a misfortune to all who are in the public service that a man of his fine type and character and attainments has been called from us.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I join in the fullest degree in the tributes which have been expressed by the leader of the majority [Mr. BARKLEY] by the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and by my good friend the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the acting minority leader in the Senate. I have known Mr. Forster for a long period and was intimately in touch with him for 10 years. I can truthfully say, and say it with a heart full of feeling that in all the years of my experience in public life I have never met a more efficient, a more competent, or a more kindly man than Rudolph Forster. He was at the White House from early morning until late at night. During the years I had occasion to be a frequent visitor at the White House, I never heard an unkind word said about him. He was a faithful and diligent public servant, a sterling citizen, and not the least of his many exceptional qualities was a delightful personality which impressed all those who came in contact with him. My life has been better because I have known Rudolph Forster, and with all who knew him I mourn his death.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I think that I had a more intimate relation with the fine character whose death we lament than possibly was enjoyed by any other Member of the Senate. For a long number of years, he and I lived in the same hotel; and very often a little group called the Sanhedrins, of which Mr. Forster was a member, would get together. I came to know him. He was a man who attracted one by his personality. He was discreet and quiet, but he was a man. That is what we need so desperately in this country today. His passing is a loss to the Nation, to the city, and to the community. Mr. Forster was universally loved in the hotel where we stayed. The little band of which he was a member met last evening and decided to express our appreciation of him by a floral tribute. I wish I had had an opportunity to express my appreciation of him while he was living. I would rather have some kind word said of me while I am living than to have flowers placed on my grave.

I desire to pay tribute to the memory of Mr. Forster, whom I considered to be an extraordinary man, one who manifested all the elements of a man without show or parade.

WARTIME INTERPRETATION OF LEGISLATIVE AND EXECUTIVE ORDERS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who has been called from the Chamber, I rise to call attention to an address which was delivered during August last by Mr. Oscar Cox, Assistant Solicitor General of the Department of Justice, before the Society for the Advancement of Management. The request of the Senator from Maryland is based upon the fact that during the debate on Tuesday last he made reference to the address by Mr. Cox. A reading of his remarks might leave the impression that in that address Mr. Cox had urged upon Government lawyers

that their duty was to make the will of the bureaus prevail over the will of Congress.

Mr. Cox sent to the Senator from Maryland a copy of his address, in which he made this statement:

The responsibility of the Government lawyer in time of war is, above everything else, the affirmative one of finding ways and means by which the decisions of the policy makers can be most promptly and effectively fulfilled. Quibbling over legalistic niceties may as decisively sabotage some aspect of the war effort as a sit-down strike on an assembly line. The lawyer must, of course, stand firm against abuses of the law. He may not countenance shady evasions nor dishonest short cuts to a desired end. He must respect the fundamental concepts of our law, or democratic processes, and the social and human values we are fighting to preserve.

Mr. President, the purpose of Mr. Cox in making the address was to call to the attention of fellow lawyers in the Government the fact that too close an application of legal theories might interfere with the war effort.

It was the desire of the Senator from Maryland to call attention to this matter; and at his request I ask unanimous consent that the entire address by Mr. Cox be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We lawyers are frequently—and many times justly—accused of having negative minds. Too often we are disposed to search out and magnify the reasons why something necessary cannot be done rather than to seek the means whereby it can be done. The counsel's office is the bottleneck of progress in many a Government agency faced with the urgent job of putting a new policy into effect or carrying out a directive from Congress.

The responsibility of the Government lawyer in time of war is, above everything else, the affirmative one of findings ways and means by which the decisions of the policy makers can be most promptly and effectively fulfilled. Quibbling over legalistic niceties may as decisively sabotage some aspect of the war effort as a sit-down strike on an assembly line. The lawyer must, of course, stand firm against abuses of the law. He may not countenance shady evasions nor dishonest short-cuts to a desired end. He must respect the fundamental concepts of our law, our democratic processes, and the social and human values we are fighting to preserve.

But without transgressing these limits, the fact remains that our legal framework allows far more latitude for administrative action than is popularly supposed. Intelligent inquiry will prompt many a lawyer to say "Yes" or "Go ahead" where traditional conservatism has always dictated only "Stop" or "Caution." Our lawyers must be sufficiently bold and imaginative to explore this new realm of freedom—to discover what the law can do as well as what it can prohibit.

Daily in the work of the Government problems arise which fully test the ingenuity and imagination of lawyers to find legal ways for carrying out our war policies. The Army and the Lend-Lease Administration had a pressing need recently to make available transport planes to carry supplies to China after the closing of the Burma Road. Some of the lawyers said, because of lack of knowledge of the problems and facts involved, that no such planes could be made available. Other Government lawyers were of the opinion that the Requisitioning Act did not empower the Government to take the planes from private transport companies for such war uses. The fact is that imagination and real craftsmanship would have made it clear that the Congress, in passing the Requisitioning Act, had in mind the granting of power to the Government to meet just such emergencies as this. Ultimately, the dissenting lawyers were convinced. The planes were requisitioned.

There were lawyers in the Government who said that the eight Nazi saboteurs could not be constitutionally tried by a military commission. In large part they based their views on what the courts had decided nearly 100 years ago—long before the days of modern warfare. They also failed to see the significant differences between the saboteur case and the remotely comparable cases of an earlier era. Above all, they ignored the factor of growth and adaptability, which is one of the healthiest and most characteristic features of our law.

The saboteurs were, indeed, tried by a military commission. They were brought to trial promptly. They were supplied with able, intelligent counsel, sincerely dedicated to securing for them every privilege and advantage to which they were entitled. They had a fair and just trial judged by any standard whatever—a procedure, as you well know, which is unthinkable in the land from which they came. But with all our studied adherence to democratic principles in this trial, we demonstrated that our system, when called upon, is capable of speedy, decisive, and appropriate action. I am convinced, all things considered, that the military commission, and not the civil courts, was the proper procedure in this case. And the Supreme Court, of course, so held.

As critical shortages developed in our war program it became necessary to find more and more substitute materials. Sometimes legal barriers were discovered which made it difficult to procure these substitutes. An interesting case in point concerns silver.

There are certain technical processes in which silver can be substituted for rarer metals. Our Government has on hand an immense store of silver being put to no practical use whatever. The question naturally arose as to whether this metal could be converted to urgent war needs. Some lawyers in the Government argued strenuously that it could not be; that new legislation would have to be passed before the silver could be touched. But the metal was needed then, and the months of delay which would have occurred while new legislation was being framed, debated, and passed would have worked a hardship on war production.

Fortunately, there were bolder, more imaginative lawyers who saw that the problem could be licked. Every bit as good craftsmen in the law as their more conservative colleagues, they found alternative and proper legal methods for accomplishing the objective. Within a matter of weeks—not months—after the problem first arose, the silver was in use producing war materials.

When it was discovered that the North American and Brewster aircraft plants were not producing as many combat aircraft as they could there were some who said that nothing could be done about it except to get new legislation. There were others that felt that there was full and ample legal authority to act by Executive order. The Executive orders were drafted. These aircraft plants went into full, efficient, and uninterrupted production.

When the problem arose of getting small businesses fully into the war program, serious legal doubts were raised as to whether the necessary financing could be done out of Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission appropriations. The more imaginative and ingenious lawyers worked out the legal methods for doing this by Executive order. Through the full cooperation of the Federal Reserve System and many of the smaller banks throughout the country, the plan went into operation. The result has been not only a speeding up in war production but the literal salvation of hundreds of small business firms from bankruptcy.

After Pearl Harbor, there arose a problem as to whether or not, in the interest of national security, the Japanese could be removed from certain critical areas on the west coast. There were many "no" lawyers who said it could not be done without new legislation. The fact is that there was ample existing authority to do this. An Executive order, based on this authority, was drafted and signed by the President. The Japanese were removed from these areas and relocated in other less critical parts of the United States.

Manpower and equipment in the prison institutions of the United States were not being used for the war effort because some Government lawyers said that the statute barred such use. The end and object of these statutes was confused by a narrow, literal interpretation. The entirely laudable purpose of these statutes was to prevent unfair competition between prison and free labor. But at a time when we were operating at more than full capacity to produce goods for the war, it seemed trivial to say that prison labor manufacturing tents, bomb equipment, and similar war articles were unfairly competing with men who already had more work than they possibly could do. An opinion was rendered by the Attorney General holding that there was no impediment to the use of Federal- or State-made prison goods by the Federal Government. A hundred thousand trained workers and $50,000,000 worth of plant and equipment, denied to our war program by the encumbrance of legalistic red tape, were thus freed by one deft stroke.

These are but a few of the many instances of the day-to-day business of the Government which indicate the need for competent, intelligent, and imaginative lawyers to assist the policy makers in carrying on with the war. If we are to win this war sooner rather than later, we must be bold. This is true of the lawyers no less than the administrators. We can be bold and imaginative—even more so than the Axis Powers—without sacrificing the very things for which we are fighting.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

THE FOOD SITUATION

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I seldom quarrel with my good friend the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I freely grant that many Senators, including myself, make remarks which are more or less unnecessary. All I can say for myself is that I hope mine do not average any higher percentage of unnecessary remarks than the general run.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator realizes that I was speaking facetiously.

Mr. REED. Of course.

Let me say, as a preface to the address which I have prepared, that there is no more important question now before the country—every part of it, every citizen of it—than the situation with regard to crop production of food and feed. The statement which I wish to make is perhaps as important as any I have made in this session of Congress. I can say that because I myself have done none of the basic work.

The economists in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, farm organizations, the grain trade, and the milling trade have all cooperated in presenting through me to this body a comprehensive statement as to the crop prospects and the volume of food production and feed production available through 1944. If that is not important, I do not know what is.

The Senator from Kentucky might not agree with me that Mr. Hoover made an outstanding address to the Farm Bureau Federation in New York. I think he did. I am taking up the subject where Mr. Hoover left off and carrying it further than he did.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have been waiting for 2 days to obtain the floor at a time when it would not interfere with any other Senator. I have a prepared statement to make. I shall make it as rapidly as possible. I will not yield to any Senator until I have concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas declines to yield.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the outstanding facts in the food situation are that the present and prospective supplies are inadequate to meet the unprecedented demands for food; that reserves are steadily being consumed; that livestock and poultry must presently be liquidated in large quantities for want of feed; that the country is about to go on a hand-to-mouth basis; that rationing must become more severe; that this country must fail to meet its commitments to other nations; and, in short, that unless a tremendous expansion in food and feed occur, this country faces a serious condition.

A timely warning was raised by former President Herbert Hoover in an address in New York on June 8, 1943, before the American Farm Bureau Federation. After reviewing the conditions, Mr. Hoover said:

> The blunt conclusion from all this is: (a) Our cities will have less food supply during the next winter and spring even than they had in the last few months; (b) we will not starve; (c) we can, by better organization and by tightening our belts, continue to feed our allies; (d) if the war in Europe should come to an end within the next few months we should have no consequential food supplies with which to feed three or four hundred millions of starving people.

There has been a very substantial adjustment of agricultural production to domestic demand in recent years. Between the harvests of 1932 and 1939 the acreage in 17 leading crops, accounting for 95 percent of our whole harvested area, was reduced by 47,000,000 acres. By 1942 we had recovered only 9,000,000 of the lost acres. Farmers' intentions to plant in 1943 indicated a 4-percent increase in acreage. It is doubtful that this goal will be realized, but if it is, with only normal yields in prospect compared to the record yields of 1942, it will fall short of an actual increase in production. An increase of 15 percent in acreage would be required to equal the 1942 production.

Actually, the 1943 production will be materially less than that of 1942, as a following analysis will demonstrate.

As Mr. Hoover says, "Our supply of food is declining, while at the same time the demand is dangerously rising," and "the failure to place food production on an equality with munitions will bring disaster."

Agricultural production must be greatly expanded—and quickly. Time does not permit the use of merely persuasive methods. The season for seeding winter wheat is only 3 months away. Unless quick decisions and prompt actions are the rule we will miss our opportunity to secure the vitally needed expansion.

The most effective incentive to greater production is a reasonable increase in price. The American farmer is loyal and patriotic and as anxious to do his part in winning the war as anyone. But the handicaps of machinery shortage, manpower shortage, Government regimentation, and unwise and vacillating price policies are real and effective deterrents. It will require increases in price to spur the farmer to the almost superhuman effort needed to achieve the necessary goals.

Nor is it the farmer only who needs the stimulation of increased reward. This has been recognized by the Government in the case of labor. To insure maximum production, labor has been granted special benefits, such as extra pay for overtime, the adjustment of wages to a higher level to aid in the prosecution of the war, raising of substandard wages, and so on.

The effect of increased price upon production was clearly demonstrated in the First World War. The price of wheat rose from 1913 to 1919, accompanied by increasing acreage.

THE QUESTION OF PRICES AND PRICE CONTROL

Mr. Hoover's address contains the following suggestions:

> Abolish the system of retail and wholesale price ceilings. It begins at the wrong end. Price fixing in a great food-producing country must begin as near as possible to the farmer and controls proceed from there on by regulation of the trades against profiteering. Prices rose less when the system was applied in the last war than they have under the present retail ceilings. We must regulate the flow of water at the nozzle instead of chasing the drops from the shower.
>
> This present price system is stifling farm production. It is not stopping inflation.
>
> Ask the farmers to appoint their own war committee on prices and do a little collective bargaining with them in fixing prices. The so-called parities should be abandoned for the war. Prices to the farmer must include floors as well as ceilings. Prices should be fixed that will take into account labor and other costs, and above all that will stimulate production.
>
> Such a revolution in the price system would save a few tens of thousands of policemen. It is difficult to catch an economic force with a policeman anyway.

War Food Administrator Chester C. Davis, in his New York speech, on June 17, said:

> The ingredients to production are farm labor, farm machinery and equipment, weather and encouragement in the form of price support and credit. If the American farmer has these, his genius will do the rest.

Before turning to further discussion of prices, let us examine the first two elements—farm labor, and farm machinery and equipment.

In April the Department of Agriculture called attention to the farm labor and machinery situations in the following terms:

> The biggest problem in exceeding or even attaining this volume of production, assuming favorable weather, is scarcity of farm labor and farm machinery. It is estimated that about 1,000,000 actual or potential workers will have migrated from the farm populations between July 1942 and July 1943, including those who entered the armed forces. The amount of new farm machinery to be available to farmers in 1943 will be only 40 percent of the quantity purchased by farmers in 1940. * * * Moreover, owing to scarcity of labor and relatively high farm wages, the demand for labor-saving machines will greatly exceed the available supply. (National Food Situation, April 1943.)

It may be observed, that statistics do not suggest labor sufficient to till the World War acres.

	Annual average, 1910–14	*May 1, 1943*
Hired labor	2,892,000	2,244,000
Family labor	9,160,000	8,248,000
Total	12,052,000	10,492,000

Between the period—1910–14—immediately preceding the First World War, and May 1 of this year, hired labor available on the farm decreased about 25 percent and family labor available on the farm decreased about 12 percent, expressed in hours of labor. This decrease in manpower calls for an increase in machine power.

Without undertaking a detailed review, it is sufficient to say that regardless of the adequacy or otherwise of labor and machinery for the 1943 crops, it is apparent that neither is any too abundant for an expansion program involving 40,000,000 additional acres to be cultivated.

The farmer, considering the calls which will be made for increased production, must take into account the following adverse factors:

First. Labor is hardly adequate to maintain present production.

Second. The existing volume of labor is far less efficient than in ordinary times because the strongest and most efficient workers have largely gone to war.

Third. The price for such labor as is available has greatly increased.

Fourth. Farm machinery is not available to support any important increase in production. Therefore, more manual labor would be required, which, as noted, is none too plentiful, is more expensive and less efficient.

Fifth. The farmer must assume the risk of the weather.

Sixth. Price policies are uncertain and confused. Unduly low ceilings are maintained, resulting in prices not consistent with the augmented strain and responsibility and risk incident to any substantial expansion.

Mr. Chester C. Davis, in his New York speech of June 17, pointed out the importance of "encouragement in the form of price support and credit" as an aid to securing increased production. He also said:

> When price is eliminated or neutralized as a factor to determine the flow of goods to market and nothing is substituted instead, then there is bound to be chaos.

Increased production requires close attention to the matter of price.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION POLICIES DETER PRODUCTION

The policy of the Government in this war, however, has been to decry advancing farm prices, and through the imposition of maximum prices, or ceilings, to restrain the advance so far as possible. The farmer is even termed by enthusiastic administration spokesmen a profiteer for expecting a return equivalent to so-called parity or one in keeping with the general forward advance of the national income. Both the philosophy and the methods of price control as applied to farm products result in the discouragement of the farmer and effectively limit increased production.

There is nothing in the law to require price ceilings at any particular maximum level. Discretion is lodged in the Price Administrator. The law limits his discretion only as to minimum price ceilings. The objective of the law is to stabilize farm prices as nearly as practicable at the level of September 15, 1942. It is not practicable to place ceilings on farm products either at that level or at the level of parity for the reason previously stated that ceilings at such levels will not be effective to obtain the desired and necessary production.

It should be realized, and in the country's best interest it should be accepted quickly, that the production of food in the time of war transcends most other considerations, and as important as price control is, it must yield somewhat to the vital necessity of food.

This is not to say that food prices should be allowed to run riot, but only that restraint should be imposed at a level that will still encourage production and in a manner to be workable. The best safeguard against high prices is abundant production, and speculation can be restrained.

Experience with price ceilings shows plainly that they immediately create in the mind of the producer the idea that the product must be worth more and he then begins to hold his product off the market awaiting the higher price which he thinks must eventually come. This then quickly causes a scarcity in the market and resulting pressure tending to higher prices. We are right now in the midst of that precise experience with regard to corn.

Such has been the experience with corn. Ceilings were summarily established in January. The farmer had up to that time sold his corn freely in the market, but the ceiling order made him bullish, he held his corn, and corn has been very scarce and difficult to obtain ever since.

In the light of the experience with corn, ceilings on wheat could conceivably result in a similar holding back by farmers, and thus make bread a scarce article. There is too little wheat in the country to run such risks.

Ceilings on farm products at the levels indicated are not only impracticable from the standpoint of production, but they are also unfair from the standpoint of relationship. Not since 1920 has the farmer had a return comparable to the rest of the Nation's economy. He has failed to profit along with others in the rising tide of income since the last war. If any ceilings are to be imposed on farm products, they should be at a level related to the war period or the period immediately before the war. While the national income rose from $53,360,000,000 in 1917 to $118,755,000,000 in 1942, an increase of 123 percent, farm income increased only from $8,329,000,000 in 1917 to $11,288,000,000 in 1942, an increase of only 36 percent. During the same period, average hourly earnings of factory workers increased from 31.1 cents to 85.3 cents, an increase of 175 percent. In justice to agriculture, no artificial restraint should be placed upon farm prices short of the point where some equalization of these unequal conditions would occur.

To support the injustice wrought upon the farmer by price ceilings at the levels indicated, the Administration has been very successful in imposing upon the minds of men a fictitious relationship between the wages of labor and the cost of living, into which, of course, farm prices enter. A simple and easy but specious formula has been devised by which men are to be frightened into believing that increases in farm prices and hence in the cost of living must inevitably result in a general increase of wages and so a dreaded "spiral of inflation" be set in motion.

There is, in fact, no necessary relation between the rates of wages and the prices of farm products. If there were, farm prices would long since have climbed to heights now undreamed of. Wages have moved steadily upward since the last war, but no corresponding increase in the prices of farm products has occurred.

To be sure, labor opportunists would demand an increase in wages predicated upon a substantial rise in farm prices. This is to be expected and must be resisted. It will be no answer to a hungry world to say that increased agricultural production could not be obtained because it might involve wage increases.

It is an answer to labor's demands that food must be had at all events and that over the long period since 1920 the farmer has never had a fair share of the national income. If this takes courage, the time has arrived to exert it.

It is, however, not only the general and broad question of policy that is involved, but consideration must also be given to the effects of price-control methods.

The plan of the Price Administrator is, first, to place ceilings at the retail or consumer level and work back to other levels. The resulting price for the raw material may or may not be in line with prices of competing materials. Once an order is issued, the Administrator is loath to change it, but the supply of and demand for the several commodities shift constantly, and thus is imposed an inflexible restraint upon a condition naturally of constant flux. Dislocations consequently occur and artificial shortages are developed.

At the present time, the price of corn fixed by the Administrator is out of line with the price of hogs, resulting in a shortage of corn for livestock and poultry raisers outside the Corn Belt. It is also out of line with the prices of protein ingredients entering into livestock feed with the result that there are local shortages of both commodities and they are fed straight, where good feeding practice requires admixture.

If farm commodities are subject only to the action of natural markets, the necessary price adjustments are constantly being made, which avoids local scarcities and allows the producers to adjust their production according to the needs of the country. Farmers are accustomed to, and have confidence in, the action of markets and can order their affairs to fit market conditions.

They do not have confidence in O. P. A. announcements and resent ceilings.

Prices of farm products should be left to normal action as long as possible. When restraints are deemed necessary, they should be applied at the source, leaving the other levels to adjust themselves naturally.

Ceilings, even at the source, should never be inflexible but should be adapted quickly to conditions as they arise. They should never be determined by men who have no responsibility for production or who are not intimately acquainted with that which they undertake to regulate.

WHEAT

Instead of presenting a problem of burdensome surplus, as in recent years, this important crop is quickly approaching a condition in which there will be little, if any, reserve, as the following table indicates:

		Bushels
Carry-over July 1, 1943 (estimated)		600,000,000
1943 crop estimate		729,524,000
Total supply		1,329,524,000
Expected disappearance:		
Flour	625,000,000	
Alcohol	120,000,000	
Feed	300,000,000	
Seed	100,000,000	
		1,145,000,000
Carry-over July 1, 1944		184,524,000

The Department of Agriculture has estimated the aggregate expected disappearance at 1,150,000,000 to 1,200,000,000 bushels. Its size will depend to a considerable extent upon the amount used for feed.

This is a dangerously short reserve in time of war. As the shortage of other foods becomes more pronounced, more and more reliance must be placed upon wheat.

The Emergency Food Commission of New York in its report, referring to the shortage of feed, said:

> Much of the animal population will inevitably be liquidated with the consequent loss to our people of much of the animal products in their present diet.

And further:

> The people of the State may shift over to the direct consumption of grains and grain products and legumes.

Moreover, wheat of all foods is more adapted to the relief of Europe, being a well-rounded-out food, compact, easily transported, and known and relished everywhere.

In the First World War, it is reported (the National Food Situation, April 1943, page 28):

The greatest demand by our allies was for grains, especially wheat. * * * It also illustrates the practical and sentimental value placed on bread by low-income groups in Europe and elsewhere. Herbert Hoover said in 1917: "With the lower classes of Europe, bread is the fetish of food * * * without the loaf you could not preserve public tranquillity."

If our obligations to other countries are to be met, abundant supplies must be provided. A reserve of only 185,000,000 bushels, with the possibility of a short crop next year, is in these conditions a matter of anxiety.

To preserve a subnormal price of bread at its present level, the Price Administrator has fixed an artificially low ceiling upon flour, which in turn holds the market price of wheat at a point about 21 cents below parity. So long as the wheat farmer received a parity payment, which amounts to about 13 cents a bushel on the present year's crop, and in addition an average of about 9 cents a bushel from soil conservation payments, this was not vital. All in all, the wheat farmer received about his parity price.

The present Congress, through insistence of the House of Representatives and over objection of the Senate, discontinued these payments. The wheat farmer is, therefore, left, for his next year's market price, with an indicated decline of 22 cents a bushel below the current year's market price.

That is in the face of an urgent request by the Department of Agriculture and the War Food Administration for an increase of 18,000,000 acres in the planting of wheat.

I have discussed these matters at length and in detail elsewhere. I shall not repeat that discussion here. That discussion will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 5, at pages 7161 and 7162.

HOW THE NECESSARY INCREASE IN FOOD PRODUCTION IS TO BE SECURED

Mr. Hoover, in his New York address, said:

Remedy for the 1943 harvest year is now too late, as the planting is mostly done. We must begin to build up the harvest of a year from now. That is in 1944. We still have time to redeem the situation. If it is to be redeemed we must have far wider vision. We must have drastic changes in national policies.

Changes recommended by Mr. Hoover are:

First. To consolidate all authority over food production and distribution under a single responsible administrator.

Second. Decentralize the work under State, municipal, and county administrators.

Third. Increase the manpower on the farms to a higher level than before the war, and plant forty or fifty million acres more in 1944 than in this year.

Fourth. Provide great additions to the supply of agriculture machinery to handle the increased acreage.

Fifth. Abolish the system of retail and wholesale price ceilings.

Then, Mr. President, I come to a very pertinent suggestion, and one which I think is entitled, in the light of a reading of today's newspapers, to great consideration. The sixth change suggested by Mr. Hoover was that the farmers be asked to appoint their own war committee on prices, and to do a little collective bargaining with them in fixing prices.

At the present time all collective bargaining is done in a field other than agriculture. It seems to me Mr. Hoover's suggestion is very pertinent. If we are to have food prices fixed by men who do not understand what they are doing, why not ask the farmers to appoint their own committees and to do a little collective bargaining?

Other changes suggested by Mr. Hoover were:

Seventh. Set rations to balance consumption.

Eighth. Suspend left-wing reform of the processing and distributing business for the duration.

Ninth. Avoid subsidies.

All those recommendations deserve careful consideration. Of outstanding importance at this time is the question of prices, not the least important matter requiring immediate and wise action in order to accelerate the tempo of agricultural production.

Mr. President, I desire to repeat briefly what I previously said. In the preparation of this study I had no part except to supervise it. I had the assistance of the country's most competent economists dealing especially with food and feed production. I have had the assistance of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the experts of the farm organizations, and the experts of the grain trade and the milling trade. I present the study here because I am mainly their mouthpiece. I present it because I think it is the most comprehensive study of the question that is available anywhere.

I do not want to take the time of the Senate or to tax my own energy by reading the analysis of the feed situation covering grains, fats, and oils. However, the study has been prepared by the same experts who helped me prepare the study to which I have just referred. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. REED. I wish to say the further word that I challenge the attention of the country and of the Senate to this most important of all questions and of all problems now facing it.

EXHIBIT A

THE FEED SITUATION

The Feed Situation for May 1943 states:

"Supplies of feed grains and byproduct feeds have increased each year since 1936. The 1942-43 supply of these feeds was the largest on record. But livestock production also has been at a record level during the past year and there has been an unprecedented disappearance of all kinds of feed."

And the following summary is given:

"The 1943 growing season so far has been less favorable for feed crops than the early part of the 1942 season. The condition of pastures and hay on May 1 was a little better than the average for the past 10 years, but not as good as a year earlier. Wet, cold weather over much of the Corn Belt, and floods in the Mississippi and Ohio Valleys have delayed the planting and early growth of the corn crop. Although much will depend on growing conditions during the remainder of the season, the unusually high yields attained last year are not likely to be repeated in 1943."

With average yields this year on intended acreages, the 1943–44 supply of feed grains, including wheat and rye feed, probably will be about 10 percent smaller than the 1942–43 supply. Demand for feed grains will be somewhat stronger. Livestock numbers are increasing and returns to livestock producers are favorable. The following changes in the feed situation for 1943–44 compared with 1942–43 are in prospect:

1. Increased use will be made of supplementary forages and winter pastures.

2. Livestock, especially hogs, will be fed to lighter weights.

3. Farmers in the Corn Belt will have less corn for shipment to deficit areas after local feed requirements are met.

4. The carry-over of feed grains at the close of the 1943–44 marketing year will be reduced to a minimum."

CORN

The 1942 corn crop was the largest on record, 3,175,154,000 bushels. The 1943 crop will be substantially less.

Farmers' announced intention to plant corn aggregated 96,287,000 acres, as compared to 89,484,000 acres harvested last year. The average yield per acre in recent years has been as follows:

	Bushels
1934	15.8
1935	24.0
1936	16.2
1937	28.3
1938	27.8
1939	29.4
1940	28.4
1941	31.1
1942	35.5

Assuming that all the intended acreage is planted and harvested with an average yield (1937–42) of 30.1 bushels, the production will be 2,898,000,000 bushels. But this desirable result is not expected. Some estimates indicate around 2,400,000,000 bushels as a likely crop.

Rather optimistic estimates of the carry-over of corn on October 1, 1943, place it around 500,000,000.

If this amount materializes, the aggregate available for 1944 will plainly be inadequate to feed the greater number of livestock and poultry indicated for next year.

OTHER FEED GRAINS

The estimated production of oats for 1943 is 1,168,850,000 bushels compared to 1,358,730,000 bushels in 1942. For barley the estimate for 1943 is 371,044 bushels compared to 426,150 bushels in 1942. For all four feed grains (including grain sorghums) the present estimate is for a crop 11 percent under that of a year ago, based on March 1 intended acreage and average yields.

It is perfectly clear that even by the questionable practice of drawing on wheat supplies to feed animals and poultry there is not this year and will not be next year enough feed, and much of the animal population must be liquidated.

The Department suggests a carry-over of feed grains into next year approximating that reported at the beginning of this year. And, on that assumption, says:

"The equivalent of the very large corn crop harvested last fall, and oats, barley, and grain sorghums harvested last summer, as well as two hundred and seventy-five to three hundred million bushels of wheat, will be used up by the end of this feeding year." (Agricultural Situation, May 1943, p. 10.)

There will be more livestock and less feed in 1944.

The reason for the enormous feed demand and the present shortages can be found in the all-time record numbers of poultry and livestock now being fed.

For example:

Egg production in April was 12 percent over last year and 36 percent above the 10-year average.

Number of layers on farms during April was 15 percent over last year and 31 percent over the 10-year average.

Number of chicks and young chickens of this year's hatching on farms, May 1, was 12 percent over last year and 38 percent over the 10-year average.

Hatchery production was up 13 percent the first 4 months of this year compared with last year, and April production was 28 percent over the 1938–42 average.

Hogs: 105,000,000 head were raised in 1942—125,000,000 are expected in 1943 compared with a 10-year average of 73,000,000 pigs. At the same time hogs are being fed to weights about 10 percent greater than normal.

Cattle: We now have the largest cattle population on record, a little over 78,000,000 head and about 3,000,000 greater than last year.

Only in the case of sheep and lambs has there been a reduction, the number being 3 percent less than a year ago.

LIVESTOCK

The 1943 goals for meat production aggregated 17 percent over last year. And it has been expected that the number of livestock on farms on January 1, 1944, will be from 5 to 10 percent over January 1, 1943. This should be compared with the estimated reduction of 11 percent in feed grains.

The statistics for January 1, 1943, as compared with 1942 are as follows:

Livestock on farms, Jan. 1 (1,000 head)

	1942	1943	Percent 1943 of 1942
Total cattle and calves	75,162	78,170	104
All milk cows	26,398	26,946	102
Hogs	60,377	73,660	122
Sheep and lambs	56,735	55,089	97
Total chickens	474,910	540,107	114
Hens and pullets	426,226	487,089	114
Turkeys	7,623	6,549	86
Commercial broilers	204,000	(1)	

[1] Expected to be much larger in 1942.

In National Food Situation for May, the Department says:

"The present level of livestock production cannot be maintained, at least not beyond 1943, unless extraordinarily good yields of feed grains are obtained. If crop prospects are not improved in the next few months the consumption of feed grains in 1943 might exceed production, and feed shortages will result in 1944 unless the rate of feeding is reduced or the output of some classes of livestock is curtailed" (p. 3).

FATS AND OILS

The following from Fats and Oils Situation of May 1943, summarizes the present supply conditions:

"Production of fats and oils from domestic materials in the 1942–43 crop year is now estimated at less than 11,000,000,000 pounds, nearly 1,000,000,000 pounds under the estimate of last December but about 1,000,000,000 pounds above production in 1941–42. The estimate of vegetable oil production has been reduced because of loss of soybeans still unharvested at the beginning of winter, feeding of large quantities of ground soybeans to hogs and other livestock, and an unprecedented demand for peanuts for peanut butter, peanut candy, and salted nuts. Estimated production of animal fats also is down as a result of a smaller hog and cattle slaughter in federally inspected establishments than was anticipated, a scarcity of meat scraps for rendering in eastern areas, and a considerably smaller yield of lard per hog than in 1941–42, despite heavier weights of hogs marketed."

The outlook is for greater requirements. "It is probable that for continental Europe as a whole, that is, including European Russia, production of fats and oils is now nearly 2,000,000,000 pounds smaller than in the pre-war period. Practically all of the decrease is in animal-fat production. Since livestock production cannot be built up quickly, it is likely that fat production in Europe will not be restored to pre-war levels for a few years after the war. Vegetable-oil production has been expanded to some extent, but the possibilities of further expansion are limited." (Fats and Oils Situation, May 1943.)

The same publication states:

"So far, the losses in supplies of fats have not been too serious to the United Nations outside of continental Europe. Reduced imports from the Orient and reduced marine-oil production have been largely offset by increased imports from areas formerly supplying the European Continent and by increased production of fats in North America. The necessity of supplying imports to Russia, formerly self-sufficient in fats, and increased domestic demands, however, have made the supply situation extremely tight in the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States. The reopening of the continent of Europe will impose a new strain on the supply. This situation could be partly relieved by allocating more shipping to South America, where some surplus of fats still exists. But in the last analysis, the fat gap in the western world probably will not be closed completely until the abundant resources of the Far East are again made available to the West, fishing and whaling activity is resumed on a large scale, and livestock production in Europe recovers to some extent at least from the low level to which it inevitably will decline during the war."

And gives the following review:

"Background: With the entrance of the United States into the war in December 1941 and the subsequent loss of most of our imports from the Far East, our fats situation was transformed from one of comparative abundance to one of tight supply. Production of fats and oils was increased about 10 percent in the 1942 crop year, but requirements mounted even more sharply under the stimulus of war needs and rising incomes. In September 1942 a general order was issued limiting manufacturers' use of fats and oils to conserve supplies, and in late March 1943 direct consumer rationing of food fats and oils was begun. Price ceilings on fats and oils, instituted in December 1941, were revised upward on several occasions during 1942. Prices of all fats and oils except linseed oil are now covered by specific ceiling orders."

1942–43 production estimates reduced

"In December it was estimated that production of fats and oils from domestic materials would total about 11,700,000,000 pounds in the 1942–43 crop year. On the basis of more recent information on crushing, other disposition, and stocks of oilseeds, and data on animal-fat production, it now seems likely that output from domestic materials will not exceed 10,800,000,000 pounds. This would be about 1,000,000,000 pounds larger than production in 1941–42. The principal reductions are in soybean and peanut oils, lard, inedible tallow, and greases.

Butter production has been slightly greater than was expected, but production of lard and inedible tallow and greases has been substantially smaller. The number of hogs slaughtered in federally inspected plants from October 1942 to April 1943 did not increase to the extent anticipated on the basis of the large 1942 spring pig crop. Yields of lard per hog in these plants, moreover, have been below those of last year despite heavier weights of hogs marketed. The average live weight per hog slaughtered in federally inspected plants in the 6 months from October 1942 to March 1943 was 249 pounds, 5 percent greater than a year earlier. But the yield of lard per hog was only 30.6 pounds, 5 percent less than a year earlier.

The upward trend under way since 1937 in the production of inedible tallows and greases apparently has been reversed, temporarily at least. The total live weight of cattle slaughtered under Federal inspection was 1 percent smaller in the first 6 months (October–March) this marketing year than last. Production of edible tallow per 100 pounds live weight of cattle was higher than a year earlier, reflecting the strong demand and comparatively high prices for edible fats, but production of inedible tallow per 100 pounds of cattle slaughtered was smaller. Another factor affecting production of inedible tallow as well as grease has been a reduction in the volume of shop fats received by renderers in the East due (1) to a reduction in the supply of meat available for sale, and (2) to an increased proportion of fat sold to consumers as meat. As a partially offsetting factor, household collection of waste fats increased fairly steadily from 3,000,000 pounds in August 1942 to 7,000,000 pounds in March 1943.

POULTRY AND EGGS

The numbers of poultry on farms are at record levels. Most recent figures are:

	April 1942	April 1943	Percent 1943 of 1942
Number of layers on farms (millions)	343.0	398.9	115
Total farm production of eggs (millions of cases)	16.68	18.69	112

Commercial hatchery operations were up 11 percent.

Chickens kept for flock replacement in 1943 will be from 10 to 15 percent greater than a year ago.

The egg-feed price relationship is the most favorable on record, resulting in an unprecedented demand for baby chicks and has encouraged farmers to feed as many as feed supplies permit.

As in the case of livestock, there is not enough feed in sight to maintain the great production of this year.

DAIRY PRODUCTS

The dairy situation is presented by the Department of Agriculture as follows (Dairy Situation, May 1943):

"Although total milk production during the first third of 1943 has been the largest on record, consumption of fluid milk has been so large that the production of most manufactured products other than butter and dried whole milk has been smaller than in 1942. Nevertheless, with the seasonal increase in production, supplies of most dairy products are sufficient to meet current demand. With consumption restricted by rationing, stocks of butter and cheese are beginning to accumulate in storage. Such stocks will be needed during the low production season if consumption is to be maintained throughout the year at current levels."

This is based on the assumption that farm labor in 1943 is adequate "to produce and harvest a 1943 crop up to the levels of the announced goals" (p. 9), although it is conceded "that dairying requires relatively large amounts of skilled labor" (p. 10). There is reason to be less optimistic about the labor situation.

The forecast also is based upon the following statement (p. 10) regarding feed:

"The number of livestock now on hand, plus the expected expansion in 1943–44, indicate livestock feed requirements will be about as large or larger than in the current year. Although total supplies of high-protein feeds were generally at a record level in 1942–43, the demand has been equal to or in excess of the supply. The current prospect is for an over-all supply of such protein feeds during 1943–44 not greatly different from the supply available for 1942–43."

Actually, the production of feed grains is now estimated to be 11 percent less in 1943 than in 1942. Moreover, the number of livestock is substantially greater now than a year ago (see Livestock Situation), although the increase in milk animals was not large. The figures:

Milk animals	Jan. 1, 1942	Jan. 1, 1943
Cows, 2 years and over	26, 398, 000	26, 946, 000
Heifers, 1 to 2 years	5, 846, 000	5, 931, 000
Heifer calves	6, 568, 000	6, 881, 000
Total	38, 812, 000	39, 758, 000

Increase: 2.4 percent.

Feed requirements, however, are affected by the total number of livestock and poultry.

POTATOES

The production of potatoes last year was 371,150,000 bushels. National Food Situation, May 1943 (p. 14) states: "It does not seem likely at this time that the total United States potato crop will exceed 400,000,000 bushels."

Figures for previous years:

Year	Acres planted	Production
		Bushels
1934	3, 760, 000	406, 105, 000
1935	3, 592, 000	386, 380, 000
1936	3, 191, 000	331, 918, 000
1937	3, 227, 000	395, 294, 000
1938	3, 082, 000	374, 163, 000
1939	3, 056, 000	363, 159, 000
1940	2, 919, 000	378, 103, 000
1941	2, 793, 000	357, 783, 000
1942		371, 150, 000

The potato shortage will continue throughout this year. The civilian demand has increased, and Government requirements are very high.

FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

It is too early to obtain a good view of the fruits and vegetables situation for 1943. The following comment appears in National Food Situation for May:

"Commercial production of early vegetables this season is running about 13 percent below last year. As a result of winter and spring freezes the combined production of soft deciduous fruits (apricots, cherries, peaches, plums, and prunes) is expected to be materially smaller in 1943 than last year. Peach production is expected to decline to a low level."

A GREAT EXPANSION OF FOOD PRODUCTION IS VITALLY NECESSARY

Mr. Hoover, in his New York address, said: "The strategy of the food front is second only to the military front in winning total war," and "The major burden of the world's food front falls on the North American farmer and the American consumer. We must realize that in peacetime on balance we are a food importing country and today we are blockaded against many imports. We must furnish extra food to our military forces. We must ship large amounts of food to our allies to support them in war. We must realize that there is a minimum level in food for our 130,000,000 civilians without impairing their physical and moral resistance. And we have also pledged ourselves to hundreds of millions of people in the world that they will be rescued from the terrible famine which has been brought upon them by a merciless enemy. We must realize that this food shortage will last for a minimum of four, and possibly 6 years. These are stupendous burdens."

During the war period the production of the principal grains was as follows:

	Wheat	Corn
	Bushels	*Bushels*
1914	897, 487, 000	2, 523, 750, 000
1915	1, 008, 637, 000	2, 829, 044, 000
1916	634, 572, 000	2, 425, 206, 000
1917	619, 770, 000	2, 908, 242, 000
1918	904, 130, 000	2, 441, 249, 000
1919	952, 097, 000	2, 678, 541, 000
1920	843, 277, 000	3, 070, 604, 000

Substantially greater yields are now possible on the same acreage because of the wide use of hybrid-corn seed.

These figures indicate that the goal set by Mr. Hoover of 40,000,000 additional acres can be achieved and that the resulting increased production could be well utilized.

Some impression of the capacity of the country to produce substantially larger crops is furnished by the following table of harvested acreage:

Crop	Acreage, 1942	Acreage during war period, 1914–20	Largest acreage since 1920
Wheat	49, 464, 000	[1] 73,700, 000	[2] 69, 869, 000
Corn, all	89, 484, 000	110, 893, 000	110, 577, 000
Oats	37, 899, 000	42, 732, 000	44, 240, 000
Barley	16, 782, 000	9, 198, 000	14, 049, 000
Rice	1, 477, 000	1, 299, 000	1, 245, 000
Rye	3, 837, 000	7, 679, 000	6, 757, 000
Sorghums	14, 811, 000	6, 540, 000	10, 325, 000
All hay	72, 744, 000	----------	----------
Dry edible beans	1, 970, 000	----------	----------
Peanuts, all	8, 337, 000	----------	2, 561, 000
Soybeans, all	14, 222, 000	----------	----------
Cowpeas, all	3, 407, 000	----------	----------
Potatoes	2, 711, 000	3, 801, 000	3, 597, 000
Sweetpotatoes	707, 000	----------	----------

[1] Seeded 79,565,000 acres.
[2] Seeded 77,440,000 acres.

The largest acreage ever sown to wheat was 80,814,000 acres in 1937. Such an acreage at an average yield of 13 bushels per acre could produce 1,050,582,000 bushels.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House adhered to its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 24 to the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1396) making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1900) to prevent the payment of excessive fees or compensation in connection with the negotiation of war contracts.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 647) to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 235. An act for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey;

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson;

H. R. 1784. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay;

H. R. 2076. An act to authorize the deportation of aliens to countries allied with the United States;

H. R. 2614. An act to increase by 1 year the period within which certain oyster growers may file claims against the United States in the Court of Claims;

H. R. 2703. An act to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2794. An act to approve and consent to the compact entered into by Iowa and Nebraska establishing the boundary between Iowa and Nebraska;

H. R. 2798. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2936. An act to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, THE FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, ETC.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 to the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
HARRY TRUMAN,
WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,
CLYDE M. REED,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

BUTLER B. HARE,
ALBERT THOMAS,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on a certain amendment of the Senate to House bill 2935, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
OF THE UNITED STATES,
July 8, 1943.

Resolved, That the House adhere to its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 to the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from amendment numbered 24.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator explain what that amendment is?

Mr. McCARRAN. Amendment numbered 24 was the amendment offered on two separate bills by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. Recently, within the last 2 or 3 hours, the House voted overwhelmingly to adhere to its position against the McKellar amendment on another bill. The House did not vote on adhering to the amendment on House bill 2935, but it would be useless to send the bill back in disagreement. Therefore I am moving that the Senate recede.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I inquire whether the House has messaged to the Senate the House action on the conference report on the Commodity Credit Corporation joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The message has been received.

Mr. BARKLEY. The action just taken in the Senate in regard to the appropriation bill for the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency, and the action of the House with regard to the conference report on the Commodity Credit Corporation joint resolution, complete action on all legislative proposals pending upon which it is necessary to act prior to the introduction and passage of a recess resolution. Such a resolution would have to go to the House of Representatives, of course, and I present and ask for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the concurrent resolution.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, July 8, 1943, they shall stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Tuesday, September 14, 1943, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after their respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.

SEC. 2. The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever in their opinion legislative expediency shall warrant it, or whenever the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House, acting jointly, or the minority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the House, acting jointly, file a written request with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House that the Congress reassemble for the consideration of legislation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, there are certain very important nominations on the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. We are to have an executive session.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It seems to me the matter of an executive session should be disposed of before the recess resolution is taken up.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am perfectly willing to wait.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is the Senator from Kentucky willing to suspend action on the resolution?

Mr. BARKLEY. I withhold the resolution until after the executive business shall have been completed, which would already have been done except for a contingency I could not foresee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand what the Senator from Kentucky is referring to.

CEILING PRICES ON SOUTH CAROLINA TOBACCO—LETTER FROM THE PRICE ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by the Honorable Prentiss M. Brown, in reply to a letter from me requesting that ceiling prices on tobacco in South Carolina be the same as in North Carolina.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., July 7, 1943.

The Honorable BURNET R. MAYBANK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: This replies to your letter of June 21, requesting that ceiling prices on tobacco in South Carolina be the same as in North Carolina.

I can assure you that we are not planning to discriminate against tobacco growers of South Carolina in any regulation to be issued controlling prices of the 1943 crop of flue-cured tobacco.

Last year we issued Temporary Price Regulation No. 21 on August 29. Some 25 days later this was superseded by a permanent regulation containing certain broadened provisions for the purpose of allowing more flexibility to buyers of this tobacco and which may have resulted in the payment of slightly higher prices for tobacco marketed in North Carolina.

This revision of the temporary regulation was merely correcting certain inequalities and was not designed to establish price differentials between leaf offerings in the two States.

Sincerely yours,

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Administrator.

ADMINISTRATION OF JACKSON HOLE AND OTHER NATIONAL MONUMENTS AND PARKS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an additional amendment, Senate Resolution 134, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 134) for the administration of Jackson Hole and other national monuments and parks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution submitted by Mr. O'MAHONEY on April 12, which had been originally reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with amendments, on page 2, line 12, after the word "committee" and the comma, to insert "which shall not exceed $5,000"; and on the same page, line 14, after the word "chairman" and the comma, to strike out "And shall be subject to the limit on expenditures contained in and be deemed to be a part of the expenditures authorized by Senate Resolution 11, Seventy-eighth Congress (authorizing such committee to sit and hold hearings during the Seventy-eighth Congress)" and subsequently reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, with an additional amendment, on page 2, line 12, in the amendment of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, before the word "shall", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the methods and purposes of, and the administration of the laws relating to, the establishment of and the fixing or alteration of the boundaries of, national monuments, national forests, Indian reservations, and national parks. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such investigation and study, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the remainder of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $3,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

The amendment of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, as amended

by the further amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 134) as amended, was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations (and withdrawing a nomination), which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALLGREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Several persons for appointment under the War Manpower Commission.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

THE MARINE CORPS—NOMINATIONS REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, I report sundry nominations in the Marine Corps. I ask that the rule that nominations be placed on the calendar before being considered be suspended, and that the nominations for temporary commissions in the Marine Corps be considered at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the nominations will be read.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for temporary appointment in the Marine Corps.

Mr. WALSH. There are a number of the nominations. I ask unanimous consent that they be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Armond W. Scott, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas D. Quinn, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the muncipal court for the district of Columbia.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. VAN NUYS] appointed me to be a member of a subcommittee to consider the nomination of Thomas D. Quinn. The hour set for the hearing was 10:30 on Wednesday morning. On Tuesday evening I was appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Senate to act as a conferee on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill. The result was that I was unable to attend the meeting of the subcommittee.

There had been voiced to me certain objections as to Mr. Quinn's status, not bearing in the slightest respect upon his character or his personal qualifications.

At this point, I should say that I am personally acquainted with Mr. Quinn. I know him well. I like him and respect him, and believe him to be a thoroughly honorable gentleman.

Certain lawyers from the District Bar called to my attention the fact that it is not even a year since the Congress passed a law, providing, among other things, that no man should be deemed qualified to be a judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia unless he had practiced law in the District of Columbia for a period of 5 years.

Therefore, in view of my inability to attend the subcommittee meeting, I ask whether the facts in the particular to which I have just referred came to the notice of the subcommittee, and if so, if the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Nevada, will state for the RECORD what facts were brought out and what conclusion the subcommittee reached with reference to them.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in answer to the inquiry made by the Senator from Connecticut, let me say that I was unable to preside at the hearings held in the Judiciary Committee room on the matter of the nomination of Mr. Quinn. I received a memorandum of what transpired there while the able junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] was presiding. The question of whether Mr. Quinn had practiced law for 5 years prior to the present date was raised. It was raised in a letter from a former president of the District of Columbia Bar Association.

The facts developed are that Mr. Quinn has been in the practice of law in the Department of Justice in the District of Columbia for more than 5 years, that he is a member of the District of Columbia Bar Association, that he was admitted to the bar in the District of Columbia some 7, 8, or 9 years ago, and during the past 5 years has been in the Department of Justice, and practicing law in that Department.

Question was raised whether such practice complies with the spirit of the law which was passed about a year ago when Congress set up the new court system for the District of Columbia. When the bill was pending on the floor of the Senate, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] propounded to the senior Senator from Nevada, who then had charge of the bill, the question whether the 5-year provision in the bill would permit one who had been practicing in the departments for a period of 5 years to be appointed to a judgeship. My answer to him was that it would; that one who had been engaged in the departments practicing law would be regarded as one having practiced law within the District for 5 years.

Immediately thereafter, in the first group of nominations sent to the Senate by the President, was the nomination of Mr. Margold who for 5 or 6 or 7 years had been practicing law in the Interior Department, and in the Interior Department only. The nomination was confirmed by the Senate, and he is now a very able judge. The same rule applies to Mr. Quinn. In my judgment he is entirely qualified, under the spirit of the law.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have known Mr. Quinn for many years, since he has been practicing in the departments, and I consider him a very able lawyer.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in view of my own very deep respect for Mr. Quinn and my own personal belief that he is eminently qualified to fill the post so far as his legal attainments are concerned, and in view of the splendid statement which has been made by the able and distinguished Senator from Nevada, who, as chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, is naturally concerned with the legal situation, I am completely satisfied.

Since these objections had been voiced to me, I wished to have the RECORD show exactly what the facts were, to the end that adequate disposition might appear of record.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in further answer to the question, I should like to say that at the hearing I asked all the questions which the Senator has raised.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified immediately.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters on the calendar are confirmed en bloc; and without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

ADDITIONAL POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS CONFIRMED

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a number of nominations of postmasters have been submitted to the Senate today. They have been approved by Senators from the several States. The list is on the desk. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement. Out of respect and appreciation for my fellow Senators, I shall not object to the confirmation of these nominations, but I should like to say, so that the RECORD

may be clear, that since December of last year we have been attempting to have a manpower director appointed for South Carolina. Up to this minute none has been appointed. However, out of respect and appreciation for my colleagues, I shall not object to the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed; and without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, today certain nominations were received by the Senate and referred to the Finance Committee. They are sundry nominations for promotion in the United States Public Health Service. The committee has not had an opportunity to consider the nominations, but several members have been consulted. The appointments are routine in the United States Public Health Service. I am advised that it is necessary that the nominations be confirmed. Anticipating that the Senate may adjourn today, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations may be received, considered, and confirmed, and that the President be notified thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none. The nominations will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

THE JUDICIARY—NOMINATIONS OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES IN MISSOURI

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, today the President sent to the Senate the nominations of two men to fill vacancies on the Federal bench in Missouri. The vacancy in the eastern district has existed since March 3, and the other vacancy has existed since the last Congress adjourned.

The two men whose nominations have been sent to the Senate by the President to fill the places are able and capable. Unless their nominations can be confirmed by unanimous consent today, the vacancies will continue to exist. The vacancy in St. Louis will cause a very serious congestion of business, due to the fact that only one judge is now sitting in that very busy district. The roving judge was appointed for the purpose of relieving that congestion of business.

Rule XXXVIII, paragraph 6, of the Rules of the Senate, provides as follows:

> Nominations neither confirmed nor rejected during the session at which they are made shall not be acted upon at any succeeding session without being again made to the Senate by the President; and if the Senate shall adjourn or take a recess for more than 30 days, all nominations pending and not finally acted upon at the time of taking such adjournment or recess shall be returned by the Secretary to the President, and shall not again be considered unless they shall again be made to the Senate by the President.

If these nominations are not confirmed today, vacancies in these two very busy districts will continue to exist. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Richard M. Duncan to be United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri, and the nomination of Rubey M. Hulen to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Missouri, be confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, paragraph 1 of rule XXXVIII of the Senate provides as follows:

> When nominations shall be made by the President of the United States to the Senate, they shall, unless otherwise ordered, be referred to appropriate committees; and the final question on every nomination shall be, "Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?" which question shall not be put on the same day on which the nomination is received, nor on the day on which it may be reported by a committee, unless by unanimous consent.

I regret very much indeed, if the nominations were made today——

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I hope the able and distinguished Senator will not object to this request, for the simple reason that the two men have been completely and thoroughly investigated time after time. They are both able men. If the nominations are not confirmed today, the courts of Missouri will be left in a very serious situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to make a suggestion, the rule which he has quoted is, of course, observed in the Senate; but, as has been frequently announced heretofore by Vice Presidents, we can do anything by unanimous consent.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the fact that always at the end of a session, on the last day, nominations and other matters are submitted to the Senate, I hope the Senator from Nebraska will not object to this request.

Mr. WHERRY. These are two very important appointments. No lawyer or other citizen in Missouri has had an opportunity to be heard before the Judiciary Committee with regard to the appointments. I think we are going pretty far when nominations are submitted and we are asked to confirm them the same day, without anyone having an opportunity to appear before the committee.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that I do not think anyone in Missouri would object to either of these nominations. I would not have made the request if I had thought so.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand that both nominations are approved by both Senators from Missouri.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is true. My colleague [Mr. CLARK] is present and can speak for himself.

Mr. WHITE. That is entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, in connection with these appointments, let me say that the question of the roving judgeship has been in controversy since early in the year. With respect to the appointment of a judge in the eastern district, a vacancy has existed for about 3 or 4 months. The man whose nomination for appointment as roving judge has been sent to the Senate by the President is not the man whom I recommended.

I will go further and say that I am on record publicly in the newspapers of Missouri to the effect that I do not think he has the legal background necessary to qualify him to be a Federal judge. Nevertheless, he is a qualified lawyer. For 10 years he was a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives. I think he is an able man. He is a man of very high character. The President of the United States submitted his nomination today, without any consultation whatever with me, and without any approval from me.

When the President takes the responsibility of sending his name to the Senate, I think his nomination ought to be confirmed, for the particular reason, in addition to everything else, that the eastern district of Missouri is one of the busiest districts in the country. We have had only one judge since the death of Judge Davis in March, when we should have had three. Whether I approve the appointment of Mr. Duncan as a judge or not, I believe that the eastern district of Missouri is entitled to relief. I regret that the nomination was submitted on the last day of the session. So far as I am concerned, I have done everything I possibly could to have the appointment made before.

With respect to Rubey M. Hulen, the other man nominated by the President, I do not think there is anyone in the whole State of Missouri who would question his eminent qualifications, for the judgeship, both as a lawyer, and as a man. I hope very much that my friend the Senator from Nebraska will not insist upon an objection to these nominations because the necessity for the filling of the vacancies in Missouri, and particularly in the eastern district, is very acute.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to make it very plain that I have no objection to the two men. I merely wanted to invite the attention of the Senate to this rule. In view of the statement made by the senior Senator from Missouri that the appointments are satisfactory to him and to the junior Senator from Missouri, I shall not make any objection with respect to the appointments.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of

the nominations? The Chair hears none. The nominations will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard M. Duncan to be United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rubey M. Hulen to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President may be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

WAR MANPOWER DIRECTOR FOR WYOMING

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have just observed that one of the nominations which just came from the President is that of James W. Morgan from the State of Wyoming, to be State manpower director at $4,600 per annum in the Wyoming State office.

I have consulted my colleague the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] and I am about to ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Mr. Morgan may be confirmed. I make the request upon the following ground: The manpower problem in Wyoming is particularly acute. We need labor for the farms and for the ranches. We need additional labor to get coal out of the mines which is required by the Government. I think it is in the interest of sound public policy that this position be filled as soon as possible. I believe that the people of the State will benefit by the filling of this office without delay. It is not now filled.

I am personally acquainted with Mr. Morgan. He obtained a position in the United States Employment Service by merit, and he is entitled to the confidence and respect of all who know him. On this basis I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, to whom this nomination was referred, I desire to state that the nomination meets with the unanimous approval of the committee, and we have recommended that the nomination be confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what is the request?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have asked unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request is to confirm the appointment in the Manpower Commission of James W. Morgan from the State of Wyoming. The nomination was received today.

Is there objection to the consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Earlier in today's session the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported several nominations in the War Manpower Commission. I ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph S. Dorton, of North Carolina, to be regional manpower director in the North Carolina State office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Walter J. Foley, of Indiana, to be area director in the Evansville area office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph D. Canty, of New York, to be area director in the Buffalo area office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rhoton P. Clift, of Tennessee, to be deputy regional manpower director in the Tennessee State office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hugh M. Magevney, Jr., of Tennessee, to be area director in the Memphis area office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of David A. Nye, of Indiana, to be area director in the South Bend area office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. From the Senate Military Affairs Committee I report sundry nominations in the Army and ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Are they routine nominations?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. They are routine nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none.

Mr. GURNEY. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc, without being read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION—HENRY E. TREIDE

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, among the nominations sent to the Senate today is that of Henry E. Treide, from the State of Maryland to be regional manpower director in the Washington regional office. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry E. Treide, of Maryland, to be regional manpower director in the Washington regional office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado subsequently said: Mr. President, a short time ago, in executive session, inadvertently Henry E. Treide, from the State of Maryland, was confirmed to be regional manpower director in the Washington regional office. This appointment has not received the approval of the Committee on Military Affairs. We make it a practice very carefully to check with the Senators from all the States involved in appointments. I therefore ask, as in executive session, that the vote by which the nomination was confirmed be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, in making the suggestion and request that Mr. Treide be confirmed, I was under the impression that the customary approval had been given. I find I was mistaken, and I concur in the request made by the Senator from Colorado.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be rereferred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed consideration of legislative business.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 17. The resolution was read a while ago, but perhaps Senators would like to have it read again. It provides for an adjournment of Congress from today until the 14th of September.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, July 8, 1943, they shall stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Tuesday, September 14, 1943, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after their respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.

SEC. 2. The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever in their opinion legislative expediency shall warrant it or whenever the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the

House, acting jointly, or the minority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the House, acting jointly, file a written request with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House that the Congress reassemble for the consideration of legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no objection to it, but it seems to me that the form of the resolution is rather unusual.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; the motion is not debatable. It has been agreed to by all parties and it is desirable that it be acted upon.

Mr. CONNALLY. It has not been agreed to by all parties, but some of us may not amount to a party. [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say for the information of the Senate and the country that during the last 1,281 days Congress has been in session 1,261 days.

In 1940 Congress was in session 366 days, that happening to be a leap year. In 1941 Congress was in session 365 days, and was in session 346 days in 1942. We took a recess or adjournment for a couple of weeks in the latter part of December 1942. During 1943 Congress has been in session 184 days.

Prior to 1941, in 1939, Congress took a brief recess, from the 5th of August to the 21st of September, but in the last 3½ years, 1940, 1941, and 1942, and up to the present time in 1943, with the exception of 20 days, Congress has been in session every day of those 3½ years.

With this record, I feel that not only is the Congress entitled to the brief recess we are taking but I think the country itself would feel perfectly satisfied, in view of the form of the concurrent resolution, that no harm could come to the country if Congress should take a recess of a couple of months.

If I may take the time of the Senate to say so, I hope that all Senators will find means to enjoy agreeable and comfortable vacations between now and the 14th of September, and that at the end of our recess they will return renewed in body and in spirit.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that today, July 8, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1316) to provide for clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BARKLEY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That notwithstanding the adjournment of the two Houses, as authorized by Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses which have been examined by the Committee on Enrolled Bills of each House and found truly enrolled.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think everything that had been expected has come over from the House of Representatives, but out of an abundance of caution, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive any messages which may come from the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

WORK OF THE NAVAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WALSH

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, a few days ago the Army and Navy Journal requested a statement from me as to the activities and work of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate during the present session of Congress. Such a report has been prepared and will be published in the Journal in a few days. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the report be published in the RECORD.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, this is a matter of very great importance. Does not the Senator think it should be printed as a Senate document? I did not realize what was happening in the matter of naval legislation until, through the courtesy of the Vice President, I was appointed a member of the board of visitors to the Naval Academy, and I learned much at the academy in 2 or 3 days which I think all the people of the United States should know. It seems to me very proper that this report should be published as a Senate document.

Mr. WALSH. I appreciate what the Senator says, and as this is a condensed report, I suggest that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate did not subscribe to the popular belief that if we entered the war Japan and Germany would be defeated within a few months. More than 3 years ago the committee pointed out that an enormous effort would be required to defeat Japan because of the great distances involved; that the matériel and personnel of our Navy and Air Forces would have to be increased manyfold; that many new operating bases would have to be constructed and maintained in distant parts of the world before our military power could be applied effectively; and that many changes would have to be made on the home front.

Prior to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor the committee had completed a large portion of its work in preparing the Navy and the Naval Air Forces for any eventuality. Before the outbreak of war the authorized strength of the Navy had been increased manyfold both in combatant and auxiliary type vessels. Authority had been granted to construct or purchase several thousand small vessels; public-works projects totaling more than $2,500,000,000 had been authorized; the number of naval airplanes had been increased from a total of 2,050 to such numbers as the President deemed necessary. As regards personnel, the number of officers and men in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps had been almost doubled, and authority also existed to enroll as many officers and men in the Naval Reserve as might be needed for the successful prosecution of the war.

As early as June 1940, the committee suspended the requirement that contracts be made on a competitive basis, and authorized the Navy Department to negotiate war contracts. It authorized the Department to advance moneys to contractors, and directed that Army and Navy contracts should take priority over all deliveries for private account or for export. This act also provided for paying into the Treasury excess profits made by shipbuilders and aircraft manufacturers.

The committee granted practically every request made by the Navy Department for increases in men, ships, aircraft, and other war material. In cooperation with the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives, it took the initative on many occasions in preparing our Naval forces for war. For example, the Congress in May 1938 directed the Secretary of the Navy to appoint a board of naval officers to investigate and report on the need for establishing additional submarine, destroyer, and naval air bases on the coasts of the United States, its territories, and possessions. The bases recommended as a result of the directive contained in this act, were partially completed before we entered the war, and our ships and planes are now operating from many of these bases in the Pacific, Alaskan, and Caribbean areas.

The act approved in July 1940, the so-called Two Ocean Navy Act, was initiated by the chairmen of the two Naval Affairs Committees and introduced simultaneously in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

As a result of its investigation of the fire and capsizing of the U. S. S. *Lafayette* (the *Normandie*) the committee recommended the creation in the Navy Department of the Office of Inspector General of the Navy.

The committee has repeatedly stressed the necessity of keeping an open mind regarding the development of new weapons and the employment of new methods in waging naval warfare. It has set forth, from time to time, new methods and new procedures which it believed the Navy Department should adopt.

During the present session, which began on January 6, 90 bills, of which approximately half are private bills, were introduced in the Senate and referred to the committee. Most of the private bills submitted to the Navy Department for comment were returned with an adverse report. The committee considered 45 bills and reported 39 favorably to the Senate, 23 of these became law, 13 are now pending in the House, and 3 are awaiting the President's signature. Four hundred and twenty-eight requests of the Navy Department to acquire or lease land were approved, and many nominations of Naval and Marine Corps officers for promotion were considered and approved. A few of the major bills approved since January 3, 1943, are as follows: Public Law No. 1 authorized an expenditure of $210,000,000 for additional ship-repair facilities. Public Law No. 19 authorized an expenditure of $1,256,607,000 for additional public works projects. Public Law No. 76 authorized an additional 1,000,000 tons of auxiliary vessels, and Public Law No. 61 authorized an additional 1,000,000 tons of landing and district craft.

From time to time the committee has conferred with the Secretary of the Navy, the Under Secretary of the Navy, the Assistant Secretary, the commander in chief of the fleet, the vice chief of naval operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, the bureau chiefs and other naval and Marine Corps officials, and has kept itself informed as to the

progress being made by the Navy. Much of the information received from these officials was of a confidential nature and cannot be made public. The committee was impressed with the speed and efficiency with which the shipbuilding program, the airplane procurement program, and public works programs are progressing.

The committee has kept itself informed of the progress being made in the repair of naval vessels damaged at Pearl Harbor. We are pleased to announce that nearly all of these vessels have been repaired and restored to service; and that the shortage of naval vessels, planes, and other weapons to combat the submarine menace has been overcome to a large extent. The building of cruisers, submarines, destroyers, destroyer escort vessels, and landing craft vessels has progressed rapidly and the building period has been very substantially lessened. It feels that the officials of the Department deserve much credit for the outstanding record that has been made to date.

The committee is familiar with the efficient and valuable work done by the Naval Affairs Investigating Committee of the House in investigating naval contracts. It has cooperated with the House committee by approving H. R. 1900, a bill to prevent the payment of excessive fees or compensation in connection with the negotiation of war contracts. The Senate committee is of the opinion that it would be undesirable for it to make an independent investigation of this nature and duplicate the work of the House committee. It is of the opinion that the House committee is in a better position to undertake work of this nature, as Members of the House, as a rule, are members of only one major committee while Members of the Senate are frequently on several major committees.

When Congress reconvenes, the committee will take up Senate bill 1173, to suspend the provisions of the Public Vessels Act of 1925 until 12 months after the termination of the war; Senate bill 1231, the purpose of which is to provide adequate protection for persons in military or naval service as to filing of State and local income-tax returns; S. 300 to establish a chief of chaplains of the United States Navy; and H. R. 2859 to amend the act creating a Women's Reserve of the Naval Reserve.

It is not possible to predict with any degree of accuracy what other major bills will come before the committee in the future. It is probable, however, that it will be necessary to authorize the construction of additional landing boats and small craft, and additional public works projects, as the war progresses. The legislation required in the future will depend to a large extent on the course of the war.

The committee may be relied upon to give all requests made by naval and Marine Corps officers prompt, serious, and sympathetic consideration, and to support them in their efforts to bring the war to an early and successful conclusion. The committee will, however, continue to scrutinize carefully all such requests and to satisfy itself that all authorizations requested are absolutely necessary for the successful prosecution of the war. It will continue to make suggestions and recommendations which, in its judgment, will improve the naval service.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, yesterday the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] asked that Senate bill 883, a bill providing for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce to deal with the subject of small business, be taken up and considered, and the bill was passed. At the time the request was made by the Senator I started to object because the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, had expressed a desire to be consulted about the bill before it was passed by the Senate. I was not sure at that time whether the Senator from Montana was in the city or out of the city. I learned subsequently that he was out of the city, but he has communicated with some of us on the Small Business Committee and requested that we ask that the bill, which has not been passed by the House, and will not be passed by the House before the recess, be returned to the Senate, not to reconsider it, but so that it might be subject to a motion to reconsider when the Senate returns.

Before making the motion, noticing that the junior Senator from Wisconsin was off the floor, I telephoned him at his office, and while he wishes to have it known that he objects to the motion, I think it would be admitted that no substantial harm would be done by the Senate recalling the measure, if it is not reconsidered.

Therefore I wish to give notice of a motion to reconsider Senate bill 883, so that the Senate may have jurisdiction to reconsider the measure if it chooses to do so, and I move that the Senate request the House to return Senate bill 883 to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator enter his motion to that effect?

Mr. PEPPER. I do enter a motion to that effect.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I ask what the motion is exactly?

Mr. PEPPER. I give notice that I shall at some time in the future, appropriate to the Senate rules, call up for consideration a motion which I now desire to enter with respect to Senate bill 883, and so that the Senate may have jurisdiction, I move that the Senate request the return of Senate bill 883.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is that the bill in which the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is interested?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; it is. I telephoned the junior Senator from Wisconsin about the matter, and advised him that I would make the motion. He said he wanted it known that he objected, but I made it clear to the Senator that I was not proposing to move to reconsider at this time, but merely to have the bill returned from the House so the motion to reconsider would be pending when the Senate reconvened.

Mr. WHITE. In view of the notice given by the Senator from Florida to the Senator from Wisconsin, I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will be entered, and, without objection, the House of Representatives will be requested to return the bill to the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if there is nothing further for the Senate to consider, and I assume there is not, I now move that in accordance with the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 17 the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the terms of Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, conditionally, until Tuesday, September 14, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 8 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Richard M. Duncan, of Missouri, to be United States district judge for the Eastern and Western Districts of Missouri (additional position).

Rubey M. Hulen, of Missouri, to be United States district judge for the Eastern District of Missouri, vice Hon. Charles B. Davis, deceased.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

M. Roland Reed, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for a term of 5 years from August 29, 1943 (reappointment).

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Joseph D. Canty, from the State of New York, to be area director, at $6,500 per annum, in the Buffalo area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Ford T. Shepherd, from the State of Ohio, to be head industrial consultant in the Bureau of Manpower Utilization, at $6,500 per annum, in the Washington office.

Leland C. Stoll, from the State of Oregon, to be deputy regional manpower director, at $6,500 per annum, in the Oregon State office.

Hubert R. Harnish, from the State of California, to be deputy regional manpower director, at $6,500 per annum, for southern California in the Los Angeles office.

Rollin R. Benedict, from the State of South Dakota, to be deputy regional manpower director, at $4,600 per annum, in the South Dakota State office.

Thomas F. Costello, from the State of New Jersey, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Paterson area office.

Frank A. Holden, from the State of Georgia, to be senior manpower field supervisor, at $4,600 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office.

Rhoton P. Clift, from the State of Tennessee (previously confirmed for the position of area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Memphis area office), to be deputy regional manpower director, at $5,600 per annum, in the Tennessee State office.

Walter J. Foley, from the State of Indiana, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Evansville area office.

Hugh M. Magevney, Jr., from the State of Tennessee, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Memphis area office.

David A. Nye, from the State of Indiana, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the South Bend area office.

Henry E. Treide from the State of Maryland to be regional manpower director at $8,000 per annum in the Washington regional office.

Reginald G. Conley from the State of Maryland to be assistant general counsel at $6,500 per annum in the Washington office.

James W. Morgan from the State of Wyoming to be State manpower director at $4,600 per annum in the Wyoming State office.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following to be assistant surgeons in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective date of oath:

Russell I. Pierce
Carl R. Kunstling
Donald J. Birmingham
Willys M. Monroe
John J. Davies
Robert S. McClintock
John T. McBurney

The following-named assistant sanitary engineers to be passed assistant sanitary

engineers in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the date set opposite their names:

Charles C. Spencer, June 3, 1943.

Ralph Porges, June 3, 1943.

The following-named passed assistant dental surgeons to be dental surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the date set opposite their names:

John M. Francis, July 1, 1943.

Robert A. Scroggie, August 1, 1943.

Leonard R. Etzenhouser, August 1, 1943.

Leland E. Weyer, August 13, 1943.

Charles B. Galt, July 1, 1943.

These officers are now serving under temporary commissions issued in accordance with the provisions of the First Deficiency Appropriation Act of March 18, 1943.

The following-named assistant dental surgeon to be passed assistant dental surgeon in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the date set opposite his name:

Fred D. Lewis, Jr., July 1, 1943.

The following-named passed assistant sanitary engineers to be sanitary engineers in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the date set opposite their names:

Vincent B. Lemoureux, June 20, 1943.

James H. LeVan, June 19, 1943.

These officers are now serving under temporary commissions issued in accordance with the provisions of the First Deficiency Appropriation Act of March 18, 1943.

The following-named senior surgeons to be medical directors in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the date set opposite their names:

Harry E. Trimble, July 16, 1943.

James E. Faris, August 1, 1943.

Mark V. Ziegler, August 2, 1943.

The following-named assistant dental surgeon to be passed assistant dental surgeon in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the date set opposite his name:

Francis J. Walters, July 1, 1943.

The above officer is now serving under a temporary commission issued in accordance with the provisions of the First Deficiency Appropriation Act of March 18, 1943.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Lt. Col. Norris Adron Wimberley, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from August 18, 1940.

Maj. Edwin Paul Crandell, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from July 1, 1940.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Maj. Charles Elford Smith, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 1, 1940.

First Lt. William Henry Jaynes, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from June 14, 1941.

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. Gerard George Wolke, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1943.

Second Lt. James Francis McCarthy, Jr., Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 1, 1941.

Second Lt. Samuel Adams Steere, Jr., Chemical Warfare Service (temporary captain), with rank from October 5, 1942.

Second Lt. Samuel Cochran Phillips, Infantry, with rank from October 7, 1942.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonel with rank from June 12, 1943

Lt. Col. Thomas Bernard Larkin, Corps of Engineers (temporary major general).

To be colonels with rank from July 1, 1943

Lt. Col. Edwin Colt Kelton, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. James Allen Lester, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Mason James Young, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

To be first lieutenants with rank from August 8, 1943

Second Lt. Howard Clarence Aylesworth, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Robert Louis Dickerson, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Gordon Arthur Bahe, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Joseph Earl Treadway, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Edwin Howerton Roberts, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 1, 1943.

Lt. Col. Allan Wilson Dawson, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 1, 1943.

Lt. Col. Anthony Joseph Vadala, Medical Corps, with rank from August 1, 1943.

Lt. Col. William Archdall Boyle, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 1, 1943, subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Albert Wright Greenwell, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 2, 1943.

Lt. Col. Myron Parkhill Rudolph, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 2, 1943.

Lt. Col. Patrick Sarsfield Madigan, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 2, 1943.

Lt. Col. William Cramer Pollock, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 2, 1943.

Lt. Col. Louis Martin Field, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 2, 1943.

Lt. Col. Humphrey Newton Ervin, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 3, 1943.

Lt. Col. Ottis Lee Graham, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 4, 1943, subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. William Scott Dow, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. John Glenwood Knauer, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 5, 1943.

Lt. Col. Fabian Lee Pratt, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 7, 1943.

Lt. Col. Charles Wallace Sale, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 8, 1943.

Lt. Col. Harry Baldwin Gantt, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 8, 1943.

Lt. Col. Daniel Bascom Faust, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 8, 1943.

Lt. Col. Wilmer Clayton Dreibelbies, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 8, 1943.

Lt. Col. Paul Richard Eddins Sheppard, Medical Corps, with rank from August 8, 1943.

Lt. Col. Christian Henry Dewey, Medical Corps, with rank from August 8, 1943.

Lt. Col. Sam Fletcher Parker, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 8, 1943, subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Albert Smith Dabney, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 8, 1943.

Lt. Col. Darius Cleveland Absher, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 8, 1943.

Lt. Col. Bertram Henry Olmsted, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 8, 1943, subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. John Wallace, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 8, 1943.

Lt. Col. Edgar Smith Linthicum, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 8, 1943.

Lt. Col. Howard Hume, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 8, 1943.

Lt. Col. William Louis Hoffman, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 8, 1943.

Lt. Col. John Joseph McCormick, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 8, 1943.

Lt. Col. Maxwell Gordon Keeler, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 9, 1943.

Lt. Col. Harold Vincent Raycroft, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 9, 1943.

Lt. Col. Hugh William Mahon, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 12, 1943.

Lt. Col. Thomas Harold Reagan, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 14, 1943.

Lt. Col. Morgan Clint Berry, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 14, 1943.

Lt. Col. Eli Edwin Brown, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 17, 1943.

Lt. Col. Ralph Elmer Curti, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 20, 1943.

Lt. Col. John Ignatius Meagher, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 25, 1943, subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Eugen Gottfried Reinartz, Medical Corps (temporary brigadier general), with rank from August 26, 1943.

Lt. Col. Albert Glenn Kinberger, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 26, 1943.

Lt. Col. Wilbur Gibson Jenkins, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 26, 1943, subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Edwin Raymond Strong, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 27, 1943.

Lt. Col. Leroy Dilmore Soper, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 28, 1943.

Lt. Col. Thomas Morris Chaney, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 29, 1943.

Lt. Col. Cleve Carrington Odom, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 29, 1943.

To be captains

First Lt. Weldon Joseph Walker, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from August 1, 1943.

First Lt. Robert Jacob Brotchner, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from August 12, 1943.

First Lt. Kenneth Eugene Pletcher, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from August 17, 1943.

First Lt. Thomas Taylor Beeler, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from August 19, 1943.

First Lt. Donald Harry Earl, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from August 22, 1943.

First Lt. Charles Hudson Talbott, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from August 28, 1943.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. James Barto Mann, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 5, 1943.

Lt. Col. Charles Jefferson Denholm, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 7, 1943.

Lt. Col. William Henry Siefert, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 20, 1943.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Louis Lathrop Shook, Veterinary Corps, with rank from August 2, 1943.

Lt. Col. Daniel Henry Mallan, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 3, 1943.

Lt. Col. Louis Goldman Weisman, Veterinary Corps, with rank from August 3, 1943.

Lt. Col. James Alexander McCallam, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 3, 1943.

Lt. Col. Harry John Juzek, Veterinary Corps, with rank from August 3, 1943, subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. William Henry Dean, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 3, 1943.

Lt. Col. Solon B. Renshaw, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 3, 1943.

Lt. Col. Frank Holmes Woodruff, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 3, 1943.

Lt. Col. Charles Oliver Grace, Veterinary Corps, with rank from August 3, 1943.

Lt. Col. Edward Michael Curley, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 3, 1943.

Lt. Col. James Russell Sperry, Veterinary Corps, with rank from August 3, 1943.

Lt. Col. Floyd Chauncey Sager, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 3, 1943.

Lt. Col. Henry Emil Hess, Veterinary Corps, with rank from August 3, 1943.

Lt. Col. Forest Lee Holycross, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 3, 1943.

Lt. Col. Raymond Irvin Lovell, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 25, 1943.

Lt. Col. Joseph Fenton Crosby, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 26, 1943.

Lt. Col. Ralph Brown Stewart, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 27, 1943.

Lt. Col. Charles Mansur Cowherd, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 30, 1943.

To be captain

First Lt. Alpheus Heise Seeley, Veterinary Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

CHAPLAINS

To be colonels

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) James Lemuel Blackeney, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from August 5, 1943.

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) George Foreman Rixey, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from August 16, 1943.

To be captain

Chaplain (First Lt.) Harold Owen Prudell, United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from August 12, 1943.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

CALIFORNIA

Andrew D. Erickson, Baker, Calif. Office became Presidential October 1, 1942.

GEORGIA

John Ridgeway Murphy, Jr., Louisville, Ga., in place of R. S. Farmer, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Sherman L. Keeler, Willow Hill, Ill., in place of F. E. Madden, transferred.

IOWA

Alice C. Watts, Arthur, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

LOUISIANA

Charles W. Carson, Pitkin, La., in place of C. W. Carson. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1942.

MICHIGAN

Harry E. Irwin, Plymouth, Mich., in place of F. K. Learned, removed.

MINNESOTA

John A. Oberg, Deerwood, Minn., in place of J. A. Oberg. Incumbent's commission expired June 3, 1942.

Irene A. Riley, Savage, Minn. Office became Presidential January 1, 1943.

MONTANA

Frank D. Stoltz, Park City, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

NEBRASKA

Martha E. McDonald, Craig, Nebr., in place of M. E. McDonald. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

George M. Ponton, Elgin, Nebr., in place of G. M. Ponton. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Martha P. Westfall, Polk, Nebr., in place of M. P. Westfall. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John W. Martinosky, Sidney, Nebr., in place of W. L. Larson, removed.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

James A. Reed, Union, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

NEW JERSEY

Gertrude A. Fowler, Leesburg, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

NORTH DAKOTA

Garfield J. Mauritson, Park River, N. Dak., in place of Emeline Robertson. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1941.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Helen E. Becker, Turton, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WISCONSIN

Thomas H. Murphy, Eau Claire, Wis., in place of Ronald F. North, resigned.

Michael T. Foley, Marion, Wis., in place of A. C. Buhr, removed.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate July 8 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Raymond Kenny, regional manpower director in the Washington Regional Office of the War Manpower Commission.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 8 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Richard M. Duncan to be United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri, additional position.

Rubey M. Hulen to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Missouri.

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Armond W. Scott to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

Thomas D. Quinn to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

APPOINTMENTS

David A. Nye, of Indiana, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the South Bend area office.

Walter J. Foley, of Indiana, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Evansville area office.

Joseph D. Canty, of New York, to be area director, at $6,500 per annum, in the Buffalo area office.

Joseph S. Dorton, of North Carolina, to be deputy regional manpower director, at $5,600 per annum, in the North Carolina State office.

Rhoton P. Clift, of Tennessee, to be deputy regional manpower director, at $5,600 per annum, in the Tennessee State office.

Hugh M. Magevney, Jr., of Tennessee, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Memphis area office.

James W. Morgan, of Wyoming, to be State manpower director, in the Wyoming State office.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

TO BE MEDICAL DIRECTORS

Harry E. Trimble
James E. Faris
Mark V. Ziegler

TO BE ASSISTANT SURGEONS

Russell I. Pierce
Carl R. Kunstling
Donald J. Birmingham
Willys M. Monroe
John J. Davies
Robert S. McClintock
John T. McBurney

TO BE SANITARY ENGINEERS

Vincent B. Lamoureux
James H. LeVan

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS

Charles C. Spencer
Ralph Porges

TO BE DENTAL SURGEONS

John M. Francis
Robert A. Scroggie
Leonard R. Etzenhouser
Leland E. Weyer
Charles B. Galt

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS

Fred D. Lewis, Jr.
Francis J. Walters

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, AND PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Lt. Col. Norris Adron Wimberley et al. for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army.

Lt. Col. Thomas Bernard Larkin et al. for promotion in the Regular Army.

(NOTE.—A list of the names of all persons whose nominations for appointment, by transfer, or promotion in the Regular Army, were confirmed today, may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for today under the caption "Nominations.")

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Homer G. Hutchinson, Jr.
Hal R. Kolp
Fred E. Haynes, Jr.
William H. McDonough
Louis C. Vandertill
Kenneth A. Gordon, Jr.
Joseph D. Baugh
Charles A. Irvine

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Donald B. McCluey, Rector.

CALIFORNIA

Andrew D. Erickson, Baker.

GEORGIA

John Ridgeway Murphy, Jr., Louisville.

ILLINOIS
Sherman L. Koeler, Willow Hill.

IOWA
Alice C. Watts, Arthur.

LOUISIANA
Charles W. Carson, Pitkin.

MICHIGAN
Harry E. Irwin, Plymouth.

MINNESOTA
John A. Oberg, Deerwood.
Irene A. Riley, Savage.

MISSOURI
Joseph H. Lowrie, Gallatin.
Wade D. Moody, Pattonsburg.

MONTANA
Frank D. Stoltz, Park City.

NEBRASKA
Martha E. McDonald, Craig.
George M. Ponton, Elgin.
Martha P. Westfall, Polk.
John W. Martinosky, Sidney.

NEW HAMPSHIRE
James A. Reed, Union.

NEW JERSEY
Gertrude A. Fowler, Leesburg.

NEW YORK
George T. Morgan, Coxsackie.

NORTH CAROLINA
Elizabeth O. Howard, Ocracoke.
Robert O. Andrews, Tryon.

SOUTH DAKOTA
Helen E. Becker, Turton.

WEST VIRGINIA
Mary Allen, Filbert.
Ethel Calloway, Maybeury.

WISCONSIN
Thomas H. Murphy, Eau Claire.
Michael T. Foley, Marion.
Mark J. Finnegan, Beloit.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 8, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our Lord, we approach Thy mercy seat with heartfelt thanks for Thy goodness which has followed us all our days. Through all our passing years Thy mercy has been over us as a Nation and we pray Thee to dissolve our hearts in gratitude and merge our wills with Thine. By the inspiration of high idealism grant that the enemies of stalking fear and selfish ambition may not disturb our unity nor our decisions.

O Spirit Divine, amid the burden and the care, the labor and the calm, direct us as we bear the yoke of toil. In that rigid service which makes us master of desire, give us a thirst for that law which inspires and lifts above belittling influence and concentrates on the very best administration for our country. Enable us to see the crown in what was once our cross, the good in what was once our thorn, and the victory in what was once our trial. Throughout our land, wherever the rugged virtue of justice is lifting its warning finger and wherever the lamp of loyalty is burning dim, preserve us from all distempered imaginations. Let Thy wonderful love encircle all our homes and bless us with good health and comfort; may no plague come nigh our dwellings. Upon our notable Speaker, all Members, officers, and employees of the Congress, let Thy choicest blessings abide. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on Wednesday, July 7, 1943, the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On July 7, 1943:

H. R. 2349. An act to adjust the pay status of warrant officers temporarily commissioned in the Army of the United States;

H.R. 2943. An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government;

H. R. 3026. An act relating to appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy in the case of redistricting of congressional districts;

H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas; and

H. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution relating to the marketing of burley and flue-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 883. An act providing for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business;

S. 990. An act for the relief of the Washington, Brandywine & Point Lookout Railroad Co.; and

S. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to amend the National War Agencies Appropriation Act of 1944.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1900. An act to prevent the payment of excessive fees or compensation in connection with the negotiation of war contracts.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial from the magazine Trusts and Estates, entitled "The Two Fronts—In Washington."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain editorial material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM A. BARDEN

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, about 10 days ago it became necessary for my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina, Hon. GRAHAM A. BARDEN, to enter the hospital at Duke University for a tonsillar operation which his physicians advised should not be longer postponed. I am glad to report that he is recovering and expects to be out in a few days. We all know the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] as a faithful, able, and diligent Member of the House. I thought it only fair that the RECORD should show the circumstances which have made necessary his absence during the last 10 days.

RECOVERY BOND BILL

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection?

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill known as the recovery bond bill. This bill provides for bonds issued by the Government in denominations of $5, $25, and $50. These bonds to be used for the purchase of articles such as automobiles, radios, and all electrical appliances that have been discontinued for the duration of the war. You can use these bonds for cash when the manufacture of these articles is again resumed after this war.

These bonds will stimulate business after the war because the purchaser of these bonds will not be able to cash them in under 5 years from the date of issuance. The purchase of these bonds will also take some of the surplus money out of circulation which the experts tell us is necessary at this time due to the fact that we have more money in circulation than we have goods. The purchase of these bonds will also add to the revenue of our Government which is absolutely necessary at this time and must be accomplished through additional taxes or through the purchase of additional bonds, voluntarily or compulsory.

It is a known fact that thousands of people will be in the market for new automobiles, electric refrigerators, radios, and dozens of other things that have now been taken off the market. They can save their money by purchasing these bonds and be in a position to pay cash for the necessary articles when peacetime production is again started.

In other words, there are three good reasons why the citizens of the United States should purchase these bonds:

First. They will add revenue to the Government.

Second. They will stimulate business after this war is over.

Third. They will provide the citizens of our country with funds to purchase articles so badly needed by that time.

It is a known fact that the American people spend millions, yes even billions, of dollars each year for automobiles, radios, electric appliances, and other items that are not being manufactured today. The bulk of this business was done on the installment plan; thus we can get some idea of the enormous market for these bonds.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two particulars, in one to include a statement I have prepared on H. R. 1649, and in the other to include an editorial which appeared in the July 7, 1943, edition of the Toledo Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

(Mr. LAMBERTSON, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. BULWINKLE asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to read a portion of a letter that a young farmer wrote to me today. I am personally acquainted with this boy and I am bringing his letter to the attention of the House because it contains a sad story, and entirely too many farmers find themselves in the same situation. Such situations are going to affect our food supplies very seriously.

Quoting from his letter, he says:

I am having to give up farming because my only man was drafted into the Army. I had no help and could not get any for my two farms. I did not get out enough corn for my own needs, and the alfalfa has gone to waste in the fields. So, on June 28 I was forced to sell my herd of 80 Guernsey cows that I was 15 years in building up. I will salvage what I can over the summer and next winter I will sell out completely and go to the shops. I did not want to quit farming but it was absolutely impossible to get along. Without my herd of Guernseys I feel as though I have come to the end of the road.

CORN

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, it is a condition that confronts us and not a theory. Yesterday the other body passed a resolution raising the price ceiling on corn. There is no finer strain of poultry in existence than the New Hampshire Reds, but the chickens of New Hampshire do not know anything about price ceilings. What they want is corn. The corn is in existence. All it takes to bring it out is relief from the present low price which has led to its being hoarded or used for other purposes. It would be a serious injury to the food program of this country if this House should recess without having taken action on the resolution passed by the Senate yesterday.

Mr. FISH. What has the Committee on Agriculture done about that bill relating to the price ceiling on corn?

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. I certainly hope the Committee on Agriculture will act and act at once.

Mr. FISH. They ought to act before we recess.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address on the subject of our relations with post-war China, delivered by our brilliant colleague the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative program today and following any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address I delivered last evening over station WMAL with some others.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article which appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each instance to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper editorial by Mr. P. P. Yolles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Westmoreland Observer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include therein a letter and certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

U. S. S. "HELENA"

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

RACE DISORDERS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein excerpts from the Evening Star of yesterday and from a certain publication issued by the International Teamsters Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CEILING PRICE ON CORN

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, a bill came over from the Senate yesterday placing a ceiling price on corn at $1.40 a bushel. It is now before the Committee on Agriculture. Unless the Committee on Agriculture acts, there will be no relief for the farmers in the Eastern States. There will be no corn for our poultry and no corn for our dairy herds. The poultry and the cattle in the East and our eastern industries cannot live on promises, alibis, and excuses. The responsibility rests squarely upon this House to act and upon the Democratic majority before we recess. It is up to the Democratic majority on the Committee on Agriculture to act immediately and give the House a chance to vote to take the ceiling price off corn.

Mr. ARENDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. The Committee on Agriculture this morning listened to Marvin Jones regarding this problem. I

would like to ask the gentleman from New York if he has any solution of the problem?

Mr. FISH. I certainly have. I want you to bring that bill out and let the friends of the farmers in this House consider and amend it, and we will vote to take the ceiling price off corn, and that will start corn moving to the East. We must have corn for our poultry, our dairy cows, and for our industries, including vital war industries, now and not 2 months from now.

The situation is critical, and unless Congress acts to afford immediate relief to the eastern farmers by providing them with corn and feed grain, many of the eastern farmers, poultrymen, and dairymen will be ruined. The New Deal is responsible for the tragic situation and for the corn-hog alliance by its stupid price fixing. The handling of the farm problem has been the greatest failure and the most colossal blunder of all the New Deal experiments and has almost wrecked and ruined our farmers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the crisis in the corn situation is assuming proportions unprecedented in the history of any agricultural product in any previous time. We are being flooded with telegrams from all sections of the country. Farmers are without feed for their stock. Poultry, dairy herds, hogs, and cattle must be shot or shipped to market unfinished. Here is a typical telegram just received this morning:

HON. CLARENCE CANNON,
Washington, D. C.:

Inventory for Osage County completed yesterday shows a total of 150,000 bushels of corn, 1,500 bushels of wheat, approximately 50,000 hogs, 37,000 cattle, 250,000 chickens. Advise if livestock should be shipped out or if feed grain will be released.

DON K. SPALDING,
County Agent.
FRANK KREMER,
Chairman, War Board.

Processors are crying for corn and no corn is available to farmers, feed manufacturers, or industry. Plants using corn in the manufacture of critical materials essential to the war program are closing down. Something must be done immediately to release the stock of corn frozen by the price impasse. Congress cannot adjourn without reaching a practical solution of this problem. If the Congress adjourns with the corn situation as it is today it will freeze every bushel of corn on the farms today, because every farmer will say, "I am going to hold my corn until Congress comes back and takes some action on this matter." Let us have a resolution from the Committee on Agriculture to provide feed for man and beast before the adjournment resolution is brought in.

I insist, Mr. Speaker, that this House cannot adjourn without disposing of this problem.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 250)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State to the end that legislation may be enacted appropriating the sum of $141,037.61 for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who have sustained losses by reason of war conditions which have been prevailing in all parts of the world during the past 5 years.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 8, 1943.*

THE CORN SITUATION

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I realize the fact that the corn situation in the United States is rather acute, but the fact remains that Mr. Chester Davis, the former War Food Administrator, issued an order saying to the farmers of the country that the price of corn was fixed at $1.07 per bushel and would not be increased until October 31 of this year. To pass the resolution which passed the Senate yesterday would be a breach of faith on the part of the Government with the farmers of America who have relied upon that statement and sold their corn. We are faced with a situation which might prove to be embarrassing to the Office of Price Administration, but it is a situation which that Office got itself into. In my opinion neither the O. P. A. nor this Congress should break faith with the farmers who relied upon the statement made by Mr. Davis.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. How in the world are you going to break faith with the American farmers by raising the price of corn? That is starting to keep faith with them.

Mr. COOLEY. The Food Administrator, Mr. Davis, told the farmers that the price of corn would not be increased above $1.07, and relying upon that promise many of our farmers have already sold their corn.

Mr. RANKIN. By keeping their prices down to starvation levels does the gentleman think we are breaking faith when we seek to raise the prices?

Mr. COOLEY. We would break faith in that Mr. Davis told the farmers that he would not raise the price of corn, and on the strength of that promise or agreemen they sold their corn. The effect would be to penalize those who went along with the Government and pay a premium to those who would not go along.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from North Carolina would not blame somebody for not going along when they are told to keep the price of corn below the cost of production, would he?

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman that our farmers should have more for their corn.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. When we realize the fact that at the present time the price of hogs is $13.75 and the fact that with the existing price of corn it is going to bring more to the farmer who feeds his hogs, what is the gentleman's suggestion as to a solution?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know what can be done, but I do know this, that it is a bad situation that the Office of Price Administration has to work out in some way and I know further that Congress cannot afford to deal with one isolated commodity.

I think the bill should have been entitled "A bill to create and legalize black markets in corn."

I did not vote to create the Office of Price Administration. Neither have I voted for any law which would authorize the War Food Administrator to place ceiling prices upon farm commodities, but notwithstanding my views the O. P. A. was created and the War Food Administrator was authorized, by Executive order or otherwise, to make the statement he made regarding price ceilings on corn. If the O. P. A. or the War Food Administrator are responsible for our present predicament, the agency or person responsible should be permitted to find a solution. I am sure that many farmers, relying upon the statement made by Mr. Davis, have sold their corn at $1.07 a bushel. I am likewise sure that much corn is now in the hands of speculators. Would it be morally right for the Government or any agency or individual connected therewith to assure the farmers that we would not permit the price of corn to be raised and thereby encourage them to sell their corn, and after they have sold it and the corn has gone into the hands of speculators, then by act of Congress force the price up or permit it to rise to $1.40 a bushel? It is plain to see that we would be penalizing patriotic farmers and bailing out and rewarding speculators and those who have withheld their corn from the market?

Think of the effect of such procedure upon the morale of the honest and patriotic farmers of America. Think also of the absurdity of Congress attempting to fix prices upon individual commodities in the manner proposed by the Senate bill which passed that body on yesterday. If we fix the price on corn, by the same token we should fix the price on cotton and every other commodity. Frankly, it is a silly suggestion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the RECORD and include therein a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

THE CORN SITUATION

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned over this corn situation because I am getting letters and telegrams from constituents who are poultry and dairy farmers who have had no promise from the Office of Price Administration. Apparently these promises were made for the benefit of the Midwest and South, with little thought of the interest of New England and the Northeast. In other words, the people were told to raise more and more poultry and more dairy products and cattle, and they have done that. Now they have no feed, no grain for their poultry and no feed for their cattle. On the other hand, the Office of Price Administration has placed a support under the price of hogs at $13.75 and a ceiling price of $1.07 for corn. The result is that the farmers of the Midwest have got to use their corn to raise hogs at $13.75 in order to secure the most money for their corn, and they are not putting their corn on the market.

I think the Office of Price Administration and the Government owe a duty to the dairy farmers and the poultry farmers of the United States to bring in other grains, wheat or barley, for the relief of these farmers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SABATH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

INCREASING PRICE BY LEGISLATIVE ACTION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this question of raising the price of any commodity by legislative action is a very serious thing. There are about 8,000,000 different kinds of products and commodities, and if we adopt the policy of raising one, it will be used as a precedent. Furthermore, do you know whether or not you will get corn even if you raise the price to $1.40? Would you have any assurance that the people who have cattle, hogs, and this corn are not going to use it for their own livestock? Thus you have no assurance whatever that this price will bring corn to the market or that the same parties sponsoring this proposal will not be back here and ask Congress to raise the price of corn to $1.75 a bushel, or $2, or $2.50. If you adopt that kind of policy, if you set that kind of precedent, you will have all kinds of clamor, not only to increase the price of corn again and again, but also the price of other commodities and thus break up price control entirely and have runaway inflation and "black markets" sure enough.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts and some tables.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CORN PRICES

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the corn-for-feed situation is not especially a problem of the East. In my own district the processors of corn are having difficulty getting corn to grind for chicken feed and for other feeding purposes. It seems to me the only solution to this problem will be to lift the ceiling on the price of corn altogether and let the age-old law of supply and demand handle the situation. With a billion bushels of corn in storage right now, I do not believe by any stretch of the imagination that the price of corn will skyrocket. It will increase only to parity with meat, or about $1.40 a bushel. We must not adjourn until this and other problems are solved. Frankly, I do not believe it a wise policy for us to adjourn at all with our country at war and our domestic economy in such a mess.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a statement by Idaho producers, dealers, wholesalers, and farmers.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two letters.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, right now is the time when the Commodity Credit Corporation is on trial, and right now they are putting out releases indicating that they intend to do foolish things. How they can expect to obtain the confidence of the Congress when they are doing that is beyond me. I have here a release from them saying they intend to go out and buy up the whole potato crop this next fall. That would be a menace to the supply of potatoes all over the country; that would create another situation that would bring distress upon the consuming public but would not help the farmer.

I think the Commodity Credit Corporation must realize that until they begin to approach in an intelligent manner the problems they have to face, and quit this monkeying around and fooling with subsidies we are going to be in more and more trouble all the time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3030), making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3030) "making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 25 and 27.

Amendment numbered 8: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House, insert the following:

"WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

"National Youth Administration: For an additional amount for the National Youth Administration in the performance of its functions from July 1, 1943, to the date of enactment of the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1944, and thereafter for the liquidation of such Administration, including not to exceed $2,000 for printing and

binding, not to exceed $1,500,000 from the unexpended balance of the appropriations for the National Youth Administration in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1943, to be added to and merged with the funds made available for the liquidation of the National Youth Administration by such Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1944; and of such merged amount not less than $1,487,000 shall be allocated and set apart to be used exclusively for payment of accumulated and accrued leave of employees: *Provided*, That all real and personal property of the National Youth Administration is hereby declared surplus, and all equipment, materials, and supplies shall be assembled, inventoried, and turned over to the Director of Procurement, Treasury Department, under Executive Order 9235 by the Administrator of the National Youth Administration as expeditiously as possible, and all real property shall be disposed of by the Commissioner of Public Buildings in accordance with the Act of August 27, 1935 (40 U. S. C. 304 (a) and 304 (b)): *Provided further*, That, under commitment to return such property to the United States at borrower's expense, any real or personal property of the National Youth Administration in use on June 30, 1943, by any non-Federal vocational education authority within any State may continue to be so used during the period of the present war and for not to exceed six months after the termination thereof, without compensation, but in no event beyond the date such property ceases to be used for vocational education purposes: *Provided further*, That during such period, the Director of Procurement, in the case of personal property, and the Commissioner of Public Buildings, in the case of real property, upon certificate of the United States Commissioner of Education that such property is to be used for vocational education and training, may loan, without compensation, to any such existing non-Federal vocational education authority, if applied for within ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act, any real or personal property of the National Youth Administration not required by any other Federal Agency (excepting the Lend-Lease Administration) or otherwise loaned under the authority of this paragraph, if such borrower agrees, in the case of personal property, to pay all expenses incident to obtaining and returning such property."

And the House agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 24 and 26.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARTER GLASS,
CARL HAYDEN,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate Nos. 8, 9, 24, 25, 26, and 27 to the bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 8: Senate amendment No. 8 permitted the continuation of the publication and public distribution of the United States Government Manual by the Office of War Information notwithstanding the provisions of the National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1944. To this amendment the House added an additional paragraph postponing until August 16, 1943, the effective date of the provision in the National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1944, prohibiting payment of salary to any person in the Office of Price Administration engaged in directing any program of price policy, price ceiling, or maximum price, unless such person, in the judgment of the Administrator, be qualified by experience in business, industry, or commerce. The Senate accepts the House amendment. The effect of the action of both bodies is to include in the bill both amendments relating to the Office of War Information and the Office of Price Administration.

No. 9: The Senate included provision relative to disposition of the property of National Youth Administration requiring the Director of Procurement to transfer to any State or State board of vocational education, or county or county board of education, without compensation, any real or personal property of the National Youth Administration which such public body might make application for within 60 days.

The House substituted for this Senate amendment a provision which accomplished the following:

1. Declares all property of the National Youth Administration to be surplus immediately upon the signing of this bill.

2. Directs that all personal property be assembled, inventoried, and turned over to the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department under Executive Order 9235 as expeditiously as possible.

3. Directs that all real property be disposed of by the Commissioner of Public Buildings under the provisions of the act of August 27, 1935.

4. Permits, under commitment of the borrower to return such property to the United States at his expense, any real or personal property of the National Youth Administration in use on June 30 last by any State or other public vocational education authority to continue to be so used during the period of the present war and for not to exceed 6 months thereafter, without compensation, so long as it continues to be used for vocational education purposes.

5. Provides that other property of the National Youth Administration, if not required by other Federal agencies, may be loaned to any State or other public vocational education authority, without compensation, for vocational education and training, for use during the period of the war and not to exceed 6 months thereafter, if applied for within 90 days, if the borrower agrees in the case of personal property to pay all expenses incident to obtaining and returning such property, and if the United States Commissioner of Education certifies that it is to be used for vocational education and training.

6. Provides an additional $1,500,000 from previous unexpended balances of the National Youth Administration to cover operations from July 1, 1943, until the date of the enactment of the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1944, and for further expenses of liquidation; adds this amount to the $3,000,000 for liquidation expenses in the 1944 appropriation act; and provides that of the combined amount of $4,500,000, which is available until January 1, 1944, not less than $1,487,000 shall be set apart exclusively for payment of accumulated and accrued annual leave of employees.

The Senate offered modifying amendments to the foregoing House proposal, which the House conferees have accepted. The first modification provides that none of the National Youth Administration property shall be disposed of under lend-lease. The second modification makes the provisions of the House amendment applicable to any "non-Federal vocational education authority" instead of to "State or other public vocational education authority". This change has the effect of making the House provision applicable to State, other local public vocational education authority, and to private vocational education authority and is broader in scope than the original House amendment.

No. 25: The Senate inserted an additional $4,318,748 for Federal Crop Insurance and a provision repealing the paragraph in the Agricultural Appropriation Act, 1944, for discontinuance of such insurance. The Senate recedes from this amendment.

No. 27: Eliminates the appropriation of $8,832,000, inserted by the Senate, for continuance of work on certain airports which was discontinued by the closing down of the Work Projects Administration.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendments are reported in disagreement:

Nos. 24 and 26: Appropriating $15,000,000 for assistance to farmers in the areas devastated by floods in 1943. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment No. 24 with an amendment.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the managers on the part of the House submit a very satisfactory report and one which I hope will meet with the general approval of the House.

As will be noticed from the statement, the Senate has receded on a large number of these amendments and on the two most controversial amendments, the amendment providing for the continuation of crop insurance and the amendment relative to completion of airports.

The amendment providing for the conservation and distribution of the surplus property of the National Youth Administration is submitted in the form in which it was submitted yesterday with two exceptions.

Under the version in yesterday's conference report, surplus property for vocational education could be lent to public institutions only. Under the language of the Senate amendment private institutions were excluded. The report submitted today modifies the language to read, "to non-Federal institutions," so that under the conference report as submitted this morning, N. Y. A. property now in the possession of schools other than public school is also left there and upon application by schools other than public schools for use of this material it can be lent to them under the conditions approved as heretofore.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. The chairman is very correct in his statement that as the N. Y. A. matter was brought in here originally, all of the facilities would be removed from all institutions of every kind that were not public schools. The idea of the committee was that the work should be continued, if possible, under school headings and if it were so used in universities or any other private institutions, as well as county institutions and State institutions, wherever it happened to be, that it would be lent to them and they would be charged for any damage that was done other than for ordinary wear and tear.

Under the improved language, as the chairman has said, the inserting of the word "non-Federal" does away with the N. Y. A. completely. It was the decision of the Congress to permit the use of this material for purposes of continued training wherever it happens to be, provided they are using it for that purpose, otherwise it is left to the discretion of the Federal Government to dispose of it.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to ask a question: Under this provision, if these facilities we will say are in a school building and this measure passes, they are loaned, as I understand it, to the school. Is it used then under the exclusive supervision of the school authorities without Federal interference?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes; it is lent to them.

Mr. RANKIN. There is no Federal interference by any Federal agency to disturb that?

Mr. RABAUT. The only Federal interference that could come, as I understand it, would be if it were needed for the Army or Navy for something that they were doing.

Mr. RANKIN. The Army and Navy could take that at any time?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. At any time they needed it?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, we are all for that.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I would like to make one slight correction. The material which is now in the schools cannot be moved from those schools as long as it is being used for vocational education. Even the Army and Navy cannot take it from such schools where it is now in use as long as it is used for that purpose, but material not in the schools, or which may be relinquished by schools, is subject to disposal and purchase by the Army and Navy and other Federal agencies—with one exception. That exception is the other change in the item.

As submitted yesterday, the Federal agencies took priority for any material they wanted and for which they would pay, after the schools had been allowed the equipment they were now using. There was no limitation of agencies. The conferees this time have provided one exception—the Lend-Lease Administration. Any Federal agency has priority except Lend-Lease. Of course, the purpose in excluding Lend-Lease is to prevent material from being transported outside the boundaries of the continental United States.

Mr. RANKIN. Suppose there is a school that has vocational training that does not have any of these facilities. Can it secure these facilities that are relinquished at other establishments?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All that is necessary is that the board of education having jurisdiction make application and they will be entitled to any of it subject, of course, to the priorities of other Government agencies.

Mr. RANKIN. That is, the Army and the Navy.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Any Government agency excepting Lend-Lease and including the Army and Navy. Material now in the schools cannot be moved and material not in schools and not purchased by Government agencies having priority may be allotted to any other school submitting approved application, for vocational education purposes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In a case where the National Youth Administration has established a unit and has equipment and materials for training war workers, and there is a desire on the part of the local community, including the county and the city near which it is located, to obtain those facilities for vocational training, what is the procedure under the terms of the agreement between the House and the Senate that will enable the local communities to obtain it?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Material in schools which are using it for vocational training——

Mr. WHITTINGTON. This is not in schools.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I understand; I am merely prefacing my statement. That material which is in institutions now using it for vocational education cannot be disturbed, but N. Y. A. material, wherever placed, or however used, is subject to the priority of the Government agencies. This material is in great demand. I will say, as I said yesterday, that the Army and the Navy are crying for some of this material. They will have first call. If in the exercise of their priorities no Government agency takes it, it is then subject to sale.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As I understand, if the United States Commissioner of Education, upon the recommendation of the State vocational board, certifies that those buildings or equipment where these units are established outside of any connection with any local school are to be used for vocational training, the Director of Procurement would give consideration to their application to acquire the property for vocational training.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is the requisite. There must be due certification by the Commissioner of Education.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I feel that this training equipment should go to those public schools which have been doing so large a part of this training and doing it so well. What agency now has control of this material and equipment? Is it the Procurement Division or is it the N. Y. A. up until January 1?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The Procurement Division has jurisdiction of personal property. Real estate is subject to Public Buildings.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. Where the Federal priorities are waived, does that give the local school authorities the right to take over all the properties that are found in these activities and use them for vocational education purposes?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They do not have to wait for it to be waived if it is now in local educational institutions and is being used for vocational education; they can continue to use it and without waiver by any agency.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. There seems to be some change made in this amendment since yesterday. I am anxious to get the exact provision. As I understand, all of this material of the N. Y. A. will be declared surplus and placed with the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department, and the War Department and the Navy Department under existing law will have a prior claim. Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It may first be claimed by those schools in which it is now being used for vocational education purposes. That is the first priority. The second priority is to Government agencies with the exception of Lend-Lease.

Mr. HARE. Then would not the United States Office of Education be classed as a Government agency, and could not the Office of Education make requisition for all of this material and use it in its vocational-training practices, thereby excluding the War and Navy

Departments entirely or any other Government agency?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The distinction there is that while it is a Government agency the requisition would not be for the use of a Government agency, it would be for the use of a local agency.

Mr. HARE. The United States Office of Education has charge of vocational training courses; that is, the only vocational training courses we have now in the States are under the supervision and direction of the Office of Education.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It would have to be for the use of a Government agency. The fact that it would be for the use of a local agency would leave it without priority.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. How would this amendment work out in a case like this? In Norfolk the N. Y. A. took over an old, abandoned boys' academy and equipped it and did very good work with it. Now they are going out of business. How would a high school which has vocational education go about getting some of this equipment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Is it sponsored by the local school board?

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Yes; operated by the local school board.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If it is sponsored and operated by the local school board, that machinery cannot be disturbed.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. I mean the N. Y. A. has been operating it by itself previously.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In that case it would have to wait until the Army and the Navy exercised their priority. If they do not want it, the school board could make application.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. If they do not want it, they would make application to the Procurement Division of the Treasury?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The United States Commissioner of Education must certify that it is for use in vocational training.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I feel that while this conference report is before us I should call the attention of the House and the country to the way in which the intentions of Congress are being carried out by one of the agencies which Congress has abolished, the National Youth Administration.

I have before me this morning's Times-Herald. In it there is this press release, very evidently from the N. Y. A.:

CLOTHING ROTS AS NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION LAUNDRY IS "WASHED OUT" BY CONGRESS

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.—An $80,000 laundry operated by the National Youth Administration at nearby Slossfield lay idle today with 15,000 pounds of soiled and wet-wash laundry rotting in its bins.

W. McKay Wright, area manager of National Youth Administration, said no funds were provided to finish the cleaning when the Federal agency was liquidated by Congress, effective last Saturday.

Now here is the picture: They were given $3,000,000 in that bill which closed them up, in order to liquidate. Instead of spending the money for liquidating and cleaning up the laundry that they had on the way they have evidently spent the money for publicity agents to give out false statements relative to the situation. Publicity agents are not a part of the liquidation, and it is about time that that gang was brought up short. I wonder how many of these telegrams that they sent out since this legislation was got together have been paid for by the Government? It is about time that people of that type had their wings clipped and clipped good and proper.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on June 10 the Department of State issued a release to the press stating in part that "a draft agreement for United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was placed" on that day by the Department of State before the governments of all the United Nations and the other nations associated with them in this war.

Very little publicity was given, but as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House these items aroused my interest and I began making inquiries. I found that the majority and minority leaders of both Houses had been called to the White House, where they were given the general outline of the idea involved. No member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee nor of the House Foreign Affairs Committee was invited to be present.

In view of the importance of the proposed agreement, your committee invited Mr. Acheson, of the State Department, to appear before it to give the history of its development and to discuss the organization and purposes set up. Even a superficial reading develops the certainty that this proposal can well be the outline of a possible pattern contemplated by the executive department for post-war international structure.

Your committee was informed that the draft agreement has been agreed to in principle by the four great powers, Russia, China, Great Britain, and the United States; that discussions are under way with the other 40 nations to which it has been sent for study; that a conference will be called as early this fall as can be arranged.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this draft agreement cannot be too carefully studied. There is little doubt in the minds of many members of your Foreign Affairs Committee that it can well be called the shadow of things to come. It is inconceivable that the people of this country will not want to assume their rightful share of the relief and rehabilitation of the devastated countries, but we should watch carefully all agreements with such far-reaching implications as this appears to have.

If the executive department is committing the United States to an agreement of vast implications imposing a moral obligation on the Congress for the fulfillment of these commitments, every Member of this House will want to be thoroughly informed. Therefore, I am inserting herewith copy of the release of June 10.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting a copy of the release of June 10.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The release referred to follows:

A draft agreement for a United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was placed today by the Department of State before the Governments of all the United Nations and the other nations associated with them in this war. These nations were informed that the draft agreement had been drawn up in consultation with the British Government, the Soviet Government, and the Chinese Government, and that the draft proposal meets with the approval of the four governments. The other governments were assured, however, that the plan is still tentative and that no action will be proposed until they all have had an opportunity for full consideration and discussion of the suggested line of approach to this all-important problem.

The draft agreement would provide for the immediate establishment of a central United Nations agency to assume responsibility for the relief and rehabilitation of the victims of war. It is hoped that preliminary discussions among all the United Nations and the nations associated with them will speedily clear the way for a meeting of all these nations at which a definite agreement will be reached providing for joint action on relief and rehabilitation. No definite arrangements, however, have been made as yet for a meeting of the United Nations and the other nations involved on the subject of this draft proposal, and no arrangements will be made until all the powers have had an opportunity to consider and discuss the draft agreement fully.

The following nations, in addition to the United States, have signed the United Nations Declaration of January 1, 1942: Great Britain, the Soviet Union, China, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Iraq, Luxemburg, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, the Philippines, Poland, South Africa, and Yugoslavia.

The nations associated with the United Nations in this war are: Chile, Colombia, Egypt, Ecuador, Iceland, Iran, Liberia, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

The draft agreement is also being brought to the attention of the appropriate French authorities.

The text of the draft agreement submitted to these nations is attached.

TEXT OF DRAFT AGREEMENT FOR UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

The governments or authorities whose duly authorized epresentatives have subscribed hereto,

Being United Nations or being associated with the United Nations in this war,

Being determined that immediately upon the liberation of any area by the armed forces of the United Nations the population thereof shall receive aid and relief from their sufferings, food, clothing, and shelter, aid in the prevention of pestilence and in the recovery of the health of the people, and

that preparation and arrangements shall be made for the return of prisoners and exiles to their homes, for the resumption of agricultural and industrial production and the restoration of essential services, to the end that peoples once freed may be preserved and restored to health and strength for the tasks and opportunities of building anew,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

There is hereby established the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

1. The Administration shall have power to acquire, hold, and convey property, to enter into contracts and undertake obligations, to designate or create agencies and to review the activities of agencies so created, to manage undertakings, and in general to perform any legal act appropriate to its objects and purposes.

2. Subject to the provisions of article VII, the purposes and functions of the Administration shall be as follows:

(a) To plan, coordinate, administer, or arrange for the administration of measures for the relief of victims of war in any area under the control of any of the United Nations through the provision of food, fuel, clothing, and other basic necessities, housing facilities, medical and other essential services; and to facilitate in areas receiving relief the production and transportation of these articles and the furnishing of these services so far as necessary to the adequate provision of relief. The form of activities of the Administration within the territory of a member government wherein that government exercises administrative authority and the responsibility to be assumed by the member government for carrying out measures planned by the Administration therein shall be determined after consultation with and with the consent of the member government.

(b) To formulate and recommend measures for individual or joint action by any or all of the member governments for the coordination of purchasing, the use of ships and other procurement activities in the period following the cessation of hostilities, with a view to integrating the plans and activities of the Administration with the total movement of supplies, and for the purpose of achieving an equitable distribution of available supplies. The Administration may administer such coordination measures as the member governments authorize.

(c) To formulate and recommend for individual or joint action by any or all of the member governments measures with respect to such related matters, arising out of its experience in planning and performing the work of relief and rehabilitation, as may be proposed by any of the member governments and approved by unanimous vote of the central committee.

ARTICLE II

Membership

The members of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall be the governments or authorities signatory hereto and such other governments or authorities as may upon application for membership be admitted thereto by action by the council or between sessions of the council, by the central committee.

Wherever the term "member government" is used in this agreement it shall be construed to embrace such authorities as shall have signed the agreement or shall subsequently become members of the Administration.

ARTICLE III

The council

1. Each member government shall name one representative, and such alternates as may be necessary, upon the council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, which shall be the policy-making body of the Administration. The council shall, for each of its sessions, select one of its members to preside at the session.

2. The council shall be convened in normal session not less than twice a year by the central committee. It may be convened in special session whenever the central committee shall deem necessary, and shall be convened within 30 days after request therefore by a majority of the members of the council.

3. The central committee of the council shall consist of the representatives of China, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America, with the Director General presiding. Between sessions of the council it shall exercise all the powers and functions thereof. It shall invite the participation of the representatives of any member government at those of its meetings at which action of special interest to such government is discussed. It shall invite the participation of the representative serving as chairman of the committee on supplies of the council at those of its meetings at which policies affecting the provision of supplies are discussed.

4. The committee on supplies of the council shall consist of the members of the council, or their alternates, representing those member governments likely to be principal suppliers of materials for relief and rehabilitation. The members shall be appointed by the central committee, with the approval of the council if it be in session and otherwise subject to its ratification. The committee on supplies shall consider, formulate, and recommend to the central committee and the council policies designed to assure the provision of required supplies. The central committee shall from time to time meet with the committee on supplies to review policy matters affecting supplies.

5. The committee of the council for Europe shall consist of all the members of the council, or their alternates, representing member governments of territories within the European area, and such other members of the council, representing other governments directly concerned with the problems of relief and rehabilitation in the European area, as shall be appointed by the central committee, with the approval of the council if it be in session and otherwise subject to its ratification. The committee of the council for the Far East shall consist of all the members of the council, or their alternates, representing member governments of territories within the far eastern area, and such other members of the council representing other governments directly concerned with the problems of relief and rehabilitation in the far eastern area as shall be appointed by the central committee, with the approval of the council if it be in session and otherwise subject to the council's ratification. The regional committees shall normally meet within their respective areas. They shall consider and recommend to the council and the central committee policies with respect to relief and rehabilitation within their respective areas. The committee of the council for Europe shall replace the inter-allied committee on European post-war relief established in London on September 24, 1941, and the records of the latter shall be made available to the committee for Europe.

6. The council shall establish such other standing regional committees as it shall consider desirable, the functions of such committees, and the method of appointing their members being identical to that provided in paragraph 5 of this article with respect to the committees of the council for Europe and for the Far East. The council shall also establish such other standing committees as it considers desirable to advise it, and, in intervals between sessions of the council, to advise the central committee. For such technical standing committees as may be established, in respect of particular problems such as nutrition, health, agriculture, transport, repatriation, and finance, the members may be members of the council or alternates nominated by them because of special competence in their respective fields of work. The members shall be appointed by the central committee, with the approval of the council if it be in session and otherwise subject to its ratification. Should a regional committee so desire, subcommittees of the technical standing committees shall be established by the technical committees in consultation with the regional committees, to advise the regional committees.

7. The travel and other expenses of members of the council and of members of its committees shall be borne by the governments which they represent.

8. All reports and recommendations of committees of the council shall be transmitted to the Director General for distribution to the council and the central committee by the secretariat of the council established under the provisions of article IV, paragraph 4.

ARTICLE IV

The Director General

1. The executive authority of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall be in the Director General, who shall be appointed by the council on the nomination by unanimous vote of the central committee. The Director General may be removed by unanimous vote of the central committee.

2. The Director General shall have full power and authority for carrying out relief operations contemplated by article I, paragraph 2 (a), within the limits of available resources and the broad policies determined by the council or its central committee. Immediately upon taking office he shall in conjunction with the military and other appropriate authorities of the United Nations prepare plans for the emergency relief of the civilian population in any area occupied by the armed forces of any of the United Nations, arrange for the procurement and assembly of the necessary supplies and create or select the emergency organization required for this purpose. In arranging for the procurement, transportation, and distribution of supplies and services, he and his representatives shall consult and collaborate with the appropriate authorities of the United Nations and shall, wherever practicable, use the facilities made available by such authorities. Foreign voluntary relief agencies may not engage in activity in any area receiving relief from the Administration without the consent and unless subject to the regulation of the Director General. The powers and duties of the Director General are subject to the limitations of article VII.

3. The Director General shall also be responsible for the organization and direction of the functions contemplated by article I, paragraphs 2 (b) and 2 (c).

4. The Director General shall appoint such Deputy Directors General, officers, expert personnel, and staff at his headquarters and elsewhere, including field missions, as he shall find necessary, and he may delegate to them such of his powers as he may deem appropriate. The Director General, or upon his authorization the Deputy Directors General, shall supply such secretariat and other staff and facilities as shall be required by the council and its committees, including the regional committees and subcommittees. Such Deputy Directors General as shall be assigned special functions within a region shall attend meetings of the regional standing committee whenever possible and shall keep it advised on the progress of the relief and rehabilitation program within the region.

5. The Director General shall make periodic reports to the central committee and to the council covering the progress of the

Administration's activities. The reports shall be made public except for such portions as the central committee may consider it necessary, in the interest of the United Nations, to keep confidential. The Director General shall also arrange to have prepared periodic reports covering the activities of the Administration within each region, and he shall transmit such reports with his comments thereon to the council, the central committee, and the respective regional committees.

ARTICLE V

Supplies and resources

1. Each member government pledges its full support to the Administration, within the limits of its available resources and subject to the requirements of its constitutional procedure, through contributions of funds, materials, equipment, supplies, and services, for use in its own, adjacent, or other areas in need, in order to accomplish the purposes of article I, paragraph 2 (a). All such contributions received by the Administration shall be accounted for.

2. The supplies and resources made available by the member governments shall be kept in review in relation to prospective requirements by the Director General, who shall initiate action with the member governments with a view to assuring such additional supplies and resources as may be required.

3. All purchases by any of the member governments, made outside their own territories during the war for relief or rehabilitation purposes, shall be made only after consultation with the Director General, and shall, so far as practicable, be carried out through the appropriate United Nations agency.

ARTICLE VI

Administrative expenses

The Director General shall submit to the council an annual budget, and from time to time such supplementary budgets as may be required, covering the necessary administrative expenses of the Administration. Upon approval of a budget by the council, the total amount approved shall be allocated to the member governments in proportions to be determined by the council. Each member government pledges itself, subject to the requirements of its constitutional procedure, to contribute to the administration promptly its share of the administrative expenses so determined.

ARTICLE VII

Notwithstanding any other provision herein contained, while hostilities or other military necessities exist in any area, the administration and its Director General shall not undertake activities therein without the consent of the military command of that area, and unless subject to such control as the command may find necessary. The determination that such hostilities or military necessities exist in any area shall be made by its military commander.

ARTICLE VIII

Amendment

The provisions of this agreement may be amended by unanimous vote of the central committee and two-thirds vote of the council.

ARTICLE IX

Entry into force

This agreement shall enter into force with respect to each signatory on the date when the agreement is signed by that signatory, unless otherwise specified by such signatory.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I have read the statement made in the press that between the 5th of January 1943, when this Congress met and the time it expects to recess today, July 8, it will have appropriated $130,000,000,000. This is a larger sum than I had thought we were appropriating. What does the gentleman say without being exact to the dollar what sum the Congress will have appropriated if this bill that is now in controversy is approved?

Mr. TABER. I would not want to say for sure, but the amount appropriated is well over 115 or 120 billions; I have not the figure exactly.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will permit, it aggregates approximately $115,000,000,000.

Mr. TABER. One hundred and fifteen billion dollars?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; for the session.

Mr. TABER. Does it include the pending bills?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; it includes pending appropriation bills. We are by this time able to estimate them with fair accuracy. In round figures the total amount appropriated for the session will aggregate approximately $115,000,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me to submit the request at this time, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include at this point a complete statement of the various appropriations made at this session.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The following statement is a listing of the various appropriations acts during the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress. These amounts are the direct appropriations enacted during the session. The total of slightly in excess of $114,000,000,000 compares with a total similarly appropriated at the last session of the Seventy-seventh Congress of $147,000,000,000.

Total of appropriation bills for direct appropriations, 78th Cong., 1st sess.

Agricultural Appropriation Act, 1944	$848, 295, 883. 00
District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1944	55, 466, 565. 00
Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1944	2, 621, 366, 879. 00
Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1944	104, 608, 921. 00
Labor-Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1944:	
Department of Labor	27, 794, 050. 00
Federal Security Agency	719, 749, 460. 00
Other related independent agencies	389, 623, 500. 00
Total	1, 137, 167, 010. 00
Legislative-Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1944:	
Legislative	28, 363, 988. 00
The Judiciary	12, 530, 490. 00
Total	40, 894, 478. 00
Military Appropriation Act, 1944	59, 034, 839, 673. 00
Naval Appropriation Act, 1944, and deficiencies, 1943	27, 637, 226, 198. 00
State, Justice, and Commerce Departments Appropriation Act, 1944:	
State Department	33, 523, 100. 00
Department of Justice	102, 657, 300. 00
Department of Commerce	85, 225, 000. 00
Total	221, 405, 400. 00
Treasury and Post Office Departments Appropriation Act, 1944:	
Treasury Department	$201, 222, 740. 00
Post Office Department	899, 468, 535. 00
Total	1, 100, 691, 275. 00
War Department civil functions, 1944	63, 657, 098. 00
Total, regular annual acts	92, 865, 619, 380. 00
Deficiency and supplemental acts:	
First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943	4, 106, 261, 194. 96
Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943	22, 410, 676. 17
Naval Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1943	3, 836, 176, 119. 00
Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1943 and 1944	26, 100, 000. 00
Further Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943	7, 246, 700. 00
Further Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943	143, 430, 591. 56
Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act (lend-lease), fiscal 1944	6, 273, 629, 000. 00
National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1944	2, 911, 697, 224. 00
Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943	253, 256, 179. 72
Total, supplemental and deficiency acts	17, 580, 207, 685. 41
Grand total, all appropriation acts	110, 445, 827, 065. 41
Permanent appropriations (exclusive of trust funds):	
Interest on the public debt, 1944	3, 000, 000, 000. 00
Public debt retirement funds, 1944	593, 907, 551. 00
Miscellaneous, 1944	197, 982, 958. 00
	3, 791, 890, 509. 00
Grand total	114, 237, 718, 574. 41

Mr. TABER. Does the $115,000,000,000 include the reappropriations?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; it is not customary to include reappropriations in such statements. To do so would be counting such funds twice. They were included in the total tabulation of the appropriations for the last session of the Seventy-seventh Congress. To include them here would amount to duplication. The total appropriations for the last session of Congress amounted to $147,000,000,000. The total for this session is $115,000,000,000 and we cannot include the same funds as an appropriation in the last session and as a reappropriation in this session. For that reason reappropriations are always omitted in comparative session statements.

Mr. TABER. The reappropriations run somewhere around $15,000,000,000, and this sum would lapse into the Treasury if it were not reappropriated. Considering therefore the amount of money this Congress has made available it is necessary to include the reappropriations and this would make approximately the figure the gentleman from Kentucky suggested, $130,000,000,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Likewise, the reappropriations next year will run somewhere around $15,000,000,000 and would also lapse into the Treasury if not reappropriated. But after counting them as appropriations this year we cannot again count the same money in the form of reappropriations next year. It is as long as it is broad, and the amount mentioned by the gentleman from Kentucky is in error. The appropriations have been accurately tabulated by the clerks of the committee who have been making these estimates for many years, and the final figure for the session is $115,000,000,000.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I would like to inquire of the Chairman of the Ap-

propriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, how much of this $130,000,000,000——

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is $115,000,000,000.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. One hundred and thirty billion dollars if you include the $15,000,000,000 that have been reappropriated.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But you cannot include the $15,000,000,000 of reappropriations because they have already been counted when originally appropriated in the last session. If you include them here then you must take out the $15,000,000,000 which will not be spent this year and will be reappropriated next year. From year to year the unexpended balances reappropriated average about the same from one session to another.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The $15,000,000,000 that have not been spent would revert to the Treasury but for the reappropriations. I just want to get the facts. How much of this $130,000,000,000——

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is $115,000,000,000.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. One hundred and thirty billion dollars is the amount that we have appropriated; $15,000,000,000 of it has been reappropriated and $115,000,000,000 is new appropriation since the 6th of January 1943. What I am trying to find out is how much of that goes for the purpose of prosecuting the war.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If you add the approximate $15,000,000,000 reappropriated from last year you will have to take out the approximately $15,000,000,000 which will remain unexpended at the end of this year and will be reappropriated for next year. So the total amount for the session is $115,000,000,000. Of this amount all except about six or seven billion dollars is for the prosecution of the war. Of the $147,000,000,000 appropriated last year, something like seven to nine billion was for Government establishments, that is, for nonwar purposes and the remainder was for the war program. During this session we have cut down nonwar expenditures somewhat and all of the $115,000,000,000 appropriated this session goes for the prosecution of the war with the exception of some six or seven billion dollars for other purposes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Missouri for the information.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, of course the conference report now contains only two amendments still in disagreement, therefore any discussion of those amendments not in disagreement is largely a waste of time; yet I think it is justified and I wish to discuss for just a few moments the amendment I sought to offer yesterday, not because I think anything can be done about it as far as this bill is concerned, but because I believe that this Congress before it recesses should make some provision for the crying needs which that amendment sought to relieve.

That amendment sought to provide $6,000,000 to carry on till July 1945, the educational program of National Youth Administration, but under the Office of Education, including the war training program. It sought to furnish the funds to enable schools and colleges to avail themselves of the properties that N. Y. A. has been using in training and manufacturing plants by re-assembling, and rehabilitating those plants.

The prime reason for continuing the educational program proper, is the desperate national need of new teachers. There are right now 13,000 classrooms without teachers. There must be found more than 100,000 additional teachers this fall unless we close the doors of the schools in America—an educational lockout, if you please—in the faces of 500,000 children.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am so happy to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. I might say that the subcommittee handling the appropriation for the Federal Security which included the National Youth Administration recommended to the full committee that if the National Youth Administration were continued that these $4,000,000 would be made available for student aid in colleges upon the condition that such students would show, first, the need for aid, and, second, that upon the completion of their course in college they would be available for teachers in the public schools. Of course, that provision was eliminated by the full committee of the House.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I thank him, too, for his cooperative attitude throughout the whole of the negotiations on this matter. I have been working with him and other Members of the House and Senate for more than a week, day and night, to put this over.

Whether or not you favored the abolition of N. Y. A., we ought to preserve the good that was in the program, especially when there is such a tragic national need at this time that these services be continued.

That is what my amendment sought to provide the money for. The amount provided was not large. It was about the exact amount of the N. Y. A. unexpended balance before we began to whittle on it. More than 100,000, nearer 1,000,000, teachers have gone to war or into war industries. This is not a criticism of them, but we must have teachers to take their places if our educational program is not to be jeopardized. Let us serve these vital needs before we go home.

For your information, please permit me to read again my amendment:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS: After the committee or House conferees' amendment, insert:

"Such unexpended balance, after the funds made available hereinabove shall have been deducted, the remainder shall be transferred and credited to the United States Office of Education for the continuation during the fiscal year 1943 of the war training and educational program in schools and colleges by virtue of the cooperation of National Youth Administration, plus such additional amount as may be necessary to increase such remainder to the sum of $6,000,000, which additional amount is hereby appropriated and made available for such purpose."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include the amendment which I sought to introduce yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DWORSHAK. In the absence of a printed report, will the gentleman from Missouri inform the House what disposition was made of amendment No. 26? I do not think any explanation of that has been made.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is the flood amendment, and that is still in disagreement. We will take that up for consideration as soon as the conference report is disposed of.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we postpone the consideration of Senate amendment No. 24 until we dispose of Senate amendment No. 26.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 26: On page 13, line 15, insert the following:

"That in order to aid in the temporary rehabilitation of farmers whose buildings, crops, livestock, machinery, and equipment were destroyed or damaged, in whole or in part, by floods in 1943, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to utilize the facilities of any existing agency or bureau to provide relief to any such farmer, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, for the purpose of aiding such farmer to replace or repair any property so destroyed or damaged, and to obtain the necessary seed, livestock, and equipment to enable him to continue farming operations, and for that purpose there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $15,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

"In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by such amendment, insert the following:

" 'In order to provide assistance to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged, in

whole or in part, by floods in 1943, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to utilize the facilities of any existing agency or bureau to provide assistance to any such farmer by loans, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, for the purpose of aiding such farmer to continue farming operations in order to produce for the war effort, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding, travel, and other miscellaneous and incidental expenses, fiscal year 1944, $15,000,000: *Provided*, That not more than 10 percent of the foregoing amount shall be used for administrative expenses.' "

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it will be noted that this amendment is presented in the form in which it was presented yesterday except that in response to the suggestion of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], the chairman of the Committee on Flood Control, who in my opinion knows more about flood conditions, flood data, and flood legislation than any other Member of either House, we omitted grants. It now applies only to loans.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In listening to the reading of the amendment I did not hear the Clerk read the language about obtaining necessary seed, livestock, and equipment. I am wondering if that language appears in the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It does not appear in the amendment, but under the provisions of the paragraph such loans are admissible under existing law.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the purpose of the loans designed to enable the farmers to obtain necessary seed, livestock, and equipment? For what are the loans to be used? It looks to me as if the language I mention is rather essential, in the absence of an explanation of the purpose and meaning of the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There are two conditions precedent. In the first place, a man must have suffered loss by flood. No one else is eligible. That is the first restriction. Second, a loan is available only on condition that it be used to stimulate the production of food. Expenditures for seed, lime, fertilizer, and so forth, would be in direct furtherance of the purpose of the act, the production of food, and would be in order. Having borrowed the money, he could use it for any of the purposes indicated by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The substitute provides that the loans shall be made in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe. If these loans are used for the purpose of purchasing seed or buying tractors or equipment, is it intended under the "terms and conditions" that the Secretary of Agriculture or the agency that he may utilize in the administration of the amendment shall require security on the livestock or equipment that may be purchased by the farmer for the purpose of producing more crops and on the crops to be grown, just as is now provided in the case of seed loans by the Farm Credit Administration, in the case of rehabilitation loans by the Farm Security Administration, and in the case of disaster loans?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is included in the phrase "terms and conditions." It is presumed that the Secretary of Agriculture will follow in this instance the same routine followed in making other loans to which the gentleman has referred. Loans made under the same terms and conditions would include the same provisions for security.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With the same security and with the same rate of interest?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The same security and the same rate of interest.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. So that this substitute eliminates grants or relief or a dole and provides only that loans shall be made with the stipulation that the terms and conditions and security are to be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This has nothing to do with doles, gifts, grants, or gratuities.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. In many instances I would think it would be necessary for rehabilitation work to be done, probably the repair of the home or the repair of the sheds, barns, and other buildings, and the ditching of fields.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If that was in furtherance of the production of food, if it was a part of the program to accelerate crop production, it would be in order. Otherwise the funds would have to be secured from some other source.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. The thing I was trying to get away from was a farmer having to borrow from two Federal agencies for the purpose of putting his farm back into operation; but if in the opinion of the gentleman work such as that may be done, he could have a place to live while he was producing.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. A farmer must have a barn for stock and equipment, he has to have a house for his family in order to continue production. Under those terms he would be entitled to a loan to provide either and similar facilities.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In this connection, I am still of the opinion that in some cases grants should be made and I assume they will be made under existing law by the Farm Security Administration. In my judgment, it would have been wiser to increase if necessary the appropriation to the Farm Security Administration to provide for both loans and grants with the same security and for the same purposes as rehabilitation loans and grants may now be made. I made my position known yesterday. I have not changed my mind. I insist on treating all flood sufferers of all years equally without discrimination.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The managers on the part of the two Houses in conference last night struck out the word "grants" in response to the objection made by the gentleman on the floor yesterday.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But did not include security which I repeatedly emphasized, although the explanation of the amendment contemplates the same or similar security as in the case at rehabilitation loans by the Farm Security Administration. This colloquy shows the intent and purpose in making the appropriation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Provision for requiring security, if conditions warrant, is clearly carried in the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Under the provisions of the language as it now is, the Secretary of Agriculture may loan money for a man to buy a new farm, may he not?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Not under this provision.

Mr. CURTIS. Why not?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Under the terms of the amendment the applicant must not only have suffered damage to his property by flood, but such loans are to enable the farmer to continue forming operations on such property.

Mr. CURTIS. Is there a Budget estimate for this?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; it is an emergency appropriation.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does not the Farm Security Administration already have funds available to rehabilitate farmers in distress and to stimulate the production of food?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Such loans would not necessarily be permissible here. Farm Security loans are limited to needy farmers. But even if such loans were in order, it must be remembered that the appropriation for such loans has been materially reduced in the 1944 bill. Whereas F. S. A. was given something like $136,000,000 for loans this year, the amount for 1944 has been reduced to approximately $80,000,000—a cut of nearly one-half in the face of vastly increased need.

Mr. HAGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. HAGEN. It is my understanding that these funds will be available to farmers in Minnesota as well? We have had floods there, you know.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Wherever farmers have suffered loss by flood; in any part of the United States, including the great and fertile State of Minnesota.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS. The purpose of the loan is for the production of food?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is the prime purpose of these loans. Some of the most fertile land in the country, the river plains where largest quotas of surplus food are produced, has been covered with as much as 6 feet of water. Machinery, stock, and buildings have been swept away. The purpose is to make it possible to get in a short crop this year and make arrangements to secure a full crop next year.

Mr. HAYS. I would like to commend the conferees for that. The district which I represent lies in the Arkansas Valley, and in many instances the recent flood, which was the most disastrous in our history, left sand banks on much of the fertile land. The cost of producing food would include the cost of removing the debris and sand and getting the land ready for production, as well as for the actual seed and other crop costs; is that true?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The purpose is to get the land back into production as quickly as possible. One of the prime needs of the country today and one of the most essential requirements for the successful prosecution of the war is food.

Mr. HAYS. One other question, because it seems to me it is vital for the production of food. I have discussed it with Governor Black, and I am sure it has given him very much concern. That is, the taking of security on other property of the farmer, than the crop to which this is devoted. In other words, you would not expect that the security, the lien, would be extended to other property?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of course, any security the farmer offered could be taken, although it is customary in making these loans to take as security property purchased with the loan.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BISHOP. I am sure there is no Member of the House more informed about this flood condition than the gentleman from Missouri. Does this satisfy the gentleman as the best thing we can possibly do for these people at this time?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. With this exception: We provided in the version submitted yesterday that grants might be made in exceptional cases. That provision has been removed in order to meet criticism made on the floor yesterday. With that exception, I think it is satisfactory in every respect.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. We already have the Disaster Loan Corporation, with a capital of $40,000,000, to make loans in case of flood disasters, but they require certain collateral. As I understand it, this proposition is to obviate that difficulty which the farmers are having?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Time is the essence. We must get action immediately. The season is far advanced in most sections of the country. The idea is to provide money for immediate use, so that production can get under way in the shortest possible time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

OREGON LEADS IN SHIP CONSTRUCTION AND LEADS THE WAY TO VICTORY

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, there are many provisions in the bill H. R. 3030 in which the people of my State are interested. There is another subject, however, which I want to discuss briefly at this time.

Mr. Speaker, there was recently launched in the Swan Island shipyard of the Kaiser Co., Inc., in my district, a 16,500-ton tanker, christened *Fort George*, which was on the ways only 67 days. The keel was laid on April 21. This was the nineteenth launching at this plant of vessels of this size. The day before, the Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation, another Kaiser company, launched the two hundred and eighth Liberty ship. During June the seven yards under Kaiser management in the Richmond, Calif., and Portland-Vancouver areas delivered into service a ship each 15 hours, and they assure us that they will deliver one every 13 hours during July. In the Richmond yard alone, 25 ships were delivered this month, which is said to be a world record for a single shipbuilding yard. In the Vancouver yard, which is in the Portland area, 3 aircraft carriers were launched in 26 days. In my district, the Swan Island yard holds the world record for production of P–2 tankers per way. This is the most famous shipyard in the world and holds all records for the launching of ships delivered for each individual way. The Kaiser plants in the Portland-Vancouver area have 90,000 workers working the clock around, producing sturdy, dependable ships, which are carrying the war to the seven seas and helping to bring victory to the Allies and to overcome the toll of the deadly submarine. In the complete Kaiser organization there are 200,000 workers. These yards have established an all-time record in speed and efficiency in the construction of ships so vitally needed in our war effort. The remarkable thing is that in this vast organization, hastily gathered together, with workers from all parts of the United States, there has been no labor trouble, management and labor toiling together 24 hours a day to construct the ships needed to carry and protect our men in uniform and to keep supply lines open that they may be fed, equipped and supplied with the tools of war.

An unfortunate incident was recently reported in the press, arising out of a misunderstanding when hearings were being held in Portland by a subcommittee of the House of Representatives, in which our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative VAN ZANDT, was credited with having said that some of the Kaiser ships were of faulty construction and that some of them had been lost at sea by reason of defects in construction. There is no basis in fact for such a contention, and the newspaper releases arose by reason of misinterpretation of the facts under consideration and through inadvertence stating that a few ships were lost through faulty construction and that they came from the Kaiser yards. As a matter of fact, there was no basis in fact for this statement. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative VAN ZANDT, corrected the false impression, as shown by a statement to the Oregon Journal of July 3. I quote from the Oregon Journal as follows:

> In a statement to The Journal Friday evening, Representative VAN ZANDT said:
>
> "I did not say that four Liberty ships from the Portland or any other Kaiser yards had broken up at sea due to faulty construction. No such statement will be found in the record of our congressional hearing in Portland or elsewhere. On the contrary, I have been up and down the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts visiting the shipyards and the best operated and functioning yards I have seen are the Kaiser shipyards at Portland and Vancouver.
>
> "One other yard I have seen in their class and that is at Sausalito, Calif. I well know the blow to the morale of shipbuilders that would be caused by the statement that Liberty ships were breaking up at sea without enemy attack. I know the fear that would be created in the minds of fathers, mothers, wives and other relatives of members of the crew.
>
> "I am glad to correct a misunderstanding by the statement I make here. I think the report, which, I repeat, is not in the record of our hearing, arose from the misreading of some statistics.
>
> "If there is any responsibility involved in this incident I wish to accept it personally and not let it rest upon the committee."

Mr. Speaker, as a representative of the Third Congressional District of Oregon, in which two of the Kaiser yards are located, I am proud of the record made by this great organization and the great contribution it is making to the winning of the war. Furthermore, I want to say that the Kaiser organization is only one of a number of concerns engaged in building ships for the war in the Portland area. The Willamette Iron & Steel Co., an organization which throughout the years has performed outstanding service in the last World War, as well as this, the Albina Engine & Machine Works, Poole & McGonigle, and Commercial Iron Works, are doing most excellent work in the production of ships and other war instrumentalities. The Iron Fireman, while not directly engaged in shipbuilding, through its work and that of its associated companies are doing an outstanding job in the construction of marine engines and other equipment for war use.

VETERANS' PAY AFTER WAR ENDS

Mr. Speaker, on July 2, 1943, I introduced in the House a bill which has for its purpose to continue the pay of all

persons serving in the armed forces of the United States for 1 year after the termination of the present conflict. The text of the bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the pay, exclusive of allowances, of all persons in the armed forces of the United States on or after December 8, 1941, and at the date of the termination of the present conflict, unless previously honorably discharged, and who shall have served at least 90 days, shall be continued for a period of 1 year from the date of their honorable discharge, separation, or release from active service, during which 1-year period such persons shall be members of the reserve forces: *Provided*, That in no event shall the monthly pay of any such persons, during the 1-year period exceed $200 unless recalled for active service: *Provided further*, That within the monthly pay limitation imposed herein, the increased percentage in pay allowed for foreign service shall apply where any such service is shown.

Mr. Speaker, we expect to have at least 10,000,000 men in the armed forces before the termination of the war. When the war ends, these millions of servicemen will be mustered out and will be faced with the problem of finding remunerative employment in civil life. At the same time, 20,000,000 or more of war workers engaged in enterprises having to do with the prosecution of the war will likewise be compelled to readjust their lives to a peacetime regime. These great groups of American citizens will be competing with one another for becoming useful citizens in the post-war world. The men who have been called to the service in this time of our great tragedy when the very life and perpetuation of our Nation is at stake are entitled to every consideration when the war ends, so that they may be transferred from military service to civil pursuit without being subjected to privation and the horrors of unemployment. We all recall the bitter experiences following the end of World War No. 1.

As stated, the purpose of this bill which I am sponsoring, which is one of a number with the same objective, namely, to cushion the shock of demobilization and provide a reasonable period on pay, bridging over the gap between demobilization and placement in remunerative civil employment. By the terms of the bill the pay of persons in the armed forces who have served at least 90 days shall be continued for a period of a year from the date of their honorable discharge, separation, or release from active service, during which time such persons shall be members of the reserve force. The enactment of this legislation would enable these men who served our Nation with honor to have sustenance during the critical period following the cessation of activities and the resumption of civil pursuits.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Would it not be well to have an explanation placed in the RECORD showing the farmers how they should go about it in order to obtain one of these loans?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is my understanding, if the gentleman will permit, that the Secretary of Agriculture will immediately upon the enactment of this law issue a detailed pamphlet on procedure. It is a matter requiring some little study and should be left to the Department rather than to attempt to take it up here at this time. But it will have prompt attention by the Department, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. I am glad to have that information. After all, there are many times when the farmers are busy and have many things to do and they do not understand exactly how to go about getting one of these loans. I receive many letters from folks asking me just such things—how they shall go about it to do certain things. It seems to me they are not getting proper information.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In each county representatives of the Department, including the county agent, the Extension Service, and the Farm Security Administration, are in a position to advise all interested farmers as to procedure.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to take this time to speak on the plight of the American farmer. I also want to preface my remarks, because they might be construed as partisan, by reading what a former ardent new dealer had to say about the farm situation in America. This is a recent statement by Louis Bromfield, well-known author and dirt farmer, who operates a big farm in Indiana:

I think it fair to say that nothing practical whatever has been done to help the farmer to produce more. This scandal, and by next autumn it will be one of the greatest scandals in American history, affects the whole future history of ourselves and of the world.

Its repercussions will destroy the future of the Democratic Party for years, the future of liberalism, even the future possibility of a decent peace.

Again I repeat, this is not a Republican speaking; it is not even a Democrat speaking; it is a former ardent new dealer and supporter of President Roosevelt.

Having prefaced my remarks by reading a statement from Mr. Bromfield, I desire to make some comments of my own. I do not know what the conference committee will do on the question of subsidies. I hope the conferees will bring the issue back to the House so we can have a fair and clear-cut vote whether we want subsidies or not. That is the only fair thing to do, to afford an opportunity to the Members of the House to meet the issue squarely, fairly, openly, and fearlessly. If we adopt a system of subsidies, if we let the camel get his nose, just the tip end of his nose, under the tent and smell these subsidies and political hand-outs, there will be no end to them. There will be no stopping the spread of subsidies ad infinitum. The only way for us to do is to meet that issue now, to nip it in the bud, to scotch it right now in the House of Representatives before the whole camel is under the tent and we are compelled to pay two or three billion dollars a year in subsidies, wrecking and ruining our farmers and our whole national economy. Payment of subsidies by the Government out of the Treasury to packers, processors, and wholesalers will promote inflation and not decrease it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the conference committee will do, but I hope there is some way to get a clear-cut vote, an honest-to-God vote on whether we want these political handouts, special privilege, and Government subsidies, and give us an opportunity to vote them up or down. Of course, we will support any proposal for sufficient sums to carry out the program with respect to any commitments that have been made or any commitments that have been put into effect, but not 1 cent for future subsidies. That ought to be the issue. I do not know what it is going to be, whether we are going to try to evade it by some parliamentary procedure, but it seems to me that is the only thing for the Congress to vote on.

I would like to see the subsidies killed here this afternoon by a vote of the Congress and not simply baby it along and have the President come in next year and say that he has made a lot more commitments and ask for a couple of billion more dollars.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If Congress and the administration will raise the ceiling price of corn, wheat, cotton, and other agricultural commodities to their normal value compared with industrial prices and industrial wages, this whole problem will clear up and there will be no need for subsidies.

Mr. FISH. I do not think we need them anyway under any circumstances. I do not think they will help solve the problem.

Mr. RANKIN. You cannot meet the situation by holding the price of wheat and cotton and corn and other farm crops down below the cost of production.

Mr. FISH. I do not know much about the wheat situation, but is there any ceiling price on wheat or barley or oats? I do not think there is any ceiling price on any grain except corn and I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi that we ought to take the ceiling price off and let it establish its own level on the same basis as other grain. That is the viewpoint of the farmers in my district. They need and want corn now and not after they have been liquidated by New Deal regimentation price fixing and incompetent bureaucrats. I include several telegrams from farmers and feed dealers in my district that show the seriousness of the farm situation:

WALDEN, N. Y., *July 6, 1943.*

Hon. HAMILTON FISH, Jr.,
Washington, D. C.:

It is necessary that Congress take immediate action to provide free movement of corn. Unless such action is taken there will be a marked curtailment of food production. Because of the low price ceiling manufacturers are unable to purchase corn. Unless this condition is corrected at once thousands of poultrymen and dairymen will be forced to liquidate their livestock. The feed situation is serious now and will be much worse unless immediate action is taken.

A. B. GARRISON.

POUGHKEEPSIE, N. Y., *July 7, 1943.*
Representative HAMILTON FISH,
Washington, D. C.:

As feed dealers we know grave situation confronting egg and milk producers. Corn ceilings must be removed or livestock will starve or be slaughtered.

CLAUDE SEARS,
Fishkillplains, N. Y.

PONEBUSH, N. Y., *July 7, 1943.*
Congressman HAMILTON FISH,
Washington, D. C.:

Only by removing corn price ceiling will manufacturers and other food processors be able to obtain supplies sufficient to prevent a serious food shortage. We emphasize that immediate congressional action is necessary to avoid chaos.

ELMER VAN KEURERN.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement from the Bureau of Reclamation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

DEVELOPING THE NATION'S WATER POWER

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me as if certain people in New York and New England were about to discover that area of the United States out where the West begins, as well as the agricultural South.

You are not going to relieve the present situation as long as you keep a millstone on the heads of the farmers of the United States. At the close of the last war when we had only $53 per capita in circulation cotton went to 40 cents a pound, wheat to $2.50 a bushel, and corn to $1.75 a bushel. Today when we have more than $125 per capita in circulation you have raised everybody's wages, everybody's prices except the man who produces the raw material.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. For a question only.

Mr. MERRITT. Does the gentleman know that since January 1941, average prices have increased 46 percent?

Mr. RANKIN. I know that everything that the farmer has had to buy has doubled.

Mr. MERRITT. Is it not also true——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield further.

The gentleman from New York is going to find out that wheat, corn, cotton, and farm products do not just produce themselves. He can join in this unholy combination to hold down the prices of farm products, but I will be darned if you can make the farmers produce them and bring them to you, especially when you have every gate guarded with a racketeer to keep us out or make them pay tribute before they can deliver them.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANKIN. I am sorry, but I must decline to yield further.

Mr. MERRITT. The gentleman might learn something.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi declines to yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, what I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is that this is a temporary relief from flood conditions, it is probably justified and it will pass with practically no opposition, but it will not relieve such condition in the future. The only way I see to prevent these disastrous floods in the years to come is to do on other streams throughout the Nation just what we have done on the Tennessee River, and that is to pass the bill I have pending to establish regional authorities on every watershed in America.

You will then not only protect the lands from floods, you will not only conserve the soil, you will not only improve the navigation of every stream, but you will harness 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of annual production of electricity that is now going to waste and which is considerably more than all the American people are using today. When that is harnessed and provided to the farmers, the people in the city and small towns, the small industries, and to the commercial enterprises of America at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution, then indeed America will come into her own.

Then you will not have these disastrous repetitions of floods and overflows, but these streams will be controlled as the Tennessee River is controlled today and as the Columbia River is today, and at the same time you will add more to the wealth of the Nation than anything else that has ever been done or that could be done at this time or in the future.

So I trust that this will be an example to those men who have opposed this program from now on to support us in our efforts to develop the greatest wealth America possesses at this time, except the soil from which we live, and that is that vast wealth of water power from the St. Lawrence to the Rio Grande, from the Columbia to the Savannah, that is now going to waste and that would add, as I said, untold billions of dollars to the wealth of the Nation and make it possible for a man to live or conduct an enterprise anywhere on American soil under pleasant and agreeable conditions.

It is the greatest piece of post-war development that lies within our reach and that is sound, reasonable, and necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Congress, its aggregate knowledge gathered from every part of the United States, should and does have a fairly good idea of what the country needs.

The Commodity Credit bill, which the President vetoed, left some things undone. It did not, for instance, restore the historic 3-cent cattle price differential destroyed by O. P. A., which, if restored, would give you more beef and pork at less prices and would save the vast stores of food which, if frost comes early, will be wasted instead of going to you in the form of beef.

The bill did provide for more food. It also prevented the roll-backs, which it is already demonstrated are taking food out of our mouths. The President said in his message he intends putting roll-backs on every single thing the worker needs—the same as saying he will diminish the supply of every single thing the worker needs.

The bill did stop further extension of subsidies. The subsidy plan forgives a few grocery dollars for the low fixed-income groups solicitously mentioned by the President. At the same time it throws on those same poor people, through increased taxes, the grocery bills of those well able to pay their bills, including the bills of millionaires who, the President said in his Ruml message, are already taxed to the limit.

The bill did prevent inflation from taking the form of a subsidy spiral instead of a less dangerous price spiral.

By killing that bill the President killed the Commodity Credit Corporation, the one agency vital to getting more food.

Congress knows that we are not producing all the food we can; therefore should produce more. Last war it was America which won the peace and saved the world from anarchy and bolshevism. With peace treaties, with a league of nations? No; with food—30,000,000 tons of it shipped from America to hungry Europeans, including enemy countries. The situation now is incomparably worse than then. Europe is hungrier. Bolshevism now has an effective political organization and a pseudo-democratic appeal called communism. This time starvation has extended across the world to the Orient, where Japs are effectively using the time we have lent them to stir up against us a billion orientals. They call it race hatred, but that hate stems mostly from the same physical need that makes a starving dog bite the hand that withholds food. America, cupboards jammed with food, did last time—could again—lure the world back to peace the way a horse hurries back to a hay-filled stable.

So Congress, having this high purpose, does not like to be thwarted through the President by the President's meddlesome cronies, who remind one of villainous characters from Charles Dickens' novels—Uriah Heep, the Murdstones, Mr. Micawber—too many Micawbers infest the White House, always promising that something besides trouble will turn up as a result of their ineptitude.

That veto message was a masterpiece of double talk. It talked that the President was against inflation. It also talked out of the other side of the mouth that he was for roll-backs and subsidies which

we know are highly inflationary, and did you notice the threat it hung over the Congress? That pert message threatened that unless Congress permits the President to do these food-decreasing, inflation-increasing things he will do the most inflationary thing possible—start a general wage raising.

Congress knows this is no idle threat because the administration never has held the line against wage demands. On one pretext and another, including wage inequities, the administration has found excuses to raise the whole average since May last year until average hourly wage rates have risen 11.9 percent and average weekly rates have risen 16.8 percent. This is the chief cause that the cost of living has risen 5.9 percent. Wage increases have already made it impossible for farmers to replace corn they are now holding at present ceiling prices and food mills are closing down.

It is shameful that the President's Rasputins play politics thus with inflation and human hunger. Since, however, professor politicians, rationalizing their mistakes in words of three syllables, make their abstruse fallacies sound as impressive as they are deceptive, they force Congress to go slowly. Congress must choose the less inflationary of the two evils conjured up by those who are cutting the food supply lines as effectively as any Nazi might wish.

Soon pigs will be slaughtered while still little, and, if there is an early frost, preventing corn harvest, foodstuffs that could be fed to cattle and hogs will be plowed under. We shall learn the hard way the practical rules of food production some economists do not understand. Perhaps when more meat platters are bare, it may become apparent that Congress, like Balaam's donkey, spoke the truth and did not deserve to be smitten.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said on the floor of this House recently about the shortage of food as well as the scarcity of feed in the market for livestock. The situation is indeed serious. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to invite your attention to controls that were put into effect not so long ago whereby farmers were penalized as much as 49 cents per bushel on their own wheat if they raised more than the amount of a quota that was fixed against them. They were not even allowed to feed their own so-called excess wheat to their livestock or poultry, except upon payment of a penalty of 49 cents per bushel on it. I opposed this policy all the way along the line.

Now, let us see what happended. The farmers in my State of Kansas in the year 1941 were penalized in the sum of $5,194,822 for raising more wheat than the quota assigned them. Even in 1942, last year, the farmers of Kansas were penalized $763,000. What was that penalty for? Nothing more than raising some extra wheat on his own land. Does not sound very good right now, does it? I do not have the figures for the other States, but am informed that the total for the country is about five times the above amounts.

So Kansas farmers were required to dig up $6,000,000 because they saw fit to produce ten or twelve million bushels of wheat that we would not have had if they had complied with the quota.

I am informed that about $2,000,000 of this money has been refunded to producers who put the money in escrow and held the wheat until the spring of 1943, provided, however, they could show to the satisfaction of the triple A of the Department of Agriculture they had reduced their production equal in amount of the penalty wheat. In other words such farmer not only held the wheat, but was required to reduce his production.

The farmer who could not afford to hold his wheat or for reasons of his own did not see fit to do so paid the penalty and the Government officials refuse to refund it, whether he has reduced his acreage or not.

Mr. Speaker, the picture does not look so very good. Only a short time ago, producers were penalized for raising a little more food than a certain quota allowed. Now we talk about incentive payments to encourage farmers to grow more food.

Mr. Speaker, the money paid by the farmers and turned over to the Government for raising the extra food, ought as a matter of right be returned to them. I have tried to get the officials in the triple A to make the refunds. They claim they are not in position to do it. I introduced a bill in this House early this year to require it. The House Committee on Agriculture, to whom the legislation was referred, has failed up to this time to approve this measure or even act on it. I think, as a matter of right and justice, the bill should be passed. I believe if you will look into the matter, you will agree with me. Since the committee has failed to act, a petition has been placed on the Clerk's desk asking for the consideration of this bill by the House. If you agree with me that these farmers are entitled to a refund of their own money—it does not belong to the Treasury—then I suggest you sign the petition to bring the bill to the floor of this House for consideration and vote. Here is a chance to correct a mistake that should not have been made in the first place.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the amendment under consideration permits the administrative unit in charge to spend not exceeding 10 percent for administrative expenses. This is a very liberal amount and I hope it will be administered in such a way that most of the 10 percent can be turned back to the Treasury.

The amendment only permits the making of loans. The loans that can be made cannot in my opinion be very large because most of these people have had their necessities covered by local loans and by help from their neighbors. It was my understanding when this was put up that the administrative fund would be limited to 10 percent of the amount of money they used rather than 10 percent of the total. I hope that that rule will be followed by those who administer it so that there will not be such terrible waste.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And the gentleman concurs in the intent of this amendment which only provides for loans and that the Secretary is expected to take security where there is livestock just as rehabilitation loans were provided?

Mr. TABER. Yes, and if he puts up money for a new barn he ought to take as security that barn.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And he is authorized to do that under this bill?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 6, insert "Department of Agriculture."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the various votes by which the motions were agreed to was laid on the table.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri filed the following conference report on the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 33 and 34 to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMETT O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABOR,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARTER GLASS,
CARL HAYDEN,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the

bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the conference report.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 137]

Allen, La.	Gillie	Murray, Wis.
Andrews	Gordon	Norman
Baldwin, Md.	Gore	Norton
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gorski	O'Brien, Ill.
Barden	Granger	O'Connor
Bender	Grant, Ind.	O'Hara
Bland	Green	O'Konski
Bradley, Mich.	Gross	O'Leary
Cannon, Fla.	Hale	Pfeifer
Capozzoli	Hall,	Phillips
Cochran	Edwin Arthur	Plumley
Costello	Hébert	Poage
Culkin	Hill	Randolph
Curley	Holifield	Reed, Ill.
Dawson	Izac	Rivers
Day	Johnson, Ward	Russell
Delaney	Keefe	Sauthoff
Dies	Kefauver	Smith, W. Va.
Ditter	Keogh	Sumners, Tex.
Domengeaux	Kilburn	Talbot
Douglas	Kilday	Tarver
Drewry	King	Taylor
Ellsworth	Larcade	Tolan
Elmer	McCord	Treadway
Fay	McCormack	Troutman
Fellows	Magnuson	Van Zandt
Fernandez	Maloney	Vinson, Ga.
Fitzpatrick	Manasco	Wadsworth
Ford	Mansfield, Tex.	Weaver
Fulbright	May	Welch
Fulmer	Morrison, La.	White
Gallagher	Morrison, N. C.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gifford	Mott	
Gilchrist	Mundt	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 331 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 647. An act to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, and

H. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 33: On page 43, line 13, insert the following:

"SEC. 203. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to pay the salary of any person at the rate of $4,500 per annum or more unless such person shall have been appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adhere to its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House adhere to its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, only two appropriation bills remain in disagreement, the War Agencies bill and the Labor-Federal Security bill. By a singular coincidence, only one amendment is in disagreement on either bill, and both relate to the same subject matter, the confirmation of certain employees by the Senate.

We have an understanding with the managers on the part of the Senate that they will abide by the action taken by the House here today. If the House votes to adhere on this amendment, the Senate conferees have agreed to recede. If, on the other hand, the House refuses to adhere, the managers on the part of the House will be in a position where it will be necessary for them to yield.

This is the final showdown on a long and much-disputed issue, as the managers on the part of the Senate have also agreed that on the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill they will abide by the action of the House on this amendment to the War Agencies bill. So we are deciding here the only point remaining at variance between the two Houses on the two bills. When we vote on this amendment and on the motion to adhere we shall have made final disposition of all appropriation bills for the session.

I understand the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has a preferential motion he desires to offer.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recede and concur with an amendment as follows: "In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate insert the following:

"'No part of any appropriation contained in this act for any agency other than that of the Office of Strategic Services shall be available to pay the salary of any person at the rate of $5,500 per annum or more, appointed after June 30, 1943, unless such person shall have been appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That those appointed between June 30, 1943, and November 1, 1943, may hold office until the latter date unless sooner than that the Senate shall have refused to give its advice and consent as to any such appointee.'"

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman indicate the difference between the amendment he has just submitted to the House and the amendment as printed in this morning's papers?

Mr. TABER. Yes; the difference is that after the word "act" I have inserted an exception which leaves out of the operation of the amendment the Office of Strategic Services. This is an agency that has engaged in work for this Government about which we should not do too much advertising. Therefore, I have left it out of the operation of this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, we are facing in these last hours of Congress before a possible recess a disagreement with the Senate with reference to the so-called McKellar amendment. Frankly, the McKellar amendment as it is in the bill is not workable because it would apply immediately and would throw off the pay roll everyone who draws $4,500 a year or above until they were confirmed by the Senate. I have drawn this amendment so that confirmation is required by the Senate only where an employee receives $5,500 or more, and those are practically all of the policy-making employees, and where they are appointed after the 30th of last June, and I have in this amendment given such appointees the right to stay on the roll until the Senate shall act upon confirmation, not later than November 1, 1943. This will permit these agencies to function.

The employees drawing $5,500 or more are, as near as I can estimate, about 12,000 in number altogether in these agencies. Assuming a turn-over of approximately 20 percent this would cover confirmation of perhaps 200 employees a month. The Senate is accustomed to confirming the ensigns and all other officers above that grade in the Regular Navy and second lieutenants and all officers above that grade in the Regular Army, so this is not an impossible task to cover.

The object of this amendment and the object of Senate confirmation at the present time is to see that the civil service in this country is cleaned up. At the present time the agencies of government have been filled up with appointments of the type that Harry Hopkins, Benny Cohen, and David K. Niles have dictated. It is about time we began to clean up the civil service of the United States. I do not think we ought to have to do this, but our Civil Service Commission, with that agency which has been functioning as a board of law examiners, has not fulfilled its obligation of seeing that we have desirable employees in the Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I do not like to interfere with the regular operations of the Government, but that civil service of ours has gone to such a low estate that we have on the lists people who are not primarily interested in our winning the war. A great many of these agencies are terribly afflicted by the situation, having on their rolls an enormous number, thousands of people, who ought not to be there. I am hopeful that we can try this thing out and see if the Senate will not make of our Government a better

Government and provide us with a better civil service.

We have tried this out for a year upon the Manpower Commission. Commissioner McNutt complained when he was before us that the Senate had not confirmed many of those who had been appointed to his Commission.

A list of those whom the Senate had failed to confirm was placed in the record of the hearings before the Appropriations Committee. One cannot examine those hearings without coming to the conclusion that the Senate had done right in protecting our civil service by failing to confirm those people.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I know the gentleman is interested in improving the civil service and he has expressed some concern about it. I wonder if he has given thought to the effect of this amendment? Every employee, if and when he is appointed to a position of $5,500 in the Government service, must have the approval of the United States Senate. Under those circumstances, every employee in a civil-service position from the time he starts at the bottom until he gets ready to go to the $5,500 class is constantly reminded that the sword of the Senate is hanging over his head, if he should, perforce, offend the Senators of the United States. Does the gentleman think that is going to help the morale or help the building up of the civil service?

Mr. TABER. I do not believe the Senate of the United States is going to prevent a man from doing a decent job just to get their approval. I believe that the Senate of the United States will meet its responsibility face to face and honestly pass on these nominees of the President and other executives for these positions. I do not believe there will be any cloud upon our people. I do not believe that cloud will be half as bad as the cloud that is there now, of absolute subservience to a great many of these people who have destroyed the morale of our Government.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it not a fact that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is limited solely to the agencies covered in this bill, and from that list he has specifically excepted the O. S. S.?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. But it is a fact that as far as employees in this bill that this amendment covers, it absolutely removes everybody from under civil service and puts them under patronage when they get $5,500?

Mr. TABER. It does not. They cannot be removed from the requirement that they should have a civil-service status and pass the examinations that are required. It simply means that the Civil Service Commission must see that these men whom they are recommending must be loyal to the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, it is not difficult to understand why the Senate would like to extend its power of confirmation. The more to be confirmed by the Senate, the greater the power of the Senators and the stronger the control of the Senators in their own States, and the stature of the House of Representatives, in my opinion, sinks in the same proportion.

It is rather interesting to note that of all matters we have had in conference, and there have been many important ones, the most uncompromising attitude on any amendment has been to secure this additional power for the Senate. The newspapers of the country have condemned it almost universally, and it is apparent why that has been done. Of course, the Senators are interested in better government. I am not questioning that; but this gives them tremendous patronage. It is unfair to a bureau head to make him and his staff subject to the will of some Senator.

With reference to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I would like to show one place where it is directly in contravention of the Constitution of the United States. The gentleman says those appointed after June 30 and before November 1 shall hold office until November 1, but the Constitution says the President shall have the power to fill all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of the next session. In other words, the gentleman from New York says they may not hold office beyond November 1, and the Constitution says they shall hold office until the end of the session.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. TABER. There will be no opportunity for a recess appointment between June 30 and the 1st day of November.

Mr. O'NEAL. That remains to be seen. The gentleman's amendment says it shall expire November 1, and the Constitution says the end of the session.

Now, do you realize what you are doing? It was never contemplated to give the Senate that power in the beginning. But since 1937 there has been a constant effort on the part of the other body to be able to say "yes" or "no" on the appointment of these Government officials. In 1937 they passed the first bill that required confirmation by the Senate, based upon a salary of $7,500. In the Justice Department bill a year ago they put in another amendment that all those drawing over $7,500 must be confirmed by the Senate. In the manpower bill they dropped it to $4,500. Now, in this bill, under the Taber amendment, they would like to make it $5,500. What a confused mess all of this would be. How unworkable it would be—all of these various provisions under civil service.

We have a committee for the purpose of studying this very question and a bill before it, and that committee can take all of the agencies, can take the whole situation, and work out something that is fair, and not have one agency with confirmation at $7,500, 14 with confirmation at $5,500, another one with confirmation at $4,500. All of that causes confusion and certainly is not a sound way to legislate.

The motion made by the gentleman from New York is directed at the so-called "long hairs" to whom he has referred many times. I would like to call attention to the fact that the salary limitation of $5,500 and over will seldom touch this type of employee. We have heard many attacks made on the men in the various departments whom the gentleman has referred to as "long hairs"; they are the ones who have been damned on this floor as analysts, economic analysts, writers, research specialists, and others, practically every one of whom is in a salary bracket below the $5,500 which the gentleman now seeks to insert in this bill. The $5,500 will not reach for the most part those who have not had the business experience so much urged lately.

We must consider this: We cannot reach the problem and the business executive by basing it on a salary limitation. If you are seeking to have confirmation of those to whom the gentleman has directed his remarks as being impractical, it should be based not on a salary limitation, but on the type of work that the men are doing; it should not be based on the salary they are drawing. He should devise such system as he wants and then say for this type of work or that type of work the individual should be confirmed. But a salary limitation, in my opinion, will not reach the people to whom he has referred.

The higher-paid executive has his research specialists around him; he is the one on whom we must rely, and often he is guided by the advice on the basic, fundamental parts of the bureau's program of those in the salary range below $5,500.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. May I ask, since the gentleman would exclude the employees in the Office of Strategic Services, if he does not recognize that it would not only be dangerous to the public to require the placing of their names in the RECORD with a statement of how much they receive, not only in that Office, but in the various other branches of service, whose names should not be published for like reasons?

Mr. O'NEAL. May I say to the gentleman that this amendment would not permit the employment of anyone drawing a salary over $5,500 without confirmation, no matter how important the work he is doing, whether or not it is of a confidential nature in the war effort. There is an exception for the Office of

Strategic Services where they have employed people on work of a confidential nature where no one knows their names and no one ought to know what they are doing except the head of the department.

But the amendment to the bill does not except the Board of Economic Warfare and other agencies in the bill, such as the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, who are operating in foreign fields and who have employees unknown to anyone but the head of the bureau.

They are scattered all over the world, some of them in the countries of the enemy; those men draw salaries, some of them, undoubtedly above $5,500. That is not only true in the Office of Strategic Services, but all of the other agencies mentioned, some three or four of them; undoubtedly they have men of that character, and it would be a very serious matter to disclose to anybody except the heads of the department under whom they work what they are doing or to bring their names before the Senate, as would have to be done if their appointments had to be confirmed.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives would also be affected by this matter. Each one of us who may have a friend up for confirmation, we would have to be making more frequent trips over to the other end of the Capitol in a suppliant manner.

This would lower the stature, as I said before, of the House of Representatives and place us in the position of having to go across to the other end of the Capitol to seek the consideration and generosity of the Members of the other body.

It is not fair to the war effort, it is not fair to the House of Representatives, it is not practical. It should go before the House committee dealing with this affair. The committee can enter into all phases of it and will not have confirmation at $7,500 in one bill, at $4,500 in another, and at $5,500 in another. The subject is, in my opinion, not being handled in anything like the careful way in which it should be handled and would be handled by our regular committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I have so much respect for the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that I never find myself able to disagree with him on a question where a principle is involved without being forced to reexamine whatever I think about the subject. If a compromise were necessary at this time upon the McKellar proposal, the compromise proposed by the gentleman from New York strikes me as the very best that could be devised. I question, however, since the statement has been made that the managers on the part of the Senate have agreed they would accept the action of the House at this time that we should let ourselves be persuaded on our convictions in regard to this matter by the pressure of a possible recess or by the request that we do something immediately.

The issue that is presented now is the entire issue that is involved in the McKellar bill. That bill is now resting before the Committee on the Civil Service. The Congress properly should consider the practice and the present state of the civil service. Personally I think the Civil Service does need some cleaning out and improvements in some of its procedure. Personally I think that we need to destroy some of the sense of security which has put some people in jobs with the thought they were going to hold them for life regardless of whether they performed efficient service or not, but I question very much whether on the short debate we are going to have on a conference proposal here that the entire issue can be resolved. In view of the fact that the other body is apparently ready to accept the position this body adopted overwhelmingly on a similar rider on another bill, it would seem to me proper that we should reaffirm that position now and let the entire problem of reform in civil service procedure be considered by the appropriate legislative committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE].

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that the Senator in presenting this amendment was not grasping for power, that he had the good of the service in mind. The Senator is an able and outstanding legislator who has an enviable record in the public service. I am equally satisfied that that is the objective of our able colleague in proposing modification of it. I believe myself that this amendment will have a wholesome influence on the Government service and will not interfere materially with good administration. It is true, as the gentleman from Kentucky said a while ago, the amendment itself will not reach a great number of employees whom we may feel unworthy, because they are drawing less than $5,500, but this provision will reach those who are responsible for naming the junior employees. There will always be a finger of restraint over them so that they will exercise their authority with greater caution, with greater care, so that they will not readily appoint those who are unfit because of their ideologies. In my opinion, there is where the difficulty arises in the Government service, the employees are named without sufficient scrutiny and without a feeling of sufficient responsibility on the part of the appointing authorities, and while it is not practicable to make the principle of confirmation apply to all employees without regard to salaries, it is practicable to make it apply to those in the higher brackets who in the main are responsible for the naming of the junior employees; and in this way it will have a wholesome influence throughout the service. I believe the proposal as modified by the able Member from New York should have the support of the Members on both sides of the aisle, and I believe if it is adopted we shall find it will become a provision that will be workable and wield a wholesome influence in the Government service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, when this matter was up for consideration yesterday it occurred to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York was an improvement over the McKellar amendment, and as between the two I would rather support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. I do not think, however, either of these amendments will do the thing the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has in mind. Furthermore, I do not think we should extend this extra power to the United States Senate. That body has enough patronage now. Regardless of what you and I think about it, these higher paid positions are going to be filled by political appointees under either the McKellar amendment or the Taber amendment; that is what will happen as sure as the world, because they will be going to the United States Senators to get their jobs regardless of civil-service classification. The political patronage crowds would take the situation in hand.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield for a question.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is a distinguished member of the Committee on the Civil Service. Does he not think that the passage of an amendment like that and the adoption of such a policy would absolutely destroy civil service on all jobs above $5,500?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will discuss that further.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Let me first discuss the question raised by the gentleman from Virginia. Let me say first that the McKellar amendment is really before the House Committee on the Civil Service. It has not yet been given consideration by that committee but it will be. I feel it would be much better procedure to let that committee consider the legislation rather than put legislation on an appropriation bill as we appear to be doing this afternoon. Let me say to the gentleman from New York before he speaks that I will go a long, long way with him in criticizing the manner in which the Civil Service is handing our Government employment. I have criticized the policies of the Civil Service on the floor of this House and in the Committee, and shall continue to do it so long as a lot of their practices are continued. As a matter of fact, I feel sometimes that our present investigation is only scratching the surface. The gentleman from New York has a good right to lose his patience because of some of the practices that are performed in our civil-service procedure. Too much is done in the name of civil service, only.

Mr. TABER. Is it not true that we have political appointments now under the jurisdiction of Harry Hopkins, Benny Cohen, David Niles, and all that gang?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, certainly we have Harry Hopkins, and Benny Cohen who is one of the chief advisers of the inner circle, and David Niles, and the Gilberts, and the young man named Prichard, the young law clerk, whom, I am informed, is one of the main policy advisers, and Mordecai Ezekiel, who is a right-hand man on agricultural questions. But the gentleman's amendment will not reach them. If I thought it would, I would take a different attitude in a minute. Of course, one of our great difficulties right now is that our policies are being made by theorists and not by trained practical individuals. I want the gentleman to know that I commend him for digging into this thing. The practices he mentions ought to and must be stopped, but his amendment will not do it in my opinion. I nearly always go along with the gentleman from New York because his judgment is sound. He is one of the hardest working Members of this House. His criticism will do a lot of good whether his amendment is adopted or not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the situation, there is a gentleman's agreement that if we fail to agree to go along with the Senate on this so-called McKellar amendment then the Senate will agree to go along with the House in refusing it. Let us send it back without the amendment, let the Civil Service Committee work on it. Let this be notice to the Membership of the House to come before that committee and offer any suggestions they may have in mind whereby the situation may be improved by legislative action. I really believe it is wiser than try to legislate on an appropriation bill without giving it more consideration than we can in these few minutes. I think that would be better; I think we will get along better and that we will have better legislation if we do that. I want to commend the gentleman from New York in his attempt to correct abuses that ought to have been corrected a long time ago. I will go along with him in his effort to get it done. I am willing and anxious to do anything I can to correct a lot of inequities and a lot of abuses that go on down there.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the proposal submitted by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

I want to emphasize that that proposal is limited to the fiscal year 1944—that is, the fiscal year we are now in—that it is limited to new appointments, that it is limited to appointments of those who are to receive $5,500 or more, and that it is limited to the agencies specified in this bill and to those agencies only, with the Office of Strategic Services specifically excepted.

I can express my views very briefly, Mr. Speaker.

I am for this 12-month proposal at this time and under existing conditions because I have become sick and tired of conditions as I see them here on what may be called the home front.

Some of the worst conditions are to be found in the agencies affected by this amendment.

We have a Federal pay roll that is loaded, in many instances, with those of radical, and to some extent, subversive thought. We have a pay roll loaded with theorists as distinguished from those of practical judgment. We have incompetency and bungling by those in positions of responsibility without parallel. We have conditions on the home front which if not straightened out promptly may well serve to undermine our entire war effort on the fighting fronts overseas.

The Senate confirms every naval ensign, every Army lieutenant, all the more important postmasters. Reservation of the right to confirm in respect to the War Manpower Commission has, in my judgment, been very helpful. The additional burden involved in this proposal can readily be handled.

As far as I am concerned, in the interest of a service based on merit at home, in the interest of the war effort at home and overseas, I am content to place the additional check proposed on the personnel in question for the period specified in the hands of the United States Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALE].

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, there is very little new that can be said about this issue. The issue seems to me, in my very humble opinion, to be one of principle, as to whether or not we shall throw open important Government jobs to political patronage. If we follow the McKellar amendment or if we adopt it to a lesser degree by adopting the Taber amendment, we will be doing just that.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does not the gentleman think there is plenty of patronage in the job now that Harry Hopkins and the rest of the crowd over there have?

Mr. GALE. I think the patronage would be a lot worse under this.

Mr. BUSBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. May I ask if it is not political patronage when the administration at the present time appoints all these lame-duck Congressmen to these different positions in the O. P. A. and other agencies?

Mr. GALE. There is not very much of an answer to that. If we adopt the McKellar amendment, we will have a situation when we go back home, and we probably will be going home very shortly, of a very embarrassing nature. We will be accused very definitely of having passed a law and having authorized and sanctioned the filling of important war administration jobs with political patronage.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this McKellar amendment will be defeated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of reluctance that I came to this rostrum in reference to the pending bill today. If I did not believe that this bill covers a tremendous import, looking down into the future years of this country and having upon the future years of this country a tremendously important bearing on the question as to whether or not this country is going to remain a great, free country or not, I would not be here.

Back in the days of Martin Van Buren the principle was recognized and established, and it is recognized all over this country today, that where the patronage lies there lies the political power. A few moments ago someone said, "Why, these jobs might get into politics." They are in politics now. Is there a man on the floor of this House today who does not know that? And if they have forgotten that, Mr. Speaker, just remember the last time any bill of great interest and importance to this country was before the House. We were besieged by a great barrage of correspondence from home people, who wrote not because it affected their daily lives but because they were relatives of the millions of bureaucrats down here in Washington. These bureaucrats would receive word from the boss at the top of the pile, they would write to their friends, relatives, and members of their families back home, and you would get the impression that there was some real interest back there. You were influenced to vote not the way which your conscience told you to vote but as you thought a lot of people down in your district thought they wanted you to vote.

I would rather take a chance on a man being appointed after he has been looked over by the United States Senator who comes from my State and who knows the character of the people down there, than in other ways. Not long ago a man was appointed to a very important position at Kansas City, and I am telling this because the same thing is happening in the district of every man here. I happen to be a Democrat, and I am interested in the Democratic Party. This man was appointed as an important lawyer, as a counsel in one of these departments. He was a man with a poor reputation before the bar. He could not have been elected to any office in the State of Missouri. He was unknown at the bar because he had never practiced,

having simply slipped around the highways and the byways in his devious practice. He happened to be a Republican, but he is a Republican such as you gentlemen on this side would not recognize. He had been out denouncing the President of the United States, yet because some bureaucrat in Washington wanted him, he got the appointment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the question resolves itself into whether we are for the bureaucrats or Senators and as for me I am for the latter. People all over this country are giving praise to the Congress of the United States for asserting itself. We are on the upgrade. The people at home are with us. This is just one more evidence to have a little emphasis by the Congress over the bureaucrats. I think it would be highly acceptable to the people. Certainly it would be just a little notice, just a little bearing down that they need, that we can do without hurting anything at all. I think we should agree to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker and friends, I invite your attention to a fundamental consideration.

The Constitution of the United States provides:

> The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America (art. II, sec. 1).
>
> He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments (art. II, sec. 2, clause 2).
>
> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives (art. I, sec. 1).

Neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives, then, has any legislative power except that granted in the Constitution. And as all of the powers of the National Government are vested in its three coordinate branches, respectively, and each is supreme in its own sphere, it is inconceivable that any part of the executive power—the whole of which is vested by the Constitution in the President—or any part of the judicial power—the whole of which is vested by the Constitution in the courts—should be thought to be in the Senate, unless specifically granted the Senate in and by the Constitution itself. And as the Constitution specifically prescribes that, even as to the legislative power of the United States, only so much thereof shall be vested in the legislative branch of the Government of the United States as granted in the Constitution, it is beyond question that no power whatsoever of the Government of the United States is in either House or Senate which is not granted in and by the Constitution.

The power of appointing all of the officers and employees of the 17 war agencies in the Executive Office of the President affected by the pending appropriation bill, or by the amendment thereof now under consideration, is, of course, in the President, or, if inferior officers, then either in the President alone or in such heads of departments in whom the Congress may have by law vested it.

Since the right of concurring in executive appointments of executive officers or employees by confirmation is specifically granted the Senate by the Constitution, that right—a limitation of executive power—is in the Senate. But it can be no more expanded by legislation than it could have been so granted.

There is, therefore, no authority—nor can there be except by amendment of the Constitution—for Senate confirmation of inferior officers whose appointment the Congress has vested by law in the President alone or in the heads of departments.

It is equally clear that if the pending amendment would not repeal so much of the acts of Congress which vest the power to appoint inferior officers in the President alone or in the heads of departments, those laws stand, and no right of confirmation exists.

If, however, so much of such acts of Congress are repealed, then the subsequent appointment of all inferior officers or employees appointed by the President alone or by the heads of departments, is void, wholly without regard to the amounts of their salaries. This would create "confusion worse confounded."

Under such circumstances of law we certainly should reject the Taber amendment now under consideration, and then adopt the motion to adhere to our disagreement with the Senate as to the McKellar amendment.

Both sides to the controversy precipitated by the McKellar and Taber amendments have the same worthy objective. One side would remove the barnacles from the ship of state in one way. The other, in another way. In my opinion neither way is wise, to say the least. There is a better way. That is set forth in H. R. 3128, now pending in committee. I respectfully urge both sides here, and all others, to join in bringing that bill, or some better one, to final passage. But, in the meanwhile, as you value your reputation as lawmakers, I beg of you that you kill the pending amendment and also the McKellar amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, if we pass either the McKellar bill or the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from New York we shall be very vulnerable to criticism both by the press and by the people, and justly so. The people will interpret the passage of this bill as a scuttling of the civil service, as an attempt to evade the provisions of the Hatch Act, and as throwing these men who would be affected into State politics, for if their confirmation depends upon the will of the Senators it is unthinkable that they will not for that very reason be plunged into State politics.

The framers of our Constitution attempted to achieve a very delicate balance between the three separate branches of Government. It is quite possible that the legislative branch of the Government has surrendered too much of its power in the past to the Executive. I do not think the cure for that, however, is to let the legislative branch of the Government take over the legitimate functions of the executive.

I feel that the recourse of this Congress in order to maintain and regain its prestige is, after the war is over and the extraordinary power of the President in wartime has ceased, to take back its legislative power and exercise it, but not attempt to go to the other extreme and try to take away the just and legal functions of the Executive.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] says he favors this modified Senate confirmation that he has offered because he wants the Senate to clean up the civil service. To me that is an amazing statement, after the gyrations the Senate went through on Watson, Dodd, and Lovett. What do you expect? You are going to get nothing but patronage, that is what, and it is going to be given to the United States Senators.

If we are going to make a political football out of the civil service, then I want my part, too, and I want you to have your part, too, and not turn it over to the United States Senate, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] proposes to do by this compromise.

We have an agreement from the other body that it will abide by what we do here, so let us hold the line and go home and tell our people that we refused to let the Senate of the United States make a political football out of the war agencies, that we did not want to make a political patronage system out of these 16 or 18 war agencies that are included in this bill. That is all it is. If you want to have that sort of a government, then let us have our share of it, too. Let us not turn it over to the United States Senate, so they will have all of it and we shall have none.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have such a warm regard and genuine affection for my good friend the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, that, as I have said before, sometimes I like to see him get really wrong, because then I know he is not infallible. I will say for him that when he does go wrong

he goes wrong good. He does not miss it. He is in awfully bad company with this Taber-McKellar amendment. I know the methods are not the same.

There are several reasons why the House should stand by its vote it took on July 3. The first reason is because it is right that we should do it. That should be enough, but there is a collateral reason which I will mention in passing. I am told that the Senate has agreed to the conference report on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill. Very shortly it will be agreed to in this body. If this vote is passed, holding the line on this amendment, your reservations for tonight or for tomorrow for the recess will be good and you may go your way. Of course, that is not a compelling reason, but, as I say, it is a collateral reason.

I would like to have you, if you will, turn to the RECORD of July 3 and see how we voted on that day. Three hundred and two Members voted against the McKellar amendment, and 29 voted for it. Oh, you will say, it has been changed since then. Yes; it has been changed a little. Just sugar-coated a little. They just try to make it a little more palatable by providing that it shall only apply to future appointments and that it should be $5,500 instead of $4,500. Let the boys from $4,500 to $5,500 under the wire, but catch them from $5,500 up. You will really get good jobs there, but you may have a little something to say about the $4,500 crowd.

In my early days I worked in a drug store. Oftentimes we would have some fellow come around who wanted a dose of castor oil. I had a way that I could mix that up at the soda fountain. I would stir it up with a lot of orange juice or sarsaparilla and one thing or another and I could make it a little more palatable, and he could take the dose and he would not taste it quite so much as it went down, but it would have the same disastrous effect in the long run. That is the way with this amendment. It does not reach what the gentleman is aiming at at all. It absolutely wipes out the civil service in the upper brackets. Any man starting in the civil service as a career, which we have tried to build up, from the time he starts at the bottom, as he begins to reach the upper brackets and he hopes some day he may be an executive or a departmental head, and that great day will come when his name will go to the Senate. Oh, he is not thinking about that civil-service examination, but can he pass the examination in the United States Senate? Now, it is no indictment of human nature to say that every one of those men, when a Senator calls him, is going to answer the telephone and he is going to make sure that the distinguished Members of the United States Senate are not going to say when his name gets up there that he should not be confirmed. That is the kind of bait that would be thrown into the civil service.

But there is a much more potent reason than that. This amendment could be labeled an amendment to hinder the war effort. The Office of Strategic Services is not the only service that has men in the foreign field. We appropriated $22,000,000 for the Office of War Information for their services in the foreign fields.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes, I yield.

Mr. TABER. Would not the gentleman like to have confirmation for the O. W. I. foreign service and the Board of Economic Warfare foreign service after what has been brought out in the last few weeks?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. You absolutely could not run the foreign service of the Office of War Information or the Board of Economic Warfare or the War Shipping Administration, having their secret agents in foreign fields, if they had to send their names to the Senate for confirmation. Each of those agencies, just as the Board of Strategic Services, has secret foreign agents. No one knows who they are. They must be secret because they operate in foreign fields. They operate in dangerous territory. It would absolutely destroy the foreign service of the Board of Economic Warfare.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Certainly I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Granting that this thing should be done which, of course, the gentleman does not and neither do I, does he not think, if we are going to pass legislation like this, that it should go to a committee and be considered and brought in and apply to all departments of the Government, instead of these popgun things coming in on each appropriation bill?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think the gentleman's observation is absolutely unanswerable. It would be absolutely untenable, illogical, and unreasonable to pick out a few at a time and say that everybody getting over $5,500 had to be confirmed by the Senate, and a department across the hall does not have it apply to it. That would create an intolerable condition.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I wonder if the gentleman realizes that in our public land States, in States where the Government owns 72 percent of the land, it is all under the control of bureaucrats, and there is no way of bringing those bureaucrats under control.

I wonder if he knows that the chambers of commerce of the States and the local chambers of commerce feel that if these bureaucrats knew that they had to be confirmed by the Senate or put under some branch of the legislative body of the Government then at least a lot of these people throughout the States would work with the State representatives with some measure of cooperation, which they are not getting now.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I agree with the gentleman that perhaps some plan possibly could be devised whereby there would be some uniform system of consideration in the confirmation of certain parties. Already it is provided by the Constitution that certain appointees of the Executive must be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, an announcement was made when this matter was here before that hearings on the McKellar bill and several other bills would be had when the Congress comes back.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] such time as he may desire.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, with all of my regard for the gentleman from New York I hope the House will vote down the amendment offered by him. It would lead to endless confusion and create interminable difficulties.

I know that Mr. TABER's aim in offering his amendment is to prevent the appointment to key positions of inefficient, visionary, crack-brained persons of the genus long-hair, to which he so frequently and feelingly adverts, but I am wondering whether he has given sufficient consideration to the sinister effects of his proposal. I fear that in divorcing himself from the long-hairs he alines himself with the spoilsmen and I doubt whether he benefits by the change of company.

All of the objections so forcefully urged against the original McKellar amendment still hold against the Taber amendment. The Taber amendment lessens the problem only in degree. The provision of the Taber amendment that Presidential appointees nominated in recess shall serve until confirmed is substantially the present law and practice, so that this leaves one substantive proposition in the Taber proposal and that is that hereafter and dating back to June 30 all appointees to positions paying $5,500 or more must be confirmed by the Senate.

The country is much opposed to this kind of legislation, believing that notwithstanding the good intent of the gentleman from New York and others who have seen fit to sponsor it that it would be spoils legislation of the worst type. Not only is public opinion as a whole against it but the press is almost unanimously opposed to it. We can only imagine what a valuable accessory it would be to machine politics in this country and how highly it would be regarded by the political bosses.

Let us visualize the case of John Jones, a perfectly competent man, who might be nominated for a $5,500 job. The local political boss would look over his records and see that John Jones was deficient as a political manipulator and would wire to the Senator from his State: "Oppose confirmation of John Jones. He is a political dud and has never done anything for our party."

Based on that high impulse, generated in the home political works, the Senator would proceed to hold up confirmation and the public interest would suffer. There are actual instances where word has gone out to persons considered for appointment that if they would agree to contribute 5 or 10 percent of their salary to the political organization at home they could depend on confirmation; otherwise not.

The War Manpower Commission has been right up against this problem ever since the rider was adopted requiring Senate confirmation of all War Manpower appointees drawing $4,500 or more. The War Manpower Commission has been caused no end of trouble by that provision and it has delayed and handicapped the work of that Commission beyond all reason. Highly eligible persons, whose services have been much sought, have flatly declined to have their names submitted, rather than go through a humiliating fight to secure Senate benediction. Not only have the personnel efforts of the Commission been demoralized in this way, but the delay caused by a backlog of unconfirmed nominations has been a heavy deterrent to successful administration of the War Manpower Commission.

Illustrative of the confusion that would be created by the Taber amendment, some perplexing problems of administration under it already are foreseen. For instance:

Does it mean that a person already in the service and who is transferred would have to be confirmed before he could accept the $5,500 position to which he is transferred?

Does it mean that a person now in the service who is promoted under the Ramspeck Act to $5,500 would have to be confirmed? Under the Ramspeck Act an employee drawing $5,400 a year after 30 months' service is automatically promoted to $5,600. Would he have to be confirmed? The Board of Economic Warfare and various secret services, intimately integrated with the military effort, operate all over the globe. Is it seriously proposed that the recruitment of this highly essential and vitally important personnel is to be held up and these vital operations are to be handicapped and delayed while United States Senators leisurely debate the political qualifications of the appointees? Some of these persons have been appointed since June 30 and are now on their way to their vital spots in foreign countries. Are they to be recalled and forced to do obeisance to a politically minded Senate?

The publicity that would be given to the agents if their names are dragged before the Senate in a confirmation proceeding would end the usefulness of their important activity. These agents operate in foreign countries under the cloak of secrecy and in the very nature of things they must operate anonymously. Probably we could do nothing that would help the enemy more than to bring their names out into the limelight of publicity in a confirmation proceeding before the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the Taber amendment, well intended as it is, would foment controversy and create delay at a critical time when unity and expeditiousness are the primary need. It would slow up the war effort more than can now be imagined. I have very direct information that it is doubtful whether the President will sign the bill if this provision goes into it. I plead with the House to give sober second thought to this amendment and if it does so I feel certain that it will reject the proposal.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the nays appeared to have it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I call for a division.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 69, nays 260, answered "present" 1, not voting 100, as follows:

[Roll No. 138]

YEAS—69

Abernethy	Hess	Powers
Allen, Ill.	Jackson	Rankin
Andresen, August H.	Jenkins	Reece, Tenn.
Bell	Jennings	Reed, N. Y.
Boykin	Jensen	Richards
Brehm	Johnson, Calvin D.	Rizley
Brown, Ohio	Johnson, Ind.	Schiffler
Bryson	Jones	Sheridan
Busbey	Jonkman	Simpson, Ill.
Carson, Ohio	Lambertson	Smith, Ohio
Carter	Lemke	Somers, N. Y.
Chiperfield	McCowen	Stewart
Coffee	McGregor	Taber
Cole, N. Y.	McKenzie	Vincent, Ky.
Cravens	McMillan	West
Crawford	Maas	Whelchel, Ga.
Davis	Martin, Mass.	White
Ellis	Merrow	Whitten
Elston, Ohio	Miller, Nebr.	Wigglesworth
Fish	Mundt	Wilson
Gibson	Murray, Tenn.	Wolcott
Harris, Ark.	Norrell	Wolfenden, Pa.
Heidinger	Philbin	Woodruff, Mich.

NAYS—260

Andersen, H. Carl	Canfield	Elliott
Anderson, Calif.	Cannon, Mo.	Ellison, Md.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Carlson, Kans.	Ellsworth
Angell	Case	Engel
Arends	Celler	Feighan
Arnold	Chapman	Fenton
Auchincloss	Chenoweth	Fernandez
Baldwin, Md.	Church	Fisher
Barry	Clark	Flannagan
Bates, Ky.	Clason	Fogarty
Bates, Mass.	Clevenger	Folger
Beall	Cole, Mo.	Forand
Beckworth	Compton	Fulbright
Bender	Cooley	Furlong
Bennett, Mo.	Cooper	Gale
Bishop	Costello	Gamble
Blackney	Courtney	Gathings
Bloom	Cox	Gavagan
Bolton	Creal	Gavin
Bonner	Crosser	Gearhart
Boren	Cullen	Gerlach
Bradley, Pa.	Cunningham	Gillette
Brown, Ga.	Curtis	Goodwin
Buckley	D'Alesandro	Gossett
Buffett	Dewey	Graham
Bulwinkle	Dickstein	Grant, Ala.
Burch, Va.	Dilweg	Gregory
Burchill, N. Y.	Dingell	Griffiths
Burdick	Dirksen	Gross
Burgin	Disney	Gwynne
Butler	Dondero	Hagen
Byrne	Durham	Hall, Leonard W.
Camp	Dworshak	Halleck
	Eaton	Hancock
	Eberharter	
Hare	McGehee	Sasscer
Harless, Ariz.	McGranery	Satterfield
Harness, Ind.	McLean	Scanlon
Harris, Va.	McMurray	Schuetz
Hart	McWilliams	Schwabe
Hartley	Madden	Scott
Heffernan	Mahon	Shafer
Hendricks	Mansfield, Mont.	Sheppard
Herter	Marcantonio	Short
Hinshaw	Martin, Iowa	Sikes
Hobbs	Mason	Simpson, Pa.
Hoch	Merritt	Slaughter
Hoeven	Michener	Smith, Maine
Hoffman	Miller, Conn.	Smith, Va.
Holmes, Mass.	Miller, Mo.	Smith, Wis.
Holmes, Wash.	Miller, Pa.	Snyder
Hope	Mills	Sparkman
Horan	Monkiewicz	Spence
Howell	Monroney	Springer
Hull	Mruk	Stanley
Jarman	Murdock	Steagall
Jeffrey	Murphy	Stearns, N. H.
Johnson, Anton J.	Myers	Stefan
Johnson, J. Leroy	O'Brien, Mich.	Stockman
Johnson, Luther A.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Sullivan
Johnson, Lyndon B.	O'Neal	Sumner, Ill.
Johnson, Okla.	O'Toole	Sumners, Tex.
Judd	Outland	Sundstrom
Kean	Pace	Talle
Kearney	Patman	Thomas, N. J.
Kee	Patton	Thomas, Tex.
Kelley	Peterson, Fla.	Thomason
Kennedy	Pittenger	Tibbott
Kerr	Ploeser	Towe
Kinzer	Poulson	Voorhis, Calif.
Kirwan	Pracht	Vorys, Ohio
Kleberg	Price	Vursell
Klein	Priest	Walter
Knutson	Rabaut	Ward
Kunkel	Ramey	Wasielewski
LaFollette	Ramspeck	Weichel, Ohio
Landis	Rees, Kans.	Weiss
Lane	Robertson	Wene
Lanham	Robinson, Utah	Wheat
Lea	Robsion, Ky.	Whittington
LeCompte	Rockwell	Wickersham
LeFevre	Rodgers, Pa.	Willey
Lesinski	Rogers, Calif.	Winstead
Luce	Rogers, Mass.	Wolverton, N. J.
Ludlow	Rohrbough	Woodrum, Va.
Lynch	Rolph	Worley
	Rowan	Wright
	Rowe	Zimmerman
	Sadowski	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hays

NOT VOTING—100

Allen, La.	Gordon	Norman
Andrews	Gore	Norton
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gorski	O'Brien, Ill.
Barden	Granger	O'Connor
Barrett	Grant, Ind.	O'Hara
Bennett, Mich.	Green	O'Konski
Bland	Hale	O'Leary
Bradley, Mich.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Peterson, Ga.
Brooks	Hébert	Pfeifer
Cannon, Fla.	Hill	Phillips
Capozzoli	Holifield	Plumley
Cochran	Izac	Poage
Colmer	Johnson, Ward	Randolph
Culkin	Keefe	Reed, Ill.
Curley	Kefauver	Rivers
Dawson	Keogh	Russell
Day	Kilburn	Sabath
Delaney	Kilday	Sauthoff
Dies	King	Smith, W. Va.
Ditter	Larcade	Starnes, Ala.
Domengeaux	Lewis	Stevenson
Doughton	McCord	Talbot
Douglas	McCormack	Tarver
Drewry	Magnuson	Taylor
Elmer	Maloney	Tolan
Fay	Manasco	Treadway
Fellows	Mansfield, Tex.	Troutman
Fitzpatrick	May	Van Zandt
Ford	Morrison, La.	Vinson, Ga.
Fulmer	Morrison, N. C.	Wadsworth
Gallagher	Mott	Weaver
Gifford	Murray, Wis.	Welch
Gilchrist	Newsome	Winter
Gillie		

So the motion was not agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Brooks for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Allen of Louisiana for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Drewry against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Ward Johnson.
Mr. Granger with Mr. Gilchrist.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Elmer.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
Mr. Fay with Mr. Gillie.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Lewis of Ohio.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Grant of Indiana.
Mr. Randolph with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Hill.
Mr. Ford with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mr. Norman.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Gordon with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Manasco with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. Gorski with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. King with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Hale.
Mr. Tolan with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Day.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Tarver with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Talbot.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Troutman.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Doughton with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Sauthoff.
Mr. May with Mr. Barrett.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. DREWRY, who, if present, would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 34: On page 43, line 18, strike out "203" and insert "204."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adhere to its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 34.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the various amendments were disposed was laid on the table.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3030) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 26 to said bill.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STEAGALL submitted the following conference report and statement:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 3.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 4; and agree to the same.

HENRY B. STEAGALL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
Managers on the part of the House.

ROBERT F. WAGNER,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
FRANCIS MALONEY,
JOHN A. DANAHER,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: Section 4 of the joint resolution as it passed the House provided that section 22 (g) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (relating to indebtedness of executive officers of banks), should not apply to loans which the Commodity Credit Corporation has agreed to take over or purchase. The Senate amendment eliminated section 4 of the joint resolution. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment merely changes a section number. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: This amendment provided that whenever a maximum price or prices has been established for any agricultural commodity, or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, including livestock, no subsidy or other payments should be made, either directly or indirectly, out of any funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other governmental agency to any person engaged in the production, marketing, distribution, or handling of any such commodity as compensation for any reduction or roll-back of maximum prices so established, unless the Congress, by appropriation or otherwise, shall have authorized the use of such funds for such purpose.

There was no corresponding provision in the joint resolution as it passed the House. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 4: This amendment added a provision to section 2 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, to make it clear that nothing in that act should be construed (1) as authorizing the elimination or any restriction of the use of trade and brand names, (2) as authorizing the Administrator to require grade labeling of any commodity, (3) as authorizing the Administrator to standardize any commodity, unless the Administrator determined, with respect to such standardization, that "no practicable alternative exists for securing effective price control with respect to such commodity", or (4) as authorizing any order of the Administrator fixing maximum prices for different kinds, classes or types of a commodity which are described in terms of specifications or standards, unless such specifications or standards were, prior to such order, in general use in the trade or industry affected, or have previously been promulgated and their use lawfully required by another Government agency. The section also repealed the provision in the National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1944, prohibiting the use of the appropriation for the Office of Price Administration for the promulgation or enforcement of orders requiring grade labeling or standardization of food products, wearing apparel or other processed or manufactured commodities or articles.

There was no corresponding provision in the joint resolution as it passed the House. The House recedes.

The purpose of this amendment to section 2 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is to meet the objection that the Price Administrator has exceeded the limitations expressed in section 2 (h) of that act in issuing certain regulations already promulgated.

The first clause prohibits any attempt to eliminate or restrict the use of trade and brand names, and clarifies the original congressional intention on this subject. The second clause prohibits any requirement for grade labeling of any commodity as that term is defined in section 302 (c) of the act. This definition embraces all commodities and products, including hosiery and wearing apparel. The third clause requires that before any commodity may be standardized, the Administrator must determine that no practicable alternative method exists for securing effective price control of the commodity. The fourth clause prohibits the tying of maximum prices to specifications or standards under any circumstances unless such specifications or grades have previously been in wide, general use in the affected industry, or have previously been lawfully required to be used, in the sale of commodities, by some other Government agency acting pursuant to congressional authorization. Thus price ceilings may be based only on grades and specifications which are in wide, general use in an industry, such as those prevailing in the lumber business; or may be based on legal standards or specifications promulgated under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or the Federal Meat Inspection Act. But requirements that standards or specifications be used in manufacturing or selling, or that such standards appear on the invoice, are prohibited except where such standards or specifications are in wide, actual commercial use, or are lawfully required by some other Government agency, acting pursuant to statute, to be used in the sale of the affected commodities. Voluntary, advisory, warehousing, proposed, or tentative specifications or standards, issued by administrative officials, cannot be written into law merely by being put into maximum price regulations.

Each of these four limitations is made separately applicable to the issuance of maximum price regulations, and is designed to make certain and specific the congressional intent originally embodied in section 2 (h) of the act. That section provided that "the powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or

methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry. * * *"

The enactment of this further provision, making clear the circumstances under which the Administrator may act, warrants the repeal of the somewhat broader limitations, recently included in the National War Agency Appropriation Act of 1944, to which the Administrator has objected.

HENRY B. STEAGALL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on House Joint Resolution 147, to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the conference report.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, there are three Senate amendments embraced in the conference report. One is purely clerical, the second relates to an amendment to the Federal Reserve Act, and the third relates to an amendment to the Price Control Act concerning grade labeling. I think it sufficient to say that these amendments are not controversial so far as the conferees are concerned either from the House or the Senate. And I am sure this is true of the entire membership of the House.

When the recent measure extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation failed to receive the approval of the Chief Executive, and when the action of the President was sustained, it seemed that the practical course left us was the enactment of the resolution which passed the House, House Joint Resolution 147, to continue the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation until the 1st of January, 1944. During this time the Congress will have opportunity to give further study to the matters in controversy and further opportunity to deal considerately with the legislation in the light of all developments between now and the 1st of January, 1944.

No new authority is conferred upon anybody with respect to the matters in controversy by this House joint resolution; it is simply a stop-gap to bridge over this period of time and to preserve the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation with its functions and activities that are so important to the farmers of the United States and to the national economy. As far as I am concerned, and I am sure it is true of other Members of the House, I have not changed my views with respect to the policy of subsidies and roll-backs as a means of controlling inflation. I repeat now as I said the other day when this matter was before the House, it was never intended that in the passage of the price control bill with section 2 (e) that we were to confer such power except for the purpose of encouraging and obtaining necessary production for the prosecution of the war.

When this matter is before the Congress again free from the complications that existed when this resolution was introduced, as far as I am concerned my position will be exactly what it was when the legislation was first before us and as expressed in my vote when I regretfully and respectfully voted to pass the bill notwithstanding the objections of the Chief Executive.

The managers on the part of the House adhered to the expressed will of the House, and I wish to say because of some seeming misunderstanding that there was no real insistence upon the so-called Danaher-Tydings amendment by the managers on the part of the Senate. We did have before us, proposed by them, a provision which, after considerable discussion and consideration by the managers on the part of the Senate, was tendered to the conferees as a substitute for the Danaher-Tydings amendment. That provision simply declared it to be the policy of Congress that we were opposed to subsidies and roll-backs. It was nothing more than a meaningless gesture. No one in conference would gainsay the correctness of that statement.

We as Representatives of the House did not think we could accept such a provision which merely declared a policy. Congress has on numerous occasions made known its attitude. We felt—at least some of us did—and I think I speak for the conferees on the part of the House, that such a provision would be objectionable, if, indeed, it would not be resented as deceptive by Members of this House who so strongly feel, as many Members do, in opposition to roll-backs and subsidies; and, so, we rejected it.

At the proper time we can take up this legislation again and give it the consideration its importance deserves and I shall be glad in my humble way to render whatever service I can in that connection. In view of misunderstanding that seems to prevail I want to say that any impression that the House conferees were stubborn or inconsiderate in the manner in which the matter was handled in conference is not justified. The fact is a majority of the conferees on the part of the House were unalterably opposed to the so-called Danaher-Tydings amendment, and it is not unfair to say that it was not really urged by the conferees on the part of the Senate. I say that for the record in order that any misunderstanding about this may be cleared up. The Senate receded and, of course, that ended the matter.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The fact the conference committee rejected the Tydings-Danaher amendment is not to be construed that the House or the Congress either confirms, approves, or authorizes roll-backs or subsidy payments?

Mr. STEAGALL. The gentleman from Minnesota inquires if this action is to be construed as in any way reflecting the will of the Congress with respect to the policy of roll-back and reduction of maximum prices by subsidies. I answer: No, no such thought entered our minds. What we intended, what we had in mind solely, was to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation with its powers as they now exist under the law until the 1st of January 1944.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact that the roll-backs and subsidies were initiated by O. P. A. and handled through the R. F. C. under section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act of 1942, which has nothing to do with the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, yes, that is quite true. What we did was with regard to the Commodity Credit Corporation and was entirely logical and consistent.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If I understand the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee correctly, he and his conferees agreed to this conference report because of the necessity of continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation activities, and this is the very best thing to do, either that or kill the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is absolutely true, but that does not mean that the members of the conference committee did not have divergent views. We wanted to preserve the life of the Corporation.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. There is something in this conference report that commits the Congress or the country or that authorizes any person to engage in roll-backs or subsidies?

Mr. STEAGALL. There is no new authority whatever conferred. I thought I had stated that. The matter is left in abeyance to be fought out, and every man in this House may pursue that controversy just as he thinks proper as heretofore, without embarrassment because of having voted for this resolution. In face of the President's veto, which we were unable to override, the practical situation required that we take steps to preserve the Commodity Credit Corporation. We were defeated for the time being by the veto and there was nothing to do except to try to preserve the benefits of the Corporation for the time being. That is what will be done by the enactment of this resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee tell the House what his attitude will be with respect to giving this matter additional attention between now and December 31, 1943, at which time the effect of this resolution expires? In other words, can we go away from here feeling that some time between now and December 31 next, in order that we may advise our constituents to that effect, it is the intention of the House Banking and Currency Committee to give this whole question of subsidy as related to the Commodity Credit Corporation and

its activities full consideration so that the House may have a chance to act thereon?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is certainly my intention, and I feel sure I speak for other members of the committee when I say that. I may say to the gentleman that that is what we had in mind in limiting the life of the Corporation to January 1 in order that the matter may be reconsidered.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, both Houses of the Congress have spoken decisively against roll-backs and subsidies for the purpose of reducing maximum prices. The President, exercising his constitutional powers, vetoed a bill which would have prohibited further payment of roll-backs and subsidies for the purpose of reducing consumer prices. After this veto was sustained, Congress had a new responsibility.

In view of the fact that had no legislation been passed the Commodity Credit Corporation, which has done outstanding work and has loaning capacity of more than $2,650,000,000, would have expired, it became our duty to at least temporarily salvage the Commodity Credit Corporation until such time as we could lay out a new program for it. In view of the very definite action taken by both the House and Senate in opposition to roll-backs and subsidies for the purpose of reducing maximum prices, it is not conceivable that the administration will expand its existing program. In fact, it has been suggested that it would not be in keeping with the spirit of democratic government if the President and the other agencies in the executive establishment were to so defy a majority of both branches of the Government.

At the present time roll-backs exist on butter and meat. They are the only roll-back subsidies that are in existence. These subsidies are being financed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I say that to clear up an impression that the $350,000,000 additional borrowing power which we give the Commodity Credit Corporation is to be used for this purpose. At the present time, so far as I know, the Commodity Credit Corporation has not laid out any program to pay subsidies for the purpose of reducing maximum prices. At the time that we held hearings, and I refer you to those hearings, Mr. Hutson, President of Commodity Credit Corporation, said he wanted a billion dollars to carry on what you and I consider the legitimate purposes of the Commodity Credit Corporation which did not embrace the payment of subsidies or roll-back prices to reduce maximum prices. So there is very little or no affiliation between the $350,000,000 in this bill and the roll-back program.

If the administration and if the executive branch of the Government has through a misinterpretation of the law done something in respect to roll-backs which we consider is illegal, we in no manner become a party to those illegal actions by the adoption of this conference report and we in no manner whatsoever put our stamp of approval on the illegal actions of the executive branch of the Government in rolling back prices or in reducing maximum prices and financing it by the payment of subsidies. I want to make it very clear that my interpretation of the Price Control Act is simply that the Office of Price Administration has the legal authority to pay subsidies for only one purpose and that is to encourage and to obtain the maximum amount of production and that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized under the same act to pay subsidies only to obtain the maximum amount of production of strategic and critical materials.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, we had this alternative.

You want to go home and find out what your people think about this and a lot of other problems before this Congress. No one denies that you are entitled to that right. I do not know whether or not you are going to get any rest, otherwise I would have said "vacation." But you have the right to go back home and talk with your people about these problems. It is essential that you do so. We are going to recess tonight for that purpose.

Had we adopted the Danaher-Tydings amendment we would have written again into the law the same language, almost the identical language that the President objected to and gave as his reason for vetoing the bill. Ten days from now, after the President had vetoed this joint resolution, had the Danaher-Tydings amendment stayed in, it would have been on the Speaker's desk. You would either have been called back here to override that veto, or the responsibility of killing a $2,650,000,000 corporation would have been on your shoulders and not on those of the President. He would have exercised his constitutional prerogative to veto the bill. Then you would have been called upon to do your constitutional duty, and come back here and save the Corporation which means so much, $2,650,000,000 worth, to the agricultural interests of this country.

This is stop-gap legislation to save the Commodity Credit Corporation temporarily so that it can function in all of its legitimate pursuits for a period of only 6 months. It does not put the stamp of approval on any of the illegal acts of the administration in respect to Commodity Credit Corporation moneys, Reconstruction Finance Corporation moneys, or O. P. A. moneys. I hope this House will accept this conference report with the very definite understanding that we are not affirming any of the actions of the administration in respect to the roll-back program, that we are just as much opposed to roll-backs and subsidies as we ever were. When we come back here next September we shall be forced under the provisions of this act to lay out a new program, because the Commodity Credit Corporation will expire again on December 31 if we do not do so. We can determine then whether we want to kill the Commodity Credit Corporation or whether we want to restrict further the roll-back and subsidy program.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. The gentleman does not contend that there is anything illegal about rolling back prices on agricultural products unless they are rolled back below parity, does he?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes, I do, if subsidies payments are made to finance them. Let me make myself clear. I said that the Office of Price Administration under 2 (e) of the Price Control Act of 1942—and I defy anyone to place any other legal interpretation on the language—can subsidize only for the purpose of obtaining the maximum production of agricultural and other commodities. To roll back a price 5 cents and then pay that 5 cents out of the Treasury of the United States surely is not any incentive or inducement to increase the production of agricultural products.

Mr. BARRY. The gentleman's objection is to subsidies, not roll-backs?

Mr. WOLCOTT. My objection is to subsidies.

Mr. BARRY. That is right.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the gentleman distinguish between subsidies and roll-backs?

Mr. BARRY. Absolutely. Under the law the President or the Price Administrator can roll back prices down to parity without paying any subsidy.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is absolutely correct. One of the contentions has been—and I want to make this clear—that there is no reason why the ceiling should be taken off foodstuffs merely because we have stopped or would have stopped the subsidy program. There is no more reason why the price of agricultural commodities should go up to 156 percent of parity than that it should go up to 300 percent. The Price Administrator is morally and legally bound, if he follows the language, the spirit, and the intent of the Price Control Act, to stabilize prices. It is up to him to do it. Because he has not done it, we have this very controversial subject before us.

Mr. BARRY. The gentleman's objection is to subsidies.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

SO-CALLED PRICE ROLL-BACK IS A DELUSION AND SNARE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the idea that the cost of living can merely be reduced or held down by subsidizing the consumer public with taxpayers' money is false and vicious. The scheme cannot reduce the cost of living one iota. On the contrary, it is bound to increase living costs and multiply our present troubles of controlling prices and rationing. Instead of lessening the dan-

gers of inflation, it will greatly increase them. But a little common-sense reasoning should convince anyone of the truth of this statement.

Take the 5-cent roll-back on butter. To outward appearances, of course, it is apt to look to many when they pay for a pound of butter over the counter that they have actually made a saving of 5 cents. The fact is, no actual saving has been made. What really happens here is not an actual reduction to the consumers in the price of butter, but merely the shifting of the payment from the grocer, processor, and producer of butter to Uncle Sam, who in turn, hands it over to the grocer, processor, and producer.

The same principle applies, of course, to all other consumer goods that may become involved in the roll-back program.

The sole source of the subsidies used in this scheme is taxes. These taxes must be paid either by present taxpayers or future taxpayers. A part of the Federal funds is raised by current taxes, while the other part is being raised by borrowing which must be paid back by future taxpayers.

Who are the current taxpayers and who will be the future taxpayers? Practically everybody now pays Federal taxes, wage earners, farmers, as well as all others. No group of people is more deceived by this scheme than are wage earners. The trouble with this roll-back is that it never stops rolling until it gets back on their pay or income.

It is true, shamefully true, that not all of the price roll-back finally falls on current taxpayers. Some of it falls on future taxpayers. Who are some of the future taxpayers that will be called upon to pay for our present cost of living? Among them will be many millions of returning soldiers. So there will be a roll-back of prices on to our soldiers who are now bleeding and suffering to save our Nation. This is a spectacle, indeed.

They will have to help pay the taxes for the interst and retirement of Government bonds that are now sold to raise the money with which to pay the roll-back subsidies. Here is something that should concern our consciences.

Under the administration's price roll-back subsidy scheme when you next sit down to your meal, and you ask the blessing and offer a prayer for the speedy and safe return of your soldier boy, or of another, give a little thought to the fact that a part of the cost of the food you are about to eat has been rolled on the one for whom you are praying.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, this conference report has been adopted by the Senate. I am sure I am in accord with the feeling of the House when I suggest that further discussion is not necessary, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HARE submitted the following conference report on the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 to the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

BUTLER B. HARE,
ALBERT THOMAS,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
HARRY S. TRUMAN,
WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,
CLYDE M. REED,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 2935.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: On page 62, line 23, after the figures insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to pay the salary of any person at the rate of $4,500 per annum or more unless such person shall have been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARE moves that the House adhere to its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCESSIVE FEES IN CONNECTION WITH WAR CONTRACTS

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1900), to prevent the payment of excessive fees or compensation in connection with the negotiation of war contracts, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 13, after "sales", insert "by."
Page 3, line 14, strike out "by."

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the transmission of this bill from the House to the Senate there was a printing error. On page 2, line 14, the word "by" was placed, whereas it properly belonged in line 13.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is the only change?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. That is the only change, and it is simply to make this correction.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It does not change the meaning of the act at all?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. No, sir; I do not think so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

JULY 8, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the following committees: Accounts, Elections No. 1, Immigration and Naturalization, Indian Affairs, Patents, and War Claims.

Respectfully submitted.

ARTHUR WINSTEAD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 297), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That ARTHUR WINSTEAD, of the State of Mississippi, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Military Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

DISTRIBUTION OF FERTILIZER

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1396) making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 15, after "laws", insert ": *Provided*, That the provisions of this act shall not apply to fertilizer distributed for experimental purposes by the Tennessee Valley Authority."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the amendment?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The amendment only excepts fertilizer manufactured by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. HOPE. And, as I understand, that is only fertilizer for experimental purposes?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. When that fertilizer is used for experimental purposes only.

Mr. HOPE. Otherwise the bill as passed by the Senate is exactly the same as the bill passed by the House?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO FILE INTERIM REPORT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of Congress the select committee appointed by the House under House Resolution 102 may file for printing in the calendar an interim report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix on two subjects and include a short newspaper article in each case.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include an editorial from the Duluth News Tribune under date of June 30.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain tables and quotations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a radio speech which I expect to make.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks regarding the Hamilton Watch Co. and to include therein two letters.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New York Times entitled "Old Colonial Church."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a statement on the death of General Sikorski.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, to include an address before the New England Town and County Church Conference by R. W. Hudgens.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by the administrator of the hospital at Hot Springs, Ark.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the United Office and Professional Workers of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects: One with reference to action directed against organized labor recently, and another an article from the Chicago Sun, of Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two different topics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include a brief quotation from Aristotle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

COLUMBIA RIVER POWER AND THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order for today for 20 minutes. I ask in lieu thereof that I may be permitted to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate most sincerely the vote of my colleagues last week in the House in restoring to the war agencies bill the item for carrying on the work of the Bonneville Administration, which had been deleted by the Appropriations Committee of the House. As you will recall, I made a very earnest appeal to you on the floor, urging that this deleted item be restored. My remarks appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 1, 1943, page 6976.

The two great hydroelectric projects on the Columbia River—Bonneville and Grand Coulee—have been of major importance in the prosecution of the war. It is clear now that if we had not had these two great enterprises furnishing the huge reservoir of power for the production of aluminum for the building of airships and the construction of the tools of war, we would not now be meeting with the successes we are on the many battle fronts throughout the world. Thirty percent of the aluminum supply essential for the production of bombers and fighter planes is coming from this one area alone. The remarkable record made by the Kaiser companies and the other shipbuilding organizations in the Portland-Vancouver area, as well as the Puget Sound area, is due in a large measure to the electric energy being furnished by these hydroelectric plants. Bonneville Dam's eighth generator was recently brought into production by means of which Bonneville and Grand Coulee are now furnishing 900,000 kilowatts. Eighty-five percent of the wholesale power delivery from these two great Federal projects is now going into war industries and war needs. The Bonneville Administration points out that existing contracts, together with commitments for war power demands in the Pacific Northwest, will utilize 95 percent of the wholesale deliveries in 1944. Only two of the huge generators of Bonneville remain to be installed and work is being rushed on them for early completion. The program provides that the full 10 units of Bonneville will be in operation and supplying electric energy to win the war by 1944. In the same year the last of three new 108,000 kilowatt units under construction will be completed at Grand Coulee. At that time Grand Coulee will have a combined rated capacity of 1,316,000 kilowatts.

Mr. Speaker, I have recently had up with the appropriate Federal agencies the necessity of locating in the North-

west one of the extrusion plants heretofore authorized in this area as a part of the rounded program for the production and utilization of aluminum. Under existing conditions the aluminum is being produced from bauxite, which is brought in from Eastern States or from South America, which involves long delays and large transportation expense. When the aluminum is produced with Columbia River power and converted into aluminum pig in the federally and privately owned plants in the Northwest, the pig aluminum is then again transported through long hauls to extrusion and fabricating plants in eastern territory. From these plants it must again be retransported to the West for the construction of airplanes in Washington, Oregon, and California, where a very heavy proportion of airplane construction is taking place, particularly in Washington and California. It is a short-sighted policy to fail to realize the importance of locating this extrusion plant in this area. If the Federal Government's investment is to be protected not only under war conditions but in the post-war world, we must have located in the area all of these several types of plants and save the long delays and transportation expense.

As a further step in the completed development of aluminum production and use, we in the West have been urging the establishment of a project which will permit the reduction of local aluminum clay deposits instead of depending upon expensive bauxite brought in from foreign countries or from the Midwestern States. There are immense deposits of aluminum-bearing clay in the Columbia River area, and the Chemical Construction Corporation, of New York, has made complete studies, investigations, and surveys of these deposits and is prepared to go forward with the location and construction of a plant. I recently had the matter up with the Mineral Resources Coordinating Division of the War Production Board, urging that this project be approved, and am happy to announce that on June 23 the Director of that Division advised me that full approval had been given to the project.

Recently Mr. I. B. Joralemon, an engineer for the Defense Plant Corporation, together with other consulting engineers, made an examination on the ground of these various deposits of aluminum-bearing clay in the Columbia River area and will soon make the report as to the proper location for this project.

Engineers report that new processes have now been discovered for the utilization of these aluminum-bearing clays which are of lower grade than bauxite so that these clays may be utilized commercially and economically. With the completion of the development of these projects for utilizing the new methods and local clays and the establishment of the fabricating and extrusion plants in the Northwest, a completely rounded process will have been developed whereby aluminum may be taken from the local deposits, reduced, processed, and put into final construction of airplanes and other equipment which depend upon this light metal in the Northwest, and save delays and transportation costs. The Government will thus not only be taking a great stride forward in war production but will have established a great industry which will make a greater contribution in the post-war world for the development of our country and the preservation of civilization and for adding to the welfare and comforts of our citizens.

IS WOOD RATIONING JUST ANOTHER BUNGLING PROGRAM?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Northwest is blessed with the greatest supply of standing timber of any portion of the United States. Lumbering is a major industry, and firewood is as plentiful as sand on the seashore. There is a problem, of course, of labor and transportation in providing fuel for consumer use. O. P. A. has recently issued the following official statement:

The supply of firewood available to consumers in the Pacific Northwest is generally not sufficient to meet demand. This deficiency is most pronounced in the heavily populated war-industry areas around Puget Sound and Portland, and Vancouver on the Columbia River.

Monthly sales reports from dealers show that the total amount of firewood delivered each month is declining. Many consumers, particularly those located some distance from dealers' yards, are not receiving their fair share of annual firewood requirements. Some have not been able to buy any firewood at all this year.

In war communities a firewood deficit is occurring daily and cumulatively throughout the year. This deficit in supply will result in serious community shortages in midwinter.

Only about 8 percent of firewood reported sold during last season was forest cordwood. All other firewood sold was produced as a byproduct of sawmill operations, which have not kept pace with the increase in fuel wood demand. If emergency conditions should develop, that would further curtail or stop sawmill operations, many communities would be cut off from their primary fuel supply. This dependence on sawmills is most pronounced in urban centers. In some towns dealers' yard stocks have disappeared as population has mushroomed in war areas, and dealers are delivering each day's sawmill production directly to consumers.

Mr. Speaker, the people of my district are aroused over this new development and are deeply concerned as to whether or not this one great supply of fuel may not, through ill-advised and bungling directives and orders from Washington bureaucrats, be denied them and that they may not only be deprived of coal and oil for heating purposes, but likewise may be denied the right to use our own supply of wood growing in our very back yard and which is going to waste.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I call up conference report on H. R. 647, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 647) to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 3, and agree to the same.

J. HARDIN PETERSON,
J. W. ROBINSON,
COMPTON I. WHITE,
K. M. LECOMPTE,
Managers on the part of the House.

CARL A. HATCH,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
MON C. WALLGREN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 647) to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The House bill authorized the Secretary of the Interior to acquire such lands, in addition to the site of the birthplace of George Washington Carver, as might be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act. The Senate amendment authorizes the Secretary to acquire interests in land. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: The House bill provided that the land to be acquired under the bill should be acquired by gift or purchase. The Senate amendment authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the land by condemnation in the event he is unable to purchase it at a reasonable price. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: The House bill provided that the Director of the National Park Service should maintain and preserve the national monument provided for by the bill. The Senate amendment merely provides that the maintenance and preservation of the monument by the Director shall be "in a suitable and endurable manner which, in his judgment, will provide" for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the United States. The House recedes.

J. HARDIN PETERSON,
J. W. ROBINSON,
K. M. LECOMPTE,
COMPTON I. WHITE,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks

in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include certain tables which I shall prepare; and I should like to have this extension so that I might put it in the RECORD at any time up to the last RECORD that is published during the recess.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of H. R. 2703.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks in the Appendix and include therein an address delivered by Walker H. Young on citizens' conference planning at Omaha, Nebr.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Dr. R. H. Martin relating to peace.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a résumé of veterans' legislation reported by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, and veterans' legislation passed by the Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include some material about the meat situation in Butte, Mont.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Oil City Derrick.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting a letter from the Under Secretary of the Treasury accompanied by statements relative to expenditures, receipts, the public debt, and the general status of the Government's fiscal affairs.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2828. An act to permit certain burials in the Scottish Rite Temple in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 2988. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 26, 1941, as amended;

H. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution relating to the provision of butter for the patients of St. Elizabeths Hospital; and

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the importance of farmers to the effective prosecution of the war, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 250. An act to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2968) entitled "An act making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendments numbered 33 and 34 to said bill.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of War.
4. Federal Works Agency.
5. Executive Office of the President:
   Office for Emergency Management.
   Office of War Information.
   Administrative Branch.
   Operating Service Division.
6. United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY], is recognized for 15 minutes.

IMPENDING OIL SHORTAGE

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I realize that at this particular time it is asking quite a lot of Members to stay to hear a special order, but this involves a matter in which every Member of Congress assumes and continues to carry a personal responsibility. The Nation is rapidly approaching a man-made oil shortage, and very briefly I want to point out some of the facts and call attention to some of the statistics that are involved.

On many occasions within the past year, I have raised this question of price of petroleum and its relation to the guaranty of a supply. There have been so many other Members, committees, representatives of agencies that are concerned with the conduct of the war—including the Army and the Navy—that much time would be consumed in merely reciting the list.

Opposed to the contention that we must safeguard our supply and that a price in keeping with cost of the effort to obtain supply must be paid, is one agency. Only the Office of Price Administration is complacent.

Our oil reserves are estimated at 20,000,000,000 barrels.

Our normal consumption approximates 1,500,000,000 barrels a year.

Our daily production for the week ending June 26, 1943, was 3,991,885 barrels.

Our daily consumption, as of the same date, was 4,115,000 barrels per day.

Conservatively, our military operations and lend-lease supplies will amount to more than a million barrels per day, which would require an increase of 25 percent above peacetime consumption peak, according to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee's report.

We depleted our above-ground stocks in 1942 by 55 million barrels.

The figure is bound to be larger for 1943.

Discoveries of oil declined for the last 4 years, so our volume of reserves has declined.

New discoveries have been declining since 1939.

Since that time discoveries have only been about one-half the consumption rate.

In 1926 crude oil sold for $1.80 a barrel, where its price now is about $1.18. Taking that year as the standard represented by 100, by comparison we have these relative prices today: Crude oil, 61.2; cost of living, 97.5; farm products, 117; bituminous coal, 120.4; industrial labor per hour, 170.4. The index price of crude, as compared with 1926, has decreased 38.8; the cost of living 2.5. There has been an increase in farm products of 17, of bituminous coal of 20.4, and of labor, 70.4.

Costs of materials, labor, and discovery have greatly increased, yet these increases are not reflected in ceiling prices.

In the last 4 years discovery cost per barrel has increased from 15 to 55 cents per barrel.

Nearly five times as many exploratory wells are required to locate the same amount of oil as 6 years ago.

The independent producer who has discovered about 75 percent of our oil is being eliminated in favor of the major producers.

The pinch of inadequate price for crude is wiping out the independent producer.

Secretary Ickes as Petroleum Administrator recommended a 35-cent per barrel

increase, less than 1 cent per gallon. The O. P. A. stopped him.

I hope the Members of the House will heed these statistics. Our oil reserves are estimated at 20,000,000,000 barrels. Our normal consumption approaches 1,500,000,000 barrels per year. This is especially interesting. Our daily production for the week ending June 26, 1943, was 3,991,000. Our daily consumption on the same day was more than that, 4,115,000 barrels. Conservatively, our military operations and lend-lease demands will amount to more than a million barrels per day.

We are producing less than we consume and our military operations must have at least a million barrels per day. That would require an increase of 25 percent above peacetime consumption. This is according to the report of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee filed in the last week. Last year we depleted our above-ground stocks by 55,000,000 barrels and the figure for 1943 will be found to be larger in the use of above-ground stocks in both the crude and refined products.

The discovery of oil has declined for the last 4 years so that our volume in reserve has also declined. New discoveries have been declining since 1939. In the last 4 years the discovery cost per barrel has increased from 15 cents to 55 cents, depending on the field. That is to say, the cost of production of newly discovered oil is about 15 cents to 55 cents per barrel, depending on the oil field in which it is produced. The average will be near 55 cents per barrel for cost.

Listen to this, if you please. Nearly five times as many exploratory wells are required now to locate the same amount of oil as 6 years ago. The net result is that the independent producer, the fellow who has discovered about 75 percent of the new discoveries, is being eliminated in favor of the major producers. Secretary Ickes, as Petroleum Administrator for War, recommended a 35-cent increase, less than a cent a barrel, but the O. P. A. stopped him and has held him stopped at that stage. He stated before the Ways and Means Committee the other day that he was going to issue an appeal. I do not know to whom or where, but there must be some authority or the Secretary of the Interior would not talk about appealing.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman said "35 cents a barrel means less than a cent a barrel." The gentleman meant less than a cent a gallon?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes; less than a cent a gallon.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is what it ultimately means. In other words, to the consumers of the Northeast, the New England States, it means an increase of less than a cent a gallon, yet Mr. Ickes' recommendation is being held up by the Office of Price Administration?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes. It ought to be said here that the relation of the cost of a gallon of gasoline to a barrel of crude oil is something like the relation of a loaf of bread to the cost of a bushel of wheat, relatively fractional. You in the consuming States need not be alarmed at a rise of 35 cents or even 75 cents a barrel in crude oil, because it would be merely fractional. The labor cost, the machinery cost, and the cost of the other items and elements that go into the discovery of oil and the drilling for new production have increased about 55 cents a barrel. These independent oilmen cannot be expected to continue to operate at a loss, yet this dumb, indefensible, unintelligent action of the Office of Price Administration stands pat on some notion which it describes as a slogan "Holding the line against inflation."

Are we encouraging inflation if we permit men, handling natural resources of which we are running short, to produce at cost or at a profit? The question answers itself.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I call your attention to the fact that based on the 1926 index number, the price of crude oil is 70, while the index for labor is 170.

Mr. DISNEY. In 1926 crude oil sold for $1.80 a barrel. The price now is about $1.18. Taking that year as the standard represented by 100 by comparison, the relative price today of crude oil would be 61.2. The cost of living is 97.5, farm products 117 and bituminous coal 120.4, industrial labor, per hour, 170.4. The cost of labor and material and discovery have greatly increased, yet these increases are not reflected in the ceiling prices of crude oil set by the O. P. A.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The O. P. A. in taking the position that it does in connection with the matter under discussion of "holding the line," as they say they are, amounts to "holding the line" against the needs of the people of this country and against success in our present war effort?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes. Let me read you a few lines from an independent oil producer:

> I have been obliged to shut down another marginal property within the last 2 weeks, and now have some 150 wells shut down, but not abandoned, hopefully awaiting some action on the crude price situation.

This is only one of the thousands of instances that show that we are surely—and not at all slowly—running into a national shortage of oil.

Let me read you a short excerpt from a letter written by an oil operator at Wichita, Kans. Take this home to yourselves, because evidently a lot of oilmen feel this way:

> I sincerely believe that the Senators and Congressmen should be held personally responsible for the crude oil shortage that is here in some places and will be widespread all over the United States. I know that I am certainly going to hold them responsible in the event my sons overseas are unable to get food or ammunition to them on account of the shortage of oil, because they have the power to run those bureaucrats out of Washington, and they are doing nothing about it.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. The gentleman is making a very interesting statement and informing the House and the country, as he always does, in a very instructive manner. The gentleman has had a tremendous amount of experience in the oil industry. Yesterday the gentleman was on the floor when the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] was talking about the oil situation. The gentleman will recall that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] was talking about wildcatters. I should like to have the gentleman explain if it is possible under present costs for the wildcatter to operate. Is not the cost of sinking wells one of the main reasons why a higher price is required?

Mr. DISNEY. It is next to impossible for them to go ahead except with the visionary idea that they may make a profit later. Secretary Ickes recommended that we needed this year 4,500 new wells drilled for discoveries of oil, and we shall wind up at the end of this year, according to the present figures—unless we get some kind of a decent price rise—with less than 2,700, probably less than 2,500 new wells drilled. Mind you, the use is 4,115,000 barrels a day and production is 3,999,000 barrels per day. The military forces need and want about a million barrels a day.

Mr. ROLPH. May I ask the gentleman if he thinks 35 cents is a sufficient increase in price?

Mr. DISNEY. Personally I do not, but that has been recommended, and I am standing by it. It ought to be about 60 or 65 cents. If we really want to "go to town" and get the oil, we had better make it interesting for somebody to drill for it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. With reference to the letter from Wichita to which the gentleman referred in which it was stated that Congress should be held responsible for this terrible condition, certainly the gentleman who is speaking has called the attention of this Congress on many occasions to this very urgent situation. I recall that last December the gentleman made a very informative speech about it.

Mr. DISNEY. The reason I read this letter is that it illustrates the feeling among these independent operators who have all the facts to prove that they have not had a square deal. If I may address myself to the Democrats for just a minute, we are going to have some difficulty in explaining an administration measure that has given them the gaff in the manner they have had it in the last few months.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I agree with the gentleman. I am not trying to escape my responsibility in this matter because I have had something to say about this also.

Mr. DISNEY. Certainly; the gentleman has made every effort. I remember he has spent a lot of time and effort trying to persuade O. P. A. to take action, and was led to believe action would be taken quickly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct; and I am sorely disappointed in what appears to be the disinterested and uncooperative attitude of O. P. A. in this important matter. I think the gentleman will agree with me also that this foolish, idiotic spacing order of 40 acres which is still in effect down in the Department has also kept the wildcatters from being able to wildcat and get oil. Certainly Congress cannot be held responsible for that impractical and unreasonable spacing-order restriction which is an important factor in preventing wildcatting and the bringing in of additional oil production so essential to the war effort.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. It may be interesting for the gentleman to know that thousands of wells in Pennsylvania are being abandoned. Our production is off 15,000 barrels a day. A barrel of crude represents 50-percent gasoline. That would be 7,500 barrels, which at 42 gallons to the barrel would be 310,000 gallons a day. This means that better than 9,000,000 gallons of gasoline a month could be produced to meet this shortage throughout the East, but they still will not do anything about it to relieve the gasoline-hungry American people. The producer has been on a starvation diet for the past 10 years.

Mr. DISNEY. That is true.

Mr. GAVIN. The Congress ought to demand that Price Administrator Brown grant this increase of at least 35 to 65 cents a barrel.

Mr. DISNEY. If they have not done something by the time we get back, we had better do something about them and their organization. I trust action will be taken soon, and recent developments lead me to believe that will happen.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman from Oklahoma has done a lot of work on this question and is concerned about it, as I am. The first consideration, after all, under the present conditions, is to get more oil. That is the main thing.

Mr. DISNEY. We cannot get it for nothing. It has to be paid for.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We talk about prices and parity prices.

Mr. DISNEY. Let me interrupt right there. The gentleman reminds me of this: It has been suggested that we offer a subsidy to the oil business to get oil wells drilled. You know what will happen under a subsidy? Everybody will drill for the subsidy, not drill for the oil. No; a subsidy is preposterous, unworkable, and unfair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 10 additional minutes because of the importance of the subject matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We discuss the question of parity and parity prices. Is it not a fact that, after all, crude oil is only about 60 percent of parity right now?

Mr. DISNEY. It is between 55 and 60 percent of parity. It seems nonsensical when we need oil so badly, that anyone would hesitate on account of the oil men's making a profit. We must not run into an oil shortage during this fearful war.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. May I suggest that the gentleman from Oklahoma has a bill before this House? I sincerely hope that if we cannot get action from the O. P. A., we will be permitted to act on that bill.

Mr. DISNEY. We run into this difficulty there. The bill provides, first, that the whole problem be turned over to the Petroleum Administrator for War to fix the maximum price. Second, the bill provides for parity prices, but we run into the same problem that we ran into with reference to corn. When we start fixing the price of one commodity, other commodities naturally follow in. If we can really persuade the O. P. A. of their unwise attitude, and see what they are forcing us into, surely they will yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman advocating assistance only to the so-called wildcatters, independents, or all oil companies? Will you find the same situation if you help the larger companies as well?

Mr. DISNEY. The big companies are integrated. They engage in all phases of the oil business. They often make more money with a low price of crude, because they sell refined products.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I mean the result is that? It hurts the war effort.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes; it does.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I am sorry to take the gentleman's time, but there is one other thing. Venture capital, even with the price raise, is still confronted with the threat that is constantly hanging over it to take away the percentage depletion.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes; we have that crawling under us all the time from a certain department, but it has not made much progress up to date.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I do not want to take much of the gentleman's time, because he is making a very fine and enlightening speech, but I want to say that I attended a meeting of oil men a year ago from the entire section of the country represented in my State, where they produce a great deal of oil, and all their complaints are along the line which the gentleman has been mentioning. None of them has thus far been recognized. The gentleman is familiar with the oil situation. Does he not recognize that the wildcatter is the one who is always bringing in new fields?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes. About 75 percent of the new discoveries are by wildcatters. The wildcatter may and often does sell out to a major company.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. But the wildcatter has to develop, and if he cannot do it we just do not get any new oil?

Mr. DISNEY. That is correct. In 1938, a normal year, the industry drilled one new productive well for each 63,000 barrels produced in the United States. In 1942 it drilled one new well for each 134,000 barrels produced, and for the first 5 months of this year, 1943, it drilled one new well for each 160,000 barrels produced; this shows a constant decline.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. Do I understand my distinguished friend from Oklahoma now preaching a heresy about price fixing for the oil industry?

Mr. DISNEY. No, sir.

Mr. DINGELL. A price per barrel?

Mr. DISNEY. No, sir.

Mr. DINGELL. Or a minimum price for oil?

Mr. DISNEY. No, no. Let us not bring up the Bituminous Coal Act now.

Mr. DINGELL. I just want to be straight on the matter.

Mr. DISNEY. The oil industry is too smart to ever be inveigled into the price-fixing plan as involved in the bituminous coal industry.

Mr. DINGELL. Well, what is involved here?

Mr. DISNEY. Ceiling prices by O. P. A.

Mr. MONRONEY. And not support prices.

Mr. DISNEY. No.

Mr. DINGELL. It is the same thing.

Mr. MONRONEY. I want to compliment the gentleman on his foresight and grasp of this problem. I remember that many months ago he called the attention of this House to this emergency. I know he feels as I do, that we are losing the most valuable part of our oil production, that part which will be irrecoverable in future years, if we let these mar-

ginal producers, pumpers, and stripper wells fill with water. Unless we do something to make it profitable to operate these high-cost producing operations we are going to lose a substantial part of our production.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes, and you must keep in mind that this 20,000,000 barrels of reserve cannot be produced in a short time. The average in Pennsylvania is only one-eighth of a barrel per day, but there is a half million barrels of reserve. It takes time to get the oil from the reserves.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. No oil is produced in my district. I do not care whether it is oil, potatoes, or corn; the American people are not so much interested in the price as they are in the question of getting what they want at any price. I just wonder how far our bombers could fly on subsidies instead of gasoline.

Mr. DISNEY. Not very far.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Surely it is not Mr. Brown who personally decides these things. Who is it in the Office of Price Administration that refuses to yield on this petroleum proposition?

Mr. DISNEY. Well, there is a labyrinth of bureaucracy down there.

Mr. CURTIS. Can the gentleman find out who makes the decisions?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes. We found out that Secretary Ickes made a recommendation for 35 cents a barrel, and it went down to the Office of Price Administration and Mr. Sumner Pike, a man who never produced a barrel of oil in his life, before the order ever reached Mr. Brown, wrote a letter rejecting the price rise recommended by Secretary Ickes. That is very interesting, but not amusing.

There are some other details that I would like to consider.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the gentleman in the Office of Price Administration realize how far reaching the consequences of his decision are, based on his ignorance?

Mr. DISNEY. Undoubtedly he does.

I yield to the gentleman from——

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to call the attention of the gentleman from Oklahoma to the fact that this same Sumner Pike was loaned to the Office of Price Administration from the Securities and Exchange Commission. I can only say that I do not know what interest rate Mr. Brown is paying for the loan of Sumner Pike, but whatever it is, it is usury.

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. May I ask the gentleman a question and then make a brief statement?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Was it not just a few years ago that instead of 20,000,000,000 barrels in reserve we had an estimated reserve of 26,000,000,000 barrels?

Mr. DISNEY. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. At the rate the reserves are going down, it will not be many years until we will have to be buying our oil from Iraq or Iran or elsewhere?

Mr. DISNEY. We are not discovering now anything but small pools; we are not discovering anything like the pools in California or East Texas or the Oklahoma City pools were, and have not done so for quite a while. And, from the small pools, as I have stated, it takes about five times as many wildcat wells to produce the same amount of oil as was produced 6 years ago, and that means a lot more expense for the same amount of oil.

About the middle of 1941 a division of the petroleum industry which is closest to the problem of finding new oil and gas fields—the independent producers—began to call attention to the needs of the situation. The industry was at that time, as the then Price Administrator admitted in his first report to the Congress, in a depressed condition. It then began to lose its manpower, attracted by defense industries paying wages with which petroleum could not compete. Cost of the equipment which the industry buys went up. Taxes increased. Only the price stood still.

On October 22, 1942, the Honorable William P. Cole, Jr., who had devoted considerable of his time to petroleum over an 8-year period, as chairman of the Petroleum Subcommittee of the House, stated the case in a letter to the President. He shouted a warning.

There have been some eight or nine separate inquiries into petroleum supply and related subjects in less than 1 year. Uppermost in every recommendation made is price.

The petroleum industry is in agreement and has so expressed itself. The Petroleum Administration, charged by the President with petroleum supply responsibility, in two strongly worded letters to the Price Administrator has said the case is urgent.

Nothing has been done to carry out this stentorian demand. There have been a few trifling, localized adjustments of crude-oil prices which have served to affect the national average not more than 2 cents per barrel. The Petroleum Administrator urged an average increase of 35 cents per barrel, nationally. The Price Administrator said, "No."

> Two agencies in the driver's seat of the truck, one pressed the throttle to supply this critical need, the other put on the brakes to stop it. One agency of the Government said "Yes," the other said "No."

That is a quotation on this subject from the report of the House Petroleum Subcommittee, dated July 3, 1943.

The needs of our war effort continue to increase. The figure of 1,000,000 barrels daily for the United States military program was released a few days ago by General Somervell. That is for the last half of this year and it includes the petroleum products needed by Army, Navy, Lend-Lease, and War Shipping Administration. It does not include two of our most important items, aviation gasoline, and lubricants. In terms of crude oil, it is one-fourth of our national production.

Every area of the country cries today for more petroleum. It cannot be supplied, even at the present rate, for long. Regardless of the new and improved means of transportation, there is no relief unless supply is stimulated. Drilling is declining and wells are being abandoned. The cost of the effort is too great, the return too small. The oil producer cannot do business at a loss indefinitely. He has been living off his hump, like the camel, for several years, but his reserve is gone.

I know of no more striking figure to illustrate the decline of petroleum effort than the following: In 1938, a normal year, the industry drilled 1 new productive well for each 63,500 barrels produced in the United States. In 1942 it drilled 1 new well for each 134,500 barrels produced. For the first 5 months of this year it had 1 new well for each 160,000 barrels produced.

We who represent districts in which oil is produced will return to our homes to see at close range the stagnation of an industry whose effort was never before so greatly needed.

You who return to districts whose interests in petroleum is solely in supply of products—of gasoline and of oil to heat the homes and run the industries—must tell your constituents that they will have to continue to get along with no more than they have had in the recent months, and probably with even less.

When we return to Washington, if no price correction has been made, Congress will be compelled to correct the matter, and that we will do it speedily.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders of the day I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today after the disposition of special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes after the special orders heretofore entered have been concluded.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House today for 5 minutes following the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

THE PETROLEUM SITUATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the last 2 or 3 days the entire House is more aroused over the necessity for the drilling of more oil wells and also for the better and wider distribution of such oil and gas that we have, than it has ever been before.

We who live on the east coast are being discriminated against as no other section of the country, or as no section of any other country during this entire war. No other country has discriminated against one section in the amount of oil and gas that has been given to it over another section; there has been an equal distribution throughout that country.

The Members know just as well as I do that this war cannot be won without gas, without high-octane gas, without oil. Our ships, our automobiles, and our airplanes are run by it and we must ship vast quantities of it abroad. If we have a recess—and it looks as though we should—I personally expect to spend a very large part of my time in Washington working on this very problem, and I am hoping that the Members who live in districts where oil and gas are produced and where they have steadily enjoyed the use of it ever since the war started, when they go home will think of the problems of the industry not only insofar as it concerns their districts but as it concerns the East and as it concerns the winning of the war. I earnestly hope, as I have said many times on the floor, that my idea and the wish of many others that a Petroleum Administrator for War will be appointed and given full power for the distribution of oil, for its production and entire control with the possible exception of transportation, may be nearer realization. Some of us have introduced legislation for that purpose. Mr. Eastman, who in the main has done a fine job in the matter of transportation, will of necessity still have something to say about the rail transportation of oil and gasoline.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution which authorizes the Speaker to appoint a committee of seven to study the personnel of the Department of State and the duties and functions of the personnel. There has been a large mushroom growth within the State Department. In the Department are many fine officials doing splendid work, but some of the things others are doing go beyond the provinces of the Department of State and are so insidious and far reaching they are alarming. In our meetings of the Committee on Foreign Affairs we have not been able to secure the witnesses we should have had come before us and our meetings have been few and far between. I have spoken of that many times on the floor within the past few years. This resolution I have introduced has as its purpose finding out what is happening within the State Department, how far they are going without the authority of the Congress, either of the House or the Senate, and also for the purpose of aiding and strengthening the Department. I believe the Department has been performing certain functions recently, also, that even some of the personnel did not feel belonged to the Department of State but properly belonged to the Congress. I hope I shall secure the support of the Members for this resolution. I say again it is not intended as a destructive measure but as a constructive measure.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentlewoman is quite familiar with the shortage of petroleum products on the eastern seaboard.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman and I have been working on the problem for many months.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentlewoman suggested the question of transportation and referred to Mr. Eastman. Mr. Eastman handles only the question of tank-car transportation, in the matter of oil. We are interested in mass transportation, and the pipe line is the only solution to our problem on the eastern seaboard.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We members from the eastern seaboard voted for a pipe line months and months ago; so did the Congress. A pipe line was authorized, but it was not started for a very long period of time after it was authorized.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. It is the cheapest means of transporting oil.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is the cheapest, the quickest, and the best in every way, now that tankers are used for other services, as the gentleman knows. Most of our oil was brought to us in tankers by water before the war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House at the conclusion of the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes following the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

IF VICTORY IS ACHIEVED THE HOME FRONT WILL HAVE TO FOLLOW THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, facts, while always stubborn, sometimes cruel, sooner or later have to be faced. The weakling, afraid that he will be unable to cope with a difficult situation, will dodge alarming or disagreeable facts, thinking, hoping, probably praying, that the situation will right itself. This, as we all know, seldom, if ever, happens. The strong meet facts, whether favorable or unfavorable, face on, because they want to know the truth. Having obtained the truth they then resolutely set out to bring about corrections, if needed.

It is time, yes, past time, that we in America faced the cold, stubborn facts with respect to where we stand in this terrible, devastating war. Well, the facts are, and we might as well face them, America faces a crisis, and she faces a crisis because there are two many people here on the home front who have not really gotten into this war.

And because so many of our people have been playing around about ankle deep in this war, when they should have taken an all-out plunge and become immersed from head to foot in the war effort, has had its effect, I am afraid, upon Congress. If we will stop and think, we will find that Congress is but the national expression of what the people back home think. Yes; the average Congressman usually reflects the thoughts, the aspirations, and the ideals of the people he represents. And this is right. The trouble right now is that Congress, having heard from this pressure group and the other pressure group, I am afraid, has mistaken the clamor that these groups are daily making for the voice of the people they represent. While I realize that many of the complaints that these different groups are registering are not without merit, and while I believe adjustments of these complaints, if they do not adversely affect the war effort, should be made at the earliest moment possible, I do not believe that the clamor we daily hear is the voice of the masses back home. The people back home, in my opinion, regardless of politics or anything else, want us to quit this eternal bickering, wrangling, and fussing, get behind our Commander in Chief, and cooperate in every way to bring this war to a speedy and victorious conclusion so our boys

can come marching back home. Believing as I do, I think the greatest contribution the Congress, at this time, can make to the war effort is to recess and go back home and become acquainted with what the people are really thinking. They will find, if I am not mistaken, that the people not only expect but demand that we fall in line and fight here on the home front, not under the leadership of this group or the other group, but under the leadership of our Commander in Chief.

There is but one way we can avert the crisis we face. That way is to get together here on the home front and stay together until the victory has been won. And whether some like it or not, we have got to get together under the leadership of the one the Constitution designates, in time of war, as our Commander in Chief. It is a good thing that the Constitution provides, in time of war, for a Commander in Chief, because, I am afraid, if it did not every pressure group in America would today be running off after some cockeyed leader whose vision is circumscribed by the particular interest he represents.

We are entirely too prone to charge every mistake, every blunder up to the President. While the Constitution makes him our Commander in Chief, it would be humanly impossible for him to personally direct every effort on the battle front and the home front. Of necessity, in many instances, he has to act through others. And in setting up the multitudinous war agencies on the battle and home fronts, mistakes, of course, were to be expected. And it was but natural that in setting up the thousands of agencies misfits would, now and then, be placed in high positions. Now, while constructive criticism calling attention to mistakes is helpful and should be freely made, this thing of charging everything that goes wrong up to the Commander in Chief is entirely another thing. And much of this destructive criticism, emanating as it has from the enemies of the President, I am afraid, has been made with the end in view of undermining the President rather than correcting the abuse. Now remember when you undermine the President, you are undermining your Commander in Chief, the man who more than anyone else holds the destiny of your boy and my boy in his hand.

Even the bitterest enemies of the President will have to admit that his three top men today on the home front—Justice Byrnes, War Mobilization Director; Fred Vinson, Economic Stabilization Director, and Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator—are not only men of outstanding ability, but men who are steeped in American traditions, and entertain an abiding faith in our institutions. These men have not been in office very long, and the fair thing, the decent thing to do, it seems to me, is to give them a fair chance before turning our wrath upon their efforts. Some time ago I heard this story, which seems to be in point. A city urchin who had led a rather free and neglected life attended his first school. A short while after entering the schoolroom the teacher asked: "Tommy, can you read?" "H—— no", replied Tommy, "I have only been here 10 minutes." Now, my colleagues, do not expect our old associates and friends Jimmy Byrnes, Fred Vinson, and Marvin Jones to clean everything up in 10 minutes. Fairness demands that we give them a chance.

Another thing. Before we really get together on the home front there are some people in this country who have got to wake up to the fact that we are at war and that war calls for sacrifice. Too many, far too many, of our people begin to squawk as soon as they are called upon to make a sacrifice. They want business as usual, gasoline as usual, food as usual, traveling as usual, strikes as usual, pleasure as usual, wage increases as usual, farm increases as usual; yes, everything as usual. What do you think the boys who no longer lead lives as usual but whose lives today are being directed in training camps and on the battle front and who obey orders without a question, though those orders lead to death itself, think of us stay-at-homes who whine and whimper every time our accustomed way of life is interfered with? I read the Sunday edition of one of our great daily newspapers last Sunday morning. I found column after column devoted to reporting this complaint and the other complaint, this bellyache and the other bellyache, until the whole sordid picture gave me the headache. Why a column or two in the paper gave a detailed account of the crowds that jammed our railway stations, milling around and clamoring for tickets to go off on a Fourth of July lark, when everyone in the crowd knew, or should have known, that our transportation system is taxed to the limit taking care of our war effort, and the Government is, and has been for some time, appealing to all to forego pleasure traveling. That evening I went out to Walter Reed Hospital to see some of the boys who were wounded in north Africa and have been brought back for treatment. As I gazed upon their ghastly wounds, some without arms, some without legs, others minus both legs and arms, I could not help but wonder what those boys thought of the complaints some of us stay-at-homes are registering. And I also wondered if they had read the paper I read that morning; and, if they had read it, if at times they did not wonder if they had not paid an awful price to save some of us griping, bellyaching, life-as-usual grouches back here on the home front.

The strange part about many of the complaints is the fact that they are steps that have been taken to protect, among others, those complaining. Yes, a great many of the complaints, as everyone knows, are against the steps that have been taken to keep down inflation. I know something about inflation, because the Republican inflation in the twenties deflated me in the thirties. When it comes to inflation, I view it in the same way a burnt child does the fire. I know it will consume your substance overnight. This war, even if we win the victory, is going to be the greatest jolt this country every suffered. If we add to that jolt, inflation, we are lost. Now, it is going to take effort and sacrifice to win the battle against inflation no less strenuous and exacting than that required to win the war. And if at times the sacrifice seems a little hard, just think of the sacrifices our boys are making to win the war, and I believe without murmur or complaint you will go ahead and make the needed sacrifice. And so I call upon all to line up behind our Commander in Chief in the great fight he is waging to keep America from falling prey to the greedy, cruel demon inflation.

I sat in the House the other day and listened to a slim blond creature of symmetrical lines and a face of beauty, whose graceful form was richly gowned, whose long, swanlike arms and tapering fingers were encased in jewels worth a king's ransom, and whose left breast was bedecked with a rose as crimson as the precious blood that oozed out of the ghastly wounds suffered by our boys as they fought from the fox holes of Bataan, give vent to spleen that I would never have associated with "a form so fair that like the air, 'tis less of earth than heaven."

The gentlewoman from Connecticut was in action going through her periodical devotions at the shrine of political hate. As she chanted her ill-considered lines of carping, bickering criticism from the manuscript before her, in her delusive performance to make the President out the chief among the isolationists by the deceptive use of legerdemain diction, somehow her voice did not have the ring of American motherhood whose boys are in the service and who daily, nightly pray for a unified home front under our Commander in Chief; and as she chanted, my southern chivalry plus her beauty and charm were the only restraining influences that kept from surging through my wicked, carnal mind the biting lines penned by one famous English woman against another English woman of equal fame:

> She isn't old and she isn't young,
> The woman with the serpent's tongue.
> The haggard face, the famished hand,
> That slights the worthiest in the land,
> Condemns the just, condemns the brave
> And blackens goodness in the grave.

Oh, if the gentlewoman from Connecticut only had a boy in the service, I wonder if she would not devote more effort to winning the battle of the Pacific, the battle of the Atlantic, and the terrific battle that will come when we invade the Continent, which, my colleagues, can only be done by promoting unity and solidarity on the home front, and less effort to prematurely fighting the political battle of 1944. Just now the boys on the battle fronts are neither Democrats nor Republicans. They are Americans. And they are fighting and making the supreme sacrifice to save, not the Republican Party or the Democratic Party, but America. And if we back our boys up, we who are left on the home front have got to forget politics, forget that we are Democrats or Republicans,

and remember that we too are Americans.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut is not the only offender. The enemies of the President, Democrats and Republicans alike, are now, and have been for some time, dealing not in constructive criticism, but in destructive criticism, in an effort to discredit him before the American people. They seem to be laboring under the impression that the President desires another term in office and that they are justified in resorting to any means to see that this does not happen. In their bitterness they forget the fact that we are at war and that under the Constitution the President is our Commander in Chief; yes, our Commander in Chief not only on the battle front but on the home front, and that it is our patriotic duty here on the home front to follow his leadership. If our boys who, in a supreme effort to preserve our liberties, are marching "into the jaws of death, into the mouth of hell," can accept his leadership, and glory in that leadership; if the people of England, Russia, and China, and the subjugated nations, whose women have been ravished, whose sons have been killed, and whose cities and countrysides have been laid in waste, can accept his leadership, and thank God for that leadership, it does seem that we stay-at-homes here on the home front enjoying security from want and hunger and danger could adjourn politics, forego bickering, carping, destructive criticism, and fall in line in solid phalanx behind our Commander in Chief until, at least, the victory has been won, and our boys have returned home. If we will only do this, we will be able to get our boys back in time, I hope and pray, to engage in the political battle of 1944. Having taken care of our enemies on the battle front, I know when they return they will be able to take care of those who, while they were bearing the heat of battle, through envy, hate, or malice, or for political reasons, played the part of the obstructionist here on the home front.

And so I call upon all here on the home front, regardless of race, or creed, or color, or sect, or politics, to give full play to their Americanism so it will become so intense, so all consuming, that it will rise above malice and hate and political considerations, unite under the leadership of our Commander in Chief, and march in solid phalanx to victory here on the home front. We have not won this war yet, and we are not going to win it if we become divided on the home front.

Some years ago one of our Vice Presidents who, in addition to being a great statesman was a great philosopher, said that what the country at that time needed most was a good 5-cent cigar. Well, today I am thinking that it is not so much a question of what we smoke, as it is a question of keeping this country, yea, the whole world, from going up in smoke. And as a contribution toward the attainment of this end, what this country needs most today, in my humble opinion, is for Congress to recess and for the Congressmen to go home and get acquainted with the thoughts and desires of the people they represent. We will find out that the mothers and fathers back home are not interested in politics, or the fortunes or misfortunes of this individual or the other individual; that they look with disfavor upon the interminable wrangles between the legislative and executive departments of Government; and that they want us to compose our differences, get together and stay together, and devote our every effort to bringing this war to a speedy and victorious conclusion so their boys can come marching back home.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have permission to sit at such times as the committee may deem necessary during the recess of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the supreme need in America at this moment is a sense of national unity. The Congress cannot supply everything that is needed to achieve unity but there are certain definite functions vital to that effort for which we alone are responsible. Our recent assertions of legislative prerogatives should confirm the people's confidence in the representative form of government. The Executive may be better fortified to act in some situations than the Congress—hence the veto power; but final authority must rest with us as representatives of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is possible for us to pursue this idea of independence in a way that will strengthen and not weaken the Nation's war effort. We are asserting leadership in a more positive way than at any stage of the war. It is well then for us to consider the relationships of the branches of Government, particularly the relationships that spring from the creation of a multitude of new agencies.

First. The relationship with the executive department. Some of you know that prior to my election to Congress I was employed in the Department of Agriculture. I was called a bureaucrat. My views are doubtless colored to some extent by reason of that experience. Still it gave me an opportunity to observe from a different viewpoint some of the friction between the legislative and executive departments. I know at least some of the weaknesses in administrative service from inside observation. I know how conscious many of the bureaucrats themselves are of these deficiencies, and how earnestly they are working to improve procedures under their particular control.

For every administrative officer who is intent upon bypassing Congress there are many more who are eager to follow legislative mandates. I have sat with these men in many informal conferences and I know their point of view. As individuals, they might complain at times, as all Americans do, about their Congressman's behavior—I hope we never reach the point where that time-honored practice cannot be indulged with complete freedom—but as officials they respect our decisions and bow to our judgments.

The execution of our laws does not call for automatons. Administrators must have latitude of thought and action if the objectives of legislative policy are to be achieved. Errors in judgment are inevitable, and we should be as tolerant of their mistakes as we ask the people to be of ours. The administrator's craftmanship can be no better than ours. We enact a law that is vague and the administrative action may follow a course that is contrary to our intentions but not our language.

Again, we enact a law with detailed and meticulous directions and the administrators unduly circumscribe their actions, often failing thereby to carry out the spirit of the law. There is no short answer to this problem, but one element is essential. We must have faith in each other and a cooperative attitude on both sides.

Secondly, there are certain fundamental principles in constitutional government which should be emphasized in a period like this. For example, the idea of majority rule is taken for granted. No one would openly challenge it; but the fact remains that we are dangerously near being governed by minorities.

The minorities are represented here as they have a right to be. I will go further. They often render a highly useful service in the making of legislation. But not a single organized lobby represents a majority of the people of the United States and the sum of two or more minorities seldom adds up to a majority. We cannot possibly legislate in the national interest if we are to be harassed by pressure groups seeking their own advancement in disregard to the conflicts with the general welfare.

I am conscious of the impossibility of eliminating economic and political conflicts. To reconcile conflicts is part of the democratic process. When these conflicts are too severe to be reconciled, frictions result that hurt the Nation. Right now those conflicts and frictions are so severe that they must be recognized and dealt with.

It is our duty to call upon every group now to subordinate its own particular and limited interest to that of the country as a whole. We cannot go on legislating in a way becoming of the war Congress by making concessions to those with demands upon us that are incompatible with the national welfare.

The Nation must come first. The fate of America is at stake. It does not matter so much in the present peril what happens to our political parties or to our individual fortunes. There has been too much speculation about a fourth term and about strategy for realizing or obstructing such a purpose. Cannot we agree to suspend activities of that kind until 1944?

In 1940 the people elected a President in the constitutional way, and his term will not expire until 1945, 1½ years

away. Until then he is not only our President; he is also our Commander in Chief.

We are entering a crucial stage of the war. The lives of millions of our men are involved. We must think and act and sacrifice together. That is what the men in service are doing. They are seeking no escape from dangers. They share them, and in their very hardships they find unity of purpose and action. They have a right to ask us to cease our bickering, to legislate in behalf of the greatest good for the greatest number, and be courageous enough to resist the toughest pressure group. They have a right to ask us to waive our personal and party ambitions—to put down every hatred and suspicion.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] said here one day that we had not yet drawn upon the spiritual resources that are available in this country and without which there will be no victory. I am sure he is right about that. Not enough has been said about the cause of the United Nations in this war. The battlefields are so far away and the terrible forces that fight us are so new and strange that we can hardly understand this war.

We have been reluctant to invoke our religion, for Christianity has abhorred holy wars, and we have not asked the churches for a blessing upon our cause. Still we can be sure that everything our religion holds dear is at stake. If it is not a holy war, it is at least a just war, as Karl Bruth would say, and a just God will hear our prayers for victory. If ever a fight for humanity was undertaken, this is it.

We know how the Nazis and the Japanese war party regard human life. We know what a low opinion of mankind they have. Since we cannot change their philosophy, we must resist and win.

Let other issues wait for the victory. Let the processes of government which represent a needed domestic service receive our joint support. Let the emphasis be placed upon the things that unite rather than divide us. Let the sublime values of human life be conserved. Let the individual—his worth and dignity and importance—be the center of our interests.

There is so much to fight for. The enemy is cruel and he is still strong. We cannot defeat him without our united resources. America's dedication to the task must be complete. This country was still at war—a divided country—when Abraham Lincoln uttered these words in his second inaugural address:

> With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan; to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the big problem before the country is that of securing an abundance of food to take care of the men in the armed forces and to meet civilian requirements. During the past few weeks I have said a great deal on this floor about food. I have talked against roll-backs and subsidies and against ill-advised policies of the O. P. A.

Generally I am quite careful in figuring out mathematical problems, but when I make a mistake, I feel I should make a correction and I am doing so at this time. I stated on the floor that the roll-back on butter would save each individual 5 cents a pound or 60 cents a year because we are allowed 12 pounds a year. I made a mistake in that calculation because each individual has saved more than 5 cents a pound on butter since the roll-back went into operation on June 1. Each individual from June 1 up to the present time has saved 55 cents instead of 5 cents a pound, and that saving was due to the fact that one could not secure butter at any price. So the roll-back scheme has worked and the cost of living has been reduced for those who wanted to buy and eat butter because it was not here for them to buy.

We would have a great deal on the cost of living if we applied that same scheme to all of the necessities of life and particularly food. All the O. P. A. has to do is to stop the distribution of food and the cost of living will be reduced at least 21 percent. The O. P. A. is applying the same roll-back scheme to beef, so you will be able to save not only 3 cents a pound a week on beef, you will be able to save approximately $4 a month on your meat bill because you are not able to buy it, except in the black market.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has demonstrated that he is a great mathematician. Under the gentleman's program, how much would a man weighing 150 pounds when he started weigh at the end of a month?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is immaterial what you weigh, because from now on you will live on roll-backs and subsidies and not have any food. Probably in a few weeks from now the gentleman from Michigan will be reduced in weight very, very considerably and there will be only a few bones remaining.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman for the happy prospect.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. That is the same type of program that was put into effect by Diocletian, the Roman Emperor, at the time he bankrupted his country. He established subsidies and roll-backs.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I understand that he originated the roll-back and subsidy scheme that was later copied by Benjamin Cohen and others, who are now running the country.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish my colleague would take advantage of this opportunity to invite the Members of the House up to the land of 10,000 lakes in the State of Minnesota where they can enjoy fishing and rest free from bureaucratic interference.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. I join him in extending that invitation. You can come to Minnesota and get all the fish you can eat, and there will be no roll-backs or subsidies in connection with them.

What I am trying to point out is that these fantastic and brilliant schemes which have been imposed upon the American people with reference to food and other commodities are destroying our system of distribution. We have an abundance of livestock, an abundance of pork, an abundance of poultry, and an abundance of dairy cattle, but the system put into operation by the O. P. A. for the New Deal is destroying all legitimate methods of distribution.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Is it not true, in all seriousness, that the prospects are very dismal as far as food is concerned?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The prospects are more dismal than most people appreciate. When next winter comes around we shall find that about half of our population will be without food.

Yes; the prospects are not very bright for essential foods. No butter, no beef, no poultry signs are appearing in the stores of the country. Supplies are plentiful, but the O. P. A. has thrown a monkey wrench into the machinery of distribution. It appears that the bright boys in Washington are out to wreck our system of distribution of food. They are not interested in helping the people get food. All they want to do is to try out their socialistic theories. Again I say, the roll-back and subsidy scheme will be the ruination of the country. It will cause inflation and the people will go hungry—and all of this in a land of plenty.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE ACUTE MEAT SHORTAGE CAN BE SOLVED

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, our country is involved in a serious meat problem. It is a situation that, unless corrected, will become critical. This country can and must be assured a maximum production and fair distribution of meat required for the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, we are in need of a practical working program dealing with the production and distribution of meat.

The immediate difficulty is not so much the question of supply of livestock and livestock products as it is the proper management of the marketing of livestock and the distribution of the finished product.

Mr. Speaker, the management of the distribution and the marketing of food, including meat, should be placed under one head with full responsibility for handling the problem. The Director of this program should be one whose background, training, experience, and understanding qualify him for dealing with and administering it. This centralized authority should operate under a plan that will keep requirements, insofar as possible, in balance with the supply available. This authority should be immediately set up and put into operation under a plan that would at all times keep the requirements in balance with the total supply of meat. We should have an effective enforcement of a consumer rationing program that would take into consideration the needs of the armed forces, an equitable distribution of meat to our civilian population, and compliance, insofar as possible, with our lend-lease commitments. The amount required for our armed forces is a relatively fixed quantity and can be reasonably estimated. It should be determined as nearly as possible in advance. Storage facilities can be used so that additional purchases may be made when supplies on the market are great. Civilian requirements should be estimated on the basis of the supply, taking into consideration the amount of meat heretofore consumed by our civilian population and the available supply at hand. The supply made available for lend-lease must be kept in balance with the over-all supply of meat. Lend-lease should be estimated as far ahead as may be done to assist in adjusting and regulating the supply of meat on the market. Lend-lease purchases could also be made when supplies in the market are comparatively abnormal. Rationing allowances should not be issued in excess of the amount of meat supplied for civilian use. Plans ought to be worked out that would bring the total requirements for meat in balance with the total supply available. Until we have a balance between the requirements and the supply there will continue to be inequalities between the different groups involved. There should be little difficulty, it seems to me, in meeting the approximate requirements of these three groups.

Mr. Speaker, in order to carry out a practical, workable program, the Food Director should have an advisory council consisting of representatives of the Army, the Navy, Lend-Lease, the processors, and the producers. All these representatives should be men of qualified experience and capable of assisting the Food Director in setting up and carrying out a program such as I have outlined.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that this program give definite consideration to the encouragement of full production of livestock because, after all, the nearer the producer comes to meeting the requirements and demands, the less rules, regulations, and rationing are required, and the less likelihood of a demand for higher prices. This committee should work out a fair relationship of prices all the way from the producer and the feeder of livestock through the slaughtering and processing to effective retail prices. The program should also encourage the production of feeding the kind of livestock for which there is particular demand. Price ceilings could be adjusted so as to take care of differentials that enter into the situation by reason of an excess or scarcity, as the case may be, of a supply of feed products. Proper consideration must also be given to all processors and packers, large and small, for an opportunity to do their share, under proper regulations, to provide a supply of meat products. The quota of 70 percent of the 1941 slaughter should be lifted.

The program I have suggested should, of course, be a part of a national policy, giving due regard to the need for encouraging an increased production of food.

Mr. Speaker, the production of livestock is a comparatively long program. So far as possible, farmers and livestock producers of this country ought to be encouraged in their efforts. They should be assured that a reasonable program is being submitted whereby their efforts to produce will be hampered as little as possible by governmental restrictions and regulations. They should be given to understand that their industry is a necessary part of the war program. If our Government will set up a program embracing the principles I have suggested, we will have a much more satisfactory situation with regard to the production, supply, and distribution of meat in this country.

Mr. Speaker, we need a program that will encourage the highest production of livestock in this country. We have a greater number of livestock than in recent years. Producers should be encouraged to see that they are matured and finished. It must not be overlooked that the demand is the greatest in our history. Regulation of slaughtering of livestock should provide for a normal flow in the market. All allocations should be on a basis of the supply at hand. The requirements of the armed forces should be satisfied. We must have a rationing program to see that, insofar as necesary, the consumers get their fair share of meat available at fair prices. The remainder should be made available for lend-lease so far as the supply will permit. The meat program should be under the control of a director qualified for the job with power and authority to assume the responsibilities of his position. There should be an Advisory Meat Board composed of men of qualified experience and training to counsel with the Director. The Board would assist in formulating a definite workable program with as few restrictions and as little red tape as possible. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we need a program of education whereby the public may be advised concerning such program and its operations and intentions. This program should include an appeal to the patriotism of the American people to assist in carrying it out.

Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that if the plan I have outlined, is put into effect, it will have the full cooperation of the livestock and meat industry, and will meet with the approval of the great majority of the consumers of this country.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am always glad to yield to the distinguished colleague from Colorado, who has given careful study to this problem. I have highest respect for his opinion.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman has called attention to the surplus of cattle in this country. I wonder if he would be kind enough to call that to the attention of Marvin Jones, the War Food Administrator?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will say to the gentleman from Colorado that I am calling it to the attention not only of Judge Marvin Jones, a former Member of this House, and I trust he will use a little independent judgment in considering the matter. I also hope he will advise with representatives on the interests involved, who have had experience and who have practical knowledge of the subject. The most important thing is to put this into the hands of someone who has enough experience to handle it; give him the power and authority and let him assume the responsibility of directing it.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The reason I made inquiry was that on July 3 Mr. Marvin Jones entered an order suspending the slaughtering license of a certain individual and gave as his reason that this individual had exhausted his slaughtering quota and that would not be tolerated in view of the scarcity of livestock in this country.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Of course, I think he is entirely wrong in his approach on the subject. Furthermore, I think that this so-called 70-percent quota of 1941 ought to be lifted. These packing concerns now are operating on a 70-percent quota of whatever they were handling back in 1941. There is not any reason why that quota should be maintained through the country. It should be raised. We ought to use our facilities and raise and process all the meat we can, and do it in an orderly way. We should supply the demand as far as possible. The greater the supply of meat, the less difficulty we will have with reference to price limitations.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to my distinguished friend from California.

Mr. ROLPH. On this question of quotas, the population of my State has increased some 19 percent, but the latest information I have is that we have not changed the quotas over 1941 in any way.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is where at least a part of the difficulty lies. The quota is fixed, regardless of the situation the gentleman has mentioned.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix on two separate subjects and to include newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

COAL AND OIL SHORTAGES

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, this Nation, without doubt, faces its fourth coal strike and inasmuch as we have heard considerable discussion this afternoon relative to the fuel shortage that will exist along the east coast insofar as oil is concerned, I want to point out that there is also going to be a fuel shortage on the east coast insofar as coal is concerned during the coming winter. I want further to point out that this fuel shortage will be brought about to some extent because of the existence in the Middle West of so-called smoke ordinances which deprive the coal-producing State of Illinois of its rightful markets in the cities of Chicago and St. Louis.

May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that geologists estimate that the Illinois fuel beds contain 200,000,000,000 tons and that although we have been mining coal commercially in Illinois since 1828, we have only removed 6 percent of that vast deposit; however, in surveying the record of production we find that Illinois has dropped from a State producing 80,000,000 tons of coal annually to a point where it now produces only 60,000,000 tons annually.

This reduction has been brought about largely through the enactment of restrictive smoke ordinances in the two aforementioned cities which prohibit the burning of high volatile coal such as is produced in Illinois. May I further point out that at present only 30 percent of the coal used in Chicago is mined in Illinois. We have also within the past few years lost a 2,000,000-ton annual market in the city of St. Louis. This loss is occasioned by the enactment of ordinances which force the consumer, in order to meet their requirements, to purchase a higher grade of fuel from the East or purchase mechanical firing equipment, which, in many instances, is impossible. May I point out in explaining the effect of these ordinances upon coal shipments that 9,600,000 tons of coal are shipped from West Virginia into the city of Chicago and that 1,000,000 tons are shipped from that State into the city of St. Louis, although the Illinois mines are within a few miles of these two cities. Thus it will be seen that coal that should be placed on eastern markets to meet acute fuel shortages is shipped to the Midwest where an abundance of coal already exists. This requires a long, unnecessary coal haul. It requires 225,000,000 extra car-miles annually to meet the requirements of smoke ordinances of these two cities, car mileage which makes an unnecessary demand on our already overtaxed transportation system.

I ask you, where is the logic in transporting coal from a section of the Nation where a shortage exists into a section of the Nation where there is a surplus, especially during this emergency?

These two cities used Illinois coal for more than a century and found no difficulty in its use. I, therefore, suggest that these ordinances be set aside for the duration and essential car-miles conserved.

I cite as proof of this car shortage the fact that we are behind schedule in the shipment of iron ore from the lake region. This break in shipment was occasioned by lake fogs and a late shipping season. More than 8,000,000 tons must be made up and transported to the steel mills in the Pittsburgh area. It will require 75,000 coal cars to move this ore. When we realize that the coal mines, during the month of May, were denied more than 4,000 cars because of the inability of the railroads to furnish them, where, may I ask, will we get the cars to move this ore if we waste 225,000,000 car-miles annually complying with restrictive ordinances which have no place in wartime.

I contend that a check should be made immediately by the Department of the Interior and the Office of Defense Transportation. I have complained to practically every office in Washington, but without result, so just remember when your schools are closed this winter, and you homes are cold because of lack of fuel, that millions of tons of eastern coal are being shipped to the Midwest to comply with these ordinances—coal which should find its rightful market in your communities.

Manufacturers throughout the Nation are being called upon by the Office of Defense Transportation to dig into their stock piles to relieve the present shortage brought about by the coal strikes. However, they refuse to do this, as the expiration of the truce in October will make it difficult to replenish their supplies.

We, in Congress, have successfully dodged the coal-strike issue. We have been relying upon the War Labor Board which many of us feel has been arbitrary in its attitude. What we should do is get the operators and the representatives of the miners together. This coal-strike question should be taken from the War Labor Board and placed in the hands of Fuel Coordinator Ickes. This coal dispute can be settled in 48 hours if he is given full control. He should call the Office of Price Administration, the Bituminous Coal Commission, the operators, and miners together. The two price agencies must grant the operators an increase in coal prices, that they may in turn grant the miners an increase in wages. While I realize that this wage increase, or portal-to-portal pay, would be reflected in the advanced price of coal, I would much rather attempt to justify this price increase in coal to the consumer than to attempt to justify the purchase of underwear for Arabs with Lend-Lease funds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the Albuquerque newspapers for Sunday, July 4, carried word of the death in the Philippine Islands of Corp. Homer Spensley, a member of New Mexico's Two Hundredth Coast Artillery and the son of Dr. and Mrs. V. H. Spensley, of Albuquerque.

Dr. Spensley, the father, has performed for the people of New Mexico and for the parents of boys from many other States a valuable service by being the founder and chairman of the Bataan Relief Organization. Like other fathers, he experienced considerable alarm over the fact that his boy was a prisoner of the Japanese and had been since the fall of Bataan. Corporal Spensley was 22 years old, a graduate of the Albuquerque High School and had attended the University of New Mexico.

In response to an appeal to young men of our State, many of them joined the National Guard years ago in order that an anti-aircraft battalion might be formed in New Mexico. That original group became the Two Hundredth Coast Artillery and as such was sent to the Philippines prior to the attack of the Japanese at Pearl Harbor.

I believe it is now definitely established that the State of New Mexico had far more men on Bataan in proportion to population than any State in the Union. The mothers and fathers in New Mexico have been tremendously interested in the efforts of this Government toward relief for those men. In the very beginning, prior to the fall of Bataan, these people demanded that the soldiers either be given help or be evacuated. They were not happy when they saw some of the generals removed to other areas and the men left to face the Japanese. They were not happy that these men were not given ammunition or the protection of planes or the assistance of big guns in their valiant stand. These people from New Mexico whose boys were on the islands cried out in an unceasing protest against what they believed to be lack of interest on the part of this Government.

The death of Corporal Spensley establishes clearly the justice of these complaints. I have presented their petitions to the State Department, to the American Red Cross, and to the White House itself. I have not used the floor of the United States Congress to criticize the attitude of this Government, but I have felt very keenly that we have not done all the things which the military situation in the Philippines early demanded and that since the fall of Bataan our Government has not been as aggressive as it should have been in negotiating for the exchange of our prisoners.

Two days ago the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] spoke to the House

about this very problem. He pointed out that our boys were dying from hunger and were being subjected to slavery and to disease in the camps of Germany and Japan, while at the same time we were taking their men in safe convoys from the European countries, bringing them here and curing them of disease. We were giving them proper food and nourishment; then we sent them out in the country to a camp where they play ball and see movies. I find myself in agreement with most of the things said by the gentleman from New York. We are extremely careful to show the last possible evidence of courtesy and kindness to those few Japanese prisoners that we have and to the thousands of German prisoners who were taken in north Africa, but we have not apparently been able to persuade the military authorities of Germany or Japan to reciprocate as far as our own boys are concerned, and particularly as far as those boys who have longest been suffering and dying as a result of their defense of American principles.

I believe we may expect, in the coming months, a rising tide of protest against the seeming indifference to the fate of the American soldiers who finally yielded to disease, hunger, and lack of ammunition in the surrender on Bataan. I include at this point a letter received by Dr. Spensley from a mother at Carlsbad, N. Mex., which I think places the issue pretty squarely in front of our Government.

DEAR DOCTOR SPENSLEY: I am writing you in regard to the boys that are prisoners of war in the Philippines and Tokyo. Isn't there one single thing we can do to secure their release before all of them have died of starvation or have been killed?

If your expenses are paid to Washington, do you suppose it would be possible to get the President to negotiate with the Japs and pay a ransom for the boys' safe return to the United States, providing they would not be put back into service? Am sure every mother, father, brother, or sister would pay any price for their return.

It doesn't seem as if we are doing our part, waiting day after day, letting them go through unheard of tortures and hardships, and us not doing any more than we are. Isn't there some way that we can get to help them?

I have a brother who is a prisoner, that was with the Two Hundredth CA(AA), and it would be worth any amount of money or any sacrifice to know that he is safe, and I am sure other parents and relatives will be willing to do all in their power to gain their freedom.

If there is anything I can do, please feel free to call on me at any time. Would be so happy to think that I was doing something for our boys.

Let's get out and fight for their liberation.

Yours truly,

(Mrs.) MARY JACKSON.

Finally, I include a letter from Dr. Spensley written to me on the morning of the very day and just prior to the time that the War Department notified him of the death of his son. In the letter he is asking my advice as to whether a trip by him to Washington would be helpful in bringing aid to his son and the comrades of his son now in the hands of the Japanese. Though he did not know it, his son was then reported as making the final sacrifice for the defense of his homeland. No words could express the feeling of grief which this letter gave me when I read it and realized the terrible situation in which this family had been placed by the few intervening hours.

I include this letter in the RECORD even though it contains an unfortunate reference to a son of the President. I do not hesitate to do so because it is quite apparent that this reference to John Roosevelt is not the reference of either Dr. Spensley or myself, but comes from the heart of some un-named mother who is determined that action should immediately be taken.

Dr. Spensley's letter, as head of the Bataan Relief Organization is as follows:

BATAAN RELIEF ORGANIZATION,
Albuquerque, N. Mex., July 3, 1943.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: You will please find enclosed a copy of letter I have just received which is, in general, indicative of the feeling prevailing among many over this country. It is self-explanatory. I am sending it to you so that you may read it as I received it and then inform me as to whether it would be conducive of results for me to go to Washington as suggested in this letter.

Along with many others, I, too, would not hesitate in the least to make any and all sacrifices in behalf of my son and his comrades who are now in the hands of the Japanese. Our purpose is not only to relieve them in every way, to which they are entitled to as the heroic men they have proven themselves to be, but to insure that they are not denied all or any of their rights and privileges guaranteed to them under our Constitution.

I am taking the liberty of quoting another communication which we have received from one of our affiliates in New Jersey. You can see very readily that we have at times been rather tame in our expressions:

"As parents of a young ensign son, betrayed by his country at Cavite and now for 18 months a Jap prisoner, please count us in on any action.

"It is up to us, relatives of those in the Philippines, to get busy and bring such a storm on Congress and the President that something is started.

"If John Roosevelt, my son's classmate, were out there, you'd see action."

Renewal of action in the south and southwest Pacific during the past few days has greatly encouraged us. We feel that this reestablishment of America's principles of the past 160 years is a definite step toward the redemption of our sons. We thank you from the bottom of our hearts for any part you may have had in promoting this action.

Respectfully yours,

DR. V. H. SPENSLEY,
Chairman.

As for myself, I feel that the people of New Mexico who have sons in the Two Hundredth Coast Artillery have been patient long enough. I believe that something more definite can be done than has heretofore been accomplished. I feel that the State Department and the American Red Cross can bring about some type of agreement with the Japanese Government and that the time to reach this agreement is immediately, before death visits more New Mexico homes. Our boys must not be permitted to die like flies from disease in Japanese camps while Japanese in this country receive better food and finer treatment than the great mass of American citizens.

Great as is the grief in the home of Dr. and Mrs. Spensley, I hope that the passing of this fine young man may ignite the keg of powder that will blast this whole situation into the open and compel vigorous action on the part of our Government now.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. OUTLAND. I think the gentleman has made a very excellent presentation of the problem of the boys from New Mexico captured on Bataan. I should like to mention the fact that from a single county in California some 250 boys left just before the outbreak of the war. The entire group was captured practically intact. Several of the boys have since died. I have tried to get information from the State Department but have been informed so far that the Japanese Government will not exchange any able-bodied prisoner. Can the gentleman tell us whether any progress has been made in the matter of prisoner exchange?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. All the information I have been able to get from both the State Department and the Red Cross as well as confirmation from the White House is to the effect that the Japanese Government refuses to negotiate. For some time we have been removing thousands of German prisoners to this country from north Africa, and have been treating them extremely well, even providing tennis courts for their amusement. I think certainly we ought to be able to negotiate through Mr. Hitler with Mr. Hirohito to have something done for our boys in Japan.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. ROLPH. I endorse fully what the gentleman has said. I have received a great many communications from parents in San Francisco who tell of similar cases; their sons have been held prisoners. They have been trying to do something toward getting them released. I hope the gentleman in bringing this to our attention this afternoon will be of some help in getting relief to these people who so sorely need it.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman. I will say simply that out of hundreds of boys reported captured not long ago, within the last 30 days, we have had to write the parents of great numbers of them advising the parents of the death of their children. I hope we can stop that story.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, this seems to be the moment to philosophize, as we await several actions by the Senate. I hope the various Members of the House when they go home will make it a point to visit not only the airfields in their districts but also those who are in charge of them and observe the various activities that go along with aviation.

If you will go down to the principal airport in your district you will find that there are many very interesting things which you may see and learn about. For example, you may find an office of the United States Weather Bureau at your principal airport and you will find it very profitable to talk with the chief forecaster there and learn from him the length of strides that have been made in the art of weather forecasting. Get him to give you a lesson in air mass analysis.

Aviation has required these strides in order to provide safety, and the Weather Bureau has responded to the need in a magnificent way. Those strides that have been made largely for aviation are going to be a great benefit to every other form of activity almost, in our country, particularly to agriculture and merchandising. You may be interested to know that the advent of accurate forecasting has brought about a new type of activity, one in which weather forecasters have found themselves to be quite valuable citizens in a private capacity.

For example, you will find that a merchant or a group of merchants understand that if they could know a few days in advance of an impending hot spell in the early part of the summer it would be advantageous to them to prepare advertising to sell such things as Palm Beach suits, straw hats, and so forth.

Those who are in the meat business would like a similar warning—and they are able to get it these days—in order that they may prepare picnic hams and that sort of thing for sale to the people on the day the hot spell arrives. There are other advantages—as, for example, there is the gentleman who is engaged in the business of cutting Christmas trees in the far Northwest and in the far Northeast. He must know accurately in advance the probable time of the first heavy freeze and the time of the first heavy snowfall because he must cut the Christmas trees between those two times and load them on cars before the snow falls. The accuracy in long-range weather forecasting as it is now practiced will enable him to know those times and save a great deal of money, which is an ultimate benefit to the people through lower prices.

Of course, everyone knows that the power companies want to know accurately what the condition of the weather will be a few days or even a week ahead of time in order that they may organize their repair crews to go out and stand ready to repair power lines that may be broken down by high winds or storms or ice. All of those activities and many more are being greatly benefited. The weather service is being greatly improved to the economic advantage of our country, and it is paying its way hundreds of times over.

There are other aspects of aviation which will interest you. You will be interested in going into the office of airway traffic control, commonly known to the aviation profession as A. T. C. Airway traffic control is the dispatching office—like the switch-tower office of a railroad—for the air. There is to be found there a very interesting and really quite marvelous set-up. You ought to go and find the airway traffic control office in your district and go and visit it and learn how it works.

You also want to visit the hangars and repair shops of these aircraft companies and air lines that may be in your district and find out what makes an airplane go, how the engine is constructed, and the great care used in maintaining those engines. You will find that the aircraft engines are taken down and completely gone over very minutely after 550 to 600 hours of flight. Then if you go into the control tower at the airport and become acquainted with the gentlemen there, probably several of them, if it is a large airport, who control the air traffic in and about that field, you will meet somebody who is really on his toes every minute of the day. You will learn a great deal about that which makes it possible for aircraft to follow certain patterns in and about an airfield and to land with safety and bring the passengers in for discharge at the loading ramp. Go on a day of low clouds so you can learn how aircraft use the instrument landing procedure.

I hope you will all take advantage of the opportunity to visit your home airports and become acquainted with the gentlemen who have charge there of the various aspects of aviation and really learn something about it, because next fall it is hoped that we of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will have an aviation bill to bring to you, and you will want to know what it is all about. We have worked hard on that bill for months. It is a technical bill and you will need to know and understand aviation in order to cast your vote intelligently. Until then I wish you a happy landing.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein several editorials on General Sikorski.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief expression by William Philip Simms on the Polish-Russian peace.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 139]

Allen, La.	Gilchrist	Morrison, La.
Andrews	Gillie	Morrison, N. C.
Baldwin, Md.	Gordon	Mott
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gore	Murray, Wis.
Barden	Gorski	Newsome
Bates, Ky.	Granger	Norman
Bell	Grant, Ind.	Norton
Bender	Green	O'Brien, Ill.
Bennett, Mich.	Hale	O'Connor
Bland	Hall,	O'Hara
Bradley, Mich.	Edwin Arthur	O'Konski
Buckley	Harness, Ind.	O'Leary
Burdick	Hartley	Pfeifer
Byrne	Hébert	Phillips
Cannon, Fla.	Hill	Plumley
Cannon, Mo.	Hoeven	Poage
Capozzoli	Holifield	Pracht
Cochran	Izac	Randolph
Colmer	Johnson,	Reed, Ill.
Courtney	Luther A.	Rivers
Culkin	Johnson,	Russell
Cullen	Ward	Satterfield
Curley	Keefe	Sauthoff
Dawson	Kefauver	Smith, W. Va.
Day	Keogh	Snyder
Delaney	Kerr	Starnes, Ala.
Dies	Kilburn	Stevenson
Ditter	Kilday	Tarver
Domengeaux	King	Taylor
Douglas	Landis	Tolan
Drewry	Larcade	Treadway
Eaton	Lewis	Troutman
Ellis	McCord	Van Zandt
Elmer	McCormack	Vinson, Ga.
Fay	Magnuson	Ward
Fellows	Maloney	Weaver
Fitzpatrick	Manasco	Welch
Ford	Mansfield, Tex.	White
Fulmer	Martin, Iowa	Winter
Gallagher	Mason	
Gifford	May	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 312 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 357. An act to authorize the presentation of an appropriate medal of honor to J. Edgar Hoover;

S. 439. An act for the relief of Perkins Gins, formerly Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn.;

S. 715. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1937, and for other purposes," approved January 29, 1937;

S. 769. An act to provide for the mailing of annual notices to owners of tax-exempt properties in the District of Columbia;

S. 881. An act to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938;

S. 964. An act to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation;

S. 1223. An act to fix the compensation of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia and the Superintendent of the National Training School for Girls;

S. 1224. An act to designate the Public Library of the District of Columbia a public depository for governmental publications;

S. 1279. An act to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes;

S. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the two Houses of Congress from July 8 to September 14, 1943; and

S. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Presiding Officers to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions after adjournment of the two Houses.

The message also announced that the House of Representatives is requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 883) entitled "A bill providing for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 533. An act for the relief of John P. von Rosenberg; and

H. R. 2912. An act to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2935) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendment No. 24 to said bill.

ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 17.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, July 8, 1943, they shall stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Tuesday, September 14, 1943, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after their respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.

SEC. 2. The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever in their opinion legislative expediency shall warrant it or whenever the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House, acting jointly, or the minority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the House, acting jointly, file a written request with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House that the Congress reassemble for the consideration of legislation.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 18.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That notwithstanding the adjournment of the two Houses as authorized by Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses which have been examined by the Committee on Enrolled Bills of each House and found truly enrolled.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE DURING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until September 14, 1943, the Clerk of the House be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain to the House that the amendment which I proposed to offer a moment ago provided for striking out the words "September 14" in the adjournment resolution and inserting the date of "August 10." In my opinion, Congress is making a serious mistake in adjourning for 2 months in view of the critical conditions now facing the country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO APPOINT COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES AUTHORIZED BY LAW OR BY THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until September 14, 1943, the Speaker be authorized to appoint commissions and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on more than one subject if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extensions of remarks, but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the recess of the Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

INCREASED PRODUCTION OF DIAPERS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I brought to the House the trials and tribulations of fathers anticipating babies without diapers or safetypins. I have had the most amazing response. I beg to inform you that the War Production Board took the desperation of the letter I read to you yesterday so seriously that it sent a special messenger up to me this afternoon with the information that due to the fact that we can once more obtain burlap direct from India the looms that had to be used for burlap in this country are going to be returned to diaper making. We shall have 7,876,000 dozen in the next year, which is an increase of 64 percent in the production of diapers over 1939 production, whereas the baby crop has increased only 19.3 percent.

Safetypins were limited to 50 percent of 1941, the highest year of record. Production is to be increased at a rate which will reach 100 percent of 1941 by the fourth quarter of this year. I quote the last paragraph of my W. P. B. letter:

The Office of Civilian Requirements is acting similarly in the case of other items needed for babies. We in the Office of Civilian Requirements realize that babies are just about our most important citizens and that their needs brook no delay.

I felt sure you would be both relieved and interested.

TOLLS OVER THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2912, to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. LEA, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts.

THE SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a very short statement:

Members of the House of Representatives, I am glad that you are going to

have a few days with your home folks. After a little more than 30 years here I can say there has never been a more faithful Congress assembled in Washington than the one in which we now serve.

We are going home because we have finished our work. The President of the United States has no more communications to make to the Congress at this time, and no recommendation for legislation that we have not already passed. We have done our job. Even though people love to criticize the Congress of the United States, I say to you that neither the Seventy-seventh Congress, that was greatly criticized, nor the Seventy-eighth Congress that is being criticized by some unthinking, unknowing people, deserves condemnation, because we have done our job by giving every authorization and every dollar necessary to the successful prosecution of the great war in which we find ourselves.

I am going home to defend what I have done. I am not afraid to do it. I think 95 or 98 percent of the people of this country love this land and its institutions. They are willing to give their sons—yea, give their all—that this mighty Republic may live. I think that 95 to 98 percent of them want to think that everything is as much right as it could possibly be in a world disturbed like the one in which we live. They want their nerves settled. We have a story to tell them of the training of their sons, the equipment put into their hands with which to defend themselves, the conversion of industry from peacetime pursuits to the manufacture of war materials, where labor and industry and all have joined. In my opinion, the conversion of industry in 1942 and its amazing mass production in 1942 and 1943 will stand out as the great achievement in this century.

We promised the people when we called their sons to war that they would go forth the best-trained army that the United States ever sent to battle. We promised them that we would put into their hands the most effective instruments with which to defend themselves that any soldiers in all the history of civilization ever had; and we are doing exactly those things.

I wish you, each and every one of you, a happy stay with your people, that you will find your people well, and that you will find them contented; that you will be willing, where you find them not quite contented, to tell the truth, as I think you can, and say things that will make them feel better.

You have been so kind and so fine to me that you have made the position, which at best is arduous and onerous, a pleasant thing. I have loved this service with you. I love the House of Representatives. It is my life and it is my love, and from the bottom of a grateful heart, I thank each and every one of you for the manifold courtesies and your great kindnesses to me.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for a half minute.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, during the 20 years that I have been a Member of this body I have served under many Speakers and great men, but not one of them, in my opinion, deserved or enjoyed a larger measure of the love and confidence of their fellow members than the great, good and wise man who is now presiding over this body. [Applause, the Members standing.]

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 883. An act providing for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 990. An act for the relief of the Washington, Brandywine & Point Lookout Railroad Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 235. An act for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey;

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson;

H. R. 1784. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay;

H. R. 2076. An act to authorize the deportation of aliens to countries allied with the United States;

H. R. 2614. An act to increase by 1 year the period within which certain oyster growers may file claims against the United States in the Court of Claims;

H. R. 2703. An act to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2794. An act to approve and consent to the compact entered into by Iowa and Nebraska establishing the boundary between Iowa and Nebraska;

H. R. 2798. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2936. An act to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 235. An act for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey;

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson;

H. R. 1784. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay;

H. R. 2076. An act to authorize the deportation of aliens to countries allied with the United States;

H. R. 2614. An act to increase by 1 year the period within which certain oyster growers may file claims against the United States in the Court of Claims;

H. R. 2703. An act to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2794. An act to approve and consent to the compact entered into by Iowa and Nebraska establishing the boundary between Iowa and Nebraska;

H. R. 2936. An act to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; and

H. R. 2798. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon, Tuesday, September 14, 1943.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to Concurrent Resolution 17, adjourned until Tuesday, September 14, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

563. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on lists of papers reported to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

564. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

565. A letter from the Executive Director, Board of Economic Warfare, transmitting a copy of the Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements for the Board of Economic Warfare covering the period ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

566. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting copies of the Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944 for each of the reporting units: Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (excluding loan liquidation and temporary pay-off employees) and Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (loan liquidation and temporary pay-off employees); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

567. A letter from the Alien Property Custodian, transmitting a copy of the Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944 for the Office of Alien Property Custodian; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

568. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Lend-Lease Administration, transmitting a copy of the Bureau of the Budget form entitled "Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements," which presents the personnel requirements of the Office of Lend-Lease Administration for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944, ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. S. 915. An act for the relief of Robert Kish Lee and Elizabeth Kish; without amendment (Rept. No. 685). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. S. 929. An act for the relief of Dr. Douglas E. Lawson; without amendment (Rept. No. 686). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 244. A bill for the relief of Morris Leff; with amendment (Rept. No. 687). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 310. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Crain; with amendment (Rept. 688). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MURPHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 937. A bill for the relief of Luther C. Nanny; with amendment (Rept. No. 689). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1049. A bill for the relief of the estate of Hyman Wiener; with amendment (Rept. No. 690). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1555. A bill for the relief of Arkansas Power & Light Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 691). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2182. A bill for the relief of John E. Haas; with amendment (Rept. No. 692). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2507. A bill for the relief of Reese Flight Instruction, Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 693). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2675. A bill providing for payment to Nellie Starr McCorkle of accumulated leave accrued and payable to her deceased husband, Capt. John Ray McCorkle, under the act of August 1, 1941 (ch. 348, 55 Stat. 616; 5 U. S. C., sec. 61a); with amendment (Rept. No. 694). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3176. A bill to regulate the furnishing of artificial limbs or other appliances to retired officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, and to certain civilian employees of the military and naval forces of the Regular Establishment; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3177. A bill to amend section 105 (b) of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 for the purpose of increasing the Government's contribution to the family allowance of servicemen having wives and children; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3178. A bill to provide for the wartime care and protection of children of employed mothers; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 3179. A bill to provide for the giving of preference to ex-service members of the armed forces of the United States in any foreign wars in approving applications for entry to public lands on reclamation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H R. 3180. A bill for the purpose of conserving the coal resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 3181. A bill to continue the pay of all persons serving in the armed forces of the United States for 1 year after the termination of the present conflict; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 3182. A bill to provide for the retention of accumulated and current accrued annual leave due to Government employees at the expiration of the statute authorizing their employment, and authorizing the appropriation of funds therefor; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 3183. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, to provide for the establishment of a uniform classification and a uniform scale of class rates for railroad freight, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. R. 3184. A bill prescribing qualifications for appointment to certain positions in the Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LAFOLLETTE:

H. R. 3185. A bill to assist in the effective prosecution of the war, to improve the health, efficiency, and morale of the civilian population and the armed forces, to provide for a more equitable distribution of food supplies through a food-allotment plan, to control the payment of subsidies for the production, processing, distribution, or other handling of agricultural commodities except as specifically authorized by the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By M. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 3186. A bill to assist in the effective prosecution of the war, to improve the health, efficiency, and morale of the civilian population and the armed forces, to provide for a more equitable distribution of food supplies through a food-allotment plan, to control the payment of subsidies for the production, processing, distribution, or other handling of agricultural commodities except as specifically authorized by the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 3187 (by request). A bill to amend section 5, Public Law No. 140, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. J. Res. 153. Joint resolution requesting the President to declare November 10, 1943, a day for the observance of the creation of the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 298. Resolution creating a select committee to make a study with respect to the personnel of the Department of State; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 3188. A bill for the relief of Robert C. Harris; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURCH of Virginia:

H. R. 3189. A bill for the relief of Thomas Lewis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 3190. A bill for the relief of Ben Grunstein; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. R. 3191. A bill for the relief of Lillian Hill, Savilla Eley, and Edna Booth; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana:

H. R. 3192. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertha Grantham; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 3193. A bill for the relief of J. C. Davidson and Vassie Lee Davidson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 3194. A bill for the relief of J. Clyde Morris; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3195. A bill for the relief of Willard Kerr, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2080. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of 97 citizens of the State of Iowa, urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed roduction of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2081. By Mr. WILLEY: Petition of Nora B. Powell and sundry other citizens of the State of Delaware asking for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2082. Also, petition of Mrs. M. Evelyn Killen, legislative director, Delaware Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Felton, Del. and sundry other citizens of the State of Delaware, asking for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2083. Also, petition of Mrs. M. Evelyn Killen, legislative director, Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Delaware, and sundry other citizens of the State of Delaware, asking for the enactment of House bill 709 and other bills in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2084. By Mr. WARD JOHNSON: Resolution adopted by the City Council of Long Beach, Calif., on June 22, 1943, commending Lt. Gen. J. L. DeWitt for his action and consistent stand for excluding Japanese from coastal areas, and protesting any move to release Japanese from relocation centers or permit return to this area; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2085. Also, petition of Glen L. Clark & Co., protesting against the enactment of any and

all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2086. Also, petition of Morris Goldhamer, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2087. By Mr. MURDOCK: Petition of D. O. Eisley and 90 other citizens of Arizona, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2088. Also, petition of Mrs. A. P. Boone and 189 other members of the Arizona Woman's Christian Temperance Union, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2089. Also, petition of Mary N. Pulsifer and 236 other citizens of Arizona, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2090. Also, petition of the First Southern Baptist Church with 38 signatures of citizens of Tucson, Ariz., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2091. By Mr. JEFFREY: Petition of Marie Pfotzger and sundry citizens of Hamilton, Ohio, urging the reduction of absenteeism, the conservation of manpower, and the speeding of war production by prohibiting the sale, manufacture, and transportation of alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2092. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of the Oregon Woman's Christian Temperance Union, asking for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2093. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition transmitted by Mrs. T. J. Town, of Jackson, Mich., and signed by 38 other residents of the community, urging the enactment of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2094. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Minnie Eastman and 128 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2095. Also, petition of Mrs. E. R. Grover and 28 citizens of East Lansing, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2096. Also, petition of Harry L. Pierce and 135 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2097. Also, petition of Jennie M. Porter and 21 citizens of Brownsville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2098. Also, petition of Herbert C. Schmalzriedt and 73 persons who attended the sessions of the Highland Lake Bible Conference at Highland Lake Inn, Highland Lake, N. Y., from June 20 to June 30, 1943, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2099. Also, petition of Mrs. J. H. Flewell and 97 citizens of Long Beach, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2100. Also, petition of Nella Merrill Cantrell and 20 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2101. Also, petition of Mrs. H. W. Bennett and 50 citizens of Mayfield, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2102. Also, petition of Mrs. W. S. Ablett and 77 citizens of Coronado Beach, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2103. Also, petition of Ida M. Lawrence and 40 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2104. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles H. Zeigler and 22 citizens of Baltimore, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2105. Also, petition of A. C. Backlond and 34 citizens of Barnom, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2106. Also, petition of S. L. Zimmerman and 22 citizens of Catonsville, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2107. Also, petition signed by a number of citizens of Port Byron, N. Y., urging enactment of legislation, forbidding liquor advertising in all publications, thereby conserving paper so necessary to war production, and at the same time be a factor in uplifting the morals of young people who read those publications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1943

The 14th of September being the day prescribed by Senate Concurrent Resolution 17 for the reconvening of the Congress, the Senate assembled in its Chamber this day.

HENRY A. WALLACE, of Iowa, Vice President of the United States, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven and in the earth and in the hearts of men, hallowed be Thy name. Without Thee our striving would be losing. Our strength is unequal to our tasks. Undergird us, we beseech Thee, with Thine enabling might, in the inner man. To us in Thy providence has been given a place of awesome responsibility in this supreme hour of the centuries. We would exercise that stewardship of power with anxious care and deep humility.

In these fateful days lead us to right decisions and to that wisdom which is from above. Conscious of a cloud of witnesses of the past and of the present, whose searching eyes are upon us in this historic Chamber, may we here consecrate ourselves anew to the fulfillment of the aims and dreams of a new world for which our sons are dying on the far battlefields of freedom. Keep us from any denial of the faith for which they are giving their all. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, July 8, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Revercomb
Andrews	Green	Reynolds
Austin	Guffey	Robertson
Bankhead	Gurney	Scrugham
Barbour	Hatch	Taft
Barkley	Hawkes	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Hill	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Holman	Tobey
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Truman
Byrd	Langer	Tunnell
Capper	Lucas	Tydings
Caraway	McCarran	Vandenberg
Chavez	McClellan	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Wallgren
Connally	McNary	Walsh
Danaher	Maloney	Wheeler
Davis	Maybank	White
Downey	Millikin	Wiley
Eastland	Moore	Willis
Ellender	Overton	
George	Radcliffe	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is detained on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent as members of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent as members of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is necessarily detained as a member of the Truman committee.

The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of July 8, 1943,

Subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate, the Secretary of the Senate received from the House of Representatives the following message:

That the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the two Houses from July 8, 1943, to September 14, 1943; and

S. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Presiding Officers to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions after the adjournment of the two Houses.

That the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2912) to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. LEA, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The message further announced that subsequent to adjournment, under authority of Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 647. An act to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument;

H. R. 1396. An act making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States;

H. R. 1900. An act to prevent the payment of excessive fees or compensation in connection with the negotiation of war contracts;

H. R. 2828. An act to permit certain burials in the Scottish Rite Temple in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 2935. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2968. An act making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2988. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved December 26, 1941, as amended.

H. R. 3030. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution relating to the provision of butter for the patients of St. Elizabeths Hospital; and

H. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes.

APPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that he had approved and signed the following acts:

On July 9, 1943:

S. 1316. An act to provide for clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes;

On July 12, 1943:

S. 35. An act to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States; and

S. 1134. An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

On July 16, 1943:

S. 1252. An act to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119), relating to water conservation and utilization projects.

ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of July 7, 1943, additional reports of the Special Committee to investigate the National Defense Program, pursuant to Senate Resolution 71, Seventy-seventh Congress, and Senate Resolution 6, Seventy-eighth Congress, were submitted during adjournment of the Senate, as follows:

On July 10, 1943, by Mr. WALLGREN, relating to aircraft (pt. 10 of Rept. No. 10); and

On July 16, 1943, by Mr. TRUMAN, relating to the comparative merits of rayon and cotton tire cord (pt. 11 of Rept. No. 10).

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ESTABLISHMENT OF SENATE LIAISON OFFICE OF BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I desire to inform Members of the Senate that the Bureau of Naval Personnel, at the request of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, has established a Senate liaison office for the purpose of answering requests by telephone from Members of the Senate and their staffs concerning factual personnel information in regard to Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. The office is located in room 461 of the Senate Office Building. Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Frederick A. McLaughlin, U. S. N. R., is officer in charge. Telephone numbers of the Senate liaison office are as follows: Extensions 1529 and 1530.

This liaison officer should be contacted only on naval personnel matters. All other naval matters or requests for information should be taken up directly with the Secretary of the Navy's office or the heads of the various naval bureaus as in the past.

The letter from the Bureau of Personnel of the Navy is as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL,
Washington, D. C., September 7, 1943.

The Honorable DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman, Committee on Naval Affairs,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This refers further to your letter of May 7, 1943, and the Bureau's letter to you dated July 3, 1943.

I am pleased to advise you that, in accordance with your request, arrangements have been completed for the establishment of a Senate liaison office to assist Members of the Senate who desire factual information concerning naval personnel. This office is to be established in room 461 of the Senate Office Building and will be in operation as of September 8, 1943.

The Senate liaison office will be in charge of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Frederick McLaughlin, U. S. N. R., and will be under the general supervision of Lt. Paul Whitehead, U. S. N. R., officer in charge, Congressional Information Service. The telephone numbers of the Senate liaison office are as follows:

Capitol, National 3120, extensions 1529 and 1530.

Navy Department, Republic 7400, extension 61209.

It is a pleasure to comply with your wishes in this matter and to extend this further service to you and other members of the Senate in matters relating to the activities of this Bureau.

Sincerely yours,

RANDALL JACOBS,
Rear Admiral, U. S. N.,
The Chief of Naval Personnel.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1943

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

To the Congress of the United States:

On July 12 I reluctantly signed H. R. 2714, the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943. I felt obliged to approve it because it appropriates funds which were essential to carry on the activities of almost every agency of Government during the recess of the Congress.

If it had been possible to veto the objectionable rider, which has been attached to this Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, but which has no relevancy to it, without delaying essential war appropriations, I should unhesitatingly have done so.

This rider prohibited any Government department or agency from employing at any time in the future, after November 15, three named individuals who are now employed by different Government agencies, unless they are appointed to office by the President and confirmed by the Senate prior to that date.

There is no suggestion that the three named individuals have not loyally and competently performed the duties for which they have been employed. They are sought to be disqualified for Federal employment because of political opinions attributed to them.

The provision aimed at these men does not define the offices they hold and does not seek to make appointment to those offices subject to Senate approval. As a matter of fact, the clause permitting them to remain in Government employment after November 15 subject to Presidential appointment and Senate approval was inserted only after the Senate had refused to accept a provision requiring their immediate removal from Government employment and their permanent disqualification for the Federal service. The Senate rejected the compromise as incorporated in this bill once, and agreed to it only after the House conferees had refused to agree to any bill without a provision aimed at the removal of these three named individuals. The Senate yielded, as I have been forced to yield, to avoid delaying our conduct of the war.

But I cannot so yield without placing on record my view that this provision is not only unwise and discriminatory, but unconstitutional.

The Supreme Court has defined a bill of attainder as "a legislative act which inflicts punishment without judicial trial." The rider in this bill operates perpetually to disqualify three named individuals from holding office in their Government unless they are nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate before November 15. It is directed at named individuals and not at specified statutory offices. No judicial trials have been held. No impeachment proceedings have been instituted. This rider is an unwarranted encroachment upon the authority of both the executive and the judicial branches under our Constitution. It is not, in my judgment, binding upon them.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 14, 1943.*

SEGREGATION OF LOYAL AND DISLOYAL JAPANESE IN RELOCATION CENTERS (S. DOC. NO. 96)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, and, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, September 14, 1943.

Subject: Senate Resolution 166 adopted by the Senate on July 6, 1943.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE:

SIR: On July 6, 1943, the Senate considered and agreed to Senate Resolution 166.

The resolution relates to the program for relocating persons of Japanese ancestry evacuated from west-coast military areas, and asks that the President issue an Executive order to accomplish two things—(1) to direct the War Relocation Authority to segregate the disloyal persons, and the persons whose loyalty is questionable, from those whose loyalty to the United States has been established, and (2) to direct the appropriate agency of the Government to issue a full and complete authoritative statement on conditions in relocation centers and plans for future operations.

I find that the War Relocation Authority has already undertaken a program of segregation. That program is now under way. The first train movements began in early September.

In response to the resolution I asked the Director of the Office of War Mobilization to issue a full and complete authoritative public statement on conditions in relocation centers and plans for future operations. A short preliminary statement on this subject was issued on July 17, 1943. A full and complete statement is being made public today. Copies of these statements are transmitted with this message.

Thus, both of the steps called for in Senate Resolution 166 have already been taken, and it appears that issuance of a further Executive order is not necessary for accomplishment of these purposes.

The segregation program of the War Relocation Authority provides for transferring to a single center, the Tule Lake Center in northeastern California, those persons of Japanese ancestry residing in relocation centers who have indicated that their loyalties lie with Japan. All persons among the evacuees who have expressed a wish to return to Japan for permanent residence have been included among the segregants, along with those among the citizen evacuees who have answered in the negative, or have refused to answer, a direct question as to their willingness to declare their loyalty to the United States and to renounce any allegiance to any foreign government. In addition, those evacuees who are found, after investigation and hearing, to be ineligible to secure indefinite leave from a relocation center, under the leave regulations of the War Relocation Authority, are to be included among the segregants.

While the precise number of segregants is not established at this time because a number of leave clearance investigations have not yet been completed, it is established that the disloyal persons among the evacuees constitute but a small minority, and that the great majority of evacuees are loyal to the democratic institutions of the United States.

Arrangements are being completed for the adequate guarding and supervision of the segregated evacuees. They will be adequately fed and housed and their treatment will in all respects be fair and humane; they will not, however, be eligible to leave the Tule Lake Center while the war with Japan continues or so long as the military situation requires their residence there. An appeals procedure to allow for the correction of mistakes made in determining who shall be segregated has been established so that the entire procedure may be fair and equitable.

With the segregation of the disloyal evacuees in a separate center, the War Relocation Authority proposes now to redouble its efforts to accomplish the relocation into normal homes and jobs in communities throughout the United States, but outside the evacuated areas, of those Americans of Japanese ancestry whose loyalty to this country has remained unshaken through the hardships of the evacuation which military

necessity made unavoidable. We shall restore to the loyal evacuees the right to return to the evacuated areas as soon as the military situation will make such restoration feasible. Americans of Japanese ancestry, like those of many other ancestries, have shown that they can, and want to, accept our institutions and work loyally with the rest of us, making their own valuable contribution to the national wealth and well-being. In vindication of the very ideals for which we are fighting this war, it is important to us to maintain a high standard of fair, considerate, and equal treatment for the people of this minority as of all other minorities.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN SECURITIES HELD BY THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the sale, exchange, or other disposition of certain securities held by the Secretary of the Treasury (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF CERTAIN PERSONS COMMISSIONED IN THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of service, with special qualifications therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service, for the period June 1 to July 31, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS ON PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to the personnel of the land forces on June 30, 1943, under the Selective Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to the personnel of the land forces on May 31, 1943, and July 31, 1943, under the Selective Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

TRANSPORTATION FURNISHED BY WAR DEPARTMENT IN PROSECUTION OF THE WAR

A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of transportation furnished by the War Department for certain Government and other personnel necessary for the prosecution of the war for the period December 1, 1942, to June 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

Four letters from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports stating all the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 108 aliens, 176 aliens, 86 aliens, and 172 aliens, respectively, whose deportation be suspended for more than 6 months, together with statements of the reasons for such suspension (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Immigration.

REPORT OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the period April 1 through June 30, 1943, of an investigation of Federal employees who are alleged to be members of subversive organizations or advocate the overthrow of the Federal Government by force (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

SPECIAL ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for the period January 1 to July 1, 1943, showing the special assistants employed under the appropriation "Compensation of special attorneys," contained in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1943, together with the rates of compensation, the amounts paid, and a description of their duties (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LANDS ACQUIRED FOR NAVAL USES

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of lands acquired for naval uses from January 1 to June 30, 1943, and stating that under the act approved February 19, 1943, there was no acquisition of land, by lease or otherwise (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

TRANSPORTATION FURNISHED BY NAVY DEPARTMENT IN PROSECUTION OF THE WAR

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of transportation furnished by the Navy Department for certain Government and other personnel necessary for the prosecution of the war, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

LEASING OF INDIAN LANDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the leasing of Indian lands for business and other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

LEASE OF LANDS IN BEHALF OF INDIANS SERVING IN THE ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the execution of leases in behalf of Indians serving in the armed forces of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EXTENSION OF BENEFITS OF SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF ACT OF 1940

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, in connection with the public lands, to certain persons serving in the merchant marine and to certain civilian workmen (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ACTS OF THE LEGISLATURE OF PUERTO RICO AND LEGISLATION PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Six letters from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a certified volume of the acts of the third regular session of the Fifteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, February 8 to April 15, 1943 (1); copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (3); and copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I. (2), respectively (with an accompanying document and papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF SURVEYS OF WASHITA RIVER WATERSHED, OKLAHOMA AND TEXAS

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, report of a survey of the Washita River watershed in the States of Oklahoma and Texas (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORTS OF SURVEYS ON CERTAIN WATERSHEDS

Four letters from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of surveys on the Little Sioux River watershed in Iowa and Minnesota, the Middle Colorado River watershed in Texas, and the Potomac River drainage basins in Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, respectively (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Commerce.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF VARIOUS GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Letters from various departments and agencies of the Government, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service, as follows:

Estimates for the quarter ending September 30, 1943, from the Treasury Department; the War Department; the Department of Justice; the Department of the Interior; the Department of Labor; National Housing Agency; Office of the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel; Securities and Exchange Commission; Federal Trade Commission; Office of Lend-Lease Administration; General Accounting Office; Office of Alien Property Custodian; Office for Emergency Management; Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; Bureau of the Budget of the Executive Office of the President; Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Operations of the Department of State; United States offices of the Panama Railroad Co.; Liaison Office for Personnel Management of the Executive Office of the President; United States Civil Service Commission; Interstate Commerce Commission; War Relocation Authority; Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs of the Office for Emergency Management; War Production Board; Federal Communications Commission; Office of War Information; Veterans' Administration; Committee for Congested Production Areas of the Executive Office of the President; Office of Civilian Defense; Export-Import Bank of Washington; Federal Security Agency; United States Employees' Compensation Commission;

Supplemental estimates for the quarter ending September 30, 1943, from the Interstate Commerce Commission; and the Veterans' Administration; and

Revised estimates for the quarter ending September 30, 1943, from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; War Manpower Commission, exclusive of the Bureau of Selective Service; Office of Lend-Lease Administration; Office of Defense Transportation of the Office for Emergency Management (two); Federal Trade Commission; Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Operations of the Department of State; National War Labor Board (two); White House Office of the Executive Office of the President; Office of Price Administration; the National Archives; Office of War Information (two); United States Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration; the Veterans' Administration; Central Administrative Services of the Office for Emergency Management; Office of Censorship; National Labor Relations Board; and Federal Communications Commission.

CLAIM OF HARRY L. SMITH AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and recommendation concerning the claim of Harry L. Smith against the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Claims.

CLAIM OF LT. COL. CHARLES H. MORHOUSE AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pur-

suant to law, his report and recommendation concerning the claim of Lt. Col. Charles H. Morhouse against the United States (with an accompanying report) to the Committee on Claims.

ANNUAL REPORT OF ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed statement of receipts and expenditures for St. Elizabeths Hospital for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF DEFENSE WORKERS

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth quarterly report of the Commissioner of Education on the education and training of defense workers, covering the period April 1 through June 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES DEFERRED FROM MILITARY SERVICE FOR OCCUPATIONAL REASONS

Three letters from the Director of the Selective Service System, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of registrants deferred for occupational reasons because of their employment in or under the Federal Government, on June 15, 1943 (2), and on July 15, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD ON STABILIZATION OF WAGES

Two letters from the Vice Chairman of the National War Labor Board, transmitting, in further response to Senate Resolution 130 (agreed to April 9, 1943), reports on the stabilization of wages and salaries for the months of June 1943 and July 1943, respectively (with accompanying reports); ordered to lie on the table.

CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO OR MODIFIED BY THE UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of contracts entered into or modified by the United States Maritime Commission under authority of Public Law 46 (77th Cong.) for the period April 1 to June 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

ANNUAL REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of its proceedings and financial and statistical data of the several public utilities in the District for the year ended December 31, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

TRANSFERS AND REDUCTIONS OF PERSONNEL IN CLASSIFIED CIVIL SERVICE

A letter from the Acting President of the Civil Service Commission, transmitting, in further response to Senate Resolution 84, agreed to March 1, 1943, supplemental reports for January, February, March, and April of transfers and reductions of personnel in the classified civil service (with accompanying reports); ordered to lie on the table.

UNIFORM TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES FOR CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

A letter from the President of the Civil Service Commission, transmitting a revised draft of proposed legislation to provide uniform allowances for transportation of civilian officers and employees, their families and effects, upon permanent transfer from one official station to another or from one Federal agency to another (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AMENDMENT TO CHARTER OF PETROLEUM RESERVES CORPORATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Senate, which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to be placed on file, and the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, September 14, 1943.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I beg to state, for the information of the Senate, that I am in receipt of a letter from the Director of the Office of Economic Warfare, under date of August 12, 1943, transmitting, pursuant to law, a certified copy of an amendment to the Charter of Petroleum Reserves Corporation, which has been placed on the files of the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN A. HALSEY,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the Secretary of the Senate has informed me that, during the recess of the Senate, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation filed with him, in accordance with law, reports for the months of May and June, 1943, and a report covering the operations of the Corporation from February 2, 1932, to June 30, 1943, inclusive, which I ask may be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reports will be referred as requested by the Senator from New York.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., favoring the enactment of legislation to extend the benefits under certain titles of the Social Security Act to the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of Puerto Rico Proindependence Congress, San Juan, P. R., and a cablegram from Dr. Juan Augusto Perea, its president, favoring the prompt enactment of legislation to provide independence for the Territory of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the chairman of the House 1943 Hold-over Committee of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, transmitting copy of a joint report on rent control in the city and county of Honolulu, T. H. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

A resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu, T. H., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1163, the so-called neighborhood development bill, to provide a certain post-war program for municipalities, so as to extend its provisions to cities in the Territories as well as in the States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the City Commission of Ironwood, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation to permit the utilization by private contractors of buildings, equipment, and machinery remaining at N. Y. A. centers, including the one at Ironwood, Mich.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution adopted by the New York State Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation, favoring postponement of action on the proposed canal across the State of New Jersey as a link in the inland waterway system from New York to Florida, until the States of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania have full opportunity to submit a revised plan; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the New York State Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation, favoring the adoption of a method of renegotiation of war contracts which will obviate the refunding of State taxes already collected and provide certain other relief to the States in connection therewith; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by a conference of the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, at Reno, Nev., relating to the control of surplus game on national forests, etc., the adoption of plans for post-war operations to increase game and wildlife promotion activities to give employment to men returning from the armed services, amendment of the 1929 Duck Stamp Act and the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the Grand Parlor, Native Daughters of the Golden West, at Santa Cruz, Calif., favoring review by the United States Supreme Court of its recent decision in a case respecting the salute to the flag by school children; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Grand Parlor, Native Daughters of the Golden West, at Santa Cruz, Calif., favoring an investigation of pressure groups concerned with Japanese activities in the Pacific coast area, the conduct of Japanese concentration camps, and the War Relocation Authority; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Native Daughters of the Golden West, at Santa Cruz, Calif., endorsing the purpose and aims of the Pacific Coast Japanese Problem League; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Native Daughters of the Golden West, at Santa Cruz, Calif., commending Lt. Gen. John L. DeWitt for organizing and coordinating the work of the Western Defense Command and favoring his retention in its administration; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Native Daughters of the Golden West, at Santa Cruz, Calif., proposing that the study of United States history be made a requirement in the schools of higher education throughout the country; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Joint Resolution 66

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Alabama,* That application be, and it hereby is, made to the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"'ARTICLE —

"'SECTION 1. The sixteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration: *Provided,*

That in no case shall the maximum rate of tax exceed 25 percent.

" 'SEC. 3. The maximum rate of any tax, duty, or excise which Congress may lay and collect with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death, or by way of gift, shall in no case exceed 25 percent.

" 'SEC. 4. The limitations upon the rates of said taxes contained in sections 2 and 3 shall, however, be subject to the qualification that in the event of a war in which the United States is engaged creating a grave national emergency requiring such action to avoid national disaster, the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of each House may for a period not exceeding 1 year increase beyond the limits above prescribed the maximum rate of any such tax upon income subsequently accruing or received or with respect to subsequent devolutions or transfers of property, with like power, while the United States is actively engaged in such war, to repeat such action as often as such emergency may require.

" 'SEC. 5. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on incomes for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

" 'SEC. 6. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight on the last day of the sixth month following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States to collect any tax on any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3, laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect;' and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is, directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

"Approved July 8, 1943."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 55

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of considering an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritance, and gifts

"*Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring)*, That this legislature respectively petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. The sixteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

" 'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration: *Provided*, That in no case shall the maximum rate of tax exceed 25 percent.

" 'SEC. 3. The maximum rate of any tax, duty, or excise which Congress may lay and collect with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death, or by way of gift, shall in no case exceed 25 percent.

" 'SEC. 4. The limitations upon the rates of said taxes contained in sections 2 and 3 shall, however, be subject to the qualification that in the event of a war in which the United States is engaged creating a grave national emergency requiring such action to avoid national disaster, the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of each house may for a period not exceeding 1 year increase beyond the limits above prescribed the maximum rate of any such tax upon income subsequently accruing or received or with respect to subsequent devolutions or transfers of property, with like power, while the United States is actively engaged in such war, to repeat such action as often as such emergency may require.

" 'SEC. 5. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on incomes for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

" 'SEC. 6. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight on the last day of the sixth month following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States to collect any tax on any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3, laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect'; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 90

"Joint resolution memorializing the President, the Congress, and certain agencies of the United States to take necessary steps to remove restrictions on corn acreage and to encourage in every way possible an expanded production of corn for food uses and to exert every conceivable effort at their disposal to provide an adequate supply of corn for industrial purposes essential to the war effort

"Whereas corn is the most important food and industrial plant in America, the production of which must be expanded at this critical time; and

"Whereas cash corn offerings by farmers at elevators have diminished to the point that the corn-refining industry will be closed down within 30 days unless prompt and effective remedies are developed; and

"Whereas this industry has only a small supply of corn on hand and there are little or no stocks of finished products either in hands of refiners or of their customers; and

"Whereas such a condition has never occurred in the 50 years' history of this industry; and

"Whereas if the industry closes down the war effort will be immediately and seriously affected because it will, in turn, force the closing or the drastic curtailing of operations of the following important industries:

"1. Steel and aluminum foundries: These must have over 100,000,000 pounds of starch products yearly for castings and moldings;

"2. Aluminum plants: These must have over 10,000,000 pounds of starch yearly for the manufacture of aluminum;

"3. Fiberboard shipping containers: These must have over 100,000,000 pounds of starch products yearly for containers for overseas shipments of food and other supplies for armed forces and lend-lease;

"4. Textiles, cotton, and rayon: These must have over 300,000,000 pounds of starch products yearly for Army and Navy contracts and essential civilian needs. This does not include the large quantity of starch necessary for home and commercial laundering of clothing;

"5. Paper products: These must have over 200,000,000 pounds of starch products yearly for products for armed forces and essential civilian needs;

"6. Adhesives: These must have over 100,000,000 pounds of starch products yearly for many types of adhesives used for Army contracts and for essential civilian needs;

"7. Drugs, vitamins, and pharmaceuticals: These must have 30,000,000 to 50,000,000 pounds of corn sugar, cornstarch, and corn sirup for many essential products;

"8. Explosives and chemicals: These must have around 50,000,000 pounds of various refined corn products for many essential products;

"9. Lend-lease: These must have over 300,000 pounds yearly of various corn products, principally starch, for multiple needs of our allies;

"10. Army and Navy are now using nearly 400,000,000 pounds of various refined corn products yearly, principally as food; and

"11. Food processors, confectioners, numerous food manufacturers, such as bakers, canners, preservers, etc., are now using nearly 2,000,000,000 pounds yearly of refined corn products for essential food products. (This does not include the quantity of corn products used as food in the home); and

"Whereas throughout 1942, and in 1943 to date, the corn-refining industry has operated 24 hours a day 7 days a week to produce its maximum output for the direct war effort and for essential civilian needs; and

"Whereas the industry requires 130,000,000 bushels of corn yearly to continue capacity operations (this is only 4 percent of the 1943 corn crop); and

"Whereas the importance of the end products of the corn-refining industry for the war effort justifies prompt action to provide sufficient corn to this essential industry so that there may be no interruption of its operations; and

"Whereas the present acreage restrictions on the growing of corn have discouraged its production and because the present ceiling price established by Federal authority on corn is so low that producers cannot afford to sell their limited supply of corn; and

"Whereas the foregoing factual situation indicates that immediate attention should be given the matter by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring)*, That this legislature hereby memorializes the President, the Congress, and each Wisconsin Member thereof, the Director of the Office of Price Administration, the War Labor Board, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Lend-Lease Administrator to do all in their power to provide an adequate supply of corn to meet the demands for agricultural, industrial, and corn-refining purposes; be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President, the Congress of the United States and each Wisconsin Member thereof, the Director of the Office of Price Administration, the War Labor

Board, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Lend-Lease Administrator."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Joint Resolution No. 38, A

"Joint resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution limiting the tenure of any President to two terms

"Whereas prior to 1940 it was the tradition in this Republic that the President of the United States should not serve for more than two terms; and

"Whereas during this 150-year-old tradition no President of the United States prior to 1940 had in fact ever served more than two terms; and

"Whereas many citizens in this country consider that such tradition should be made permanent in our fundamental law in order to preserve the ideals and basic principles upon which our democratic government was founded; and

"Whereas the precedent set in 1940 may lead in the future to further violations of this time-honored tradition unless restriction is written into the Constitution; and

"Whereas a number of States have already adopted resolutions requesting Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing a constitutional restriction and many other States will no doubt take similar action: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a constitutional convention at which an amendment to the Constitution of the United States shall be proposed limiting and restricting the tenure of the President to two terms; be it further

"Resolved, That duly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to both Houses of the Congress and to each Wisconsin member thereof."

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to draft pre-Pearl Harbor fathers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

Memorials of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Memorials of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill, relating to the control and regulation of the liquor traffic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution of Timber and Sawmill Workers Union, Local No. 15, I. W. A.-C. I. O., Ironwood, Mich., favoring the prompt repeal of the so-called Smith-Connally Act, relating to war labor disputes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution of Timber and Sawmill Workers Union, Local No. 15, I. W. A.-C. I. O., Ironwood, Mich., protesting against the enactment of the so-called Bryson bill, relating to the control and regulation of the liquor traffic, or any measure of similar nature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution of Timber and Sawmill Workers Union, Local No. 15, I. W. A.-C. I. O., Ironwood, Mich., relating to certain political action by members of the union; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution of Timber and Sawmill Workers Union, Local No. 15, I. W. A.-C. I. O., Ironwood, Mich., relating to puppet governments; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of Timber and Sawmill Workers Union, Local No. 15, I. W. A.-C. I. O., Ironwood, Mich., endorsing the action of the National Maritime Union in its refusal to take supplies to Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of Timber and Sawmill Workers Union, Local No. 15, I. W. A.-C. I. O., Ironwood, Mich., protesting against the Chinese Exclusion Act and requesting its repeal; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Yates Center and vicinity, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF W. C. T. U. OF ABILENE, KANS.—RIGHT OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES TO VOTE IN NATIONAL ELECTIONS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a resolution from the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Abilene, Kans., asking for an amendment to our laws that will make certain that the boys in the armed forces will not fail to have the right of the ballot in the national election. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred. I believe the bill introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], if passed, will accomplish what the Abilene (Kans.) W. C. T. U. has asked for. I am in favor of the proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We the members of the Abilene (Kans.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, request you to register your vote, in favor of giving our boys in the armed forces the right of the ballot in the national election.

THE ABILENE WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION,
MRS. PEARL WATSON,
President.
MRS. ALFRED LICHTE,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF RETAILERS' COMMITTEE OF WICHITA (KANS.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to resolution adopted by the Retailers' Committee of the Wichita (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce following a meeting held Aug. 26, 1943, attended and addressed by the Honorable Ed H. Rees, Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas, and myself.

The retailers particularly urge that more businessmen shape the policies and formulate the regulations of the Office of Price Administration and other Government agencies. It is my understanding that Price Administrator Prentiss M. Brown is working in this direction, and that the results are becoming apparent. I hope this trend continues; it is highly desirable that our system of distribution be not destroyed or crippled to a greater extent than is absolutely necessary to the war effort.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, and to have appropriately referred the resolution adopted as a result of this meeting.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution passed at a meeting sponsored by the retail committee of the Wichita Chamber of Commerce and attended by Senator CAPPER and Congressman REES and heads of prominent retail stores and chamber of commerce leaders in Kansas:

"Whereas the position of loyalty of the retailers of America in all war efforts is unquestioned, and whereas the retailers are unanimous in their support of reasonable price control as a curb to inflation, be it resolved, first, that it is the sense of this gathering that the O. P. A. regulations should be planned and administered by practical businessmen experienced in the activities to be negotiated; second, that the practice of pricing merchandise by volume classifications should be dissolved.

"Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to all those in attendance, to the United States Chamber of Commerce, to the National Retail Dry Goods Association, the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce, and to newspapers and publications and to Kansas State Senators and Representatives."

The resolution was passed unanimously by the gathering of retailers from nearly 20 communities, and was signed by approximately 60 of those in attendance.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY LIVESTOCK AND FEED CONFERENCE AT KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, a few days before I returned to Washington from a stay of several weeks in Kansas, I attended a meeting of farmers and livestock men at Kansas City, Mo., on September 2, 1943. It was one of the most interesting and instructive meetings of its kind I ever attended. There were more than 2,000 farmers and livestock men at the meeting. The registration showed that the conference, called by W. A. Cochel, editor of the Kansas City Weekly Star, drew men and women from 26 States. Mayor La-Guardia of New York was present at the conference.

Primarily the meeting was called to consider the livestock and feed situation. The resolutions which were adopted actually covered even more territory than that, and I believe should be studied carefully by every Senator. The testimony of these livestock men confirmed what many of us had sensed last spring—that unless the War Food Administration and the Office of Price Administration show better judgment in handling the livestock and feed problems in the immediate future than these agencies have shown in the past, there is grave danger of a meat famine by next year.

I do not intend to make a speech with respect to the meeting and the resolutions there adopted, but I do want to call particular attention to some of the points raised.

I desire especially to direct the attention of the Senate to Resolution No. 4, which calls upon Congress to resume its responsibility for lawmaking and to

put a stop to the flood of what the conference called Government by directive. I will read this particular resolution:

Whereas there has been a decided trend toward government by Executive order, directives from the White House being issued in increasing volume and with the full force and effect of law; and

Whereas these directives are often developed by staff employees with little, if any, practical experience in the field of operation to be governed by such orders: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Livestock and Feed Conference, in session at Kansas City, Mo., September 2, 1943, That we urge Congress, the direct representative of the people, again to assume the responsibility for law making, and that there be a cessation of law making by Executive order except in cases of extreme emergency.

Mr. President, in this connection permit me to say that in my travels over the State of Kansas, and from the hundreds of people with whom I talked directly, and the several thousand letters I received at Topeka, I have found that this opposition to government by directive is not confined to the livestock men. It is evident in all classes and groups in Kansas, and, I believe, all over the mid-continent area.

The livestock men are much disturbed over the price policies of the O. P. A.; they are opposed to subsidy roll-backs in place of prices; they insist that if the War Meat Board were allowed to handle the situation more production would be assured, and also a more equitable distribution of the available meat supplies.

I heartily endorse the program set forth in these resolutions; I believe the program proposed in them is in the interest of the consumer, the producer, and the national welfare. I also earnestly urge my colleagues to study carefully the resolutions, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE LIVESTOCK AND FEED CONFERENCE, IN SESSION AT KANSAS CITY, MO., SEPTEMBER 2, 1943

PREAMBLE

We have a dual purpose in this meeting:

First, to present the picture of the livestock industry to the country in order that immediate corrective steps may be taken before further serious damage is done our industry and our country; and

Second, to acknowledge the major and direct interest the consumers of the country have in what we are seeking to accomplish here today.

We need the consumers; the consumers need us.

RESOLUTION NO. 1. WAR MEAT BOARD

Whereas from the very beginning of the imposition of price ceilings on meat the net result of confusion and conflicting orders and statements has been to bring chaos to one of our Nation's greatest and most necessary industries; and

Whereas the livestock and meat industry, at a conference held at Chicago early in April 1943, unanimously adopted a meat-management program which, in its opinion, would go far in controlling black markets, encouraging maximum production, and insuring better distribution of meat available; and

Whereas the War Food Administration, the Office of Price Administration, and the office of the Quartermaster General approved the general principles of the plan as submitted by the industry following the Chicago meeting and by agreement set up the War Meat Board to administer the war meat-management program; and

Whereas, despite such approval, the War Meat Board has not been given an opportunity to carry on the program outlined, but instead there have been continued threats of live-animal ceilings, allocation of supplies, and even Government purchase of all livestock and meats: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Livestock and Feed Conference, in session at Kansas City, Mo., September 2, 1943, That we urge the responsible Government agencies dealing with the war food program to clear the track so that the War Meat Board can properly function and, in the meantime, to see that threats of further Government controls which would hamper rather than help be immediately stopped.

RESOLUTION NO. 2. CEREALS AND VEGETABLE PROTEINS AS MEAT SUBSTITUTES

Whereas provincially minded people, completely failing to grasp the importance of livestock in our national economy and ignoring the detrimental effect of a reduced meat diet on our national health, have urged that we must turn from the long-established practice of feeding grain and protein concentrates to livestock, to a new national program which contemplates far greater direct use of cereals by the human population, and to some extent the substitution of vegetable proteins for animal proteins in the diet, utterly ignoring the fact that animal proteins are far superior to vegetable proteins in stimulating and supporting the human-body processes; and

Whereas 55 percent of our national acreage is in grass and only through its use by livestock can it be efficiently processed into human food; and

Whereas the nutritional basis of Anglo-Saxon success is the reliance on a meat diet, the importance of which is attested by the demands of the Army for meat far in excess of normal civilian per capita consumption: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Livestock and Feed Conference, in session at Kansas City, Mo., September 2, 1943, That we strongly protest the loose thinking and loose talking of those who, in the name of the war emergency, would seek to make impractical changes which would be disastrous to the country as a whole and could only seriously hamper the war effort itself.

RESOLUTION NO. 3. SUBSIDY ROLL-BACK

Whereas, in order to appease those whose buying power is greater today than ever before in the history of the country, the subsidy roll-back program applying to meats and butter was initiated some weeks ago; and

Whereas, as anticipated, this program was immediately reflected in the livestock markets with packers making strenuous efforts to buy on a substantially lower basis, and it is now clear that in many instances the price already has been rolled back on the producer and feeder; and

Whereas the use of subsidies for such purposes, necessitating as they do even greater taxation than the heavy burden now being borne, is frowned upon by the rank and file of the people of this country: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Livestock and Feed Conference, in session at Kansas City, Mo., September 2, 1943, That we urge Congress to take such action as would insure a discontinuance of the present subsidy roll-back program and put a stop to the efforts to expand it.

RESOLUTION NO. 4. GOVERNMENT BY DIRECTIVE

Whereas there has been a decided trend toward government by Executive order, directives from the White House being issued in increasing volume and with the full force and effect of law; and

Whereas these directives are often developed by staff employees with little if any practical experience in the field of operation to be governed by such orders: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Livestock and Feed Conference, in session at Kansas City, Mo., September 2, 1943, That we urge Congress, the direct representative of the people, again to assume the responsibility for law-making, and that there be a cessation of law-making by Executive order except in cases of extreme emergency.

RESOLUTION NO. 5. CONGRESSIONAL JOINT COMMITTEE

Whereas we deeply appreciate the presence here today of many State Governors, United States Senators and Representatives, thereby attesting to the recognition of the seriousness of the meat problem confronting the Nation today; and

Whereas the recommendations of the livestock industry as to how to terminate the present chaotic condition have been largely ignored by the administrative officials in Washington and particularly by officials of the Office of Price Administration: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Livestock and Feed Conference, in session at Kansas City, Mo., on September 2, 1943, That we urge the Senators and Representatives here today to take it upon themselves to form a joint committee, of which they will be the nucleus, and that this committee devote itself to the current problems of the livestock industry and demand that the administrative officials take immediate steps to restore confidence in the industry, and to assure maximum meat production during the coming feeding season. We believe this can best be accomplished by putting into effect immediately the meat-management program which the War Meat Board was set up to administer.

RESOLUTION NO. 6. CANCELING CONTRACTS FOR PROTEIN CONCENTRATES

Whereas the Commodity Credit Corporation, in recently announcing the new and substantially higher schedule of prices for protein concentrates for the 1943–44 crop, also arbitrarily canceled all existing contracts for old-crop cake and meal, although offering to resell the contracted product to the same users at an advance in price of $10 to $12 per ton, the profit resulting therefrom to go into the fund of Commodity Credit Corporation; and

Whereas such cancelation of existing contracts will cause many feeders of livestock to take substantial losses on operations planned months ago, without any chance to protect themselves from such losses; and

Whereas this action is resulting in many feeders emptying their feed lots and refusing again to assume the heavy risk of feeding livestock unless action is taken to reimburse them for losses suffered on bona fide contracts: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Livestock and Feed Conference, in session at Kansas City, Mo., September 2, 1943, urge the Commodity Credit Corporation to honor claims filed by feeders for the amount of loss suffered under such bona fide contracts.

RESOLUTION NO. 7. LOW BYPRODUCT PRICES

Whereas for more than a year rigid price ceilings have been maintained upon dressed meat products, and in the case of beef these ceilings are relatively low compared with the long-time relationship between beef and other meat products; and

Whereas the cost of labor, grain, and protein concentrates has advanced substantially without a compensatory advance in the meat ceilings themselves being permitted; and

Whereas it is recognized that any move to decrease fat cattle prices below levels existing today would inevitably further dis-

courage feeders and retard beef production: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Livestock and Feed Conference, in session at Kansas City, Mo., September 2, 1943, That, as a partial measure of relief, the ceilings on hides and other byproducts should be immediately raised to a reasonable level.

RESOLUTION NO. 8. PROTEIN CONCENTRATES

Whereas during the past year there developed a serious shortage of protein concentrates not due to any decrease in supply, but only to sharply increased demands and poor distribution; and

Whereas now all is confusion as to the program—if program there is—for the distribution of these protein concentrates during the coming season; and

Whereas it is of first importance that both producers and feeders should be able to plan now—immediately—for their operations during the coming winter, in order to determine the size of the herds to be carried over or the amount of feeding to be done, and

Whereas unless producers and feeders are enabled to purchase these products in reasonably adequate supply within the next few weeks, it will of necessity cause substantial liquidation of breeding herds and reduce feeding operations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Livestock and Feed Conference, in session at Kansas City, Mo., on September 2, 1943, urge the Commodity Credit Corporation to make an immediate announcement of a program for the equitable distribution of protein concentrates from the 1943–44 crop, and that producers and feeders be allowed to buy the product in the customary form and protein content.

RESOLUTION NO. 9. PACKER MEAT QUOTAS

Whereas the rationing of meat to consumers and the set-aside order to packers make entirely unnecessary the continuation of the packer quota system covering volume of meat to be made available for civilian use; and

Whereas the operation of this quota system has tended to encourage black markets and has unnecessarily increased the transportation burden because local packers in surplus livestock producing areas are not permitted to slaughter in volume sufficient to meet the local ration-coupon demand, causing livestock to be shipped out, processed, and the product returned for distribution: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Livestock and Feed Conference in session at Kansas City, Mo., on September 2, 1943, That we commend the War Food Administration for its action yesterday in suspending these quotas for 60 days, and urge that the suspension be made permanent.

RESOLUTION NO. 10. MEAT PRODUCTION

Whereas with so much publicity on the shortages of meat which developed this spring, it is not generally realized that the livestock industry has tremendously expanded meat production, setting a new record for total production in 1940, 1941, and 1942, with every indication that this year's total production will exceed the all-time record set last year; and

Whereas despite this record of great production, administrative agencies have resorted to charges that the livestock industry was responsible for the shortages so much publicized by hoarding livestock which should have gone to market: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Livestock and Feed Conference, in session at Kansas City, Mo., September 2, 1943, That we protest this unfounded charge of hoarding, which was nothing but a smoke screen to cover up the bungling of the said administrative agencies.

RESOLUTION NO. 11. LIVE ANIMAL PRICE CEILINGS

Whereas over a period of 50 years or more the livestock industry of this country has developed an intricate system of marketing which enables producers in any section of the country to make spot-cash sales in public markets, auction markets, concentration points, or, in many instances, right on the home farm, or ranch; and

Whereas the Office of Price Administration, unnaware of the confusion that would result from disturbing this marketing system, has repeatedly threatened to impose live-animal price ceilings which would completely upset this whole marketing structure, making necessary a complicated and unworkable system of allocating supply, and would in effect merely extend to the producing end of the industry the same confusion that has existed in the processing end ever since the imposition of the first price ceilings: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Livestock and Feed Conference, in session at Kansas City, Mo., on September 2, 1943, That we are unalterably opposed to any tinkering with our marketing structure and demand that the threat of live-animal ceilings be removed from the livestock picture at once.

RESOLUTION NO. 12. ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBILITY

Whereas it has been clearly shown that both feeders and producers have made every effort to expand production; and

Whereas unfortunately, administration tactics have leaned largely toward the pyramiding of regulations instead of toward cooperative effort that would bring far greater results; and

Whereas there are in the country record numbers of livestock, and prospects are for production of fairly adequate supplies of coarse grains and protein concentrates: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Livestock and Feed Conference, in session at Kansas City, Mo., September 2, 1943, desire to call the attention of the consumers of the country to the fact that if under these conditions there should develop, next winter and spring, an even more serious shortage of meat, and particularly beef and lamb, than was the case last spring—and such a situation now seems possible unless administrative agencies move quickly along the lines long recommended by the livestock industry itself—that the full responsibility for such a meat shortage must be accepted by the administration.

RESOLUTION NO. 13. BLACKSTRAP MOLASSES

Whereas there is a definite shortage of proteins (cottonseed cake, soybean pellets, etc.) as well as grains (corn, etc.); and

Whereas blackstrap molasses is increasingly important as an ingredient in dairy, range, and poultry feeds: It is hereby

Resolved, To request the Secretary of Agriculture and the Chemicals Division of the War Production Board, Washington, D. C., to reconsider W. P. B. Order M–54, with the object of providing additional quantities of blackstrap molasses for general feed use, and permitting a more flexible administration of the order through increasing the use of molasses for feeding purposes.

RESOLUTION NO. 14. SUGAR BEETS AND THEIR BYPRODUCTS

Whereas in the sugar-beet growing sections of the country a large and very important livestock feeding business has been developed by the feeding of beet byproducts; and

Whereas the uncertainty of the sugar-beet program and the out of balance of prices fixed on sugar beets in relation to other farm crops have resulted in a curtailed acreage, thereby reducing the supply of our essential sugar and meat: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge upon the War Food Administration, first, that there be no restriction in the planting of sugar beets, and, second, that a price be set on sugar beets that will encourage a normal planted acreage.

RESOLUTION NO. 15. THANKS

We desire to extend our hearty thanks to Mayor Gage; Mr. Cochel; Messrs. Catts and Atzenweiler, of the Kansas City Chamber of Commerce; and to all others who have extended unusual courtesies to us in this convention.

RICE GROWERS OF THE SOUTH—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN RICE GROWERS COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted at a special meeting of the board of directors of the American Rice Growers Association, in Lake Charles, La., September 9, 1943, called for the purpose of discussing the gravely critical shortage of labor for harvesting the rice crop in Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The rice growers of the South are now inexorably faced with the fact that unless a great deal more labor is made available immediately much of the rice crop now ready for harvest in Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas will be left in the fields because of their utter inability to cut, shock, thresh, and haul the crop without help.

The largest crop in history is made. It is standing in the fields ripe and ready for harvest. Much of it will be wantonly wasted unless the present acute labor shortage is relieved immediately.

There are few, if any, crops from which may be obtained so large a yield of food per man-hour invested. Because of its high caloric value, with not an ounce of waste, and because it is thoroughly dehydrated, few other foods are so ideally adapted to wartime uses. The rice growers and the Nation cannot afford to see a pound of it lost.

Appeals to governmental agencies for help were made months ago. We have attempted to secure war-prison labor. We have tried to secure Mexican and other foreign labor. We have attempted to secure industrial workers with a farm background. We have investigated every possible method by which our labor needs might be met. These efforts have so far been entirely ineffective.

Shining through the miasma of confused inaction, conflicting authority, misleading and erroneous statements, voluminous red tape, surveys, certifications, and arbitrary regulations, is the indisputable fact that the governmental agencies having control over the labor situation have not in any degree made it possible to secure either war prisoners or foreign labor, and growers have become thoroughly disillusioned and disheartened.

The Agricultural Extension Divisions have been striving valiantly to render all the aid they possibly can, but they have been unduly and needlessly hampered by the confused situation with which they are faced on every hand.

There is no further time to spend on surveys, certifications, inspections, and red tape. The situation is too gravely critical to permit departmental conflicts and prerogatives, divided authority, and the protection of theoretical group interests to stand in the way of the needs of rice growers, which in this instance, are also indisputably the needs of the Nation. We, therefore, in our distress appeal to the governmental agencies involved for quick and effective action and the final termination of those policies which have been so completely ineffective.

We appeal to the war industries, operating in the heart of the rice-producing territory

to immediately furlough all those employees who have an agricultural background.

We appeal to the older school boys and to their parents for help in this emergency.

We appeal to the selective-service boards to defer the induction of farm labor.

We appeal to all others in towns and cities within the rice territory to do everything within their power to meet this grave emergency.

As a people we must no longer delude ourselves with the comfortable belief that food comes from the corner grocery store. Food comes from the unremitting toil and sweat of farmers, who are today facing problems as acute as any in the Nation. Food will be too precious in the coming months to permit of its waste. We must face the fact squarely that in this emergency all the help from every source may still be too little and too late to prevent waste and want.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1338. A bill to permit the granting of beverage licenses in the District of Columbia to service clubs of other United Nations;

S. 1339. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved January 15, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 1340. A bill to establish a sanitary code governing the operation of restaurants in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1341. A bill to provide for loans to enable veterans of World War No. 2 to pay debts existing at the date of their discharge from the service; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 1342. A bill to provide for the setting aside of convictions of Federal offenders who have been placed on probation and have fully complied with the conditions of their probation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1343. A bill to amend title IX of the act of March 27, 1942, Seventy-seventh Congress, entitled "An act to further expedite the prosecution of the war," by adding a new section thereto providing free postage under certain conditions for persons serving in the armed forces of any foreign country with which the United States may be associated in the prosecution of war (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1344. A bill to provide for continuing the pay of members of the armed forces for 6 months following the date of discharge from the service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1345. A bill to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam heating purposes in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1346. A bill for the relief of the R. B. Walker Funeral Home;

S. 1347. A bill to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942;

S. 1348. A bill to amend the second paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942;

S. 1349. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York certain lands within the Brooklyn Navy Yard in the city of New York;

S. 1350. A bill to establish the grades of commissioned warrant officer and warrant officer in the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

S. 1351. A bill to amend the act of May 27, 1908, as amended, authorizing settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps;

S. 1352. A bill to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service;

S. 1353. A bill to further amend the act of February 14, 1931, relating to allowances for travel by automobile; to permit of allowances for transportation in excess of minimum first-class accommodations, and for other purposes; and

S. 1354. A bill to amend the act approved January 16, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United States Naval Academy"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE—AMENDMENT TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD an amendment intended to be proposed to the first deficiency appropriation bill which comes over from the House. The amendment deals with the reinstatement of crop insurance, which was defeated by the Congress earlier in the present session.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. LUCAS to the deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the proper place in the bill insert the following new section:

"Sec. —. Effective as of July 12, 1943, the paragraph under the caption 'Federal Crop Insurance Act', in the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes', approved July 12, 1943 (Public Law 129, 78th Cong.), is amended by striking out '$3,500,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$7,818,748', and by striking out the proviso which reads as follows: ': *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for or in connection with the insurance of wheat and cotton crops planted subsequent to July 31, 1943, or for any other purpose except in connection with the liquidation of insurance contracts on the wheat and cotton crops planted prior to July 31, 1943.'"

INVESTIGATION OF CONDITIONS AT GALLINGER MUNICIPAL HOSPITAL

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 178), which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, or any duly appointed subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized to investigate conditions at Gallinger Municipal Hospital, with particular reference to sanitation, food, diet, and the treatment and care of tubercular patients.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. REYNOLDS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 179), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures authorized by Senate Resolution 32, agreed to January 14, 1943, authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs to hold hearings during the Seventy-eigth Congress, is hereby increased by $5,000.

TOLLS ON GOVERNMENT TRAFFIC OVER GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2912) to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BAILEY, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McNARY, and Mr. JOHNSON of California conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROSPECTIVE INCREASE IN SOCIAL-SECURITY TAXES

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to present a very important letter from Dr. Arthur J. Altmeyer, Chairman of the Social Security Board, regarding a problem which has not as yet been brought officially to the attention of the Congress but which must be answered in the next 90 days, and I should like permission to speak briefly in definition of the text.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to present for the RECORD and for reference to the Senate Finance Committee a very important letter from Dr. Arthur J. Altmeyer, Chairman of the Social Security Board, relating to the prospective 100-percent increase in social-security taxes on next January 1 in respect to the old-age benefit and survivors' insurance program.

Senators will recall the fact that the present pay-roll taxes for these purposes is 1 percent on employers and 1 percent on employees. The law as originally written required an increase in both of these taxes to 2 percent 2 years ago. Senators will also recall the fact that Congress voted in each of these 2 preceding years to postpone the increase and to leave the tax at the existing level.

The question now recurs as to whether this statutory 100-percent increase in these taxes shall be permitted to become effective on January 1, 1944, as will be the case in the absence of any congressional action to the contrary. Inasmuch as I was somewhat responsible for presenting the facts upon which Congress acted upon these two previous occasions, I have felt a particular responsibility to inquire into the current situation with this New Year's deadline in view.

I submitted a questionnaire to Dr. Altmeyer. He has fully and frankly replied. The Social Security Board again recommends against any further postponement of the 100-percent increased pay-roll tax. I opposed the Board's recommendation in 1941 and 1942 and Congress rejected its advice for what I believe to have been wholly sound and legitimate reasons. But I am frank to say that I do not think the case is quite so clear from an actuarial standpoint for a further postponement of the pay-roll-tax increase. I am keeping an open mind upon the subject. But I think it should be fully canvassed by both the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee in connection with other tax decisions which are to be made this fall.

The total receipts from social-security taxes for old-age benefits for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943, amounted to $1,130,000,000 while the total draft upon the fund for the payment of benefits and administrative expenses was only $176,000,000. This still leaves a tremendous gap between income and current expenditure. But this by itself is no criterion whatever as to the needs of the fund for 1944 because the primary purpose of these tax payments into the fund during these early years of its existence is to create a sound actuarial reserve for the future.

Thus once more we confront the question of what constitutes a sound reserve. This reserve on June 30, 1943 was $4,268,000,000. The existing law sets up the following rule to govern the essential size of a prudent reserve: "During the ensuing 5 fiscal years" the reserve shall substantially equal "three times the highest annual expenditures anticipated during that 5-fiscal-year period." The reason Congress postponed the 100 percent increased pay-roll tax in 1941 and 1942 was that the reserve at the existing 1-percent rate of current taxation did produce a trust fund which was in excess of "three times the highest annual expenditures anticipated during that 5-fiscal-year period."

On the face of the arithmetic—as indicated by Dr. Altmeyer's letter—the reserve assets on December 31, 1944 would still be more than adequate under the foregoing rule even if no employer or employee contributions were collected in 1944. This certainly justifies the action previously taken by Congress in 1941 and 1942 to postpone the 100-percent increase in pay-roll taxes. By the same token it would appear to justify a further postponement of this pay-roll tax increase next January. But the tremendous and unanticipated expansion of employment and resultant social-security coverage as a result of the war effort now injects some new and highly speculative factors into the actuarial calculations for the future. Obviously we must keep the Trust Fund absolutely sound. Obviously, on the other hand, we should collect no more pay-roll taxes than are necessary to finance the existing coverage of the social-security law. The question thus becomes one of sound judgment. Instead, therefore, of taking the responsibility for making a personal recommendation this year contrary to the advice of the Social Security Board I am suggesting most earnestly that the matter shall be immediately studied by the appropriate committees of the House and Senate.

The subject is directly related to the question of the further general tax increases which will shortly be under study by the House Ways and Means Committee and Senate Finance Committee, because if the Social Security Act is not again amended the 100-percent increase in pay-roll taxes will become automatically effective next January 1, and will of itself add approximately $1,200,000,000 to next year's tax bill as it falls directly upon industry and upon labor.

This subject is unrelated in any way to the proposed expansion of the Social Security Act in respect either to coverage or to benefits. It deals solely with the adequacy of revenue to protect existing benefits under existing coverage.

Mr. President, I ask that Dr. Altmeyer's complete letter upon the subject be printed at this point in the RECORD, and I ask that the entire subject matter be referred to the Senate Finance Committee.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be referred to the Senate Committee on Finance, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD,
Washington 25, D. C., August 27, 1943.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: This is in reply to your letter of June 15 in which you ask a number of questions concerning the old-age and survivors' insurance program and the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund. In addition to answering your specific questions, I am appending a presentation of the major reasons why, in the opinon of the Social Security Board, it would be unwise to defer the increase in the contribution rates of the program now scheduled to take effect on January 1, 1944.

I am answering your specific questions in order below in accordance with your numbering.

(1) What will be the total receipts from Social Security taxes for old-age benefits (referring to the existing 1-percent tax on employers and also on employees) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943?

Total taxes received under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943, amounted to $1,130,000,000.

(2) What will be the total draft upon this fund for (a) administrative expenses, and (b) the payment of benefits for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943?

Total benefit payments from the Trust Fund during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943, amounted to $149,000,000 and reimbursement for administrative expenses amounted to $27,000,000, or a total of $176,000,000.

(3) What will be the reserve under this section of the law on June 30, 1943?

The total assets of the Trust Fund as of June 30, 1943, were $4,268,000,000.

(4) What will be the highest prospective annual benefits to be paid in the ensuing 5 years? I shall be glad to have this question answered not only on the basis of your original actuarial calculations but also on the basis of the maximum charge against the fund which you might contemplate in any of the next 5 ensuing years.

Rapid changes in the patterns of employment and earnings during and after the war as well as the extra war mortality, and the numerous other uncertainties connected with the changing national and international situation, make it very difficult to estimate old-age and survivors insurance disbursements during the coming 5 years.

Numerous assumptions must be made as a basis for specific estimates of prospective annual benefits. The use of differing assumptions would naturally produce quite divergent results. On a basis of two different sets of assumptions, each of which seems reasonable in view of the present economic situation and the possibilities inherent in the changing situation, it appears that annual benefit payments during the highest of the ensuing 5 years might run as low as $450,000,000, on the one hand, or as high as $900,000,000, on the other. On the assumption that the highest amount of annual benefit payments for the 5-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1948, is $900,000,000 and that approximately $40,000,000 is disbursed for administrative expenses, it would appear that a total of $940,000,000 would represent the highest annual expenditures expected in the 5 fiscal years ending June 30, 1948. It is possible, however, that benefit disbursements for a particular year during this period might fall outside the range between these two estimates. Under a combination of extreme circumstances in which a substantially larger number of aged persons than was assumed in the preceding estimates build up wage credits in covered employment and then retire and the toll of the war is reflected in increased survivors payments, it could happen that total expenditures in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, would exceed $940,000,000 and would approach one-third of the assets of the fund as of June 30, 1943. It would be reasonable, however, to refer to $940,000,000 as the probable maximum expenditure.

The foregoing figures are tentative since they are made substantially in advance of the Fourth Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance Thust Fund. They are based on a rough projection of certain of the estimates contained in the Third Annual Report, a copy of which is available in the office of the clerk of the Senate Committee on Finance.

(5) What pay-roll tax on employer and employee is necessary in 1944 in order to maintain a reserve which is three times the highest annual expenditure expected in the ensuing 5 years?

The answer to this question depends, of course, upon the choice of assumptions as to conditions affecting both amounts of taxable wages and amounts of expenditure. Consistent with probable maximum expenditures of $940,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, the probable maximum for the calendar year ending December 31, 1949, would be about $1,100,000,000. If no employer or employee contributions were collected in 1944, the assets on December 31, 1944, would amount to about $4,600,000,000, which is more than three times the estimated expenditures during the calendar year 1949. Under these assumptions, therefore, no taxes would be required in 1944 to maintain a ratio of assets to expenditures (in the fifth ensuing year) of at least 3 to 1, but the rates of 2 percent each on employers and employees now scheduled in the law are desirable for the adequate long-run financing of the program and represent appropriate minimum rates for 1944 under present circumstances, as pointed out below.

(6) Is it, or is it not, a fact that the social security pay-roll taxes which would be collected in 1944 at 1 percent (without rate change) would be equal to the taxes (and

actually exceed them) which you and your Board estimated 4 years ago could be collected in 1944 at the rate of 2 percent on employers and employees?

On the assumptions that the social-security pay-roll taxes continue at their present rates of 1 percent each on employers and employees and that the amount of taxable wages remains at its 1943 level, over $1,300,000,000 would be collected in taxes under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act during 1944. This amount would be in excess of the estimate for 1944 presented in the Report of the Senate Committee on Finance on the Social Security Act Amendments of 1939, which stated that the actual figures for any year would differ from those shown (Senate Report No. 734, 76th Cong., pp. 17–18). This qualification was necessarily made in the report, since the figures presented were a straight-line projection for a 15-year period based on then existing levels of earnings and employment and took no account of specific year-to-year fluctuations around the projection. The annual figures in the report were illustrative and do not indicate the amounts necessary to finance the program in any given year or under circumstances where wage credits of workers have risen above previous expectations.

The larger-than-expected taxes have resulted from the high levels of employment and wages accompanying the war which has similarly increased potential benefit obligations of the fund over those anticipated in 1939. The great increase in the number of persons acquiring wage credits is indicated by the fact that in the second quarter of 1939, when the report referred to was prepared, 26,900,000 workers had taxable wages, whereas in the last quarter of 1942 the corresponding figure was 37,900,000 persons.

The major reasons why it would be unwise, in the opinion of the Social Security Board, to defer the increase in the contribution rates now scheduled to take effect on January 1, 1944, may be stated as follows:

1. The contribution rates scheduled in the existing law, together with interest receipts to the Trust Fund, may eventually prove inadequate to meet the benefit payments provided in the existing law and the administrative expenses of the program, depending upon developments which cannot be foreseen with confidence. Any reduction in the scheduled contribution rates would lessen the temporary excess of receipts over disbursements, would lessen what would otherwise be the size of the fund, and, hence, would reduce the future interest income of the fund. This would increase the likelihood of an eventual deficit, or would hasten and increase the size of such a deficit. No doubt the existing law would be amended before an actual deficit developed. At such time an increase in contribution rates beyond the highest now scheduled, or a reduction in the scope or level of benefits, or a Federal subsidy, or some combination of the three, would become necessary. A reduction in the tax rates scheduled to apply in 1944 would be a step toward such an eventual situation.

2. A consideration of the provisions of the existing law concerning the reports which the board of trustees of the Trust Fund is required to make to Congress supports the view that the scheduled tax rates for the year 1944 should not be reduced. It is true that the existing law requires the board of trustees to report to Congress whenever the board is of the opinion "that during the ensuing 5 fiscal years the Trust Fund will exceed three times the highest annual expenditures anticipated during that 5-fiscal-year period." However, the law does not require Congress to take any action upon the receipt of such a report, nor does it suggest that the three-times rule is the sole indicator of the proper size of the reserve. Indeed, as I tried to bring out in my letter of September 2, 1942, to you, this provision was written into the law with the thought that it would be meaningful only with respect to the reserve when the benefit load has reached a considerable degree of stability and not for the early years.

3. The unusually high level of tax receipts under the old-age and survivors' insurance program during the past year or so should not be thought of as constituting a clear "gain" to the Trust Fund. The wages which give rise to the increased current receipts will also, in the future, serve to qualify many individuals for benefits who would not otherwise receive them and will increase the potential benefit amounts payable to other individuals. In other words, the increased present income to the fund means increased future disbursements from the fund. A reduction in the scheduled tax rates of the program because of wartime fluctuations in the amount of taxable wages under the program would seem to be unsound in the light of the increasing liabilities. Moreover, it would lend credence to the thought that scheduled tax rates are not to be taken seriously, but that increases and decreases in the scheduled rates are to be expected in accordance with temporary economic fluctuations.

4. The chief reason why a graduated schedule of contribution rates was incorporated in the law was to permit the ultimate contribution rates of the program to become effective gradually. The scheduled one percent increase in the rate of the taxes on employers and employees would not seem unduly burdensome, particularly since its existence in the law has led to its being anticipated and discounted long ago. Indeed, because of the present high levels of business activity and wages, the scheduled increase would be less burdensome on employers and employees than might ordinarily be the case. Moreover, a postponement of the scheduled increase in tax rates would not reduce the long-run tax burden of contributors, whereas a continuance of the 1-percent rates is likely to mislead contributors with respect to the actual costs of the old-age and survivors' insurance program and would lead to the necessity for sharper increases in pay-roll taxes in later periods when business conditions and earnings may be less favorable than at present.

5. In the early years of the operation of the old-age and survivors' insurance system the actuarial value of the benefits provided is very many times the value of the individual worker's contribution. For example, a single individual who contributes for 10 years to the system and at the maximum salary taxable under the law ($250 per month) might have obtained from a commercial insurance company an annuity of only about $2 per month with his own contributions; whereas, this law entitles him to a benefit of $44 per month—or 22 times the amount purchasable from an insurance company by his own contributions (S. Rept. No. 734, 76th Cong., p. 16.) A married man might be entitled to $66 per month or 33 times the value of his own contributions. Moreover, the actuarial value of the survivorship benefits alone is crudely equivalent to a 1-percent contribution rate. The present value of these survivors' benefits at the date of death (corresponding to the face amount of life insurance) is between $3,000 to $10,000 for most families (and as high as $15,000 for some families). Therefore equity to the contributors who do not receive benefits until after many years suggests that the contribution rates be increased to 2 percent.

6. In addition to the equity of levying contributions at the 2-percent rate, it would seem prudent to increase the rate to 2 percent in order to convey to the contributors the real value of their insurance protection. The continuation of the present 1-percent rate tends to undervalue the protection afforded in the minds of the contributors and their families as well as employers and the public generally.

7. As the President pointed out in his letter of October 3, 1942, adherence to the scheduled contribution rates of the program is not only in accordance with the necessities of the program itself, but at the same time "would contribute to the noninflationary financing of the rapidly mounting war expenditures."

The fact that there are these two good reasons for adhering to the scheduled contribution rates does not mean that social security contributions are being levied for other purposes than social security. As you know, all of the contributions are deposited in the Trust Fund and all of the bonds held by the Trust Fund are United States Government securities. As the representative Advisory Council on Social Security stated in its report of December 1938, it is necessary and desirable that these contributions be invested in United States Government securities. A large portion of life-insurance reserves are invested in Government securities but the policyholder still does not feel that he pays for anything else but his insurance.

The social-security contributor benefits by increased contributions and their investment in two very important ways. First, because the collection and investment of these contributions at this time help to combat inflation. As the life-insurance companies have pointed out in their recent Nation-wide advertising campaign, it is a matter of vital importance to all insurance beneficiaries to combat inflation which automatically results in a decrease in the purchasing power of their benefits.

The second reason why social-security contributors benefit from this increase in rates is that future annual Government expenditures will be proportionately lower. This is because the Government debt in the hands of banks and other private investors will be that much less. Or, putting it another way, the Government will pay to the trust fund what it would otherwise have been obliged to pay to these banks and other private investors. In other words, instead of having to make two payments—one to the Trust Fund and another to the banks, the Government will only have to make the one payment to the Trust Fund.

Some people have said that the fact that the Government will be required to levy taxes to redeem the Government obligations issued to the trust fund means that the social-security contributors are being taxed twice for the same purpose. This, as you know, is not true. The truth is that the social-security contributors are taxed only once to pay for their benefits when they make their regular contributions. As taxpayers they may also be obliged to pay taxes to redeem Government obligations issued to the Trust Fund but when they do so they are paying for the cost of the war and not for the cost of social-security benefits. They would have to pay these taxes to cover the cost of the war whether the bonds are sold to the trust fund or to individuals or to financial institutions.

The same situation exists as regards the purchasers of War bonds. They pay the Government once for the Government's promise to pay them the face value of their War bonds. They pay the Government again in the form of taxes to enable the Government to pay them back the amount that they loaned the Government. However, when they pay their taxes as citizens to enable the Government to pay them as creditors, they are paying for the cost of the war and not paying the Government twice for the same War bond.

So far as social-security contributors are concerned, the net result is that if these increased contributions are not paid now they will be worse off in later years becaues they will have to pay higher social-security con-

tributions then and will also have to pay the same amount of taxes to cover the Government debt.

I am pleased to have had the opportunity to provide you with the foregoing material. If I can be of any further assistance to you, please call on me.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. ALTMEYER,
Chairman.

PROGRESS OF THE WAR—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the progress of the war delivered by the President of the United States on July 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THIRD WAR LOAN DRIVE—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the President of the United States on September 8, 1943, in connection with the opening of the Third War Loan Drive, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT WE FIGHT FOR—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "What We Fight For," delivered by the Vice President of the United States, in Chicago, Illinois, September 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SALE OF WAR BONDS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CONNALLY

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator CONNALLY at Austin, Tex., on August 26, 1943, in connection with the war bond campaign, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNCONDITIONED NATIONALISM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR AUSTIN

[Mr. AUSTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Unconditioned Nationalism," delivered by him at the eastern conference of the Republican Post-War Policy Association, at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, July 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS AT ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF ILLINOIS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the annual convention of the American Legion, Department of Illinois, held at Chicago, Ill., August 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECORD OF THE SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Record of the Seventy-eighth Congress," delivered by him before the Alabama Bar Association at Birmingham, Ala., July 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PEACE OR POLITICS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Peace or Politics," delivered by him before the American Bar Association at Chicago, Ill., August 26, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

BUILDING FOR THE FUTURE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Building for the Future," delivered by him at the Kiwanis State Convention, at Milwaukee, Wis., August 2, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATE RESOLUTION 114, ITS NATURE AND ITS MISSION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BURTON

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on Senate Resolution 114, its nature and its mission, delivered by him in Carnegie Hall, New York City, September 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOCIAL-SECURITY PROTECTION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WAGNER

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him on August 14, 1943, regarding social-security protection for servicemen, war workers, and civilian population, together with a Gallup poll relating to the same subject, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE WILL TO WIN—ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Will to Win," broadcast on the radio August 16, 1943, by Hon. James F. Byrnes, Director of the Office of War Mobilization, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY HON. CORDELL HULL

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Our Foreign Policy in the Framework of Our National Interests," delivered by Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, September 12, 1943; and Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Hull Post-War Policy," from the Washington Daily News of September 13, 1943, and an editorial entitled "American Peace Aims," from the New York Times of September 13, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

SCARCITY OF OIL—ADDRESS BY HON. HAROLD L. ICKES

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Oil Is Scarce," delivered September 1, 1942, by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior and Petroleum Administrator for War, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN POLICY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS OF THE REPUBLICAN ADVISORY COUNCIL

[Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the report of the Committee on Foreign Policy and International Relations adopted by the Republican Advisory Council, at Mackinac, Mich., September 7, 1943, together with editorials from various papers on the subject, which appear in the Appendix.]

LIBERTY AT HOME—RESOLUTIONS OF THE REPUBLICAN POST-WAR ADVISORY COUNCIL IN DOMESTIC POLICY

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD resolutions of the Republican Post-War Advisory Council in Domestic Policy entitled "Liberty at Home," adopted at Mackinac Island, Mich., September 7, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

SUMMARY OF PROBLEMS, REPUBLICAN POST-WAR ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR FUTURE STUDY

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a summary of problems approved by the Republican Post-War Advisory Council for Future Study, at Mackinac Island, Mich., September 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SAFEGUARDING OF CIVIL RIGHTS—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by David Lawrence, entitled "New Congress Must Guard Civil Rights," which appears in the Appendix.]

ATTITUDE OF THE PEOPLE OF OREGON ON PUBLIC POLICIES

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by E. C. Grant, of Clackamas, Oreg., regarding the attitude of the people of Oregon on public policies, which appears in the Appendix.]

TODAY'S YOUTH—ADDRESS BY MISS BETTY LONG

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Today's Youth," delivered by Miss Betty Long, of Iowa Falls, Iowa, at the old settlers' picnic, Eldora, Iowa, on August 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHORTAGE OF TRANSPORTATION FOR GRAINS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that all over the Northwest, and particularly in North Dakota, one of the largest crops in the history of the State and of the entire Northwest has been produced. At the present time there is a boxcar shortage, and that area has been unable to ship out its flax and its wheat and its barley. The storage facilities there are insufficient. The elevators are full.

I hold in my hand a number of telegrams which I desire to read in order that the Senate may understand the great seriousness of the problem insofar as it relates to the war effort. I may add that some time ago I took up the matter with Mr. Eastman, the Director of Defense Transportation, but so far without any appreciable result except that at one time approximately 1,000 boxcars were sent into that area.

The first telegram I shall read is from Ray, N. Dak., in the northwestern corner of the State:

RAY, N. DAK., *September 13, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Boxcar allotment for grain shipment inadequate. Thousands of bushels in piles on ground. Large flax crop beginning with no space in elevators and no cars for shipment. Hope you will do utmost to obtain larger car allotment.

RAY FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR CO.

The next telegram is from Wheelock, N. Dak.:

WHEELOCK, N. DAK., *September 9, 1943.*
Hon. Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

We demand you do all in your power to alleviate boxcar shortage and to allocate cars to elevators according to past volume of business, not by so-called equal distribution as is being done at present.

SAMUEL WESTPHAL,
President, Wheelock Marshall Farmers Union, Local No. 391.

The next telegram, which is from Watford City, N. Dak., very close to the Montana State line, indicates that the situation in Montana, from which come the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], is similar to that in North Dakota:

WATFORD CITY, N. DAK.,
September 13, 1943.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Your able assistance in correcting the unjust distribution of railway freight cars will be greatly appreciated.

FARMERS COOPERATIVE ELEVATOR CO.,
EINAR H. DAHL, *President.*

The next telegram I shall read is from Ellendale, N. Dak., in the southern part of the State:

ELLENDALE, N. DAK., *September 13, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Supporting Thatcher's efforts in allocating cars will be appreciated.

ELLENDALE FARMERS UNION COOP. ASSN.

The next telegram is from Van Hook, N. Dak., in the central part of the State:

VAN HOOK, N. DAK., *September 14, 1943.*

Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

We request you help in securing fair allocation of box cars instead of A. R. A. ruling of 1923 C. C. S. No. 1. Contact Senator WHEELER or have railroad or O. D. T. rescind this discriminatory order and distribute cars on basis of historic volume. Our business is 10 to 4 over competition. Because of this order we receive one-half of empties. This forces stockholders of this cooperative association to haul their grain to competitors.

FARMERS UNION COOP. ELEVATOR ASS'N.

The next telegram is from Clifford, Traill County, N. Dak., in the eastern part of the State, very close to the Minnesota State line. I believe the telegram calls for the particular attention of the Senators from Minnesota. It reads as follows:

CLIFFORD, N. DAK., *September 13, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Chamber:

We urge immediate correction railroad present method grain car allocation.

CLIFFORD FARMERS ELEVATOR CO.

The next telegram is from Harlow, N. Dak., which also is located in the central part of the State:

HARLOW, N. DAK., *September 2, 1943.*

Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Farmers Union elevator, Harlow, shipping 250 to 300 cars grain a year. Car shortage up now. We are getting same treatment as every small elevator shipping 20 to 50 cars a year. Is this a fair deal? We are completely plugged today, unable to take a bushel of grain. Our competitor the O. & M. is also plugged. One car on the Soo line today for us. Grain going to N. P. and G. N. points. We are losing business and we don't like that. Can you do something about this? Farmers threshing and wild to get their grain in somewhere. We are depending on you.

FARMERS UNION COOP. ELEV. CO.
A. P. LALUM, *Pres.*
CARL HELGERSON, *Vice Pres.*
HERMAN HERMANSON, *Secy.*
C. M. ABRAHMSON, *Mgr.*

The next telegram is from Crookston, Minn., showing that the condition to which I have referred prevails all over the Northwest. The telegram reads as follows:

CROOKSTON, MINN., *September 14, 1943.*

Senator LANGER,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:

Office of Defense Transportation regard distribution of grain boxcars very unfair. Please investigate.

DRAYTON FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR.

The next telegram comes from the Farmers Union Elevator Co., located at Buxton, N. Dak., in the eastern part of the State, adjoining Minnesota. It reads as follows:

BUXTON, N. DAK., *September 14, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Protest unfair distribution of grain cars. Present method favors private grain trade at expense of farmers' cooperatives. Get in touch with Senator WHEELER and O. D. T. and do whatever you can to get this corrected.

FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR CO.,
A. M. RINGHAM.

The next telegram comes from the heart of the Red River Valley, the breadbasket of the world:

WHEATLAND, N. DAK., *September 13, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to endeavor to correct the railroads' present system of allocating boxcars without regard to volume handled. The prevailing system works severe hardship on cooperatives and disturbs orderly and efficient marketing producers' grain.

WHEATLAND FARMERS UNION GRAIN CO.,
H. H. WHEELER, *Secretary.*

Let me read now a letter from the former president of the North Dakota Taxpayers' Association, one of the outstanding farmers and businessmen of North Dakota, Mr. John Dawson:

OAK COULEE RANCH,
Mandan, N. Dak., September 10, 1943.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: There doesn't appear to be any equality in the present method of distribution of cars for the shipment of grain.

As I understand it, each elevator is allotted the same number of cars regardless of the amount of grain they have been handling.

It seems to us that the proper method of distribution of cars should be on the basis of what was handled the previous year by the different elevators.

I urge you to use your influence to see that there is a proper distribution of cars.

Sincerely yours,

MANDAN FARMERS COOPERATIVE ELEVATOR,
JOHN DAWSON, *President.*

Of course, all Members of the Senate can understand how foolish is the present method of distribution, when an elevator handling a small amount of grain receives the same number of boxcars as does a very large elevator handling 10 times as much grain.

I read next a telegram coming from Jud, N. Dak., in the central portion of the State:

JUD, N. DAK., *September 13, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Please use influence. Correct railroad present system allocation cars.

JUD FARMERS UNION GRAIN CO.

The next telegram comes from Reynolds, N. Dak., in the northeastern corner of the State:

REYNOLDS, N. DAK., *September 13, 1943.*

Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

Please use your influence to correct present allocation of boxcars for grain shipments.

REYNOLDS COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION.

Let me read now a letter from Nels P. Jensen, who is the inspector of weights and measures for all the elevators. Mr. Jensen is also deputy land commissioner of the State land department, which has charge of university and school lands. He has 1,000 farmers under his department. In his letter he registers complaint because the farmers are unable to obtain storage for their grain. He also says:

My problem is grain shipment. Am president Farmers' Cooperative Elevator, Hazen. We have three grain buyers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
STATE LAND DEPARTMENT,
BISMARCK, N. DAK., *September 10, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: They tell me that if no one else can do anything about it tell Bill your troubles. I'll make it as short as possible as I know your time is limited.

My problem is grain shipment. Am president Farmers Cooperative Elevator, Hazen. We have three grain buyers. Farmer has for many years handled 50 to 60 percent of all grain. All elevators are now filled and cars are distributed on an equal basis, giving no consideration to the amounts handled by each elevator in the past. This naturally works to the disadvantage of our elevator and compels our stockholders and customers to patronize our competitors. Please do everything possible to correct this injustice and make cars available on a percentage basis of past business.

With kind personal regards to you and the family.

Sincerely,

NELS P. JENSEN.

Mr. LANGER. Let me read now a telegram coming from Buchanan, N. Dak., from the manager of one of the largest grain elevators in the State:

BUCHANAN, N. DAK., *September 14, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

The practice being used by the American Railway Association of alloting grain cars on a 50-50 basis at stations having more than one elevator is working a hardship on the farmer patrons and the cooperative elevators. Grain cars should be allotted on the basis of past shipping record and we ask you to work for this method of car distribution and for the discontinuance of the unfair practice that is being used at present.

BUCHANAN FARMERS UNION GRAIN CO.,
R. D. KNUDSON, *Manager.*

Next I read a telegram coming from Verona, N. Dak.:

VERONA, N. DAK., *September 13, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

If present railroad allocation boxcars continues cooperatives will lose large part volume.

VERONA FARMERS UNION GRAIN CO.

I now read a telegram coming from Zahl, N. Dak., in the northwestern section of the State:

ZAHL, N. DAK., *September 13, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

Crisis confronts grain producer due to shortage boxcars. Your influence may relieve the situation.

ZAHL CO-OP GRAIN & TRADING CO.

Here is a telegram from Dickinson, N. Dak.:

DICKINSON, N. DAK., *September 13, 1943.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the board of directors of the Gladstone Farmers Union Elevator, speaking for over 250 stockholders, request that you do all in your power to investigate and abolish that vicious rule known as A. R. A. 10, used as a guide by railroads in distributing boxcars because it discriminates against cooperative elevators such as ours. Under this rule cooperative stockholders are forced to deliver their grain to competitor elevators because cars are allotted on even basis and records show that our elevator shipped 70 percent of station receipts in past years.

LORENZE DASSINGER, *Secretary.*

Here is one from Williston, N. Dak., next to the Montana line:

WILLISTON, N. DAK., *September 12, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you to try and get more freight cars for movement of grain from this territory and a more fair distribution of same. Operating elevator with a yearly expense of $20,000 and am allowed same amount of cars as competing elevators with yearly expense of about $6,000. Due to unfair allocation of cars our customers are forced to patronize competing companies. Situation very bad. Many thousand bushels grain will spoil if cars for movement are not available at once.

FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION,
JAMES COVLIN, *Manager.*

Here is one from McGregor, N. Dak.:

MCGREGOR, N. DAK., *Sept. 12, 1943.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge your support in obtaining more favorable car allocation. Much grain being ruined account of insufficient storage space. Many thousand dollars lost to farmers.

MCGREGOR FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR CO.

Here is one from Hensel, N. Dak.:

HENSEL, N. DAK., *Sept. 12, 1943.*
Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Grain box shortage very acute. Two elevator houses, capacity 85,000, blocked several times. A. R. A. ruling very disastrous.

HENSEL FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR.

Here is one from Sutton, N. Dak.:

SUTTON, N. DAK., *Sept. 11, 1943.*
Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Elevator plugged. Not getting our share of cars. Farmers forced to haul grain to our competitor's house.

SUTTON FARMERS UNION GRAIN CO.

Here is one from Parshall, N. Dak.:

PARSHALL, N. DAK.

We are in a desperate situation due to lack of grain cars. Elevators are full of old grain, and farmers commencing to combine, and there is no room for new grain, as railroads failed to move old grain out. Considerable amount of this new grain is out of condition due to rush harvest, and will be spoiled unless we have room to take and condition it. Please use your influence to see if relief can be had. Rush action imperative.

AXEL OLSON, *State Senator.*

Mr. President, when I was at home last week I made my own investigation. We have had a great deal of rain in North Dakota. Hundreds of thousands of acres of grain are still in the shock. The elevators are filled. Hundreds of thousands of bushels of old grain have not been moved; and unless something is done, if the rain continues and if the wheat, flax, and barley are piled upon the open ground, it will simply mean that the war effort will be sabotaged and hamstrung. It will mean further that the farmers of that area will suffer tremendous loss, and some of them may be forced into bankruptcy because they cannot dispose of their product.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these telegrams and letters be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and that the committee be asked to make a report shortly upon them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the telegrams and letters will be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Francis D. Culkin, late a Representative from the State of New York, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STAR-SPANGLED BANNER

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to read a letter directed to the Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The letter is as follows:

GENERAL SOCIETY OF THE WAR OF 1812,
Jackson Heights, N. Y., September 6, 1943.
Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE,
President, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PRESIDENT WALLACE: Note is taken that Congress will open its deliberations again as of September 14.

It goes without saying proper respect is always shown the American standard on such occasions. But inasmuch as that date is the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the birth of The Star-Spangled Banner, may we inquire if special significance can be given the birthday anniversary in your opening session?

Yours sincerely,

J. HALL LONG,
President General.

Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate except for a moment by remarks on this subject. We know that March 3, 1931, Francis Scott Key's song, The Star-Spangled Banner, was accepted as our national anthem and that in 1939 the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the writing of The Star-Spangled Banner was celebrated in Baltimore, as a result of the national movement endorsed by the Congress of the United States by the passage of a resolution authorizing the celebration at Fort McHenry and appointing a committee for that purpose, of which committee I was chairman.

It is highly appropriate that each year we should gladly avail ourselves of the opportunity to call attention to the outstanding significance of this anniversary and it is a pleasure indeed for me to do so today. Certainly it is fortunately true that the events of the past 12 months have added greater importance and even brighter lustre to our flag as an emblem of liberty and freedom in the United States and throughout the world.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

INVESTIGATION RESPECTING COAL SHORTAGES IN THE VARIOUS STATES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, to be forewarned is to be forearmed. This country is threatened with a fuel shortage more desperate than that which prevailed last winter. This is particularly true of New England and the North.

There is scarcely a single ton of surplus anthracite coal at the mines. In past years, a backlog of huge stores has been available from which could be drawn emergency allotments.

New England dealers—men who know their business from years of experience—report that only approximately 40 percent of next winter's coal is now on hand, either in homes of the consumers or in storage facilities of dealers.

By 40 percent I do not imply that everyone who will burn coal has that percentage of his necessary supply on hand. Thousands of people patriotically converted from oil to coal-burning equipment at the Government's request. Many of those people cannot now purchase coal. Imagine how they feel. People at their own expense patriotically converted tens of thousands of oil-burning furnaces to coal-burning furnaces in order to conserve oil. They are now faced with the fact that they cannot get coal.

Dealers are obviously not looking for new customers.

By October 15 many people in New England must start their winter fires. Some will start them before that date.

It must be apparent to my colleagues that drastic measures, supplemented by swift action, are necessary to cope with this situation.

Last winter, New England and the Northeast bore the brunt of a bad fuel-oil situation which left too many people with insufficient supplies of fuel oil, and real suffering followed.

This winter there must not be too little too late.

It is our responsibility to see that everything possible is done to get action now, not next January.

The situation in which we find ourselves today, so far as the coal supply is concerned, was brought about by several principal factors:

First. Strikes which cut down production at the mines.

Second. Overtaxed transportation system.

Third. Taking off of boats along the Atlantic coast.

Fourth. Conversion of many from oil-burning equipment to coal equipment.

Fifth. Increased military needs.

It is very important that action be taken. We have enough ingenuity in America so that we need not be stumped by this problem. I believe that with the vast sources of supply, the transportation we have in America, and the will of the people to do the impossible, this emergency can be met.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that this crisis is coming. We are faced with a coal shortage. Within 2 or 3 months Senators will have some people descend upon them very forcefully if the people of the northern United States are unable to obtain coal with which to keep warm. It is a serious problem. At a time when we have hardly a ton of surplus anthracite at the mines, with practically no reserve supply in the hands of the dealers, and with the winter months coming on, it is important that something be done. I am serving notice on the floor of the Senate today that unless something is done in the immediate future, some day when suffering occurs and freezing weather comes, somebody will have to answer.

To that end I send to the desk a resolution calling for the appointment of a committee of five to conduct a full investigation into the facts surrounding the coal situation, and to make recommendations for avoiding a serious condition which may affect the lives of many.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The resolution submitted by Mr. BRIDGES (S. Res. 177) was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to shortages of coal in the various States, and to obtain such information as it deems desirable with respect to the development, production, distribution, utilization, transportation, and handling of coal, with a view to determining the most effective means that may be employed for insuring an adequate supply of coal for civilian and war purposes. Such committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations for any necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the subject just discussed by the Senator from New Hampshire is of tremendous importance to the people of New England. There is grave apprehension that the shortage of coal during the coming months will cause much suffering and widespread hardships. It is a subject that I have been much interested in, and accordingly, I have been in communication, together with Representative PHILBIN, with the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, with respect to the situation, stressing the importance of vigilant action to prevent grave consequences to the health and comfort of our people, if remedies are not forthcoming. I have not before me the letter which we sent to Secretary Ickes, but I have a statement given to the press and which contains the substance of our letter to Mr. Ickes. I request that this statement be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last winter New England experienced a very serious shortage of fuel and range oil which caused not only inconvenience but, in many cases, hardship to our people.

At that time and since, officials of the United States Government have repeatedly urged domestic consumers and others in this area, in order to relieve the oil shortage, to convert to coal. Many of our patriotic citizens responded to these urgings in the belief, and with at least implied assurance, that adequate supplies of coal would be available this winter. It is now apparent that this will not be the case but to the contrary, New England will be faced with greatly reduced supplies of coal, especially the kinds used by ordinary domestic consumers. Present conditions indicate that this situation threatens to have worse effects for this section than the shortage of oil last winter.

The stocks of distributors and retail dealers on hand at present are at the lowest point in many years. One retailer in Worcester County has received only 50 tons of anthracite coal since April. Most other dealers, while not in such a desperate situation, have in their bins at present, available for delivery to the public, only a negligible percentage of the requirements for next winter which they would now normally have.

Under present Government allocations, these stocks are not being built up fast enough, if at all. In most cases, they afford no prospect of adequate solid fuel supplies in New England, but every prospect of dangerous scarcities.

Many reasons have been ascribed for these now desperate shortages, principally the coal strike. While the strike has been undoubtedly of some effect, it surely does not and cannot account for the present alarming deficiencies in the inventories of New England coal dealers. Facts are available which show that the supply of coal which went into New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and other States for the last coal year greatly exceeded shipments of the previous year while the supply to New England was considerably less. It is stated by responsible authorities that the increase in New York alone was over 1,000,000 tons over the previous year. It is also reported that trucks moving in interstate commerce have gone to the coal mines in Pennsylvania in large numbers and carried very substantial tonnages of coal back to New York. These reports, apparently from authentic sources, would seem to indicate that coal which should come to New England in sufficient quantities to serve the needs of our householders and domestic consumers, has been and is being diverted to other parts of the country.

The anthracite situation in New England is growing more desperate every day because the fact is that New England is not getting its due share of hard-coal products and hundreds of our dealers are, at this moment, without coal. The total amount of hard coal shipped to New England from January 1943 to the end of July shows that almost 500,000 tons less were shipped than during the corresponding period in 1942.

New England is doing its full share for the war effort and has made notable contributions to national war production. In fact, New England industries have been indispensable to our industrial achievements. Notwithstanding this fact, it is apparent we have been discriminated against in many ways. Oil, gas, meats, and other provisions have been scarcer here than in most other places throughout the country since rationing began. Now coal is added to this list of dangerously scarce necessities of life which our New England people must have, not only to contribute their utmost, as they are doing, to the war effort, but also even to live at tolerable standards of subsistence, health, and comfort. The evidence seems to indicate unfortunately that many of these programs have been conducted without regard for those fundamental principles of equity and equality of treatment which should, of necessity, accompany the rationing of vital foodstuffs and commodities if it is to command the respect and cooperation of the people.

Admittedly the job of parceling out many things which are required, in the first instance, by our armed services is a difficult one, but our New England people have very justifiably become most impatient over the unusual and disproportionate hardships and sacrifices imposed upon them by either short-sighted policies, inept administration, or unwise handling of these basic problems of distribution and allocation of vital necessities.

The time for constructive action has been too far delayed. Though we appreciate the magnitude of these problems and are eager, as all Americans are, to join in every feasible possible way with Government officials in seeking to solve them in the interest of the war effort and the needs of our military and naval services, we feel constrained at this time, because of the deep anxiety we necessarily feel, in the light of the alarming coal shortages that currently exist in New England, to urge upon Secretary Ickes and the O. P. A. authorities and other agencies set up to deal with New England solid-fuel allocation the compelling need for concentrating immediately upon the shipment of very substantial tonnages of anthracite coal into this State and into New England so that great hardships to our people may be avoided during the coming winter months. The situation cannot wait. It is desperate. Neither the profits of coal operators, the activities of racketeering black-market manipulators, or any other consideration should be permitted further to delay the prompt shipment of anthracite and bituminous coal to our distressed people so that dealers' inventories may be replenished and gravest crises avoided.

CONDITIONS ON THE HOME FRONT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, when the Congress recessed 8 weeks ago the apparent purpose of the recess was to enable us to make contact with our constituents and ascertain their points of view with reference to vital matters pending before Congress. I do not sup-

pose there was any justification for the recess except to get the viewpoints of our constituents.

Today we have heard related by two Senators what they ascertained with reference to conditions back home. First, there was the matter of feed. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] mentioned the situation with reference to crops in his territory. It is truly critical and tragic, especially when one considers that the problem of feeding the cattle and other livestock of this country is a tremendous one. Unless we are able to furnish the necessary feed we shall experience tremendous losses in food.

The subject discussed by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] relating to coal is one which concerns everyone in this country. About 6 weeks ago I traveled along the southern shore of Lake Superior and I saw that the coal-dock yards in that region were three and a half to four million tons short of the season's requirements. I then telegraphed to Mr. Ickes. I told him of that situation, and after 2 weeks Mr. Ickes replied and acknowledged that the coal situation was critical. In my telegram to him I gave a partial solution. I said that the boats which were hauling iron ore from Superior to the ports in Pennsylvania returned empty in order to make three trips where they would ordinarily make two. I said that if they should come back with coal we could arrive at a partial solution of the problem. We found that the coal companies were shipping coal into the East because there was a small margin of profit over shipments into the West. Secretary Ickes agreed to look after this matter and I am glad to note that more coal is arriving in the Middle West.

Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly in relation to matters which I ascertained from my constituents.

I traveled about 3,000 miles in my State, speaking to farm groups as well as to labor groups. I spoke on village street corners and on city streets. I also spoke to other groups such as fraternal organizations, service clubs, commercial groups, and so forth. I spoke at county fairs. In all, I made about 50 talks in a period of about 6 weeks. I came into contact with thousands of people. I talked to farmers, laboring men, and little businessmen, hearing their tales, acting as sort of father confessor to their worries and fears, and trying to antidote them in order that the morale on the home front might be strong.

I wish briefly to state my conclusions as a result of these experiences.

Back in the State I found the following:

Big businessmen and little businessmen are concerned about the trend in government toward state socialism. They all feel that war made governmental supervision and control necessary to a certain degree, but they are all looking forward to the time when war ceases and freedom of enterprise returns to the home front.

Everywhere on the home front, among the farmers, among the businessmen, we find a grave concern about the vast bureaucracy of Federal employees. They are all eager to see action by Congress that will make for a reduction of the great number employed in Government.

On the home front there is great concern about the multiplication of Government corporations, which have the privilege of Government institutions and too few of the responsibilities of private corporations. Many of these Government concerns operate without adequate control, and even without audit. Private business is very much concerned over such competition.

On the home front all are concerned with the waste in Government spending. They expect Congress to take steps that will result in material savings. They expect Congress also, in the tax measure that is to be brought out of Congress, to provide for the creation of reserves which will aid industry to take the bumps in the post-war period. The people know a paralyzed industry would mean a paralyzed country. The people look to Washington to antidote any such condition. They want real planning now to meet the multitude of post-war problems when we cut war expenditures $85,000,000,000 and demobilize from 70 to 80 percent of our armed forces.

But, Mr. President, they demand of their public servants here in Washington that there be manifested in them a vital, living purpose to win the war and to prepare the way for a lasting peace.

They are very much concerned about the matter of peace. They want to know whether we are going to "miss the boat," as we did the last time. They want their public servants—the Executive and the Senate—to set an example for internal collaboration. I emphasize the statement that they want their public servants—the Senate and the Executive—to set an example for internal collaboration and to do their part in providing the political and economic framework for international collaboration.

The United States must cooperate actively with all other like-minded nations in an effort to preserve the world peace.

These people back home are practical. They know it is a simple matter to get together and say "We will make a contract—five or six of us—and go into business." But they know that going to a lawyer and having a contract drawn up does not do the job. They know that back of that contract there must be the physical, economic, sociological, and even the spiritual effort of all those who join in that contract in order to make it a success.

World peace can best be assured only when sovereign states, while preserving their own sovereignty and their own special interests, find this common ground on which to work together. This common ground can be found only by clearing away the existing differences, particularly among the major Allied Nations, and building on the basis of a definite common purpose a new international order. Until such time as international relationships become beyond all question orderly and secure, the people of the Middle West want us to keep our eyes open. They know that in this matter we are dealing with international poker players who have been playing the game for a thousand years, and they believe that the United States should maintain such armaments as will not only enable us to discharge our international obligations, but will assure our national security. They believe that the United States should secure adequate air and naval bases to assure our national security.

The architects—that means the United Nations—must agree on a plan. First, let us see what we in America can agree on, and following that let us see what we and our allies can agree on. Then the job really just begins. Then must follow the building, the assembling of the material, and the united effort of all the builders.

Mr. President, the people back home are very much concerned about the manpower question. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] showed how they were lacking in boxcars. I take it that, connected with that, is the question of manpower. In Wisconsin, as I traveled through that State, I saw working in the fields old gray-haired men who retired 10 years ago; I saw little children from 7 years old to 15 working in the fields; I saw girls driving tractors; I saw women there looking after the hay crops. We hear it said that the Middle West is complacent. I want to tell you, Mr. President, the Middle West is not complacent. The people of that section are doing a tremendous job. No one can be complacent, especially the mothers who have put in the neighborhood of 250,000 of their own blood into the service. They are doing a tremendous job in my own State. What we are producing in foodstuffs surpasses imagination. It is the old men and women who were, so to speak, on the shelf, and it is the girls who are performing men's jobs upon the farms who are doing this tremendous work. They are wondering whether or not the Government is going to take the few remaining men who are left. I want to tell you, Mr. President, that manpower is a tremendous problem. The Government wants now two and a half million more workers in its plants. We could use 100,000 men on our farms in Wisconsin.

We have before us the question of inducting married men. The people back home are thinking about manpower. They want the Congress to stand on its feet and use its head and not be swept away by illogical statements or drummed-up facts.

Concerning the question of inducting married men, I have taken the position that it is primarily a military question, but it is also a legislative question. In the first place, we passed a law that made it possible. Now, when there is a great quest for manpower on every front, we cannot "pass the buck" simply by saying that it is a military question. I believe

it would be wise, Mr. President, for the Senate of the United States to go into executive session and insist that General Marshall or such officer as he might designate should give the facts and the whys and wherefores of the manpower situation, and why we should or should not induct fathers into the military service.

As I have said, the people at home are eager to see what action Congress will take for the reduction of the great number employed in government.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a very significant statement which I desire to have placed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement is as follows:

Latest figures available on State and Federal Government employees

	State	Federal[1]
California	30,850	232,500
Indiana	15,040	32,600
Iowa	11,700	12,700
Louisiana	13,950	44,400
Massachusetts	21,000	129,000
Michigan	24,700	51,000
Missouri	12,700	49,000
Nebraska	5,680	24,600
Ohio	25,000	90,000
Pennsylvania	44,500	215,000
Tennessee	8,140	38,360
Virginia	17,112	120,595
Wyoming	1,100	6,200
Wisconsin (May figures)	[2] 7,800	19,000

[1] Executive service only.
[2] This 7,800 is both State and local employees.

Mr. WILEY. From the statement it appears that in Wisconsin there are 7,800 State and local employees, while in the same State there are 19,000 Federal executive employees. I wonder if that fact means anything. Well, the folks back home are getting very much concerned about it, anyway.

I said that the farmers are concerned about manpower. They are also concerned about the lack of farm machinery. I sincerely hope that it will be possible for the farmers to get more machinery, especially if more of the manpower is taken and put into the military service.

Mr. President, I have said that the people on the home front are greatly concerned about the multiplication of Government corporations, and that private business is greatly agitated by the competition of such corporations. I wish to inject the statement that the reason why these people are concerned is that the Government now has in the neighborhood of $30,000,000,000 invested in private enterprise, and the people are asking what is going to happen after the war. Is the Government going to retain these industries and operate them, as it is doing largely now? What is going to happen to little business, and is the big businessman to be merely a cog in the Government machine?

Mr. President, I shall speak for a moment about the matter of reserves. I know that the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee is giving this matter consideration; but I called at the office of a large industry in my State a little while ago. Responsible officers of the company said, "Senator, we just had to go to New York to borrow $100,000,000 in order to handle this great program which the Government has thrust upon us. Our profits, because of the Renegotiation of Contracts Act and because of taxes, are such that it is impossible to build up any reserves. What are we going to do when the war is over, when we have to reconvert from this war program to a civilian peace program? Are we to become, too, a Government creature or are we going to be independent men?" I was asked "What is your solution?" I said "I am not on the Finance Committee, but I have an idea. I think we should create what I have called conditional reserves; that provision should be made in the tax bill for a percentage of money to be set aside conditionally, so that if within a 10-year period such a concern as yours in the post-war period should go into the red, it could use a part of such reserve to pay the reconversion charges and pay the cost of maintaining labor." I said my recommendation is this: Get in contact with your labor leaders; let labor and industry learn to cooperate; let them get together. We are all in the same boat. Unless there is such cooperation, industry and labor will go down together; jobs will be lost, business will be gone, and the community will be paralyzed. I interject that suggestion at this point because I think it is fundamentally sound.

We hope that at the end of the war our industries will be capable of rehiring the boys who will be returning, taking up the economic slack, if you please. But if the industries have not the reserves with which to pay for the reconversion, if they have not the reserves to take care of labor costs during the time they are reconverting, then there will be economically broken industries, and they cannot hire labor, and cannot produce the financial economy that is needed.

Mr. President, the people are becoming aware that "big government" makes for unnecessary, unreasonable, and destructive orders, directives, regulations, and even laws by government administrators—bureaucrats—and that this system makes for loss of freedom and destruction of free government. The awareness of the people is bringing about an awakening. They want Congress to see to it that all unnecessary centralization is obviated.

I see before me the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and I call his attention to the fact that from the table before me it appears that in his State the State employees—that is, State and local employees—number 30,850. The Federal Government, in the executive service alone, had 232,500 employees in California. That is almost enough to decide any election.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator would be good enough to bear with me just one second until I can make an announcement.

Mr. WILEY. I am practically through, I may say to the Senator. It will take me only 2 or 3 minutes to conclude.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on the point to which he has just referred?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. With respect to the number of Federal employees in California, has the Senator a break-down of the classifications or categories in which those employees are found?

Mr. WILEY. This statement was given to me yesterday. The figures as to Federal employees refer to executive service only.

Mr. LUCAS. What does that mean?

Mr. WILEY. I suppose it means in the service of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. LUCAS. Would that include the Army and Navy employees in California, and shipyard workers?

Mr. WILEY. I do not think so. These are said to be latest figures available on State and Federal Government employees. The figures were given to me yesterday, and I have not had an opportunity to break them down further, but if the Senator desires I shall be glad to make the request that they be so broken down.

Mr. LUCAS. My only reason for making the inquiry was that the Senator is laying great emphasis on the fact that there are this many Federal employees in the State of California, and I think that for the benefit of the Senate and of the country he should have gone into the figures and have broken them down, so that we could know exactly the categories in which those employees are found. In other words, I should like to know what they are doing. It is my understanding, from one of my colleagues sitting near me, who seems to know, that a great number of these employees are included in the shipyards which are now building our ships, as well as the plants building planes in that area.

Mr. WILEY. I am very happy to have the suggestion of the Senator. I have given him the figures, and I assume he will be interested also in finding out how they are broken down, into what categories. This statement was given to me yesterday. All of us returned from our own States within the last few days, and when I heard of these figures I called for them, particularly as they related to my State, and the others were thrown in by the Government instrumentality which furnished them. I was astonished to see that in California, according to the note, State and local employees, which included employees of counties and municipalities, number 30,850, while Federal employees, those in the executive service only, aggregate the figure I have given. I do not see how executive service workers would be employees in shipyards, but perhaps they would be. I should be glad, however, to get further light on the subject.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator permit me a further observation?

Mr. WILEY. Certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is discussing a very important question insofar as employees of the Government are concerned. I think the Senate is obviously

anxious to see that as few persons as possible are employed by the Government. At the same time, I know the Senator from Wisconsin wants employed every man who is necessary to carry on the war effort, and when he makes the statement that there are so many Federal employees in California, and lays unusual stress on the fact, indicating that there is apparently something wrong about having so great a number, I think it would be only fair to the Senate that he provide a break-down of the figures so that we may ascertain definitely what the employees are doing, and in what classifications they are found, in order that the Senate and the country may intelligently reach their own conclusions upon the subject.

Mr. WILEY. I am very happy to receive the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, but I am discussing the reaction of the home folks to this extended bureaucracy, and to substantiate that I quoted figures given to me yesterday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. WILEY. I shall yield in a moment. To substantiate this further, I call attention to the fact that a distinguished member of the administration resigned his position just a few days ago. He told about where we could get men for the services, that we could get them out of the bureaus in Washington and elsewhere. The figures given by me are confirmatory of his statement. But if it will satisfy the distinguished Senator from Illinois, I assure him that I shall ask for a break-down of these figures, putting the employees into categories and classes, for my State and his State, and California, and any other States which appear on this exhibit.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator states that he is making these remarks primarily to inform the country about the great bureaucracy which exists at the present time. When the Senator merely states these figures, as he has done, without giving any information as to who these people are and what they are doing, he is not giving a true picture of the so-called bureaucracy about which he is talking. That is why I interrupted the Senator, to ask him whether or not he had a break-down, because I think it is fair that we should have that if he is using these figures to tell the country that there is a sprawling bureaucracy here in Washington.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the distinguished Senator again for his criticism. But let us not get off the point.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not off the point.

Mr. WILEY. The point I am discussing is that the people back home are aware of this large bureaucracy, and that these figures which were given me are confirmatory of the correctness of their conclusions. I shall have the figures broken down. But when on this very exhibit there is the statement that the "executive service only" in California employs 232,000, and that the State employees, meaning State and local employees, number 30,000, it seems to me that is pretty clear and definite and definitive as to the character of the executive employees.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would the Senator indicate the Government agency which furnished these figures to him?

Mr. WILEY. As I recall, I asked my secretary to telephone to the secretary of the committee presided over by the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and these figures were furnished. That is my recollection.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was a senatorial agency, and not an executive agency, then?

Mr. WILEY. A Government agency, I said.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was a congressional and not an executive agency which furnished the figures?

Mr. WILEY. I think so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, while it is desirable that we keep the country informed and that the country keep us informed of its reactions about what goes on in Washington, it seems incredible to me that in any one State there would be 232,000 executive employees, unless those employees included everyone working for a Government agency, and we all know that in California some of the Government agencies, such as the Maritime Commission, are employing thousands of men, as is the case in Louisiana, and that the airplane plants are employing thousands of men. It is necessary to know whether the 230,000 referred to by the Senator are Federal employees such as collectors of internal revenue, F. B. I. agents, or any other employees in similar categories, or men who were working in the plants.

Mr. WILEY. I agree with that conclusion, and I assure the Senator I shall get the information. I shall request it, anyway.

Mr. President, the people back home want their National Legislature to know the facts; they want Members of Congress to become acquainted with the facts which are necessary for them to take into consideration in making a determination. They want their Congress to look after the legislative business of the Nation. They do not want the Executive to run the whole show. I use that language very advisedly.

The people back home are sick of the tactics indulged in by certain persons whose arguments consist simply of abuse of their opponents. The people are sick of name calling in this great period of our history. The old designations of "tory stalwart", "conservative", "anti-liberal" are no longer very potent. The people know that we are fighting for our national existence. Any mother who has sent her son into the armed services of the United States, and who has received word that he has made the supreme sacrifice, is not thinking of so-called tories or liberals, or antiliberals. Yet a great deal of use is made of such epithets. When a proposal comes before this body it is not measured by such a yardstick.

Mr. President, I bring this subject to the attention of the Senate because I feel I have an obligation to it and to my country to do so in this great period of crisis. We are all asked to think our problems through clearly, and, of course, not on a partisan basis. I repeat the old analogy. We are all in the same boat. Members on the other side of the aisle and we on this side are all in the same boat. We hope the boat will make port safely and we strive to do our part to bring it safely to port. Consequently it is our business to pull together. If Senators on the other side of the aisle pull one way and we on this side pull the other way we shall not arrive anywhere. Such action will simply cause the boat to spin around.

Mr. President, in looking at the large issues it seems to me we are getting closer together. It seems to me the little meeting recently held at Mackinac Island indicated clearly, as I have said heretofore, that there is unanimity of effort in trying to effectuate a plan, in trying to get the architects together to the end that some great over-all plan may be perfected, and then, following the drafting of such a plan, that there may exist in the reservoir of the various nations sufficient brains and reason and judgment and vision to assure the collaboration which is needed. That is what makes for successful building.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WILEY. I shall yield in a moment. The real question is expressed in the word "how." The question is how to accomplish the objective. The people back home are concerned about that question. They do not think it is the business of America to become a perpetual international Santa Claus. The people are paying a tremendous price for what is going on now. As I previously said, the people want us, their lawmakers, to keep our feet on the ground. It would not hurt if we had a few Scotchmen representing us on our side in the deals which are being made, who could have a hand in looking after America's exchequer. Oh, yes; we want to be benevolent, we want to be kind and considerate, but we also know that there is a limit even to national spending, and the people are sick and tired of seeing the looseness with which their money is being spent in various directions. I say it is the function of Congress, wherever it can do so, to pick up the loose ends, to see that the leaks which exist are stopped up. If eventually we shall find ourselves confronted with a debt of some three hundred billion dollars which will be loaded onto the people of the United States, at a time when seven or eight million boys come back home looking for jobs, and when there is also a multitude of international problems pressing upon the Nation—when we come to that time, when, as Lincoln once said about himself,

"There is no other place to go except to my knees," then is the time when real collaboration will be needed on the home front.

Mr. President, in the August issue of one of the national magazines—Fortune—there was published an article dealing with the resolution which I submitted about a year ago to provide for the creation of a liaison committee between the Senate and the President. The article indicated clearly that perhaps there was some merit to that resolution. Since the meeting on Mackinac Island was held, which provides an indication of unity in spirit in this country, it seems to me it would be well for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to consider the question of reporting my resolution to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. There is one subject mentioned in the Senator's remarks concerning which I wish to ask him further.

Mr. WILEY. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for that purpose.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator discussed only briefly the question of reserves for business for the post-war period. As I understood the Senator from Wisconsin, he said he had a plan which would call for the building of conditional reserves.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator from Wisconsin amplify that statement? The reason for my question is that he touched upon a perplexing and very puzzling problem, one which is receiving consideration from a committee of the House at this very moment.

Mr. WILEY. Yes, Mr. President; I shall be very happy to respond to the distinguished Senator's question. I realize that in my previous statement I had not fully clarified the matter. Let me put the suggestion of a conditional reserve concretely. Let us assume a corporation which has a $20,000,000 income tax. It may employ as many as 10,000 men. Let us assume it is entirely—100 percent—engaged in the manufacture of war materials; that it has pulled out all the machinery which it used in normal peacetimes, and has replaced it by machinery which makes implements of war. The time apparently will come when there must be a reconversion. We have assumed that the corporation pays $20,000,000 income tax. If there were created a reserve of 10 percent, that would amount to $2,000,000. That would be called a conditional reserve. Let me show how it would be conditional. Over a period of 10 years, we will say, that reserve remains as a reserve. If it is needed to pay the cost of conversion, to pay labor costs, if the concern is going into the red, the conditional reserve can be utilized. If at the end of the 10-year period the reserve is not needed it will go into the Treasury of the United States. The reserve would operate as a buffer, as a dam, as an absolute insurance policy so that there would be money available for reconversion. Of course, if it were to operate in only that way, certain persons would say, "Oh, again you are favoring only the big fellow."

Well, Mr. President, let us see. If in the first or second year it were found that creation of the reserve would keep that industry going in the community, and that 10,000 men were employed, who would be the greatest beneficiary? The community would be. There can be no question about that. The economic current which would come from that concern would make that community economically healthy. There can be no question about that.

Very well; who next would be the beneficiaries? Of course, the laboring men themselves. They would get the money. That would keep their homes and their insurance payments and their tax payments in healthy shape. Of course, the concern itself would benefit, in the sense that it would be a going concern; because if it went down the chances are its millions of dollars of investment would be worthless.

Let me cite an example. In my community when I was a youngster there was a large sugar plant which cost three-quarters of a million dollars to build. It was making money, and it was considered a good investment. The Bank of Milwaukee put a $100,000 bond issue on it—fine—7½ to 1. But, Mr. President, something happened to the sugar business, as Senators who are familiar with the sugar industry know. The farmers could not afford to raise sugar beets. The three-quarters-of-a-million-dollar plant was shut down. It was worth that much when it was a going concern, and contributed to the economic lifeblood of that community, and put into that community the thing which made it healthy—dollars. When it was shut down the investors could not get their funds out. The economic current decreased; and finally the building was torn down. Did the bondholders get $100,000? They did not. They got $10,000.

That example illustrates what might happen in this country if we do not prepare buffers and dikes against the approaching storm, when it comes to a matter of trying to reorganize when the war is over, when our 10,000,000 fighting men come back, when we stop spending $100,000,000,000 a year, and probably reduce our expenditures to a much less amount, when we stop war spending. Then is the time when we shall need these conditional reserves. By conditional, I mean that they could be utilized for the payment of labor and for reconversion only upon the condition of the plant going into the red. The part which was not utilized after a given term would be recaptured by the Treasury of the United States.

Again, Mr. President, I say that we are all in the same boat. We have had too many divisionists among us, men who built their careers, as Hitler did, upon the idea of "divide and conquer"—setting labor against management, and the farmers against the city folk, creating venom and prejudice in the minds and hearts of people.

Here is a chance for labor and management to present to the Congress a constructive policy which would result in insuring the economic health of the country.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM DRAFT—MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement about a meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs. The committee will meet tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock in the caucus room in the Senate Office Building, for the purpose of hearing some high authorities of the Military Establishment in reference to the drafting of fathers, a matter in which our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is interested.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, with reference to the announcement just made by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, of course, I have no objection, and could not have; and it would do no good if I should object to their calling General Marshall and Admiral King before the committee. However, I call attention to the fact that my bill providing for the deferment of fathers was pending before the Committee on Military Affairs for some months. I asked for a hearing with reference to the matter, and was permitted to appear before the committee. At the time of my appearance before the committee, only two members of the committee were present. At the same time Colonel Keesling appeared before the committee. Letters were read from the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, at that time opposing the proposed legislation.

When the Congress recessed, a statement was given to the press, and information came to me definitely, that fathers were not to be called. However, during the recess, announcement was made by Mr. McNutt that fathers would be called the 1st of September, as I recall, or the 1st of October, notwithstanding the fact that the Congress was not to meet until the 14th of September. When I heard that, I felt it was taking undue advantage of the Congress of the United States, when the House of Representatives had almost overwhelmingly passed a bill providing in effect that fathers should be deferred until all single men had been inducted. It seems to me that it came with poor grace from whoever was responsible for it, to say that fathers were to be taken beginning on the 1st of October, when the bill was pending before the Senate Committee, and had been overwhelmingly passed by the House, and when my bill had been reported from the Senate committee by a vote of approximately 11 to 3.

Let me say that another bill has the right-of-way before the Senate. However, immediately after that bill is out of the way, I expect to move that the Senate take up the fathers' deferment bill, which I introduced and which is on the calendar; and I now serve notice that I intend to do so.

In this connection I call attention to the fact that in many places fathers are already being called. The draft boards have been notified, and in my State they are calling fathers in some instances. Just before I left Montana a man came to see me. He said he had five children, and that he not only had to support them but also had to help support his father and mother. Another man who came to see me said he had five children whom he had to support. Both men were to be called.

Mr. President, I do not know who is responsible for this situation. I have been told by some that it is not the Army and the Navy, but that it is the President, who is responsible for it. On the other hand, I have been told that it is the Army and Navy. Let me say that if any one had set out deliberately and premeditatedly to sabotage this administration he could not have done a better job than has been done by the Selective Service and the O. P. A. in the confusing statements which they have issued almost from day to day.

Earlier in the day I asked to have inserted in the RECORD a statement by John O'Donnell, published in the Washington Times-Herald. Since that time I have been handed a statement which was issued by the Canadian Minister of National Defense, Col. the Honorable J. L. Ralston. The press release states:

The Canadian Minister of National Defense, Col. the Honorable J. L. Ralston, announced today that a plan has been approved for the reorganization of the Canadian Army in Canada under which the Seventh and Eighth Divisions now on duty in Canada will be disbanded and the Sixth Division will be partially disbanded.

Canada has five divisions overseas and three divisions at home. Of the three divisions at home, two and a half divisions are being disbanded.

The news release further states:

The plan particularly affects that portion of the Army in Canada which is allotted operational tasks. It will result in a reduction in the number of troops required to carry out those tasks. It will also have consequential effects in reducing the number of personnel required for servicing operational troops. The plan is made possible by the improved strategic position on both coasts of Canada resulting from the eviction of the Japs from the Aleutians; the military victories in the Mediterranean and the Russian successes; and the striking betterment in antisubmarine activities in the Atlantic.

The scheme will involve a readjustment downward of local defenses on both the east and west coasts.

The Minister's statement is in part:

"Events of recent months have greatly improved the general strategic situation in respect to the defense of both coastal regions of Canada.

"In the Pacific there has been the eviction of the Japanese from the Aleutians and the increasing scale of operations in the southwest Pacific.

"The European area has seen the continuance of Russian successses with increasing menace to Hitler, the destruction of the Axis forces in north Africa, and the capitulation of Italy. These successes intensify the threat of further offensive operations against the Axis both in northwestern Europe and in the Mediterranean area.

"While these developments do not remove the threat of enemy action in certain forms against this continent they reduce materially the scale of any possible operation of that kind.

"The degree of probability and the possible type and weight of any such operations have been appraised in consultation with the United States authorities.

"In the light of this appraisement it is possible to revise the composition of the portion of the Army in Canada which is allotted to operational tasks and to effect a reorganization and a substantial reduction in the number of troops to be employed for that purpose.

"Obviously, operational troops in Canada are employed principally in connection with the defense of the Atlantic and Pacific coastal areas. Consequently, the main features of the reorganization will include—

"(A) Downward adjustments in local defenses at strategic points, having regard to their relative importance and vulnerability.

"(B) The Seventh and Eighth Divisions now on duty in Canada will be disbanded and the Sixth Division will be partially disbanded. In substitution for these divisions it is proposed to retain a composite formation of three brigade groups each capable of operating independently. These troops will be administered and trained under a modified divisional headquarters.

"In terms of personnel the reorganization will have the following effects:

"(A) All personnel of age, rank, and medical category suitable for potential reinforcements will be absorbed into units or training or other establishments;

"(B) General servicemen who are below category for operational duties will, as far as required, be absorbed in less active posts in Canada for which their physical category may be suitable;

"(C) All personnel not of an age, rank, or medical category suitable for operational duties and who are not required for less active posts in Canada will be discharged to resume civilian occupations, and thus improve the manpower situation for essential civilian activities.

"The general result will be:

"(A) To provide a reduced but thoroughly efficient body of operational troops in Canada;

"(B) To introduce an additional phase of advanced training which will be given to reinforcements before they proceed overseas;

"(C) To release a considerable number of lower category personnel, who will thus be enabled to take up civilian occupations and supplement available manpower.

"It should be understood that disbandment of divisions does not necessarily mean that all the units will be disbanded.

"The reorganization will result in reducing the establishment for operational troops in North America by about 20,000. This does not mean that that number will go out of the Army. Many will be reallocated according to the needs of the service to fill up remaining units and for potential reinforcements, depending on age, rank, and medical category.

"It is not possible to estimate the actual number who will be released to civilian life, but the number will be substantial at this stage.

"It must be emphasized that the fact that there is to be a reduction in requirements for operational troops in Canada does not mean that the demand is reduced for overseas."

It is stated also that the question was taken up with American authorities and that the action met with their approval.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I am not going to consent to any delay in connection with this bill. As I stated before, the bill was pending before the committee for months, and then was reported from the committee by a vote of 11 to 3. I think it comes with poor grace, 2 months after the bill was reported, to say that there must be a thoroughgoing investigation of the question of manpower in the United States. On the trains running through Montana—the Milwaukee, the Northern Pacific, and the Great Northern—one can see troops going East and troops going West. The trains are loaded with troops going East, and they are loaded with troops going West. Many of the men have been in the Army for 12 or 18 months and have been trained, but they are not being used. Many of them are lying around in the camps. That situation is breaking down the morale of the men. It is breaking down the morale of the people of the country. It is affecting the manpower situation. Small businessmen are being put out of business and shops are being closed. Necessary clerks are being taken away. Further, and most important of all, many children are being sent to institutions because their parents cannot provide adequate care for them.

In my judgment, the drafting of fathers is the most idiotic plan that has been proposed by the Government. It is not necessary and cannot be shown to be necessary.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Dealing with one of the things to which the Senator has just referred, I wish to read two or three sentences from a letter which came to me today from a very responsible person:

Several Army officers who have visited me in the past few months complain of a dull, inactive life. They claim that there are pools of men in the larger camps where men are awaiting assignment. Some have lain around a long time. They hear and read about manpower shortages in civilian life, and many have given up businesses and positions where they were really needed to keep up the civilian needs.

I am frank to say that I have come to no conclusion in respect to the Senator's bill because of my very great diffidence in subordinating military decisions to civilian decisions in time of war. However, it seems to me that an authentic and reliable decision by the Congress on the Senator's bill requires a very frank presentation of the total facts by the authorities who have them in their possession, to determine, not the immediate question of whether fathers should be drafted but the primary question whether the existing draft reservoirs are being adequately used, or whether there is a misuse of existing and available draft material.

I can understand the Senator's feeling when he says that he wants no further delay in respect to action on his bill, particularly since the draft of fathers has

been ordered; but it seems to me that if the draft of fathers were suspended for even a week or two, so that the Congress could have the final and total answer to these fundamental questions, upon which answer I must base my judgment if it is to be of any use, it would be a very advantageous thing.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that I have asked that fathers be deferred until January 1, 1944. That would give the Selective Service officials 6 months. In that 6-months' period of time they could then come to the Congress and give us the facts. Certainly no one could successfully argue that any harm could be done if we should defer the drafting of fathers for 6 months when everyone knows the situation which now exists. We do not have to have a military or a naval expert to tell us what it is. All we have to do is to go from one end of the country to the other and to see the millions upon millions of boys who are now in the service. I have talked with many men in the Army. I talked with one man who had, during the last war, volunteered his services. He wanted to do something to help the country and to help the war effort. He was wholeheartedly for the President's foreign policy. He published newspapers which had opposed me and my stand. However, since entering the Army he came to me and said, "Senator, I could be of much more service to my country by staying at home, because I am now doing nothing that is of any benefit to it. There are thousands of men who are in exactly the same position I am in, doing nothing of benefit to the country at the present time." That is not only true of Regular Army officers, but doctor after doctor who has been taken into the medical branch of the Army has come to me and told me the same thing, or has written letters to the same effect.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to ask the Senator a few questions in order to determine the present situation with regard to the subject under discussion.

Under existing law there is, of course, no doubt whatever that married men and fathers can be drafted, within certain age limits.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. There is no doubt in my mind, and I assume there is none in the Senator's mind, that there is a great deal of agitation in the country favoring legislation to prevent drafting fathers.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator agree with me that that does not indicate any disposition on the part of any American not to do his whole part and, if necessary, whether married or single, enter military service?

Mr. WHEELER. I have said repeatedly that if the people of this country—the married men of this country and everybody else—felt it was necessary, they would sacrifice their homes and their lives and everything else.

Mr. WALSH. Now that the issue has assumed such magnitude, and is one with which we all agree Congress should deal, and deal with speedily, it seems to me that the sooner all fathers who are subject to the draft know what their status is with certainty and definiteness the better it will be for the country.

In the light of this observation, I inquire of the Senator whether or not there has been any attempt made to determine, for the purpose of satisfying the country, that there is a real need for drafting fathers; to ascertain the extent to which the country has been combed to discover the possibilities of drafting single men or married men without children in Government departments and so-called defense work before drafting fathers.

Mr. WHEELER. Frankly, I do not think that such an attempt has been made. We all know of instances here in Washington, right under our noses, of single men, and of married men without children, who are not only working and drawing large salaries from the Government, but whose wives are working, and yet we are told, "These men are essential to this department," as if it were impossible to find others in executive departments to fill the jobs of the bureaucrats in Washington.

Mr. WALSH. If the country could be convinced that there is a real military need for a larger army, and if the country could be satisfied that all available physically fit married men without children, and single men as well, had been drafted without favor or discrimination or unnecessary deferments the problem of the Congress would be an easy one, would it not?

Mr. WHEELER. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. The sooner the country has been informed by reliable authority, and it has been demonstrated beyond doubt that there is actual need for the enlargement of our military forces, and that there has been a genuine and satisfactory effort made to enroll into the military personnel all single men regardless of their occupation—unless absolutely essential and irreplaceable—I say if that is amply demonstrated I doubt very much that there would be any objection to Congress continuing the present law in effect and thus permitting the drafting of married men. However, there is no doubt in my mind that there is a widespread feeling of concern and of real anxiety, and of deep regret over the uncertainty surrounding the drafting of married men. This is due to the continuing inconsistent statements and rulings made by Government officials. The information coming to me indicates that many married men with children who are drafted, as distinguished from those who have volunteered, are mentally disturbed, upset, and really not able to enter into the spirit of the fighting forces which is essential for satisfactory military service.

Not long ago a very prominent citizen of my State called my attention to the case of his son. His son was married a few years ago and has two children. He was well to do, prosperous, and very successful. He had the patriotic urge to go and serve his country. He went into the service and is still in the service. But after he had been in the service for some time, he realized that his patriotic zeal had led him into a position where he necessarily neglected his family, his home, and the obligation he had to his wife and very young children, and that as a result he became mentally disturbed. He does not want to get out of the service, but undoubtedly is anxious, disturbed, and unsettled in mind as to whether or not he has made a mistake in leaving his home and his family. Many similar cases could be cited even where fathers have volunteered.

Mail which comes to me is very touching and largely so because of the anxiety it expresses of wives and mothers. If it is necessary to draft these men, let us do so, but let us clear up these doubts, these mists, these uncertainties, by a factual investigation that will once for all determine whether there is real need of fathers and whether or not deferments have not been too freely granted.

I repeat that if it is made clear that all has been done which can be done to comb this country for single men to meet our available military requirements, I doubt very much that any married man, or the wife of any married man, would hesitate for a moment to have her husband go forward and do his full share in the war. But before we take that step we owe it to them to clear the atmosphere and remove these uncertainties and doubts.

I wish to commend the Senator for his persistent effort to call attention to this subject and to seek action upon it. We owe it to ourselves, to the country, and to the military forces to make a decision, whatever it may be, and end this controversy and determine what the future holds for the family life of this country. We should not fail to keep in mind the importance of keeping the family life of the country as secure as our present grave circumstances permit.

ELIMINATION OF PRIVATE SUITS ARISING OUT OF FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business which the clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I was not present at the close of the last session, and, therefore, am not familiar with this bill. When, however, I came to the Senate this morning I requested the Senator in charge of it, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], to defer action on it until some future day this week. I see he is not present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I may say, if the Senator from Montana will permit me, that it is not the purpose to take this bill up today. The Senate will

meet tomorrow and proceed then with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. That is perfectly satisfactory. It meets the situation I had in mind.

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

Mr. WHEELER. I understood that the senior Senator from Indiana was not going to press the bill today but that it would come up tomorrow. I want it understood, however, that I am going to ask for action on my bill immediately after the unfinished business shall have been disposed of.

Now I want to thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his observations, and say that I agree with them wholeheartedly. I noticed the statement of General Hershey, as reported in the newspapers, that the bill proposing to prevent the drafting of fathers affects only about 455,000 men. I have talked with draft boards in Montana and with draft boards in other places and I have received letters from people, all indicating that the trouble is that in some places the draft boards have not exhausted the quotas of single men; in some places the draft boards still have single men on their draft lists, while in other counties they have exhausted the single men and are today—not tomorrow—taking married men with children.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. In various cities and communities draft boards place different interpretations on the law. Some have refused to take married men until single men have been drafted while in other places the boards indiscriminately call married men into the service.

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly, and that has been going on for some time. I have talked with members of draft boards. I said to them, "General Hershey made this statement"; but they said, "We have no orders about it; all we have is statements in newspapers, and we pay no attention to statements in newspapers."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The statement of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, I think, is probably correct in its application to many cases; but I am wondering what the answer to it is.

Mr. WHEELER. The answer to me is simple. After all, we passed a national selective-service law. We did not pass a county selective-service law or a city selective-service law. The idea of everybody was, I think, that single men should be taken before married men, but, as the system is actually operated, it is not a national selective service; it is based on counties.

I was about to refer to North Dakota. A very well-known man got on the train in which I was traveling. He told me, "In this particular country the draft board will not take married men until all the single men have been inducted into the service. Another county is taking married men." As I suggested during the last session of Congress, if they took first all the single men, regardless of the particular community in which they lived, then we would have selective service on a national basis rather than on a county basis.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate what the Senator says, but, nevertheless, we are looking into an actual condition and not what should have been done according to what the Senator now says.

Mr. WHEELER. But it could be done now.

Mr. LUCAS. Perhaps it could be done now if we passed certain legislation.

Mr. WHEELER. It could be done without passing any legislation.

Mr. LUCAS. Who is responsible for the determination?

Mr. WHEELER. The War Manpower Commission.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the War Manpower Commission responsible or is interpretation of the power delegated to the local boards?

Mr. WHEELER. No; Mr. McNutt, of the War Manpower Commission, and the Selective Service have complete power.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that, but I will say to the Senator from Montana that I have known of regulations promulgated by the War Manpower Commission through the Selective Service which have been interpreted by one board in one way, as the Senator from Massachusetts said a while ago, and by another board in the next county in a different way. How are we going to correct that situation? That is the point I made a while ago.

Mr. WHEELER. If I had people working for me or if the Senator from Illinois had people working for him, and they did not do what they were ordered to do, what would happen?

Mr. LUCAS. We would get others.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; and we could get new draft boards.

Mr. LUCAS. In that event, perhaps it would be necessary to have new draft boards in many counties in the United States and to change them every other week. I do not question the integrity of draft boards. I think they are following instructions to the best of their ability.

Mr. WHEELER. One trouble is that there have been so many confusing statements.

While I am on my feet I want to call attention to the fact that I am informed—and I think reliably so—that the Navy has such high standards that the Army has had to raise its standards because otherwise the Navy would be taking the cream and merely leave the remainder to the Army.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. What does the Senator mean by standards—physical standards?

Mr. WHEELER. Physical standards; yes.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, it is well known that in the Navy the eye test is very much more rigid than it is in the Army. That was so in time of peace, and, of course, it is so at the present time. The Navy takes the position that nobody should be in the Navy who has not good eyes. All persons in the Navy are subject to sea duty, and, of course, in my opinion, should be subject to sea duty. So the Senator is correct in saying that there is a more rigid requirement, particularly as to eyes, and perhaps as to other physical requirements in the Navy than in the Army.

I think it should also be noted that the Navy, so far as I am informed, has preferred the volunteer system to the draft system.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not complaining about the Navy standards.

Mr. WALSH. I think the result is that when a man who is drafted says, "I want to go into the Navy" and requests his draft board or requests his commanding officer in the camp to which he goes after he is selected to permit him to go into the Navy; he is told, "You cannot go into the Navy; you do not meet the physical requirements."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, my information is that there are a large number of aliens in this country many of whom have come here since the war broke out. Under the law we take aliens for the military service provided they are friendly to the United States. The Navy, as I understand it, refuses to take aliens.

Mr. WALSH. That is my understanding.

Mr. WHEELER. But the Army takes them.

Mr. WALSH. In order to enlighten, so far as I may, the discussion, I should say the Navy really has few places in its combat force for any man over 30 years of age. It has administrative officers in large numbers who are over 30 years of age, but the real need of the Navy, at all times, is for young men between 18 and 30, or even less, to prepare for combat service.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes. I was saying there are in this country a large number of aliens for whose protection we are fighting, as well as to enable democracy to be set up in their countries—that is what we say we are doing—yet such aliens in this country are not in the armed services. Some of them are single; some of them are married. We are taking, however, American fathers and forcing them to leave their children while aliens in this country are not being taken into the armed services in the same proportion.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Why is that? Does the Senator know the answer to that question?

Mr. WHEELER. No; I do not know what the answer to it is.

Furthermore, Mr. President, a large number of illiterates are not being taken into the Army. A great many single colored men are not going into the Army because they are illiterate. There have

been boys training in the Army for 17 or 18 months. Why does not the Army take some of these illiterates and teach them to read and write? Deferring them stirs up class feeling and bitterness, as when a woman sees her son going off or sees the father of her children being drafted, and at the same time sees some big husky fellow left at home, a single man, who is not taken into the Army because he cannot read or write. Talk about stirring up class feeling and racial hatreds in the United States; the present policy in this regard is doing as much to stir up feeling as anything else, and it is wrong in principle.

Does anyone think for a moment that the Russian Army or the Chinese Army does not take men into the ranks because they are illiterate? I was told by the American consul general at Hongkong a few years ago that 90 percent of the Chinese were illiterate. Everyone knows that, prior to a few years ago, the great bulk of the Russians were illiterate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator knows that as a matter of fact 85 percent of the Russian people were illiterate prior to 1917.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. When the Senator and I were in Russia together in 1930 we found that a system of compulsory education had been inaugurated there and that illiteracy had been reduced from 85 percent to 40 percent at that time.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Russians have carried on their compulsory education program during the last 13 years as successfully as they carried it on for the 13 years prior to that, there is probably very little illiteracy left in Russia.

Mr. WHEELER. I assume that to be true. I wish to say further for the Russians, that one thing they did and one thing for which they should be commended was that they set up a system of compulsory education. They did, of course, instruct the children in the principles of communism, but they also taught them to read and write, and taught them arithmetic. As I have said, they indoctrinated them with the principles of communism. They did them a good service, however, in teaching them to read and write, and were attempting to instruct the whole population of Russia so that they could read and write and know something about arithmetic.

I did not intend to speak on this subject at this time, and I shall cover the subject, I hope, more fully when the proposed legislation comes before the Senate. I do not want any delay. I am glad the committee is to hear General Marshall tomorrow, and I hope they will hear Admiral King, and that the hearings will not be delayed for the purpose of deferring action on the bill, because we must realize that every day all over the United States, fathers are being taken into the service when legislation on the subject has been proposed and is pending before the Senate, and when a bill has passed the House of Representatives by an overwhelming vote. It looks as if the War Manpower Commission, or whoever is responsible, was trying to put its ideas into operation while Congress was away, thinking that at a time when we would not have a chance to act upon the subject their object would be accomplished. I do not like that idea. There has been entirely too much of bypassing of the Congress by the executive offices. They have taken advantage of the war in many instances, and have taken advantage of the patriotism of the American people for the purpose of putting into operation by Executive order measures which they felt they could not get through the Congress. Speaking for myself. I shall not, so far as I am able, permit any delay in the consideration of the proposed legislation, if there is an attempt to delay by prolonging the hearings. It was to make this statement that I rose.

I also wish to call attention to the fact that there are in Central and South America governments which we boast are our allies, to whom we are shipping lend-lease supplies, but there is not one of those countries which has sent a single solitary man overseas to fight. What are we doing? We are defending Central and South America, are we not? We are not only helping to defend Central and South America, but in addition we are sending them lend-lease supplies. Yet not a single solitary man has been sent overseas from those countries to fight for democracy, so far as I have been able to learn, or for the "four freedoms"—or for the seventeen freedoms, as I think the number is now. The Vice President has recently added to them, I believe.

Mr. McNARY. Eleven.

Mr. WHEELER. Eleven all together?

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. I stand corrected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to discuss the merits of the bill of the Senator from Montana, or the number of freedoms which are involved in the war, and the fight we are all making to preserve them, whatever the number may be. I should not like to take the time of the Senate to discuss this matter from the standpoint of prejudice against any country that is associated with us in the war, but I do think the Senate and the country should know the status of the legislation and the course which it has taken up to now, because the Senator from Montana, I am sure unconsciously and without any intention on his part, left the impression, or might leave the impression, that the War Department and the Navy Department and the Selective Service officers waited around Washington until Congress adjourned and then all of a sudden decided to draft fathers, That is not accurate.

The Senator from Montana introduced his bill, which is now on the calendar, on the 25th day of February 1943. Before that, however, or about that time, the House passed the Kilday bill. I do not recall whether the House passed the Kilday bill before the Senator introduced his bill.

Mr. WHEELER. They did.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was my impression, which is now confirmed by the Senator, that the House passed the Kilday bill prior to the introduction of his bill.

The Kilday bill came to the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, where it still reposes. It has never been acted upon by the Committee on Military Affairs, and is not now on the Senate Calendar. Whether any hearing was had on the bill, I do not know. The Senator from Montana says that they have held hearings on it; but they took no action on the bill.

On the 5th of May the Senator from Montana appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs in behalf of his bill, and the pamphlet which I hold in my hand, consisting of 18 pages, contains the complete hearings of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs on the Wheeler bill. No Army officer appeared except Colonel Keesling, who is described as the liaison officer between the Selective Service and the Senate or the Congress. He is an officer who is available to us all here, who spends part of his time with the Committee on Military Affairs, so that he can answer questions we may propound to him about military affairs.

The hearing had upon this bill on the 5th of May consisted largely of a dialog between the Senator from Montana and Colonel Keesling with reference to this subject. Colonel Keesling did not testify as a witness, but he answered questions, and probably asked some, and he sought to give information to the committee.

The record shows that only two Senators were present at that hearing, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] as chairman, and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. The record will show that no other Senator asked any questions in reference to this matter except the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who was a member of the committee and was present at the hearing. That hearing was had on the 5th of May. The bill had still not been acted upon, and Congress was about to adjourn. My information is from members of the committee that the Senator from Montana again went before the committee to urge action on his bill, stating that he realized that Congress was in an adjournment mood, and if the committee would report his bill he would not press for action upon it prior to the adjournment. The bill was reported on the second day of July, which was 6 days before the Congress adjourned, and it was placed on the calendar. Congress adjourned and we went to our respective homes.

About 2 weeks after the adjournment I received a telegram from the Senator from Montana asking me to take steps, under the terms of the adjournment resolution, to reassemble Congress for the purpose of considering his bill. If the Senator from Montana has no objection, I should like for the information of the Senate to insert in the RECORD at this point the correspondence between him and me on this subject.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BELTON, MONT., *August 7, 1943.*
Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Washington, D. C.:

In view of Governor McNutt, Director of the Selective Service Board, to call pre-Pearl Harbor fathers by October 1 regardless of the number of children they have, in view of the further fact that the Kilday bill passed the House by overwhelming majority and my bill as reported out of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate by over two-thirds vote, I respectfully suggest that Congress be called back into session in the immediate future for the purpose of taking up these bills to determine the policy of this Nation on the subject. As you know, the Army has over 7,000,000 men, according to its own figures, and only expects to send 2,700,000 troops with equipment abroad by the end of 1943 and 2,000,000 more by the end of 1944, which would leave over 2,000,000 men in the Army in the United States at the end of 1944 even if not another person were called. It would seem to me that this disruption of the American home is unnecessary at this time. It should be recalled also there are 100,000 boys reaching 18 every month, which will be added to the 7,000,000 already in the service. Best wishes.

Senator B. K. WHEELER.

PADUCAH, KY., *August 11, 1943.*
Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Belton, Mont.:

Your telegram suggesting that Congress be reconvened before the termination of the pending recess on September 14 for the purpose of considering the Kilday bill and the Wheeler bill dealing with the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers has been received. In view of the fact that the Kilday bill was pending before the Military Affairs Committee for several weeks before the congressional adjournment, and in view of the fact that the Wheeler bill was reported by the committee to the Senate and placed on the legislative calendar on July 2, 6 days before Congress adjourned, and no effort that I recall was made by any Senator to bring the bill before the Senate for consideration before adjournment, and in view of the fact that the pending recess will terminate more than 2 weeks prior to October 1, the date on which the draft order under discussion is supposed to take effect, which will give Congress ample time to consider and dispose of any legislation on the subject if it desires to do so, and in view of the fact that the modified orders of General Hershey on the subject of drafting fathers substantially meet the objection to which you refer, I do not feel that I would be justified in taking steps to reconvene Congress prior to September 14, when the recess expires. I have communicated with House Majority Leader John W. McCormack, and although he states to me that he has received no telegram from you on the subject, he concurs in the above views expressed by me. I am unable to verify your figures as to the number of men the Army expects to send abroad by the end of 1943 and 1944, respectively, but I assume and I think the American people assume that the Army and Navy and all those responsible for the conduct of this war will send men to the scenes of conflict as fast as they can train and equip and transport them and in such numbers as will be necessary to win the war completely in the shortest possible time and get it over with and get all our men back home as soon as possible. Kindest regards to the family.

ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

Mr. BARKLEY. The record of the hearing shows that there was a dialog had between the Senator from Montana and Colonel Keesling, and probably the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. On the last page of the hearings will be found the statement by Colonel Keesling that at that time the Selective Service officials were contemplating the drafting of fathers in August of this year.

The Senator from Montana of course introduced his bill back in February in order to forestall the drafting of fathers. It is a matter which is not new. It has been under discussion in military circles and in Congress ever since the passage of the draft law. We discussed it even when we passed the draft law in 1940. So it is something which is not new. I do not think it is quite fair to intimate that the War Department and the Selective Service waited until the Congress adjourned and then announced that they were going to begin the drafting of fathers, because the testimony had before the committee showed that such action was contemplated in August.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Statements were given out, however, to the effect that the authorities were not going to draft fathers until October. Statements were given out by the Selective Service—and I am quite sure I have in my office clippings containing the statements—that they were going to cut down the number of men to be drafted. Statements were made to the effect that the number was to be cut down in July, and further statements were made to the effect that the number was to be cut down in August, and that the number was further to be cut down from that time on. I am sure I have in my office clippings containing statements to that effect.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I simply wanted to clear up what might have been a misconception with respect to what the Senator from Montana said, that the Selective Service and the War Department took advantage in our absence, while Congress was in adjournment, to draft married men, to draft fathers, because the subject had been under discussion, and as the hearings show, such action had been contemplated before we had ever really thought of adjourning at all.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to suggest to the Senator that one of the most vicious features of this whole situation, one of its most complicating and confusing features is that no one knows what is being contemplated with respect to the matter. Mr. McNutt will make a radio speech one night in which he says that something is going to be done. The next day General Hershey will give out a newspaper interview directly at variance with the statement previously made by Mr. McNutt. Then the next day a directive will come from national headquarters which is directly at variance with both statements previously made.

Mr. President, before I returned to Washington I attended a meeting held in the city of St. Louis by heads of draft boards in Missouri. I did not do any talking. I was there simply for the purpose of hearing the discussion which took place. Every speaker mentioned the terrific confusion which existed, and the great difficulty in administering the draft law, and the popular unrest created by the conflicting directives issued, and statements made to the press or over the radio by Mr. McNutt, by General Hershey, and by various officials of the Selective Service and the War Department. It has the American people in a state of seething unrest which seems to me to be absolutely unnecessary.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator from Missouri. We all appreciate the confusion which is created by conflicting announcements. As I said yesterday to some newspapermen who came to my office, orders have been issued, and then modified or postponed, until there is a feeling that the people do not know just what to depend upon. I think the average man would rather know definitely that he must go into the Army, than to feel that he does not know what to depend upon, and cannot make his plans accordingly.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Recently I read in a newspaper a statement attributed to General Hershey that the total number of fathers to be taken was 465,000. The question of the drafting of fathers affects about 30,000,000 persons in the United States. The statements which have been made concerning the matter have created confusion, and statements are still being made and there is still confusion existing. As I previously said, if it is necessary to draft fathers, well and good. However, no one can make the American people believe that it is necessary. As one travels up and down the country one sees soldiers traveling from place to place, being transported from one section of the country to another. A man who wrote me said he had been in the Army 16 months and had drawn a pay check at only one place, and at one time, during those 16 months. He had been transferred from place to place so often that he had drawn a pay check only once.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, of course I am not able to comment intelligently upon the extent to which the men are sent from one camp to another. I have been to some of the camps within my section of the United States, naturally having an interest in the way they are being operated. I have traveled somewhat during the adjournment of Congress. I went into Texas, and into Missouri, and into Tennessee, and all the trains on which I traveled were crowded with servicemen.

I saw an analysis and an explanation of that situation in a newspaper the other day. The reason for it is that when

we passed the draft law and organized the present Army, we insisted that the men should be trained not less than 1 year before they were sent overseas. I think we will not be satisfied unless they are trained at least a year in this country before they are sent overseas. In order to train these men properly, however, and to give them the best possible training, I think it has been the policy of the War Department to train them for a while in one camp and then transfer them to another. For instance, when men are transferred to desert training I presume it is contemplated that they may have to fight upon terrain of that sort. Whether there has been too much transferring from one camp to another I do not know That is one of the items of ignorance, of lack of information that I think confronts the Senate in dealing with this subject.

When I came back to Washington a day or two ago, I noticed in the press statements which the Senator from Montana had made in Montana that he intended to try to obtain consideration of his bill at the earliest possible time. When I asked the Committee on Military Affairs for the hearings held on the bill, I found this pamphlet, as I stated a while ago, consisting of 18 pages of dialogue, mainly between the Senator from Montana and Colonel Keesling and one member of the Committee on Military Affairs. I felt that the Senate did not have sufficient information to enable it to vote intelligently on this subject. Frankly, I do not have sufficient information on the subject. If I were to vote on the bill today, or tomorrow, I do not know how I could vote, except to follow my emotions and my sentiments in regard to the matter, which, of course, are naturally against the drafting of fathers. If I were to vote my sentiments, my desires, my preferences, that is the way I should vote. But I do not know whether that would be an intelligent vote.

It seemed to me the way to clear up the matter was to obtain testimony from the high-ranking responsible military and naval officers of the United States Army and Navy—and that includes the highest of them, General Marshall, the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, in whom the people of this country have confidence, and in whom the Congress of the United States has confidence, and Admiral King, Chief of Naval Operations, who is the head of the Navy. I believe we can all feel proud of the record these high officers in the Army and Navy have made in planning and strategy, and the way they have conducted the war on the sea and in the air and on foreign soil. I think the judgment of our military and naval men has been superb. We cannot expect that there may not be reverses. We cannot expect that mistakes will not be made. But the military and naval officers have withstood the impatience some of us may have exhibited toward the progress of the war. The wisdom of every move they have made in the Pacific since we got into the war, every move they have made in Africa and in Italy, has been confirmed by the knowledge that they exercised good judgment and that they exercised the best ability which we have been able by training to inculcate into their minds.

So I believe the people of the country have confidence in our high-ranking military officers, from General Marshall all the way down, and in our high-ranking naval officers, from Admiral King all the way down.

It occurred to me that, in view of the scarcity of accurate information we possess, 2 or 3 or even 4 days would not be wasted if we could have these men come before the committee, and have them, so far as possible, let their hair down and tell us what the facts are. I suggested to the Senator from Montana this morning, as he will, I think, confirm, that that ought to be done, and the Senator agreed to that suggestion.

I have conferred with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and arrangements have been made to begin the hearings. They will be brief. It seems to me they should not last more than 3 or 4 days.

I appeal to the Senator from Montana upon this basis. I think it is more important for the Senate, for the Congress, and for the country to have the facts and the truth than it is that the bill be taken up on any one day.

I do not want to delay the bill. I would not countenance for a moment having the hearings for the purpose of delay upon the subject. I think the matter is one upon which the American people should pass. I wish it would be possible to obtain an over-all picture of the entire manpower situation, not only insofar as fathers are concerned but insofar as our people are concerned, with regard to industry, with regard to agriculture, and with regard to everything else. However, involved in the situation are equities and questions which it is extremely difficult for us in our consciences to decide. It would be useless to go into that phase of the situation at this time; we shall debate it when we get to it.

It is difficult to determine as a matter of equity whether it is right to exempt as a class all men who happened to be married prior to the date December 7, 1941, without regard to their financial ability to support their families, and to make that date the dead line between those men who were married on the 6th or the 7th day of December, and those who were married on the 8th or 9th day of December, and to say that one group shall be drafted and the other shall not. In regard to those matters it is impossible to draw a straight line down the highway and say that everything on the right is correct and everything on the left is wrong.

All those considerations enter into the situation. I feel that it would be helpful to have the information the high ranking military and naval officers can give us, and to which we and the country are entitled, and that no harm can come from having 3 or 4 days' delay during consideration of the bill, so that we may learn the truth and may cast an intelligent vote.

I will say to the Senator from Montana that I will cooperate with him and with all other Senators to see that the hearings be not delayed, and that there be no postponement of the consideration of the bill. I would not have insisted that hearings be held at all except that I felt that I myself was ignorant of the facts, and that other Senators have told me they were ignorant of the facts regarding the matter, and wanted further information.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me say that I do not wish to prevent the Congress and the Senate from having the facts, but I call attention to the fact that the bill has been pending since February. The Secretary of the Navy sent down a letter, and the Secretary of War sent down a letter; but neither General Marshall nor anyone else in the Army, nor anyone in the Navy, asked permission to appear before the committee. If such permission had been requested, they could have appeared.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, that may be the fault of the committee. I do not know what the custom is about asking a high ranking officer whether he desires to testify.

Mr. WHEELER. I think that probably is true. Nevertheless, neither the War Department nor the Navy Department asked to be heard before the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator can put the blame where he wants. I do not care. The fact is that we need information. If someone has been guilty of negligence in obtaining it, the Senate and the country are not responsible for that. I think the whole country and its representatives in Congress are entitled to the facts. When I obtain the facts, I shall be ready to vote as best I can, according to my judgment of the needs of our country in the situation.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator has said. I thoroughly concur in the statement he made with reference to the confidence the country has in General Marshall's judgment and Admiral King's judgment with reference to the way they have conducted the war overseas. I have great respect for General Marshall. I know him, and I have a very high regard for him. I admired these officers because of the way they stood fast when there was a clamor on the part of some persons that a western front should be opened. I said then, when people asked me what I thought should be done, that I was not a military expert, and that I wanted to leave to the good judgment of the Army and the Navy the matter of deciding what was the best procedure to follow. It is my judgment—I may be wrong about it; others disagree with me—that they have acted wisely in the policy they have pursued in reference to the overseas operations. However, I submit it does not take a military expert to know about some of these matters. We have heard about men in the Army going from one camp to another. The statement was made that it would be impossible this year to equip and send overseas more than 2,700,000 men. That was not my

statement; it was the statement of the War Department. The statement was that this year not more than 2,700,000 men could be equipped and sent overseas, and that next year not more than 2,000,000 could be sent. If not another man were taken, approximately 2,300,000 men, aside from casualties, would be left in the armed forces in this country.

It was also testified that 100,000 boys are becoming 18 years of age every month, and that of that number it should be possible to obtain 70,000 who would be eligible. That would provide another 1,200,000 men in 18 months.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator will recall that in the hearing to which I referred a while ago, Colonel Keesling testified that the net number would be approximately 400,000.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not recall the statement by Colonel Keesling.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator was present.

Mr. WHEELER. Well, I do not recall a statement to that effect. However, I do recall that the statement was made on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, that of the 100,000 boys becoming 18 years of age every month, 70,000 would be eligible, which would mean 1,200,000 in 18 months. That would be aside from the single men and the married men without children. How many more of those are available I do not know, because the facts were not stated.

The reason why I suggested that the drafting of married men with children be deferred for 6 months was because I felt, exactly as the Senator says he feels, that there should be a review of the whole manpower situation, but that in the meantime American families should not be broken up, with the tremendous consequences to the people of the country, until the Congress itself had had a complete picture of the situation. If the drafting of married men with children were deferred for 6 months from the time of the passage of the bill, and then if Congress made a complete study of the whole manpower situation, Congress would be in a position to act.

However, in the meantime we shall not get an answer to the manpower question simply by having General Marshall and Admiral King testify for several days. To my mind there is no doubt what they will say. However, we shall not get a complete picture of the manpower situation in the United States.

Let me say to the Senate that the manpower situation is critical not only in war-production industries but on the farms and in every little store. The shortage of men is putting out of business small merchants from one end of the country to the other. They are having to close up their shops because they cannot get the men they need. Let me say frankly that I have had responsible businessmen say to me that they think there is some ulterior motive in this matter, aside from the furthering of the war effort; they think there is a desire to get everyone into the armed forces. The statement also has been made that the draft is being used for the purpose of driving married men with children into war industries. However, it has not had that effect. It is not going to have that effect to any extent.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator does not believe that, does he?

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator asks whether I believe it. I am listening. I do not know what to believe, from the statements which have been made.

Mr. LUCAS. I am simply wondering whether the Senator is going to make that statement as his own, or whether he is quoting from someone else. I cannot believe that the Senator, as I know him, would believe such a statement to be an actuality. I can quote to the Senator all kinds of rumors, some based upon an honest conception of facts, others based upon political or prejudicial reasons.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course.

Mr. LUCAS. I can get them from every corner of America.

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly.

Mr. LUCAS. If I believed them all I would go crazy.

Mr. WHEELER. That is what is happening to many persons. They are going crazy because of the confusion existing in the departments, and the confusing statements which are being made.

Mr. LUCAS. I am aware of the fact that there is a great deal of confusion; but when we talk about confusion and irresponsibility, we have such things right here in the United States Senate, in connection with the Senator's own bill. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] tells the Senate that only two members of the Military Affairs Committee were present, and only the Senator from Montana testified upon one of the most serious issues in America today. When a bill of such importance is reported to the Senate from the Military Affairs Committee in that manner we should not talk about irresponsibility and confusion.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is not talking about me.

Mr. LUCAS. I am talking about the Committee on Military Affairs, and the United States Senate. If General Eisenhower should plan an offensive campaign upon such meager information, I am sure that his army would be cut to ribbons. Then he would hear from the United States Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to bring my remarks to a conclusion. I did not wish to get into a discussion about the merits of the bill. I tried to lay the picture before the Senate to justify the feeling that we need information on the subject. It is easy for someone to come to me and report that men are being needlessly sent back and forth around the country. Someone has been facetious enough to say that the Army ought to issue a poster saying, "Join the Army and see the United States," similar to the slogan which the Navy once used, "Join the Navy and see the World." The effort is made to leave the impression that the Army is sending men from one camp to another in order that they may see the country. That is perfectly ridiculous. No one in his right mind would believe anything of the sort.

We need information. We cannot go into the entire manpower situation as it may affect agriculture, industry, or the professions; but we certainly can obtain more information regarding this bill and the need for it than we now have available. It is for that purpose that I suggested that the committee hold hearings.

I hope the Committee on Military Affairs will give this subject its undivided attention. It is a subject which merits the attention of the committee and the attendance and cooperation of its members. There has grown up in the Senate, on the part of committees—it does not apply particularly to the Committee on Military Affairs or any other committee—a tendency to act in a lackadaisical way regarding important legislation. Sometimes members of committees vote over the telephone. A Senator will be called on the telephone and told, "We have before us this bill. How do you wish to vote?" And he will vote over the telephone, without having the benefit of hearings or knowing very much about what is in the bill. That is poor legislative procedure, no matter whether followed by the Committee on Military Affairs or any other committee. In view of the fact that this question is to be gone into more fully by the committee, I hope the committee will give it the consideration to which it is entitled.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I agree with what the Senator says. In further response to the comments of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], I agree that the Senate is not perfect. We all have our faults. However, I wish to call attention to the fact that when this bill was reported, it was reported by a vote of 11 to 3; and while only 2 members were present at the time I appeared before the committee, the committee did have the statements of Secretaries Knox and Stimson. In addition, it had a great deal of other information, because it had held hearings with reference to the whole Army situation. It had held prolonged hearings about the size of the Army. It had before it a statement showing the number of men in the Army; the number of men which the Army could send abroad in 1942, and the number of men which the Army could send abroad in 1943. It had before it information showing the number of young men who would become 18 years of age and who would be eligible for service. So the committee had many facts before it. If the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy did not see fit to come before the committee when they knew that this bill was pending and was set for hearing, it was not the fault of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator knows what happened. The same thing happened in this case as often

happens. The committee sent the bill to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, asking for an expression of their opinion.

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly.

Mr. BARKLEY. And they responded by letters, which are a part of the hearings.

Mr. WHEELER. That is true. What happens when the Committee on Interstate Commerce or the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any other committee, sends a bill to the Department of Agriculture, the Interstate Commerce Commission, or one of the other departments? Perhaps the Interstate Commerce Commission will say, "We would like to have a hearing on the bill. It is an important bill." Or the Department of Agriculture may say, "We wish to have a hearing on this bill." That is what takes place.

It is all very well to criticize the Congress. Never before since I have been a Member of it have the people of the United States looked to the Congress as they are doing today. When we criticize the Congress we must remember that the people of the country get the kind of representation in the Senate and in the House they deserve—no better and no worse. The majority of the people of the country elect Members of the Senate and of the House; and if they get a poor Congress, if they get poor Senators, or poor Representatives, who do not attend to their business, that is the fault of the people themselves for not paying more attention to the men whom they elect.

Mr. LUCAS. What the Senator says about the legislative branch is true of the executive.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has been criticizing the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. WHEELER. I have not criticized the Executive. I am criticizing persons who do not run for office, who do not dare to run for office, and who could not be elected dog catchers if they should run.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand what the Senator is talking about. Nevertheless, he is criticizing indirectly the Executive, who is responsible for the appointment of those men.

I do not disagree with the Senator with respect to the confusion of orders which have come from the various departments. I say that it is absurd and ridiculous to have orders constantly being issued which more or less contradict one another. I am not attempting to criticize any Member of the Senate, because perhaps I am guilty of many of these things. The point I stressed a moment ago is that when an important measure of this kind comes before the Congress it should have adequate consideration. The country is concerned about the drafting of fathers. Candidly I do not know what I shall do with respect to the bill, because I have no information upon which I could base an intelligent opinion. I am not going to vote by rule of thumb or emotion. I am going to try to examine the facts, and vote for what I conceive to be, in the final analysis, the best interest of America.

Mr. WHEELER. I am sure the Senator will do so.

Mr. LUCAS. But when the Senator from Kentucky makes the statement that such a far-reaching bill of this kind, which is causing so much consternation throughout America at the present time, was reported by the Military Affairs Committee when only two members of the committee were present—then candidly I am disturbed.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. LUCAS. All I know is what the Senator from Kentucky said.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator misunderstood him.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know how many members were present when the bill was reported, or whether there was a quorum present or not; but two members heard the statements.

Mr. LUCAS. Two members heard the statements, and the only testimony they had was that of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. They had the testimony of Colonel Keesling.

Mr. LUCAS. It may be that the Military Affairs Committee had a backlog of information which would give them the knowledge upon which they could base an intelligent opinion with respect to how to vote; but I think I know what I am talking about with respect to some committees. Perhaps I am just as guilty as anyone else. What I say may be called a condemnation of committees of Congress. Time and time again I have seen committees of the Senate fail to assume the responsibility which they ought to assume. I have seen it time and time again in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of which I am a member. When I was in the House of Representatives I saw an agriculture committee which I thought was conducted almost with perfection. When I came to the Senate I thought I would see something better, because I was coming to the greatest legislative body in the world; but I am frank to confess that I am greatly disappointed. I do not say that all Senate committees operate alike; but I do say, with the utmost sincerity, that in these times of stress, when the world is in a military blaze and we are in the middle of it, committees ought to assume their proper responsibility in connection with measures before them. Let it be understood in conclusion that I am not blaming the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I think the Senator is entirely mistaken in his view because, as I have said, while it is true that Colonel Keesling represented the Selective Service as liaison officer, he was more than a liaison officer. He testified that he was there to represent the Selective Service Board. If the Selective Service had wanted someone there, Mr. McNutt or General Hershey should have been there. But they have testified before the committee time and time again, as I think the members of the committee will agree.

I am not defending the Military Affairs Committee. I have disagreed with them at times, but I think in this particular instance they had a great deal of background and other testimony which was given at different times before the committee.

I agree with the Senator. I have said repeatedly, and I have said to the Interstate Commerce Committee many times, that I think the committees of Congress ought to pay more attention to important legislation which comes before them. That is the reason why time and time again I have appointed subcommittees composed of Democrats and Republicans whose points of view differed with mine, and I said to them, "I want you to study this legislation, regardless of whether I introduce it for the administration, or whether it is an administration bill, or otherwise." In the last 10 years, particularly I have observed in the Congress of the United States that the same careful attention was not given to legislation which was given when I first came to the Senate. One reason for that is that when there is an overwhelming majority of either Republicans or Democrats in the Senate, or an overwhelming majority on a committee, the Members do not give the close attention to proposed legislation that it should receive. I observed that the Republicans did not give requisite attention when they had an overwhelming majority, and I have also observed the same with respect to the Democrats. Time and again I have heard it said in effect, "The administration wants this legislation," and it would be voted out by a majority of the committee because the administration wanted it. That is not the way legislation should be handled, whether it is for a Republican administration, a Democratic administration, or any other administration.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I should like to ask a question for information. I just came upon the floor and have been interested in the discussion which has been taking place between the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Illinois. I found in my file Senate bill 763, with a report from the Military Affairs Committee recommending that the bill pass with an amendment. That is all there is in the report except the letters from the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy recommending that the bill do not pass.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. Of what value is such information to the Members of the Senate who have an opportunity to look at the report?

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator from New Mexico that I hope he does not hold me responsible for a report coming from the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. HATCH. Oh, no.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not responsible for reports coming from any committee except the committee of which I am chairman. I have tried to have the pro-

posed legislation studied and to have a full report made by that committee. I believe that any member of the committee will so testify.

Mr. HATCH. I realize that. My only reason for mentioning it is my interest in the discussion, and, after examining the report, all I found in it was that to which I have referred.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will yield, I have been interested in the general discussions taking place with reference to the action taken by the Military Affairs Committee on the Senator's bill.

I wish to point out that since January last the Military Affairs Committee has held meeting after meeting dealing with the general subject of manpower, and the use of manpower in this country. We have had before us members of the General Staff of the Army, representatives of the War Department, representatives of the Navy, and also Mr. McNutt and other representatives of the War Manpower Commission. Information was presented by them to the committee over a course of months. The committee dealt generally with the question of using men. It might be called a background for the bill which will shortly be considered here. Some of the information and evidence was given in executive session. Some of it was information which should not be published. However, I feel that the brief report which accompanied the bill does not represent all the information the members of the Military Affairs Committee had upon the subject.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. As a member of the Committee on Military Affairs of course the Senator has all this information, some of which was presented in executive session. But how about the others of us who are not members of the Military Affairs Committee, and who do not have the information to which we can refer? We have no background for all the testimony presented to the committee. Should we not be furnished with a complete report from the committee, giving us as much information as possible?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will say to the Senator that I think there is sufficient information in print upon the question of the size of the Army, of the manpower available in the country, as well as its use, though not accompanying the report on this bill. I believe there was evidence presented before the Military Affairs Committee which, if collated and placed with the bill, would probably furnish sufficient information to the Senate. I am not opposing hearings, but I am simply rising to the point raised by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator has referred to the various authorities who came before the committee prior to the time the committee made its rather brief report. I should like to propound a question: As the Senator has considered this important legislation, did he or did he not have the benefit of advice from that distinguished leader of this country and genius on military subjects, the Honorable Harry Hopkins?

Mr. REVERCOMB. No; I may say, in answer to the Senator's question, that we did not have that advice.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Did the Senator from New Hampshire appear before the committee and testify?

Mr. REVERCOMB. No; he did not.

Mr. LUCAS. Was the Senator present when the bill was considered?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I was present when the bill was voted on, as I recall.

Mr. LUCAS. And not when the testimony was given?

Mr. REVERCOMB. No; not when the testimony of the two men was given, but since the convening of the Seventy-eighth Congress I have sat day after day with the Military Affairs Committee listening to testimony. I believe that I have spent more time with the Military Affairs Committee than with any other committee on which I have served. The Senator knows that there are times when we cannot attend all sessions of a committee.

Mr. LUCAS. That is true, and that is why I am asking for information as to what happened in the Military Affairs Committee concerning what must be one of the most important measures the Congress has had to consider for a long time.

I am not opposed to this proposed legislation. I do not know what I shall do about it. I do not know what the future holds for me, but I cannot vote blindly upon such a serious proposition as this. It seems to me that if the Military Affairs Committee, of which the able Senator from West Virginia is a distinguished member, had thought the matter was as serious as it now seems to be, so far as this country is concerned, they could have given Congress the benefit of the information which they have been able to obtain over this long period which the Senator is now discussing.

I cannot go back and correlate all these hearings and bring them up to date. I do not have the time. That is for the Military Affairs Committee to do. We have all agreed, of course—and we all agree now—that hearings should be held on this bill, and we now come to the point where the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee will ask General Marshall, Admiral King, and other distinguished officers of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps to come before the committee and give their testimony. We are not now saying to these men, "Well, if you do not come we will pass this bill anyway." We are now inviting them, as we should do, in my opinion, to come and testify before the Military Affairs Committee and give the Senate the necessary information.

I am not attempting to deride anyone in this connection. I am not attempting to play any politics in connection with it or to drag Harry Hopkins into the debate in order to play a cheap little game of politics. I am attempting merely to obtain, through facts, the proper answer. I must reach an honest determination about one of the most important problems that is before the country. That is all the Senator from Illinois is interested in, and I am satisfied that is all the Senator from Montana and the Senator from West Virginia are interested in.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I rose merely because there had been injected into this discussion a suggestion of lack of action on or lack of consideration of this great question by the Committee on Military Affairs. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois it is a serious question, and was so considered by the committee. If the Senator from Illinois has suddenly become so interested in this question—and it has been pending here for some time—he himself does not have to collate all the facts. He can go to the clerk of the Committee on Military Affairs and get that part of the printed record and read it. I am not objecting to bringing before the committee General Marshall, Admiral King, and others, but I do want the Senate to know that those who acted on this serious bill, have sat and listened to testimony dealing with the issue.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, in view of what has been said, I think it appropriate that the RECORD should show the attendance of the Military Affairs Committee on the day the bill in question was reported. The following Senators were present in the committee on that occasion:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

I may add that members of the committee not included among those present were polled in person by the clerk of the committee, and only two refused to vote.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CULKIN OF NEW YORK

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives, which were read as follows:

House Resolution 299

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
September 14, 1943.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. FRANCIS D. CULKIN, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I offer the resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 180) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the

death of Hon. FRANCIS D. CULKIN, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 15, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 14, 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for appointment to the offices in the Foreign Service of the United States, to which they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, as follows:

Maurice L. Stafford, of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Henry M. Wolcott, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Walter W. Hoffmann, of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Reginald P. Mitchell, of Florida, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Rollin R. Winslow, of Michigan, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for promotion in the Foreign Service of the United States, to the offices to which they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, as follows:

From Foreign Service officer of class 2 to Foreign Service officer of class 1:

Maynard B. Barnes, of Iowa.
William P. Blocker, of Texas.
Richard P. Butrick, of New York.
Felix Cole, of the District of Columbia.
Frederick P. Hibbard, of Texas.
Robert F. Kelley, of Massachusetts.
Joseph F. McGurk, of New Jersey.
Edward L. Reed, of Pennsylvania.
H. Earle Russell, of Michigan.
Rudolf E. Schoenfeld, of the District of Columbia.
Harold H. Tittmann, Jr., of Missouri.
Orme Wilson, of New York.

From Foreign Service officer of class 3 to Foreign Service officer of class 2:

Ellis O. Briggs, of Maine.
Parker W. Buhrman, of Virginia.
Herbert S. Bursley, of the District of Columbia.
William E. De Courcy, of Texas.
Dudley G. Dwyre, of Colorado.
Walter A. Foote, of Texas.
Waldemar J. Gallman, of New York.
George D. Hopper, of Kentucky.
Charles A. Livengood, of Washington.
Sydney B. Redecker, of New York.
Laurence E. Salisbury, of Illinois.
Harold Shantz, of New York.
Ashley B. Sowell, of Tennessee.
Edwin F. Stanton, of California.
Christian T. Steger, of Virginia.
Howard K. Travers, of New York.
Fletcher Warren, of Texas.

From Foreign Service officer of class 4 to Foreign Service officer of class 3:

Wainwright Abbott, of Pennsylvania.
Charles A. Bay, of Minnesota.
Hiram A. Boucher, of Minnesota.
Clarence C. Brooks, of New Jersey.
George H. Butler, of Illinois.
Harry E. Carlson, of Illinois.
Owen L. Dawson, of Illinois.
Samuel H. Day, of California.
Hooker A. Doolittle, of New York.
Fayette J. Flexer, of Illinois.
Raleigh A. Gibson, of Illinois.
Julian F. Harrington, of Massachusetts.
Frank Anderson Henry, of Delaware.
Karl deG. MacVitty, of Tennessee.
Thomas McEnelly, of New York.
John R. Minter, of South Carolina.
John J. Muccio, of Rhode Island.
Earl L. Packer, of Utah.
Austin R. Preston, of New York.
Benjamin Reath Riggs, of Pennsylvania.
Joseph C. Satterthwaite of Michigan.
James T. Scott, of Georgia.
Samuel Sokobin, of New Jersey.
George Tait, of Virginia.
Marshall M. Vance, of Ohio.
Jesse F. Van Wickel, of New York.

From Foreign Service officer of class 5 to Foreign Service officer of class 4:

Charles E. Bohlen, of Massachusetts.
Russell M. Brooks, of Oregon.
John H. Bruins, of New York.
John M. Cabot, of Massachusetts.
A. Bland Calder, of New York.
Leo J. Callanan, of Massachusetts.
Archie W. Childs, of Ohio.
Walton C. Ferris, of Wisconsin.
George Gregg Fuller, of California.
W. Perry George, of Alabama.
Franklin C. Gowen, of Pennsylvania.
Robert Y. Jarvis, of California.
Edward B. Lawson, of the District of Columbia.
Edward P. Lawton, of Georgia.
John J. Meily, of Pennsylvania.
Harold M. Randall, of Iowa.
James W. Riddleberger, of Virginia.
William W. Schott, of Kansas.
Edward J. Sparks, of New York.
Maurice L. Stafford, of California.
Alan N. Steyne, of New York.
Harry L. Troutman, of Georgia.
Frederik van den Arend, of North Carolina.
James R. Wilkinson, of Wisconsin.
Miss Frances E. Willis, of California.

From Foreign Service officer of class 6 to Foreign Service officer of class 5:

Ware Adams, of Georgia.
Burton Y. Berry, of Indiana.
Lee R. Blohm, of Arizona.
James C. H. Bonbright, of New York.
Daniel M. Braddock, of Michigan.
James E. Brown, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Homer M. Byington, Jr., of Connecticut.
Everett F. Drumright, of Oklahoma.
Elbridge Durbrow, of California.
Peter H. A. Flood, of New Hampshire.
Richard B. Haven, of Illinois.
Charles H. Heisler, of Delaware.
Hervé J. L'Heureux, of New Hampshire.
John H. Madonne, of Texas.
Erik W. Magnuson, of Illinois.
Horatio Mooers, of Maine.
James K. Penfield, of California.
Edwin Schoenrich, of Maryland.
Horace H. Smith, of Ohio.
Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr., of Colorado.
Edward T. Wailes, of New York.
Carlos J. Warner, of Ohio.
Thomas C. Wasson, of New Jersey.

From Foreign Service officer of class 7 to Foreign Service officer of class 6:

Theodore C. Achilles, of the District of Columbia.
Garret G. Ackerson, Jr., of New Jersey.
Roy E. B. Bower, of California.
Montgomery H. Colladay, of Connecticut.
John Davies, Jr., of Ohio.
William S. Farrell, of New York.
Heyward G. Hill, of Louisiana.
J. Winsor Ives, of Illinois.
Robert G. McGregor, Jr., of New York.
Edward Page, Jr., of Massachusetts.
George W. Renchard, of Michigan.
Henry E. Stebbins, of Massachusetts.
Francis Bowden Stevens, of New York.
Laurence W. Taylor, of California.
Robert F. Woodward, of Minnesota.
James H. Wright, of Missouri.
Lloyd D. Yates, of the District of Columbia.

From Foreign Service officer of class 8 to Foreign Service officer of class 7:

Hector C. Adam, Jr., of New York.
William K. Ailshie, of Idaho.
E. Tomlin Bailey, of New Jersey.
Russell W. Benton, of New York.
Roswell C. Beverstock, of California.
Glen W. Bruner, of Colorado.
Richard W. Byrd, of Virginia.
Glion Curtis, Jr., of Missouri.
Andrew B. Foster, of Pennsylvania.
Owen W. Gaines, of Georgia.
Norris S. Haselton, of New Jersey.
Douglas MacArthur 2d, of the District of Columbia.
Elbert G. Mathews, of California.
Donal F. McGonigal, of New York.
J. Graham Parsons, of New York.
Marselis C. Parsons, Jr., of New York.
John C. Pool, of Delaware.
George F. Scherer, of New York.
William P. Snow, of Maine.
Carl W. Strom, of Iowa.
Earle C. Taylor, of Pennsylvania.
T. Eliot Weil, of New York.
Ivan B. White, of Oregon.
Arthur R. Williams, of Colorado.

From Foreign Service officer, unclassified, to Foreign Service officer of class 8:

William Belton, of Oregon.
Lampton Berry, of Mississippi.
William O. Boswell, of Pennsylvania.
Charles R. Burrows, of Ohio.
Robert T. Cowan, of Texas.
Leon L. Cowles, of Utah.
H. Francis Cunningham, Jr., of Nebraska.
Philip M. Davenport, of Maryland.
Richard H. Davis, of New York.
Arthur B. Emmons 3d, of Massachusetts.
Vernon L. Fluharty, of Ohio.
Fulton Freeman, of California.
A. David Fritzlan, of Kentucky.
Ralph C. Getsinger, of Michigan.
John Goodyear, of New York.
Robert Grinnell, of New York.
Theodore J. Hadraba, of Nebraska.
Robert F. Hale, of Oregon.
Parker T. Hart, of Massachusetts.
Franklin Hawley, of Michigan.
Martin J. Hillenbrand, of Illinois.
John Evarts Horner, of Colorado.
Outerbridge Horsey, of New York.
Hungerford B. Howard, of California.
William L. Krieg, of Ohio.
Carl F. Norden, of New York.
R. Kenneth Oakley, of Arkansas.
Robert W. Rinden, of Iowa.
George Lybrook West, Jr., of California.
Randolph A. Kidder, of Massachusetts.

THE JUDICIARY

Guy T. Helvering, of Kansas, to be United States district judge for the district of Kansas, vice Hon. Richard J. Hopkins, deceased.

Harry E. Pratt, of Alaska, to be United States district judge, division No. 4, district of Alaska. Judge Pratt is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired August 5, 1943.

Ellen K. Raedy, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia. Judge Raedy is now serving in this post under an appointment which expired August 25, 1943.

Charles E. Cassidy, of Hawaii, to be third judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Harold E. Stafford, deceased.

Albert J. Tully, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Alabama, vice Francis G. Inge, resigned.

G. Douglas Crozier, of Hawaii, to be United States attorney for the Territory of Hawaii, vice Ingram M. Stainback.

William W. Hart, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois, vice Henry Grady Vien, deceased.

Edney Ridge, of North Carolina, to be United States marshal for the middle district of North Carolina, vice William Thomas Dowd, deceased.

Leslie E. Given, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of West Virginia, vice Lemuel R. Via, term expired.

Frank E. Flynn, of Arizona, to be United States attorney for the district of Arizona. Mr. Flynn is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 2, 1943.

Howard L. Doyle, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Illinois. Mr. Doyle is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired August 3, 1943.

Harold Maurice Kennedy, of New York, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of New York. Mr. Kennedy is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired August 4, 1943.

George L. Grobe, of New York, to be United States attorney for the western district of New York. Mr. Grobe is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 23, 1943.

Frederick V. Follmer, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania. Mr. Follmer is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 27, 1943.

John J. Boyle, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin. Mr. Boyle is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 23, 1943.

Walter Bragg Smith, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Alabama. Mr. Smith is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 31, 1943.

James H. Patterson, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 3, district of Alaska. Mr. Patterson is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 23, 1943.

J. Henry Goguen, of Massachusetts, to be United States marshal for the district of Massachusetts. Mr. Goguen is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 19, 1943.

John J. Barc, of Michigan, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Michigan. Mr. Barc is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 23, 1943.

John J. Farrell, of Minnesota, to be United States marshal for the district of Minnesota. Mr. Farrell is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 23, 1943.

Felipe Sanchez y Baca, of New Mexico, to be United States marshal for the district of New Mexico. Mr. Sanchez y Baca is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 2, 1943.

Jesse Jacobs, of New York, to be United States marshal for the northern district of New York. Mr. Jacobs is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 2, 1943.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Nelson Lee Smith, of New Hampshire, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1945 (vice Seavey).

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Joseph A. Ziemba, of Chicago, Ill., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 39, with headquarters at Chicago, Ill. (Reappointment.)

Martin R. Bradley, of Hermansville, Mich., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 38, with headquarters at Detroit, Mich. (Reappointment.)

Bernice Pyke, of Cleveland, Ohio, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 41, with headquarters at Cleveland, Ohio. (Reappointment.)

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY

Capt. Roscoe E. Schuirmann, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 16th day of May 1942.

Capt. Edward J. Moran, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, Motor Torpedo Boat Squadrons, South Pacific Force, to rank from the 5th day of July 1943.

Capt. Henry S. Kendall, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, Fleet Air Wing 1, to rank from the 5th day of July 1943.

Capt. Giles E. Short, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commandant, Naval Operating Base, Midway, to rank from the 5th day of July 1943.

Capt. Leslie E. Gehres, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, Fleet Air Wing 4, to rank from the 5th day of July 1943.

Capt. Thomas S. Combs, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, aircraft, Southwest Pacific Force, and commander, Fleet Air Wing 10, to rank from the 5th day of July 1943.

Capt. Edward J. Foy, United States Navy, to be commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Deputy Commandant, Army-Navy Staff College, to rank from the 27th day of May 1943.

Capt. Frederick G. Reinicke, United States Navy, retired, to be a commodore in the Navy, on the retired list, for temporary service, while serving as port director, New York, N. Y., to rank from the 27th day of May 1943.

Capt. William A. Sullivan, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Chief of Navy Salvage, to rank from the 27th day of May 1943.

Capt. Andrew F. Carter, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, while serving as executive, Army-Navy Petroleum Board, to rank from the 27th day of May 1943.

PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE CORPS

Brig. Gen. William H. Rupertus to to be a major general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 28th day of September 1942.

Col. Lemuel C. Shepherd to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 16th day of September 1942.

PROMOTIONS IN THE COAST GUARD

The following captains to be commodores, for temporary service, in the Coast Guard while serving as district Coast Guard officers, to rank from the 1st day of June 1943:

Capt. Wilfred N. Derby, first naval district.

Capt. Gordon T. Finlay, fifth naval district.

Capt. Joseph F. Farley, eighth naval district.

Capt. Philip F. Roach, twelfth naval district.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal Father, supreme in existence and everlastingly perfect in goodness, grant that our prayer may have sacred meaning at Thy holy altar. Disdain not our feeble words, but quicken the wings of our thought; we would model our deliberations after Him who came to minister and not to be ministered unto. Give us the zest of soul that sorrow cannot suppress and the cheer that burdens cannot crush, for we know that Thou hast strength for all who labor, sympathy for all who sigh, and tenderness for all who mourn.

As guardians and trustees of the future of our country may we be grimly persuaded that we need Thee to lead us through the perils of these times. Standing at the threshold of unparalleled responsibilities, we pray for a deep realization of our mission. Diffuse our deepest beings with a consuming energy and devotion that we may do that which honor and conscience demand. Without hesitation or vacillation, casting aside sectional and political differences, may we work in unity for a common goal. Blessed Lord, enable us to renounce all selfish ambitions that this anguished world may be redeemed from its inhuman hordes. O comfort and sustain our fellow countrymen who are far away on the battle lines and give consolation to those who wait for their return; only the hope of a better world reconciles us to its present tragedies. Almighty God, be with our notable President each passing hour, also with our most capable Speaker, the leaders and all Members that Thy will may be magnified in all decisions. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 8, 1943, was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Friday next, and that when the House adjourns on Friday next, it adjourn to meet on the following Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include a speech delivered by our distinguished Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Representative-elect LAWRENCE LEWIS, of Colorado, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had on July 8, 1943, examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 647. An act to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument;

H. R. 1396. An act making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States;

H. R. 1900. An act to prevent the payment of excessive fees or compensation in connection with the negotiation of war contracts;

H. R. 2828. An act to permit certain burials in the Scottish Rite Temple in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 2935. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2968. An act making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2988. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 26, 1941, as amended;

H. R. 3030. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution relating to the provision of butter for the patients of St. Elizabeths Hosptal; and

H. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on July 8, 1943, he did on Friday, July 9, 1943, sign the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House:

H. R. 647. An act to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument;

H. R. 1396. An act making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States;

H. R. 1900. An act to prevent the payment of excessive fees or compensation in connection with the negotiation of war contracts;

H. R. 2828. An act to permit certain burials in the Scottish Rite Temple in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 2935. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2968. An act making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2988. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 26, 1941, as amended;

H. R. 3030. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution relating to the provision of butter for the patients of St. Elizabeths Hospital; and

H. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on July 9, 1943, present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 647. An act to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument;

H. R. 1396. An act making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States;

H. R. 1900. An act to prevent the payment of excessive fees or compensation in connection with the negotiation of war contracts;

H. R. 2828. An act to permit certain burials in the Scottish Rite Temple in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 2935. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2968. An act making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2988. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 26, 1941, as amended;

H. R. 3030. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution relating to the provision of butter for the patients of St. Elizabeths Hospital; and

H. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On July 6, 1943:

H. R. 2536. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes.

On July 8, 1943:

H. R. 6. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control;

H. R. 249. An act for the relief of Gertrude Ricketts;

H. R. 1081. An act for the relief of Frank Borah;

H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of El Paso Electric Co.;

H. R. 1334. An act for the relief of J. Frank Meador;

H. R. 1397. An act to authorize the exchange of certain patented lands in the Death Valley National Monument for Government lands in the monument;

H. R. 1557. An act for the relief of Robert H. Pulliam;

H. R. 1602. An act for the relief of Robert N. Bickert;

H. R. 2047. An act to correct an error and to confirm, as of March 2, 1861, the title to certain saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to Edward Holden;

H. R. 2089. An act for the relief of Jennie Walker;

H. R. 2527. An act to amend the description of the area affected by the act of May 28, 1928, entitled "An act for the relief of the town of Springdale, Utah," and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3020. An act to authorize the use of part of the United States Capitol Grounds east of the Union Station for the parking of motor vehicles.

On July 9, 1943:

H. R. 1004. An act to relieve newspapers and periodical publications which have voluntarily suspended publication for the duration of the war from payment of second-class application fees upon resumption of publication;

H. R. 1940. An act prescribing the salary for the Commissioner of Public Roads and the Commissioner of Public Buildings;

H. R. 1991. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school students who have completed more than half of their academic year; and

H. R. 2663. An act to provide for the willful violation of regulations or orders respecting the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities.

On July 10, 1943:

H. R. 1315. An act for the relief of George Bartole and Vernon Wayne Tennyson.

On July 12, 1943:

H. R. 2481. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2714. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2719. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2088. An act for the relief of John Rhoden;

H. R. 997. An act to establish in the Medical Department of the Army a corps to be known as the Pharmacy Corps;

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson;

H. R. 1784. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay;

H. R. 2106. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Sir William Blackstone, the work of the late Paul W. Bartlett, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2794. An act to approve and consent to the compact entered into by Iowa and Nebraska establishing the boundary between Iowa and Nebraska;

H. R. 2935. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2968. An act making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Signed 3 p. m. eastern war time.

H. R. 3030. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Signed 4 p. m. eastern war time.

H. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution relating to the provision of butter for the patients of St. Elizabeths Hospital.

On July 13, 1943:

H. R. 235. An act for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey;

H. R. 2076. An act to authorize the deportation of aliens to countries allied with the United States;

H. R. 2614. An act to increase by 1 year the period within which certain oyster growers may file claims against the United States in the Court of Claims;

H. R. 2683. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-

seventh anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 19 to 23, inclusive, 1943;

H. R. 2703. An act to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2798. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes.

H. R. 2828. An act to permit certain burials in the Scottish Rite Temple in the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 2988. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 26, 1941, as amended.

On July 14, 1943:

H. R. 647. An act to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument; and

H. R. 1900. An act to prevent the payment of excessive fees or compensation in connection with the negotiation of war contracts.

On July 15, 1943:

H. R. 2936. An act to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

On July 16, 1943:

H. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes.

POCKET VETOED

On July 13, 1943:

H. R. 986. An act to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct; and

H. R. 1712. An act for the relief of Sarah Ann Elizabeth Holliday Foxworth and Ethel Allene Brown Haberfeld.

On July 16, 1943:

H. R. 1396. An act making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States.

MEMORANDUM OF DISAPPROVAL

I have withheld my approval of H. R. 986 (78th Cong.), "An act to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct." The purpose of the measure is to modify the existing misconduct bar to both service-connected and non-service-connected pension and compensation benefits under Veterans Regulations promulgated pursuant to Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, so that it shall only include disability or death resulting from the veteran's felonious misconduct.

The term "felonious" is not defined in the bill. In the majority of cases the misconduct resulting in disability would involve a breach of State rather than Federal law. Many acts constituting felonies under the law of some States are not felonies under the law of other States or the Federal statutes. It is not possible to estimate accurately the effect of inserting the word "felonious" before the word "misconduct," although apparently the ultimate effect would depend upon the fortuitous circumstance of location of commission.

The act would authorize the payment of service pension for disabilities not incurred in service, and due to venereal diseases, alcoholism, drug addiction, and other offenses clearly contravening accepted standards of a highly civilized society but not felonious. As to service-connected compensation or pension, the act would authorize the payment of the high rates for service-connected disability or death in such cases where the inception of the disease or disability was in active service in mere point of time and absent causative relationship. The act fails to take cognizance of the requirement of line of duty under Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and the Veterans Regulations, specifically paragraph VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 10—Series, under which cases involving offenses of very much lesser magnitude would still have to be denied. Specifically, notwithstanding the amendment which would be effected by this act, certain cases would not meet the line of duty requirement of the law, particularly those contained in the proviso of paragraph VIII which reads as follows:

Provided, however, That the requirement will not be met if it appears that at the time the injury was suffered or disease contracted, the person on whose account benefits are claimed (1) was avoiding duty by deserting the service or by absenting himself without leave; (2) was confined under sentence of court martial or civil court or was resisting lawful arrest; (3) was relieved from all active performance of duty by command of his superior officer as a result of the intemperate use of drugs or alcoholic liquor or because of injury or disease contracted or suffered as a result of his own misconduct; (4) was acting in disobedience of the lawful orders of his superior officer or in violation of the rules and regulations of his organization; or (5) whether at his post or lawfully absent, if the injury or disease was in fact, caused by something not involving misconduct but done in pursuing some private business or avocation.

It seems apparent that the definition of misconduct should be correlated with that of line of duty.

In view of inequalities and injustices which would result in the administration of this act, which I do not believe the Congress intended, and because it is my belief that the apparent intention of the amendment would authorize payment of benefits in misconduct cases never heretofore authorized by law and as to which the Federal Government should not be required to pay benefits, it is necessary for me to disapprove this particular legislation. I feel that it would cheapen the distinction of membership on the pension roll, which throughout history of this Nation has been maintained as a roll of honor, to base entitlement upon disabilities of such dubious character.

I am advised by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs that as a result of studies made pursuant to understanding with certain committees of the Congress suggestions as to possible amendatory legislation to remove recognized defects will be submitted for consideration of the Congress at an early date.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 13, 1943.*

MEMORANDUM OF DISAPPROVAL

I have withheld my approval of H. R. 1712, "For the relief of Sarah Ann Elizabeth Holliday Foxworth and Ethel Allene Brown Haberfeld."

It is the purpose of the bill to pay the sum of $5,000 to Sarah Ann Elizabeth Holliday Foxworth, the widow of P. E. Foxworth, who, at the time of his death, was an assistant director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, and the sum of $5,000 to Ethel Allene Brown Haberfeld, the widow of Harold D. Haberfeld, who, at the time of his death, was a special agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the said Foxworth and Haberfeld having been killed in an airplane accident in Dutch Guiana on January 15, 1943, in the line of their official duties.

Mr. Foxworth and Mr. Haberfeld were traveling in a transport airplane in which there were a number of other Government passengers when the accident occurred. All of the crew and all of the passengers, including two civilian employees of the State Department (Hodson and Henryson), and two civilian employees of the War Department (Lewis and Seeger) lost their lives in this accident.

The proposal contained in the bill is objectionable for the reason that it discriminates in favor of the widows of the two Federal Bureau of Investigation employees as against the widows and dependents of the civilian employees of the State and War Departments, insofar as this particular accident is concerned, and also discriminates in favor of the widows of the two Federal Bureau of Investigation employees as compared with the benefits that are accorded the widows and dependents of all other civilian employees of the Federal Government, where said employees lose their lives in the performance of their official duties.

The act of September 7, 1916, as amended, provides a means of administrative adjudication of all claims against the Government arising from the injury or death of its civilian employees while engaged in the performance of their official duties; and the Employees' Compensation Commission has already received and adjudicated the claims of the widows of the two Federal Bureau of Investigation employees, as well as the claims of the dependents of the other civilian employees who were killed in this accident. The Employees' Compensation Commission advises that this action resulted in an award to the widow of Mr. Foxworth of an amount that may be paid during her expectancy of life, in case she does not remarry, aggregating $17,640, and a similar award that may ultimately be paid to the widow of Mr. Haberfeld of $16,170. These awards are independent of and in addition to the payments proposed by the present bill.

While I have approved a number of private relief bills providing payment of $5,000, in each instance, to the widows of employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice,

and the Secret Service, Treasury Department, these payments have usually been in cases where the employees have lost their lives as a direct result of the pursuit or apprehension of criminals.

The Employees' Compensation Commission points out that; in the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the Commission has had occasion to consider and make awards with respect to the death of a substantial number of employees fatally injured while in the performance of their duties connected with the prosecution of the war; and that in many cases the deaths have resulted directly from war-risk hazards or from incidents as spectacular and tragic as those involved in the above-mentioned accident. The Commission refers, in this connection, to an aircraft accident in Alaska on November 19, 1942, claiming the lives of three employees of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and to other cases where civilian employees have lost their lives as a direct result of enemy action through submarine sinkings and otherwise.

If it should be the feeling of the Congress that additional benefits beyond those provided by the present Employees' Compensation Act should be made available to civilian employees of the Federal Government who are engaged in the performance of unusually hazardous duties, it would appear that these benefits should be provided by way of general legislation which would accord uniform treatment in this respect to all civilian employees.

In view of the awards already made to Mrs. Foxworth and Mrs. Haberfeld, respectively, under the provisions of existing law applicable to all cases of this character, and of the fact that the proposed additional payment of $5,000 to each of these two widows represents obviously discriminatory action in their favor as against the widows and dependents of all other civilian Government employees who find themselves similarly situated, I do not feel that I would be justified in giving the bill my approval.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 13, 1943.*

MEMORANDUM OF DISAPPROVAL

I have withheld approval of H. R. 1396—an act making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States.

This bill would require Federal agencies which distribute seeds, livestock and poultry feed, nursery stock, fertilizers, or soil-conditioning or other material to farmers to comply with the inspection laws of the State within which such seeds, feed, or other material are distributed. An exception is made for fertilizer distributed by the Tennessee Valley Authority for experimental purposes. With this single exception, neither the Tennessee Valley Authority nor any other Federal agency would be permitted to distribute any of the named materials unless it first permitted inspection by the State and paid the inspection fees and unless the materials conformed to such standards as the States might see fit to impose at any time in the future.

The distribution of seeds, feed, nursery stock, fertilizers, and similar materials is a proper function of the Federal Government. Congress has authorized their distribution by Federal agencies, including the Department of Agriculture and the Tennessee Valley Authority. If additional controls are necessary to insure the quality of the materials distributed by Federal agencies, the Congres should prescribe them. The granting to the legislatures of each of the 48 States of the power to regulate and, indeed, to veto a constitutional program of the Federal Government would constitute a sharp departure from precedent and a departure which I consider dangerous and unwarranted.

Another reason for my disapproving the bill is the effect which it would have upon the fertilizer program of the Tennessee Valley Authority. One of the primary objectives of the Congress in creating the Tennessee Valley Authority was to insure the distribution to farmers of low-cost and high-quality fertilizer. The requirement that fertilizer distributed for other than experimental purposes comply with State laws would seriously hamper the Authority's program since it would, in effect, permit the States to regulate the manufacture of such fertilizer. This requirement would make possible the passage of legislation in various States which would deprive the farmers of those States of the benefit of the new types of fertilizer developed by the Authority. That this legislation would burden the Authority's fertilizer program was frankly admitted by the National Fertilizer Association, which appeared at the hearings in support of the bill and opposed an amendment excepting all fertilizer produced by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

For the reasons above stated, I cannot approve H. R. 1396.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 16, 1943.*

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE HON. FRANCIS D. CULKIN, OF NEW YORK

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I send a resolution (H. Res. 299) to the desk and move its adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. FRANCIS D. CULKIN, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, when Hon. FRANCIS D. CULKIN was elected to Congress on November 6, 1928, by the citizens of the Thirty Second Congressional District of New York, they rendered a great service to the State and to the Nation. Tireless in his efforts to be useful to the people by whom he had been honored, Representative CULKIN drew heavily, all too heavily as we now know, upon his strength.

The country can ill afford to lose a man of conspicuous ability. There are few men who enter Congress with such a thorough training and experience as did FRANCIS CULKIN. He had been a member of the New York bar since 1902; he served as a private in the Spanish-American War and as captain in the New York National Guard from 1901 to 1908. From 1911 to 1921 he served as district attorney, as county judge from 1921 to 1928. Each of these offices was filled by him with rare ability and distinction, constituting an admirable preparation for the exacting duties of Congress.

I sympathize deeply with Mrs. Culkin and with the son and daughter in their loss of a devoted husband and father. The death of my dear friend came as a severe shock to me and I, too, deeply mourn his loss. If ever the prayer of the poet God Give Us Men was answered, it was when Hon. FRANCIS D. CULKIN was elected to Congress—

God give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor—men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagog,
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking!
Tall men, sun crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty, and in private thinking.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as one of the Democratic Members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, on which our distinguished colleague, FRANCIS CULKIN, served, I wish to join the New York delegation in expressing my profound sorrow at his untimely passing away.

Mr. CULKIN was a man of honor, and integrity, a man of industry, a man who placed the welfare of his country above selfish gain. He was a real patriotic American who longed for the day when victory would crown our war efforts, when America would return to the paths of peace and we could pursue our normal ways of life, our normal activities—when America could return to those normal, fundamental principles upon which our Government and our civilization are founded.

FRANCIS CULKIN was not destructive. His criticism was always of a constructive nature. He never attempted to tear down the character of anyone. Some one has said:

Isn't it strange that princes and kings,
And clowns that gather in sawdust rings;
And little folks, like you and me
Are builders for eternity?
Each is given a bag of tools,
A shapeless mass and a book of rules;
And each must make e're life is flown
A stumbling block or a stepping stone.

FRANCIS CULKIN labored to build a stepping stone for the betterment of mankind.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, with sorrow I join with my as-

sociates in paying tribute to the memory of our beloved colleague. Those of us who have known FRANCIS CULKIN during the years knew him as a fine, honest, able, and conscientious public servant. He was a man who was always genuinely devoted to the public welfare. He was ready at any time to sacrifice his own individual welfare in order to contribute to his country's progress. As a member of the Committees on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Rivers and Harbors, he rendered invaluable service. He was an expert on maritime problems and his great knowledge was helpful in solving the problems of shipping. In the post-war days when our shipping problems will be acute he will be badly missed. FRANK CULKIN died because of his devotion to the service of his country. He was here in this House many times when he should have been home protecting his health. Like a good soldier he insisted in carrying on. In these troublesome days we need strong, able men like FRANK CULKIN, and it is well for us to pause a moment to comment upon his fine life. A great American has passed on; a beloved colleague and friend has gone to receive the reward which comes from a well spent life.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our dearly beloved friend and colleague, FRANCIS CULKIN, is a serious blow to the National House of Representatives, and a personal loss to me. I do not know anyone during my years of service in this body who impressed me more with his sincerity, his loyalty and his devotion to duty, his vision, and his courage. As our distinguished friend from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] so well pointed out, his gentlemanliness was ever pleasant. He never criticized except to engage in constructive criticism, always expressing himself along constructive lines. I never met one who was more constructive than our late friend and colleague.

There is not much that one can say on an occasion of this kind except to make an expression of sympathy. I know that every Member of the House joins with me in conveying to Mrs. Culkin—to whom I wrote a letter of sympathy immediately upon reading in the public press of the death of our late friend—and the other members of our late colleague's family and his dear relatives our deep and profound sympathy in their bereavement. I know that my colleagues from other States in the Union join with me in conveying to our colleagues of the great State of New York our keen feeling of regret in the great loss that fine delegation has substained in the passing on of our very dear and beloved friend, FRANK CULKIN.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, in addition to our service together in this body, it was my pleasure to be associated with the late FRANCIS D. CULKIN on the Jefferson Memorial Commission. I admired him as an able statesman. I loved him as a devoted friend. He is gone but not forgotten. In that sweet bye and bye of promise we shall be with him again.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. As a freshman Member of the House, I was assigned to a committee which, fortunately for me, placed my seat next to that of the Honorable FRANCIS D. CULKIN. I found him to be a delightful gentleman imbued with a spirit of kindliness which he shed upon me in abundant measure. He was an able legislator and a sympathetic and helpful friend. He advised, encouraged, and guided me on many occasions. I generated for him an intensive affection, as well as high admiration.

I shall miss him as greatly as this House and the Nation shall suffer by his passing. I join his family and his colleagues in mourning for him. His memory ever shall remain fresh in all our minds.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member so desiring may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I, too, join with my colleagues in voicing our sorrow in the passing of our late friend and associate and in the message of sympathy to the widow and family of FRANCIS D. CULKIN.

Until recent months when prevented by the illness which finally took him from us, Mr. CULKIN was one of the most active Members of the House. Interested in all legislative matters, he was especially concerned over the welfare of the dairy producers in the country, whose cause he championed on many, many occasions. A strong advocate of a large American merchant marine, FRANCIS CULKIN recognized the importance of constructing and maintaining vast harbor improvements in all sections of the country and his vision and cooperation are shown today in the great fleet of merchant ships which now flies the American flag.

Though a Republican, Representative CULKIN was liberal and progressive in his thoughts and votes. He espoused the cause of the common man with a sincerity which aroused the admiration of his colleagues. Slow to take any step which might involve the Nation in the great international conflict in which it is now engaged, Mr. CULKIN did not hesitate for an instant to concentrate his full efforts and influence in support of all measures relating to the prosecution of the war.

Mr. Speaker, in the untimely passing of FRANCIS CULKIN, the New York delegation in the House of Representatives has lost an experienced and valuable associate, the House an able leader and advocate, and the Nation a trusted and respected legislator. We mourn his death today and send our most sincere condolences to his widow and children whom he dearly loved.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, today I join with my fellow Members in paying a deserved tribute to one of our departed friends and colleagues from New York, FRANCIS D. CULKIN.

Representative CULKIN had a long and distinguished career in the service of the people. Beginning with his service as a soldier in the Spanish-American War, as a district attorney, as a county judge, and from 1928 to the time of his death, as a Representative in Congress from the Thirty-second Congressional District of New York, Mr. CULKIN devoted more than 30 years of his life in the interest of good government. Throughout that long period of time, FRANCIS CULKIN discharged his many official duties faithfully and well. He was tireless and successful in his efforts on behalf of his district and his State.

He was a strong partisan but never permitted his loyalty to his party to interfere with duty to his country. He was an aggressive advocate but always a fair opponent. He believed intensely in his own side of an argument, but he was tolerant of opposition and ever ready to applaud in an adversary that ability and character which bespeaks conviction and denotes sincerity.

May the Lord deal with him as one who has gained the palm and may his place in the world beyond the grave be even higher and more glorious than that which he won for himself among men.

IN MEMORY OF FRANCIS D. CULKIN, A DISTINGUISHED AND ABLE REPRESENTATIVE FROM NEW YORK STATE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep personal sorrow that I join in paying a tribute to the memory of FRANCIS D. CULKIN, of Oswego, N. Y., with whom I served for the past 16 years in the House of Representatives.

He was one of the ablest and highest type of public servant that I ever met. We can ill afford to lose such an independent thinking and courageous acting Member of Congress in these critical days of our country. He was no rubber-stamp Member of Congress. He took no orders from anyone and always voted his convictions without fear or favor even when they might differ temporarily with the majority of his party. There was no more determined fighter or more effective champion of any cause that he engaged in and it was always on the side of popular government and the rights of the American people. He was never swayed or influenced by selfish groups against what he conceived to be the interest of the people he represented or of all the American people.

The farmers of New York State have lost a fearless and tireless champion who knew their problems and the solutions better than any eastern Member of Congress. I always depended upon him for leadership and advice on all issues affecting the dairymen and farmers of our State. Since his death I have relied on his friend DAN REED for farm

advice and have studied farm legislation more in detail myself and hope that I can carry on in a small way the constructive services he rendered to the farmers of our State who have lost a true and distinguished friend. FRANCIS CULKIN was a credit to his district, to New York State, and to the Republican Party in Congress.

In the many years I had the privilege and honor of serving with him in the Congress I never knew any Member that surpassed him in character, integrity, and devotion to his country. His family have my deepest sympathy, but those of us who knew him best in Congress loved him for his many virtues.

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, our congressional summer recess was saddened by the death of Representative FRANCIS D. CULKIN, of the Thirty-second District of New York. Mr. CULKIN was one of my colleagues on the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Having made the acquaintanceship of Mr. CULKIN in this first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, I did not have the good fortune of knowing him to the same great personal advantage as did his fellow citizens of Oswego, N. Y., and his fellow members of the bar. My few contacts, however, with FRANCIS D. CULKIN, persuaded me that he was an amiable man and a conscientious representative in Congress.

Although we knew Mr. CULKIN to be ill, we were nonetheless shocked when we learned that death had come to him as it must to all men.

Writing like sentiments of sorrow on the occasion of the passing of a friend, George Washington said:

> It is the nature of humanity to mourn for the loss of our friends; and the more we loved them, the more poignant is our grief. It is part of the precepts of religion and philosophy to consider the dispensations of Providence as wise, immutable, uncontrollable; of course, that it is our duty to submit with as little repining as the sensibility of our natures is capable of to all its decrees. But nature will, notwithstanding, indulge, for a while, its sorrows.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, in the death of FRANCIS D. CULKIN, the House of Representatives and the State of New York have lost a respected public official and one who served his country well. Those of us who knew him well realize that his talents and qualities will be sorely missed.

I shall remember best not FRANCIS CULKIN'S official record but my association with him and the bonds of lasting friendship which death cannot sever.

The greatest comfort and consolation that can come to the family of our late colleague is not alone his splendid record but the heritage of his good name which he has transmitted to his children.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of my friend, our colleague, the Honorable FRANCIS D. CULKIN, the Nation and the House of Representatives have suffered a distinct loss, particularly at this crucial period of our history when men of his sterling character, ability, and courage are so badly needed.

Judge CULKIN served his country as a soldier, as a jurist, and as a legislator of the first magnitude. Absolutely free and untrammeled, he devoted his life to fighting for just causes.

In his passing the American merchant marine lost a strong and sincere friend. He served for years on the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. His splendid legal training and judicial experience were a guidance and help to those of us who were fortunate in being associated with him on that important committee in solving the many problems constantly before us.

Few men, if any, had greater knowledge of this globe and its history, either ancient or modern, than FRANCIS D. CULKIN.

He lived and fought for the causes that needed assistance—against the wrongs that needed resistance—for the good that he could do.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD an address made by my colleague, Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, before a meeting of the Intracoastal Canal Association at the Rice Hotel in Houston on August 26.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a proclamation issued by Hon. Fletcher Bowron, mayor of Los Angeles, setting aside one week as a tribute to Poland; and, second, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address given by my distinguished friend, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, before the annual convention of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, at Detroit, Mich., August 9, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by Ambassador Joseph Clark Grew at Bristol on September 6.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper excerpt with reference to two families in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a poem entitled "Uncle Sam's Waves."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an outline of food production for 1944 by James Patton, of the National Farmers' Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on three subjects and include some short resolutions in each case.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the other business before the House today I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the other business before the House today and any other special orders I may address the House for 7 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks in the RECORD and includ therewith a newspaper article on the Manpower Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the meeting of the Republican Post-War Advisory Council and to include therein copies of the resolutions adopted by it at its recent meeting, and copies of two editorials relating to the resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include certain addresses made on August 14 at the award of the Maritime M to the Moore Drydock Co. of San Francisco and Oakland, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a newspaper editorial from the Milwaukee Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein releases from the Treasury.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS] may be extended together with an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TREES DO GROW IN BROOKLYN

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, trees do grow in Brooklyn, ailanthus yes, but also many fine, strong, and sturdy trees. But

what is more important is the fact that in Brooklyn there are 3,000,000 fine loyal Americans, and I am impelled today respectfully to disagree with the distinguished authoress and to tell her and you that those Americans in Brooklyn have not abandoned and will not abandon hope. I must tell her, too, that they live and work in Brooklyn and are happy, peaceful, contented people. With personal knowledge, I must disagree with her expressions with respect to that class of American womanhood that has unselfishly devoted its life to the teaching profession. I might take the liberty to suggest to that authoress that if she is interested in having a fairer and clearer and certainly more elevating description of Brooklyn and its people she should read You Look So Young, the autobiography of a distinguished woman of the American theater and a native Brooklynite, Miss Peggy Wood. But more important than all else is that the people of Brooklyn along with their fellow Americans throughout the Brooklyns of this great Nation will today, tomorrow, and next week see that the difficult job that lies ahead of all of us will be done well and completely and that thereafter peace will again come to Brooklyn and its trees will still grow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered over the radio and two letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by the Governor of the State of California at the last convention of the American Legion of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief poem sent to me by a constituent from California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAXES

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, apropos of the recently enacted tax law, I quote a brief poem which a constituent sent me, which reads:

A man stood at the pearly gate,
His face was worn and old;
He merely asked of the man of fate
Admission to the fold.

What have you done, St. Peter asked,
To seek admission here?
Why, I tried to estimate my income
Tax from now to the end of the year.

The gates swung open sharply,
As St. Peter touched the bell;
Come in, he said, and take a harp,
You've had enough of hell.

NOT NEEDED AT FRONT

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the House read with amazement the story that appeared on the front page of the Washington Times-Herald this morning entitled "Not Needed at Front. F. D. approves Canada's plan to disband combat troops."

The story goes on:

President Roosevelt has approved the suggestion of the politically harassed Prime Minister Mackenzie King of Canada that combat divisions in the Dominion be disbanded at once and returned to civilian life because they are no longer needed on a fighting front.

Contrast the situation in Canada, my friends, with the situation here in this country, where we are about to begin the drafting of fathers for war service.

We want to know what has become of the statement that Winston Churchill made a year or two before Pearl Harbor, when he said:

Send us the implements of war and we will do the job. We do not need your men.

Notwithstanding this assurance we have already sent several million boys to the various fronts and others are to follow.

We want to know what became of our first line of defense, when we had to split up the Pacific Fleet and send half of it over to defend that first line of defense. It was that split up of our fleet that brought on Pearl Harbor.

I would like to hear from the distinguished Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House, if he is present, and I would ask that he be given ample time in order that he may reassure Congress and the American people that America will not be discriminated against during the balance of this war. If Canada does not need to send any more men to the combat front then certainly the United States should not be called upon to furnish more boys. Let the President remember that there already is a serious manpower shortage in our country, both on farm and in factory.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein the article from the Times-Herald of Washington previously referred to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. The article referred to follows:

F. D. APPROVES CANADA'S PLAN TO DISBAND COMBAT TROOPS—ACT FALLS LIKE BOMBSHELL IN CAPITAL AS UNITED STATES PREPARES TO DRAFT FATHERS

(By John O'Donnell)

President Roosevelt has approved the suggestion of the politically harassed Prime Minister Mackenzie King of Canada that combat divisions in the Dominion be disbanded at once and returned to civilian life because they are no longer needed on a fighting front.

This official information, sponsored by Canada's representatives in this Capital, crashed last night as a political bolt of lightning.

It broke on the eve of the convening of the Congress of the United States in which Members of House and Senate are faced with the War Department's insistence that pre-Pearl Harbor fathers be called in the draft and the cry from the voters back home that such a vote means political death at the next election.

The Canadians bluntly put responsibility for their decision to disband Dominion troops already under arms on "United States approval," which means the okay of President Roosevelt, good friend and Harvard colleague of Canada's premier.

VICTORIES CAUSE MOVE

Victories in the Aleutians, the "destruction of the Axis forces in north Africa, and the capitulation of Italy" are cited in the formal statement from Canada for the decision to return their armed forces to civilian life. "All decisions," the formal announcement here in Washington declares, "have been appraised in consultation with the United States authorities."

According to the official announcement from the Canadian Wartime Information Board here in Washington, present plans call for the disbandment of the Seventh and Eighth Divisions and the partial disbandment of the Sixth.

"The reorganization will result in reducing the establishment for operational troops in North America by 20,000," announced Col. J. L. Ralston, Canadian Minister for Defense.

The Canadian chief of Dominion's armed forces, who sat with President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill and Mackenzie King at the famous Quebec conference, declared:

REASONS FOR RELEASE

"It is not possible to estimate the actual number who will be released to civilian life, but the number will be substantial at this stage."

The formal Canadian announcement declared that the decision to release their troops was:

"Made possible by the improved strategic position on both coasts of Canada resulting from the eviction of the Japs from the Aleutians; the military victories in the Mediterranean, and the Russian successes; and the striking betterment in antisubmarine activities in the Atlantic."

The scheme will involve a readjustment downward of local defenses on both the east and west coasts, the Canadian authorities declared.

Colonel Ralston stated, and this shocked the War Department:

"Events of recent months have greatly improved the general strategic situation in respect to the defense of both coastal regions of Canada.

"In the Pacific there has been the eviction of the Japanese from the Aleutians and the increasing scale of operations in the Southwest Pacific.

RED SUCCESSES ARE FACTOR

"The European area has seen the continuance of Russian successes with increasing menace to Hitler, the destruction of the Axis forces in north Africa, and the capitulation of Italy. These successes intensify the threat of further offensive operations against the Axis both in Northwestern Europe and in the Mediterranean area.

"While these developments do not remove the threat of enemy action in certain forms against this continent they reduce materially the scale of any possible operation of that kind.

"The degree of probability and the possible type and weight of any such operations have been appraised in consultation with the United States authorities.

"In the light of this appraisement it is possible to revise the composition of the portion of the army in Canada which is allotted to operational tasks and to effect a reorganization and a substantial reduction in the number of troops to be employed for that purpose.

"Obviously, operational troops in Canada are employed principally in connection with the defense of the Atlantic and Pacific coastal areas. Consequently, the main features of the reorganization will include:

"(a) Downward adjustments in local defenses at strategic points having regard to their relative importance and vulnerability.

"(b) The Seventh and Eighth Divisions now on duty in Canada will be disbanded and the Sixth Division will be partially disbanded. In substitution for these divisions, it is proposed to retain a composite formation of three brigade groups each capable of operating independently. These troops will be administered and trained under a modified divisional headquarters.

GENERAL RESULT

"The general result will be:

"(a) To provide a reduced but thoroughly efficient body of operational troops in Canada;

"(b) To introduce an additional phase of advanced training which will be given to reinforcements before they proceed overseas;

"(c) To release a considerable number of lower category personnel, who will thus be enabled to take up civilian occupations and supplement available manpower.

"It should be understood that disbandment of divisions does not necessarily mean that all the units will be disbanded.

"The reorganization will result in reducing the establishment for operational troops in North America by about 20,000. This does not mean that number will go out of the army. Many will be reallocated according to the needs of the service to fill up remaining units and for potential reinforcements, depending on age, rank, and medical category.

"It is not possible to estimate the actual numbe who will be released to civilian life, but the number will be substantial at this stage.

"It must be emphasized that the fact that there is to be a reduction in requirements for operational troops in Canada does not mean that the demand is reduced for overseas."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two different subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution, passed by the New England Council to continue the program for the winning of this war and for the post-war activities; also to include certain memorials to Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on four subjects and to include therein certain speeches and a copy of a bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address by Rupert Hughes on the international scene. I am advised by the Public Printer that the cost is $67.50.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article which appeared in a New York City newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ASYLUM FOR OPPRESSED PEOPLES

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next I may address the House for 30 minutes after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today House Joint Resolution 154 which appeals to the American people and to this Congress to do something to save the human lives that are now being destroyed by the Nazis in the areas they dominate.

I noted in the press a few days ago that both the Democratic and Republican National Committees went on record for such a program. It will be one of the finest gestures the American people can make: To allow a certain number of the people in those countries now dominated by the Axis, people who are slated for d struction, to enter this country for a temporary stay only, to return to their own countries 6 months after the war is over.

I am going to write a letter to every one of you asking your opinion and your help. I hope that we will be able to get our assistance to the unfortunate victims of Nazi barbarism before it is too late.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the New York Times of August 15, 1943, in regard to the Atlantic Charter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WARD JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article which appeared in the Long Beach Independent, of Long Beach, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address recently made by the minority leader in Denver, Colo.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address I delivered on the occasion of the dedication of the MacArthur lock at Sault Ste. Marie and also two articles pertaining to that same event.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on peace planning for the post-war world.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Stuart A. Seelye, president of the New Orleans Association of Commerce, at a conference with Louisiana Senators and New Orleans Congressmen on Tuesday, August 24, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects and to include therein a copy of a telegram and two newspaper articles, the cost of which will be $112.50.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address delivered by Hon. Roy Miller,

president of the Inter Coastal Canal Association before that association in the city of Houston on August 26.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Mr. Charles I. Stanton.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRICE ROLL-BACKS AND CONSUMER SUBSIDIES

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, we are all just back from our districts. I traveled over 60 days through 13 counties, and everywhere, at every cross road, they said: "Above everything else, go back and assert yourselves as a Congress. Reduce this directive government by bureaucrats."

On the way in yesterday I read in the paper where Chester Bowles, of the O. P. A., announced a new $100,000,000 roll-back subsidy program, saying he had the money, the very thing we repudiated in both the House and the Senate just before we left here, repudiated by a majority vote.

We should assert ourselves anew and begin doing it right now. I do not want to delay it 1 day. The first thing we are faced with on our return is an expenditure of a hundred million dollars for a program diametrically opposed to what we voted by a majority just before we left here last July. I think we had better begin asserting ourselves in a very articulate manner.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 7 minutes today after the disposition of the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DRAFTING OF FATHERS INTO THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess I had the opportunity to contact a great many people in various sections of the country, and I found universal opposition to the drafting of fathers into the armed forces.

People generally are questioning the advisability or necessity of increasing the armed forces beyond present strength.

Personally I am opposed to the drafting of fathers until every able-bodied and sound-minded man up to the age of 45 years who is now in our penal institutions is inducted into military service. I know that there is opposition in certain quarters, but in 1941 Congress let down the bars to eliminate the prohibition against enlistment in the military service of the United States of any person convicted of a felony.

I see no good reason why these men now in penal institutions should not be given the opportunity to prove themselves. From time to time, thousands of these prisoners are paroled, and I see no reason why society should accept men that the Army refuses to take. After all, the man behind the bars is no worse than the man on the outside who has committed the same offense but was never caught.

Most penal institutions are overcrowded and are a terrific public burden. I believe that if these men were inducted into the armed forces and given an opportunity to prove themselves, we could parole those men who receive an honorable discharge after hostilities cease, thus greatly cutting down the population of these institutions as well as the public expense.

With this in mind I am drafting a bill which I shall present, hoping that the House will take favorable action at an early date, and thus prevent the breaking up of many thousands of homes as well as creating a great many widows and orphans by the induction of fathers.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the address of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] today I may address the House for 10 minutes in reference to the Walter Lippmann attack on Cordell Hull.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two articles from the Chicago Sun and one from the Baltimore Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a report which I requested from Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator of the Public Works Agency, with reference to operation of child-care centers under the so-called Lanham Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address I made last month on keeping livestock healthy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE]?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER LEND-LEASE ACT FOR PERIOD ENDED JULY 31, 1943 (H. DOC. NO. 263)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith to the Seventy-eighth Congress a report of operations under the Lend-Lease Act for the period ended July 31, 1943.

In the month of July alone, lend-lease aid exceeded a billion dollars. Lend-lease supplies are hastening the day of final victory.

Sicily has fallen. The fascist dictator has been thrown out of power. For the first time the United Nations forces occupy part of the homeland of the enemy.

The subjugated peoples of Nazi Europe are now aware that the European fortress is not impregnable. The great offensives of the Soviet Army on the eastern front, the continued heroic struggle of the Chinese, and the British offensives in other areas, aided by lend-lease munitions and supplies, are having their repercussions both on and behind the battle lines. Our might and that of our allies is being felt in the Axis satellite nations of the Balkans and middle Europe, and in Nazi Germany as well. From Hamburg on the North Sea to Ploesti in Rumania, the people know from first-hand experience with what crushing force the United Nations can strike.

Except for the responsible fascist leaders, the people of the Axis need not fear unconditional surrender to the United Nations. I have said that we shall bring food for the starving and medicine for the sick in the areas liberated by the United Nations. We have done so, under lend-lease, in North Africa. We are doing so in Sicily. We shall continue to do so in other areas, as they are liberated, to prevent economic break-down and to aid the liberated peoples to produce and to help themselves. We shall provide these necessary civilian supplies in support of our military operations and as a matter of simple humanity. The people of Axis-controlled areas may be assured that when they agree to unconditional surrender they will not be trading Axis despotism for ruin under the United Nations. The goal of the United Nations is to permit liberated peoples to create a free political life of their own choosing and to attain economic security. These are two of the great objectives of the Atlantic Charter.

But until the day of unconditional surrender, the United Nations will continue with the force of all their power to hit the enemy. We are striking hard and ready to strike harder. Greatly increased

United States forces and greatly increased lend-lease supplies are on the way to the battle fronts. The lon_ r this war goes on, the stronger the United Nations will become.

The United Nations are growing stronger because each of them is contributing to the common struggle in full measure—whether in men, in weapons, or in materials. Each is contributing in accordance with its ability and its resources. Everything that all of us have is dedicated to victory over the Axis Powers.

This report on lend-lease and reverse lend-lease activities should be both an assurance and a warning to our enemies. The power of the United Nations is great. The will of the United Nations is fixed. In this common war we fight as one man, for one victory—and we shall have it.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1943 (H. DOC. NO. 264)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following further message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On July 12 I reluctantly signed H. R. 2714, the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943. I felt obliged to approve it because it appropriates funds which were essential to carry on the activities of almost every agency of government during the recess of the Congress.

If it had been possible to veto the objectionable rider, which has been attached to this Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, but which has no relevancy to it, without delaying essential war appropriations, I should unhesitatingly have done so.

This rider prohibited any Government department or agency from employing at any time in the future, after November 15, three named individuals who are now employed by different Government agencies, unless they are appointed to office by the President and confirmed by the Senate prior to that date.

There is no suggestion that the three named individuals have not loyally and competently performed the duties for which they have been employed. They are sought to be disqualified for Federal employment because of political opinions attributed to them.

The provision aimed at these men does not define the offices they hold and does not seek to make appointment to those offices subject to Senate approval. As a matter of fact, the clause permitting them to remain in Government employment after November 15 subject to Presidential appointment and Senate approval was inserted only after the Senate had refused to accept a provision requiring their immediate removal from Government employment and their permanent disqualification for the Federal service. The Senate rejected the compromise as incorporated in this bill once, and agreed to it only after the House conferees had refused to agree to any bill without a provision aimed at the removal of these three named individuals. The Senate yielded, as I have been forced to yield, to avoid delaying our conduct of the war.

But I cannot so yield without placing on record my view that this provision is not only unwise and discriminatory, but unconstitutional.

The Supreme Court has defined a bill of attainder as "a legislative act which inflicts punishment without judicial trial." The rider in this bill operates perpetually to disqualify three named individuals from holding office in their Government unless they are nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate before November 15. It is directed at named individuals and not at specified statutory offices. No judicial trials have been held. No impeachment proceedings have been instituted. This rider is an unwarranted encroachment upon the authority of both the executive and the judicial branches under our Constitution. It is not, in my judgment, binding upon them.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 14, 1943.*

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 96)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Subject: Senate Resolution 166, adopted by the Senate on July 6, 1943.

SIR: On July 6, 1943, the Senate of the United States considered and agreed to Senate Resolution 166.

The resolution asks that the President issue an Executive order directing that the War Relocation Authority, in administering the relocation program for Japanese-Americans evacuated from the west coast, segregate the disloyal persons from the loyal, and directing the appropriate agency of the Government to issue a full and complete authoritative statement on conditions in relocation centers and plans for future operations.

I find that the War Relocation Authority has already undertaken a program of segregation. That program is now well under way. The first train movements began in early September.

In response to the resolution I asked the Director of the Office of War Mobilization to issue a full and complete authoritative public statement on conditions in relocation centers and plans for future operations. A short preliminary statement on this subject was issued on July 17, 1943. A full and complete statement is being made public today.

I am attaching hereto for the information of the House of Representatives copies of my message to the Senate in response to Senate Resolution 166 and of the two public statements concerning the relocation program that have been recently issued.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 14, 1943.*

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks an address by Maj. Gen. James A. O'Connor recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

THE ALASKA HIGHWAY—AN EPIC OF THE ARCTIC

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Territories, I made an inspection tour through the Territory of Alaska during the recent recess of the Congress. At a later date, after I have had an opportunity to report my observations to my committee, I will bring to the attention of the House some of the matters which I observed during this trip. I particularly desire to discuss the major part Alaska is playing in our war program, insofar as censorship will permit. I will also hope to discuss in some detail the Alaska Highway, which has now reached that stage of construction that the entire length from Dawson Creek, the initial point in British Columbia, to a point well beyond Whitehorse, a distance of over a thousand miles, is now usable, and passenger busses are making regular trips from Whitehorse to Dawson Creek, carrying Army and construction civilian personnel. Much of the balance of the 1630-mile highway is completed. I made the journey by bus from Whitehorse to Peace River Bridge, which gave me an opportunity to secure first-hand information of this outstanding road construction achievement by our military forces.

The Alaska Highway project is under the supervision of Brig. Gen. James A. O'Connor, commanding general of the Northwest Service Command, who, together with his staff, is entitled to the commendation of every American for the outstanding service he and his staff and civilian assistants have rendered to our country in this great war effort which is engaging the services of us all. General O'Connor was graduated from West Point in 1907, coming from West Bay City, Mich. In his work with the Army Engineers, he has supervised projects over much of the globe and was in charge of the job of tunneling Corregidor Fortress in Manila Harbor. He had direct charge in the construction of the southern half of the Alaska Highway. It is said his men used to see him in a jeep, face and uniform blackened with grime, bouncing along right behind the lead "cats" as they forged through the primeval forest. My personal observations of General O'Connor's personal activities in this big construction job leads me to say that this characterization of him is most accurate. He is not a swivel-chair general but one who may be found at the front line of the construction projects of which he is in charge.

In passing, may I say that Col. K. B. Bush, General O'Connor's chief of staff of the Northwest Service Command, as well as all of the military officials with whom I came in contact, showed me every consideration and made it possible for me in the short time at my disposal, not only to get the full and complete facts concerning the Alaska Highway, but the Territory of Alaska in general. Capt. Richard L. Neuberger, who is a resident of my congressional district, is aide to General O'Connor, and was most helpful in assisting to arrange my itinerary through Alaska and in securing information and data requested by me.

At an occasion marking the first anniversary of the Northwest Service Command, on September 4, 1943, at the officers' barracks in Whitehorse, Yukon Territory, Canada, General O'Connor made a noteworthy address, in which he called attention to the military achievement of the construction of this arterial highway, for the first time linking continental United States with our great Alaskan Territory. I include as a part of my remarks General O'Connor's address, which is as follows:

I would speak extemporaneously tonight were it not for the fact that the sponsors of this program have asked me to reduce my brief remarks to writing, so that copies may be distributed as a souvenir of the occasion. They are a poor souvenir, I assure you, but they are broached in the utmost sincerity and appreciation.

As we gather here tonight, there is not one of us who can fail to contrast our present situation with that of a year ago. At that time we had one building, an old C. C. C. structure. We had our offices in the front of that building, if very small cubbyholes may be termed offices. In the back of that building we all lived. We had no mess hall of our own and stood in line in front of the Public Roads Administration to get our meals. On many days we were out of such basic office supplies as envelopes, paper clips, and carbon paper—although there may be some, and not a minority either, who would term such depletion a blessing in disguise.

A year ago the highway from Dawson Creek to our headquarters in Whitehorse had just been broken through. The first truck, driven by two enlisted men of our headquarters company, Sergeant Gronke and Corporal Bowe, had arrived here. But the road was still a pioneer trail. Pitch yet ran in the pine stumps along its edge. Today, there is daily bus service, by the largest Greyhound busses, between Whitehorse and Dawson Creek. These busses carry military personnel and civilian contractors' employees to their various tasks.

As commanding general of the Northwest Service Command, I feel that my role tonight, in this brief message, is to express heartfelt appreciation to those who deserve our gratitude.

My greatest measure of thanks is reserved for the soldiers of seven United States Army Engineer regiments and the associated Quartermaster, Medical, and Signal Corps troops who in the short time of 8 months, hammered through the first land route in history to Alaska.

Those men are the real heroes of this undertaking. Without maps, without previous surveys, without knowledge of the rivers and mountains and canyons they had to traverse, they shoved through the wilderness and completed their assignment. They lived on emergency rations. Clean laundry was practically nonexistent. They slept in tents or on the ground. Their mail was heartbreakingly infrequent. But they had the spirit of the pioneers, the spirit which prompted the American soldiers under Capt. Meriwether Lewis and Lt. William Clark to blaze a frontier trail to the Pacific Ocean. I venture to predict that a generation from now, when men gather around their campfires in the north country, the story of the Engineer troops who built the Alaska Highway will be one of the epics of the Arctic—an epic ranking with the story of the Klondike gold rush and with the stern tale of Inspector Fitzgerald's famous lost patrol of the Northwest Mounted.

From tribute to the soldiers who hewed the highway through the fastnesses, let us spend a moment on our friends in Washington

Nearly 2 years have passed since these projects were initiated. After the fate of December 7, 1941, our fleet in the Pacific had been badly damaged and the United States was distinctly on the defensive. The military importance of Alaska was suddenly exposed. The length of the war, the struggles it would entail, the vicissitudes which we might have to meet were unknown and to many, fearsome. The order to open up this land route to Alaska with its allied projects was a bold and farseeing one. The mainspring back of the execution of this order was Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, commanding general of the Army Service Forces. And the accomplishment made so far would not have been possible without his continuous and effective support and urging.

His example and interest have been supplemented and followed by all the various agencies with which we have had to deal. The most vitally concerned has been the Corps of Engineers. The excellent planning of Brig. Gen. Clarence L. Sturdevant, Assistant Chief of Engineers, and the notable work of Brig. Gen. William Hoge, who helped fix the initial route and had charge of the northern half of the road, give these two officers places of particular honor.

We of the Army are also heavily indebted to Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, and Mr. Thomas H. MacDonald, Commissioner of the Public Roads Administration, for their magnificent assistance and splendid background of road-building knowledge.

To all of you here tonight my appreciation is extremely personal. No commanding officer can succeed without the loyalty and generous assistance of his subordinates. I well realize that the advances of the past year would have been impossible had not the officers and men of the Northwest Service Command contributed their effort, ingenuity, and talent in the most wholehearted measure. No commanding general has enjoyed more sincere and devoted assistants than Colonel Bush and Colonel Hazeltine. In the many trips which have been necessary by me, they have carried on with great efficiency and fidelity. I count myself fortunate to have had them here.

The list of people to whom we owe gratitude and thanks could be extended indefinitely. The good people of Canada, our allies and neighbors, have received us with characteristic hospitality and generosity. Alaskans have been equally open-armed. To such eminent public officials as Gov. Ernest Gruening, of Alaska; Premier John Hart, of British Columbia; Premier E. C. Manning of Alberta; and the very illustrious Prime Minister of Canada, the Right Honorable W. L. Mackenzie King, we extend our thanks for the most splendid type of understanding and friendship.

I must also express my personal thanks to the Members of the American Congress who have come here during the past summer to visit our command. We have been fortunate in being privileged to be hosts to a number of distinguished Members of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives. I count it an outstanding public service for these men to visit the Far North to see for themselves the task we are doing. From us, they may learn something of our problems and our aspirations. From them, we are sure to learn ways in which we may improve our performance and increase our capacity for constructive effort. I welcome any visit by the elected representatives of the American people, whose wealth and lives are pledged to the task before us.

As I conclude, I must ask you all to remember that we are a very small cog in a vast undertaking. Once more our country is pledged to the defense of freedom and decency. Aerial might is playing a vital role in the onward march of the forces of democracy Our task is to service the airway to Alaska and the North Pacific theater of war; that is our mission. Never must we lose sight of the fact that the Alaska Highway, basically, was developed as an overland route to link aircraft landing areas and not, as generally supposed, an out-and-out truck supply route. The main purposes of this first land route to Alaska are two: (1) To supply, supplement, and anchor the air route to the North Pacific; and (2) to provide an alternative route to Alaska in case control of the sea should be endangered. I have been more than pleased to note a recent statement by Gen. Henry H. Arnold, commanding general of the Army Air Forces, that the highway is filling well its intended role.

This is our first anniversary. I think we must give thanks to the Almighty for the progress we have been allowed to make. On our second anniversary I am sure the strides will be much longer. And in the distant years to come, I feel certain that we all will take pride and satisfaction from our participation in a historic and pioneer undertaking. There can be no nobler measure of achievement, for inner satisfaction which survives the test of years is its own reward.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] is recognized for 7 minutes.

THE SECOND BARUCH REPORT

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, it has not been my privilege to see and examine the second Baruch report which has just been announced. However, from the portions of it which have appeared in the press I feel that it is, in general, a very good report, and it is a step which should have been taken much earlier. Had a report of this kind been made months ago when many Members of Congress were urging the President to authorize the step we would not be in the chaotic state of affairs that involves the problem covered by the report.

To the suggestion that the Government set the example by cleaning house and eliminating labor hoarding, and restrict oppressive red tape and questionnaires that breaks the back of the management, I am in full accord.

Without having given a detailed study of the report I can see no good reason to disagree with the suggestion that a method of contract fees be established which would remove the inclination or necessity to hoard labor; the assurance of a uniform contract cancelation policy is wholesome, and a post-war thinking policy for employers and employees is entirely sound and constructive. It is my belief that the report's approach to

consideration of national service legislation is logical, and I certainly agree that whatever manpower program may be adopted cannot succeed without community support. That suggestion is, of course, in direct conflict with the administration attitude of compulsion.

I cannot, however, agree with the conclusion reached that the farms have been made a "draft dodgers haven", and that our farmers hoard labor. The committee must have overlooked Indiana in this part of the survey. I have just returned from several weeks stay at home, and if any farmers in my district are hoarding labor I do not know where they are hiding it. There is no available farm labor to be found. If more strict standards are fixed for farm deferment we will not have any farmers.

The suggestion that we are building up an oversupply of much war material deserves further investigation. An investigation into material hoarded by the military, and also to include all Government procurement agencies would produce some startling revelations.

The Corps of Army Engineers, for instance, might be induced to proceed with a plan which was once considered, but very mysteriously rejected, to release 500,000 coils of barbed wire, which is approximately one-half of the supply on hand, for use by farmers and ranchers. That same organization might also make available for civilian use quite a quantity of nails from the 600 carloads—6,000,000 pounds—hidden away in depots over the country. And it might also aid in solving the storage headache which resulted from a mistake in requisitioning 8,800 gallons of bituminous mulch paint that resulted in the Army purchasing 8,800 barrels, or 440,000 gallons, that cost a proportionate excess in dollars. That excess bituminous material could be used to a great advantage in many civilian needs.

If this war should last for 25 years, the Government has on hand enough of many items to last for the duration without another unit being produced. Now is the time to utilize the excess supplies held by the Government. The period of transition of industry and labor from war to peacetime production will bring enough grief without the Government then unloading its excesses upon the market.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] is recognized for 7 minutes.

THE PROBLEMS BEFORE CONGRESS

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, "Even a fool when he holdeth his peace is counted wise." Perhaps I had better hold my peace at this moment, as I dislike to put a discordant note into the proceedings of the day. However, we have just returned from our people and we have many messages for the administration. There are many subjects that should be debated and disposed of at once. We should not have adjourned over until Friday. I regret to file this objection, but this is our particular forum. I cannot, of course, blame the leadership for not wanting the policies of the administration discussed and criticized, but they are only putting off for a few days a veritable torrent of complaints of the inefficiencies of our present bureaucratic Government.

I have had many problems put up to me that I should like to discuss with the Members and learn their viewpoints. My people would like to know what the feeling in Congress is about many important questions, but until Friday our mouths are to be closed, even when the newspapers have told our people that the drafting of fathers, for instance, would be acted upon promptly. Now, even that matter has been shoved aside except as it may be discussed before a committee. It would be helpful if Members could take the floor and tell how their people feel about it. We all know that is a matter of very great interest and concern at this particular time. Our people are aroused. I am extremely concerned. If I could debate the subject with you, you would be helpful to me in making my decision.

I want my people to know that I am definitely opposed to the further drafting of fathers until it can be shown to me that they are absolutely needed, and the military must now show real necessity. I think it is now time that the military authorities be questioned regarding many phases of activity. I have been most careful to refrain heretofore. Certainly we have given them about everything they have asked for. The time has now arrived, under the recent developments, where we may well ask whether the Army is not too large already for the civilian ability to supply it.

I express myself as disappointed that we should have adjourned until Friday and that this matter could not have been fully aired from the floor. I dislike to think that democracy may be again declared to be inefficient because of its slowness in performance. There should be quick action. The people have been led to believe that prompt action would be taken.

I wanted to argue other problems with you. I wanted to take up the renegotiation legislation pending and the situation existing in critical labor-shortage areas, and whether the rulings made by the War Manpower Commission have been wisely made. Many areas fear that business is to be taken away from them.

We should discuss many of the doings of this administration. I want to be critical only to be helpful. I want the administration to hear through you from the Nation. I suppose that I must cheerfully adhere to the decision of the leadership of the House, but I do greatly regret that we shall have to adjourn until Friday and that this forum will not be open to us.

We are back here, most of us with little to do except our office work, when we wish to report the demands of our people. We were sent home to learn of their problems.

I hope that is not too discordant a note. I trust the leadership will not take it as too much criticism. But it seems that the party in power usually attempts to adjourn immediately after Congress meets to the end that the minority may have little opportunity to criticize or complain. I have many problems that annoy my people. So have you. We would like to argue them.

I repeat, "A fool when he holdeth his peace is counted wise." However, this does not console me much.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WALTER LIPPMANN'S ATTACK ON CORDELL HULL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein excerpts from a speech of Secretary Cordell Hull, and also excerpts from an attack on him by Walter Lippmann.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in today's paper Walter Lippmann, the chief propagandist for an alien-minded group in this country, presumes to attack Hon. Cordell Hull, the Secretary of State, because Mr. Hull did not go far enough in his recent speech to suit those interventionists who want to meddle in the internal affairs of every other country in the world after this war is over, and incidentally give others the right to meddle in our internal affairs.

There are three different positions on foreign affairs. There are what some call isolationists, a term we Democrats used to apply to the high-tariff Republicans because they were excluding foreign trade. There are what they call the internationalists, of which Secretary Hull is the outstanding exponent. They believe in cooperating to maintain peace among the nations of the earth.

Then there are the interventionists, of which Walter Lippmann and his ilk are fair examples, who want to intervene in the internal affairs of every other nation in the world in order to protect certain activities of individuals or enterprises that tend to bring about local disturbances in those areas.

Let me say in the beginning that I served with Cordell Hull in this House for 8 years. He is my friend and I am his. I think he is the outstanding man connected with this administration, and has been so for these 10 years.

Now, understand this: I have never gone back on, and I do not think Secretary Hull has ever repudiated, the fundamental doctrine laid down by Thomas Jefferson on foreign affairs when he said it should be that of "peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, with entangling alliances with none."

Secretary Hull the night before last made this statement:

> The foreign policy of any country must be expressive of that country's fundamental national interest.

Does any red-blooded American disagree with that statement?

He goes on to say:

> No country can keep faith with itself unless that is so.

Do any of you take issue with that contention? Do you think our men in the armed forces would question that?

In determining our foreign policy—

He says—

we must first see clearly what our true national interests are. We must also bear in mind that other countries with which we deal in the conduct of foreign relations have their national interests, which, of course, determine their policies.

Does any real statesman on earth take issue with that statement? Continuing, he says:

Obviously there are between friendly nations differences as regards their respective means and purposes and as regards the means of attaining them, but there are also many areas of common interest. By cooperating within those areas the nations not only can advance more effectively the aims and purposes which they have in common but can also find increased opportunity to reconcile by peaceful means, to mutual advantage, such differences as may exist among them.

I have not time to read the entire speech of Mr. Hull, but I shall offer it for the RECORD; and I submit that in his statement night before last he went just as far as the American people would want to go at this time in formulating an international policy. Yet today we find this Walter Lippmann, who is keenly exercised about the sale of his own book, attacking Secretary Hull, in my opinion, in the most sinister manner; and if you will read their two statements, you will find the difference I have mentioned. Here is the crux of the whole trouble: Mr. Lippmann says:

If the global generalities—

He refers to Mr. Hull's speech as generalities; he probably wanted him to name time, place, and individuals—

If the global generalities truly reflect our foreign policy, he will reach a very different practical solution of the problem of relief.

Are we going to embark upon a policy of administering relief to the rest of the world? Have not we had enough of that experiment at home? We are for winning this war. There is not a more ardent advocate of winning the war than Cordell Hull; but we are not for setting out on an international relief expedition and attempting to feed and clothe everyone from Singapore to Timbuktu when the war is over.

The next one he mentions is "rehabilitation." Rehabilitating what? Is it the job of America to go out and rehabilitate the world? Had we not better look to the rehabilitation of our own people, and of our 10,000,000 servicemen when they come come? I am for rehabilitating them first.

Next he mentions "reconstruction." If that thought is not a nightmare to northern Republicans, it certainly is one to southern Democrats, because you tried to "reconstruct" us once, and of all the miserable messes ever made we all admit today that it was made then. It not only was a miserable failure but it engendered hatred that lasted for generations.

Next he said—and here is the milk of the coconut—the "restoration of finances and commerce." Whose finances are we going to restore? Whose finances does Mr. Lippmann want us to restore? That is not what our boys are fighting and dying for in Italy. That is not what our boys are fighting and dying for on Guadalcanal. They are fighting for victory, to overthrow dictators, to bring a cessation of hostilities, and restore the peace of mankind, and not the "restoration of finances and commerce" throughout the world.

Another one is "future shipping and civilian aviation," and the last one is "raw materials."

If you will take those statements and analyze them carefully you will find the differences between the statesmanship of Cordell Hull and the carping criticisms of Walter Lippmann, who would have us intervene in the internal affairs of other countries.

I take the position, and I so expressed myself at home, as I have done here, that we are for fighting this war to a victorious conclusion, and when it is over we are willing to join the other nations of the earth in enforcing international law, and guaranteeing the freedom of the seas; but we are not for intervening in the internal affairs of every nation of the world, nor are we for policing every money-changer who wants to exploit the finances of some other section of the world, or every oil magnate who wants to develop an oil field anywhere in the world, or the steel company that wants to exploit the manganese of some foreign territory, or a rubber concern that wants to plunder the rubber plantations of the Orient.

I say that Cordell Hull in his statement went just as far as the American people would have him go in laying down our foreign policy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LANE (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. STEVENSON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, as a further mark of respect to our deceased colleague, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.), the House, pursuant to its order heretofore entered, adjourned until Friday, September 17, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

569. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 18, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a beach erosion study, Long Beach, Calif., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, and an act approved on June 26, 1936; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

570. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved on January 21, 1927, section 10 of the Flood Control Act approved on May 15, 1928, and other authorizations, a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 2, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, containing a general plan for the improvement of Muskingum River and its tributaries, Ohio, for the purposes of navigation and efficient development of its water power, the control of floods, and the needs of irrigation (H. Doc. No. 251); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with 13 illustrations.

571. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting, in accordance with the provisions of section 11 of the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943 (Public Law No. 49), approved May 7, 1943, and Bureau of the Budget Circular No. 421, copies of estimates of personnel requirements covering the quarter ending September 30, 1943, for the bureaus and offices of the Department of the Interior as called for by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

572. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, in accordance with Public Law No. 49 and Budget Circular No. 421, its quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the first quarter of the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

573. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to the provisions of section 11, Public Law No. 49, one set of the Commission's requests for personnel for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944, which was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget in accordance with Budget Circular No. 421; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

574. A letter from the Director, War Relocation Authority, transmitting a copy of the Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements, Bureau of the Budget Form No. 80–R001, for the first quarter of fiscal year 1944, required by the Bureau of the Budget in accordance with Public Law No. 49; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

575. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to section 11 of title 49, copies of reports to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, relative to determining the number of employees required by the various units of the Department of Justice for the proper and efficient exercise of its functions for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

576. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a supplement to its quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the first quarter of the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1943, submitted on July 12, 1943, in accordance with Public Law No. 49 and Budget Circular No. 421; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

577. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, as required by section 11 of the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943 (Public Law No. 49), statements in connection with the personnel requirements of the Federal Communications Commission for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

578. A letter from the Office for Emergency Management, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, transmitting, in accordance with the requirements of section 11 of the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943 (Public Law No. 49),

copy of the estimate of the number of employees required by this Office during the period ending September 30, 1943, as submitted to the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

579. A letter from the Third Vice President, Panama Railroad Company, transmitting, as required under section 11 of the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943 (Public Law No. 49), approved May 7, 1943, on behalf of the United States offices of the Panama Railroad Company, Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements, for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

580. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of War Information, transmitting, in accordance with instructions in the Bureau of the Budget Circular No. 421, a copy of the Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

582. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, as required by the provisions of section 11 of Public Law No. 49 (78th Cong.), copy of the report submitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to the personnel requirements of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

583. A letter from the Administrator, National Housing Agency, transmitting, in accordance with the requirements of the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943 (Public Law No. 49), copies of the requests for personnel needs during the first quarter of fiscal 1944 as placed before the Bureau of the Budget on July 1; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

584. A letter from the clerk, United States Office of the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, transmitting, in accordance with Budget Bureau Circular No. 421, dated May 31, 1943, Form 80-R001, Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements, and Civil Service Form 3257, Report of Federal Civilian Employment, for the month of June 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

585. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943, a copy of the Quarterly Estimate of the Personnel Requirements of the Federal Trade Commission for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

586. A letter from the Assistant Director, Office of Strategic Services, transmitting in compliance with the provisions of section 11, Public Law No. 49, approved May 7, 1943, and in accordance with instructions issued by the Bureau of the Budget, a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of Strategic Services; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

587. A letter from the Director, the Office of Defense Transportation, transmitting in accordance with Bureau of the Budget Circular No. 421 dated May 21, 1943, one copy of Budget Bureau Form Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

588. A letter from the Office for Emergency Management, Director of War Mobilization, transmitting Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements of the Office of War Mobilization for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

589. A letter from the Office for Emergency Management, Director of Economic Stabilization, transmitting Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements of the Office of Economic Stabilization for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

590. A letter from the Office for Emergency Management, Director, Division of Central Administrative Services, transmitting Quarterly Estimates of Personnel Requirements of the Division of Central Administrative Services for the quarter ending September 30, 1943—separate estimates are submitted for employees whose salaries are payable from the pending appropriations for Salaries and Expenses and Working Capital Fund; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

591. A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the President, transmitting in accordance with Public Law No. 49, the Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements of the Liaison Office for Personnel Management for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

592. A letter from the Executive Office of the President, Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting pursuant to the provisions of Public Law No. 49, Seventy-eighth Congress, an estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending September 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

593. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting in compliance with section 11 of Public Law No. 49, information, as required by the Bureau of the Budget, which specifies the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the Department of Labor and its bureaus, for the quarter beginning July 1; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

594. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from this Department to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, together with forms executed by various bureaus, offices, and divisions of this Department, reflecting the number of employees estimated to be required during the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944 for the proper and efficient exercise of their respective functions, referring to section 11 of Public Law No. 49, Seventy-eighth Congress, and in compliance with instructions from the Bureau of the Budget, contained in Budget Bureau Circular No. 421, dated May 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

595. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting pursuant to the provisions of the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1944, approved July 1, 1943, a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from January 1, 1943, to July 1, 1943, under the appropriation "Compensation of Special Attorneys, etc., Department of Justice"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

596. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the execution of leases in behalf of Indians serving in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

597. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York certain lands within the Brooklyn Navy Yard in the city of New York; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

598. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

599. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of lands acquired for naval uses covering the period from January 1 to June 30, 1943, pursuant to the requirements of Public Law No. 420, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session; Public Law No. 440, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session; Public Law No. 499, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session; and Public Law No. 528, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

600. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to establish the grades of commissioned warrant officer and warrant officer in the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

601. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, in accordance with the provisions of section 2 (d) of Public Law No. 46, Seventy-seventh Congress, report of contracts entered into or modified under authority of Public Law No. 46 for the period beginning April 1 and ending June 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

602. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

603. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

604. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certified volume comprising the acts of the third regular session of the Fifteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, February 8 to April 15, 1943; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

605. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a letter from the Ambassador of Cuba with regard to a resolution of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Cuba to the effect that there shall be called in the House of Representatives of the Republic of Cuba, a solemn session, on each April 14, beginning with the year 1944, to celebrate the Day of the Americas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

606. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide aid to dependent children in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

607. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength, approved June 3, 1942 (56 Stat. 306)"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

608. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a copy of the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

609. A letter from the Chairman, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting the thirtieth annual report of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

610. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 108 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

611. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 20, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Boyer River, Iowa, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 28, 1937; to the Committee on Flood Control.

612. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 14, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustration, on a review of reports on Racine Harbor, Wis., re-

quested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on March 24, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 255); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

613. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 26, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Nishnabotna River, Iowa and Mo., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 253); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

614. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 29, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Knife River and its tributaries, North Dakota, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 11, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 252); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

615. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 29, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Delaware River and its tributaries at, and in the vicinity of, Morrisville, Bucks County, Pa., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 11, 1939; to the Committee on Flood Control.

616. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 13, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Stillaguamish River, Wash., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

617. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 29, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Flint Creek and its branches, Morgan County, Ala., authorized by the Flood Control Acts approved on April 15, 1932, and June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

618. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 29, 1943, submitting a report, together with the accompanying papers and illustrations on the study of beach erosion on the south shore of Cape Cod, Mass., made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act, approved on July 3, 1930, and an act of Congress approved on June 26, 1936; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

619. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 14, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives adopted on September 12, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

620. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 29, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Soldier River, Iowa, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Flood Control.

621. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 20, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Milwaukee River and tributaries, Wisconsin, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Flood Control.

622. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 20, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of streams in Davis County, Utah, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Flood Control.

623. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 14, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Ogdensburg Harbor, N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 8, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

624. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 21, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Vermilion Harbor, Ohio, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives adopted on June 16, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

625. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 18, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a beach erosion study of a portion of the shore of Hancock County, Miss., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, and an act of Congress approved on June 26, 1936; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

626. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 29, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a preliminary examination of Mimbres River and tributaries, New Mexico, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Flood Control.

627. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting the twenty-second Annual Report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

628. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting statements of the cost of manufacture at the armory and arsenals named therein for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

629. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a list of persons commissioned without prior military service for the period June 1, 1943, to July 31, 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

630. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of May 27, 1908, as amended, authorizing settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

631. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the setting aside of convictions of Federal offenders who have been placed on probation and have fully complied with the conditions of their probation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

632. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to permit the granting of beverage licenses in the District of Columbia to service clubs of other nations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

633. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to extend the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, in connection with the public lands, to certain persons serving in the merchant marine and to certain civilian workmen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

634. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

635. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

636. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Civilian Defense, transmitting copies of Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements for the quarter ending September 30, 1943, covering regular operations of the Office of Civilian Defense and its prospective property program as submitted to the Bureau of the Budget in accordance with Public Law No. 49 and Budget Circular No. 421; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

637. A letter from the Superintendent, National Park Service, United States Department of the Interior, transmitting report of Federal Civilian Employment for the Executive Mansion and Grounds for the month of July 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

638. A letter from the Chairman, War Shipping Administration and United States Maritime Commission, transmitting copies of his letters of August 9, August 10, and August 12, 1943, with attachments, to the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting revised quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for the period ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

639. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a copy of amendment No. 1 covering the personnel requirements of The National Archives for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

640. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a copy of material supplied to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, setting forth the estimate of the personnel requirements of the War Department for overhead purposes in the continental United States, for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

641. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a copy of the information furnished the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for the purpose of making a determination of the Veterans' Administration personnel requirements for the first quarter of the 1944 fiscal year; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

642. A letter from the Acting Deputy Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting a revised quarterly estimate of personnel requirements (Budget Bureau Form No. 80–R001), in accordance with the provisions of Public Law No. 49; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

643. A letter from the Director, Committee for Congested Production Areas, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements for the Committee for Congested Production Areas for the quarter ending

September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

644. A letter from the Director, Division of Administrative Management, National War Labor Board, transmitting a quarterly estimate of the personnel requirements of the National War Labor Board for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944—these estimates represent revisions of those forwarded July 1, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

645. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting copies of letters dated August 2 and August 3, 1943, addressed to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget requesting an amendment in the personnel limitation for the Veterans' Administration during the first quarter of the current fiscal year; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

646. A letter from the Associate Director, United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, transmitting a copy of Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements for the quarter ending September 30, 1943, covering the appropriation "Maintenance, Executive Mansion and Grounds" as provided in Independent Offices Appropriation Act, approved June 26, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

647. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of United States Civil Service Commission Form No. 3257 giving the employment statistics of the various bureaus of the Department of the Interior, together with a summary, for the month of June 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

648. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Victor H. Loftus, disbursing clerk, American Embassy, Mexico, D. F., Mexico; to the Committee on Claims.

649. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the leasing of Indian lands for business and other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

650. A letter from the Administrative Officer, the White House, transmitting the Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements for the White House Office as required by Public Law No. 49 and Budget Circular No. 421, amending the estimate transmitted with letter under date of July 1, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

651. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation made pursuant to the appropriation act of July 2, 1942 (Public Law 644, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

652. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report and recommendation concerning the claim of Lt. Col. Charles H. Morhouse, Medical Corps, United States Army, against the United States; to the Committee on War Claims.

653. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of the R. B. Walker Funeral Home; to the Committee on Claims.

654. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to further amend the act of February 14, 1931, relating to allowances for travel by automobile; to permit of allowances for transportation in excess of minimum first-class accommodations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

655. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 14 of the act entitled "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from the District Training School and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, and to amend section 15 thereof, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

656. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide uniform allowances for the transportation of civilian officers and employees, their families, and effects, upon permanent transfer from one official station to another or from one Federal agency to another; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

657. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

658. A letter from the Director, the Office of Censorship, transmitting a revised statement of personnel limitations for the Office of Censorship for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

659. A letter from the Secretary, United States Employees' Compensation Commission, transmitting copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements presented to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

660. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a copy of letter dated August 19, 1943, addressed to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget requesting an amendment in the personnel limitation for the Veterans' Administration during the first quarter of the current fiscal year; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

661. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of United States Civil Service Commission Form 3257 giving the employment statistics of the various bureaus of the Department of the Interior, together with a summary, for the month of July 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

662. A letter from the Administrator, National Housing Agency, transmitting copies of the Civil Service Commission Form 3257 for the months of June and July; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

663. A letter from the Director, Division of Administrative Management, National War Labor Board, transmitting revised Forms 80-R001, Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements, for the Disputes Divisions, the Divisions of Administrative Management, and the summary of the various divisions of the National War Labor Board; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

664. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, under the provisions of section 2 of Public Law No. 779, Seventy-seventh Congress, report covering the period from the date of approval of the act (December 1, 1942) to the end of the first fiscal year (June 30, 1943); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

665. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the report covering its operations for the period from the organization of the Corporation on February 2, 1932, to June 30, 1943, inclusive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

666. A letter from the Director, Office of War Information, transmitting a copy of the Office of War Information request to the Bureau of the Budget for a revision in personnel ceilings for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

667. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the second paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

668. A letter from the Director, Office of War Information, transmitting a revised copy of Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements, which was originally submitted under date of July 21, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

669. A letter from the Administrative Officer, Office of Defense Transportation, transmitting a copy of Budget Bureau No. 80-R001 which has been prepared relative to the personnel ceiling for the first quarter of the 1944 fiscal year, pertaining to similar form transmitted on July 20, 1943, which has been revised; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

670. A letter from the Director, Office for Emergency Management, Division of Central Administrative Services, transmitting copies of revised Quarterly Estimates of Personnel Requirements of the Division of Central Administrative Services for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

671. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend title IX of the act of March 27, 1942, Seventy-seventh Congress, entitled "An act to further expedite the prosecution of the war," by adding a new section thereto providing free postage under certain conditions for persons serving in the armed forces of any foreign country with which the United States may be associated in the prosecution of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

672. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting pursuant to the act of April 10, 1928 (45 Stat. 413), report and recommendation concerning the claim of Harry L. Smith against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

673. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting a revised quarterly estimate of personnel requirements of the National Labor Relations Board for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

674. A letter from the President, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting, as requested in Budget Circular No. 421, and in accordance with Public Law No. 49, Seventy-eighth Congress, a copy of letters of July 6, July 13, and July 31, addressed to the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

675. A letter from the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, transmitting his final report covering the period May 1937 through August 23, 1943, the expiration date of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

676. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the summary report of the exercise by the Navy Department of the authority granted in the basic law, pursuant to the provision of section 2, Public Law No. 779, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

677. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 86 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

678. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 13, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Snohomish River, Mason County, Wash., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 11, 1939; to the Committee on Flood Control.

679. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting revised copies of statements in connection with the personnel requirements of the Federal Communications Commission for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944, as required by section 11 of the War Overtime

Pay Act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

680. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of a survey of the Little Sioux River watershed in Iowa and Minnesota, pursuant to the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

681. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of a survey of the Potomac River drainage basin in Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, pursuant to the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

682. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of a survey of the Middle Colorado River watershed in Texas, pursuant to the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

683. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 172 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

684. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 17, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on the cooperative beach erosion study at Niagara County, N. Y., made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, and an act of Congress approved on June 26, 1936; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

685. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a copy of a letter addressed to Hon. Harold D. Smith, Director, Bureau of the Budget, certifying that the Post Office Department is within the quota set by that Bureau under dates of July 29 and August 25, 1943, for each of the appropriation units involved; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

686. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting a second list of registrants who have been deferred because of their employment in or under the Federal Government as of June 15, 1943, in accordance with the provisions of subsection C of Public Law No. 23, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved April 8, 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

687. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting reports on War Department contracts, in excess of $150,000, let during fiscal year 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

688. A letter from Alfred Tawresey, captain, United States Navy, transmitting report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of service, with special qualifications therefor, of each person commissioned from civilian life in the Navy from May 30, 1943, to July 29, 1943, and in the Marine Corps and Coast Guard from June 1 to July 31, 1943; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

689. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting a supplementary list of registrants who have been deferred because of their employment in or under the Federal Government as of June 15, 1943, in accordance with the provisions of subsection C of Public Law No. 23, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved April 8, 1943 (list prepared from reports submitted in the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

690. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting the third monthly list of registrants who have been deferred because of their employment in or under Federal Government as of July 15, 1943 (list prepared from reports submitted in the continental United States and the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

691. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated April 3, 1943, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Pensacola Harbor, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

692. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated March 18, 1943, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers on a preliminary examination and survey of Miami River and tributaries, Ohio, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Flood Control.

693. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting an interim report dated October 26, 1942, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Detroit River, Mich., concerning only that portion known as the American Channel north of Belle Isle, between Windmill Point and Fairview Slip, Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

694. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to limit compensation for services in connection with certain claims against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

695. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to implement the jurisdiction of service courts of friendly foreign forces within the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

696. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a second revised form of quarterly estimate of personnel requirements, for "Salaries and expenses, community war services," for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; also some revised quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for the Public Health Service for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

697. A letter from the Assistant Superintendent, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting report of Federal Civilian Employment for the Executive Mansion and Grounds for the month of August 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

698. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting information forwarded to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, showing the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of various constituent organizations of the Federal Security Agency; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

699. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act approved January 16, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United States Naval Academy;" to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

700. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Fourth Quarterly Report of the United States Commissioner of Education on the Education and Training of Defense Workers, covering the period beginning April 1, 1943, and ending June 30, 1943; to the Committee on Appropriations.

701. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report covering activities under the Federal aid to wildlife-restoration fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943; to the Committee on Agriculture.

702. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

703. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

704. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of Resolution No. 35, to provide for the construction of post-war plans for the Virgin Islands, which was passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John on March 27, 1943; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

705. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a detailed statement of receipts and expenditures for St. Elizabeths Hospital for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

706. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $250,000 (H. Doc. No. 265); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

707. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 4, 1943, forwarding a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of the Ohio River and its tributaries for pollution control, authorized by section 5 of the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 266); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 312. A bill for the relief of Freda Utley; without amendment (Rept. No. 700). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2131. A bill for the relief of Henry Angell; without amendment (Rept. No. 701). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2509. A bill for the relief of Marie Engert; without amendment (Rept. No. 702). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2902. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William Leo; without amendment (Rept. No. 703). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3115) granting a pension to Mrs. Julia Hinton, and the same was referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 3196. A bill to provide insignia for persons discharged from the armed forces of the United States because of disabilities not

due to their own misconduct; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3197. A bill to make title VIII of Public Law 753 of the Seventy-seventh Congress entitled "Renegotiation of War Contracts," as amended, inoperative as to future war contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3198. A bill to prohibit unauthorized agreements with foreign nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 3199. A bill to authorize the appropriation, for expenditure by the Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Operations, of certain amounts received from services of conscientious objectors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 3200. A bill to provide certain benefits for members of the armed forces upon their discharge or release from active duty, to provide for the use and disposition of surplus war property in the interests of small business enterprises of veterans and others, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 3201. A bill providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy of certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 3202. A bill providing for the deferment of fathers until certain prisoners have been inducted; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEIDINGER:

H. R. 3203. A bill to prohibit the fixing of a maximum price of less than $2 per barrel on crude petroleum; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 3204. A bill to establish and provide for a system of old-age and survivors insurance for employees of religious, charitable, educational, and certain other organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 3205. A bill to provide for the deferment of fathers from training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 3206. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3207. A bill to provide for the inspection and registration of bicycles in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3208. A bill to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3209. A bill authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 3210. A bill to extend to certain civilians abroad the provisions of law prescribing a special method for voting now applicable to members of the armed forces in time of war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 3211. A bill relating to the induction of registrants who applied and who were accepted for induction and assigned to educational institutions for special and technical training under the provisions of the act approved August 31, 1918, but whose induction without fault of their own was not completed; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution to provide for the temporary admission into the United States of political or religious refugees from the Axis Nations; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 300. Resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the manuscript entitled "Handbook for Servicemen and Servicewomen, World War II, and Their Dependents", as a public document, and providing for additional copies thereof; to the Committee on Printing.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution relative to paying of taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution relative to the income-tax law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution relative to taxes on incomes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Deputies of Peru, relative to the Independence Day and definite triumph over the German-Italian-Japanese triumvirate; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to limit the term of the President of the United States to not more than two consecutive terms; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take necessary steps to remove restrictions on corn acreage and to encourage an expanded production of corn; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish a republic of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Dodecanesian Unions in Egypt, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that the ardent desire of the inhabitants of the Dodecanese is to be united with their motherland, Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with a report on rent control in the city and county of Honolulu, T. H., to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Republic of Costa Rica, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with a cordial sympathy and continental solidarity to the House of Representatives of the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish the independence of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 3212 (by request). A bill for the relief of Amelia A. Mannshardt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 3213. A bill for the relief of Ludwig Bial, Grete Bial, Ernest Bial, and Ottilie Bail; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 3214. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3215. A bill granting an increase of pension to Forrest E. Andrews; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 3216. A bill granting an increase of pension to Frances A. Bruce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3217. A bill for the relief of Claribel Moore; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3218. A bill for the relief of Enid M. Albertson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3219. A bill providing for the payment to Yatie Fowler of money due on account of Civil War service of her grandfather, George W. Allison; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3220. A bill granting an increase of pension to Catherine J. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 3221. A bill for the relief of Ponogetis Vassilliou; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 3222. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret McWilliams; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2108. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Dominic Streff and other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2109. Also petition of Thomas V. Carrens, president, U. A. W. A., C. I. O., Local 936, St. Louis, Mo., and other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2802, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2110. Also petition of Joseph Langen and other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2111. Also petition of Wolff Tober Shoe Co. and other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2112. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Hiesler and other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to

enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2113. Also petition of George W. Kutter and other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2114. Also petition of Robert W. Cutty and other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2115. Also petition of H. McCormmick and other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2116. Also petition of Herman Stamm and other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2117. Also petition of William M. Yates and other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2118. By Mr. LYNCH: Resolution of the Board of Aldermen of the City of Burlington, Vt., supporting legislation to provide for a ship canal between deep water in Hudson River at Albany, N. Y., and deep water at Crown Point, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2119. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 47 members and adherents of the United Presbyterian Church of New Bedford, Pa., requesting the passage of all bills now before the House to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages, to ban beer and liquor sales at military and naval centers, to make it unlawful to furnish alcoholic beverages to anyone in uniform, and to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of all alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2120. By Mr. TARVER: Petition of Mrs. A. Barton and 93 other citizens of Rome, Ga., requesting the Congress of the United States to enact House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2121. By Mr. SUNDSTROM: Resolution of the Senate of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation to provide municipalities with compensation in lieu of taxes lost by reason of Federal Government acquisition of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2122. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Comité de la Colonie Francaise, San Francisco, Calif., urging upport of House Resolution No. 117 and Senate Resolution No. 100; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2123. Also, resolution of French Hospital, San Francisco, Calif., urging support of House Resolution No. 117 and Senate Resolution No. 100; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2124. Also, resolution of Seminole Tribe No. 54, Improved Order of Redmen, San Francisco, Calif., urging support of House Resolution No. 117 and Senate Resolution No. 100; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2125. Also, resolution of Seminole Council, No. 65, Improved Order of Redmen, San Francisco, Calif., urging support of House Resolution No. 117 and Senate Resolution No. 100; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

2126. Also, resolution of Ligue Henry IV, San Francisco, Calif., urging support of House Resolution No. 117 and Senate Resolution No. 100; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2127. Also, resolution of French war relief fund, French War Veterans, San Francisco, Calif., relative to urging support of House Resolution No. 117 and Senate Resolution No. 100; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2128. Also, resolution of Les Anciens Combattants Francais de la Grande Guerre, San Francisco, Calif., urging support of House Resolution No. 117 and Senate Resolution No. 100; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2129. Also, resolution of Le Courrier du Pacifique, San Francisco, Calif., urging support of House Resolution No. 117 and Senate Resolution No. 100; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2130. Also, resolution of Alliance Française, San Francisco, Calif., urging support of House Resolution No. 117 and Senate Resolution No. 100; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2131. Also, resolution of Les Chasseurs, Inc., San Francisco, Calif., urging support of House Resolution No. 117 and Senate Resolution No. 100; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2132. Also, resolution of Franco-American Lodge No. 207, I. O. O. F., San Francisco, Calif., urging support of House Resolution No. 117 and Senate Resolution No. 100; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2133. Also, resolution of French Laundry Owners' Association, Inc., San Francisco, Calif., urging support of House Resolution No. 117 and Senate Resolution No. 100; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2134. Also, resolution of La Auloise, San Francisco, Calif., urging support of House Resolution No. 117 and Senate Resolution No. 100; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2135. Also, resolution of S. F. French Athletic Club, urging support of House Resolution No. 117 and Senate Resolution No. 100; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2136. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of C. A. Schafer and other residents of Wheeling, W. Va., and vicinity, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2137. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Karl F. Cady and sundry residents of Attleboro, Mass, urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2138. My Mr. MICHENER: Petition signed by Charles Gilson, Wells Road, Maybee, Mich., and 16 other residents of that community, urging the enactment of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2139. By Mr. HOPE: Petition relative to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2140. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Women's Auxiliary of the National Maritime Union of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the roll-back-the-prices order of the President; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2141. Also, petition of the Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation, New York State, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to renegotiations of contracts and their effect on State tax revenues; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2141. Also, petition of the Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation, State of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to New Jersey Canal project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2143. Also, petition of the members of the First Church of the Nazarene, Austin, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2144. Also, petition of the Henry George legislative committee, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to land value taxation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2145. Also, petition of the director, the Urban Land Institute, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 1163; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2146. Also, petition of the president, Mining and Metallurgical Society of America, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to post-war policy for the mineral industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2147. Also, petition of the chairman, Municipal Council, St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., St. Thomas, V. I., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to benefits of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2148. Also, petition of Francis Jean Reuter, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to petition 221, Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on ne Judiciary.

2149. Also, petition of Francis Jean Reuter, of Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to petition No. 221, Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2150. Also, petition of Francis Jea Reuter, of Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to petition No. 221, Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2151. Also, petition of the City Council of Dearborn, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to payment by the Federal Government of a service charge equivalent to the amount of tax that would be paid as if the plants and machinery were the property of a private enterprise and subject to taxation; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

2152. Also, petition of the American War Dads, Dallas, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the case of Max Stephan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2153. Also, petition of the Texas State Federation of Labor, Austin, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to price control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2154. Also, petition of the executive director, Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to water pollution for the city of Chicago; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2155. Also, petition of the executive secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to prisoners of war as workers on the railways of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2156. Also, petition of the national director, Women's Auxiliary of the National Maritime Union of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the strengthening and building of national unity; to the committee on Military Affairs.

2157. Also, petition of the national secretary, National Maritime Union of America, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the civilian war assistance; to the committee on Appropriations.

2158. Also, petition of the Twenty-third District Townsend Club, Williamsport, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2159 Also, petition of the Automotive Trade Association managers, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to investigation and solution of the current gasoline shortage; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2160. Also, petition of the United Steelworkers of America, Alabama City, Ala., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the cost of living level; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2161. Also, petition of the chairman, Mexican-Kickapoo Indian Tribe of Oklahoma, petitioning consideration of their resolution protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1311; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

2162. Also, petition of the office of the city and county clerk, Honolulu, T. H., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 1163; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who art the hope of all the ends of the earth and the light of all our seeing, help us who grope in the darkness of earth's dim ways to remember that even the shadows themselves are born of light. Lift upon us the light of Thy countenance. Save us from the blighting company of those for whom humanity's wistful longings are but a target for sneers. May we be saved from despair by hope and by faith. Deliver us from political policies which are symptoms of spiritual disease. Even while we are spurred to fight with all our might against a present evil may we also be lured by the vision splendid of a coming good. Give us courage and strength for the vast task of social rebuilding that needs to be dared if life for all men is to be made full and free. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HATCH, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, September 14, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ellender	McNary
Andrews	Ferguson	Maloney
Austin	George	Maybank
Bali	Gillette	Millikin
Bankhead	Green	Moore
Barbour	Guffey	Murray
Barkley	Gurney	Overton
Bridges	Hatch	Radcliffe
Butler	Hawkes	Revercomb
Capper	Hill	Reynolds
Caraway	Holman	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Clark, Idaho	Kilgore	Taft
Clark, Mo.	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Danaher	McCarran	Tobey
Davis	McClellan	Truman
Downey	McFarland	Tunnell
Eastland	McKellar	Tydings
Vandenberg	Wallgren	White
Van Nuys	Walsh	Wiley
Wagner	Wheeler	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent as members of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is detained on official business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent as members of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HARRY E. PRATT TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF ALASKA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing of the committee will be held on the morning of September 22, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Harry E. Pratt, of Alaska, to be United States district judge, division No. 4, district of Alaska. At that time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make representations to the committee.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ELLEN K. RAEDY TO BE ASSOCIATE JUDGE, MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing of the committee will be held on the morning of September 22, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Ellen K. Raedy, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia. At that time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make representations to the committee.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF GUY T. HELVERING TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, KANSAS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing of the committee will be held on the morning of September 22, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Guy T. Helvering, of the State of Kansas, to be United States district judge for the district of Kansas. At that time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make representations to the committee.

CONTROL AND REGULATION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC TO REDUCE ABSENTEEISM—PETITION

Mr. ANDREWS presented the petition of the president and members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Green Cove Springs, Fla., which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached thereto, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

To reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization, we, the undersigned citizens of the State of Florida, petition the Congress of the United States to pass the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) introduced by Hon. JOSEPH BRYSON, of South Carolina.

RESOLUTION BY WOMAN'S MISSIONARY SOCIETY, EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN AUGUSTANA SYNOD, WICHITA, KANS., IN OPPOSITION TO THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, copy of a resolution recently adopted by the Woman's Missionary Society of the Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod of Wichita, Kans., reaffirming its traditional opposition to the liquor traffic and calling upon public officials, local, State, and national, to drastically curb such activities. I share wholeheartedly the convictions of these people on this subject.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas our Nation is at war and the strength of our entire Nation must be rallied; and

Whereas we are faced with such a serious wave of juvenile delinquency; and

Whereas we need all manpower possible in this crisis, on the farms and in the factories; and

Whereas absenteeism is seriously hindering our production of the materials of war in our munition plants and shipyards; and

Whereas our armed forces must be trained effectively and efficiently; and

Whereas the sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages, including 3.2 beer, constitutes a major factor in handicapping our Nation in our crisis; and

Whereas we are deeply concerned because this traffic and its associated evils is at enmity with everything the church stands for, and as our Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod, with an adult membership of 275,355, has often expressed itself with respect to the use of liquor, and as early as 1875 warned its members against even a moderate use of liquor as it might lead to an immoderate use: Be it

Resolved—

1. That the Woman's Missionary Society of the Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod, with an adult woman membership of 37,611, in annual convention assembled June 5, 1943, at Minneapolis, Minn., reaffirms its traditional opposition to the liquor traffic, including 3.2 beer;

2. That we call upon our public officials, local, State, and National to drastically curb the activities of the liquor and beer traffic;

3. That we specifically and particularly deplore the sale of alcoholic liquors to men and women in the uniform of the United States armed forces and the availability of 3.2 beer, an alcoholic beverage, at the post exchanges;

4. That we urge immediate and effective steps be taken to curb the sale of alcoholic beverages to workers in and near essential industrial plants;

5. That we urge greater efficiency in the apprehension, conviction, and punishment of persons selling alcoholic liquors to minors;

6. That we request the cessation of all advertising of alcoholic beverages by newspaper, magazine, billboard, and radio;

7. That we request the president and secretary of each of our 13 conferences to send a copy of these resolutions to the Senators and Representatives of the States represented in their respective conference;

8. That we, each and severally, use our individual influence and energy toward the accomplishment of the above purpose.

RESOLUTIONS OF HODGEMAN COUNTY (KANS.) FARM BUREAU

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, at this point, resolutions adopted September 7, 1943, by the executive board of the Hodgeman County (Kans.) Farm Bureau. The resolutions were sent to me by Ted N. Rankin, of Jetmore, president of the Hodgeman County Farm Bureau.

The seven points in the resolutions, expressing views of farmers in the Wheat Belt of the Great Plains area, cover the main points in the national farm policy thinking of the farmers in the Wheat Belt. I send the resolutions to the desk for appropriate reference.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK
IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME
ECONOMICS, STATE OF KANSAS,
Jetmore, Kans., September 7, 1943.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senator from Kansas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The executive board of the Hodgeman County Farm Bureau, representing 300 members with farmer interests, wishes to express to you its views on the following policies affecting agriculture:

1. We urge that prices of all agricultural products for domestic consumption be maintained at such levels as to yield parity income—either parity as defined by law or some other definition if a better one can be found.

2. We believe that food subsidies to protect the consumer are not in keeping with the Nation's effort to curb inflation, nor is it needed by the wage earners it is designed to protect.

3. We believe that further drafting of men and boys for the armed services from a rural community such as this one is will only serve to aggravate the food production problem.

4. We urge that proper consideration must be given to the farmers' needs for gasoline, protein supplements, truck and machinery supplies and repair parts, and other farm equipment requirements, if the farmers' continued all-out effort in food production is to be assured.

5. We recommend continuance of the basic provisions of the A. A. A. program, including crop loans, soil conservation features and wheat parity payments. We recommend the continuance of wheat parity payments in lieu of crop insurance.

6. We recommend that rationing programs be used only to effect equitable distribution of essential goods which are of necessity produced in insufficient quantities, and that unnecessary regulations be eliminated as they restrict production.

7. We urge the United States War Savings bonds be continued as nonnegotiable certificates.

Very truly yours,
TED N. RANKIN,
President,
Hodgeman County Farm Bureau.

RESOLUTIONS BY ENGINEERING COMMITTEE OF MISSISSIPPI VALLEY FLOOD CONTROL ASSOCIATION

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred resolutions adopted by the engineering committee of the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association at New Orleans, La., on July 20, 1943, entitled "An Urgent Message to Congress."

These resolutions are the result of a conference of some of the ablest flood-control engineers in the United States of America, and represent clearly and succinctly the flood-control problems in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN URGENT MESSAGE TO CONGRESS

To the Congress of the United States:

The engineering committee of the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, composed of engineers representing every levee district in the valley, adopted the following resolution at its meeting in New Orleans on July 20, 1943:

Fifteen years ago the Congress first became convinced of the national responsibility for control of floods on the Mississippi River and directed the Chief of Engineers to proceed with the construction of protective measures embodied in the Jadwin plan.

The lower valley was then suffering from the shock and despair caused by one of the greatest catastrophes in history. In order to rebuild the morale of the people in the valley and to do things of first importance first, the Corps of Engineers concentrated its efforts on the prevention of periodical inundation by the construction of immense levees, shortening the river by cutting the channel across long narrow points, and the provision of controlled outlets for excess flood waters.

This program, revised from time to time by Congress, with the advice of the Chief of Engineers, has been ably prosecuted, and the completion of the new work contemplated by the 1928 act and its amendments is definitely in sight.

A very different psychology has made itself manifest in these last few years among the valley people; a psychology marked by confidence that the floods will not destroy them again and by renewed courage to work and develop the fertile country in which they dwell.

The program to date, however, has been mainly concerned with furnishing protection from disaster and keeping the channel in usable condition for navigation.

Control of the course of the river itself has not heretofore been the paramount objective. Where the river has attacked its banks, endangering the levee system, it has generally been the policy to set the levee line at that location back from the bank a sufficient distance to insure for a time the defenses from being breached by caving. Setting back of some portions of the levee line which have been enlarged to project dimensions has been found necessary, although the projected protective works have not yet been completed.

The highest ground and best soil in the alluvial valley are invariably found nearest the banks of the river. Setting back of the levees abandons better land to the river every year than the land which is left. Levees built farther back from the river must also be larger and the foundations are generally much worse. Another bad feature of setting back the levees is that the construction of embankments of the size required for adequate protection involves a long period of time, which frequently is not safely available if caving proceeds rapidly.

The only satisfactory final solution to the problem of control of the floods in the Mississippi River lies in the control of the river itself; to keep the river not only within its levees but by means of revetments, channel dredging, and dike construction to keep the river within a fixed channel location. This task, although contemplated by engineers for the past 200 years, is only now possible of achievement.

Great strides have been made in recent years in equipment and methods. We have available today ordnance of sufficient caliber for the battle and an organization which is capable of the design and execution. All that is lacking to secure adequate control of the river is authorization and appropriations from Congress for the work.

During the present war emergency all forward-looking men are thinking considerably about what can be done to absorb the manpower which will be released by the winning of the war. The Congress will undoubtedly be greatly concerned with this problem during the coming months. There is no more worth-while project available for that purpose than confining the Mississippi River to one channel and keeping it there.

The engineering committee of the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, therefore, resolves to urge upon the President and the Congress of the United States the advisability of directing an immediate survey by the War Department to develop a definite and enlarged project for confining the Mississippi River to a permanent channel location from Cairo, Ill., to the Gulf of Mexico, to be commenced as soon as the war emergency will permit, with the understanding that no money shall be spent for the enlarged stabilization project until full protection, as contemplated by the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928, and amendments thereto, has been provided. Meanwhile, the emergency revetment work on the Mississippi River should be continued even in wartime, in the interest of both flood control and navigation.

REPORTS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1151. A bill to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to the carrying of concealed weapons; without amendment (Rept. No. 408);

S. 1338. A bill to permit the granting of beverage licenses in the District of Columbia to service clubs of other United Nations; without amendment (Rept. No. 409);

S. 1345. A bill to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 410); and

S. Res. 178. Resolution authorizing an investigation of conditions at Gallinger Municipal Hospital; with an amendment (Rept. No. 411).

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO ACCOMPANY SENATE BILL 1272

Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a report (No. 412) to accompany the bill (S. 1272) to amend section 813 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended, for the purpose of making the provisions of such section prohibiting political contributions apply equally to labor organizations and management organizations, heretofore reported by Mr. FERGUSON (for Mr. HATCH) from that committee without amendment.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. 1355. A bill for the relief of Robert C. Harris;

S. 1356. A bill for the relief of S. H. Brown and M. Brown, also known as the Universal Steamship Co., a Georgia corporation, to cover the loss of their bark *Brown Brothers*, destroyed by a German raider during the World War; and

S. 1357. A bill for the relief of Universal Steamship Co. for losses sustained due to the interruption of a voyage of the American schooner *Ninetta M. Porcella*, by reason of a Presidential Proclamation, effective September 28, 1917, forbidding sailing vessels from entering the war zone; to the Committee on Claims.

ELIMINATION OF PRIVATE SUITS ARISING OUT OF FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. MURRAY each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE CANADIAN PARLIAMENT

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the President of the United States in Ottawa, Canada, on August 25, 1943, to the members of the Canadian Parliament, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOINT STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT AND PRIME MINISTER CHURCHILL TO MARSHAL BADOGLIO AND THE PEOPLE OF ITALY

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a joint statement dispatched by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill to Marshal Badoglio and to the people of Italy on September 10, which appears in the Appendix.]

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR McCARRAN

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a commencement day address entitled "Our American Constitutional Commonwealth—Is It Passing?", delivered by Senator McCARRAN at Georgetown University, Washington, D. C., on September 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CHALLENGE TO LABOR LEADERSHIP—ARTICLE BY REPRESENTATIVE CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

[Mr. DANAHER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, of Connecticut, entitled "The Challenge to Labor Leadership," published in the September 1943 issue of the Connecticut State Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIVESTOCK AND FEED CONFERENCE—ADDRESS BY JOHN R. JIRDON

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by John R. Jirdon, president of the Colorado-Nebraska Lamb Feeders' Association, to the Livestock and Feed Conference held in Kansas City, Mo., September 2, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

GIVE OUR FIGHTING MEN A VOICE—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON NEWS DIGEST

[Mr. BARBOUR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Give Our Fighting Men a Voice," published in the September 1943 issue of the Washington News Digest, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEW ALLIANCE DEBATE LIKELY IN CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "New Alliance Debate Likely in Congress," written by David Lawrence, which appears in the Appendix.]

BARUCH REPORT ON WEST COAST MANPOWER PROBLEM

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD the pertinent portion of an editorial in this morning's New York Herald Tribune entitled "Let's Have the Report." It refers to the latest Baruch report on the west coast manpower problem.

I know of no reason why a report of this importance, particularly in view of its source, should be suppressed, at a time when it obviously would have a distinct bearing upon congressional judgment in respect to the manpower question. I wish heartily to endorse the editorial I have presented, and to urge upon Mr. Byrnes that he try to find it within his conscience to give Congress the benefit of Mr. Baruch's study. I think we are entitled to it.

There being no objection, the portion of the editorial referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S HAVE THE REPORT

Why Mr. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, has hesitated to make public the Baruch report on the west coast manpower problem remains something of a mystery. On the strength of it he has proclaimed what has been called a drastic program to cope with the critical shortage of workers, especially in west coast aircraft plants, but the text of the report, prepared by Mr. Baruch and his assistant, John Hancock, and described as another "bible" on the order of the rubber report, has been withheld from publication. In light of the country's confidence in Mr. Baruch's judgment and thoroughness of inquiry, as confirmed in his committee's disentanglement of the rubber muddle, we consider this a mistake.

ELIMINATION OF PRIVATE SUITS ARISING OUT OF FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The routine morning business is concluded.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] desires to proceed with the unfinished business, which is House bill 1203.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 1203.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I thought yesterday the RECORD indicated that this bill was the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does not come before the Senate automatically until 2 o'clock.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that, but it is in fact the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Indiana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment will be stated.

The first amendment of the committee was on page 2, line 3, after the word "suits" and the period, to insert the following:

Such suit may be brought and carried on by any person, as well for himself as for the United States; the same shall be at the sole cost and charge of such person, and shall be in the name of the United States, but shall not be withdrawn or discontinued without the consent, in writing, of the judge of the court and the district attorney, first filed in the case, setting forth their reasons for such consent: *Provided*, That no district court of the United States shall have power or jurisdiction to hear, try, or determine such suit brought or carried on by any person for himself and the United States unless based upon information, evidence, and sources original with such person and not in the possession of or obtained by the United States in the course of any investigation or proceeding instituted or conducted by it, and unless prior to commencement thereof (1) such person has made full disclosure in writing to the Attorney General of the grounds thereof, including substantially all information and evidence in his possession and has requested the Attorney General to cause such suit to be brought; and (2) the Attorney General has, after receipt of such disclosure and request, declined in writing to comply with such request, or has allowed 6 months to elapse after receipt of such disclosure and request without causing a suit to be brought for part or all of the relief requested: *Provided further*, That in the event that the Attorney General takes action hereunder following receipt of such disclosure and request, the court may award to the person who made such disclosure and request, out of the proceeds of such suit or

any settlement of any claim involved therein, an amount which in the judgment of the court is fair and reasonable compensation to such person for original information, evidence, and sources so disclosed which was not in the possession of or obtained by the United States in the course of any investigation or proceeding instituted or conducted by it, such awards or failure to award and the amount thereof to be final and conclusive. In no event shall the amount of such award exceed one-tenth of the proceeds of such suit or any settlement thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask the chairman of the committee to make a statement concerning the necessity of passing such a bill at this time? I think it would be very enlightening if we were to have a statement from the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I shall be very glad to make such a statement. The bill was passed by the House last March by a very substantial majority. It came to the Senate, and on April 2 was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, which had it under consideration until the 8th day of June, when it was reported favorably with amendments. The bill has been on the Senate Calendar for over 3 months.

Very briefly, the bill amends section 3491 of the Revised Statutes, which is a part of an act adopted in 1863 during the progress of the Civil War. The first section of the act provides that anyone not in military or naval service who shall make false claims against the Government shall be subjected to a forfeiture of $2,000 and double the amount of damages sustained by the Government. That provision of the act is not proposed to be changed by the pending bill.

The next section of the act provides that suits for such forfeiture and damages may be instituted and prosecuted by any individual and that such individual may receive one-half of the forfeiture of $2,000 and half of the damages recovered in judgment. The pending bill would change that phase of the old 1863 statute.

Mr. President, the old statute of 1863 served a useful purpose during the progress of the Civil War. At that time the Attorney General's office was not staffed as it is today. Then we had no agency corresponding to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, with its hundreds and thousands of representatives and inspectors and agents all over the United States. The War Department then had no investigators, nor were there in existence the checks and balances which exist today; so the Government then was largely dependent upon information received from private individuals concerning fraudulent claims against the United States. As I have said, the old statute served a useful purpose at that time, but conditions have changed, and today that statute has become one of the worst sources of racketeering since the days of Al Capone in the prohibition era.

In January 1943, in the case of Marcus against Hess, the Supreme Court sustained a judgment for $315,000 rendered in a suit brought under the old statute, and thus it has placed upon Congress the duty of amending or repealing the statute in order to get rid of the racket which has been growing up in the United States ever since that decision.

At this time I should like to read excerpts from a letter written to me by the Attorney General under date of March 22, 1943:

The result of this decision—

The decision in the case of Marcus against Hess—

is that whenever a grand jury returns an indictment charging fraud against the Government there may be a scramble among would-be "informers" to see who can be the first to file civil suit based on the charges in the indictment. There are now pending 19 such suits.

This letter, as I said, was written March 22, 1943.

In 18 of these suits the basic allegations of the informers' pleadings were copied from the indictments.

In other words, the informer would have no personal knowledge of the facts at all, but would hurry to the courthouse as soon as a grand-jury indictment was returned in open court and copy verbatim the language of the indictment, changing the caption and the prayer from a criminal action to a civil action.

To offset this condition the Department of Justice has undertaken to file civil actions at the same time that indictments are returned. But this has been found impractical. The exact time an indictment will be returned can rarely be anticipated. Moreover, this makeshift practice does not give adequate time in which to prepare proper pleadings.

I believe that the Congress should by legislation put a stop to this unseemly and undignified scramble. The Government should have sufficient time in which carefully to consider the advisability of bringing such suits and the nature and contents of the pleading to be filed, instead of being forced to proceed in the hasty manner which alone is now available.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask that the entire letter be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1943.

Hon. FREDERICK VAN NUYS,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: As a result of the Supreme Court's decision in *Marcus* v. *Hess* (decided January 18, 1943) a situation has arisen which I think requires the prompt enactment of remedial legislation.

In the Hess case the Supreme Court held that any person might bring a qui tam action under Revised Statutes, secs. 5438 and 3490–3493 (U. S. Code, title 31, secs. 231–234), even if he had discovered or furnished no information relative to the fraud sued upon but based his action entirely upon information secured by the Government in a criminal proceeding. The only qualification of this holding is an intimation that if the Government has filed civil suit under the statutes involved a subsequent action thereunder by a private person would not lie.

The result of this decision is that whenever a grand jury returns an indictment charging fraud against the Government there may be a scramble among would-be informers to see who can be the first to file civil suit based on the charges in the indictment. There are now pending 19 such suits. In 18 of these suits the basic allegations of the informers' pleadings were copied from the indictments.

To offset this condition the Department of Justice has undertaken to file civil actions at the same time that indictments are returned. But this has been found impractical. The exact time an indictment will be returned can rarely be anticipated. Moreover, this makeshift practice does not give adequate time in which to prepare proper pleadings.

I believe that the Congress should by legislation put a stop to this unseemly and undignified scramble. The Government should have sufficient time in which carefully to consider the advisability of bringing such suits and the nature and contents of the pleading to be filed, instead of being forced to proceed in the hasty manner which alone is now available.

In determining the nature of the remedial legislation to be enacted consideration should be given to the following questions:

1. Should the informer provisions be repealed entirely?

2. Should the basic principle of informer suits be retained with a provision that a private person, as a prerequisite to bringing such a suit, must notify the Attorney General of his purpose, giving in full the information in his possession, after which the Attorney General would be allowed a reasonable time in which to determine whether this Department would institute suit for the Government, the informer perhaps to be awarded proper compensation for any useful information furnished by him?

3. Should the Attorney General be authorized to intervene in and take control over suits of this character now pending with provision for an award to the plaintiffs, out of any recovery, of proper compensation for any useful information furnished by them?

4. If an award for information is made should it be made by the Attorney General or by the court?

I suggest that the Committee on the Judiciary may care to undertake a study of this entire question. This Department will be glad to furnish you all possible information and assistance.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. In the committee amendment on page 5 of the bill I read the following language:

If the previous suit brought by such person was timely, the period within which the Attorney General may cause a suit to be brought based in whole or in part on the same act, acts, or transactions shall not expire until 8 months after the date of the enactment of this act, or until the expiration of the time provided by section 3494 of the Revised Statutes, whichever is later.

I imagine a great many suits will be brought under the provisions of this measure if it shall be enacted into law. The time in question—8 months—would pass very rapidly. I wonder if the provision in question allows sufficient time. I should like to have the Senator make a statement in respect to that phase of the matter.

Mr. VAN NUYS. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I shall come to that later. I am taking up the measure paragraph by paragraph.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well. That is perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it the Senator's purpose to offer an amendment or a modification to the committee amendment in accordance with the suggestion I offered to him personally yesterday?

Mr. VAN NUYS. There may be a suggestion or two as to the phraseology, but the general objective of the Senator's proposed amendment is accepted.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VAN NUYS. As I said before, the great majority of the suits—I will epitomize the number of them and the total demands in a few minutes—are simply copied verbatim from indictments returned by Federal grand juries in criminal cases. In case there was a hearing in Washington before the Truman committee relative to a matter allegedly involving fraud against the Government in the delivery of some defective machinery or other equipment. The Washington newspapers recorded the substance of the hearing. The transcript was not even written when three suits were filed in the Midwest for millions of dollars—I forget the exact amount—based solely on the testimony before the Truman committee. The informers in that case had no more real, original knowledge of the facts than did I or any other Senator. That instance is a sample of how the racketeers rush into court in an undignified, unseemly way to recover half the judgment, the other half going to the United States Government. As Judge Otis said in an opinion passing on a motion in the pending informer suit, this unseemly race and scramble between representatives of the Department of Justice and the racketeering lawyers who copy indictments, take newspaper reports as final, and bring suit against the companies for millions of dollars is a disgrace to the Government.

Another handicap to the Government is that when the suits are filed the lawyers demand that the records in the F. B. I. and elsewhere in the Department of Justice be opened to them in order that they may subpena witnesses and attempt to prove the allegations. Then they begin to take depositions. There is some evidence—I cannot prove it—that some of the suits are collusive as between the defendant companies and the informers, so that they can take depositions and discover what the Government has in the way of criminal prosecution. Every former prosecuting attorney in this body knows that is not possible in a successful criminal prosecution.

Now getting down to the question of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], I have summarized the suits by way of States and districts. In the southern district of New York, before the recess of Congress, suits aggregating $55,000,000 were pending. In the eastern district, suits aggregating $2,301,000 were pending.

In the western district of Missouri suits aggregating $3,500,000 were pending.

In the eastern district of Pennsylvania, suits aggregating $4,000,000 were pending.

In the northern district of Illinois, suits aggregating $1,000,000 were pending.

In the northern district of Ohio, suits aggregating $2,000,000 were pending.

They make a total of $68,920,000 demanded by the informer suits.

Since the recess of Congress, seven additional suits have been filed, making the total demands at this time by the informer suits $144,000,000, one-half of which, or $72,000,000, would go, if the evidence sustained it, to the informers. That is the potential pot that the informers and their racketeering lawyers are thrusting upon the Department of Justice and the people of the United States.

One suit by reason of alleged false claims recently filed against the Union Oil Co. and the Union Pacific Railroad totals $1,200,000,000. Senators can see what such suits do to companies in the way of expense. Many of the companies are engaged in war production. Senators can understand what that does to the Department of Justice, because the Attorney General has no right to appear and conduct the suits. He is not even informed of them when they are filed, except in some instances the court immediately notifies him. That gives an idea, let me say to the Senator from Tennessee, as to the extent of the practice.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, Mr. President; I have no doubt of it; and I have no doubt that the measure is a very timely one. I am simply wondering whether, so far as the informer system is concerned, it is not retained in the bill; and I am wondering about the system. I should like to have the Senator's view about it. I never have had very great confidence in informers. I am simply wondering if it would not be better to place the entire burden of the prosecutions upon the Attorney General and the Government itself.

However, I have not gone into that matter. I am merely making the suggestion, and should like to have the Senator comment on it.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, taking up the bill at this time, and discussing it by sections, let me say that all of page 1, down to line 3 on page 2, ending with the word "suit," is written exactly in the words of the old law of 1863. From there on we tried to protect bona fide, honest informers. Let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that we spent days and days in public hearings and in conference in company with Mr. Tom Clark, the Attorney General, and others representing the Department of Justice, trying to appease a certain member or members of the Committee on the Judiciary who conscientiously, I admit, objected to the repeal of the present law in its entirety. Those efforts were made to protect honest, bona fide informers; and there are some of that class. One was a man from St. Louis, as I remember, named Coates. He had a suit against some concern in St. Louis. He appeared personally before the committee, made a fine appearance and impression, and had spent considerable money in prosecuting his case and in bringing it to issue. We exempted him; and Tom Clark assured him, in front of the full committee—and to my mind Mr. Clark is one of the upstanding representatives of the Department of Justice—that under the terms of the amendment now under discussion, in no case would he move to dismiss that pending suit, so that Mr. Coates could continue to prosecute the suit to a finish. I think the Senator from North Dakota will agree with me as to that.

As I say, the pending bill is the same as the old law down to line 3 on page 2, in fact down to the word "Provided" in line 10, the language is practically the same as that of the old law. No substantial change has been made.

Beginning with the word "Provided" in line 10, the new amendment is as follows:

Provided, That no district court of the United States shall have power or jurisdiction to hear, try, or determine such suit brought or carried on by any person for himself and the United States unless based upon information, evidence, and sources original with such person and not in the possession of or obtained by the United States in the course of any investigation or proceeding instituted or conducted by it.

At that point the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] has a proposed amendment which I am willing to accept and to let go to conference, because it is in keeping with the general objective of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. McNARY I do not wish to interfere with the question propounded to my very distinguished friend from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER]. The Senator in charge of the bill was reading a portion of the proviso on page 2. Yesterday the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] called my attention to the fact that he intended to suggest that the following language in line 13 on page 2 be deleted:

Unless based upon information, evidence, and sources original with such person and not in the possession of or obtained by the United States in the course of any investigation or proceeding instituted or conducted by it, and.

The Senator may have answered the question when he referred to the amendment of the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER]. The Senator from West Virginia is absent at this time attending a meeting of the Military Affairs Committee. While the Senator from Indiana is discussing the question and showing his familiarity with the language and its application to the objectives of the bill, I thought I might obtain from him a statement regarding the removal from the bill of the language referred to. Would such an amendment meet with the approval of the Senator?

Mr. VAN NUYS. The original bill met with my approval. I wish to read now the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut. I think it will answer the Senator's question.

The Senator from Connecticut proposes, in line 16 on page 2, after the word

"investigation", to add the following language: "by a grand jury, congressional committee, or other public body, or before a United States commissioner".

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield further to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Do I correctly understand that the language just read is proposed to be inserted in line 16 on page 2, after the word "investigation"?

Mr. VAN NUYS. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. And the deletion of the remainder of that sentence would stand, as suggested a moment ago?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Yes; including the words "or proceeding instituted or conducted by it."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. In reply to the questions propounded by the Senator from Oregon, I should like to comment that what the Senator from West Virginia has in mind and the point to which the Senator from Oregon alludes unquestionably are in the right direction, for if the language from lines 13 to 17, inclusive, in the clause commencing "unless," should remain in the bill unamended, there would be precipitated in every case an issue in advance of trial, as to whether the informant did or did not supply original information, and whether or not some department conducted an investigation. Obviously under those circumstances the jurisdiction of the court would be most tenuous at best.

Having in mind that so far as possible we ought to avoid any such dilemma, and at the same time accomplish what are certainly the laudable purposes of the bill, as explained by the Senator from Indiana, I intended, by the language which I have suggested, to make the word "investigation" mean a public investigation, by a public body such as a grand jury, a congressional committee, a United States commissioner, or other public body, which might include an investigation by a State grand jury.

With those thoughts in mind, I can see how the bill would be markedly improved and meet the point raised by the Senator from West Virginia if we should delete from lines 13 to 17 the clause to which the Senator from Oregon refers. We would not do violence to the purpose of the bill were those words taken out. On the other hand, if they were left in, and if they should be modified by the language which I have suggested, I think we would substantially cover the same point.

I make these observations in the hope that they may be helpful to the Senator from Indiana in his discussion with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut. I did not know what was in the mind of the Senator from West Virginia. I would much prefer to accept the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut rather than to delete the language in lines 13 to 16.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have been in attendance at a meeting of the Military Affairs Committee, and regret that I could not be present earlier.

I have asked that there be deleted from the bill the following language on page 2, beginning with line 13: "unless based upon information, evidence, and sources original with such person, and not in the possession of or obtained by the United States in the course of any investigation or proceeding instituted or conducted by it, and unless."

As I recall the hearings upon this bill before the Judiciary Committee, the Attorney General first wanted the entire repeal of the Informers Suit Act. I take it the Senate has been informed that the so-called Informers Suit Act was enacted during the Civil War days.

Mr. VAN NUYS. In 1863.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes. Of course, the purpose of such suits was to prevent frauds being committed upon the Government. The Judiciary Committee did not adopt the first plan or suggestion for the repeal of the entire act, but did say that it was a matter which should be handled by the Government, and that those who had information with respect to frauds practiced upon the Government should first bring that information to the attention of the Attorney General, and then if the Attorney General should fail to act within 6 months, the person having the information might proceed. That is the gist of the bill as reported from the Committee on the Judiciary.

I wish to call attention to the language which I have asked to have deleted. The bill provides that the United States district court shall not have jurisdiction of a suit brought by any informer on behalf of himself and the United States "unless based upon information, evidence, and sources original with such person and not in the possession of or obtained by the United States in the course of any investigation or proceeding instituted or conducted by it."

Suppose the informer should gain information through an investigation conducted by the Government, and the Government should not see fit to prosecute the suit. The right would be left entirely in the hands of the Attorney General to say whether or not the suit should be prosecuted, in a case in which a citizen believes that a fraud has been committed. It makes no difference whence he may obtain his information.

With that language deleted, we should then truly have what I believe to be the judgment of the Judiciary Committee after considering this question. In other words, if the Attorney General will not prosecute the suit within 6 months, any citizen should have the right to prosecute it if a fraud has been committed, regardless of the source of his information.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Let me suggest to the Senator that there is such a provision in the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. This language would nullify it.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I invite the Senator's attention to the language at the end of line 22 on page 2:

> And (2) the attorney general has, after receipt of such disclosure and request, declined in writing to comply with such request, or has allowed 6 months to elapse after receipt of such disclosure and request without causing a suit to be brought for part or all of the relief requested.

What would happen in that event? The individual could proceed to prosecute his case.

Mr. REVERCOMB. But in order to prosecute his suit, under the terms of the bill as written, he must not have obtained his information from any Government investigation, because the very first language limiting the jurisdiction of the court provides that in order to prosecute any suit the individual must not have obtained his information from any Government investigation.

Mr. VAN NUYS. The suggested deletion would strike at the very vitals of the bill. If we should delete the language referred to, how could we prevent an informer from grabbing a grand jury indictment, changing the caption and the prayer, and making a civil suit out of it?

Mr. REVERCOMB. He could not do that unless he had given the Attorney General an opportunity to institute the suit. I am afraid I am not making my point clear to the able Senator.

I am not trying to take from this bill the right of the Government first to prosecute the suit and have 6 months within which to institute it. That right would continue to exist if this language should be deleted. However, there is other limiting language which says that the informer may not maintain his suit even after 6 months, even after the Government, through the Attorney General, has declined to prosecute unless he obtained his information from some source outside a Government investigation.

Mr. President, I feel that if this bill is passed in its present form the Attorney General may say, "I do not want to prosecute this suit. There is not sufficient evidence of fraud. The information was gained through a Government investigation." But a citizen may come along and say, "I do not agree with that view; it is wrong. If I myself had this information to begin with, and the Attorney General refused to prosecute I could go ahead and prosecute. But if I obtain the information from a Government investigation, however public the information may be, I cannot prosecute under the terms of this bill."

In other words, the deletion of this language would not take out of the bill the right of the Government to 6 months' time to institute such a suit, regardless of the source of its information, whether the information be gained from an informer, or whether it obtained the information itself. But if we leave the language in the bill and the Government obtains its information through a Government investigation the informer cannot prosecute, even after the 6 months' period has passed.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia whether

the proposed amendment prepared by the Senator from Connecticut does not practically answer that question. The amendment refers to an investigation by a grand jury. I cannot conceive of a private informer going to a grand jury and getting the notes, and, after the grand jury refuses to indict, instituting a civil suit. I do not think that is fair to the Government. I do not think it is just.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I feel that any course would be just which would give the Government 6 months in which to proceed to prosecute the suit.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I should like to ascertain whether I correctly understand the Senator from West Virginia. If the language to which he refers should be deleted from the bill, then any person who had no information whatever of his own, who had taken no step and had done nothing but take what information may have been developed by a Government investigation, could file a suit upon the basis of the information which the Government itself had developed, to which he had contributed nothing. He would be permitted the right to bring an action of that kind in a civil court simply because he might disagree with the Attorney General as to whether such suit should be brought. Do I correctly understand the Senator in that regard?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator does not go far enough. The Government would have 6 months within which to bring suit, or the Attorney General might refuse to bring it. If the Attorney General should refuse to bring it, I think that any citizen who feels that fraud exists should have the right to bring suit at his own expense, as he may do now under the law. It would make no difference where he obtained his information if he were striking at fraud committed against the Government.

Mr. HATCH. If the Attorney General has refused to prosecute the case, or if 6 months had elapsed, then any citizen who has contributed nothing except the filing fees and the employment of an attorney—probably on a contingent-fee basis—could come in and file a suit.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course, that is the law today.

Mr. HATCH. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And we are trying to correct it by providing that anyone who has information of fraud may not bring a suit, and the court may not take jurisdiction of the case until such person has brought the information to the attention of the Attorney General. The Attorney General has the right to say, "I will not prosecute that suit." Then the man who obtained the information may institute the suit. That is the way the bill is now written. That is the way the proposed law would read. Or, in the event the Attorney General does not act within 6 months, the suit may be instituted.

Mr. HATCH. But under the terms of the pending bill he must not have derived his information from an investigation conducted by the Government.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is the sole difference. It is a question whence he derived his information. It is not a question of striking at fraud.

Mr. HATCH. The amendment of the Senator from Connecticut would confine the provision to an investigation by a grand jury or some other public body, including a United States commissioner.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. After everything is said and done, as a practical matter this bill would effectually preclude suits by informers to recover in their own names for frauds perpetrated against the United States unless certain conditions named in the bill were met.

Mr. VAN NUYS. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. If, in fact, those conditions are met, the suit may still be brought, whether the Attorney General agrees that there is a cause of action or not.

Mr. VAN NUYS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. The difficulty arises, Mr. President, solely from the question as to the point at which jurisdiction attaches to the district court, for a preliminary inquiry will certainly become necessary in any case when challenge is offered to the jurisdiction, to determine, first, whether or not the information in fact is original with the suitor, the plaintiff, and, second, whether or not it is information which has not previously been obtained by the United States itself through a public investigation. But those conditions having been met, if the plaintiff submits all his information, or substantially all of it, to the Attorney General with a request for a suit, and the period allowed by the bill elapses and the suit is not brought, the plaintiff may, nonetheless, bring the action, and under those circumstances we give the court jurisdiction to proceed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I have just one more thought.

My amendment would preclude an official in a department from saying, "We investigated that case long ago, and found nothing to it. There is no merit in it." Unless we define the term "investigation," jurisdiction will be denied to the court. But if we preclude the plaintiff from resting his case upon information which he obtained through the report of a grand-jury action, or perhaps from attending a United States Commissioner's inquiry, or that of some congressional committee, or some other public body, then, Mr. President, in my judgment, we give the Government as much protection as it ought to have in that particular, and, at the same time, by defining the term "investigation" in that way we leave a suitor or plaintiff free to prosecute the action if he meets the conditions otherwise prescribed.

Either of two things may take place: Either we can eliminate the language to which the Senator from West Virginia objects or we can make the modification which I have suggested. If we adopt the view of the Senator from West Virginia, there will be no limitation upon any suitor, after the lapse of the prescribed period, to bring suit in his own name, whether he obtained the information as the result of a grand-jury investigation or not. Am I not correct?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Therefore, when Congress vests in the Attorney General control of certain types of prosecutions, whether they be civil or criminal, if in the exercise of that discretion he fails to act, the Senator from West Virginia would substitute for the discretion of the Attorney General the discretion of the trial judge who will later try the case.

I personally think that it goes too far in that it would establish a principle which would make the courts decide not only the issue in the case but whether or not an executive officer had, in effect, breached his duty and had failed in the trust which we had reposed in him. I, therefore, would not want that conflict to arise, and I think that we should stand on the modification as I have submitted it.

I thank the Senator from Indiana for permitting me to expound, in these few remarks, my understanding of the bill and its ultimate purpose.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I thank the Senator from Connecticut. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] will propose—and if he does not do so I will for him—an amendment providing that where there is a pending suit and the Attorney General adopts the theory of the informer and takes his facts, then the informer shall be entitled to not more than 10 percent as fair and reasonable compensation for the work he has done. The difference is that, instead of the informer and a certain type of lawyer, in the case of a billion-dollar suit against a railroad, for instance, getting half a billion dollars, they would get not more than 10 percent.

Certainly there can be no criticism of that clause in the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have no debate upon the proposal of the Senator from Indiana with respect to that amendment, but let me ask, in reply to both the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Connecticut, What difference, in fact, does it make whence the man gets his information? The whole purpose of this bill, the purpose of the right given any citizen, is to prevent frauds being committed upon the Government, and certainly there is no better safeguard, Mr. President, than the cost of such litigation. Furthermore, the Government has not been deprived of its right to proceed and protect the Government against fraud when it is given 60 days and there is a right in the Attorney General to refuse to prosecute the proceeding. I see no particular force in the argument as to whence the information may come. The purpose is to prevent frauds on the Government, and to see that those who have defrauded the Government pay money for it. If the Attorney General refuses to prosecute, and there has been a fraud com-

mitted, why should not a citizen proceed regardless of whence he may get the information as to the wrong that has been done? That is my position in the matter.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I do not disagree with the Senator from West Virginia in that respect, but I want to reiterate that if we should delete that language from this bill we might as well defeat the measure, for it would take the very innards out of the proposed legislation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I must disagree with the Senator from Indiana, because the other part of the bill gives the Government, through the Attorney General, 6 months within which to bring suit, and requires any man having information to give such information, first, to the Attorney General, and to let the Government prosecute the suit. That is the gist of the proposal.

Mr. VAN NUYS. There are three parts of the proviso: First, that it must be original information with the informer; second, he must reveal all his information and evidence in his possession to the Attorney General; and third, the Attorney General, after the receipt of such disclosure and request, declines in writing to comply with the request or allows 6 months to elapse.

Then the new part, on page 3, provides that, instead of awarding the informer one-half of the recovery, his compensation must be fair and reasonable as fixed by the court, but not to exceed 10 percent of the entire recovery. That relates to pending cases.

In new cases—and this is largely repeated—the informer has to go to the Attorney General and reveal the source of his information, what facts he has, and the information must be original with him. Then the Attorney General has the same rights.

If he declines in writing to file a suit or lets 6 months elapse without bringing suit, the informer may proceed just as he may under the old statute. We are not taking that right away from him. I am now talking about new suits.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, as the bill is now written, a citizen could not proceed to obtain his information from a Government investigation.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Of course, there is a difference of opinion between the Senator from West Virginia and myself and the Senator from Connecticut, but I think, with the proposed amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, that the objection of the Senator from West Virginia has been met.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield..

Mr. DANAHER. In that event I formally offer, so that it may appear definitely to be a part of the committee amendment, the matter which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read as requested.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 16, after the word "investigation", it is proposed to insert "by a grand jury, congressional committee, or other public body, or before a United States commissioner."

Mr. DANAHER. I will add the words "or agency" after the word "body."

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. And after the word "or" and before the word "proceeding", it is proposed to insert the word "other."

Mr. VAN NUYS. There is no objection to that amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from Indiana to ascertain if I understand the bill as proposed to be amended. Am I to understand that where a fraud has been perpetrated upon the United States Government, and the fraud has been exposed by action of the Attorney General through an indictment, nevertheless, the Attorney General could decline to bring a civil suit upon the evidence he has adduced and no private citizen would be entitled to take advantage of such evidence which was disclosed in the criminal prosecution for the purpose of instituting a suit, as previously permitted under the law? The Attorney General could refuse to bring a civil action, and no private citizen would be entitled to bring suit, because he himself would not have the original evidence.

Mr. VAN NUYS. That is not true at all. Either in pending suits or in new suits the informer must be possessed of original information. The Senator from Montana, I presume, does not object to that.

Mr. MURRAY. No; I object to the proposition that the citizen in order to bring suit must have possession of the original information.

Mr. VAN NUYS. If the informer goes to the Attorney General and reveals to him the source of the information and all the information he has—full information—and if the Attorney General refuses in writing to bring a suit, which he has done in some instances, then, the individual is entitled to prosecute it, just as he could under the old statute, except instead of getting one-half of the recovery he will get not more than 10 percent.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; but he would be limited in bringing suit to cases where he himself has the original evidence, and he would not be entitled to take advantage of the existence of proof that may have been brought to light by an investigation of the Attorney General.

Mr. VAN NUYS. No. This merely moves to the jurisdiction of the court. If he can comply with the provisos written in by the Judiciary Committee, after he has complied with them, he can file suit and then can subpena anybody he pleases.

Mr. MURRAY. But he cannot comply with the provisos because he himself has not information of his own knowledge and has to go to the files and records of the Attorney General's office to discover the proof which he might want to use in the action. If he were not permitted to file a suit based upon the evidence existing in the Attorney General's office, he would not be able to bring suit. No suit would then be brought. Suppose the Attorney General should decline to bring a suit against the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co. for the fraud it perpetrated on the Government not long ago. No private citizen would have original information or knowledge of the facts involved in the case, yet the Attorney General could refuse to bring suit, and no citizen could bring the suit on his own motion.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I disagree with the Senator 100 percent. If a private citizen should go to the Attorney General and reveal his information, and the Attorney General refused in writing, or failed for 6 months, to institute a suit, the individual might proceed as under the old statute.

Mr. MURRAY. But the individual would have no complete information. The individual's knowledge and information would be entirely in the hands of the Attorney General, and the individual would have no knowledge whatever of the facts or circumstances, except as they existed in the hands of the Attorney General.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Let me ask the Senator from Montana, does he think that is the way to conduct business? Has not the Senator sufficient confidence in the man who is a member of the President's Cabinet, the Attorney General, to believe that he will conserve the best interests of the public?

Mr. MURRAY. We have found that that cannot always be relied upon. We know that in this country for some time there has been a failure upon the part of the Department of Justice to prosecute antitrust litigation, for example. It seems to me that there should be some way of leaving it open to a private citizen to bring a suit if the Attorney General failed to bring it. It seems to me that if a fraud has been perpetrated, and the evidence exists in the office of the Attorney General, and the Attorney General is failing to take advantage of it, any private citizen in the United States should be entitled to bring up the case in court. The Government is being defrauded in many instances and the information and knowledge of the facts is often exclusively in the hands of Government agencies or in the possession of the Department of Justice. If the Department of Justice fails to bring suit, any American citizen should be entitled to institute suit regardless of where he finds the proof.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Since the decision in Marcus against Hess, which was handed down in January 1943 by the Supreme Court, the Attorney General has filed 54 civil suits.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. VAN NUYS. In the last 6 months he has filed 54 suits.

Mr. MURRAY. The chances are he could have filed five or six hundred if he had taken advantage of all the facts.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Oh, well, if the Senator desires to go into speculation and things of that sort, there is no answer.

Mr. MURRAY. It seems to me a private citizen should be able to take advantage of facts developed by the Attorney General's office, or by any other public body, in a case where no prosecution is being brought against the perpetrator of the fraud.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I may be a little prejudiced and biased, but I think the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate is the outstanding Senate committee, or congressional committee. It is composed of ex-judges and lawyers, experienced in the practice of law for years and years. We spent days and days ironing out this amendment in order to protect the honest, bona fide informer. It is the consensus of the committee. With the exception, perhaps, of one member, all the members of the committee voted for the bill as amended.

Mr. MURRAY. I am not interested in protecting any informer. I am interested in protecting the people of the United States and in protecting the Government of the United States, so that nothing may prevent a suit being brought where a crime has been committed, where a fraud has been perpetrated, merely because the citizen who desires to bring the suit has not the original source of information. If a fraud has been perpetrated upon the American people, someone should be entitled to bring suit, if the Attorney General fails to do so.

Mr. VAN NUYS. The Senator from Montana will surely agree that it is the duty of an informer to inform the Attorney General of the facts he has in his possession.

Mr. MURRAY. He may not have any facts.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Then how could he bring suit? Should we put into the hands of the racketeering lawyers of Chicago or Brooklyn power to sue for a million dollars, without any knowledge of the facts?

Mr. MURRAY. But suppose there is knowledge in the hands of the Attorney General that the facts exist, and his office fails to bring suit. This very legislation, when it was originally enacted, was intended to protect the interests of the American people against the failure of the proper Government officials to prosecute when a prosecution should be conducted.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Confirming what the Senator from Montana has said, I ask the distinguished Senator from Indiana how many of these suits he supposes Harry M. Daugherty would have brought when he was Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. VAN NUYS. The Senator had better ask someone on the other side of the Chamber about that.

Mr. MURRAY. I think that is a proper question. It seems to me it is very possible that some Attorney General might be appointed in the years to come who would be there for the purpose of protecting people engaged in perpetrating frauds on the United States, and I certainly would never vote for the pending bill unless it were made clear that a prosecution could be brought by any American citizen who did not want to see the people of the United States defrauded by corrupt corporations.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I desire to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment is already pending.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Am I in order to offer another amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has offered an amendment, which is now pending.

Mr. DANAHER. The amendment which I offered was designed particularly to reconcile various conflicting views among the very able lawyers who have participated in the discussion, namely the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Indiana. I added the words "or agency" in an effort to meet an objection raised by the Senator from Indiana. It is not my choice. I therefore take the liberty, if I have the floor, of modifying my amendment by striking out the words "or agency."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. That squarely raises the issue whether we want to have the definition of the term "investigation" as the Senator from Indiana sought to establish it in our colloquy, as contained within the amendment now pending, or whether we are to take the other view, and delete the language entirely.

Am I correct, I ask as a matter of parliamentary inquiry, that the Senator from West Virginia may offer an amendment to modify the committee amendment, or as a substitute, at least, for the amendment I offered?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I desire to offer it as a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be an amendment in the third degree, and would not be in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Then I respectfully ask that the Senator from Indiana permit an order to be entered accepting my amendment.

Mr. VAN NUYS. As I understand the Senator from West Virginia, he does not intend to press for a vote on his proposal. He merely wants to file the amendment and have it on the desks of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That can be done.

Mr. REVERCOMB. For that purpose, I offer the following amendment, on page 2, beginning in line 13, to strike out the following words: "unless based upon information, evidence, and sources original with such person and not in the possession of or obtained by the United States in the course of any investigation or proceeding instituted or conducted by it, and unless."

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, under the major portions of the bill, in pending suits a district court or other Federal court shall give the Attorney General notice that such case is pending, and he shall have 30 days in which to dismiss the case if he so desires. Then it goes through the same routine as provided for pending suits. The statute of limitations is 6 years, so that no one is going to be harmed by the statute of limitations. We do not repeal the old 1894 section, which is the statute of limitations.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. The concluding sentence of the first committee amendment is as follows:

> In no event shall the amount of such award exceed one-tenth of the proceeds of such suit or any settlement thereof.

I offer an amendment to that language to substitute the words "twenty-five percent" for "one-tenth", so as to make the sentence read:

> In no event shall the amount of such award exceed 25 percent of the proceeds of such suit or any settlement thereof.

I offer the amendment in order to present an inducement for private citizens to bring suits of this character to recover damages or judgments against persons who perpetrate frauds on the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana will be printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. VAN NUYS. The Senator is not asking for a vote on his amendment to the committee amendment now, is he? An amendment to the committee amendment is now pending.

Mr. MURRAY. No. I am not asking for a vote on my amendment now.

Mr. VAN NUYS. The Senator has simply offered the amendment and has asked that it be printed?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, if there are no other questions to be asked at this time——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I offer an amendment to the first committee amendment, on page 5, line 7, after the word "otherwise", to insert a semicolon and the following: "and, if such suit brought by the Attorney General is based in whole or in part upon original information, evidence, or sources furnished or obtained through such pending suit or by the plaintiff in such pending suit, the court may, upon application made by such plaintiff, award to him, out of the proceeds of the suit brought by the Attorney General or any settlement of any claim involved therein, an amount not in excess of one-tenth of the proceeds or settlement, which in the judgment of the court is fair and reasonable compensation to such plaintiff."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I shall have no objection to that amendment. I think it is repetition, but it clarifies the language of the measure.

Mr. FERGUSON. I offer the amendment in order to clarify the language.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield so I may ask a question of the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Does not the Senator from Michigan anticipate that many persons will immediately write letters to the Attorney General announcing their version of what may or may not be fraud to the end that they may stake out a claim, so to speak, upon a possible recovery by the United States? Is not that danger inherent in holding out the hope that the informer will participate in any amount the United States may recover against someone for fraud?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should say that that suggestion is rather far fetched, but I do say that my amendment would assure the people of the country of some diligence upon the part of the citizenry to advise the Attorney General of any frauds being committed against the United States. The Attorney General has his own means of obtaining information. He might obtain it through the F. B. I. or his other agencies. But I think it is well, particularly during wartime when so much money is being spent, that any citizen should advise the Attorney General if in his opinion fraud is being perpetrated upon the Government of the United States. That is my purpose in offering the amendment. If a suit is brought by the Attorney General and a recovery is had or a settlement is made with the Attorney General, I have confidence that the court will protect the United States Government if a private citizen were to ask the court to give him 10 percent of the amount recovered, or an amount that might be deemed reasonable.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. What is to be done in the event the Attorney General brings suit against some one for perpetrating a fraud upon the United States, and then permits 1 year to elapse, or 2 years to elapse, or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 years to elapse without pressing for action, as was done in the Hague case in New Jersey? What is to be done in such a case?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, may I answer that question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. VAN NUYS. The suit to which the Senator from North Dakota refers was an informer suit. The Government has no right to dismiss such a case, or to prosecute it, or to request that it be set for trial, or bring it to issue. It is a private suit. The Senator from North Dakota no doubt has better knowledge than I of why the suit has been delayed. But the Government has nothing to do with that.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I beg the distinguished Senator's pardon, but the facts are that the Government instituted a criminal case in 1935, and the Attorney General permitted it to remain without taking action in 1936 and in 1937, and then in 1938 he permitted seven of the big boys to get away; he dismissed suit against them. Then he brought in the little fellows, and one was fined $200 and several were fined $400 each. The largest fine assessed against any defendant was $800. The total of the fines assessed in this case was $18,800. The Federal judge apologized when he fined the defendants.

Mr. President, after the statute of limitations has expired the Government now brings a suit for $1,200,000, when the Government knows it cannot recover one single dollar. Those are the facts in that situation. I have evidence of those facts on my desk, and when I shall speak on the pending measure I shall give the facts and dates.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I obtained my information from the Attorney General who filed the civil suit.

Mr. LANGER. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Indiana that I have letters from Attorney Joseph A. Weinberger, of Passaic, N. J., and shall be glad to show them to the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have gone over the facts of the New Jersey case, and I agree that many of the facts are as stated by the Senator from North Dakota. I think the case would bear investigation. In my opinion the criminal action has not been properly handled nor has the civil suit. But the pending bill specifically exempts the New Jersey action, so that this private citizen in New Jersey may prosecute that suit. It is my humble opinion that the criminal action was not properly prosecuted. Neither was the matter prosecuted properly by the New Jersey authorities so far as the civil action was concerned. It is for that reason that we find language in this bill in line 15, on page 5, as follows:

> Nothing in this act shall affect any such suit which was filed prior to June 15, 1942.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me make certain that I understand fully the Senator's purpose with respect to his proposed amendment on page 5, line 7. I have not seen it in written form and related to the bill, but as I interpret his proposed language the award of 10 percent, for which his amendment would provide, applies only to those cases where suits had previously been brought, and where the Attorney General caused a suit to be brought as the result of the language of this bill. Am I correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the intention.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], as modified to the committee amendment beginning on page 2, in line 3.

The amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment, was agreed to.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I now offer the amendment to the committee amendment which I previously had proposed, and which was read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I dislike to suggest the absence of a quorum, but if we are to have a vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia, I shall be compelled to suggest the absence of a quorum. Inasmuch as the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] expects to consume the remainder of the afternoon I would ask the Senator from West Virginia not to ask for a vote on his amendment now.

Mr. LANGER. If it is in order for me to speak at this time I think a quorum of the Senate should be present.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I shall not ask for a vote on my amendment at this time.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I understand that opposition views, representing the minority views of the Committee on the Judiciary, are to be presented to the Senate, and I take it that the Senator from North Dakota will take the floor for that purpose. Am I correctly advised with respect to that matter?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; the Senator is.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it the Senator's purpose to present his minority views at this time?

Mr. LANGER. Yes, Mr. President, as soon as the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] has concluded his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] to the first committee amendment.

Mr. LANGER obtained the floor.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Overton
Andrews	Green	Radcliffe
Austin	Guffey	Revercomb
Ball	Gurney	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hatch	Robertson
Barbour	Hawkes	Scrugham
Barkley	Hill	Taft
Bridges	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Kilgore	Tobey
Caraway	Langer	Truman
Chavez	Lucas	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Vandenberg
Connally	McFarland	Van Nuys
Danaher	McKellar	Wagner
Davis	McNary	Wallgren
Downey	Maloney	Walsh
Eastland	Maybank	Wheeler
Ellender	Millikin	White
Ferguson	Moore	Wiley
George	Murray	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, very briefly I desire to give the history of House bill 1203, which is now under discussion.

The bill was introduced in the House on January 14, 1943. Apparently nothing was done with it until April 1, 1943,

when the following took place on the floor of the House:

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk, for immediate consideration, the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of fraud against the United States.

Mr. GWYNNE stated:

Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill was reported unanimously by the Judiciary Committee. I should like to have the gentleman from Pennsylvania, however, make a brief explanation of it.

Then Mr. WALTER said:

Under the statute which is sought to be repealed, which statute was enacted during the Civil War, suits have been instituted all over the United States by private citizens against people who have had business dealings with the United States and have been charged with wrongdoing in connection therewith. It has become a racket—

Mind you, Mr. President, this was away back in April 1943—

It has become a racket, and it seems to me that the quicker we eliminate the possibility of harassing people by those who have not contributed one iota to the disclosures, the better off the Nation will be.

Recently a citizen in my own State—

That is, the State of Pennsylvania, where the Marcus Hess case arose—

brought suit for a very large sum of money against the United States Steel Corporation, basing his suit upon information adduced before the Truman committee. This citizen did not have the faintest idea of the matters disclosed before that committee. He took full advantage of the fact that there had been alleged wrongdoing and used that as a basis to bring a large suit. That suit is typical of many that have already been brought. I am certain that with the Army, the Navy, and the Truman committee making investigations constantly we are going to have a veritable flood of similar actions all over the Nation.

As I said before, it has become nothing but a racket.

Then Mr. KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, spoke up:

I think the gentleman should also call the attention of the House to the suit of the *United States* v. *Marcus Hess*, where a judgment was recovered in the district court and in the circuit court of appeals for $315,000, where the plaintiff got all of his information out of an indictment and he had no information. He was just snooping around trying to bring up a claim for his own personal reward.

Mr. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, said:

Yes; and in that case the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit set aside the judgment and in its opinion said that this was nothing but a racket. The Supreme Court of the United States unfortunately reversed the judgment because the Supreme Court held that while the statute was still in existence this suit could properly lie.

Mr. President, in just a moment I shall show that the bill was never debated in the House, and that not a single witness was called before the Judiciary Committee. I wish to call to the attention of the Senate two questions asked by two Members of the House, showing that they did not know what the bill was about.

The first was by Mr. RANKIN, the gentleman from Mississippi. He said:

The gentleman from Tennessee said this individual got his information from an indictment. Does he refer to that Mother Hubbard indictment I inserted in the RECORD last Monday, in which they attempted to indict all these publications and all these various organizations from the Daughters of the American Revolution to the American Legion? I wonder if that is the indictment he used.

That shows that, without any blame on his part, Mr. RANKIN had absolutely no conception of what the debate was about.

Then we come to Mr. BISHOP. He asked this question:

Will this have anything to do with keeping farmers who have had their lands taken away from them, from bringing suit against those agencies that are supposed to be representatives of the Department of Agriculture, but which are taking their land?

So it can be seen that so far as the House Members were concerned, apparently—at least from their questions—they, because there had been no hearing, knew nothing of what was involved in the bill. The bill passed the House with only two Members inquiring about it.

Under date of August 28, 1943, we wrote to the clerk of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House. The reply, addressed to Mr. Dunham, is as follows:

This will acknowledge your letter of August 28, regarding the bill H. R. 1203.

I wish to advise that no hearings were held before the House Judiciary Committee in connection with this proposed measure.

A copy of the report of the committee is enclosed. As you will note, this is a majority report; no minority report was submitted.

Now we come to the Senate. As I recall, the bill came to the Senate about the 2d of April.

On August 19, 1943, Mr. Mattice, the assistant clerk of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, notified Mr. Dunham as follows:

On H. R. 1203, which was ordered reported favorably by this committee on June 8, 1943, the action was by a voice vote and no record of individual votes was made. As I recall it, Mr. LANGER was the only Member present who was opposed.

Mr. President, I am sorry the distinguished Senator from Indiana, who is in charge of the bill, is not present. The facts are—and they are undisputed—that there never was a hearing on this bill before anybody. There were 33 lawsuits pending. I hold a list of them in my hand. Not one attorney who had anything to do with those lawsuits was notified except two or three attorneys whom I myself called on the telephone. At my own expense I called Mr. Coates, of St. Louis, Mo. After the Attorney General of the United States had said that these actions had been brought by racketeers and by a bunch of lawyers who had copied the indictments, Mr. Coates, after being promised 10 minutes before the Judiciary Committee, remained with the committee more than 2 hours. The Judiciary Committee went into the greatest detail so far as the Coates case was concerned, and when they got through, Tom Clark, Assistant Attorney General, who was present, announced that he would set the Coates case aside.

However, that is not all, Mr. President. When this measure came over from the House an amendment was proposed by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the effect of which would have been entirely to protect Mr. Hague in the case in which he was involved. The Senator from New Jersey did not do that intentionally, because I am entirely satisfied from the information which I have received, and from the investigation I made, that the amendment was presented only at the instance of a Representative from New Jersey who is interested in Mr. Hague's lawsuit. The amendment was introduced as a favor to him, and before the Senator from New Jersey understood the substance of it. It was introduced under those circumstances.

When that was done, I called the attorneys in the Marcus Hess case. Mr. Charles J. Margiotti came to Washington.

Under the original filing of the amendment proposed by my good friend the Senator from New Jersey—inadvertently, I say, because he has no ulterior motives in this matter—it was extremely doubtful whether the processes of court could have been used to collect the judgment of $315,000 which had been affirmed in the Supreme Court of the United States.

In passing, allow me to say that the judgment was affirmed in the Supreme Court of the United States by a vote of 5 to 1. The only member of the court voting against that judgment was former Attorney General Mr. Jackson.

Mr. President, there are undisputed records supporting the fact that many of the plaintiffs to whom I have referred spent a great deal of their money in bringing these lawsuits under the statute passed while Abraham Lincoln was President, and that not one of them was notified either by a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, or by the Judiciary Committee itself that hearings would be held. To substantiate that statement I will read some of the replies which I received to several telegrams which I sent last night.

Here is one from Cleveland, Ohio:

The John Harsch Bronze Foundry Co. manufactured bronze castings for the Packard Motor Car Co. of Philadelphia to be used in submarine engines. Investigation by governmental agencies resulted in indictment of company officials and employees to which charges pleas of guilty were entered. No action was taken for about 6 months—

Mind you, Mr. President, we have a Department of Justice. We appropriated $101,000,000 for it. There are Department of Justice lawyers to the right of us and to the left of us. The record shows that even after this company plead guilty 6 months passed and no action had been taken by the United States Government.

I resume reading from the telegram:

No action was taken for about 6 months after plea was entered until informer suit was filed by myself for damages sustained by Government. Amount indefinite and cannot be fully established until depositions will determine extent of damage. Suit now pending in Federal court.

While our boys were dying on foreign fields these men were committing these frauds and they plead guilty to them.

I continue reading from the telegram:

Offense consisted of eradicating rejection marks on defective castings and doctoring same so that defect was not remedied but was not obvious on inspection and reselling same after tempering. Was not notified by subcommittee of any proceedings at any time.

Mr. President, here is another telegram. It comes from Newark, N. J.:

Received no notice prior to recommendation of bill to repeal Informers Act. My case small. Total recovery contemplated may not exceed ten thousand. Case not being moved pending congressional action on bill. Does retroactive provision remain in bill? Please send copy if possible. Thank you for your interest.

MARTIN SIMON.

Here is another telegram which comes from Chicago:

National Bronze & Aluminum Foundry Co. made imperfect castings for material used by the armed forces and delivered same for use.

Mr. President, there has been some talk about crooks and scoundrels. The distinguished Senator from Indiana has spoken of Al Capone. Why, Mr. President, Al Capone was a gentleman, he was a statesman, a scholar, and a patriot compared with the officials of companies which are making these imperfect castings, making these imperfect airplanes, and permitting our soldier boys to use them when knowing that the chances are that the boys will suffer death as a result of such use. These companies did this so that they could make a little more money.

Mr. Yellen, the sender of this telegram, continues as follows:

Suit is for penalty under statute for claim. The total amount is undetermined due to lack of knowledge of exact number of claims made by defendant. I believe total should be well over $1,000,000.

That means $1,000,000 for a bunch of grafters and crooks who will be benefited by this legislation, if passed.

Mr. President, I now read from a telegram which comes from New York:

We were not notified.

He refers to the holding of hearings either by the subcommittee or by the Committee of the Whole.

Our case *Mandel* v. *Cooper et al.* commenced April 1941. Complaint dismissed on technicality without trial on merits. Appeal pending. Arises because of alleged fraudulent bids in sale of rubber tires. Judgment demanded for over $700,000.

Mr. President, 1941 has gone by, as well as 1942 and 1943, and the Government has not yet brought a suit in this matter.

Here is a telegram from New York. It reads as follows:

Was not notified by subcommittee of Senate Judiciary hearing on bill to repeal Informers Act the amount claimed in the suit in which I represent the defendant—

He represents the defendant, mind you—

is about $200,000. My motion to dismiss the case heard before Federal Judge Bright in Federal court, southern district of New York, on July 27, 1943. No decision yet.

So, Mr. President, neither the attorneys for the plaintiffs nor for the defendants in these cases were notified by the Judiciary Committee or by the subcommittee.

Here is another telegram from Chicago, which was received this morning:

CHICAGO, ILL., *September 15, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Judiciary Committee,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

I am very much honored by the courtesy of your inquiry. Positively at no time was I notified of any hearings. The fact in my case are that the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation was engaged in furnishing the United States Government and the Navy with its products. The steel was to be subjected to certain definite tests in order to meet Government and Navy standards. These tests were not made. However, a record book was kept in which false reports were made by employees on instructions from superiors as if the steel had met the standard set-up. Five percent of the monthly output amounting to 3,000 tons per month was thus sold to the Government, although it was substandard. Investigation by the American Bureau of Shipping into the sinking of the tanker *Schenectady* indicated substandard steel furnished by the Carnegie-Illinois to be the mainspring of the disaster. The ramifications of the case are without limits, and we feel confident that our case will recover for the Government a sum probably in excess of $25,000,000. In the hope that you will not be successful in defeating this bill to repeal the Informers Act the Carnegie-Illinois has pressed all of Pittsburgh to delay the trial and has until October 27 to answer the charges in my informer's suit. I appreciate and shall be indebted to you for your mighty efforts in seeking to defeat this bill which abolishes the right of the citizen to step in where the Government fails. If I can aid you with further information please consider me completely at your disposal.

HERMAN M. COGAN.

Here is another telegram which comes from Brooklyn:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *September 14, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Reply your wire concerning Rockbestos case. Case involves eight corporations collusively bidding for wire cable needed by Government. Bids submitted were identical to the penny. Amounts involved in excess of $20,000,000.

Eight corporations, Mr. President, bidding on different contracts involving $20,000,000 and, mind you, their bids are alike to the last cent. Talk about collusive bidding. Tomorrow I expect to have additional telegrams from others to whom I telegraphed last night, and I think the record to be disclosed will substantiate the things I say here.

Case on October 11 calendar for trial subject to congressional action. I never received any notice of hearing from Senate Judiciary Committee. Nor was I notified of any House action other than by newspaper reports. Am told by lawyers in similar cases that they were similarly ignored. Moreover, I am convinced that retroactive aspects of proposed legislation are altogether unconstitutional.

ISRAEL BECKHARDT.

Mr. President, I ask any Senator upon this floor what he knows about these 33 cases. We are asked to vote to prevent their prosecution. There has not been a hearing anywhere on a single one of them. I challenge any Senator upon this floor to tell us what the case of United States ex rel. against Baker Lockwood Manufacturing Co. is about; to tell us how much money is involved; to tell us what the facts are. Yet we are asked to take action which will prevent the prosecution of that suit, even though the plaintiffs may have spent thousands upon thousands of dollars relying upon the present statute to bring these cases to protect the American people. The cases are from different parts of the United States and from every part. I am satisfied I am going to get telegrams just like those we have already received.

Mr. President, I say that if this measure is passed, the principal one who is going to benefit, either himself or his friends, is Frank Hague, who is vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee. He is going to benefit, through his friends, to the amount of $1,438,529.20. Ah, Mr. President, it is a very significant case—the case of Frank Hague and his associates in New Jersey. I am glad to have with me here some of the records on it.

Away back, Mr. President, a long time ago, but at a time when the Attorney General had plenty of money given to him by the Congress, over in Jersey City and the towns surrounding Jersey City where Frank Hague lives, some of his friends, sand and stone contractors, were criminally charged—by whom? By this Government. Not, as the distinguished Senator from Indiana suggested, by private lawsuits; these criminal lawsuits were brought by the Government in 1935 to 1936. These concerns at Jersey City and the surrounding towns were furnishing materials for W. P. A. jobs in northern New Jersey.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT—COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I inquire if the Senator will conclude his argument today on the pending bill?

Mr. LANGER. No.

Mr. McNARY. I should like to ask the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee if he will be ready to bring the bill relating to the drafting of fathers before the Senate this week?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say, in answer to the Senator, that we had an open meeting of the committee this morning and will hold hearings in executive session this afternoon and possibly tomorrow. We expect to have General Marshall before our committee Monday. We will not complete the testimony until Monday.

Mr. McNARY. Then, the Senator will not have the case ready for consideration until Monday?

Mr. REYNOLDS. In my opinion, no.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to ask the Senator from North Carolina a question. May I suggest to the able chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs that if the inquiry is going over until Monday there are a great many of us in the Congress and many more in the country who would like to know why the Baruch manpower report seems to be suppressed at a time when the information in it respecting the question of the manpower situation ought to be available to Members of Congress in respect to the particularly serious manpower decision which it is about to make. I respectfully suggest to the able chairman of the committee that it would be very helpful to many of us if he should find it desirable to demand the publication of the Baruch report.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall be glad to make mention of that this afternoon to the Assistant Secretary of War, who, incidentally, quoted briefly from the Baruch report.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will yield, I did not hear the preliminaries of the discussion of the Baruch report. As I understand, the investigation made by Mr. Baruch was made at the request of Mr. Byrnes, and the report is one made to Mr. Byrnes. It is not a matter over which the Secretary of War or the War Department has any jurisdiction, as I understand.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator is correct in that.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be that even if Mr. Byrnes wanted to make the report public—and I do not know whether he does or does not, because I have not conferred with him about it—he would feel under some obligation to submit the matter to the President, or get the President's advice about it, before taking any action. I have no information on that subject, either; but I do not think it would be wise to assume that the War Department or the Committee on Military Affairs would have any power to compel Mr. Byrnes to make public a report which he asked Mr. Baruch to make to him on a subject which, of course, is of great public interest; but the report may or may not be made public, depending upon the circumstances, I suppose, which the Director of Economic Stabilization, Mr. Byrnes, may find to exist. It may be that the report will be made public, and I agree that if the information we have received about what the report contains is accurate, it is no doubt a valuable report, which the public should have, and it would be helpful in considering the manpower situation. Whether it would be helpful in connection with the particular bill now under discussion I do not know, not having seen the report.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I entirely agree with the Senator that the question of jurisdiction may be involved regarding the control of the release of the report, and I had no purpose to indicate an effort to pry the report loose by any improper approach. I merely raised the general question, and it seems to me that since the Committee on Military Affairs is the committee which now has this particular manpower problem under consideration, and since behind the decision as to whether or not fathers shall be drafted lies the much larger problem as to whether the total manpower situation is being adequately handled, whether or not the method of handling it may or may not be the reason why fathers are to be drafted, it occurred to me that it would be appropriate for this particular committee to inquire officially whether or not Congress may not have made available to it, by whatever appropriate source controlled, whatever comments Mr. Baruch has made as a result of the official inquiry which he made at the request of Mr. Byrnes, because we all have great confidence in Mr. Baruch, the country has substantial confidence in him, and anything which could contribute confidence at the present moment would be a great novelty.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am surprised to have the Senator make that statement as to the novelty of it. In view of the important function he performed at Mackinac Island recently in framing the declaration of the modus vivendi of the great party of which he is a great leader, I am surprised to hear him say that nothing has happened recently that has created confidence.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am very grateful to the Senator from Kentucky for his well merited compliment to the Mackinac meeting. I agree, with this postscript, that if the manpower problem can be handled as successfully as the problems were handled at Mackinac, then we will have reached the result to which I am addressing myself.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the fact that in both spheres there was great confusion, and probably still is.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President I do not yield further. I merely want an understanding as to whether the Senate shall recess at this time until Friday, or adjourn until tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is that all the Senator wants to know?

Mr. McNARY. That is what I want to know, and I want to know it pretty quickly.

Mr. BARKLEY. What penalty is to be inflicted on us if the Senator does not get the information as to what we are to do?

Mr. McNARY. I shall take appropriate action. The Senator from North Dakota can not conclude today. We are unable to take up the Wheeler bill until Monday, if I am correct in my assumption of the attitude of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs. I suggest that we adjourn at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it is fair to the Senate to say that yesterday, when we arranged for the hearing before the Committee on Military Affairs beginning today, it was not known that General Marshall was then on his way to Mexico on an important mission. No one would have thought of interfering with him to bring him back here to testify, and he will not return until Saturday night, and cannot appear until Monday, at which time I think he is to appear before a joint meeting of the two Committees on Military Affairs of the House and Senate. Certainly we should want his testimony, and whatever he can contribute. Therefore we cannot take up the Wheeler bill until later.

Mr. McNARY. That is what I stated.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no desire to postpone for one moment longer than is necessary the consideration of the bill. If we will lose no time by going over until Friday, I have no objection to that, and I think it might give some of us an opportunity to hear the testimony before the Committee on Military Affairs. I certainly should like to hear it. I was present this morning, but had to leave before the testimony was finished, and before I had an opportunity to ask some questions I desired to propound to one or two of the witnesses. So that if we may understand that the Senator from North Dakota can conclude his address on Friday——

Mr. McNARY. The Senator has just advised me that he can conclude his remarks on Friday, and I am sure that if there are other speeches to be made and the Senate should go over until Tuesday, it would not interfere with the early consideration of the Wheeler bill next week. We could await consideration of that until the pending bill was disposed of, but I desire to get through with the pending bill this week.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope we can conclude its consideration on Friday, so that we will not have to meet Saturday; but taking a chance, I am perfectly willing to go over until Friday, and let the matter go until that time, although I will not make any agreement now which would not involve a session Saturday, if necessary.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that. Then will the Senator at this time move that the Senate adjourn until Friday?

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no Executive Calendar, and if it is the desire of the Senator from Oregon that a recess be taken now, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, September 17, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 15, 1943:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Joachim O. Fernandez, of New Orleans, La., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Louisiana, to fill an existing vacancy.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE CAPTAINS, JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT, WITH RANK FROM JULY 13, 1943

Capt. Nicholas Eugene Allen, Judge Advocate General's Department Reserve.

Capt. James Wesley Booth, Judge Advocate General's Department Reserve.

Maj. George Brainerd Chapman 3d, Army of the United States.
Maj. Edward Burton Crosland, Army of the United States.
Maj. John Marshall Fasoli, Army of the United States.
Maj. William Franklin Fratcher, Army of the United States.
Lt. Col. Frank Joseph Gollings, Army of the United States.
Maj. Joseph Alexandre Guimond, Army of the United States.
Maj. David Moffatt McConnell, Army of the United States.
Lt. Col. Reginald Conklin Miller, Army of the United States.
Lt. Col. William Dempsey Partlow, Jr., Army of the United States.
Lt. Col. John Marshall Pitzer, Army of the United States.
Maj. Robert Frederick Hoke Pollock, Army of the United States.
Capt. Gerald Pflaum Rosen, Judge Advocate General's Department Reserve.
Maj. Raymond Paul Sharood, Army of the United States.
Lt. Col. William Taylor Thurman, Army of the United States.
Maj. George Clark Van Nostrand, Army of the United States.

TO BE CHAPLAINS, WITH RANK OF FIRST LIEUTENANT, TO RANK FROM JULY 14, 1943

Chaplain (Maj.) Russell Lloyd Blaisdell, Army of the United States.
Chaplain (Capt.) Steve Pettie Gaskins, Jr., Army of the United States.
Chaplain (Capt.) Frank Louis Grafton, Army of the United States.
Chaplain (First Lt.) Elmer Everett Wehking, Army of the United States.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, DENTAL CORPS, WITH RANK FROM JULY 14, 1943

Capt. John Alexander Duthie, Army of the United States.
Capt. Paul Joseph Lundell, Army of the United States.
First Lt. Frank Monroe Taylor, Jr., Dental Corps Reserve.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, MEDICAL CORPS, WITH RANK FROM JULY 31, 1943

Maj. Alfred Hiller Bungardt, Army of the United States.
Capt. Arthur Lynn Burks, Army of the United States.
Capt. Stanley David Burton, Army of the United States.
Maj. Dan Crozier, Army of the United States.
Capt. Arnold Lewis Field, Army of the United States.
Capt. Joseph Arthur Gautsch, Army of the United States.
Maj. Leo Joseph Geppert, Army of the United States.
Capt. Thurman Knight Hill, Army of the United States.
Capt. Charles Bullard Hooker, Army of the United States.
Capt. Camp Stanley Huntington, Army of the United States.
First Lt. Herbert William Jenkins, Medical Corps Reserve.
Capt. George Thomas Kelleher, Army of the United States.
Maj. Paul Victor Kiehl, Army of the United States.
Capt. Joseph Davis Lea, Army of the United States.
Maj. Donald Withers Lyddon, Army of the United States.
Capt. Frank Alphonzo Mantz, Jr., Army of the United States.
First Lt. George Deshon McAfee, Medical Corps Reserve.
Maj. William Henry Merritt, Army of the United States.
Maj. Hugh Mullan, Army of the United States.
Capt. Orland Stenberg Olsen, Army of the United States.
Capt. James Archer Orbison, Army of the United States.
Maj. William David Tigertt, Army of the United States.
Lt. Col. James Arista Wier, Army of the United States.
Maj. Herman Saul Wigodsky, Army of the United States.

TO BE CHAPLAINS, WITH RANK OF FIRST LIEUTENANT, TO RANK FROM AUGUST 5, 1943

Chaplain (Capt.) Warren Earl Ferguson, Army of the United States.
Chaplain (First Lt.) Maury Hundley, Jr., Army of the United States.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT, PHARMACY CORPS, WITH RANK FROM AUGUST 26, 1943

Capt. Charles Joseph Mrazek, Jr., Army of the United States.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, MEDICAL CORPS, WITH RANK FROM SEPTEMBER 6, 1943

Capt. Irving Abelow, Army of the United States.
Capt. Burton Elias Ezra Adams, Army of the United States.
Capt. John Hawes Amesse, Army of the United States.
Capt. Frank Louis Bauer, Army of the United States.
Capt. Kenneth Lennox Brown, Army of the United States.
Capt. Wilson Gordon Brown, Army of the United States.
Maj. Bernard Tetlow Daniels, Army of the United States.
Capt. William Todd DeVan, Army of the United States.
Maj. Alf Torp Haerem, Army of the United States.
Capt. Welland Angel Hause, Army of the United States.
Maj. Harold Mendez Jesurun, Army of the United States.
Capt. Louis Caspar Kossuth, Army of the United States.
Capt George Vernon Potter, Army of the United States.
Capt. Thompson Eldridge Potter, Army of the United States.
Maj. Percy Hall Sutley, Army of the United States.

TO BE CHAPLAINS, WITH RANK OF FIRST LIEUTENANT, TO RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Chaplain (Capt.) Harold Francis Donovan, Army of the United States.
Chaplain (Capt.) Arthur Henry Marsh, Army of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Capt. Samuel Fayette Silver, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 13, 1939.

TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Capt. Charles Harlow Miles, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 13, 1943.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Second Lt. Raymond Ira Schnittke, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 11, 1941.

TO INFANTRY

Col. Madison Pearson, Adjutant General's Department (temporary brigadier general), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Lt. Col. Clyde Lloyd Hyssong, Adjutant General's Department (temporary brigadier general) with rank from August 18, 1940.
Lt. Col. Frank Martin Smith, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel), with rank from January 5, 1941.

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. John Barkeley McPherson, Cavalry (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1943.
Second Lt. Edward Sterling Abdo, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from October 5, 1942.
Second Lt. William Edward Byerts, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Second Lt. Thomas William Fishburn, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Second Lt. Alpha Alsbury Fowler, Jr., Infantry, with rank from October 7, 1942.
Second Lt. Howard Anthony Linn, Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from January 19, 1943.
Second Lt. Robert James Lynch, Infantry, with rank from October 7, 1942.
Second Lt. Ernest Darius Scott, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from January 19, 1943.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonels with rank from August 1, 1943

Lt. Col. Edwin Albert Zundel, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Clinton Wilbur Howard, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Charles Manly Busbee, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Albert Whitney Waldron, Field Artillery (temporary major general), subject to examination required by law.
Lt. Col. Raymond Marsh, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Henry Benton Sayler, Ordnance Department (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Joseph May Swing, Field Artillery (temporary major general).

To be colonel with rank from August 7, 1943

Lt. Col. Charles Wolcott Ryder, Infantry (temporary major general), subject to examination required by law.

To be colonels with rank from September 1, 1943

Lt. Col. Stafford LeRoy Irwin, Field Artillery (temporary major general).
Lt. Col. Joseph Taggart McNarney, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant general), subject to examination required by law.
Lt. Col. Pearson Menoher, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Albert Henry Warren, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from September 4, 1943

Maj. George Huston Bare, Infantry (temporary colonel).

To be first lieutenant with rank from September 3, 1943

Second Lt. John Edward Burrows, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. George Earl Hesner, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 1, 1943.
Lt. Col. William Alexander Smith, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 1, 1943.
Lt. Col. Edwin Leland Brackney, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 3, 1943.
Lt. Col. Edward Jones Strickler, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 5, 1943.
Lt. Col. Aubrey Kenna Brown, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 6, 1943.
Lt. Col. Frank William Pinger, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. Neely Cornelius Mashburn, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. Charles Booth Spruit, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. Lucius Featherstone Wright, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. Herbert Hall Price, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. William Elijah Moore Devers, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. Samuel Elkan Brown, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. Clyde Clifford Johnston, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. Ernest Farris Harrison, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. Walter Midkiff Crandall, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. Harry Ainsworth Clark, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. Malcolm Cummings Grow, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. Clarence Clinton Harvey, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. Daniel Currie Campbell, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. Jose Canellas Carballeira, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. Clyde Danford Oatman, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. Carroll Porteous Price, Medical Corps, with rank from September 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. Henry Charles Johannes, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. Donald Ion Stanton, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. Charles Beresford Callard, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. Joseph Hall Whiteley, Medical Corps, with rank from September 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. Clyde McKay Beck, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. William Clare Porter, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. James Bliss Owen, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 6, 1943.

Lt. Col. Joseph Sherman Craig, Medical Corps, with rank from September 6, 1943, subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Lincoln Frank Putnam, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 7, 1943.

Lt. Col. Rufus Leroy Holt, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 9, 1943.

Lt. Col. John DuBose Barnwell, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 16, 1943.

Lt. Col. Everett LeCompte Cook, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 20, 1943.

Lt. Col. Ralph Leslie Cudlipp, Medical Corps, with rank from September 27, 1943.

Lt. Col. Virgil Heath Cornell, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 28, 1943.

Lt. Col. Gordon Adams Clapp, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 29, 1943.

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. Kincheon Hubert Bailey, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 19, 1943.

To be captains

First Lt. James Arista Wier, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 31, 1943.

First Lt. Stephen Lawrence Gumport, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from September 2, 1943.

First Lt. Edward Mansfield Gunn, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from September 2, 1943.

First Lt. William Maurice Jackson, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from September 5, 1943.

First Lt. George Howard Wood, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from September 10, 1943.

First Lt. Raymond Arnold Lawn, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from September 11, 1943.

First Lt. Carl Frederick Tessmer, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from September 17, 1943.

First Lt. James William Humphreys, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from September 19, 1943.

First Lt. Walter Albra Ricker, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from September 20, 1943.

First Lt. Charles Fore Wilkinson, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from September 21, 1943.

First Lt. Elwyn Nickell Akers, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from September 22, 1943.

First Lt. William David Tigertt, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from September 22, 1943.

First Lt. Joseph Harold Bornstein, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from September 23, 1943.

First Lt. Irving Richard Lyman, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from September 25, 1943.

First Lt. George Sauter Bozalis, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from September 26, 1943.

First Lt. Willard Henry Cleveland, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from September 28, 1943.

First Lt. John Ficicchy, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from September 30, 1943

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Roy Albert Stout, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 12, 1943.

Lt. Col. Roy L. Bodine, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 13, 1943.

Lt. Col. James Jay Weeks, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 15, 1943.

Lt. Col. Thomas Joseph Cassidy, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 17, 1943, subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Howard Austin Hale, Dental Corps, with rank from September 18, 1943.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Francois Hue Karl Reynolds, Veterinary Corps, with rank from September 3, 1943.

Lt. Col. Charles Sears Williams, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 10, 1943.

Lt. Col. Fred W. Shinn, Veterinary Corps, with rank from September 10, 1943.

Lt. Col. Irby Rheuel Pollard, Veterinary Corps, with rank from September 10, 1943.

Lt. Col. Frank Caldwell Hershberger, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 10, 1943.

Lt. Col. Clifford Eugene Pickering, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 13, 1943.

Lt. Col. Raymond Randall, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 14, 1943.

Lt. Col. Joseph Hiriam Dornblaser, Veterinary Corps, with rank from September 16, 1943.

Lt. Col. Seth C. Dildine, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 16, 1943.

Lt. Col. George Leslie Caldwell, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 18, 1943.

Lt. Col. Jacob Landes Hartman, Veterinary Corps, with rank from September 18, 1943.

Lt. Col. John Harold Kintner, Veterinary Corps, with rank from September 18, 1943.

Lt. Col. Samuel George Kielsmeier, Veterinary Corps, with rank from September 21, 1943.

Lt. Col. Oness Harry Dixon, Jr., Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 26, 1943.

Lt. Col. John Wesley Miner, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 29, 1943.

CHAPLAINS

To be colonels

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) John Ralph Wright, United States Army, with rank from September 18, 1943.

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Harry Carleton Fraser, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from September 18, 1943.

To be captain

Chaplain (First Lt.) Russell Lloyd Blaisdell, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from July 30, 1943.

PHARMACY CORPS

To be colonel with rank from September 12, 1943

Lt. Col. Arthur Elmer Brown, Pharmacy Corps.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 12, 1943

Capt. Thomas Grimsley Hester, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. William Harvey Kernan, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. William Clarence Williams, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Frank Steiner, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Max Verne Talbot, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

To be majors with rank from July 12, 1943

Capt. Edward Martin Wones, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Seth Overbaugh Craft, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Douglas Hall, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Charles Lawrence Driscoll, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Edward James Gearin, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Paul Estabrooke Zuver, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Orion Victor Kempf, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Robert Lee Black, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Paul Nixon, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Leonard George Tate Perkins, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Harold Lincoln Gard, Pharmacy Corps, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Joe Edward McKnight, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Homer Clarence McCullough, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Joseph Carmack, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

Capt. Louis Felix Williams, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

Capt. Frank Randle Day, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

To be major with rank from July 21, 1943

Capt. Paul Christian Borup, Pharmacy Corps.

To be captains with rank from July 12, 1943

First Lt. Carrol Conrad Barrick, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

First Lt. Thomas Raymond Jones, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. Cornelius John Curran, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. Gerard Adrien Belanger, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. Guy Wycoff Harlow, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

First Lt. Wilfred Arthur Emond, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. Harland William Layer, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. Eugene Gordon Cooper, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

First Lt. Arthur Melville Henderson, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. Eli Egbert Daman, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt Everett Walter Partin, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt Andy Vaughan Little, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. Omar Kenneth Andrews, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. Frank Stepczyk, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major)

First Lt. Jacob Bruce Martin, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

First Lt. Harry John Nelson, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. James Thomas Johnson, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt Glenn Keith Smith, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. Howard Brim Nelson, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. Leonard Paul Zagelow, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

To be first lieutenants with rank from July 12, 1943

Second Lt. Claud Dale La Fors, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Bernard Korn, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Ennis Dallas Sandberg, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. James Thomas Richards, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Paul Cable Larnce, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Emerson Beery Taylor, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Thomas Floris Criswell, Jr., Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Woodrow Charles Herbert, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Elliott Powell Rigsby, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

To be first lieutenant with rank from September 11, 1943

Second Lt. Edward Casimir Rogowski, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain).

SENATE

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of our salvation, from whom alone all just designs and righteous judgments proceed, Thou makest hope to spring eternal in the human breast. We thank Thee for all the loveliness that summer unfolds through flower and field and forest, as by still waters and green pastures our jaded spirits have been restored. We are grateful for happy memories like quiet pools that mirror peace.

In weary and wearing days freighted with stress and strain, help us to listen beyond the tumult of the world to voices heard only in gentle stillness. May we take the anxious and restless striving of our perplexed generation and set it against the wider background of Him with whom a day is as a thousand years and a thousand years as one day. Through the blare of today's blatant voices, with steady faith may we march to the beat of a distant drum that selfish hearts can never hear. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, September 15, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON THE NOMINATION OF CHARLES E. CASSIDY TO BE THIRD JUDGE OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT, HAWAII

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and in accordance with the rules of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing of the committee will be held on the morning of September 24, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Charles E. Cassidy, of Hawaii, to be third judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, for the Territory of Hawaii. At that time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make representations to the committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

JURISDICTION OF SERVICE COURTS OF FORCES OF FRIENDLY FOREIGN NATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of State relating to an exchange of notes in which the British Government recognized the right of the service courts and authorities of the United States to exercise exclusive jurisdiction in respect of criminal offenses that might be committed in the United Kingdom by members of the United States armed forces, and transmitting a draft of proposed legislation "To implement the jurisdiction of service courts of friendly foreign forces within the United States, and for other purposes" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Letters from departments and agencies of the Government, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service, as follows:

Revised estimates for the quarter ending September 30, 1943, for the Department of the Interior and the Federal Security Agency; and

Quarterly estimate for the quarter ending December 31, 1943, for the Executive Mansion and Grounds.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES DEFERRED FROM MILITARY SERVICE FOR OCCUPATIONAL REASONS

A letter from the Director of the Selective Service System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth monthly list of registrants deferred for occupational reasons because of their employment in or under the Federal Government (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITION

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Paola, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF STAFFORD COUNTY (KANS.) FARMERS UNION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a resolution adopted by the Stafford County (Kans.) Farmers Union which I am glad to present to the Senate and ask that it be appropriately referred. It reads as follows:

Our Stafford County Farmers Union wish to go on record as favoring the following resolution: "In view of the fact that the farmers of the United States have contracted to feed the world, we feel that we should have an even break with industry, and be guaranteed costs plus."

The backbone of the Nation is the farmer, and all these other industries depend on him. Why should he not be protected the same as industry? The farmer must have this consideration.

Yours truly,

Mrs. RALPH HENRY,
Secretary, Stafford County Farmers Union, Stafford, Kans.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution presented by the Senator from Kansas will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Joachim O. Fernandez, of New Orleans, La., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Louisiana, to fill an existing vacancy.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 1358. A bill for the relief of Nels J. Pedersen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1359. A bill for the relief of the Truckee-Carson irrigation district; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 1360. A bill to authorize the sale, exchange, or other disposition of certain securities held by the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1361. A bill to extend the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, in connection with the public lands, to certain persons serving in the merchant marine and to certain civilian workmen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim Armed Services Honor Day for the recognition and appreciation of the patriotic devotion to duty of all members of all branches of the armed military and naval forces of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

IMPORTANCE OF THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on my desk this morning I found a copy of the Prairie Farmer, an excellent farm paper published in my section of the country. Included therein is an editorial entitled "Don't Kill Farm Credit." It is so important, to my way of thinking, that I shall take the time of the Senate to read it into the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

DON'T KILL FARM CREDIT

Bankers seem to have short memories. During the great period of financial rioting with easy money, and stocks and bonds gambling, bankers offered and did lend money to meet the needs. They did not always have enough reserves, but they loaned the money, anyhow.

When firecrackers exploding in the grain pits of the board of trade caused the speculators to run for the nearest exits, when otherwise sensible businessmen realized they were busted and jumped out of seventh-story windows, when pathetic widows stood in line at bank windows to get back money they had invested in foreign bonds upon advice of investment bankers—

Mr. President, if you will pardon me for diverting for a moment from the editorial, let me say that I myself had some of those bonds back in the good old days of 1932, when the bankers of my home town convinced me that 7½ percent bonds were about the safest things in the country. In that one little city of some 4,000 persons, one banker sold to widows, farmers, merchants and people like myself who should have known better, approximately $125,000 worth of sugar bonds with interest rates of 7½ percent. That type of banker sold his depositors down the river. It was such irresponsibility that caused so many bank failures.

The editorial continues:

When bankers themselves took the road to foreign parts, walked their ways to prison, or died of broken hearts because of the panic which they were helpless to stop—in those days bankers became humble citizens. They accepted the bank holiday and the flood of Federal funds which came to their banks to stem the tide of panic and restore financial reason to a money greedy world.

Let me further digress to say that so far as the domestic issues of this country are concerned, President Roosevelt will long be remembered for declaring the bank holiday or the bank moratorium, as it was called at that time, saving literally billions of dollars for the depositors of banking institutions. When others at that moment did not have the courage to step forward and declare a moratorium, President Roosevelt did. That is what the editorial is talking about. However, strange as it may seem, many people in this country soon forget what transpired in one of the most critical eras of the United States.

The editorial further says:

Now things are booming again. Bankers' associations, State and national, are forgetting how they failed in their job during the days before the depression. They forget how they hurried during the darkest days of the depression to have farm mortgages bailed out of their banks so that they might have the cash. The Federal farm-land banks did that job.

Farmers who could not get a dime from banks for working capital found lifesaving financial blood in the funds which they could get through the production-credit associations formed so that the business of farming might not be wrecked.

So now when the bankers through their associations square away to talk to Congress, they are in poor position to say that these farm mortgage and working capital branches of the Farm Credit Administration are worthless and that the banks are prepared to meet the financial needs of the country in all emergencies.

Surely their memories are not that short. Their consciences cannot be clear as they stand before the legislators making such an argument for the destruction of the farm credit system which dates back more than 25 years, and which, in a great financial crisis, proved its worth.

INVESTIGATION OF CONDITIONS AT GALLINGER MUNICIPAL HOSPITAL

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is pending on the Senate calendar a resolution reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia at the last session of the Senate. The resolution would authorize the Committee on the District of Columbia or any duly appointed subcommittee thereof to proceed with an investigation of Gallinger Hospital. At this time I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered out of order. In that respect I wish to say I have presented the matter to both the majority leader and the minority leader, and they have given me the green light on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 178) reported by Mr. McCARRAN from the Committee on the District of Columbia, authorizing an investigation of conditions at Gallinger Municipal Hospital.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the word "patients", to change the period to a colon and insert *"Provided*, That such committee or subcommittee shall call upon the United States Public Health Service for such professional, technical, or other assistance as it may deem necessary for purposes of the investigation herein authorized," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, or any duly appointed subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized to investigate conditions at Gallinger Municipal Hospital, with particular reference to sanitation, food, diet, and the treatment and care of tubercular patients: *Provided*, That such committee or subcommittee shall call upon the United States Public Health Service for such professional, technical, or other assistance as it may deem necessary for purposes of the investigation herein authorized.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

SECURITY FOR ALL—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WAGNER

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Security for All" broadcast by him over the radio September 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR COLLABORATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Post-War Collaboration" delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah at Carnegie Hall, New York, on September 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FUTURE OF AVIATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Future of Aviation" delivered by him at Quincy, Ill., on August 5, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BALL

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of post-war peace delivered by him at a mass meeting held at the Chicago Stadium on September 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEW APPROACHES TO PEACE—ADDRESS BY HERBERT HOOVER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "New Approaches to Peace" delivered by Hon. Herbert Hoover before the joint session of the St. Paul-Minneapolis branches of the Foreign Policy Association and the University of Minnesota, at Minneapolis, Minn., September 3, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPEAL TO HUNGARY TO WITHDRAW FROM THE WAR

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an appeal by the Verhovay Fraternal Insurance Association to Hungary to withdraw from the war, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENTS OF POLICY ADOPTED BY DIRECTORS, WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD statements of policy adopted by the directors of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture, meeting in Madison, Wis., September 9, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN POLICY FOR POST-WAR UNITED STATES—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Foreign Policy for Post-War United States," published in the Washington Times-Herald for July 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ELIMINATION OF PRIVATE SUITS ARISING OUT OF FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] to strike from the first committee amendment certain language, as amended, beginning on page 2, line 13.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I understand that there will be discussion of this amendment. The Senate is in the midst of a discussion of this bill at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is debatable.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am very anxious to present a very important report briefly to the Senate. I wonder if the Senator from West Virginia will permit me to proceed for just 5 minutes in that respect?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, at the Wednesday session of the Senate——

PROGRESS OF THE WAR—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the message just received from the President, as I understand, is directed in part to the matter the Senator from Michigan has in mind, and it seems to me that the message should be laid down first.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is quite satisfactory to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

During the 2-months' recess of the Congress, many important events have occurred at the war fronts and at home. You return at a time when major battles in Europe and in Asia are beginning to be joined. In recent months, the main tides of conflict have been running our way—but we could not and cannot be content merely to drift with this favorable tide.

You know from the news of the past few days that every military operation entails a legitimate military risk and that occassionally we have checks to our plans—checks which necessarily involve severe losses of men and materials.

The Allied forces are now engaged in a very hard battle south of Naples. Casualties are heavy. The desperation with which the Germans are fighting reveals that they are well aware of the consequences to them of our occupation of Italy.

The Congress and the American people can rest assured that the landing on Italy is not the only landing we have in mind. That landing was planned at Casablanca. At Quebec, the leaders and the military staffs of Great Britain and the United States made specific and precise plans to bring to bear further blows of equal or greater importance against Germany and Japan—with definite times and places for other landings on the continent of Europe and elsewhere.

On the 10th of July a carefully prepared expedition landed in Sicily. In spite of heavy German opposition it cleared this large and heavily fortified island in 38 days.

British, Canadian, and American losses in killed, wounded, and missing in the Sicilian campaign were 31,158, of which the American forces lost 7,445. The casualties among the Italians and Germans were approximately 165,000, including 132,000 prisoners.

The unmistakably sincere welcome given to the Allied troops by the Italian people has proved conclusively that even in a country which had lived for a generation under a complete dictatorship—with all of its propaganda, censorship, and suppression of free speech and discussion—the love of liberty was unconquerable.

It has also proved conclusively that this war was not waged by the people of Italy on their own choice. All of Mussolini's propaganda machine could not make them love Hitler or hate us. The less said about the feelings toward Mussolini, the better.

I believe that equal jubilation and enthusiasm will be shown by the people of the other nations now under the German heel when Nazi Gauleiters and native Quislings are removed through force or flight.

How different was this invading army of the Allies from the German forces that had come into Sicily, ostensibly to "protect it." Food, clothing, cattle, medicines, and household goods had been systematically stolen from the people of Sicily, and sent north to the "master race" in Germany. Sicily, like other parts of Italy, and like the other satellite and conquered nations, had been bled white by the Nazi and Fascist governments. Growers of crops were permitted to retain only a small fraction of their own produce for themselves and their families.

With the Allied armies, however, went a carefully planned organization, trained and equipped to give physical care to the local population—food, clothing, medicine. This new organization is also now in the process of restoring to the people of Sicily freedoms which, for many years, had been denied to them. I am confident that, within a year, Sicily will be once more self-supporting—and, in addition to that once more self-respecting.

From Sicily the advance of the Allied armies has continued to the mainland. On the third day of September they landed on the toe of the Italian Peninsula. These were the first Allied troops to invade the continent of Europe in order to liberate the conquered and oppressed countries. History will always remember this day as the beginning of the answer to the prayer of the millions of liberty-loving human beings not only in these conquered lands but all over the world.

On July 25—2 weeks after our first landings in Sicily—political events in Italy startled the world. Mussolini, the incubus of Italy for a generation, the man who is more responsible for all of the sorrows of Italy than anyone, except possibly Hitler himself, was forced out of office and stripped of his power as a result of his own dismal failures, his wanton brutalities, and the overwhelming demand of the Italian people. This was the first break in Axis leadership—to be followed, we are determined, by other and similar encouraging downfalls.

But there is one thing I want to make perfectly clear: When Hitler and the Nazis go out, the Prussian military clique must go with them. The war-breeding gangs of militarists must be rooted out of Germany — and out of Japan—if we are to have any real assurance of future peace.

Early last month, the relentless application of overwhelming Allied power—particularly air and sea power—convinced the leaders of Italy that it could not continue an active part in the war. Conversations were begun by them with us. These conversations were carried on with the utmost secrecy. Therefore, much as I wished to do so, I could not communicate the facts of the case to the Congress, or the press, or to those who repeatedly expressed dismay or indignation at our apparent course in Italy. These negotiations turned out to be a complete surprise to nearly everyone, not only to the Axis but to the Italian people themselves.

I am sure that the Congress realizes that there are many situations in this war—and there will be many more to come—in which it is impossible for me to make any announcement or even to give any indication of the policy which

we are following. And I ask the American people as well as the Congress to bear with me and with our chiefs of staff. It is difficult to remain silent when unjustified attack and criticism come from those who are not in a position to have all the facts.

But the people and the Congress can be sure that the policy which we follow is an expression of the basic democratic traditions and ideals of this Republic. We shall not be able to claim that we have gained total victory in this war if any vestige of Fascism in any of its malignant forms is permitted to survive anywhere in the world.

The armistice with Italy was signed on September 3 in Sicily, but it could not be put into effect until September 8, when we were ready to make landings in force in the Naples area. We had planned these landings some time before and were determined to go through with them, armistice or no armistice.

Italian leaders appealed to their Army and Navy to end hostilities against us. Italian soldiers, though disorganized and ill-supplied, have been fighting the Germans in many regions. In conformity with the terms of unconditional surrender, the Italian Fleet has come over to our side; and it can be a powerful weapon in striking at the Nazi enemies of the Italian people.

When Hitler was forced to the conclusion that his offensive was broken, and he must go on the defensive, he started boasting that he had converted Europe into an impregnable fortress. But he neglected to provide that fortress with a roof. He also left various other vulnerable spots in the wall of the so-called fortress—which we shall point out to him in due time.

The British and American Air Forces have been bombing the roofless fortress with ever-increasing effectiveness. It is now our purpose to establish bases within bombing range of southern and eastern Germany, and to bring devastating war home to these places by day and by night as it has already been brought to western Germany.

When Britain was being subjected to mass bombing in 1940 and 1941—when the British people, including their King and Prime Minister, were proving that Britain "could take it"—the strategists of the Royal Air Force and of our own Army Air Forces were not idle. They were studying the mistakes that Goering and his staff of Nazi terrorists were making. Those were fatal mistakes, as it turned out.

Today, we and the British are not making those mistakes. We are not bombing tenements for the sheer sadistic pleasure of killing, as the Nazis did. We are striking devastating blows at carefully selected, clearly identified strategic objectives—factories, shipyards, munition dumps, transportation facilities, which make it possible for the Nazis to wage war. And we are hitting these military targets and blowing them to bits.

German power can still do us great injury. But that evil power is being destroyed, surely, inexorably, day by day, and if Hitler does not know it by now, then the last trace of sanity has departed from that distorted mind.

We must remember that in any great air attack the British and Americans lose a fairly high proportion of planes and that these losses must be made up quickly so that the weight of the bombing shall not decrease for a day in the future. In fact, a high rate of increase must be maintained according to plan—and that means constant stepping up of our production here at home.

In the remarkable raid on the Ploesti oil fields in Rumania we lost 53 of our heavy bombers; and more than 500 of our finest men are missing. This may seem like a disastrously high loss, unless you figure it against the damage done to the enemy's war power. I am certain that the German or the Japanese high commands would cheerfully sacrifice tens of thousands of men to do the same amount of damage to us, if they could. Those gallant and brilliant young Americans who raided Ploesti won a smashing victory which, I believe, will contribute materially to the shortening of the war and thus save countless lives.

We shall continue to make such raids all over the territory of Germany and the satellite countries. With Italy in our hands, the distances we have to travel will be far less and the risks proportionately reduced.

We have reliable information that there is definite unrest and a growing desire for peace among the peoples of these satellite countries—Rumania, Hungary, Finland, and Bulgaria. We hope that in these nations the spirit of revolt against Nazi dominance which commenced in Italy will burst into flame and become a consuming fire.

Every American is thrilled by the sledge-hammer blows delivered against the Nazi aggressors by the Russian armies. This summer there has been no successful German advance against the Russians, as in 1941 and 1942. The shoe today is on the other foot—and is pinching very hard. Instead, the Russians have forced the greatest military reversal since Napoleon's retreat in 1812.

The recapture of Kharkov, Stalino, and other strongholds by the Russians, the opening of the Ukraine and the Donets Basin and the freeing of millions of valuable acres and hundreds of inhabited places hearten the whole world as the Russian campaign moves toward the elimination of every German from Russian soil—toward the invasion of Germany itself. It is certain that the campaign in north Africa, the occupation of Sicily, the fighting in Italy and the compelling of large numbers of German planes to go into combat in the skies over Holland, Belgium, and France by reason of our air attacks, have given important help to the Russian armies along their advancing front from Leningrad to the Black Sea. We know, too, that we are contributing to that advance by making Germany keep many divisions in the Balkans, in southern France and along the English Channel. I like to think that these words constitute an understatement.

Similarly, the events in the Mediterranean have a direct bearing upon the war against Japan.

When the American and British expeditionary forces first landed in north Africa last November, some people believed that we were neglecting our obligations to prosecute the war vigorously in the Pacific. Such people continually make the mistake of trying to divide the war into several watertight compartments—the Western European front—the Russian front—the Burma front—the New Guinea and Solomons front, and so forth—as though all of these fronts were separate and unrelated to each other. You even hear talk of the "air war" as opposed to the "land war" or the "sea war."

Actually, we cannot think of this as several wars. It is all one war, and it must be governed by one basic strategy.

The freeing of the Mediterranean, which we started last fall, will lead directly to the resumption of our complete control of the waters of the Eastern Indian Ocean and the Bay of Bengal. Thus, we shall be enabled to strike the Japanese on another of their highly vulnerable flanks.

As long as Italy remained in the war as our enemy—as long as the Italian Fleet remained in being as a threat—a substantial part of British naval strength had to be kept locked up in the Mediterranean. Now that formidable strength is freed to proceed eastward to join in the ever-increasing attack upon the Japanese. It has not been sufficiently emphasized that the freeing of the Mediterranean is a great asset to the war in the Far East.

There has been one serious gap in the lines of our globe-girdling sea power. That is the gap between northwest Australia and Ceylon. That gap can now be closed as a result of victory in the Mediterranean.

We face, in the Orient, a long and difficult fight. We must be prepared for heavy losses in winning that fight. The power of Japan will not collapse until it has been literally pounded into the dust. It would be the utmost folly for us to try to pretend otherwise.

Even so, if the future is tough for us, think what it is for General Tojo and his murderous gang. They may look to the north, to the south, to the east, or to the west. They can see closing in on them, from all directions, the forces of retribution under the Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, General MacArthur, Admiral Nimitz, and Admiral Lord Mountbatten.

The forces operating against Japan in the various Pacific theaters are just as much interrelated and dependent on each other as are the forces pounding against Germany in Europe.

With the new threats that we offer from the Aleutians, Japan cannot afford to devote as large a proportion of her forces to hold the lines in other areas.

Such actions as the taking of Attu and Kiska do not just happen. They are the results of careful and complete planning which was going on quietly while some of our critics were so perturbed that they

had reached the verge of tears over what they called the threatened invasion of Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. It was difficult for them to realize that the carefully prepared and crucial tests in the Coral Sea and at Midway and in the Solomons rendered the Japanese toehold in the Aleutians untenable.

Japan has been hard put to it to maintain her extended lines. She had to withdraw her garrison from Kiska in the face of the oncoming American-Canadian forces because she could not maintain a steady stream of adequate reinforcements and supplies to the Aleutians.

In the Solomon Islands, with heavy fighting, we have gained so many island air bases that the threat to Australia and New Zealand across the Coral Sea has been practically dissipated. In fact, it is safe to say that our position in that area has become a threat on our part against the Japanese in the seas that lie north of the Solomons and north of New Guinea.

American, Australian, New Zealand, and Dutch forces in a magnificent campaign in New Guinea and the Solomons have destroyed much Japanese strength, and have gained for us new bases from which to launch new offensive operations.

After a long period of defensive strategy in Burma, we are determined to take the offensive there. I am also glad to report to you that we are getting more supplies and military help to China. Almost every day word comes that a new air battle has destroyed two and three times more Japanese planes in China and Burma than we ourselves have lost. That process will continue until we are ready to strike right at the heart of Japan itself.

It goes almost without saying that when Japan surrenders, the United Nations will never again let her have authority over the islands which were mandated to her by the League of Nations. Japan obviously is not to be trusted. And the same thing holds good in the case of the vast territories which Japan has stolen from China starting long before this war began.

Since the beginning of our entrance into the war, nearly 2 years ago, the United Nations have continuously reduced enemy strength by a process of attrition. That means, cold-bloodedly, placing the ever-increasing resources of the Allies into deadly competition with the ever-decreasing resources of the Axis. It means the training and use of the allied manpower—which is greater than the Axis. It means the use of our superior facilities and ability to make more munitions, and above all aircraft, more quickly than our enemies can do.

For example, the Allies today on the European front have a definite superiority in almost all weapons of war on any and every point of the encircling line—more guns, more tanks, more planes, more trucks, more transports, more supply ships, and more warships.

In the Pacific, we have taken a steady toll of Japanese war planes and a steady toll of Japanese ships—merchant ships and naval vessels. The odds are all in our favor—for we grow in strength and they cannot even replace all their losses. It might be called a simple mathematical progression.

However, unless we keep up and increase the tempo of our present rate of production, this greater strength in planes and guns, tanks, and ships can all be lost.

Our great production program started during the darkest days of 1940. With the magnificent contribution made by American industry and American labor, it is approaching full production. Britain has already attained full production. Today, the British Empire and the United States, together, are turning out so much of every essential of war that we have definite superiority over Germany and Japan which is growing with every succeeding minute. But we have no minutes to lose.

Realization of the distances we must cover brings to mind problems that every American should realize—problems of transporting from our shores to the actual fighting areas the weapons and munitions of war which we make. Burma and China can be reached only with extraordinary difficulty. Two years ago, most of the planes we sent had to be knocked down, crated, put on board ship, transported, then uncrated and put together again in India, and from there sent up to the fighting front.

In the case of China, they had to be flown over enormous mountains. Even after they were safely delivered there, the planes had to be kept supplied with ground crews, tools, oil, gasoline, and even spare parts. Since the Japs cut the Burma Road, all these supplies have to be flown over hundreds of miles to bases which had to be built in China.

The same slow process was also the rule in the southwest Pacific.

With the present increased range of airplanes and the establishment of additional bases, we are now flying more of them under their own power than before, but all the things that go to supply them—the gasoline, the tools, the spare parts—still have to be taken by ship to the fighting fronts all over the world. Practically every soldier and all his weapons and equipment have to go by ship. And every time a new forward move develops the whole outfit has to go by ship.

I wonder how many people realize what it means to carry on the war across the Atlantic and the Pacific and through the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean, along lines of supply attacked by submarines and dive bombers at many points.

The combined operation of the British and Americans last November against Morocco and Algeria was in point of numbers the largest military movement over the longest number of miles to landings under fire that history has recorded anywhere.

The ships for such an amphibious operation cannot be loaded in the ordinary way, to be unloaded alongside a comfortable, safe wharf. Most of the ships must be "combat loaded" in such a way that the troops go ashore first and are immediately followed in the proper order by guns and ammunition, tanks, trucks and food, medical equipment and all the supplies of a modern army. Preparations must be made to conduct these landings under enemy fire, and on beaches instead of at docks. People who have seen or planned this kind of operation even over short distances do not speak glibly about landing great expeditions on a few days' notice or on all the beaches of Europe at the same time.

The Members of the Congress have undoubtedly had an opportunity to see at first hand in their own home districts some of our war factories and plants and shipyards throughout the United States which are now working at full blast turning out the greatest amount of war production in the history of the world.

In June and July we were worried by a reduction in the rate of increase in production. Great as our production had been we could not afford to level off. We had to continue the upward curve and not pause on any plateaus.

I am happy to report that the increase was resumed in August. In this month of September it is even better.

For example, during the two months of the recess of the Congress our factories produced approximately 15,000 planes. There was an especially important increase in the production of heavy bombers in August. I cannot reveal the exact figures on this. They would give the enemy needed information—but no comfort. However, the total airplane production is still not good enough. We seek not only to come up to the schedule but to surpass it.

During those same 2 months American shipyards put into commission 3,200,000 tons of large merchant ships—a total of 281 ships, almost 5 ships a day.

Even as the actual fighting engagements in which our troops take part increase in number, it is becoming more and more evident that this is essentially a great war of production. The best way to avoid heavy casualty lists is to provide our troops with the best equipment possible—and plenty of it.

We have come a great way since this Congress first met in January of this year. But I state only a blunt fact when I tell the Congress that we are still a long, long way from ultimate victory in any major feat theater of the war.

First. Despite our substantial victories in the Mediterranean, we face a hard and costly fight up through Italy—and a major job of organizing our positions before we can take advantage of them.

Second. From bases in the British Isles we must be sure that we have assembled the strength to strike not just in one direction but in many directions—by land and sea and in the air—with overwhelming forces and equipment.

Third. Although our Russian Allies have made a magnificent counter offensive, and are driving our common enemies back day by day, the Russian armies still have far to go before they get into Germany itself.

Fourth. The Japanese hold firmly established positions on an enormous front

from the Kuriles through the mandated islands to the Solomons and through the Netherlands East Indies to Malaysia and Burma and China. To break through this defensive ring we must hit them and hit them hard not merely at one point but at many points, and we must keep on hitting them.

In all of history, there has never been a task so tremendous as that which we now face. We can do it—and we will do it—but we must plan and work and fight with every ounce of intelligence and energy and courage that we possess.

The Congress has reconvened at a time when we are in the midst of the Third War Loan drive seeking to raise a sum unparalleled in history—$15,000,000,000. This is a dramatic example of the scale on which this war still has to be fought, and presents some idea of how difficult and costly the responsible leaders of this Government believe the war will be.

Nothing we can do will be more costly in lives than to adopt the attitude that the war has been won—or nearly won. That would mean a let-down in the great tempo of production which we have reached, and would mean that our men who are now fighting all over the world will not have that overwhelming superiority of power which has dealt so much death and destruction to the enemy and at the same time has saved so many American lives.

That is why I have always maintained that there is no such separate entity as the "home front." Every day lost in turning out an airplane or a ship at home will have its direct effect upon the men now battling up the leg of Italy or in the jungles of the Southwest Pacific or in the clouds over China.

There have been complaints from some sources about the way this production and other domestic activities have been carried on. Some of these complaints of course are justified. On the other hand, some of them come from selfish people who merely do not like to give up some of their pleasures, or a part of their butter or meat or milk.

Fair-minded citizens, however, will realize that although mistakes have been made, the job that has been done in converting peacetime America to a wartime basis has been a great job and a successful one, of which all our people have good reason to be proud.

It would be nothing short of a miracle if this unprecedented job of transforming a peace-loving, unprepared industrial America into a fighting and production machine had been accomplished without some mistakes being made and some people being given cause for complaint.

The Congress is well aware of the magnitude of the undertaking, and of the many gigantic problems involved. For the Congress has been actively involved in helping to work out the solutions to these unprecedented problems.

A few facts will show how vast an enterprise this war has been—and how we are constantly increasing the tempo of our production.

The total amount spent on the war from May 1940 to date is $128,123,000,000. The bill is now running at the rate of $250,000,000 per day.

Up to September 1, 1943, among the more important items produced and delivered since the armament program started in May 1940 are the following:

Airplanes	123,000
Airplane engines	349,000
Tanks	53,000
Artillery weapons	93,000
Small arms (rifles, carbines, machine guns, etc.)	9,500,000
Small-arms ammunition (rounds)	25,942,000,000
Trucks	1,233,000

In most instances more than half of the above total delivered to date was produced during the first 8 months of 1943.

Airplanes	52,000
Tanks	23,000
Artillery weapons	40,600
Small arms (rifles, carbines, machine guns, etc.)	4,638,000
Small-arms ammunition (rounds)	13,339,000,000

The number of fighting ships and auxiliaries of all kinds completed since May 1940 is 2,380, and 13,000 landing vessels.

In the 2½ years between January 1, 1941, and July 1, 1943, the power plants built for installation in Navy vessels had a horsepower equal to all the horsepower of all hydroelectric plants in the United States in January 1941.

The completions of Navy ships during the last 6 months were equal to completions in the entire year of 1942.

We have cut down the time required to build submarines by almost 50 percent.

The antiaircraft and double-purpose guns produced by the Navy since the defense program started in May 1940, if fired all together, would throw 4,600 tons of projectiles per minute against the enemy.

The output of underwater ordnance—torpedoes, mines, and depth charges—during the first half of 1943 was equal to the total production of 1942.

During the month of August 1943 we produced almost as many torpedoes as during all of World War No. 1.

Anyone who has had to build a single factory, tool it up, get the necessary help, set up an assembly line, produce and ship the product will have some idea of what that amount of production has meant.

We have had to raise and equip armed forces approaching 10,000,000 men. Simultaneously, in spite of this drain on our manpower, we have had to find millions more men and millions of women to operate our war factories, arsenals, shipyards, essential civilian industries, and the farms and mines of America.

There have been the problems of increasing greatly the output of our natural resources—not only for our own Army and Navy and for our civilians at home but also for our allies and our own forces all over the world.

Since the outbreak of war in Europe we have increased our output of petroleum by 66 percent. We have stepped up our bituminous coal production by 40 percent, chemicals by 300 percent, iron ore by 125 percent, hydroelectric power by 79 percent, and steel by 106 percent.

There were the problems of raising and distributing more food than ever before in our history—for our armed services, for our own people, and to help feed our allies.

There was the formidable problem of establishing a rationing system of the necessities of life which would be fair to all of our people.

There was the difficulty of keeping prices from skyrocketing and fighting off the serious specter of inflation.

There was the problem of transporting millions of men and hundreds of millions of tons of weapons and supplies all over our own country and also to all corners of the world. This necessitated the largest railroad and shipping operations in all history.

There were the problems involved in our vast purchases in foreign countries; in our control of foreign funds, located in this country; in our custody of alien property; in our occupation of liberated areas. There were new problems of communications, of censorship, of war information.

There was the problem of maintaining proper management-labor relations; of fair treatment and just compensation to our millions of war workers; of avoiding strikes; of preventing the exploitation of workers or natural resources by those who would seek to become war profiteers and war millionaires.

There were the problems of civilian defense; of lend-lease; of subcontracting war contracts to smaller businesses; of building up stock piles of strategic material whose normal sources have been seized by the enemy—such as rubber and tin.

There was the problem of providing housing for millions of new war workers all over the country.

And touching all of these, there was the great problem of raising the money to pay for all of them.

No sincere, sensible person doubts that in such an unprecedented, breath-taking enterprise errors of honest judgment were bound to creep in, and that occasional disputes among conscientious officials were bound to occur. And if anyone thinks that we, working under our democratic system, have made major mistakes in this war, he should take a look at some of the blunders made by our enemies in the so-called efficient dictatorships.

Even sincere, sensible people sometimes fail to compare the handfuls of errors or disputes, on the one hand, with the billions of instances where the agencies of government in cooperation with each other have moved with the precision of a smoothly working machine.

Some people, when a doughnut is placed before them, claim they can see only the hole in it. Sometimes this is an example of sheer individual pessimism; but sometimes it is caused by motives not consonant with war-winning ideals.

The American people as a whole, however, are fair-minded. They have learned to distinguish between the sen-

sational and the factual. They know that there is no so-called news when things run right. They know, for example, that a few newspapers and columnists and radio commentators can make controversy create news which is eagerly sought by Axis propagandists in their evil work.

Obviously, we never could have produced and shipped as much as we have, we could not now be in the position we now occupy in the Mediterranean, in Italy, or in the southwest Pacific or on the Atlantic convoy routes or in the air over Germany and France, if conditions in Washington and throughout the Nation were as confused and chaotic as some people try to paint them.

We know that in any large private industrial plant doing a thousandth part of what their Government in Washington is doing, there are also occasional mistakes and arguments. But this is not a good comparison. It is like comparing a motorboat with a battleship.

What I have said is not in any way an apology; it is an assertion and a boast that the American people and their Government are doing an amazingly good job in carrying out a vast program which 2 years ago was said to be impossible of fulfillment. Luckily the American people have a sense of proportion—and a memory.

As General Marshall has said in his biennial report:

> The development of the powerful Army of today * * * has been dependent upon vast appropriations and the strong support of the Congress, and the cooperation of numerous Government agencies.

I urge all Americans to read General Marshall's fine, soldierly record of the achievements of our Army throughout 2 of the most tremendous years in our history. This is a record which Americans will never forget.

As the war grows tougher and as new problems constantly arise in our domestic economy, changes in methods and changes in legislation may become necessary.

We should move for the greater economic protection of our returning men and women in the armed forces—and for greater educational opportunities for them. And for all our citizens we should provide a further measure of social security in order to protect them against certain continuing hazards of life.

All these things, as well as eventual demobilization, should be studied now and much of the necessary legislation should be enacted. I do not mean that this statement should be regarded in any way as an intimation that we are approaching the end of the war. Such an intimation could not be based either on fact or on reason. But when the war ends we do not want to be caught again without planning or legislation, such as occurred at the end of the last war.

On all these, and on other subjects, I expect to communicate with this Congress from time to time.

In this critical period in the history of our country and of the world we seek cooperation between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government to furnish our citizens with the security of the standard of living to which their resources and their skills in management and labor entitle them in all matters which concern this Nation's welfare, present and future—and the first of such matters, obviously, is the winning of this war.

Finally, as the war progresses, we seek a national cooperation with other nations toward the end that world aggression be ended and that fair international relationships be established on a permanent basis. The policy of the good neighbor has shown such success in the hemisphere of the Americas that its extension to the whole world seems to be the logical next step. In that way we can begin to keep faith with our sons and daughters who are fighting for freedom and justice and security at home and abroad.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 17, 1943.*

BARUCH REPORT ON WEST COAST MANPOWER PROBLEM

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, at the Wednesday session of the Senate I addressed a public request to Hon. James F. Byrnes, Director of the Office of War Mobilization, for the release of the so-called Baruch report on the west coast manpower situation. I made the demand in the open Senate because the press constantly reported that request for publication of the report, which was originally made on August 19, 1943, had heretofore been denied. Mr. Byrnes immediately wrote me under date of September 15, 1943, releasing the full Baruch report to me and adding a request that I should present it for full publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In view of this prompt and forthright response by Mr. Byrnes—which is entirely in keeping with his character as we knew it when he was one of our greatly respected colleagues—I regret that I did not make my original request directly to him because I would not care to be a party to any presently unfounded implications of suppression. I am very glad now to comply with his request and to present, first, his covering letter to me; second, the full text of the Baruch report on west coast aircraft manpower, which is dated August 19, 1943; and third, the official mimeograph statement issued by the War Mobilization Committee on September 4, which orders the application of some of the Baruch recommendations in the west coast area as of September 15, 1943. I ask unanimous consent that these exhibits be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Without objection, the exhibits may be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibits A, B, and C.)

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, it seems to me it would be unfair to the report to attempt to summarize it. For the same reason, I hesitate even to speak particularly of any excerpts. I prefer that Senators should read the complete documents, and I assure them that they will find it well worth their while. But I hope I am justified in emphasizing the general trend of the findings and recommendations made by Mr. Baruch in view of the large confidence which the country rightly has in his ability and his patriotism.

While the Baruch report deals specifically only with a serious manpower shortage in west coast aircraft manufacturing plants, it bears relatively upon the manpower situation as a whole and—as it itself asserts from time to time—offers a key to greater efficiency in the war effort throughout the country.

The Baruch report starts from this premise:

> Proper handling of manpower has been made impossible by the failure of Government agencies to work as a team with a clearly defined program. Measures undertaken by one agency have been undone by the conflicting actions or inactions of other agencies. In discussions with officials of the War Production Board, War Manpower Commission, and other agencies we have sought to develop a program on which all agencies can agree and take action at once and one which will work.

The Baruch report thereupon proceeds to make its specific recommendations dealing with the attainment of these objectives—an attainment which Director Byrnes correctly says has been substantially embraced in his directive of September 4 respecting the west coast manpower problem. After dealing with the necessity for dependable deferments for all necessary aircraft workers, and the need for the continuing use of high-school boys and girls in the production lines, the Baruch report asserts that the "Demand for labor and supply are hopelessly out of line" and that "a breakdown can be avoided only by the concerted action of all agencies behind a plan that goes to the root of the trouble." Thereupon the report outlines the need for labor priorities and develops in adequate detail a so-called labor budget plan which is aimed to correct this difficulty. This labor budget plan calls for decentralized administration under local auspices and makes this pertinent observation:

> The time must end when agencies spend their energies battling to build up empires of power. It is time to reassert the fact that there is one Federal Government—speaking with one voice—not a "centimouth."

The report thereupon lists these further sources of menace to the maintenance of adequate manpower in essential war production:

1. Reduce the alarming turn-over of workers.
2. Enlist every possible source of new labor.
3. Curtail less essential activities.
4. Step up efficiency of labor already in plants.
5. Minimize the disruptive effects of the draft.
6. Combat the hoarding or waste of labor.
7. Improve management.
8. Reduce demands on the labor supply.

The report deals specifically with each of these necessities. It admits that "all through the country, much labor is being hoarded or poorly utilized," and particularly condemns "the prevailing cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts" as encouraging these wastes. I think I should quote the following language:

Under these contracts the Government pays all costs—whatever they are. Since the Government is footing the bill, there is no incentive for manufacturers to economize in the use of materials, facilities, or labor. More workers are hired than are needed. Workers may stand idle—it costs the manufacturers nothing. Much labor is wasted.

The report thereupon constructively discusses the advisability of promptly developing not only "incentive wages" for labor but also "incentive contracts" for producers—and it adroitly suggests means for linking up both types of "incentives" with the post-war era. Meanwhile, it says:

Until now the energies of Government have been directed principally at reducing the 5, 10, or 15 cents of a production dollar that goes into profits. While not relaxing our efforts to prevent profiteering, it is time we turned our attention to reducing the 85, 90, or 95 cents of the production dollar represented by costs.

The report suggests the furloughing of key industrial workers back from the Army into industry. It warns that what it calls premature peace jitters are already threatening an adequate realization of the production job and the military needs still remaining. It condemns too many investigations by congressional committees which overlap each other, although it insistently defends the importance of congressional inquiry. It particularly condemns the utterly enormous paper work required by the Government and costing manpower sadly needed for more productive enterprise.

What I have said is merely a key to the contents of the report. I repeat that the report should be fully read so that it may wholly speak for itself. But I have wanted to say enough to indicate the high importance of the report as it affects the general manpower problem of the country, and I want to express the belief that if its general theme can be translated into general action—as Director Byrnes has already done in certain instances on the west coast through his directive of September 4—we shall greatly simplify our problem and find it much easier to meet.

I wish again to commend Director Byrnes for his prompt and unequivocal response to my request for the publication of the Baruch report and for his swift adoption—at least in one region—of some of its major recommendations. But the report still contains much unmined gold, and it is richly worthy of prompt and intensive study by all concerned in the manpower problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the exhibits requested by Director Byrnes to be fully extended in the RECORD be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., September 15, 1943.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR VAN: I am advised that in the Senate you demanded that the Baruch report on the west coast manpower situation be made public immediately.

This report made at my request by Mr. B. M. Baruch and Mr. John Hancock was presented with the statement that it was for my consideration and not for publication. It has been treated like all other interoffice memoranda presented by my associates. However, it is a splendid argument in favor of the action which was taken by the War Mobilization Committee on September 4, which is set forth in the program herewith enclosed.

While ordinarily interoffice memoranda is not made public, I am happy to send this to you with the request that you be kind enough to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD both the report and the program adopted by the committee.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES,
Director.

EXHIBIT B

REPORT ON WEST COAST AIRCRAFT MANPOWER
AUGUST 19, 1943

As requested by you, Mr. Byrnes, we have been examining the manpower problem in the west coast aircraft manufacturing plants, which was brought to your attention by Under Secretary of War Patterson. Briefly, the facts cited by him were:

"The Boeing plant in Seattle fell behind schedule by 40 Flying Fortresses a month because of insufficient labor. In mid-July the Boeing plant was short 3,000 workers; Los Angeles aircraft plants by 15,000. Although a shortage of engines is now threatened, manpower—not materials—promises to become the principal factor limiting production. Instead of building up their labor forces to the numbers required to meet expanding production schedules, west coast aircraft plants have been barely able to hold their own. If these conditions persist, we will fall short of the present aircraft production program for 1943 at a time when the military need for aircraft is greatest."

Airplane production schedules can—and must be met. The air operations over Europe which are doing such spectacular damage to our enemies are limited today by the supply of planes. When we increase production we increase the bombings over Germany, both the number of raids made and how deeply into Germany those raids can go. We bring the bombing of Tokyo that much closer. We bring the war that much nearer to an end. No other military production program, as far as we can see, will give us such results in so short a time.

Therefore, we have proceeded on the basis that whatever is to be done must be done immediately; that action cannot be delayed in searching for perfection, or until new legislation, such as a National Service Act, can be obtained.

Proper handling of manpower has been made impossible by the failure of Government agencies to work as a team with a clearly defined program. Measures undertaken by one agency have been undone by the conflicting actions or inactions of other agencies. In discussions with officials of the War Production Board, War Manpower Commission, and other agencies we have sought to develop a program on which all agencies can agree and take action at once and one which will work.

Nor was there time to make this a study of the entire manpower problem. It is aimed primarily at west coast aircraft difficulties, although some of these recommendations can be applied elsewhere.

DRAFT LOSSES CHECKED

The most pressing need was to halt any further losses of manpower by these plants. Steps were taken promptly to defer all aircraft workers on the west coast until October 1. While meeting the immediate need, this action provided only temporary relief and left much uncertainty in workers' minds as to what will happen after October 1. We recommend that all necessary aircraft workers on the west coast definitely be assured of deferment. These deferments should be extended to subcontractors manufacturing parts for the west coast plants.

This assurance should be given workers immediately so they will know where they stand; it should not be held up until after October 1.

Continuance of these deferments, it should be understood, will depend on the aircraft industry assuming responsibility for seeing that deferments are requested only for absolutely essential workers.

SCHOOLBOY LOSS THREATENED

A second threatened loss is of high-school boys and girls now working in aircraft plants and who are likely to return to classrooms in the fall. In the entire country, we are told, there are 2,000,000 schoolboy war workers alone. They are excellent workers, and their loss would be a serious blow to production.

The War Manpower Commission has been trying to work out plans by which as many as possible of these young workers are retained on a part-time basis. These efforts should be pressed most vigorously. In many communities, school authorities already have worked out such arrangements. In one California aircraft plant, for example, schoolboys work 6 weeks, then go to school 6 weeks. Elsewhere, they will work part of the day or part of the week.

The money earned by these boys will help many obtain a college education that might otherwise be denied them. The feeling of self-reliance that comes from being able to serve their country should make them better citizens when they grow up.

It is urgent that arrangements for keeping these boys on the job be completed before school opens. We recommend that the Governors of these States and the school authorities be requested to meet with the War Manpower Commission to push this program through.

DEMAND EXCEEDS SUPPLY

Draft deferments and part-time shifts for schoolboys will avert the two most immediate threats to the west coast aircraft industry, but they cover only part of the problem.

A simple balance sheet of prospective labor demands and supply tells the story. In the next 6 months, it is estimated, provided all workers now on the Pacific coast remain there, that 500,000 new workers still will be required to meet the needs now foreseen for essential industry and military service. At best, the Manpower Commission estimates about 240,000 additional local workers can be found. This would include 94,000 women now at home, 53,000 youths not now in the labor market, and 40,000 workers employed in less essential industries. Even with the most successful recruiting of new workers, the local labor supply apparently can meet only about one-half of the production demands already scheduled in coming months. And this makes no provision for additional labor demands that are certain to come as we press our offensive in the Pacific.

BREAK-DOWN THREATENED

Demand for labor and supply are hopelessly out of line.

A disastrous break-down of vital production programs all through the Pacific coast region is threatened, not only aircraft but shipbuilding, ship repairs, canning, mining, lumbering, and others. This break-down can be avoided but only by the concerted action of all agencies behind a plan that goes to the root of the trouble.

LABOR PRIORITIES NEEDED

The first and greatest gap in our manpower program is the failure, thus far, to apply any system of priorities to labor. There is one all-important rule of war organization.

When demand exceeds supply, someone—in this case the War Production Board—must decide the order in which things are to be produced. Without such priorities, the distribution of scarce supplies of materials would be chaotic. With these priorities on materials must go priorities for labor so that the limited supply of workers is directed where it should go so that these most essential things do get produced. Such ratings as to the more essential uses of labor are indispensable to any successful manpower program, whether it be voluntary or whether it takes the form of a National Service Act.

Since labor is not like a commodity to be readily shifted or stored, it only means that labor priorities must be administered locally, plant by plant. Each community being different, no national administration is feasible. But priorities for labor there must be.

REGION OVERLOADED

The second root cause of our manpower difficulties has been that production has been planned, new facilities built, and contracts awarded without adequate regard to the supplies of labor available locally. Areas already overloaded have been burdened with additional contracts with the result that tight labor situations have been aggravated.

The west coast's manpower problems cannot be solved by thinking solely in terms of labor controls. Control over production is equally important. The fundamental objective of any sound manpower program must be to bring production demands and labor supply into balance.

LABOR BUDGET PLAN

To accomplish this, we are proposing that a new labor budget plan can be set up in each critical labor community on the west coast, such as Seattle, San Diego, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Portland. This labor budget would have two sides to it, as with all budgets. On the one side, employers would draw upon the budget on the basis of priorities, with the War Manpower Commission regulating the flow of labor. On the other side, the War Production Board and other procurement agencies would be responsible for keeping production demands in balance with labor supply. No new contracts would be let in the area unless other production demands were reduced so as to keep the budget in balance.

Detailed procedures on how this budget plan is to operate are being worked out by Mr. McNutt for submission to the various agencies concerned. The basic principles of the plan are—

1. A recognition that the problem is a local one and essentially not one that can be handled on a national basis.

2. On the labor supply side of the budget, a system of priorities rating the comparative labor needs of all employers in each critical labor community.

3. To operate these priorities, in each community a labor priorities committee on which all Government agencies concerned sit.

4. The community, itself, should name the chairman of its priorities committee, a strong citizen who has won public confidence and whom both management and labor trust.

5. On the basis of the priorities laid down, the War Manpower Commission should direct the flow of labor to those plants whose products are most essential and whose labor needs are greatest, and in such a way as to stimulate the use of women workers, curtail the use of labor in activities least essential to the war, and hoarding of labor; make for more effective utilization of labor in plants; and as a guide to draft deferments so that war production is not jeopardized by disruptive drawing of workers into the Army.

6. Employers retain the right to do their own hiring, but they must hire workers from the pool referred to them by the War Manpower Commission on the basis of priorities.

7. Prompt action by the priorities committee, under the leadership of the community chairman, on all local problems affecting manpower, such as housing, transportation, and the erection of day-care shelters.

8. On the production side of the budget, prompt determination by the War Production Board and other procurement agencies of the priority for war of all products made in these areas.

9. A review of all production programs on the west coast and, where necessary, the shifting of contracts to bring production needs into balance with labor.

10. The curtailment of less essential activities.

11. A constant review of all new contracts involving any increase in employment in the area before they are let, as to whether labor is available. If labor is not, the contract should not be approved unless the procurement agencies can curtail other production demands proportionately so that the labor budget is kept in balance.

DECENTRALIZED ADMINISTRATION

If this labor budget plan is to work, there must be adequate delegation of power from all Washington agencies to their west coast representatives and the communities themselves must get on the team. The job cannot be done from Washington. The best men available must be put in charge in the field. There also must be a clear realization on the part of all agencies of the responsibilities that each must carry out. The right hand controlling labor supply, and the left hand controlling production demands must work together.

The time must end when agencies spend their energies battling to build up empires of power. It is time to reassert the fact that there is one Federal Government—speaking with one voice—not a "centimouth."

WEST COAST COMMITTEE

For handling the production side of the labor budget, it has been suggested that a single production priorities committee be created for the entire west coast, composed of representatives of the Government agencies affected, with the War Production Board man as chairman. This would meet with our full approval. Such a piece of governmental machinery would prove particularly helpful in the future when greater emphasis is placed on fighting in the Pacific and fresh demands will be imposed on the west coast.

COORDINATING THE PROGRAM

The War Manpower Commission should be given the responsibility for coordinating this program and for reporting to you progress in establishing these labor budgets and in keeping the budgets in balance.

LABOR DRAFT THE ALTERNATIVE

This labor budget plan represents more drastic controls than any yet introduced in any community. Manufacturers will have to forego their right to hire as many workers as they please and be contented only with the numbers allotted them according to priority. Workers will be limited in their choice of jobs. No one would suggest such controls in peacetime. But the only alternative to some plan of this sort is a National Service Act for the drafting of labor, which carries with it tremendous implications and would take time to get. Plane production cannot wait.

Without arguing the merits of a National Service Act—which is for Congress to decide—it can be said that everything called for in this labor-budget plan would be necessary in the administration of such an act.

We have always felt that the American people will do voluntarily what is expected of them as long as they know what is wanted and why—and feel that they are being treated fairly.

The planes lost each month because of insufficient labor are equivalent to the number of planes lost in several days combat. By adopting and enforcing this plan we can offset these battle losses.

IT IS A LOCAL PLAN

The fact that the chairman of the committee, setting local labor priorities, is to be an outstanding citizen of the community should be assurance that the plan will be administered with a full awareness of the needs of the community.

Too much emphasis cannot be laid on the importance of selecting the best man possible in the community to serve as chairman of the local priorities committee and of the necessity for giving him the fullest community support. Able, public-spirited citizens working in their own home towns can do more to relieve its manpower difficulties than anyone else

The communities, though, must accept their responsibilities and not leave everything to the Federal Government.

The communities also must realize that the extent of adjustment that will be required on the production side of the budget—how much in contracts will have to be shifted out of the region—depends on how effectively the labor priorities work and how intensively every possible source of new labor is mobilized.

While aimed to meet the conditions on the west coast, this labor-budget plan is likely to afford a pattern that can be applied in other communities. However, we feel it wiser to put the plan into effect first in a few of the most critical labor areas and perfect its operations before extending it.

NO SINGLE FORMULA

No single formula—whether it be this plan or a national service act—will solve the manpower difficulties on the Pacific coast or anywhere in the country. In addition, there are needed vigorous and unceasing efforts to:

Reduce the alarming turn-over of workers.

Enlist every possible source of new labor.

Curtail less essential activities.

Step up the efficiency of labor already in plants.

Minimize the disruptive effects of the draft.

Combat the hoarding or waste of labor.

Improve management.

Reduce demands on the labor supply.

TURN-OVER IS HIGH

Vigorous actions are needed to overcome the causes of the alarmingly high turn-over of workers. Many of the west coast plants suffer a 100 percent turn-over a year. In some plants 12 new workers must be hired for each net gain of 1 worker. The turn-over rate for women is higher than for men. With workers streaming through the plants, much labor is lost; efficiency suffers; training is wasted; management problems are aggravated—all of which increases the total labor requirements of these plants. If the rate of turn-over could be reduced, labor needs would be materially eased.

Prompt steps should be taken to improve local housing and transportation conditions; to erect additional day-care shelters for the use of mothers who want to work but have no place to leave their children; to adjust shopping hours, where possible; to correct unsanitary conditions; to relieve the innumerable other annoyances that come with congestion. Price and rent ceilings should be enforced more vigorously. Government alone cannot do the job. Management, labor, and the communities themselves must help. In fact, they must do the bigger part of the job of relieving the difficulties that come with congestion.

COMMUNITY PROGRAM NEEDED

There are entirely too many agencies studying these problems, arguing abstract issues,

and not getting enough done. We suggest that the community itself, through its chairman of the labor priorities committee, take the lead in tackling these problems and that every agency of Government do what this community chairman wants done.

No more studies are needed; what must be done is known. Action alone remains necessary.

WAGE ADJUSTMENTS

Differences in wages between industries often are cited as another cause of turnover. Simply to permit wages to be raised in competitive bidding by industry against industry is no solution. Far from reducing turn-over, it probably would make things worse. It would add to the inflationary pressures, already too great for our country's good. However, there will be instances when the effective allocation of manpower cannot be made without some wage adjustments. That is a matter to be determined case by case on the basis of the facts.

We are told that a new classification plan is under consideration at the Boeing plant in Seattle. It would be most helpful if action on this plan is speeded.

COST-PLUS CONTRACTS

Not alone on the west coast but all through the country much labor is being hoarded or poorly utilized. Many workers have written us of the waste of labor in the plants in which they themselves are working. Such wasteful practices are encouraged, among other things, by prevailing cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. Under these contracts the Government pays all costs—whatever they are. Since the Government is footing the bill, there is no incentive for manufacturers to economize in the use of materials, facilities, or labor. More workers are hired than are needed. Workers may stand idle—it costs the manufacturers nothing. Much labor is wasted.

In the early stages of war production when manufacturers were asked to produce things they never made before, there might have been some justification for cost-plus arrangements. By now, Government and industry surely have had sufficient experience in the manufacture of many munitions for fixed prices to be agreed upon.

The various procurement agencies have been considering and experimenting with new types of contracts that would give manufacturers an incentive to reduce costs. These new types of contracts should be substituted for prevailing cost-plus contracts, wherever feasible and as quickly as possible, along the west coast as a starter. Effectively carried through, this change in contracts should save billions of dollars in the prices we are paying for weapons. Through more efficient use of labor, it ought to give us the equivalent of an additional labor force running into the tens of thousands, perhaps, the hundreds of thousands.

Until now the energies of Government have been directed principally at reducing the five, ten, or fifteen cents of a production dollar that goes into profits. While not relaxing our efforts to prevent profiteering, it is time we turned our attention to reducing the 85, 90, or 95 cents of the production dollar represented by costs.

WAGE INCENTIVE PLAN

The Chairman of the Aircraft Production Board, Charles E. Wilson, feels strongly that an incentive wage plan, properly conducted, would contribute to increasing aircraft production. Any plan that will stimulate workers to greater efficiency would be of enormous benefit in the manpower situation. However, it is wise to bear in mind that there is no magic in the term "wage incentive" by itself. To work successfully, an incentive plan must be tailor-made for each specific plant, and must command the enthusiasm of workers. Many difficulties may limit the idea to no more than a small number of plants. In view of the great potential advantages, we recommend that Mr. Wilson's experience be fully utilized in exploring the possibilities of introducing sound wage incentive plans in the Pacific coast aircraft plants and, where they will command the support of labor and management, be put into effect promptly.

NO GOVERNMENT HOARDING

In any drive against the hoarding and poor utilization of labor, Government-operated plants should set an example. Recently, the War Department ordered a reduction of the number of workers in plants directly under its supervision. All agencies should be asked to review their manpower requirements, plant by plant, and to reduce personnel wherever possible.

PROCUREMENT REVIEW NEEDED

An immediate review of all west coast production programs should be ordered to bring these programs into better balance with prospective labor supply. This should lead to the shifting of some contracts; cancelation of others; more intensive subcontracting in areas where the labor supply is not as critical; and, if desirable, delaying of schedules for some items. The requirements of all items being produced on the west coast should be reexamined in the light of combat experience to see if they are excessive or out of balance. It may develop that certain types of munitions being produced on the west coast are so safely ahead of schedule that we can afford slowing their production to release manpower for stimulating the output of lagging items.

If such a review is to be effective, it cannot be done by the War Production Board alone. The Army, Navy, and other procurement agencies must cooperate wholeheartedly. The services must recognize that, when they impose excessively heavy demands on the west coast for things that can be produced elsewhere, they inevitably delay those programs which can be efficiently produced nowhere else.

MORE SUBCONTRACTING NEARBY

An immediate survey should be made of the possibilities of subcontracting in nearby communities on the west coast.

TIGHTEN FARM DEFERMENTS

Several times in the course of this examination, the belief was expressed that the legislation practically exempting farm labor from the draft may have created something of a haven for draftees on the farms. We could find nowhere sufficient facts available to determine the accuracy or inaccuracy of this charge. The operations of farm deferments should be examined to see whether they have had such effect.

We must have an adequate supply of farm labor to produce as much as possible of essential foods. This has been provided for by the law liberalizing farm deferments. However, it does not serve the Nation's interests to have more labor on the farms than is needed, when labor is so critically short for all activities. The manpower needs of our Nation are so intertwined that to permti excess labor to remain anywhere may force the closing of businesses, the drafting of fathers who would not ordinarily be drafted, more rigid controls for all workers, etc. In particular, the seasonal aspects of agricultural deferment should be examined. Farmers must have the labor they need in peak seasons; but when the season is over these men must become available for other war jobs.

PART-TIME SHIFTS

Every possible local source of additional labor must be tapped and steps taken to facilitate drawing in these new workers. Since the aircraft industry is becoming increasingly dependent upon women, it would be well to consider a part-time shift for women who cannot work a full day. Such a shift would also help in recruiting schoolboys.

FATHER'S DRAFT

The interests of war production demand that from now on deferments be made more on the basis of occupation than family status. The draft already has cut so deeply into the ranks of skilled workers that war production is being hurt. Of the 7,000,000 undrafted fathers of military age, about one-half are believed to be engaged in industries less essential to the war. If these fathers were free from the draft, they would be able to remain untouched in these less-essential industries, contributing nothing to the mobilization of manpower for war.

In a number of instances the armed forces have been compelled to release draftees whose skills could not be replaced. To dip further into the ranks of war workers with irreplaceable skills, while leaving untouched some millions of fathers not engaged in war work, would be to invite serious retarding of war production.

FURLOUGHS MAY BE NEEDED

In the operation of the draft, the aircraft industry has been hit particularly hard in the loss of engineering and supervisory personnel. Some west coast aircraft plants warn that any further drafting of skilled engineering personnel will force a halt in work on developing new airplane designs. The armed forces should be asked to furlough selected keymen, new in the Army, back to the aircraft plants from which they were taken.

Possibly, men who have left aircraft plants can be recruited back to the plants.

CURB LESS ESSENTIALS

Even with every other step taken, it still will be necessary to curtail less essential industries to release workers for more essential war jobs. Otherwise, airplane production schedules on the west coast cannot be met. The decision as to which industries are less essential is a difficult one. It is bound to be resisted. But it must be made.

Curtailing less essential activities has this important advantage: The labor already is in the community and does not have to be brought in from outside with the consequent aggravations of housing and transportation difficulties, food supplies, and other problems.

PEACE JITTERS DANGEROUS

Peace jitters that seem to be spreading around the country give us much concern. Workers are reported feeling that the war is about over, and there is no need for them to stay on their jobs; others are refusing to take jobs in war plants. Manufacturers are distracted from all-out attention to the war by the desire to get back into peace production. Reconversion no longer seems to them a matter of years—but of months. These jitters are being aggravated by needless speculation as to when the war will end, or when reconversion will begin.

As you have said, the surest way to lengthen the war and increase our toll of casualties is to act as if the war were already won. This time we must beat the Germans and Japs so badly that they will never be able to make war on us again. Those Americans who are letting themselves fall victims to peace jitters must realize that they are playing into the enemy's seeking for a negotiated peace. They will make it more difficult for us to stand by our determination upon unconditional surrender.

PRIORITY ON RECONVERSION

Peace speculation is now so widespread that consideration should be given to some measures that will minimize its bad effects. One thought has been that it might be well to

develop, as a matter of public policy, a plan by which priority in reconversion to peace will be given to those plants and workers with the best records in production for war. It might also be helpful for individual companies to develop post-war employment policies which would give preference to those workers who, by their patriotic efforts and continuity on the job, have earned—along with the soldiers—the right to favorable placement after the war. The announcement of such policies now might help reduce turnover. Where companies have dismissal wages, such wages might be adjusted to give larger dismissal guaranties to workers who have stayed on the job. These are only tentative thoughts put forward to stimulate thinking on the problem.

TOO MANY INVESTIGATIONS

Not all of our difficulties with aircraft production are caused by manpower problems. Recently a manpower investigation was made by one congressional group on the Pacific coast. Plant managers and workers were taken from their jobs to answer questions; the newspapers were filled with all sorts of statements, conflicting with established administrative policy. A few weeks later a second congressional group held another series of hearings on manpower problems—also on the west coast—and the same sort of thing was repeated. We are told that still another congressional group is preparing still another manpower investigation.

We would be among the first to insist upon both the right of Congress to investigate and the need for such investigations. But multiplicity of congressional investigations can be as confusing and damaging as duplication and overlapping of authority on the part of the executive branch of the Government. The American people have a right to expect that the number of congressional investigations on the same subject be cut down, and that these investigations be handled so that they do not interfere with the actual management of plants and that they do not hurt war production.

TOO MANY QUESTIONNAIRES

Some west coast aircraft manufacturers complain that more than one-fourth of their time is taken up in answering Government inquiries and questionnaires, and in being interviewed by representatives from different Government agencies. The aircraft companies have expanded so rapidly that their management is spread rather thin—too thin to bear so great a burden of Government curiosity. We recommend that Mr. Wilson, as Chairman of the Aircraft Production Board, take steps to reduce the number of inquiries and interviews to which airplane manufacturers are subjected.

CONFUSION OVER TAX

Another disturbing factor is a misinterpretation by some workers as to how the new withholding tax operates. It has been reported to us that some workers lay off a day to avoid earning wages which will put them in brackets subject to the tax. The Treasury Department should intensify its efforts to make clear to all workers that the withholding of taxes each week makes no difference in the total taxes paid by each worker during the year. How much in taxes a worker must pay depends on his total income during the year. The sums drawn off in withholding are applied as a credit against that yearly tax. If more money is withheld than the tax finally adds up to, the worker gets that money back.

CONTRACT POLICY

Uncertainty in the minds of manufacturers as to the policies the Government will pursue in terminating or canceling war contracts also is likely to distract them from their best production efforts. The various procurement agencies have been working on the formation of such a policy. If left to themselves, these agencies might develop conflicting policies which would confuse industry. It would seem wiser to have the agencies agree on a uniform policy which can be announced in the near future so that manufacturers will know what to expect.

CONSTANT REVIEW NEEDED

In asking this examination and report we have concerned ourselves only with the problems of the west coast aircraft plants and not the aircraft industry, throughout the country. It may be that some of the things proposed for the west coast should be examined for other parts of the country. This, of course, can be done by the existing agencies. We have touched upon only those things that the Government can do to help solve the aircraft problem. We have not gone into the many things that management itself can do—working in its own plants in daily contact with the workers.

Our study of this problem also emphasizes anew the necessity for your constant review of military and lend-lease requirements, to see that all the different parts of the program are in balance with one another and that the program as a whole is balanced against the essential needs of the civilian economy.

We have reached the stage of our war economy when there is not much to spare. Something gained in one direction must mean a loss in another direction. Consideration of the over-all obligations for food, ships, planes, munitions, etc., raises doubt whether we can carry through all our promises and undertakings unless there is an increase in efficiency, or civilian supplies are reduced, or the program readjusted. We may not be able to get all of everything, but we can get enough of a well-rounded flexible program. By keeping the program under vigilant review, we can make the cuts where they will do the most good.

EXHIBIT C

James F. Byrnes, Director of the Office of War Mobilization, today made public the west coast manpower program after it had been approved by the War Mobilization Committee.

The program calls for cooperative and direct action by several Government agencies in formulating the plan for dealing with the acute labor shortage problem on the west coast.

In announcing the new program, Justice Byrnes stated that some weeks ago it became apparent a serious labor shortage was developing on the west coast, where a large percentage of ship construction and bomber and fighter plane production is centered.

The program announced today is the outgrowth of a critical study made under the direction of B. M. Baruch and John Hancock for the Office of War Mobilization.

In issuing the west coast manpower program, Justice Byrnes said:

"We have already fallen behind schedule for vitally important war items on the west coast due to manpower shortages. The war work scheduled for the west coast this fall and winter would require 160,000 persons in shipbuilding and ship repairs and 100,000 more in aircraft construction.

"It is obvious that drastic measures are required to increase the available labor supply on the west coast and to insure the most efficient and economical use of the available labor supply.

"It is also obvious that the production program schedules for both war materials and civilian supplies must be carefully reexamined to make certain that the production most urgently needed is not held back by efforts to meet production less urgently needed and that, whenever feasible, work that can be done elsewhere is shifted to areas where labor shortages are less acute.

"Manpower and production cannot be dealt with separately for they are inseparable parts of a single but complicated problem. The west coast war manpower program calls for the closest cooperation between the War Manpower Commission, the War Production Board, and the various procurement agencies on a national, a regional, and an area basis. The program is based to a large extent on a plan developed in the Buffalo, N. Y., area which, within a smaller field of operation, has worked with success. If it is equally successful in the west coast area, it will be extended to other areas.

"The program adopted is not a program to investigate and report. It is a program which provides for the setting up of operating machinery for the flexible and continuing adjustment of manpower and production in accordance with the changing needs of our strategy.

"If when all available labor is exhausted there is still a shortage and after review of contracts it becomes apparent that the war effort would best be served by canceling certain war contracts in an acute labor shortage area and placing these contracts in another area where more labor is available, such action will be taken. However, the greatest care will be exercised not to disrupt existing production and no essential contracts will be canceled and production shifted elsewhere until after thorough study and investigation it is determined that labor is not available in the area involved."

An outline of the program follows:

WEST COAST WAR MANPOWER PROGRAM

The critical production situation on the west coast requires that effective action be taken immediately to restore and maintain the essential balance between production demand and manpower supply. The program outlined below is designed to accomplish this purpose. It involves an accurate determination of the total manpower available and of the volume of production, including transportation and other essential services, which can be maintained when production schedules and manpower resources have been brought into balance.

I. Direction and over-all coordination

The War Manpower Commission will be assigned the responsibility for directing and coordinating those phases of the west-coast manpower program concerned with the supply and distribution of labor.

II. Determination of production urgencies and manpower priorities

A. The War Production Board is made responsible for directing and coordinating those phases of the west-coast manpower program concerned with the adjustment of production programs to meet the available labor supply, as reported and developed by the War Manpower Commission. The War Production Board will exercise its control in the adjustment of the military programs through the Chairman of the Production Executive Committee of the War Production Board. The War Manpower Commission will appoint a representative on Production Executive Committee. The Production Executive Committee will take prompt action to adjust production schedules so as to effect and maintain a balance between the manpower requirements and supply, and will submit a monthly report of progress to the Office of War Mobilization.

B. Area Production Urgency Committees:

1. There shall be established for such west-coast areas as may be deemed necessary by the War Production Board and the War Manpower Commission an Area Production Urgency Committee, composed of one responsible representative of each of the following: War Production Board (chairman), War Manpower Commission, War Department, Navy Department, Maritime Commission, War Food Administration, Aircraft Resources

Control Office, Office of Defense Transportation (when transportation problems are involved), and such other agencies as the committee may from time to time invite to assist it.

Where adjustments in the military programs become necessary, due to shortage of labor, after full effort to increase the available supply either the full committee or a subcommittee composed of those members representing the military programs and War Manpower Commission under the chairmanship of the representative of the War Production Board, will submit their recommendations with respect to such adjustments to the chairman of the Production Executive Committee of the War Production Board for action.

2. The chairman of each Area Production Urgency Committee, who shall be appointed by the Chairman of the War Production Board, shall, subject to the provisions enumerated in paragraph II B 1, after advice and consultation with the committee, perform the following functions:

(a) Determine the production programs which are feasible in the area and their relative urgency in accordance with standards established by War Production Board under its authority over procurement policies.

(b) Inform the War Manpower Commission of approved production schedules or production requirements of establishments or categories of establishments in the area.

(c) Review proposals for facilities and for major supply contracts in the area, as provided in section III A, and make appropriate recommendations to the War Production Board in the light of the prospective availability of manpower.

(d) In accordance with policies of the War Production Board develop a program for balancing labor supply and requirements by redistributing production from one area to another when maximum manpower supplies and minimum requirements necessitate such redistribution.

(e) Recommend to the War Production Board the need for adjustment of civilian production, as provided in section III C.

C. Manpower priorities:

1. On basis of urgencies of production and essential services as determined by the Production Urgency Committee manpower priorities and allocations will be determined by area manpower priorities committees, composed of one responsible representative of each of the following: War Manpower Commission, Selective Service System, War Production Board, War Department, Office of Defense Transportation (when transportation problems are involved), Navy Department, Maritime Commission, War Food Administration, Committee for Congested Production Areas, and such other agencies as the committee may from time to time invite to assist it.

When the same agency is represented on both the Production Urgency Committee and the Manpower Priority Committee the same representative should be designated for both committees.

Each area War Manpower Commission Management Labor Committee shall be requested to recommend the chairman of the Area Manpower Priority Committee, who shall be, preferably, an outstanding citizen not affiliated with any of the above agencies nor identified with a dominant group interest, or, if such a person is not available, a member of the staff of the War Manpower Commission. The chairman shall be appointed by the War Manpower Commission.

2. It shall be the responsibility of the Area Manpower Priorities Committee to make recommendations to the Area Manpower Director in manpower priorities and allocations as follows:

(a) On the basis of urgencies of production and essential services as determined by the Production Urgency Committee, list establishments, services, or categories of establishments and services within the area according to their urgency and their need for labor; fix employment ceilings for individual plants, services or activities, and advise the Area Director, War Manpower Commission, thereof.

(b) List significant establishments, services or activities in the area in three classes:

(1) Class I: those which may expand their employment to the established ceilings.

(2) Class II: those which may maintain employment at an established ceiling through continued hiring as necessary.

(3) Class III: those which may not hire (except in emergencies) and from which workers will be drawn by issuing releases and by direct recruitment by the War Manpower Commission.

(c) Advise the Area Director of the War Manpower Commission on all questions of priority listings and ceilings established for individual plants or services.

(d) Advise the Area Production Urgency Committee concerning production of essential plants or activities within the area which might be redistributed to other areas.

(e) Advise and recommend to the Area Director of the War Manpower Commission civilian services within the area which might be adjusted, to the extent required to maintain the manpower budget, consistent with the maintenance of essential community services.

D. The War Manpower Commmission will establish standards for the Manpower Priorities Committees to be used in translating production urgencies into manpower priorities.

E. The War Manpower Commission will integrate the work of the Area Manpower Priority Committees with its established appeal procedure—and the existing management-labor committee organization.

III. Balancing Production and Manpower Requirements

A. Future expansions requiring manpower on the west coast will be avoided insofar as possible:

1. The area production urgency committees will review all proposals for new facilities and all supply contracts involving increases in employment, with accompanying proposals from the procurement agency for the reduction of other contracts to provide the necessary manpower, and will submit their recommendations thereon to the War Production Board.

2. The area production urgency committees will cooperate with the War Manpower Commission to the end that labor released in the area will be utilized promptly and effectively.

B. Where it will be advantageous to the war program, war production will be removed from the west coast by the curtailment and redistribution of production and by forcing subcontracting, with due regard for differences in efficiency of production.

1. Whenever there is a reduction in overall production requirements for any item produced on the west coast, consideration should be given to withdrawing production from the west coast.

2. Whenever there is capacity (and available labor) to meet the production requirements of a given program elsewhere, production commitments on the west coast should be adjusted as quickly as possible and redirected to other regions.

3. Procurement agencies will use every means at their disposal to encourage contractors to subcontract as much as possible of their work to producers outside the west coast region.

C. On the basis of recommendations by the area production urgency committees, the War Production Board will exercise its authority over priorities and the allocation of materials to adjust civilian production and services, insofar as such action will make needed labor available to essential war production.

1. The area production urgency committees will recommend where and to what extent curtailment of less essential production in areas or industries is to be effected.

2. The chairman of the War Production Board will instruct the appropriate industry divisions of the War Production Board and the Smaller War Plants Corporation to be guided by these recommendations in granting assistance and allocating materials.

D. The War Manpower Commission will take concurrent action to place in high priority employment, workers released through curtailment and redistribution of production.

IV. Mobilization and Stabilization of the Labor Force

A. The War Manpower Commission will institute manpower priorities for all non-agricultural employment as follows:

1. All establishments and services entitled to hire workers shall select only workers from among those referred by the United States Employment Service or through other approved channels according to standards and conditions prescribed by the War Manpower Commission (as provided in II C). Workers will select employment only from among those jobs to which they have been referred in accordance with the provisions of this section.

2. The standards and conditions for the referral of workers through approved channels other than the United States Employment Service must include provision for the referral of workers in order of established manpower priority listing and relative urgency of manpower need.

B. In respect to agricultural employment, the following steps will be taken:

1. The War Food Administration will determine the labor requirements for essential agriculture, by crop and by area, based on production and manpower requirements.

2. The War Food Administration will institute a system for periodic reporting of employment and labor requirements to the area manpower priorities committees.

3. The War Food Administration will distribute agricultural labor throughout the west coast according to manpower needs established in accordance with B-1 above and consistent with agreements entered into with foreign countries.

4. The War Manpower Commission will aid the War Food Administration in obtaining manpower for peak seasonal requirements, including, where necessary, release of non-agricultural workers for farm work, importation of foreign workers, and allocation of prisoners of war, and, in emergencies, United States Army units.

5. The War Food Administrator, working in conjunction with the Selective Service, will, from time to time, review all class II-C and class III-C deferments to give assurance that such deferees are actually engaged in essential agricultural employment.

C. Selective Service withdrawals from rated establishments will be related to employment ceilings and replacement possibilities with adequate consideration for the deferment of key workers.

1. Replacement summaries will be required of all establishments with class I and class II ceilings.

2. To avoid reduction of employment materially below the established ceilings, the Selective Service System will accept replacement schedules for the regulation of withdrawals in high-priority establishments.

3. Registrants in critical occupations will receive full consideration for deferment if they are working in high priority establishments. Registrants qualified in critical occupations who are not working in high priority establishments will be referred to the

United States Employment Service for placement when their cases come before the Selective Service System for classification or reclassification; and such registrants will be considered for deferment if they accept jobs at their highest skills in high priority establishments.

D. The War Manpower Commission will utilize all of its own facilities and obtain the cooperation of all other agencies in impressing upon the workers the important role which they play in the total war program. The objective will be through improved worker morale to influence each worker to find the right job and to remain in the employment where he is needed.

V. Manpower utilization

A. The War Manpower Commission will expand and intensify its manpower utilization programs. At the request of management of any establishment or the War Production Board, it will undertake in the order of urgency of need to assist management to reduce labor hoarding and under-utilization of skills, to improve training, supervision, and personnel management, to eliminate causes of turn-over and absenteeism, and to minimize labor requirements of listed plants. In carrying out this program the War Manpower Commission will coordinate the manpower utilization activities of other agencies and will make full use of their facilities and resources. Relationships between the W. P. B. and the W. M. C. relative to manpower utilization shall be governed by the agreement of September 1943 between the two agencies.

1. In determining employment ceilings, Area Manpower Priorities Committees will take into account the effectiveness of labor utilization and the possibilities of meeting additional production requirements in whole or in part by more effective utilization of labor.

2. In effecting manpower economies, plant management will have the help of Manpower Utilization Consultants of the War Manpower Commission who will be advised and assisted by procurement and other agencies of Government in the conduct of utilization surveys of major plants. Such surveys will result in recommended measures for:

(a) Improving utilization of skills through job analysis, transfer, upgrading, and labor productivity procedures.

(b) Improving personnel policies, practices, and supervision, and worker morale.

(c) Eliminating in-plant causes for turnover, absenteeism, and labor hoarding.

3. The War Production Board and the appropriate procurement agencies will use their authority in support of such surveys, and will implement the execution of approved recommendations.

VI. Manpower recruitment

A. The War Manpower Commission, in collaboration with the Office of War Information, will use to the maximum every device and medium available to intensify the recruitment of additional workers from within the area. This will include the use of the press, radio, and all other means of public information, to encourage and facilitate:

1. Transfer of workers from less urgent work, by direct recruitment and by exercise of authority to require releases.

2. Recruitment of women and other groups not now employed in essential work.

3. Use of part-time workers, including boys and girls in cooperation with schools.

4. When necessary and under appropriate standards facilitate the

(a) Importation of foreign labor.

(b) Use of prisoners of war.

(c) Use of troops.

B. To avoid the unnecessary reduction of essential work contracted for the west coast, if improved production per worker, and the recruitment of additional workers locally do not close the gap in need for workers, the War Manpower Commission will recruit additional workers from outside the area in accordance with established War Manpower Commission standards and procedures. This will require a Nation-wide and intensive informational and recruitment campaign. It may also demand the establishment of manpower priorities for workers between other sections of the country and the west coast.

VII. Community and living conditions

A. The War Manpower Commission and the Office of War Information will conduct informational campaigns to impress on the west coast communities the seriousness of the manpower situation, the threat to war production and the war effort, and the need for individual cooperation and community support in the program.

B. The Committee for Congested Production Areas in the Executive Office of the President will coordinate the activities of the Federal agencies, stimulate necessary action by State and local governments, and will otherwise utilize their authority by prescribing such policies and actions as may be necessary to effect the coordination of Federal agency actions relating to facilities and services.

VIII. Effective date

The effective date of this program is September 15, 1943.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did the Senator from Michigan include in his request for publication in the RECORD the release of September 4 by Mr. Byrnes?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I did.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not wish to comment on the report by Mr. Baruch and Mr. Hancock to Mr. Byrnes, which is the subject of the present animadversions. I believe it ought to be stated, however, that my information is that there was never anything in the report which Mr. Byrnes, Mr. Baruch, or, so far as I know, anybody else, desired to keep from the public. The report was made to Mr. Byrnes at his request by Mr. Baruch and Mr. Hancock. They made a survey of the situation which Mr. Byrnes had in mind, and then made a report to him as has now been indicated. That report, of course, as many reports which Mr. Byrnes has called for, and must call for, involves a discussion of certain agencies and departments, and the adoption of the program which may be suggested. That was particularly true in this case. So it was necessary for Mr. Byrnes as the Director of War Mobilization, to call into conference the representatives of some of the agencies, including the War Manpower Commission. He called into conference Mr. McNutt, head of the War Manpower Commission, who later submitted a plan substantially to put into effect the recommendations made in the Baruch report. He also called in representatives of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission, which are likewise involved in recommendations and suggestions contained in the report.

Manifestly, it is the obligation of the Office of War Mobilization and of Mr. Byrnes, as its directing head, to reconcile, if possible, any controversies which may exist among departments and agencies before such controversies reach the press or the public. We all know what has happened in the past with regard to some controversies prematurely reaching the public press when there was a chance to iron them out and adjust them and give to the country united action on any particular problem. So it was necessary for Mr. Byrnes to pursue that course in regard to the Baruch report.

I am sure that I am within the truth—I have been so assured by Mr. Byrnes—when I state that, subject to the requirement on his part to consult with and harmonize the agencies involved in the report, which agencies had to take action, there never at any time was any question of the desirability of making the report public.

I am glad that it is now possible for the report to be made public, and I am glad to cooperate with the Senator from Michigan in that regard.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator's attention was diverted when I started to present the report. I think he will find that I have said on my own account just as conclusively as he has said it that there should be no implication whatever of criticism of Mr. Byrnes for any heretofore suggested suppression of the report.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's reiteration of that point; but I think it should also be said that in the performance of his duty in a sort of over-all overseeing capacity it is perfectly obvious that Justice Byrnes has called for reports and information, and will in the future call for reports and information, which cannot immediately be given to the public because they involve interdepartmental and interagency relations which it is a part of his duty to harmonize and put into effect. No doubt there will be other instances in which he will ask for reports from those in responsible positions; and it may not be advisable, until the reports and their recommendations are threshed out by all the agencies involved, to give publicity to the textual content of the report itself. I think there can be no misunderstanding among us here or between us and the executive departments as to the propriety of the action in such cases.

Referring further to the Baruch report, I think it ought to be stated—and I am sure the Senator from Michigan will agree—that as a result of the action taken following that report and in the directive issued on September 4 all the agencies of Government involved or who have any duty to perform in regard to the recommendations of that report are on the west coast cooperating in undertaking to carry out the recommendations of Mr. Baruch.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree to that, but I would not want it overlooked that Mr. Baruch has also included a number of highly fundamental recommendations covering the situation as a whole, as exemplified, for example, by his statement that the cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts are desperately injurious to the national economy. I would not want it overlooked that there is still infinitely

much in the report which requires great study and far wider application.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; but the Senator will agree that it is more difficult to cover the broader field, as it has been attempted to cover the specific field on the Pacific coast with regard to the sources of labor supply.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree with the Senator.

SUBSCRIPTION OF GRAVES COUNTY, KY., TO THIRD WAR LOAN

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, while I am on my feet let me say that some weeks ago in the little village of Fancy Farm, Ky., which is in Graves County, about 3 miles from where I was born, I made a brief talk on the approaching War bond campaign. I was optimistic enough to predict that that county would not only meet its quota in the bond drive now in progress but that it would exceed its quota, and I complimented the county upon the fact that in all the drives thus far it had exceeded its quota. I have before me a telegram from Mr. Jess G. Anderson, editor of the Mayfield Messenger, referring to my comment on that occasion. I ask that the telegram now be read by the clerk and put into the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Without objection, the clerk will read the telegram.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

MAYFIELD, KY., *September 17, 1943.*

Senator ALBAN W. BARKLEY,
United States Senate:

I have the honor to inform you that Graves County has already oversubscribed its Third War Loan quota of $637,000 and may double that figure by the end of the campaign. You said at Fancy Farm that you would tell about Graves on the Senate floor. We have not announced we are over the top. If you would care to you may. Population, 30,000. Graves has never fallen shy of any quota of bonds, etc.

JESS G. ANDERSON,
Editor, Mayfield Messenger.

ELIMINATION OF PRIVATE SUITS ARISING OUT OF FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, as amended, on page 2, line 13, after the words "United States", it is proposed to strike out "unless based upon information, evidence, and sources original with such person and not in the possession of or obtained by the United States in the course of any investigation by a grand jury, congressional committee, or other public body, or before a United States commissioner, or other proceeding instituted or conducted by it, and."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I want to invite the attention of Members of the Senate to the pending bill, which is of great importance and deals with a law which has been on the statute books of this country since 1863. The Senate at this time is asked to consider a change in that law, which is known as the Informer's Act. It is of particular importance at this time when so many great war contracts have been made and are in process of performance. In substance, the act, as it exists today, provides that if anyone discovers or has knowledge of a fraud committed upon the Government he may institute a suit in the Federal court for the recovery of the money of which the Government has been defrauded.

The Department of Justice came before the Judiciary Committee and wanted that law repealed. A majority of the committee decided not to repeal the law, but has reported to the Senate a bill which, in substance, provides that before any individual may bring such a suit upon information of fraud in the case of a Government contract he must submit to the Attorney General of the United States the information upon which he would act, and the Attorney General may then institute the suit or may refuse to do so. If, in his wisdom, he does not think the suit should be brought or if 6 months elapse after notice has been given by the informer without suit being brought by the Attorney General, then the informer may bring suit. That, in substance, is the measure as reported to the Senate after being changed by the Judiciary Committee.

I have offered an amendment which I desire to call to the attention of the Senate. I ask that there be stricken from the bill, as reported by the Judiciary Committee, the following words:

unless based upon information, evidence, and sources original with such person and not in the possession of or obtained by the United States in the course of any investigation by a grand jury, congressional committee, or other public body, or before a United States commissioner, or other proceeding instituted or conducted by it.

The offering of this amendment presents this situation, Mr. President: If this bill shall be passed as reported by the Judiciary Committee, the Attorney General after receiving the report of information may decline to bring suit, but a citizen who himself does not have original information but may obtain such information from some other source cannot bring suit even after the Attorney General has refused or declined to bring it. On the other hand, if the amendment which I have submitted shall be adopted by the Senate, the informer or the person who has knowledge must go to the Attorney General and ask him to bring the suit, and the Attorney General has 6 months in which he may bring suit to recover for the fraud. Then if the Attorney General should decline to bring suit under this amendment any citizen could bring suit on behalf of himself and the United States Government, regardless of whence he may have obtained the information.

I think that that ought to be the law. If this bill remains intact as written, and is passed by this body in its present form, the court is deprived of jurisdiction to hear a suit or to pass upon or entertain a suit brought by one who has to get his knowledge from some other source than his own knowledge. In other words, unless this amendment be adopted, the information upon which such a suit must be brought must originally initiate with the plaintiff. I read the language of the bill as written:

upon information, evidence, and sources original with such person.

If that language be left in the bill, Mr. President, it absolutely destroys the whole force of the informer's act.

I am not speaking on behalf of anyone who wants to bring a suit; I am not interested in that. I recognize that there may have been abuse under the present statute, but chance for further abuse is certainly eradicated when we give the Attorney General 6 months to bring suit before any individual may institute such an action, as is now proposed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Do I understand correctly that the language provides that a suit cannot be brought by a private citizen unless the information—the facts—are original with him?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is the exact language.

Mr. MURRAY. If someone else had discovered the facts ahead of him, even though the other person was not going to use the facts on which to base a suit, nevertheless, he, not having original knowledge, would be prohibited from bringing a suit?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is my understanding of the language of the bill.

Mr. MURRAY. Obviously, the purpose of the amendment is to prevent suit being brought by a private citizen where the Department of Justice fails to act or refuses to act.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct, sir.

Mr. MURRAY. It is legislation in the interest of protecting those people who design to defraud and cheat the Government of the United States?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The original statute is aimed at bringing to punishment those who commit frauds upon the Government and to recover money that has been obtained by fraud from the United States Government under contracts between the Government and private citizens.

Mr. MURRAY. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Certainly.

Mr. MURRAY. What will be the situation if the bill is passed as it is now written with reference to compensation of the individual who brings suit if he does bring a suit upon original information?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Under the original act the Government received 50 percent of the recovery and the individual who undertook the suit and paid the expenses of it received 50 percent.

I should like at this time to make an inquiry of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MURRAY. My understanding is that the provision to which the Senator has just referred is now proposed to be stricken out and that no compensation whatever will be allowed the private citizen who brings such a suit, nothing will be allowed to compensate him for the efforts he makes in discovering the evidence and prosecuting the case.

Mr. REVERCOMB. No; up to a maximum of 10 percent may be allowed by the court, when the Government brings the suit upon information.

Mr. MURRAY. If the Attorney General brings the suit, and the suit is based upon information furnished by a private citizen, the court is entitled, in such a case, to allow a part of the recovery by way of compensation to the individual who furnishes the evidence?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Up to a maximum of 10 percent.

Mr. MURRAY. Up to a maximum of 10 percent, but no provision whatever is made for the private citizen who brings suit on his own motion after a failure of the Attorney General to sue.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield for an answer to the question just asked.

Mr. VAN NUYS. The Senator from Montana is entirely wrong in his assumption. The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] offered an amendment on that subject, which he can explain better than I can.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield for an answer to the question propounded.

Mr. FERGUSON. The bill now provides that in case the Attorney General shall be notified and evidence shall be given to him and he fails to bring suit within 6 months, or prior to the end of the 6 months' period he notifies the party furnishing the evidence that he will not bring suit, the party then bringing the suit would get one-half of the penalty, which is, under the statute, $2,000, and one-half of the damages, which in such a case are double damages, as provided in the statute.

Mr. MURRAY. In other words, the original law is not changed in that respect?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is not changed at all in that respect.

Mr. MURRAY. So that the original act provides for a double penalty, and provides that 50 percent of the recovery shall go to the person bringing the suit, in case of the failure of the Attorney General to bring suit?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MURRAY. That part of the original act is not changed?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct; it remains just as it is.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Then, I say to the junior Senator from Michigan, his interpretation is entirely different from that of the chairman of the committee, and I can refer to his explanation, which is just the opposite. I call the Senator's attention to page 5871 of the RECORD for June 15. In reporting the bill, the distinguished Senator from Indiana made the following statement:

> The only difference in the remedy is that under the old statute the informer received half the recovery. Under the amendment he will receive such compensation as the court may deem to be fair and reasonable, provided it does not exceed 10 percent of the recovery.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senato. from Indiana?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. VAN NUYS. If the Senator from North Dakota, who was present every moment of the time while I was addressing the Senate, will read the context, he will find that I was talking about an entirely different proposition than the one raised by the Senator from Montana. If the provisions written into the new bill, by amendment, are carried out, the informer may then receive not more than 10 percent compensation for his services in furnishing the original information.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator from West Virginia yield further?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The statute is not changed with respect to the recovery by the informer. When the informer brings his suit, he still gets his 50 percent. Is that correct?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. That is not in this proposed amendment of the statute.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is in the original act, and therefore it is not covered by the proposed amendment. That is the original act.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am glad to have that question put at rest.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. For what purpose?

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia a question, if I may.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to page 2, line 14, and ask him if every proper purpose for which he argues so cogently could not be accomplished if he were to limit his amendment merely to striking out the words "original with such person and"? The provide would then read:

> *Provided*, That no district court of the United States shall have power or jurisdiction to hear, try, or determine such suit brought or carried on by any person for himself and the United States unless based upon information, evidence, and sources not in the possession of or obtained by the United States.

And so on.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not think that would meet the situation, because it is my position that after the Attorney General has had an opportunity to institute a suit and has not done so, any citizen of this country, regardless of the source from which he may get his information, whether from a Government investigation, whether someone else may tell him, whether from some other trial, some other judicial proceeding, such person should have a right to bring a suit in the name of the United States. The whole matter is aimed at stopping fraud, and recovering money obtained by fraud.

I do not think that the citizen who undertakes to do that should be limited to information originally obtained, by him, or to information other than that in the possession of or obtained by the United States in the course of any investigation or proceeding instituted or conducted by it. In other words, if such a man obtains information through any proceeding conducted by the United States, or any inquiry, and the United States Government declines to prosecute the suit, I think the citizen should have a right to prosecute it. That is my position, and that is why I do not think the able Senator's suggestion meets the question raised here.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Merely for the observation, and to preserve the continuity of our colloquy, down through the whole history of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence suits in the names of private individuals in behalf of the Crown and in behalf of the sovereign were brought under circumstances such as those referred to by the Senator from West Virginia; but experience taught, and it seems to have been the better judgment of mankind, that private suits in the name of the Crown or in the name of the sovereign, generally, should be limited. Consequently, through the proposed remedial legislation reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, we have now sought to relegate to the past an archaic practice, and have sought rather to limit this type of action to the designated authorities, who are the creatures of the Government, who are appointees of the Executive, and who are sworn to do their duty.

With those observations, I would at another time discuss further the contentions of the Senator from West Virginia; and let me say that I have very great respect for his position, and know that he is perfectly sincere in urging the suggestions he submits to this body. That was his attitude in the committee, and I know that there everyone had great respect for his opinions and observations. Under our system of procedure here, however, when we do not agree, we raise the issue, and sooner or later we vote and decide it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from Connecticut, who always makes an able contribution to any discussion in which he engages.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall yield to the Senator from Michigan in a moment. I wish to say, however, that while

we must have full trust in the appointed officers of Government, it is now proposed that we change a very old statute, and that we pass a statute which shall be applicable for all time, or until changed again. The greatest check upon the proper conduct and action of a public official lies in action taken by the people themselves. If some Government official should fail to do his duty with respect to a fraud against the Government, then that fraud would continue unchecked, unchanged, uncorrected, unpunished, if the bill shall be passed in its present form. I ask the adoption of my amendment deleting this restrictive language, so that any citizen of this land, after the Government shall have failed to prosecute, may come forward and prosecute the case in the name of the Government. My amendment will provide a safeguard. My amendment will not hurt the public official if he performs his duty. It provides a safeguard against failure in public duty which I feel should be provided by Congress.

I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have a question I should like to submit. Suppose we amend the language which the Senator from West Virginia asks to strike out, which I believe should be amended for the purpose of clarity as follows: After the word "evidence", in line 14, on page 2, change the word "and" to "or"; after the word "not" in line 15, add the word "then"; after the words "possession of", in line 15, insert the words "the United States", and after the words "or obtained", insert the words "from such person", so the language would then read:

> By any person for himself and the United States unless based upon information, evidence, or sources original with such person and not then in the possession of the United States or obtained from such person.

I have in mind that that change in language would enable a person with the evidence to go before a congressional committee or a grand jury and give his evidence freely, and have the United States Government obtain it in that way, and would then be able to bring his suit as provided for in the act.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I may say to the able Senator from Michigan that the suggestion made by him does not meet the point, because my position is that no restriction whatsoever should be placed upon any citizen to bring suit after he shall have informed the Attorney General, and given the Attorney General 6 months within which to proceed. It seems to me that any citizen should have the right to proceed against the wrongdoer, without restriction as to where he may obtain the information and facts upon which he proceeds.

I think such a provision as I propose would create a desirable safeguard against failure on the part of the Department of Justice and its agents to perform their duties. When frauds occur—and already instances have been cited in which such frauds have occurred—under the immense war contracts, it is proposed to leave the matter entirely in the hands of the Department and its agents. What harm can be done by saying to the Department of Justice, "If you do not perform your duty some citizen of this country is going to rise and perform it for you"? I think such provision should be made. I am not saying that the Department will not perform its duty, but if the Department is going to perform it, why be afraid of this requirement, this measure of force, so to speak, that will require it to perform its duty?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I am in accord with the Senator from West Virginia. I think he has stated the situation very clearly. It seems to me there is no necessity for all the legal phraseology and verbiage which is contained in the bill. The original act with a few simple amendments should be allowed to stand exactly as it is, for the purpose of protecting the Government of the United States from frauds which are being perpetrated during the present war.

The act should be allowed to stand precisely as it is, except that it should be amended so as to prevent suits from being brought by private individuals until the Department of Justice is given an opportunity to act or decline to act. When the Department acts, of course the private individual would be foreclosed. The right of the individual to sue upon default of the Attorney General is an insurance against fraud. All that is necessary in the present situation is merely to provide that no suit can be brought by an individual until 60 days after the Attorney General shall have had notice and an opportunity to study the case and determine whether or not suit should be brought. Then of course if the Attorney General refuses to act, the private citizen should be free to base his suit either on original evidence or on evidence which he may secure from a grand jury or from any other source—from the Department of Justice or even from the local county courts.

It seems to me the purpose of the proposed legislation should be to protect the Government and the people of the United States from the serious and widespread frauds being perpetrated nearly every day. On my desk this morning I found a clipping dated yesterday which sets forth a description of a new suit brought against a large national concern for cheating the Government in respect to the manufacture and sale of aluminum castings essential for the war. Some of the frauds we read about are perpetrated in such manner as even to endanger the lives of the boys at the front. It seems to me there should be no question but that every opportunity should be given to any American citizen, where he sees fraud being committed, to bring it to the attention of the Attorney General, and if the Attorney General fails to sue, the citizen himself should be entitled to bring suit. Half the time it is impossible for the Attorney General's office to devote the study and care necessary in developing the proof in some of these cases, especially cases of fraud in connection with bidding, when persons have submitted bids and are entitled to an examination and consideration of their bids, yet are shut out by reason of influence or pressure, and fraud has thus been perpetrated upon the Government by reason of which the Government has been compelled to pay immense sums of money for materials which the original bidders could have supplied at lower figures. In all such cases the individual should have the right to sue if the Attorney General fails to act. Individuals should be given the opportunity in such cases to call the matter to the attention of the Attorney General, and if he fails to act, they should be entitled to act on their own accord. It seems to me the bill should be amended simply in that respect, and in no other respect.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I feel I have made my position clear on this subject. I believe the situation is understood, particularly in view of the very clear explanation and statement made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. I submit to the Senate that my amendment creates a safeguard because it first gives the Government the right to bring the suit, and, in fact, the citizen cannot bring it, and the court cannot even take jurisdiction of it, until the information has first been given to the Attorney General, and he has had 6 months within which to act to bring suit. If the Government sees fit not to bring suit within that time, the individual should be permitted to bring suit, and should not be foreclosed on the question whence his information comes. Are we to say that because the information is revealed by a congressional investigation, or because some Government agency discloses the fraud, if the Attorney General chooses not to bring the suit, a citizen cannot bring it? I do not see the reason for taking such a position. I do not see why such protection should be thrown around any Government official. His judgment, though made in the utmost of good faith, may have been wrong in not bringing a suit, but I feel that if the citizen knows of a fraud, or if he learns of a fraud from sources not original with him, and submits the matter to the Attorney General, thus giving him an opportunity to bring suit, and the Attorney General refuses or fails to do so, then, regardless of whence the information comes, for the protection of this country, the citizens, or any one of them, should be permitted to maintain the action.

I know that is my position on this subject. I hope I have made it clear.

Mr. President, at this time I desire to have a vote on my amendment.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, if the Senator from West Virginia is pressing for a vote at this time, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURTON in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Overton
Andrews	Green	Radcliffe
Bailey	Guffey	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Barbour	Hawkes	Robertson
Barkley	Hill	Scrugham
Bridges	Holman	Stewart
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Langer	Truman
Chavez	Lucas	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Tydings
Connally	McClellan	Vandenberg
Danaher	McFarland	Van Nuys
Davis	McKellar	Wagner
Downey	McNary	Wallgren
Eastland	Maloney	Wheeler
Ellender	Millikin	White
Ferguson	Moore	Wiley
George	Murray	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent as members of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is detained on official business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent as members of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] to strike from the first committee amendment certain language, as amended, beginning on page 2, line 13.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

SECRETARY OF STATE HULL AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hull Talks Sense" appearing in the Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn., of September 14, 1943. The editorial refers to Mr. Hull's recent statement over the radio concerning our foreign relations and our situation generally.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HULL TALKS SENSE

Secretary of State Cordell Hull talked sense last Sunday evening in his analysis of the Nation's post-war aims. Plumping squarely for United States participation in world affairs after the war, Secretary Hull based his recommendations on simple, practical grounds that the man in the street can understand. In other words, he avoided altruistic twaddle and sweet-scented moonshine to put the whole business where it belongs as a means of accomplishing good for everybody through the effort of everybody.

Secretary Hull wants: An international police force that can and will be allowed to slap down any aggressor; an international court of justice empowered to settle legal differences among nations; sound trade relations established on a basis of mutual benefit and profit, and such help to dependent or backward nations as will allow them to develop to the stage where they can and will help themselves. This sort of program is as refreshing as a cool drink of water in hot weather. It is the type of plan that offers benefits for all in return for the work of all, which is no more and no less than any people should ask or want.

Particularly encouraging is Secretary Hull's emphasis on sound trade and other economic relations based on the actuating principle of enlightened self-interest to the end that all would profit in proportion to endeavors expended and good will displayed. Nowhere in Secretary Hull's talk was there any hint of establishing a world W. P. A. or lowering the standards of the more advanced nations if the backward ones cannot be persuaded to raise theirs. Mr. Hull proposes to level up instead of leveling down, which is right down the alley of the average worth-while American. We hope this sort of businesslike approach will prevail.

Mr. McKELLAR. The statement of Secretary of State Hull has been well received by the entire country. It contains a very great amount of good hard common sense, and should be read by every American.

Tennessee is proud of Secretary Hull, proud of the position he takes, and is practically unanimously behind him. I believe the country is, too. This is no time for "isms," and we do not find any "isms" in Mr. Hull's statement.

While I am on my feet, Mr. President, I call attention to an article which I wish to submit for the RECORD. It is an article appearing on Thursday, September 16, 1943, in the Washington Evening Star by Mr. Raymond Moley entitled "Mr. Hull and His Critics."

We all recall that Mr. Moley was at one time an Under Secretary of State under Mr. Hull, but later resigned because differences of opinion arose between him and Mr. Hull. I was one of those who sided with Mr. Hull at the time in that controversy and for that reason it gives me the greatest pleasure to read to the Senate Mr. Moley's article. I want, figuratively speaking, to take my hat off to Mr. Moley for his clear and convincing statement concerning our foreign policy under Mr. Hull, and to compliment him on his broad and generous attitude.

I invite Senators to listen to this short article, written by Mr. Raymond Moley, who, as I have stated, almost at the beginning of President Roosevelt's administration had a difference with Mr. Hull. The article, as I believe, shows what he in his heart thinks of Mr. Hull. It reads as follows:

The critics of Secretary Hull learned on Sunday night that he is no reed shaken by the wind. To examine with care his interpretation of American foreign policy is to feel the assurance that our external affairs are being conducted in the light of good traditions.

The critics will not be satisfied, of course. One of them has already said that Mr. Hull's speech merely rattled the bones of international law. This is like saying that Chief Justice Stone is rattling the bones of the Constitution.

It is a very sensible comparison. I continue reading:

The bones of international law are not dead. To imply that they are is to say that all men of good will and intelligence have created in the international relations of 3,000 years vanishes at the first whiff of powder.

Wars do not mark the failure of international law; they merely indicate that there is a vast area of international relations which lies beyond the scope of international law. That area, Mr. Hull says, is being explored and, in building post-war arrangements, will be explored further in a nonpartisan conciliatory spirit.

It is clear that Mr. Hull's main purpose in his speech was to indicate that our diplomacy has labored to save lives in this war and to make easier the thrusts of military force. In wartime, that is what a State Department is for. If it should work to make Europe over permanently, while war is still raging, the war itself might ultimately be very much more costly in lives and in time. If, for example, we seek to precipitate revolutions when we still have a chance to eliminate an enemy wholesale, we add to the agonies of both victor and vanquished. Mr. Hull makes the case—and the facts have amply proved his case—that in Spain, in Vichy, and in north Africa, our diplomacy served well as a primary aid to military power.

In acting as such, Mr. Hull and his department have relied upon a tradition of international law which his critics would scrap whenever they dislike the internal affairs of another country—the traditional principle of recognition. That principle was discarded by Wilson in 1913, in the Mexican affair. It was set aside in our relations with Russia for 15 years. But it is still the only permanent workable policy under which international affairs can proceed.

With reference to Mr. Hull's attitude toward Russia, this writer has some basis for a judgment, for he served in the Department during the months before the recognition of Russia in 1933. There was never any indication of prejudice toward Russia on Mr. Hull's part then, when, if ever, it was likely to manifest itself. Nor have events since that time revealed any such bias. To

suggest that such a bias exists is to impair relations with Russia, which are now a matter of life or death.

There are many post-war questions about which there may be honest disagreement with Mr. Hull. But the country is fortunate in having had, since we entered the war, so steady a hand as his in the State Department.

Again, Mr. President, I say that, coming from Mr. Moley, what I have read is an excellent expression.

Mr. President, one other statement, and I shall be through. The article of Mr. Moley is particularly interesting in view of some of the critical publications which have recently appeared concerning Mr. Hull's fine, American, statesmanlike utterances.

One critic in attacking Mr. Hull's position has seen fit to denounce our foreign policy for the past 40 years, and to undertake to ridicule Mr. Hull and also our foreign policy. He was especially hard on Mr. Wilson's attempted League of Nations. I agree with Mr. Hull rather than with this critic. The Monroe Doctrine has not ceased to exist, and in substance was never more alive than it was the other day when a South American nation, which had been flooded with Nazi propaganda for years, seeing the Nazi regime was soon to fall to pieces, wanted to get on the American band wagon. Secretary Hull's reply was, in effect, to state to that nation that the Monroe Doctrine was still in force and the United States would brook no tampering with it either by European nations or by any American nation.

Mr. President, since 1900 we have had some very able and splendid Secretaries of State. This critic animadverts on our foreign policy for the past forty-odd years. I want to say that in that time we have had some of the ablest Secretaries of State that any nation has ever had. I will mention all their names because they were all worthy men. I begin in 1900 with John Hay, followed by Elihu Root, Robert Bacon, Philander C. Knox. I do not know how many Members of the present Senate served with Mr. Knox, but I had several years' service with him, and I may say that he was one of the ablest men in the Senate at that time and one of the ablest men in the country. Following Mr. Knox there came William Jennings Bryan, Robert Lansing, Bainbridge Colby, Charles Evans Hughes. While I have not always agreed with Mr. Hughes, he made a great Secretary of State, as we all know, and that he should be criticized while we are at war with another nation to me is not seemly.

Then came Frank B. Kellogg. A number of us served with Mr. Kellogg in this body, and we all know that he was an able man.

He was followed by Henry L. Stimson, who is now Secretary of War. Lastly, now occupying the great office of Secretary of State is Cordell Hull.

In that 40 years America's position among the nations of the earth has constantly improved; indeed, so constantly and so effectively has it improved that today it stands as high as any other nation on earth and our diplomatic advice and leadership is followed by many other nations, and is, I believe, respected by all nations. Our outstanding purpose in diplomatic matters is, and has been during the life of the Republic, to make plain that we want no other nation's territory and want no indemnities and no reparations; that we want no interference by European nations further establishing themselves in any part of America; that we simply want the good will and esteem of all nations; that we want to be helpful to other nations whenever we can; that we want peaceably to trade with other nations and have them trade with us on terms of justice, fairness, and honesty; and that we simply want to live in peace and harmony with the rest of the world. That is a very simple foreign-relations policy, but it is the American foreign policy. We do not want to take other people's territory; we do not want to take other people's business; we merely desire, in this very simple way, to live with the other nations of the world in peace and harmony.

This is what Washington meant when he said we wanted "no entangling alliances with other nations"; this is what Monroe meant when he announced his justly celebrated doctrine. This is what Wilson meant when he said that we wanted no other nation's territory and no indemnities and no reparations. It is an exceedingly simple policy, and it seems to me that not only our own people but the people of other nations should respect it. It has been disregarded time and again, and it is necessary that in the future we be able to protect this general doctrine. Secretary Hull has outlined our policy in the most excellent and conservative way, and so far as he has gone, I for one certainly approve his position, and I believe the American people approve the position he so cogently and clearly stated last Sunday night.

Mr. President, it is easy to criticize, but, in my judgment, when everything seems to be coming our way, when our soldiers are winning on every front, when our stock is going up all over the world, when it looks as if the war will be settled before very long, I believe much earlier than most people expect, it seems to me is no time for columnists and other critics to indulge in criticism of our present Secretary of State. Some of them even go so far as to indulge in criticism of our foreign policy for the past forty-odd years. To all that, I demur; and so I have thought it wise to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate at this time.

ELIMINATION OF PRIVATE SUITS ARISING OUT OF FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I need not reiterate to those present my personal views on the amendment now pending. I have stated on the floor of the Senate that the adoption of the amendment would cut the very vitals out of the bill. I would rather see the bill defeated than to see the amendment agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] to strike from the first committee amendment certain language beginning on page 2, line 13, and continuing to line 17. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] are absent because of illness in their families.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent as members of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent on official business.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. I announce the following general pairs on this question:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]; and

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who would vote "yea," has a pair on this question with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent as members of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily detained.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—18

Aiken	Langer	Robertson
Ball	Millikin	Stewart
Danaher	Moore	Thomas, Idaho
Gillette	Murray	Tunnell
Gurney	Overton	Wheeler
Holman	Revercomb	Willis

NAYS—39

Andrews	Ferguson	McKellar
Bailey	George	Maloney
Bankhead	Green	Radcliffe
Barbour	Guffey	Reed
Barkley	Hatch	Reynolds
Burton	Hawkes	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Hill	Truman
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Vandenberg
Connally	Kilgore	Van Nuys
Davis	Lucas	Wagner
Downey	McCarran	Wallgren
Eastland	McClellan	White
Ellender	McFarland	Wiley

NOT VOTING—39

Austin	Clark, Mo.	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Gerry	Pepper
Bone	Glass	Russell
Brewster	Hayden	Scrugham
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	La Follette	Smith
Buck	Lodge	Taft
Bushfield	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Maybank	Tobey
Byrd	Mead	Tydings
Capper	Murdock	Walsh
Chandler	Nye	Wherry
Clark, Idaho	O'Daniel	Wilson

So Mr. REVERCOMB's amendment to the amendment of the committee, as amended, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] was rejected, I now bring to the attention of the Senate a letter written by the attorney for the former Governor of the State of Kansas, Mr. Ratner. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] stated that the Attorney General of the United States might at times be depended upon to do his duty. There is no disposition on my part to minimize the honesty or the efficiency or the ability of the Attorney General of the United States, but I desire now to bring to the attention of the Senate a case in which the Attorney General, after an investigation lasting over a year, has not said that there is basis for the action requested.

Mr. President, I shall read a letter written by the attorney for the former Governor of Kansas, Mr. Ratner, because the case therein cited is, I believe, typical of what is going to happen to the billions and billions of dollars of which the taxpayers of the United States have already been defrauded and are going to continue to be defrauded by a bunch of racketeers, crooks, and scoundrels. I read as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am very glad to supply you with some of the details of the Sunflower ordnance works fraud which bears so vitally on H. R. 1203, in which we are both interested.

The Sunflower works is a powder plant being built under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract—

The very thing that a few moments ago the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] condemned.

The Sunflower works is a powder plant being built under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract by Wm. S. Lozier, Inc.-Broderick & Gordon as architect, engineer, manager, agents in behalf of the Federal Government. For these architectural, engineering, and managerial services, they are to receive a fixed fee and may subcontract out the actual work on a lump sum or fixed-fee basis, to subcontractors or to themselves.

So, Mr. President, we now have the basis under which they have been operating for years.

This plant is located at De Soto, Kans., about 30 miles southwest of Kansas City, and will consist of 3,150 buildings constructed with Wm. S. Lozier, Inc., of Rochester, N. Y., as architect and Broderick & Gordon of Denver, Colo., as the constructing engineers. The project originated with an initial contract which called for the expenditure of—

Mind you, Senators—

of $56,000,000 but expanded into a complex net of addenda and subcontracts which involved the expenditure of approximately $129,000,000.

So, Mr. President, we have seen this contract rise from an estimated $56,000,000 to the point where they have already spent $129,000,000. I am speaking of this particularly at this time when the third-war-loan drive is under way, when we have the Back the Attack drive on, and I wish to show how money has been wasted and squandered almost beyond belief.

To investigate thoroughly a proposition of such magnitude needs months, but, from the comparatively few items cited below, you will see that the scratching of the surface which has been done exposes a quagmire of graft, and you will feel yourself justified in throwing back into Senator VAN NUY's teeth his accusation that you have, by upholding the informer law, "given protection to thieves and crooks."

Mr. President, I did not expect very many Senators to stay in the Chamber while I was speaking this afternoon. Some time ago when the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] told of the terrible things which took place in connection with the manufacture of war material by the Anaconda Cable & Wire Co., there were only 11 Senators upon the floor, and although the case to which I now call attention is of greater importance than even the Elk Hills exposure, I see only 9 Senators actually present at this moment.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. That may be explained, I will say to my dear friend, by the fact that some of us are obliged to be in attendance at meetings of the Military Affairs Committee and other committees which are now in session. As interested as I am in the Senator's discourse and as sympathetic as I am with his statement, I must leave the Chamber in a few minutes to attend a committee meeting.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am extremely sorry to see the Senator from Oregon go. I wish he would stay. But, Mr. President, what I have here in my hand is the result of months of work, and is paid for, not by the Federal Government, but by private taxpayers of the United States, who are so disgusted at the lack of cooperation they have received from the Attorney General of the United States that they have spent thousands of dollars of their own money in connection with this matter.

For example, Mr. President, one item in connection with this matter is that of lead pencils. The contractor bought 1,000,000 lead pencils at 9 cents apiece, when anyone of us can go out and buy pencils at 2 for a nickel. Think of the contractor buying 1,000,000 pencils. For what purpose? He could not possibly use a million lead pencils on a contract for the building of 3,150 buildings. That is simply a small sample of what the attorney for the former Governor of Kansas says is a "quagmire of graft." The attorney for the Governor in his letter continues:

From the inception of the project to date, carloads of material have been left exposed to the weather, to warp and rust, in spite of a contract which demands proper storage of materials; carloads of new and thoroughly usable lumber have been burned daily while farmers are unable to get what they need to build chicken houses and outbuildings and building contractors throughout the country have had to close up their businesses for want of lumber. Over ravines on the reservation culverts were laid of heavy, new dimension lumber, were used weeks or months, torn out by bulldozers or caterpillars when the road was moved; and, while the lumber was still wholly usable, it was trucked off to the firing pit and burned. This represented not only the cost in dollars of a much needed commodity but represented, too, our virgin forests, the manpower needed to transform the timber into usable form, and its transportation by railroads and trucks from the forests to Sunflower. Large quantities of lumber were broken and cracked by inexcusably careless unloading practices and were crushed by bulldozers and caterpillars. Lumber cut to measure by carpenters and stacked and labeled, "Do not use," was carted away and burned, representing lumber and labor loss.

Mr. President, this letter is not written by a so-called racketeer. It is not written by one who, as the distinguished Senator from Indiana, who is chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, said, "was worse than Al Capone of Chicago." This letter is written by the attorney for the former Governor of Kansas, Mr. Ratner, whose term expired only a few months ago. The letter continues:

Millions of pounds of concrete were defectively mixed of substandard material with lumps much larger than the specifications

permitted. Mudballs, sometimes as big as buckets, were in the aggregate, not occasionally but day after day, to such an extent that it was necessary to put two men at the conveyors to fish them out. Concrete mixes were not varied, in accordance with good building practice, to conform to the uses for which the concrete was to be put or to the specifications; but pours for piers, columns, floors, foundations, walls, platforms, etc., were made from the same mix with the result that walls cracked and crumbled and piers had to be torn down and reconstructed. William S. Broderick, one of the defendants, held stock in the subcontracting company furnishing rock for cement work and holding the roadbuilding contract at Sunflower. We understand no prime contractor may own stock in any subcontracting company furnishing material.

So, Mr. President, I submit you may have a violation of the contract there.

The letter goes on to say:

Structural steel was omitted from buildings where the most ordinary good building practice demanded its incorporation. The testimony of Col. E. E. Taylor, representative of the Army engineers on the job, admits the collapse of foundations and walls where the steel was omitted because, he maintained, it was cheaper to build and see what happened than to build according to tested and accepted engineering practices.

Why, the buildings fell down, they were so poorly constructed. Yet, Mr. President, the letter goes on to say:

Yet steel was burned on the reservation in large quantities—kegs of nails (steel and brass or copper), kegs of bolts and plumbing fittings, lengths of pipe, hundreds of guards for electric lights that had never been attached and used, tons of iron rails from tramlines, etc. Twenty tons of steel cut and shaped for the roof of the reservoir were buried by a bulldozer.

And that at a time, Mr. President, when on the farms in my State of North Dakota loyal, patriotic men and women were gathering together every scrap of iron and steel they could possibly locate, while down in Kansas that crooked outfit was, as the letter says, burying tons of steel, kegs of bolts, and plumbing outfits, lengths of pipe, hundreds of guards for electric lights, and a great deal of other material.

The letter goes on to say:

The plans had been changed; and when the attention of an official was called to the wrecked roofing by an employee, the official remarked, "It is too bad, but there is nothing we can do about it now"; and the operator of the bulldozer declared he had orders to bury the steel. This, with you and me and all the children of America picking up nails from the streets and salvaging milk-bottle caps and giving up trophies of World War No. 1, brought home by its heroes from the battlefields of 1917, so that our fighting men at the front may be sure of all of the weapons of war that they need.

That is what happened.

The writer of the letter goes on to say:

Hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of pipe line were intentionally laid defectively, over unfit and untamped fills, off grade, without T's, gate and cross valves, with lead cooked until the sulfur content was gone and it would not seal, so that gangs of workmen could come back and excavate again and the fittings could be added and the ditches again filled and more costs might accrue for the Government to pay for.

Mr. President, I repeat that the letter is not one from some racketeer. It is from the attorney for the former Governor of Kansas. In his letter he warns the Senate of the scores and hundreds of lawsuits that we shall have to face before the taxpayers of America get what is justly due them.

He goes on to say:

The inspectors protested, but they were unable to do anything to protect the Government's rights and force conformance with the requirements of the contract between the Government and William S. Lozier, Inc.-Broderick & Gordon. Frank C. Delle Cese, acting in behalf of the A. E. M., posted an order to all inspectors: "Do not stop any work. Do not give any orders at any time." The job of inspection degenerated into the making of progress reports which took about 5 minutes a day by the admissions of many inspectors. There are some 700 inspectors at Sunflower being paid about $1,932,000 for inspection it did not get. Add to that figure the substandard material and construction that went into the structure and the labor and material involved in the necessary reconstruction; and the Government's loss is multiplied again.

Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the letter, and I read further from it:

Consider, Senator, that one building out there, No. 4015 joined to 242-3 in a T-shaped structure, line D, nitrocotton, a building which should have cost the Government no more than $3,500, has cost $9,800. It was torn down three times and built four. Each time the structure went up added to the material and the labor that the taxpayers of the United States are paying for and the cost-plus that the wrongdoers are putting into their pockets.

The one building just referred to is an extreme but not an isolated case. Many hundreds of foundations have cracked and sagged; and rebuilding is a common occurrence which can perhaps be calculated accurately only by putting an auditing force on the books of William S. Lozier, Inc.-Broderick & Gordon.

The excess amount of water in the concrete mix, which shows up constantly in the log reports on the cylinder tests, increased the amount of the concrete poured. The foremen received bonuses based on the amount poured.

The more water they poured, the more bonuses they received.

I continue to read:

The larger the pour, the bigger the bonus, the higher the cost, the larger the cost-plus. There is a concrete dump at the plant where each shift dumped its excess mix. It is a sea; yet much has been broken out and carried away to another dump, involving more labor, transportation, and equipment.

Literally hundreds of workmen, according to their own statements—

Mind you, Mr. President, this is sworn testimony—

have been hidden out at Sunflower, sometimes in ones and twos, sometimes whole gangs of steamfitters, carpenters, plumbers, cement finishers, laborers, whose hourly wage went from 90 cents per hour up. Sometimes they hid out under orders for hours at a time. Other times they were idle for days for lack of material. Materials arrived daily in carload lots; yet men and material did not get together, and men were idle while they swear material was burned and run over by bulldozers and left unstacked and unsheltered in the open to rust and warp.

Why, Mr. President, I say that with that kind of supervision, not a single taxpayer in America should buy one bond if this Government and its War Department cannot protect its people and the citizens of a State from paying $129,000,000 when the contract reads $56,000,000. I submit that until that kind of situation is remedied, the Senate should be ashamed to ask any boy or girl to take his or her little savings out of the savings banks and buy War bonds.

The writer continues:

We have instances of 1,000,000 pencils purchased at 9 cents each, with a retail value of two for 5 cents; of doors sold to our Government for $10.50 each but bought for $4.97 each; of orders for lumber marked "Rush," which thereby increased delivery costs, while lumber was being burned at the plant; of the purchase of lumber, tractors, heavy motor equipment, etc., from favored vendors with no competitive bidding (in spite of contractual demands for competitive bidding) and of kick-backs to the A. E. M.

Other specific details of interest are: Three men on separate shifts (three shifts of 8 hours each) were employed 2 or 3 months at a labor cost of $1,500, $1,000, and $900 to pump water from a building after the sinking of an elevator shaft opened a spring. This was building 1800-1. The spring was finally cut out, as it should have been in the beginning, releasing the men and the pump to other work. Almost equally ridiculous, if not more so, was the practice of keeping two able-bodied men per shift in the wash house, where the water kegs were cleaned, to tend fires in small stoves that warmed the place.

The labor cost on three C. C. C. type buildings which were torn down and brought from Iowa was $55,000, when $15,000 would have paid for the labor and material to build similar structures of brick.

W. P. B. regulation L-158 restricts the purchase of parts; but Sunflower storage warehouses are full of parts forbidden to be stored.

We have evidence of pay-roll padding and checks issued in the names of terminated employees and evidence of butchers, cooks, barbers, redcaps, elevator operators put on the rolls as inspectors, steamfitters, cement finishers, carpenters, and plumbers and given the wages of skilled workers, which vary around $1.50 per hour, according to the craft.

A. E. M. admits that the cement content was 6 percent short in the aggregate; that labor was 35 percent inefficient (the latter would amount to an approximate labor waste of $25,000,000); that roads were built according to a system that had been proved costly and inefficient in other governmental construction. Leavenworth, I believe, is one example, Leonard Wood, another.

There were numerous instances where material that was rejected and was admittedly unfit for use was incorporated into the structures by order of superior authority. For instance, 18 carloads of rock with liberal mixtures of mudballs were rejected but went into the mix just the same.

One overcharge on cement, $56,000.

Dirt moved at a contract price of $2.50 per cubic yard (which price should have been $1.50 per cubic yard, according to the prevailing scale) was so manipulated by hauling one yard of dirt in a five-yard capacity truck and making a five-yard charge therefor and by additional pay for excessive overhauls that the cost was pyramided to $20 per cubic yard. In the end, the job turned out to be a matter of $5,000,000, when at $2.50 a cubic yard, without manipulation, it would have been only a $625,000 job, which means that at the $2.50 charge there was an overcharge to the Government of $4,625,000.

This overcharge does not take into consideration the cost of unnecessary labor employed or any charge for equipment, the cost of fuel for the equipment, and the wear and tear.

Forty-one thousand dollars was actually paid for the laying of a 24-inch water main from the north to the south bank of the Kaw River, after a bid of $15,000 was rejected for the same job.

In other words, Mr. President, men offered to lay this 24-inch water main for $15,000. The bid was rejected, and then this contractor was paid $41,000 for the actual laying of the 24-inch water main from the north to the south bank of the Kaw River.

Last October, November, December, approximately 2,100,000 yards of earth was moved for 56 cents per cubic yard. This yardage was arrived at by using scoops represented as being of 20-yard capacity but holding only 12 yards and by using other scoops represented as being of 12-yard capacity but holding only 6 yards. One yard of dirt was hauled in a 5-yard capacity truck, and a charge was made for 5 yards. Also, the movement was made needlessly from place to place. This dirt-moving job, too, bears investigation.

Insurance frauds are more than indicated. The Government insurance plan calls for the insurance of only the vehicles leaving the reservation; but the Government plan has not been conformed to at Sunflower at least not until a very recent date. It will be noticed that the employment of numbers of unneeded workmen would not only increase labor costs but would automatically increase insurance costs and also the amount due the contractors under cost-plus.

The substitution of substandard material for standard is found in concrete, lumber (grade 3 for grade 1), rock, etc.; and, in most cases, the prices paid were for the standard material. Col. E. E. Taylor admits this in his testimony before the Truman committee.

This plant as expanded demands the expenditure of approximately as much money as did the War of 1812 in its entirety; and the project, when complete, will be substandard and in many respects not in accord with the specifications. This may be the reason that rumor persists that from one-half to three-fourths of the plant is to be scrapped and that a minimum of $10,000,000 in material will never be used.

Machinery bases have been put in and torn out time after time, in one case a group of buildings had one side torn out and reset because the machinery bases did not fit the space allotted. After the installation of machinery, the delicate alinements which many require will undoubtedly be jeopardized by the collapse and settling of defective bases under vibration, and there is a possibility that the lives of the workers will be endangered because of the faulty construction and that the quality of the products needed by our fighting men at the front will be impaired.

The foregoing is taken from information that has been turned over to me from time to time. We have much more.

I may add that I have the complaint before me. The defendants are: W. S. Broderick, D. G. Gordon, partners, doing business as Broderick & Gordon, and Wm. S. Lozier and Wm. S. Lozier, Inc., F. C. Delle Cese, Earl S. Stone, U. S. Transit Mix Corporation, Cory & Joslin, Inc., a corporation, William E. Joslin, P. B. Gibson, C. R. Walker, James L. McClenahan and James W. McClenahan, partners doing business as Cory-Joslin and Macnsons.

Continuing to read from the letter:

The lawyers for the defendants in this case boasted openly in court last Monday, July 5, that Congress would put an end to the Sunflower fraud case in 10 days.

I judge from the last vote taken, Mr. President, that they are right.

Senator FERGUSON said for publication that H. R. 1203 is directed against this particular suit. The contractors at Sunflower brag of political influence which makes them immune to investigation and joke about stretching out the project so they will not have to pay all their income tax in 1 year. It is common rumor that a son-in-law of the Secretary of the Treasury is prominent in Lord Electrical Co. (Evans-Lord are the electrical subcontractors at Sunflower; Evans of Kansas City and Lord of New York)—

Because I cannot prove the next statement I shall not read it. It simply says that this man is related to a member of the Cabinet.

Continuing:

These rumors are not confirmed. I repeat them because of their persistence and your saying you have means of seeking out the truth which are not open to us.

We have been refused information as to the ownership, officers, stockholders, and directors of the U. S. Transit Mix Concrete Corporation of New York by the authorities of New York State for the purported reason that these public records are confidential.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator stated that I said that the pending bill would put an end to the case to which he has referred.

Mr. LANGER. I said a publication so stated.

Mr. FERGUSON. How would the bill in its present form put an end to the case? How could it possibly put an end to that case?

Mr. LANGER. Why would it not put an end to the case? This case was brought after June 15, 1942.

Mr. FERGUSON. It would merely mean that the plaintiff would be compelled to give the facts to the Attorney General, and he, on behalf of the people, would become the plaintiff in the case and prosecute it. The amendment which I have offered would allow the present plaintiff in this case to receive up to 10 percent of the damages. In other words, this case would be prosecuted, and, in my opinion, should be prosecuted. However, it should be prosecuted first by the Attorney General, the responsible agent of the United States. For whatever work the plaintiff has done in the case he should be paid due compensation. Therefore it would not end the case. I never made such a statement, and it could not possibly end the case. It would merely transfer it to the Attorney General's Office and the present plaintiff would receive up to 10 percent, as the court might determine.

Mr. LANGER. Ah, Mr. President, let me state to the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan that Mr. Ratner and his lawyers have time and time again appealed to the Attorney General. Men were sent out to investigate. They reported back that they could not find anything.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. That being true, if the pending measure should be passed, after 6 months had elapsed, the plaintiff could go ahead with his suit just the same as he could before this so-called amendment should be adopted.

Mr. LANGER. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator has missed the point of what these men are doing. I call attention to the case allegedly involving Frank Hague. I have the files here with me. The case stinks to high heaven. The Government brought action in 1935, brought it all right, but let it lie there during 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, and 1940. It was only when private persons went in that final action was taken. Not only that, but I have the letters here from the Attorney General of the United States, refusing to have anything to do with the case.

Here is a letter written by Thurman Arnold on April 16, 1942, to the attorney for the taxpayer who was suing those persons in New Jersey. The letter states:

DEAR SIR: I have your letter of April 6, 1942, in regard to the above-entitled case. Although the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit rejected the views submitted by the United States in *Marcus* v. *Hess*, the attitude of the Attorney General in respect to suits of this character has not changed. Consequently, I am unable to authorize Government officials to cooperate with you in the prosecution of the above case.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I submit, Mr. President, that in the Marcus against Hess case in Pennsylvania the Attorney General's office of the United States moved heaven and earth to prevent the plaintiff from getting a judgment. After all those facts were called to the attention of the Attorney General's office, nothing was done. It was only after that suit was brought, only after the plaintiffs had dug up all the facts, only after a jury had given the plaintiffs a verdict for $315,000, and after the case had been appealed by the defendants, that for the first time we find the Attorney General's office appearing.

What did they do? Why, Mr. President, although the defendants offered to pay $100,000 in settlement, yet the Attorney General's office designated Thurman Arnold to appear in opposition. I suggest that the brief which was filed be read. That brief held that the plaintiffs should not recover. We find the spectacle of the Attorney General appearing for the defendants. The circuit court did hold for the defendants, and then the plaintiffs appealed, and it was the Supreme Court of the United States which reinstated the judgment. That is why those plaintiffs received $315,000. They received it in spite of the Attorney General of the United States.

So we return to the Sunflower case, to which the junior Senator from Michigan has referred. It may be that if that case is turned over to the Attorney General's office they will not do anything more about it than was done in the Frank Hague in New Jersey, or in the Marcus against Hess case.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with much that the Senator from North Dakota has said relative to the case in New Jersey. However, under the present language of the pending bill that case is not touched. I know that the Senator from North Dakota is saying much that is true with regard to the Sunflower case, because I was on the Truman committee and investigated it. An action should be brought by the Attorney General.

The letter from Assistant Attorney General Arnold is just the kind of a letter that would permit a plaintiff to bring a suit under the present law when the Attorney General refused to bring the suit. I believe the time has come when we must choose between the evil of having an Attorney General who fails in his sworn duty to take care of cases where fraud is committed against the United States, and permitting any lawyer, whether he has the facts or not, at any time, and under any circumstances, to bring suit. I am inclined to the opinion that we should take the view that we will hold responsible to the people of the United States the Attorney General, and when he fails in his duty, it is time for the people of the United States to see that they get another Attorney General. We can control one man in the Attorney General's office much better than we can control thousands of lawyers all over the country. I am inclined to the opinion that we could do it in the way provided for in the bill, and that is why I am in favor of the bill.

Mr. President, I agree that many of the things stated by the Senator from North Dakota are true. I believe that any man who buys a million lead pencils, as the Senator has said, is wrong and should be prosecuted for that fraud. The statute now provides that he can be penalized $2,000 plus double the actual damages. We should hold responsible the Attorney General of the United States and, as I have already said, if we find him failing in his duty then it is time that we have a new Attorney General. However, it is easier to control him than it is to control hundreds and thousands of lawyers all over the country.

So, Mr. President, there is no dispute between the Senator from North Dakota and myself on the facts. I, too, want every fraud case prosecuted, but I think the people of the United States should have those cases prosecuted by the Attorney General, their responsible officer, rather than by private citizens.

The responsibility to prevent frauds is on the Government as well as on the citizen. When the citizen gives the facts to the Government the case should be prosecuted by the Government, but the citizen should be able to use his original evidence to prosecute in case the Government does not do so.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I do not know of any man upon the Senate floor, in view of his very distinguished record in connection with the prosecution of crooks and grafters, that I would rather have interrogate me than the junior Senator from Michigan himself. Now he says he wants to hold the Attorney General of the United States alone responsible. That is not done in Michigan; it is not done in my State; it is not done in any State of the Union of which I know. Whenever a sufficient number of taxpayers are dissatisfied, whenever they think an attorney general or county attorney is not doing his duty, they can go to a court, and, under the statute, the court can set aside the attorney general and name a prosecutor, either in a criminal or civil case. If my memory serves me correctly, that is exactly what happened in the State of the junior Senator from Michigan himself.

Why, in heaven's name, I ask, Mr. President, assuming that there is a corrupt Attorney General, assuming another Harry M. Daugherty in the Attorney General's office, why should the American people wait for years, during which time witnesses may die and the testimony may disappear, before a suit of this kind can be brought? How, I ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan, are we going to get rid of an Attorney General who refuses to take action?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the answer is obvious.

Mr. LANGER. Very well, how is it going to be done?

Mr. FERGUSON. Change the administration. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGER. The Senator says "change the administration," but Mr. President, that may take 12 years [laughter]; and if it takes 12 years, then the cases are outlawed. If that is the only remedy the distinguished Senator from Michigan has, I submit it is no remedy at all.

Mr. President, that is the very crux of this entire argument. What, I ask is the distinguished Senator now occupying the chair [Mr. BURTON in the chair] going to do if this bill is passed and if there is crookedness and fraud in war contracts in Ohio? What is he going to do when a constituent comes to him and says, "Mr. Senator, they stole $100,000 on this deal; we want the case prosecuted"? All the Senator can say is, "I cannot do anything about it; I cannot go to a county attorney; I cannot go to the State attorney general; I can go to only one man and that is the Attorney General of the United States. I went to him and he brought a case 2 years ago, 3 years ago, 4 years ago, 5 years ago, 6 years ago, such as the Frank Hague case." Very well. The Senator from Ohio and every other Senator in this body is helpless, for the Attorney General alone can bring the suit.

I repeat, that such practice is not customary in any State of the Union. In some States even 10 percent of the voters signing a petition and presenting it to a judge can have the judge appoint a prosecutor in a civil or a criminal case. There is no provision of that kind in this bill. Who may be Attorney General 2 years or 4 years or 6 years from now? Even if there is an honest Attorney General, he has to depend upon assistants, and who knows who the Assistant Attorney General will be who may have charge of these war fraud cases? Do you not see, Mr. President, the position the Senate is putting the people of America into when not a single taxpayer can bring a suit except through one man? That is my objection to this bill. I do not see how the bill can possibly be amended so that it will be worth anything.

The present law was good enough for Abraham Lincoln, it has been good enough for the people of this country for 80 years, and I submit, in spite of all that has been said here, that the law has not been abused.

I have before me, Mr. President, a list of all the cases that have been brought. They number 33. It is true that in perhaps 6 or 7 of them the indictments were copied in order to bring the suit, but, as we read in the newspapers last evening, when the last case was brought all the Attorney General said was, "I had already sued them." In every future case where people are arrested, and war fraud cases brought, all the Attorney General has to do is to bring a civil suit at the same time.

Mr. President, this bill, in my judgment, goes much further. It is sought to wipe out the 33 cases that have already been brought, but it is being done without a hearing. There never was a hearing before any committee, either in the House or in the Senate. Why should not the people who are interested be heard?

Mr. President, I have here before me, coming again to the matter of the Attorney General of the United States, a report by Mr. Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, under date of January 21, 1943. What does he say? Take, for example, this overpayment case from this report of the Comptroller General of the United States of an investigation of contracts and other records of the United States Maritime Commission:

> Overpayment: Based on Commission's General Order No. 24, the value of the vessel at the time of acquisition—

And the name of the vessel, by the way, was the *President Roosevelt*—

> Based on Commission's General Order No. 24, the value of the vessel at the time of acquisition was only $178,531, and since $600,000 was paid therefor, an apparent overpayment of $421,468.99 resulted in view of the provisions of section 902 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

There is a case. Here is another case brought to the attention of the people by Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, which is pertinent and of interest. It is a report dated August 21, 1943, less than a month ago. Let us see how these crooks and scoundrels are operating while small boys and girls are being asked to buy war bonds. Mr. Warren says:

> In purchasing the five vessels from the corporation as aforesaid instead of exercising the option to repurchase the vessels sold under the written agreement of June 8, 1940, the Commission laid out and expended the sum of $1,995,502.68 more than it should and would have expended had it exercised said option, without regard to reasonable depreciation of the vessel sold under said written

agreement, as will more fully and clearly hereafter appear.

Then it goes on and cites the instances.

I have another report here from Mr. Bland, of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives. It is exceedingly interesting. As I have said, it is from the House, where they have already had an investigation. I shall refer to page 7. It is of date November 24, 1942, and relates to an investigation of the South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation.

It is difficult to understand why South Portland Ship should ever have entered into such a lease. It is impossible to justify it. Testifying before your committee, Mr. Newell explained the rent by stating that an officer of the Portland Terminal Co. had informed him that the property was worth $600,000, 6-percent return on which would amount to $36,000, but that he had made no investigation of his own to verify the value. He could offer no explanation for the inclusion in the lease of the strange and unusual provisions relating to the construction of the bridge. In response to questions concerning that provision, his testimony was that he didn't remember the lease contained such provision. He finally admitted that either the railroad company of which he is a director had driven a "sharp bargain" or "somebody was asleep" in his organization.

No prudent businessman, dealing with his own money, would ever have entered into such a lease. Its improvidence and imprudence can be explained only by keeping in mind that all costs incurred are reimbursable by the Maritime Commission.

Again, on page 9, it is stated:

Materials Handling—

The name of a corporation—

Materials Handling has never had sufficient equipment to supply all the needs of the yard. Accordingly, it has rented equipment from others, and in turn rerented it to the yard at a higher rental than that which it paid. An example of the operation of this method is the following: A firm known as Truck Leasing Corporation rented a truck, supplying gasoline and oil, but without a driver, at $6.50 per day to Hunnewell Trucking Co., hereinafter referred to as Hunnewell. Hunnewell placed a driver on the truck and rented it to Materials Handling at $2.75 per hour. Materials Handling in turn rented the same truck with the Hunnewell driver to the yard at $3.50 per hour.

So Senators will see that the same truck which originally rented at $6.50 a day finally rented to the driver of the truck at $3.50 an hour, and the United States paid the difference.

Again, on page 9 of this report, I find this:

The rental of trucks to the yard is a most profitable business. During the period from its incorporation in January 1941 to September 30, 1942, Materials Handling Corporation showed a profit of $87,394.30, after deducting officers' salaries totaling $38,000, and after writing off depreciation based on an 18-month life for equipment, a rate of depreciation wholly unjustified by any standard. If a 3-year life for the equipment were taken as a base—the equipment was all purchased new—the profit would be over $107,000, after deducting the afore-mentioned salaries. Of the total of $38,000 salaries, $10,000 was paid to Kenneth T. Burr and $9,875 was paid to Miss Barbara Burr, a daughter of Kenneth T. Burr. Miss Burr is 22 years of age, and is employed as a stenographer by Bancroft & Martin at a salary of $25 per week.

But when the Government was paying the bill, her salary was jumped from $25 a week to $9,875 a year.

Again:

While these salaries were being paid the individuals so recompensed were all receiving very substantial salaries from Bancroft & Martin, for which firm they were chiefly working. The total profits received by Materials Handling, plus the total salaries paid, amount to $145,000. To repeat, the total investment was $3,000.

But the profits from the $3,000 investment were, according to the House committee, $145,000. To me it is a mockery to think that this administration should be going out and asking boys and girls, young men and young women, to buy War bonds when we have this kind of an administration of the fiscal affairs of the Government, when a company investing $3,000 makes $145,000. This is all sworn testimony. Yet the Senate committee says no one shall investigate this, that no one shall bring a suit except the Attorney General of the United States. To me it is unbelievable that the Senate of the United States of America could pass any sort of legislation of that kind.

Now let us turn to page 10 of the same report, where we find the following:

The experience of Hunnewell is equally interesting. It was not until the last part of 1941 that Materials Handling began to rent trucks from Hunnewell in any appreciable number. During the years 1936 to 1940, inclusive, Hunnewell's average profit was approximately $2,000 per year, after deduction of officers' salaries, which never exceeded $12,000 in any one year.

I call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the years, 1936 to 1940. The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who sits before me, well knows the evidence of the conditions would still be buried, if it had not been for the Truman committee, although we have appropriated $101,000,000 for the Office of the Attorney General of the United States.

On page 10 we find this:

During the years 1936 to 1940, inclusive, Hunnewell's average profit was approximately $2,000 per year, after deduction of officers' salaries, which never exceeded $12,000 in any one year. It first began to receive business from Materials Handling in 1941 and in that year showed a profit of over $5,000, after deduction of officers' salaries totaling $24,000. For the 9-month period ended September 30, 1942, the profit of Hunnewell was $71,000, after deduction of officers' salaries at the rate of $36,000 per year.

That is the girl getting $25 a week, who suddenly jumped to $9,875 a year.

Then there is some more. I turn to page 15 of the same report:

The fees paid to South Portland Ship as of October 31, 1942, amounted to $450,000. These fees are, for all practical purposes, net earnings of South Portland Ship. Its total investment is $250,000. All costs and expenses incurred by it, including salaries of officers, even $6,575 of the $10,000 salary paid to Mr. Newell, are being reimbursed to it by the Maritime Commission. It has already received a return on its investment of almost 200 percent. Under its contracts with the Commission it is to build 84 ships. Judging by its performance to date, its fees will not exceed $60,000 per ship, as on the ships built so far the penalties imposed for bad performance keep the fees at the minimum figure. Even at the minimum figure, however, its total fees will amount to $5,040,000, or a return of 2,000 percent on investment.

I want you to mark this well, Mr. President. Even at a minimum figure, assuming that all the penalties were imposed, the total fees will amount to $5,040,000, or a return of 2,000 percent on the investment.

I repeat, Mr. President, here is evidence of a dividend return of 2,000 percent to a dirty outfit of this kind, which is robbing the taxpayers of this country, while we have in Washington this exhibit, "Back the Attack," attempting to get every dollar possible out of the people of Washington and vicinity to pay a concern like this 2,000 percent profit; and no action has been taken. And I have more of this kind of cases.

I have before me other cases, but I shall not read them all. If anyone is interested in them I shall be glad to present them. Some are much worse than the one I have just mentioned. One was a case in which there was merely a $500 investment.

Mr. President, I read from page 6 of the preliminary report made by former Senator Black, now Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, from the Special Committee to Investigate Air Mail Contracts, in the matter of the investigation of air-mail and ocean-mail contracts. In his report former Senator Black said:

The policy of extending aid to shipping enterprises in the form of mail contracts has been constant for many years. This aid was in existence even prior to the Merchant Marine Act of 1920. Under that act and prior to the enactment of the Merchant Marine Act of 1928, contracts were let and compensation paid as follows:

The Oceanic Steamship Co. received $1,892,818; the Munson Steamship Line, $1,277,151; the Export Steamship Corporation, $341,666.66; the American South African Line, $135,000; the Dollar Steamship Line, $948,000; the Grace Steamship Co., $564,003; and the New York & Porto Rico Steamship Co., $29,070, a total of $5,188,012.66. It will be noted that out of seven contractors under the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, six hold contracts under the Merchant Marine Act of 1928. The seventh, the New York & Porto Rico Steamship Co., was awarded a contract under the Merchant Marine Act of 1928 which expired on July 1, 1932. This seventh company is a subsidiary of the Atlantic, Gulf & West Indies Steamship Lines, which holding company controls the New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co., present contractor on routes 20 and 21.

The above résumé demonstrates clearly that since the World War it has been the continuous policy of this Nation to expend the public funds to build up and maintain a privately owned and operated American merchant marine and further demonstrates, that shipping interests have taken advantage of this policy to build up private fortunes at public expense.

The report further on speaks of the $500 company. If any Senator is interested in the matter he can find it in hearings held by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, December 7, 8, and 12, 1942. Also hearings before the Committee on Merchant Marine and

Fisheries, Seventy-seventh Congress, December 15, 16, and 17, 1942.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand the records of the 33 informer cases which are now pending in the United States, and I again call attention to the fact that the telegrams which I have received from the plaintiffs in these 33 lawsuits in every instance stated that the plaintiffs were not notified of any hearing before a committee of the House or of the Senate. Let us take the Kansas case, in which private individuals have expended thousands upon thousands of dollars, and have appealed time and again to the Attorney General of the United States. Certainly no one will claim that the former Governor of Kansas is a racketeer. He is in charge of bringing this case. In connection with that case private individuals have expended thousands upon thousands of dollars. Yet the Judiciary Committees of the House and the Senate did not do former Governor Ratner of Kansas even the courtesy of notifying him so that he might appear and protect his own interests or the interests of those who were associated with him.

We are now asked to pass the pending bill without giving former Governor Ratner or any of his associates the chance to be heard, although they are protecting the interests of the people of the United States under a statute 80 years old. Neither was he given an opportunity to appear at the time the Committee on the Judiciary met. Some persons did appear before the committee. Those were the persons who I myself notified. One of them was a Mr. Coates of St. Louis. He happened to write me a letter and I telegraphed to him and told him the facts with respect to hearings. He came to Washington. I telephoned to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary who said he would give Mr. Coates 10 minutes before the committee. When Mr. Coates appeared before the committee, members of the committee became so interested in what he had to say that he remained before the committee over 2 hours, and when he had finished, the committee advised him to confer with the Assistant Attorney General, Tom Clark, and as a result of that conference Mr. Coates' case was exempted by agreement with the Assistant Attorney General of the United States.

We come back to the case of Marcus against Hess. In that case the Supreme Court, as I have previously stated, affirmed the judgment for $315,000, and, as I stated day before yesterday, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] submitted an amendment to the pending bill, which had been passed by the House, an amendment which would make it extremely doubtful whether the officers of any court could be used to collect that judgment, and it was only after Mr. Margiotti came to Washington from Pittsburgh and had seen the Attorney General of the United States, that that matter was clarified to the extent that it was known that he could collect his portion of the judgment.

We turn again to the New Jersey case, the Hague case. In that case the judge, Judge Fake, apologized to the defendants when he sentenced them. That represents a situation worse than that in connection with the case in Kansas City. The judge in the New Jersey case fined some of the defendants $200, some $400, some $600, and some $800, and according to newspaper accounts he apologized when he did so. He sentenced them on December 31, 1941. The defendants in that case did not plead guilty until nearly 6 years after they were arrested. And then only the small fry pled guilty. The big boys all got away. The case against every single millionaire company was dismissed. All the big boys got away, but the little fellows were held.

I have a copy of the complaint in the case before me, and we find that the United States Government entered suit last May for nearly one and a half million dollars against the same persons to whom the Federal judge apologized when he fined them. That case is pending now. I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Michigan to the fact that the Government case is outlawed. The Government has already impounded the records. They are not public. A further case cannot be brought because it is outlawed. The only case left there is this pending one, because that was brought by a taxpayer in New Jersey. As the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] said, the Attorney General has agreed that that case shall proceed to trial. But he agreed only after a fight was made in the Judiciary Committee. If the pending measure, which has been passed by the House, were to become the law of the land, this pending lawsuit also would be dead.

Mr. President, I have in my hand the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Marcus against Hess. It is peculiarly significant that the opinion in the case is written by a former United States Senator, who is now an associate justice of the Supreme Court, Hugo Black. I say that before any Senator votes in favor of the pending measure the least he can do for his own satisfaction is to read the opinion by Mr. Justice Black in the case of Marcus against Hess, remembering all the time that in this case the Attorney General of the United States did all he could for the defendant; that Mr. Thurman Arnold appeared in court and filed a brief for the defendants.

Read the language of Mr. Justice Black, and then remember that he is the same Mr. Black whose disclosures, made while he was a Senator, I read a few moments ago.

I shall not take time to read the entire case. On page 379 of the volume of opinions, we find that Mr. Justice Black said:

> Furthermore, one of the chief purposes of the act, which was itself first passed in wartime, was to stimulate action to protect the Government against war frauds. * * * To that end, prosecuting attorneys were enjoined to be diligent in enforcement of the act's provisions, and large rewards were offered to stimulate actions by private parties should the prosecuting officers be tardy in bringing the suits.

Mr. President, that language is curiously apropos to the present situation in the United States. There are billions and billions of dollars worth of war contracts. Mr. President, at this particular time why should that law be repealed or emasculated? Under the present statute the Government cannot lose.

Mr. President, look at the facts. Let us take the Bausch & Lomb case in which that company is being sued for approximately $45,000,000. If the plaintiffs win, the Government will get $22,500,000. The plaintiffs will get $22,500,000 more, but the Government will get most of that under the income taxes. Is not that correct? So, because of the actions of those plaintiffs, the Government will be $22,500,000 richer; and added to that amount will be all the millions of dollars the Government will take out of the other half going to the plaintiffs; and also added will be $2,000 more for each violation of which the company may be found guilty.

So, Mr. President, in heaven's name how can any one honestly object to keeping the statute just the way it is today—except a lot of war profiteers and crooks who have been defrauding the common people of the country, and who now do not want to disgorge some of the profits they illegally obtained.

Reading further from Mr. Justice Black's opinion, we find that he said:

> The punishment given in that action was not intended to compensate the Government, in any manner, for damages it suffered as a result of successful execution of the conspiracy.

The whole intention of the statute was to have the Government get back for the taxpayers the money which had been wrongfully extracted from them.

So, Mr. President, to every Senator who says he does not want the United States Government run by bureaus, I submit that if the measure is passed in the shape in which it now is, the Attorney General's office, and that office alone—an office operating through an Assistant Attorney General, and no Member of the Senate knows who that person may be tomorrow—will have delegated to him its sole and exclusive power to say whether an action should be brought. I say that if that man should chance to be dishonest, he could do exactly what was done in the Frank Hague case, when the case was continued during 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, and 1940, and then dismiss the big fellows, and get the little fellows; and there would not be anything any one Senator individually could do about it except to apologize to those of his constituents who might happen to ask about a particular case which involved their particular State.

I submit that the present statute now on the books is a most desirable one. What harm can there be if 10,000 lawyers in America are assisting the Attorney General of the United States in digging up war frauds? In any case, the Attorney General can protect himself by filing a lawsuit at the time when he files the indictment.

Certainly there is nothing in the 33 cases now pending that is so important

that we must change the statute which has been on the statute books for 80 years. The other day the distinguished chairman of the committee said that these rackets are worse than any racket Al Capone ever had. However, I submit the chairman of the committee is mistaken because, so far as I know, Al Capone never got a dollar at the hands of any court or jury.

I submit that the title of the act should not be an "informer's act" but should be a "recovery act," for the recovery of money for the taxpayers of the country; and I submit that before any man can recover anything for himself he must go before a court and jury. How can that be a racket? He must submit the facts to a court and jury, and in the case of a recovery of any appreciable amount the Government will take out of the plaintiff's half a large chunk for income taxes.

So, Mr. President, in view of the facts—in view of the fact that all the lawyers for the 33 pending cases were not notified, and never had a hearing before any subcommittee—I submit that the measure should be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary for hearings. We already have 6 amendments pending. Many of the Senators to whom I have talked have said they did not know anything about this matter. They have come back after being away for 2 months during the recess. They have not had an opportunity to study the measure. I believe the bill should be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary, and that hearings should be had there. Thereafter the Judiciary Committee will be able to take such action as it may consider appropriate.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the measure be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator refer to page 3 of the committee report, where the statement is made:

> The Department's principal desire for the enactment of this bill—

I assume the bill as proposed to be amended is meant—

> is that the United States be protected against being compelled to disclose its facts involved in any criminal prosecution it may have undertaken or is about to undertake. Their experience has shown that upon filing of such civil suits, steps are soon taken to compel discovery, by taking deposition and otherwise, in the civil suits to ascertain the facts upon which the Government is proceeding.

Would that in any way affect or injure any criminal proceedings?

Mr. LANGER. I cannot see how it would in any way at all. The theory of the argument is that fictitious suits might be brought. In other words, it is said that a defendant in a criminal case might set up a fictitious suit, and take depositions before a notary public, and so find out all about the Government's case.

I submit that here in America the Government is not concerned with putting innocent men in the penitentiary. I submit that the Government is not concerned, when a man is arrested, with hiding all the evidence. Either the man is guilty or he is innocent. If the Government says he is guilty, why should not the Government be willing, even in such a case as the Senator mentions—and such cases are rare—to make the testimony known to the defendant? What objection can there be honestly to the testimony being known to the defendant? It is either true or false. I repeat, here in America we do not believe in the theory that we are going to keep the defendant in ignorance of all the testimony, and then suddenly produce it overnight, giving the innocent defendant no time to prepare to refute it, resulting in his conviction.

Mr. FERGUSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ellender	Murray
Andrews	Ferguson	Overton
Bailey	George	Reed
Ball	Gillette	Revercomb
Bankhead	Green	Reynolds
Barbour	Guffey	Robertson
Barkley	Gurney	Scrugham
Buck	Hatch	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Hawkes	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Hill	Truman
Butler	Holman	Tunnell
Capper	Kilgore	Vandenberg
Caraway	Langer	Van Nuys
Chavez	Lucas	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Wheeler
Connally	McFarland	White
Danaher	McKellar	Wiley
Davis	Maloney	Willis
Downey	Millikin	
Eastland	Moore	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to recommit House bill 1203 to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HOLMAN (after having voted in the affirmative). I have just been reminded of my general pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. Not knowing how he would vote, I shall have to withdraw my vote. I previously voted my convictions—"yea."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent as members of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. NARY], who is detained on official business.

Mr. WHITE. I announce the following general pairs on this question:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]; and

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], who is detained on official business, with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "yea." He is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent as members of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—12

Aiken	Davis	Murray
Ball	Langer	Revercomb
Capper	Millikin	Robertson
Clark, Mo.	Moore	Thomas, Idaho

NAYS—48

Andrews	Ellender	Maloney
Bailey	Ferguson	Overton
Bankhead	George	Reed
Barbour	Gillette	Reynolds
Barkley	Green	Scrugham
Buck	Guffey	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Gurney	Truman
Bushfield	Hatch	Tunnell
Butler	Hawkes	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hill	Van Nuys
Chavez	Kilgore	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Lucas	Wallgren
Connally	McCarran	Wheeler
Danaher	McClellan	White
Downey	McFarland	Wiley
Eastland	McKellar	Willis

NOT VOTING—36

Austin	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bone	La Follette	Shipstead
Brewster	Lodge	Smith
Bridges	McNary	Stewart
Brooks	Maybank	Taft
Byrd	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	Murdock	Tobey
Gerry	Nye	Tydings
Glass	O'Daniel	Walsh
Hayden	O'Mahoney	Wherry
Holman	Pepper	Wilson

So Mr. LANGER'S motion to recommit was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on page 2, in line 11, in the committee amendment after the words "United States" I move to amend by adding the words "as hereinbefore set forth."

My reason for offering the amendment is that on page 1, lines 6 to 10 the courts are described as "the several district courts of the United States, the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, the several district courts of the Territories of the United States."

I also move to amend in line 14, page 2, after the word "evidence" and the comma, to strike out the word "and" and insert the word "or" so that it will read: "or sources."

I further move to amend in line 15 on the same page by inserting after the word "not" the word "then"; after the words "possession of" to insert the words "the United States"; and after the word "obtained" in the same line, to insert the words "from such person."

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan and I have gone over these amendments in detail. They are purely for clarification, and I hope they will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments offered by the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 2, line 11, after the words "United States", it is proposed to insert the words "as hereinbefore set forth"; on the same page, line 14, after the word "evidence", to strike out the word "and" and insert the word "or"; on the same page, line 15, after the words "and not", to insert the word "then"; in the same line, after the words "possession of", to insert the words "the United States", and after the word "obtained", in the same line, to insert the words "from such person."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the vote will be taken on the amendments en bloc. The Chair hears no objection. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to address a question or two to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in relation to the pending bill. I have been privileged to listen to the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. I think he has made out a pretty good case to this point, that there has been a tremendous amount of fraud in dealing with the Government by probably a relatively small number of our citizens. There is no evidence to show the amount of the fraud in dollars compared with the total expenditures, but the question I wish to address at this time to the distinguished Senators whom I have mentioned is, With the amendments now incorporated in the bill, will they kindly tell me if we pass the bill in its present shape whether there is any danger of any rights the public may have being prejudiced or being lost? After all, if, due to bad men dealing with the Government, we have a loss of the people's money, there should be certain instrumentalities in Government available to recapture the lost money, and I should like to know how the bill will provide adequate protection for the recovery of money the Government has lost through fraud. I will address the question first to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I must admit that I am grateful to my colleague the Senator from Wisconsin for the obvious note of confidence sounded by his addressing such a question to me, but I think, properly, it should be answered by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, who is in charge of the bill. My own efforts in connection with it have been, as my colleagues know, in the direction of attempting to perfect it in order to accomplish the objectives which the Senator from Indiana seeks to achieve, and, since he is in charge of the bill for the committee, I think the question properly should be addressed to him.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, as I understand the question of the Senator from Wisconsin, it is how is the public protected in the bringing of suits for fraud and resulting damages? Is that the question?

Mr. WILEY. That is substantially the question. I might amplify it in this way: The original law, as enacted in 1863, was passed, as I understand, in the interest of the public. Recognizing that war frauds had been committed, that the Government itself, probably, did not have adequate information that individuals had, therefore, the law gave the right to individuals by informer suits to recover funds which rightfully belonged to the Government, and the informer was given a certain percentage of such funds recovered. We have proceeded in that way over the years, and some 33 suits have been prosecuted in this period of 80 years. Now, all at once, we find ourselves in a war period incident to which our national expenditures are increased from about $15,000,000,000 to $100,000,000,000 a year, and, of course, great opportunity for fraud arises. Now we come to the point where it is proposed to modify the existing law. Of course, there is going to be much said, as considerable has been said, to the effect that an implication might be drawn that we are trying to protect somebody, that we are trying so to provide that people who have committed fraud will not be held accountable. I think the matter should be plainly set forth in the RECORD so that it will appear definitely and clearly how the public interest is to be protected; and I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Indiana can tell us that.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I have twice gone over in detail that aspect of the bill, once yesterday and once before the Senate recessed. Without going into it at length now let me say that the House bill now before the Senate proposed to repeal the old statute of 1863 in its entirety. The bill came to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and after laboring many days, as the Senator from Wisconsin well knows, as he is a distinguished member of the committee, the amendments submitted and now appearing in the bill were agreed upon almost unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill is designed to prevent fraud upon the part of racketeering informers and their lawyers, running into millions of dollars at this time.

In 1863 the Government did not have an F. B. I. with hundreds of trained investigators and agents all over the United States; the office and staff of the Attorney General were comparatively small; the Treasury Department did not have agents and investigators as it has today. So at that time the Government was largely dependent upon individual informers to secure information as to frauds being perpetrated on the Government, and such informers were offered a handsome reward of 50 percent of the recovery for supplying the information.

I am not going to say that all the informers and their attorneys are racketeers; but the main purpose of the Judiciary Committee, in the days and days hard work it put on the pending bill, was to protect the honest informer. We have reduced from 50 percent to not more than 10 percent the compensation paid under recovery resulting from a suit. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I think, intends to offer an amendment to increase that to 25 percent. I think that is unnecessary. Ten percent is a reasonable compensation when there are billions of dollars involved and there is an alluring prospect of obtaining loot, as I call it, upon the part of some loose lawyer, not bona fide informers at all, but racketeers and blackmailers, if I may say so, for that is exactly what they are, who file these suits and then go to factories and corporations and offer to compromise for a pittance. That is all they expected to get when they filed the suit, and, if that does not smack of blackmail, I do not know what it is. I have heretofore been all over this with Members of the Senate, and we have agreed on practically everything. The honest informer, the bona fide informer, is adequately protected in the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is it a fact that the bill was never heard before a subcommittee, or that no hearings were held by the full committee?

Mr. VAN NUYS. That is absolutely untrue in its foundation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Some of the leading lawyers of my State have spoken to me about this matter. The Senator speaks of blackmailing lawyers. I do not know anything about blackmailing lawyers in connection with this matter. I do know that some of the leading lawyers in my State regard the whole procedure as an outrage, an attempt to change a practice which has been pursued in good faith under a statute on the books for 80 years. If the Senator knows anything about blackmailing attorneys, he should bring the matter to the attention of the proper authorities.

Mr. VAN NUYS. If I had my full files here, I could cite a dozen cases which smack of blackmail pure and simple.

Answering the Senator's question, there is a man in his State, in St. Louis, by the name of Coates, representing the Coates Manufacturing Co. He discovered that there was what he thought was a case which he should bring under this informer's statute. He appeared before the full committee and testified. That case had been on file for 2 or 3 years. He had spent a considerable amount of money in the prosecution and preparation of the case. Mr. Tom Clark, who is an outstanding, honest public official, was present, and heard the testimony, and he told Mr. Coates that he would not move to dismiss his case, that he could prosecute it to a finish.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me further, I do not know anything about that particular case. This matter was called to my attention primarily as what I regard as a perfectly disgraceful attempt on the part of the Attorney General of the United States—at least a letter was signed in his name, I do not know whether he actually wrote it himself—to interfere in an action in Kansas City which was actually pending, and set for trial, and about to be tried.

If the Senator will permit, I do not know Mr. Clark, but from what I know about him he is an excellent man, and an eminent public servant, but when we leave the matter of prosecuting these cases absolutely to the discretion of a department, it seems to me we are on extremely dangerous ground. Suppose we were to have a situation in this country—which God forbid—like that at the time when Harry Daugherty was Attorney General of the United States, when the Department of Justice was turned over to a lot of thieves. This statute would have been the only means by which the public interest could possibly have been conserved. It seems to me we are treading on dangerous ground in any such proposal.

Mr. VAN NUYS. If the Senator himself had been present during the long and continued hearings, with the representatives of the Department of Justice, and anyone else who wanted to be heard, because we admitted everyone, I think he would agree with me that the pending bill protects the honest informer as nearly as we can do it by statute.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. It seems to me it would not make much difference how lengthy the hearings before the committee were, the bill itself is so plainly a move on the part of someone to prevent the prosecution of these cases that it cannot be escaped. Millions and millions of dollars are involved. We hear talk only about the racketeers and informers. We do not hear critical reference to those who are perpetrating frauds on the American people and on the Government of the United States, running up to perhaps billions of dollars. Not one word in condemnation of the extensive fraud being perpetrated in this country has been uttered in behalf of the Senator's committee during this debate. All his criticisms are about the racketeers and the informers. No one here is interested in protecting the racketeers and the informers. The way to get rid of them is for the Attorney General to bring these suits, and it is perfectly proper to provide that no informer should be entitled to institute a suit in the name of the United States Government until after the Attorney General's office has been given full opportunity to bring the suit. But when he fails to bring it, then the private citizen should have the right to come into court on behalf of the people of this country. You are foreclosing citizens from this right by this legislation.

Mr. VAN NUYS. If the Senator will point out where we are foreclosing them—

Mr. MURRAY. You just defeated the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia, who is now on the floor.

The Senate in a vote just defeated his amendment, which would have made it possible for a citizen to bring a suit when the Attorney General failed to prosecute.

Mr. VAN NUYS. There is a difference of opinion, and we have spent 2 days arguing it.

Mr. MURRAY. There can be no difference of opinion on that. It is as plain as A B C. It was stated here on the floor by the Senator from Indiana that he thought we should have confidence in the Department of Justice, that we must depend upon the Department of Justice. The present Attorney General is an outstanding citizen, a great lawyer, and we all have every confidence in him, but he has to depend on the advice of hundreds of others in his Department. How can he look into all these cases? And there are hundreds of them. They are occurring every day. This morning I had a clipping which was brought to my attention about a suit brought by the Department of Justice against the National Bronze & Aluminum Co., which describes a fraud which jeopardized the lives of Allied pilots. The accusation was made by the United States attorney, Dan C. Miller, in his statement to a jury of seven men and five women who tried the company and seven of its former officers on a nine-count indictment charging sabotage and conspiracy to defraud the Government in the sale of aluminum castings. Suppose a suit for fraud to recover damages against the company is not instituted by the Department of Justice. Why should it not be possible for some citizen to bring such a suit? The Senator's bill would prevent that from happening.

Mr. VAN NUYS. The Senator is entirely wrong, but I do not intend to go into that again. I have been over it for 2 solid days.

Mr. MURRAY. But the Senator cannot escape that conclusion.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Is that the case of Harsh Bronze Co.?

Mr. MURRAY. The National Bronze & Aluminum Co.

Mr. VAN NUYS. In this case the Government filed its suit 17 minutes after the informer had filed his suit, and the court held that the informer had priority, when he had not done a thing in the case except copy the indictment.

Mr. MURRAY. The pending legislation would protect against that, and I am in favor of the protection of the Government against racketeers. I want that stopped, but I do not want the American people denied the right to come into court with these suits whenever the Attorney General's department refuses to act.

Mr. VAN NUYS. It would not prevent an honest informer from coming in. I hope I will not have to repeat that again. If the Senator from Montana will read the bill he will know I am correct about that.

Mr. MURRAY. I have read the bill and I understand it, and the matter was presented and voted upon here this afternoon. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] offered an amendment which would have made it possible for a private citizen to bring such a suit after the matter had been first brought to the attention of the Attorney General and a suit requested and he had declined to sue. The citizen would have had the right to sue, under the amendment which was proposed by the Senator from West Virginia. That would end the racketeers. The way to get rid of the racketeers is for us to stop these frauds in the United States. Millions of dollars are being stolen from the Government in the war contracts every day. We heard the testimony a few months ago with reference to the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., and the method by which they sought to prevent the Government from detecting their frauds. We learned how they set up a complicated system which prevented the inspectors from discovering the defective wire and cable which was being manufactured for use by the armed forces, the use of which jeopardized the lives of the men at the battle fronts. It seems to me that that kind of fraud is being looked at too lightly by the Congress of the United States. All we are thinking of here is punishing a few racketeers and a few informers, but not one word is being said in condemnation of the most dangerous racketeers there are in the United States, those who would

jeopardize the lives of American boys at the front in order to make illegitimate profits for themselves. All I ask is that the original bill be amended so as to prevent the bringing of these suits until the Attorney General is given an opportunity to sue.

The original act had the approval of Abraham Lincoln. It was put on the statute books for the purpose of preventing frauds in the period during which he was President. The frauds in that period were like petty larency compared with the frauds which are being committed today. Yet at this time all you can hear of is stopping the informers from bringing these suits in court. You are not thinking about stopping the real frauds. I think it will be found that when this bill is enacted we are going to stop the prosecution of cases which are already pending in court involving millions of dollars, and the perpetrators of these frauds will be given a gift of millions and millions of dollars.

Mr. President, it seems to me we should proceed very carefully with respect to this sort of legislation. It is the most dangerous kind of legislation which we are called on to consider. I submit that the bill should be given very exhaustive consideration before it is finally voted on.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In order to clear up the controversy which has arisen here at this hour, let me submit a question based upon the inquiry made by the Senator from Wisconsin. He propounded this question. Suppose that information should be revealed by the Truman committee of a fraud in connection with a Government contract, and that such information were given to the Atorney General, and the Attorney General in his judgment were to say that he did not desire to proceed in the case, or he did not believe it should be prosecuted. With the bill as it is written could a citizen of the United States proceed in the name of the Government under that state of facts?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Absolutely.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to say that I have great respect, of course, for the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, but I ask how the individual could do so in view of the following language which has been left in the bill:

> No district court of the United States shall have power or jurisdiction to hear, try, or determine such suit brought or carried on by any person for himself and the United States unless based upon information, evidence, and sources original with such person and not in the possession of or obtained by the United States in the course of any investigation or proceeding instituted or conducted by it.

In other words, if information were revealed by the Truman committee, and the Attorney General decided not to proceed, no citizen could bring suit, because a citizen could not do so unless he were the original obtainer of the information. That is the question I wish to raise.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Of course, we passed on that point today by a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes, we did.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I respect the views of the Senator from West Virginia. Of course the individual could not bring suit unless he were able to comply with the provisions of the new act.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct, and under the provisions of this measure he could not proceed if the information were produced by the Truman committee.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Absolutely. If the Truman committee were in session in this Chamber, and some one were in the Senate gallery listening to the testimony, and rushed out and hired a public stenographer and dictated a bill, and sued some company for a billion dollars, does the Senator from Wisconsin think such procedure would be just and equitable and right and fair to the duly constituted agency of Government, the Department of Justice?

Mr. REVERCOMB. No, I do not; and that I will say is not what could happen, because the person who obtained the information must first give it to the Attorney General, who would have 6 months in which to act upon it.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. But, according to the way the bill is now written, if the Attorney General should not act upon the information within 6 months, then the citizen in question could not proceed.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I am glad the Senator from West Virginia brought that point up. He speaks of a period of 6 months. I know of a case in which 28 investigators, public accountants, clerks, and lawyers, have worked for 6 months preparing a civil suit. Twenty-eight persons have worked for 6 months to dig out the data necessary in order to bring suit, yet the man who sits in the gallery and listens to testimony could bring suit in 24 hours, and ultimately obtain half a million dollars for himself if a total of a million dollars should be recovered.

Mr. REVERCOMB. With all respect to the Senator from Indiana, I will say that such a person could not bring suit until he himself, under the very terms of this measure, had advised the Attorney General that he had information for the Attorney General, and then he would have to wait 6 months for the Attorney General to act. He could not institute suit in 24 hours after he received the information, because the court could not even hear him until he alleged and showed that 6 months before he brought his suit he went to the Attorney General and told him about the matter.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Let me ask a question of the Senator from West Virginia. A suit was filed only yesterday for $1,000,000,000 against a railroad and some codefendants. That suit was filed based on a report of a congressional committee, when the transcript had not even been written. No one aside from the committee knows what the facts are except on the basis of what the newspapers have said. How long would it take the Department of Justice to examine into the merits of that claim made against the railroad for $1,000,000,000 damages? It would take more than 6 months.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary complaining about the 6 months' period? I thought that we had all agreed on that.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I am not arguing about that. I would have made the period a year, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Whether the period is 6 months or a year makes no difference to me. What I am saying is that once the Attorney General fails to act there is taken from the citizens of this country the right to act in the name of the Government unless they themselves originally had the information in question.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I think the Senator from West Virginia must agree that the Attorney General should have sufficient time within which to act. We have argued this matter for the last few days.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. It seems to me that the Senator from Indiana does not fully answer the question propounded by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I have tried to do so. I am sorry if I have not succeeded.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from West Virginia has pointed out that under the language of the bill as it now is, the private citizen would be precluded from bringing suit even after the Attorney General had investigated the case and had refused to prosecute for some reason or other. That is exactly what the bill provides as far as I am able to see The Senator from Indiana does not answer the question asked by the Senator from West Virginia. The Senator from Indiana merely continues to point out that if someone sitting in the gallery overhears testimony revealed in a committee hearing showing that fraud has been committed, he might rush out and file suit immediately. But such action is prevented by the present legislation. Now no suit can be brought until after the matter has been brought to the attention of the Attorney General, and he has been given 6 months' time within which to bring suit. But what we want to see is that the bill shall provide that after he has had that 6 months' time within which to bring suit, and declines to do so, a private citizen can then file suit, and if that private citizen makes a mistake in doing so he shall be held for the cost of the litigation, which in itself would be sufficient to deter him from entering a suit which was not based on real facts.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Let me ask the Senator from Montana a question. Does the Senator favor the old law under which a man can rush in and copy an indictment, and change the caption in the prayer and make a civil suit out of a criminal action, without having any original knowledge at all with respect to the facts in the case? Does the Sen-

ator from Montana favor that sort of thing?

Mr. MURRAY. No, I am opposed to that. Whether the citizen has original knowledge or not, I am opposed to such procedure. I am willing to vote for the provisions of the bill which forbid such action to be taken. But I do not want the bill to be in such form that persons perpetrating frauds on the Government may escape from the responsibility of their fraudulent act merely because the Attorney General fails to bring suit. As was said by the Senator from Missouri a moment ago, let us suppose that we had an Attorney General such as we had some years ago, who, when frauds were being perpetrated right and left, took no action. It seems to me we should have a provision which would be insurance against such frauds being perpetrated. Corporations and individuals who perpetrate fraud can escape being sued by informers and racketeers merely by performing contracts honestly and not undertaken to defraud the Government. It is only those who cheat and defraud the Government who are in danger of being sued by racketeers and informers.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I wonder if the Senator from Montana is familiar with the fact that the Department of Justice has instituted 54 cases since Congress adjourned a couple of months ago?

Mr. MURRAY. Oh, yes; but it is possible that 554 cases could have been instituted.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Upon what foundation of fact does the Senator from Montana make that statement?

Mr. MURRAY. I understand there are 600 investigations on foot, or over 600 cases that are now being investigated. It seems to me there are dozens and dozens of cases which will never be investigated.

Frauds are being committed all over the country. Nothing can be done about many of them by the Attorney General's department because he may not have access to all the facts; he does not have the personnel to take care of the entire situation. As a result, such frauds will be perpetrated, and the perpetrators of them will be getting away with millions of dollars. It seems to me that the protection and insurance the people of the country need is a law which will permit a citizen to file a case when the Attorney General fails to act. If a private citizen files a case which has no merit, he will be held for the costs of the prosecution, which are by no means light, and would be a sufficient deterring force to prevent persons from bringing unnecessary and fruitless suits.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I inquire what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee's first amendment, as amended, extending through line 15 on page 3.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, pending that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ellender	Murray
Andrews	Ferguson	Overton
Bailey	George	Radcliffe
Ball	Gillette	Reed
Bankhead	Green	Revercomb
Barbour	Guffey	Reynolds
Barkley	Gurney	Robertson
Bridges	Hatch	Scrugham
Buck	Hawkes	Stewart
Burton	Hill	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Holman	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Truman
Capper	Kilgore	Tunnell
Caraway	Langer	Tydings
Chavez	Lucas	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Wagner
Connally	McFarland	Wallgren
Danaher	McKellar	Wheeler
Davis	Maloney	White
Downey	Millikin	Wiley
Eastland	Moore	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I understand that the pending question is on the first committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I desire to address myself not so much to the amendment as to the subject matter of the bill. It seems to me that what we are doing here is to proceed in an exceedingly hasty and wasteful manner by which we are about to deprive the public of any opportunity whatever of bringing to light and recovering for the Government damages for causes accruing to the Government on which the bureaucrats in the Department of Justice do not see fit to proceed. As I say, I can see that in a situation similar to that which once existed in this country, but which I pray to God may never again exist, although it might exist, as it did when there were a lot of thieves in the Department of Justice in the regime of Harry Daugherty—repeal of the measure might cost the United States untold sums of money.

What is the occasion for the bill? The occasion is that the Department of Justice sought unsuccessfuly in the Marcus case to inject itself into private litigation on appeal, and the result was that the Department of Justice was rebuked by the Supreme Court, that the Government collected some fifty-odd thousand dollars in fines on pleas of nolo contendere, and that the private litigation recovered for the Government something more than three times that amount.

The proposed measure, as reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, is intended to allow the Attorney General at his will and in his discretion to abolish all pending causes of action brought by private persons in instances in which the Department of Justice, to use the language of Mr. Justice Black, of the Supreme Court of the United States, has been "tardy"—and "tardy" is the kindest word which can be put upon some of the conduct of the Government—in bringing suits for fraud against the Government. There has been a regular lobby conducted here by the Department of Justice. I do not think anyone questions that. I have been advised by reputable members of the bar that they never have been given any notice or any opportunity to be heard in opposition to this measure. The statute has been on the books of this country for eight decades. It was originally proposed by no less a person than President Abraham Lincoln. It has been many times construed by the courts. It has been described better than I can describe it by a distinguished Federal court as a remedial statute. In the celebrated Griswold case the court said in speaking of the very statute which it is now sought to repeal:

> The statute is a remedial one. It is intended to protect the Treasury against the hungry and unscrupulous host that encompasses it on every side, and should be construed accordingly. It was passed upon the theory, based on experience as old as modern civilization, that one of the least expensive and most effective means of preventing frauds on the Treasury is to make the perpetrators of them liable to actions by private persons, acting, if you please, under the strong stimulus of personal ill will or the hope of gain. Prosecutions conducted by such means—

Said the Court—

> compare with the ordinary methods as the enterprising privateer does to the slow-going public vessel.

This statute has been on the books for 80 years. It has always been treated as having been successful. It has always been treated by the courts as a remedial statute. It is only now, when many actions have actually been brought and are pending, that these actions are sought to be abolished by retroactive legislation. I undertake to say that in all except the most unusual and extreme cases, retroactive legislation is always bad legislation.

What is the conduct of the Department of Justice? Let me give one example which has come to my notice. I quote from the court records in this connection. In the so-called Baker-Lockwood case, pending at Kansas City, Mo., there was a so-called informer suit brought by private parties, a civil suit, and also a criminal case. The criminal case was twice continued at the instance of the Government. Then, when the civil suit came on for trial the Attorney General of the United States proceeded to do the absolutely unprecedented, and in my judgment, unjustifiable thing, of writing a private letter to the trial judge, referring to the act the repeal of which is now pending in the United States Senate, and urging the trial judge to continue the civil suit until the cause of action could be abolished by the possible enactment of the proposed statute. Let me read the letter. This is taken from the official records in the case:

> OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
> *Washington, D. C., July 21, 1943.*
>
> HON. MERRILL E. OTIS,
> *United States District Judge,*
> *Kansas City, Mo.*
>
> MY DEAR JUDGE OTIS: It was a pleasure to cooperate with you in your request of June 29, 1943, concerning the criminal case of *U. S.* v. *Baker-Lockwood Manufacturing Co. et al.* I regret exceedingly that circumstances beyond my control made it impossible to arrange for the appearance of one of the witnesses. Assistant Attorney General Tom C. Clark has discussed with me your order of July 12, 1943, continuing the case

on the defendants' motion, and I can understand that the condition with which you were confronted precluded any other action except to grant some postponement.

A serious problem is created, however, by the circumstance that the civil suit against these defendants relating to the same offense is now set for trial on a date which precedes the trial date of the criminal case.

The Government, which had been a party to the continuance of the criminal case, now asks that the civil suit be postponed until the cause of action can be abolished, as will presently appear.

I have recently received two communications from J. Francis O'Sullivan, Esq., attorney for the plaintiff in the civil suit, and I enclose a copy of his letter of July 16, 1943, for your information.

The civil suit, as you are undoubtedly aware, is not under my control. The statute which gives the right of suit to an informer, in the name of the United States, does not provide for governmental control of that litigation.

Your familiarity with criminal fraud cases is well known to me—

"Lathering" the judge up a little—a compliment, however, which was very justifiable—

and I am sure you can readily appreciate the prejudice that might be caused to a criminal case by a full disclosure of the Government's evidence in a civil case prosecuted by advocates not selected by the Government or charged primarily with the problem of the Government's rights and interests.

Now we come to the milk in the coconut:

The Senate is presently considering House Resolution No. 1203, which provides for the repeal of the statute under which the civil suit was filed. This bill has been passed by the House and has been recommended by the Senate committee. If it becomes law at an early date, which now seems likely, it would appear that the right to maintain the civil suit would be withdrawn from the plaintiff Nathanson.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has conducted the investigation of the facts of this case and it has long been the Department's policy that the results of such investigations are confidential and not available even to congressional committees. Under the circumstances you can readily appreciate that I could not turn over the results of this investigation to Mr. O'Sullivan.

I will appreciate it if you will give consideration to all the facts involved and advise me of your opinion as to whether the ends of justice cannot best be served by a postponement of the civil suit and a stay of the taking of the proposed depositions until after the criminal action has been tried.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

Every lawyer in this Chamber, every lawyer everywhere else, and every citizen who is not a lawyer, but who is familiar with the procedure of the courts, knows that if an ordinary lawyer should write such a private letter as that to a competent Federal judge before whom an action was pending, suggesting that the trial of the case then set for trial be postponed until a statute could be enacted to remove the cause of action, that lawyer would land in jail for contempt of court, and would be very lucky if he were not disbarred.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In fairness to the Attorney General, does not the Senator think that the letter of Judge Otis to which this was a response ought also to be read into the record? It seems that the judge had asked the Attorney General——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not find in the Attorney General's letter any reference to a letter from the judge. I am about to read Judge Otis' letter in response to the one which I have read.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Attorney General refers——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Attorney General starts by saying that he is glad to cooperate with the request. It does not appear whether a letter was written to the Attorney General.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was under the impression that the Attorney General had received a letter from the judge.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not so understand. As I understand, a request was made in open court by the Government. I intend to read the letter of Judge Otis in response to the letter of the Attorney General, which I have just read.

The reply is under date of July 29, and reads as follows:

JULY 29, 1943.

Hon. FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: A few days' absence from Kansas City on official business has delayed an acknowledgment of and reply to your letter of July 21, 1943, concerning the case of *Nathanson* v. *Baker-Lockwood Manufacturing Company et al.*, and the companion criminal case of *United States* v. *Baker-Lockwood Manufacturing Company et al.* I was further delayed by the necessity of consulting with counsel in those cases before I could reply to your letter. I just have finished a conference with them.

In your letter you express your reasons for believing that the trial of the case of *Nathanson* v. *Baker-Lockwood* (an informer suit) should be delayed until after the trial of the case of *United States* v. *Baker-Lockwood* (a criminal case charging the same facts as are charged in the informer suit).

I agree that the criminal case should be tried first. Whether that now can be done in fairness (you are the last man who would think of asking me to do it otherwise) is a real problem. I read your letter in the conference just held. I said to counsel that I would like very much to comply with your request. I said also, however, that I must be guided in the matter by principles that are applicable generally unless counsel would stipulate that the civil case might be delayed until after the trial of the criminal case. Counsel for Nathanson, Mr. Francis O'Sullivan, was not willing to enter into such an agreement except upon a condition which I shall state hereafter.

Of course, Mr. O'Sullivan would certainly have been exceedingly unmindful of his duty to his client if he had agreed to a continuance in the case after he had been notified, by a letter from the Attorney General to the trial judge, that the Attorney General was simply trying to stall off the trial of the case until the cause of action could be abolished. Any lawyer who would make such an agreement as that should be disbarred.

Several months ago I announced that the criminal case would be tried in advance of the civil case, provided the criminal case was tried when it was set, unless any delay in the criminal case was not chargeable to the United States. The case was set twice—once for June 21 and then for July 12. It was continued twice. The United States was clearly responsible for both continuances. The first continuance was necessary because of the fact that the United States brought in a new indictment against the defendants just a few days before June 21. The second continuance was made necessary because the United States (not the Department of Justice) made impossible the attendance of certain of defendants' witnesses who, on the allegations set out in the application for a continuance, were essential witnesses.

The United States attorney did not feel that he could agree that the witnesses, if present, would testify in accordance with the statements set out in the applications for a continuance. Probably the United States attorney should not have agreed that they would so testify, but I am not certain that his case would have been jeopardized by that agreement. He did not make the agreement because he did not believe the witnesses would testify as it was said they would. At any rate, it was the action of the United States, the plaintiff in the case, which prevented the trial.

He is speaking now of the criminal case. Having deliberately prevented the trial of the criminal case, the Department of Justice now asks that the rights of the civil litigants acting on behalf of the Government be prejudiced by the postponement of their case until, by a successful lobby in Congress, the Department can get their cause of action abolished.

Judge Otis further wrote:

Since I repeatedly had announced in open court, in the presence of all of the parties, that the civil case would be tried when reached in due course if the criminal case had been delayed through the fault of the United States, you must agree with me that I must keep faith with the parties and give the plaintiff in the civil case an opportunity at least to prove his case. It does not seem to me that as the time set for trial draws near he will be so anxious to proceed as he is now. That, however, is not a matter with which it is my duty to concern myself.

I have said that counsel for Nathanson in open court agreed this morning that he would stipulate that the civil case should be tried after the criminal case on a condition which he stated. It is his contention, and your letter to me confirms it, that it is the hope of the Government that the pending legislation directed against suits of this character will make it impossible for the plaintiff ever to get a trial. It seems that the pending bill contains a provision for the filing of a motion by the Attorney General to stay any civil case of the character here involved.

Counsel for Nathanson agrees to enter into the stipulation I have referred to if the Attorney General will stipulate that in this particular case he will not file such a motion. I do not apprehend at all that you will agree not to file such a motion, but it does seem to me that counsel's proposal is not entirely unfair. Probably counsel ought not to be expected to enter into a stipulation that he will hang himself on a not too distant date.

I have written more fully than probably is justified, but I have done that out of my great respect for you and my most earnest

desire in every proper way to cooperate with you.

I repeat my statement, Mr. President, that it is my opinion—and I think it will be concurred in—that any private lawyer who had written such a letter in an attempt flagrantly to interfere with any litigation would have been put in jail for contempt of court and very likely would have been disbarred. I hold to the old-fashioned view that public officials should adhere to at least as high a standard of decency and fair dealing as should individual practitioners at the bar.

Mr. President, I desire to offer and have pending an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the entire bill. I send it to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause as amended, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

That section 3491 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C. title 31, sec. 232) be, and it is hereby amended by adding a new paragraph as follows:

"Sec. 3491. (a) In any suit heretofore or hereafter filed under section 3491, if the Attorney General or any district attorney deems it in the public interests so to do, he may file a motion in the court in which any such suit is now or hereafter pending to stay all proceedings therein until after the trial, dismissal, or other disposition of any indictments returned in that, or in any other court of the United States, against any defendant or defendants named in any such suit, and arising out of the transactions involved therein, or any related transactions. If any indictment returned against any such defendant relates to any transaction or transactions involved in said suit, or any transaction related thereto, and impedes or interferes with or may tend to impede or interfere with the prosecution of any such indictments, the court in which any such suit is pending shall thereupon order that all proceedings in said suit and all depositions, interrogatories, or methods of discovery therein, be stayed until after the trial, dismissal, or other disposition of all such indictments returned against any defendant or defendants named in such suit. This act shall not affect or impair the substantive rights of any person who has heretofore filed any such suit for himself as well as for the United States. After the trial, dismissal, or other disposition of indictments against defendants in any such suit, all officers and employees of the Government shall produce any evidence, papers, statements of witnesses, or documents known to them upon subpena issued in any such suit, or as directed by any order of the court made upon motion after reasonable notice of such motion is given to the Attorney General or district attorney who has filed a motion to stay proceedings."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the effect of the proposed substitute would be to accomplish the announced purpose of the bill as originally proposed; that is to say, it would prevent any one of the plaintiffs in an informer suit from disclosing in the trial of a civil case any information which might be necessary to the Government in the trial of a criminal case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Missouri suspend for a moment so that the Chair may propound a question? Will the Senator state whether the proposed substitute is offered as a substitute for the entire bill, or for the first committee amendment as amended?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is offered as a substitute for the entire bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If it is offered as a substitute for the entire bill, the pending amendments to amend the original bill take precedence over it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that to be true, Mr. President. I am offering the amendment in the nature of a substitute to have it pending and to be acted upon after the other amendments have been disposed of; but I understand I have a right to offer it and to discuss it at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The purpose of the substitute, Mr. President, is to accomplish any remedial purpose which is sought to be accomplished and which has been urged by the Department of Justice in support of the pending bill. It would permit the Department of Justice to have the fullest control over the disclosure of information necessary to the prosecution of criminal suits, and it would prevent the plaintiffs in any of the informer's suits, so-called, from disclosing any information which the Government might not desire to have disclosed. At the same time, however, it would not be retroactive in character, but would permit so-called informer suits to be maintained under proper regulations.

Therefore, Mr. President, I say that there is no justification on earth for the retrospective features of the pending bill.

Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. VAN NUYS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Indiana. Has the language in the first section, at the bottom of page 1 and at the top of page 2 of the bill been changed, or does it remain as it was?

Mr. VAN NUYS. No; that is the old statute, simply rephrased.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then the language reading, "within whose jurisdictional limits the person doing or committing such act shall be found"——

Mr. VAN NUYS. That is in the original act.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does that mean that if a man resided in Indiana, for instance, or wherever he might be, and if he could be caught in New York, he could be sued in New York and tried there?

Mr. VAN NUYS. That was the original 1863 statute.

Mr. CONNALLY. I know that, but the Senator is proposing to reenact it.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I agree with the Senator that the man could be tried in New York. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not believe in that. I do not think the Federal courts or anybody else should exercise jurisdiction except where the act was committed. If the act was committed in Indiana, the defendant should be tried in Indiana. I do not believe there should be a roving court. It seems to me that the jurisdiction should be limited in some way.

Mr. VAN NUYS. The actual working of it, let me say to the Senator from Tennesee, is that 99 percent of the cases are against corporations, as the Senator from Texas might well suppose.

Mr. CONNALLY. They have a situs, though.

Mr. VAN NUYS. The cases can be brought in any State in which the corporations are doing business, wherever they may be found.

Mr. CONNALLY. The provision is that they may be sued wherever they may be found.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Yes. A corporation found in any Federal district is subject to the Federal court of the district in which it is legally doing business.

Mr. CONNALLY. But the action, by the terms of the statute, is not limited to a corporation. It might be against an individual doing business.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I agree.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think the Federal courts should exercise jurisdiction over a citizen wherever he might be overnight, catch him in New York, and sue him there, when he might live in Indiana, thus entailing a great deal of expense and cost. I shall not offer an amendment, but I just suggest this to the Senator.

Mr. VAN NUYS. In answer to the Senator from Missouri concerning the Baker-Lockwood case, let me read the notation I received from the Department of Justice a day or two ago:

This case in Kansas City involved the bribery of a Government civilian army procurement officer at Wright Field in the purchase of airplane shelters made of canvas.

As I understand, the shelters covered motors used in north Africa, to keep off the sands, and were used in Alaska, with a heater inside, to keep the motors warm, and so on.

Unfortunately, a stenographer in the Justice Department in transmitting a complaint to the United States Attorney at Kansas City failed to enclose a copy with the letter and a Chicago lawyer flew into Kansas City and filed an informer suit 2 or 3 hours before the Government's case was filed.

He having obtained his information in a Chicago newspaper as to what happened.

The lower court dismissed the Government suit and the case was argued in circuit court last week. This is the case—since the recess of Congress the plaintiff in the informer suit has taken a deposition of witnesses appearing before the Grand Jury in our indictment. This has given to the defendents in the indictment most of the evidence of the Government which, of course, will materially affect the prosecution of this case.

I think the point made by the Senator from Missouri about staying of the trial or the taking of depositions in a civil suit until the indictment is prosecuted to

a finish or dismissed is a good suggestion, but as a substitute for the entire bill, after all this work it is almost unthinkable. However, that phase of the motion to substitute is well taken, and I should be glad, if it were offered as an amendment to the bill, to take it to conference.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So far as I am concerned, I do not intend to vote for any retrospective statute. I am very frank about that. I think that the statute of 1863 is a good law; I think it has been an extremely remedial statute. I think that if there are abuses such as those the Senator from Indiana has outlined, they could be corrected. But what he is doing is to cut the dog's tail off right behind the ears. He is proposing to abolish a remedial statute in order to get rid of some abuses in the matter. It seems to me that the motion to recommit which was voted on awhile ago should have been carried, and after the amendments are disposed of, so far as I am concerned I intend to make another motion to recommit to the committee with instructions to report back by a day certain, which I understand will be in order. I think the bill should go back to the committee, that all these matters brought out in the discussion on the floor should be considered, and that there should be reported by the committee a bill which would preserve the remedial features of the statute without at the same time permitting the abuses to which the Senator from Indiana has referred.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I wish to call the Senator's attention to what has already been discussed. On page 2, beginning in line 10, we find this language:

Provided, That no district court of the United States shall have power or jurisdiction to hear, try, or determine such suit brought or carried on by any person for himself and the United States unless based upon information, evidence, and sources original with such person.

Of course, taken literally, that means that a man could not bring a suit and could not conduct a suit unless all the information originated with himself. To me that is entirely too broad.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, not only must the original information be in possession of the person undertaking to bring the suit but it must be in the possession of the Attorney General.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. Of course, the moment the information is given to the Attorney General, he is in possession of it, and no suit can be brought.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Will the Senator from Montana yield in order that I may answer his colleague?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. VAN NUYS. It is evident that the junior Senator from Montana has not followed the course of the pending legislation. This provision has been amended by the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER]. The information which the Attorney General must claim he has must come from a grand-jury investigation, a congressional-committee investigation, or from some public body, or from a United States Commissioner.

Mr. MURRAY. But I do not think the amendment is sufficient to remedy the situation which will continue to exist. It will be impossible for a private citizen to bring a suit unless the facts are original with him, and, of course, notwithstanding the fact that the Attorney General has the information, he can decline to bring the suit, and then no one can bring suit to protect the interests of the Government.

Mr. WHEELER. I have been out of the Chamber, and I am not familiar with the Danaher amendment. I wanted to clear up that point, because I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that during the Daugherty administration of the Department of Justice I conducted an investigation into that Department. It was found that the Federal Trade Commission had worked up cases of fraud, not one, but hundreds of cases, and had submitted them to the Attorney General of the United States. The Attorney General did nothing about them, except in one or two instances when he might have had it in for someone, but in the great bulk of the cases there was no prosecution of any kind. Clearly, a private person should have been permitted to bring suit in those cases even though he did not work up the evidence himself. Otherwise frauds go unprosecuted, and designing men get away with all kinds of fraud upon the Government, particularly during time of war.

When the present war has ended, it will be found that a great many frauds have been perpetrated upon the Government of the United States, as there were during the last war; indeed, because of the greater magnitude of this war, and the greater expenditure of public money, undoubtedly greater frauds will be perpetrated upon the Government in this war than during the last war. It is almost an impossibility that it be otherwise. Already the Truman committee and others have brought out facts which show that frauds are being committed at the present time.

I might call attention to the fact that a man came to my home this summer, a rancher of my State, a very reputable man, who worked in one of the shipbuilding plants in San Francisco. He said, "If you go to a certain river, you can find that tons and tons of steel are being dumped into that river." That is done because the contractors get contracts with a fixed price, and the price is fixed high, and the contracts are sometimes, in my judgment, carelessly handled by the departments. They say, "We will renegotiate"; but if a man finds he is making a great deal of money, he then wants to make it possible, when the contracts are renegotiated, for him to show that carrying out the contract has cost him a great deal. The same thing occurs in the case of many subcontractors. The contractors let subcontracts to some of their friends and others at very high prices; and when they renegotiate, they can show what they have paid to the subcontractors. That is one of the things going on in the country with respect to the matter of hoarding of labor.

I may say to the Senate that today, this very noontime, a large and very reputable manufacturer from the State of Ohio came to my office and commented upon what I had said with respect to the hoarding of labor by many war contractors. He said that what I had said with respect to hoarding of labor is exactly what is going on. He gave me illustrations by telling me what is taking place in certain factories in the State of Ohio producing war materials. He said that someone in the Government should check up on the matter of manpower with respect to which we are now scraping the bottom because of the hoarding of labor in many war industries. Hoarding of labor is going on in shipbuilding and in many other industries. That, Mr. President, is one reason why I have advocated postponement of the drafting of fathers. I do not think fathers should be drafted while hoarding of labor is taking place in war industries. Fathers should not be drafted, and thus cause homes to be broken up, while single men are hoarded in war industries.

Mr. President, I had intended to offer an amendment in an effort to rectify that situation; but until I see the Danaher amendment I shall not offer the amendment I had intended to propose.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to hold hearings on it and report it back not later than December 1, 1943.

Mr. HOLMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	Moore
Andrews	George	Murray
Bailey	Gillette	Reed
Ball	Green	Revercomb
Bankhead	Guffey	Reynolds
Barbour	Gurney	Robertson
Barkley	Hatch	Stewart
Buck	Hawkes	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Hill	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Holman	Tunnell
Butler	Kilgore	Vandenberg
Capper	Langer	Van Nuys
Caraway	Lucas	Wagner
Chavez	McCarran	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Wheeler
Connally	McFarland	White
Danaher	McKellar	Wiley
Eastland	Maloney	Willis
Ellender	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to hold hearings on it and to report it back to the Senate not later than December 1, 1943. [Putting the question.] The noes seem to have it——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent as members of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and will vote. I vote "nay".

Mr. WHITE. I announce the following general pairs on this question:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]; and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], who is detained on official business, with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "yea." He is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent as members of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The following Senator are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], who has a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], is detained on official business. If present he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—24

Aiken	Hawkes	Revercomb
Ball	Holman	Robertson
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	McClellan	Vandenberg
Capper	Maloney	Wheeler
Chavez	Millikin	White
Clark, Mo.	Moore	Wiley
Ferguson	Murray	Willis

NAYS—30

Andrews	Ellender	McFarland
Bailey	George	McKellar
Bankhead	Gillette	Reed
Barbour	Green	Reynolds
Barkley	Guffey	Stewart
Burton	Gurney	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Hatch	Tunnell
Connally	Hill	Van Nuys
Danaher	Kilgore	Wagner
Eastland	McCarran	Wallgren

NOT VOTING—42

Austin	Hayden	Pepper
Bilbo	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brewster	La Follette	Scrugham
Bridges	Lodge	Shipstead
Brooks	Lucas	Smith
Buck	McNary	Taft
Byrd	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	Mead	Tobey
Clark, Idaho	Murdock	Truman
Davis	Nye	Tydings
Downey	O'Daniel	Walsh
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wherry
Glass	Overton	Wilson

So the motion of Mr. CLARK of Missouri to recommit with instructions was rejected.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, to the first committee amendment, I propose an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 3, line 14, it is proposed to strike out the word "one-tenth", and to insert the words and figures "25 per centum."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the amendment would make the last sentence of the first paragraph on page 3 read as follows:

> In no event shall the amount of such award exceed 25 per centum of the proceeds of such suit or any settlement thereof.

The purpose of the amendment is to provide an inducement to such persons to furnish information upon which frauds of such character can be prosecuted and recoveries made by the United States.

I think the matter has been so fully discussed during the course of today and Wednesday that it is unnecessary for me to say anything further in support of the proposed amendment. It seems to me that the way to prevent any argument about informers being racketeers is to make it possible for suits to be brought and recoveries to be had without the necessity of having private citizens bring suits.

So, under the bill as it should be worded, the Attorney General should have a short period of time—60 days or 6 months or a year, or whatever may be necessary—within which to bring the suit. If he fails to bring the suit within that time, then any American citizen should be entitled to bring the suit or to furnish to the Attorney General the evidence upon which a suit can be brought; and if he fails to sue, then the suit should be brought by the private citizen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana to the first committee amendment.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, just one word. I know the hour is late, and that Members of the Senate are anxious to have today's session closed, and to get to their homes. I hope the amendment to the amendment will be rejected. I think 10 percent is a very reasonable limit for the compensation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] to the first committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment of the committee, as amended.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, in the committee amendment as amended, on page 2, line 14, I move to strike out the language "original with such person and", so that the language will read:

> That no district court of the United States as hereinbefore set forth shall have power or jurisdiction to hear, try, or determine such suit brought or carried on by any person for himself and the United States unless based upon information, evidence, and sources not in the possession of or obtained by the United States in the course of any investigation or proceedings—

And then go on with Danaher amendment.

If that is done, it seems to me it would eliminate one of the most objectionable features which has been complained of, because then a citizen would not be confined to evidence which was original with him. Certainly, in court, no person should be confined to the proposition that all the evidence must originate with him and that if he obtains evidence from some other source he cannot use it. If that were true in any trial, a great many suits could not be maintained. Certainly a man should be able to use any evidence he can procure, which is not in the possession of the United States, or does not originate from a grand-jury investigation or an investigation by a committee of Congress, or something of that kind. I cannot see any objection to the proposed amendment to the amendment.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Montana what language his amendment covers or would strike out?

Mr. WHEELER. It simply covers the language in line 14, "original with such person and."

Mr. VAN NUYS. The Senator is moving to strike out that language; is he?

Mr. WHEELER. I am moving to strike it out.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, it is very palpable that the bill will go to conference, and I am willing to accept

the amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, then would it not also be necessary to strike out the same language on page 4, in lines 19 and 20?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I think that is true—that in line 20, the words, "original with such person and" should also be stricken out, so as to make the language correspond.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The latter committee amendment is not before the Senate at the present time. The Chair understands that by unanimous consent the proposed amendment to the latter committee amendment may be considered.

Unless there is objection, the question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Montana to strike out from the committee amendment on page 2, lines 14 and 15, the words "original with such person and", and from the committee amendment on page 4, line 20, the words "original with such person and."

The amendments to the committee amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A while ago the Chair stated that the question was on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment as amended.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As I read the bill, the whole bill in its present form is a committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The Chair understands that the first committee amendment extends through line 15 on page 3. That is all that is before the Senate at this time.

The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, after line 15, it is proposed to strike out:

SEC. 2. Sections 3493 and 3494 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 31, secs. 234 and 235) are hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 17, to insert:

SEC. 2. No district court of the United States shall have power or jurisdiction to hear, try, or determine any suit pending at the time of the enactment of this act brought under Revised Statutes, section 3491, by any person for himself and the United States over which it would not have jurisdiction if such suit had been brought after the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That the court in which such suit is pending shall forthwith stay all further proceeding in said suit until the Attorney General shall have 30 days' opportunity to move as hereinafter provided and shall forthwith cause written notice to be given the Attorney General that such suit is pending; and the provision of this section preceding this proviso shall not be applicable to any such pending suit unless the Attorney General shall within 30 days after receipt of such written notice, move the court to dismiss the suit under this act: *Provided further*, That if after the dismissal under this act of any such pending suit a person having brought such suit makes a full disclosure and request in accordance with the provisions of said section 3491, as amended by section 1 of this act, and the Attorney General declines in writing to comply with such request, or allows 6 months to elapse after such disclosure and request without causing suit to be brought for part or all of the relief requested, such person may bring and carry on a new suit based on the same act, acts, and transactions involved in the suit previously brought if prior to the previous commencement thereof, the information, evidence, and sources upon which such suit was based were original with such person and not in the possession of or obtained by the United States in the course of any investigation or proceeding instituted or conducted by it. If the previous suit by such person was timely, the time within which such new suit may be commenced by such person shall not expire until 8 months after the date of the enactment of this act, or until the expiration of the time provided by section 3494 of the Revised Statutes, whichever is later: *Provided further*, That the Attorney General may cause a suit to be brought based in whole or in part upon the act, acts, or transactions involved in such pending suit previously brought by such person either after receipt of such disclosure and request or otherwise. If the previous suit brought by such person was timely, the period within which the Attorney General may cause a suit to be brought based in whole or in part on the same act, acts, or transactions shall not expire until 8 months after the date of the enactment of this act, or until the expiration of the time provided by section 3494 of the Revised Statutes, whichever is later.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 5, line 7, in the committee amendment, after the word "otherwise." I offer the same amendment which I proposed yesterday, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 7, in the committee amendment, after the word "otherwise", it is proposed to insert a semicolon and the following: "and, if such suit brought by the Attorney General is based in whole or in part upon original information, evidence, or sources furnished or obtained through such pending suit or by the plaintiff in such pending suit, the court may, upon application made by such plaintiff, award to him, out of the proceeds of the suit brought by the Attorney General or any settlement of any claim involved therein, an amount, not in excess of one-tenth of the proceeds or settlement, which in the judgment of the court is fair and reasonable compensation to such plaintiff."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to explain the amendment. If the Attorney General takes over a suit which is already pending, this amendment would permit the court to allow a reasonable fee, up to 10 percent, to the plaintiff who had started the case. It would be the same as though he had given the evidence and an original case had been initiated by the Attorney General.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment. I am very glad to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the committee amendment on page 5, line 7.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 13, to insert:

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall affect any such suit which was filed prior to June 15, 1942, or in which a final judgment has heretofore been entered, whether or not the cause be pending on review in an appellate court.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for section 3 in the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to substitute for section 3 in the committee amendment the following:

The act shall not apply to any suit filed prior to the effective date hereof: *Provided, however*, If the Attorney General deems it in the public interests, he may cause to be filed or file a motion in the court in which any such suit is now or hereafter pending to stay all proceedings therein until after the trial of any indictments returned in that, or in any other court of the United States, against any defendant or defendants named in any such suit, and arising out of the transactions involved therein or any related transactions. If the court finds that any indictment returned against any such defendant relates to any transaction or transactions involved in said suit, or in any transaction related thereto, and that any proceedings which might be taken in said case impedes or interferes with or may tend to impede or interfere with the prosecution of any such indictments, such court shall thereupon order that all proceedings in said cause and all depositions, interrogatories, or methods of discovery be stayed until after the trial of all such indictments returned against any defendant or defendants named in such suit. This act shall not affect or impair the substantive rights of any person who has heretofore filed any such suit for himself as well as for the United States.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, this substitute for section 3 would accomplish essentially the same purpose which was intended by the substitute for the whole bill which I sent forward a little while ago, and which has not as yet been acted upon. The substitute for section 3 would fully protect the Government in its right to protect itself against the disclosure or use of information which the Government does not desire to have prematurely disclosed or used in a civil suit, a so-called informer suit. At the same time, it would do away with the retroactive feature of the committee amendment, and preserve the rights of everyone. It would permit a stay at the instance of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

ment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] in the nature of a substitute for section 3 in the committee amendment. [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Millikin
Andrews	Gillette	Murray
Bailey	Green	Reed
Ball	Guffey	Revercomb
Bankhead	Gurney	Reynolds
Barbour	Hatch	Robertson
Barkley	Hawkes	Stewart
Burton	Hill	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Holman	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Caraway	Kilgore	Vandenberg
Chavez	Langer	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Lucas	Wagner
Connally	McCarran	Wallgren
Danaher	McClellan	Wheeler
Eastland	McFarland	Wiley
Ellender	McKellar	Willis
Ferguson	Maloney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] in the nature of a substitute for section 3 in the committee amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. PADCLIFFE], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I announce that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent as members of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to the State of Maryland.

Mr. FERGUSON. I announce the following general pairs on this question:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]; and

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], who is detained on official business, with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], if present would vote "yea." He is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent as members of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] has a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. He is detained on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily detained.

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—16

Aiken	Gillette	Robertson
Ball	Holman	Vandenberg
Capper	Langer	Wheeler
Chavez	Millikin	Willis
Clark, Mo.	Murray	
Eastland	Revercomb	

NAYS—37

Andrews	Green	Maloney
Bailey	Guffey	Reed
Bankhead	Gurney	Reynolds
Barbour	Hatch	Stewart
Barkley	Hawkes	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Hill	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Caraway	Kilgore	Van Nuys
Connally	Lucas	Wagner
Danaher	McCarran	Wallgren
Ellender	McClellan	Wiley
Ferguson	McFarland	
George	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—43

Austin	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Bone	La Follette	Shipstead
Brewster	Lodge	Smith
Bridges	McNary	Taft
Brooks	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Mead	Tobey
Bushfield	Moore	Truman
Byrd	Murdock	Tydings
Chandler	Nye	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	O'Daniel	Wherry
Davis	O'Mahoney	White
Downey	Overton	Wilson
Gerry	Pepper	
Glass	Radcliffe	

So the amendment of Mr. CLARK of Missouri in the nature of a substitute for section 3 was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the third committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I call up the substitute for the entire bill which I offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] as a substitute for the bill, as amended.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The bill (H. R. 1203) was passed.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I move that the title be amended to read as follows:

A bill to limit private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States.

The motion was agreed to.

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the Senate for a moment. It is the purpose of the Senator from Montana to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill to defer the drafting of fathers—the Wheeler bill. I have no objection to the motion being agreed to so far as making the bill the unfinished business is concerned. It is my purpose to move that the Senate recess until next Tuesday. It is understood that General Marshall, who has been called on an important mission to Mexico City, will return to Washington tomorrow night, and will be here Monday to testify before the Committee on Military Affairs on the subject of the bill.

The Senator from Montana has agreed—and I think properly so—that the bill should not be considered until General Marshall has had an opportunity to testify before the committee.

It is my hope that we may take the Wheeler bill up Tuesday and dispose of it, but I wish to state that it is desirable that the hearings which have been held before the Committee on Military Affairs, and those which will be held on Monday, shall be printed and made available to all Senators. I have conferred with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], who has ordered that the hearings be printed as soon as it is possible to get the transcript to the Printing Office. While it is the purpose to make the bill the unfinished business and to go over until Tuesday,

if by any chance the hearings should not be available Tuesday, I would feel that we should then let the bill go over until Wednesday, until we can obtain the hearings, because manifestly all Members of the Senate could not attend the hearings. Some of us who were not members of the committee did attend, but it is extremely desirable that Senators be permitted to read the hearings and get the viewpoint of those who expressed themselves.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not perfectly obvious that if General Marshall is not to testify until Monday, the printed hearings cannot be available Tuesday?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; that is not obvious, because the hearings have been closed already, with the exception of the testimony of General Marshall, and the testimony taken so far has been ordered printed.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am speaking of General Marshall's testimony.

Mr. BARKLEY. The chairman of the committee advises me that he thinks it entirely feasible to have General Marshall's testimony ready by Tuesday.

Mr. WHEELER. If for any reason the hearings are not ready by Tuesday, I shall be willing to let the bill go over until Wednesday, but I do want it made the unfinished business.

I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 763.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is now the unfinished business of the Senate.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. There being no Executive Calendar, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, September 21, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, teach us that as our faith is inspired and sustained by the redeeming love of Thy Son, remaining strong and loyal, "we are more than conquerors." We pray that the present eclipse may purge our vision, widen our sky, and increase our power; thus in Thee we shall know the truth and force of right and learn to deaden the love of self. Keep our minds attentive by sincerity of spirit and integrity of life; thus we shall help to turn wicked shadows into Thy righteous morning.

Send us forth to our problems with open and unbiased minds, realizing that we must identify ourselves with the suffering and perishing races of earth and that immortal badges are won only on the field of self-sacrifice. Do Thou deliver our country from false teachers who through ignorance, prejudice, or conceit mislead the unwary to make shipwreck of faith. Never before was it greater folly to be skeptical about Divine guidance in the long purpose of humanity. Great God, in the midst of all, lead us to light the candle rather than curse the darkness. Help those who are in spiritual need; open our eyes that with expanding vision we may see the clouds of war becoming the chariots of the Most High breaking over the mountains. And Thine shall be the praise. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, September 14, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2912) entitled "An act to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BAILEY, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCNARY, and Mr. JOHNSON of California to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 180):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. FRANCIS D. CULKIN, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

PARTICIPATION IN WORLD PEACE

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on a motion to suspend the rules and pass House Concurrent Resolution 25 be extended to 4 hours, such time to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and that said motion to suspend the rules shall be the continuing order of business of the House until finally disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HOFFMAN and Mr. DAY objected.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

HON. SAM RAYBURN, THE SPEAKER

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the third anniversary of the term as Speaker of the gentleman from Texas, Hon. SAM RAYBURN. As chairman of the Texas delegation and by their direction and in their behalf, I extend to him not only the hearty congratulations of the delegation from his own State, but of all the people of Texas, and I have an idea that I also express the sentiments of this House, regardless of political or party affiliations.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Texas is certainly expressing the sentiment of the Members on this side of the House. We all admire and respect our good Speaker for his high purpose and integrity. We extend our sincere felicitations.

Mr. THOMASON. I am very sure that is correct, and I know that the Members on both sides thoroughly appreciate the attitude of the minority leader. I know the warm friendship and mutual admiration that exists between the Speaker and the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Of course, the distinguished Speaker is the son of Texas, but his strong character, constructive contributions, and his unusual ability have lifted him above State environment and State associations into varied fields, and he is now considered the son of all of the States of the Union.

Mr. THOMASON. SAM RAYBURN belongs to the Nation. No man can be a Member of this body for 34 years and not possess high character and unusual ability. To become Speaker he must also have capacity for leadership, which Speaker RAYBURN has proved he has in a marked degree.

I feel confident in expressing the thought that the present Speaker of the House will rank with the great Speakers of this body. I am sure that I voice the sentiment of the House, not only in extending its congratulations on his outstanding record as Speaker and his fairness to every Member of the House on all occasions, but I also voice its sentiment in wishing for him long life and much happiness.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT
(H. DOC. NO. 272)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

During the 2 months' recess of the Congress, many important events have occurred at the war fronts and at home. You return at a time when major battles in Europe and in Asia are beginning to be joined. In recent months, the main tides of conflict have been running our way—but we could not and cannot be content merely to drift with this favorable tide.

You know from the news of the past few days that every military operation entails a legitimate military risk and that occasionally we have checks to our plans—checks which necessarily involve severe losses of men and materials.

The Allied forces are now engaged in a very hard battle south of Naples. Casualties are heavy. The desperation with which the Germans are fighting reveals that they are well aware of the consequences to them of our occupation of Italy.

The Congress and the American people can rest assured that the landing on Italy is not the only landing we have in mind. That landing was planned at Casablanca. At Quebec, the leaders and the military staffs of Great Britain and the United States made specific and precise plans to bring to bear further blows of equal or greater importance against Germany and Japan—with definite times and places for other landings on the continent of Europe and elsewhere.

On the 10th of July a carefully prepared expedition landed in Sicily. In spite of heavy German opposition it cleared this large and heavily fortified island in 38 days.

British, Canadian, and American losses in killed, wounded, and missing in the Sicilian campaign were 31,158, of which the American forces lost 7,445. The casualties among the Italians and Germans were approximately 165,000, including 132,000 prisoners.

The unmistakably sincere welcome given to the Allied troops by the Italian people has proved conclusively that even in a country which had lived for a generation under a complete dictatorship—with all of its propaganda, censorship, and suppression of free speech and discussion—the love of liberty was unconquerable.

It has also proved conclusively that this war was not waged by the people of Italy on their own choice. All of Mussolini's propaganda machine could not make them love Hitler or hate us. The less said about the feelings toward Mussolini the better.

I believe that equal jubilation and enthusiasm will be shown by the people of the other nations now under the German heel when Nazi gauleiters and native Quislings are removed through force or flight.

How different was this invading army of the Allies from the German forces that had come into Sicily, ostensibly to "protect it." Food, clothing, cattle, medicines and household goods had been systematically stolen from the people of Sicily, and sent North to the "master race" in Germany. Sicily, like other parts of Italy and like the other satellite and conquered nations, had been bled white by the Nazi and Fascist governments. Growers of crops were permitted to retain only a small fraction of their own produce for themselves and their families.

With the Allied armies, however, went a carefully planned organization, trained and equipped to give physical care to the local population—food, clothing, medicine. This new organization is also now in the process of restoring to the people of Sicily freedoms which for many years had been denied to them. I am confident that within a year Sicily will be once more self-supporting—and, in addition to that, once more self-respecting.

From Sicily the advance of the Allied armies has continued to the mainland. On the 3d day of September they landed on the toe of the Italian peninsula. These were the first Allied troops to invade the continent of Europe in order to liberate the conquered and oppressed countries. History will always remember this day as the beginning of the answer to the prayer of the millions of liberty-loving human beings, not only in these conquered lands but all over the world.

On July 25—2 weeks after our first landings in Sicily—political events in Italy startled the world. Mussolini, the incubus of Italy for a generation, the man who is more responsible for all the sorrows of Italy than anyone, except possibly Hitler himself, was forced out of office and stripped of his power as a result of his own dismal failures, his wanton brutalities, and the overwhelming demand of the Italian people. This was the first break in Axis leadership—to be followed, we are determined, by other and similar encouraging downfalls.

But there is one thing I want to make perfectly clear: When Hitler and the Nazis go out, the Prussian military clique must go with them. The war-breeding gangs of militarists must be rooted out of Germany—and out of Japan—if we are to have any real assurance of future peace.

Early last month the relentless application of overwhelming Allied power—particularly air and sea power—convinced the leaders of Italy that it could not continue an active part in the war. Conversations were begun by them with us. These conversations were carried on with the utmost secrecy. Therefore, much as I wished to do so, I could not communicate the facts of the case to the Congress, or the press, or to those who repeatedly expressed dismay or indignation at our apparent course in Italy. These negotiations turned out to be a complete surprise to nearly everyone, not only to the Axis but to the Italian people themselves.

I am sure that the Congress realizes that there are many situations in this war—and there will be many more to come—in which it is impossible for me to make any announcement or even to give any indication of the policy which we are following. And I ask the American people, as well as the Congress, to bear with me and with our Chiefs of Staff. It is difficult to remain silent when unjustified attack and criticism come from those who are not in a position to have all the facts.

But the people and the Congress can be sure that the policy which we follow is an expression of the basic democratic traditions and ideals of this Republic. We shall not be able to claim that we have gained total victory in this war if any vestige of fascism in any of its malignant forms is permitted to survive anywhere in the world.

The armistice with Italy was signed on September 3 in Sicily, but it could not be put into effect until September 8, when we were ready to make landings in force in the Naples area. We had planned these landings some time before and were determined to go through with them, armistice or no armistice.

Italian leaders appealed to their Army and Navy to end hostilities against us. Italian soldiers, though disorganized and ill-supplied, have been fighting the Germans in many regions. In conformity with the terms of unconditional surrender, the Italian Fleet has come over to our side; and it can be a powerful weapon in striking at the Nazi enemies of the Italian people.

When Hitler was forced to the conclusion that his offensive was broken, and he must go on the defensive, he started boasting that he had converted Europe into an impregnable fortress. But he neglected to provide that fortress with a roof. He also left various other vulnerable spots in the wall of the so-called fortress—which we shall point out to him in due time.

The British and American air forces have been bombing the roofless fortress with ever-increasing effectiveness. It is now our purpose to establish bases within bombing range of southern and eastern Germany, and to bring devastating war home to these places by day and by night as it has already been brought to western Germany.

When Britain was being subjected to mass bombing in 1940 and 1941—when the British people, including their King and Prime Minister, were proving that Britain "could take it"—the strategists of the Royal Air Force and of our own Army Air Forces were not idle. They were studying the mistakes that Goering and his staff of Nazi terrorists were making. Those were fatal mistakes, as it turned out.

Today, we and the British are not making those mistakes. We are not bombing tenements for the sheer sadistic pleasure of killing, as the Nazis did. We are striking devastating blows at carefully selected, clearly identified strategic objectives—factories, shipyards, munition dumps, transportation facilities, which make it possible for the Nazis to wage war. And we are hitting these military targets and blowing them to bits.

German power can still do us great injury. But that evil power is being destroyed, surely, inexorably, day by day, and if Hitler does not know it by now, then the last trace of sanity has departed from that distorted mind.

We must remember that in any great air attack the British and Americans lose

a fairly high proportion of planes and that these losses must be made up quickly so that the weight of the bombing shall not decrease for a day in the future. In fact, a high rate of increase must be maintained according to plan—and that means constant stepping up of our production here at home.

In the remarkable raid on the Ploesti oil fields in Rumania we lost 53 of our heavy bombers, and more than 500 of our finest men are missing. This may seem like a disastrously high loss, unless you figure it against the damage done to the enemy's war power. I am certain that the German or the Japanese high commands would cheerfully sacrifice tens of thousands of men to do the same amount of damage to us, if they could. Those gallant and brilliant young Americans who raided Ploesti won a smashing victory which, I believe, will contribute materially to the shortening of the war and thus save countless lives.

We shall continue to make such raids all over the territory of Germany and the satellite countries. With Italy in our hands, the distances we have to travel will be far less and the risks proportionately reduced.

We have reliable information that there is definite unrest and a growing desire for peace among the peoples of these satellite countries — Rumania, Hungary, Finland, and Bulgaria. We hope that in these nations the spirit of revolt against Nazi dominance which commenced in Italy will burst into flame and become a consuming fire.

Every American is thrilled by the sledge-hammer blows delivered against the Nazi aggressors by the Russian armies. This summer there has been no successful German advance against the Russians, as in 1941 and 1942. The shoe today is on the other foot—and is pinching very hard. Instead, the Russians have forced the greatest military reversal since Napoleon's retreat in 1812.

The recapture of Kharkov, Stalino, and other strongholds by the Russians, the opening of the Ukraine and the Donets Basin and the freeing of millions of valuable acres and hundreds of inhabited places hearten the whole world as the Russian campaign moves toward the elimination of every German from Russian soil—toward the invasion of Germany itself. It is certain that the campaign in north Africa, the occupation of Sicily, the fighting in Italy, and the compelling of large numbers of German planes to go into combat in the skies over Holland, Belgium, and France by reason of our air attacks, have given important help to the Russian Armies along their advancing front from Leningrad to the Black Sea. We know, too, that we are contributing to that advance by making Germany keep many divisions in the Balkans, in southern France, and along the English Channel. I like to think that these words constitute an understatement.

Similarly, the events in the Mediterranean have a direct bearing upon the war against Japan.

When the American and British expeditionary forces first landed in north Africa last November, some people believed that we were neglecting our obligations to prosecute the war vigorously in the Pacific. Such people continually make the mistake of trying to divide the war into several watertight compartments—the western European front, the Russian front, the Burma front, the New Guinea and Solomons front, and so forth—as though all of these fronts were separate and unrelated to each other. You even hear talk of the air war as opposed to the land war or the sea war.

Actually, we cannot think of this as several wars. It is all one war, and it must be governed by one basic strategy.

The freeing of the Mediterranean, which we started last fall, will lead directly to the resumption of our complete control of the waters of the eastern Indian Ocean and the Bay of Bengal. Thus, we shall be enabled to strike the Japanese on another of their highly vulnerable flanks.

As long as Italy remained in the war as our enemy—as long as the Italian fleet remained in being as a threat—a substantial part of British naval strength had to be kept locked up in the Mediterranean. Now, that formidable strength is freed to proceed eastward to join in the ever-increasing attack upon the Japanese. It has not been sufficiently emphasized that the freeing of the Mediterranean is a great asset to the war in the Far East.

There has been one serious gap in the lines of our globe-girdling sea power. That is the gap between northwest Australia and Ceylon. That gap can now be closed as a result of victory in the Mediterranean.

We face, in the Orient, a long and difficult fight. We must be prepared for heavy losses in winning that fight. The power of Japan will not collapse until it has been literally pounded into the dust. It would be the utmost folly for us to try to pretend otherwise.

Even so, if the future is tough for us, think what it is for General Tojo and his murderous gang. They may look to the north, to the south, to the east, or to the west. They can see closing in on them, from all directions, the forces of retribution under the Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, General MacArthur, Admiral Nimitz, and Admiral Lord Mountbatten.

The forces operating against Japan in the various Pacific theaters are just as much interrelated and dependent on each other as are the forces pounding against Germany in Europe.

With the new threats that we offer from the Aleutians, Japan cannot afford to devote as large a proportion of her forces to hold the lines in other areas.

Such actions as the taking of Attu and Kiska do not just happen. They are the results of careful and complete planning which was going on quietly while some of our critics were so perturbed that they had reached the verge of tears over what they called the threatened invasion of Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. It was difficult for them to realize that the carefully prepared and crucial tests in the Coral Sea and at Midway and in the Solomons rendered the Japanese toehold in the Aleutians untenable.

Japan has been hard put to it to maintain her extended lines. She had to withdraw her garrison from Kiska in the face of the oncoming American-Canadian forces because she could not maintain a steady stream of adequate reinforcements and supplies to the Aleutians.

In the Solomon Islands, with heavy fighting, we have gained so many island air bases that the threat to Australia and New Zealand across the Coral Sea has been practically dissipated. In fact, it is safe to say that our position in that area has become a threat on our part against the Japanese in the seas that lie north of the Solomons and north of New Guinea.

American, Australian, New Zealand, and Dutch forces in a magnificent campaign in New Guinea and the Solomons have destroyed much Japanese strength and have gained for us new bases from which to launch new offensive operations.

After a long period of defensive strategy in Burma, we are determined to take the offensive there. I am also glad to report to you that we are getting more supplies and military help to China. Almost every day word comes that a new air battle has destroyed two and three times more Japanese planes in China and Burma than we ourselves have lost. That process will continue until we are ready to strike right at the heart of Japan itself.

It goes almost without saying that when Japan surrenders the United Nations will never again let her have authority over the islands which were mandated to her by the League of Nations. Japan obviously is not to be trusted. And the same thing holds good in the case of the vast territories which Japan has stolen from China starting long before this war began.

Since the beginning of our entrance into the war, nearly 2 years ago, the United Nations have continuously reduced enemy strength by a process of attrition. That means, cold-bloodedly, placing the ever-increasing resources of the Allies into deadly competition with the ever-decreasing resources of the Axis. It means the training and use of the Allied manpower—which is greater than the Axis. It means the use of our superior facilities and ability to make more munitions and, above all, aircraft, more quickly than our enemies can do.

For example, the Allies today on the European front have a definite superiority in almost all weapons of war on any and every point of the encircling line—more guns, more tanks, more planes, more trucks, more transports, more supply ships, and more warships.

In the Pacific we have taken a steady toll of Japanese war planes and a steady toll of Japanese ships—merchant ships and naval vessels. The odds are all in our favor, for we grow in strength, and they cannot even replace all their losses. It might be called a simple mathematical progression.

However, unless we keep up and increase the tempo of our present rate of production, this greater strength in planes and guns, tanks and ships, can all be lost.

Our great production program started during the darkest days of 1940. With the magnificent contribution made by American industry and American labor, it is approaching full production. Britain has already attained full production. Today, the British Empire and the United States together are turning out so much of every essential of war that we have definite superiority over Germany and Japan, which is growing with every succeeding minute. But we have no minutes to lose.

Realization of the distances we must cover brings to mind problems that every American should realize—problems of transporting from our shores to the actual fighting areas the weapons and munitions of war which we make. Burma and China can be reached only with extraordinary difficulty. Two years ago, most of the planes we sent had to be knocked down, crated, put on board ship, transported, then uncrated and put together again in India, and from there sent up to the fighting front.

In the case of China, they had to be flown over enormous mountains. Even after they were safely delivered there, the planes had to be kept supplied with ground crews, tools, oil, gasoline, and even spare parts Since the Japs cut the Burma Road, all these supplies have to be flown over hundreds of miles to bases which had to be built in China.

The same slow process was also the rule in the southwest Pacific.

With the present increased range of airplanes and the establishment of additional bases, we are now flying more of them under their own power than before, but all the things that go to supply them—the gasoline, the tools, the spare parts—still have to be taken by ship to the fighting fronts all over the world. Practically every soldier and all his weapons and equipment have to go by ship. And every time a new forward move develops the whole outfit has to go by ship.

I wonder how many people realize what it means to carry on the war across the Atlantic and the Pacific and through the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean, along lines of supply attacked by submarines and dive bombers at many points.

The combined operation of the British and Americans last November against Morocco and Algeria was in point of numbers the largest military movement over the longest number of miles to landings under fire that history has recorded anywhere.

The ships for such an amphibious operation cannot be loaded in the ordinary way, to be unloaded alongside a comfortable, safe wharf. Most of the ships must be "combat loaded" in such a way that the troops go ashore first and are immediately followed in the proper order by guns and ammunition, tanks, trucks, and food, medical equipment and all the supplies of a modern army. Preparations must be made to conduct these landings under enemy fire, and on beaches instead of at docks. People who have seen or planned this kind of operation even over short distances do not speak glibly about landing great expeditions on a few days' notice or on all the beaches of Europe at the same time.

The Members of the Congress have undoubtedly had an opportunity to see at first hand in their own home districts some of our war factories and plants and shipyards throughout the United States which are now working at full blast turning out the greatest amount of war production in the history of the world.

In June and July we were worried by a reduction in the rate of increase in production. Great as our production had been we could not afford to level off. We had to continue the upward curve and not pause on any plateaus.

I am happy to report that the increase was resumed in August. In this month of September it is even better.

For example, during the 2 months of the recess of the Congress our factories produced approximately 15,000 planes. There was an especially important increase in the production of heavy bombers in August. I cannot reveal the exact figures on this. They would give the enemy needed information—but no comfort. However, the total airplane production is still not good enough. We seek not only to come up to the schedule but to surpass it.

During those same 2 months American shipyards put into commission 3,200,000 tons of large merchant ships—a total of 281 ships, almost 5 ships a day.

Even as the actual fighting engagements in which our troops take part increase in number, it is becoming more and more evident that this is essentially a great war of production. The best way to avoid heavy casualty lists is to provide our troops with the best equipment possible—and plenty of it.

We have come a great way since this Congress first met in January of this year. But I state only a blunt fact when I tell the Congress that we are still a long, long way from ultimate victory in any major theater of the war.

First. Despite our substantial victories in the Mediterranean, we face a hard and costly fight up through Italy—and a major job of organizing our positions before we can take advantage of them.

Second. From bases in the British Isles we must be sure that we have assembled the strength to strike not just in one direction but in many directions—by land and sea and in the air—with overwhelming forces and equipment.

Third. Although our Russian allies have made a magnificent counteroffensive, and are driving our common enemies back day by day, the Russian Armies still have far to go before they get into Germany itself.

Fourth. The Japanese hold firmly established positions on an enormous front from the Kuriles through the mandated islands to the Solomons and through the Netherlands East Indies to Malaysia and Burma and China. To break through this defensive ring we must hit them and hit them hard not merely at one point but at many points, and we must keep on hitting them.

In all of history, there has never been a task so tremendous as that which we now face. We can do it—and we will do it—but we must plan and work and fight with every ounce of intelligence and energy and courage that we possess.

The Congress has reconvened at a time when we are in the midst of the Third War Loan Drive seeking to raise a sum unparalleled in history—$15,000,000,000. This is a dramatic example of the scale on which this war still has to be fought, and presents some idea of how difficult and costly the responsible leaders of this Government believe the war will be.

Nothing we can do will be more costly in lives than to adopt the attitude that the war has been won—or nearly won. That would mean a let-down in the great tempo of production which we have reached, and would mean that our men who are now fighting all over the world will not have that overwhelming superiority of power which has dealt so much death and destruction to the enemy and at the same time has saved so many American lives.

That is why I have always maintained that there is no such separate entity as the home front. Every day lost in turning out an airplane or a ship at home will have its direct effect upon the men now battling up the leg of Italy or in the jungles of the southwest Pacific or in the clouds over China.

There have been complaints from some sources about the way this production and other domestic activities have been carried on. Some of these complaints of course are justified. On the other hand some of them come from selfish people who merely do not like to give up some of their pleasures, or a part of their butter or meat or milk.

Fair-minded citizens, however, will realize that although mistakes have been made, the job that has been done in converting peacetime America to a wartime basis has been a great job and a successful one, of which all our people have good reason to be proud.

It would be nothing short of a miracle if this unprecedented job of transforming a peace-loving, unprepared industrial America into a fighting and production machine had been accomplished without some mistakes being made and some people being given cause for complaint.

The Congress is well aware of the magnitude of the undertaking, and of the many gigantic problems involved. For the Congress has been actively involved in helping to work out the solutions to these unprecedented problems.

A few facts will show how vast an enterprise this war has been—and how we are constantly increasing the tempo of our production.

The total amount spent on the war from May 1940 to date is $128,123,000,000. The bill is now running at the rate of $250,000,000 per day.

Up to September 1, 1943, among the more important items produced and delivered since the armament program started in May 1940 are the following:

Airplanes	123,000
Airplane engines	349,000
Tanks	53,000
Artillery weapons	93,000
Small arms (rifles, carbines, machine guns, etc.)	9,500,000
Small arms ammunition, rounds	25,942,000,000
Trucks	1,233,000

In most instances more than half of the above total delivered to date was produced during the first 8 months of 1943:

Airplanes	52,000
Tanks	23,000
Artillery weapons	40,600
Small arms (rifles, carbines, machine guns, etc.)	4,638,000
Small arms ammunition, rounds	13,339,000,000

The number of fighting ships and auxiliaries of all kinds completed since May 1940 is 2,380 and 13,000 landing vessels.

In the 2½ years between January 1, 1941 and July 1, 1943, the power plants built for installation in Navy vessels had a horsepower equal to all the horsepower of all hydroelectric plants in the United States in January 1941.

The completions of Navy ships during the last 6 months were equal to completions in the entire year of 1942.

We have cut down the time required to build submarines by almost 50 percent.

The antiaircraft and double-purpose guns produced by the Navy since the defense program started in May 1940, if fired altogether, would throw 4,600 tons of projectiles per minute against the enemy.

The output of under-water ordnance—torpedoes, mines, and depth charges—during the first half of 1943 was equal to the total production of 1942.

During the month of August 1943 we produced almost as many torpedoes as during all of World War I.

Anyone who has had to build a single factory, tool it up, get the necessary help, set up an assembly line, produce and ship the product will have some idea of what that amount of production has meant.

We have had to raise and equip armed forces approaching 10,000,000 men. Simultaneously, in spite of this drain on our manpower, we have had to find millions more men and millions of women to operate our war factories, arsenals, shipyards, essential civilian industries—and the farms and mines of America.

There have been the problems of increasing greatly the output of our natural resources—not only for our own Army and Navy and for our civilians at home, but also for our allies and our own forces all over the world.

Since the outbreak of war in Europe, we have increased our output of petroleum by 66 percent. We have stepped up our bituminous coal production by 40 percent; chemicals by 300 percent; iron ore by 125 percent; hydroelectric power by 79 percent; and steel by 106 percent.

There were the problems of raising and distributing more food than ever before in our history—for our armed services, for our own people, and to help feed our allies.

There was the formidable problem of establishing a rationing system of the necessities of life which would be fair to all of our people.

There was the difficulty of keeping prices from skyrocketing and fighting off the serious specter of inflation.

There was the problem of transporting millions of men and hundreds of millions of tons of weapons and supplies all over our own country and also to all corners of the world. This necessitated the largest railroad and shipping operations in all history.

There were the problems involved in our vast purchases in foreign countries; in our control of foreign funds, located in this country; in our custody of alien property; in our occupation of liberated areas. There were new problems of communications, of censorship, of war information.

There was the problem of maintaining proper management-labor relations; of fair treatment and just compensation to our millions of war workers; of avoiding strikes; of preventing the exploitation of workers or natural resources by those who would seek to become war profiteers and war millionaires.

There were the problems of civilian defense, of lend-lease, of subcontracting war contracts to smaller businesses, of building up stock piles of strategic material whose normal sources have been seized by the enemy—such as rubber and tin.

There was the problem of providing housing for millions of new war workers all over the country.

And touching all of these, there was the great problem of raising the money to pay for all of them.

No sincere, sensible person doubts that in such an unprecedented, breath-taking enterprise errors of honest judgment were bound to creep in, and that occasional disputes among conscientious officials were bound to occur. And if anyone thinks that we, working under our democratic system, have made major mistakes in this war, he should take a look at some of the blunders made by our enemies in the so-called efficient dictatorships.

Even sincere, sensible people sometimes fail to compare the handfuls of errors or disputes on the one hand, with the billions of instances where the agencies of government in cooperation with each other have moved with the precision of a smoothly working machine.

Some people, when a doughnut is placed before them, claim they can see only the hole in it. Sometimes this is an example of sheer individual pessimism; but sometimes it is caused by motives not consonant with war-winning ideals.

The American people as a whole, however, are fair-minded. They have learned to distinguish between the sensational and the factual. They know that there is no so-called news when things run right. They know, for example, that a few newspapers and columnists and radio commentators can make controversy create "news" which is eagerly sought by Axis propagandists in their evil work.

Obviously, we never could have produced and shipped as much as we have, we could not now be in the position we now occupy in the Mediterranean, in Italy, or in the southwest Pacific, or on the Atlantic convoy routes, or in the air over Germany and France, if conditions in Washington and throughout the Nation were as confused and chaotic as some people try to paint them.

We know that in any large private industrial plant doing a thousandth part of what their Government in Washington is doing there are also occasional mistakes and arguments. But this is not a good comparison. It is like comparing a motorboat with a battleship.

What I have said is not in any way an apology—it is an assertion and a boast that the American people and their Government are doing an amazingly good job in carrying out a vast program which 2 years ago was said to be impossible of fulfillment. Luckily, the American people have a sense of proportion—and a memory.

As General Marshall has said in his biennial report:

> The development of the powerful Army of today * * * has been dependent upon vast appropriations and the strong support of the Congress, and the cooperation of numerous Government agencies.

I urge all Americans to read General Marshall's fine soldierly record of the achievements of our Army throughout two of the most tremendous years in our history. This is a record which Americans will never forget.

As the war grows tougher and as new problems constantly arise in our domestic economy, changes in methods and changes in legislation may become necessary.

We should move for the greater economic protection of our returning men and women in the armed forces—and for greater educational opportunities for them—and for all our citizens we should provide a further measure of social security in order to protect them against certain continuing hazards of life.

All these things, as well as eventual demobilization, should be studied now and much of the necessary legislation should be enacted. I do not mean that this statement should be regarded in any way as an intimation that we are approaching the end of the war. Such an intimation could not be based either on fact or on reason. But when the war ends we do not want to be caught again without planning or legislation, such as occurred at the end of the last war.

On all these and on other subjects I expect to communicate with this Congress from time to time.

In this critical period in the history of our country and of the world, we seek cooperation between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government to furnish our citizens with the security of the standard of living to which their resources and their skills in management and labor entitle them in all matters which concern this Nation's

welfare, present and future—and the first of such matters, obviously, is the winning of this war.

Finally, as the war progresses, we seek a national cooperation with other nations toward the end that world aggression be ended and that fair international relationships be established on a permanent basis. The policy of the good neighbor has shown such success in the hemisphere of the Americas that its extension to the whole world seems to be the logical next step. In that way we can begin to keep faith with our sons and daughters who are fighting for freedom and justice and security at home and abroad.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 17, 1943.*

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] may address the House for 5 minutes this afternoon, following any other special orders that may have been entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE FIRST LT. DAVID NATHANIEL MURDOCK

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the President's message stated that there were 7,445 American fighting men who gave their lives in the invasion of Sicily. One of those men was David Murdock, the eldest son of our colleague, the gentleman from Arizona, Hon. JOHN MURDOCK. I know that in paying solemn tribute to him I express the feeling of every Member of the House. We pay our sincere homage and respect, and we offer a nation's reverent gratitude for this gallant sacrifice to the memory of a noble young American and to his bereaved parents, whom we know and love.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects. In one, to include a statement by Mr. Edward O'Neal, president of the Farm Bureau, and in the other a speech by Francis A. Flood, assistant to the War Food Administrator.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects; in one to include a speech delivered by Mr. Dewey L. Granberry, manager of the Chamber of Commerce, Victoria, Tex., at a conference of the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, held at Houston, Tex., on August 26, 1943; and in the other to extend a speech made at the same meeting by Mr. Frank E. Bourgeois, chairman of the Waterway Transportation and Development Committee of the Association of Commerce of New Orleans.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by Mr. John M. Fouts, of Fort Worth, Tex., general manager of the Trinity Improvement Association, at a conference of the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, held at Houston, Tex., August 26, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE FULBRIGHT RESOLUTION

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Monday or Tuesday next, so it has been announced, the House will vote on the Fulbright resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) under a suspension of the rules, which precludes amendments. This concurrent resolution provides, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein.

There is not a reservation or limitation in the resolution to preserve, protect, or defend the sovereign rights of a sovereign people. International machinery can be set up, and undoubtedly will be set up, to which this resolution can commit this Government, and by which our people will be expected to and be called upon to finance, feed, and rehabilitate groups of people in each of the sixty-odd states which at present compose the family of nations.

This Fulbright resolution is purely a wild and reckless plunge in the dark without regard to the extent that the proposed international machinery may require the United States to destroy its own security, prosperity, standard of living, its liberties, and institutions which now exist by virtue of our constitutional guaranties.

We do not know whether the proposed international machinery to be set up is for Union Now or not. Prime Minister Churchill said:

> No one can stop it. Like the Mississippi, it just keeps rolling along. Let it roll in full flood, inexorable, irresistible, to broader lands and better days.

Is Union Now to be our commitment under this resolution?

Hon. Leslie Hore-Belisha puts the proposal more boldly, thus:

> Mr. Churchill had the imaginative idea of offering France a common citizenship. There is far more reason—

Said Leslie Hore-Belisha—

> for common citizenship with America. If we can replace the Declaration of Independence—

Said he—

> with a declaration of interdependence, it should lay the firmest foundation for permanent world peace.

It is not difficult to draw peace resolutions in a moment of emotionalism and pass them without debate, but what has been the history of treaties of peace, drawn with the intention that each should be permanent? The record shows that "from the year 1500 B. C. to A. D. 1860 more than 8,000 treaties of peace, meant to remain in force forever, were concluded. The average time they remained in force is 2 years."

It is an inherent right in every nation, based on self-preservation, that it shall retain the right to protect its sovereignty, its life, and its vital interests by every means at its disposal. I am sure that no reputable student of international law will dispute the soundness of this doctrine.

This proposed resolution, when examined by the people of more than 60 other members of the family of nations will be construed in the light of their respective hopes and desires. To all too many of them it will be a share the wealth of the United States program, by which each foreign nation will expect its portion under this resolution and other promises already made without the knowledge or consent of our people.

The best and surest way to assist the world is to stabilize the United States. The world cannot become stabilized until the United States becomes stabilized. A share the wealth of the United States program with the world is not a stabilizing plan but, instead, it is an international W. P. A. deficit-financing program, to be borne, not by foreign taxpayers, but by the taxpayers of the United States.

I am not willing to support a resolution which gives notice to the world that we have replaced our Declaration of Independence with a declaration of dependence.

On the monument over William Bradford's grave in Burial Hill, Plymouth, Mass., are carved these admonitory words:

> Do not basely relinquish what the fathers with difficulty attained.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter addressed to me by the Worcester County War Price and Ration Boards Association together with

a resolution recommending a 14-point program of operation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on September 14 I received permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include certain declarations adopted by the Republican Post War Advisory Council. I find that this comprises more than two pages and have an estimate from the printer that the cost will be $112.50. Notwithstanding this I desire to make the extension.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

(Mr. SAUTHOFF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by the president of the New Orleans Association of Commerce. I have an estimate from the Public Printer that it will cost $120. I ask unanimous consent to extend this matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit as indicated.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by Judge J. F. T. O'Connor made in Los Angeles, Calif., on September 1.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

RESULT OF ELECTION IN SECOND DISTRICT KANSAS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, those who are following political trends will be interested in the election which took place in the Second District of Kansas this week. At that election the Republican candidate to succeed our late colleague, U. S. Guyer, received 69 percent of the total vote. Last November Mr. Guyer with the same opponent and with the same issues involved received 59 percent of the total vote.

I have no comment to make except to say I believe that this great increase in the Republican vote accurately reflects the trend of political sentiment in Kansas and surrounding States at this time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have three unanimous consent requests. First, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by Mr. Chase, president of the New England Council, recently, and, second, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address I made at Williamstown, Vt., and, third, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENTAL FIGURES ON FOOD INACCURATE

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the figures put out by the various Government authorities dealing with food are notoriously inaccurate. The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee has been trying to reconcile the figures on the roll-back of prices recently given out by Mr. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration.

It is impossible to apply any accepted statistical principles to his announcement that an over-all reduction of 2.3 percent in the cost of living would result to the consuming public through rolling back the prices of the seven commodities he mentioned. If the entire estimated 1943 production of these seven commodities, that is, apples, oranges, onions, potatoes, lard, vegetable oils, and peanut butter were subsidized as he proposes, the aggregate cost of the subsidy would be approximately $525,000,000, and not $100,000,000 as Mr. Bowles stated.

Everyone knows that 1943 living costs are higher than 1942, yet in 1942 the over-all cost of living has been reported as $69,000,000,000 in this country. Even if we spent $525,000,000 to accomplish the roll-back which he talks about it would still be far from a 2.3 percent reduction in the cost of living. It would require $1,600,000,000 to be paid in subsidies to do what he says can be done with $100,000,000.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our colleague from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG], I ask unanimous consent that he may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech made by Mr. E. O. Taulbee, of Bay City, Tex.; also that I may have permission to put in the RECORD my own remarks and to include a statement on the betrayal of Palestine; second, to include a statement appearing in the Free World, which the Public Printer estimates will cost $45; and third, to include a statement appearing in the New York Times, which I am advised will cost $67.50; and fourth, to include a brief poem by the Librarian of Congress, Archibald MacLeish.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain facts developed at the conferring of a Navy E in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I obtained permission to insert in the RECORD a speech delivered by Ambassador Joseph Clark Grew at Bristol, Va., on September 6. At that time I did not realize that the speech would take more than two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am advised by the Public Printer that the speech will occupy approximately three pages and the cost will be $135. I ask unanimous consent that this speech may be printed notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement by the bankers of Indianapolis, Ind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House today for 30 minutes at the conclusion of all other business and after any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the reconvening of Congress I received permission from the House to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert therein an address delivered by our Civil Aeronautics Administrator. I have received word from the Public Printer that the speech runs in excess of the two pages allowed and that the cost will be $112.50. I would not repeat my request ordinarily, but I believe the excellence of the things contained in the speech should be available to all Members, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have this speech printed notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brochure sent to me by a constituent,

and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Akron Beacon Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE]?

There was no objection.

THE PROBLEM OF RAISING AND DISTRIBUTING MORE FOOD

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I differ with what the President had to say in his message this morning, and correct one word. He states:

> There were the problems of raising and distributing more food than ever before in our history.

I would correct the word "were" to make the sentence read, "There is the problem of raising and distributing more food than ever before in our history."

I have come directly from my district. I want to know why the agencies of government have not made it possible to release to the dairymen and the poultrymen of my section of up-State New York enough corn to feed their dairy herds and poultry flocks.

I intend to ask the Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a member, for an investigation to find out why the O. P. A. has refused to raise the ceiling price on corn above $1.07 a bushel for the midwestern farmers so that they can release this corn to eastern dairymen and poultrymen in my district in order that they may participate in the food for victory program, which the President expects them to do.

Unless my farmers can obtain feed corn, the country will face a real shortage of milk and eggs by October. This House must intervene and save our Nation from such a disaster.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New York Journal-American, and also the report of the committee on domestic problems of the Republican Post-War Advisory Council at Mackinac Island, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

IMPORTATION FROM CANADA FREE OF DUTY OF CERTAIN GRAINS AND OTHER PRODUCTS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to follow the President's suggestion and see the doughnut instead of the hole. I call the attention of the majority leadership and also the minority leadership to the fact that I am today introducing a House joint resolution to permit the importation from Canada free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock feed. It reads as follows:

> That notwithstanding the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, the following, when imported into the United States from Canada during the period of 90 days beginning with the date of enactment of this joint resolution, to be used as, or as a constituent part of, feed for livestock, shall be exempt from duty: Wheat, oats, barley, rye, flax, or hay, or products of any of the foregoing. As used in this joint resolution the term "United States" means the several States and the District of Columbia.

The War Food Administration is very apprehensive of the future milk supply of our country. Marvin Jones yesterday at a meeting said that the price of milk to the consumer must advance to encourage or maintain milk production at the present level or else feeds must be made available in greater amounts.

We are in war. We cannot allow tariff walls to impede the war food program. Governmental agencies have urged more and more livestock production. Our obligation is to furnish this livestock feed from all available sources.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter written by a member of the armed forces.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Hartford Courant.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech I recently made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

(Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. COCHRAN asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in one to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article written by Mr. Clergue C. Schilling, of Saulte Ste. Marie.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

INDUCTION OF FATHERS INTO THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation today is agitated over the question of the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. A situation obtains of which I think every one of us should take note. The military say they need these men, and they care not from where they come. Down in my section of the country I have talked to a number of members of draft boards and I have talked to a number of the people throughout that section. They tell me that in the Government services down there there are any number of single men or young married men who do not have children who are being deferred by their draft boards on the request of their employers. They tell me also that there are any number of single Negroes down there who are not at this time available for military service because the draft boards will not take them. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that section 4, paragraph A, of the Selective Service Act states that there shall be no discrimination as to race or color, and that every man shall be given the same opportunity to serve his country.

Yet, when the Selective Service sends quota directives down to the local draft boards they stipulate so many white men and so many Negroes. One board in my district told me that their September quota called for 82 white men and 31 Negroes. That same draft board said that to fill this quota they would have to take 9 pre-Pearl Harbor white fathers, yet they had a pool of 281 single and childless Negroes, all processed and ready to go. Is that no discrimination against those white fathers? Certainly it is. If the law means what it says, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that the Selective Service has no right to say send me so many men of this color and so many of that. Their only right is to request so many men in each quota. Did not the military authorities say that they did not care where the men came from but that they needed so many? Then why do not they act like they talk? I demand, Mr. Speaker, that the Selective Service follow the letter of the law.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial appearing in the Memphis (Tenn.) Press-Scimitar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement and resolution on the Edwards Perpetual Calendar, regarding which I presented a resolution to the House today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of war veterans' legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

NEW TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have just read reports through press that members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House criticize the administration leaders for a long delay in submitting a tax program for this year. Very likely this is a just criticism, but if this Congress is to wait for the administration to make up its mind we will be again confronted with some more last-minute legislation.

I see no reason why this House should not do a little legislating on its own and not wait for plans and blueprints to be handed us by the executive department of the Government on the tax question. Furthermore, we do not want any retroactive tax legislation for this year. I realize we are spending more than twice of the amount raised in taxes, but even at that I think the ordinary average taxpayer has just about as much of a tax load as he can carry right now. The individual in the lower and middle brackets is already taxed to the limit on his income.

The committee could do a lot of good among other things if it would submit legislation that would simplify these tax reports that are giving people a lot of headaches throughout the country right now. Personally, I just don't see the necessity for all these complicated reports. Mr. Speaker, I trust that, whatever legislation is submitted in the way of providing for additional revenue, it will not wait until the last minute as has been the case so many times in the past.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including an address by the Commissioner of Agriculture, Tom Linder, of Georgia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the recommendations of the Michigan Food Conference of Farmers, Processors, and Distributors, held August 9, 1943, at Lansing, Mich.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Sun entitled "Italian Finance."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE RUML PLAN

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, now that that awesome date of horrifying memories is behind us, that 15th day of September when 50,000,000 Americans were put on the tax rack, everyone, I am quite sure, will agree that the so-called modified Ruml tax plan is the very worst tax measure ever to be written upon the statute books. To the American people, the very thought of it is a nightmare.

If old Beelzebub himself were intent on producing a tax measure to drive a rugged people to the point of distraction, he could not have done a better job than in producing this "very simple" Ruml plan with its tantalizing system of estimates and reestimates, calculations and recalculations, adjustments and readjustments, all these with penalties and penalties, piled on penalties.

It is not surprising that the then proponents of this thoroughly unworkable revenue monstrosity, realizing, as all of them now do, the failure of their program, should be screaming to the heavens for simplification. When a law has been demonstrated as fundamentally unsound, why half-measures? Is not outright repeal the answer?

"Pay as you go before you know what you owe" simply cannot be made to work. The sooner we make up our minds to abandon this fallacious formula and return to the time-honored principle of "pay as you go when you know what you owe" the better it will be for our country. So let us wipe Ruml and all of his works from our statute books as soon as the good Lord will let us.

There is an old saying that "50,000 Frenchmen can't be wrong," but, true or false, Banker Ruml, single-handedly and alone, has certainly thrown 50,000,000 American taxpayers for a loop.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative program today and all other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of the legislative business of today and any other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of my remarks the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution recently adopted by the Executive Committee, Department of Massachusetts, American Legion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper story of Senator CAPPER'S farm conference at Topeka.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DIRECTIVE GOVERNMENT

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I could not let this occasion go by without saying that while this is a certain birthday, it is also Constitution Day. Yet, contrary to all of the years before, we have not heard one word about it. Is this the result of the growing directive

government that we have, so that we have no chief executive anywhere, or even a newspaper, that has once referred to this 17th day of September as Constitution Day, a day we used to have programs in every village of the country? I listened to the splendid address of the President on the war effort, and it was a good message, but there are two other fronts in Washington going on all the time besides the war effort. One is the effort trying to change the form of government, and the other is the activity in favor of the fourth term. I am wondering if the setting aside of Constitution Day, in celebration, is not in line with the development of this directive government that is building up today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

THE DRAFTING OF FATHERS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, after listening to the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. McKENZIE] about the drafting of Government employees, I determined to join him and suggest that before we draft any pre-Pearl Harbor fathers with children, that we draft several hundred thousand Federal Government employees that are now hiding away in Government dugouts and fox holes all over this country and particularly in the city of Washington, and put them in the armed forces of the United States.

Before calling upon the pre-Pearl Harbor fathers back in our own districts, and families that have already given two or three sons, why not draft Government employees, power-hungry bureaucrats, and O. P. A. gestapo agents, if they will not volunteer themselves. I have in mind one under secretary, 32 years of age, being paid $10,000 a year, with a wife receiving $7,000 from the Government pay roll, and they have no children. Such men should be the first to set an example and not receive or accept a deferment. I think before we draft the pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, with children, we should dig out several hundred thousand Federal employees in Government dugouts and put them in our armed forces. None of them is indispensable. Women and veterans of the World War could replace everyone of them. Already 90,000 deferments have been granted and that is 90,000 too many.

Let us in Congress put an end to these Government deferments and special privileges and favoritism and treat all American citizens on the same basis whether holding safe Federal appointments on the Government pay roll or in private life.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and embody a letter that I have received from one of the fighting soldiers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

POLITICAL SNIPING

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have followed closely today the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and other Republicans, as I also did last Tuesday the statements of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON], and read with amazement the extension of remarks of many other Republicans in Tuesday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it is extremely difficult for me to understand how they justify their unwarranted attacks, criticisms, and snipings against the administration.

A few days ago the outstanding Republicans—well, I will not say outstanding Republicans, but some Republicans—including the gentlemen whom I have mentioned, and many other Republican Members of Congress, attending the Mackinac Island conference, spoke for the Republican Party and endorsed the administration's foreign policy and agreed to its domestic policy. In view of that action, it would appear to me that those Members who took the floor today and Tuesday, instead of encouraging should discourage unfair criticism of the departments. After reading the reports of the Mackinac Island conference, I felt that there would be closer cooperation, unity, and accord, and a joining in harmonious action in order to encourage our fighting forces to still greater efforts to insure an early, speedy, and decisive victory.

Of course, some of the outstanding Republicans maintained that it was not a real Republican gathering because ex-President Hoover and two former Republican Presidential candidates—Mr. Landon and Mr. Willkie—were not only not present, but were not even invited. Nevertheless, I am inclined to think that there has been a Republican savor to the conference. A friend of mine stated that the conference was held at Mackinac Island, Mich.—where people go to be cured of hay fever—and it was hoped that others might be cured of other fevers. Another friend of mine stated that it is a good fishing resort and that the conference was held to agree on the best possible fishing bait for 1944—a bait with which the Republicans might be able to catch the largest number of suckers. Personally, of course, I am not in position to state the underlying reason why they selected Mackinac Island, nor will I charge that it was a Republican conference. Nevertheless, only Republicans were invited, including Members of the Senate and House, such as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], and even another gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]; yes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]; and even some Republican Governors—I am told that there were 20 of them in attendance. After 2 days of planning and conferring to everyone's surprise they endorsed President Roosevelt's foreign policy. Therefore, I believe it is manifestly unfair when, only a few days thereafter, these gentlemen should again pursue their fault-finding policy, and to go far afield in attacking the Fulbright resolution with respect to participation by the United States in prevention of future aggression and the maintenance of peace.

Their action must appear to the people to be contradictory to the matured deliberations in the Grand Mackinac Island Hotel. I fully appreciate that there will be some Republicans who will not quite agree with my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I wish to say that it is rather strange to me that all Members who opposed and voted against our preparedness or defense programs, instead of admitting the errors of their ways, should continue to find fault with our war efforts. Rather than work for complete unity and harmony they seek to bring about discord. I am making these few observations in the hope that we will work in harmony, cooperate, and show to the members of our armed forces we are ready and willing to give every aid in every way possible. We have our brutal enemies on the run. Let us work and pull together until they are completely defeated and destroyed in order that we may prove to our future generations how all of us did our part and share in gaining a great victory for humanity and the preservation of our democratic form of government and its Constitution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

POLITICAL SNIPING

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to my colleague from Chicago, the soldier and farmer from Chicago, that in talking about this sniping——

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under the rules, when a Member addresses the House and calls attention to another Member, it is required that he state "the gentleman from" the State from which he hails, and which he in part represents. The gentleman from Michigan does me the honor invariably to state "the gentleman from Chicago." I am proud of the fact that I am a citizen of

Chicago, but under the rules I think it is required that he should omit the city which I have the honor to represent, and should give credit to the State of which we are Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan will proceed in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it the ruling of the Chair that I shall not refer to him as "the gentleman from Chicago"?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The rules require that a Member in referring to another Member use the name of the State from which he comes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There are several gentlemen from Illinois. I would not want anyone to misunderstand—not to know to whom I am referring. So if the gentleman will tell me from what district he comes, I will refer to him as "the gentleman from such and such a district of Illinois." I did—I do—not wish to refer to the Member by name.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan may proceed in order.

Mr. SABATH. I will enlighten the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would like order, Mr. Speaker. I do not now wish to be interrupted.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman desires information.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I decline to yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan declines to yield. The gentleman from Michigan will proceed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, humbly do I apologize, not only to the House, but to the gentleman from the —— district of the State of Illinois for having referred to his place of residence, of which he seems to be somewhat ashamed. I only want to call attention to the fact that the so-called sniping to which he referred was applauded by the soldiers in the gallery before they were called to order by the Speaker of the House, and if the farmer and soldier from the State of Illinois, from that unknown district, would forget his political sniping we would get along with the war effort.

The men in the armed service do not look with approval at—their sense of the fitness of things is outraged by—the fact that this administration is sheltering thousands—yes, perhaps hundreds of thousands—of young men in Government jobs who might well be called to the service of their country, were it not for the attitude of the President, who by order deferred Abe Fortas, thirty-odd years of age, with a $10,000 annual salary and a wife on the Federal pay roll drawing $5,600, but with neither chick nor child.

The draft authorities seem to be interested not at all in calling to the colors young men—not fathers—who are, however, politically helpful to the administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THE DRAFTING OF PRE-PEARL HARBOR FATHERS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, relative to this drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, I quite agree with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] it is about time that the Congress gave some consideration to these parasitic bureaucrats who are firmly entrenched in cushy-seated swivel-chair jobs at salaries ranging from $3,500 to $10,000 a year.

The average American boy in our communities throughout the various districts of the country are inducted into service at $50 a month, to have their insides splashed out on the sands of north Africa or Sicily, or die like rats in submarines, or blasted to their eternity in the air; they do their jobs in a fine, patriotic, American manner. The various boards throughout the country are doing a splendid job in handling selective service, regardless of whether a man is high or low, rich or poor, whether they are Catholic, Jew, or Protestant, whether they are Republican or Democrat, they get a square deal. They are taking their places in fine American manner; they ask for no deferments; they know there is a job to do, and they are doing it. Down here in Washington, however, there are thousands of these bureaucratic termites who are given deferment and security when they should step up like honest Americans, thankful for being American, and take their places and serve in the United States armed forces.

I think the Congress should give this matter immediate consideration at this time, and if necessary compel these deferred bureaucrats to take their places in the Army and Navy as other American boys.

The public is shocked that this condition would be permitted to exist in the District of Columbia. Those boys who are considered bright young men are granted deferment.

Brigadier General Hershey should submit to the Congress a report of the situation existing in the District of Columbia, and the local boards here in Washington should have the authority to see that justice is done.

The time may come when we may find it necessary to draft pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, but until every available eligible single man is in the service no action should be taken on pre-Pearl Harbor fathers.

The cry here in Washington is that these bureaucrats are necessary to the war effort. I am satisfied that we can get along with the war effort in a more satisfactory manner if they were put in the service, where they rightfully belong, like other American boys. A great many here in Washington who have been granted deferment are responsible for the social reforms that are causing confusion, conflict, and chaos in this fight on the home front, and the quicker we rid the Government of this element the greater will be our productivity.

If military exigencies demand the fathers, well and good; but first purge the list of selective service here in the District of Columbia on what is termed "necessary men to the war effort." This purge is needed, and needed badly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on the first day following the disposition of the Fulbright resolution and following the disposition of all business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FISH. I would like to ascertain from the Speaker if there is any way to obtain permission, by unanimous consent, to address the House for 1 minute, having already done so?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are special orders pending.

Mr. FISH. I know, Mr. Speaker, and my inquiry is whether having spoken once I might make a unanimous consent request to speak for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The practice of the House is to recognize the same Member not more than 1 minute.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I make the request by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York desires to break the long practice of the House?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to respect the rules of the House and make the request by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will put the request of the gentleman from New York. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I suggest to the gentleman from New York that what he is asking would break a custom that we have had for years, a custom that has gone along very satisfactorily. As a matter of fact, I think it should be the concern of the gentleman on that side as much or more than mine to see that the practice is respected.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the gentleman from Massachusetts can arrange for the House to hear me long enough to clear up one point. I only want to answer the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Rules Committee, criticizing the Mackinac conference report

on American foreign policies. If the gentleman is going to insert that kind of statements in the RECORD he should be answered and that is all I wanted permission to address the House for 1 minute; I really do not need to take as much time as a minute, a half a minute would do to answer such a silly criticism. If the gentleman from Massachusetts will allow it I can make the explanation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I am not arguing, I am trying to preserve something that has proven a benefit to all of us and the gentleman from New York himself ought to want to preserve it in the interest of order.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I may not insist on the request. I just want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that if the chairman of the Rules Committee would grant a rule permitting the House to substitute the Mackinac conference report on Foreign policies for the Fulbright resolution, I would go along as it is a much stronger and constructive proposal and far more comprehensive and understandable.

Mr. McCORMACK. This colloquy, Mr. Speaker, has permitted the gentleman from New York to accomplish what he sought and preserve a practice.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CASE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD at this point:

WE MUST TRY TO SUCCEED

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the plan to bring the Fulbright resolution on for a vote Monday, for myself I want to express a belief that is a good thing to do. Our war effort, at home and abroad, needs an expression from the Congress on the subject of post-war goals. The inadequacy of unconditional surrender as a formula when an enemy nation collapses is shown in Italy. Had there been ready, when Mussolini stepped down, a positive program, the forces of the United Nations might have stepped in and established their positions instead of giving that time and opportunity to Hitler. It would have saved lives lost at Salerno.

And again, speaking for myself, as I said on this floor on July 5, prior to the recess, the time has come in the history of the world when the responsible nations must join together to maintain law and order. When victory on the battle fronts comes, as it is coming, we must not lose the opportunity and the responsibility to maintain order and to establish the foundations of law.

We should not and need not take steps that are involved and complicated. We need not surrender our sovereignty and we need not ask other nations to surrender their sovereignty. Neither we nor they need to give to any group the right to pass resolutions or treaties binding upon us or them until each has passed upon them in its own way of ratification. We need, however, to provide the machinery for establishing order and for providing law.

We may not succeed in preventing all wars. This generation, however, which has seen two world wars, has the obligation to try to establish a condition which will mean more of peace and less of war. History will not condemn us utterly if we fail; but humanity can never forgive us if we fail to try.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Unanimous Consent Calendar on Monday be dispensed with and that it be in order to call the calendar on Tuesday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I notice the chairman of the District of Columbia Committee is present. He spoke to me just a moment ago stating that he had some noncontroversial bills that had passed the Senate, which were coming up on Monday. I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider those bills on Tuesday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Would the gentleman from West Virginia, the chairman of the District Committee, who is present, advise the House what the bills are, so that the Members will have advance notice?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I will place a statement to that effect in the RECORD.

Mr. McCORMACK. So that it will appear in the RECORD during this colloquy?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; I shall be pleased to do that.

Mr. McCORMACK. So that the Members will be apprised of the bills.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The measures, all having passed the Senate unanimously, are:

S. 789. An act to provide for the mailing of annual notices to owners of tax-exempt properties in the District of Columbia;

S. 881. An act to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938;

S. 1223. An act to fix the compensation of the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia and the Superintendent of the National Training School for Girls; and

S. 1224. An act to designate the Public Library of the District of Columbia a public depository for governmental publications.

PRESIDENT CHIANG KAI-SHEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States were saddened when the late Dr. Lin Sen, President of China, a profound scholar and gentleman, a fine philosopher, with high ideals, dignified conduct, and courage, died. The late President of China aroused our admiration and respect.

The action of the plenary meeting of the Central Executive Committee of the Kuomintang in electing Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek as his successor is to be congratulated.

Under the leadership of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek the brave people of China have been fighting a vicious, destructive foe for over 6 years.

The name of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek is identified with the spirit of China of today. He truly represents the spirit of China of today in its pain, and of the greatness of China in the courage and determination of its people to preserve their independence. He will represent the strength of Chinese character and stability under post-war conditions.

His leadership of his people has been superb in war. It will be outstanding in peace.

Gen. Chiang Kai-shek, as a military leader, as a statesman leading and guiding his people under most trying circumstances, will go down in history as one of the outstanding men of the world's history.

He will truly and properly take his place in the history of China as one of its greatest sons.

To the people of China I know I express the sentiment of my colleagues in the House, without regard to party, in extending our congratulations on the selection of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, military leader, philosopher, statesman, as their President. No better choice could have been made.

To Gen. Chiang Kai-shek we extend the best wishes of a friendly people, a friendly nation, and a friendly ally, and our assurances of cooperation in every way possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

PRICE OF MILK

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been convinced that something should be done to give the producers of milk in the United States an increased price for their products. I am more convinced of that as a result of conferences and conversations I have had with milk producers in the State of Connecticut during the past 2 months' recess. I doubt if any agency of this Government will now contend that the milk farmer is receiving the cost of production plus a fair return for his labor and his investment. Several people with whom I talked during the recess were inclined to blame Congress because something had not been done to aid the milk farmer. It is my contention that the blame should not be placed on Congress, that Congress dealt with that situation adequately when it passed the Price Control Act and its amendments of October 1942. The act very clearly provides that when due to increased cost of labor or other reasons the producer of a farm product is not receiving a fair return for his product adjustments, not "may be made" but "shall be made." It may take some additional time to work out a solution of the problem nationally, but with the powers given to the Administrator of O. P. A. in the Price Control Act itself and funds that this Congress has made available for that purpose, there is no reason why relief should not

be given the milk producer, particularly in the very acute spots that are known to exist.

Some people feel it would be dangerous to permit an increase in the retail price of milk. I fail to see how anyone can object to the milk producers of this Nation at least receiving the benefits of the so-called Little Steel formula. If the milk farmers of my district were permitted an increase in their wages which would come to them through an increase in the price of their milk of 15 percent, you would not hear much complaining from the milk farmers of that area as to price; in other words, give the farmer the benefit of the Little Steel formula, at least bring them up to that level. With that thought in mind I am dropping into the hopper today a resolution that simply directs the Administrator of the Price Control Act to comply with and make effective the provisions of Federal Law No. 729 of the Seventy-seventh Congress—the Price Control Act—calling particular attention to the second proviso of section 3, which I now quote:

Provided further, That modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes, or where by reason of increased labor or other costs to the producers of such agricultural commodity incurred since January 1, 1941, the maximum prices so established will not reflect such increased costs.

Whether or not Congress can compete with the directives of the Executive branch of the Government remains to be seen, but I do believe that we must issue certain directives to some people in the bureaus of our Government directing them to carry out the clearly, plainly stated intentions and orders of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, during the Congressional recess just concluded, I made it my very earnest business to conduct comprehensive inquiries among my people of Louisiana, in an effort to determine their views concerning the problems which they consider affect them most at this time. To be frank with my colleagues here in the House, I find everywhere interest and concern to be concentrated, for the most part, in the problems that definitely relate to home matters. In other words, our people here in America, essentially are interested in things American. They still dedicate themselves to those tasks they deem necessary to the protection and perpetuation of the fundamentals of American life. They are proud in the fact that they are, first of all, Americans. They want, first of all, to provide for their own common defense against all outside influences that have as their primary consideration, the welfare of peoples, strange both to our political ideals and to our economic standards of life. Our citizens, ladies and gentlemen, still insist upon their right to the freedom of promoting, first of all, their own general welfare. They see and they recognize some of the squabbles of the Far East, the Middle East, the Near East, as well as in all other directions of the compass, but I am convinced that leadership in this country will prove to be short sighted if it concludes that Americans forever will allow themselves to be distracted from those selfish principles, so justifiably advocated by a self-respecting and independent people in the very charters of their own existence. Our people, ladies and gentlemen, today, still are interested in establishing justice, in their own land, if you please, and intend, whether someone else likes it or not, to provide for the establishment of tranquillity, at least among themselves. Given by God Almightly a bounteous economy that should form the basis of continued prosperity and happiness for our own great land, our people zealously intend to protect such treasure by defending it, first and foremost, by exploiting our God-given blessings in the name of our own general welfare, by insisting upon justice for all in our great country, and by so regulating our own political, social, and economic affairs as to make for peace and tranquility at home in America.

In recognizing the essential character of American thought today, we representatives of the American public are, in my opinion, duty bound to give careful analysis and profound consideration to the grave issues confronting our country, to the end that our acts here can be made to conform to the wishes of the people, and not to the dictates of any political dictator or the exaggerated ego of any inflated bureaucrat. It is our solemn duty, furthermore, to examine these vital issues with the thought in mind that we are charged with responsibilities not only of protecting the priniciples to which our people always have subscribed, but also, to provide a leadership for America so that, along the lines of her traditionally adhered-to policies, this free country can go forward without the impostion upon her of any alien force, either of intrigue, cajolery, economic threats, or the power of arms.

We are now engaged in a great war of world-wide proportions—one which every good American willingly supports and one which we must win. Underlying our determined purpose in this high resolve, I have found that there runs a fear on the part of many of our citizens that whilst fighting abroad for the great principles we hold so dear, we may lose them at home; that whilst prating the virtues of a democracy we once so firmly established, we may be losing it, in fact, by subjecting our country to the imposition of financial and economic burdens too terrible even for our system to endure; and, what is more, whilst following our flag through the far-away jungles and over the highways and seas of the world, we may be lowering our guard, so to speak, to allow an infiltration into our national life of foreign ideologies, alien "isms," fascist or communistic tendencies that surely may contaminate our own democratic atmosphere, regiment our people—both in body and in mind—and bring to us dangerous warning of the possible transition of our American system into something new and strange to us—fashioned by the minds of foreigners and advocated, within our midst, by people newly come to our shores.

Some persons today omit consideration of present problems and jump to the post-war world.

Our esteemed Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, now calls upon us to join some other nations of the world after the war shall have ended, so that we can crack down on criminals who would, in future time, start wars in other sections of the globe—to keep the peace, as we want it, everywhere. Without going into the question of principle as to just what the right and the wrong of future issues may be as they arise—depending, of course, upon the perspective from which they may be viewed—I believe the people of America, in future years and before sacrificing more and more of their blood and their treasure, finally will insist upon knowing that the causes for which they are to do battle be causes characterized as real American issues. Most of our people believe that the world will ever see wars, more wars, and rumors of wars. Most of our people want to avoid a national policy that will keep America perpetually in wars revolving essentially around foreign issues. Most of our peoples do not care a rap about how hotheaded a Heinie becomes over his pet "isms," so long as it does not infringe upon our own political doctrine or our own well-being. Most of our people do not care at all whether the Italian nation goes fascistic or to a spaghetti dinner, so long as such doings do not deny us the freedom for which we have fought. Most of our people, also, are not inclined to die fighting or to give our last crust of bread in order to preserve present-day world-wide empires—whether monarchic or communistic; whether present friend or present foe—unless such sacrifice be absolutely justified in the name of vital American issues.

This business of setting upon the international gangsters is one thing, but, fellow members, I have found that we have imported into this great country of ours, some foreigners who have become scoundrels in our own land. Their sons, in many instances, have followed in their father's footsteps—to produce for us, second generations of American citizens, some of whom seem still more interested in European boundary questions, foreign racial problems, alien isms, and world power politics, than they are in some of our American home problems. In fact these people, some of whom sit either in high seats of political machines to control voting in this country or even in seats of high governmental authority, constitute very definite dangers to numerous of our home communities.

I say that the international gangsters are rightly condemned by Mr. Hull, but, what about the gangsters in our own

home? What about them—of alien persuasion and influence—many sitting high in political power in our local communities—too many of whom, alas, already have infiltrated directly into the fabric of our own national governmental structure. These people seem surcharged, first with international leaning, bent upon diluting or destroying the American economy, and on effecting change in our political system in favor of foreign issues and peoples not only strange to us and to the ideals for which we have lived but also, in fact, jealous of our successful experiment in democracy; eager, I believe, to sap our strength in the so-called post-war world to the end that they may have easy life through living off the substance of the sweat, the toil, and industrious enterprise of our people.

While talking about the international squabbles of the world and while discussing the needed chastisement of all the international gangsters Mr. Hull's future world may produce, let us Americans, as we spill the blood of our boys and distribute the treasure of our land to all the good neighbors who want it for their own, let us never be distracted to a point where we forget that the best ism for us is that found only in Americanism—Americanism that was born in such great pronouncements as the Declaration of Independence, Washington's Farewell Address and the Monroe Doctrine. In these State documents are to be found the real Americanism that will save us today. The principles and policies set forth in these great declarations are those which should guide us today in solving the problems of America, now being ignored in favor of world issues.

With victory after victory recorded to our credit, and looking forward to end this war of blood and hate, we should now record our views and aims in the new war of economics to come. The new era will create new isms and some of these isms may be aimed at the very economic structure and foundation of this Nation.

When our boys return home they will take stock of our stewardship during their absence. Our actions and votes will all be subject to their scrutiny. Idealism, the lack of foresight and vigilance on our part will not be an answer to their just and promised demands "We want our jobs back—a chance to make a living." Already we have underwritten the world ills and furnished the men, money and materials. All this and more has been poured into this war of blood, and the end is not yet in sight.

The world leaders, guided by military and political strategy, may be the masters and in charge of the peace strategy and aims in the war of economics. Can we continue to subscribe blindly to some of these aims now in the making? Will the same power be surrendered by us in the war of economy as in the war of blood? Will the old cry be raised, "This is an emergency and it is unpatriotic to question our leaders?" We know the power of international salesmanship, capitalizing the maudlin sentimentality of some of our people in the impractical dream of one world—meaning the abolishing of all economic barriers. Since time immemorial it has been blood, faith, tradition, and greed and will be ever so. It has been the textbook of every power. It is the textbook of today and tomorrow. We have boastfully and rightfully stated to the world we are the richest nation on earth. We have hung our sign up and we have opened the doors. In this economic war to come, will we defend our economic shores—as well as we defend them in this war of blood? Nations never stand still—they go up, or they go under—that was proven in the last war and will be proven in this war. We have a sacred duty before us: This Nation was entrusted to us to defend and pass on to the future generations intact. The clear straight road for our country is clearly defined in two great documents—the Declaration of Independence, and the Monroe Doctrine. There should be a rereading of both. And, if we follow that course America will remain great. An interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine, clearly and ably analyzed in a recent book, My Country 'Tis of Thee, should open the eyes of every American to the economic dangers facing us.

I quote as follows:

One of the greatest principles ever enunciated by American statemanship is that which is known, the world over, as the Monroe Doctrine. Supported wholeheartedly by the American people since the day on which its announcement placed their Nation on record as forbdding any further acquisitions by European nations of territory in the Western Hemisphere, the Monroe Doctrine—so called from its author President James Monroe—was definitely a defensive measure. It threw security around the nations of both North and South America by placing the force and power of the United States as a guaranty against imperialistic design on the part of any ambitious foreign government. For, as President Monroe proclaimed, the United States, in future, would regard any attempt by any European power to extend its system to additional territory in the Western Hemisphere as an "unfriendly act," directed against the peace and security of America.

The doctrine was enunciated at a time when empires were in the process of building, through their espousal of imperialistic policy. It came forth as nations aspired to greatness through the ruthless domination of foreign peoples and through the so-called right that lay in the conquest, by force of arms, of other peoples' territory and the great riches of the world. Historically, it was the first great call from a decent section of humanity, in idealistic protest against the crass policy of imperialism other nations shamelessly had adopted as a natural means toward their own aggrandizement.

The purpose and spirit of the doctrine were idealistic, genuine, and sincere. The doctrine, moreover, was practical in the extreme. As America realized and abhorred the moral injustice of the expansion of imperialism throughout the world, so she knew that such an encroachment in the theater of her own hemisphere must, of necessity, eventually threaten her own national sovereignty and the welfare of her own free people. Her challenge to the further introduction and spread of imperialism, therefore, held both high ideals and good, practical sense as well.

With such support, the world has learned that America means business when it comes to a matter of defending the Monroe Doctrine. Its assertion originally was an act of real statesmanship, and the policy to which the United States has dedicated itself in effectuating its purpose has been a wise and successful one.

But prior to the time of the adoption of the Monroe Doctrine the world, so to speak, was considered to be a "free for all" for adventure, an open sesame for the certain and willing admittance to the greatest of its treasures, for all those of courage and of piratical disposition who girded themselves with the arms and armadas necessary to assert dominance over and to subjugate the weak. From the booty gained from such state of affairs had come the growth of empire and the installation of supreme dignity in the government of modern man. From such also had evolved the "greatness" and the so-called majesty of rich emperors and monarchs whose edicts and pronunciamentos then directed the destinies of the vast majorities of the world's people. From such also had grown the rule of aristocracy, the so-called best of humanity—that upper section of human society that gained, in most parasitical manner, its livelihood and support from the menials over whom it ruled.

Taxation of its subjects by such government, with the accompanying premise that their representation in the government which their taxes supported was "taboo," became such an accepted principle that all dignity and majesty were upset at the mere thought that mere man should even think of expressing a desire, much less a determination, for an actual participation in the government which his labors maintained and which his blood defended on the field of the battles that his overlord planned.

It was but natural that democracy, born of common effort in America and supported by an individualism that naturally had not allowed itself to be subjugated to such rule, would rebel at the expansion of imperialistic policy in the Americas. The Monroe Doctrine was but the emphasizing of the irreconcilable differences between the genuine individualist and the real imperialist. It accentuated, also, the differences in the ideals to which each subscribed in the furtherance of policy in their respective governments. It strongly implied that clash of arms would be inevitable were the two ideals to come into conflict. And it warned the world to avoid such conflict in the Western Hemisphere.

The Monroe Doctrine put an end to the idea that, by swashbuckling display and brute force, world-wide empires could subjugate the individualism of the Americas. In effect, the doctrine announced that the robbery of peoples and the piratical expeditions of European governments, so far as we of our particular hemisphere are concerned, would cease. We rather preferred to go about in our own freely chosen way, to build the best we could build in the way of government of our people and to develop, as freemen, the bounteous economy with which our particular section of the world naturally had been blessed.

And, free from European intrigue and influence, we have developed our Government, as we, also, have maintained freedom in our democracy. We have, too, developed and exploited, to a full extent, our wondrously bounteous economy in America. Hand in hand with the progress in our development, both in government and in our economies, we have enjoyed a freedom for individuals in this country to the likes of which no person of any other part of the world can lay claim. This we have done because of the protection afforded us by the Monroe Doctrine. It has kept us free from the depredations foreign imperialists have imposed upon weaker peoples elsewhere. It has isolated and protected us from the baneful effects of imperialistic policy.

But just as we today can appreciate fully the beneficial results that have flowed from our Monroe Doctrine, so, also, must we conclude that wisdom in national policy dictates the restriction of government to the bounds of the peculiar economy that supports it. This is true, of course, in principle. The Monroe Doctrine has, in its way, demonstrated the efficacy of such principle.

This principle, however, applies not alone to the manner in which it has been insisted upon by our Nation—it works in two directions. Logical reasoning suggests that the adoption of the principle of the Monroe Doctrine would be a natural and proper policy, e. g., for the nations of Europe. For the economy of Europe well could be protected, too, by the adoption of such principle. And such is to say, that imperialistic policy should be opposed by such principle anywhere or at any time, otherwise the economy of nations can be intruded upon in unnatural fashion by foreign imperialistic policy, to the detriment of the nations that suffer such imposition.

For the American people, then, to sense excuse for their seizure, in the Eastern Hemisphere, of islands adjacent to the European Continent, would be to flaunt arrogant, if not, indeed, flippant, disregard of those basic principles and rights of peoples to their own protection, which we insist upon for ourselves, but, in so doing, would deny to others. Every section of the world that embraces a homogeneous economy should have its own Monroe Doctrine to protect its own rights and privileges; and no other section of the world, on peril of a war of defense, should violate such a doctrine. For misguided leadership of America to advocate the possible capture by us of the Cape Verde Islands, e. g., or of a portion of Africa, the better, so to have it, in the way of protecting freedom and democracy in our Western Hemisphere, is to leap upon a swiftly moving policy bent toward hemispherical wars—a policy of aggression—a policy of destruction for the American system of government and all that it means in the way of freedom and liberty for the individual. Such would be worthy only of the vagaries of a mad mind, an inconsistency unworthy of the name of statesmanship—a measure that only madness could conceive as one of defense for us.

But just as the Monroe Doctrine sprang from the determination of American individualism to protect its own political system of democracy against the depredations of European imperialism, so has there developed increased tension in the European economy which houses the headquarters of the kings and queens of imperialism. This tension in European economies has come about, in part, due to the fact that, of late, there are few more worlds left for imperialism to conquer. This has resulted in an increasing scarcity of the booty, in the way of economic advantages, in a shortage of the wealth of natural resources belonging to other peoples. In such circumstances, European imperialistic powers have been compelled to turn to a more serious struggle for their existence, one grounded in the problems of economics, a far more difficult struggle, submerged, as it is, in the competition with other nationalities of equal rank and quality, than had been the earlier one which was characterized by the sallies of freebooters and throat slitters upon ignorant and unprepared natives of the seven seas.

The economies of the European nations became specialized to a high degree, and European imperialism, spread as it was, over all the world's face and embracing many and diverse economies, became an anomaly in government and in economics that simply and naturally could not and would not function effectively or properly. Its attempt to do so, without the abnormal upsettings that go with war, disrupted its natural economic tempo. Its own efforts became nullified by the many inconsistencies encountered in its diverse and complex problems.

All this development followed the acquisition of territories scattered throughout the world in all the different economies of the world, each with its own peculiar problems and opportunities, unsuited to being geared to that which the European economy of the homeland had to offer to such a system. America had recognized the lack of homogeneity of European economy with that of its own, and such recognition was one reason why she enunciated the Monroe Doctrine in the hope of avoiding being drawn into the vortex of a futile attempt toward the admixture of two unmixable substances.

The truth in this regard, that America, wisely, in her early history had realized, went unseen, however, by her neighbor, Canada—which always has enjoyed the same blessings of the identical economy as that on which the United States has built so magnificently. No more splendid example of an inconsistency in government exists, where civilized and cultured men live, than in Canada. Part and big parcel of the North American economy of which the United States is the heart, Canada, still is tied, politically, with the giant of dying European imperialism—pushed and pulled economically to a point where her living standard has never kept pace with us—dragged by the mother country into every European war, the basic issues of which were always unrelated to her proper path of destiny. And so—Canada bleeds under her unnatural combination of government and economics, and longs for the better things her people could naturally have, but for the damnable political ties that bind her to a foreign and archaic system that must surely die. Housed in an economy bounteous and as yet, unexploited, Canada groans under the weight of old Europe's pains—as yet not alive to the beneficial influences to be derived from nature's wealth when untied from the foolishness of a political system unsuited to its economy.

But, inexorable as are the natural laws in their functioning, so is it inevitable that Canada and the United States, embracing, as they do, the same natural economy, ultimately, from natural causes, will combine to support a common political system, indigenous to their common economy, and free from European political ties. It is incomprehensible that Canada, a part of the bounteous North American economy, should, in most unnatural manner, continue under a political system blighted by the European economy of scarcity. The political ties that pull her into Europe's every war of destruction eventually must weaken and part, as her economy will be called upon—more and more—to support a system foreign and unnatural to it, and to the political ideals of her people.

And this matter of America's economic bedmate's political alinement to a system foreign to that of our own—and to hers as well (since the economy of both Canada and the United States is homogeneous) will become a matter of ever-increasing moment, so far as our national policy is concerned. If America is to be spared the threats incident to the continual bringing of European struggles next door to her, she well may be compelled to go the Monroe Doctrine one step further.

On account of the fact that Canada, for no reason other than her motherland's battle over purely European issues, is compelled to inject her portion of North America's territory and economy into the uncertainties of European squabbles, America must reckon with a new danger that, today, equals, if not transcends, that which first impelled the enunciation of the Monroe Doctrine. It is time now, therefore, to give thought to the need for complete abolition forever—and in the name of our national defense—of all ties that bind any part of America with Europe and its policies which conflict, seemingly evermore, with our own.

Under the Monroe Doctrine, America forever forbade European countries to acquire additional territory in the Western Hemisphere. She did this in days when ribaldry and piracy were legitimatized by government under the "by right of conquest" principle of empire building. Today, when the economies of the world are highly specialized as to different sections of it, when time has allowed the natural evolution of political development to harmonize with the various economies that naturally support it, America should assert herself—as her spokesman Monroe once before so ably did—and declare to the world that her policy henceforth will be to oppose, as an unfriendly act, the continued possession by any European power of any territory whatsoever in her particular sphere of influence in the Western Hemisphere, viz., the North American Continent and its adjacent islands. By giving effect to such principle, Canada can be freed, as we freed ourselves, from the baneful influences of European political government in exerting its authority and power over freemen of the New World. So freed, Canada then can take her rightful place alongside the United States, to develop to the utmost, that part of the bounteous North American economy which is hers. Being essentially of similar racial, ethnological, and lingual origin to that of the United States, she then, naturally, can join America in a common political system, to build sure guaranty for that greater destiny that such combination naturally and surely would bring to her. America in her own defense, in this newly changed world lately affected profoundly by the natural functioning of fundamental economic influences, could never consider union with any territories outside the natural boundaries of her own national economy, but she eventually and inevitably must insist upon this new step in Canada's behalf. The destiny of Canada and of America, herself, demands it.

The economic Horse of Troy landed on our shores years ago. The international salesmen soon made inroads in many of our colleges, organizations, and even into the two major political parties; and, to me one of the most dangerous—if not the most dangerous—is a plan that, if successful, will destroy the economic future of our country. I refer to the St. Lawrence River waterway—the free passage into the very heart of the United States. In our "cooling off" period—which has been suggested after this war—that is one issue that we should all cool off on and lay it away on ice. We all know our waterways, our ports, and our transportation would all suffer and many sections of our country would pass into economic obscurity. The Mississippi Valley is the market basket of the United States, and it may be the market basket of the world for many days to come. With the building of the St. Lawrence River waterway it would be national—if not international discrimination against this country—every vestige of our economic advantage would be surrendered to foreign flags and our potential economic enemies. The agenda to be laid on the peace table will clearly define many demands by Russia, England, China, and our other allies. As in the last war we may ask nothing; just what we got, and, just what we may get. After this war the demands will be very heavy on us. We have given much; and

we will give more. But we cannot ever surrender our economic independence.

The St. Lawrence River waterway, if built to the tune of the internationalists, will turn the Mississippi River traffic in reverse gear. This traffic now naturally goes down the river touching the docks of many American cities, finally offering itself to the marts of the world at the port of Louisiana's greatest city, New Orleans. The Mississippi River is an American river, serves the American Nation, and constitutes one of the greatest waterways in the world to make possible easy and natural handling—by Americans—of the fruits of the vast bulk of American farmers and industries. It brings lifeblood to the New Orleans port which, without the river's traffic, would shrivel as an important city. The river, naturally used, guarantees to America a great trade with our neighboring countries of South America. In these respects, Mississippi Valley traffic as now charted is an absolutely essential economic instrumentality for the prosperity of all of America.

On the other hand, the St. Lawrence waterway, peculiarly advocated by well-known internationalists — so-called — would divert this great stream of American commerce into channels immediately foreign, would allow the flags of foreign countries to enter into the very heart of our great country—there to dictate to us—the terms and conditions of their service; would allow an unfavorable competition with our own industry and commerce; and finally, by shunting the business northward and away from the normal, natural trends, would weld still another shackle upon the great Southland—already discriminated against by too many adverse economic influences. Gentlemen, we cannot allow, by this monstrous proposal, garbed as it is in a coat of sweet-scented internationalism, we cannot allow the Southern States of this country to be sacrificed to an unfair and unnatural and a cheap competition with foreign economies that pay nothing toward our well-being but, instead, seek to sap the substance from our own American economy. I predict, if the St. Lawrence waterway be completed, my Southland will be gutted economically to a point that without hope, we shall be abandoned forever as a perpetual sacrifice to a foolish foreign economic policy that never will be a benefit to our own great country.

Let us build America. Let us not vitiate her substance and her strength. Let us not have our land become a melting pot cracked by alien influences. Foreign peoples may be justly proud of their accomplishment in getting all they can from the world at large—let them parade to the martial tunes that stress their national pride. But let Americans be proud too—proud in their own individualism, proud in their own accomplishments, and proud in their determination, and in their protected ability to take care of themselves in this sorely troubled world. For only in such spirit can America become great in the sense that I know our people demand it shall be.

In concluding my remarks to you my colleagues, let me say that I have had recent conversations in my State with the dairymen, the cotton farmers, the vegetable growers, the sugarcane growers, the rice planters, the strawberry farmers, the tobacco group, the oil producers, and others, representing the principal industrial activities of my home State, and I find they are all dissatisfied with conditions relating to inequities of price, marketing abuses, production restrictions, lack of efficient transportation facilities, burdens of official regulations and red tape, shortages of materials and equipment, fears of continued and increasing inflationary tendencies, high taxes, and so forth.

Now that my people complain of these tragic matters so demanding attention, let no man cry a charge of isolationism against my people. Such technique is often used successfully to conceal real purpose. But, my colleagues, no American is to be upbraided as a traitor to good cause among us, simply because he interests himself in American problems first and in general support of real Americanism to the exclusion, when necessary in our own welfare, of foreign matters. While we busy ourselves with everybody else's business, while we become absorbed in the planners' plans for a sweet and happy post-war world, let us as legislators give heed to the entreaties and demands of our people, and pay a little attention to the problems of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANNON of Florida). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 25 minutes, under previous order of the House.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time and I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative business of the day on Monday next has been disposed of and at the conclusion of other special orders I may speak for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for 10 minutes under previous special order of the House.

SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's message, a mimeographed copy of which consisting of 11 pages single-spaced I hold in my hand, contains much good advice which it would be well for him to follow.

I note that he tells us of the size of the war and of the difficulty of winning that war. In fact, he devotes several pages to that topic. See pages 7, 8, 9, and 10.

Mr. Speaker, that—the size, the extent of this war—is something that most of us thought about, and seriously, before we got into this war. When we were playing around with the so-called lend-lease proportion, which was to keep us out of war, he, having in his possession all the facts at the time as he told us and again advising us to let him shape a policy to keep us out of war, must have known lend-lease was nothing but a gift from the American people to whoever wanted to come and get it or whoever wanted to wait and have it sent to them. When he was talking about that and assuring us that our sons never would be sent to fight on foreign soil, many of us knew that the fighting of a battle or a war throughout the world would be a sizable task and that lend-lease and the shipment of munitions of war to one of the belligerents was an invitation to war.

Many of us knew, as he points out now, that the fighting of that kind of a war would involve questions of transportation, production of munitions, and of food such as had never before confronted any one nation or all the nations of this world.

He comes along now at this late day, after we are in it and cannot get out even if we wanted to, after we are in it, I repeat, and the sacrifices are being made by our people, and tells us that it is a sizable war which cannot be won in a few weeks or perhaps in a few months.

The President must have known, as did those who sought to avoid war, that it meant, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] once warned us, that we would wade through oceans of blood if ever we were in it.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, if it is not impertinent, that many of us who lacked education and experience and a world-wide knowledge, some of us who had never been out of our own States or counties, were told by our common sense and by our judgment that a world war would tax, would inevitably tax, the resources and the manpower of our Nation, or any combination of the richest nations in the world. Many of us knew then that men were going to die by the thousands because that always happens in war. It was inevitable in a world war that casualties would run into the millions.

The President now seems to have discovered the fact that a world-wide war cannot be won either by fireside chats or by New Deal planning. Yes, people throughout this country who heard the President's message, who read and who will reread it, will be encouraged if they can be assured in some way that he will read it again himself and sense what it means, then follow some of the suggestions there made.

True to form the President could not resist questioning the motives of some of us. Let me in reply say that never from this floor or elsewhere have I heard a Republican question the motive of the administration or of any of those who presume to announce its policies. Many of us, myself included, have questioned the good sense, the judgment, and the administrative ability of the President and his chief advisers, and some of us, including myself, continue to question it today.

Coming from home, as we have, let me venture the suggestion, too, that every single man who has returned from talking with his people can give illustration after illustration of the lack of common sense and sound judgment here in Washington which not only is today

hindering, but will in the near future hinder, the production of food and munitions.

Over here on page 10 I find three paragraphs in which the President questions the motive of a group of American people upon whose efforts the success of this war depends. For instance, there is this paragraph:

> Some people, when a doughnut is placed before them, claim they can see only the hole in it. Sometimes this is an example of sheer individual pessimism; but sometimes it is caused by motives not consonant with war-winning ideals.

That is a charge that some of us do not want to win the war. It is a charge that is false and the President in his own mind knows it is false. I know of no one, and I met no one, and I challenge any Member to point to anyone in his own district, and there are some 400 Members in this body who visited their home districts, who gave any indication that he did not want to win this war or that we had anything else in our minds but the winning of the war.

I do know that there are hundreds of thousands, yes, many millions of people in this country, who honestly and sincerely believe, as a result of their own judgment and experience, that this war cannot be won if the New Deal methods which are now being employed continue in force. Those methods, instead of encouraging and increasing production, hinder and delay and, in some instances, stifle production.

The next two paragraphs of the President's message are along the same line, questioning the motive and creating disunity.

At the bottom of page 7, I find this statement:

> Nothing we can do will be more costly in lives than to adopt the attitude that the war has been won—or nearly won.

Then over on the next page there is the following:

> That is why I have always maintained that there is no such separate entity as the "home front."

Once more, let me state I am in full accord with what the President says there. There is no such separate entity as a home front. The home front is the foundation upon which the whole war effort rests.

For weeks and for months the administration has been deliberately destroying that foundation by its New Deal planning. We need only go back and show what all of our people at home know, how the planning and the orders and the directives and the regulations of this New Deal as promulgated from time to time have created a shortage of food, beef and butter and fats, everything down the line; coffee, when there was plenty of it in the southern countries that might have been brought in, but it would not come from the particular nation with which the President's advisers wanted to trade. How those directives have reduced the production of munitions!

Today we have the same policy at work. I can cite concrete example after concrete example, and so can each and every Member of this body, showing just how the food supply is being cut off, and that production is being hindered.

Let me call to your attention one example I had up yesterday with Marvin Jones. In two little counties in Michigan they will have between 50,000 and 65,000 tons of grapes. The Army and the Navy want them, and rightfully, to go into food, and they want the food processors to take care of them. Every figure I mention and every fact I name in connection with this situation having to do with grapes will be verified by Leo V. Card, former Democratic agricultural commissioner of the State of Michigan and now on special duty down here, who has just returned from a personal investigation in those two counties.

The food processors, those who turn the grapes into food, into juice, jell and jam, can take care of but 23,000 to 24,000 tons. Those are Card's figures. Twenty-six thousand tons of grapes will not be used either by the wineries or the food processors, and why? Because of a regulation promulgated down here that these grapes, fresh grapes—and this regulation takes effect on midnight of the 20th of this month—cannot go on the fresh market.

The result will be, unless there is a modification of the orders and the proposed orders, that 26,000 tons of grapes which otherwise would go on the fresh-grape market, be bought up by the housewives and a large proportion made into juice, jell, or jam, will either rot or go into the black market and be found in the hands of makers of bootleg wine.

Today on the Benton Harbor market, which is the greatest fruit market between the Alleghenies and the Rockies, grapes are selling at $1.50 per jumbo basket, equivalent to $165 per ton, while the ceiling put upon the grapes sold by the farmer to the food processors is $70 per ton, although New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania grape growers have a discriminatory price of an additional $10 per ton.

Because of the corrupt and vicious political alliance between the C. I. O. and this administration, the farmers are to be compelled to sell their grapes at $70 a ton to food processors, who can take care of less than half the crop, and let the others, worth $165 a ton, rot or sell them to black-market operators.

This administration and the head of it have sold the farmer down the river in return for the political support of organized labor.

In addition to cheating the farmer, the administration is following a course which will deprive our soldiers of the food values which might have been produced from this grape crop.

A similar situation exists with reference to celery. Within the hour, I was notified from home that carloads of celery are ready for market. The buyers are ready to purchase, but they dare not purchase because they do not know what the ceiling price will be, and my advice from the Department—a Mr. Stanton—is that sometime within the next 2 or 3 weeks a price ceiling will be fixed.

Again we see the hand of the C. I. O. striking out to snatch from the farmer a decent return for his weeks and months of back-breaking toil in producing celery.

Did time permit, instance after instance of similar actions which hinder and delay, and in some cases halt completely, the production of food necessary to support the armed forces and the civilian population might be cited.

Yes; the President's message is full of good advice, and it is regrettable that neither he nor those who administer his policies have seen fit to recognize it, put it into force.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE DRAFTING OF FATHERS

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I complained a few days ago that we were deprived time for discussion. I have therefore taken these few minutes now made available. I take it as much for the Members of the House as for myself, hoping that you will avail yourselves of the opportunity to interrupt for your own suggestion. Oh, "What small potatoes we all are, as compared to what we ought to be." The country is looking to us to do something.

I listened to the message today with a great deal of satisfaction. It was a heartening message on the whole. It was in the same tone as the message of January. We were told, in effect, that we ought to gloss over complaints. The hint was that we would be anything but good citizens if we complained; that there was lack of real patriotism among those who did complain. Certainly that was implied in the message.

If I were politically wise, perhaps I would hold my peace, but I am a Member of the Congress and my people certainly think I have some part in relation to the conduct of the home front.

Cheerfully I have voted for all that the military have requested in former days. During the last 3 weeks I was home I received many messages to deliver to the Congress. I should not fear to deliver them. Discretion is something you never learn until you are too old, when it does not do you any good. I will speak briefly of one or two matters.

I have said, and I repeat, that I am definitely opposed to the drafting of fathers until real necessity exists. I can then vote as I think proper. That is the way most of you seem to feel about this matter. Why hesitate to express yourselves? Your constituents are anxious to know what you intend to do about it.

I have told my people that I would ask some questions and may feel compelled to vote as the military may advise us.

After reading the discussion before the committee, I learn that the Army wants plenty of men, and do not care where they get them. I care very much from what source they are taken, and so do you. It is really within our province to say to the Army where they shall take them. That is our right; that is our privilege;

that is our duty, to determine where they shall take them. If there is no real necessity for breaking up homes and taking the fathers, let us not do it. You are not talking much about it—except privately, but it is plainly evident that most of you agree with me in that reasoning.

If we shall have a National Service Act, I may say to the gentleman from New York, then, they claim, they would have the power to take men, and put them where they ought to go in essential industry, but they hesitate to take your suggestion to ask for that power. Even today, they do not want to assume it, although they are again whispering about it and may recommend it if they fear that we may take direct action.

I do not want to be too sentimental, but I want to read something and have it appear in the RECORD. Here is a letter handed to me from a soldier. I think he represents the thoughts of most soldiers:

As the war starts on the upward road, in earnest, I find more and more, that the soldiers follow the news. Subject of hotness second only to John L. Lewis would be the drafting of fathers. For God's sake, is Congress to stand alone in trying to stop such an idiotic situation? Could it be true that Congress is looking to the fall elections, but whatever the motive they are certainly on the right track. For the first time I ask you to do something regarding the war effort—write a letter to all the Congressmen you can think of and tell them to bury that father-drafting foolishness. They've got twice too many men already—what are the big boys after; a finger on every man and his whole personal life and identity?

That soldier wants to do what is right and he wants us to do what is right. I must have some real information in order to answer that letter because, as I look about I see that there are many soldiers scattered all over this Nation doing a great deal of work that we thought the WAC's, and the WAVES, and the SPARS would do. Seemingly there are already too many in positions of that type. We should assume to ourselves more responsibility about manpower and food problems.

I do wish to ask questions. A great leader of the United States Senate states that he has been informed "off the record," and is satisfied with the assistance that our allies, below the Rio Grande, have given to the war effort. I ask why they are not permitting their soldiers to be sent overseas, and supported by their population. They have assured us that they are our allies. Can they not give a few soldiers for the front? Have our boys got to do all the fighting? Is that all we can expect under the good neighbor policy? They have declared war on the Axis partners. But I know this great Senator, who says that he has been told this "off the record" seems often to have capitulated at a minute's notice by a slight whisper from the White House. He is not a leader in the great Senate. It would seem that he is not so much the leader in the great Senate, as the leader delegated from the White House. Leading from there, they become our drivers, forcing us too often to go in directions contrary to our real desires. Oh, "What small potatoes we all are, as compared to what we ought to be," and, what our people think we ought to be. Let us wake up and exercise our authority. But, I should not complain, according to the message received today. We hear no mention of John Lewis holding up production and how damaging the results, and no comment on the remedy given by the Congress, even over a veto. There was simply a recital of the wonderful production brought about by whom? The Congress? Oh, no! The Executive and those whom he has appointed conduct it all. What have we done except to O. K. what the Executive wanted? I do not wish to make a political speech. If I followed the Democratic code and would say to him who complains, "you are not patriotic," he might say to me "I have two sons in the Solomons," or he might look at me and say, "This is my Government, and I expect efficiency." Is the administration so interested in the war, that they will make little attempt to correct the troubles on the home front? One man said that there was one war in history that he was perfectly satisfied with, and that was the Trojan war. It was about a woman. He understood the cause of that one.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Since speaking in the Well of the House, I have had a communication from my district and the celery growers there. The celery growers have carloads of celery now on the tracks. The buyers are there, and they want to buy, and the growers are there, and they want to sell, but down here they advise me, Mr. Stanton in the Department, that they cannot tell what the ceiling price will be for 2 weeks yet. Will the gentleman tell me what they are going to do with that celery that is in the cars?

Mr. GIFFORD. I am unable to suggest. The retail fish people had an item of instruction as to how much to charge for fish at retail. An editorial in the paper tried to explain it, but they said, "That it was as clear as mud but that perhaps the fish would understand it." That is too generally the situation. Our people are unable to understand this foolishness. The war effort has apparently taken attention from the home front or at least the time of the Executive seems to be so absorbed in military matters that the home front is not being taken care of. As I have said before, Marvin Jones and Prentiss Brown and others of our own former Members have been appointed to carry out the will of the President—"kicking us with our own feet." Marvin Jones came before our committee yesterday and wanted to pay subsidies for 3 or 6 months. Seemingly all at the committee meeting opposed this plan, but it is plainly evident that the administration seems determined to force us to accept it.

As a result of that meeting, we could come to no resolution thereon. That Mr. Jones must first consult somewhere else before he could act seems apparent, although he is supposed to be food czar. However, they seem determined to force subsidies down our throats. It appears to matter little what we think. Will you assert yourselves? I might be willing to capitulate for 3 months. Milk must be produced, but I want to give notice that I shall capitulate for only 3 months. I realize how stubborn the President is. I realize his fight with John Lewis caused the hold-the-line order which has brought upon us so much trouble. I want the O. P. A. to raise the price of milk if necessary or reduce it when necessary, as we must have milk production. The hold-the-line order has rendered the O. P. A. and other agencies helpless to bring relief when common sense dictates necessity of action.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman will recall that Marvin Jones also said that he did not have authority to deal with it, and the only course he could pursue was to come to Congress and tell us his troubles.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes. I asked him, "Are you not War Food Administrator?" He has no authority over O. P. A. Is that not a pity? The White House has to tell the O. P. A. and our friend Marvin must first get orders from there. And I suppose they are pretty busy down there.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes. I want to ask him some questions about onions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANNON of Florida). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to ask the gentleman about onions. We realize that onions are a substantial part of the diet that the servicemen must have. Our growers are ready to harvest their onions. We want to know what about these ceiling prices. They tell us down at the Department that on the 22d there will be hearings about the ceiling price on onions, but what will we do with the onions in the meantime? Those crops are ready to be harvested and marketed. The growers want to sell and the buyers want to buy, but no one dares make a move. What are we to do with all this food while we are waiting for the Department down here?

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not know. I had a long letter from the Department this morning about onions and other vegetables; information about ceiling prices, but I have many other sad letters on my desk which seem to me to be rather evasive. I much doubt if they know how to handle the problem.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How would it be if we took that authority away from the O. P. A.?

Mr. GIFFORD. Now, you are talking sense. If we have the power to set them up, have we not power to pass legislation restricting, instructing, and laying down

policy? Every day many complaints are placed before us. I think there should be emergency legislation passed quickly to bring relief to our people. We cannot go on as we are going. Food ready for harvest must be freed from impossible restrictions. I want the Congress to assume some of this burden, and our people demand that we do. I want to live happily with this administration. I want to back the President. We will have 4 years more of him, apparently. Drew Pearson said he would not run again, but the President shortly afterward called him a confirmed liar. So we must make the best of it all. I want to work in harmony with him. I want to help him. I do not wish to be critical. I greatly desire to be helpful. I want to help him out of this mess. His appointed czars seem to fight among themselves. He needs to have the help of the Congress in matters of policy. Let us rescue him. He is my President. I am not criticizing him on his military conduct of the war. I would not if I could. I am talking about the home front, which is largely your job and mine. Are you going to lie down on it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman think that the President's political alliance with the C. I. O., and these other fellows, justifies charging 25 cents a week to the soldiers who volunteered to do canning?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, probably these votes are worth it. Remember that only last week we were told of their rising and applauding for 3 minutes for a fourth term. Labor. Labor which has endorsed WALLACE in taking down all barriers of trade and letting cheap goods come into the country. Labor with its demand for high wages, so blindly following. Following blindly. In the next election let us have an issue so strong that no matter who is nominated, we can win. If some courageous man would come forward and say, "I am running on a platform to cut out one-half or even one-third of the bureaus, and give the Government back to its rightful owners," he would not need a half-billion dollar smile and voice in order to win.

I close by begging you to help our President in these problems affecting the home front.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is asking someone to come forward on a platform to do away with some of the bureaucrats. Has the gentleman forgotten the President's promise and his campaign platform, where he promised economy and the curtailment of bureaucracy?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, no; but he forgot it.

My people ask me why we in Congress do not do something. I read in the Reader's Digest the argument of our friend, the gentleman from Texas, HATTON SUMNERS, "Don't blame the bureaucrats!" All I can say is that we love the gentleman from Texas, HATTON SUMNERS; we rise and applaud him when he makes a speech, but when he votes the way he talks it will be something to be joyful about.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

STABILIZATION PLAN

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I introduced a resolution, as a member of the Coinage Committee, requiring that in discussions and considerations for the formation of an international bank, a committee from Congress should be permitted to sit in and to learn of the understandings reached between the contracting nations. Up to the present time the Treasury Department has refused to approve the resolution which sought to create this special committee.

We now learn from London sources that a group of financial experts from England are here discussing the creation of this international bank, and I want to read to you a London dispatch dated September 14, which gave out this information to the American people. It is an Associated Press article from London, and reads as follows:

> Two major financial plans—calling for establishment of an international institution for regulating investments, stabilization of world prices for major commodities—will be discussed by Lord Keynes, who now is in Washington for conferences with United States Treasury officials, it was reported yesterday.
>
> The Financial News said Lord Keynes was accompanied by Sir Frederick Leith-Ross, Sir David Waley, Prof. Lionel Robbins, and other British experts. He is expected to make an effort to reach a compromise between the Keynes and the revised White currency stabilization plans.
>
> The Financial News said the experts also would consider the creation of a bank for reconstruction of united and associated nations.
>
> Such a bank would make long-term loans to countries where a scarcity of capital prevents adequate utilization of economic resources.
>
> Lord Keynes is the author of a British plan which proposes to stabilize currency through an international clearing union which would have no assets, but would permit participation on the basis of each nation's world trade.

Apparently the Treasury officials in Washington were unwilling to give the news of the present conference to the American people, and therefore we were forced to get our news from London, which has been the source of a great deal of news in the past on financial and other problems.

It occurs to me that many things can be discussed at such a conference. I feel that the Members of Congress, the representatives of the people, should have an opportunity to sit in to learn what is going to be done to them.

Incidentally we have approximately $22,000,000,000 worth of gold, most of which has been purchased from England and other countries of the world at inflated prices. No doubt the financial experts from England are here to tell us how to use our gold and other resources for the benefit of the rest of the world. "Me thinks" that the American people and Congress ought to have something to say about it. At a later date, when more information is available, I hope to have more to say about the English plan and the Treasury proposal for an international bank.

Secretary Morgenthau promised that before anything would be done he would come to the Congress and present a plan, because he thought it was only fair that he should come before the representatives of the people with his ideas. But the Congress will never learn of the secret agreements that are made or what is to be done by and between the international bankers under any plan cooked up in secret session by the financial wizards of the world. Secret understanding and plans kept under cover are dangerous to the future welfare of our country, and Congress should insist on having full information on arrangements being made at the present Treasury conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial entitled "Religion, Labor, and the Common Good," by A. F. Whitney.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PLOESER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) from September 20 to 22, inclusive, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 250. An act to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 357. An act to authorize the presentation of a medal of honor to J. Edgar Hoover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 439. An act for the relief of Perkins Gins, formerly Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 715. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1937, and for other purposes," approved

January 29, 1937; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 789. An act to provide for the mailing of annual notices to owners of tax-exempt properties in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 881. An act to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 964. An act to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

S. 1223. An act to fix the compensation of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia and the Superintendent of the National Training School for Girls; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1224. An act to designate the Public Library of the District of Columbia a public depository for governmental publications; to the Committee on Printing.

S. 1279. An act to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its order heretofore entered, adjourned until Monday, September 20, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

708. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of a survey of the Washita River watershed in the States of Oklahoma and Texas, made by this Department, pursuant to the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 275); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

709. A letter from the adjutant general, Grand Army of the Republic, transmitting the Journal of the Proceedings of the Seventy-sixth National Encampment, held at Indianapolis, Ind., September 13–18, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 32); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

710. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting two supplemental estimates of appropriation, totaling $8,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, to remain available until expended, for the War Department for flood control (H. Doc. No. 274); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

711. A letter from the acting president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 10 of the act of March 3, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor-vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia, increase the number of judges of the police court, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

712. A letter from the Associate Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements; for the quarter ending December 31, 1943, covering the appropriation "Maintenance, Executive Mansion and Grounds," as provided in Independent Offices Appropriation Act, approved June 26, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

713. A letter from the Under Secretary, United States Department of the Interior, transmitting copies of revised estimates of personnel requirements, covering the quarter ending September 30, 1943, for various bureaus and offices of the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

714. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1944, in the amount of $40,000 (H. Doc. No. 273); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

715. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting the fourth monthly list of registrants who have been deferred because of their employment in or under the Federal Government, as of August 15, 1943, in accordance with the provisions of subsection C of Public Law No. 23 (78th Cong.), approved April 8, 1943 (list prepared from reports submitted in the continental United States and the territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2972) to suspend, as respects vessels of the Navy or in the naval service, certain provisions of the act approved March 3, 1925, authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty for damage caused by and salvage services rendered to public vessels of the United States, and to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to settle and pay claims for damages caused by vessels of the Navy or in the naval service, or for towage and salvage services to such vessels, and for other purposes, and the same was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3223. A bill to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DREWRY:

H. R. 3224. A bill to establish the grades of commissioned warrant officer and warrant officer in the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 3225. A bill to amend the act of May 27, 1908, as amended, authorizing settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 3226. A bill to establish a Department of Air Defense, to establish the United States Air Forces as a separate branch of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr BARRY:

H. R. 3227. A bill to abolish the Office of War Information and transfer its functions to the Department of State; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3228. A bill to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 3229. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York certain lands within the Brooklyn Navy Yard in the city of New York; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3230. A bill to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 3231. A bill to facilitate payment of unpaid retired pay of personnel of the armed services and to avoid needless clerical expenditures; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 3232. A bill to fix maximum rents in the New York City defense-rental area at the September 1, 1942, level; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3233. A bill to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 3234. A bill to amend the act approved January 16, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United States Naval Academy"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON:

H. R. 3235. A bill to authorize the transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3236. A bill to provide aid to dependent children in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3237. A bill to permit the granting of beverage licenses in the District of Columbia to service clubs of other United Nations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3238. A bill to amend section 14 of the act entitled: "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from the District Training School, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, and to amend section 15 thereof, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 3239. A bill to provide for the setting aside of convictions of Federal offenders who have been placed on probation and have fully complied with the conditions of their probation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3240. A bill to amend title IX of the act of March 27, 1942, Seventy-seventh Congress, entitled "An act to further expedite the prosecution of the war," by adding a new section thereto providing free postage under certain conditions for persons serving in the armed forces of any foreign country with which the United States may be associated in the prosecution of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3241. A bill to implement the jurisdiction of service courts of friendly foreign forces within the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 3242 (by request). A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized

strength," approved June 3, 1942 (57 Stat. 306); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3243. A bill to amend the second paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3244. A bill to extend the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, in connection with the public lands, to certain persons serving in the merchant marine and to certain civilian workmen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 3245. A bill amending title II of the Social Security Act to provide for crediting service in the armed forces for old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 3256 (by request). A bill to provide for increases in the rates of payments of salaries, compensation, pension, retirement benefits, social-security benefits, and other monetary benefits not based on specific contracts by 10 percent of the basic amounts thereof for each 10-percent increase in the cost of living, as compared with the index figure of the cost of living during the first half of 1940, to be computed for each 6-month period following enactment, to be put into effect, prospectively, as of the 1st of the fourth month after each such 6-month period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 155. Joint resolution to permit the importation from Canada, free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock feed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution directing the Price Administrator to make effective immediately the provision of Public Law 729, Seventy-seventh Congress, entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim Armed Services Honor Day for the recognition and appreciation of the patriotic devotion to duty of all members of all branches of the armed military and naval forces of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF:

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that certain married servicemen on duty overseas be granted furloughs to visit their families; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the resolution (H. Res. 30) authorizing and directing an investigation of the progress of the war effort; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to propose to the nations of the world the adoption of the Edwards Perpetual Calendar; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. Res. 301. Resolution providing additional compensation for the clerk of the Committee on Ways and Means so long as the position is held by the present encumbent; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Republic of Uruguay, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, with applause on the magnificent triumph of the cause of democracy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 3246. A bill for the relief of Robert H. Wilder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 3247. A bill for the relief of Joseph Langhorne Walker; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 3248. A bill granting a pension to Fannie J. Mann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 3249. A bill granting a pension to Birdie Ann Mock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 3250. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court of Maine; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOCH:

H. R. 3251. A bill for the relief of Harry F. Gracey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 3252. A bill granting an increase of pension to Grizelda Hull Hobson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 3253. A bill for the relief of Clay Guthrie and Detroit Automobile Inter-Insurance Exchange; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H. R. 3254. A bill granting a pension to Ernest Manley Gordon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey:

H. R. 3255. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma M. Devo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2163. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Emily B. Stokes and 582 citizens of Woodbury, N. J., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2164. Also, petition of Edna M. Souers and 516 citizens of New Philadelphia, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2165. Also, petition of Zura Peck and 71 citizens of Meyersdale, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2166. Also, petition of Jessie Ward Davis and 50 citizens of Patterson, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2167. Also, petition of W. L. Moody and 82 citizens of Wood River, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2168. Also, petition of William Schooley and 80 citizens of Rosemead, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2169. Also, petition of LeRoy A. Sheldon and 164 citizens of Riverside, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Commitee on the Judiciary.

2170. Also, petition of Mrs. D. R. Brazel and 22 citizens of Alton, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2171. Also, petition of Ray P. Watt and 116 citizens of Inglewood, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2172. Also, petition of Alice Price Logare and 39 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2173. Also, petition of Gertrude Chambless and 85 citizens of Portland, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2174. Also, petition of Mrs. Joseph C. Hummer and 20 citizens of Titusville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2175. Also, petition of Mrs. H. R. Wilton and 82 citizens of Charlotte, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2176. Also, petition of Rilla B. Cox and 21 citizens of Wymore, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2177. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Burlingame and 35 citizens of Cincinnatus, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2178. Also, petition of Elsie Barthel and 50 citizens of Watervliet, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2179. Also, petition of Lena M. Lisle and 39 citizens of Salem, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2180. Also, petition of Lula Rae Wiser and 14 citizens of Beloit, Kans., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2181. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles F. Tate and 61 citizens of Chandler, Ariz., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2182. Also, petition of Inez Ware and 50 citizens of Stafford, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2183. Also, petition of Mrs. O. P. Burbes and 165 citizens of Nickerson and Sterling, Kans., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2184. Also, petition of Mrs. A. M. Fombelle and 30 citizens of Wooster, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2185. Also, petition of Mattie Brumfield and 39 citizens of Winchester, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2186. Also, petition of Paul B. Stone and 41 citizens of Kalispell, Mont., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2187. Also, petition of 139 citizens of Nickerson, Kans., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2188. Also, petition of 123 members of the Oregon Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Portland, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2189. Also, petition of 88 members of the First Baptist Church of Salem, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2190. Also, petition of Mrs. R. C. Garner and 107 citizens of Missouri, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2191. Also, petition of 195 citizens of Worthington, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2192. Also, petition of Hazel D. Stanton and 40 citizens of San Pedro, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2193. Also, petition of Mrs. Howard Hughey and 67 citizens of Greenville, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2194. Also, petition of Mary K. Brown and 36 citizens of Los Gostos, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2195. Also, petition of 17 members of the Woodlawn Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2196. Also, petition of Edward E. Washburn and 40 citizens of Newfield, N. J., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2197. Also, petition of Mrs. C. E. Burts and 24 citizens of Anderson, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2198. Also, petition of Verna Willey and 20 citizens of Industry, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2199. Also, petition of Jennie M. Price and 50 citizens of Oakland, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2200. Also, petition of Mrs. A. H. Owen and 50 citizens of Newfield, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2201. Also, petition of Cora Marsh and eight citizens of Creston, Mont., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2202. Also, petition of Rev. V. C. Mulkin and 40 citizens of Madison, Wis., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2203. Also, petition of Mrs. E. M. Hall and 17 citizens of Weston, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2204. Also, petition of 65 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Burlington Union in Vermont, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2205. Also, petition of E. S. Roxburgh and 72 citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2206. Also, petition of Alice S. Williams and 74 citizens of Portland, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2207. Also, petition of Mrs. Walter Hall and 443 citizens of Salam, N. J., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2208. Also, petition of Grace Peterson and 62 citizens of Hermitage, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2209. Also, petition of Bertha L. Harris and 36 citizens of Leesburg, N. J., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2210. Also, petition of Fannie Nixon and 72 citizens of Cedaredge, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2211. Also, petition of Mrs. George Peters and six citizens of Mercersburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2212. Also, petition of Viola M. Currier and 40 citizens of San Bernardino, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2213. Also, petition of Raymond E. Cunningham and 24 residents of Denver, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2214. Also, petition of Rhoda Yocom and 43 citizens of Adrian, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2215. Also, petition of Mrs. S. T. Dundore and 48 citizens of Millersburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2216. Also, petition of Rev. J. J. Keiser and 25 citizens of Anoka, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2217. Also, petition of Gertrude Mason and 41 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Castle Rock, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2218. Also, petition of Mrs. George Wolfenden and 20 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2219. Also, petition of Kate J. Alonso and 132 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Gainesville, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2220. Also, petition of Sara Howanstine and 40 citizens of Newport, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2221. Also, petition of Mrs. W. K. Love and 41 citizens of Riverside, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2222. Also, petition of Olive E. Curtis and 20 citizens of Beaumont, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2223. Also, petition of Mary Waddell and 35 citizens of Mansfield, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2224. Also, petition of Mrs. Adah L. Riley and 26 citizens of Nashport, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2225. Also, petition of Mrs. O. J. Skrain and 120 citizens of Seattle, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2226. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. G. W. Hassler and 116 citizens of Chambersburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2227. Also, petition of Grace F. Watkins and 45 citizens of Chesapeake City, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2228. Also, petition of Rev. Joseph W. Barton and 54 citizens of Overlea, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2229. Also, petition of Mrs. David Haskele and 40 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2230. Also, petition of Lydia Rux and 41 citizens of Greeley, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2231. Also, petition of Della Henry and eight citizens of Philipsburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2232. Also, petition of Mrs. Obert Tweten and 23 citizens of Glyndon, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2233. Also, petition of Isabelle Tebbe and 11 citizens of Yreka, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2234. Also, petition of Mrs. Arthur May and 18 citizens of Solway, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2235. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. George Whisler and 50 citizens of Bluford, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2236. Also, petition of Mrs. A. L. Smith and 39 citizens of Atlanta, Ga., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the committee on the Judiciary.

2237. Also, petition of Flora Ramos and eight citizens of Arroyo, P. R., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2238. Also, petition of Myrtle K. Arnold and 41 citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2239. Also, petition of Mrs. R. C. Garner and 61 citizens of Maplewood and Hannibal, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2240. Also, petition of Mr. S. H. Magill and 19 citizens of Petersburg, Alaska, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2241. Also, petition of Mrs. D. J. McCanne and 21 citizens of Denver, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2242. Also, petition of Rev. K. Dunkelberger and 27 citizens of Washougal, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2243. Also, petition of Anna M. Sweet and 50 citizens of Herkimer, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2244. Also, petition of 100 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2245. Also, petition of Anna C. Almy and 21 citizens of Syracuse, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2246. Also, petition of Mrs. Carl Orthner and 69 citizens of Burlington, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2247. Also, petition of Mable Glaque and 42 citizens of Brush, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2248. Also, petition of Mrs. R. P. Ingraham and 20 citizens of Denver, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2249. Also, petition of Mr. V. K. Beshgetoor and 152 citizens of Alma, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2250. Also, petition of Mayor R. H. Wallace of Amoret, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2251. Also, petition of Agnes Smith and 30 citizens of Killbuck, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2252. Also, petition of Mr. W. E. Speaker and citizens of East Liverpool, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2253. Also, petition of Mrs. Lacy McKinney and 45 citizens of Basin, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2254. Also, petition of Mrs. A. G. Buley and 20 citizens of Glenville, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2255. Also, petition of Rev. H. E. Weaver and 18 citizens of Duluth, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2256. Also, petition of Rev. Albert B. Benton and the Christian Churches of Youngstown, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill

2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2257. Also, petition of Annie L. Shepherd and 42 citizens of Springfield, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2258. Also, petition of Eva I. Williams and 20 citizens of Cato, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2259. Also, petition of L. R. Collins of Jackson, Miss., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2260. Also, petition of Mrs. H. I. Cecil and 36 citizens of Saint Paul, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2261. Also, petition of Mrs. N. J. Snaby and 21 citizens of Peterson, Minn., urging enactment of House bill, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture. sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2262. Also, petition of 10 members of the Methodist Church, Mora, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2263. Also, petition of Edward I. Besecker and 53 citizens of Maryland and Pennsylvania, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2264. Also, petition of Mrs. H. D. West and 15 citizens of Bowman, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2265. Also, petition of Mrs. Garner and 260 citizens of Missouri and Illinois, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2266. Also, petition of Mrs. C. M. Betchie and 7 citizens of Cedarville, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2267. Also, petition of Raymond Keys and 50 citizens of Winchester, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2268. Also, petition of Rev. Ezra Budke and 71 citizens of Waseca, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2269. Also, petition of Margaret B. Rife and 26 citizens of Cedarville, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2270. Also, petition of J. B. Rife and 23 citizens of Cedarville, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteesim conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2271. Also, petition of Rev. Everett J. Spring and 180 citizens of Edinburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2272. Also, petition of Ella H. Llewellyn and 19 citizens of Hatboro, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2273. Also, petition of Mrs. O. E. Crandall and 80 ctizens of Battle Creek, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2274. Also, petition of Mrs. C. E. Ryan and 203 citizens of Brule, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2275. Also, petition of Mrs. A. F. Fredin and 32 citizens of Duluth, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2276. Also, petition of Mrs. George Dahl and 10 citizens of Littlefork, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2277. Also, petition of Margery H. Adams and 24 citizens of Townville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2278. Also, petition of Florence Evans and 23 citizens of Merion, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2279. Also, petition of Olive N. Pettit and 42 citizens of Harrisburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2280. Also, petition of Mrs. Henry F. Jacobs and 131 citizens of Battle Creek, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2281. Also, petition of Grace Carpenter and 51 citizens of Hemlock, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2282. Also, petition of Mrs. J. B. Boyd and 40 citizens of Bellaire, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill, 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2283. Also, petition of Sophia G. Amsbury and 21 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and

speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2284. Also, petition of the Woman's Progressive Bible Class of Trinity Methodist Church, Berkeley, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2285. Also, petition of Minnie Hanson and 46 citizens of Bellingham, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2286. Also, petition of Mrs. E. G. Nabell and 30 citizens of East Point, Ga., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2287. Also, petition of L. W. Seaback and 33 citizens of Santa Ana, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2288. Also, petition of Mary Jenkins and 78 citizens of Pasadena, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2289. Also, petition of Mrs. H. J. Riordan and 10 citizens of Duluth, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2290. Also, petition of L. E. Rambo and 146 citizens of Raymondville, Tex., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2291. Also, petition of Grace M. Melton and 19 citizens of Riverside, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2292. Also, petition of Reginald Shepley and 46 citizens of Greenville, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2293. Also, petition of Ernest W. Peterson and 30 citizens of Ashtabula, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2294. Also, petition of Mrs. J. O. Woolf and 45 citizens of Elmira, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2295. Also, petition of Lera V. Burmerster and 60 citizens of Des Plaines, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2296. Also, petition of Mrs. Herbert Tice and 200 citizens of Sullivan, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2297. Also, petition of 19 members of the Woman's Society of Christian Service, Elsberry Methodist Church, Missouri, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2298. Also, petition of Mrs. C. W. Fletcher and 63 citizens of Felicity, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2299. Also, petition of Mrs. E. L. Bishop and 20 citizens of Colorado Springs, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2300. Also, petition of Mrs. Ida Witner and 140 citizens of Wingate, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2301. Also, petition of Mrs. Clara B. Newcomb and 40 citizens of Cherry Creek, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2302. Also, petition of Mrs. Nora Berringer and 21 citizens of Brunswick, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2303. Also, petition of Rev. F. T. Reed and 115 citizens of Weston, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2304. Also, petition of Mrs. C. W. Clift and 28 citizens of Harlingen, Tex., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2305. Also, petition of Mrs. G. E. Walston and 32 citizens of Atwater, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2306. Also, petition of Mr. B. V. Edmonty and 48 citizens of Plains, Mont., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2307. Also, petition of Mrs. Blanche McGee and 20 citizens of Greensburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2308. Also, petition of Mrs. Curtis Henderson and 30 citizens of Sherwood, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2309. Also, petition of Mrs. Gwendoline A. Thompson and 60 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2310. Also, petition of Mrs. C. P. Ely and 21 citizens of Westerville, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to

reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2311. Also, petition of Mrs. J. B. Boyd and 58 citizens of Bellaire, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2312. Also, petition of Lydia Hill and 20 citizens of Oakland, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2313. Also, petition of Minnie Dawley and 22 citizens of Forestville, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2314. Also, petition of Lucy G. Whitwell and 62 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2315. Also, petition of Mary H. Taft and 21 citizens of Montgomery, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2316. Also, petition of Garner's Music Store and 133 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2317. Also, petition of Mrs. William E. Wood and 18 citizens of Grasston, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2318. Also, petition of Edward E. Blake and 54 citizens of Eugene, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2319. Also petition of Mr. John M. Sorensen and 21 citizens of Colorado Springs, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2320. Also, petition of the Adult Bible Class of Finksburg Church, Finksburg, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2321. Also petition of Mrs. T. J. Hisel and 20 citizens of Purdin, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2322. Also, petition of Mr. Richard C. Stockes and 51 citizens of Royal Oak, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2323. Also petition of Mrs. Stella Evans and 38 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2324. Also petition of Mrs. Minnie Baertsch and 21 citizens of Kalispell, Mont., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2325. Also petition of Rev. Wm. L. McGlasson and 19 citizens of Salem, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2326. Also, petition of Claude A. Watson and 17 citizens of Everett, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2327. Also, petition of Franklin Price and 20 citizens of Moosic, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2328. Also, petition of W. R. Griswold and 23 citizens of West Union, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082 a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2329. Also, petition of 50 citizens of Kalispell, Mont., sent to Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD, urging enactment of House bill 2082 a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2330. Also, petition of Mary E. Dugan and 33 citizens of Bellingham, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2331. Also, petition of Jennie E. Hovey and 30 citizens of South Fork, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2332. Also, petition of Minnie Baertsch and 57 citizens of Kalispell, Mont., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2333. Also petition of Mrs. W. H. Kniefel and 20 citizens of Parma, Idaho, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2334. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Petition signed by some 50 persons in Niagara County, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2335. Also, letters from the "Friend" Manufacturing Co., Gasport, N. Y., and the M. J. Grass Screw Machine Products Co., Buffalo, N. Y., urging changes in the existing laws having to do with renegotiation of contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2336. Also, communication received from the firm of Hickman, Coward & Wattles, Inc., Buffalo, N. Y., outlining the views of the dairy business favoring passage of House bill 2400; to the Committee on Agriculture

2337. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of Joseph Lemma & Sons, Inc., and other residents of Oregon, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2338. Also, petition of Oregon Woman's Christian Temperance Union asking for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2339. By Mr COCHRAN: Petition of Andrew Baum and 40 St Louis citizens protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2340 Also, petition of Adolph Wohlbrett and 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to

enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2341. Also, petition of Mrs. Jos. Hauser and 40 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2342. Also, petition of L. Schroeder and 42 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2343. Also, petition of E. Hahn and 23 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2344. Also, petition of Clyde Stemmermann and 19 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2345. Also, petition of the St. Louis Mailers Union No. 3 and 31 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2346. Also, petition of Mrs. Frank R. Bellew and 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2347. Also petition of Ernie H. Meininger and 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2348. Also, petition of Mary Hays and 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2349. By Mr. GIFFORD: Petition of sundry citizens of New Bedford protesting against enactment of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2350. By Mr. GREGORY: Petition signed by 42 citizens of Paducah, Ky., urging early and favorable consideration of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), in order to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war, to reduce absenteeism, increase production, and eliminate sources of disorder and physical disability which are hampering our war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2351. Also, petition signed by 130 members of the First Methodist Church of Mayfield, Ky., asking that legislation be passed prohibiting the sale and advertising of liquors in any form and prohibiting the distribution of unwholesome and vicious moving pictures and magazines detrimental to the young people of America, both in Army and civilian life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2352. By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia: Petition of sundry citizens of Suffolk, Va., in support of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2353. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Suffolk, Va., in support of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2354. By Mr. TOWE: Petition of Mrs. Isabel M. Koetter, of Dumont, N. J., and 23 other citizens of Bergen County, requesting the Congress of the United States to enact House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2355. Also, petition of Mrs. Elizabeth A. DuRio and 25 other residents of Closter, N. J., requesting the Congress of the United States to enact House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2356. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Association of Retired Federal Civil Service Employees, San Francisco, Calif., urging the Congress of the United States to recognize the urgent necessity of granting relief to the Federal civil-service employees in the lower brackets, and recommending passage of House bil. 2195 and Senate bill 878; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2357. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Theodore L. Sushka and other citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., in opposition to the passage of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2358. Also, petition of patrons of Eddie's Lunch, of Wheeling, W. Va., in opposition to the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2359. Also, petition of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, of Follansbee, W. Va., in opposition to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2360. Also, petition of the Allegheny Club, of Wheeling, W. Va., in opposition to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2361. By Mr. GAMBLE (by request): Petition signed by the residents of White Plains, N. Y., urging early consideration of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2362. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of R. P. Essman and 87 others, urging early consideration and a favorable vote on House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2363. Also, petition of Bud's Grill, Columbus, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2364. Also, petition of Aquilla Aerie, No. 2290. Fraternal Order of Eagles, Columbus, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2365. Also, petition of the Hill Distributing Co., of Columbus, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2366. Also, petition of J. Henry Mann and 34 others, urging early consideration and a favorable vote on House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2367. Also, petition of Ella Foltz and 19 others, petitioning Congress to pass House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2368. Also, petition of the Scioto Distributing Co., of Columbus, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2369. By the SPEAKER: Petition of State Camp of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the flag salute; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2370. Also, petition of William J. Bennet, counselor of law, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to admission to the United States of aliens who are religious refugees; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2371. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of citizens of Charleston, W. Va., urging the early consideration and favorable vote on the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and loving Father, who hast folded back the curtain of another night and given us once again the promise of a new day, be gracious to hear our prayer and accept our praise; we would refresh our minds and spirits by regrasping the teachings of our Lord. Grant that we may not be too blind to see or too deaf to hear; O give us the power to will and the will to wait.

Today we are turning one of the great bends of history; while the road is long and the hills steep and rough, guide us into the highways of a courageous conviction that we may help to lift the motley multitudes from their abyss of human woe and degradation. Blessed Lord, there is something within us which declares that if Thy Spirit had been in the souls of the nations, these tragic, crimson years could not have stained the fair face of this weeping world. O lead us to choose the best and the supreme, and undergird us until we cross the threshold of escape from deathful clods into deathless service. O God of wisdom and the Father of us all, be in the deliberation of this day. In the holy name of our Master, we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, September 17, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1203. An act to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM IN ITS RELATION TO SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts I submit the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 303), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 294 of the Seventy-seventh Congress and continued by House Resolution 18 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, incurred by the select committee appointed to study and investigate the national defense program in its relation to small business in the United States, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $25,000 additional including expenditures for the employment of experts, investigators, attorneys, clerical, stenographic and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or any subcommittee thereof conducting such investigation, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker——

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 140]

Anderson, N. Mex.	Hill	Pittenger
Baldwin, Md.	Holmes, Mass.	Ploeser
Bates, Mass.	Izac	Price
Boren	Jackson	Rockwell
Camp	Johnson, Calvin D.	Rogers, Calif.
Carter	Johnson, J. Leroy	Rowe
Chenoweth	Kerr	Smith, Va.
Coffee	Kirwan	Somers, N. Y.
Creal	Knutson	Spence
Cullen	Lewis, Colo.	Starnes, Ala.
Curley	Luce	Stevenson
Drewry	McGranery	Thomas, N. J.
Elliott	McKenzie	Treadway
Furlong	May	Wasielewski
Gale	Miller, Pa.	West
Gallagher	Myers	White
Goodwin	O'Connor	Winter
Granger	O'Konski	Wolcott
Green	O'Leary	Woodrum, Va.
Hartley		

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and seventy-one Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

PARTICIPATION IN WORLD PEACE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution (H. Res. 302), which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the time for debate on a motion to suspend the rules and pass House Concurrent Resolution 25 shall be extended to 4 hours, such time to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and said motion to suspend the rules shall be the continuing order of business of the House until finally disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 9 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution just reported by the Clerk is simply to provide that under suspension of the rules that will take place debate on the Fulbright resolution will be extended to a period of 4 hours. As we all know, under the rules of the House, unless this resolution is adopted, debate would be limited to 40 minutes, 20 minutes on each side.

The motion to suspend the rules on the Fulbright resolution will be made in accordance with the rules of the House, rules that have existed for many years and which this House, without regard to what party was in power or in control of the House, provided many years ago. The motion to suspend the rules on the Fulbright resolution, therefore, is strictly in accordance with the rules provided for by this body and by many Congresses of the past. Needless to say, I hope the resolution will be adopted as it is proposed to extend the debate for a period of 4 hours.

Mr. Speaker, the Fulbright resolution places the House in favor of "appropriate international machinery" to maintain peace, and "participating by the United States therein."

While expressed in general terms, as it should be at this time, this resolution is significant in its directions. It is a recognition that the road of war that mankind is traveling must be stopped. It is an expression of our determination that out of the pain and suffering of this conflict, and of World War No. 1, that the United States shall assume its leadership in building the road of future peace. It signifies our determination to take our place as a leader of the nations of the world in laying the foundations for, and in establishing permanent world peace after this conflict is over.

It signifies our determination to join with other decent nations of the world in outlawing any nation whose principal business is war, aggression, or conquest.

It signifies our intentions to fight on the side of reason, order, peace; and against hate, disorder, and war.

It signifies our intention to regulate and curb imperialism.

Enduring peace is the challenge of this generation. The opportunity is present. It will require men and women of vision and courage to attain this objective. The scoffers, the demagogs, the false prophets, the dividers, the bigots will operate just as they have in the past. Whether or not they will be successful depends upon an enlightened and aroused public opinion, upon the vision and courage of our people, and the decent people of other nations.

No one now can venture a prediction as to the details of a program for permanent peace.

However, the people of the United Nations can, as Sumner Welles said in an address delivered at the convocation of the University of Toronto last February:

> March together, with other forward-looking nations, along the road to a fruitful and secure post-war world, provided the people * * * support the Government, with understanding and determination, in their efforts to do something within their power to achieve these great objectives.

Within a generation the world has undergone two general wars. Millions of lives have been destroyed. How many more will be destroyed before the present war will be over, is incapable of estimate. The youth of today are wearing the uniform and fighting. Will their children be wearing the uniform in another world conflict 25 or 30 years from now? Can our civilization withstand the shock of another war, when another generation of fighters have been born and grown up? Do we not owe it to the generation yet unborn to remove from it 25 or 30 years from now the fear and experiences of war? These are some of the questions in the minds of men and women everywhere.

If we drift along, with a do-nothing policy after victory is achieved, we must frankly face the fact that the fear and shadow of war will constantly threaten us in the future.

One of the slogans of the last war was "the war to end wars." The people believed. Failure resulted. The group that was betrayed in that failure was the children of twenty-odd years ago, and less, the youth of today who are now fighting and dying. They had no voice. If something had been done then, they might not be fighting and dying today. The strong probabilities are they would be living a normal, peaceful life. All of our emotions were played upon to divide us; but very little, if any, thought was given to the next generation, who could not speak for themselves.

What about their children, the generation of tomorrow? Will they, too, be forgotten? What about the trust we owe them to do something to curb and restrain lawless nations—to definitely block the road of war that mankind is traveling; to enable our children and our children's children to live a normal, happy, peaceful life?

We must establish a fundamental community of interest and ideals that will be the basis for permanent peace in order to prevent international anarchy, and the existence of a world situation that will be a potential menace to our security and the security of world order and peace. We must create a compatability of system values throughout the world. Some kind of a stabilizing force, spiritual in its origin, and realistic and practical in its operation, must be put into effect throughout the world to assure the peace that mankind wants and seeks; to prevent those elements and forces from arising again anywhere who were responsible for the last war and are responsible for the present conflict.

Either we must be friends with other nations on a cooperating basis, which our realistic interest prompts, or we must develop our own fighting strength to a point where no other nation or nations will contest our right to take what we want—and that means imperialism.

We underwent the pain and suffering of the last war. We are undergoing the pain, suffering, and destruction of this war. It is pain and suffering that mainly prompt mankind to think of remedies for their ills. It is mainly as a result of pain and suffering that mankind makes progress.

Everywhere the feeling and opinion exists that this should truly be "the war to end wars." Mankind is at one of its turning points of its history. We of this generation have a real opportunity to make the greatest contribution in the known history of man—attaining the great objectives of permanent peace. It will require vision and courage and the united effort of men and women of good will to bring this about.

We have the golden opportunity.

The adoption of the Fulbright resolution will be a real contribution in that direction.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the Fulbright resolution as amended to read

at the end of it "through its constitutional processes," an amendment that was added by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but I am opposed to bringing that resolution up under a suspension of the rules and not permitting the Members of the House to offer any amendments whatever or to work their will upon the resolution or to shape it in any way they so desire.

It seems to me that this procedure turns the House of Representatives into a mere rubber stamp, either to approve or disapprove a foreign policy, no matter how vague or how broad it may be. It smacks too much of dictatorship and totalitarianism, the very principles of government that we are fighting. Therefore, I am opposed to bringing the Fulbright foreign policy declaration before the House without power of amendment.

The resolution itself, brought up under a gag rule, starts off by stultifying the powers of the House of Representatives. When it reaches the other body, I do not believe it will be seriously considered. The other body may even resent such action and ridicule it, that the House of Representatives initiates a foreign policy resolution and adopts it with limited debate and without affording any opportunity for amendments. That amounts to a repudiation of democratic processes and is the essence of totalitarianism.

The papers today headline the fact that the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Churchill, is to appear in the House of Commons in a day or so to answer all questions in regard to war policies in a 3-day debate, and every member of Parliament has a right to ask any question he wishes; yet we must hush up this very simple and rather innocuous and harmless resolution and not even have the power to offer amendments.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Is it not true that this resolution does not even assure to the opponents of the Fulbright resolution any time for debate? The time is to be divided between the majority and minority members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, both of whom support the resolution.

Mr. FISH. I shall answer that by saying that I have confidence that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], will be fair. I assume also that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] will also, so that both sides will have an opportunity to speak. However, instead of having 4 hours of debate, we ought to have at least 12 hours. When the debate is limited to 2 hours on a side, the time is taken up mostly by the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs themselves. This resolution comes from a distinguished committee, but it held no hearings on it and reported it three months ago and many things have changed in the world since then.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman has made the statement that he is opposed to the Fulbright resolution.

Mr. FISH. No, I said I was in favor of the Fulbright resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As I understood, the gentleman said that he is opposed to the pending resolution.

Mr. FISH. No; I said I am opposed to bringing up the resolution without permitting the Members the right to offer amendments, and I am opposed to having a limited time for debate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman vote that way?

Mr. FISH. I shall vote for the Fulbright resolution as amended.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman spoke of an amendment which reads "according to constitutional processes." Will this amendment be offered despite the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution? How will this amendment be attached to this resolution?

Mr. FISH. I assume it is already in the resolution. I should like to have the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs answer that question.

Mr. BLOOM. In answer to the gentleman's question, I may say that the amendment will be offered at the time the motion is made to suspend the rules.

Mr. CELLER. Will there be any debate on that amendment?

Mr. BLOOM. There will be 4 hours of debate on the entire resolution, but no amendments can be offered.

Mr. FISH. This is a pious legislative resolution, more or less a beautiful mirage with very little substance, because I am fearful it will not be even considered when it reaches the other body. But it is before us. Nobody wants to vote against the Ten Commandments. Nobody wants to vote for sin. We have a resolution before us that asks us to go on record in favor of a just peace. Who is not in favor of a just peace? It asks us to go on record for a just and lasting peace. Everybody ought to be in favor of that. That is the resolution that is before us, yet we are unable to amend it in any shape or manner.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of a just peace. I will do anything in the world, I will give my right arm, to bring about world peace and to stop world wars on the basis of a just peace. But who knows what the peace is going to be? Who knows if it is going to be a just peace? We may have very different opinions as to what a just peace is. I think the only kind of a lasting peace must be a just peace and this war will have been fought in vain and the lives of our sons sacrificed in vain unless we have a lasting peace.

Of course, we propose to defeat and crush our enemies and disarm them, but the minute you take away territory belonging to any of our enemies, territory which they have held for hundreds of years, territory populated by their nationals, it will mean another war of liberation in 25 years.

By the same token, assume that we were defeated and crushed and that our enemies took away from us New England and Massachusetts. Certainly in another generation free Americans would try to recover by a war of liberation all of Massachusetts and New England and bring it back into the Union.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand the amendment that is to be offered as part of the resolution is one agreed upon by the Republican leadership on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Will the gentleman from New York tell us just what that amendment means?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

I can speak only for myself. I may say that I was very eager to have it put in very simple words, "through its constitutional processes." It means, to my mind, simply that any commitment that is made, any agreement, any treaty with foreign nations, must go through in a constitutional way, either by a two-thirds vote of the Senate or by the approval of the entire Congress. That is my interpretation, and I do not see how it can have any other meaning. It is definite. There are a number of Members of Congress who will oppose this resolution, and I respect their judgment. They are afraid that some secret commitments will be entered into and that the Congress will be by-passed, and that the Constitution will be ignored. Therefore this amendment was put in by a request of some of us on the minority side, and I think it is an effective amendment. On the other hand, it is no guaranty against secret commitments, as the Congress does not have any way of knowing about them unless asked to ratify or approve them. No secret agreement or commitment is binding until approved by Congress under the Constitution. If this resolution meant that the President of the United States could enter into an agreement to create a supergovernment, then, of course, the Congress should have the final say as to whether we should be a party to a world supergovernment or not, or into a permanent alliance with Great Britain or any other nation, or whether we should establish a glorified W. P. A., world-wide, in foreign nations, so that they can boondoggle with our money.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Does the word "Constitution" in the proposed amendment mean the Constitution of the United States or is the word used in a general sense?

Mr. FISH. Oh, this is an American resolution. This emanates from the Congress of the United States. We have nothing to do with the foreign policies

of other nations. This means the Constitution of the United States and nothing else.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Then why not put those additional words in there?

Mr. FISH. I do not believe it is necessary. The time has come for some of us at least to take an American view of our foreign policies. I admire Mr. Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of England. I admire him because for one thing he is for England and the British Empire first and all the time. I even admire the policies of Stalin, because he is for communism and the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics all the time. My God, is it not time when we in America should put the interest of America first and keep them uppermost all the time?

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I am sorry but I cannot yield any more. I have promised to reserve some time for several Members. I want to make this observation and I make it for what it is worth: I do not understand how it is that there are so many organizations—and I think there are 137 of them—in America who are already solving all of our post-war problems. How in the name of heaven can anybody seriously attempt to solve any post-war problem until we know the peace aims of Soviet Russia or the British Empire? Do they mean to say that we can solve these problems without knowing what Stalin proposes to do, whether he proposes to take over a part of Poland and communize Poland, or possibly communize Germany? Shall we commit ourselves in advance to be a party to communizing Europe? To me it is sheer nonsense to embark on the consideration of post-war problems until we win the war. Let us win the war first, and then find out the peace aims of our allies, and on that basis, and on that basis alone we will determine what is best for America. That is the yardstick for us to go by, and to try to keep out of foreign wars.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Do I understand that the language which the gentleman says is suggested by the Republican side are just those words—the addition of the words "through its constitutional processes"?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman from Texas is correct. I am speaking as one Member and I think we must be willing to take half a loaf, for it is better than none.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. But this resolution is not even a crust of bread.

Mr. FISH. We are trying to improve it without having the power of amendment, and we have to take half a loaf instead of none at all.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. As I say, it is not even a crust of bread. "Through its constitutional processes." How could anything be done except in that way?

Mr. FISH. Oh, I have seen certain promises made that were not kept in the past by the two leading candidates for President in the last election.

The surrender of Italy will do much to shorten the war and bring an all-out victory over the Nazis and Japs. We are all united in winning the war as quickly as possible and with the least possible casualties. To do so we must continue to give all-out service and sacrifice to the war effort. The withdrawal of Italy will help to undermine the morale of the German people and will set an example for Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Finland to sue for separate peace terms.

I anticipate the war in Europe will not last more than another year, and that with Japan not more than 2 years. We are on the march to final victory. After the war has been won we must keep our promises to our citizen warriors, and when they return we must see to it that they are provided with jobs and opportunities to earn a livelihood and that our free institutions and form of government—for which they have fought—are maintained in the United States for their benefit and for all Americans.

There is nothing I would not do to preserve world peace. I am wholeheartedly in favor of the Republican foreign policy declaration made recently at Mackinac, for a responsible participation by the United States in post-war coperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world. This war will have been fought in vain, and the lives of our sons will have been sacrificed in vain unless we can achieve a program for permanent peace. Civilization cannot stand more world wars. No sacrifice is too great to put an end to them before they destroy us. World wars are more than mass murders and destruction. They are the greatest menace to humanity, religion, free institutions, and civilization itself. Their aftermath is bankruptcy, poverty, famine, political unrest, and civil wars. Communism breeds on the dregs of war, with ensuing unemployment, undernourishment, disillusionment, fear, and hatred.

I am not in favor of making any specific post-war commitments until the war has been won, and we know the peace aims of Joseph Stalin and of the British Empire. I certainly believe it would be deplorable if a few individuals, without consulting the American people and our victorious veterans, should commit them to any policy that might force communism on Poland, Germany, or Italy. I believe we should make haste slowly in entering into any post-war commitments until all the factors are known and presented to the American people for their decision. Neither the Congress nor the the American people will stand for any secret commitments.

I have been for international cooperation ever since the last war. It is true that I was a noninterventionist; that is against intervening in foreign wars, but I have never been an isolationist, or against international cooperation, arbitration, mediation and peaceful settlement of international disputes. I believe that the preservation of peace should be the continuous policy of all civilization. I know what war means in blood, death, and tears, in shattered bodies and maimed, blinded, and disabled veterans returning from the war.

Our first objective is to win the war and the second to win the peace, a just and lasting peace. We want to make sure that war does not recur every generation; that is something worth fighting for. World wars are the curse of civilization, Christianity, and humanity and, unless ended, will destroy America with the rest of the world. In modern war, even the victor goes down with the vanquished in bankruptcy, poverty, undernourishment, and ruin.

The American people and the returning soldiers must have a voice in the peace through their Representatives in Congress. We do not want, nor will we accept, any peace dictated by a few men on the basis of greed and imperialism that will sow the seeds of future wars.

I have the utmost respect for those Members of Congress who oppose the Fulbright resolution; they do so because they are fearful of giving President Roosevelt any kind of congressional authority, no matter how indirect or vague, to enter into permanent military alliances, to set up a super world government or to establish a glorified world W. P. A. in foreign nations. They are mindful of the campaign promises of Franklin D. Roosevelt, made in Boston on October 30, 1940:

> And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

On the same day the President said, at Hartford, Conn.:

> I notice that for 7½ years, nearly 8, the United States has remained at peace, not only has kept from any foreign entanglements but the United States today is at peace and is going to remain at peace.

Rightly or wrongly, some Members of Congress will not vote for the Fulbright resolution that might be used to assume authority to enter into secret commitments. I do not agree that the Fulbright resolution gives the President any authority to enter into any secret agreements but only agreements sanctioned by the United States Senate or the Congress.

I am glad to have this public discussion, because I do not believe a single advocate of the Fulbright resolution will undertake to say that it in any way empowers the President to make either secret commitments or even open agreements without the approval of the Senate or the Congress.

I hope that all nations will take cognizance of it, and remember that in America all foreign commitments must be approved in accordance with the wording and intent of our Constitution.

Members of both major political parties are agreed on upholding and maintaining constitutional government. The sooner all foreign nations understand that, the less chance of any misunderstandings in the future.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make this statement in answer to the gentleman from Michigan in respect to the words "constitutional processes." The period after the word "therein" in the resolution is taken out so that the amendment will read:

and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes.

That means nothing else than the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and include certain newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WHY SURRENDER OUR INDEPENDENCE?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the dream dreamed by the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, is a beautiful one. If that dream could come true, the sacrifice of our independence and of our sovereignty might be justified. Let me repeat, if we could for the future, to the end of time, have universal peace, our sovereignty and our independence might well be sacrificed. But it is only a dream—only a dream.

The Fulbright resolution provides that we shall join in establishing international machinery which shall be adequate to maintain forever the peace of the world. Now, weigh that statement. That means but one thing, that we repeal the Declaration of Independence. That means that we forsake the policy which has guided our destinies for more than 160 years; a policy which has made us as a Nation, what we are; the envy of all nations which has given to the people of this United States blessings and liberties envied by the peoples of all the world.

This resolution means that we adopt a foreign policy which commits us to an alliance either with Great Britain, or with Great Britain and Russia, or with such other countries as may desire to come into that combination or alliance, when we know that opposed to that alliance today and tomorrow, as throughout history there has been, there will be, an alliance of the other countries of the earth who do not subscribe to the doctrines set forth by us.

Mr. Speaker, as a sop, as a gesture of appeasement, to those who believe, as do Churchill and Stalin, that the interests of their own countries should be first protected, the majority has tossed into the legislative hopper an amendment to the pending resolution, the substance of which is that, in the creation of international machinery sufficiently powerful to not only establish, but to forever maintain, peace throughout the world, our Representatives will be guided by constitutional processes.

What a concession for the world planners to make. The advocates of this resolution now concede that, in carrying out its purpose, the fundamental law of the land should be obeyed.

The apparent concession is no concession at all. Actually, it is an insult, for the fact that it is made implies one of two things—either that it was intended to establish this international machinery without regard to the Constitution, or that the overwhelming majority of Congress was unduly suspicious of the purpose for which the resolution was to be used and the purpose of the amendment was to allay that suspicion, gain votes for its support.

In considering this resolution, we should keep in mind not only what it actually says; not only what we think it means, but the meaning which other nations will put upon it, the promises which they will imply from its adoption.

To me, the amendment means nothing, for it should not be assumed that the forces back of it intend to violate constitutional procedure. If they do, the resolution is unworthy of the support of any loyal American.

The amendment means nothing for, since the policy of appointing the members of the Supreme Court, regardless of their political faith, or of dividing those appointments among men of different political philosophy, has been abandoned, and places on that Court have been filled by men who held to the New Deal philosophy and since some of the decisions of Justice Frankfurter to the effect that the Constitution is what the Supreme Court says it is, an amendment of this kind is in no way actually restrictive of the actions of any group of internationalists gathered together under this or subsequent action.

Moreover, recent orders and directives issued by the Executive Department and which have been upheld by the Supreme Court and which have destroyed the liberty of our citizens heretofore exercised by them, give no promise that any major political philosophy of the New Deal will, while the Supreme Court is constituted, as it stands today, be held unconstitutional.

When a court will decide, as the present Court has decided, that men belonging to one organization may be forced to join another in order to earn a livelihood; when it will hold, as it has held, that if men belong to a particular organization they may practice racketeering without restraint, the average citizen can gain no comfort from words written into legislation opening the door to judicial interpretation.

The Detroit Times, in its editorial of September 15, referring to international alliances, well said:

There are two burning questions involved in this situation:

One question is whether the United States wants any kind of international alliance whatsoever.

The second question is whether the United States can get the kind of international alliance it wants even if it wants one.

To begin with, any permanent international alliance means a complete departure from the tried and proven policy of the United States for 150 years.

It is not likely that the present crop of erratic, fanatic, irresponsible, and experimental statesmen who have messed up matters, political and financial, in this country during their brief tenure of office are wiser and sounder than the statesmen who founded the Nation and conducted it more successfully than any other nation on earth for a century and a half.

Yet, even assuming that an international alliance is permissible as one of the inspired innovations of the New Deal, why is it necessary?

What will it accomplish that we have not been able to accomplish without an alliance?

It was on Friday last from the Well of this House—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 7627—that the Member who has served longest in this Chamber, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], made the statement that the Republicans at Mackinac Island had endorsed the foreign policy of the President of the United States. He said:

After 2 days of planning and conferring, to everyone's surprise they endorsed President Roosevelt's foreign policy.

That statement is in the RECORD. If that be true and if the gentleman was sincere—and I assume he was—and if he wants unity, as he said he did, then why not substitute for the Fulbright resolution, the declaration of policy adopted at Mackinac Island? That contains provisions which are not in this resolution. That contains provisions which would safeguard for all time the integrity of our Nation, our national existence, which would insure the liberty and freedom of our people. Where is the Member in this body, I ask, where is the Member in this body who will pledge us to some foreign entangling alliance and agree that we will, when once we are in, forget that America comes first? Is there any reason why we should hesitate, why we should be ashamed of the proposition that we are for America first? I for one am not. I heard members of that conference, which I attended by invitation, but of which I was not a member, though I was permitted to sit with the committee as were other Congressmen who were present, declare that they were for America first.

Just what is the declaration of foreign policy promulgated by the Republicans who met at the island?

That declaration pledges us, as a nation, to "participation in the making of the peace"; to "responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world," keeping always in mind the effect of our international acts "upon the vital interests of the Nation"; and that, wherever there be a conflict between our own interests and international developments, we "adhere to the policy which will preserve" our constitutionalism, "as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution itself, and the Bill of Rights," and that we at all times maintain our sovereignty.

In full, that declaration reads as follows:

RESOLUTION ON FOREIGN POLICY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE REPUBLICAN POST-WAR ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEPTEMBER 7, 1943.

The members of this council are aware of the gravity of the problems our Nation faces.

We are fighting a desperate war, which must be won as speedily as possible. When the war is ended, we must participate in the making of the peace. This puts upon the Nation a triple responsibility.

(a) We must preserve and protect all our own national interests.

(b) We must aid in restoring order and decent living in a distressed world.

(c) We must do our full share in a program for permanent peace among nations.

At this time a detailed program for the accomplishment of these great objectives would be impractical, and specific commitments by this council, by the Republican Party, or by the Nation, would be unwise. We cannot know now what situation may obtain at the war's end. But a specific program must be evolved in the months to come, as events and relations unfold.

Therefore, we consider it to be our duty at the beginning of our work as an Advisory Council of the Republican Party to declare our approval of the following:

1. Prosecution of the war by a united Nation to conclusive victory over all our enemies, including—

(a) Disarmament and disorganization of the armed forces of the Axis;

(b) Disqualification of the Axis to construct facilities for the manufacture of the implements of war;

(c) Permanent maintenance of trained and well-equipped armed forces at home.

2. Responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

In making this recommendation we ground our judgment upon the belief that both the foreign policy and domestic policy of every country are related to each other so closely that each member of the United Nations (or whatever cooperative organization, perpetuating existing unity, may be agreed upon) ought to consider both the immediate and remote consequences of every proposition with careful regard for:

(1) Its effect upon the vital interests of the Nation,

(2) Its bearing upon the foreseeable international developments.

If there should be a conflict between the two, then the United States of America should adhere to the policy which will preserve its constitutionalism as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution itself, and the Bill of Rights, as administered through our republican form of Government. Constitutionalism should be adhered to in determining the substance of our policies and shall be followed in ways and means of making international commitments.

In addition to these things this Council advises that peace and security ought to be ultimately established upon other sanctions than force. It recommends that we work toward a policy which will comprehend other means than war for the determination of international controversies; and the attainment of a peace that will prevail by virtue of its inherent reciprocal interests and its spiritual foundation, reached from time to time with the understanding of the peoples of the negotiating nations.

In all of these undertakings, we favor the widest consultation of the gallant men and women in our armed forces who have a special right to speak with authority in behalf of the security and liberty for which they fight.

It is determined that this Council make complete examination of the means by which these aims may be fully achieved, with due regard for all American interests and responsibilities.

The Council invites all Americans to adhere to the principles here set forth to the end that our place among the nations of the world and our part in helping to bring about international peace and justice shall not be the subject of domestic partisan controversy and political bitterness.

There is a declaration of foreign policy, if we must have such a declaration at this time, to which isolationists and interventionists, if love of country comes first, if adherence to our own form of government is supreme, can all wholeheartedly subscribe.

It was enthusiastically approved by two Republican Members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs—the Member from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], the ranking Republican Member on that committee.

The resolution, even if amended as proposed, should be defeated, for it repudiates our national policy, which has existed since the birth of the Republic, to which the Father of our Country advised us to adhere.

"Appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace" means nothing less than a military alliance between the United States of America, Great Britain, and such other countries as may choose to join.

In order to be effective, it means, on the one hand, that not only shall we join in such an alliance with Great Britain, but with Russia and any and all other nations which may so desire, and that then, sitting around the peace table, we shall agree upon a world policy which will include the division of the earth's surface among the participating nations.

It means that that alliance shall create, equip, and maintain an international army powerful enough to enforce its decrees.

It means that that alliance shall raise the money, furnish the food and the clothing and the transportation and everything else that affects the lives of men, in sufficient quantity so that all will be satisfied, or, if not satisfied, be in no position to effectively object.

If the resolution does not mean that, then it means that if Russia or any other country or countries refuses to join in such an alliance or to abide by its decrees we, with Great Britain, shall by armed force impose our will upon the recalcitrant nation.

It should not be forgotten that if we join in setting up such international machinery we are, to all intents and purposes, surrendering a portion of our sovereignty, becoming one of a group of states, instead of maintaining our national existence, our freedom of action.

The carrying out of this resolution means that we sit at a council table, where we can be outvoted, where decisions can be made which are detrimental to our national existence and to which we have already, by our participation, pledged our obedience.

And we should not forget that, being the richest nation—at least, so we are told—in the coalition, our taxpayers will be required to furnish the money determined by our associates to be necessary to carry on this world supergovernment.

All too many of our people who advocate this sort of action overlook the fact that when it is accomplished we shall not be masters of the situation; we shall be but a part—and it may well be but a subordinate part—of a new, a world government.

We shall not be an India, but we may find ourselves, to our sorrow, in the position of an Australia, New Zealand, or Canada—a royal province, back once more under the Union Jack instead of the Stars and Stripes.

Our forefathers brought forth the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and the Constitution. Through the trying days of the Revolutionary War, through the War of 1812, and again in the War between the States, men not only fought and bled but died that we might remain a nation.

If we adopt this resolution and it is carried out, we surrender our independence of action; Lincoln's admonition and prayer, made on the battlefield at Gettysburg, "that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth," will be no more than sounding brass and tinkling cymbals, for we shall have here in America, not a government of, by, and for the people, but a government, in national affairs, at least, of an international tribunal.

Are we here today, the Representatives of the people in Congress assembled, to wipe out the Declaration of Independence and, in its place, adopt a declaration of interdependence upon Great Britain and other nations of the Old World?

Such would be the construction placed by some other nations upon the adoption of this resolution.

In support of this resolution it has been argued that adopting and following it will prevent all war. If that would be its effect, perhaps the loss of our independence, of our sovereignty, might be a compensating sacrifice.

But the history of civilization—yes, and back of recorded history, back into the mists of the beginning—military alliances have proved ineffective for that purpose.

The proposed alliance between this country and Great Britain, if not joined by Russia, would but lead to a counteralliance by other nations. If joined by Russia, there would still be a counterworld force, made up of all those who do not belong to the Caucasian race.

Until the world, and all the world, accepts the doctrine of the Christ there will be no world peace. On the point of the sword, the Crusaders carried Christianity to the so-called infidels of the East, but they did not establish lasting world peace.

It is futile for us, even though joined by Britain, to talk of establishing and imposing the rules which shall guide the destinies of the people of the world until

we know—not guess—what Stalin and Russia will do when comes the peace.

Much has been said here in Congress during the last few years about our dependence upon the British Empire and her Navy.

It is time that something be said about the dependence of the British Empire upon the American fighting men.

For the record let it be said that in 1917 Great Britain and her allies were defeated and that the United States of America rescued the British Empire, saved it from utter defeat.

Again, after Dunkerque, it was only because of the aid extended by America, it was only because of the munitions of war, of the supreme sacrifice made by thousands of American fighting men, that the British Empire exists as such, that Churchill is enabled to come to us and plead for aid.

Today Great Britain is extending her commercial empire while we furnish the sinews of war and aid in financing her international trade through the expenditure of our lend-lease funds.

There is no reason to believe that an administration which has exercised unlimited power here at home over the lives of our people in their domestic affairs and, by the exercise of that power, has created a shortage of food, clothing and shelter, destroyed the liberties of the people, possesses the ability to successfully regulate the lives of a world-wide population, even though it be guided by the statesmanship of a Churchill, who thinks first and always, as he should, of the British Empire; who pauses not in his efforts to build up that empire, to free the people of India, or to give to them any one of the "four freedoms."

Why this resolution at this time?

Is it true that the British and Churchill have so little faith in us, that their trust in us is so weak, that we must come forward with a declaration that we will follow through to the end of the war and that we will aid in an effort to establish peace throughout the world?

Are not the billions of dollars, the hundreds of thousands of lives which have been sacrificed, the mountains of munitions which have been furnished, the ships which are sailing the seas, proof enough of our sincerity, of our determination to see the thing through to the end?

Why should we now make this gesture of dependence upon the British Empire, or upon any other nation or group of nations?

Is this resolution offered at this time as the opening wedge for a United States of the World, for Union Now, for a Federated United Nations?

We all recall how lend-lease was offered as a measure to keep us out of war, with the assurance that, when the war was over, all the material furnished or its equivalent would be restored to us.

We all recall how it was promised that our men should never be sent to fight on foreign soil. We all recall how Churchill said:

> Give us the tools and we will finish the job.

Well do we remember that, when the United States entered the war and it became necessary to send our men to die on foreign soil, it was the same Churchill who said:

> That is what I have dreamed of, aimed at, and worked for, and now it has come to pass.

And ever in our minds echoes his statement:

> Let me, however, make this clear, in case there should be any mistake about it in any quarter: we mean to hold our own. I have not become the King's first minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire.

Well did we know, when we sent munitions of war through belligerent waters to one of warring nations that war would follow, and well do we know now that the adoption of this resolution is, as just stated, the entering of the thin point of the wedge which, when driven home, means the loss of our independence, of our sovereignty, of the flying above the Stars and Stripes of an international flag.

That such is the purpose, and that there is a determined effort to accomplish it, can no longer be concealed. It was Cecil Rhodes who, on January 1, 1899, created the famous Rhodes scholarships to, and I quote:

> Encourage and foster * * * the union of the English-speaking peoples.

How greatly he contributed toward the supremacy of the British Empire in world affairs is shown by the fact that, as far back as 1940 and 1941, in high official places in our Federal Government were 49 individuals who were educated in part at least by Rhodes money. A list of those so placed, together with an article showing the situation, taken from the Chicago Tribune of yesterday, September 19, is printed herewith and made a part hereof, marked "Exhibits A and B."

If we are to have an alliance with Great Britain or with any other nation; if we are to sit in the international game of power politics, let us at the very least insist that the game be played with an unmarked deck; that we be dealt as many cards as any other participant in that game; that we be given opportunity to deal and that the chips used be placed openly on the table, so that all may see and know the stakes for which we are playing.

On Monday, January 5, 1942, by full-page advertisements in Washington and other great dailies, an appeal was made by Federal Union, Inc., Streit, president, to form a world united states, otherwise a united states of the world, and that appeal was recommended by a member of the Cabinet, Harold L. Ickes, and by a Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Owen J. Roberts. The Fulbright resolution is but a continuation of that effort.

World Fellowship, Inc., asked for a billion and a hundred million dollars to further the plan of a super united states of the world.

The purpose, if I read the signs aright, of all of these organizations—and, may it be added, the result of the adoption and the carrying out of this resolution—is to surrender our independence, relinquish our sovereignty, replace our national flag with some sort of a world organization to be maintained principally by the American taxpayer and the American soldier.

Hore-Belisha, former War Minister of Britain, in September of 1941, referring to the eight-point Atlantic Charter, expressed the hope that it would lead to a union of Great Britain and the United States, and he disclosed its purpose when he said:

> If we can replace the Declaration of Independence with a declaration of interdependence, we should lay the firmest foundation for permanent world peace.

That statement carries with it the implication that, throughout our national existence, we shall bear the burden of fighting the wars in which Great Britain may become involved, even though they concern us not at all.

It is my hope that the British Empire may continue while governments last, but that hope carries with it no obligation to fight Britain's battle at the expense of our national existence.

This resolution should be defeated.

Let the determination of our world policy await the return of the millions of soldiers who are fighting the battle; who, in the end, regardless of what we may say or do here, will guide the future destiny of our Nation.

EXHIBIT A

REVEAL RHODES SCHOLARS NOW ON UNITED STATES PAY ROLL—1940–41 ROSTERS ALSO LIST OXONIANS IN JOBS

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 18.—The American Oxonian rosters for 1940 and 1941, the latest available, list the following American Rhodes scholars who are on the Federal pay roll, their jobs and their college affiliations, here and at Oxford (those in the Army and Navy are not included):

Representative CHARLES R. CLASON (Republican, Massachusetts), Maine and Christ Church, 1914.

Representative J. W. FULBRIGHT (Democrat, Arkansas), Arkansas and Pembroke, 1925.

Representative ROBERT HALE (Republican, Maine), Maine and Trinity, 1910.

Elmer Davis, Director, Office of War Information, Indiana and Queen's, 1910.

Bryton Barron, Assistant Chief, Division of Research and Publication, State Department, South Dakota and Pembroke, 1918.

E. O. Belsheim, Treasury Department, North Dakota and St. John's, 1927.

Harlan Cleveland, Division of Information, Farm Security Administration, Ohio and University, 1938.

H. B. Cox, Department of Justice, Nebraska and Christ Church, 1927.

Richard L. Disney, member, United States Board of Tax Appeals, Arizona and Exeter, 1910.

C. J. Durr, Assistant General Counsel, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Alabama and Queen's, 1918.

C. D. Edwards, Economic Consultant, Department of Justice, Missouri and Lincoln, 1921.

Guy O. Farmer, National Labor Relations Board, West Virginia and Brasenose, 1936.

J. Fischer, Director of Information, Farm Security Administration, Oklahoma and Lincoln, 1933.

E. M. Fitch, chief statistician, Railroad Retirement Board. South Dakota and St. Edmund Hall. 1923.

Oscar Gass, economist, Treasury Department. Oregon and Queen's. 1934.

M. B. Giffen, Division of Research and Publication, State Department. Missouri and Queen's. 1908.

Fowler Hamilton, special assistant to the Attorney General. Missouri and Christ Church. 1931.

S. K. Hornbeck, adviser on political relations, State Department. Colorado and Christ Church. 1904.

J. Burke Knapp, Jr., Division of Research and Statistics, Federal Reserve Board. Oregon and St. John's. 1933.

Norman M. Littell, Assistant Attorney General. Indiana and Christ Church. 1920.

W. C. Lowdermilk, Assistant Chief, Soil Conservation Service. Arizona and Wadham. 1911.

C. D. Mahaffie, member, Interstate Commerce Commission. Oklahoma and St. John's. 1905.

E. O. Mather, principal attorney, Solicitor's office, Department of Agriculture. Texas and Lincoln. 1927.

H. L. Merillat, attorney, Office of Legislative Counsel in the Treasury. Arizona and Merton. 1935.

S. H. Sabin, vice president and secretary, Commodity Credit Corporation. South Dakota and Queen's. 1927.

B. E. L. Timmons, foreign funds control, United States Treasury. Georgia and Balliol. 1938.

B. B. Wallace, adviser on international trade policies, United States Tariff Commission. Minnesota and Pembroke. 1904.

Bruce Waybur, Division of Research and Statistics, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System. California and Balliol. 1937.

J. D. Burrus, Jr., principal attorney, Office of Price Administration. Wisconsin and Brasenose. 1927.

W. W. Butterworth, State Department. Louisiana and Worcester. 1924.

Carol H. Foster, consul general and first secretary, Foreign Service, State Department. Idaho and Brasenose, 1905.

Patrick A. Gibson, special assistant, Attorney General, Antitrust Division. Virginia and Christ Church. 1931.

E. S. Griffith, director of Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, New York and Merton, 1917.

D. L. Harley, associate research technician, National Resources Planning Board, West Virginia and Merton, 1931.

Grenville Ross Holden, chief, Aluminum and Magnesium Section, Office of Production Management, Idaho and Brasenose, 1931.

Samuel Adams, assistant director, Management Division of Defense Housing Coordination, Office for Emergency Management, Arizona and Worcester, 1934.

P. T. Homan, economic adviser on steel priorities, Office of Production Management, Oregon and Lincoln, 1914.

B. M. Hulley, second secretary and consul, State Department, Florida and Christ Church, 1917.

K. G. Karsten, consultant, National Resources Planning Board, New Mexico and Hertford, 1911.

John B. Martin, chief of Industrial and Agricultural Machinery Sections, Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, New Hampshire and Oriel, 1931.

L. G. McConnell, Jr., Information Section, Farm Security Administration, Oregon and Corpus Christi, 1938.

Waldemar Neilsen, social science analyst, Department of Agriculture, Missouri and Brasenose, 1939.

A. F. Scotten, United States Civil Service Commission, California and Balliol, 1930.

Carl Spaeth, assistant coordinator of inter-American affairs, Office for Emergency Management, New Hampshire and Exeter, 1929.

R. M. Stephenson, Division of Export Control, Economic Defense Board, Indiana and Balliol, 1916.

C. W. Strom, State Department, Iowa and Queens, 1924.

Donald N. Wheeler, Monetary Research, Treasury Department, Oregon and Pembroke, 1935.

Ralph T. Wilson, public assistance analyst, region IV, Social Security Board, Nebraska and Lincoln, 1918.

W. A. Ziegler, care Federal Works Agency, Washington, Iowa and Wadham, 1910.

The publications list the following "OONRS"—Old Oxonians Not Rhodes Scholars in Federal employment:

John M. Cabot, American Legation, Guatemala, Brasenose.

J. T. Callahan, assistant general counsel, Securities and Exchange Commission, New College, 1920.

Robert Douglas Coe, Foreign Service officer, secretary in the diplomatic service and consul, State Department, Magdalen, 1927.

Bertram R. Coen, attorney, Department of Labor, Exeter, 1933.

Francis E. Holman, secretary to Justice Harold M. Stephens, United States Court of Appeals, Exeter, 1936.

W. Wallace Kirkpatrick, lawyer, Department of Justice, Queens, 1934.

Joseph Pendergast, special assistant to the Attorney General, Balliol, 1927.

Edna Vosper, associate reference supervisor, The National Archives, St. Hugh's, 1924.

Evan M. Wilson, American vice consul, State Department, New College, 1931.

John Murray Begg, division of cultural relations, State Department, Magdalen, 1922.

Walter G. Green, senior attorney, Federal Security Agency, Lincoln, 1926.

R. Keith Kane, special defense unit, Department of Justice, Balliol, 1922.

Joseph Walford Martin, research associate, War Communications Research, St. Catherine's, 1930.

Martin Wagner, field examiner, National Labor Relations Board, Chicago, Magdalen, 1935.

EXHIBIT B

49 IN TOP UNITED STATES POSTS AIDED BY RHODES' MONEY—ENGLISH PAID SCHOLARS BACK UNION MOVES—PRO-BRITISH GROUP BACKS UNION

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 18.—American Rhodes scholars, who were educated in England in the hope that they might bring the United States back into the British Empire, occupy 3 seats in Congress and 46 important positions in the Federal Government, the latest rosters of the American Oxonian, official magazine of the Association of American Rhodes Scholars, showed today.

These volumes disclose a total of 63 Oxonians, including the Rhodes scholars, in the service of the United States Government as of 1940 and 1941. More of them may have obtained Government jobs in the last 2 years, for which no lists are available.

The post-war military alliance with Great Britain proposed by Secretary of State Cordell Hull and the partnership of the United States in the British Empire suggested by Prime Minister Churchill has focused attention on these wearers of the old school tie whose education was financed through the will of Cecil Rhodes, diamond and gold mine magnate, and one of the greatest empire builders in England's history.

INCLUDES CONGRESSMEN

Rhodes scholars were among the chief protagonists for union with England before the war and before the current crop of post-war plans. Among them are Clarence Streit, author of Union Now; Representative J. W. Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, who introduced a resolution to pledge Congress in advance to a world supergovernment; Representative Robert Hale, Republican, of Maine, who has been stumping for the Ball-Burton-Hatch resolution; Elmer Davis, the Director of the Office of War Information and former pro-war radio commentator, and Ernest K. Lindley, New Deal Washington columnist.

Active along with these scholarship winners in post-war plans is a group known affectionately in Oxonian circles as "OONRS"—Old Oxonians Not Rhodes Scholars—who were graduated from the English university without the help of Rhodes' £400 a year grant. Henry R. Luce, head of the Time-Life-Fortune axis, is one of them.

DESCRIBED AS CONSPIRATOR

Rhodes' purpose in founding Oxford scholarships with his immense fortune is described by John Hays Hammond, an American mining engineer, who was intimately associated with Rhodes for 7 years, was his close friend, and was engaged with him in the management of large gold and diamond mining enterprises in Africa. Of this association Hammond wrote in his autobiography: "Most important of all, we were coconspirators in a political revolution."

Hammond tells how Rhodes' political theories were written in the first of his six wills: "The preamble states his reasons for accepting the aggrandizement of the British Empire as his ultimate aim of practical achievement. It ends with a single bequest—everything of which he might die possessed was to be used to further this great purpose.

SECRET SOCIETY PLANNED

"Rhodes' plan was to form a secret society whose aim would be to extend British rule throughout the world by perfecting a system of emigration from the British Isles to any and all lands that could be colonized successfully by energy, labor, and enterprise," Hammond wrote. "He specifically enumerated those parts of the world which he considered suitable for this purpose: The whole of Africa, Palestine, the Euphrates Valley, Cyprus and Crete, all of South America, whatever of the Pacific islands that were not already possessed by Great Britain, the Malay archipelago, the Chinese and Japanese seaboard, and, lastly, the recovery of the United States as an integral part of the British Empire.

"He proposed to have these colonies represented in an imperial parliament which would weld them together. The resultant power would 'render war impossible and would promote the best interests of humanity.' "

HELD BRITISH NEEDED UNITED STATES

Hammond wrote that Rhodes once exclaimed with great vehemence, "Unless we English-speaking peoples stand together, all that we hold dear and all the ideals we represent will be lost."

"On another occasion he roundly denounced George III for the loss of America and stated that but for the King's stupidity there would now be one great country with two capitals—one in London and the other at Washington."

Hammond recalled that Rhodes, who felt so interested in America that he wanted it back in the British Empire, knew so little about this country that at the time his will was drawn he thought that the United States still consisted of the Original Thirteen States.

Hammond also related that at one time he suggested to Rhodes that it might be well to have English scholars attend American universities, because they knew so much less about America than Americans did about England and her traditions. His suggestion was received coldly, and he wrote that "my views did not prevail."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

WOULD DISARM OUTLAW NATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the Fulbright resolution, now under discussion and which will be voted on today after more than 4 hours of debate, should receive the support of every Member of this House, notwithstanding the speech in opposition by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], who referred to the resolution as a mirage and in many other uncomplimentary terms, and then indicated that he will vote for it. It should receive the unanimous support of all Members, despite another address by another well-known isolationist, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], who called the resolution an idle dream and an empty gesture, and then expressed grave fear of what the result of passage of the resolution would mean. Fortunately, Congress has refused to follow either of these well-known isolationists in the past, and I am certain will not follow them today. Their remarks, however, are the best evidence that the ideas of the so-called isolationists have not changed. In fact, nothing about them has changed except their tactics.

The Fulbright resolution is short, simple, and understandable, and, when passed, will place the House of Representatives definitely on record as favoring an enduring peace following the present struggle. I submit in all seriousness that peace—a lasting peace—next to winning the war decisively and getting our boys home as soon as possible, is closer to the hearts of our people than any other problem. A lasting peace is not only uppermost in the minds of our fighting men on the many far-flung fronts of the world but it is also one of the consuming thoughts and innermost desires of the fathers and mothers of all those men in uniform.

The Fulbright resolution, in short, proposes—

> The creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States.

It has been charged that the Fulbright resolution is too vague and entirely too general in its character. Answering, I will say that the creation of appropriate international machinery must, of course, be worked out after the war. That will not be an easy task for a war-weary world to set up if history repeats itself. It will be recalled that too much partisan politics and jealousies of certain well-known isolationists and Woodrow Wilson haters got into the discussion of setting up such international machinery after World War No. 1 and thus defeated President Wilson's dream of world peace via the League of Nations and World Court.

Of course, none of us know whether or not the Wilson plan would have been successful. What we do know is that we are once again engaged in another gigantic world combat. One other thing is certain, nothing will deter an outlaw nation from going to war when it has the kind of leadership that has cursed the Axis Powers for the past couple of decades. Written promises and signed agreements are treated as mere scraps of paper when a gangster nation forgets all laws of decency and decides to go on a lawless, murderous rampage, extend its borders, and enslave citizens of other countries who are not prepared to defend themselves.

All the international machinery in the world will not guarantee an enduring peace among the liberty-loving, God-fearing peoples of the earth so long as the bandit, outlaw, gangster nations are permitted to arm to the teeth.

When an individual bandit or murderer is caught, tried, and convicted, he is not turned loose or partially disarmed, but is usually executed or placed behind bars for the remainder of his life. The same principle is true with reference to outlaw nations, such as Germany, Italy, and Japan. They must be totally disarmed following their absolute and unconditional surrender. They must not be permitted to have a single man in uniform, a single battleship, destroyer or U-boat. The Axis nations must not be permitted to retain a single fighting plane or bomber, or a hook on which to hang a bomb. Regardless of international machinery, which may or may not be set up, if the gangsters do not have the ships, planes, guns, and ammunition with which to start another war, then and then only will the lives and homes of decent peoples of the earth be secure.

It has been suggested that if this be done the United States will have to help police the world. But as one soldier boy, now fighting in the southwest Pacific, recently wrote me:

> To help police the world would be a whale of a lot less expensive in lives and in materials than having to fight another war 25 years hence.

If we must help police the world, however, then it should be done, not at the expense of the American taxpayers, but by all means at the expense of the gangster nations, whose detestable tactics, damnable philosophies, and hypocritical acts have plunged the world into the most gigantic war of all ages.

In this connection, I am glad to report that the American Legion department of Oklahoma, at its recent State convention at Guthrie, unanimously passed a much more definite declaration than the Fulbright resolution, which the House will adopt by an overwhelming vote as a general policy here today. The Legion resolution, which I was asked to draft by the legionnaires of the Sixth District at a conference at Guthrie, proposes very definitely: "First, that the representatives of the armed forces have a voice in writing the peace; second, to disarm the culprit outlaw nations; and, third, to treat them as bandits and outlaws after the war by keeping them disarmed, and helping police them at their own expense. That resolution, which certainly has food for thought, is as follows:

> Whereas the department of Oklahoma feels that it is not too early to begin constructive planning for a just and durable peace when the Axis Powers sue for peace and shall make an unconditional surrender; and
>
> Whereas it is the sense of every loyal, patriotic American that the liberty-loving peoples of the earth shall be permitted to live in peace and security in the future, and that our children will not be called upon to fight this war over 25 years hence; Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved*, That our gallant men in uniform who are fighting for our liberties on the many far-flung fronts of the earth shall have an influential voice in writing the peace treaty; be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That we favor treating the gangster leaders of the enemy nations who are now opposing us, as bandits and outlaws; that such nations be completely disarmed on land, sea, and in the air, and that the Allied Nations police these outlaws at the Axis' expense as a sure and practical means of guaranteeing future world peace.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. If I understand the gentleman's remarks, he is in favor of the Fulbright resolution. The question now being considered in the debate is not upon the merits of the resolution, but rather whether we suspend the rules, which, as I understand, prohibits any Member from offering any amendment to the resolution. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As I understand the resolution the main question involved is whether or not this House will take only 40 minutes to discuss this important legislation or shall we take 4 hours to discuss it. Of course, the gentleman presents a parliamentary question.

Mr. RIZLEY. Surely the gentleman does not favor bringing the resolution before the House under a rule so that the average Member of the House cannot offer amendments to the resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, the gentleman is getting very technical. He insists on raising a parliamentary question that I am sure the able and distinguished Speaker of this House will be glad to answer and do so with authority. The gentleman, of course, knows that I am as much opposed to so-called gag rules as any Member of this House. If I had my way about it there would be no gag rules, but I am more interested in winning the war and securing and preserving a lasting peace than in any rule of this House.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman has no more interest in winning the war, personal or otherwise, nor the peace to follow, which we hope and pray may be permanent, than do I; on the other hand it seems to me that the importance of this resolution warrants full debate and that the average Member should be permitted to offer amendments. In other words, why should the resolution be considered under a rule which prohibits Members of this body offering amendments. I am sure the people of Oklahoma are fully fed up on legislation enacted the past few years by so-called gag rules and which has contributed much to the bureaucratic control which now confronts us. They want their Representatives to function under the ordinary processes of the legislative branch of the Government and get away from

gag rules and legislation by Executive directives.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield with pleasure to a statement by the Speaker of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] is apparently propounding a parliamentary inquiry. The question before the House on the present motion to suspend the rules is whether or not we will have 4 hours of debate on the Fulbright resolution or 40 minutes' debate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the Speaker for answering very clearly the parliamentary inquiry of my colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the resolution is voted down, would it then not be in order to obtain a rule from the Rules Committee?

The SPEAKER. It would not. The Chair has just stated that the question before the House now is whether there is to be 4 hours' debate on the Fulbright resolution or 40 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to sound just a reassuring note. This resolution lives up fully to the old adage—from the Bigelow papers—dear to the heart of every politician and political party:

> Never say nuthin' unless you are compelled tu; then say nuthin' you can be held tu.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am, of course, in favor of the resolution to proceed with debate for 4 hours.

Mr. Speaker, I smell punk everytime the Foreign Affairs Committee hands us a pig in the poke in the form of one of these un-American gag rules.

Mr. Speaker, the punk in this instance is found in the secret testimony of the State Department witness before the Foreign Affairs Committee in which it is made perfectly clear that our super-exalted State Department has already completely bypassed the Congress in committing this Nation to a series of present and post-war programs for which "all the Congress has to do is simply appropriate the fund," in the amount to which the State Department has already committed us as a nation.

This Fulbright resolution as presently written—and despite its lofty aims—is entirely too broad in scope and I fear, if adopted, will be regarded by the theorizers uptown as a carte blanche authority from the Congress to go the limit in committing this Nation entirely without any further consideration or consent being given by this Congress, who are the duly elected representatives of the people who expect us to fully safeguard their rights. This gag rule permits of no amendments whatsoever to this simple and yet extremely broad resolution.

I am perfectly agreeable to a program of post-war cooperation and collaboration between nations, but as far as I am concerned, I will vote for no program that commits this Nation in advance, without having had due consideration given to the provisions of the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and the Constitution of the United States of America. We, and we alone, shall be the masters of our own destiny; and we, and we alone, in the Congress of the United States, should give full approval to any and all commitments to which this Nation binds itself. We, and we alone, shall retain our complete sovereignty at all times.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the pending resolution determines one thing and one thing only, whether the debate upon the Fulbright resolution, if taken up under suspension of the rules, shall be 40 minutes or 4 hours.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a moment to discuss the speeches that have been made in opposition to the Fulbright resolution.

The gentlemen who have spoken against it have said, that is, two of them, they would vote for it, but that it did not mean anything. Then in the next breath that it means too much. Another says that if we pass it maybe the Senate will kick it out and not consider it.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, is a resolution declaring the policy of the United States as to what we should do when this war is ended in trying to prevent another war. It means this and it means what it says and it says what it means, that there is to be participation between the United States and other countries in setting up machinery to try to prevent another war. It means that we are not going, this time, to sit supinely by until the world is engulfed in another war and take no steps whatsoever to try to prevent that war, and that means much to the American people, and it means much to the boys who are fighting now on the battlefronts of the world, it means much to the people of this country who are buying bonds to provide for the conduct of this war to have that assurance; it will stimulate the morale of our people and it means much to our allies, fighting with us, to know our attitude.

It means that we are not going to make the same mistake that we have made twice within the past 25 years, after the war is over, that we are not going to show any interest or take any steps to prevent another war.

It means that the United States realizes that it owes a responsibility for our own salvation and to mankind, that we must not escape; that we cannot escape—it means that we, as the representatives of the American people, want to declare to our allies and to warn our enemies that the United States henceforth will cooperate in trying to preserve the peace of the world, and that is not just a Fourth-of-July declaration; that is necessary for the preservation of the American people and for the peace of the world.

Mr. Speaker, if this resolution were submitted to the vote of the American people, 90 percent of them, if not more, would vote in its favor. Let us not as their representatives here today, let them down. Let us not be divided by those who condemn, who want to create division. Let us take it on its merits. We are trying to do one thing and one thing only here, nothing further. The defeat of this resolution at this time would be a tragic disaster.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] to ask a question of the gentleman from Texas.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas if he does not feel that this resolution is an authorization to the President to create the machinery which in his opinion will keep wars down?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. No; it is not an authorization to the President; it is a declaration by the Congress that we favor setting up machinery or attempting to set up machinery that will prevent another war. It is not the act of the President, it is the act of the Congress as the representatives of the American people.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Am I to understand from the gentleman's words that he thinks it is a ratification in advance of the President's acts?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. No. We do not know what can happen; we do not know what can be worked out. This is not legislation, it is a declaration of policy. That is a matter that will have to be worked out after the war ends. All of us are against war. By this action we declare our purpose as favoring machinery to prevent another war. That is all we can do now.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Does the gentleman think it ratifies any agreement the President has already made?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Absolutely not.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time—I believe it is 2½ minutes—to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, there is only one central issue before the House, before the country, and before the world at this moment, all inclusive, transcending every other. [Can we substitute processes of law and peace for force and death in international relations?] That is all. That can never come unless the United States participates in it. The United States cannot participate successfully unless the Congress representing the people participates and exercises

its constitutional functions and authority.

We are here today to set in motion a resolution which announces that the Congress will take its part in helping to avert the universal destruction of civilization by continued war. I have a personal reason for wanting to see this passed. I had seven of the finest boys in the world in my family—fine boys, just as you have in yours. One of them died of his wounds over Holland on the 30th of July; another one was killed near Nuremberg on the 10th of August; five are left. I hate that. And, before God, I am going to vote for anything that I think will avert the necessity for sacrificing the young manhood of this Nation. In face of these supreme realities to quibble about the time of debate I think is silly. I do not care whether you have 40 minutes or 14 hours; let us stand up and face our responsibility and make this one gesture to show that we are in favor of abolishing forever wholesale murder in the name of civilization

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe there is some confusion as to the exact terminology of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be again read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the resolution.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The resolution contains two substantive proposals. Is it by reason of this fact divisible?

The SPEAKER. Not under a suspension of the rules, because the first proposal suspends all the rules.

The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the resolution?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 252, noes 23.

So two-thirds having voted in the affirmative the rules were suspended and the resolution was passed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass House Concurrent Resolution 25 with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. May a second be demanded by one who is not opposed to the resolution?

The SPEAKER. That was practically cured by the resolution just passed, which provides that the time shall be in control of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]. The formality was gone through.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I raise the point that the time now provided is in the control entirely of four Members.

The SPEAKER. The House decided by a vote of 252 to 23 that that was to be the program.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Speaker ruled that a second is ordered, and then the same persons who control the time controlled the 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The House ordered that by unanimous consent. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] demanded a second, and a second was ordered by unanimous consent. However, that was a formality, because the time was already controlled by the terms of the resolution under which the House suspended the rules.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the interpretation of the ruling as just announced by the Speaker, this resolution which we have just passed, and which we were assured dealt with but one thing—that is, the allowing of 4 hours' debate instead of 40 minutes—had in it language which does away with the right of the opposition to control a part of the time in debate as provided for by the rules and precedents of the House. Is that true?

The SPEAKER. The resolution just passed fixed debate at 4 hours instead of 40 minutes, and the Chair stated that.

Mr. MICHENER. Under the resolution the gentleman from New York, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, rose and asked to suspend the rules and pass a certain concurrent resolution. I thought when the House passed the resolution a few minutes ago that that resolution did just two things; that is, extended the time on this concurrent resolution from 40 minutes to 4 hours and made the resolution the continuing business of the House until completed. Many of us did not understand that we were denying the opposition a part of the time for debate, as required by the rules.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say, having some responsibility in this matter, that he does not think there is any ambiguity whatever in the resolution offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts and passed by the House.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE. Did not the motion adopted which embraced the resolution specifically refer to the resolution presently under consideration, so that the rule with regard to extension of the time applies only to the resolution now pending?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, did the resolution just adopted do away with the rules of the House which provide a second may be demanded on a motion for suspension of the rules?

The SPEAKER. The Chair asked if a second was demanded. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] demanded a second, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] asked unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered, and unanimous consent was given.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, do not the rules provide that a second must be demanded by someone opposed to the motion?

The SPEAKER. It might, but there may come a time when someone might want to debate the resolution when there was no one opposed to it.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, first I want to answer the question that was raised with reference to the amendment which was reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee. The amendment that we have adopted and which is here for consideration is an amendment accepted unanimously by the entire committee after many different words were suggested and many amendments were proposed.

The amendment by striking out the period after the word "therein" and leaving it all in one sentence states "among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes." The words "its constitutional processes" refers to the United States, so there cannot be any question about that. All of the members agreed upon that and we think that the wording that we have adopted here is satisfactory and should be satisfactory to everyone.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In other words, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs construes this to mean that when specific proposals for this international cooperation are presented or agreed to, they will come before the Congress and Congress will pass upon them in the constitutional manner?

Mr. BLOOM. The Congress could not do anything else. Let me read what your oath of office is and this does not do away with that in any way. When you were sworn in as a Member of Congress you solemnly swore or affirmed that you would support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

You could not do anything else whether that is in there or not. That is your oath of office. But it was suggested to satisfy some people that we should put that in there and that is why it is there.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There was a fear on the part of a good many Members that the Executive might negotiate these agreements and might bypass Congress.

Mr. BLOOM. This is only a concurrent resolution. We are only expressing an opinion here. It is not a law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No. But the gentleman then will concede that the administration could not go ahead and negotiate agreements without submitting them to Congress?

Mr. BLOOM. That is very true. Let me quote what the State Department has said in its White Paper with reference to that. This is entitled "Peace and War, United States Foreign Policy, 1931 to 1941." Among other things it is stated:

> The fullest possible agreement on basic policies and to later arrangements at the proper time and above all that there must not be any secret agreements.

There it is on page 108 of Peace and War, the Foreign Policy of the State Department. There "must not be any secret agreements."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman from New York is chairman of the committee which reported this resolution and the amendment. For the benefit of the House, I should like to have the gentleman's interpretation of the amendment as to its meaning and effect.

Mr. BLOOM. This resolution merely states that whatever you do you must do it under the Constitution of the United States. You could not do it any other way if you wanted to. That is all there is to that.

Does that answer your question, Mr. COLE?

Mr. COLE of New York. Yes; as far as the meaning of the amendment, but not as to its effect.

Mr. BLOOM. The effect of the amendment will be that there will be no participation by this country in any international machinery unless and until approval of that participation has been obtained within the terms and provisions of our Constitution.

Mr. COLE of New York. Thank you.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then the amendment is no limitation whatever upon the resolution?

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman had better take that up in his own time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No.

Mr. BLOOM. What does the gentleman mean by that?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman mean that this amendment is a limitation upon the resolution; or is it not?

Mr. BLOOM. No; you could not have a limitation as far as this amendment is concerned. You could not do anything against the Constitution if you wanted to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. So the amendment does not mean anything, does it?

Mr. BLOOM. It does.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What does it mean?

Mr. BLOOM. This amendment simply reaffirms that nothing will be done contrary to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You promise you will not do anything that you cannot do, is that it?

Mr. BLOOM. You wanted that. We put it in there to satisfy you folks.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not me; do not say "you." Oh, no; I want to retain our sovereignty. I want America to come first.

Mr. BLOOM. So do all of us.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want in there the provision that we look after America first and retain our sovereignty.

Mr. BLOOM. I think we all want that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why not put it in there, then?

Mr. BLOOM. What does the gentleman want in there?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just what I said.

Mr. BLOOM. You cannot get any more than that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, I could say that when the interests of other countries and of our country come in conflict we should take America first. Protect our country at all hazards as do the statesmen of other nations.

Mr. BLOOM. We all agree to that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then why not put it in there?

Mr. BLOOM. That satisfies the committee and it satisfies the Republicans who met the other day.

Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further. I am sorry.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. May I ask the chairman of the committee if the agreement in the committee was unanimous, on both sides?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes. I cannot say any more than that it was unanimous. It was not suggested from our side, either; it was suggested from the Republican side. The committee has been unanimous on everything.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is cooperating with other free nations in using brute force to knock out and disarm aggressors. We are at war because the world has not yet found any other way to protect liberty. Unless we find that other way we must expect every few years to be forced to buy liberty with the blood of our children. This is an intolerable curse, and the intelligence of mankind is under indictment so long as we submit to this system of brute force.

The American people demand that the United States and other free nations try to find a way to keep aggressors powerless, so that we shall not forever have to pay in blood for freedom. In response to this demand this concurrent resolution is before you. It has been unanimously approved by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. This is not a partisan measure, and I cannot describe this resolution better than to quote what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] said when the resolution was reported to the House last June.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is thus reported in the RECORD of June 16:

> Mr. Speaker, the Fulbright resolution reported by our Foreign Affairs Committee on post-war participation is important and will prove to be historic in my judgment. It is so brief and simple that it can hardly be misunderstood or misconstrued. I want to point our for those who have not read it and do not know its history just what it is and what it is not.
>
> It is not just a pious generality. On the other hand, it is not a blueprint of a supergovernment. It is not a "must" measure from the Executive. On the other hand, it is not an antiadministration measure. It is not a commitment. It is not a pledge. It is merely a statement of congressional preference in post-war policies. Nevertheless, it is important and historic. The Fulbright resolution was home-made by representatives of the people and by nobody else. Mr. FULBRIGHT'S original draft, which he made himself, was overhauled and revamped by the committee, and by no one else, in a devoted and earnest attempt to secure a statement which would show the unanimous preference of our committee on post-war participation. It was not forced on the minority by the majority, or vice versa. I hope it will be considered in the same spirit by the House and the Senate.
>
> * * * We prefer post-war participation, not post-war isolation. If the House and Senate are like minded, this resolution we have reported will be adopted. * * * For 4 years, I have urged that our foreign policy, whatever it is, should be brought down from the clouds into reality and out of the closets into the open, and that the people's representatives in Congress should attempt to state in official words our war aims and our peace aims. This is a historic and important step in this direction.
>
> The resolution is so short and simple that it speaks for itself. It is the hope of our committee that it will be considered because of what it says, not because of what is said about it. My sole purpose in this statement is to urge that the resolution be considered on this basis.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing remarks that I have quoted fully explain the scope and purpose of this concurrent resolution. I earnestly hope that we will suspend the rules and pass this resolu-

tion by such an overwhelming vote as to prove that the United States is eager to attack the problem of a lasting world peace.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes, I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Has Great Britain or any other government now allied with the United States taken any similar step through their lawmaking body?

Mr. BLOOM. That I do not know.

Mr. DONDERO. Was any information brought to the committee to that effect?

Mr. BLOOM. I could not answer, because any information that we received might not be the same as this.

Mr. DONDERO. And this proposition is the first in the hope that we are expressing to the world today.

Mr. BLOOM. I think we lead the way. And I may say to the gentleman that there were many different resolutions before the Congress, the House and the Senate, up to the present time, and they were varied in their ideas. Some were referred to the Rules Committee, some to the Ways and Means Committee, some to the Judiciary and many to other committees; and the Committee on Foreign Affairs considered all the resolutions that had been introduced up to that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I approve strongly of the speech of our chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]. I particularly liked the quotation from my speech which he gave at such length; it sounded better than when I heard myself say it last June, and the House now has not only Mr. BLOOM'S assurance but mine, that that is an accurate history of the Fulbright resolution, and that nothing has transpired in the past 2 months to change its history or genealogy.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-eight Members have answered to their names, not a quorum.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 141]

Anderson, N. Mex.	Cullen	Hill
Barry	Curley	Hinshaw
Boren	Elliott	Hobbs
Bulwinkle	Ellsworth	Holmes, Mass.
Burgin	Ford	Izac
Carter	Furlong	Jackson
Celler	Gale	Johnson, Calvin D.
Chenoweth	Goodwin	Johnson, Okla.
Clark	Granger	Keefe
Coffee	Green	Kerr
Cole, Mo.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Kleberg
Courtney	Hart	Knutson
Creal	Hartley	LaFollette
Lane	Rizley	Treadway
Larcade	Rockwell	Wasielewski
McKenzie	Rowan	Weaver
May	Russell	Welchel, Ohio
Miller, Pa.	Schwabe	Welch
O'Connor	Spence	West
O'Konski	Starnes, Ala.	White
O'Leary	Steagall	Winter
Peterson, Fla.	Stevenson	Wolcott
Philbin	Sundstrom	Woodrum, Va.
Pittenger	Taylor	
Ploeser	Thomas, N. J.	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and fifty-five Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we all want to win the war. The question is, How will we know we have won the war? We have shown that we know how to win battles, but how do we win the war and keep it won? Who keeps the score on who wins? After we have beaten Hitler and Hirohito, then what? I submit that we will know we have won the war, not when our troops march into Berlin and Tokyo but when our troops march out of Berlin and Tokyo for home and for good. That is the test of whether we have won the war. If our military occupation must continue indefinitely because of a break-down in international law and order, we will have lost the war. Those who urge that we wait until the boys come home before we start to discuss peace plans apparently forget that the boys will not start home at all until peace plans, of some kind or other, are put into effect. We dare not wait. We should be getting some commitments on peace from our allies now while we are needed, and not wait until too late, as we did before, and those commitments should be public and should be approved by Congress.

We must wage peace as skillfully as we wage war. What is needed is the creation of appropriate international machinery, with power adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace; and in order to have that happen, the United States must participate therein. That is what the Fulbright resolution provides: those are the very words of the Fulbright resolution.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think the gentleman has made a fine statement, and I would like to know this: The Fulbright resolution is a general resolution urging or guaranteeing American participation. Specific proposals will come up as a result of national agreements and treaties. Under this resolution, will all of those agreements and treaties be presented to Congress for consideration?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I can only say that I hope so. I shall have more to say on that in a few minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the last proviso, amended and agreed to by the gentleman's committee, guarantee that we will follow the Constitution of the United States when it comes to the ratification of those treaties?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. It certainly does; but we have a situation now in which many agreements are not brought to the Congress for approval, which is not reached by this resolution and cannot be.

Let me go through this resolution and tell you some of the things it says and some of the things it does not say. An amusing thing is this, that it is not Members' own interpretations of the resolution itself that are feared so much, but it is because of the way somebody interprets somebody else's interpretation of this resolution that is causing alarm. I urge you not to count your interpretations before they are hatched. This resolution is a general statement. It is very short and very simple. What does it say?

First, "Congress hereby expresses itself," and that is a historic step for Congress to take in the field of foreign policy.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] asked whether any other nation or any governing body of any other nation has made an attempt to express itself in a simple, general statement of post-war policy. I know of no other such statement. This one creates a precedent for the whole world, and we are therefore participating in what I believe is a very historic step at this time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is fear on the part of many that this resolution, when passed, will be construed by the Executive so that he can bypass Congress and negotiate agreements without referring them to Congress.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The purpose of this, it seems to me, is to avoid the bypassing of Congress, because the Congress expresses itself on foreign policy and shows that the determination of appropriate machinery must involve an expression from the Congress from now on.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true, then, that this Nation will be leading other nations of the world instead of following? We are a great and powerful Nation and perfectly capable of leadership.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes; instead of tagging along and getting dragged into something we did not help to fix up.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It gives us power in deciding what shall be done and in watching constantly every move that is made.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. We will be there on hand to insure that appropriate international machinery is set up.

Now I go to the next expression:

The Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring—

Not as guaranteeing, or pledging, or committing this country or future Congresses, but simply as favoring, what?—

the creation of appropriate international machinery.

Those words show that this is homemade. Whoever heard of using the word

"machinery" in a document of this kind before? The reason it is used is because in this country—this country of machinery—everyone knows what we mean by "international machinery." It is a very general expression that the common man can understand, instead of using some 2-gallon, $4 diplomatic word. What do we mean by "appropriate"? Who determines what is appropriate? The Congress reserves to itself the right to determine whether the machinery which is proposed is appropriate or not. For instance, under lend-lease the combined boards and joint staffs composed solely of United Kingdom and United States representatives, in equal numbers, dispose of lend-lease materials for the whole world. It is proposed in certain quarters that this set-up be continued as peacetime machinery. I do not consider this appropriate international machinery for peace, and if appropriations or other legislation to support such peace machinery should come to Congress, I believe it would not be approved, even though the Fulbright resolution had passed both Houses.

Now I come to the next phrase:

With power adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace.

I have heard criticism of the phrase "adequate power." Do you want inadequate power? Would that be a sensible expression? Do we want to name the kinds of power? Possible powers would be, let us say, military, economic, and moral power. The Mackinac Island declaration wisely emphasized the great importance, in a world of force, of moral force. In my judgment, the extent to which we set up appropriate machinery that will use moral force and economic force will determine the extent to which it will be unnecessary to use military force.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Did I understand the gentleman to say that under this resolution the Congress would be the judge or have an opportunity to judge of "appropriate international machinery?"

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. It seems to me the language can bear no other construction; that the body expressing itself, the Congress, which "hereby expresses itself" as favoring "appropriate machinery," is obviously reserving to itself the power to determine what machinery is appropriate when it does not attempt to define "appropriate."

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does that not mean that those in charge of our diplomatic relations, and so forth, can go ahead under this resolution and determine what is appropriate machinery?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. It seems to me clearly that it is not subject to that interpretation.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. FISH. Is the gentleman at all fearful that the Executive might not twist or distort the provisions of this resolution and enter into commitments, secret commitments, without regard to the constitutional processes?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. There is no authorization in this resolution to enter into secret commitments or to make any sort of commitments at all. The Congress itself does not commit itself to anything. It certainly does not authorize any commitments by the Executive in this resolution.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. In view of the fact that the administration has time and again indicated that it believes it can do anything by executive agreement that can be done by treaty consented to by the Senate, is there not danger that the administration may construe this resolution as a mandate to enter into international agreements by executive agreement and without submitting the subject matter to Congress at all?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. That is a very good question, and I want to bring that up under the next phrase to which I will refer, the amendment which was unanimously placed in this resolution this morning, "through its constitutional processes." Before I come to that, there was a question which came up about "establish and maintain." Some people say that we ought to establish a just peace, but not maintain it; that we ought to repeat the mistakes we have made in the past. There are many who state that when the United States established peace after the last war and failed to maintain it after Versailles, we sowed the seeds of this conflict. My own feeling is that when the London Economic Conference failed in 1933, because our Government refused to participate further, that was the last chance to maintain world peace. In any case, we must profit by our past experience, and unless we want perpetual war we must not only make sure that a just peace is established, but we must make sure that it is maintained. We know now that no one else will maintain peace for our benefit. We had better help maintain it for our own benefit.

No one will disagree with the goal we express in these words, "A just and lasting peace." I dare any Member of this House to admit that he favors an unjust or a temporary peace.

Next, I want to call attention to the most important word in this resolution, "Participation." We are going to participate in international affairs. Whether it is an encouragement or a warning, we are saying to the world, "Count us in from now on. We are going to take part."

We always have participated in world affairs; the amount of our participation has varied, and may vary again; we have not always participated wisely. I hope we will be wiser in the future; but by this resolution we are saying, "We favor participation; include us in, not out."

Now, I want to answer the question of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART]. What are the possibilities as to the types of constitutional processes that will be used in our future participation? The same possibilities will exist—and I want to fool nobody—that have existed in the past.

We are not amending the Constitution by this provision; we are not circumventing the Constitution. Under the Constitution, up to the present time, our Presidents have made over a thousand agreements back through the years, going clear back to the first President. These were made under both Republican and Democratic administrations. These Executive agreements have consisted of three kinds: One, Executive agreements that are clearly within the power of the Executive to make, such as an agreement about a diplomatic license tag for an ambassador's automobile in some foreign country, or some similar matter. The President can make a military agreement during war, such as the agreement to invade Sicily. Second, an Executive agreement that has no legal force, but merely political force. Such an agreement, as Mr. Atcheson explained before the committee, is not a legal agreement, but the political commitment of the administration. Such an agreement can have great importance even though it has no actual legal status under our Constitution. The United Nations agreement is of this character. I think this resolution does as much as we can do to head off that type of agreement by offering our cooperation and aid to the Executive and by showing the capacity of the Congress for speedy and intelligent action; but the Congress cannot amend the Constitution or take away the power of the President to make Executive agreements. The third type of Executive agreement is one authorized by law by Congress. For instance, the President makes binding international agreements under our postal laws, and under our trade-mark law. The Congress can limit the Executive in making this type of Executive agreement by amending or repealing the laws which authorize the agreement. Under existing laws, in the reciprocal trade-agreement law and in the Lend-Lease Act, the Congress has authorized the Executive to make certain types of agreements. There may be many occasions in the future where the Congress, by joint action of both Houses, by a majority vote, will authorize certain agreements or repeal the authority for certain agreements. And whether we do or not is not determined and cannot be determined at this time in this resolution.

Another way of proceeding under the Constitution is by treaty ratification by the Senate.

These are the processes that have been used by the Executive under our Constitution. When we put in here a reminder that we expect to participate through constitutional processes it seems to me that we are doing all we can do at this time.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. I am quite in agreement with the gentleman that we cannot expand or restrict the provisions of the Constitution by the passage of this resolution, or any other as far as that is

concerned, but the passage of this resolution is going to give great encouragement to the President to construe what is appropriate international machinery, what is adequate power, and then proceed to put it into definite writings called Executive agreements.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Well, if the President is so encouraged by a bill which expressly states that the Congress is to determine what is appropriate, he will be due for a discouragement on that subject later on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Ohio 1 additional minute.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Is the gentleman's interpretation of the phraseology in the resolution before us that there is nothing therein that will prohibit or prevent the President of the United States from committing the people of the United States to policies which, when submitted to them and their representatives, they would not approve?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. There is nothing in here to prohibit the President from doing that; he has no such power now. He can commit himself and his administration, but not the people of the United States. He has made political commitments which have had vast importance, commitments which I felt should have been submitted to the Congress, but with respect to limiting the constitutional power of the President to act, we cannot do it by this resolution, any more than we can broaden his constitutional power to act. We are certainly not delegating any additional authority in this resolution.

We cannot amend the Constitution by the adoption of this resolution. What we are doing is emphasizing the constitutional processes, and by expressing ourselves and by participating—without invitation, if you please—in the determination of foreign policy, the Congress is assuming its rightful place and responsibility with the hope that the Executive will cooperate. If the Executive fails to do so, the time may come when political commitments, or negotiations are brought to the Congress; to the Senate, for ratification, or to the Congress for appropriations and the Congress may not approve.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman think the machinery involved in this resolution for the maintenance of peace can be set up successfully without the use of force and without in some degree surrendering our sovereignty?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I think it cannot be set up without the use of some degree of force. I would hope that the force used would be primarily moral force, the force of law, and economic force and diplomatic, political force might be used, but it is quite possible that at some time in the future we may have to face the possibility of military force being used again, whether we pass this resolution or not.

On the question of sovereignty I want to remind the gentleman that we have already lost so much of our sovereignty that we have been twice forced unwillingly into unwanted wars. The ability to decide whether to go to war or not is the most important aspect of sovereignty. I think that by wise participation in appropriate international machinery for peace we will regain more of that kind of sovereignty than we will lose.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written about the significance of this resolution. There are those who say it is too strong, that it goes too far; on the other hand, there are those who say it is innocuous and meaningless, that it is too weak. The one thing I gather from this discussion is that it must actually be about halfway between, and therefore about right.

I believe that many have become unduly suspicion of this plain and simple statement of basic principle.

I have no illusions that this resolution is the panacea for all our afflictions. It expresses what I believe the people of this country desire as the fundamental principle for our conduct toward the other nations of the world. It is simply the first small step in the process of building a policy which I hope may have better results than that which we have followed in the past. We now have, throughout the world, ample evidence of the inevitable consequences of that policy. Surely it is worth while to try a new approach to the problem of total war, even though no one can guarantee the success of our efforts. After this first step is taken, it is obvious that many more steps must be taken before an adequate policy can be achieved.

As the editor of the Washington Star said in yesterday's paper:

> What we need now is a simple expression of our determination that, having won a global war, we shall live up to our responsibilities of maintaining global peace. This resolution will not settle the future of the world. But if the House gives it united support tomorrow, the representatives of the people will have outlined the pattern of the policy we are to pursue in international collaboration after the war. What most Americans want to see is some agreement among their representatives on where we are going after this war is won. Nonpartisan endorsement of this resolution by a solid House will tell them and tell them what they want to know.

This resolution is not a grant of power to the Executive; it is simply an expression by our people, through their representatives, that we intend to participate sincerely in an effort to bring order into the world. If this resolution is adopted, the Executive can negotiate as to details with assurance that the people are willing to support any reasonable system of collective security. But, as the various components of the system are agreed upon by the different governments, they still must be approved by legislation in the nature of treaties or by joint resolution of the Senate and the House of Representatives. This is not a final acceptance now of any kind of agreements that may be evolved. Even if nothing acceptable results from these negotiations, nevertheless we will have the satisfaction of having tried and cannot in any respect be any worse off than we will be if we do nothing.

This resolution tells the world that the United States recognizes that any organization for peace must be based upon power adequate to enforce peace, and that the United States will share both in supplying that power and in the responsibility for the exercise of that power. One may say that this is a commitment that this Nation undertakes to participate with the other nations of the world in a genuine and bona fide effort to find some reasonable means to solve the international disputes by methods other than by war.

Much has been said about a provision for the use of force. The words "power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace" not only envisage the use of some kind of force, but may also include the power, if necessary, to control the productive capacity of instruments of aggressive warfare. The traditional police force which disturbs so many people may not be nearly so important in the long run as control of strategic materials and productive capacity.

The question of relief and rehabilitation or as some call it an international W. P. A. has little to do with the formulation of a foreign policy or the creation of machinery to keep the peace. It may be that relief in the form of food or other goods has a place in military operations in occupied countries or in the settlement of this particular war. But this war is but a tragic and horrible episode which one of these days must end.

A proper foreign policy, together with the machinery to keep the peace, is continuing in its nature; it does not consist of sporadic instances of emotional altruism or niggardly selfishness. To be successful it will require the assiduous daily attention of the best brains of our country. It is brains and leadership that we must supply, and not merely gifts of bread, and milk, and money, and oil. It is not contemplated that we, the people of the United States, are to give our goods to others, that we are to raise the standards of living of the peoples of the world, or even to give them all a free and democratic government. If we can contribute leadership and our fair share of the force found necessary to make an international system of control effective, that is all the world can or should expect. As a matter of fact, if these total wars can be prevented for a reasonable length of time, most of the peoples of the world probably can work out their own economic and political salvation. I assume, of course, that our influence will always

be on the side of free and democratic processes.

Participation by this Nation in a system designed to prevent war is inspired and justified primarily by the desire to preserve that integrity and freedom of the individual which is the great distinction of our Nation, and the hope of the world. It is, of course, true that in saving our own freedom we will inevitably benefit other peoples of the world. But surely we will not refuse to save ourselves simply because in doing so we may help save others.

Perhaps the most significant thing about this resolution is the fact that it originated in this House of Representatives and is a nonpartisan measure. Both are important. Our foreign policy must be consistent over the years. It must not be a partisan affair, shifting with every election. Further, since the House of Representatives is at all times more nearly reflective of the will of the people than any other body, it should play an important part in the formulation of fundamental policy. Only with congressional sanction can the other nations of the world rely with assurance upon the commitments of our Executive. The adoption of this resolution by the House and the Senate will create a precedent for the further participation by the House of Representatives in the matter of foreign policy and will give that policy stability and force. Nothing in the Constitution prohibits the participation of this House in the formulation of basic policy. If we show some intelligence and courage in expressing positively our views on these matters, I am confident they will not be ignored by our own Government or by the governments throughout the world.

Before I close, I should like to read to you part of a letter as an example of many that I have received during the past few months. It is a V-letter of September 6 from Staff Sgt. James Winfield Qualls, 86 Bomb Group D, Sicily:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FULBRIGHT: After read-Life's full-page editorial on your foreign-policy resolution—it was June issue, I believe—magazines are that late over here, I had to write you my extreme gratification and convey my very best wishes of your inspiring effort.

"I think all America realizes that you have taken the all-important first step that must be taken if our country is to live in a future world where peace and freedom can dwell secure. What could be a more fitting way to take this first step (the Chinese proverb says "A journey of a thousand miles begins with a first step") than your simple, cogent one-sentence resolution? By such an official congressional commitment in the midst of global war—especially if both Houses concur by a two-thirds vote at least—the world atmosphere is cleared as it has not been since 1918. If it is America's official, nonpartisan intention to join in post-war international collaboration to preserve peace, then nearly all doubt is swept away about the future.

I can think of nothing that would do more to strengthen the determination of our allies and insure the fruits of our victory than a positive declaration by the United States and by all the United Nations that this time we intend to work together, in peace as well as in war, to destroy the ruthless and savage forces of aggression.

The people of this country—particularly those at the front fighting the savage Jap and German—want to do something to stop recurrent wars. We Members of the House have an obligation to do everything in our power to see that the children of today's heroes do not have it all to do over again in 20 years.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I favor the passage of the Fulbright resolution, especially since it has been amended by the Foreign Affairs Committee this morning. This amendment is designed to serve notice upon all concerned that we intend to carry out all post-war commitments within the framework of our Constitution and its processes. This is as it should be.

As you all know, before the Congress recessed your Committee on Foreign Affairs voted unanimously its approval of the Fulbright resolution. At that time there was no suggestion that this resolution should not be brought in under an open rule, which would give an opportunity for free debate and germane amendments to be offered.

Unfortunately, in my judgment, it has now been decided to bring this resolution before the House under a gag rule, which prohibits amendments.

While I voted for the Fulbright resolution because it was the best statement that could be unanimously agreed upon by the 14 Democrats and 11 Republican members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I do not contend it was in any sense the final or best version that could be reached by the considered judgment of the House itself. I believe the House should have had a free opportunity to amend this resolution.

There are those who contend it is so broad it can be interpreted as expressing approval of some kind of super world government which might possibly destroy our sovereignty, our constitutional form of government, and independence of action. I entirely disagree with such an interpretation and believe to reach such a conclusion it is necessary to put words into the resolution which are not contained therein.

There is nothing in this resolution which determines the extent of our participation or even the agency to be used. It merely points the way. We should be willing to play our rightful part in attempting to establish a just and lasting peace after this war is over. Can we do less? If one should ask the simple question whether we should attempt to have a voice at the peace table after the expenditure of billions of our treasure, thousands and thousands of lives, and countless sacrifices by the citizens of this country, the answer to me would seem axiomatic.

Since apparently there is some doubt on the part of some of the Members as to the exact meaning of this resolution is the very reason why I wanted it to be brought up under an open rule, and if necessary amend it so that it would include certain reservations.

In any post-war collaboration I maintain we must preserve our sovereignty, our constitutional form of government, and our independence of action.

I would like to have seen at least the opportunity to consider some reservations along these lines as was done in the statement of foreign policy adopted by the Republicans recently at Mackinac Island.

The Congress must not be bypassed nor binding agreements made with foreign governments without congressional approval.

While I am wholeheartedly in favor of cooperating to help establish a just and lasting peace, I want to keep America American.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS].

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the pending resolution, but with no illusions. There is a grave inherent dangerous implication in the Congress passing this resolution under present circumstances. The danger is that too many people in and out of Congress, and at home and abroad, may interpret this action as the end of the matter. Many may feel that Congress has spoken and thereby discharged its responsibility in the whole matter. Others may assume that the Congress has now given the President a blank check on post-war commitments, to which the country hereafter is bound because Congress has passed this resolution. Foreign countries may erroneously assume that we have cloaked the President and his representatives with full powers to bind us to secret agreements that they may now make, or may already have made.

There are also those among us here at home who will take the attitude that if Congress insists on participation in future post-war plans, we will be attempting to interfere in the administration of the laws, on the basis that if this resolution is passed, it becomes a law, and that the implementing of that law by agreements, treaties, and arrangements for the post-war world are strictly the administrative concern of the Chief Executive.

I strongly object to the procedure by which this resolution is being considered. Either this resolution is meaningless, and the House should not waste 10 minutes on its consideration, instead of 4 hours, or the resolution is of the utmost world-wide import, and should receive full and complete debate, and not be limited to this ridiculous 4 hours, and then be given no opportunity to even consider amendments.

I believe in world cooperation. Unless civilization is to destroy itself, we must have world cooperation. But, I demand that the rest of the world cooperate with us for a change. I have no confidence in leagues of nations, by whatever name they may be called.

One of only two methods of post-war settlements have always been tried throughout history. Both have failed miserably.

The more common method was for the victor to subjugate and exploit the vanquished; for the victor to rise by holding down all others. That is the empire method.

The other system has been tried, less frequently, but often enough to demonstrate its futility; that is, for the victor, or victors, to ally themselves and such useful neutrals as they can coerce into a system of allied states. Whether it be called a holy alliance, a league of nations, a united nations, a superworld government, or what it is, a plain offensive and defensive military alliance, the result is the same. Counteralliances inevitably spring up and lo, the foundation for your next war is already laid.

I am opposed to a military alliance with Great Britain, or with anybody else. Such an alliance will merely stimulate counteralliances; and to what purpose such an alliance for us? The last two wars have demonstrated that we must provide the substance and sustenance for Britain's military machine. Why entangle ourselves in her or anybody else's quarrels—quarrels over which we are given no power to effect a settlement except by providing the arsenal and most of the military manpower, as well, for such countries to battle out their problems in a war.

The League of Nations, the last of these noble experiments, was a failure. Its failure has been blamed on the United States, because we did not join it. Our refusal to become a party to that military alliance had nothing whatever to do with its failure. The League's failure was inherent in the League itself.

Not once did the United States refuse to cooperate with the League. In every crisis, we threw our weight behind the League. But, on the other hand, the League failed us. On the really critical occasion, the occasions that led directly to this war, the League and all of its member nations, refused to cooperate with us.

We requested, urged, and begged the League's cooperation in stopping Japan's aggression against China in Manchuria. But the League significantly remained silent and refused its responsibility. We were unable to stop Japan alone, because we alone of all nations, had been the only one to make a real sacrifice in the interest of international cooperation for peace—the naval disarmament.

We sacrificed a Navy in being, the most powerful Navy in the world, after the last war. That sacrifice, predicated upon joint action against aggressors, was in vain, because no other nation would join us in challenging aggression when it first raised its serpentine head. The refusal of the League to interfere with Japan's violation of her treaties with and guaranties to China, was not because we were not a member of the League. It was because powerful members who dominated the League and who would have done so whether we had been members or not, did not want to see Japan stopped in the Pacific. Powerful interests feared the rise in influence in the Pacific of the United States. They foresaw an uncurbed Japan as a check upon the United States in the Pacific; and so Japan was openly permitted to expand in order to provide a balance of power against the United States.

Again, when Italy invaded Ethiopia, the League voted sanctions, but did not enforce them. The United States, though not a member of the League, did voluntarily abide by those sanctions.

No, it was not the United States that was responsible for the collapse of the League of Nations. The course of the world would have run exactly the same whether we had been members of the League or not.

Therefore, it is a false hope, and a cruel one, to assume that the only thing necessary to maintain world peace is to recreate the League of Nations, perhaps call it by another name, and this time have the United States as a participating member.

Such a conclusion, so popular right now, is based upon the assumption that the United States will underwrite the stability and peace of the world. That is the only deduction possible, and why not? We have bailed the world out of two world revolutions within one generation.

We have already had to assume the burden of being the principal and main global defender in both materials and men. We have also apparently already been assigned the post-war role of feeding the world, and paying for the policing of the world. It is not intended that we shall control the policing of the war, just pay for it. We are also to reestablish everybody else's post-war trade for them, even to giving them the ships in which to carry on their competition with us.

If we are to accept the role of being the main support of the world in both war and in peace, then we must assume the major share of the authority that goes with such responsibility.

If the domination of an empire system will not assure peace, and if supergovernments of Leagues of Nations cannot guarantee peace, what is the outlook?

There is another method, as yet untried on a world scale, but the pattern for which has already been laid. It has demonstrated its possibilities sufficiently to justify a full scale trial.

The empires and the leagues might be likened to our business organizations. The great holdings and control of vast business enterprises by individuals or families, being the empires; the great corporations, being the leagues. But there is still another very successful business and professional type of organization, and that is the partnership.

Since empires and leagues have failed, this time let us organize the world into partnerships, each sharing in responsibility and cost, in proportion to what is contributed to the common partnership. Each partner would retain his own domestic sovereignty and groups of partners could be assigned specific areas of responsibility.

For instance, the Scandinavian countries might well form a confederation and be given the job of maintaining stability and order in northern Europe.

China, Burma, and India might well confederate under Chinese leadership to assume the responsibility in the Orient, as another illustration.

The American nations, both South and North, have demonstrated that they can work together to maintain international law and order in the Western Hemisphere.

Liberated territories and peoples, not yet economically self-sufficient or not yet sufficiently trained for self-government, would be the responsibility of the world partnership as a whole under a joint management until each such territory or people were able to assume full self-government.

There must be no more handing peoples about from one nation to another under any system of individual mandates or protectorates.

Yes; a partnership offers real possibilities of a new type of world cooperation that could succeed.

In every partnership, there must be a senior partner. We have both the right and the responsibility to assume the senior partnership. We are the only nation in the world who can do so. We are the only nation who would be trusted by all the rest of the world in such a role.

There are many reasons for this. We want no territorial acquisitions. We are fortunately geographically situated so that we are not naturally involved in the local border disputes of the rest of the world. Our enormous resources, manpower, productive capacity, and industrial and inventive genius constitute such a powerful force, that thrown to either side in any conflict, it becomes the dominating factor.

Since we wish no world empire for ourselves, but only peace and peaceful trade, our motives will not be under suspicion; that is, if we are not committed to any one nation or group of nations by military alliances or otherwise.

As an independent force, as a senior partner among nations, we can be the stabilizing influence in the world for decency, law, order, and world peace.

If we are allied to one or some nations as against others, then we become mere partisans, and involved in all their disputes, committed to their quarrels, but with no corresponding right nor power to prevent such quarrels.

The world is seeking a new kind of leadership. The United States has demonstrated its capacity for such leadership, and nowhere better than in the Philippines. There we set up neither an empire nor a league. We established a partnership. We truly freed the Filipinos. We did not add their territory to ours. We did not selfishly exploit the Philippines nor the Filipinos. We developed the Philippines for the Filipinos.

We were rewarded by their loyalty and their fighting fidelity to the bitter end. The fact that the Filipinos, as a people, were the only nation to fight to the end for their so-called conquerors has made a profound impression all over the world, but particularly in the Orient.

The example of our treatment of a subject people in the Philippines has been the inspiration and hope of subject peoples everywhere in the world. They will accept that kind of leadership. They want it. They will accept nothing less.

Yes, there is hope for a new world order, not Hitler's, not Tojo's, but the partnership of nations, with the United States as senior partner.

By all means, let us have world cooperation. Let the world cooperate from now on with the United States.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the time for debate on this very important matter which now claims our attention, is very much limited.

When the Fulbright resolution was first promulgated and when it first came to my attention my first impression of it was very unfavorable. I have from the beginning maintained that it is unwise for Congress or any other activities of the Government, either legislative or executive, to commit itself definitely on post-war matters. I have insisted most emphatically that our first duty is to win the war and that we should make no definite commitments of any kind that would bind us to any post-war activity until we know what the circumstances will be when the war ceases. I have always felt, however, that since we are recognized as the greatest Nation in the world and since our participation in the present World War is equal to that of any other nation that we should take steps to prepare ourselves for any exigency that might develop after the close of the war. I think that every sensible American feels that we should be ready to cooperate with the other nations of the world in establishing a just peace. In my judgment we should not be committed to any plan of cooperation until we know what plans will be best under all of the circumstances. Congress should not take any steps that will justify the Chief Executive in making commitments which he is very prone to do.

My opposition to the Fulbright amendment in its original form has been vigorous and consistent. Vigorous opposition by myself and others has been responsible for the amendment which has been added to the original Fulbright resolution. Without that amendment I feel certain the resolution would not pass the House of Representatives. The people of the country are perfectly willing and are really anxious that our country do its part in establishing a just peace and they appreciate that its part is of such great importance that it is unlikely that any effective peace agreements could be worked out without the participation of the United States. The people are likewise anxious that we do not surrender any of our sovereign rights and that we do not implicate ourselves in any plan or system that may lead to a surrender or compromise of any of our sovereign powers.

The original Fulbright resolution is as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby express itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein.

The amendment which has been offered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives at the end of the Fulbright resolution and to which I have already referred, is as follows: "through its constitutional processes." This language, to my mind, is language that will meet the almost unanimous approval of the American people. Without this language I should not have supported the Fulbright resolution. With this language included I expect to support the resolution.

At the expense of being tedious I am again reading the original resolution with the amendment, for, under the rules of procedure under which we are operating today, the amended resolution is the only resolution that will be voted upon:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes.

In discussing this resolution we must not lose sight of the fact that this is a congressional resolution which does not seek to bind this Congress or any future Congress to any definite course. If this resolution should become a law, it will not in any way bind the Chief Executive. It will, however, give the Chief Executive to understand that the Congress is expecting to proceed only "through its constitutional processes." Under the Constitution the Chief Executive has certain powers in connection with our dealings with foreign nations. Likewise, under the Constitution, all treaties must have the concurrence of two-thirds of the Members of the United States Senate. Likewise many circumstances could develop wherein the concurrence of the House of Representatives would be necessary to bind our country to obligations toward foreign nations. If the President and the Congress proceed only "through constitutional processes," we will not have much to fear.

The purpose of this resolution, as stated above, is not to bind any branch of the Government or any future Congress, but rather the purpose is to state the present inclination of the Congress toward the present world conditions. And with the amendment above referred to we are assured that the Congress is making it clear to the world that it will not favor any action that will not thoroughly conform to our constitutional processes. Without the amendment referred to the Congress might express itself as favoring appropriate international machinery through which a just and lasting peace might be established. That in itself might imply that Congress would favor the taking of such steps regardless of what branch of government took them or in what directions the steps would lead. But the amendment restricts all activities under the resolution, so that whatever steps are taken must be thoroughly in conformity with the Constitution of the United States. That means that Congress is taking the position that Congress and the country are perfectly willing to cooperate with the nations of the world in every appropriate way to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, but it wants the Chief Executive and the world to know that it does not now, and it does not at any time in the future, expect to approve any program except through constitutional processes. Under this language, Congress does not bind, but says that it is willing to say to the world that the United States will cooperate with the other nations of the world, but that this cooperation must be measured and determined by the Congress when it is proceeding through its constitutional processes.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY].

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, like every other American I have studied the purport of the "four freedoms." I have studied the purport of the Atlantic Charter. I have studied the purport of many of the declarations of post-war policies of political leaders and humanitarians.

But, gentlemen, when all the phraseology has been refined down to one basic philosophy, it is that of permitting a man to buy a loaf of bread with the currency of his own country, earned by himself in a free economy.

We have met here today to give consideration to a resolution under which the Congress expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power, from which machinery and from which power it is hoped a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world may be maintained.

I shall vote for this resolution, but in doing so I wish to serve notice that when the machinery is set up I shall investigate every wheel and spindle with the utmost care.

I take it that this resolution is but a broad declaration of intention. There should be several guiding principles in the working out of the detail. First, constitutionality of procedure; second, that in our collaborative effort we do not weaken our own economy.

We cannot serve abroad if we are not strong at home.

I noted in the paper the other day a statement to the effect that modern and forward-looking economic thought would now be slowed in its progress because the "common-sense boys" were

mobilizing. I never hope to have a higher compliment than to be criticized because my judgment is based on common sense.

In considering the various plans that will be offered, let us not forget that, despite the purifying flame of the terrible war through which we are passing, no moratorium on international selfishness will be developed. Despite the lofty purposes of the "four freedoms," it should be noted that the only proposed plan for post-war adjustment that has so far been published is of an economic nature—to wit, a proposal by the Treasury Department for the stabilization of international currencies by the formation of an international stabilization fund. As we discuss the pending resolution, experts from Great Britain are considering this very subject in the Treasury of the United States. This will be part of the "machinery with power" that is mentioned in this resolution.

I admit that the whole post-war economic situation has the aspect of a vicious circle, for without stabilized currencies foreign trade cannot be carried on, but common sense and experience in international finance have taught me that no currency can be stable unless the economy of the particular country is based on a sound, wealth-producing foundation.

I apologize to my colleagues for injecting what might appear to be an extraneous detail in the consideration of the pending resolution. I only do so to accent my point of view that the pending resolution must be implemented by a great many details and decisions of this and succeeding Congresses.

As each item is brought before the Congress, I hope the decisions will be based on common sense, proven methods, and the fundamental principle that unless we can so plan our own post-war economy that we can provide jobs for those who are now employed—jobs for our returning soldiers—reduce unnecessary expenditure and provide for a rapid transition from war to peacetime production, all assurances of post-war aid to others will be but empty gestures.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, does not the gentleman feel that all proposals to implement this resolution should be brought before Congress so that Congress may pass on them?

Mr. DEWEY. Without doubt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives of the United States is about to take a straw vote.

It is in the nature of a Gallup poll to find out how our part of the citizenship of the United States would feel as to what Senate action should be on some treaty yet to be formulated and as to whose terms we cannot, of course, be advised. It is not insisted that the House of Representatives as a legislative body has now or ever will have jurisdiction over the subject matters to which the pending resolution relates.

Having presumably solved all of the important questions relating to the prosecution and winning of the war, to the national economic situation, to agriculture and labor, to taxation, and to a thousand and one other problems with which we are confronted, we are now asked to take time off to project our wizard minds into the future, to envision conditions as they will exist after the war, and to declare passionately our fondness for some form of world organization, any form of world organization among nations which will have the power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace.

Presumably, if it will have the power to control other nations, it will also have the power to control us.

Also, presumably, if situations should arise under which subject nations of the world, such as India, with its 300,000,000 people subject to a nation of 40,000,000, seek to obtain freedom for themselves, this proposed superworld organization would preserve peace. This, of course, would mean that these subject nations could never achieve freedom except by peaceful persuasion of their masters, and such persuasion has always been unavailing.

What are to be the boundaries of the countries of the world after the war which we will, in effect, bind ourselves to to help maintain if we enter into a world organization to preserve whatever peace agreements are reached to end the war? Will Russia's victorious armies surge on into Poland and the Balkans and she insist upon taking over those countries and absorbing them into the Union of Soviet Republics? If she does, in view of the part she has played in this war, the sacrifices she has made, the millions of lives she has lost, and her contribution to victory, who will predict that her demands will not be granted? If that should be part of the treaty of peace, will there be any who would be willing to pledge this country to help by force of arms or through any organization with power sufficient for that purpose, as contemplated by this resolution, to help maintain Russia's hold on these nations, should they by armed force seek to obtain their liberties? Is it or not essential, before we determine the extent to which we will be willing to go in maintaining the status quo after the war, first to know whether that status quo will be one that we would be willing to sacrifice the lives of American boys to maintain?

I have great respect and admiration for the English; and yet I am not one of those who would entrust the future of our country to England. I am not one of those who were charmed by the recent suggestion of Winston Churchill in his address at Harvard of the possibility of our common citizenship with the English after the war. I would not be willing for our country to be part of any world organiziation dominated by Great Britain. Before I pledge myself to support whatever sort of world organization may be proposed, I would at least like to know something about its component parts, the degree of our representation in it, the courses to which we might bind ourselves in the event of trouble anywhere in the world, the degree to which we would ourselves observe its mandates, and a great many other things as to which, in reading the pending resolution, a man can only resort to his imagination.

Let those who want to go to rest in the bosom of the British Empire remember that after the last war we had little evidence of gratitude from England for the part we played in it, and little credit for the final result. Recently a Gallup poll in England on the question of what nation had contributed most to Allied successes in this war resulted in the nations being ranked in the following order:

First, Russia; second, Great Britain, third, China; fourth, the United States. Only 3 percent of those polled placed the United States first. If this poll indicates anything, it shows that the hopes of those who feel that our British cousins are going to fall in our arms and weep tears of gratitude after this war for having saved their country, as we will have done, are doomed to disillusionment. Anybody who thinks that in a world supergovernment we would always have the support and backing of Great Britain is merely a wishful thinker. If anybody looks after the interests of the United States, it will be the United States. And in my judgment we will not do it very well if we pledge ourselves in advance to any sort of world organization which may be attempted after the conclusion of this war in the name of preserving international peace. Already, Great Britain has shown more interest in making plans to take over airfields we have built in her possessions for her peacetime commercial use and for reestablishing dominance as a world commercial power than in any program based upon gratitude to the United States, although but for the United States she would have lost the war long ago.

Our legislative masters who lay down the rules under which we consider legislation will not even permit this resolution to come before us in such a way as to permit us to amend it, so that it may really express our collective opinion. It is true that one amendment insisted upon by our Republican colleagues is to be adopted. That is an amendment to insure the adoption of methods within the purview of the United States Constitution which, of course, was never intended as a Constitution for a superworld government, and is regarded as a crumb to our Republican brethren who will thus be persuaded that they are voting for the declaration of Mackinac Island which gave the low-down on what the Republican Party believes, or is supposed to believe.

It needed only this amendment to at least place the resolution on a parity with the Mackinac declaration which has so far been without a peer except in the humble annals of the tumblebug

for facing in one direction and pushing in another.

So far as I am concerned, I shall not vote for it.

I am for peace, and for the exertion of the influence of this Nation in behalf of peace in every reasonable way whenever future world situations arise which justify the exertion of that influence, the nature and form and extent of the influence to be exerted to be determined by those then in charge of our Government upon the basis of the conditions then existing. I believe in the continued maintenance of a strong Army and Navy, so that our influence for peace may be effective. That is the only way by which it may be made effective.

I believe in collaboration with other nations for the common good and united exertions of all peace-loving powers to eliminate causes of international discord, and to suppress unitedly international outlawry. This can be done without pledging our allegiance to any international organization with the power and right to impose its judgment upon us as to what causes merit our intervention, and on which side. These are questions that, so far as my vote is concerned, will always be left within the jurisdiction of the people of the United States and their responsible officials serving them at the time each problem may arise.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. BLOOM. I am sorry; I have not the time.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman has not yielded any time to opponents of the resolution.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one-half minute in order to answer the gentleman from Georgia.

The gentleman from Georgia asked me for time to speak in opposition and I gave him the time he asked for.

Mr. TARVER. I thought the gentleman ought to yield to somebody in opposition to the resolution.

Mr. BLOOM. And I yielded time to the gentleman; I treated him very fairly.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman from New York gave me only 5 minutes in opposition to the resolution whereas he and his colleagues who have preceded him and who are to follow him will have 4 hours.

I ask the gentleman for 1 additional minute. May I have it?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I shall not vote for this resolution and thereafter seek to justify my action by saying to the people I represent, "It means nothing. The particular kind of international authority to which I sought to pledge the Government of our country is not set out."

Nor shall I vote for it and say to them, "It was merely the expression of my opinion. The House of Representatives has nothing to do with the approval of treaties. That power, under the Constitution, rests in the Senate."

It is not the function of the House of Representatives to take straw votes, to pass on questions which if they ever arise will be within the jurisdiction of the Senate, to attempt to pledge our Government by an unauthorized assumption of responsibility on our part to a course so indefinitely charted that its proponents cannot agree upon what it means, nor to participate in the widespread campaign now under way to propagandize the Senate, the country, and the world into believing that the United States desires to surrender at least a part of its national individuality, a part of its sovereignty, if you will, to some sort of world supergovernment.

Those of you who vote for this will never dare open your mouths against the approval of any sort of treaty which may be proposed to set up an international power capable of controlling our national destiny. You will be told, "Why, when you voted for the Fulbright resolution you pledged your support of this."

It will not be worth while for you to say that you had something entirely different in mind. You will be asked why, if you had something definite in mind, you did not express it in the resolution for which you voted. You might then try the lame excuse of saying that the House leadership would not permit you to do it—would not permit you even to offer an amendment to the resolution.

It is much easier to vote with an overwhelming majority than it is to be with a small minority, and I am fully aware that the press and radio will not fail to castigate those who do not go along with this indirect effort to commit the people of the United States to a policy they have never approved and, in my judgment, never will approve.

But I can sleep better at night if I do not support this. Without it, there would be nothing to handicap this Nation through proper constitutional channels in accepting any post-war plan for the preservation of peace of the world which, in the light of conditions existing at the end of the war, it would desire to approve. The fact that it comes up now shows there is some powerful influence which is not willing to await the impartial and better informed judgment which may be possible at that time. There is somebody who wants to tie us up to something now. It may be a weak thread but it is just as strong as they dared to make it. It may mean all things to all men, but those who want a strong world supergovernment will insist it means what they had in mind. I do not see any way by which its passage could contribute to the welfare of my country, and I can reasonably envision many ways by which it might be a stumbling block to future efforts to work out a sound peace agreement at the end of this war.

Therefore, I shall vote against it.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] seems to be suffering from fears which are if he knew the facts wholly without foundation. This resolution was not inspired by any foreign government, it was not inspired by anyone in any of these various departments, it was not inspired by anyone who wants to do something wrong to the United States of America. It originated in the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House without any suggestion or request from any organization or from any individual or from any government or from the State Department. It originated because 25 different resolutions bearing upon this subject matter had been introduced by different Members of this House, showing the spontaneous feeling of the membership in reference to this matter and their desire to do something about it, and when the resolution was taken up each one of the 25 suggestions was considered by the committee. This resolution is the joint product of that committee, uninfluenced, uninspired, and not dictated by anyone.

The gentleman is wholly inconsistent. He says that we have no business dealing with this, that it is a matter or prerogative of the Senate, that the Senate makes treaties and the House has nothing to do with it. If that be true, I suppose the gentleman thinks that so far as foreign affairs are concerned we should be like the small child, seen but not heard. He does not even want us to be heard, he does not want us to express an opinion. If Congress has the right to make war, it certainly has the right to express its opinion about peace. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the House has certain powers in determining the policy of the Government as to our relations with other governments, and that while the Senate alone, under the Constitution, has jurisdiction over treaties, binding resolutions by Congress in reference to our relationships with other governments can be by joint resolution of both Houses. I cite as a notable instance of that fact that the admission of Texas into the Union was not by treaty. Texas at that time was a republic, an independent sovereign republic. An effort was made to get it admitted through a treaty, but this was not done, and it was admitted by joint resolution of both the Senate and the House.

My answer to the gentleman is that this is not a straw man, it is not a straw vote; it is the vote of the Representatives of all the American people upon the question of whether or not the United States is going to stand with the other nations of the world in trying to prevent another war or not. If that is important, then this resolution is important. If it is unimportant, then the gentleman's remarks that it is a straw man, a mere gesture, are correct. Otherwise he is standing upon shifting sand that will not sustain his position.

I am surprised at the distinguished gentleman from Georgia. He is an able man, one with whom I usually agree upon all questions, but in this instance

evidently he has been dreaming bad dreams at night or thinking about some matters entirely foreign to this resolution, or has not considered it with that thoroughness usually characteristic of him.

Mr. Speaker, this matter is important. I say it is important for three reasons. In the first place it is important to let the other countries of the world know that the United States, when this war is over, wants to do something in order to prevent another war and that we are willing to cooperate in trying to set up some machinery to do that.

In the second place, it is important to our allies to know that we are going to do that and, in the third place, and the more important reason, is that we may let our own people know, we may let the fathers and mothers whose boys are dying in this war know that their sons are not fighting in vain, that when this war ends we are not going to close our hands and fold our robe around us and say we are through and will do nothing to prevent another war.

By this resolution we say that we are going to throw the influence of the United States with other law-abiding nations of the world in preventing another war. I think that is a responsibility and duty that this Congress owes to the American people and that by the passage of this resolution we will reflect their will.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER].

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I propose to support the resolution as presented with its amendment. I can freely do so without reservation because it symbolizes the feelings and desires of the millions of Americans today. It is the fervent prayer in every civilized country that wars be ended forever. It is the dream of every boy and girl on the fighting front that their sacrifices shall not be in vain.

The adoption of this resolution, together with the additional legislation that it will require to bring into operation its object and purposes, will enable us to aid in the fulfillment of the noblest of all human ambitions. We must not stop with the adoption of this resolution but immediately set to work in a constructive manner to aid in establishing machinery that will prevent future futile wars that threaten the destruction of our civilization and the remaining natural resources of the world.

I am encouraged by the adoption of the amendment to the resolution in that whatever the procedure may be to accomplish the objective of this resolution it shall be done only through the constitutional processes of our Government. Secret agreements are prohibited. Connivance and schemes in contravention of the objects of this resolution are automatically, by its provisions, eliminated. Whatever the machinery set up, in whatever manner we are to participate, and the extent of such participation, are all to be settled and approved in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

This is an assurance to the people of our own country that I know is most heartening. It is also a notice to all the nations of the world with whom we do deal that we shall dedicate ourselves to the purposes of a just and lasting peace, but that such shall not be accomplished except that we as a sovereign nation, will approve the plan in accordance with the fundamental law of our land.

With this restrictive prohibition in the resolution and the noble objectives sought to be attained, every American as well as all the people of the world have good cause to look forward to a better world in which we and the succeeding generations can live and the sacrifices made in this war shall not have been in vain, but that democracy shall prevail and be safeguarded throughout the world.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CARSON].

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I know there is not a man or woman in this House who is not in favor of a just and lasting peace. But our simple expression means nothing unless we definitely set forth the ways, means, and methods of establishing such peace. My own personal opinion is that the resolution which we are now considering is similar to signing a blank check. What do we mean when we say "creating international machinery with power adequate"? Does it mean that we are obligated to maintain indefinitely a large standing Army and Navy, or to establish a world court—and with whom?

We in the House are not unmindful that we will have nothing whatever to do with any treaty which may be signed, except to assume the responsibility of appropriating sufficient funds. Article 2 of the Constitution grants sole power to our Commander in Chief, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

We have created, and are still creating, the largest debt in our history. The President in his recent message says we are spending $250,000,000 each day. This necessitates some planning for our home front which must be borne in mind in planning our post-war service to the world.

After World War No. 1 many people desired our country to take a place beside the continental nations and become involved in the European system. Perhaps they were right. We have been accused of letting Europe down after World War No. 1. This is totally unjustified criticism and carries an implication that the United States was largely responsible for the present conflict. This is a dangerous contention.

The cry of the last war was "make the world safe for democracy." In this we miserably failed. Now we have the "four freedoms." What will be the reaction after this war? We must always bear in mind that in the last analysis it is the people who make the peace. What do the people want? We as representatives of the people are obligated to protect them to the best of our ability. We must take into consideration human nature, and right now when the tension of war is relaxing we find the wind of human nature shifting. It is turning to realism exactly as it has at the end of every war in history. It is imperative that our wartime managers be exceedingly modest, careful, and restrained in what they do and say. By making carte blanche promises and visionary plans such as contained in this resolution we may grievously hurt the cause and greatly hamper America's place in the post-war world. Millions of people are watching us. They are bewildered. We must act wisely. They are looking to us for protection.

It is indeed gratifying that we are still mindful of our Constitution, the one-hundred and fifty-sixth anniversary of which we recently celebrated. This Constitution sprang from the people. It is their grant of power to government and it is a grant of power—not an endowment of irrevocable right. In fact, it is the people's declaration of war on all powerful and ambitious men who would seize government and direct it as the master of the people. If today we find the safeguards of our Constitution being broken down it is not the Constitution which is failing but it is the men who pledged themselves under God to uphold it. I still have confidence in the people. This is the greatest country in the world and ours are the finest people on earth.

In our deep anxiety to be helpful to the world, and to ourselves, we are by adopting this resolution making promises and assuming superior attitudes which America and the world may deeply regret. America can hurt Europe. I hope and pray we shall have wisdom and charity enough not to do that. In justice to the American people we should first determine what Europe can do for herself before we blankly obligate ourselves. Let us first reestablish self-faith. The primary factor in American life is our own self-faith. Our millions are citizens of the state. The state exists for the sake of man and no man for the sake of the state. In justice to the American people let us have statesmanship, political courage, patience, and unselfishness and not obligate our people beyond their limits.

We have an obligation to assist toward a better world. Our duty is to be useful, not according to our desires but according to our powers. There is a limit to what we can absorb. At some point our statesmen failed, which resulted in the depression. At another point there was a failure or we would have been strong enough to have perhaps averted this war. We will undoubtedly fail again if we obligate our citizens with the impossible burdens of the world. The idea that our Government promises to arrange freedom and prosperity for the peoples of the world is preposterous. Let us first set the example at home.

I may be severely criticized for opposing this resolution. Let me again assure

you that I am wholeheartedly in favor of post-war planning, but I am just as vigorously opposed to blankly obligating our people to anything as indefinite as this resolution.

It has been said that we must pass this resolution to show the world that we are favorable to post-war planning. We are spending approximately $1,000,000,000 each month on lend-lease. Our men at this moment are dying on the world's battlefields. Actions speak louder than words. Need we go further to prove our sincerity? If we obligate ourselves to do more than is within our power to perform we shall make enemies of our allies. Let us make honest promises within our power to fulfill—then live up to them. Let us recognize our own limitations first; assist in every way we can within those limitations; and abandon the idea of rebuilding the entire world in the American concept.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 142]

Anderson, Calif.	Gossett	O'Brien, N. Y.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Granger	O'Connor
Andrews	Green	O'Konski
Boren	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Leary
Buckley	Hartley	Peterson, Fla.
Celler	Hébert	Pittenger
Chenoweth	Heffernan	Ploeser
Clark	Hill	Rockwell
Coffee	Hobbs	Spence
Creal	Holmes, Mass.	Stevenson
Crosser	Holmes, Wash.	Sundstrom
Cullen	Izac	Thomas, N. J.
Curley	Jackson	Thomas, Tex.
Davis	Johnson, Calvin D.	Treadway
Dawson	Johnson, Ward	Voorhis, Calif.
Dickstein	Kefauver	Wasielewski
Ditter	Keogh	Weichel, Ohio
Durham	Knutson	Weiss
Elliott	LaFollette	West
Fay	Lane	Whelchel, Ga.
Ford	McKenzie	White
Furlong	May	Winter
Gale	Miller, Pa.	Wolcott
Goodwin	Norton	Woodrum, Va.
		Worley

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 357 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have the most profound respect for Prime Minister Churchill of England. He certainly tells the truth and he speaks for his own country at all times, at all places, and under all circumstances. I have great admiration for the British people who, with their backs to the wall, are fighting for the preservation of the British Empire. I glory in the courage and the heroism of our boys as they are figting on the various fronts throughout the world making their sacrifices.

It is because I respect my country, because I am interested in the safety of my country, that I am opposed to this untimely commitment which appears in this resolution as first introduced, and subsequently amended as a mere sop to try to garner a few votes for this untimely and premature proposal.

I want to ask a few pertinent questions in regard to this resolution. I want to know how far my people are going to be committed to any post-war scheme. I am not in favor of blank checks or blank powers delegated to any foreign machinery that may be set up by foreign nations.

To what does the Fulbright resolution commit this Nation?

It commits the United States to become a part of any post-war machinery that a group of foreign nations may set up It proposes to do this without any effective limitations or reservations whatsoever. Sovereign rights, constitutional rights are by this resolution to be delegated, effective at least as a moral obligation, to a group of foreign nations who will set up machinery in which, if we adopt this resolution, we will have pledged the United States to participate.

What if this great post-war machine calls upon the United States to alter its immigration laws to admit millions to our shores?

If this is to be part of the program of the new world order, then must we submit to immigration and, if so, in what number, from what countries, what races and under what conditions?

Is this foreign machine, to which this resolution morally commits the United States, to dictate what our trade policy, foreign and domestic, shall be, as a contribution to the so-called peace of the world?

We have heard much recently about this question. Is there to be no protection for our industries and trade in this country? Is there to be wholly free trade? Is there to be government by international cartels controlled from abroad, using their powers to crush us? They certainly have been attempting to do it for more than 20 years, although we did participate in the last World War.

Shall the United Nations under this resolution guarantee the "four freedoms" to racial and to religious minorities in each of the more than 60 nations? If so, how is this to be done? Is it to be by armed force? Is this guaranty to be reciprocal to the end that the superminds in charge of this international machinery shall pass judgment on the United States as to its treatment of the colored people, or of the Indians, in our various States, and if so will it make for peace to have an indictment found against us and an attempt made to enforce the decree?

Shall the United States, as a member of the family of nations, be bound by the international machinery to be set up, not to recognize a community which has declared its independence and broken off from its parent state?

How about India? How about Australia, and many other countries that could be named?

Is the United States in accord with the plan, possible under this resolution, to have the international machine distribute and allocate essential raw materials wherever found to nations in need of them? Such a proposal was made at Versailles in 1918.

To what extent under this resolution is the United States to be morally committed to furnish men, money, and armaments to assist the international machine to dominate alien lands and peoples and to govern them as inferiors?

Are we, as a free people, by the terms of this resolution to become entangled in a program of economic imperialism to enable certain nations to exploit the natural resources of nations too weak to defend their rights?

Shall the United States determine its post-war air routes on this continent or shall it submit, under this resolution, to place the future of our control of the air on some international machinery?

Are we, by this resolution, committing ourselves to accept the program of the international planning board now functioning, under which the foreign markets of each nation are to be allotted and the type of goods each nation shall sell in the markets assigned to them?

Are we, by this resolution, to forego our rights under international law to protect our sovereignty, our life and our vital interests by every means at our disposal?

Is the United States under this resolution to surrender the right to determine independently of outside authority, when, where, and how it shall in its sovereign capacity best serve the vital interests of its people? Are we as a free people to assume under this resolution to accept the responsibility of mandates?

Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin on all occasions speak for their own people. Where is the voice speaking for America? Is this greatest legislative body in the world going to surrender and run to cover under the propaganda laid down by one of the greatest international propaganda organizations ever organized in the history of the world?

To what extent does this resolution place responsibility on the United States to become the dominant force by which other nations can more effectively exercise political control of the world's population? To what degree now do several of the nations have political control of the world's population? Great Britain has 24.4 percent political control of the world's population. Russia has 8.2 percent. France, prior to the present war, had 5.3 percent. The United States 6.9 percent. Italy 2.2 percent. The Netherlands, prior to the war, 3.5 percent. All other western countries 18 percent. China, prior to the war, 20.3 percent. Other nonwestern countries 4.1 percent.

To what extent do these same nations exercise political control of the world's land surface of the world?

Great Britain exercises political control of 23.9 percent of the world's land surface; Russia 16 percent; France, prior to the present war, 9.3 percent; the United States 7.3 percent; Italy, prior to the present war, 2.1 percent; Belgium, prior to the war, 1.9 percent; Netherlands, prior to the war, 16 percent; Other western countries, 22.5 percent; China

prior to the present war, 6.9 percent; Japan, prior to the present war, 1.5 percent; Other nonwestern countries, 4.1 percent.

How many of these nations under this resolution, do we as a part of the international machine propose to totally disarm, set up their form of government—perhaps not to their choice or of ours, and send out a few million of our young men to police these countless subject millions lest they rebel against the particular brand of four freedoms handed to them at the point of a gun?

Does that make for peace? Of all the silly proposals that have ever been made, the silliest is this proposal to send our uniformed soldiers into foreign countries to police them. They would be annihilated, just the same as soldiers of other countries would be annihilated if they attempted to police the United States.

What is the financial commitment under this resolution as the price of entering into this international machine? This will not be a case where "we owe the billions to ourselves." The present financial commitment of the United States for the prosecution of the war is $330,000,000,000, and the end of this war is far off, so the President warns.

The fundamental principal upon which our individual freedom is based is equality before the law. The conception of Roman natural law that all men are equal was applied by writers on international law to states. The doctrine of equality between states, as Vaitel formulates it:

> A dwarf is as much a man as a giant is; a small republic is no less a sovereign state than the most powerful kingdom. From this equality it necessarily follows—

We are reminded by Vaitel—

> that what is lawful or unlawful for one nation is equally lawful or unlawful for every other nation.

Is the United States, by adopting this Fulbright resolution, to join an international machine before some assurance is given that this international machine will not be used for the brutal domination of smaller nations?

When this international machine is set up and the United States, under this resolution, adheres to it, what will be the influence on any or all of the questions I have raised?

Will the vote of the United States as a great power be measured by the yardstick of "predominant military force"? If so, how about Russia? This is not the only test that will be applied to reduce the influence and the votes in the proposed international machinery. Combined with predominant military force will be economic and financial strength, the size of territory, the possession of colonies, and the size of population. Where then does the United States stand in all of these categories in evaluating its influence in making major decisions?

What is the main consideration of other nations in the conduct of foreign policy? Lord Palnerston said in the House of Commons in 1848:

> The principle on which I have thought the foreign affairs of this country ought to be conducted, is the principle of maintaining peace and friendly understanding with all nations, so long as it was possible to do so consistently with the due regard to the interests, the honor, and the dignity of this country. * * * If I might be allowed to express in one sentence the principle which I think ought to guide an English minister, I would adopt the expression of Canning and say that with every British Minister the interests of England ought to be the shibboleth of his policy.

Sir John Fischer Williams said—letter in 1939 to editor of the Times:

> It is just as true now as ever that it is vain to expect governments to act continuously on any other grounds than national interest. They have no right to do so, being agents, not principals. For this reason, the reproach of selfishness is beyond the point of foreign policy as based on the interests of my country: Those who decide on taking risks are the members of the government, in particular the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary; in making the decision they do not act selfishly for themselves, they have a duty to the forty-odd millions of the population of this country; for these millions they are trustees, for them the risk is undertaken. The government may or may not be unwise, but is is not fair to call it selfish.

What about our responsibility to protect minorities under the international machinery to which this Fulbright resolution commits the United States? It has been repeatedly reaffirmed by the Permanent Court of International Justice that the main object of the minority treaties is to assure respect for the rights of minorities and to prevent discrimination against them by any act whatsoever on the part of the country bound by these obligations. Yet we are to be committed to that program under this resolution; morally, at least.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. It is well, before adopting such a resolution as the Fulbright resolution, to examine the possibilities inherent in this weapon. When the Balfour declaration relating to Palestine was being considered in the House of Commons July 4, 1922, Winston Churchill said:

> It was considered that the support which the Jews could give us all over the world, and particularly in the United States of America and also in Vienna, would be a definite palpable advantage.

That is the way they use minorities. Should we go into that mess, with 50 nations that have minorities?

We base our income-tax laws in this country on the premise of ability to pay. Is it unreasonable when considering this resolution that commits us to post-war billions to aid foreign countries that we should consider our ability to pay? The best tax experts now claim that if this war continues 6 months longer our peacetime national budget will be not less than $20,000,000,000 per year, this from a national income which will have shrunk overnight to a point where it will not produce $20,000,000,000.

Prime Minister Churchill said:

> I was not selected as the King's First Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire.

I say all praise to him for that statement. We were elected to preserve, protect, and defend our institutions and our liberties, not to destroy the sovereignty, the liberties, and welfare of the American people.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], as well as others, have discussed this resolution, I think, with ability and in such fashion as to make its meaning perfectly clear to the Members of the House. I have listened with interest and respect to the remarks just made by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]. During the course of his remarks he put—and rather rapidly—a considerable number of questions to the House, the great majority of which, in my humble judgment, are based on a false assumption, the assumption being that this resolution commits the House of Representatives to support that collection of rather extreme measures which he recited. I think in a great number of instances the answer to his questions should be in the negative. I cannot remember them in sequence, but for the life of me I cannot read into this resolution a commitment on the part of the House of Representatives that the United States shall become the subject slave of a supergovernment. That, expressing it briefly, is the general tenor of his suspicions or fears. Rather, I see in this resolution an assertion on the part of the House, perhaps for the first time in its history, an expression, rather, on the part of the House as to what may be hoped and worked for in the world after this war is over. We would better be realistic about it. I think I am speaking the truth when I say that there can be little hope for peace and decency in the world without the help of the United States. I hope that we take the leadership; and I use that expression in the best sense and meaning of the word. We are best equipped to do it. Without reflecting on any of our allies, I make that assertion. Our motives cannot be questioned. We do not seek additional territory. We do not contemplate aggression, direct or indirect. We ourselves want to be safe and happy. That is our primary interest. Is it dangerous for this great country to collaborate with others who want to be safe and happy? I think not. I cannot visualize any surrender of essential sovereignty in a collaboration of that sort. I know that if we do not collaborate—yes, indeed, I know that if we do not lead—there can be little hope that decent people the world over may live in peace. Somebody may say that it is wiser for us to set ourselves aside and watch the procession go by. I am wondering if we would then be safe and happy.

I suppose it is impossible to indulge in much reminiscence in connection with this resolution, because the time will not permit. I happened to be a Member of the Senate when the League of Nations covenant was debated there. I gained

some profound impressions at that time, some of which have been emphasized since in the last twenty-odd years. Without criticizing any person prominent at that time, it struck me then and has struck me since with ever-increasing force, that you cannot make the world over in 5 months. That literally was the attempt made at Versailles in writing the Covenant of the League of Nations. It was a contract proposed to be signed by fifty-odd nations, a binding contract, which turned out later to be unenforceable.

Reference has been made to our constitutional procedure or processes here. When the Committee on Foreign Affairs unanimously agreed to suggest that amendment, we had in mind that the fate of the United States could not be trifled with by any action outside the purview of the Constitution of the United States. We cannot surrender sovereignty except by due constitutional process. There is no possible way of doing it otherwise. And, again, my memory goes back to the famous article X in the Covenant of the League of Nations around which centered the principal controversy. It was fundamental in character. Under article X every member of the League, in effect, pledged itself to come to the defense of every other member of the League in case of aggression, and in such manner as the Council or supergovernment of the League might direct. A clear majority of the Senate held to the view that a pledge of that kind was without the purview of the Constitution of the United States, which says, among other things, that the Congress, and the Congress alone, may declare war. This resolution does not pretend in my humble judgment to give the impression to the world at large that we are to abandon our constitutional processes.

It does intend, however, to announce to the world that we should participate in the organization of an appropriate piece of machinery. None of us can say what will be appropriate when this war is over. We do not have to take the commands of foreign governments, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] has suggested. We will be the masters of our own destiny. If we are not competent to pass judgment upon what is appropriate, then we are not competent to live as a nation. I have faith in the Congresses of the future and I have faith in the American people to see these things sensibly. None of us can tell what will come from all this terrible war. How long actual hostilities will last we do not know. How long the period of readjustment will be we do not know. It is almost inevitable that we shall encounter an infinite variety of conditions the world over when unconditional surrender is imposed upon Germany and Japan. There are nations to be reconstituted in accordance with their own best wishes. I refer to the nations that are now occupied by the aggressors. We should give them every encouragement to set up a government which will enjoy the respect of their own people and the respect of the world.

Let me express in just one sentence the mission of America as I see it: Let us be strong and patient and decent; and, again, let us be strong.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I shall gladly support the Fulbright resolution because in my opinion it expresses the will of 90 percent of the American people who are tired of the death, destruction, and disruption caused by war.

It also gives voice to the determination of the House of Representatives to favor the participation of the American Government in the creation of international machinery, clothed with adequate power, to establish and maintain, by force if necessary, a just and lasting peace among the nations of the earth.

The opponents of this resolution have characterized it as a dream, as a myth, as a wild and reckness plunge in the dark, and various unbridled assertions that smack of the old League of Nations battle when a little group of witless men, through forcing the withdrawal of the United States from the peace settlement laid the foundations of the present World War.

The sinister shadows, for the most part, of these same gentlemen, are once more emerging from the Stygian gloom to which their inglorious achievement in scrapping the League of Nations entitled them, and are sounding the tocsin of isolationism. History, no matter how graphic or bloody its pages, apparently fails to teach them anything.

They deplore war in one breath and with the next fulminate against any attempt on the part of men of vision and courage to render war less likely.

The Fulbright resolution is not a panacea for the prevention of war. It is only an expression of determination on the part of honest, God-fearing, Christian men and women to proclaim to the people of America and the world that we, as a Nation, will, when war ceases, lend our aid and counsel to the nations of a harassed and blood-drenched world in an honest and sincere and intelligent manner to any plan or program that seems at least to offer a possibility that a just and lasting peace may be achieved.

If that is a bad dream, a shadowy myth, or a blind plunge in the dark, then the day of honest, high-minded, intelligent idealism is past.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with my pessimistic friends. I still hold that honor and faith and good intent still exist in this world and, believing that, I am going to vote for the Fulbright resolution and give it full faith and credit as a worth-while step in the right direction.

In closing, let me call the attention of the House to this salient fact. The opponents of this resolution—many of whom will vote for it—are responsible for a philosophy that has been responsible for the present World War, as well as the greatest depression in all history.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, a mass meeting was held in Rhode Island some days ago at which the attendance went all-out in support of the principles embodied in the Fulbright resolution.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter explaining just what was done at that meeting.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

RHODE ISLAND COMMITTEE CO-OPERATING WITH UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION AND COMMITTEE OF CITIZENS,
Providence, R. I., August 31, 1943.

HON. AIME J. FORAND,
The United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FORAND: I am writing to advise you that, at a public meeting held in the Rhode Island School of Design auditorium on the evening of Monday, August 30, 1943, approximately 800 citizens of Providence there assembled adopted the following resolution and authorized its transmittal to the United States Senators and the Members of the House of Representatives from Rhode Island:

"We favor the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world; we favor the participation of the United States therein; and we urge Congress to give expression to this purpose at the earliest appropriate moment."

In order that you may realize the importance of this public meeting and this expression of public opinion on a vital national issue, on the part of the citizens of Rhode Island, I am pleased to furnish the following information regarding the meeting and its sponsorship.

The plans for the meeting were made by a committee consisting of the following persons: The Very Reverend John J. Dillon, O. P., president of Providence College; Mr. Joseph H. Gainer, former mayor of the city of Providence; Mr. G. Burton Hibbert, president of the Rhode Island Hospital Trust Co.; and Dr. James P. Adams, vice president of Brown University, who served as chairman.

This committee on arrangements, cooperating with the United Nations Association, invited 200 persons in the State of Rhode Island to accept membership on a committee of citizens to sponsor this public meeting in support of American participation in postwar international cooperative effort for the maintenance of world peace. In extending this invitation, the committee on arrangements gave expression to its purpose in the form of the resolution quoted above and invited sponsorship of the meeting on this basis. One hundred and eighty-three of the persons invited accepted membership on the committee of citizens, only six formally declined. Several of the others were away from home and could not be reached.

The members of this committee of citizens were selected without reference to their points of view with respect to this national issue. The committee was widely representative of the several geographical areas and political subdivisions of the State and of the various social, economic, political, national origin, racial, and religious groups residing therein. It included persons who hold positions of leadership or are affiliated with religious bodies, the State and municipal governments, educational institutions, agricultural organizations, the professions, financial,

commercial, and industrial enterprise, labor organizations, veterans' organizations and their auxiliaries, civic clubs, war-relief agencies, social-welfare groups, national-origin societies, and women's organizations.

The meeting was well publicized. Tickets were widely distributed and several hundred seats were made available to the general public. The attendance was approximately 800 persons. The two principal speakers were Senator HAROLD H. BURTON, of Ohio, and Representative HOWARD J. MCMURRAY, of Wisconsin. Gov. J. Howard McGrath was present and introduced the speakers. Dr. James P. Adams, chairman of the committee, presided at the meeting and offered the resolution for the consideration of the persons there assembled. The resolution was approved enthusiastically by the assembly and, although an opportunity was offered, no voice was raised in dissent.

Acting as chairman of the committee on arrangements and the committee of citizens and as chairman of the meeting, I am pleased to transmit to you this resolution and this information regarding the meeting and its sponsorship as an evidence of an affirmative judgment on this national issue on the part of this representative group of Rhode Island citizens.

It is our earnest hope that you will give support in the House of Representatives to legislative action which will achieve the purposes expressed in this resolution.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES P. ADAMS,
Chairman.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the Fulbright resolution should be passed. By that action the House of Representatives can serve notice that it is on guard to prevent a recurrence of so tragic a blunder as we stumbled into following the last war.

I do not wish to minimize the broad significance of this resolution nor in any sense to be critical. It is extremely important that we give expression to the overwhelming desire of the American people that we take our place of leadership in world affairs.

But in all frankness I am impelled to question whether in the end it will make much difference what position this body takes with reference to international settlements so long as the House of Representatives has no real voice in the ratification of treaties.

This resolution calls for our participation in some organization for the maintenance of a just and permanent peace.

The covenant of the League of Nations called for the same participation.

But the League Covenant was embodied in a treaty that was defeated by the veto power of a minority in the United States Senate.

Unless we amend our Constitution to make it possible for treaties to be ratified in the democratic way by a majority vote of both houses of the Congress, any treaty embracing a plan for international cooperation may face the same sad fate of being defeated by one-third, plus one, of the other body of Congress.

In November of last year I introduced a joint resolution proposing an amendment that would give the House of Representatives concurrent jurisdiction over treaty ratifications, and give it at least as much voice in the making of peace as it has in the making of war.

On the opening day of the Seventy-eighth Congress I reintroduced that resolution.

I cannot at this point review all the background to the provision which finally was adopted as a part of the Constitution, and which gave the Senate full power over treaties, and required a two-thirds vote of all Senators present.

I believe that any person who will but take the time to re-read the debate in the Constitutional convention, and to trace the development of the philosophy of treaty making from the Articles of Confederation, and then study carefully the course of events during which custom and practice departed entirely from the original concept, he will find overwhelming evidence and argument in favor of an amendment at this time.

I have been assured by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], that House Joint Resolution No. 31 will be referred to a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

Let us, then, pass with a smashing majority, this Fulbright resolution, and send it on to the other body.

And then, let us, as quickly as possible, pass the resolution calling for a constitutional amendment that will give this body a real voice in the making of treaties.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am in full support of the Fulbright resolution, with the hope that it will prevent a recurrence of another war such as this. In the discussions of the Fulbright resolution which I have heard thus far, it seems that some Members hesitate to vote on this proposal in the fear that it may lead to commitments contrary to our Constitution and thus be in violation of the oath of office which every Member has taken. It seems to me that the amendment to the original Fulbright resolution, which I understand was unanimously endorsed by the Foreign Affairs Committee, assures us that any action taken under the Fulbright resolution must be according to the Constitution and therefore in accordance with our obligations to support and defend that Constitution.

It has been my custom as a Member of the House to remind myself and my colleagues on September 17, or Constitution Day, of the significance of the thing we celebrate that day and how precious is the thing we have all sworn to support and defend. At our last Friday's session on Constitution Day I found myself too choked with emotion because of the tragedy of war to make my usual reference to Constitution Day, but I have here a statement which I ask unanimous consent to incorporate as an extension of my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD under the title "What Does It Mean To Support and Defend the Constitution?"

Mr. Speaker, God has seen fit to permit me as fine a family as I or any citizen should care to hope for, and yet I have often reproached myself that I, as a father, am responsible for bringing into this world children at such a tragic time and have them confronted with these increasingly tragic conditions. When in the history of the human family have three such decades as the three just passed presented more gloomy outlooks or confronted any generation with more preventable hazards than have these later generations of young people had to face?

Oh, yes; I was of age and presumably of thinking ability at the conclusion of the last war, but it was only a feeble voice I raised then in support of a great humanitarian when he sought so earnestly to prevent this global calamity and he himself was crucified as well as thwarted in his efforts. True, I did then, as a private citizen, favor the establishment of some machinery which would substitute law, order, and decency among nations for the brutality of war, but those in power did not do it and in their failure, whether that failure was from indifference, ignorance, or selfishness, they sowed the seed of destruction for which our children, as well as ourselves, must pay in blood and tears.

I know better now than I knew then what the bitterness of that price may be, and I have today a clearer view of my duty to my remaining children and to your children. I would feel it a base betrayal of those who have already died in this war, as well as those who are yet to die, if I did not make every effort to plan to minimize the possibility of the recurrence of such a war. To my mind nothing short of this clear stand on the part of our Nation will be worthy of those who have paid and are paying the price for our folly of a quarter century ago.

The Apostle Paul, speaking of those "who had kept the faith" in a spiritual sense and had died while looking for a better country, said of them—after enumerating their many kinds of trials and hardships—"of whom the world was not worthy," as characterizing those martyrs who wandered in mountains, in deserts, and in dens and caves of the earth. Now, our heroic dead who have kept the soldier's faith in this war have had similar hardships. This was true not only in battle but in deserts, in mountains, in jungle swamps and seas while they fought for a better country here. If we who have power and influence are motivated by ignorance, bigotry, political advantage, or commercial greed, and fail them now, our soldier dead may be justly characterized as those "of whom their countrymen were not worthy." God forbid it to happen again.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in no sense am I an isolationist. I realize that some sort of government must and is going to move into the unoccupied realm that lies between the governments of the world, but the resolution at this time and all similar controversial matters, in my judgment, cannot help the winning of the war, nor add to our internal strength or to the solidarity of

the fighting peoples alined on our side of the war. I realize there is difference of opinion on this point, but let us examine it. There is much difference of opinion among us as to what nations should participate in whatever may be undertaken in line with what the resolution proposes. The whole world situation is delicate for us. We know that. My position is that discussion and consideration of this and similar matters should await the victorious conclusion of this war. Why? It is not something we can attend to now. We cannot afford to encourage the attitude that the war is all but won and that we may now turn aside and quarrel about these things which we cannot do anything about now, and thus divert our own effort and inject elements of discord, however slight, and speak words of criticism of some of our allies or indicate an attitude of partiality among them which might constitute material for hurtful propaganda against the solidarity and good accord among ourselves and our allies. Such words are spoken and such attitudes are taken in these controversies, as this debate will disclose. I have great respect for the distinguished author of this resolution and only a sense of duty compels me to try to urge the strategic unwisdom of this character of proceeding at this time. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has just said, and very correctly, that nobody knows what the situation is going to be when the war shall have been won. Nobody knows what things we will want to do when the war shall be won, or can do. This we do know, however, that we are now in a death grapple, with but one business at the moment, and that is to win the war as soon as possible. Anything calculated to divide our people or to detract attention from that one thing, I respectfully insist, is not in line with the best public interest. I feel I must say these things for whatever consideration you will give. I feel the House ought to set the example to the country of avoiding, till the war is won, every avoidable occasion for controversies which will weaken our internal solidarity, divert our interest, or give occasion for statements which might give offense to any of our allies. It is not proposed to begin working on this matter now. England and Russia are not considering such matters yet. They are fighting this war. I cannot get it, to save my life, why we are now engaged in the discussion of a thing which everybody says will have no immediate effect on winning the war or can bind our judgment, or influence our attitude when the time for action comes. That will have to await the conclusion of the war.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], who was in the Senate when the League of Nations matter was being considered, has just said the mistake was made of trying to make the world over in 5 months. Some people would try that again. I recently heard a public discussion in the hotel where I live. A distinguished public official was one of the participants in that discussion. He indicated the opinion that in the sort of government there being proposed the constituent nations would have no right, as he put it, to secede. There is a lot of money being spent providing for the expenses of people going over the United States now advocating what we shall do after the war. What I think we ought to do first is to win this war and get our boys home and then act in the light of conditions then. This sort of proceeding cannot help to get that result. All this talk about this war must not be fought in vain and our boys having died in vain on Flanders Field in the last war is utterly beside the point. Turning aside now from winning this war to quarrel about what we are to do after the war is won will not help to get our boys home from Flanders Field or any other field. If, after the war is over, the people favor this thing, then we will do it. We can see clearer then. Why try to commit the House now as to what shall be done after the war? If after the war the House and the people do not favor what is here proposed they will not do it. This Congress today cannot bind them. All it can do is to stir up a big row. That is what I am trying to impress. I cannot get it, to save my life. It just does not make sense to me. Maybe I am just dumb. What is the reason for it all? Does anybody say that it is well for the Congress of the United States to set an example that the people should divert their effort to win this war, I do not care in how small a degree, and weaken their solidarity by following our example, with some favoring exclusion of some of the people fighting on our side in this war, some wanting only democracies participating, which excludes Russia, and getting the whole thing messed up, having people concerned now about what kind of government we are going to propose for the world? Why not wait until we win this war? Are we afraid to trust the American people when they shall look at this thing more clearly when the world is no longer shrouded in this curtain of battle smoke that disturbs their vision now?

I am not an isolationist. As stated, I recognize the fact that some sort of government must enter that realm that lies between the governments of the world, the breeding ground of the nations' wars. But why not wait until we have won the war? We are setting the example. We are saying to the American people, "Open up debating societies all over the country, with some of you possibly stating that you favor Chinese exclusion and some of you favor excluding Russia—all sorts of things being said." Can anybody say that will help bring about and maintain solidarity and unity between ourselves and the people who are fighting with us in this World War? Will that tend to hold us as a people more singly to the one supreme task of the moment? Will that give us greater internal solidarity, and therefore greater strength?

I do not question the patriotic purposes of the sponsors of this resolution. This is the place where honest judgments differ. I have devoted much time since it became evident we were moving into fighting contact with this war to an effort to arouse our people to the realization of our common danger and to help build a solidarity and a unity of purpose and effort. I realize that it is also highly important that the Congress present as solid a front as reasonable concessions and compromises make possible. This resolution is before us. I do not think it ought to be here now. Similar controversial matters should be avoided until this war is won. I hope what I have said may receive some consideration in determining the policy as to such matters. This particular resolution is here and must be voted up or down. All things considered, I feel it would be more dangerous to the public interest to defeat it than to pass it, and I have determined to vote accordingly.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to the able and distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], who has just said that it would be unwise to act now on the pending resolution. The gentleman seems to overlook the fact that we are in a total war, a death grapple.

I believe one cannot study the history of wars nor be cognizant of the intangible elements inherent in the present global conflict without reaching the conclusion that political and psychological appeals have a very great bearing on the outcome of war. For instance, President Wilson's famous 14 points are now acknowledged to have had a tremendous effect on the outcome of World War No. 1.

Today, in an effort to hasten the collapse of the enemy and to offset Axis propaganda, the United Nations—at least the United States and our principal allies—are undertaking to tell the world that a victory for the United Nations would be a good thing for the world; that it would make a more cooperative world in which there would be a better chance for establishing a lasting peace; that after a United Nations victory, there would be a better chance of building a system by which all nations could work out their own destiny within a framework of law and order. This appeal is directed not only to the neutral peoples but to the teeming millions of oppressed people who are searching for a hope. They look to the United States for leadership, to be sure.

But there is skepticism about these promises of cooperation. They remember, to use their own blunt phrase, the "United States run-out" after the other war. If the whole Congress would now go on record as favoring United States participation in an international organization to keep peace and let the world know it, I believe it might be one of the great victories of the war.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I have only a few minutes, but I yield gladly to my distinguished colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I look with misgivings upon a statement made in the Congress of the United States that America ran out at the close of the last war.

Mr. GORE. A minority of the United States Senate—a minority of another body, I should say—prevented America from playing its part in the only peace structure which had any hope of keeping world peace, proposed by our own President. Of course, to use a common phrase, it was "a run-out." I deplore the fact perhaps more deeply than the gentleman deplores the term.

There is another reason why I think Congress should act favorably upon this resolution now. It is that nations can now more easily reach agreement upon the fundamentals of a sufficiently cooperative structure. By a common danger, the Allies are united, and I have heard the distinguished gentleman from Texas say in this Well that the greatest uniting force which mankind has ever known is a common foe. Thirty-two United Nations face a common foe. They are held together by stern necessity, and I think while we are held together by stern necessity would be the most propitious time to inaugurate and test principles of cooperation; that it would be the most fortuitous time for establishing a system of cooperation which would endure the trying years of peace.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Does not the gentleman think that the defeat of this resolution at this time would be tragedy, insofar as its political effect on our allies is concerned?

Mr. GORE. I think defeat of this resolution now would be a great victory for the enemy, and that is what I consider one of the important reasons for its adoption.

There is still another reason why I think the Congress should move in this general direction now. I think this is the best time to build a nonpartisan foreign policy. To speak plainly, a Presidential election will be held next year. We would have a better chance this year, while we are united for victory, of developing a national foreign policy which could be supported on a nonpartisan basis. We do not need a Republican foreign policy when the Republicans are in power and a Democratic foreign policy when the Democrats are in power. No other great nation allows the general course of its foreign policy to be subject to the whims and shifting fortunes of party politics, and we can no longer afford it. Mistakes in foreign policy are too costly in blood and life. We need a national foreign policy built upon an enlightened consideration of our long-term self-interest that is bigger than either or both political parties.

A fourth reason is that by acting now in indicating the general direction of our future foreign policy we can not only give our executive authorities something firm upon which to rely but also we can lessen the danger of disapproval by Congress later.

The Nation's foreign policy is no longer a foreign affair for most American families. Empty chairs at the firesides have brought it home.

Our foreign policy, the means of developing it, and the manner of approval must be democratized. If our part in the peace arrangement is to be permanent, it must be rooted in popular will.

Despite the extensive constitutional powers of the President to formulate the Nation's foreign policy, he cannot, for very long, lead where the people and the Congress will not follow.

I think Congress—the whole Congress, not just the Senate—must have a more vital part in developing America's part in the peace structure. I do not think it is safe for Congress and the people to leave themselves out of the current developments. The gentleman from Texas has frequently been eloquent about preserving the people's power.

If Congress is to have a living part in the peacemaking, it must act before the fact as well as after. In other words, Congress should act now by indicating the general direction and outlining the broad principles of our post-war foreign policy. Far from being premature, I think it is the better part of wisdom for the general objectives and direction of our future foreign policy to be considered by Congress now. If, after full consideration and debate, Congress should approve general post-war objectives, and if they be concurred in by the President, the policy thereby formulated could be regarded by us and by the world as not only a Roosevelt policy but as a national policy, developed and ingrained in popular will.

Far from being an innovation in American politics, this procedure has been used in some of our major foreign policies. For instance, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the recent policy of neutrality, the lend-lease program, and others.

Now, we may as well recognize that the gravest danger to a consistent program of international collaboration for us, which now seems to be supported by an overwhelming public sentiment, is that Congress and the people may finally disapprove whatever arrangements may be made. That danger can be lessened in two ways: First, by having America's part in the peace developed in the fullest cooperation between the Executive and the Congress. This is not a one-way street. Not only must the President do his part; the Congress itself must act cooperatively and must take a part in current developments, instead of sitting on the side lines grumbling about being ignored. Second, we must make final and continued approval subject to majority will.

I believe the House is about to take a historic step. I believe this is another long but sturdy stride in strengthening the influence of the House of Representatives over the Nation's foreign policy.

In this connection, it is important to realize that binding peace arrangements can be made without the consent of two-thirds of the Senate. In other words, the Nation's foreign policy need not be at the mercy of 34 Members of the Senate.

True, the Constitution requires ratification of treaties, to use a commonly accepted phrase, by two-thirds of the Senate.

What Congress would do by this resolution is to announce to the world that it favors the principle of collaboration with other nations to keep peace after this war and to take a part in current developments by giving this expression of the people's will regarding the broad principles and direction of the Nation's future foreign policy. At this time, we can afford to do no more, but certainly not less.

Later, when other steps become advisable, Congress can take further steps in indicating the people's will—supreme before as well as after.

Now I concede that this is no time to determine and commit ourselves to all the details of the peace structure, but we are not attempting to do that by this resolution. The future is too uncertain for that. But it is high time that we were deciding in what direction we will go. Must we be as ill-prepared for peace as we were for war? God forbid.

But our international understandings do not have to be in the form of treaties. They may, with equal force and effect, take the form of agreements and be approved by ordinary majorities of both House and Senate.

Fortunately, no constitutional change, desirable though it is, is necessary to validate such action. Indeed, the number of our international agreements—more than 1,000—which have not required ratification by two-thirds of the Senate, far exceeds the number of treaties in our history.

In fact, had it been necessary for all our foreign agreements and policies to be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, the foreign affairs of the United States could not have been successfully conducted—much less can they now be conducted by such an undemocratic procedure.

It is mighty hard to see how majority action by both Houses of Congress, whether in giving expression to the people's will beforehand or in final approval of the Nation's part in the peace structure, can be reasonably opposed. To do so, one must contend that every objector should be equal to every two advocates. It would be to argue for minority, rather than majority, control over a question of supreme importance to the people. Control of foreign policy by a minority of only one House of Congress, instead of furthering popular control, subverts it. Unquestionably, the whole Congress is more representative of the American people than a mere minority of one House of Congress.

From the earliest recorded days, mankind has found collective action necessary to secure him in his rights and safety against the desperado and outlawry. I believe world civilization is

fully qualified to broaden the concept of collective security into a world arrangement.

It is plain to see that an international agency must be created which, to quote Secretary Hull, "Can—by force, if necessary—keep the peace among nations in the future."

To be successful, the workings and processes of such an organization must be based upon respect for the principles of law and order—the foundation upon which all civilized progress has been builded. And unless the organization has adequate power to insure effectively respect for international law and rights, as well as to enforce its own decisions in preventing wars of aggression, it would soon become little more than an international debating society, falling victim to the machinations of power politics.

Thus, as I see it, there are at least two essentials of an enduring peace structure: First, an organization of peace-seeking nations with authority to make decisions in the interest of preserving peace and order, and, second, adequate power to enforce its decisions in preventing further wars between nations.

The details of how the job is to be done will necessarily be a matter for determination and agreement between nations and, of course, will be affected by both circumstances and time.

I think the important thing right now is for us to develop a will and a determination that the United States will play its part in doing the job—and let the world know it.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair advise me how the time stands?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has consumed 45 minutes; the gentleman from New Jersey, 41.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, there has been altogether too much alarm sounded as to the dangers of this resolution. Here is what it says:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States.

Assuming that this resolution means what it clearly says, I think it expresses the desires of 90 percent of the American people. Where can be found any great number of people who are not in favor of establishing some kind of machinery to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace? Where can be found a great number of people who are not willing to have the United States participate in that effort?

Some maintain, in this debate, that the resolution should be amended so that our Constitution would be preserved. Those advocates miss the point entirely. The nations who will set up this machinery will be many nations, four large ones in particular: The United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China. Each of these nations, it is hoped, will help build this machinery, and of course each of those nations, and many others, will contribute to the machinery with the constitutions they have at the time. None of these countries will be asked to alter their form of government—surely we will not. Is it not possible for a nation like England, a monarchy; and a nation like Russia, a union of Soviets; and a nation like China, just emerging into a great republic; and a great democracy like the United States, to want to combine their strength to maintain peace? No one would ask them to give up the government they have—in this resolution we are not asked to give up ours. These nations simply say "We will maintain the peace of the world or try to." That will be the result if other nations adopt our philosophy contained in this resolution.

At the present time we are merely stating what our course will be. Our course will not ripen into any international machinery to maintain peace until other nations agree with us. We can at least tell the world what we believe in respect to maintaining peace. We must first win the war; secondly, the peace must be written by four great powers—United States, England, Russia, and China. We cannot say now what the peace will be because the war has not yet ended. When it does end those who have contributed to the defeat of our enemies will all have something to say about the peace. It is idle for us to tell what the peace will be.

Post-war plans with respect to our own country are very much in order now, but post-war plans with respect to the rest of the world must await final victory over our enemies. It might be news to some of these peace advocates, to announce that the war has not yet been won. Any soft peace will not be accepted by the people of this country. The war is on and there should be no turning back, which would require the war to be fought over again as soon as our enemies rested up.

We have much to do, enough to do, in this Congress to outline post-war plans for the United States. We know we shall be deluged with millions of soldiers and war plant workers who will almost, overnight, come back to our ordinary life. It is certain that private industry cannot absorb these millions in a short space of time. What must take the place of private employment until it is possible to again establish peacetime production? The answer is that the Government must furnish employment. We should not wait this time until hunger is upon us to do this planning. We should plan now to take up this slack that is as inevitable as the rising and setting of the sun.

In the meantime respecting the international peace, we can at least announce our intentions and purposes in striving for a just and lasting peace. This we can do in this resolution. The resolution does not go into details—it cannot. We do not have the actual situation before us. Conditions may change and what is definite as a detail today may not be true tomorrow. But we can express a philosophy of stopping future wars that will fit changed conditions. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the resolution.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCOWEN].

Mr. MCCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, this concurrent resolution is brought before the House under a gag rule such that no amendment can be offered. No change in the wording can be made. It therefore becomes necessary for the Members to vote either "yes" or "no." This method is very undemocratic and particularly so at this time.

I do not like the expression "international machinery." Some interpret it one way, others interpret it another way. International organization or cooperation and collaboration might have been less dangerous.

Then, too, one might inquire what is implied in "with power adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace." May that not also be dangerous?

I am voting for the resolution with the understanding given by several leaders, and spoken by some in the debate that the resolution is not a commitment that will give up any of our sovereignty nor force us without constitutional consent to engage in a new war.

I am for cooperation and collaboration with other nations to secure, hold, and maintain a lasting peace and such agreements as may be necessary to do that but only under our Constitution.

I am not in favor of a United States of the World in which we will have only one vote and always be outvoted. This would in my opinion not make for peace but for war. Other nations would tell us what to do and when to do it. This would mean to give up some of our sovereignty.

I am voting for the resolution with the idea that it means only our efforts to get a realistic peace and maintain it. I shall consider my vote as binding me no further than that. I shall never be for any commitment that gives away one iota of our national sovereignty.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the various views presented to us this afternoon. They resemble closely the views I have been listening to for some weeks.

Since the Fulbright resolution was unanimously voted out of the Foreign Affairs Committee in June we have been back in our districts. I have yet to talk with any House Member who went home who was not overwhelmed to the point of exhaustion by the demands upon him for time to discuss the problems facing his people. My experience was no exception. Naturally the emphasis was on the immediately pressing problems of living costs, renegotiations, rents, housing farm labor and prices, and so on. These were of first importance to the individual. But I found a very real interest in and concern for the international aspects of Washington activities. When I discussed these I discovered a very strong opinion that it is high time that the Congress, not the Executive,

express the general opinion of the people that the United States assume its share of responsibility for post-war action among the nations. I found very generally that the Fulbright resolution was considered to be a sound first step, no more than that. I found a general opinion that such a word from the Congress would make it less possible for agreements to be entered into by the executive branch of Government that would endanger the whole world situation if not agreed to by Congress. I found an amazing determination upon the part of a large majority of my people to insure participation by this country in the difficult task of building a new world.

There were a few who felt the simple wording of this resolution to contain dangers, but I think most of these would feel the addition of the committee amendment sufficient protection against these possible dangers. There were certain others who held somewhat the same opinions as have been expressed on this floor by those who very sincerely believe there is a crucial danger to us as a nation in these simple words. I respect these men and women too much to try to brush their thinking aside. Rather do I thank heaven we are still Americans, free to differ, in duty bound to express our opinions, each and every one of us sincerely trying to do what we believe to be in the best interests of our beloved country.

Now, it was my privilege to be one of the committee to draft the Mackinac foreign policy resolution. If you will permit, I would like to speak of this for a moment, not because I think the Republicans, in agreeing to a basic point of departure for themselves have necessarily found adequate expression for all other groups, but because there was a spirit in the small drafting committee, and in the council of 49 as a whole, that I wish might be ours today and tomorrow.

I have read with regret certain newspaper articles that speak of the end result at Mackinac as "a compromise"—that suggest there was bitter difference of opinion. Differences there were, for none of us went to Mackinac without ideas as to this country's obligations; but bitterness, no. Nor was the result a compromise. Rather was it a final meeting of minds after a prolonged discussion and a sincere desire, a determination even, to express in as few words as possible a simple formula that could serve as a basis for agreement upon which, with further study as the coming months move us into new areas, we can build a sound structure for a truly American foreign policy.

Did not many of you find your people, as I found mine, sincerely anxious to have their representatives in both Houses take hold of the international problems and assume a definite responsibility in solving them? Of course, many who held that opinion do not have accurate knowledge of the actual procedure under the Constitution and they blame the House severely for permitting the executive branch to have the latitude it has had. But we of the Foreign Affairs Committee know full well that it is the Senate that has treaty responsibility. We have no desire to infringe upon such rights but we think it would strengthen their hands to have the House express itself in favor of participation by the United States in some method of international cooperation. We feel it will create an added sense of security everywhere if this resolution is accepted.

As I said on this floor in June, I believe the Fulbright resolution to be a very simple starting point for unified action, not setting up specific methods but expressing a definite intention. Our sons and daughters are giving themselves to the grim business of war. It is our right and theirs to participate in building the structures of peace. This resolution advises all and sundry that we are not going to forget that that very right gives us a responsibility we do not propose to set aside.

Once having agreed that the United States should participate in setting up machinery that will make possible the building of a new world—not only shall we be free to criticize whatever methods are proposed but we shall be obligated to study what Mr. Dewey so well called the wheels and every spindle of the proposed machinery. This should give a sense of security to our people. I trust that the resolution may receive a very large vote from this House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, when 25 years ago we concluded the first World War in which America had ever participated, in fact, the first one in history, it was but natural I suppose, for many very understandable reasons, for the great majority of the people of America to be fed up with war, to be through with what we regarded as entangling European alliances, and particularly were we anxious not to have anything to do with future European wars. We therefore withdrew into our shells, as a nation, and placed our head in the sand like an ostrich, in the hope that the 3,000 miles of ocean on the east and the 6,000 on the west would not only assure us against future attack from without but would also assure us against the necessity of participation in any European war which might occur.

I am a great believer in the theory that the Congress of the United States represents the wishes of the majority of the people of the United States. It may be for that reason that the League of Nations was not ratified in the other body although the necessity for a two-thirds vote to ratify may have influenced the situation against this rule; be that as it may it was not ratified. I criticize no one for that. On the other hand, I concede to everyone that he acted absolutely conscientiously, and yet the fact remains that, in my opinion, that was one of the grave mistakes of the ages. In my opinion, had a different result occurred, and had America, therefore, when Mussolini started to violate Ethiopia been present as an active vigorous participant in the councils of the League of Nations instead of merely as an observer, I believe that the weight of her tremendous influence would have been placed behind the effort of Anthony Eden to enforce economic sanctions against Italy by the powers signatory to the League of Nations and that Italy would not have gone into Ethiopia. In the same way when Hitler commenced to militarize the Rhineland, I believe that had America been present at Geneva as an active partner instead of merely as an observer and thrown the weight of her tremendous influence into the scales, Great Britain and France would have followed her leadership and the Rhine would not have been remilitarized with the probable result that this war would not have occurred. The same possibility exists as to Manchuria.

As I say, I criticize no one for it. I may be mistaken. I am merely expressing my opinion, but the fact which confronts us now is that we have been drawn into another world war and the question is whether at the end of that war we shall again withdraw into our shell and not participate in any preparations for possible peace, which may follow.

History certainly has taught us the positive fact that because of the comparative smallness of the world now, resulting from the development of aviation, the radio, and other sciences, no future world war will occur without the necessity of final participation therein by the United States. If this be true do we want to wait until 1 or 2 years after the war commences and then become interested? Or do we wish to participate in the plans between possible wars, in the efforts to avoid war? I would call the attention of you who may regard it as a utopian dream to think of avoiding war, to the fact that the most heinous, the most horrible weapon developed during the last war, the weapon which so nearly annihilated that British Army at Ypres when it was sprung on them when they were naturally unprepared for it, that heinous gas has not, so far as I know, been used during this war. It is my opinion that it will be possible, not only to prevent the bombing of civilian districts of cities and innocent women and children next time, but I believe that the influence of America thrown in the balance along with that of all other peace-loving nations can contribute so much that there is a real possibility for permanent peace in this world provided we do our part.

So far I have spoken largely from a selfish American standpoint, but let us reflect on the fact that when we entered the last World War America was a debtor nation, a comparatively weak nation so far as making war was concerned. Because we were not war-minded we were not prepared.

We concluded that war as a creditor nation and as a powerful military nation. Our situation in these respects 25 years ago, even at the end of World War No. 1, is insignificant as compared to the power of our influence as a creditor nation and as a military nation, if you

please, at this time. Just as I have always believed that freedom of the press imposes on these gentlemen in the press gallery and upon every editor and publisher in America the duty not only to speak the whole truth but to do it in at least a reasonably fair way, so do I believe that the responsibility of our great country has increased now that we have become so much more powerful with the progress of the years to such an extent that we cannot shirk the responsibility we owe not only to our boys who are fighting over yonder but to the world. America cannot avoid, as I believe has been said here today, America must not try to retreat from the position of leadership our power and standing in the world naturally places her in. Nor do the great majority of the people of America wish her to do so. This resolution is merely a step in that direction.

Being a concurrent resolution, it, as you know, enjoys no force of law. It merely says to our own boys who are fighting our battles, to the people of America and to those of other countries, that it is the sense of the present Congress that America should not again place its head in the sand, reduce its Army to all but nothingness, and sit idly by while the trends, passions, and national enmities, which are more or less natural, are whirled about and accelerated as if by a whirlwind into the explosion of another world war. Yes; we will say that it is the sense of this Congress that America participate along with other peace-loving nations in the plans for peace with the fervent hope that permanent peace may be the happy result.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken or will speak this afternoon on this resolution may have permission to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COURTNEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ELMER].

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Speaker, I supplement my speech of June 30, 1943, in this House on the Fulbright resolution, by incorporating in the RECORD an article by Constantine Brown, published September 19, 1943, as a part of my speech as follows:

UNALLIED UNITED STATES HELD BEST ABLE TO PRESERVE POST-WAR PEACE

(By Constantine Brown)

In his recent brilliant speech at Harvard University, Prime Minister Churchill urged that the United States and Britain continue their present military alliance after the war is over.

Mr. Churchill is not alone in advocating such a solution for maintenance of peace in the world. There are many Americans who not only endorse his views but go further and say that this would be the solution to prevent another war.

The combined forces of United States and the British Empire, they say, are so vast and their power so great that no nation would dare set the world ablaze when they know that Uncle Sam and John Bull are patrolling the seas and the skies with fleets so strong that they can crush them without trouble.

Under the emotional impact of the war the formula suggested by the British Prime Minister and backed by a number of thinking Americans appears about the only hope for peace. American-British cooperation in the war has been running as smoothly as possible. It must continue until peace is signed and the map of the world is reshaped and established in such a manner that another war can be avoided for one or, if we are lucky, several generations.

But many people question the wisdom of a definite military alliance between the United States and Britain or, for that matter, with any European country.

Alliances have never guaranteed peace. If formed between strong and powerful nations they guarantee the winning of a war. In the past alliances always have called for counteralliances. All were clothed in a beautiful language assuring the world that they were intended exclusively for the good of humanity. But they always ended in catastrophe.

The German-Austrian-Italian alliance established years before the outbreak of the World War brought about an entente cordiale—another name for a military understanding—between Russia, France, and Great Britain.

AXIS BROUGHT ALLIANCE

The foundation of the German-Italian Axis led to the alliance between Britain and France. Both groups were bidding for the support of Russia, which held aloof until it decided which way to turn to serve the best interests and aspiration of the Russian people.

Historically alliances have never prevented wars—quite the contrary. They have been necessary in Europe where wars always have been endemic plagues. They have served the purpose of being pacts to help win wars and not to guarantee peace.

It is argued that in a British-American alliance a new peace ideology would be brought into play since the American people are such ardent pacifists and can derive no profits from the war. This is true and it is also true regarding Britain so long as she is not called on to defend the Empire against the covetous aggressor. There is no question that the merger of the military and economic resources of both countries would present the world with an enormous power which others would be hesitant to tackle.

This combination of forces might be successful if the rest of the world thought along the same terms as the English-speaking nations. But they do not.

A military alliance between Britain and the United States would be interpreted as an attempt of the Anglo-Saxons to dominate the world. It would call immediately for counteralliances of other powers.

SOVIET LEADERS SUSPICIOUS

The leaders of the Soviet are particularly suspicious men. They consider such a merger of forces as a potential danger to Russia's national aspirations and would look immediately to some other countries with the same interests as herself to combat the menace.

It is sufficient to read the frank declarations of Premier Stalin, who says that the Germany Army must be preserved because it is bound to be an element which would help to prevent complete chaos and destruction in Europe.

The Soviet Government is not anxious to disarm Germany's forces and suppress all her military establishments where war implements are being manufactured. The Russian Premier probably would endorse a proposition calling for complete disarmament of all nations after the war.

But the idea that the present Allies keep their forces intact to prevent the threat of another world war is not in high favor in Moscow. To the Russians it smacks too much of the Versailles Treaty which in the end proved such a poor one.

If a permanent peace is to be maintained and wars avoided, all nations must be disarmed immediately. It is difficult to say whether this is possible. It has never been tried. But it is safe to argue that so long as some nations want to expand they will do so by force and will find the means to fight unless the world has really learned a lesson and the necessary expansions can be done by international agreement in which all the nations decide to play fair with each other.

It is extremely doubtful that we have reached the advanced stage of civilization when each nation recognizes the other's right to share in the world's prosperity and racial hatreds are obliterated. This is particularly true as far as Europe is concerned where so many nations and races merge into ethnical groups in a small enclosure.

DOG INCIDENT CITED

A few days ago a group of trained dogs, led by their soldier trainers, appeared at the Back-The-Attack show in Washington. The dogs acted perfectly at the first performance, obeying the almost imperceptible signs of their trainers, jumped, laid down, fetched, and carried objects at the slightest sign or whispered order.

The next day, however, a collie apparently did not like the looks or the behavior of an Alsatian police dog. He broke away from his master and in a twinkle was at the throat of the Alsatian.

This was the signal for the rest of the dogs to join in the fight, and pandemonium reigned in the enclosure until the soldiers restored order and separated the howling, biting, and fighting animals.

The trainer of the collie maintained that his dog was not the aggressor, but that the Alsatian had growled challengingly at him. The Alsatian's trainer said his ward was perfectly under control and fought only in self-defense.

The other soldiers said they could not prevent their charges from fighting once the battle started. Some of those who tried to break up the fight came out of it with bruises and minor bites, as is inevitably the case in every dog fight.

This illustrates perfectly the history of peace and war down through the centuries.

Hundreds of years of wars which brought about a temporary glory for their makers, but only disaster to the people, have not taught the European nations that war does not pay. It is highly improbable that the present conflict will teach them differently. Of course, if the leaders of the victorious nations could show enough wisdom to refrain from retaliations, the picture might be different.

FORGIVENESS UNLIKELY

But this war, in which the Axis held the upper hand at first, has brought such misery and the subjected nations have been so dastardly treated by their temporary conquerors that it would be asking too much to expect forgiveness for those who have been guilty of wanton destruction and murders.

Therefore, it is unlikely that the cooling-off period after this war will be long, and during that period the victorious groups will have to remain armed while the others are disarmed.

If there were complete harmony among the victors immediately after the war is over, some sort of a stable peace might be established. But unfortunately this may not be the case. Already there have been some sharp exchanges between Moscow and some of the United Nations' governments in exile, such as Poland and Yugoslavia.

We have endorsed the complete independence of Poland and Yugoslavia and the restoration of their territories. How will this harmonize with the Moscow views about the future boundaries of Poland?

The British Government is looking sympathetically toward the monarchs in exile who have led their nations in the fight against the Axis. What will be the attitude of the British police forces in Greece, for instance, in the event the Greek people decided to change their form of government and depose King George, who is being strongly supported by the British Government?

But what is more important than these local squabbles, which could be ironed out eventually by the application of intelligent statesmanship, is Britain's position regarding Russia.

WARM WATER PORT ISSUE

Although it may be unwise in time of war to point it out, we cannot blind ourselves to the fact that there are some conflicting interests between Russia and Britain in the Middle East. The Russians desperately need an outlet to the warm Indian Ocean. Their best bet is the Persian Gulf.

The Soviet now has a number of divisions in Persia and, according to reports which have not been denied, the Soviet a few months ago annexed two Persian provinces bordering the Caspian Sea.

We may assume that once the war is over the Russians will wish to make arrangements with the Iranian Government whereby they can reach the Persian Gulf which is now in the British zone of influence. At least two British divisions are in that area and two complete armies are in other Middle East areas.

Should the Russians, at the end of the war or at a later date, decide that they want to gain that access and should the British oppose the move, it is hard to conceive that the matter could be treated amicably.

Russia's insistence on getting to the gulf by way of Iran might be easily construed as an aggression and if United States and Britain had a military alliance this country would be pledged to support her ally. This, of course, might avert a clash of arms, but, on the other hand, it might not.

The same situation conceivably might prevail in the event the British Government insisted on keeping Hong Kong as a crown colony after the Japanese have been defeated. If the Chinese were to oppose the British, who have a legal right to that Chinese city, we would be pledged to side with our ally unless the British government declared now that Britain's former holdings in China will be returned to the Chinese.

These are only instances of what could happen if an American-British alliance becomes an accomplished fact.

The United States unquestionably is the strongest military power in the world. In the past our slight influence in international affairs has been attributed to "too much ideology and pacifism" and also to the fact that we have always disarmed at the end of a war.

Should the American people who already have paid a heavy price for their hatred of militarism—as military preparedness previously has been erroneously called—decide to maintain a strong army pledged to no nation in particular, there is no doubt that we can hope to see peace in the world for a number of years.

But the picture can be changed entirely if beforehand we sign up to support one particular nation or a special group of nations.

The above article is a masterly presentation of the vital phase of the issues confronting us. For that reason I offered it in my speech to preserve it for future generations.

The Fulbright Resolution uses the word "power" which means force—military force. We are to be a party to using it and must supply our share of it. It is the heart of the old League of Nations covenant covered with sugar.

The amendment, "through its constitutional processes," means nothing and is sop to get supporting votes to the resolution. Constitutional processes mean that the President can negotiate treaties and the Senate confirm or reject. Such process excludes the consideration of the subject by the House, and our acts are corum non judice. The whole resolution and our vote is a mere gesture to lure our people one step closer to the brink of national disaster.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, sometime late this afternoon I will vote for the passage of the Fulbright resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 25 I am going to support this resolution in spite of the fact that I am opposed to the gag rule under which it is being considered in the House today. Within the next few years Congress will have to pass judgment on a great many proposals relating to foreign affairs, and it is my sincere hope that adoption of the Fulbright resolution under a gag rule, which prevents the offering, consideration, or adoption of amendments, will not be taken as a precedent as other measures are brought before the House.

The Fulbright resolution is not a law. It is not a directive to the President. It is not a mandate. It is simply an expression of opinion by the Congress, and I believe it has the support of the overwhelming majority of the American people. In this resolution we simply say, "That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional process." I believe we are all agreed that appropriate international machinery should be created to maintain a just and lasting peace; but, first of all, we must make secure that just and lasting peace referred to in the resolution.

The question has been asked as to what the language "through its constitutional process" means. To me that language simply means that whatever is done by representatives of the executive branch of our Government must be done within the limitations of our Constitution. This language would simply nullify any secret agreement entered into by any official of the United States. It seems to me that today we are in much the same position as we were in during the early part of 1919. If my memory serves me correctly, there was little, if any, opposition to President Wilson's proposal that we join with the other nations of the world in setting up an organization to prevent future wars. The controversy developed because of certain language in the Covenant of the League of Nations, just as there is bound to be debate and, undoubtedly, controversy in the original proposal that will be made for a post-war world organization. Such controversy can be held to a minimum by barring all partisan consideration in the formulation of whatever post-war organization is set up.

I hope that when we finally sit around the peace table, all schools of thought will be represented in the delegation that will represent the United States.

The thoughts that I have just expressed actually have no bearing on the adoption of the Fulbright resolution. I hope for a speedy adoption of this resolution and that it be accepted both abroad and at home for what it really is—an expression of the opinions of those who support it.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, it so happens that when the Fulbright resolution was before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs for consideration the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] and I were in California conducting an investigation of the Japanese situation at the instruction of the Dies committee so that we did not have an opportunity to participate in the discussions of the committee nor in the vote at the time it was voted on unanimously by that committee. Had I been at the meetings there are several amendments I would like to have proposed, at least one of which I shall discuss during the course of my remarks today.

I do want to say preliminarily to that statement, however, that as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee I am definitely opposed to the procedure and method by which this resolution is brought before us today. That is not news to the House, because I have frequently voiced my opposition to anything resembling a gag rule or any effort on the part of our committee or any other committee to keep the Members of this body from offering suggestions and amendments on the floor of the House. I think it is unfortunate that our committee has so frequently come before you with legislation under a gag rule, so that you must take it and like it or leave it. I hope that in the future we shall cease to err so frequently in that direction. You may be sure I shall continue my efforts toward that end.

As to the Fulbright resolution itself may I say that I expect to vote in favor of the resolution on the roll call, but before doing so I think I should make a report to you as to what I consider to be the implications of the measure before us at the present time. First of all I think it is extremely unfortunate that the measure is drawn as loosely as it is. It is especially unfortunate inasmuch as we are unable to improve it or strengthen or amend it on the floor of the House today due to the invocation of the gag rule.

As a matter of wise public policy, as a matter, if you please, of practical congressional procedure and as a matter of

peaceful and persuasive international relations in the future, I believe we should refrain from bringing before this House and the country resolutions which are so cloaked in uncertainty and so subject to honest differences of interpretation in the fierce crucible of practical affairs, as is the case of the Fulbright resolution. I fear this resolution may actually do more harm than good by its passage. Even so, in my opinion, its defeat would be more harmful than its passage at the present time.

I say this because the gist of the resolution is found in the words "appropriate international machinery." On the floor of the House today and in the corridors I have heard "appropriate international machinery" defined by individuals varying all the way from a superstate of some kind to a league of nations, to Union Now, clear over to the other extreme of a world court or Hague tribunal or just a series of treaties. Frankly, I fail to see how anybody can in good justice refuse to vote for the resolution, because it seems to me that within its boundaries is haven enough for the most ultra-isolationist in the country as well as the most "super dooper" internationalist in the world. "Appropriate international machinery" is not what the author defines it to be, but what it actually proves to be in the operation of the future history of the world; and its inadequacy once proven and war having come, it is too late then to change the definition or the result.

In this connection I was disturbed a few minutes ago; and if it had not been so serious, I would have been amused. I refer to the speeches delivered by the two gentlemen from New York, speaking consecutively, the Honorable DAN REED and the Honorable JIM WADSWORTH; I wish every Member of Congress would read those two speeches in the RECORD tomorrow. Both have served in the House an equal length of time, both have equal ability, and both, I am sure, are equally honest. One defined this resolution as a step toward a superworld state, and the other one said that it expresses merely a sentimental hope. Who is right? Who is wrong? Who is the best interpreter of this legislation, Jim or Dan? I do not know.

If Members of this House who have served for 20 years are so badly confused as to the intention of the legislation, what can it mean to the country and what can it mean abroad? How will Joe Stalin interpret it, or Gen. Chiang Kai-shek or Churchill and all the rest. How will our constituents interpret it if two Members of the House as honest, able, and sincere as the gentlemen from New York [Messrs. WADSWORTH and REED] disagree so diametrically on the contents of this short resolution?

Those of us who serve with DAN REED and JIM WADSWORTH love and respect them both. Their integrity is unquestionable; their judgment is respected; their counsel is coveted by us all. But here we find these two able legislators speaking on the same measure, interpreting the same language, reading the same words in the Fulbright resolution, utterly unable to agree between the two of them as to what it means, what it implies, what it conveys, what it withholds, and where it leads. Who among us is to say that Dan is right and Jim is wrong or that Jim is correct and Dan is confused? Who is there to referee a quarrel between the giants? Mr. Speaker, the fault lies with the legislation and not with the ability nor the sincerity of either Mr. WADSWORTH or Mr. REED. The fault is inherent in this resolution because it is couched in such general terms and such complete abstractions that two equally able and honest men can read into it two entirely different interpretations with equal ease and justice. To me, the greatest indictment taking place this afternoon against the procedure of bringing before this body legislation which may mean all things to all men, everything to some, and nothing to others, was the difficulty exhibited by the two gentlemen from New York in trying to find a common interpretation of the meaning and the scope of the Fulbright resolution.

In an effort to present legislation which is noncontroversial, I am afraid the committee has brought forward a resolution so vague that it is likely to be inconsequential. Perhaps less attention to seeking unanimity and more devoted to seeking clarity would have been helpful. Some there are today who indicate they think this resolution approaches the millenium; others there are who dub it a gesture of futility.

I am afraid that those who say this is a gesture of futility are perhaps correct. I am afraid, in fact, that perhaps it will rival in futility the situation where, when, pressing for help in the south Pacific, Douglas MacArthur asked for men and equipment, we answered by sending Eleanor to New Zealand in an Army plane! I am afraid it is as futile as that, but I sincerely hope I am mistaken.

I urge you to vote for this resolution for this reason, however—and I agree with the gentleman from Texas [HATTON SUMNERS], that peerless sage of the House, who said it is unfortunate this is foisted upon us now—that, it being before us today, I think it better that we vote in favor of this resolution, risking the misinterpretations which are bound to take place in this land of ours, as a lesser danger than risking the misconstruction which would be placed upon our action abroad if now we were to defeat this legislation. That, to me, would be a serious thing, a very serious thing, if the world abroad should get the idea that this country is unwilling to cooperate to bring about a peaceful world. We are willing to cooperate. It is unfortunate, however, that we have such a puerile arrangement of pretty phrases and no definite procedure to discuss today so that we might make our intentions clear both at home and abroad.

I offered the following amendment in the committee this morning in an effort to give some force and substance to the Fulbright resolution. I shall read it to you. It is brief:

Be it further resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of a Post-War Planning Commission, comprised equally of Democrats and Republicans, for the purpose of analyzing various forms of appropriate international machinery for the establishment and maintenance of a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and for making recommendations to the President and the Congress as to the position which the United States should occupy in the post-war world in the light of what is considered to be intelligent and effective foreign and domestic policy.

If the resolution which we are about to adopt is to mean anything, this would provide a means of implementing it; yet my amendment was rejected. If we are going to pay heed to the pious cause of keeping foreign policy out of politics, the way to do it is to permit a post-war commission, equally representing Democrats and Republicans, to have that authority. Although on the first day that this Congress convened, I introduced a resolution (H. J. Res. 28) to bring that about and make it possible, as yet I have been unable to have a hearing on that resolution before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. The way to take politics out of foreign affairs, I submit, is to charge Democrats and Republicans evenly with the responsibility of formulating an honest and adequate foreign policy devoid of all partisanship.

I do want to urge on those, however, who feel inclined to vote against this legislation because they have envisioned it to provide for a superstate, and those who feel inclined to vote against it because they say it is a futile gesture, that, now since it is before us, I think from the standpoint of its international implications and from the standpoint of the misconstructions which would be placed upon its defeat abroad, we had better vote for this legislation, weak, vacillating, vague, and meaningless though it is. I hope that in the future this House, before considering legislation on such an important matter as foreign affairs will ask itself, as the gentleman from Texas, HATTON SUMNERS, asked the Members of the House, "What will it gain us if we pass it? Is it worth the effort? Does it take a step forward? Will it help prevent war? Or is it simply a matter of passing some pretty phrases and then congratulating ourselves on having done a good job?"

Legislation which can be interpreted as variously by honest and sincere Members of this House as this resolution has been here today cannot possibly, in my opinion, give much solace at home or much comfort abroad from the standpoint of formulating a foreign policy worthy of the stature of the United States.

Let us approve this now, since disapproval would be dangerous and misunderstood abroad but let us henceforth discontinue passing resolutions against sin and get down to the tangible job of specifying which sins we are going to eliminate and how we are going to proceed to get the job done. Only by thus facing the real facts of life can we move sanely and soundly in the direction of a world without war.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress officially expresses itself in three ways:

First. By the passage of bills.

Second. By the passage of joint resolutions.

Third. By the passage of concurrent resolutions.

We are now discussing a concurrent resolution which reads as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein.

Any bill or joint resolution may become law and be placed upon the statute books of the land. A concurrent resolution has no such dignity. Jefferson's Manual, the parliamentary guide of the House of Representatives, makes the distinction clear. It says:

In the modern practice concurrent resolutions have been developed as a means of expressing fact, principles, opinions, and purposes of the two Houses.

Therefore, the Fulbright resolution does not have the force and effect of law. It is not binding as a law. It grants no authority or power. It is simply an expression of the opinion and the purpose of those who favor it.

The resolution is artfully drawn and well worded; indeed, it is a superb diplomatic utterance. It leaves to the reader the option of making his own interpretation. It does not contain any definite, conclusive language as to just what could or could not be accomplished by virtue of the resolution, even if it had vitality. In this uncertainty may lie latent danger.

For instance, if the President were to ask the Attorney General as to his power to perform under this resolution, and the Attorney General should so interpret the resolution, the President might, even though without constitutional or legal authority, make promises or commitments and perform extrajurisdictional acts which might be very embarrassing to the Congress if legislative ratification is sought.

In these circumstances, it is vital that the Congress make it clear to the President, to the Attorney General, and to all foreign nations that this resolution grants no power to the President, to make treaties or agreements, which he does not already have.

I regret that the resolution is susceptible of individual and varied interpretation, and wish it were otherwise. However, I can see no objection to voting for a measure concededly expressing only a hope and a desire toward a laudable end and without any specific promises on the part of Congress.

Conditions throughout the world are so chaotic at the moment it would be unwise on the part of the Congress to pass a law or make a definite commitment, attempting to bind our Government, until we have some idea as to conditions existing at the end of the war. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the author of the resolution, concurs in this belief. This resolution is not a formula.

In these circumstances, I feel justified in voting for this resolution—not that I approve of its uncertainty or its language, but because I applaud the principle that our country should do everything possible, under the Constitution, to prevent the recurrence of terrible world wars. In so voting, I am not giving to the Executive power to make binding promises and commitments as to postwar obligations on the part of our Government. Under the Constitution, the Executive may propose and negotiate, but no treaty is binding until approved by the representatives of the people—either the Senate or the House and the Senate. There is no delegation of power here.

Our allies, as well as the rest of the world, must take official notice of this fact.

In short, Mr. Speaker, so far as assured accomplishment is concerned, this resolution is a venture in futility. Its only possible value is psychological. We want the world to know that our country is not only ready but anxious to cooperate in every reasonable way to maintain peace in the future. At the same time, we want them to know that the executive branch of the Government is not clothed with authority to make binding commitments and promises except such as are contemplated by our Constitution or specifically authorized by the Congress. That is just as far as this resolution goes, and no farther.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAY].

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is in direct conflict with the Constitution. The House of Representatives, under our system of government has nothing to do with the making of treaties. This function is lodged with the President and the Senate, who have equal and exclusive powers in the making of treaties. Throughout the history of the United States this practice and procedure has been uniformly recognized. The Supreme Court of the United States in a unanimous decision rendered by Mr. Justice Davis held as follows:

In this country a treaty is something more than a contract, for the Federal Constitution declares it to be the law of the land. If so, before it can become a law, the Senate, in whom rests the authority to ratify it, must agree to it. But the Senate are not required to adopt or reject it as a whole, but may modify or amend it, as was done with the treaty under consideration. (*Haver* v. *Yaker*, 9 Wallace, 32, 35.)

The action of the House of Representatives at this time will not bind a future Congress and can only serve as an embarrassment to the Senate.

Mr. George Ticknor Curtis in his Constitutional History of the United States thus states the law:

The theory of the Constitution undoubtedly is that the President represents the people of the United States generally and the Senators represent their respective States, so that by the concurrence which the rule thus requires the necessity for a fixed quorum of the States is avoided and the operations of this function of the Government are greatly facilitated and simplified. The adoption also of that part of the rule which provides that the Senate may either "advise or consent," enables that body so far to initiate a treaty as to propose one for the consideration of the President—although such is not the general practice.

The States in the convention of 1787 agreed to share the treaty power with the President created by the Constitution, but they had no thought of resigning it, or of retaining anything less than they granted. Under American constitutional law, the Senate having two Senators from each State directly represents the States and the House of Representatives directly represents the people in the various Congressional districts. In the making of treaties, the people are already represented by the President and this by the positive provisions of the Constitution excludes any participation by the House of Representatives who likewise represent the people, in other capacities but not in the capacity of treaty making.

The phraseology of this resolution is so vague that under its provisions international machinery could well mean an instrumentality constituting a world superstate, with sovereignty of such magnitude that a membership therein could only be accomplished by a complete surrender of our American citizenship as ordained and established by the Constitution of the United States; in fact, such a supersovereignty has been directly advocated by Clarence Streit in his Union Now and by Mr. Justice Roberts of the United States Supreme Court in his address before the American Society of International Law on May 1, 1943, a copy of which address was inserted in the RECORD by the gentleman from Arkansas, Representative FULBRIGHT, the author of this resolution. Obviously, if this resolution is so broad as to give our assent and approval to such a program, it is clearly in violation of our oath of office to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. We are perfectly justified in reaching this conclusion, inasmuch as the gentleman from Arkansas, Representative FULBRIGHT, the author of the resolution, was a Rhodes scholar taking advantage of the provisions of the will of Cecil Rhodes, establishing a large fund to educate American students to consummate the surrender of our American independence and the return of the United States into the British Empire.

The words "international machinery with power adequate" can mean nothing less than a political machine of power politics using force through a world police and this world police must of necessity operate under the direction of a world superstate. The resolution does not state who would control such international machinery, but it is safe to say that the United States could exercise only a very minor influence as compared with the powerful British Empire and the Soviet Union. The United States is an independent republic with a limited jurisdiction constituting a national sovereignty. The British Empire, or rather

the British Commonwealth of Nations, is today a world government, and the Soviet Union is today the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of the world. We are thus asked to surrender our sovereignty and join these two world organizations. They have already entered into a military alliance for a period of 20 years, which is undoubtedly beyond the duration of the present war. If the author of this resolution were frank and entirely candid in the phrasing of the resolution he must have it read that as of this hour the House of Representatives of the United States expresses itself as favoring the surrender of our national sovereignty, our Constitution, and our independence to join a fixed alliance with the British Empire and the Soviet Union in a military alliance or in a world superstate, from which we could never secede. This is the most drastic and bold surrender of everything which the American people hold dear. It goes much further than the League of Nations advocated by President Wilson. There was a special reservation in the Covenant of the League of Nations for the withdrawal by any nation who had signed it.

What can be the purpose behind this attempt to place the Members of Congress on record at this time? Do its proponents not know that we are engaged in a critical war? Do they not know that any action we take today is in the absence of the millions of our boys who are fighting all over the world and that these boys will have no voice in framing these schemes of international obligations? Can it be possible that there are secret commitments which desire an expression from this body to protect those who have made such secret commitments from the wrath of the American people?

The future cannot now be forecast. There are too many uncertain elements. When future historians write the record of this period, they will say that the insistence and magnitude of pressing domestic problems broke down the arguments of the internationalists. We must have freedom of action in the direction of our home affairs after this war is over, or this great Nation will be torn apart in civil rebellion. The American people simply will not stand for the waste and excesses of profligate internationalism. We have grown accustomed to liberty and the American way of life, and God help the man or set of men that would try to take these precious possessions away from the American people. We are making a record here today. I want to be recorded with those who remain faithful to our American Constitution, and as one who will not yield our sovereignty under that Constitution to any world superstate or world government. We must preserve in all its integrity the destiny of this great Republic and refuse entangling commitments which will weaken and destroy the blessings of our American citizenship.

If you place world citizenship above American citizenship, you must open our ports to the immigration of all races, colors, and creeds. Where we now have conflicts along these lines, they will be intensified and inflamed. American labor has worked for many years for the restriction of immigration so as to keep American jobs for American workers. Under the world superstate comprised within the scope of this resolution, we could not refuse the entering of these immigrants because we would have previously surrendered any control over the subject. If this immigration grew to such magnitude that we would be swamped by the new infusions into our American population, all freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly now guaranteed to us by our Bill of Rights would be lost in a confusion of tongues and a veritable mob of foreigners demanding the things which we Americans call our own and for which we are fighting today all over the world.

This proposal would create a supergovernment from which the world police force will take its orders. Under the provisions of the Constitution a declaration of war must be made by the Congress of the United States. The American people insist that this sovereign right be retained by their chosen Representatives. We must not agree in advance to fight any other war than that solemnly declared by the American Congress. This proposal would place our armed forces at the disposal of other nations and permit them to make the decision of peace or war for the United States. The Republican Party, true to its great traditions, abhors this type of internationalism and stands by the time-honored provisions of the Constitution of the United States as the shield of our republican form of government.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the pending resolution is not of itself important. It in no way commits our Government to any course of conduct. It binds it to no policy. It is neither a treaty to be ratified, nor a contract subject to congressional approval. It grants no authority to make any such treaty, nor to enter into any such contract. It authorizes no action, it forbids no action. It violates no precedent. It neither expresses a new idea, nor clothes an old one in a new garb. In spite of the claim of critics, its wording carries no hidden meanings, nor grants any express or implied authority. All in all, the resolution is entirely without force and effect insofar as it imposes any obligations upon the American people or their Government.

If the statement I have just uttered is a correct analysis of the measure, it is, of course, pertinent to inquire into the purpose, if any, to be served by its adoption. There is a purpose, a worthy purpose, one justifying our earnest support of the proposal.

The resolution before us expresses a thought that all of us must have long since entertained. In truth, it voices a conclusion from which there is no escape, and that is, that the world can never be made secure against war until and unless there is established an international agency clothed with authority and power to preserve peace.

The passage of the resolution by this body, with the concurrence of the other legislative branch, will amount only to an expression by Congress, as a body, of that conclusion at which most of us must have long since arrived as individuals. It will, I believe, mark our first step toward the goal of a lasting peace. It is our first opportunity to take such a step and our failure to grasp that opportunity now, will, in my judgment, be nothing less than tragic. The tragedy in the defeat of the resolution will lie in the disappointment and, possibly, in the disillusion of millions of people of other nations who are today looking hopefully to America, not only for leadership but for a declaration of post-war intentions on which they can pin their hopes for future security. Insofar as the pending resolution may be considered as such a declaration, it is, in my opinion, not enough, but it will go far. It will bring some light into a dark and troubled world, while our failure to make it will leave the world still in the shadow of doubt and uncertainty.

As I have already said, the resolution in no way commits the Government to any specific course of action. It does not take us anywhere along the road toward the accomplishment of the task we must ultimately undertake; that task is the actual building and installation of the peace machinery it suggests and endorses.

If I could have my way in the matter, I would make the resolution directory in character rather than advisory. I would make it a joint resolution rather than concurrent, and have it confer upon the President and the State Department the necessary authority to enter into agreements with all the other members of the United Nations for the establishment of an international court or other agency for the preservation of a lasting peace. I would have the resolution direct that such court or agency be given the authority, clothed with the power and vested with the instrumentalities to enforce its orders, decrees, and awards. And, lastly, I would direct that the agreements for establishing this machinery to maintain peace be made between this Government and the other members of the United Nations immediately or without avoidable delay. This is what I would like to see done and, in my opinion, it is a step that must be taken if we ever hope or expect to maintain a lasting peace. In the meanwhile, however, let us take the first step toward the desired objective by adopting the resolution we are now considering.

Mr. Speaker, is it possible that we in America can find anything controversial in the proposition that machinery should be established to maintain peace after the end of the long, bitter struggle in which we are now engaged? Is it possible that we, as well as those who now fight with us, have had no profit from the bitter lessons of the past? Is it not unthinkable that we may once again lose at the conference table all we have won

in battle on land, on sea, and in the air? Although it has been said that opportunity never knocks twice at the same door, yet we of America are now face to face with the same opportunity that we had 25 years ago to give lasting security to the world. Let us not repeat that failure of the other years.

There are those who oppose the pending resolution because they say it is innocuous, it means nothing, it cannot even be implemented in a manner to make it effective. That argument may be more or less true, but it is likewise true that the passage of the resolution will open the way for further and more effective action when the proper time has arrived. Such further action, in my judgment, should and will take the form of a joint resolution authorizing in express terms the procedure suggested by the resolution now before us. The present existence of the United Nations as a vital, active, effective organization, should and will make it comparatively easy at this time for our Government to carry out the mandate of the joint resolution I have suggested. Let me briefly explain this statement.

We are not fighting this war alone. Standing with us, shoulder to shoulder, are 33 other nations banded together under the pact of the United Nations. As all men know, this union of sovereign states was effected in the city of Washington in January 1942, at a meeting of representatives from 28 free and independent nations of the world. At this meeting, held just 25 days after the treacherous assault by the yellow horde upon Pearl Harbor, the 28 nations, including our own, first endorsed and approved the Atlantic Charter, the declaration of principles theretofore, to-wit, on the 14th day of August 1941, signed and published by President Roosevelt on behalf of the United States and Prime Minister Churchill on behalf of the British Empire. Next, the several nations represented at the meeting entered into a solemn and binding agreement whereby they pledged their united efforts against the Axis powers and agreed that no one of the signatory nations would make with their enemies a separate armistice or peace.

Thirty-four nations of the world have now signed this pact. These 34 nations are therefore now bound together as an existing, functioning world-wide organization. All that is needed to make it effective in the establishment of a permanent peace is for this great association of nations to add one more pledge to the pact already binding them together. That additional pledge could be expressed in the following language: "Each government party to this agreement, pledges itself that when the war is ended, it will participate in the establishment of an international agency vested with adequate authority and instrumentalities to maintain a lasting peace among the nations of the world."

I firmly believe that the participation by our Government in this pledge should be authorized by Congress through the passage of the joint resolution I have already suggested. I am also confident that, under the leadership and counsel of the United States Government, the various other members of the United Nations would now gladly consent to the addition of this pledge to the existing pact. It is likewise my firm conviction that under this agreement with the United Nations, there would be set up, immediately after the close of hostilities, a world agency or court, clothed not only with authority, but also provided with the instrumentalities necessary to enforce obedience to its orders.

Mr. Speaker, this world is now in its Gethsemane, and the night is dark; but out of the shadows of the night a light is breaking; across the barren fields and devastated lands of Europe, and over the jungle clad islands of the tropic seas, the winds are carrying to hopeless peoples the whispers of a new day. In the skies of the Far East and above the lands bordering the Mediterranean, where clouds were once the darkest, there are signs of a new dawn. Every wind from the south and every vagrant breeze from the west are carrying today a message of hope to the world's oppressed. Soon to the ears of those who so breathlessly wait will come a sound never to be forgotten, the sound of the marching feet of American soldiers, crusaders of the century, and accredited agents for the destruction of Hitlerism and tyranny. Their coming will mean victory, their victory will mean freedom. Thus will come peace to the world. It is and will be our sacred duty to see that this peace is never broken—that it be preserved as a precious thing and handed down as the heritage of future generations.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I was struck with the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] of the Foreign Affairs Committee, when he said that this was cooked up entirely by the House committee or words to that effect—at least it came solely from the House committee. For 4 years everything that I can recall, from the lifting of the embargo, was sent down here to the Foreign Affairs Committee and usually as an emergency matter, from the White House, and if this is something that that committee has cooked up, I think it is probably the first thing that it has done of that kind in 4 years. Let us wait and see who fights true to the end. Let us not give any more blank checks, any more excuses for subterfuges. I think that we can well wait, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] said in his first speech; wait and get the boys home first, and then let them help decide something about our foreign policy. We will all be so exhausted that we will not be able to fight again soon.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. EATON. Is the gentleman referring to Philip drunk or Philip sober?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. To Philip sober in his first speech. I am convinced that this is a delegation to the Executive of authority and I do not think the author of the resolution would tell the House that he has not discussed this with the President and I yield right now to him, if he so desires.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the gentleman will yield I do not mind saying that I did not discuss the matter with the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BURGIN].

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution has a positive meaning to me. I realize that the membership can read into it anything they like, but it is a positive declaration, as far as I am concerned, and I think that when the resolution is passed, as the House will pass it, it means that we favor some arrangement after the war is over by which peace in the world can be had. That is positive to me. I come from a section of the country that was not very much impressed with what General Sherman did, but they are very much impressed with what General Sherman said about war, that it is hell. They want to avoid another war if it is possible to do so. Let me quote now from an article by Robert Quillen, carried in the Charlotte Observer of August 23, 1943:

> While the big men are planning the economics and "isms" of the new world, the little people are thinking in simpler and broader terms. They want something, anything, that will forever insure them against the murderous imbecility of war.
>
> They know it can be done—not by dreamers or by tricky politicians, but by men of good will and good sense who are determined not to fail.
>
> The question is not what we'd like to do, or what would be nice if we could do it, but what can be done, with the world as it is and human nature as it is.
>
> It is not possible to maintain order in a family, factory, army, or nation without some authority with power to enforce it. Lawmakers can do no good without law enforcers. And enforcement supposes the power to punish.
>
> The problem is to find that power.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that I represent here the sentiments of the people of my district in voting for this resolution. I believe I represent the sentiment of the great majority of the people of North Carolina. Somebody has said to me that it is impossible; that we cannot get world peace. Nevertheless, I think it is our duty to try. I think it is our bounden duty to do everything we can to that effect. We cannot have a Christian world, perhaps, but it is our constant duty and we are constantly trying to bring it about. Of course, it cannot be done in 5 days or 5 months or 5 years, but so far as the House is concerned, it seems to me that all we can do is to vote here for this resolution. The Senate may not O. K. it. They may have something else, but we will have done our duty. Moreover, recently, just before recess, we voted an appropriation for war for 1 year to the extent of something over $115,000,000,000. The world cannot stand to have another war from an economic standpoint within 25 years. The world cannot stand disruption of its own life, its community life, nor the loss of

the lives of men and boys being snuffed out on the battlefields of Europe. The world cannot stand another war like the one we are going through now and it seems to me to be our duty to declare ourselves by voting for this resolution. As I said, I believe I represent the majority of the people of my State in doing so. I think the people are looking to this Congress, both Houses of it, to make some arrangement to bring about peace. There appeared before our committee Mr. David R. Morrow who, I think, is one of the greatest interpreters of United Nations hopes to us, and our hopes to the nations of the world, and he said positively that the passage of this resolution, in his opinion, would give great hope and encouragement to the people who are our allies. I pray God the resolution will pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today is simply an abstract declaration of principle that this country will not turn to an ivory-tower seclusion after the war.

The resolution is weak just because it is abstract. For my own part, I have little confidence that this administration can work out an equitable post-war settlement. Nor do I believe that the decisions made in our State Department will bring the "four freedoms" to the many nationalities now in occupied Europe.

However, it would be shortsighted blindness not to recognize that the American industrial economy requires international security both for our investments abroad and for our markets. Following this war the tonnage of the American merchant marine will be more than that of all the other nations combined. It will be two to three times as great as the British merchant marine. Great funds of American capital will exist for investment. Our international economic relationships with Canada, South America, Australia, and New Zealand already involve us to a tremendous extent in the economic life of those nations.

It would be foolhardy to believe that we can escape the responsibilities which go with economic power. Without question American industry and its full peace-time operation will require international agreements of many kind. Our Government and our people should understand now that from here onward the American Nation has become the dominant economic and social power in the world today.

The issue before us is not merely to pass this resolution, but to formulate a sound international economic policy and a sound foreign policy, neither of which this administration to date has shown any capacity to do, or any willingness to undertake.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. It has been suggested that we wait until the boys come home to determine international law and order. Is there not grave danger that the boys never will come home if we do not take steps at this time?

Mr. BENDER. I think the gentleman is exactly right.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I hope the pending resolution will be adopted by a near unanimous vote of the House. The Members of Congress have just returned from a 2 months' visit with their people. The fact that action upon this resolution is the first order of business in the House is an encouraging sign that this country will assume its part of the responsibility in keeping the peace secure. When we visited our districts and talked with the people back home, we found that next to winning the war the greatest problem in the minds of our people was to bring about the adoption of machinery which would prevent this holocaust from occurring again. Indeed, after winning the war this is the paramount problem in the minds of people all over the world.

There are those who say that all discussion of our post-war plans should await until the enemy is brought to unconditional surrender. This is a short-sighted view. The problems are upon us now. They will continue to come upon us with increasing rapidity until victory has been won.

Also, I think the adoption of this resolution has a definite value toward winning the war. The millions of people existing under the Axis yoke will be further inspired to rise up and throw off their cruel conquerors if they can be assured the course this country intends to follow. We all recognize that the most serious inhibition regarding the formation of the United Nations' post-war plans is the uncertainty that exists regarding the policy we are going to pursue in the future. The Fulbright resolution would remove some of this uncertainty. By its adoption Congress would express itself as "favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and maintain a full and lasting peace." And, furthermore, we would express our willingness to participate. There are some that will say this resolution is too vague and general to have much value. I personally wish it could be more specific. But so long as a definite program remains to be worked out, no harm, and much good, can be done by a general pledge binding this Nation to support an international peace mechanism.

Civilization has learned its lessons the hard way. Even though painfully learned, we have heretofore ignored their obvious teachings. The hopes of the last generation being saved from another world war were blasted by our failure to enter the League of Nations. The world was small then. Since then it has become smaller. We must know now that no part of the world can be at war without this Nation being affected. In every society we find criminals and desperadoes. Here in this country 48 States have banded themselves together in a system of collective security. We must have law enforcement agencies to protect law-abiding people in the exercise of their liberty and rights. Generally, the people of the world want to live in peace just as do the people of this great country. But the lessons of history teach us that for this to be possible we must have a system of collective security and that system must be backed up by power sufficient to prevent the outlaw from again getting the upper hand.

The failure of the League of Nations came about because of two principal omissions: First, the United States, the most powerful Nation in the world, refused to lend its influence in support of the League, and, secondly, the League did not have force to back up its decisions. This resolution will bind the American people to reverse the policy we followed 25 years ago. It will bind us to participate and to create a mechanism "with power adequate to establish and maintain a full and lasting peace."

Some people will say that it is the Senate, and not the House, that should consider and pass a resolution of this kind because only the Senate has power to ratify treaties. I think it is important that the House act first on this issue. This is true because the House will accurately indicate to the Senate and to the people of the world the attitude of the citizens of this country. We Members of the House are close to the people, and we have recently been in close personal contact with our people. If this resolution carries by an overwhelming vote, the Senate will not be long in following our lead. Certainly the world's teeming millions will know how the people of the United States stand, and our stand will be an inspiration to them. Furthermore, it would be difficult for any international policy to remain virile unless it receives support from the Members of the House of Representatives. The program must be implemented by legislation and by appropriations which must receive the sanction of the House as well as the Senate.

It is true that this resolution is short and the language is simple. But our action today will, in my opinion, be the most important and far-reaching decision taken by the House of Representatives during this session. The future of this Nation, the ambitions of our people, will to a large extent depend upon what we do today. The people of the world are looking to us, to the great and mighty United States. Let us not fail them. Let us not again allow the hopes of a peace-loving people to be deterred by partisan politics, or by small prejudices and suspicions. These things are unworthy when we come to dealing with the lives and rights of our children and of the generations yet to come.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MCMURRAY].

Mr. MCMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I do not think a great deal can be added to the arguments that have been made here today on this issue. It is true that this

resolution is drawn in general terms. It does not commit us specifically to any one type of action, but I think the resolution is extremely important, because it does definitely point a direction.

The question has been raised this afternoon about why we should deal with the problems of the peace before we have won the war. I think everyone here knows that the war is not won, will not be won, cannot be won until we establish a just, lasting, and living peace. The war and the peace to follow are both parts of the same whole, and we who are left at home, we who are doing the lesser part of the work in this war effort, we who have more time and energy to spend ought to work diligently toward the creation of machinery which will keep the peace, once the boys who are in the fox holes and on the battle fronts all over the world have won the fighting war.

Let me reiterate, Mr. Speaker, there is no end to this war until we have builded a peace. And whether someone takes objection to it or not, I should like to repeat that the last war did not end on November 11, 1918. We are now passing through the second great violent phase of a gigantic world conflagration. The first World War did not end even though our boys won their battles nobly. They won the military phase of the war; yet the political leaders of the world, and specifically the political leaders of the United States of America, failed and failed miserably to measure up to the expectations of the men who had died. Let me point out that we did break faith with those who died on Flanders Field. Our boys are dying today all over the world and our actual participation in the war is just starting. The blood is just beginning to run. Let us not again break faith with those who die. Let us here determine that this shall be the last war, that we will build the peace. This resolution points toward that peace.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, throughout the ages men have sought peace. That they have failed to find a basis for lasting peace should not deter this body in seeking a solution to this age-old problem.

You cannot by resolution or statute instill in the hearts of men love for their fellow man. As long as you have individual greed and selfishness you are going to grow seeds that tend to ripen into war. However, the adoption of this resolution would be a substantial token of our interest—though it is only an expression of our desire for mutual cooperation with the other nations of the world.

Win the war? Yes—but we must also win the peace. A great historian said after the last World War, "That it meant nothing, had ended nothing, and had settled nothing." It was difficult for me to understand such a statement. Had we not given thousands of our men to "save the world for democracy"? Had we not left thousands of the finest youth of this Nation sleeping in Flanders Fields, men who had gone into battle with the promise of their country that this was a "war to end war"? Today we know that World War No. 1 did not save the world for democracy, for since 1918 more totalitarian states have come into existence than ever before. And we also know with such tragic assurance that it did not end wars, for today we are fighting another World War on a far greater and more terrible scale than ever before.

The torch which those brave men threw to us in 1918 has not been held high. We have broken faith with those who died. Did they die in vain? God forbid that there should ever be a third such scourge visited upon a peace-loving people.

What can we promise? We must, with God's help, do everything we can to assure the brave men now fighting that it will not be another war in a quarter of a century.

I can hear the anguished cry of millions of mothers, widows, and orphans. I can see millions of men made lame, blind, and injured by this holocaust. This grateful Nation will spare no expense in providing for their care. This is our duty and responsibility. Let us promise them something heartening, something definite. Let us promise them that this Nation will seek to find by every means possible a sure and safe road to permanent universal peace. If only half the effort required in the preparation for war is used in preventing it, peace could be maintained.

Peace throughout the world must come through educational processes. The youth of the world could and should be taught peace as they have been taught war. If the youth of Germany, Italy, and Japan had learned from their schools a love for peace rather than love of conquest and pride of battle, there would have been very little popular demand for war in those countries.

After the last World War President Woodrow Wilson sold his peace plans to Europe, but after returning home he found, after it was too late, that he had not sold them to his own countrymen. Some claim that had this Nation entered the League of Nations we would not be in war today. That is difficult to establish. However, we do know that we did not enter the League of Nations and that we are now at war. Therefore, if we had entered the League we would not be in any worse situation. Frankly, I would not desire this Nation to become a member of any world organization if we could otherwise maintain peace. After this conflict there seems to me to be only three courses that can be followed: First, to isolate ourselves from the rest of the world; second, become an imperialist nation; or, third, join the other nations of the world in forming a league or federation to guarantee peace and equity for all. I realize that the latter course means a departure from the traditions of the past. It is one price of peace.

We must carefully analyze all peace organizations. Many world-wide peace organizations go too far. We must not surrender our national unity. A compromise must be found that will be acceptable to the great majority of American people. We cannot accept the views of either the extreme internationalist or the extreme isolationist.

The adoption of this resolution cannot bring about a Utopia, but it is a sign of our intentions nailed onto the post of hope. Through it we say to the world America is ready to do what is necessary to secure the peace she is now buying at so appalling a cost.

The hopes of the world look to this Congress. We here shape the very destiny of future generations, yes, of civilization itself.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I consider the Fulbright resolution the most dangerous bill ever presented to an American Congress.

The words in this resolution sound harmless and innocent as a congressional prayer for post-war peace. However, this language furnishes internationalists with all power they ask to enable them to rob Americans of their independence and fix it so that America shall be in a world government or alliance which will not mean peace for America but repeated wars.

The President is adroit. He will probably never tell us ahead of time just how he intends making the existing alliance with Britain permanent. His tricky lawyers, however, can interpret this vague language as giving him unlimited power to sign us up permanently in any way he chooses—in a permanent military alliance, a permanent world government, or he could even make us in effect nothing but another dominion in the British Empire. If the Senate passes anything like this Machiavellian resolution, it can be interpreted as an authorization or ratification in advance by the Senate of anything the President chooses to do with American independence.

We no longer have a Supreme Court which would stand up for American rights and declare such an action unconstitutional. The independence of our Supreme Court is notoriously gone. One New Deal Supreme Court Justice has already interpreted this same language for you; Justice Roberts stated publicly in a radio address that a united nations of the world government, backed up by an all-powerful army which he called a police force, could bring eternal peace and was the only kind of machinery which would.

It is known that the President does not favor creating a formal united nations of the world in one act, presumably because it would be too big a gulp for the American people to swallow and because it is easier to do the deed informally and step by step the way this country was involved in war before Pearl Harbor. The trick is to mix up our affairs with England's until we cannot extricate ourselves. Once done, it is irrevocable, and the President does not need to worry about what people might do to him in the next election. How could we secede from a united nations government, backed up by a world army, except by a bloody revolt like the one which

mowed down the South in the War of the Rebellion?

If you think the President would not dare do such a thing, you forget how ambitious our President is. Foreign sharpers, knowing his ambition is the key to the United States Treasury, have flattered him until he pays countries to fight who have more interest to fight Hitler than we, because they are nearer Hitler. They keep telling our President that there would be no war if we had a world government and that he is the only appropriate leader of it. I predict that historians will say of Roosevelt, as they say of the German King, Charles V, that he did not bother to govern his own country successfully because he was so ambitious to have it said that he was ruler of the world—of a holy Roman Empire, which was neither holy, Roman, nor peaceful.

The advocates of world union are the same spokesmen who worked to involve America in the present war. Americans should beware of peace plans and arguments these people advocate. I doubt that they want lasting peace. What they really want is to get us into every war all over the globe as soon as it starts. From now on, England is likely to have plenty of wars all over the globe, not against Germany or Japan, if we win this war and vanquish them thoroughly, but against other countries, because England is now hated from one end of the world to the other, particularly by Musselmen. England is hated in Ireland, France, Egypt, India, Burma, and China, in fact, almost everywhere except in America, where we do not hate anybody and only feel ashamed and humiliated when we see that our leaders lack the patriotism for our magnificent country that every single foreign diplomat has for his country, however unimportant his country.

Americans wish to be friends with England, particularly now that we are in a desperate war which we dare not lose. But the English diplomats who come over here are so slick that they create ill-feeling against the English people. Not satisfied with our traditional policy of hands across the sea, they want "handouts across the sea." American help has saved their island from invasion, has saved Egypt and the Mediterrantan, which is the key to their vast Empire.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. EATON. I yield the gentlewoman from Illinois 2 additional minutes. Will the gentlewoman yield to answer a question?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. EATON. I would like to ask the gentlewoman from Illinois if she is firmly convinced that the present President is going to continue on indefinitely?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. That would depend on the alternative, if there is an alternative. That, it seems, does not satisfy them. They want to finish this war richer than they were when they got into it—at American expense. In addition they want us to give up our independence by joining an alliance which will throw us into every war they fight. They are going too far. A few weeks ago I heard they were trying to get General Marshall kicked upstairs because he stands up for our American rights and, after Quebec, they started to get rid of Admiral Leahy for the same reason. For the same reason they keep General MacArthur from heading our war effort. Their technique is subtle. Whenever they find an officer who stands up for American rights they get some American officer they can handle to ask that the officer they cannot handle be put somewhere that looks like a promotion, or sent to South America, or given a vacation. I reiterate—they are going too far. They keep on propagandizing for a permanent hook-up through their talk has already caused Russia to come out for a strong post-war Germany. Their talk helps Germany in the war because it tempts Russia to make a separate peace with Germany which would leave our American soldiers trapped in the Balkans.

Out in the Midwest, which is the place where Americans usually wake up first, people are beginning to get mad. They are losing faith in the ability of the Republican Party to save the country. They say that Republican leaders follow Roosevelt and Roosevelt gives the country away. They say that if in 1944, as in 1940, they have only a choice between two candidates for President whom the internationalists can handle, they will not vote. They say we need an American Party. That feeling may spread like wildfire.

I have been in Congress long enough to learn not to expect great things of Congress because ability is stifled in Congress by the seniority system. I think that the only gospel which will bring lasting peace to this deteriorating world is Americanism and that the trouble with America is that we are losing our Americanism. I think that we in America will go deeper and deeper into trouble unless and until the American people learn how to detect pretenders and elect Presidents and Members of Congress who are sincerely for America first, last, and all the time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 17, 1943.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. CLAIR ENGLE as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-eighth Congress from the Second Congressional District of California, to fill a vacancy in that district, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,
SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—SCHAFER AGAINST WASIELEWSKI (H. DOC. NO. 282)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Elections No. 1 and ordered printed.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 17, 1943.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to lay before the House of Representatives the contest for a seat in the House of Representatives for the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States for the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Wisconsin, John C. Schafer against Thaddeus F. Wasielewski, notice of which has been filed in the office of the Clerk of the House; and also transmit herewith original testimony, papers, and documents relating thereto.

In compliance with the act approved March 2, 1887, entitled "An act relating to contested-election cases," the Clerk has opened and printed the testimony in the above case, and such portions of the testimony as the parties in interest agreed upon or as seemed proper to the Clerk, after giving the requisite notices, have been printed and indexed, together with the notice of contest and the answer thereto and original papers, and exhibits have been sealed up and are ready to be laid before the Committee on Elections.

Two copies of the printed testimony in the aforesaid case have been mailed to the contestant and the same number to the contestee, which, together with the briefs of the parties, will be laid before the Committee on Elections, to which the case shall be referred.

Yours respectfully,
SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—McEVOY AGAINST PETERSON (H. DOC. NO. 283)

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read, and with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Election No. 2 and ordered printed.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 18, 1943.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to lay before the House of Representatives the contest for a seat in the House of Representatives for the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States for the First Congressional District of the State of Georgia, Edward T. McEvoy against Hugh Peterson, notice of which has been filed in the office of the Clerk of the House; and also transmit herewith original testimony, papers, and documents relating thereto.

In compliance with the act approved March 2, 1887, entitled "An act relating to contested-election cases," the Clerk has opened and printed the testimony in the above case, and such portions of the testimony as the parties in interest agreed upon or as seemed proper to the Clerk, after giving the requisite notices, have been printed and indexed together with the notice of contest, and the answer thereto and original papers and exhibits have been sealed up and are ready to be laid before the Committee on Elections.

Two copies of the printed testimony in the aforesaid case have been mailed to the contestant and the same number to the contestee which, together with the briefs of the parties, will be laid before the Committee on Elections to which the case shall be referred.

Yours respectfully,
SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—THILL AGAINST MACMURRAY (H. DOC. NO. 284)

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read, and with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Elections No. 3 and ordered to be printed.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 17, 1943.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to lay before the House of Representatives the contest for a seat in the House of Representatives for the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States for the Fifth Congressional District of the State of Wisconsin, Lewis D. Thill against Howard J. McMurray, notice of which has been filed in the office of the Clerk of the House; and also transmit herewith original testimony, papers, and documents relating thereto.

In compliance with the act approved March 2, 1887, entitled "An act relating to contested-election cases," the Clerk has opened and printed the testimony in the above case, and such portions of the testimony as the parties in interest agreed upon or as seemed proper to the Clerk, after giving the requisite notices, have been printed and indexed together with the notice of contest, and the answer thereto and original papers and exhibits have been sealed up and are ready to be laid before the Committee on Elections.

Two copies of the printed testimony in the aforesaid case have been mailed to the contestant and the same number to the contestee which, together with the briefs of the parties, will be laid before the Committee on Elections to which the case shall be referred.

Yours respectfully,
SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order pending. In view of the lateness of the hour I ask unanimous consent that in lieu thereof I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, following the business of the day, and any other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of other business and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes; and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that if the House does not meet on Thursday I may have permission to address the House on Friday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution introduced by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three subjects and include therein certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NEW ENGLAND SAFETY RECORD

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to include as a part of my remarks a brief statement by Mr. Lewis MacBrayne, the regional director for the Conservation of Manpower in War Industries of the United States, Department of Labor, in which he says that New England has next to the lowest factory-accident frequency in the country. Mr. MacBrayne was born and brought up in my home city of Lowell, and has a very enviable record in National as well as State safety work.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I hope the record just referred to will be even better in New England and all over the United States than it has been, because it is of vital importance today not only to prevent accidents in factories for the welfare of those working in factories but for the speedy winning of the war. Accidents delay production of vital war products.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the business of the day and following any other special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by me appearing in the September issue of the Nation's Schools entitled "Let's Treat the Red Man White."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the business of the day and following any previous special order heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes on the subject The Need for a Domestic Affairs Commitee and a Domestic Policy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, on Wednesday, September 8, 1943, before the Boston Building Congress entitled "Nazi Blitzkrieg Stopped."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted unanimously by the general assembly of the Puerto Rico Pro Independent Congress, held in San Juan, P. R., August 15, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 25 minutes.

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, section 312 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, provides as follows:

SEC. 312. (a) The Comptroller General shall investigate, at the seat of government or elsewhere, all matters relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds, and shall make to the President when requested by him, and to Congress at the beginning of each regular session, a report in writing of the work of the General Accounting Office, containing recommendations concerning the legislation he may deem necessary to

facilitate the prompt and accurate rendition and settlement of accounts and concerning such other matters relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds as he may think advisable. In such regular report, or in special reports at any time when Congress is in session, he shall make recommendation looking to greater economy or efficiency in public expenditures.

(b) He shall make such investigations and reports as shall be ordered by either House of Congress or by any committee of either House having jurisdiction over revenue, appropriations, or expenditures. The Comptroller General shall also, at the request of any such committee, direct assistants from his office to furnish the committee such aid and information as it may request.

(c) The Comptroller General shall specially report to Congress every expenditure or contract made by any department or establishment in any year in violation of law.

Recently testifying before the Ramspeck committee, Mr. Warren, Comptroller General, made this statement.

My observation is that Congress has practically no information on how the appropriated money is spent. Members of the Appropriations Committee will tell you that it is a hit-or-miss affair with them in the development of the various appropriation bills.

In view of this positive mandate of section 312 of the Budget and Accounting Act, it is indeed regrettable that the Comptroller General, who is charged with the responsibility of reporting facts to Congress, should make this type of statement to any congressional committee. The Congress has the will to cut out unnecessary duplication and waste of public funds; however, it is dealing with an expenditure by 3,000,000 employees in the executive department. On the sheer force of numbers alone, 434 Representatives in Congress and 96 United States Senators are inadequately equipped to find out how 3,000,000 people in the executive department are spending the money appropriated to them and it is high time that the General Accounting Office fulfills its obligations.

It is indeed regrettable that the Comptroller General has never asked for funds if he is short-handed so that he can carry out this positive mandate of the Budget and Accounting Act.

I propose an appropriation of $20,000,000 for the balance of this fiscal year so that the Comptroller General will immediately start making the reports and recommendations that Congress expects and wants to save manpower and money.

The people of the United States are mad. The President recently said:

For, the longer this war goes on the clearer it becomes that no one can draw a blue pencil down the middle of a page and call one side the fighting front and the other side the home front. The two of them are inexorably tied together.

The people are quite satisfied with the progress at the fighting fronts but they are miserably disappointed with the conduct of the war on the home front which the President says is inexorably tied with the war front.

We must admit that we have not begun to start to commence to cut waste of manpower and money on the home front; even if we have the will to do it, we do not have the manpower in Congress to get the job done properly. Since we are in war I am quite willing to use the facilities of the General Accounting Office, the agent of the institution of Congress, and I think their manpower ought to be available to any Member of Congress who wants to put his shoulder to the wheel to attack this waste on the home front.

I have also prepared a bill to strengthen the duties imposed by section 312 on the Comptroller General's office and to give him certain further mandatory duties as follows, to wit:

(f) It shall be the mandatory duty of the Comptroller General of the United States, in addition to reporting to the Congress every contract and expenditure made in violation of law, as aforesaid, to make disallowances and to withhold credits in the accounts of appropriate accountable officers of the Government for and in respect of each and every expenditure made in violation of law; and he shall report to the Congress, annually or specially, and in detail, every such disallowance and withholding of credit pursuant hereto.

(g) It shall further be the mandatory duty of the Comptroller General of the United States to raise proper charges, and to institute, or cause the institution of, collection proceedings against any and all persons and concerns to whom any and all illegal payments or disbursements shall be found to have been made; and he shall report to the Congress, annually or specially, in detail, all charges so raised and all collection proceedings commenced or requested to be commenced pursuant hereto.

(h) It shall further be the mandatory duty of the Comptroller General of the United States to, and he shall, upon request, furnish the details of all such disallowances, withholding of credits, and collection proceedings instituted or requested to be commenced, to any committee of either House of Congress, or to any Member of Congress, together with copies or originals of investigative reports pertaining thereto submitted to him in the course of business of his office.

(i) It shall further be the mandatory duty of the Comptroller General of the United States to, and he shall, make a study of the functions of the agencies of the Government and make a report to Congress annually as to their overlapping of duties and functions, and report such findings to any Member of Congress upon request.

These bills are introduced in the spirit of improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the last great deliberative body in the world—our Congress. The people of the United States are depending upon the Congress coming back to life and they see the activities at the end of our session in June and July of this year as signs of the rebirth of an independent Congress; however, we as Members of Congress and the people shouldn't be drawn into a false sense of security by our accomplishments. Should we feel secure when we limited the right of O. P. A. to put into force and effect grade labeling when 2 weeks after Congress adjourned Fred Vinson established grade labeling of meat and claimed to get authority from the war powers of the President? Should we and the public feel secure when the O. W. I. have spent several million dollars on the home front for publicity agents and ask for $6,000,000 for the next fiscal year without the Congress of the United States ever turning off the 35,000 publicity agents in every department, agency, and independent establishment of the Government on the pay roll, full time and part time, to the tune of $27,000,000 for salaries, $2,500,000 for duplicating paper, and a large portion of the $49,000,000 franked mail expense of the departments?

Is it not a fact that it took us 18 months after Pearl Harbor to eliminate a prewar "make work" organization, the National Youth Administration? As a matter of fact, we did not eliminate it until there was a critical shortage of manpower throughout the length and breadth of the United States and the Manpower Commission organized with millions of dollars to solve that problem. The Congress of the United States has had the will to eliminate duplication and waste but it has not had the facts from the executive departments and the General Accounting Office to get the waste and duplication stopped with dispatch.

The American people are expecting, and depending upon, the Congress of the United States to do that job now and this is an effective step in the right direction to arm us with the manpower, facts, and original data for a commando raid on the wasters in the Federal Government.

If $20,000,000 seems alarming to you, let me show you a report from the Library of Congress. The percentages of appropriations quoted, estimated for research in the executive departments for the year 1943 are based upon the factual study made in 1938 by the National Resources Planning Committee:

There were 91 additional agencies given in this table but because the proportion of their expenditures for research was less than 50 percent we did not include them.

	Amount	Percent
Department of Agriculture:		
Beltsville Research Center	$105,855	99
Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry	927,484	99
Bureau of Agricultural Engineering		85
Bureau of Dairy Industry	764,757	90
Bureau of Home Economics	388,890	99
Bureau of Plant Industry	5,192,197	99
Office of Experiment Stations	7,182,705	99
Department of Commerce:		
Bureau of the Census	5,442,000	99
Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce	1,853,000	54
Coast and Geodetic Survey	4,129,400	99
Department of the Interior:		
Bureau of Mines	23,372,140	75
Geological Survey	4,691,000	85
Office of Education	166,378,970	55
Department of Labor:		
Bureau of Labor Statistics	1,937,021	99
Children's Bureau	12,158,765	85
Division of Labor Standards	146,585	55
Division of Public Contracts	423,500	75
Secretary's Office	4,952,574	55
Women's Bureau	158,720	99
Department of State: No appropriation found for agencies given in report.		
Navy Department:		
Hydrographic Office	884,945	99
Naval Observatory	217,907	99
Naval Research Laboratory	1,798,653	99
Office of Naval Records and Library	38,865	99
Treasury Department: Division of Research and Statistics	182,925	99
Independent agencies:		
Central Statistical Board	1,982,000	55
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	22,582,736	75
National Archives	1,045,125	99
Smithsonian Institution	1,670,405	55
U. S. Tariff Commission	868,200	99

Listen to what the Library of Congress concludes:

The total appropriations for these agencies amount to $271,477,414. We do not know that they are using the same approximate percent of their funds for research in 1943 as they used in 1938, but if they are, the expenditure for research by these agencies amounts to around $175,000,000.

And that is not all:

The Library of Congress makes a further report of 13 additional agencies:

Thirteen additional agencies, the names and functions of which indicate that they spend a large proportion of their funds for research, are also given:

Office of Information, Agriculture Department	$1,700,144
Special research fund, Agriculture Department	1,150,000
Bureau of Agricultural Economics	528,798
Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations	223,795
Agricultural Marketing Service	6,785,512
Office for Agricultural War Relations	475,000
Board of Economic Warfare	12,000,000
Board of Investigation and Research	500,000
National Resources Planning Board	774,422
Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	33,638,000
Office of War Information	25,000,000
War Manpower Commission	13,417,680
War Production Board	68,546,300
Total	164,739,651

Therefore the $20,000,000 that we are spending to do a job of streamlining the home front, save manpower and money, is still a parsimonious sum when compared with the enormous expenditures of the executive department for research in the political science and social field.

Further emphasizing the necessity of Congress having the facts: On May 5 I asked the Lend-Lease Administrator 68 questions. He refused for 3 reasons: Manpower, a military secret to which a Congressman is not entitled, and that the answers were in various hearings. All 3 of these reasons are typical excuses, but they are not real. The Army and Navy have been much more cooperative on giving information, and, in fact, they have never refused me information that I have asked on the grounds of military secrecy, so that the reason given by this international boondoggler, Stettinius, is certainly invalid, because the Army and Navy do not give the same excuse to a Member of Congress.

The personnel of Lend-Lease Administration and the six agencies that furnish service to them certainly should be utilized by answering any Congressman's questions about their operations. If they refuse to answer, of course, the alternative is that the Congressman seeking it, has to use no more than four persons to do the job that an entire army of civilian employees ought to be doing to give him the facts. As a matter of fact, I did get substantially all the facts I needed from other agencies of the Government. However, I would never have gotten my 68 answers had not the majority leader promised me in the heat of debate on the appropriation bill for $6,000,000 for the Lend-Lease Administration that the answers would be given me. Approximately 2 months later on August 5, Stettinius gave me some of the answers; and, by the way, they should have been given me in 2 days instead of 2 months. I have had time to check the hearings over the recess and the answers to the questions could not be found in the hearings. The answers refused on the ground of military secrecy I have gotten from the Army and Navy. Now that presents a picture of a studied effort of the executive department to keep the Congress of the United States in the dark on the way its money is being spent.

Of course, I realize that this is an issue between one Member of Congress and the executive department. The pattern of keeping Congress in the dark also works with congressional committees.

I saw convincing evidence of it a few days after Congress adjourned. The Cox select committee presented a subpena duces tecum to James Lawrence Fly, Chairman of the Board of War Communications and Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and to Mr. Harold Smith as Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Both men refused to bring the papers called for in the subpena duces tecum on the grounds that they were confidential and to this day the select committee does not have the information.

To me, this presents a fundamental issue that the Congress of the United States ought not take long in settling and I hope that the Cox select committee brings the matter to the floor of the House for contempt charges against Mr. Fly and Mr. Smith because this Congress is entitled to any facts requested and any documents having to do with an agency that Congress created.

I think a grave error was made when the Congress approved Reorganization Plan No. I, transferring the Budget Bureau from the Treasury Department to the Executive Office of the President. I have asked the Budget Bureau, since the reorganization plan was approved, for information about executive departments with which my Subcommittee on Appropriations dealt and have been refused the information on the ground that it was confidential. This, to me, is a tragic situation, striking at the very heart and integrity that the Constitutional fathers meant for the institution of Congress to have. I am, therefore, introducing a bill today to correct this situation at once. The bill speaks for itself, as follows, to wit:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of Reorganization Plan No. I, transmitted by the President of the United States April 25, 1939 (53 Stat. 1423), pursuant to the Reorganization Act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 651) transferring the Bureau of the Budget from the Treasury Department to the Executive Office of the President, be, and the same hereby is, repealed and rescinded; and the Bureau of the Budget shall, from and after the approval of this act become and be an independent establishment of the Government, and it shall be independent of the executive departments and under the direction and control of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

SEC. 2. The Bureau of the Budget shall henceforth report to the President and to the Congress its findings and conclusions, together with recommendations, in respect of any and all requests by departments, agencies, and establishments for appropriations for the carrying out and performance of their respective powers, duties, and functions, and especially from the standpoint of whether appropriations requested are intended to be, and will be, used in the performance and carrying out of the lawful and authorized powers, duties, and functions of the several departments, bureaus, agencies, and establishments of Government, and each of them.

SEC. 3. The Bureau of the Budget shall forthwith transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate copies of any and all original requests by each agency, department, and independent establishment of the Government, and its findings, conclusions, and its recommendations regarding the various items contained in the annual budget or special estimates for appropriations, and, when requested, shall furnish like information to any committee of either House of the Congress, and to any Member of Congress when requested; and shall likewise make available for inspection all files, records, documents, and data of the Bureau of the Budget by regular and special committees of each House of Congress and their duly authorized representatives, for appropriative or legislative purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. WILLIAM S. HILL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. F. L. SUNDSTROM (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. SPENCE (at the request of Mr. CHAPMAN) for 3 days, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 21, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

716. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $7,500,000 for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1944 (H. Doc. No. 276); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

717. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $18,633,000 (H. Doc. No. 277); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

718. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of contracts awarded by the Navy Department for the fiscal year 1943; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

719. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a copy of the material supplied to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, setting forth a revised estimate of the personnel requirements of the War Department for overhead purposes in the continental United States, for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

720. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting the fourth report of the Attorney General covering the period from May 26, 1943, through September 15, 1943; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

721. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the disposition of the proceeds to accrue as a result of the interlocutory judgment of the Court of Claims in the suit brought against the United States by the Menominee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

722. A letter from the Attornely General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 21 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

723. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting a report of economies effected in national office operations with respect to employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

724. A letter from the chairman of the board, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report of the Corporation for the month of July 1943; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

725. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a set of all laws passed by the municipal councils and legislative assembly of the Virgin Islands during the fiscal year 1943; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

726. A letter from the Administrative Officer, Office of Economic Warfare, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Bureau of the Budget setting forth the Director's determination certifying that the instructions contained in his letter were complied with in accordance with the overtime pay law; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

727. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for the War Department for the improvement of existing river and harbor works, to remain available until expended, amounting to $170,000 (H. Doc. No. 278); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

728. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Federal Works Agency for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $4,920,000 (H. Doc. No. 279); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

729. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, for the fiscal year 1944, in the amount of $10,356,000 (H. Doc. No. 280); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

730. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting two copies of a draft of a proposed bill to provide effective date of awards of death pension or compensation in cases of persons missing or missing in action to authorize payment of such benefits from the date of death of such person as reported or found by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

731. A letter from the Chairman, War Production Board, transmitting seventh bimonthly report, dated August 31, 1943, for the period June 6 through July 31, 1943, on activities of the Smaller War Plants Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

732. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Investigation and Research, transmitting annual report of the Board of Investigation and Research for the year ended September 18, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 281); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

733. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting the contest for a seat in the House of Representatives for the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States for the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Wisconsin, *John C. Schafer* v. *Thaddeus F. Wasielewski* (H. Doc. No. 282); to the Committee on Elections, No. 1, and ordered to be printed.

734. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives transmitting the contest for a seat in the House of Representatives for the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States for the First Congressional District of the State of Georgia, *Edward T. McEvoy* v. *Hugh Peterson* (H. Doc. No. 283); to the Committee on Elections No. 2, and ordered to be printed.

735. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives transmitting the contest for a seat in the House of Representatives for the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States for the Fifth Congressional District of the State of Wisconsin, *Lewis D. Thill* v. *Howard J. McMurray* (H. Doc. No. 284); to the Committee on Elections No. 3, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. H. Res. 303. Resolution providing for the expense of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 18, Seventy-eighth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 704). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3208. A bill to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 705). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 3257. A bill to amend subtitle—Insurance of Title 11 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3258. A bill to prevent double recovery on claims under section 1 (a) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to seamen employed by the United States through the War Shipping Administration; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3259. A bill to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3260. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for requisition or purchase of vessels owned by subsidiaries of American corporations; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3261. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3262. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 3263. A bill relating to the foreign tax credit in the case of an individual owning a majority of the voting stock of a foreign corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 3264. A bill to amend the patent laws with respect to practice in interference cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 3265. A bill amending the Servicemen's Dependents' Allowance Act of 1942 to provide an increase of 25 percent in the amount of the Government's contribution to the dependents of enlisted men entitled to family allowances under such act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 3266. A bill to authorize the issuance of non-interest-bearing obligations of the United States for war financing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. R. 3267. A bill to amend section 145 of the Revenue Act of 1942, which amends section 114 (b) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 3268. A bill to provide Federal unemployment-compensation allowances for members of the land and naval forces upon termination of service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANCOCK:

H. R. 3269. A bill to affirm the intent of the Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States and that the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as amended, be not applicable to that business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3270. A bill to affirm the intent of the Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States and that the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as amended, be not applicable to that business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 3271. A bill to extend to November 15, 1943, the time for filing declarations of estimated tax for 1943; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 3272. A bill providing for loans to war-service persons for educational purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. JONES:

H. R. 3273. A bill to make the Bureau of the Budget an independent establishment of Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 3274. A bill to amend section 312 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 3275. A bill making appropriation for the General Accounting Office for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WARD JOHNSON:

H. R. 3276. A bill to authorize the construction of permanent access facilities with regard to Terminal Island, Calif.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that veterans of the present war should have a voice in the formulation of the terms of peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution to provide temporary sleeping quarters in the legislative garage for men of the armed services; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CULLEN:

H. R. 3277. A bill for the relief of the legal guardians of John Buchan and Lawrence Gillingham, minors; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FISH:

H. R. 3278. A bill for the relief of the estate of Bartholomew Lawler; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HALLECK:

H. R. 3279. A bill for the relief of Clarence G. Doelling and Doris J. (McNeil) Doelling; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 3280. A bill for the relief of William Dyer; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3281. A bill for the relief of Margaret L. Hawkins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 3282. A bill granting a pension to Mary G. Sherwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 3283. A bill for the relief of William Thompson Sansom; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3284. A bill for the relief of Paul J. Mueller; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3285. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Poisson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3286. A bill for the relief of Capt. Millard L. Treadwell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 3287. A bill to correct the military record of Herbert Horrell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, in whose almighty hand the future lies, give us understanding minds, patient hearts, and determined wills that through us Thou shalt create among the nations Thy chosen pattern of government and Thy charter for freedom and justice in all the earth. In these troubled days, confronted with anxiety, tragedy, and death, and the mystery that lies beyond death, our hearts cry out for a meaning that is larger than the things we see. Lest our feet slip we must be upheld by something that has an eternal faith behind it.

Give us that penitence for our own sins, that contempt for our own prejudices, that hatred for our own hate, that shall enable us to put on the whole armor of God as we fight against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. Make us worthy to look unashamed into Thy face as we say with full purpose of heart:

"We lift our living Nation
A single sword to Thee."

In the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, September 17, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUITS UNDER ANTITRUST LAWS AND FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to law, his fourth report covering the period from May 26, 1943, through September 15, 1943, pursuant to section 12 of Public Law No. 603, Seventy-seventh Congress (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 21 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Immigration.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT AND RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Letters from the Secretary of War and the Chairman of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending September 30, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

CONTRACTS AWARDED BY THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of contracts awarded by the Navy Department for the fiscal year 1943, including a supplemental report covering negotiated contracts in excess of $150,000, with the names of persons who consummated the making or concluded the negotiation on behalf of the Government and of persons who participated in the negotiations on behalf of the contractor (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PROCEEDS ACCRUING FROM JUDGMENT OF COURT OF CLAIMS BY MENOMINEE TRIBE OF INDIANS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposition of the proceeds to accrue as a result of the interlocutory judgment of the Court of Claims in the suit brought against the United States by the Menominee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

LEGISLATION BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a set of all laws passed by the Municipal Councils and the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands during the fiscal year 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

JULY 1943 REPORT OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the month of July 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SEVENTH REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER THE ACT TO MOBILIZE PRODUCTIVE FACILITIES OF SMALL BUSINESS (S. DOC. NO. 98)

A letter from the Chairman of the War Production Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the seventh report of his operations under the act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

AWARDS OF DEATH PENSION OR COMPENSATION IN CASES OF MISSING PERSONS

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide effective date of awards of death pension or compensation in cases of persons missing or missing in action to authorize payment of such benefits from the date of death of such person as reported or found by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF BOARD OF INVESTIGATION AND RESEARCH

A letter from the Board of Investigation and Research (under the Transportation Act of 1940), transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Board for the year ended September 18, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

ADVERTISING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES—PETITION

Mr. GREEN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wakefield and vicinity, in the State of Rhode Island, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached, as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

Whereas on February 1, 1943, the Dominion of Canada banned the advertising of alcoholic beverages as a war measure; and since such advertising is carried over the international border by radio and magazines from the United States, thereby hindering this protective measure of our neighbor and ally;

And inasmuch as there are before the Congress of the United States two bills for the control of such advertising; the Johnson bill (S. 862) prohibiting advertising of alcoholic beverages by radio; and the Capper bill (S. 569) making it unlawful for any newspaper, periodical, newsreel, photographic film, or record advertising alcoholic beverages to be carried from one State to another;

We, the undersigned citizens of the State of Rhode Island, ask that these bills be enacted into law.

ELISABETH S. HODGE,
ANNIE TINGLEY,
ELSIE L. SHERMAN
(and sundry other citizens of Wakefield and vicinity, Rhode Island).

PROTEST AGAINST THE ENACTMENT OF PROHIBITION LEGISLATION—PETITIONS

Mr. GILLETTE presented petitions numerously signed of sundry citizens of the State of Iowa, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and the body of one of the petitions was ordered to be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached, as follows:

Whereas the professional prohibition organizations are attempting to force the consideration and passage of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war;

Whereas these same prohibitionists are also sponsoring legislation which would bring back prohibition by banning the sale of beer to our fighting forces in and near military camps, as well as to civilians in zones around such camps;

Whereas the object of all such legislation is to reestablish complete national prohibition in the United States during the absence from their homes of more than 8,000,000 citizens in the military service of their country;

Whereas any such legislation is opposed by the War and Navy Departments as well as by the great majority of our soldiers, sailors, marines, and civilians;

Whereas national prohibition, during a test of 13 years from 1920 to 1933, brought upon the Nation the uncontrollable evils of the speakeasy and the bootlegger—the degradation of teen-age girls and boys—Nation-wide home manufacture of illegal liquor—widespread vicious crime, official corruption, and disrespect for law—all of which so outraged public decency that the eighteenth amendment was repealed by a majority of 10,000,000 votes;

Whereas the enactment of any such legislation would completely destroy all legalized control and cause the loss of Federal revenues of more than $1,500,000,000 a year and local revenues of $500,000,000 a year without any compensating benefits to either State or Nation;

Therefore, we, the undersigned citizens of the United States, protest against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress and herewith request our Senators and Representatives to vote against any and all such proposed legislation. We further respectfully request that this petition be referred to the proper committees and listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RELEASE OF JAPANESE FROM RELOCATION CAMPS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a strong statement from public officials and businessmen of Ness City, Kans., protesting against the releasing of 76,000 Japs from relocation camps. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred. I have also received a similar appeal from 141 citizens of Haviland, Kans.

There being no objection, the statement was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NESS CITY, KANS.,
August 6, 1943.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER: We strongly protest the release of 76,000 Japs. Do everything in your power to prevent it.

Vida Hollenbeck, former county superintendent, Ness County; W. O., Disney, grain and coal dealer, Ness City; Frances D. Disney; Mr. and Mrs. John Schiereck, Dighton, Kans.; Mr. and Mrs. F. Blair Eibert, Ness City, Kans.; Mr. and Mrs. Porter W. Johnston, city drayman, Ness City, Kans.; G. M. Fitzgerald, Ness City, Kans.; Elder C. B. Coleman, Ness City, Kans.; Mrs. Ethel A. Coleman, Ness City, Kans.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS BY FOREIGN GROUPS — LETTER FROM WASHINGTON BAPTIST PASTORS' CONFERENCE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter I have just received from the Washington Baptist Pastors' Conference strongly protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 1338, a bill now on the Senate Calendar.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BAPTIST CONVENTION,
Washington 1, D. C., September 20, 1943.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: The Washington Baptist Pastors' Conference hereby strongly protests Senate bill No. 1338 as reported by the Senate District Committee. We understand that this bill provides for additional outlets for the sale of intoxicating liquors by foreign groups for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter, and that it also modifies the conditions on which such privilege is accorded to American citizens. This bill we believe to be very hurtful to the war effort and to the moral interests of our city.

We strongly protest against such legislation, urging its defeat, and request that this action be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD O. CLARK,
President, Baptist Pastors' Conference.
GAYE L. MCGLOTHLEN,
Secretary, Baptist Pastors' Conference.

OPPOSITION OF MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL LEAGUE TO ESTABLISHMENT OF UNIFORM 15-HOUR VOTING DAY

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Michigan Municipal League, which speaks for 280 cities and villages of Michigan, is opposed to the enactment of Senate bill 1089, which has for its purpose the establishment of a uniform 15-hour day in every polling precinct for all elections in which Federal officials are on the ballot. I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the Michigan Municipal League be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

There being no objection, the statement was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL LEAGUE,
Ann Arbor, Mich., September 14, 1943.

To the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives Representing Michigan in the Congress, Washington, D. C.:

The attention of the elections committee of the Michigan Municipal League, in this State, representing 280 cities and villages and comprising 90 percent of the urban population, has been directed to S. 1089 introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress by Senator LUCAS of Illinois. This bill proposes to establish a uniform 15-hour day in every polling precinct for all elections where Federal officials are on the ballot.

The committee has given careful study to this proposal and our considered opinion is that it should be defeated for the following reasons:

1. Present hours are adequate: Present provisions of Michigan law (Act 72, P. A. 1943) establish a uniform 13-hour voting day throughout the State. Polls recently conducted by responsible election officials throughout the Detroit metropolitan area, in Flint and other congested war-production areas in which industrial and labor leaders were contacted, failed to reveal any dissatisfaction among working people generally with the present 13-hour election day. In fact, various shifts now in effect on a staggered basis have made it possible for any person desiring to vote to do so during the present 13-hour period.

2. Administrative problems would be increased: As officials charged with the responsibility for administering elections as efficiently as possible under existing procedures, we wish to remind you that votes, after they are cast, must be counted. This counting process, in cities using paper ballots (comprising the majority of Michigan municipalities) has been known to last until 9 or 10 o'clock in the morning following, where Federal, State, and municipal elections are held coincidentally.

The Lucas bill would either force the employment of double election boards with resultant heavy increase in local election costs or add materially to the physical and mental strain to which election workers are now subjected. Obviously war conditions have greatly aggravated problems of recruitment and training of qualified personnel as the members of this committee can testify to have been their experience.

3. Invasion of States' rights and municipal self-governing privileges: Federal control of election hours per se is not believed to be the solution for conditions that apparently exist in some States. If citizens are being unjustly deprived of their constitutionally guaranteed right of franchise by 8- or 9-hour election day, then remedial action properly rests with the respective State legislatures.

Michigan has, in our opinion, provided ample opportunity for its citizens, civilians and military alike, to enjoy this important civic privilege. S. 1089 would, if enacted into law, compel every polling precinct, thousands of them, to keep a 15-hour day, regardless of varying local needs and conditions. Such doubtful benefits as might arise from enactment of this mandatory Federal legislation would, we have reason to believe, be nullified by the resulting administrative problems. Action of this kind hardly seems calculated to make for a more harmonious and cooperative relationship between the several levels of government—Federal, State, and local.

We do, then, join in respectfully enlisting your personal opposition to this proposal for the reasons above elaborated.

Sincerely yours,

COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS,
By THOMAS E. SHAWCROSS,
Chairman, City Clerk, Highland Park,
HARRY W. LOTT,
City Clerk, East Lansing,
NED J. VERMILYA,
City Clerk, Flint,
ALBERT ZAK,
City Clerk, Hamtramck,
OAKLEY DISTIN,
Director of Elections, Detroit,
HARRY A. FURTON,
Village Clerk, Grosse Pointe Farms.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Walter Bragg Smith, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Alabama;

Albert J. Tully, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Alabama, vice Francis H. Inge, resigned;

Edney Ridge, of North Carolina, to be United States marshal for the middle district of North Carolina, vice William Thomas Dowd, deceased;

Howard L. Doyle, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Illinois;

William W. Hart, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois, vice Henry Grady Vien, deceased;

Jesse Jacobs, of New York, to be United States marshal for the northern district of New York;

Harold Maurice Kennedy, of New York, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of New York;

George L. Grobe, of New York, to be United States attorney for the western district of New York;

Frederick V. Follmer, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania; and

G. Douglas Crozier, of Hawaii, to be United States attorney for the Territory of Hawaii, vice Ingram M. Stainback.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Felipe Sanchez y Baca, of New Mexico, to be United States marshal for the district of New Mexico.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY (for himself and Mr. VAN NUYS):

S. 1362. A bill to affirm the intent of the Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States and that the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as amended, be not applicable to that business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1363. A bill for the relief of William M. Greene with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1364. A bill for the relief of Eddie Bessire; and

S. 1365. A bill for the relief of J. C. Drewry; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. HATCH introduced Senate bill 1366, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 1367. A bill to authorize the presentation of a Congressional Medal of Honor to Frank L. Williams; and

S. 1368. A bill to extend equal treatment to retired enlisted men of the Army and Coast Guard on parity with that extended to retired enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps in respect to retirement; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE:

S. 1369. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy; and

S. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. J. Res. 79 (by request). Joint resolution to suspend the provisions of the law relating to compulsory retirement for age of officers of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. FERGUSON introduced S. J. Res. 80, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS PREPARED BY NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY (S. DOC. NO. 97)

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document a paper entitled "Questions and Answers on the Equal Rights Amendment," prepared by the research department of the National Woman's Party.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION RECOMMENDATIONS FOR WAR FOOD PROGRAM

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of the statement of Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, presented to the President of the United States on September 15, containing the Farm Bureau's recommendations for a practical war food program.

While I have the floor, I desire to say that I consider the eight-point program is entitled to the careful consideration of the President, the Congress, and the agencies created to deal with the many angles of the important war food program.

As Mr. O'Neal states, in war the food front is second only to the military front. American farmers are being asked to produce sufficient food to meet the needs of our armed forces, the United Nations, the starving people of the liberated countries, and our civilian population.

Mr. O'Neal is eminently correct in his statement that the ability of the farmers to meet those needs is gravely jeopardized "by confusing and hampering price policies and orders, unwise efforts to appease organized labor and consumer groups, shortages of farm machinery, farm labor and supplies, the multiplicity of agencies and divisions of authority dealing with policies affecting the production, processing, and distribution of food."

I commend the statement to the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF EDWARD A. O'NEAL, PRESIDENT AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE WHITE HOUSE, SEPTEMBER 15, 1943

The food front is second only to the military front in war. It is the first front in establishing and maintaining a just and lasting peace. The broad objective of a wartime food program should be an abundant production, tied in with a permanent conservation program at stabilized prices which are fair to farmers, distributors, and consumers. American farmers are being asked to produce sufficient food to meet the needs of our armed forces, the United Nations, the starving people of the liberated countries, and our civilian population.

The ability of farmers to meet these needs is gravely jeopardized by confusing and hampering price policies and orders, unwise efforts to appease organized labor and consumer groups, shortages of farm machinery, farm labor and supplies, the multiplicity of agencies and the division of authority dealing with policies affecting the production, processing, and distribution of food. It is imperative that immediate action be taken to provide a constructive, practical, and coordinated war-food program. The essential features of such program should be as follows:

1. Support or "floor" prices at adequate levels should constitute the foundation of a program to assure abundant production and stabilized prices. Such prices should be announced early and should continue long enough to protect farmers through the postwar readjustment period.

2. Ceiling prices must be adjusted so as to assure maximum production and avoid subsidies. Under no circumstances should the ceiling price be placed below the floor price. Subsidies to roll back prices or to maintain price ceilings in lieu of price adjustments are unnecessary and inflationary, and should be abandoned. There is no justification for such consumer subsidies when, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, during the period of January 1941 to June 1943 the average hourly earnings of industrial workers increased 40 percent, and average weekly earnings increased 63 percent, but the cost of living increased only 24 percent. It is an unsound and dangerous policy to add this additional burden to the Federal debt and pass on our current food bill to be paid by our boys returning home after the war and by future generations. The national income is now at the highest level in history; employment has reached an all-time high; and food costs are lower in relation to the income of workers than ever before.

3. All unnecessary controls and restrictions on food production should be removed during the war emergency and unneeded supervisory manpower should be freed for other work.

4. Relative prices as between commodities should be adjusted so as to encourage the production of the types of food most needed. Such an adjustment would not only be fair to farmers, but would tend to stabilize living costs and reduce consumers' expenditure for food.

5. To the extent that governmental authority is required over the production, processing, distribution, rationing, and prices of food, such authority should be centered in the War Food Administrator. He should be given more authority and cooperation in the procurement of adequate farm machinery, farm supplies, and farm labor. He should be represented on all boards dealing with all phases of the food problem, both national and international, and no decision relative to food should be made without his approval.

6. Responsible boards for the major farm commodities—similar to the War Meat Board—should be established under the War Food Administrator, to direct processing and distribution to prevent alternate gluts and shortages at major consuming centers, such as have occurred during the last year.

7. The public should be fully informed concerning the critical importance of maintaining adequate farm production and of conserving and sharing foods.

8. American farmers, in their supreme efforts to break all-time production records each year in order to meet the evergrowing food requirements, are entitled to the closest cooperation between the President and the

Congress in establishing and maintaining an understandable, workable, and coordinated war food program.

THE NAVY'S MANPOWER SITUATION—QUESTIONS BY SENATOR DAVIS AND ANSWERS BY REAR ADMIRAL JACOBS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, yesterday at the joint hearings of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs and the House Committee on Military Affairs, in the hearing room of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, at which General Marshall and Admiral King submitted their views with respect to the drafting of fathers, I presented to Rear Admiral Jacobs, of the Personnel Division of the Navy, eight questions which he has answered. I ask unanimous consent to have the questions and answers printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Would it not be possible for the Navy Department to reduce its physical standards sufficiently to permit the induction into the Navy of at least a part of that group now designated as 4–F under the Selective Training and Service Act—especially those rejected for illiteracy or for slight physical defects?

The Navy now takes, and has in the past taken, in substantial numbers, men who are below the minimum physical standard for general service. A recent change in the literacy test has been established to differentiate the men with native intelligence from the morons. Regardless of their previous education, those with native intelligence are accepted.

2. Does the Navy Department accept men for "limited service," or must all inductees meet the physical standards required for those men who engage in combat duty?

The Navy accepts, up to the numbers it can profitably use, men whose physical condition is approximately the same as the upper limit of the Army's "limited service" standard. These men are placed in duties where they are least subject to active combat duty.

3. If the Navy Department does not accept men for limited service, could not a substantial saving in manpower be realized if the Navy Department were to accept such men for desk jobs and thus release such able-bodied men as are now holding these desk jobs for combat duty?

This is now done to the maximum extent practicable. Attention is invited to the fact that WAVES are being procured for this very purpose. It is the policy of the Navy Department to utilize the services of personnel disabled in combat with the enemy wherever it is possible to do so; this can only be accomplished by utilizing the jobs suggested.

4. In your opinion, is the Navy Department now utilizing its present available manpower to the fullest degree of efficiency possible?

It is believed that the Navy is making full use of its available manpower.

5. Which group in your opinion would prove of greatest military value to the United States Navy—the fathers of the land or the young men of the 17-year-age group?

Seventeen-year-olds and fathers in the lower age bracket, who meet the physical requirements, are of equal military value to the Navy.

6. In your opinion, would the enactment of a law by the Congress to prohibit the induction of fathers seriously curtail the ability of the United States Navy to carry out its designated operations fully and properly?

It definitely would. Unless the manpower needs of the Navy, as now foreseen, are met, ships and aircraft now being built or acquired cannot be manned.

7. Does the Navy Department know with certainty that all the manpower it has requested will be needed and fully used, or does the Navy Department intend to create a manpower reserve which will see action only in the event of certain unforeseen military developments?

All men requested will be needed. The Navy has never had a manpower pool from which to draw, and none is contemplated in arriving at personnel estimates. Personnel estimates are based solely on known requirements.

8. If the Navy Department is building up such a reserve of manpower, how large is that reserve to be?

There is no reserve contemplated.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'DANIEL AT NATIONAL FOOD CONFERENCE

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "What America Needs Most Is a House Cleaning in Washington," delivered by him at the National Food Conference, at Chicago, Ill., on September 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR REVERCOMB ON THE OCCASION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECESS

[Mr. REVERCOMB asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on July 10, 1943, on the occasion of the congressional recess, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOD BY EXECUTIVE ORDER—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BUSHFIELD

[Mr. BUSHFIELD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Food by Executive Order," delivered by him before the National Food Conference, at Chicago, Ill., on September 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. JESSE H. JONES AT BACK THE ATTACK, UNITED STATES IN ARMY BOND SHOW

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, at Back the Attack, United States Army War bond show, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S INNER FORTRESS—ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES P. POPE

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "America's Inner Fortress," delivered by Hon. James P. Pope, Director, Tennessee Valley Authority, before the Rotary Club of Mobile, Ala., on August 26, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE SCHOOL SYSTEMS—EDITORIAL FROM THE ANNISTON STAR.

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Shameful Lesson," discussing the need of Federal assistance to State school systems, published in the Anniston (Ala.) Star, of the issue of September 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MACKINAC ISLAND CONFERENCE

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the September 13 issue of the New Republic entitled "Republicans and Post-War Policy"; an editorial from the September 18, 1943, issue of the Nation, relative to the action taken by the Republican Party's Post-War Advisory Council, and two articles from John O'Donnell's column, Capitol Stuff, published in the Times-Herald on September 7, 1943, and September 8, 1943, respectively, all relating to the recent Republican conference at Mackinac Island, Mich., which appear in the Appendix.]

ATTACKS ON SECRETARY HULL—ARTICLE BY FRANK R. KENT

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article discussing criticisms of Secretary Hull, written by Frank R. Kent in his column The Great Game of Politics, which appears in the Appendix.]

A. L. M. WIGGINS, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN BANKERS' ASSOCIATION—ARTICLE FROM THE STATE, COLUMBIA, S. C.

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Small Town Banker Heads the American Bankers' Association," published in the September 19, 1943, issue of The State, Columbia, S. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

"COME-BACK OF SMALL BUSINESS"—ARTICLE FROM THE NATIONAL WEEK

[Mr. SCRUGHAM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Come-back of Small Business: Meeting the Needs of Civilians," published in the September 24, 1943, issue of the National Week, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMENDMENT OF RENEGOTIATION OF CONTRACTS LAW

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, some months ago the Truman committee made a study of practices under the Renegotiation Act. Renegotiation procedure is something new. It certainly behooves the Congress to understand as much as possible about the procedure and practices under the existing law and to consider carefully questions of proposed amendments. Under usual, normal, peacetime competitive conditions renegotiation of contracts would not and should not be tolerated. Under wartime conditions, which in many instances practically obliterated all competition, and also under the extraordinary expansion of plants and facilities with production far exceeding any conception of ordinary needs and requirements, it appeared that renegotiation of contracts was absolutely necessary.

Experiences of the past 18 months indicate that some renegotiation procedure is still necessary. We continue to purchase many new and unfamiliar articles and continue to deal with rapidly fluctuating production volumes. Free competition, which in peacetime provides the usual methods of holding prices in line, is not operative in wartime and some substitute for such free competition continues to be necessary.

While the excess-profits tax is effective in a large way to prevent exceedingly large profits, there are cases of profiteering by a few greedy war contractors, scandalous cases. Such contractors apparently seem to think that the extra dollars they try to obtain for themselves, regardless of the stress and strain under which the whole country labors in our gigantic war enterprise, is of more importance than the splendid reputation which industry on the whole has earned and is daily earning for patriotism,

honesty, and fair dealing. To guard against such unpatriotic and selfish practices renegotiation is a powerful weapon. It not only presents the opportunity of controlling scandalous profits but also it is sufficiently flexible to permit additional rewards to the most effective and efficient contractors as incentives for better performance.

The Truman committee made its report to the Senate some months ago on the subject of renegotiation. We have continued our studies, and, as chairman of the subcommittee, I felt that we should not content ourselves with reporting to the Senate, but should make specific recommendations concerning what we believe to be necessary amendments to the existing law.

Since the report was filed, counsel for the subcommittee, Mr. Stewart, of New York City, has been in constant touch with the departments, observing the different steps in the renegotiation procedure and the results obtained. As an outgrowth of the investigation and the studies which have been made, amendments to the act have been drawn, and I submit them today. I cannot say that these amendments are recommended by the Truman committee, because they have not been submitted to the committee, which is, after all, not a legislative, but an investigating committee. The committee which has responsibility for legislation concerning the Renegotiation Act is the Committee on Finance, of which the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is chairman. The amendments which have been drawn and which I introduce today are suggestive in character and I introduce them for the purpose of sending them to the Committee on Finance, to which committee I have asked that the amendments be referred in the hope that that committee will, as I have every reason to believe it will, review and study the entire principle of renegotiation, and carefully consider the suggestions made in these amendments.

In order that they might be fully understood, I asked Mr. Stewart, counsel for the committee, to prepare a statement explaining the amendments and their effect on the present law. I want to give that explanation at this time. The general purpose of the proposed amendments is to preserve the admitted advantages of renegotiation and to correct, at least in some particulars, the principal causes of complaint which have been made against the existing law.

The specific amendments now proposed are intended to accomplish three objectives:

First. To bring about increased uniformity of policy and procedure, to reduce the chances of conflicting administration among the numerous agencies now charged with the responsibility for administering renegotiation, and to provide a central authority to which contractors dealing with all departments may appeal, by requiring the delegation of power to supervise those functions to a single board composed of representatives of all affected departments;

Second. To establish a workable, minimum test—a floor below which profits shall by law be deemed not excessive; and

Third. To expedite the work of renegotiation both for the government and for businessmen by a requirement of compulsory filing of such material as will, on the one hand, permit the Government authorities to screen out those contractors who have obviously not earned excessive profits, and, on the other hand, will not impose upon business the burden of additional unnecessary questionnaires.

With these amendments the law will, in my opinion, be improved, but with this, as with all other laws, interpretation and administration will spell success or defeat of congressional intent and purpose.

I. THE SINGLE PRICE ADJUSTMENT BOARD

There are now subject to renegotiation 6 separate departments, each with its own independent Price Adjustment Board: the War Department, the Navy Department, the Treasury Department, the Maritime Commission, the War Shipping Administration, and 4 subsidiaries of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Treasury Department, the War Shipping Administration and the subsidiaries of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation have been added one at a time at different times during the past year. They are at various stages of organizing their work. At least 1, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, is still at the very threshold. Some of the others are now well along in the job. The 3 departments which were originally made subject to the law are organized on entirely different bases. The Maritime Commission and Treasury Department have only 1 board each. The Navy Department has 4 boards, but their functioning is closely coordinated. The War Department alone, however, has between 40 and 50 subsidiary price adjustment sections scattered around the country and set up as a part of the Army Service Force. These sections function directly under military command in the various services of supply of the Army. Indeed, the lines of military command are so closely observed in the War Department set-up that the Army maintains 5 separate boards in the city of Chicago. The price adjustment sections in the War Department are also subject to the same command as the original procurement.

All departments attempt to handle renegotiations with all types of war contractors. For example, a steel manufacturer or a rubber-tire manufacturer may be renegotiated by the Navy Department, while one of his competitors is being renegotiated by one section of the War Department, another competitor by another section of the War Department, a third competitor by the Treasury Department, a fourth competitor by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and so forth. The only basis agreed on by the departments for the determination of which department shall renegotiate with which contractor is the dollar amount of contracts outstanding. This method of assignment sometimes results in a contractor being renegotiated by a department which has only 15 percent or 20 percent of its contracts, while one of its competitors doing exactly similar work but with a somewhat different distribution of contracts will be renegotiated by an entirely different group.

A plan for so-called industry assignments or product assignment would make it possible for substantially all competitors to be renegotiated by the same group. Each group could in that way acquire a good understanding of the problems of a particular business and administer renegotiation with uniformity and fairness. But such a plan can never be worked out practically except under the supervision of a single authority with power to make assignments and supervise administration for all departments.

The Truman committee's report on this subject which I presented last March recommended the creation of such a single board at that time. The advantages of the plan have received general recognition, but the departments have not yet put the plan into effect.

The principal objection which has been raised is that the existing organizations have acquired experience in the handling of renegotiation, and that it would retard the administration of renegotiation to turn over the function to new and inexperienced personnel. The plan which I now offer meets this objection by utilizing existing personnel of the departments and simply requires the creation of this single coordinating board from within the departments and gives it supervisory powers, which should enable the board to administer the entire job of renegotiation much more effectively than has been possible under the highly departmentalized set-up which has existed heretofore.

A second objective which could be achieved through this change is that of publication of price-adjustment policies. The scattered authority which now exists has resulted at times in the determination and application of departmental policies before publication for the information of contractors and before adoption by the other departments. If all policy-making for all departments were vested in a single body and that body were required by law to publish its policies and interpretations, there could be no room for misunderstanding.

A third objective of the single board is to provide an impartial appeal in such cases as involve questions of basic policy or obvious injustice. The only appeal now open to contractors is to the secretary of the department whose board is responsible for the original renegotiations. The natural tendency of the secretaries is to back up their boards. The only practical method of bringing about uniform administration of the policies of a single board is to give that board the final voice in controversial cases. The appeal function should not prove unduly burdensome to the board, because the bill vests in it discretion to determine which cases it will hear, and it is not assumed that a hearing on appeal would be found necessary in very many cases.

I think it is fair to say that I have seen evidence of closer coordination among the departments in recent months than existed at the time of the commencement of the Truman committee's

investigation of this subject last January. I believe, however, that the present set-up can still be greatly improved by adoption of the proposed amendment with respect to a single board.

II. THE TEST FOR AUTOMATIC EXEMPTION

I propose an aid to the screening process for the elimination of contractors who obviously have not earned excessive profits. This is not a formula for renegotiation, but a method of reducing the number of companies which will have to go through the renegotiation process.

The test selected is applicable to manufacturers doing business on fixed-price contracts, and requires such a contractor to meet two conditions to obtain automatic exemption from renegotiation: First, his profits before the deduction of Federal income and excess-profits taxes must not exceed 8 percent of his total sales; second, his total sales must not be more than three times his average total sales during the base-period years, 1936 to 1939, inclusive.

The desirability of some test which can be applied readily by contractors and renegotiators alike has been evident from the inception of renegotiation. One of the principal complaints of contractors has been a lack of "standards." By that term most contractors have meant lack of a mathematical formula by which they could figure out in advance what result would be reached by the renegotiators. Experience has demonstrated that no exact formula for computing the proper amount of refunds due from all war contractors is possible. The same experience, however, has demonstrated that an exemption formula such as that now proposed is practical and should aid the work of renegotiation, as well as be of assistance to businessmen in formulating business policies and plans.

We have had an analysis made of each of the 683 cases cleared by the War Department prior to July 24, 1943, without any recapture of excessive profits. That analysis shows that 469 of the 683 cases involved profits on all sales (whether renegotiable or not) of 8 percent or less. I have also had an analysis made of more than 3,000 cases in which recaptures were effected by the War Department Price Adjustment Board prior to September 10, 1943, and that analysis shows that in only 163 of these more than 3,000 cases the contractors were left after renegotiation with less than 8-percent profit on their total sales.

A second test, therefore, was sought which would exempt a worth-while part of the clearance cases under 8 percent and at the same time preserve the right to renegotiate in most of the recapture cases under 8 percent. The test found most practical was that of three times the average volume of sales during the 1936–39 base period. Three hundred and thirteen of the clearance cases would have been cleared under this test and only 30 of the more than 3,000 recapture cases would have avoided renegotiation. None of the very large war contractors were included among these 30. The maximum recovery obtained from any one of the 30 was $90,000. The total recovery obtained from the entire 30 was $847,500. It may be safely assumed that 75 percent of even this figure would have been recovered under the excess-profits tax law.

Needed checks to prevent the concealment of excessive profits by padding such cost items as salaries, advertising, and reserves for contingencies may be made by the Price Adjustment Board with the aid of the information received pursuant to the compulsory filing provision in the proposed amendments.

III. COMPULSORY FILING

There is now pending before the Congress a bill sponsored by the War Department and the Navy Department which, among other things, requires the compulsory filing of information by contractors subject to renegotiation. The Departments have doubtless been handicapped during the first 18 months of renegotiation by the lack of some such provision. It has made for a great deal of uncertainty as to the extent of the job to be done and as to the certainty and location of the contractors with whom renegotiation should be instituted. For example, at the time of the hearings on the renegotiation law conducted by the Truman committee last January and February the representatives of the War Department estimated that 85,000 contractors were subject to renegotiation. Their latest estimate, as a result of their experience of the past 6 months and their searches for contractors subject to the law, has convinced them that the number does not exceed 20,000. There seems no doubt, therefore, that some form of compulsory filing is necessary to make possible proper planning for the job ahead.

In my opinion, however, the bill sponsored by the War Department and the Navy Department is properly subject to criticism as going too far. In substance, it requires contractors to file any information which may be requested by the departments. That is a reasonable requirement as to contractors whose available figures have been examined and have been found, as a result of preliminary examination, to indicate the probable presence of excessive profits. It does not seem to me to be a reasonable requirement for all contractors regardless of the possible presence of excessive profits.

The amendment now proposed, therefore, is designed to give the renegotiators such information as they need for a preliminary examination, without increasing the burden of questionnaires already imposed upon business to an alarming degree. The information required by my proposed amendment should be readily available in any business organization, and should be adequate to enable the Price Adjustment Board to determine in a preliminary way whether there is any likelihood of excessive profits. If, as a result of the preliminary examination, they should determine that there is likelihood of excessive profits, they have complete authority under the law as it now stands to require the filing of any additional information which they may require.

IV. POST-WAR RESERVES

One of the most frequently heard complaints of contractors respecting renegotiation has been the policy of the renegotiators to disallow reserves for post-war conversion of plant facilities, inventory losses determined on cancelation of war contracts, severance pay for unneeded wartime employees, overhead losses during post-war periods of change-over, and the like. Congress has already made at least three provisions for this purpose:

First, the post-war credit under the excess-profits tax law, which, in the case of top-bracket corporate excess-profits taxpayers, may amount to as much as 9 percent of the total profit before taxes; second, the provision for acceleration of amortization of emergency facilities which are worthless at the end of the war, if the war should terminate before the expiration of the 5 years currently allowed for the emergency amortization; third, provision for a 2-year "carry back," as well as "carry forward" of losses, with the requirement of a cash refund by the Government in the event of application of the "carry back" provision. This last provision could be very important to contractors whose businesses are really hard hit at the termination of the war and could result in losses for a 2-year period at the end of the war being entirely made up by the Government.

Nevertheless, there is undoubtedly real justification for the complaint that some war contractors are so vitally affected by war conditions that these provisions are not sufficient. The problem is to make additional provision for such contractors which will give them something approaching their needs without providing improper and unwarranted windfalls for other contractors upon whom the impact of war is not so severe. No exact determination of the amounts required can be made at this time. Inquiries which we have had made of the 100 largest war contractors in the United States during the past 2 months have shown that very few of them are able to estimate their own post-war reserve requirements with any degree of accuracy.

It has been urged by members of the price adjustment boards that post-war reserves do not present a question which can properly be determined in renegotiation and that excessive prices for war matériel are not warranted by the businessman's natural desire to provide a cushion for the shock of possible post-war business reserves.

They urge that the proper place for relief legislation of this character is the tax law, and I agree with that view, and have therefore refrained from offering any amendment authorizing the allowance of post-war reserves as a cost in renegotiations. Although it is not within the purview of these amendments to set up a scheme for amendment of the tax law, I do urge, as the most practical method of handling this problem, a proposal which has recently been made that the tax law be amended so as to provide:

First. That reserves claimed by taxpayers in amounts not exceeding 20 percent of their taxable income shall be deductible as an operating expense in computing Federal income and excess-profits taxes, subject to the following conditions:

Second. That the amount set aside in such reserves be invested in a special issue of nonnegotiable, non-interest-bearing Government bonds, redeemable at any time prior to a date 18 months after the cessation of all hostilities.

Third. That simultaneously with the liquidation of such securities, the taxpayer must return the amount derived from such liquidation to his taxable income for the year of liquidation.

This plan has several notable advantages over every other plan I have heard suggested for the handling of the post-war reserve problem. In the first place, it is simple to administer and does not require the exercise of discretion by any Government bureau. In the second place, it automatically differentiates between those contractors who have a serious post-war expense and declining income problem and those who have not. The former would get the maximum benefit of this provision, while the latter would get little or no benefit from it. In the third place, this plan would keep all moneys required for these intangible post-war items now in the form of Government securities, making such funds completely available for war purposes until they are actually needed for post-war purposes.

Such a plan is, in my judgment, infinitely superior to any proposal which can be made for the handling of post-war problems through the renegotiation process. I commend the plan to the consideration of those committees of the Congress now about to undertake a revision of the tax law.

Mr. President, I certainly trust that the committees in charge of the tax bill will give most serious consideration to this suggestion, which as I have said, is far better than any other suggestion I have heard proposed.

At this time I send to the desk a bill which includes the proposed amendments to the law I have discussed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1366) to amend section 403, Public Law 528, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended by section 801, Public Law 753, Seventy-seventh Congress, by section 1, Public Law 108, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, and by Public Law 149, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

MACKINAC ISLAND CONFERENCE FOREIGN POLICY STATEMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I shall ask the attention of the Senate for only a few moments.

At the recent meeting of the Republican Postwar Advisory Council held at Mackinac, the forepart of September of this year, a remarkable statement of foreign policy was prepared. I believe it is one that the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate might well adopt and submit to the Senate for declaratory action. It definitely states that when the war is ended there will be an obligation on our part to participate in the making and the keeping of the peace, and it calls for the preservation and protection of our national interests. It particularly stresses the point that constitutionalism should be adhered to in determining the substance of our policies and should be followed in ways and means adopted in making international commitments.

In section 6 of article I of the Constitution there is the provision that Congress, not the Executive, shall have the power to coin money, regulate the value thereof and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures. Our Supreme Court has definitely declared that this clause conferred exclusive power in the Congress, and that the power extends to laws regulating the subject in every detail.

Recently the New York Times carried a story from London indicating that an agreement between British and United States financial experts was expected early in 1944 "possibly not later than February."

The article goes on to state:

> It is understood that the Washington consultations will embrace not only postwar currencies but also the creation of international institutions for regulating the flow of international investments and for stabilizing world prices of major commodities.

The story does not say how any post-war agreement on currency stabilization could be made without the consent of Congress; but the article raises the question, at least, of a possibility of an attempt along that line.

After all, earlier this year, the administration concluded some type of executive agreement with other nations in connection with rehabilitation and international food relief.

I am very reluctant to believe that the administration would even contemplate any similar procedure in connection with international currency stabilization.

Mr. President, back in September of last year, I introduced a resolution, Senate Resolution 290, which has been lodged in the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, which would create a Foreign Relations Advisory Council. It seems to me it is imperatively necessary that the resolution be reported and the President be given an opportunity to create such a liaison committee.

Somebody in the State Department or in the office of the Executive is certainly blind to what the people back home are thinking in relation to the way our dealings with foreign nations should be handled. There is not any question that the President has the biggest job in the world, but that is all the more reason why he should recognize a constitutional partner—I mean the Senate of the United States—in dealing with foreign nations. He should get rid of blind men and bunglers in the Department.

In the August issue of Fortune magazine, Joseph M. Jones, of Texas, formerly connected with the State Department, comments on the attitude of that Department toward my Foreign Relations Advisory Council suggestion. He said:

> It was like a breath out of the nineteenth century—

Meaning, of course, they had better catch up with what is needed in the twentieth century.

Everything we read, every suggestion made by the leaders of the United Nations, the Mackinac declaration of foreign policy—all suggest the basic need of understanding and cooperation between the Executive and the Senate—those who have the treaty-making powers.

Therefore, Mr. President, it appears to me that if the consultations referred to by the New York Times are going on—conferences relating to post-war currencies and other matters—in the effort to regulate the flow of international investments and to stabilize prices, the State Department should get rid of its nineteenth-century attitude, and should consult with and advise with the Senate of the United States.

It might be interesting to recall what happened to President Johnson in 1867 when he concluded an agreement with the Danish Government for the purchase of the Danish West Indies. The House of Representatives thought it over and decided that with the then existing finances of the country further purchases of territory were inexpedient.

I cite that instance, Mr. President, because there is no need to have all these misunderstandings, if there is only a common-sense approach toward cooperation.

With reference to any currency stabilization agreements, Congress would still hold the purse strings. Any down payments or quotas would have to be approved by Congress. However, I think it serves a very constructive purpose at this time briefly to focus attention on the procedure for international monetary stabilization.

I do not want to see any attempts made to bypass Congress when monetary agreements are made. The question of international machinery to effect an exchange stabilization is one which must be considered, but it cannot be considered by the executive branch alone, nor can it be the subject for executive agreement without any congressional participation.

If any kind of international monetary machinery is ever to be approved, Congress must be consulted long before the stage of final agreements is reached.

It may be argued that Congress cannot be consulted in this matter because it has no machinery, because it has not made any independent investigation, and has no information with which to talk along except such information as may be doled out to it by the administration back-room financial experts.

I propose the creation of such machinery, and in the immediate future I propose to introduce a bill which would create a joint congressional international monetary stabilization committee. This

committee should include both majority and minority membership from the Senate Finance Committee, the House Ways and Means Committee, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

This committee should have an adequate appropriation so that it could maintain its own staff of independent research consultants in the field of international finance.

Then Congress would be equipped to participate in this vital matter. All the talk about peace agreements and peace objectives is splendid, but I want to see some evidence that Congress is ready to assume responsibility in making the peace something more than a lot of words—mere generalities and platitudes.

Fine words will not do the job. We need congressional participation in the formulation of the peace itself, and we need congressional participation—informed and fully advised participation—in any financial agreements which may be made. These things cannot be the subject for executive action alone. Congress cannot evade its responsibility by passing a few pious resolutions expressing a devout hope for a better world, or even expressing the hope of international collaboration.

If Congress means these things, let Congress give evidence that it is preparing to sit in on the agreements and make a constructive contribution, rather than permitting the executive branch to run a star-chamber back-room conference with only a posthumous congressional consultation.

I am not saying that the administration contemplates any such procedure, either in the conduct of the peace itself or in any international monetary stabilization agreements which may be reached. I am merely pointing out the possible menace.

Representative government crumbles when confidence wanes. Confidence wanes when the representatives of the people are bypassed and a strong executive branch takes over gradually.

The entire question of international monetary agreements is extremely basic in two respects:

First. The procedure for concluding these agreements will either mark a vigorous and informed assertion of proper congressional authority, or it will mark a further decline of that authority with a consequent strengthening of executive power.

Second. The character and nature of the monetary agreements which are concluded may well determine when the next war will break—or whether there will be such a future war.

Peace treaties alone are not enough. The causes of war either have to be eliminated or controlled. Economic problems are a frequent cause for strongman governments and subsequent wars. A sound international monetary agreement could be an important guaranty for future peace. This is an avenue which must be explored. Failure fully to explore this avenue would be a serious dereliction from the obligation of Congress. Neglect to set up the machinery for thinking through the international economic problems would mean that Congress was gravely remiss.

MANPOWER NEEDS OF THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, there has been much discussion about the induction program of the Army of the United States, and the policy which is being pursued.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum? Does not the Senator think we should have a quorum?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am not asking for a quorum. I shall speak for only about 5 minutes.

Mr. WILEY. I assume that one of the reports from the Senator's committee is forthcoming. Such reports are always informative.

Mr. TRUMAN. This is not a report from the committee. This is a statement of my own views. I am not speaking for the committee now. I am speaking only from my own point of view.

The object, of course, is to win the war as quickly as possible, and that is what we all want. I do not believe that any special class of citizens should be exempted by law. I think the administrative branch of the Government should formulate the policy and carry it into execution, on the basis of the draft law which has been enacted by Congress, which is fair to all classes of people; but there are certain phases of the situation which I wish to discuss.

We have been informed that in order to obtain an army of 7,700,000 men by the end of this year and to fill Navy requirements it will be necessary to induct about 1,221,000 more men, 446,000 of whom will have to be pre-Pearl Harbor fathers.

Fathers make no claims to any special rights. They are just as patriotic as anyone else, and many of them would doubtless volunteer if they thought that they would be accepted for combat duty and would have the privilege of facing the enemy in actual combat. However, most of them are older men and would be accepted for limited duties only—duties which many of them honestly believe are less valuable to the war effort than those in which they are now engaged.

If the war effort can best be served by taking these men, then they must be taken. The hardships upon their families, although a most important consideration, is secondary.

The determination of where and how we shall fight and what we shall need to fight with are matters which can best be left to the Army and Navy, and we civilians must and should rely chiefly upon the opinion of the experts of the armed forces.

The Army believes that it will need 7,700,000 men in order to achieve a goal of 4,750,000 men abroad by the end of 1944. That goal has been set because the Army believes that that many men are necessary to assure supremacy over our enemies. Even then we will not have numerical supremacy, but we should have actual supremacy by reason of our better and more numerous articles of war matériel, particularly guns and planes.

Transportation of such a vast number of men and their equipment and supplies, at the same time that we continue to supply our Allies with war matériel, food and clothing, presents an enormous task.

In this war, we have been forced to fight at the ends of the earth, in mountains and in deserts, and in primitive places where there are no transportation facilities. We have had to build harbors and harbor facilities, railroads and their terminal facilities and roads and bridges for truck transportation. All of this has had to be done, and the supplies with which to do it had to be transported before we were able even to start work upon the actual military installations, such as the airfields, repair and storage depots, and camp facilities. Despite these difficulties, the Army has been careful not to expose our soldiers to risk of defeat by reason of failure of supplies. For example, the soldiers in north Africa were backed by food in Africa or en route sufficient to supply them for 272 days.

The progress that has been made to date has amazed and confounded our enemies. The Army deserves great praise for the job that has been done abroad. Approximately 2,000,000 men have been transported outside the limits of continental United States.

Only a fraction of these 2,000,000 troops have engaged in actual combat with the enemy, but they have already achieved great successes. The task of bringing the remainder of these troops into contact with the enemy and of transporting abroad by the end of 1944 an additional 2,750,000 men is very great. The Army believes that it can be accomplished, and it believes that the ships necessary for supplies can be made available. We should all do everything in our power to assure that it is accomplished.

It is only by actually engaging the enemy in combat that victory can be achieved. The enemy is not impressed by news that we are inducting more men into the Army. He is impressed only by the soldiers he is forced to meet in combat. For these reasons it is idle and foolish to talk of mere numbers in our Army, or to seek to have as many men in the Army in this country as there are in the Army inside Japan.

In theory our job is to induct men into the Army at the rate and at the time that will enable them upon completion of their training to go abroad, either for actual combat or as reserves to support those in actual combat in case of need.

We should not induct men before there is a reasonable expectancy that they can be sent abroad at the end of their training. For these reasons, I strongly urged about a year ago in Boston that the Army should exercise the utmost care in determining its size and the rate of induction, so as not unnecessarily and carelessly to increase our manpower shortage, which even then was our greatest single limiting factor. I am glad to note that the Army has reduced its original estimate of requirements of 8,248,000 men

by 562,000, which was achieved partially by reductions in its overhead and in the replacement and school programs.

But even with these reductions, and even assuming that the Army is successful in its efforts to transport abroad 4,750,000 men by the end of 1944, we still would have almost 3,000,000 men in uniform within the continental limits of the United States at the end of 1944. The great majority of these would have been in the Army from 1 to 2 years.

I am well aware that we need many men in essential activities at home, such as housekeeping at the numerous Army posts, defense of continental United States, and guard duties over prisoners, and also that we must always have several hundred thousand men in schools and colleges, and replacement training centers for specialized training. But I question whether we need 5,000,000 men in the Army this month in continental United States and whether the Army needs an additional 630,000 men this year, so that even if we achieve our hoped-for goal of 4,750,000 men abroad by the end of 1944 we shall still have 3,000,000 men left in this country.

The fact is that the number of men who have been in the Army for 12 months or more and are still in the United States has been steadily increasing until today we have many hundreds of thousands of men in the Army who are impatient to be sent abroad or returned to their homes. The other members of the committee of which I am chairman, and myself, have inspected a large number of Army camps, and have had the privilege of talking with hundreds of the men in the ranks about their work. Over and over again we have been told that the soldier is doing now the same thing he was doing 6 months or a year or even 2 years ago, and that he is learning nothing new. The boys themselves and their relatives and friends are fully aware of this situation, and they properly resent it.

There are many reasons for this waste of manpower by the Army itself.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Missouri that I know he is much more familiar with the situation to which he refers than I am because of the fact that as chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program he and the other members of his committee have visited probably a great many more military camps than has any other Member of the Senate. However, the same story which the Senator is now reciting comes to me when visiting the few camps which I have visited, and also in the mail which I have received. I have received letters from enlisted men, as well as from Army officers, bearing out exactly what the Senator has said. These men have been in the camps, some for a year and some for 2 years, and some of them have said, "When we went into the Army we thought they needed men but apparently they do not need us, because we are lying around and doing nothing." Such statements have been coming from Army officers from as far West as San Francisco, from the Southern and New England States, and from one end of the country to the other.

Mr. TRUMAN. One of the quarrels which I have had with the Army is that it has tremendous pools in various parts of the United States consisting of thousands of officers who are waiting to be sent somewhere to go to work. The Army is discharging hundreds of officers in the 50-years-of-age class, as well as those who are approaching 60 years of age, to make room for the younger officers to serve. I do not know whether the Army is losing efficiency by so doing. I am not in position to say; but I believe it is something which we ought to consider in whatever policy we follow in respect to appropriations for the Army during the coming year.

I wish further to say to the distinguished Senator from Montana that I shall not vote for his bill. I do not believe in that sort of class legislation. I think the subject is an administrative one, and I think it should be handled by the Manpower Commission and the Army in such a way that the economy of the country will be least disturbed.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. So far as I am concerned, it is not a question with me as to who will vote for the bill, or who will not vote for it. I disagree with the Senator in one respect. After all, the Congress of the United States is responsible for the over-all policy of this country. The Army looks at it from one standpoint; the War Production Board looks at it from another standpoint. But, after all, it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to determine the over-all policy of this country.

Mr. TRUMAN. I agree with the Senator, and I think we provided for that in the draft law which is now in effect.

Mr. WHEELER. If we say that only the Army shall determine what the policy shall be, then we do the very thing which we are fighting against. We set up, in effect, military dictatorship and fascism in the United States of America.

Mr. TRUMAN. I think the Senator is entirely mistaken when he makes the statement that the Army has leave to set up the policy. I think the policy is worked out on the basis of what the armed services say they need in order to win the war. I do not believe anyone can say what the armed services may need in order to win the war except the armed services themselves; but I think they ought to be compelled to make efficient use of the men inducted into service.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Missouri in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield further to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. What the Senator has said is correct. I am thoroughly in accord with his view that the Army should make efficient use of the men it has.

I have great respect for General Marshall, because of his honesty, integrity, and ability; but I submit that when the Chief of Staff has an Army of more than 7,300,000 men at the present time, and when his duties take him from the United States to Quebec, to Italy, to north Africa and elsewhere and call upon him to hold consultations with Mr. Churchill and others overseas, it is a physical impossibility for him, no matter how active and wise he may be, to know the details of the manner in which the Army is being used and whether it is being used efficiently in the United States.

Mr. TRUMAN. Of course, the Chief of Staff has to depend on the various branches of his staff for information as to the efficiency of the Army. I think the Chief of Staff has a good and efficient staff, and I have the greatest confidence in the Chief of Staff of the Army and also in the Chief of Naval Operations of the Navy.

Mr. WHEELER. But the fact remains, regardless of the great respect in which the Chief of Staff, General Marshall, is held, that an overwhelming number of reports from all over the country are to the effect that the men in the Army are not being utilized and have not been utilized in the most efficient manner during the past 2 years.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is what I am saying.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. TRUMAN. We must expect a great deal of waste and inefficiency when we attempt to create overnight so vast a military establishment. Also, changes in the nature of warfare, and the lessons learned at the front require disruptions which interfere with efficiency. But, after making full allowance for all these things, the fact still remains that many who have been inducted into the Army are not being productively employed. If and when they are productively employed, the total requirements of the Army can safely be reduced very substantially. The same is true of the Navy.

Surely it is the duty of the Army before disrupting families and civilian industries to make sure that it is effectively utilizing the men it already has and that it can effectively utilize those it still seeks to induct.

We are engaged in a total war. The armed services have properly been accorded a first call upon the Nation's manhood, but it is not and cannot safely be a blank check.

To win this war mass production is essential. We must have an uninterrupted flow of materials from the mines and quarries, forests and farms, on through to the finished products. We must not only have the materials needed for our armed forces, but we must have those needed to supply our essential civilian requirements, so that the armed forces can have what they need.

We must maintain our transportation industry, and provide the railroad, truck and bus companies with the facilities to continue their vital work. We must provide the farmer with machinery to enable him to raise greater crops with less labor. In short, we must maintain a sound, healthy economy, so that the fearful burden of the greatest war in history can be sustained, not for months or for a year or so, but for as many years as may be necessary in order to achieve total victory. The more that can be left for civilian use, the stronger we will become. After we have won the war, we must have a foundation on which to rebuild and make secure the American way of life.

Any frittering away of our resources of manpower or materials whether by the armed forces or by civilians will weaken us, and if carried too far, will sow the seeds of discord and dissatisfaction that might make us a prey to overtures or a stalemate peace.

Nearly a year ago the committee, of which I am chairman, in its report on manpower, warned that a serious manpower shortage existed and pointed out a number of simple and practical means of alleviating the shortage by the efficient utilization by industry and the armed services of the men available to them.

Some progress along these lines has been made, but I am sorry to say that it has been much less than we had a right to expect from industry and labor in a war effort. Huge blocks of manpower are still being hoarded or wasted by the continuance of practices which management and labor have a clear duty to end. My committee has investigated a number of individual situations and has forced many improvements. It will continue to do so and will be increasingly severe in its criticisms where industry or labor wastes manpower.

It has been suggested that the way to abolish these evils is to pass a national service act, and the Undersecretary of War has frankly admitted that a major reason for the Army's desire to induct fathers is to force them into war work. Such proposals are attractive because of their simplicity. But, unfortunately, it is not possible to end these problems by legislative fiat, especially where that action simply sets up a huge, unwieldy bureaucratic organization with a direction to make literally thousands of important determinations. Our prior experience with such bureaus and with the existing manpower agencies does not warrant any confidence that the benefits would equal or exceed the decided detriment of trying to get production out of forced labor.

I am here to say that I do not think it is possible to force any man to work unless he wants to work. I know it cannot be done without a sacrifice of efficiency. He has to have an incentive and a will to work if he is to work efficiently. I have just been discussing one of the worst situations in the country with Henry Kaiser; I do not know whether or not he can work it out; but it is a situation brought about by misunderstanding between management and labor which causes labor not to want to work. Some means must be found to make men want to work; they cannot be forced to work.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I was present when the Under Secretary of War appeared before the committee and dramatically stated that he was in favor of the so-called Austin-Wadsworth bill and felt it ought to be enacted. When I asked him whether he was speaking for himself or for the Administration, he said that he was speaking for himself. I agree with what the Senator from Missouri has said; and I desire to suggest that in one respect at least there seems to be some misapprehension on the part of some people with reference to the drafting of labor. It is one thing to draft people for work when they are working for the Government; it is quite another thing to draft men when someone else will make a profit off their labor. That distinction, it seems to me, is one which should be borne in mind by everybody who is talking about the drafting of labor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. Is not the Senator from Montana suggesting, perhaps by implication, that if there should be a draft of labor there should be a corresponding draft of industry?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. So that labor would be working for the Government and not for private individuals?

Mr. WHEELER. I entirely agree with the Senator. If we are going to draft labor, then industry as well must be drafted. We cannot simply say we are going to draft manpower for industry without drafting industry, and when we draft industry, and labor, and everything else, what have we? We have got a Fascist government in the United States, which is the very thing we are fighting against throughout the world.

Mr. TRUMAN. I do not want to draft industry and labor. I do not think there is any substitute for efficiency, and I do not think there is any substitute for a man wanting to do the job that he is doing. There are hundreds of plants in this country which are efficiently operated, which have good management and fair labor relations, plants which have gotten along well with their men, and are doing a wonderful job. There are others, however, one of which I mentioned awhile ago, which are absolutely inefficient because they have no proper management or their management, in many instances, is spread too thin.

It is efficiency that we must seek, and not more complex and unworkable controls. Certainly, the draft of fathers is not warranted as a mere scheme to force a shift of manpower.

To prosecute the war effectively, we must have balance. We everywhere find that war industries and industries essential to civilian life are losing keymen, and, still more, are fearful that in the drafting of more than a million more men this year, they will suffer very heavy losses. The local draft boards are under the necessity of meeting their quotas. Their position is difficult, and in the best of good faith they have frequently taken men whose loss has impaired the home front. This has often been the fault of the men or the employers themselves in failing to make an early and proper presentation of their cases to the draft boards, but it is nonetheless an unfortunate thing. There is a most serious question as to whether the attempt to take more than a million more men during the next 3 months will not do more harm than good.

This was recognized by the Under Secretary of War, who stated that he realized that men in aircraft plants should be deferred. Work in aircraft plants is by no means the only essential occupation. A truck driver moving important freight may be even more necessary, even though on first impression he appears to be engaged in a strictly nonwar activity.

The induction of fathers must stand or fall on its own merits, and it is my opinion that before undertaking that very serious step, with all the disruptive consequences that would be entailed, it is up to the Army and the Navy to demonstrate that they have reduced their requirements to the bare minimum by efficiently utilizing all the men they now have. I believe that by so doing they can reduce their requirements by several hundred thousand men without impairing their striking power.

At the same time I believe that both industry and labor are under obligation to stop practices that hoard and waste manpower, and that every man, including fathers, who hopes for deferment should be very certain that he is actually engaged in the type of work in which he can make the best contribution to the war effort. The lessened pressure on local draft boards to meet stiff quotas should enable them to exercise a careful discretion, so as not to take men where great hardship would be involved, men who are already usefully employed in work which, although not always war work, is essential to the country.

We must not permit hardship and suffering, by drafting men whose families will be left without support and will become a burden on the public, just because we lack the courage and ability to force the armed services and industry and labor to utilize efficiently a supply of manpower that is adequate to do all that needs to be done.

If at the end of the year we have failed to achieve the necessary efficiency, our obligations to the men in combat will require that we proceed to draft fathers. But it is my considered opinion that if we all pitch in, that efficiency can be achieved.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Did the Senator make the statement in his address and Judge Patterson, Under Secretary of War, testify before the Committee on Military

Affairs that the drafting of fathers was being used for the purpose of forcing men to go into the war industries in this country?

Mr. TRUMAN. I do not think Secretary Patterson so testified. That was a statement I myself made.

Mr. LUCAS. I understood the Senator to say something about what Judge Patterson had said.

Mr. TRUMAN. Let me repeat what I stated about Judge Patterson. I said:

It has been suggested that the way to abolish these evils is to pass a national service act, and the Under Secretary of War has frankly admitted that a major reason for the Army's desire to induct fathers is to force them into war work.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the Senator's own conclusion?

Mr. TRUMAN. That is my own conclusion.

Mr. LUCAS. Not Judge Patterson's?

Mr. TRUMAN. No.

Mr. LUCAS. I misunderstood. I thank the Senator.

THE QUIZ KIDS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senate has on many occasions had distinguished visitors to whom it has paid tribute. I now wish to interrupt the proceedings of the Senate sufficiently long to call attention to the fact that there sits in the family gallery at this time, on the front row, a distinguished group of citizens for whom I have the highest admiration and respect. They are commonly referred to as The Quiz Kids. Every Sunday night when it is possible I listen to their radio program with a great deal of interest, and obtain not only pleasure and entertainment, but a great deal of information. I am happy to have the Senate pause at this time in its deliberations to recognize these young people, and to say that we are delighted to have them as our guests today.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico has made my speech. I was sitting here quietly waiting for an opportunity to say what my able friend has said about these distinguished young people in the gallery, because they happen to be my guests in the Senate today.

Mr. HATCH. Perhaps I should apologize to the Senator from Illinois for having anticipated him.

Mr. LUCAS. Not at all.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to recognize the fact that these young people come from the Senator's city of Chicago, but neither his city nor the State of Illinois has any monopoly upon the entertaining and educational features of their program. I feel that they belong to the entire country.

Mr. LUCAS. There is no doubt of that.

Mr. HATCH. I am sure the Senator will point out now the purposes of their present tour, which I forgot to mention.

Mr. LUCAS. There is no question about what the Senator has said to the effect that these young people belong to the Nation and to no particular State. But, fortunately for Illinois, three of them live in the city of Chicago, and the other youngster lives in the State of Indiana.

I am happy to pay my tribute to these distinguished young people now in the gallery, who are making a tour of the country in the interest of selling War bonds.

Perhaps I should add that the Quiz Kids' hour has already appeared on 10 different programs in Washington, D. C., backing the attack against the Axis Powers. After one further appearance at the Naval Hospital tomorrow, they will continue on to Richmond, Va., before returning to Chicago. No group of youngsters in America is doing more to promote the sale of War bonds. More power to them as they continue in their noble and patriotic endeavors.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is no citizenship in the United States that more uniformly listens to, or appreciates more keenly, the program of the Quiz Kids on Sunday night than the people of Kentucky. I, myself, listen to them nearly every Sunday night, and I enjoy their program. I listened last Sunday, and I was not only entertained and amazed by some of their erudite answers to questions, which are not prearranged, as I understand, but I was also very much amused at the situation which arose when the young lady from Brazil, I think Anna Maria Martins, paid a very deserved compliment to one of the boys of the group, I believe Richard.

I wish simply to say that not only was the compliment well deserved, but if occasion arose I could pay the same kind of compliment to them all, not only from the standpoint of their appearance and their standing, but to me it seems amazing that young girls and boys of their tender age have been able to accumulate such a vast store of knowledge as to be able to answer questions which, I am sure, would sometimes embarrass even Members of this body, as I know they would me.

I hope the Quiz Kids not only will be able to rejoice at the success of their mission in the sale of bonds, but that they will cherish the memory of it as long as they live, as affording them an opportunity which has come to them earlier in life than such opportunities come to most young men and women of our country, to render a service to the American cause and to the cause of liberty and civilization.

I congratulate the Quiz Kids, and I hope they will return to see us on some other occasion. I might even express the hope that some day one or more, if not all of them, may occupy seats as Members of this body if their ambitions should run in that direction.

PROHIBITION OF COST-PLUS-FIXED-FEE WAR CONTRACTS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may introduce a joint resolution and say a few words upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the joint resolution of the Senator from Michigan will be received, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Baruch committee in its report on labor conditions on the Pacific coast, said:

Not alone on the west coast but all through the country much labor is being hoarded or poorly utilized. Many workers have written us of the waste of labor in the plants in which they themselves are working. Such wasteful practices are encouraged, among other things, by prevailing cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. Under these contracts the Government pays all costs—whatever they are. Since the Government is footing the bill, there is no incentive for manufacturers to economize in the use of materials, facilities, or labor. More workers are hired than are needed. Workers may stand idle—it costs the manufacturers nothing. Much labor is wasted. In the early stages of war production when manufacturers were asked to produce things they never made before, there might have been some justification for cost-plus arrangements. By now, Government and industry surely have had sufficient experience in the manufacture of many munitions for fixed prices to be agreed upon.

This statement of Mr. Baruch's committee summarizes what I have found to be true, and I have every reason to believe that the statement is true, which was made by the Manpower Utilization Section at a press conference, to the effect that if maximum use was obtained from manpower in the Pacific coast area it would be 25 percent above what it is now; in other words, that 25 percent is being lost.

We have before us the question of the drafting of fathers. The Senate Military Affairs Committee, in conjunction with the Military Affairs Committee of the House, has taken testimony on this question. It appears from that testimony and from the facts that if the Manpower Commission will revise its usage of manpower, under fixed-price contracts, it may avoid and is likely to avoid the drafting of fathers, and it is bound to obtain the machinery and equipment for war faster and at a great saving to the taxpayers.

The cure for this evil is to abolish cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts, as we abolished the cost-plus-percentage-of-cost contracts, which were used in the last war.

I therefore introduce a joint resolution, which I ask to have read at the desk and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 80) to prohibit the use of the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system of contracting in connection with war contracts was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That as used in this act the term "Department" means the War Department, the Navy Department, the Treasury Department, the Maritime Commission, Defense Plant Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, Defense Supplies Corporation, Rubber Reserve Company, or any other department or agency of the Government (including Government-owned or controlled corporations) exercising functions in connection with the prosecution of the war effort.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Department shall, in the exercise of its functions in connection with the prosecution of the war effort, enter into any contract providing for payment to the contractor of cost plus a fixed fee, except in

extraordinary cases in which the head of such Department personally certifies that, because of lack of precedents or experience upon which to base fixed prices, it is necessary to use the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system of contracting.

SEC. 3. Where any Department has outstanding on the date of enactment of this joint resolution any cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract which is unexecuted in whole or in part, the head of such Department shall proceed as rapidly as possible to require the contractor to renegotiate such contract for the purpose of placing it on a fixed-price basis, and shall, pursuant to such renegotiation, place such contract on a fixed-price basis.

SEC. 4. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to supersede or modify in any way the provisions of section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, as amended, except that, where practicable, the renegotiation of any contract under section 3 of this joint resolution may be carried out in conjunction with any renegotiation required with respect to such contract under such section 403.

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT—AMENDMENT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending measure, Senate bill 763, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The amendment submitted by Mr. TAFT to the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. TAFT. The amendment provides roughly, in lieu of the provision of the bill postponing the drafting of fathers, that all fathers be divided into two classes, one class those under 30 years of age, and the other class those of 30 years of age and over; that substantially all other persons shall be drafted before the younger group of fathers is drafted, and that substantially all the younger group of fathers shall be drafted before those over 30 years of age are drafted.

Mr. President, as long ago as April 1942, I offered a measure to carry out very much the same purpose, which would have classified these groups into definite classes, and I feel very strongly that if it had been adopted at that time the controversy and difficulty which have now developed would not have arisen. At that time I submitted a calculation showing that in all probability it would be necessary to draft fathers under 30 years of age, but that in all probability it would never be necessary to draft fathers over 30 years of age, and as the figures stand today that prediction is substantially accurate.

We can obtain the fathers who are now asked for, 460,000 approximately, from among the fathers under 30 years of age, and we can therefore fix practically permanently the status of those men and of those over 30 years of age.

There are a number of reasons, it seems to me, why the line should be drawn at that figure. In the first place, from the military standpoint, there is not any doubt that men under 30 years of age make better soldiers. All military testimony is to that effect.

In the second place, I do not think there are many fathers under 30 who are very comfortable staying at home. Practically all their friends have gone into the armed forces and I do not believe any substantial objection will be found from any father under 30 years of age to being drafted.

In the third place, the fathers under 30 years of age have not reached any key positions in business, labor, or the professions, and, therefore, the domestic economy is not upset when they are drafted.

In the fourth place, they have not built up in their families anything like the high standard of expense which the older men have built up.

Finally, their wives are younger and nearly all of them have families to whom they can return, and with whom they may live during the period that their husbands are in service.

Mr. President, I feel very strongly that the proper solution of the whole difficulty is the drafting of fathers under 30 years of age. I think it will meet the needs of the Army. I feel there will be no substantial objection in the country to the drafting of fathers under 30 years of age, and, if we do it, I do not think we are ever going to be obliged to disturb the families of fathers over 30 years of age, who incidentally comprise approximately three-fourths of the total number of fathers who have not already been taken into the service.

THE MACKINAC ISLAND CONFERENCE

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, there has been an avalanche of material placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by those attending the Mackinac conference. The conference did not distinguish itself by the adoption of any plan by which international peace could be maintained. The conference was interesting in that, if it had any meaning, it was calculated to prepare the Republican voters of the country for a departure from the traditional isolationist policy of the Republican Party which dominated its conduct up until Pearl Harbor. On page A3744 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in a quotation from the Washington Star, we find the following language:

> For a political party which had become identified as the champion of isolation, this is a long step forward. The G. O. P. has its eyes on the future, and if the statement of the advisory council is adopted at the party's next national convention it will have buried the past. To put it another way, this means that the question of the willingness of the United States to assume its legitimate responsibilities in the world of tomorrow would no longer be a subject of partisan politics, and, with a national election in the offing, this is eminently desirable.

Here reference is plainly made to the reputation which the Republican Party had made as to its record of isolationism. Assuming that that was the position of the Republican Party at that time, and up until the Mackinac meeting, the world will agree that this meeting was, indeed, a long step forward. The Detroit News, a newspaper printed in the State in which the meeting was held, is quoted on the same page of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the following language:

> This resolution will be interpreted abroad as eliminating the question of post-war collaboration with other nations as an issue between the two major American political parties. It will be taken as assurance that history will not repeat and that the Republican Party will not again be the instrument or exploiter of any post-war revulsion toward isolationism.

This article calls attention to the possibility of eliminating the controversy with respect to the question of post-war collaboration with other nations as between the two major American political parties. It holds out the hope to our European allies that the Republican Party will not again be the instrument or exploiter of any post-war revulsion toward isolationism. The New York Times in the article which was also placed in the RECORD on the same page of the Appendix is in the following language:

> From the beginning of the Mackinac Island conference it was evident that the isolationist thinking so long dominant in the councils of the congressional Republicans had been routed by events and that there would be no battle over isolationism in this conference.

Those interpretations by prominent friendly newspapers are encouraging to the world. One might be permitted to suggest that if the absent Wendell Willkie was able to impress upon that gathering the wisdom of some international organization, Mr. Willkie will not have lived in vain. However, on page A3786 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I find the following language of a distinguished member of the Mackinac conference:

> I suggest that instead of passing vague resolutions about machinery with force we ought to discuss the basic principles by which we can hope to assure a peace in the world, which will enable America to work out her destiny at home. The time has not come when the President, or Congress, or the people can make a final decision, because we do not know the conditions which will exist at the end of the war. Until that time comes I do not believe we should, if we could, tie our hands against the adoption of any policy which the American people after due consideration may then desire to adopt.

That leads one to believe that at least some members of that conference had in mind what might be known as the open door, leaving the party in position to advocate in 1944 or at the end of the war any policy which the American people, after due consideration, may then desire to adopt. The foregoing quotation is from the speech of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], delivered 7 days after the conference at Mackinac Island. We are told that the conference was remarkable for its harmonious conclusions. One can scarcely see how there can be room for disagreement if we are to have no plan or policy which would prevent the adoption of any policy at a later date. However, it appears that the conference did not confine itself to after-the-war policies. On page A3759 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there are what are known as liberty-at-home resolutions, adopted at the Mackinac Islant conference. The program endorsed by the council is set out in part as follows:

It must maintain full employment through private enterprise, and full production to furnish the goods and services so needed by our people. In so doing we must seek to make sure that the unemployment and insecurity of the years preceding the war do not return, and that hardship and poverty shall be prevented by a supplementary but comprehensive program of social security on sound principles. We must eliminate all unnecessary regulation of the individual and of business, restore and protect small business which has been so recklessly destroyed, and assure incentive and equal opportunity for the youth of America.

The language "unemployment and insecurity of the years preceding the war" took in a very large period. It undoubtedly referred to the Hoover administration, during which at one time there were as many as 15,000,000 unemployed persons in the Nation, so we are told. The "insecurity," no doubt, refers to the feeling of the American people at that time. "Hardship and poverty" were also to be prevented—this, no doubt, to be done by the placing of 2 chickens in every pot and 2 cars in every garage. Again, it provided that the program was to "restore and protect small business which has been so recklessly destroyed." That statement undoubtedly refers to the period when all business, both large and small, was destroyed during the same Republican administration. We are told in the same paragraph that the program is to "assure incentive and equal opportunity for the youth of America." The last time that party had an opportunity to display its legislative ability and to assure incentive and equal opportunity for youth, it drove the youth of America from it, and since that time youth has not voted the Republican ticket in national elections.

As to "liberty at home," we are told that the Republican Party is devoted to the Federal system of government by which basic rights and duties are reserved to the States, free of dictation and subject to the control of their people. If those who subscribed so liberally to the finances of the Republican Party believed for one minute that the basic rights and duties would be reserved to the States, not used entirely and exclusively by the special interests, the next national campaign would not see such tremendous contributions to every imaginable subsidiary organization of the Republican Party. The plain provisions of the law with reference to contributions could not be evaded by the device of fake committees under every conceivable name to be used for the Republican national ticket.

However, perhaps the choicest paragraph of Liberty at Home is in the denunciation of the treatment of labor which is found on page A3760 in the following language:

We denounce the political effort to reduce labor in the United States to the European level of a class-conscious vote shackled proletariat. We reject the doctrine that the American workman's mind must be made up in Washington and his personal life turned over to the management of Washington's political coddlers. The basic position of American labor in the American economic system must be guaranteed by fair and equitable laws. The destiny of American labor is not Fascist. It must remain American.

One would gather from the language of the foregoing quotation that American labor is entirely dependent upon the Republican Party for its position in American life. The denunciation of union labor by practically every leading organ of the Republican Party, as well as by the greater number of its spokesmen, explains the fact that American labor does not know, and did not know until the Mackinac conference, that the Republican Party was the great friend of labor.

The promise to the veterans on page A3759 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is interesting. One is constrained to wonder why, after the First World War, with 12 years of control of the executive and legislative branches of the Government, the jobs, good honest jobs, were not furnished to those who fought our First World War. It is true that those veterans who returned from the First World War had the right to launch projects which were sure to fail. They had the right to till the soil with assurance that their work would fail to produce a livelihood for themselves and family. They were free to forge ahead, but there was no possibility of success. The veterans, the youth and the older citizens of our country during that period faced a wild orgy of speculation and a hopeless period of despondency, when their homes were lost, their families separated, and their businesses sacrificed. The only business that thrived was that of the sheriff in the sale of American homes and the wiping out of American hope; and the only consolation received from this party in full control of the Government was the statement that prosperity was just around the corner. Three times those promises have been held out to the American people. Three times they have been told that the hope of America lies in Republican success, and three times have the American people by tremendous majorities selected the party of Jefferson, Jackson, Cleveland, Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt to guide them. The candidate of the Liberty at Home Party, in 1932, received 59 electoral votes. In 1936 the candidate of this party received 8 electoral votes, and in 1940 he received 82 electoral votes.

The people of the United States have a very clear picture of the situation, and have had during all that period.

A statement made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] prior to the convention at Mackinac is interesting. It is contained in a press release dated August 30, 1943. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

That post-war conference of the Republicans to be held at Mackinac Island September 6 would be better described as a preconvention conference, for its purpose is as plainly political as the disguise of that purpose is transparent.

The G. O. P. has a fierce factional war on hand. The prospective collusion between the Willkieistic allied cooperation program after the war, and the isolation sentiments attributable to some other Republican candidates has little to do with international results and much to do with internal G. O. P. strategy. Hence the session on Senator VANDENBERG'S home grounds, with membership largely composed of pre-Pearl Harbor noninterventionists, leavened by a considerable group of straddlebugs, mostly afflicted by the necessity of being ready to vault to whatever side of the fence seems most useful—and with the prospective marked absence of Wendell Willkie himself.

We may look for in the report of this gathering a series of platform planks that will cover every phase of the problem, and more or less astutely dodge them all. We may expect a ringing declaration that nothing must be allowed that would hamper our country's desires, but that we must adjust our demands to the opinion of our allies; that we must go the limit in collaboration with our allies, but must safeguard our own interests uncompromisingly; that our soldier boys must be guaranteed good jobs when they return from the battlefields, but that this must be done without prejudice in the allotment of positions to the men and women on the home front.

Clarence Buddington Kelland has already budded a program for our taking over all the European colonies in this hemisphere except Canada. That this would mean our assumption of the burden of forever supporting the population of a hundred tiny islands which have always been on the verge of famine, flyspeaks on the map that have neither industrial possibilities nor strategic value, and by the acquisition of which we would gain only the glory of policing, feeding, and protecting them. A more realistic policy, if we go in for that sort of thing, would be to select such points as might be of use to us and which our allies might be unwilling to yield without compensating countenance to their own respective ideas of expansion which, in turn, might not be equally agreeable to all of our important allies.

These things are matters to be settled at the peace conference and not at a Republican caucus aiming to duck a complication of candidates jockeying for a nomination.

This is no time to be spreading political ballyhoo and bunk. No one should be indifferent to America's crucial period. Building a platform for the Republican Party does not come within my idea of the war's "Work or Fight" order.

Mr. TUNNELL. On September 11, 1943, the Senator from Pennsylvania issued a statement giving his summary of what had already taken place at Mackinac Island. I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The mountain that labored and brought forth a mouse, was eclipsed by the G. O. P. conference at Mackinac Lake which produced twin mice.

The declaration of Senator VANDENBERG'S committee is the most entertaining straddle in the history of political declarations. To the Willkieites it promises devotion to an international accord—a League of Nations with teeth practically—and to the isolationists it pledges adherence to the immortal principle that nothing shall be done that infringes our title to do as we please without regard for what such an international body to which we subscribe might determine. The Lodge reservations that killed the old League of Nations project had nothing on the Mackinac theory. In brief this declaration to the hypothetical world congress is

"we are with you to the limit, but with limitations." An old nursery rhyme had it, "Hang your clothes on a hickory limb but don't go near the water."

The principle of a global plan to prevent such wars as those into which we were twice forced is that representatives of the various countries shall assemble and work out a program for peace. Obviously if every country considers only its own interests such a convention would be futile. Obviously no nation's representatives are going to barter away its fundamental sovereignty, but, on the other hand, if the grouped nations are to police the world against bandit countries no member of the group can, after being party to making a law, dodge the responsibility for enforcing it, or assert its privilege of observing it or not.

Solemnly the body assembled at Mackinac insisted that our Constitution could not be violated. As every treaty has to be endorsed by a two-thirds majority of the United States Senate to become valid nobody is going to be excited by that declaration.

The G. O. P. manifestation would probably have counted for more—and certainly would have been more comprehensible—if the platform had read simply: "Damn the New Deal and hurrah for the Star-Spangled Banner." Perhaps the mixed congregation of isolationists, interventionists, middle-of-the-roaders, and know-nothing-about-its are more to be pitied than blamed when political necessities in the midst of confusion and party division, forbade a plank that would have either meaning or sense.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is my purpose to move that the Senate take a recess until Friday, and on that day it is proposed to take a recess until the following Tuesday. I wish to explain to the Senate the situation which calls for such action.

As the Senate knows, the unfinished business is Senate bill 763, the so-called Wheeler bill, dealing with the drafting of fathers.

For several days the Committee on Military Affairs has been engaged in holding hearings on that subject. Those hearings have not been concluded. The committee has made every effort to conclude them as rapidly as possible and to have the hearings printed as soon as possible, but the hearings have not been concluded, and will not be concluded before tomorrow afternoon, if then. I assume that they will be concluded tomorrow afternoon, but I have no way of knowing. I understand that Mr. Baruch is to appear before the committee tomorrow afternoon, and probably his testimony will require most of the afternoon. Yesterday General Marshall, Admiral King, and others appeared, and their testimony has not yet been printed.

It is desirable that the hearings be concluded and that the testimony be printed and made available to Senators before the bill is taken up. Manifestly, it is impossible that that should be done earlier than Friday, if then. It is not certain that the hearings will be available even on Friday. Even if they should be, I believe that Senators, many of whom have spoken to me about it, desire to have an opportunity to read the hearings so as to know what they contain before the bill is taken up.

Under those circumstances, I have consulted the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] as well as the minority leader [Mr. MCNARY] and other Senators. It is thought advisable not to enter upon consideration of the bill until one week from today, or next Tuesday. I wish to notify Senators so that they may govern themselves accordingly. Therefore it is planned to take a recess from today until Friday, and from Friday until Tuesday of next week.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a number of Senators have manifested a desire to consider at an early date some of the bills on the calendar; but in view of the present situation I assume that the call of the calendar had better go over until after the bill is considered next week.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is my judgment. I will attempt to have the calendar called as soon thereafter as possible.

Mr. McNARY. So we shall not have any business transacted on Friday?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE—NOMINATION OF JOACHIM O. FERNANDEZ

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there being only one nomination on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that it be considered as in executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Joachim O. Fernandez to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none. Without objection, as in executive session, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be immediately notified.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, September 24, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, September 21 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Rear Admiral DeWitt C. Ramsey to be Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

Rear Admiral Thomas L. Gatch to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

Rear Admiral Arthur B. Cook to be a vice admirals in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 22d day of July 1943, and to continue during his assignment as commander, Caribbean Sea Frontier, and commandant, tenth naval district.

Rear Admiral John S. McCain to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 28th day of July 1943.

The following-named captains to be rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Edward W. Hanson, August 23, 1942.
Ernest G. Small, September 1, 1942.
Thomas L. Gatch, September 5, 1942
Ralph O. Davis, October 11, 1942.
Lloyd J. Wiltse, October 15, 1942.
Henry M. Mullinnix, November 13, 1942.
Robert B. Carney, December 11, 1942
Arthur W. Radford, December 15, 1942.
Van Hubert Ragsdale, December 27, 1942.
John Wilkes, January 1, 1943

Capt. George F. Hussey, Jr., United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, to rank from the 4th day of September 1943.

Capt. Samuel A. Clement, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving with Commander all forces Aruba-Curaçao, to rank from the 24th day of August 1943.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Jack G. Campbell, July 1, 1941.
Thomas F. Saunders, Jr., June 1, 1942.
Jordan R. McCann, June 1, 1942.
Edward T. Steigelman, June 1, 1942.
Donald R. Levy, June 1, 1942.
Robert B. Satterford, June 1, 1942.
Luther R. Johnson, June 1, 1942.
Marion R. Clark, June 1, 1942.
Marion R. Clark, June 1, 1942.
Richard H. Seligman, June 1, 1942.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Jack L. Grayson, April 15, 1940.
John D. Eicher, July 1, 1940.
Robert E. Newman, July 1, 1940.
Edmond A. Trudeau, July 20, 1940.
Wilmon H. Ayer, September 1, 1940.
Quentin R. Thomson, January 22, 1941.
Richmond P. Burr, April 28, 1941.
William B. Wood, May 1, 1941.
James B. Hildreth, May 11, 1941.
Richard B. Hutchins, June 9, 1941.
Henry J. Cappello, June 28, 1941.
Henry J. Kuehn, July 1, 1941.
Edward S. Parks, Jr., July 1, 1941.
William A. Whitman, July 1, 1941.
Hugh E. Wright, July 1, 1941.
Joseph J. Bodell. Jr., July 7, 1941.
William J. Rogers, Jr., July 7, 1941.
William H. Taylor, Jr., July 15, 1941.
Jerome H. King, Jr., July 16, 1941.
Joseph A. Locke, Jr., July 22, 1941.
John R. Baker, Jr., August 20, 1941.
George A. Sullivan, December 10, 1941.
Fred S. Frederickson, May 11, 1942.
Lloyd J. Reuter, June 13, 1942.
Fred W. Pump, Jr., June 15, 1942.

The following to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Frederic F. Wipperman, February 17, 1941.
Harold T. Klein, May 26, 1941.
Bernard W. Rothblatt, May 26, 1941.
Ernest A. Zinke, Jr., May 26, 1941.
William B. Smith, March 12, 1942.
James F. Wright, March 12, 1942.
William S. Gevurtz, March 12, 1942.
William A. Van Nortwick, March 12, 1942.
Samuel H. Wallace, Jr., March 12, 1942.
William C. Thoroughgood, May 6, 1942.
Ira D. Le Fevre, Jr., May 6, 1942.
Jerome Noble, May 6, 1942
Joseph J. Smith, May 6, 1942.

Hugh J. Lenahan, Jr., May 6, 1942.
Arthur G. Lueck, May 6, 1942.
Robert A. Frost, May 6, 1942.
John T. M. Giannini, May 9, 1942.
Edward M. Burns, May 11, 1942.
Max O. Sartori, May 12, 1942.
Peter S. Kwiatkowski, May 14, 1942.
Carl M. McCandless, Jr., May 16, 1942.
Robert M. Dunlap, May 20, 1942.
Walter I. Chapman, Jr., May 27, 1942.
Charles G. Merckel, Jr., May 19, 1943.
Joseph C. Pinto, May 19, 1943.
James D. Skillen, May 19, 1943.
John A. Duffalo, Jr., May 19, 1943.
Santino F. Lando, May 19, 1943.
Robert P. Johnston, May 19, 1943.
George E. Sullivan, May 19, 1943.
Willard G. Snow, May 19, 1943.
Abe Alper, May 19, 1943.
Edward M. Wurzel, May 19, 1943.
Philip H. Soucheray, May 19, 1943.
Julius H. Smith, May 19, 1943.
James B. Flanagan, May 19, 1943.
Richard W. Miles, Jr., May 19, 1943.
John T. Reilly, May 19, 1943.
Joseph J. Groom, May 19, 1943.
Joshua W. Baxley 3d, May 19, 1943.
Irwin Perlmutter, May 19, 1943.
Lindsay R. Riddle, May 19, 1943.
Bernard C. Wildgen, May 19, 1943.
Edwin D. Sharpless, May 19, 1943.
Clifford B. Cole, May 19, 1943.
Robert K. Anderson, May 19, 1943.
Thomas A. Noble, May 19, 1943.
Robert E. Bowen, Jr., May 19, 1943.
Charles J. Donaghey, May 19, 1943.
Thomas M. Marshall, May 19, 1943.
Almon R. Cross, May 19, 1943.
Albert F. P. Bozic, May 19, 1943.
Robert S. Darrow, May 19, 1943.
Willis H. Taylor, Jr., May 19, 1943.
Kenneth P. Knudtson, May 19, 1943.
Samuel E. Elmore, Jr., May 19, 1943.
Felice A. Garcia, May 19, 1943.
John J. Konefal, May 19, 1943.
William P. Davey, May 19, 1943.
William W. Mead, May 19, 1943.
Paul E. Bondo, May 19, 1943.
Arthur C. Tedford, Jr., May 19, 1943.
James W. Packard, Jr., May 19, 1943.
Thomas E. Byrne, May 19, 1943.
Jack C. McCurdy, May 19, 1943.
Charles R. Sias, May 19, 1943.
Byrne W. Mayer, May 19, 1943.
Arabion N. Taylor, May 19, 1943.
James A. Turner, May 19, 1943.
Rustan H. Hicks, May 19, 1943.
Francis S. Brown, May 19, 1943.
Quentin J. Florence, May 19, 1943.
Manley C. Williams, May 19, 1943.
John W. Trenton, May 19, 1943.
Arthur R. Errion, May 20, 1943.
John J. Rieder, May 20, 1943.
Frank R. Bussey, Jr., May 22, 1943.
Bernard W. Coan, May 23, 1943.
Robert P. Watterson, May 25, 1943.
Frank H. Thomas, Jr., June 3, 1943.
James F. Gleason, June 4, 1943.
George C. Calderwood, June 4, 1943.
Clarence Crane, Jr., June 4, 1943.
Francis J. McMahon, June 4, 1943.
Maurice Schiff, June 6, 1943.
John S. Ewing, Jr., June 6, 1943.
William C. Hurly, June 8, 1943.
Milton M. Small, June 8, 1943.
Henry C. Gomley, June 8, 1943.
Scott Whitehouse, June 8, 1943.
Harry B. Adams, Jr., June 14, 1943.
Leo S. Loomie, Jr., June 15, 1943.
Richard C Wixson, June 17, 1943.
Charles E. Pruett, June 17, 1943.
Romulus L. May, June 18, 1943.
William L. Smith, June 20, 1943.
Griffith Marr, June 20, 1943.
William A. Little, Jr., June 24, 1943.
James M. Smith, June 24, 1943.
George R. Gage, June 24, 1943.
Joseph A. Federowicz, June 24, 1943.
Edward S. Liska, June 25, 1943.
Richard G. Berry, June 25, 1943.
Daniel M. Pino, June 25, 1943.
Edwin L. Rushia, June 26, 1943.
Dwight A. Callagan, June 26, 1943.
Albert J. Zuska, June 26, 1943.
Franklin W. Smith, June 26, 1943.
Harold B. Thurston, June 26, 1943.
Miles J. Bielek, June 26, 1943.
George F. Grisinger, Jr., June 26, 1943.
Lindell E. Ramey, June 27, 1943.
Edwin C. Sweeney, June 27, 1943.
Albin A. Galuszka, June 27, 1943.
Paul W. Sunderland, June 27, 1943.
Leon R. Lezer, June 27, 1943.
Robert J. Brennan, June 27, 1943.
Armando R. Pallais, June 29, 1943.
Karl S. Erhardt, June 29, 1943.
Gaylon C. Williamson, June 29, 1943.
Joseph B. Callahan, June 29, 1943.
Henry G. Wagner, June 29, 1943.
Stanley W. Ogush, June 29, 1943.
Sarkis S. Sarkisian, June 29, 1943.
Charles E. Cook, Jr., June 29, 1943.
Russell M. Maynard, June 29, 1943.
Fred R. Cochrane, Jr., June 29, 1943.
Stanley J. Lloyd, June 29, 1943.
Frederick Menick, Jr., June 30, 1943.
John H. Cheffey, June 30, 1943.
Robert A. Jones, July 1, 1943.
John P. Greene, July 1, 1943.
James N. Sussex, July 3, 1943.
Richard R. Ross, July 4, 1943.
Donald B. Miller, July 7, 1943.
William A. Harvey, Jr., July 8, 1943.
Richard L. Shorkey, July 8, 1943.
James O. Cooper, July 8, 1943.
Francis J. Townsend, Jr., July 8, 1943.
Raymond Q. Seyler, July 9, 1943.
Richard B. Berlin, July 9, 1943.
George St. G. Tyner, July 9, 1943.
William N. Thomas, Jr., July 9, 1943.
Frank W. McCarthy, Jr., July 9, 1943.
Frederick E. Wetzel, July 9, 1943.
Maurice N. Manning, July 10, 1943.
Charles F. Downing, July 10, 1943.
William G. Donald, Jr., July 10, 1943.
John J. Beck, July 10, 1943.
Herbert F. Williams, July 10, 1943.
Fountain C. Beattie, Jr., July 10, 1943.
Charles F. Ashby, July 10, 1943.
Frank R. Keith, July 10, 1943.
Frank N. Reimer, Jr., July 10, 1943.
Paul W. Bransford, July 11, 1943.
Eugene M. Frame, July 11, 1943.
Edward P. MacKenzie, July 11, 1943.
Caesar F. Orofino, July 11, 1943.
Robert G. Kuehnert, July 11, 1943.
John P. Platt, July 12, 1943.
William W. Hoback, July 12, 1943.
Edward W. Davis, July 12, 1943.
John F. Cowan, July 13, 1943.
Alfred A. Schiller, July 13, 1943.
Edward F. Mee, July 13, 1943.
Charles W. Reynolds, July 13, 1943.
William G. Alfred Jones, July 13, 1943.
William L. Brown, Jr., July 13, 1943.
Philip J. Laux, Jr., July 13, 1943.
Kenneth C. Bebb, July 13, 1943.
David P. Osborne, July 13, 1943.
Clifford C. Chappell, Jr., July 13, 1943.
Harold Hanzlik, July 14, 1943.
Carroll H. Smith, Jr., July 14, 1943.
Merle J. Davis, July 14, 1943.
Fred M. Burdette, Jr., July 14, 1943.
Bernard M. Blumberg, July 14, 1943.
John H. Davis, July 16, 1943.
John P. Ferrell, July 16, 1943.
James B. Johnson, July 17, 1943.
Robert P. E. Meany, July 17, 1943.
Alphonse J. Degasis, July 18, 1943.
Duncan B. McRae, July 18, 1943.
Robert G. Dunn, Jr., July 18, 1943.
John K. Lingo, July 19, 1943.
Walter O. Pendley, July 20, 1943.
Frederick C. Emery, July 20, 1943.
Henry D. Hoskins, July 20, 1943.
John Q. U. Thompson, July 20, 1943.
Harry A. Weiss, July 20, 1943.
Edward P. McCreery, Jr., July 21, 1943.
Howard A. Andersen, July 22, 1943.
Malcolm J. MacDonald, July 22, 1943.
Francis C. Hoare, July 22, 1943.
Coleman Mopper, July 22, 1943.
John T. Godwin, July 23, 1943.
Harold H. Edelbrock, July 23, 1943.
William K. Hall, July 23, 1943.
Andrew F. Braff, July 23, 1943.
Robert B. Miller, July 23, 1943.
Edmund M. Henderson, July 25, 1943.
Earle G. Canfield, July 25, 1943.
Walton L. Jones, July 25, 1943.
Robert C. Brown, July 27, 1943.
Robert P. Hall, July 27, 1943.
William C. King, July 27, 1943.
Robert N. Smith, Jr., July 27, 1943.
Max R. Gaspar, July 28, 1943.
Donald A. Dupler, July 28, 1943.
Manning W. Alden, July 28, 1943.
Donald W. Jones, July 28, 1943.
Frederick S. Gardiner, July 28, 1943.
Leonard M. Roberts, August 17, 1943.
Michael L. Allegretti, August 18, 1943.
William E. Owen, August 19, 1943.
Louis F. Gould, August 19, 1943.
William J. Staubitz, August 19, 1943.
Jerome J. Zuflacht, August 21, 1943.
Andrew F. LoPinto, August 22, 1943.
Sidney H. Silver, August 22, 1943.
Benjamin F. Lovett, Jr., August 22, 1943.
James F. Flanders, Jr., August 22, 1943.
Donald P. McDonnell, August 22, 1943.
Melvin R. Link, August 23, 1943.
Herschel C. Sudduth, August 26, 1943.
Ervine S. Bills, August 26, 1943.

The following to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

William C. Wohlfarth, May 21, 1941.
Edward Heidt, January 12, 1942.
Stanley Jakubs, May 5, 1942.
Gifford McK. Lloyd, May 5, 1942.
Robert B. Young, October 29, 1942.
Edward A. Moore, October 29, 1942.
Chester B. Stromberg, October 29, 1942.
Fred F. Wood, October 29, 1942.
Rupert S. Walker, October 29, 1942.
Frits A. S. Winblad, October 29, 1942.
Paul E. Feiock, October 29, 1942.
William L. Rudder, October 29, 1942.
Edwin B. Tharp, October 29, 1942.
Richard H. White, October 29, 1942.
Herbert C. Foster, Ocotber 29, 1942.
Harold F. Birk, October 29, 1942.
Kenneth G. MacLeod, October 29, 1942.
William A. Aldridge, October 29, 1942.
Charles S. Segrest, October 29, 1942.
James C. Ramsey, October 29, 1942.
Joseph H. Stone, October 29, 1942.
Spencer A. Rappold, October 29, 1942.
Lynden M. Kennedy, October 29, 1942.
Raymond R. Friesz, October 29, 1942.
Michael J. Terzis, October 29, 1942.
Arthur H. Pearson, October 29, 1942.
Albert C. Funk, October 29, 1942.
Charles R. Phinney, October 29, 1942.
Frank Kanter, November 1, 1942.
Bruce S. Hetrick, November 25, 1942.
Ervin J. Drow, November 30, 1942.
John E. Flocken, December 7, 1942.
Joseph R. Megna, December 7, 1942.
Ernest A. Rambaldi, December 8, 1942.
Jack E. Myers, January 15, 1943.
Arthur E. Anderson, January 24, 1943.
Jesse C. Gibson, February 8, 1943.
Perry A. Ratcliff, February 15, 1943.
Robert F. McGannon, February 24, 1943.
Albert R. Oesterle, March 8, 1943.
Victor S. Leocha, March 24, 1943.
Darrell L. Johnson, April 20, 1943.
Eldon O. Schnoebelen, April 20, 1943.
Edward R. McClean, May 20, 1943.
Julian R. Conant, July 19, 1943.
Francis N. Johnston, July 19, 1943.
Henry G. Zoff, July 19, 1943.
Robert L. Cooper, August 5, 1943.
Richard G. Cooper, August 5, 1943.
Edwin F. Stuckmeyer, August 26, 1943.

The following named officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant paymasters in the

Navy, with the rank of ensign to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

James W. Parker, November 5, 1940.
Walter R. Seaberg, November 7, 1940.
Jonathan M. Thornton, Jr., November 7, 1940.
Carl A. Raymond, Jr., November 7, 1943.
William C. Nielsen, November 7, 1940.
Lotus H. Loudon, Jr., November 7, 1940.
Stanley D. Parker, November 19, 1941.
Lee B. Whitcomb, November 19, 1941.
Sherwoode A. Taffinder, Jr., November 19, 1941.
Harold R. Clark, November 19, 1941.
James H. Corey, November 19, 1941.
William B. Hamilton, Jr., November 19, 1941.
Patrick W. Moore, November 19, 1941.
Arthur W. Mann, November 19, 1941.
Richard Ironmonger, November 19, 1941.
Graham C. Bonnell, November 19, 1941.
Charles F. Healy, Jr., November 19, 1941.
James L. Whitcomb, November 19, 1941.
Benajah L. Rainey, November 19, 1941.
John W. Roper, November 19, 1941.
Richard H. Griffin, November 19, 1941.
Don W. Phillips, November 19, 1941.
Winfield G. Knopf, November 19, 1941.
Lawrence D. Wornom, November 19, 1941.
Charles M. Williams, November 20, 1941.
Jesse C. Wilson, Jr., November 20, 1941.
Andrew M. McCrone, November 20, 1941.
Bescherrer A. Crisman, Jr., November 20, 1941.
William A. Rapp, Jr., November 20, 1941.
William H. Ross, November 20, 1941.
Edward McE. Burke, November 20, 1941.
Bernard L. McCreery, November 20, 1941.
Irving F. Macey, November 20, 1941.
Harry J. Nuttle, November 20, 1941.
William V. Hughes, November 20, 1941.
Jack P. Fairley, November 20, 1941.
Theodore L. Recker, November 20, 1941.
Richard A. Rosso, November 20, 1941.
Douglas J. Coyle, November 20, 1941.
Ben D. Floyd, Jr., November 20, 1941.
George L. Boorn, November 20, 1941.
George D. Hack, November 20, 1941.
Robert W. Kreitler, November 20, 1941.
Joseph J. Burton, November 20, 1941.
Louis B. Wagner, Jr., November 20, 1941.
Eli P. Fay, Jr., November 20, 1941.
Lewis E. Dreyfous, November 20, 1941.
Robert J. Norton, November 20, 1941.
Hector E. Lynch 3d, November 20, 1941.
Sewell T. Kauffman, November 20, 1941.
Albert E. Pickhardt, November 20, 1941.
Jack L. Graham, November 20, 1941.
James Hovey, November 20, 1941.
William H. Storck, November 20, 1941.
William B. Ferguson, November 20, 1941.
Edwin D. Jones, Jr., November 20, 1941.
James W. Bower, November 20, 1941.
Charles D. W. Wenrich, November 20, 1941.
Clarence LeR. Nelson, November 20, 1941.
Dan C. McNeill, November 20, 1941.
Lamar D. Whitcher, March 23, 1942.
Stephenson Wells, March 23, 1942.
Robert W. Decker, March 23, 1942.
James F. Dawson, Jr., March 23, 1942.
Lawrence A. Marsden, March 23, 1942.
Robert C. Simmons, Jr., March 23, 1942.
Rex O. Kessinger, March 23, 1942.
Wilber E. Smith, March 23, 1942.
Henry R. Johnson, March 23, 1942.
George C. Waters, Jr., March 23, 1942.
Edgar T. Boynton, March 23, 1942.
Donald P Reid, March 25, 1942.
Frank VanN. Gregg, March 28, 1942.
William R. Love, March 29, 1942.
Gerald L. Griffin 2d, April 2, 1942.
George A. Schreiber, April 10, 1942.
Anthony Gerharz, Jr., April 20, 1942.
Robert J. Gerhardt, April 21, 1942.
Jack L. Hunt, May 15, 1942.
John F. Sieck, May 22, 1942.
Bernard A. Mago, May 26, 1942.
John D. Ramsey, September 11, 1942.
Wellington H. Lewis, September 11, 1942.
John C. Speer, September 11, 1942.
William K. Woodard, February 13, 1943.
Donald A. Hempson, March 27, 1943.
Alfred B. Barnes, September 1, 1943.
Clark H. Grant, September 1, 1943.
Herbert L. Johnson, September 1, 1943.
Richard R. Koontz, September 1, 1943.
Robert F. Henderson, September 1, 1943.
Richard G. Henninger, September 1, 1943.
William C. Howard, September 1, 1943.
William A. Johannesen, September 1, 1943.
Robert H. Madden, September 1, 1943.
Calvin A. Vobroucek, September 1, 1943.

The following-named ensigns to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

William J. North, February 7, 1941.
Algernon H. Kerr, Jr., June 19, 1942.

Assistant Civil Engineer William F. Luce to be an assistant civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) to rank from the 1st day of June 1942, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Commander Vincent R. Murphy to be a captain in the Navy, to rank from the 30th day of June 1942.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the 30th day of June 1942:

Rudolf L. Johnson	Frederick M. Trapnell
Harry B. Jarrett	George A. Dussault
Emmett E. Sprung	Alvin D. Chandler
William T. Rassieur	

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Harry D. Hale, January 1, 1942.
Robert H Wilkinson, June 30, 1942.
Nicholas Lucker, Jr., June 30, 1942.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Harrison P. McIntire, January 1, 1942.
Richard M. Farrell, January 1, 1942.
Donald E Willman, January 1, 1942.
Fitzhugh L. Palmer, Jr., May 2, 1942.
Robert F. Kelly, June 30, 1942.
Jasper N. McDonald, June 30, 1942.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of June 1942:

James D. Arbes	Thomas M. Bennett
Charles E. Roemer	James M. Hingson
James F. Rigg	Robert C. Gillette
Duncan A. Campbell	John B. Anderson
William J Ruhe	Edward J. Murphy
Robert R. Green	Lloyd R. Vasey
William M. Ringness	George S. Simmons 3d
William J. Keim	Norman W. White
Reuben N. Perley, Jr.	

Ensign Harry A. Fredrickson to be an ensign in the Navy, to rank from the 16th day of July 1941, to correct spelling of name as previously nominated and confirmed.

Passed Assistant Surgeon Paul K. Perkins to be a surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the 30th day of June 1942.

Assistant Dental Surgeon Myron G. Turner to be a passed assistant dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

The following-named boatswains to be chief boatswains in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 1st day of June 1942:

Fred W. Beyer
Harry E. Story

The following-named carpenters to be chief carpenters in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 1st day of June 1942:

Carl W. Bennett
Monte E. Adams
Dowl V. Emerson

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Robert B. Buchan, October 1, 1939.
Matthew E. Darchuck, September 6, 1941.
Raymond C. Demarest, September 6, 1941.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Russell J. Morrical, MC–V (G), United States Naval Reserve, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 19th day of May 1943.

Gunner John E. Rutherford to be a chief gunner in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 1st day of May 1940.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. Alexander A. Vandegrift to be a lieutenant general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 28th day of July 1943.

Brig. Gen. Keller E. Rockey to be a major general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 28th day of September 1942.

Brig. Gen. Allen H. Turnage to be a major general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 28th day of September 1942.

Brig. Gen. Earl C. Long to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 25th day of August 1942, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Brig. Gen. Pedro A. del Valle to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 26th day of August 1942, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Col. Oscar R. Cauldwell to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 26th day of August 1942.

Col. Alfred H. Noble to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 18th day of September 1942.

Lt. Col. (temporary) Lester S. Hamel to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April 1942.

Peter D. Lambrecht, a naval aviator of the Marine Corps Reserve, to be a first lieutenant in the Regular Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from the 1st day of October 1940.

The following-named naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Regular Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from the dates stated:

Frederick M. Rauschenbach, from the 10th day of February 1941.
George C. Axtell, Jr., from the 12th day of May 1941.
Raynold G. Tomes, from the 24th day of May 1941.
George B. Woodbury, from the 18th day of August 1941.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of December 1942:

Samuel L. Grigsby, a citizen of Louisiana.
Frank M. Platt, Jr., a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Howard G. Gunter, a citizen of Alabama.

The below-named meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 27th day of January 1943:

First Sgt. John F. Skorich.
Platoon Sgt. James R. Galbreath.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 23d day of February 1943:

Joe B. Griffith, Jr., a citizen of Texas.
Robert V. Perkins, a citizen of Ohio.
James P. Prowell, a citizen of Texas.
Robert L. Scott, Jr., a citizen of Texas.
Stephen D. Ryan, Jr., a citizen of New York.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 10th day of March 1943:

Harry Wollin, a citizen of California.

Paul J. Brown, Jr., a citizen of North Carolina.

Irvin J. Gershen, a citizen of New Jersey, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 21st day of April 1943.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of May 1943:

James F. Hovey, a citizen of Minnesota.
William S. Brewer, a citizen of New York.
Harris H. Barnes, Jr., a citizen of Mississippi.
Archie B. Norford, a citizen of Virginia.
Thomas M. Brown, a citizen of Virginia.
Robert J. McKirnan, a citizen of Ohio.
Philip T. Kujovsky, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
James L. Cullen, a citizen of Ohio.
Richard H. Jeschke, Jr., a citizen of Virginia.
John E. Shepherd, Jr., a citizen of Pennsylvania.
James T. Pearce, a citizen of South Carolina.
LeRoy Bald, a citizen of Maryland.
William L. Dick, a citizen of Washington.
Eugene C. Swift, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Serge S. Gorny, a citizen of Washington.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 5th day of May 1943:

Robert S. Stubbs II, a citizen of Florida.
James K. Roberts, a citizen of West Virginia.

Platoon Sgt. John P. Sawyer II, a meritorious noncommissioned officer, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 19th day of May 1943.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 19th day of May 1943:

Harry B. Persinger, Jr., a citizen of West Virginia.
Robert D. Thurston, a citizen of New Jersey.
James B. Ord, Jr., a citizen of the District of Columbia.
Louis G. Nickell 3d, a citizen of Arkansas.
Richard F. Ladd, a citizen of Vermont.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of June 1943:

George F. Lewis, a citizen of Kentucky.
Herbert E. Roser, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Wilford L. Stone, a citizen of Iowa.
Frank H. Griffin, Jr., a citizen of Pennsylvania.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 16th day of June 1943:

John B. Green, a citizen of New Jersey.
Maurice S. Dampier, a citizen of Missouri.
Eugene J. Adams, a citizen of California.

Corp. Bidwell C. McClelland, Jr., a meritorious noncommissioned officer, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 30th day of June 1943.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 30th day of June 1943:

Benjamin W. Dulany, a citizen of Virginia.
Frederick Knoth, Jr., a citizen of New Jersey.
Benjamin H. Sweney, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 14th day of July 1943:

Alexander Kositch, a citizen of California.
Warren A. Butcher, a citizen of California.
Donald R. Hall, a citizen of Montana.
Odia "E" Howe, Jr., a citizen of California.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 28th day of July 1943:

Paul M. Hupf, a citizen of New York.
Robert A. Heath, a citizen of Indiana.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of August 1943:

Hugh C. Kiger, a citizen of North Carolina.
James P. Jacobson, a citizen of South Dakota.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate, September 21 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Joachim O. Fernandez, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Louisiana.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious Father in Heaven, Creator of the morning and our Guardian through the night, inspire us with the master spirit as we go to the labors of this day. As wickedness infernal is stalking the earth and chaos seething up from its depths, nerve our souls with Christian righteousness and justice. We rejoice that brute forces cannot triumph, because the Lord our God omnipotent reigneth; His hosts of freedom ever face a glorious tomorrow.

Blessed Lord, earth would grow cold without Thy ministrations, hope would die and life be disenchanted. We pray that we may keep the true way, having our thoughts pure and our deeds valiant, giving our faith a new emphasis, opening wells of inner vitality that rise to all eternity. In the name of our Master we pray that we may be clothed with those verities which temper and flame against the encompassing horrors of helpless humanity. Give us strength to watch every stroke and touch on the canvas of our daily lives; thus by our example our countrymen shall know that we are accepting our problems with honor and sacrifice and are determined to achieve the high aims of patriotic citizenship. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMUNICATION FROM CARLOS SAYAN ALVAREZ, PRESIDENT, CHAMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES OF PERU

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

[Translation]

SEAL OF CONGRESS OF PERU,
Lima, August 18, 1943.

The Honorable SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF NORTH AMERICA:

Engineer Federico Uranga, national representative for Pisco, who is traveling to the United States on a special government commission for the study of earth dams and problems of cooperative organizations, conveys also the greetings of the Peruvian representatives to the honorable Representatives of the United States of North America.

I beg Your Excellency to accept the expressions of cordial friendship which Representative Uranga bears, especially when he refers to our desire that the formidable strength of that great Nation may always serve to maintain the principles of justice and right in the world.

I avail myself of this opportunity to offer to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.

God guard Your Excellency.

CARLOS SAYAN ALVAREZ,
President, Chamber of Representatives of Peru.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

THE LATE JAMES HERBERT SINCLAIR

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a clipping from a Fargo, N. Dak., newspaper which announces the death on September 5 last of a distinguished former Member of this body, the Honorable James Herbert Sinclair.

The older Members will recall that their friend Sinclair was first elected in 1918 as a Member of the Sixty-sixth Congress and subsequently was reelected to each succeeding Congress until the Seventy-fourth.

After leaving Congress he remained in Washington and devoted considerable time to efforts to promote Missouri River diversion. He was later appointed a member of the Mexican Claims Commission, on which commission he rendered distinguished service.

Mr. Sinclair had been in failing health for some time prior to his death and was living in Miami, Fla., when the final summons came.

He is survived by his widow and two sons and two daughters, James H. Sinclair, Jr., of Kenmare, N. Dak.; Daniel Sinclair, of Dayton; Mrs. Wesley Bertelson, of La Crosse, Wis.; and Mrs. Harold Hannah, Cut Bank, Mont. He also leaves a sister, Miss Edith Sinclair, of Los Angeles, and a brother, W. D. Sinclair, of Hannaford, N. Dak.

Mr. Sinclair was born near St. Mary, Ontario, Canada, on October 9, 1871, and went to North Dakota Territory with his parents in 1883.

Those of us who remember his valiant championing of the causes nearest his heart, his untiring devotion to the interests of his constituency, and the distinction which attended each and every act of his as a Member of Congress join with the people of his State and with his family to mourn his passing.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, on September 5 of this month death claimed the Honorable James H. Sinclair, a former Member of this House from North Dakota. He was elected to the Sixty-sixth Congress and every succeeding Congress for 16 years.

He was my opponent in both the primary and general elections of 1934, but during those campaigns in referring to him I had nothing to say that was not complimentary.

James H. Sinclair was born at St. Mary, Ontario, Canada, October 9, 1871, and was therefore in his seventy-second year when he passed away. He was a

good man; honest, courageous. He also had another excellent quality that unfortunately is not possessed by all. He was thoughtful of others and would never advance his own interests if by doing so he knew it would injure someone else.

From 1935 he served on the Mexican Claims Commission by appointment by President Roosevelt.

It is unnecessary for me to recall to you older Members his service here in the House—you served with him during those many years, you knew him. To know him intimately, as you knew him, is to speak his praise.

North Dakota and the Nation have lost a truly outstanding citizen.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, indelibly filed away in the innermost recesses of the human mind there are records of former days and happy recollections which, though long forgotten, or seldom recalled, spring to life and memory in all their pristine clearness and beauty at the mention of a name or a glance at a printed page.

So, to all who knew him in the busy and useful days of his long and distinguished service in this Chamber the sad tidings of the passing of Jim Sinclair brings vividly to mind his many admirable traits of character and many pleasant associations with him in committee and on the floor.

He served on the Committee on Appropriations and was one of the most active and valuable members of the committee in a particularly critical period. Throughout his congressional career he rendered exceptional service to his constituency and his country. Few men have left so enviable a record in the annals of the House.

The day is just a little darker, the road is just a little steeper and the burden just a little heavier, knowing that he is gone.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much to hear of the death of Hon. James H. Sinclair, of North Dakota. He was a very able and forceful Member of this House and served here for many years.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations he was diligent, faithful, and always had in mind the interests of his State and his country. I have never known a Member who tried more persistently and more earnestly to serve his people. He will be greatly missed by all of those who came in contact with him.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two resolutions, one offered by the distinguished Governor of New York State, Mr. Dewey, with reference to the Polish celebration and another offered by the Supreme Council of the Knights of Columbus, at an international meeting held on August 19, 1943. I may add, Mr. Speaker, that these resolutions were sent to me by Mr. Tuszynski.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the T. V. A. yardstick and to include therein some excerpts from the report of the Electric Power Board of the city of Chattanooga, Tenn., together with some tables I have had compiled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Prairie Farmer, published in my State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a telegram from some of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next at the conclusion of the regular business in order for the day and after any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address I delivered before the Rotary Club in Chicago, and also to include a letter written to Mr. Fred M. Vinson, Stabilization Director.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]?

There was no objection.

Miss STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, on the labor record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article written by Ed A. Nowack, published in the Michigan Digest. I am advised by the Public Printer that this will require two and two-thirds pages of the RECORD at a cost of $120.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two speeches delivered at the Arkansas Flood Control Commission meeting at Fort Smith, Ark., on September 2. They will consume more than the allotted amount of space in the RECORD and the Government Printing Office advises that the cost will be $225.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include in my remarks a manuscript entitled "Planning for Liberty," the cost of which will be $495.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by our majority leader before the 1943 national encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans at Boston on August 16; and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein two editorials concerning our former Postmaster General.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter received from a constituent of mine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech delivered by Mr. Lucian W. Shaw, a tax authority, on the renegotiation of contracts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Army and Navy Register.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech by Mr. Clayton Rand before the Rotary Club of Gulfport, Miss., on The New Deal and Diocletian.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a former distinguished Member of this body, the Honorable John O'Connor, on the subject of the President's recent diatribe against Congress for seeking to dispense with the services of Watson, Dodd, and Lovett.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today and also tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PARTICIPATION IN WORLD PEACE

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 25.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, it is generally understood by statesmen everywhere that national foreign policy primarily seeks to forward the welfare of the nation adopting that policy. No doubt when Mr. Churchill approaches the problem as to whether or not Great Britain will enter into an international cooperative effort to establish and maintain peace he will first consider the interests of Great Britain; and when Mr. Stalin considers that problem, he will no doubt consider the interests of Russia. Likewise, when the Generalissimo of China considers that great problem, he will look first to the interests of China; and the Congress in the consideration of this resolution should look first to the interests of the United States.

I have decided myself to support the Fulbright resolution upon the ground that it is to the best interests of the United States to pass the resolution. I have come to that conclusion upon the basis of evidence. And what is that evidence? We all know that war is the curse of mankind. That has been proven to us time and time again, and every page in history testifies to that fact. We know that during the last 25 years we have had two world wars. We know that we depended upon our neutral rights and international law to preserve our neutrality during the first war, and we know that the people of the United States wanted to stay out of the First World War. However, notwithstanding that, we became involved. We know that thousands of youths of this land were killed on the battlefields of Europe and elsewhere.

We know that billions of the dollars of the taxpayers' money was spent that victory might be won in that war. Victory was won, and we turned to the problem of trying to evolve some plan to keep a world war from recurring. I do not intend to discuss here why those plans failed—why we did not enter into some form of cooperation in order that another world war might not come about; but that happened. We did not enter into world organization to preserve the peace. It was not entirely our fault; it was not entirely the fault of Great Britain, nor the fault of any other nation, but it was a combination of all of the faults of all the nations of the earth, each looking after its own selfish interests and not considering that a peaceful world would be for the best interests of each individual nation, in addition to being to the best interests of the world at large. So we went along for about 20 or 25 years, again depending upon international law to preserve peace, and this Congress decided to supplement international law by the passage of several neutrality acts, acts to circumscribe the rights of our own citizens in connection with their dealings and operations with foreign nations, and even some of the national rights of our citizens, because we felt it was worth paying that price to secure peace. We passed those neutrality laws, and the world went to war again, but the United States was out of it. Things moved along and this thing and that came up until the Congress decided that it should pass amendments to the neutrality law, and ended in finally repealing the neutrality laws. We then went back to nothing but international law in our efforts to preserve peace for the United States, but international law failed. Why? Because it was not backed up by force, or power to enforce its decrees. So now we are in the greatest war history has ever known. Only last year this Congress appropriated more of the taxpayers' money for the prosecution of this war than had ever been appropriated by the United States Congress from the time of George Washington until the end of the First World War, and today on all battlefields American boys are laying down their lives that victory may be secured for us. We know what is happening today, and what has happened in the past, and we know the future can be judged only by the past. So what are we going to do about it? Are we going to depend upon the reeds in the wind that failed us before? Or are we going to try to evolve some new means and blaze new paths in order that the scourge of mankind may never again visit this earth in the form that it is visiting it now? Some say that the lower House of Congress has nothing to do with this problem.

It is true, I admit, that, according to the Constitution of the United States, the power to ratify treaties rests in the Senate of the United States. But there is nothing in the law of the land, nothing in the Constitution that prohibits the lower House of Congress from asserting its views on this vital question.

Today we are considering the question of whether or not we will cooperate after this war with the other nations of the world to establish and maintain a joint organization with the purpose of preserving lasting peace. The Congress may not have the right to make agreements with foreign nations, but the Congress has had to deal with foreign nations. We only have to remember that we passed several neutrality acts to isolate ourselves from the machinations of foreign nations. I do not hesitate to say that I voted for those acts because I thought at that time they were for the best interests of the United States. But I have been disillusioned. This war has come. We are in it for better or worse. I reiterate that the question that should be uppermost in our minds today in consideration of this resolution is whether or not the Congress should take the responsibility of expressing to the world its united opinion that this great Government is willing to embark on new seas in its effort to preserve the peace in the future.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. RICHARDS. Some here have said that this House has no say-so as to the preservation of the peace after this war. Well, this House has had plenty to do with preparing this Nation for war and providing funds for the prosecution of the war. This House voted to declare war. This House voted to conscript the men and boys of our country to fight our battles.

We put rifles on their shoulders and sent them to foreign fields to die there. Why then should not this Congress express its opinion in regard to the prevention of future wars?

After this world war is over we will even vote to appropriate some money to build a monument over there in Arlington Cemetery and inscribe the words on that monument: "Here lies in honored glory another American soldier, known but to God."

It is my belief that could the American soldier speak who lies over there now, a hero of the last war, he would say to us today that he would much rather that we erect as a memorial to him a solidified effort on the part of the United States to sponsor some form of cooperative international organization in order that this outrage on humanity will never happen again.

This Congress is blazing new trails today. No such resolution has ever been presented here before. But the daring must blaze new trails, and the Congress of the United States should lead in the blazing of this particular trail.

The old saying, "He either fears his fate too much, or his deserts are small, that dares not put it to the touch to win or lose it all," applies to the Congress of the United States and to nations everywhere as it does to individuals.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, after having listened to the arguments pro and con on the Fulbright resolution as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I favor its passage because I believe it is in the right direction toward the formulation of plans for a permanent and lasting peace. In my opinion it is a definite step toward the elimination of future conflicts, which is certainly foremost in the thoughts of every American citizen.

During my recent stay at home with the people of my district, they emphasized to me that the steps such as are planned through this resolution are right and they are wholly in accord with my vote on this momentous legislation. They also are of the opinion that we should collaborate with other countries of peace-loving people, and by doing so thus strive to eliminate any cause for discord in the future.

It is the desire of every American, as well as all the people of the world, to look forward to permanent peace and a better place for the present and future generations to live in, that the valor and sacrifices of our men in arms in the present war shall not have been in vain.

On the passage of this resolution I am of the belief that this will fulfill the wish and desire of every man and woman and, through its provisions, will establish a key to stop any future futile aggressions that are so devastating to the civilization of the world.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to the subject at hand, I quote the pending resolution as now proposed:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes.

While this resolution contemplates peace among all the nations of the world and would, therefore, bless all peoples everywhere, the consideration that it is designed to bless our own people and to save them from the horrors of another or other wars is not to be forgotten; and he who would be so narrow and selfish as to deny these blessings to our own country because other nations and peoples may be likewise benefited and saved can hardly claim to be America's best friend and therefore an American first.

It has surely been demonstrated that our refusal to help secure the peace of the world will not contribute to the peace or security of our own Nation. It is written, "No man liveth unto himself, and no man dieth unto himself."

The light that shines farthest shines brightest nearer home.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, commits us to seek peace at home and peace abroad; these being shown to be inseparable.

As an American first but with a concern for the welfare and peace of the world I shall gladly support this resolution.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, in supporting the Fulbright resolution today, I do so as I feel it is the necessary and logical first chapter of a charter of peace. It is the starting point from which the Congress and the Executive, together, can go on to establish the basic requirements for international peace.

I think the fact is well established by history, by our own experience within the last 25 years, to prove that without international cooperation we cannot hope for lasting peace. Otherwise we must follow in the same old paths that have always led to war.

In passing this resolution today, the Congress is merely catching up with the thinking of the people of this Nation. They are for international cooperation and are determined that we do not again fumble the chance for peace after World War No. 2. By its passage, we will assure our own people and those of other lands that we in Congress do not intend to repeat the tragic mistakes of World War No. 1.

By our agreement today on the question of international cooperation, we will have arrived at the point where the Congress, if it chooses to aid the Executive, then can limit and specify the particulars necessary for the outline of an enforcible and an enduring peace. Without this agreement now, the discussion of the mechanics and the organization is futile.

I am anxious for the House of Representatives to speak on this vital issue. Foreign policy, after all, broken down to its real meaning, means national security. I am unwilling to surrender to 33 Members of the Senate, one-third of that body, the life or death veto over the security of future generations of Americans.

After the passage of this resolution, I feel it is the duty of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House to consider other and more specific plans to make possible the bringing about of the objectives of this resolution. The American people are for this ideal and they wait on their Congress for us to provide the minimum specifics of such an international organization. It is true that they want no superstate. But they do want a good neighborhood of nations and they feel that it is not asking too much of their elected representatives for us to try to work out such a plan.

I disagree completely with those who say that we ought to wait until the war is won before we discuss the ways and means for peace. It would be just as idiotic for us to wait—as it would have been for the admirals and the generals to wait until we were attacked at Pearl Harbor before making plans on how to fight a war. If we are to avoid those tragic words of "too little and too late" at the peace table, it is high time that the Congress acts, not only on this resolution, but on others to follow.

By taking action now we can tell the rest of the world and particularly those who suffer under Nazi aggression that this time the United States will not withdraw after the fighting and permit the peace to be lost by lesser nations or lesser statesmen. We can make a real contribution to military success by our affirmative action now. We can remove, by acting now, this vital question of national security from the arena of partisan politics into which it would drift by next year. We can also provide, while the common danger of 80 percent of the civilized world holds us together as United Nations, the framework of judicial machinery for adjusting the myriad disputes that are bound to grow out of the transition of the world from war to peace. Those problems will be on the doorstep with the armistice whether we have international cooperation or not. And you had better have the means for the peaceful arbitration of them available before the magnitude of the problems stare you in the face.

I believe the House is wise in taking affirmative action on the Fulbright resolution today. I hope then, with its passage, that the Foreign Affairs Committee will consider some such resolution as S. 114, by Senators BALL, BURTON, HATCH, and HILL, to work out the limited and specific authority necessary and to provide a framework within which an enduring peace can be secured.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I doubt the wisdom of this Nation, through its Congress, making definite commitals now which might weaken or embarrass us in dealing with the questions which will inevitably arise as a result of the present world conflict.

I am not fully advised as to the motives inspiring consideration of this resolution at this particular time but certainly its terms are so broad and general that I cannot construe it as any such committal.

Machinery under this resolution in order to be appropriate must contain the essential elements of ample wisdom and unselfish singleness of purpose in addition to power and it is difficult to visualize the creation of such perfectly balanced machinery by any agency other than the Divine Creator Himself. I consider, therefore, that this body in approving this resolution is only reaffirming in a general way its faith in the Christian ideals upon which our civilization is founded, and I am voting for its adoption.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, if a piece of legislation was ever presented to this House which has resulted in a disease among the Members best diagnosed as a "diarrhea of words and constipation of the brain," this Fulbright resolution is it.

Many of the supposed intellectuals of the House have spewed words by the hundreds, condemning and openly admitting that it is fallacious and in reality only a mirage. In other words, they are alibiing and making excuses for voting to accept the resolution.

One respected and distinguished Member, who is certainly old enough to have his feet on the ground, very rightly asserted, "I cannot get it, to save my life, why we are now engaged in a discussion of a thing which everybody says will have no effect on the immediate winning of the war or can bind our judgment or influence our attitude when the time for action comes." Within a very few minutes, he went into a tail spin and openly made an about face. "A wise man changes his mind; a fool never," you say. Well, in my opinion, it was a "foolbright" resolution that caused this wise man to about face and not any merits of the Fulbright measure.

What did the author of this resolution, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] say on the floor yesterday? And I quote:

> If this resolution is adopted, the Executive can negotiate as to details with assurance that the people are willing to support any reasonable system of collective security.

What is reasonable collectivism? We have seen it foisted upon the American people in many forms during the past few years in this country. To those doing the foisting, it no doubt seems reasonable, but to those who are being foisted upon, it seems anything but reasonable.

Peace and cooperation with the nations of the earth, certainly; but how in the name of sanity can we be engaged in total war, teaching our young men to hate and to kill, with an olive branch held between their teeth? We as human beings cannot react rationally when two great emotions are surging within us at one and the same time. First, win the war and then, with hatred and killing banished from our hearts and our thinking, sit down with the one emotion of brotherly love and cooperation in our hearts and work out a permanent peace for all the world.

One Member has said that there can be no peace without America participating and I heartily agree, but neither can there be a global war without our help, and if we had been strong internally and had not been so anxious to furnish the munitions of war to countries which we knew were preparing for war, just for the sake of amassing fortunes in this country, we would not be at war today.

But regardless of whether we went around with a chip on our shoulders daring someone to knock it off, we are at war and must and will win at all costs. But in the name of common sense, let us stick to the two immediate problems before us now. First, win the war; and secondly, do our utmost to save the home front, and then, when this has been accomplished, lend our efforts to the program of working out a better and more permanent civilization, and let us not waste 2 days of our time and the taxpayers' money considering "foolbright resolutions" which will have no more effect on determining the peace which England will demand and Russia will get, than these remarks of mine will have.

What we need in America is another member of the President's Cabinet designated as the secretary of peace, just as well as a Secretary of War.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, on the floor of the House, the question was asked why we should consider the Fulbright resolution now before the war is won. The answer it seems to me is obvious. Our post-war policies are now being formulated. The issue is already on our doorstep. The administration is not waiting until the war is won but is determining our post-war policies almost daily.

Let us examine the record. We have already had a refugee conference in Bermuda. Do you or I know what commitments were made at that conference? No. They are so secret they are not to be imparted even to the members of your Foreign Affairs Committee although the chairman was the delegate to that conference from the House.

We all recall the food conference which was held just before the Congress recessed. The sessions were secret and the press and Members of Congress were barred. What commitments were made there or post-war promises? Who knows? Do you as Members of Congress know? Is it not high time we begin now to take an interest in post-war policies? If we do not we will wake up one of these days and find our course of action in post-war matters has already been determined for us without any initial approval of the Congress. We will find commitments have been made and the only time we will be consulted concerning them is when we are asked to appropriate money for the administration of the international agencies and to carry out their purpose.

Let me point out a specific example which is in the process of being carried out right now. On June 10 the State Department gave out a press release that there was soon to be called, probably the last of September or early in October, a rehabilitation conference of the United Nations. The original draft, which I understand is now being changed, provided for each country to send a delegate to this international council. There was to be a central committee composed of Great Britain, Russia, China, and the United States, and an international director. This central committee and the international director were evidently going to be the "big shots" of the organization. Whether this met with objections from the smaller countries I do not know but at least the original draft is in the process of being changed.

Incidentally there was to be a committee for Europe and a committee for Asia. Since we are not geographically a part of these areas it might well be we would not be a member of these subcommittees. But there was to be created another committee upon which you can bet your bottom dollar we will be well represented, and that is the committee on supplies. We will be counted on to do our full share even in the face of rationing which is almost certain to be continued long after the war.

Apparently the powers that be decided it was necessary to soften up our people to such a program, so through the O. W. I. there was an appeal made to the radio industry to assist in such a program. The appeal was very subtle. They were asked to publicize the second anniversary of the signing of the Atlantic Charter, which was about the middle of August. But in making this request of the radio industry the O. W. I. did not confine itself to calling attention to the actual contents of the Atlantic Charter but proceeded to give its own unwarranted interpretation of it. This in spite of the fact we all know the sole function of the O. W. I. is to furnish the American people with the true, unvarnished facts.

The O. W. I. stated in substance that in the Atlantic Charter we had guaranteed the world should be free from want, and the time had now come when we should set up the international institutions to carry out these economic promises. They also stated the Atlantic Charter had been formally ratified by the United Nations. We all know the Congress has never approved the Atlantic Charter, or in any way been called on to carry out its provisions. The same is true of foreign countries. Take the case of Russia. Maxim Litvinov agreed to the terms of the Atlantic Charter for Russia and he has now been recalled. Whether his action is still approved is a question.

Fulton Lewis called attention to these facts in a most forceful manner in a recent radio broadcast, and proved conclusively there was no promise or guaranty on our part that the world should be free from want in the Atlantic Charter, nor was it formally ratified by the United Nations.

But is it not significant just before a rehabilitation conference the O. W. I. is attempting to sell our people the erroneous idea we guaranteed and promised the people of the world they should be free from want in the Atlantic Charter? More so because the extent of our participation in such a rehabilitation conference is to be determined without the initial approval of Congress, and its only duty apparently will be to provide the necessary funds to carry out the program.

There is also being formulated right now a plan for post-war stabilization of international credit.

There is also being considered the removal of international trade barriers under section VII of every master agreement we have entered into under Lend-Lease.

There has been set up a committee composed of a number of assistant secretaries of the Cabinet to plan for post-war aviation.

There are also those in high place who right now would like to see our country join a super world government, and transform the world into a glorified W. P. A. Has not the time arrived when we should begin to beware of the kind of a man who is "a steady patriot of the world alone, the friend of every country but his own."

Under these circumstances, how can the Congress sit back and say, "Wait until the war is over before we start doing anything about post-war planning"? We, the Congress, are not leading the parade. It is passing us by.

Is your Foreign Affairs Committee being asked to approve bills requesting authorization of Congress to join these international agencies? Are we asked to what extent we should participate in a rehabilitation program? All we will be told some day is that certain commitments and promises to foreign governments have been made, and it would be most embarrassing and undesirable for Congress not to make the necessary appropriations to carry out the promises in which Congress had no voice of approval or dissent.

Was not that exactly what happened in the recent Panama Canal bill? Did not the State Department go ahead and make an executive agreement with the Republic of Panama to cancel a loan and give her certain property belonging to the United States, amounting in all to over $12,000,000? Were we asked to approve this action before it had been agreed on? No. We were told the agreements were made and it would be most embarrassing in the midst of a war, and with Panama cooperating so sincerely, not to approve the action taken by the State Department.

Do not you think it is about time we take an interest in post-war problems by passing the Fulbright resolution, and also insist that the Congress not be bypassed in post-war planning?

I am fully aware of the prerogatives of the Chief Executive in foreign affairs, and of the Senate in confirming treaties. I am not suggesting we Members of the House should trespass on these prerogatives, but I am urging the closest cooperation between the Chief Executive, the State Department, and Congress so that these proposed post-war commitments, wherever feasible, will have the approval or disapproval of the appropriate legislative body before commitments are made, and that we not be asked only to appropriate the necessary funds to make these commitments an accomplished fact.

Perhaps I am too hopeful this can be accomplished, but if I am it is all the more reason why we should insist it be done.

We all realize what happened after the last war. A certain course of action was proposed which never received the approval of the Senate. We all know the result. Let us not make that mistake again. This time we should insist on a united front by threshing out our differences ahead of time on post-war policy and formulate a policy on which the vast majority can agree and which will preserve the best interests of the Republic by establishing a just and lasting peace.

By passing the Fulbright resolution we can serve notice on the world that it is at least our intention to bring about such a peace.

We all realize how delicate foreign relations are in the midst of a war. It is easy to wonder whether this nation or that nation is doing her full part, or will continue to do so after the war. Let us at least declare we are willing to try to do our part now. Whether this will be helpful to the Allied cause is best answered by a question I asked Mr. Edward R. Murrow, European representative of the Columbia Broadcasting System, who appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee when he returned to this country in June. At that time I asked him how the passage of the Fulbright resolution would be received in England and if he thought it would be helpful? He said:

> Well, sir, it would be more than that, and not only in England. There isn't anyone in England now who any longer has any doubts we are going to win this war. There are people not only in England but on the Continent as well who have serious doubts as to our will and determination to win the peace. But this would serve to remove most of those doubts in England and particularly the people who come from the Continent; I do not think anyone who has failed to talk to those people can appreciate the extent to which American policy dominates their hopes and their aspirations and it would give them encouragement and hope. I am not presuming to pass any judgment on the bill. I am only reporting what its effect would be.

What we all are interested in is not only to realize our responsibility to the world in attempting to secure a just and lasting peace but even more important to realize our responsibility to the people of the United States and the future of our country. We all want complete victory and a secure peace. But we want also a secure United States of America, a sovereign nation with its constitutional form of government, and our American way of life preserved and maintained.

It is my hope we can have both—a just and lasting peace and still keep America American.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am impelled to vote against the Fulbright resolution that Congress favor the setting up of international machinery with power to establish and maintain peace among the nations of the world.

It seems to me the lower House is attempting here to perform a function which does not properly belong to it. The subject matter of this resolution deals specifically with treaties. The Constitution definitely vests in the President the "power to make treaties," but only "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." I think this is sufficient reason for voting against this resolution.

The phrase in the Fulbright resolution, "international machinery with power adequate to establish and maintain * * * peace among the nations of the world * * * participation by the United States therein," can mean but one thing, namely, creation of an international police force, with the United States participating, for maintaining an armed peace among the nations of the world. In my opinion, this is no time for the United States to be making any such commitments as this. There are entirely too many unknown factors at this juncture to safely undertake the formulation of so far-reaching and revolutionary a policy as this would involve.

Moreover, those of us who take the position that the peace treaty should be made in strict conformity with the Constitution can hardly be consistent when at the same time we vote for the Fulbright resolution. It would be wholly incongruous to attempt to stand on constitutionalism in the writing of the peace, on the one hand, and to vote for the Fulbright resolution, on the other, since this resolution seeks to perform a duty which the Constitution vests exclusively in the upper Chamber.

It may be expected the Senate will uphold its constitutional prerogative.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this concurrent resolution so ably considered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and other members of the Foreign Affairs Committee is well conceived and carefully composed. To agree with its objective, to favor its purpose is easy. Is it possible there could be a Member of the Congress opposed to lasting peace? To place this idealistic conception in practical operation is the job that is difficult. When the time comes that will require greatness.

But here, now, we are not concerned with details of this later most complex task. Here we are concerned with an expression of general policy.

Is it not possible for us here to place our eyes on the sights and aim at the objective of lasting peace, and somehow conceive the beam on which we must fly to reach this goal? Certainly we can try. The beam we must travel, the method we must use, the final action we take are considerations of tremendous importance to our country; upon the paths chosen, the beams followed, will America stand as the greatest power in the world or stand as an average power subjected to the will of more powerful nations or combination of nations? Power is never static: it is either increasing or decreasing.

Ten million men and women are now fighting the battle for America. Upon them and them alone rests the final decision as to whether the action we express today can have any meaning at all. They are fighting, they are not talking. They are dying and willing to die for the America they believe in.

It is what they believe in, and believe in so strongly, that is tremendously important. It is the America they want. The world order they desire, the place of America in the world of the future they are fighting for, that must be considered. Before this Congress or any Congress or any representative of this Government can justly bind this America of ours to any details of plans or methods involving the future these factors must be known.

I believe the views of the organized fighting men and women of this country must be heard and most carefully considered.

That privilege is their right. Details therefore necessarily must be left to a later day. The ideal expressed in the Fulbright resolution is in the right direction.

It was dreams and ideals which brought about the discovery of America.

It was dreams and ideals that brought the early settlers to America. It was dreams and ideals that brought about a free America. It was the dreams and ideals of a little group of Americans who wrought the pattern of a free American Government, which has been the wonder and envy of the entire world.

It is the ideals and dreams and high honor of the men and women in our services that give them the strength and courage to lay down their very lives that American freedom may live.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, this morning the press reported that the vote taken on the resolution which was considered yesterday was indicative of what would happen on the pending resolution. I have some different ideas about the resolution we discussed yesterday and I am frank to admit to this body and to others that I was one of those who are recorded among the 23 because I wanted to avail myself of the opportunity to protest against this manner of consideration of the most important problem before the American people and before the world. I have been out on the hustings this summer exhorting my people to think, to talk, to discuss peace and peace proposals. I have asked them to discuss it freely. Then we return here to be confronted with the rather astonishing situation that we should vote to bind our own hands, to shackle our own voices for a period of 4 hours on the most important problem before the world. It was said here yesterday that we must not let the people down. It occurs to me that that is letting the people down. It is said that we should trust the people. I thoroughly agree. But we begin by distrusting each other as this method of consideration indicates because it is impossible to amend or alter the pending resolution in any way whatsoever to make it more expressive. The first value of a resolution of this kind is in the discussions that go with the explorations which this body can make. There must be preparation for peace as well as of peace, and through discussion here we make preparation for peace and give opportunity for public thinking to congeal.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] remarked yesterday that this might not be in the interest of unity because there are hundreds of propagandizing organizations in the country today. How else offset them except by the voice of this body and to indicate at length and through fullest discussion what notions we entertain and what course we believe ought to be followed?

Congress invites public reproach by such hasty action as this. It will be a case of 4 hours' discussion in the House and 4 months in the Senate. How can such action be defended in a deliberative body?

That is just the reason that I protested. And I see in this that we are going to have to fight for peace and that enduring peace is going to have much to endure before we get through.

The point that will be belabored here and has been belabored here on yesterday, in my judgment, needed no belaboring. I think the people are generally sold on the idea that we have to collaborate with other nations of the earth. We must collaborate on a practical basis. We must do our full share in the cause of lasting peace. The idea of cooperation needs no emphasis. It is the method and approach which count now. The time has come to spell out in greater detail what we propose to do. There is the oft-repeated phrase that everything will be so different at the end of the war and that nothing can be done now. I disagree. The world, its people and the fundamental questions to be settled will not differ greatly from what we can now see. Then why not a more realistic approach now to avoid differences, misunderstandings, and quarrels in the days to come?

I am a little distressed with what I call this nebular way in which we write resolutions. When I came back from Mackinac and landed in Chicago I picked up the morning papers. No two editorials agreed on what we did. One editorial said:

> A conspiracy nailed at Mackinac.

Another editorial said:

> Republicans travel in the middle of the wrong road.

A third editorial said:

> Republicans pass the customary resolution.

I thought I had a pretty fair idea when I came back of what we had done and I spelled it out to the editors in my own district and tried to make it clear—the very nub of the resolution—in which our good friend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] so well collaborated and did such a fine job and I stood with him on it.

The time is here for us to make it abundantly clear what we propose to do and what we intend. Think of the scores of questions which have been asked on this floor as to what this resolution means. I favor saying something purposeful and definite even though it be wrong.

We have got to make it clear to the people what we are going to do. We are not doing it. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] said yesterday that some people think this goes too far, others think it is innocuous, and therefore it must be a middle-of-the-road course. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] said yesterday that it was a declaration favoring machinery with adequate power, and that it might mean military power in the future. I am ready to embrace the doctrine of force if necessary, but why not say so to the people instead of keeping them in a state of suspense and then having them wonder what the Congress really did? Is it not time that we spell out our intent so that all will know what we mean? The faith and confidence of the people is the only rock upon which we can stand.

The time has come to speak; it will be too late to speak when the Russians are in Berlin because the day for understanding will have passed. I am ready now for a declaration of peace aims because I do not want to see happen what happened after the last war. Yet, how can public sentiment be tested on such a proposition? Congress has deliberately gagged itself and cannot speak.

It was not the Senate, it was the fact that the people had no chance to be prepared that occasioned our difficulties a generation ago and so the peacemakers became the prisoners of public opinion. They will be in the same fix again unless we make clear what we are saying today. So I do not go along with this opinion that it means nothing, that all people can stand on this document. The time has come to say something, and I may say to the gentleman from New Jersey that I am in his corner on that score.

I favor collaboration, organized justice, the curbing and prevention of military aggression, the disarmament of Axis Powers, a clarification of peace aims now before it is too late, a strong United States Army and Navy, the use of constitutional processes, and the preservation of our national interests. Why not say so in language that all can understand? Must language be used to obscure rather than reveal our intent? Peace will come from the bottom up, not from the top down and the time is here to let the people know what we mean that they might speak their minds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMASON). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I take sufficient time to ask the gentleman from Illinois how he is going to vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am going to vote for the resolution. I would rather go further than that, but I cannot help myself since there is no opportunity under

the procedure employed to offer any amendment or suggestion.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with the statement of the gentleman from Illinois that the action the Congress will take today will be important. I certainly cannot agree with him however when he put before this House the proposition that we ought at this time to start discussing all of the details of the coming peace—and that is what I believe he wants to put forward. In fact, he wants to discuss—I think he said—a blueprint of what our aspirations should be, what we should demand, what we should give other nations and how we should go about starting to make the peace immediately. I certainly do not think this is the time for Congress to start blueprinting the peace.

Mr. Speaker, the House by action which it is going to take today will, I hope, take the first step in a continuing line of steps in the process of making contributions toward the future peace of the world. This day may, in fact, become a historic one; insofar as I am able to learn, this branch of the Congress has never before taken similar action. We are saying to our soldiers, our sailors, our marines, and to all others in the armed services, to the people of this country, as well as to the peoples of all the world, that it is the heart and spirit of the Members of this body that there shall never again be a time such as the one we are now passing through. We further say that we believe it is possible to prevent a recurrence of the present tragedy.

Our first and immediate task, of course, is the defeat of those evil forces which have thrust this horror upon the world. In this task, no one will deny that our country is contributing a heroic share—perhaps even playing the decisive role.

Now that the signs point along the road to eventual victory, of almost as great, if not as great, importance is the task, and I should say the immediate task, of beginning to lay the ground work for that peaceful world for which we all fervently hope. I know of no better way to make a beginning than by a declaration that this great Nation desires to collaborate and cooperate with all other nations of similar good will and good intentions to the end that that goal may be achieved.

I cannot agree with the proposal of some distinguished Members that this country should sit back and do nothing whatever until the war is over. Should this advice be followed, upon the signing of an armistice, the world would be confronted with indescribable chaos thrust upon it without any thought or preparation having been made for the preservation of temporary order, and many portions of the world would be confronted with all the horrors of anarchy.

Mr. Speaker, we in America like to say that the United States is the most powerful and leading nation of the world. Leadership does not come from power alone, but power nearly always comes from leadership. This great Nation is in duty bound, because of its position in the affairs of the world at this time, to take upon itself leadership in the great and noble task of attempting to bring about such a spirit of collaboration, good will, and security among the nations so that each individual, serene in mind and soul, can pursue peaceful pursuits, undisturbed by thoughts of hated and impending wars.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania yields back 2 minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, at this juncture, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by inserting an editorial on the United States foreign policy by Mr. Walter Lippmann.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe, as some who have spoken have stated, that this is a trifling thing we are doing here today. It is of extreme importance, perhaps the most important vote that we may cast in this Congress, because we are asserting our fundamental foreign policy for the future. I think it wise that this should be initiated in the House of Representatives because the House has been traditionally closer to the people than any other agency of government. This step should be taken now because after the war the comradeship which the United Nations have found in fighting together may well be dissipated and after the war we may also find a situation in which if we have not taken action ourselves, the other nations will ally against us. It is important also that the United States rather than the other nations initiate this program for two reasons:

One is largely historic. The nations of Europe are by their geographic position closely intertwined in their destinies. For them, unlike ourselves, the choice is not between isolationism or participation in an association of nations. Their only choice is an alliance between several nations based upon power politics or an association of all the nations. Without America, this association will be impossible. Our choice, on the other hand, is between isolation and association.

Our traditional foreign policy of isolationism served us well until the turn of the century. Now we realize it is out of date and no longer serves our best interests. However, it is well to tell the nations of the world, and we should take the initiative in doing this, that we have abandoned this policy and have decided that the best policy for us in the future in order to protect our national interest is to combine with the other nations of the world in the hope that we may be able to prevent future world wars.

The other reason we should initiate this program of participation is constitutional, and is due to the division of power as to treaties between the President and Congress which is characteristic of our Government. Congress should lay down the broad policies which the President may follow in negotiations. This will afford some guaranty of a sympathetic reception by Congress when it passes upon the finished product. Neither England with its parliamentary government, nor Russia with its autocracy, need any guidance by their legislatures, because neither must submit a peace treaty to its legislature for ratification.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, like all other Members of the House, I have given this resolution and its ramifications serious and prolonged thought. I have listened carefully and intently to the debate here yesterday and today. I have discussed the matter off the floor with many of my colleagues and with intelligent citizens in my district and elsewhere. From this consideration of the question a few things stand out clear:

Every rational person in this country wants to make sure, if it is humanly possible, that we shall have an enduring peace after this war is won. Most persons think the United States made a serious mistake in not cooperating, in some manner, with the other nations of the world in safeguarding peace after the First World War, though I do not think anyone can say with certainty that a majority of the people of the country favored our participation in the League of Nations at the time that question was up for determination. This time, the people do not want to take any chance on having a similar mistake made. They definitely and, I think, almost unanimously favor some sort of an international system that will prevent another outbreak of hostilities for as long a period as we can safeguard against it.

In seeking to achieve this devoutly desired goal, however, I am absolutely positive that our loyal and patriotic American men and women, who love and cherish our form of Government and way of life, and who have enjoyed so many blessings of all kinds under our Constitution and democratic institutions, are not willing to surrender any of our national sovereignty nor submit to any impingement of our exclusive control of our domestic affairs. They believe, and rightly so, that we in America can cooperate with other peoples throughout the world in setting up peace machinery that will function efficiently and successfully without yielding to any of the other peoples any right to dictate or determine how we shall operate our own exclusively governmental machinery.

The very delicacy of the problem involved, and the time and thought that are necessary, in designing and building the international machinery that will be capable of establishing and maintaining a fair and just peace, constitute the motivating force behind the present desire to set in motion before the war is over the effort to effect a harmonious under-

standing between the 32 United Nations that will be reflected in the treaties and covenants to be written at the peace conference. Our people do not think that we can afford to wait until the war is over and the delegates take their seats at the peace table to begin to talk about the kind of peace we are going to have. They think it is imperative that we proceed without delay to weigh and determine the problems involved and seek to devise solutions that can be incorporated in formal agreements when the time comes.

That brings us to the resolution before the House today. It embodies the wish of virtually all of our people that the United States say to the world that we are as determined to win the peace as we are to destroy the Axis aggressors. It is an expression of the sentiment of the Congress that the work of peace should be begun while the task of victory is in the process of accomplishment.

But it would be a gross violation of the people's wishes to say that there is any purpose to clothe anybody with blanket authority to establish peace machinery other than through and in strict accordance with the provisions and restrictions of the Constitution. It merely says to those who will represent the United States at the peace conference that we want a lasting peace, and we realize this will require the participation of the United States in its establishment and maintenance, but that Congress still must have its constitutional part in the framing of the terms, and whatever they do must be brought back to Congress, either to the Senate in the form of a treaty or treaties or to both Houses in the form of a concurrent resolution or resolutions. If anyone undertakes to interpret this resolution as a mandate to do any particular thing or to bind this Government in any manner, that person will be departing from the spirit and the letter of the resolution.

I think this debate has made it so plain that there is no possibility of misunderstanding that there is no grant of power to the Executive; we have the direct word of the author of the resolution for that in his remarks today. There is no direction to enter into any alliance. There is no implied authorization to set up any world W. P. A.

It also should be emphasized as a matter of record that there is no commitment, direct or implied, on the part of any Member of the House that because of his vote in support of this resolution he will vote for or support any plan or proposal brought back to the Congress for ratification or approval. Each and every one of us is left entirely free to follow his own judgment and the dictates of his own conscience, if and when he is called upon in the future to pass on the merits or advisability of any tentative agreement entered in or any arrangement made by representatives of the United States with representatives of other nations.

To sum up, most of our people strongly favor some intelligent and energetic effort to establish and maintain a fair, just, and enduring peace. A majority here apparently feel that this resolution is a reflection of that sentiment and a step in the desired direction. Some have apprehended that it might be interpreted as a blank check to the Executive in making peace. That fear has been dissipated by the assurances that now are a matter of official record. Others have thought that perhaps by voting for the resolution they would be committing themselves to support any kind of peace terms agreed upon at the international council table or any kind of system proposed to be set up to maintain peace. We likewise are definitely assured that such is not the case; that we will retain complete freedom of action on any proposals later submitted.

In the light of those facts and assurances and because this expression on the part of the Congress would be encouraging to the other United Nations and helpful in promoting unity among those seeking a lasting peace, I believe this resolution should be passed.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, some time ago before the Fulbright resolution was presented to the House I sent out a questionnaire to several thousand people in my district in order to ascertain their views on various important and pressing public questions. One of the questions which I asked read as follows:

> Do you favor participating with other nations in some sort of international organization which would be effective in preventing aggression and for the maintenance of peace after this war has been won?

It was interesting to me to observe that more people answered that question than any other question on my questionnaire, which included 33 questions, and it was even more interesting to observe that of those who did answer it 93 percent said "Yes." In so doing it will be evident that, though neither they nor I was conscious of it at the time, they were in effect giving approval to the Fulbright resolution.

I have wondered why so overwhelming a majority expressed themselves as they did. And I think it was basically because the ordinary people of the world pay such a terrific price whenever a war takes place. Americans will do that. They can do it and they will do it through patriotic motives and love of country alone, if necessary. But it helps a great deal if people can see a hope ahead and if they can feel that their sacrifice is not only for the defense of their Nation's life but also a means of building positive gains for their children in the future.

As I conceive it, the most important single job this Congress has to do is the prevention of future wars. I cannot see that the bringing of this resolution into the House of Representatives is a matter of no significance, as some people have said. If I am correct, and I believe I am, this will be the first time that the House of Representatives has made a pronouncement of this character on the foreign policy of our country. In my opinion, it is altogether fitting and proper that we should do so. Nor can I see how it can possibly be interpreted as some have attempted to interpret it as a surrender of any of the prerogatives or rights of the Congress. On the contrary, it seems to me that it is an assertion by this House that we recognize that we, too, have a share of the responsibility for preventing future wars and for guiding our country's action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if we assume, and I think we must, that our paramount and primary duty is to keep faith with the men who are winning this war by helping to build a peace that will prevent a similar world tragedy every 25 or 30 years then we may ask, How can that be done? Well, I confess to being one of those people who hoped most earnestly before Pearl Harbor or at least up until a few months before Pearl Harbor that by means of staying in our own corner of the world we might avoid involvement in war. But we have to learn from experience. The isolationist method of attempting to keep America out of war has been proven to be inadequate in this small world, and we do live in a small world. If the experience of the past 30 years proves anything I believe it proves that.

The second possibility is the bringing about of some kind of an alliance between our country and maybe Great Britain or some other single nation and thus assembling and keeping assembled a military force so overwhelming as to be able to maintain peace. The danger in such a course, to say nothing of its overwhelming expense, is certainly very obvious. Inevitably it would lead to growing resentment in the rest of the world and to the formation of counter-alliances in the old balance of power fashion. Peace has never been maintained for long that way.

The only other alternative that exists is the alternative offered by the general policy contained in the Fulbright resolution—the policy of substituting for continual conflict an international order based on equity and on law. For this reason I believe it is our duty to pass this resolution.

It alone will of course not assure peace. Indeed before we can expect any organization for the preservation of peace to have any hope of success we must root out and deal with the basic causes of war, the sources of conflict. But that too can be done.

I know there will be some who will say it cannot be done. They will contend that there have always been wars and always will be. I simply do not believe they can be right. For this war is proving that a continuance of this sort of destruction will mean the utter destruction of such progress as man has made in thousands of years. Win it we must, whatever the cost. But having won it, it must stay won not for our own sakes alone but for the sake of all mankind. And who is to say that all the history of the upward climb of man along a path stony, steep, and difficult, a climb on which he has been led by the

unseen hand of a providence that aided mankind well—who is to say the end of that long path is a precipice over which we are foreordained to plunge ourselves. No. To believe that is to deny the whole purpose of human life. God has made possible a better fate for us if we but have vision to see.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the remarks made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]. We are at war. The all important thing for us to do is to win that war. Our sons are giving their lives and limbs on foreign battlefields. This is no time for creating disunity not only of the American people but of our allies.

I also agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] that this resolution is either a blank check that will come home to plague us or it is a fraud and deception. I feel that it is both a blank check and political camouflage. It can serve no useful purpose. No one now knows what the terms of peace will be or what the "adequate power" mentioned in the resolution is to be used for.

We went into this war to protect the smaller nations against aggressor nations. Now suppose that at the end of this war that some nation should insist upon taking over these smaller nations. Is this "adequate power" to be used to keep these smaller nations under subjugation? These are problems that we can only decide after the war is won and the peace terms known.

I, too, have mingled with the people during the so-called recess. I have spoken to large crowds in several States. I have been on the trains most of the time. I have stood in trains crowded with soldiers without a seat. I know that the American people and the men in service are sick and tired of having Congress hand out blank checks for financial or political purposes to the "give-me Jimmies" of the world. These servicemen are more concerned with what is going to be done for them when they return than they are with policing the world after they have won this war.

It is so easy to deceive ourselves by wishful thinking. We all want permanent peace, but, unfortunately, mere words will not bring about that result. As I listened yesterday to the appeals of some of my colleagues I wondered whether they were placing the welfare of their Nation above their own political welfare. I do not believe that any Member of this House is foolish enough to believe that the passing of this resolution will bring about permanent peace.

Throughout the ages there has been, and will be, a desire for permanent peace. Yet the institution of war is as old as man. It had its inception when Cain arose and slew his brother Abel. The world has been cursed with it ever since. It is the hope of all that war may be ultimately abolished, but to jump from the frying pan into the fire is no solution. That will not bring about permanent peace but may bring about permanent friction and war.

There were many "one worlders" before. The idea of bringing about permanent peace by force was tried by Augustus Caesar, Alexander the Great, Charlemagne, Napoleon, and now by Hitler and lesser satellites but it always failed. The very idea of force means war. The very idea of adequate power means war. If this power had been adequate in the days of the former "one worlders" then the world perhaps would not be worth living in. It would have been subjugation and slavery by force.

The insinuation that if we had joined the League of Nations that then there would not have been another war is again the child of wishful thinking. Great Britain, China, Russia, Italy, Japan, Germany, and Austria were all members of the League of Nations. Why did they not bring about permanent peace? That was the object of the League.

When Japan wanted to grab a part of China, she resigned from the League. China's entering the League did not assure her peace or justice. The United States offered to back the League. So did Great Britain, but then shied away. Would it be too much to say that there was a falling out among the aggressors as far as the League was concerned? May we not say that history may repeat itself? Let us have the courage to act wisely and become fully informed before we blindly commit our Nation to a blind rendezvous.

A few years ago I heard a former president of the League of Nations complain about the Big Three. He told us that the Big Three were not interested in the welfare of the smaller nations, that they were selfish and grasping. He named the Big Three at that time as being composed of Great Britain, France, and Italy. He assumed that if the United States had also come into the League that then the smaller nations would have been safe. Of course, he did not know that if we had joined the League it would have been the Big Four in place of the Big Three.

I recently saw a cartoon where Uncle Sam was reading the Declaration of Independence. Miss Columbia, all dressed up and bedecked with the Stars and Stripes, was admiring her Uncle. There was a fence and a vacant lot. The vacant lot was designated "European intrigue." A little further down was "lover's lane." At the end of "lover's lane" was "super government." In the vacant lot, leaning on the fence, was an individual. He was whispering to Miss Columbia, "Are you looking for a blind date?" Is this resolution the blind date? Miss Columbia gave the cold shoulder to that individual. The American people will also give the cold shoulder to the "one worlders." They will not surrender their sovereignty. They will not sell out the future of this Nation to the "one worlders."

There is only one solution for the smaller nations of Europe—if there are any left when the peace treaty is finally signed—and that is for them to form the United States of Europe. They must abandon their religious and racial hatreds. We are all for helping them. We are all for cooperation and collaboration after the war ends, but let us win the victory first.

The other day the President gave us a picture of the war progress. We have reason to be proud of that record. It is we—the people—in action. It appears that America is doing more than her share of furnishing the manpower and material to win this war. We are glad to do this, but we are not going to accept the blind date. We are not going to surrender our sovereignty. We are not going to continue to finance the world. We are not going to continue to police it. We are all for cooperation and collaboration, but other nations must do their share. Uncle Sam is not going to be a perpetual Santa Claus.

There never was a time that the United States did not cooperate and collaborate with any nation that wanted permanent peace. We are all for peace. We hope that when this war is ended there will be a sufficient cooling off period given before the final peace and the machinery for permanent peace is established.

Let me also assure you that when the boys come back from the battle fronts they are going to have something to say about the future of this Nation and its relation with other nations. I am confident they will be favorable to cooperation and collaboration and friendship among the United Nations. They will, however, never substitute a mongrel flag for the Stars and Stripes. You can stake your life on that.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I will support the Fulbright resolution. While it does not undertake to offer a blueprint for the future nor could it hope to do so, it is in an important sense a guidepost to the intentions of the American people and of their representatives.

I think that it is extremely important that this Nation's foreign policy shall not descend by edict from above but shall rise from the people. No foreign policy has any chance of enduring unless it shall represent the considered opinion of the very great majority of American citizens and such opinion cannot be a considered opinion unless it has been fully debated and discussed throughout the Nation.

I am glad this resolution has been presented to us. I hope that in the future our Government will be more candid in giving us sufficient information as to its intentions toward the rest of the world. A lasting American foreign policy can only be based upon informed discussion, and informed discussion can only take place if the information is supplied. The information, in turn, can only come from the Government. Therefore, unless the Government informs the people it cannot complain if, having kept the facts secret too long, the public and its representatives balk at adopting such foreign policies as the administration may seek to force through the legislature.

The people of America are reasonable people. They will do the right thing and they can be trusted. They would like their Government to be reasonable too. They would like to trust their Government. It would be a lot easier for them to trust their Government if they felt their Government trusted them.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I listened to the debate, supposedly on the Fulbright resolution, which is the only business before the House and I regret to say that most of the speeches dealt with many other things than the Fulbright resolution and much effort was exerted to play upon the emotions of the Members. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I propose to save as much time as possible by confining my remarks to the resolution under consideration.

A great deal has been said regarding the interpretation that might be put upon the three words in the resolution, "appropriate international machinery." Inasmuch as different Members interpreted these words differently, I sought Webster's New International Dictionary for their definition, and this is what I find: "appropriate" means to set apart for a particular use; "international" means a person—in this case nation—having relations or obligations to two nations; "machinery" is defined as the assemblage of contrivances. For fear there might be a multitude of interpretations put upon the word "contrivances," I find the same dictionary defines this word as "a scheme." Therefore when one inserts the definitions for the three words "appropriate international machinery" into the Fulbright resolution, it would make it read as follows:

That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of a scheme obligating the Congress to other nations with funds and men adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes.

It is obvious the phrase "among the nations of the world" is not necessary and does not add anything to the resolution, because the definition of the word international means relations with, or obligations to, other nations. Likewise the phrase "and as favoring participation by the United States." It has already been set forth in the resolution that you favor obligating the Congress to other nations in much stronger language than just favoring participation by the United States. Therefore we are able to omit that phrase.

Then as a clever idea, hoping to catch enough Members who have not made up their minds, the original resolution was amended by adding "through its constitutional processes." Every Member of this House knows that before he can become a Member of this body he had to take the following oath:

I, A. B., do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

Mr. Speaker, surely every Member of the House of Representatives took that oath in good faith, and that being true, and I hope it is, you will not want to do anything that is not through constitutional processes. Granting that is true, it should not be necessary to reaffirm to the world we mean to keep our oath of office. Therefore, the amendment to the original resolution can be omitted as not adding anything of value that is not already provided for.

Therefore, when you have omitted the surplusage of words and phrases to the Fulbright resolution, it is boiled down to the following: "That Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of a scheme obligating the Congress to other nations with funds and men adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace."

Now, who in the name of Jehovah is willing to stand up now and prove he can guarantee to maintain a just and lasting peace?

I yield to no man in my sincere desire to contribute my share in every possible way toward bringing about a more harmonious relationship between the nations of the earth and working toward a lasting peace. But before I can conscientiously vote for this particular resolution in its present form, and considering the circumstances under which it is brought before Congress, the following questions will have to be answered satisfactorily:

First. Why should any resolution be brought before Congress under the gag rule which prohibits Members of Congress representing more than 400 congressional districts in the United States from expressing their views by offering amendments?

Second. Does not the Fulbright resolution commit the United States to action agreed upon by a majority of other nations?

Third. Would it not be a good idea to first maintain a just and lasting peace within the borders of the United States and its territories by eliminating lynching and race riots as an example of our ability to maintain peace at home before we assume the responsibility of maintaining peace throughout the world?

Fourth. Is the author of this resolution in a position to guarantee to the Congress, if this resolution is passed, there are no secret agreements between any of the nations of the world that would not lead us to another war if we started to invoke the adequate power of the appropriate international machinery?

Fifth. I have heard a great deal said during debates against dictators and admonishing us to follow democratic processes. Is there a single Member of this Congress who is willing to stand up now before the House and say that bringing the Fulbright resolution before the House of Representatives under a gag rule which prohibits over 400 representatives of the people from expressing their views by offering amendments, is not exactly the kind of procedure practiced by dictators?

Sixth. The author of this resolution, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], admitted yesterday he discussed the resolution with the President. In view of that statement, are we still supposed to be so gullible as to believe this resolution is the work of the Foreign Affairs Committee and that committee alone?

I would like to have someone attempt to convince me that this is not another scheme, like a lot of propaganda put out by the Office of War Information, to help lay the foundation to make the President of the United States the first International President of the World. Last May the President of the United States was responsible for bringing together the representatives of 38 nations, including the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, at Hot Springs, Va., to what was known as the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture.

Why is it not just as important to bring together representatives of the United Nations at this time to consider the peace aims of all these countries? Certainly all these nations are considering and making post-war plans. Therefore, would it not be fitting and proper to bring them together and have their plans expressed in the open? For all anyone knows, there may have been some discussions at Hot Springs regarding the peace aims of various countries, but inasmuch as it was a secret conference we have no way of knowing what took place there.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, offered the following resolution yesterday morning at a meeting of that committee:

Be it further resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of a Post-War Planning Commission, comprised equally of Democrats and Republicans, for the purpose of analyzing various forms of appropriate international machinery for the establishment and maintenance of a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and for making recommendations to the President and the Congress as to the position which the United States should occupy in the post-war world in the light of what is considered to be intelligent and effective foreign and domestic policy.

In view of the fact it seems to be the desire of the present administration to establish various boards and commissions on post-war planning, including the cradle-to-the-grave commission, why would it not be far better to have adopted Mr. MUNDT's resolution and had something definite brought before Congress for consideration and action rather than a vague, weak, and meaningless resolution open to any interpretation anyone cares to put on it.

Hanging on the wall of the home of George Washington at Mount Vernon is a plate which was presented to him through Congress, a plate designed by

Dr. Charles Buxton and made and presented by the publisher, Charles Smith, in 1798. The title of this plate is "The Bowling Green Washington." There are two shafts on each side of the plate similar in design to the Washington Monument. On the base of one shaft is inscribed the word "Liberty," on the other "Independence." George Washington is standing on the base of a pedestal on which are inscribed these words: "Sacred to patriotism." At the bottom of the plate one reads the following: "This plate is with our respect inscribed to the Congress of the United States."

Mr. Speaker, need I say more than to remind the membership of this House to be ever faithful to their oath of office and to be ready at all times to fight for those gallant principles which we all admire in George Washington?

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

OUR JOB IS TO WIN THE WAR AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, our job is to win the war as quickly as possible. And when it comes to the peace, it is our sworn duty to protect the interests of the United States and its citizens. Too much visionary speculation at the present time for bringing the "four freedoms" to the rest of the world may cause disunity amongst the United Nations, and certainly, after the peace is written, our country will be the most hated Nation in the world because of our inability to give the promised Utopia to the suffering peoples of the globe.

To be sure, everyone wants a permanent peace, when victory is won, and we should do our part to achieve this object with other free nations of the world. It is much too early to make definite plans for the post-war era. Time and events will be the controlling factors to determine our course in this respect. Above all, our enemies must be defeated, and then we can take our part at the peace table to make solemn commitments without destroying our national sovereignty or jeopardizing the future welfare of the American people.

Under the Constitution, it is not within the provinces of the House of Representatives to pass upon treaties or international agreements. This authority is vested in the Senate. In view of this fact, it is rather difficult for me to understand why the leadership of the House has now brought the Fulbright resolution before us for consideration. The leaders, on both sides of the aisle, do not expect the Senate to approve the resolution. One reason given for considering the resolution is that the Representatives, who are close to the people, should express the views of American citizens for an arrangement which will guarantee permanent peace for the world. If such be the case why is it that the Democratic leadership ventures to consider the resolution under a gag rule which prohibits the consideration of amendments? Can it be that they do not trust the representatives of the people? If that be true, we must assume that the Democratic leaders do not trust the rank and file of the American people. If this is to be a people's peace, then the people should have something to say about it through their chosen representatives, and the resolution should be considered under the general rules of the House with an opportunity to consider amendments.

To make certain that the Fulbright resolution could not be construed as giving the President authority to bypass Congress in its constitutional right to consider treaties and international agreements, I presented to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House the following amendment to the resolution:

Provided, however, The approval of this resolution shall not be construed as legislative consent to any international agreement or treaty contrary to the method for such approval provided therefor by the Constitution of the United States.

Under the gag rule, I am not permitted to offer this amendment in the House. The purpose of my amendment was to guarantee to the American people that the Constitution of the United States would be strictly followed when the time came for considering specific proposals for international cooperation to assure permanent peace, and in such manner the people would speak through their chosen Representatives in Congress on the merits of such treaties and international agreements. While the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs did not adopt my amendment in its entirety, I am nevertheless pleased that they have agreed to the idea that constitutional procedure must be followed in the consideration of proposals to carry out the general objectives of the Fulbright resolution.

The action of the Foreign Affairs Committee in offering the constitutional procedure amendment as a part of the motion to suspend the rules, coupled with the statement of the chairman and other members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to the effect that the Constitution of the United States will be followed in the consideration of specific treaties to carry out the objectives sought by the Fulbright resolution, is an assurance of definite legislative intent, which must not be bypassed by the Executive or his State Department. As one Representative in this House, I want the constitutional body in Congress to pass upon the merits of every proposal which is to bind our country in its relations with the nations of the world. If it were not for this safeguard, I would not vote for the Fulbright resolution.

Furthermore, I want to make it clear, that when specific proposals are made for international participation on the part of the United States to set up machinery to maintain world peace, I will insist:

First. That all such treaties and international agreements be openly made and passed on by the Congress in the manner provided by the Constitution of the United States.

Second. That the security and welfare of American people shall always be given first consideration.

Third. That no foreign alliance be entered into which will jeopardize the sovereignty of the United States or dissipate our resources. I shall vigorously oppose any scheme which contemplates that the United States shall play the role of Santa Claus for the rest of the world.

Fourth. That in our effort to secure a lasting peace, our enemies shall be disarmed, their armament works and war machinery shall be kept permanently destroyed, and all individuals, companies, corporations, or governments, within the United Nations or elsewhere, engaged in the manufacture of war materials or things that can be used for war purposes, shall forever be prohibited under heavy penalty from providing any potential enemy with such war supplies and materials.

I have tried to make my position clear as I do not want any misunderstanding of my views of the part our country is to take in the post-war collaboration to maintain a lasting peace. My first duty is to my country and the American people.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL].

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the pending resolution.

The hope of the American people for a war-free world represents the real essence of this measure. In understandable, honest terms it seeks to translate our feelings and our thoughts as to the approach we should make as a great nation in establishing and maintaining a just peace.

The resolution is a simple expression of a basic principle. Is there anyone who does not favor the creation of appropriate international machinery with power to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace? And is it not necessary that the United States participate therein? Surely wise self-interest urges the adoption of this declaration of policy at this time.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, last June I was permitted to speak briefly in favor of this resolution. The reasons for its adoption which seemed to me compelling at that time are more cogent and compelling now.

We have already procured the unconditional surrender of Italy, and various other nations will detach themselves from the Axis when and if they think it to their advantage so to do. I do not doubt that a prime consideration with these nations is the desire to be with the winner. But all of these smaller countries of Europe would like to know whether this country is going to go the way it went in 1919 or to choose another course. I do not care whether you say that this country ran out on its responsibilities in 1919 or walked out or what other metaphor you employ. The fact is that we were so afraid of being entangled by the alliance which had enabled us to win the war that we dropped out of it, and in 1941 we found ourselves entan-

gled not in an alliance but in a war which a sufficiently firm alliance preserved since 1918 could and would have prevented.

I believe that if the smaller nations of Europe can be made to realize today that this country wants appropriate international machinery to establish and maintain peace they will join us as quick as they can. These small countries lack every capacity to make war. They have no chance of survival save through some system of collective security. Convince them that they will have such a system and they will aid you in the prosecution of this war and feel certain that they can give aid. The people of Hungary and Bulgaria and Rumania have not fought for Hitler because they loved him so much but because they had no means of resisting his aggressions.

Next month we are to confer in Moscow with representatives of Russia and Britain, and possibly other powers. Will these representatives not be assisted by knowing that we are interested in "appropriate international machinery to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace"? As to what machinery would be appropriate and what peace would be just, there is all the room in the world for honest difference of opinion and free discussion. But if we are not in favor of any international machinery, then why pay the expenses of Mr. Hull or any other American representative on the long trip to Moscow. Surely you cannot expect other nations to make or even to consider any commitments to us unless we are willing to contemplate commitments to them.

The opposition to this resolution is largely fanciful, based on unfounded fears of something ulterior which might happen when some particular piece of international machinery has been fabricated. But there will be plenty of time to scrutinize and consider the wheels and the spindles. How could this Congress by the passage of this resolution repeal a single syllable of our Constitution or a single statute of the United States? What is there here which would modify our policy of immigration, change a tariff, sacrifice our right to our aerial commerce, or lend ourselves to any of the horrors that have been conjured up?

As the gentleman from Arkansas observed, this resolution gives no grant of power to the Executive. It is not a blank check. It is not a check at all. It is a notice to the world that we want a bank of good will established, and that we want some recognizable and enforceable negotiable instrument law, and not a lot of people skulking in corners with guns in their hands and masks over their faces.

I do not consider that any of us has a mandate to liquidate the affairs or property of this Republic any more than Mr. Churchill has a mandate to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. But let us recognize the plain fact that Mr. Hitler was out to liquidate—took the mandate of his people to liquidate both the British Empire and the American Republic as thoroughly as he liquidated the French Republic and the Kingdoms of Norway, Belgium, Holland, and Greece, and so on down the line. It is the prevention of that kind of liquidation that interests me, and in declaring against this kind of liquidation I think first, last, and all the time of the United States, which with all its might and power is outnumbered more than 10 to 1 by the other peoples of the earth.

Let us not be so vain as to imagine that our great power is omnipotent. Let us not lose in sloth or arrogance, as we did before, the victory which had cost us so dear.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SULLIVAN].

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly in accord with the resolution offered by the able and distinguished member from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and denominated House Concurrent Resolution 25. I think it is altogether fitting that such a resolution should originate in this House of the Congress and, furthermore, that now is the acceptable time to go on record as to the subject matter.

Treating these points in their inverse order, I feel, first, that the longer the legislative branch of our Government equivocates by taking refuge in silence or in meaningless generalities on the subject of post-war peace, the longer will be the postponement of that unity of effort among the allied and embattled nations productive of a speedy termination of the war. We know that the legislative branch of the Government scrapped the plan for peace tardily enunciated in the closing days of the last World War. We know that effort was not only abortive but late. The allied nations committed with us to the war on aggressions have not forgotten that failure and it is now imperative for us to take timely steps giving assurance that such a failure will not occur again. A frank, clear, and authoritative declaration at this time will do measureless good, whereas its absence will work irreparable harm.

The origination of this resolution in this House is well advised. The House of Representatives is the popular chamber of the Congress, being proportioned to population, of recent and short tenure of office, and thus closest and most responsive to the popular will. True it does not hold the veto over treaties, as does the Senate, and, true, it does not conduct negotiations with foreign powers, as does the Executive, but this House does hear and express the voice and desire of the people and this resolution has no other function than to declare its understanding of and its intention to carry out that voice and will. I feel, therefore, that we should not decline to speak out at this time merely for reasons of deference to any other agency of Government. We must look to our duty and do it as we see it.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is singularly and admirably free from complexity. We do not pretend to outline the terms of any treaty of peace. We do not pretend to "ride the lightning or direct the storm" of any military engagement. We concern ourselves with expressing our own concept of the sense of the people to effect that henceforth it will be our duty to currently set up and maintain, by an adequate share of contribution and sanction, international machinery to preserve the peace of the world. That is what we refused to do after the last war.

I do not conceive, Mr. Speaker, that the adoption of this resolution will embarrass the military arm in restoring and maintaining order immediately after the belligerent enemy forces are brought to their knees. Nor are we concluded thereby in the matter of alleviating that scourge of starvation and depletion that will be most acute when the cannon are silenced. We do, it is true, commit ourselves, by the import of this resolution, to such a surrender of our freedom of action, or rather our past repudiation of the duty to act, that some people call an attribute of sovereignty. But I would remark that in civil municipal law we are accustomed to surrender a part of our freedom in order to secure and make safe the whole thereof, and if we are to learn by experience we must conclude that henceforth in the world we must, in the language of Franklin, "hang together or we will hang separately."

I feel, too, Mr. Speaker, that the adoption of this resolution will be very advantageous of crystallizing public sentiment in this country. The desire for peace among our people in the past has been so strong that we have been living like an ostrich with its head in the sand, or flapping along like a scarecrow in a cornfield. We have always waited for the first blow and now we realize that some day the first blow will be the last. We must be militant from now on and it is better to be militant for peace than for war.

In the absence of participation in any league to enforce peace in the past we have perforce contented ourselves by addressing homilies to offending nations and prayerful encouragements to the better-disposed countries in an endeavor to preserve the status quo. The result has been destructive alike to our prestige and our pride that stood at a high-level mark immediately after the last war. It is true that with practically identical ideas of right and wrong we might for a time by parallel action and pronouncement restrain evil-doers, but until we are committed to action and not talk, and action to the uttermost, we shall never improve the good-neighborhood of the world. Walter Lippmann has charged that we have never had a foreign policy. That in a measure is true. Our historic policy has not been policy at all except a policy of action which has been as old as Patrick Henry's day when he said: "We must fight; I repeat it, sir, we must fight." We always have fought when we had no alternative, when in the language quoted by Woodrow Wilson: "God helping us, we can do no other."

The American people and the world must face this fact and the sooner the better: We must raise a standard to which the wise and the just can repair. The event is in the hands of God.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this resolution as amended. It embodies my settled convictions on the proposition and is expressive of the will of the people I represent in this body.

The resolution simply expresses the feelings of the Members of the House of Representatives that we favor "the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States through its constitutional processes." This is a joint resolution. If it is adopted by the Senate, then it is an expression by the Congress in favor of the objectives stated in the resolution. It does not have the force of law.

I favor such a treaty between this Nation and the nations with whom we are now allied in the war to defeat Germany and Japan and their satellite allies to create appropriate machinery to establish peace upon a just basis. We are justified in believing that such a peace would be lasting. And when such a peace is agreed upon, it must be enforced with power. And, of course, if we become a party to such a treaty, we must participate in its enforcement to make it effective.

Our armed forces are fighting alongside of the British, the Russians, the Chinese, the French, and other peoples who are allied with us. With them we will win the war. With them we must and can win the peace. The great majority of the American people are determined that the fruits of victory shall not turn to ashes upon their lips. They are of one mind that the spending of our treasure and the shedding of the blood of our strongest, bravest, and best shall not be in vain.

The resolution provides that whatever we do shall be done through the means provided by the Constitution. This expression limits the approval to any plan for the establishment, maintenance, and enforcement of world peace to the treaty making power of the President, which can only be exercised "by and with the consent of the Senate." And this consent of the Senate to make a treaty effective must be by a vote of two-thirds of the membership present.

The Constitution further provides:

> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in persuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.

So it is seen that the adoption of this resolution, of necessity, leaves to the President, the Senate, and the whole Congress, when victory shall have been won, the making of the necessary treaty or treaties, and the enacting of legislation to preserve the peace of the world. Such treaties, and such laws, will require machinery to carry them into effect.

The good faith, the unity, that now exists between our country and our allies, we may well assume, will continue when Germany and Japan are defeated. To say that the United Nations cannot work together in peace as they are now cooperating in war is to confess that civilization is a failure. And this we are not prepared to admit. The adoption of this resolution will help to win the war; it will strengthen the morale of all the allied peoples. It may well be the first step on our part to a "peace on earth, good will toward men" that for years to come will enable the decent peoples of the earth to enjoy ordered liberty under law, free from the fear of ever recurring wars.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain excerpts from the resolution and the resolution adopted by the Mackinac Conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have for some time given the deepest consideration of which I am capable to the questions raised by the Fulbright resolution before the House today. The resolution may be no more than a pious hope as expressed by some of the able and experienced Members of the House, and on the other hand, it may be fraught with perils for the future of our country as expressed by other Members equally as able and experienced. If this resolution is adopted by the Senate, and I do not believe it will be, the effect upon our country in the future will depend largely upon the thinking and attitude of mind of those in charge of our Government. I regret exceedingly that those in charge of the House insisted on bringing up this resolution under suspension of the rules of the House, thereby making it impossible to offer, have considered, or adopted, any amendment. We must vote for or against the resolution as is without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t."

The resolution is embraced in a single sentence containing only six lines. It declares:

> That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes.

The resolution as reported by the Foreign Relations Committee of the House did not contain the words "through its constitutional processes." The Republican leader of the House [Mr. MARTIN] and the Republican steering committee of the House, of which I am a member, insisted that the Foreign Relations Committee reassemble and add the words "through its constitutional processes."

Of course, I strongly favored that amendment. No one could be more deeply interested than I am in establishing and maintaining a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world. Our country is not seeking the territory of any other nation or the right to exercise autocratic powers over any other people or peoples. We are a peace- and liberty-loving people. We desire that justice shall prevail in all the dealings between the nations of the earth, and, of course, the American people greatly desire a just and lasting peace when this war ends. There is no doubt the people generally of the world are yearning for peace, and, excepting those who desire conquest and control of other peoples or minorities, entertain the fervent hope that there will be a just and lasting peace. To inquire if any loyal American citizen is in favor of a just and lasting peace would be about the same as I observed many times during my youth while attending rural church revivals, when the minister would put the question to those present, "All who are in favor of going to heaven stand up." Of course, such proposal received unanimous response from the sinners as well as the saints in the congregation. What person in the congregation did not hope some day he would live in the holy city of the New Jerusalem, walk its golden streets, sit under the tree of life on the banks of the river of life with a golden harp in his hand? But I found that there was much difference of opinion as to the course each individual person should follow to attain that desired end.

Let us bear in mind that this resolution has nothing to do with bringing about peace. We are still at war with Germany, Japan, and some of their lesser satellites. President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and representatives of other Allied Nations have declared time and again that they will not consider anything short of unconditional surrender of our enemies. We are therefore committed to the policy of terminating the war by force—military might. If this resolution means anything, it means that after we have won an unconditional surrender by force, that we participate in the establishment and maintenance of a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world. It offers no hint or suggestion as to how that is to be accomplished. It lays down no formula to be followed by our country or any other country. It does not explain what is meant by "appropriate international machinery" or what power is to be used to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace. There have been many world changes in the last few months, and there will be many more before we have brought about the unconditional surrender of our enemies. No one has the power to lift the veil that hides the future from us and say with any degree of certainty what conditions will confront our country and the world when the war is over. Does this international machinery and power contemplate that our Army and Navy and the armies and navies of other countries will constitute the means by which we will establish and maintain peace? Does it mean that we shall participate in the policing of the world by keeping millions of our

young men 2, 3, or 5 years or longer after the war on the five continents, the seven seas, and the thousands of islands of the world? Could lasting peace be established and maintained by force? Are we to use this force against all those nations that refuse to join in with the program of ourselves and one or two other nations? Are we to bear an unjust proportion of this heavy burden, or, as some people have suggested, will we set up a world-wide W. P. A. requiring that the American taxpayers feed, clothe, and otherwise provide over a period of many years for tens and tens of millions of people of other countries in order to keep them satisfied and peaceful? Or will we be called upon to join a supergovernment made up of ourselves, the British Empire, Russia, China, and some other nations and include conquered Germany, Italy, and Japan?

There is a considerable organization in this country now with some outstanding men and women at the head of it, supplied with plenty of money, who insist on setting up that kind of superworld government, with a constitution of its own to displace the Constitution of the United States, and a world nation's flag to supplant the Stars and Stripes. This supernation to elect a president, vice president, members of the legislative body, according to the population of the various member countries as we now do in the United States, or will it be some other kind of federation of nations advocated by others, or will the price required of us be that we repeal our immigration laws and take away the protection that the American farmers, American industry, and the American workers now have under our protective laws, so that the peoples of the various countries may move freely from one part of this world nation to the other, and that their products may move freely in competition with the American farmers, American industry, and American workers; and if there should be such a superworld government of this supernation, would the majority elect an Englishman, Russian, Chinaman, Italian, or citizen of some other one of the member nations as the head of this supergovernment, or would many other nations elect a congress in which the people of the United States would have little to say? We already have announcements that the reciprocal trade agreements would be used freely to induce other countries to go into this supergovernment or some allied cooperative government, federation, or world arrangement. Or would the fact that we have more wealth per capita than other countries require the people of the United States to contribute the lion's share toward the maintenance of such supergovernment or any allied cooperative federation, or the maintenance of this international machinery? This resolution is silent on all of these matters.

Thirty-three nations have signed up as members of the Allied governments cooperating with us actively or passively in the present war. Many of them are receiving great sums of money, credits, and munitions of war through the Lend-Lease, but are merely sitting in the cheering section and have furnished no men or ships to fight the common enemy. How is the course that we should pursue to be determined? Will these 33 nations have an equal voice in determining that course, or will the nation's voice be determined by its population? We know that those in charge of the present administration in Washington are strongly inclined toward internationalism. Instead of placing the welfare of our own country first, many other countries are first in their thinking. We admire Prime Minister Churchill for his ability, and because he never fails to speak up for the British Empire. He and the British people place their country's welfare first. Mr. Churchill announced to the world that as the Head Minister of the British Empire that he was not placed in that position to preside over the liquidation of the Empire. This unswerving zeal has characterized the attitude of Premier Stalin and the Russian people. They have placed Russia and the interests of the Russian people first. As the present war progresses and the post-war situation unfolds, we shall see more and more clearly that Mr. Stalin and the Russian people never lose sight of the best interests of their own country.

In order that my motives may not be misunderstood, I shall vote for this resolution. We are in the war. No stone should be left unturned to win it at the earliest moment possible so that your sons, my son, and the sons of millions of other fathers and mothers may return to their homes and loved ones, and our country be restored once more to normal living. The President and some of the other outstanding leaders in the Army and Navy have expressed the belief that this war may not be over before 1949. I do not think that that opinion is justified It may not be over before 1945, and I firmly believe that the American people will not place Mr. Roosevelt and the present administration in power for another 4 years. They will select some able man who will prosecute the war with more vigor than it is at present being prosecuted, and that man and a Republican House, and perhaps a Republican Senate will not abuse any latent power that there may be under this resolution, but will look first to the welfare of our own country and the American people. After this great carnage, loss of lives, and the sacrifice of the American people, we all desire to see a just and lasting peace. It is generally admitted here that the resolution that we shall likely pass today will go to the Senate and end there. I am sure that the Senate will give this important subject more consideration and a wider inquiry and discussion, with plenty of opportunities to propose amendments, than we had under the gag rule here in the House. When this matter comes back to the House in a conference report of the House and Senate, we will have an opportunity to vote for something that cannot be designated as a futile gesture or that will imperil the rights of the people of our own country.

THE MACKINAC FOREIGN POLICY COMMITTEE

There was brought together at Mackinac, Mich., early in September 1943, 12 Republican Members of the House, a number of Republican Members of the Senate, the Governors of 24 States, and many other outstanding Republican leaders of the Nation. They formed what is known as the Committee on Foreign Policy and International Relations. Every shade of thought on the important question of our foreign policy and international relations after the war was represented. After days of thorough study and discussion this great committee on September 7, 1943, issued a report in which, among other things, they used this language:

> The members of this council are aware of the gravity of the problems our Nation faces. We are fighting a desperate war, which must be won as speedily as possible. When the war is ended, we must participate in the making of the peace. This puts upon the Nation a triple responsibility.
>
> (a) We must preserve and protect all our own national interests.
>
> (b) We must aid in restoring order and decent living in a distressed world.
>
> (c) We must do our full share in a program for permanent peace among nations.
>
> Therefore, we consider it to be our duty at the beginning of our work as an advisory council of the Republican Party to declare our approval of the following:
>
> 1. Prosecution of the war by a united Nation to conclusive victory over all our enemies, including
>
> (a) Disarmament and disorganization of the armed forces of the Axis;
>
> (b) Disqualification of the Axis to construct facilities for the manufacture of the implements of war;
>
> (c) Permanent maintenance of trained and well-equipped armed forces at home.
>
> 2. Responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression, and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.
>
> In making this recommendation we ground our judgment upon the belief that both the foreign policy and domestic policy of every country are related to each other so closely that each member of the United Nations (or whatever cooperative organization, perpetuating existing unity, may be agreed upon) ought to consider both the immediate and remote consequences of every proposition with careful regard for (1) its effect upon the vital interests of the Nation; (2) its bearing upon the foreseeable international developments.

You will observe that the committee of Republican leaders in Mackinac set forth first: "We must preserve and protect all of our national interests." This is the identical policy that has been and is being followed by Great Britain, Russia, and China, our active allies, in this great war, and they stated, "we must do our full share in the program for permanent peace among nations," and furthermore, they stated, "prosecution of the war by a united nation to conclusive victory over all our enemies, including disarmament of the Axis Powers, "disqualify the Axis Powers to construct facilities for the manufacture of implements of war." They say that the foreign policy and domestic policy of our country and every other country are allied to each other, and in considering our foreign policy we must not lose sight of our domestic policy in the war—its effect upon the vital interest of the Nation—our Nation—its bearing upon the foreseeable

international developments, and then they make this significant statement, if there should be conflict between the vital interests of our own Nation and international matters, then the United States of America should adhere to the policy which will preserve its constitutionalism as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution itself, and the Bill of Rights, as administered through our republican form of government, and they also declared, in all of these undertakings we favor the widest consultation of the gallant men and women in our armed forces who have a special right to speak with authority in behalf of the security and liberty for which they fight.

In this way we bring into the picture for consultation and aid the experience of the heroic men and women who have sacrificed so much for our country and who too would be vitally interested in preserving a just and lasting peace and preserving and protecting our own national interests, our Constitution, and our form of government. We must be cooperative with other peoples of the world, but this does not mean that we should neglect the interest of the American people or weaken or destroy our own form of government and our own great country. We want to do justice. We want to help preserve the peace of the world, but we should place the welfare of our own country and our own people first.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, to win the war is not enough. We need not go far back in memory to recall another time when we fought and won a war against aggressor nations, a war to make the world safe for democracy. We thought we gave democracy to the world. Then we turned our backs, and in nation after nation freedom exploded into anarchy, dictators reaped the benefit of America's good intentions. We must think ahead, for we cannot endure the horror and cost of war every 25 years. Human lives are too precious to be sacrificed in vain. This time we must also win the peace.

If we are to win the peace, it is not a day too soon to start laying the groundwork for a peace that is lasting and just. Today as never before the world looks to this Nation for leadership. If we again refuse to accept the mantle of world leadership, it must fall to other shoulders, and world policies will again be shaped by other hands. God forbid that they be the hands of another Hitler, but wishful thinking will not make them friendly hands or kind hands.

I know something of the evils of foreign entanglements, but likewise I know that America cannot build around itself a wall and exist in a world of its own. Neither policy will insure peace, and either of them can involve us in war. America has become of age. It is a great and powerful Nation, and the world has shrunk so that we cannot pretend to be unaffected by the things which concern our neighbors. Participation in world affairs is obviously unavoidable for this Nation. Hence a judicious participation by our people, and a wise application of democratic leadership, may steer all the world away from war.

We gain nothing by avoiding the issue. Surely American statesmanship is big enough to meet squarely and to forge from this issue a clear, forceful, and beneficial policy. The passage of the resolution before us will show that the Congress, speaking for the American people, has the courage to face facts.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the most comforting, the most sustaining thought of our people today is the hope, ah, the prayer, that out of the crucible in which the nations of the world are writhing today there may come such a realistic vision of the blessings of peace and the futility of war, that the hearts of the peoples of the earth may be quickened and touched in such a way that they will rise in their might and demand that the nations of the earth band together and set up international machinery that will establish and maintain a just and lasting peace.

All the resolution before us today does is to boldly, publicly express to the world this American hope, this American prayer.

As a man "thinketh in his heart, so is he," and so will he act. The same is true of democratic nations, because the national heart of such nations is but the composite of the hearts of its people. Yes, the uppermost thought in the hearts of our people today, my colleagues, is that out of the devastating conflict that is now raging may come a just and lasting peace. And, be not deceived, our people demand that we, their representatives, give voice to their thoughts; yea, that we do more, that we translate their thoughts into a reality.

Timid souls may draw back, they may give vent to misgivings and fears, they may obstruct, they may impede, but thank God in a democracy they cannot suppress the thoughts of the people, nor can they arrest action by their chosen representatives in translating those thoughts into a reality.

Do I hear the timid cry that the words in the resolution, "power adequate to maintain a just and lasting peace," calls for the use of force? I answer "Yes," that is right, and the resolution should make such a declaration. And I make the answer because, as a practical man, I know that under the present state of civilization force is the only thing the aggressor nations will respect. I know that international peace, if effective, will have to be policed in the same way county, city, State, and national peace is policed.

May I ask these timid souls if it is right and proper to use force, if the necessity arises, to maintain local, State, and national peace, why is it not right and proper to use force, if the necessity arises, to maintain international peace? Oh, I know their stock-in-trade answer about losing a part of our sovereignty—that we will lose complete and unlimited control over our own affairs. I answer that peace and security and safety through the centuries have traveled a long way, through the family unit, the tribal unit, the city unit, the county unit, the State unit, the national unit, and that each step in the progressive effort to bring peace and security and safety to all the people demanded, if the necessity arose, not only the use of force, but the surrender or giving up of something on the part of the people. But I know that in return for the something given up in each instance the members of the family unit, the tribal unit, the city unit, the county unit, the State unit, the national unit, received in return something infinitely greater, namely, peace and security and safety. And I know that there is something radically wrong when sovereignty is exercised in such a way as to safeguard and protect the peace and security and safety of its citizens all the way up from the family unit to the national unit only to let them fall prey, as they have twice in the past 25 years, to mechanized scientific international slaughters. Such a concept of sovereignty completely overlooks one of the fundamental rights the citizen should enjoy from the sovereign; international peace and security and safety and protection against international slaughter. And this, my colleagues, can only be accomplished by taking the next logical step in making the protective unit international in scope.

And, further, to those who make the spurious argument that to take such a step our Government would, to that extent, be losing its sovereignty, let me remind them of the fact that in a democracy sovereignty resides in the people, and that that sovereignty can be granted or withheld as to them may seem best. If the people think their peace, safety, and security will be best promoted by delegating a part of their sovereignty to an international set-up to police the nations of the world and hold them in check, can it be said that they have lost their sovereignty? Rather, should it not be said that they have wisely delegated a part of their sovereignty to further protect their sovereign, God-given right to peace, safety, and security?

If the sovereign people find out—and they have found out—that the sovereign rights delegated to the central government "in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty" to themselves and their posterity do not fully vouchsafe to them that peace and that security that is the God-given heritage of a free and liberty-loving people, why should not they make a further delegation to some international agency or association that can vouchsafe that peace, that safety, and that security? Prudence and common sense dictate that they should. And remember that we will not have to give up a single sovereign right that the other member nations will not have to give up.

To the question, How is this international machinery to be set up? I answer

frankly: I do not know any more than the delegates to our Constitutional Convention knew when they met in Philadelphia just how our Federal Government would be set up. I do know that by exchanging ideas, by compromise, by toleration, the delegates finally got together and drafted a great system of government. They succeeded in coming to an agreement because the necessity was upon them; their general welfare, their happiness, their peace, their safety and security demanded action. And I am persuaded that the future peace and security of the world today demands action, and that if the representatives of the nations meet in the same spirit that animated our forefathers, a plan for world peace can be worked out.

Necessity is the mother of government, and I have not lost faith in the genius of man, when the necessity is upon him, to continue to work out problems of government. The process at times may be slow; but when driven by necessity, the solution has always been found. The necessity is upon us; the solution must and will be found.

The challenge to this generation is the working out of a just and lasting peace. Let us act the part of men, God-fearing, peace-loving, courageous men; men who are not afraid to assume the responsibilities of their day, and accept the challenge.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, if time permitted I would enjoy studying with you a little while why the framers of our Constitution lodged so largely, if not exclusively, the conduct of our foreign affairs in the President of the United States subject to ratification by the Senate, but time will not permit. It is the constitutional process of our great Republic. Therefore, I accept it as founded on good reason.

We cannot make any contracts or treaties or enter into any obligations with foreign countries save through the initiative of the President of the United States. This Congress cannot make such an agreement with any country. Such agreements as the President makes must be ratified at least by the Senate branch of the Congress. So we need not be afraid of our committing ourselves in a strict legal sense to any technical and exact terms. We are simply exercising the right that the free people of this country have exercised since its foundation to undertake by public expression of their views to enlighten the conscience of the President and the ratifying power of the Senate about the conduct of foreign affairs.

This resolution simply expresses our opinion as representatives of the people, and I for one give it my hearty support because I wish to see this world organized for peace and against war. It ought to have been so organized some decades ago. We are not going to get as much benefit, probably, from any arrangement made when this war is over as we would have gotten if we had entered into such an arrangement some years back, because it will be a long time before the free people of this country will ever agree again to trust entirely to paper protection of the liberties of this country.

The old League of Nations covenant had in it a disarmament provision. I supported it as a humble public man down in my State with all my might. But now I would not support such a provision. Why? I want all the protection we can get from paper agreements with the great countries of the world, but I do not want to trust to that alone. I want to see our country adopt instead a wise policy of military training and keep prepared, so that, if our agreements are not kept by the nations with whom we may enter into them, we shall defend our liberty and this great fabric of free government with the lives and courage of our citizens.

We are not going to be able to trust as implicitly to some such agreement as this as we would have done but for past experience. Now let us move toward organizing the world for peace, but keep the old American gun in the forks above the door until we see clearly that the world is truly dedicated to peace.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives today has an opportunity to make a small gesture assuring the boys at the front that their children of today will not be called upon to fight another war 25 years from now. Had the United States, the greatest democracy in the world, entered some kind of an international set-up after World War No. 1, the prestige and edicts of this international body would have been potent and forceful and the Axis Powers would not have been permitted to construct their gigantic war machines. Furthermore, Japan would not have desecrated China; Italy would not have overwhelmed Ethiopia; and Hitler would not have possessed the Panzer divisions to conquer the smaller countries of Europe in 1939 and 1940.

This Fulbright resolution is simple, concise, and general. Its essence and meaning could be easily abbreviated to 14 words, to wit: "That the United States wants to aid in maintaining a just and lasting peace."

From the general tenor and sentiment expressed in the speeches delivered on this resolution yesterday, there is no doubt in my mind that this Congress will, by an almost unanimous vote, consent to cooperate in its afterwar mission for the future peace of the world. In just a few of the speeches yesterday did I notice the issue of partisan politics being presented in order to befog the minds of some of our Members as to the real issue involved in our after-war problems. The Members of this House must be constantly on guard that local partisan political issues be not allowed to hamper our war effort and hinder us from carrying out our sworn obligation to the millions now at the front and to future generations.

One of the blackest pages in American history was written 25 years ago when partisan politics and political hatreds in the United States Senate brought about the defeat of the peace treaty after World War No. 1. The League of Nations set-up was not perfect, but had political hatreds been eliminated, compromises could have been brought about so that the United States could fulfill its obligation toward world peace without surrendering any of its constitutional sovereignty.

Lest we forget and that the Congress be forever diligent and on guard against the green monster of political hatreds interfering with permanent peace after World War No. 2, I would like to hereby present first-hand testimony, or as lawyers would say, "prima facie evidence," as to what happened 24 years ago.

Former Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate 23 years ago, led the fight against the League of Nations. Former Senator James E. Watson, of Indiana, was second in command and floor leader in the senatorial fight against the League of Nations.

In 1936, Senator Watson edited a book entitled "As I Knew Them," a copy of which I received from the Congressional Library recently. On page 190, the distinguished ex-Senator reveals for the first time in public print the inside story on how the League of Nations was defeated and how Senator Lodge, at a private Sunday evening dinner in Senator Lodge's home, had revealed to him the legislative trickery and connivery that would bring about the United States' rejection of participation in the future peace of the world. I will hereby quote the exact words used by Senator Watson on pages 190 and 191 of this book:

> We had not been in the contest 10 days before Senator Lodge called me over the telephone and asked me to take dinner with him that evening, Sunday. He was the majority leader at that time and was also the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, a most fortunate circumstance for the Nation. At that Sunday evening dinner he said to me that, while Senator Curtis was the regular whip and would have charge of all matters pertaining to the ordinary routine of legislation, yet he wanted me as his special representative to have charge of the organization in the Senate in the League of Nation's fight. He asked me to keep mum on this assignment and to report to nobody but him, to which I readily agreed. My service having been largely in the House up to that time, I had never had to deal with a treaty concerning which there was any conflict and knew little or nothing of the method of procedure in such cases.
>
> "Senator," I said to him, "I don't see how we are ever going to defeat this proposition. It appears to me that 80 percent of the people are for it. Fully that percentage of the preachers are right now advocating it, churches are very largely favoring it, all the people who have been burdened and oppressed by this awful tragedy of war and who imagine this opens a way to world peace are for it, and I don't see how it is possible to defeat it." He turned to me and said: "Ah, my dear James, I do not propose to try to beat it by direct frontal attack, but by the indirect method of reservations." "What do you mean by that?" I asked. "Illustrate it to me." He then went on to explain how, for instance, we would demand a reservation on the subject of submitting to our Government the assumption of a mandate over

Armenia, or any other foreign country. Senator Lodge then went on for 2 hours to explain other reservations and went into details of the situation that would be thus evolved, until I became thoroughly satisfied that the treaty could be beaten in that way.

It took the capable and convincing former Senator Lodge 2 hours to convince the equally capable Senator Watson that the League of Nations could be defeated in spite of Senator Watson's statement that 80 percent of the American people and churches favored it. As further direct evidence that partisan politics and political hatred defeated the peace after World War No. 1, I now quote from page 202 of Senator Watson's book:

Senator Borah and I have often talked it over, and both of us have said to each other frequently that the hatred of Wilson for Lodge and of Lodge for Wilson kept the United States out of the League of Nations. And there is no more doubt about it than there is that the event occurred.

Let us not again descend to the partisan levels and political battles that ruined the peace after World War No. 1.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN].

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly favor the pending resolution and shall vote for it either in the form as originally drafted by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] or with the amendment as agreed upon by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Personally, I am unable to see wherein the language of the amendment modifies or changes the import and meaning of the original resolution in any way unless it be that the words, "constitutional processes," will assure some of our doubting Thomases that the occupant of the White House, whoever he may be, and the Congress will not participate in the establishment of appropriate international machinery to establish and to maintain the just and lasting peace in an unconstitutional manner or to repeal the Declaration of Independence and scrap the Constitution and the Bill or Rights.

Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this resolution will be a step in the right direction and will, in my opinion, greatly strengthen the spirit and morale of our soldiers who at this very hour are gallantly fighting and dying on many battle fronts to make sure of our continued freedom and independence and our American way of life and to bring peace to a war-torn world. Furthermore, the adoption of this resolution at this time will renew the courage and spirit of the enslaved peoples of the world in their life-and-death struggle to free themselves from the scourge of ruthless dictators and war lords and inspire the hope of again living in a peaceful world. It has been said during this debate that now is not the time to adopt such a resolution; that the resolution under consideration is ineffective and that it cannot serve any useful purpose at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the people back home, the people who are fighting this war on the home front and who have sent their brothers, sons, and sweethearts to fight and die for their country, are tremendously interested in the winning of this war in the shortest possible time and in making it possible for our boys to again be at home. They heartily approve the fine cooperative effort that the Allied Nations are putting forth to stop the march of international gangsters and murderers in their program for world conquest and domination and in their hearts they daily pray and hope that such a war, with all its destruction, misery, and suffering, will never again come to them or to their children. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that our people likewise want to do everything in their power and cooperate in every possible way to make certain that in the years to come such a war as we are now engaged in will never again curse this world. If we can trust our allies to win a war, we can trust them in a cooperative effort to prevent future wars. This resolution merely expresses the feeling and sincere desire of all right-thinking people and we should let them and the world know our attitude on this all-absorbing question.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for the resolution and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago a group of earnest citizens met at Mackinac, representing the Republican Party, where they agreed upon and drew a set of principles which shall guide the party in the 1944 campaign, known as The Mackinac Declaration of Foreign Policy. This post-war policy for the Republican Party was adopted unanimously by the Republican Party war advisory council on September 7, 1943.

In these troublesome times, with the whole world thrown out of balance by the global war that is raging, the leaders of this party felt that it was necessary to give to the people of the Nation a tenable foundation base from which to start in an effort to bring stabilization out of economic world chaos at the close of this gigantic struggle. But in thinking of the world picture and in offering our cooperative leadership for the establishment, if possible, of world peace in the future those men and women who formed this declaration of post-war policy for the Republican Party were careful in the certainty of the language of this document to protect, first, our sovereignty, our nationalism, and, second, the general welfare of the American people. Let me quote the first three principles enumerated. They are worthy of the endorsement and careful consideration of every American.

(a) We must preserve and protect all of our national interests.

(b) We must aid in restoring order and decent living in a distressed world.

(c) We must do our full share for a permanent peace among nations.

Then dealing again with foreign participation for the establishment of peace we find this: The Council declares its approval of a "responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace for organized justice in a free world." The declaration further sets out, in substance, that in the consideration of any post-war policy that the United States of America should adhere to such a policy as will preserve its constitutionalism as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights as administered through our form of government. Constitutionalism should be adhered to in determining the substance of our policies and shall be followed in ways and means of making international commitments.

Mr. Speaker, there has been much talk, for many months, of world peace after this war is over. The hope of world peace caused leaders of the Republican Party to assemble and give thought and utterance to this document which, in my judgment, is a great and unselfish declaration of statesmanship. It is probably the most important declaration that has or will be given to the Nation of this decade. It is my belief that on these sound principles the people of the Nation will establish prevailing wise and enduring foreign policy for the future, in the hope of attaining their ultimate hope for world peace and at the same time preserving their national sovereignty.

Looking in this direction and because, to a large extent, the Fulbright resolution fairly well follows through in this line of thought for world peace, I have decided to vote for it. I wish that it were more definitely written and that it guarded with a little more certainty our constitutional safeguards. I am aware that this resolution is mostly a test of sentiment in the House and I feel certain that the Senate, which body in the future must ratify any peace commitments, will clarify its language with added constitutional safeguards which may or may not be necessary according to interpretation placed on the resolution.

It is to be hoped that the Chief Executive and others will interpret this resolution as expressing a desire of the people through their Representatives for some sort of world-peace plan, the machinery of which will later be worked out with the cooperation of the Senate with full protection for the national interests of this Nation. In fact, this resolution should serve notice on the Executive and the people and leaders of other nations that the Congress of the United States will insist on its full share and opportunity in consummating international peace terms.

Let it not be in any manner interpreted by the Executive or our multitude of dreamers and planners as a blanket endorsement of any benevolent and farfetched or projected theories for the making of a new world order, but rather a first conservative and sensible step in the interest of our people, and I emphasize our people, in their welfare at home and world-wide.

It is to be hoped that our leaders who later shall sit at the peace table will have in mind first and at all times the interest of America. That is why we want to make certain that the constitutional rights of our people will be safeguarded. That is why we insist on the preservation of the treaty rights of the Senate. The Congress will always speak the voice of the American people.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY].

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess of Congress, I spent practically all of my time in various parts of my district consulting with my constituents on the major problems confronting them and confronting Congress. In those contacts and in the speeches which I made, I was frequently asked what I thought of House Concurrent Resolution 25. I stated to my constituents, as I now state here, that I would not vote for this resolution until I was assured that it had nothing to do with a superworld government or with the sacrifice of the essential sovereignty of this country.

I am a firm believer in the fact that the United States must be one of the world leaders toward a just and lasting peace. But I am not in favor of any attempt made by certain proponents thereof to sacrifice essential sovereignty of this Nation or to lower the dignity and the effect of our Constitution and our flag.

During the discussions that have occurred on this resolution, it has been frequently stated on the floor of the House that this resolution was not a part of any scheme whereby the United States was to become a member of a superworld government, losing sovereignty thereby. On the other hand, it has been repeatedly stated that this resolution is simply a declaration of principle or of opinion by the Congress of the United States that our Nation, acting as a Nation, should do everything within its power to perfect a lasting peace. With that statement, I am in accord.

The original resolution as presented to the House was amended by the words, "through its constitutional processes." Some may argue that that amendment is innocuous, but to me it is primarily essential. The Constitution is still the fundamental law of the land, and this resolution as amended comes within the purview of the Constitution and does not in any way infringe upon it or its powers.

We owe it to our 11,000,000 men now in the military service of this country, we owe it to the fathers and mothers of those boys, and to all American citizens, and to the Nation itself to see that these global wars shall no longer occur, and that the United States shall be a definite, positive leader toward world peace.

With that thought in mind, I shall vote for the resolution.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of talk lately about idealizing, whatever that may mean.

The declaration in the text of the G. O. P. report from Mackinac Island, "We must aid in restoring order and decent living in a distressed world," will be heartening to our people. It is a suggested contribution by the United States in an experiment to cure and control disease caused by world conflict.

Why should the world distrust us? For a second time we are spending our blood and treasure in wars spawned in Europe. This has been done without any previous declaration of participation on our part. We would seem already committed by our actions heretofore to do our part in a world convulsion.

A good omen has been called to my attention. Mackinac Island, Mich., furnished America's first scientific contribution to medicine in the experiments and observations carried on there in 1822 and a few years thereafter by Dr. William A. Beaumont, our pioneer in real experimentation of the physiology of digestion. His 51 inferences, all new at the time, remain 90 percent valid today. His published book is now the most prized of medical Americana.

My friend seems to see this good omen in the pledging of our part in contributing toward the determination of the causes and cure of war.

The Fulbright resolution is only a statement of our purpose to take part. No blueprint is attached. I commend your careful reading of the clear statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]. My personal appreciation to him for that contribution. It ought to clear the muddy waters stirred by our fears and prejudiced opinions. This nonpartisan decision to pass this resolution is most heartening and should surely give notice to the world that we are not politically divided in our good intentions, at least. It was wise, indeed, to add the amendment to the original resolution. Such declaration should make our Vice President and others ponder before making further commitments.

We desire greatly to help those nations who may be willing to help themselves. To carry liberty and freedom to all of them is impossible. Many are far from ready to receive it. We, ourselves, are giving up our own freedom at a rapid pace and allowing bureaucratic government to dictate under the guidance of an emperor, whatever his nomenclature. After this war is over we must reclaim our liberties, or the world will have but little confidence in our own abilities to preserve them.

Hundreds of blueprints are sent us with urgent requests for their consideration and adoption. We cannot build until the site is secure. A dream house is the only kind now possible. We will for about the first time determine a question of foreign policy. Heretofore such a policy has been weak or entirely lacking. I spoke on this in this forum on November 11 in an address entitled "Stop! Look! and Listen!" I wish I had the time to repeat some of those statements, and particularly recall statements made by others during the discussion at that time. I believe that an alliance of the English-speaking people will certainly come out of this struggle. Great Britain cannot exist safely without us. The United States cannot live safely without Great Britain and her Commonwealths. We at least must unite for mutual protection. But let us be careful that we do not tell Poland, Hungary, and other nations that we will come to their rescue if an aggressor nation should attack them. The great Russian nation must join with us before we make such commitments. We can now only conjecture what course she will be willing to follow after her own safety is assured. I had hoped for time to make other comments but will reserve them for a later time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, the resolution now pending before us—Fulbright resolution—has been variously interpreted by various speakers. It is inevitable that any resolution worded in such general terms should be subject to different interpretations, but even though such variations are bound to exist, the value of the resolution remains unimpaired. The United States has assumed a position of tremendous importance in world affairs. Its own selfish interests require it to maintain this position in the future. In a world where changes are developing with extraordinary rapidity, the constitutional spokesmen for this country, namely, the President and the Secretary of State, cannot speak with validity for the Nation unless they have some assurance from the Congress of the United States with respect to the major matter of policy which this resolution covers, namely, cooperation with other nations to preserve, by force if need be, a just and lasting peace.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs deserves tremendous credit for its unanimous, nonpartisan action in initiating this resolution. The statesmanlike explanation of the resolution by its original sponsor, the gentleman from Arkansas, Representative FULBRIGHT, states very clearly what, in his opinion at least, the resolution purports to do, and even more important, what it does not purport to do. I subscribe fully to the sentiments which he has expressed. From a personal experience, which included sitting through the peace conference after World War No. 1 and seeing commitments made which were later repudiated, I have the profound conviction that this Nation cannot properly take its place among the great nations of the world, its leaders cannot speak for it with authority, unless the Congress has done its share as exemplified by the measure now before us. Uncertainty and floundering with respect to our future course would relegate us to a negative and minor role in world affairs.

No American can contemplate such a role with equanimity. I therefore hope that the vote which this resolution receives today will be construed as notice to the world that in the matter of the vital interests of this Nation in the conduct of our foreign affairs, we can proceed on a nonpartisan basis.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, America at war is a nation fighting also for peace. The passage of the Fulbright resolution will be a fundamental approach to the problem of world collaboration with other nations. It does not matter so much to the American people whether this declaration of intent comes from the House of Representatives in the first instance or from the Senate of the United States. Our citizenry does place upon us today the grave and inescapable responsibility of acting with courage, not only for our own Republic but for our relationship when peace has come again.

It was my privilege a few days ago to talk to Pvt. Maurice Eumans, a Washington, D. C., lad of 21 years. He had lost his leg fighting in Guadalcanal. Any bitterness in his own heart for the affliction which had been wrought to his own body was dissipated in his hopeful expression to me that never again could this country or the peoples of the earth be plunged into a terrible conflict.

May I say with humility, but with all seriousness, to the Members of this body that when we consider what we shall do today on this subject matter we certainly should do it with the clear thought in mind that the sovereignty of America must be preserved. The expressions of men and women on both sides of the aisle in this debate has clearly shown that we should, and rightfully can, expect Great Britain, Russia, and other nations when they come to the terms of practical peace, to think, first of all, from the standpoint of their own nationalities and the people within. So today, without effort of suspicion in what we are doing, I ask you to think deeply about the responsibility of remembering that the best interests of America and the world will be served if we approach that problem of peace, keeping in mind always that we are Americans and that we must preserve the identity of this land.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us appreciate the very serious responsibility that confronts this House in dealing with the general terms and provisions of this resolution. Personally, upon so tremendous an issue, I want to disagree with the theory on which such a resolution is being brought to us under a gag rule, under so limited a time as 4 hours for debate, and that we take or leave the expressions of a single committee of this House, all without chance of amendment.

I shall also exercise the right of a Representative to express my own opinion on a resolution involving the hopes and the petitions and the prayers of the people that we represent on this most important question.

I find some difficulty myself in reconciling the ringing terms of unconditional surrender with the broad, general terms of this resolution. I find myself in disagreement with the theory of those who have spoken for this resolution that it will end all wars, because such a statement is so contrary to the human relationships and human history that I am not particularly impressed with that type of an argument.

I do feel that it would be well for us to consider the fact that this is a problem on which the Senate of the United States will write such terms and such resolutions as it sees fit. I have in mind that those who are in this House will have little to say about the terms of peace when it comes; and what the terms of peace will be, will be shaped by many elements—all of which will affect our post-war world.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the gentleman know of any other country or of any other legislative body in which a similar resolution is pending at this time?

Mr. O'HARA. There has been none that I know of and none that has been acted upon by any other country of the world.

I appreciate that this problem has a tremendous appeal to the sentiments and emotions of the people of this country, but is there any other country that has longed for peace any more than this country?

Mr. Speaker, I have a most profound respect for those who have expressed themselves in debate on the Fulbright resolution. I feel deeply the heavy responsibility which rests not alone upon us, but alike upon the peoples of the world to provide the machinery for the establishment of international machinery, or whatever name you may call it, in an effort to establish and maintain peaceful relationships one with the other.

I protest that so all-important a question as we are debating should be limited under a gag rule and be so limited an allotment of time, which prevents the expression of the will of the people through us as their representatives, in expressing what may be a composite wish of our people of the United States. The result is that we are handed a vague generality by a committee and told to "take it or leave it."

I have listened to the flagellants who wear the hair shirts and beat their breasts charging us, the people of the United States, with being responsible for this war.

I have as much at stake upon this question as any individual Member of the House. I am but one of many who serve in this House who gave years in the last war, and who have sons in this war.

We are a melting pot of the peoples of the world, and as a consequence we are a conflict of human emotions and blood ties with every country in the world.

We are entitled to express our views, which are the views of our people. That is both a duty and a responsibility.

This resolution will not end wars. The enforcement of this resolution means the death of men of this country upon the face of the earth and the hollow promise that this is something to end all wars is a vagary which disregards the appealing slogan of the last war and blatantly disregards the history of the human race.

Let us be frank and honest in the discussions of these matters, and not haul out false hopes and false ideals. Let us be practical.

No matter how lofty our ideals and our desires and petitions may be for a just and lasting peace, it will be first the representatives of our Government who will make that peace, influenced by all of the uncertainties that lie ahead.

Have you ever tried to be friendly as a neighbor with a neighbor who did not want to be friendly? Was there ever anything so lofty and altruistic in ideals as the League of Nations? And why did the League of Nations fail?

Who permitted Mussolini to attack the barefoot tribes of Ethiopia? Who permitted the Japs to take over Manchuria? What outside selfish interest financed Hitler?

What do all of these things add up to?

Was there ever anything so unselfish as the part and the price we paid and the sacrifices we made in World War No. 1? Are there any peoples upon the face of the earth who are as anxious for a just and a lasting peace as the people of this country? What will be the attitude of the other peoples, both our allies and the Axis Powers, toward this new world order? What will their post-war aims be?

Let us not be flagellants. Let us not be hysterical. Let us be sane, sensible, just, and, above all things, let us remember that our views will be respected by some only by our own strength.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member on our side of the Foreign Affairs Committee I wish to express my sincere regret that I could not lengthen these moments so as to give all the Members who wish to speak all the time they desired.

I would like to be permitted now to yield myself the balance of the time on this side, as a member of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 11 minutes.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I am profoundly grateful for two recent experiences that have come to me unsought, and which have stirred my mind to its depths and encouraged my heart as to the part which my own country is preparing to play in the world.

The first experience was during the first week of this month at Mackinac Island, in Michigan. Over 100 citizens, representing a cross section of the finest

people in this country—even if they were Republicans, as will be admitted, I hope, by all sides—met at that historic island. They came there for the purpose of developing the principles which must underlie our national foreign policy in the post-war period. Each one of these citizens exercising the inalienable rights and prerogatives of every free American had personal convictions which they were prepared to assert and defend. In a few days I witnessed one of the most amazing transformations that has ever come to my attention. There developed an unconscious spiritual unification of thought in the interest of our beloved country and our responsibility to the world which made possible the farvisioned and unanimous principles decided on by the council. On September 6 a committee of six, on which I had the honor, with my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], met. It took us 6 hours to draw up a declaration of our position. We received much personal testimony. We examined over a hundred communications, and we ended in absolute unanimity of thought and purpose upon a policy which, I believe, will be an event of fundamental importance in the history of our country, and which I hope will be adopted by both of our major political parties.

Among other things, we came to these conclusions as to our post-war foreign policy:

(a) We must preserve and protect all our own national interests.

(b) We must aid in restoring order and decent living in a distressed world.

(c) We must do our full share in a program for permanent peace among nations.

1. Prosecution of the war by a united Nation to conclusive victory over all our enemies, including

(a) Disarmament and disorganization of the armed forces of the Axis;

(b) Disqualification of the Axis to construct facilities for the manufacture of the implements of war;

(c) Permanent maintenance of trained and well-equipped armed forces at home.

2. Responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

I came from the Mackinac Conference to take my place as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House. We have, I think, 12 Republicans and 13 Democrats on this committee. The membership is not arranged quite as a Republican would like it, but that is how it stands; and we drew up the resolution which is before this House now. We were unanimous; yet we received the delightful compliment here today that this resolution is "a mess of pious platitudes." My God. If your committee has sunk to that level, what about the rest of you?

It is time, Mr. Speaker, that this House recognized its responsibility and dignity in handling its affairs; and when one of your great committees, composed of intelligent, patriotic, and industrious men and women, make a report to you its conclusions ought to receive rational and courteous consideration.

Mr. Speaker I am for this resolution, not because it will solve all our problems, not because it fixes a detailed foreign policy; I am for it, first, because it is in full accord, so far as it goes, with the policy that we devised at Mackinac Island.

Secondly, I am for it because, at least, it places the House of Representatives in its proper place as a constitutional and recognized and authoritative portion of our Government.

And, lastly, I am for it because it will have a salutary effect upon the public opinion of the world as to the place America will hold in the processes of construction after we have spent billions of dollars and thousands of the precious lives of our people in the process of destruction.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer for a moment to the problem of sovereignty. Through the years I have had to give some attention to that particular subject, not as a lawyer but simply as a humble student. Where did sovereignty originate? When the first human being was separated from the other animals, way back in the prehistoric dawn of time, he found refuge for himself in some cave. He had no fire, no weapons, no language. He was just a trifle above the other animals, but he was possessed of the most eternal principle common to all animate nature, the desire for self-preservation. That was the beginning of the doctrine of sovereignty; that is where it resides today: the desire for self-preservation.

By and by, as man grew in intelligence, he became organized into rudimentary societies, and then there emerged something new. As this primeval animal became more human, something known as reason, and justice and responsibility, was evolved, and there emerged in rudimentary form the thing we call law. By and by man was organized into communities, and those communities were made possible because he could substitute law in defense of his desire to perpetuate himself in the place of physical force. In the beginning all he had was his club and his muscle, but now he had law.

Accordingly, as he developed he came to accept the authority of moral law in the activities of his little community, and at last as history grew, we, the descendants of the cave man, have a whole civilization resting upon law for the solution of disputes and problems, rather than upon physical force.

That shift from brute force to law took place among individuals and we did away with dueling. That shift took place place among communities, and by and by there emerged on this continent the greatest experiment in social progress based upon law the world has ever seen. If you want to know the whole story of sovereignty, study the history of your own country. We have now 48 sovereign States, and the sovereignty of those States is completely manifested in their sovereign action in delegating a part of their power and authority to a central body known as the Government of the United States.

A couple of generations ago some of our States decided to change over from an appeal to law to an appeal to force in doing what they felt they had a perfect right to do. That was one of the great calamities that befell our system, but it convinced us that an appeal to physical force was always a failure for human beings when they could appeal to recognized and just law.

Mr. Speaker, the problem that confronts mankind today is the last group of communities in the world which still retains the cave-man system of self-preservation by appeal to physical force rather than to law. That group is the family of nations, strange as it may seem, and the problem that is emerging out of this war is the necessity for the family of nations to do what the States of the American Union have done; to do what the British Commonwealth of Nations has done: Establish law in the place of physical force.

That will not come at once. These little resolutions of ours will pass out of the picture—so will we. Our progress toward the light will be very slow. We must by trial and error build up a system of international law expressing the best moral sense and the widest intelligence of the peoples of the world. In the leadership of that great achievement stand a people who for a longer period than any other have practiced as best they knew the principles and ideals of civilized human beings: The English-speaking races.

Study your Declaration of Independence and the last paragraph of that immortal document will be a revelation when its light is turned on this resolution we are considering today. It will take a hundred years or more to establish the family of nations on a civilized basis and keep them from going back to the cave-man theory of sovereignty, but we are headed that way.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey .

Mr. EATON. I thank the gentleman from New York, my honored colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I could not sit down without expressing the most solemn and secret and powerful ideal of my life. I believe in the Christian religion even though I do not practice it very well. The Christian religion is the first and only universal philosophy the world has ever had. Jesus Christ came to save all mankind because they were children of God, their common Father. In His ideal of the kingdom of God He found place for every human being in every land to fulfill the possibilities of His own nature, and He furnished that universal ideal of His kingdom with a social law that would make it possible for these people to live together in peace and cooperate for their own interests and the interests of all. That law is the Sermon on the Mount, the Golden Rule. To make sure that men could and would accept the Golden Rule He gave to each individual the power to reconcile with that law his own inner warring nature, his will, his judgment, his conscience, and his intelligence.

So I end as I have ended many times, to ask you, dear men and women and all my fellow citizens, to have faith. This is still God's world.

Have faith, men and women, in yourselves and in each other as divine beings. Have faith in your country, the fairest that God has ever given to the sons of man. Have faith in His eternal and divine purpose to bring the human race at last into a civilization that rests upon law, justice, goodness, and truth, and banish forever to the jungle the hateful passions of the tiger.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have known the author of this resolution from his boyhood; longer, perhaps, than any other Member of the House, and my knowledge of his high purposes and his keen understanding of world problems gave me an initial assurance that the resolution represented a sound approach to the establishment of a foreign policy.

I know what is in the mind of my colleague from Arkansas in urging the adoption of this resolution. You can be sure there are no undisclosed objectives. He has always believed in the direct method of doing things. When he played football at the University of Arkansas, he was distinguished not by sensational style of playing but by his direct action. If he found a hole in the line, and he seemed very adept at doing that, he went straight through it. His punting was effective, not so much because the punts were longer, but because he knew how to place them. The ball went where he meant it to go.

So, with this resolution, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] wants to say what I believe the overwhelming majority of us think should be done, namely, to banish all doubt about our Nation's policy in the post-war world. The passage of this resolution will lay the foundation for the kind of international cooperation that the American people favor.

I saw the beginning of this war. I was a student in Washington when the Senate debate over the Versailles Treaty was in progress, and I listened to the final roll call from the gallery. I was one of the discouraged observers that day, because I felt we were doomed to disappointment in placing our hopes for permanent peace in any kind of arrangement except action in concert with like-minded people in other parts of the world. It is not to place the blame for this war upon our own country to suggest that things might have been different if a vigorous policy of international cooperation had been adopted at the end of the First World War. We can only speculate on that point. The spiritual elements so essential to the maintenance of peaceful relations have seemed lacking in the policies of other powers, but now that there is everywhere evidence of conversion to a better plan, do we want the responsibility in America of withholding cooperation when it might prove very costly?

This resolution involves no commitment that we cannot cheerfully subscribe to. It does not foreclose the determination of economic policies. It does not surrender sovereignty. It does not invite the establishment of a superworld state, but it does signify the intention of this Nation to work with all peace-loving people in a united plan for peace.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic day in the history of our country. Today we propose to pass a resolution which serves notice to the world that when we have won this war we shall try to keep it won. Never before has such action been taken by Congress. The resolution known as the Fulbright resolution is as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby express itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes.

We are fighting this war to prevent defeat and subjugation of our country by foreign powers. But we are fighting for even more than that. We must win the war, but we must also keep it won. Those two things must be ever present in our minds. In my opinion, the passage of this resolution will contribute to the winning of the war and toward keeping the war won. Our action will be a message of encouragement to our men in uniform, to their parents, and to freemen everywhere.

The American people do not want another World War. They are not sure of the exact procedure to follow in seeking to prevent future wars, but they propose to win this war and try to the utmost of their ability to keep it won. That was the attitude which I found among the Texas people this summer.

This resolution within itself will not prevent future war. I do not think it possible to banish war from the earth forever. But this generation has already experienced two wars. If we cannot eliminate war forever, we can postpone the day of future war for as long a period as possible. In doing so, we can save million of lives and give a ray of hope to all mankind. We may fail; I hope we shall not. We must not. I want my voice and my vote recorded among those who are doing what they can to help win this war and keep it won.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of gratification to me, and I am sure to the millions who have sons and relatives in the service, that the Congress is giving thought to a peace commensurate with the sacrifice involved in this fight for our freedom and approaching the problem as it should be approached, in a nonpartisan manner. For the first time in many years a House committee has acted unanimously on a declaration dealing with foreign policy. Personally, I would like to see this resolution adopted by as large majority as was given to our declaration of war because both are of the same general pattern. We declared war because there was no other means of preserving our freedom. The winning of that war, at the present time, is of course the paramount aim of our foreign policy and the paramount aim of our allies. But as our distinguished Secretary of State so aptly said on September 12:

> If there is anything on which all right-thinking people are agreed, it is the proposition that the monstrous specter of a world war shall not again show its head. The people of this and other lands voice this demand insistently. There is danger in complacency and wishful thinking. The nations that stand for peace and security must now make up their minds and act together—or there will be neither peace nor security.
>
> It is abundantly clear that a system of organized international cooperation for the maintenance of peace must be based upon the willingness of the cooperating nations to use force, if necessary, to keep the peace. There must be certainty that adequate and appropriate means are available and will be used for this purpose. Readiness to use force, if necessary, for the maintenance of peace is indispensable if effective substitutes for war are to be found.

After making due allowance for the shortsightedness and selfishness of democratic nations, including our own, the fact remains that the chief threat in modern times to world security has been the warlike attitude of two aggressor nations—Germany and Japan. It is not just the military leaders of those nations, it is the rank and file of the people of those nations who have endorsed the philosophy that might makes right and that a nation is justified in taking by force anything it is able to take in that manner. If that be true, and I do not think it can be successfully contradicted, our job will not end with the unconditional surrender of Germany and Japan. We must render them impotent to start another world war and keep them impotent until we are satisfied a generation has been born in Germany and Japan with a new conception of common decency and a new philosophy of life. Working, therefore, within the framework of our own best interest we will need friends and allies to do the job that lies ahead, namely, to win a peace that will be lasting as well as just.

Woodrow Wilson was more than a scholar in politics, more than a successful leader in a great war effort; he was a man with a broad vision and a great soul. He was convinced that those who died in World War No. 1 for the preservation of our democratic institutions will have died in vain unless in the post-war era our Nation agreed in a suitable and appropriate manner to cooperate with other democratic nations to preserve the peace of the world. Whether or not his plan known as the League of Nations would have accomplished that purpose will never be known because without our participation the program was doomed to failure from the start. In the Presidential election of 1920 this Nation, by an overwhelming vote, turned down the Wilson plan for world peace and decided to take its chances on a policy which, for lack of a more appropriate name, may well be called a policy of isolation. We know that policy cost us dearly. Germany, the aggressor nation in 1914, be-

came the aggressor nation again in 1938. The principal democracies of the world in their weakness and in their aversion to war as the arbitrament of international differences futilely attempted a policy of appeasement. Our Nation warned Germany and our Nation warned Japan, but to no avail, because both Germany and Japan well knew those warnings, at the moment, would not and could not be implemented by force. Germany and Japan both well knew that the oceans on which some in this country relied for protection were but avenues of approach and they likewise knew we had no long-range bombers nor protection against long-range bombers. While Japan struck first, it was really a concerted blow by Germany and Japan. Axis Powers were convinced we could be knocked out before we had an opportunity even to defend ourselves, much less carry the war to them.

As I have indicated, we have attempted a policy of going it alone and with disastrous consequences. To return after this war to that same policy would simply be suicidal. To attempt to maintain our present military strength in the post-war era would be a back-breaking burden and even then we could not hope single-handedly to defeat the whole world or even a major part of it. The alternative, therefore, is to have friends who will cooperate with us and with whom we will cooperate in a lasting peace. Every individual knows the truth of Emerson's statement—"He who hath a thousand friends hath not one to spare." And every individual knows that to have friends you must be a friend. Nations are but the aggregate of the individuals that compose them and to have friends among foreign nations we must at least indicate a desire on our part to be a friend. That desire is well expressed in the pending Fulbright resolution which declares one of our war aims to be a just and lasting peace and one of our post-war foreign policies to cooperate with other nations which share those sentiments.

Recently we dedicated at Staunton, Va., an Army general hospital to the memory of Woodrow Wilson and for the use of those broken and crippled in World War No. 2. We will provide ample hospitalization for the veterans of this conflict. We will provide money payments for veterans who survive the ordeal and pensions for the dependents of those who do not. But as Walter Lippmann recently pointed out in a striking article, there is but one currency in which those who die for honor can be paid and that is the currency of honor. Those of us who served in World War No. 1 have sons and relatives serving in World War No. 2, although we were told in the spring of 1917 we were to go forth to battle not only to preserve our democracy but likewise to prevent another similar attack upon it. The body of one who died in that conflict was brought home and interred in our national cemetery and over his grave was inscribed, "Here rests in honored glory an American soldier known but to God." But his story was graven only on stone; the ideal for which he fought and for which he died was repudiated. While our men still fights on far-flung battle fronts and untimely graves are being dug in every corner of the earth I want this Congress to send to them the message that this time our boys will not die in vain and that when we bury the body of an unknown soldier of World War No. 2 in our national cemetery we can engrave upon his sepulchre the words of Pericles:

> So they gave their bodies to the commonwealth and received, each for his own memory, praise that will never die, and with it the grandest of all sepulchres, not that in which their mortal bones are laid, but a home in the minds of men, where their glory remains fresh to stir to speech or action as the occasion comes by. For the whole earth is the sepulchre of famous men; and their story is not graven only on stone over their native earth, but lives on far away, with visible symbol, woven into the stuff of other men's lives.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, while I have at all times been in favor of this resolution, I have been criticised by some for withholding action on it by the Committee on Rules. Yes, I admit that I have not called a meeting of the Committee on Rules to take action on the resolution in reporting out a special rule for its consideration because I wanted to ascertain that its passage would be certain when it would be acted upon by the House. Knowing that a recess would take place, I felt that the members should have an opportunity to obtain the views of their constituents on this question. For many months a vast majority of the American people have urged that Congress go on record that our country favors a world-wide agreement that will bring about the complete disarmament of the Nazi-Japanese barbarians in order to safeguard our country and the world democracies from future wars and to work out a common sense plan that will insure permanent peace.

Mr. Speaker, in compliance with that universal demand the Committee on Foreign Affairs after due consideration reported the Fulbright resolution, which reads as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein.

Congress has now returned after a 10 weeks' recess and the Members, having obtained the reaction and views of their constituency, know that the people are in favor of this resolution, and I feel that they will vote in accordance with the wishes of the people they represent. The leaders of the House after a conference, came to the conclusion that instead of passing the resolution by a mere majority vote that the bill should be considered under a suspension of the rules, which requires a two-thirds vote, and also agreed to increase the customary time of 40 minutes that is permitted for general debate, to 4 hours. On the vote on the resolution to consider the Fulbright resolution 252 members voted aye, and 23 Republicans voted nay. The vote took place after an attack against the resolution by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and the two gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN and Mr. BRADLEY]. These three gentlemen and the 20 of the 23 who voted against the resolution to consider have generally opposed and voted against nearly all bills for the preparedness and war program, against appropriations for the fortification of Guam and other bases, against lend-lease, against the amendment of the Neutrality Act, the conscription and draft acts, the Stabilization Act, and others. From their votes in opposition to these and other measures it cannot be said that they have cooperated in the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, it was indeed gratifying how well the President's message of a few days ago was received by the membership of the House and the country. Only a few isolationists and appeasers imbued with Nazi-Fascist ideology or influenced by the propaganda of George Sylvester Viereck—the now convicted Hitler-Goebbels paid agent—did not approve the President's honest résumé of our achievements and accomplishments since the treacherous Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

I insert at this point an excerpt from an article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of September 15, 1943, entiled "G. O. P. Put on Record for Council of Nations." It is as follows:

> Joliet, Ill., September 15.—Deneen A. Watson, National Chairman of the Republican Postwar Policy Association, said September 13 that the recent declaration of the Republican leaders at Mackinac Island "stands as a pledge for a definite world organization and a world court to adjudicate international disputes."

Long before the Mackinac Island Conference the Republicans promised to cooperate in our war efforts. I am not going to charge that the Republicans whom I have mentioned are unpatriotic and that they continue to play into Hitler's hands. Many of those who, like them, up to the time of the attack on Pearl Harbor, opposed defense and preparedness measures and criticized administration policies, have desisted from their attacks, but we still have a handful who unfortunately seem to follow the George Sylvester Viereck propagandist agents and professional publicists and carry on subversive activities such as is disseminated by men like William Dudley Pelley, Gerald L. K. Smith, Merwin K. Hart, William J. Grace, James True, Edward James Smythe, Gerard B. Winrod, Edward Holton James, Lawrence Dennis, William Griffin, Col. Eugene Nelson Sanctuary, Mrs. Leslie Fry, George E. Deatherage, Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling, Robert Edward Edmondson, and others.

Do they not realize their responsibility to the country and to the millions of our boys at the front, of whom over a hundred thousand have already been killed, wounded, and disabled, or reported missing in action? Surely the President's message should have instilled the utmost

confidence as to the conduct of the war and have shown his great desire to safeguard the United States and the freedom and liberty which our Constitution guarantees to us. I am at a loss for words to appeal to this handful of gentlemen to desist from their attacks and fault-findings which encourage the Nazi-Fascist hirelings, not only in their subversive but seditious activities, but to continue in their organizing of dubious societies under patriotic names and to publish un-American magazines and pamphlets in the hope of creating discord and resentment and inciting racial hatred and destroy our unity.

Mr. Speaker, I have been all my life for the freedom of the press, freedom of speech, as well as freedom in religious worship, but these professional publicists and propagandists whom I have mentioned, are abusing those privileges, and, while many of them have been indicted and convicted for conspiracies and seditious activities, those who up to now have escaped apprehension, still continue in their subversive activities. I feel that this handful of Representatives here owe it to the country and to themselves to cease feeding and encouraging these Benedict Arnolds and Quislings in their dastardly work.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the heroic work on the part of 180,000,000 Russian people in aiding the United Nations to defeat the Nazi-Jap war lords, I feel that it is deplorable that some should continue in their criticism. Instead the Russian people are entitled to the plaudits of all liberty-loving peoples the world over. Not being able to hide the atrocities of the Hitler hordes, by their shouting and ranting over communism, they now seek to bring about friction and discord among the United Nations by charging that Russia contemplates a separate peace with Hitler and that it cannot be trusted in the post-war program. It seems to me—and I hope I am wrong—that these members are trying to follow in the footsteps of those responsible for our failure to enter the League of Nations and who thus made it possible for Hitler and the Japs to rearm and, therefore, upon whose shoulders rests the responsibility for this war and the loss of thousands of our boys and at a staggering cost to our country of billions and billions of dollars. There are some persons in our country who feel themselves secure in continuing their subversive activities, but I assure them that in the long run the truth will out and overtake them.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this resolution and shall vote for it. The limitation on the time of debate, with preference given to the members of the committee, forces me to be brief. It requires the vote of both the House and Senate to declare war, and that is what this body did on December 8, 1941. It is neither unconstitutional or improper for this House to declare for peace and express its determination to do everything possible to set up proper machinery for international cooperation, to the end that there shall be no more wars. This resolution does not invade the treaty-ratifying powers of the Senate. It is not even a blueprint and sets up no specific formula. I am sure, however, it voices my own conviction, and that of the people I have the honor to represent, that we should at least take the first step now to let our allies know we will join hands with them to see to it that in the future war aggressor nations will be stopped before they get started. This resolution, I am sure, expresses the sentiment of the overwhelming majority of the American people. It will be a message to our boys on every war front in the world that they are not fighting in vain. I am one of those who believe if Woodrow Wilson had realized his dream and hope, we would not now be in this war. I believe it would be very heartening not only to our allies but to all the people in our own country if when the roll is called the vote for the resolution would be unanimous.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is in the midst of the greatest crisis in her history. We have a twofold task. One is the immediate task of checking the reign of terror let loose by the Axis throughout the world. There is no possibility of there ever again being a decent, orderly, peaceful world, with security for ourselves, unless there is a complete defeat of the things that Japanese militarism and Hitlerism represent. But we can get that defeat, as we did once before, and still not get the decent world.

Victory over the enemy is prerequisite, but victory in itself does not touch the solution of our larger problem. It only gives us a chance to solve that problem.

And what is the problem? Basically, it is just this, very simple and very difficult—the peoples of the world learning to live together. That is the long-term task. We must help build new relationships between nations, and new techniques for solving their disputes, so that this sort of thing cannot happen every 25 years. To do that we must achieve with our allies a long-term collaboration and teamwork.

What kind of a world do we want? I think that if we examine our own minds and desires carefullly, we will say the two things the majority of Americans wants, most of all, are prosperity and security. Can we get either of those objectives just by our own effort without regard to the rest of the world?

Let us consider first prosperity. In order to furnish food and supplies for ourselves, our men on dozens of battle fronts, our allies, and hungry millions being liberated from Axis tyranny, we have been forced to build up in America productive capacity far in excess of what we at home can consume, or at least more than we can buy and pay for. After the war we will be left with an enormously overbuilt plant, agricultural and industrial. We must then either drastically reduce our plant to what we can consume, which would mean putting millions of men and women out of work at the very time soldiers are being demobilized and we need several million more, not fewer, jobs; or, we must find new markets for our surplus productive capacity. There are only two places to develop such new markets—at home and abroad.

We must be planning now to multiply job by building up in every possible way new industries and markets here at home. But with all the expansion possible, the American market simply cannot be enough to keep the American farmer and manufacturer and laborer at full employment. We must, therefore, lay long-range plans to increase our markets abroad.

America can exist by herself alone, even as a farmer can exist by himself. He can grow enough grain, vegetables, chickens, hogs, sheep, and so forth, to feed and clothe himself and his family; but he cannot develop a high standard of living, he cannot secure modern conveniences, he cannot develop a satisfying social and cultural life without trade and cordial relations with his neighbors. Wealth and prosperity come from exchange of commodities on a mutually beneficial basis; and rich culture and civilization come from interchange of ideas and personalities.

But there is no possibility of such trade and interchange between nations, and therefore no possibility of long-term economic prosperity here in America, unless there is political security throughout the world. One cannot enter into a contract with a firm in a foreign land unless there is reasonable certainty that goods can go and come, and that media of exchange will be stable, and that war or revolution will not be breaking out.

That brings us back to the other major objective—security. That is the fundamental problem—how can we get security? How can we preserve the peace after we have won it? How can we prevent these periodic outbreaks of increasingly violent, and costly, and disastrous wars?

In all history there have been but three types of security. The first was by individual armaments. Every man on our plains carried a gun on his hip. But it did not give him adequate security, because two or three others could always gang up against him.

Therefore, he went to the second stage—the stage of alliances. The cattle thieves, and horse rustlers, and highwaymen were allied in gangs. Therefore, the law-abiding citizens had to form alliances also. They were not ideal. They led at times to perversions of justice, to vigilante groups, to lynch law. But on the whole, they gave a greater degree of security than just individual armaments. It was the balance-of-power system.

Then our forefathers, as the country became more thickly settled and society became more complex, were wise enough to proceed to the third stage—that of organized security. If a man wanted to be sure that his family had a maximum of security with a minimum cost of his own time and money, the way to do it was to join with his neighbors in organizing the community to make sure there would be

clean water for all, and good sewage disposal, and good schools, good highways, good public health, and a good police force.

It was not because he was more interested in his neighbor's wife than in his own that he recognized it was part of his business to see that the neighbor's wife was safe and secure. It was only because he could not be sure of his own wife's safety unless he helped build a community orderliness which would make every law-abiding person in the area reasonably secure. Only when that had been achieved could he give up carrying his gun.

We in America tried for 20 years to get along without any one of the three. We would not go into alliances with the nations whose interests were nearest to our own. We would not join with other countries in an attempt to get organized security. And then we gave up our gun. No wonder we are fighting for our lives.

We allowed ourselves to be deluded by the fact that our country, until recent decades, was able to get security by physical separation from the rest of the world. Nature gave us two wide oceans, but we ourselves destroyed them with our own inventions. It was we, not the Germans or Japanese, who invented the steamboat, the submarine, and the airplane. We ate up the cake of our physical isolation with our own inventions, and still thought we had it. We jammed ourselves into the same boat with the rest of the world, and assumed that the boat could sink, but that by some magic we remain afloat.

Sometimes I wish we had a planet all by ourselves. Wouldn't that be fine? And yet I know what we would do, being Americans. We would lie awake at night until we could think up some way to get across from that planet to this one, so we could start doing business with the people here. And then we would wonder why we no longer had the security that came from separation.

No, to try to stand alone in this jungle of a world is to be overwhelmed. How then can we get security? Only by working with other peoples of like mind to achieve in full, frank cooperation agreement as to the rules and procedures by which life and intercourse on this planet are to be conducted. They must be agreements that will be to the benefit of all parties concerned, and therefore will serve the vital interests of each. Otherwise, we cannot expect the agreements to be adhered to faithfully either by others or by ourselves.

The resolution under consideration today makes clear to the world that we of both political parties realize this situation and want to do our utmost to work out if possible such mutually beneficial rules and procedures. It recognizes fully that we in this House do not have the authority to make binding commitments in our foreign relations. It recognizes that the machinery set up in our Constitution for making treaties and binding commitments with other nations is a partnership—the Executive and the United States Senate. Any contract entered into by only one partner without the full consent of the other cannot, of course, be binding. We have not forgotten, and neither have our allies—nor our enemies—that President Wilson once made some commitments which had not been agreed upon in advance by two-thirds of the Members of the Senate and by both political parties, and which, therefore, were rejected. How can we expect a President to negotiate with other nations without handicap, or expect those nations to negotiate freely and frankly with him, if they are not sure what the other partner, the Senate, will do?

Why should anyone expect Mr. Stalin to lay his cards on the table and perhaps reach an agreement with us, when he knows that an agreement has no validity from our standpoint until ratified by the Senate? How can leaders of other nations plan intelligently with us if they have no assurance as to what the foreign policy of the United States will be after 1944?

It has been said here that we cannot make plans for the future because we do not know what Churchill's plans, or Stalin's plans, or other nations' plans are. As a matter of fact, we do know pretty well what their basic ideas are. We may not agree with some of those ideas, but they have made fairly clear what they consider their vital interests to be. We should be as frank. Until we do, we, not they, are the great question mark in the world.

Do we want to compel them to make their own plans for the post-war world without us? Does anyone believe a settlement as good for us can be reached by them without us?

Therefore, we are saying in this resolution that we in this House believe that our vital national interests require that the President and two-thirds of the Senate—and that means both political parties, too—seek to reach a basic agreement on a sound, continuing, national foreign policy. It must be neither Democratic nor Republican, but American—just as the Monroe Doctrine has always been American. The whole world has known for over a hundred years, that, no matter who was President of the United States, or what party was in power, we would not stand for any foreign nation trying to encroach on this hemisphere.

Agreement must be reached in the next few months, before we get into the heat of the Presidential campaign, before passions are stirred up over the domestic issues about which there are such vigorous and important differences of opinion.

If the Germans know now what America's position with regard to the war and the peace will be, no matter who is elected next year, they are more likely to crack up. If they think we may be disunited on this issue, or try to withdraw from cooperation with the United Nations, then our enemies are encouraged to hang on desperately, and that means more Americans boys killed every day.

I venture to warn that if our Republican leaders are willing—as I hope and believe will be the case—but the administration and Democratic leaders refuse to cooperate now in trying to work out a truly national, nonpartisan, continuing foreign policy and plans for post-war collaboration, then whatever settlement the Executive reaches in secret with other countries will be rejected by the Senate, and by the people, even though the agreements be as good as the Ten Commandments.

On the other hand, if the administration and the Democratic leaders are willing, but the Republican leaders refuse to cooperate in trying to work out now, before the campaign, such a truly national foreign policy, then the Republican Party will be rejected at the polls, and will deserve to be rejected—because it will have demonstrated it is not sufficiently constructive and forward looking and responsible to be entrusted with power in so critical a period.

This resolution both strengthens and restrains the President in his negotiations with our allies and with our enemies. It does not try to define now exactly what "appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace" would be. But it gives no carte blanche. It makes clear that the Senate will determine at the proper time what is or is not appropriate.

I hope its passage by an overwhelming majority will encourage the members of both parties in the Senate to advise in the near future approximately how far they will go along in international collaboration to establish and maintain the peace. The Executive's hand would be enormously strengthened in his negotiations with other nations—as long as he stays within the general framework. If he should be tempted to make commitments too far outside that general framework, both he and the other nations are forewarned that such commitments are likely to be considered inappropriate, and therefore be rejected—and he is properly restrained.

Somehow we must rise above politics and partisanship to achieve a real unity and teamwork on this vital issue, so that America and the world will know that, no matter what decision Americans make in 1944 as to how they want their domestic affairs run, our foreign policy will be realistic, stable, predictable, and continuing.

It may be objected that we would be surrendering some of our sovereignty to join in a cooperative effort to maintain the peace. Well, did we have complete sovereignty? Did we have in our own hands control of the question as to whether we went to war or not? No. Japan decided for us.

Do we have absolute sovereignty now in waging the war? No. Scores of units of our fleet are fighting under the command of British admirals. Tens of thousands of British, and French, and Greeks, and Dutch, and Chinese, and Australians, and New Zealanders are fighting under the command of American generals. Americans are fighting under the command of a Chinese general. We would not hesitate to place some of our

forces under Stalin's command if they were needed and he wanted them on the Russian front.

We recognize fully that there are risks in delegating, whether in war or peace, control of certain functions to the United Nations, but we do it, nevertheless, because we recognize that the risks in not working together in such a fashion are enormously greater.

America is in the valley of decision. Today and in these next few months we will be deciding, probably without realizing it, the basic attitudes and directions which are likely to determine the course of our Nation and of the world for the next half century. Four main choices are before us. First, we can try to go back to so-called isolationism. It once was possible, but that day has gone. The progress of invention, the ability of the airplane to disregard all land boundaries, and the refusal of other nations to ignore us, no matter how much we want to ignore them, make it an absolute impossibility.

Second, American imperialism. Some will say, "Well, if we can't escape the world, then we will rule it. If the world will not leave us alone, then we will get control of the key islands, and critical air bases, and main routes of trade, and fortify them until impregnable, and then build such a giant air force and navy and army that it will be certain no nation can ever attack us."

That sounds big; but let us examine, first, whether it is possible, and second, what the attempt would cost in men and money.

It is difficult for us Americans to realize that we are rapidly becoming a have-not nation in many crucial materials because of the rate at which we are exhausting our resources. If we try to police the world, the other nations certainly will gang up against us, just as we now gang up against those who would try to rule us. Those who are now helping supply us with tin, oil, rubber, copper, zinc, bauxite, tungsten, chromium, and so forth, would refuse us free access to their supplies of those resources which we never had or have used up.

Again, we will have a population of less than 140,000,000, a little tired and disillusioned, and asking only to be let alone. But there are 200,000,000 Russians, and they are not tired. There are 450,000,000 Chinese, just awakening from the sleep of the centuries, and their leaders are aflame with the love of human freedom as our forefathers were in 1776. Ferment is beginning to work among 375,000,000 in India, and there are 150,000,000 in Latin America, restless and uneasy. Does anybody really think we with our limited resources and manpower can run the world or police it single-handed?

To try to do it would mean that two or three millions of our sons who are now in uniform will never get back to civilian life. Do we want them to win the war only to be permanently in uniform?

It would cost 15 to 25 billion dollars for armaments in every annual budget. Mr. Speaker, we cannot possibly contemplate such a permanent expenditure. Our taxes would have to go constantly higher. We would have less and less money for the comforts of life, the things we Americans are used to and crave. That would mean increasing dissatisfaction and discontent throughout all sections of our populace. Gradually our standard of living would go down and we would either break up into factions and go the way of France—national disintegration—or some man with a hynotic personality would come along and promise relief if we would but follow him, and the mass of people would go with him into a totalitarian system and the loss of our basic freedoms.

For America to try imperialism would be suicidal.

Third, America could try to buy the world's goodwill, by endeavoring to supply the world adequate food, clothing, medicines, and so forth, out of our own resources—the philosophy of giving people things, instead of helping them get on their feet so they can develop their own freedom-from-want. That philosophy has always been and always will be self-defeating in the long run. It destroys independence and will and initiative. Besides our Nation simply does not have the resources and money to sustain any such program.

If we cannot escape the world, or rule the world, or buy the world, is there any course left except a genuinely cooperative effort to achieve with our allies an organized security? It is not possible to settle now actual details of such organization, nor is it within the jurisdiction of the House; but if we and the other peoples of the world see, first of all that we must find some other way than war of solving our disputes, I am perfectly confident the actual appropriate machinery for doing it can be evolved.

If we are sufficiently intelligent, and wise in our own interests, to work out with our allies ways by which we can jointly win the war, then surely we are sufficiently intelligent, and wise in our own interests, to be able to work out with our allies ways by which we can jointly win the peace and jointly prevent war.

Let us, by an overwhelming vote, tell our soldiers, our people generally, our allies, and our enemies that we are dedicating ourselves today to that stern, inescapable task.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time on this side.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is playing its proper role in the Government when it voices the will of the people. We are here for that purpose. The people have unmistakably made known that they favor such a resolution as we are passing. They recognize the fact that the United States is vitally concerned in finding ways and means to prevent another World War. They are willing that the United States should join in the search for a method of preserving world peace.

This resolution does not prejudge the work of the conference that will follow the United Nations' victory. We are not committing the country or Congress to any peace plan. We are asking that a concerted search be made for such a plan. Then, if a plan is evolved, and if it meets the situation and appeals to the sovereign judgment of the United States, it can be approved.

It is well that Congress should voice the will of the people on this subject. It is well for both enemies and friends to know that the United States is determined that the peace to follow this war shall be a just and lasting peace. In order to accomplish this purpose it is necessary that a search for a workable plan be made by the free nations. That is what we ask for in this resolution. It may be that this action will pave the way for universal peace. God grant that it may be so.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution as amended?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 360, nays 29, answered "present" 1, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

YEAS—360

Abernethy	Cooper	Graham
Allen, Ill.	Costello	Grant, Ala.
Allen, La.	Courtney	Grant, Ind.
Andersen, H. Carl	Cox	Gregory
Anderson, Calif.	Cravens	Griffiths
Andresen, August H.	Crosser	Gross
Andrews	Cunningham	Gwynne
Angell	Curley	Hagen
Arends	Curtis	Hale
Arnold	D'Alesandro	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Auchincloss	Davis	Hall, Leonard W.
Baldwin, Md.	Dawson	Halleck
Baldwin, N. Y.	Delaney	Hancock
Barden	Dewey	Hare
Barrett	Dickstein	Harness, Ind.
Barry	Dies	Harris, Ark.
Bates, Ky.	Dilweg	Harris, Va.
Bates, Mass.	Dingell	Hart
Beall	Dirksen	Hays
Beckworth	Disney	Hébert
Bell	Ditter	Heffernan
Bender	Domengeaux	Hendricks
Bennett, Mich.	Dondero	Herter
Bennett, Mo.	Doughton	Hess
Blackney	Douglas	Hinshaw
Bland	Drewry	Hoch
Bloom	Durham	Hoeven
Bolton	Dworshak	Holifield
Bonner	Eaton	Holmes, Wash.
Boykin	Eberharter	Hope
Bradley, Pa.	Ellison, Md.	Horan
Brooks	Ellsworth	Howell
Brown, Ga.	Elston, Ohio	Hull
Brown, Ohio	Engel	Jarman
Bryson	Fay	Jeffrey
Buckley	Feighan	Jenkins
Buffett	Fellows	Jennings
Bulwinkle	Fenton	Jensen
Burch, Va.	Fernandez	Johnson, Ind.
Burchill, N. Y.	Fish	Johnson, J. Leroy
Burdick	Fisher	Johnson, Luther A.
Burgin	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Butler	Flannagan	Johnson, Okla.
Byrne	Fogarty	Johnson, Ward
Camp	Folger	Jonkman
Canfield	Forand	Judd
Cannon, Fla.	Ford	Kean
Cannon, Mo.	Fulbright	Kearney
Capozzoli	Fulmer	Kee
Carlson, Kans.	Gale	Keefe
Carter	Gallagher	Kefauver
Case	Gamble	Kelley
Celler	Gathings	Kennedy
Chapman	Gavagan	Keogh
Chiperfield	Gavin	Kerr
Church	Gerlach	Kilburn
Clason	Gibson	Kilday
Cochran	Gifford	King
Cole, Mo.	Gilchrist	Kinzer
Cole, N. Y.	Gillette	Kirwan
Colmer	Gillie	
Compton	Gordon	
Cooley	Gore	
	Gorski	
	Gossett	

Kleberg	Murray, Wis.	Sikes
Klein	Myers	Simpson, Ill.
Kunkel	Newsome	Simpson, Pa.
LaFollette	Norman	Slaughter
Landis	Norrell	Smith, Maine
Lanham	Norton	Smith, Va.
Larcade	O'Brien, Ill.	Smith, W. Va.
Lea	O'Brien, N. Y.	Smith, Wis.
LeCompte	O'Neal	Snyder
LeFevre	O'Toole	Somers, N. Y.
Lesinski	Outland	Springer
Lewis, Colo.	Pace	Stanley
Lewis, Ohio	Patman	Starnes, Ala.
Luce	Patton	Steagall
Ludlow	Peterson, Ga.	Stearns, N. H.
Lynch	Pfeifer	Stefan
McCord	Philbin	Stewart
McCormack	Phillips	Stockman
McCowen	Ploeser	Sullivan
McGehee	Plumley	Sumners, Tex.
McGranery	Poage	Taber
McGregor	Poulson	Talbot
McLean	Powers	Talle
McMillan	Pracht	Taylor
McMurray	Price	Thomas, Tex.
McWilliams	Priest	Thomason
Maas	Rabaut	Tibbott
Madden	Ramey	Tolan
Magnuson	Ramspeck	Towe
Mahon	Randolph	Treadway
Maloney	Rankin	Troutman
Manasco	Rees, Kans.	Van Zandt
Mansfield, Mont.	Richards	Vincent, Ky.
	Rivers	Vinson, Ga.
Mansfield, Tex.	Rizley	Voorhis, Calif.
Marcantonio	Robertson	Vorys, Ohio
Martin, Iowa	Robinson, Utah	Vursell
Martin, Mass.	Robsion, Ky.	Wadsworth
Mason	Rodgers, Pa.	Walter
May	Rogers, Calif.	Ward
Merritt	Rogers, Mass.	Weaver
Merrow	Rohrbough	Weiss
Michener	Rolph	Welch
Miller, Conn.	Rowan	Wene
Miller, Mo.	Russell	Wheat
Miller, Nebr.	Sabath	Whitten
Miller, Pa.	Sadowski	Whittington
Mills	Sasscer	Wickersham
Monkiewicz	Satterfield	Wigglesworth
Monroney	Sauthoff	Wilson
Morrison, La.	Scanlon	Winstead
Morrison, N. C.	Schiffler	Wolfenden, Pa.
Mott	Schuetz	Wolverton, N. J
Mruk	Schwabe	Woodrum, Va.
Mundt	Scott	Worley
Murdock	Shafer	Wright
Murphy	Sheppard	Zimmerman
Murray, Tenn.	Sheridan	

NAYS—29

Bishop	Gearhart	Reece, Tenn.
Bradley, Mich.	Heidinger	Reed, Ill.
Brehm	Hoffman	Reed, N. Y.
Busbey	Johnson, Anton J.	Rowe
Carson, Ohio		Short
Clevenger	Jones	Smith, Ohio
Crawford	Knutson	Sumner, Ill.
Day	Lambertson	Tarver
Ellis	Lemke	Whelchel, Ga.
Elmer	O'Brien, Mich.	Woodruff, Mich.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

O'Hara

NOT VOTING—40

Anderson, N. Mex.	Hartley	Pittenger
	Hill	Rockwell
Boren	Hobbs	Sparkman
Chenoweth	Holmes, Mass.	Spence
Clark	Izac	Stevenson
Coffee	Jackson	Sundstrom
Creal	Johnson, Calvin D.	Thomas, N. J.
Cullen		Wasielewski
Elliott	Lane	Weichel, Ohio
Furlong	McKenzie	West
Goodwin	O'Connor	White
Granger	O'Konski	Willey
Green	O'Leary	Winter
Harless, Ariz.	Peterson, Fla.	Wolcott

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Willey and Mr. Sparkman for, with Mr. Calvin D. Johnson against.

Mr. Hobbs and Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts for, with Mr. O'Konski against.

General pairs:

Mr. Cullen with Mr. Hill.
Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Pittinger.
Mr. Creal with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Harless of Arizona with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Coffee with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Weichel of Ohio.
Mr. Anderson of New Mexico with Mr. Sunstrom.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Jackson with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Rockwell.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Winter.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from today's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request from the Senate:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

July 8 (legislative day of May 24), 1943.

Ordered, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 883) entitled "A bill providing for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business."

Attest:

EDWIN A. HALSEY,
Secretary.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request of the Senate is granted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the Connecticut Wholesale Milk Producers' Council.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS PIPE LINES FOR STEAM-HEATING PURPOSES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3208) to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and are hereby, authorized and empowered to grant permission to Lansburgh & Bro., a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia and doing business in said District, and the owner of lots 819, 803, 817, and 804, square 431, all on the east side of Eighth Street NW., between D and E Streets, and lots 17, 810, and 811, square 407, all on the west side of Eighth Street NW., between D and E Streets, and all in the District of Columbia, its successors and assigns, to lay down, construct, maintain, and use pipe lines for the carriage of steam heat, together with necessary return pipes, from a point within said lot 819, square 431, across Eighth Street NW., to a point within said lot 17, square 407.

SEC. 2. That all the construction and use provided for herein shall be under such regulations and rentals as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may make and establish in connection therewith and all plans and specifications for such construction shall be subject to their approval. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have full authority to designate the location and to cause such repairs or relocation of said pipe lines as the public necessity may require, any such repairs or relocation to be at the expense of Lansburgh & Bro., its successors or assigns.

SEC. 3. That no permission granted or enjoyed hereunder shall vest any title or interest in or to the land within Eighth Street NW.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC LIBRARY

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 1224) to designate the Public Library of the District of Columbia a public depository for governmental publications, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, in response to the request of the distinguished ranking minority member of the House District Committee, may I say to the Members that the bill S. 1224 passed the Senate unanimously. At the present time the District of Columbia Public Library does not have the right to act as a depository for public documents of the United States. This bill simply gives to the Librarian of the District of Columbia the right to receive such documents.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Public Library of the District of Columbia is hereby constituted a designated depository of governmental publications, and the Superintendent of Documents shall supply to such library one copy of each such publication, in the same form as supplied to other designated depositories.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAILING OF ANNUAL NOTICES TO OWNERS OF TAX-EXEMPT PROPERTIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 789) to provide for the mailing of annual notices to owners of tax-exempt properties in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from West Virginia explain the bill?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this measure also passed the Senate unanimously. It is simply a procedural bill which calls upon the tax collector of the District of Columbia to provide for the mailing of annual notices to those persons holding tax-exempt properties within the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of Public Law 846, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 24, 1942, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the section and inserting a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That such rules and regulations shall include provision for mailing annually, on or before February 1 of each year, to each of the institutions, organizations, corporations, or associations required by section 3 of this act to file annual reports, notice of its contingent tax liability under this act, together with a copy of any standard form for such reports which shall have been prescribed by the Commissioners under authority of this section."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION OF RECORDER OF DEEDS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND SUPERINTENDENT OF NATIONAL TRAINING SCHOOL FOR GIRLS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 1223) to fix the compensation of the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia and the Superintendent of the National Training School for Girls, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I reserve the right to object and suggest that the chairman make some explanation of the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this measure will allow and direct an increase of salary to the two officers within the District of Columbia. The recorder of deeds for this jurisdiction would have his salary increased from $6,400 to $8,000 per year, and the superintendent of the National Training School for Girls would have her salary increased from $2,700 to $3,600 a year. It is felt that the salaries for these two public officials are not commensurate with the salaries paid for comparable work done in other positions of trust and administrative capacity in the District of Columbia. I believe I should read to the House this comment from the report which accompanies the bill in the Senate prior to its passage:

It should be made clear that this bill, so far as it relates to the recorder of deeds, concerns only the question of compensation. Another bill (S. 1251) now pending before this committee is a measure relating to the matter of the authority of the District of Columbia Commissioners over the recorder of deeds.

Then the report states this further, that it should be stated frankly that it is the opinion of the committee that the two positions which this bill concerns would pay higher salaries if filled by white incumbents, and also that it is the sense of the committee that no taint of discrimination should be attached in any way to any salaries paid in or under the government of the District of Columbia.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Does the gentleman think that these two are the only inequalities existing in the government of the District of Columbia?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; and I would say to the gentleman as he well knows from his services here, that there are other inequalities and inequities existing in the government of the District of Columbia. Such things exist also in the State of Kansas, as well as in my own State. The gentleman does well to call attention to the fact from time to time so that we may deal justly with those receiving less than their services should command.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the date of approval of this act the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia, appointed in accordance with section 548 of the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1275), shall be paid a salary at the rate of $8,000 per annum.

SEC. 2. From and after the date of approval of this act, and notwithstanding any provisions of the act of July 9, 1888 (25 Stat. ch. 595), or any provisions of the act of March 16, 1926 (44 Stat. ch. 58), or any provisions of any other act heretofore approved, the Superintendent of the National Training School for Girls shall be paid a salary at the rate of $3,600 per annum.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEVYING AND COLLECTING OF TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS OF TAXES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 881) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments and for other purposes, approved June 25, 1938, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object and ask the gentleman from West Virginia to make some explanation of the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this would amend the act presently in force in the District of Columbia in connection with the levying and collection of taxes and assessments. The purpose is to assure the mailing of real estate tax bills to all taxpayers whose addresses are known to the assessor's office.

In this connection I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes", approved June 25, 1938, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 12. On or before August 1, 1943, and on or before the first day of August of each subsequent year, the assessor of the District of Columbia shall mail to the record owner of each lot or parcel of land upon which a regular assessment has been levied by the District of Columbia as of July 1 of the same year, a notice of the amount of such assessment, and of the manner in which the amount of such assessment is payable according to law; and such notice shall also include notice of any previous assessments, or portions thereof, levied by the District of Columbia against such lot or parcel of land, which on July 1 of the year in which such

notice is sent remained unpaid, and of any fines or penalties accrued or levied by reason of such delinquency: *Provided*, That if the address of the owner be unknown, such notice shall be mailed to his tenant or agent; and if there be more than one record owner of any lot or parcel, notice mailed to one of the owners shall be deemed compliance with this section: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall affect in any way the provisions of section 3 of this Act."

The Clerk read the amendment as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANDOLPH: Page 1, strike out all of section 12, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 12. Annually and subsequent to July 1, the Assessor of the District of Columbia shall mail to the record owner of each lot or parcel of land upon which a real estate tax has been levied by the District of Columbia as of July 1, of the same year, a notice of the amount of such real estate tax, and of the manner in which the amount of such real estate tax is payable according to law; and such notice shall state whether there were any delinquent real estate taxes unpaid on July 1 of the year in which such notice is sent; *Provided*, That if the address of the owner be unknown such notice shall be mailed to his agent, if known; and if there be more than one record owner of any lot or parcel, notice mailed to one of the owners shall be deemed compliance with this section: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall affect in any way the provisions of section 3 of this act: *Provided further*, That failure of the property owner or his agent to receive such notice shall not relieve the property owner of the payment of any penalty or interest as required by law for the delinquent payment of real estate taxes."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

EXTENT AND CAUSE OF ABSENTEEISM

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar (H. R. 2553) directing the Secretary of Labor to make an investigation and study of the extent and causes of absenteeism and to make available the facilities of the Department of Labor to act as a clearinghouse for information on methods to control absenteeism.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Two objections are required.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

WARTIME CONSTRUCTION OF RECLAMATION PROJECTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3018, authorizing wartime construction and operation and maintenance of reclamation projects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to embark upon the construction and opening up of new reclamation and irrigation projects without any restriction as to location or the amount of money involved. It is too important to be passed by unanimous consent. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1388, to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the construction of a scenic parkway to provide an appropriate view of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park from the Tennessee side of the park, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept, on behalf of the United States, donations of land and interests in land in the State of Tennessee for the construction of a scenic parkway to be located generally parallel to the boundary of the Great Smoky Moutains National Park and connecting with the park, in order to provide an appropriate view of the park from the Tennessee side. The right-of-way to be acquired for the parkway shall be of such width as to comprise an average of 125 acres per mile for its entire length. The title to real property acquired pursuant to this act shall be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior. All property acquired pursuant to this act shall become a part of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park upon acceptance of title thereto by the Secretary, and shall be subject to all laws, rules, and regulations applicable thereto.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSAL OF MATERIALS OR RESOURCES ON PUBLIC LANDS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2697, to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Secretary of the Interior is opposed to this measure and it is not approved by the Budget, it should not be passed by unanimous consent. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GRANTING OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE CITY OF SITKA, ALASKA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 340, to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to grant and convey certain lands to the city of Sitka, Alaska, for street purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask if any one of the objectors can give some explanation of this bill? What is the location of the land?

Mr. PRIEST. The Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] has explained that.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] can probably do that better than any member of this committee. He is not present in the hall at this time. If the gentleman from Washington has any serious objection he might request that the bill be passed over until the Delegate from Alaska is present.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NONFAT DRY MILK SOLIDS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 149, to increase agricultural purchasing power and to meet the need of combating malnutrition among the people of low income by defining and making certain a reasonable definition and standard for nonfat dry milk solids.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, although personally in favor of the measure, in view of the fact that the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency has indicated his disapproval of the bill, I think it should be brought to the attention of the House in its entirety and not passed by unanimous consent. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF FISHERY COORDINATION

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1242, to authorize appropriations for salaries and expenses, Office of Fishery Coordination.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have some explanation of the bill?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly willing to dispense with the explanation if the bill will go through. But for many months of this session, as well as some months in the last session of Congress, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries held many hearings on matters pertaining to the fisheries industry and it became very apparent there was need of coordination.

It developed there were 22 war and other agencies that were affecting the fisheries industry very seriously, and unless there was some one agency that could attempt to coordinate those things, there would be hopeless confusion.

Personally, I appealed to the President and to the Bureau of the Budget for the establishment of a fisheries coordinator, if for nothing else than to relieve my

committee of the burden that was resting upon it, for if we had some one person to whom the fisheries could look to represent the fisheries with the various agencies, many problems could be solved.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. May I ask the gentleman from Virginia if the committee reported the bill?

Mr. BLAND. This bill was carefully considered and unanimously reported by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How much money is authorized to be appropriated under the bill?

Mr. BLAND. The bill authorizes the necessary appropriations, and I understand there is pending a request for about $207,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I might say for the information of the House that the situation was so chaotic in Seattle in respect to fisheries that until the office was created, representatives of the industry had been down here seeking some solution; it has operated very successfully through setting up the Office of the Fisheries Coordinator.

Mr. BLAND. And they were instrumental in meeting many of the fisheries difficulties, as, for instance, there were a number of boats that had been requisitioned and were necessary for the prosecution of the fisheries. The Coordinator assisted in securing the return of some of them.

Mr. BARDEN. I might add that the feeling within the fisheries industry is that this step is one of the best contributions to the promotion of the fishery industry that has been made.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I think this is too important a bill to be brought up under this kind of a rule.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I can say to the gentleman from Iowa that there is no more important bill for the fisheries industry pending before the House at this session, and I do not know of any objection that has ever been interposed to it. Every man familiar with the fisheries industry who came before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries emphasized the necessity of having some agency to which they could go and the Coordinator has established them now. I think some eleven or twelve regional areas have been established, and the fisheries generally are in touch with these agencies, and through them are getting better results. There is no complaint from the fisheries.

Mr. JENSEN. May I ask the gentleman from Virginia if this bill has been considered by the committee and if this is the result of consideration by the full committee?

Mr. BLAND. It has been considered by the committee. I do not know that I can tell the gentleman how many members were present at the time, but I will say that the things leading up to this bill have been considered by the members of the committee from time to time.

Mr. JENSEN. Has it been voted out of your committee?

Mr. BLAND. It has.

Mr. JENSEN. It has been favorably acted upon?

Mr. BLAND. It was voted out as of July 2, 1943, and the report on the bill is No. 642. There was no objection whatsoever interposed.

Mr. JENSEN. We are setting up another agency, I will say to the gentleman, are we not, under this bill?

Mr. BLAND. It is setting up what is necessary as coordination between these agencies in order that something may be accomplished. If we do not do this we are not going to get the benefits of fisheries that are necessary for them to continue the production of food that is so much needed now.

Mr. JENSEN. Will it require many employees in the Department?

Mr. BLAND. There will be need, necessarily, for some employees to carry on the work and that is covered in the appropriation that is being sought.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to the gentleman from Virginia that our difficulty is just this: We have the Fish and Wildlife Service in the Department of the Interior, and I was of the opinion it was its job to coordinate the various activities, and I know nothing about the necessity for the expenditure of in excess of $200,000 involved in the creation of the coordinators' office.

Mr. BLAND. It was very evident to the committee that the Bureau of Fisheries could not do the job that needed to be done in coordinating the 22 agencies and getting this work done.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Speaking for myself, I have never been advised by Dr. Gabrielson that his agency was not doing this work.

Mr. BLAND. He is trying to do it; he is doing a splendid job.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; that is right.

Mr. BLAND. But certain additional force is needed and additional equipment needed in order to make contact with the 22 Government agencies with the returning of boats, supplies, and the shipping going up to Alaska; there is additional work incident to the war agencies in connection with some of the products that are needed and that could be loaded, and there is need for personal contact in order to do that work.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, of course, if additional appropriations were made to Fish and Wildlife they might very conceivably handle this job without the necessity of creating another agency.

Mr. BLAND. The agency is not being created by the Congress; the agency was created by the President under Executive order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. BLAND. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct as I understand it.

Mr. BLAND. The Congress is only providing the necessary appropriations. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. BARDEN. I might say to the gentleman from Illinois that a lot of this work is already being done. If the gentleman lived in the district where the work was being done he would understand just the situation that confronted them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope the gentleman from Illinois will not object to this, because the Alaska salmon fishing industry is now just about at its peak. They had the problem of shipping men and supplies up there, for instance, for doing the work, through the O. P. A. to get food for the fishermen; then they ha dto work through the Army and the Navy to get to Alaska, and all these agencies. It finally became so chaotic that some of the fishermen just threw up their hands and said they would not go. Then they created this coordinator. He in turn fixed all this up and coordinated the whole thing so that the whole fleet went to Alaska. Many of them are now on their way back and if this agency does not continue I am afraid the fishermen may get snagged up there in a lot of red tape with a lot of the agencies.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The fact of the matter is all these problems can be taken care of by existing agencies. This comes to us without any specific request of any kind. I have talked to Dr. Gabrielson about this matter. The point is you set up another agency and when this emergency is over the question is whether it will not continue like so many emergency agencies and be back for further appropriations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There will be no necessity and, of course, Dr. Gabrielson is using men from his own Division who are experienced coordinators.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This agency once established will continue and continue; it will follow tradition.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. I wish to read some of the benefits that have resulted thus far:

Coordination has worked in the last few months—

1. In food production.

2. In securing priorities involving material and equipment for repair, replacement, and expansion of (a) fishing gear, (b) fishing boats, and (c) shore processing plants.

3. In promoting fishing vessel construction and release of fishing vessels for fishing.

4. In effecting return of requisitioned fishing vessels as speedily as possible.

5. In helping to supply net and twine requirements for fishing industry.

6. In alleviating restrictions imposed on fishing areas for military purposes, such as bombing ranges, port restrictions, hours of fishing at sea, and radio restrictions on shipping vessels at sea.

7. In assisting OPA in fixing price control, in determining maximum prices for fishery products and in working out allocations to minimize dislocations occasioned by price control.

8. In establishing liaison with each of 23 Government agencies having authority for action seriously affecting fish production.

9. In working out expanded program for production and also improving methods of conservation. In helping to keep up morale and active efforts of fishermen to meet the difficult problems arising from war conditions.

The fishermen who came before my committee were ready to throw up their hands because of the difficulty of getting their problems solved and the contacts that are necessary to be made with these various agencies, something which is very evident to every Member of Congress when he undertakes to deal with any one of these agencies in a solution of the problems that come before him.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I happen to be a member of the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations. Is it not strange that no one has ever said anything to the subcommittee about this matter? And it takes an appropriation for its activities.

Mr. BLAND. This is an authorization, and the matter has to come before the gentleman's committee to say whether the money is granted or not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But once an authorization has been approved by Congress the appropriation follows as a matter of course.

Mr. BLAND. Not always.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Almost inevitably.

Mr. BLAND. Not always, and I say that based on my experience of many years in this House.

Mr. JENSEN. Generally it does. To me it is rather strange that our committee has heard nothing from either Dr. Gabrielson or the departments.

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say that the Navy has taken over a great number of boats. Also, in various areas off the coast they have planted mines, and they had to have a committee cooperating between this branch and the Navy Department to remove the mines from the fishing areas. Many priority questions have to be settled. I am sure the gentleman knows how difficult it is to get one department to go to another department to get something done. There are 23 bureaus that have to do with the fishing industry, and this industry being so important it was absolutely necessary to have some coordination between these departments or the fishermen would just throw up their hands. Half of them come filing into the Congressmen's offices. To be perfectly frank with you, this is a relief bill for the Members of Congress who represent these seacoast areas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot move to strike out the last word when the bill is not before the House.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF AN ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2801, to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], chairman of the committee that reported this bill, is not here, and also due to the fact I want some more information on the bill, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS]?

There was no objection.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN LAND TO MONTEZUMA CASTLE NATIONAL MONUMENT IN ARIZONA

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 378, to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Secretary of the Interior is not in favor of this bill, nor has it been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget; therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF OYSTERS FROM WATERS OF YORK RIVER AND QUEEN CREEK, VA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2886, to provide for the removal of oysters from the waters of York River and Queen Creek, Va., affected by sewage disposal emanating from the construction battalion training camp at Camp Peary, Va., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the committee how much it will cost to save these $136,000 worth of oysters? This bill provides for saving $136,000 worth of oysters.

Mr. BLAND. I noticed that and inquired about it. I understand a request will be made of the Bureau of the Budget for $75,000. My information is that there will be practically no cost—I know how that is always taken with a smile, I do so myself—to the Government for the reason that the purpose of the plan is to buy these oysters and transfer them to the waters from which they may be sold.

The situation is that these oyster lands around York River and Queen Creek, are in an area that was free from pollution. In order to secure freedom from pollution the State of Virginia, the city of Williamsburg, and the localities around there expended about $250,000 on a P. W. A. project, then the State of Virginia passed a law which absolutely prohibited any pollution within this area. Acting under those laws and under that procedure, these persons planted their oysters.

The oysters are now in good shape to be removed to other bottoms and after purification for the necessary period will be sold. The Government, exercising its powers, acquired the upland properties for a CB battalion camp and they have there a CB battalion camp with no provision as to sewage from camp or hospital and no provision to take care of any of the sanitation whatever. There are now about 50,000 men in the plant and the evidence shows there will be about 80,000 there shortly.

The lands of the owners who planted these oysters were taken and they have no place to put their boats or to move the oysters. The plan of the Navy is to have an organization that will take care of this. There is one organization that can help take care of this. I refer to the Chesapeake Corporation. The plan of the Navy is to acquire these oysters, transfer them to unpolluted areas and sell them. They have now, so Commander Earle told me last night, considerable demand for the oysters and he says there will be practically no loss to the Government. Of course, I say that with a little bit of qualification.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. This, I understand, is to save these oysters, is that correct?

Mr. BLAND. It is to save the oysters because they will be ready to be marketed soon. If they can be sent to the unpolluted areas they can then be sold and the supply of oysters, I may say, is extremely low.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman tell me from his long experience if there is any way to take care of grape growers in two of my counties who have 26,000 tons of grapes? The Department of Agriculture, through Mr. Card speaking for them, says those grapes will be wasted. They are worth $100 a ton, a total of $2,600,000. Is there any way I can hook that grape proposal onto your oyster bill.

Mr. BLAND. I do not think so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman know while he is trying to save these $200,000 for the folks down in the oyster beds how I can do something for these grape growers?

Mr. BLAND. I wish I could find out. If I could I would tell the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The substance of the answer now is that we can go whistle. The same thing is happening with reference to onions and celery running into millions of tons.

Mr. BLAND. I wish I could give the gentleman the answer.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Can we not get a coordinator who can do something?

Mr. BLAND. I would like to be able to do it, but if the gentleman cannot do it, certainly I cannot.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot do anything. I wish I could. If I had my way I would wipe them out down there.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to investigate the extent of damage, actual or potential, to

oysters in the waters of York River and Queen Creek, Va., resulting from sewage disposal emanating from the construction battalion training camp, at Camp Peary, Va., and to take such action as he may consider expedient to cause such oysters to be removed and transplanted into unpolluted waters of the vicinity, or otherwise to provide for their marketability for human consumption at the earliest lawful season.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the Consent Calendar.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

RENZIE GRAHAM

The Clerk called the first individual bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 550, for the relief of the estate of Renzie Graham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the administrator of the estate of Renzie Graham, of Athens, Ohio, for the use and benefit of the widow and children of said Renzie Graham the sum of $6,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States Government for the death of the said Renzie Graham resulting from injuries sustained by him during a period of hospitalization in the veterans' facility, Dayton, Ohio, due to the negligence of the staff of said hospital when the said Renzie Graham was burned by X-ray treatments given by the said staff; and for medical, hospital, traveling, and other expenses incurred and paid by the said Renzie Graham and by his said widow by reason of the illness and death and burial of the said Renzie Graham: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after "to", strike out "the administrator of the estate of Renzie Graham, of Athens, Ohio, for the use and benefit of the widow and children of said Renzie Graham" and insert in lieu thereof "Mrs. Renzie Graham, of Athens, Ohio, widow of Renzie Graham, deceased."

Page 2, line 1, after "of", strike out "$6,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,900."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Renzie Graham."

MOSES TENNENBAUM

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2456, for the relief of Moses Tennenbaum.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. MOTT, and Mr. McGREGOR objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

ELEANOR McCLOSKEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 438, for the relief of Eleanor McCloskey, also known as Evelyn Mary Mikalauskas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the warrant of arrest and the order of deportation against Eleanor McCloskey, also known as Evelyn Mary Mikalauskas, heretofore issued on the ground that admission to the United States had been fraudulently gained, and that she shall hereafter be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of entry.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA M. KOHLER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1434, for the relief of Anna M. Kohler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, an immigration visa shall not be refused and an exclusion at a port of entry shall not be required in the case of Anna M. Kohler under the moral turpitude clause of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, insofar as the offense which she admitted committing in Canada may be concerned.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL SZELIGA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2134, for the relief of Paul Szeliga.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel the warrant of arrest and the order of deportation heretofore issued against Paul Szeliga. Hereafter, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, such alien shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on June 1, 1923.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM F. FEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2184, to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to set aside the trial-board conviction of Policeman William F. Fey and his resultant dismissal and to reinstate William F. Fey to his former position as a member of the Metropolitan Police Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR, Mr. PRIEST, and Mr. SPRINGER objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

GENERAL STATE AUTHORITY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 135, to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the General State Authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the General State Authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, said claim arising out of certain grants and commitments, agreements, and contracts to and with the United States of America, by and through the Public Works Administration and other agencies and administrations. Suit hereunder may be instituted at any time within 1 year from the date of the enactment of this act, and proceedings therein, appeals therefrom, and payment of judgment thereon, if any, shall be had in the same manner as in the case of claims over which said court had jurisdiction under the provisions of the Judicial Code.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD GILLAM

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 254, for the relief of Edward Gillam.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. McGREGOR objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

PREMIER INSURANCE CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1317, for the relief of Premier Insurance Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Premier Insurance Co., the sum of $421.50. Such sum is for reimbursement of the amount paid by said company to George Henry Bartole, San Diego, Calif., as insurance for property damage sustained on May 3, 1942, when his automobile was struck on United States Highway No. 101, near San Clemente, Calif., by a United States Corps jeep.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, after "Company," insert "of 650 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif."

In line 7, after "$421.50" strike out the period and "Such sum is" and insert a comma and the following: "in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

At the end of the bill insert the following: "That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services

rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LILLIAN WOODWARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2718) for the relief of Lillian Woodward.

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. McGREGOR objected and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

KATHLEEN B. MAIER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2734) for the relief of Kathleen B. Maier.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $72, to Kathleen B. Maier, of Passaic, N. J., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for services rendered as a temporary clerk in the office of Local Board No. 8, Passaic County, N. J., Selective Service System, in September 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALICE STAMPS AND HENRIETTA E. STAMPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2824) for the relief of Alice Stamps and Henrietta E. Stamps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alice Stamps, $288.10; to Henrietta E. Stamps, $1,136.35; said sums being in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, property damage, or medical expenses resulting from a collision on November 4, 1939, when the claimant's automobile was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck in the city of North Tonawanda, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the words "Alice Stamps," insert the language: "of Niagara Falls, N. Y., the sum of."

Page 1, line 6, after the words "Henrietta E. Stamps," strike out the language "$1,136.35; said sums being" and insert in lieu thereof the language "of Niagara Falls, N. Y., the sum of $886.35."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the word "or" and insert in lieu thereof the word "and."

Page 1, line 10, strike out the word "claimant's" and after the word "automobile" insert the words "of Alice Stamps."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIDELITY & CASUALTY CO. AND BAUGH CHEMICAL CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3016) for the relief of the Fidelity & Casualty Co. and the Baugh Chemical Co.

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. PRIEST objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

GEORGE F. THOMPSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1869) authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Cross to George F. Thompson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Cross to George F. Thompson, of the United States Marine Corps, for conspicuous bravery while serving as a private in the Marine Corps on the morning of July 18, 1918, at the forest of Retz.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VELMA PIKKARAINEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 332) for the relief of Velma Pikkarainen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $825, to Velma Pikkarainen, of Towner County, N. Dak., in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for the value of a Ford automobile seized by agents of the Bureau of Customs, Treasury Department, on June 22, 1939, and sold on November 10, 1939, the basis for such seizure and sale being that such automobile allegedly had been used by O. V. Pikkarainen, the husband of the said Velma Pikkarainen, to facilitate a violation of the customs laws, although the criminal case against the said O. V. Pikkarainen was dismissed: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRIET B. RICKARDS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 346) for the relief of Harriet B. Rickards.

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. McGREGOR objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

RICHARD P. BEALE AND EVA M. BEALE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 247) for the relief of Richard P. Beale and Eva M. Beale.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Richard P. Beale and Eva M. Beale, of Pasadena, Calif., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of Richard Dodge Beale, son of Richard P. Beale and Eva M. Beale, who was fatally injured on December 2, 1941, when the automobile which he was driving on United States Highway No. 99, Ridge Route, Kern County, State of California, was struck by a United States Army 2½-ton truck, Chevrolet No. W328099: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to, or received by any agent or attorney, on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to", strike out the language "Richard P. Beale and Eva M. Beale, of Pasadena, Calif., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be" and insert in lieu thereof the language "the estate of Richard Dodge Beale, deceased, the sum of $5,542.87."

Page 1, line 9, strike out the language "son of Richard P. Beale and Eva M. Beale."

Page 2, line 1, strike out the words "two-and-one-half-ton."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COMDR. WALTER H. SCHWARTZ

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 273, for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Walter H. Schwartz, Medical Corps, United States Navy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lt. Comdr. Walter H. Schwartz, Medical Corps of the United States Navy, the sum of $. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Lt. Comdr. Walter H. Schwartz against the United States on account of damage to his household effects while such effects were en route from Honolulu, Hawaii, to San Francisco, Calif. The said Lt. Comdr. Walter H. Schwartz was serving in line of duty. On or about December 27, 1941, the household effects of the said Lt. Comdr. Walter H. Schwartz were shipped from Honolulu on a vessel chartered by the

Navy Department under contract N-220s-65213, and arrived in the United States in a badly damaged condition: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $7,592.27 to the persons whose names appear below, as compensation in full for damages to their private property shipped from Pearl Harbor, T. H., to San Francisco, Calif., on or about December 27, 1941, on a vessel chartered by the Navy Department for the purpose of evacuating the families of naval personnel from Hawaii: Wilma L. Aeschliman, $167.15; Commander Lysle W. Cease, United States Navy, $178.67; Carpenter Robert A. Dusch, United States Navy, $175.83; Grace Lee Gench, wife of E. L. Gench, chief machinist's mate, United States Navy (deceased), $867.73; Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Charles A. Giermann, United States Navy, $321.50; Donald E. Harvey, aviation metalsmith, first class, United States Navy, $26.50; Machinist E. F. Kyne, United States Navy, $198; Mrs. O. A. Martin, wife of O. A. Martin, torpedoman, first class, United States Navy, $655.63; H. L. Pott, chief water tender, United States Navy, $66; Mrs. V. E. Pruess, wife of V. E. Pruess, radioman, first class, United States Navy, $700.92; Mrs. W. H. Schwartz, wife of Lt. Comdr. W. H. Schwartz, United States Navy, $1,599.38; L. P. Smith, chief boatswain's mate, United States Navy, $190; Lt. Comdr. A. M. Townsend, United States Navy, $400.69; Commander J. P. Wood, United States Navy, $886.85; Anna T. Guthrie, wife of F. Guthrie, chief boatswain, United States Navy, $473.67; Reuben J. Kemper, carpenter's mate, first class, United States Navy, $161; Jim Caudel, radioman, first class, United States Navy, $333.42; Carpenter H. L. Powers, United States Navy, $189.33: *Provided*, That if any of the beneficiaries under this act are deceased, payment herein authorized shall be made to their heirs: *And provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended to read: "A bill to authorize settlement of individual claims of naval personnel for damage to private property shipped from Pearl Harbor, T. H., to San Francisco, Calif."

ROBERT A. HUDSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 383, for the relief of Robert H. Hudson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. PRIEST objected and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

SIGURD J. E. WALLSTEDT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 400, for the relief of Sigurd J. E. Wallstedt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sigurd J. E. Wallstedt, a resident of the Territory of Alaska, the sum of $18,911.35, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for injuries sustained on July 17, 1941, at Seward, Alaska, while a passenger in a United States Army vehicle: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$18,911.35" and insert "$4,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ROBERT C. ANDERSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 938, for the relief of Mrs. Robert C. Anderson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Robert C. Anderson, Denham, Minn., the sum of $58.38. Such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Robert C. Anderson against the United States on account of necessary expenses incurred by her in connection with a journey from Minneapolis, Minn., to Memphis, Tenn., and return, such journey having been undertaken as the result of the receipt of a telegram from the Department of the Navy stating that her husband, a fireman, second-class, in the United States Navy and stationed at the United States Naval Training School at Memphis, was seriously ill. Upon her arrival in Memphis, the said Mrs. Robert C. Anderson learned that her husband was not ill and that the telegram had been sent to her by mistake.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the figure "$58.38" strike out period, insert comma, then strike out words "Such sum shall be."

Page 1, line 7, strike out the words "of the said Mrs. Robert C. Anderson."

Page 2, line 4, after the word "ill" strike out period and the word "Upon" and insert comma and words "when upon."

At the end of bill strike out period and add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH PASTE ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1665, for the relief of Joseph Paste, Anna Paste, Rose Paste, and to the legal guardian of Doris Paste, and to the legal guardian of Evelyn Paste.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $400 to Joseph Paste; the sum of $1,000 to Anna Paste; the sum of $300 to Rose Paste; the sum of $1,000 to the legal guardian of Doris Paste; the sum of $300 to the legal guardian of Evelyn Paste in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damages as a result of a collision between the car on which they were riding and a United States Army truck, on State Highway No. 3, in Plymouth, Mass., on November 16, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. INA MAE SHIPMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1769, for the relief of Mrs. Ina Mae Shipman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Ina Mae Shipman, of Osceola, St. Clair County, Mo., the sum of $18,766.40, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of her husband, Bernal Shipman, and property damage, personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses sustained by her as a result of a collision between the automobile in which they were riding and a United States Army truck on United States Highway No. 54, near Collins, Mo., on November 30, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor

and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, at the end of the line, strike out "$18,766.40" and insert "$11,039."

Page 1, line 9, strike out the words "property damage."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAROLD E. DALTON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1887, for the relief of Harold E. Dalton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harold E. Dalton, of Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $18,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by the said Harold E. Dalton on October 20, 1938, when the automobile which he was driving at or near Rialto, Calif., was struck by a United States Forestry fire truck.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "of", strike out "$18,000" and insert "$5,382.09."

Page 2, line 1, after the word "truck", insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARL W. BUCEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1915, for the relief of Carl W. Bucey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Carl W. Bucey, Canton, Ohio, the sum of $313.16, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States Government for damages done his Plymouth sedan by an Army truck at the intersection of State Route No. 31 with Chaffee Avenue, Fort Knox, Ky., on February 5, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$313.16" and insert "$330.35."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD A. SILVIA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1918, for the relief of Edward A. Silvia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States, the sum of $7,500 to Edward A. Silvia, of Quincy, Mass., for medical and hospital expenses and for personal injuries received as the result of being struck by a United States Army vehicle on June 26, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$7,500" and insert "$2,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARCUS O. AND FAYE D. ROWLAND

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1920, for the relief of Marcus O. and Faye D. Rowland, the parents of George L. Rowland, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Marcus O. Rowland and Faye D. Rowland, the parents of George L. Rowland, deceased, of Locust Grove, Mayes County, First District, Okla., the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses sustained by said Marcus O. Rowland and Faye D. Rowland on account of the death of George L. Rowland, deceased, who died from injuries received October 20, 1938, in the accident when the automobile in which he was driving at or near Rialto, Calif., was struck by a United States Forestry fire truck.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the figures "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$4,000."

Page 2, line 2, strike out word "driving" and insert in lieu thereof the word "riding."

At end of bill strike out period and add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DANIEL D. O'CONNELL AND ALMON B. STEWART

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1962, for the relief of Daniel D. O'Connell and Almon B. Stewart.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Messrs. SPRINGER and McGREGOR objected and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

FRANK AND NANCY FOGLIA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2244, for the relief of Frank and Nancy Foglia, parents of Frank Foglia, a minor, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank and Nancy Foglia, parents of Frank Foglia, a minor, deceased, the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of Frank Foglia and for all expense incidental thereto. The death of the said Frank Foglia was the direct result of injuries sustained by Frank Foglia while he was a passenger in a truck which was the property of the United States and which was operated by an enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, beginning with the word "Frank" after the word "to", strike out all of the bill through and including the word "Corps" on line 3, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the language "Frank Foglia and Nancy Foglia, of Fairview, N. J., parents of Frank Foglia, a minor, deceased, the sum of $5,983.35, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of their son, Frank Foglia, a minor, and expenses incident thereto, resulting from personal injuries sustained while he was riding in a Civilian Conservation Corps truck near Preakness, N. J., on August 19, 1941."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PACIFIC CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2915, for the relief of the Pacific Construction Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of Pacific Construction Co., Ltd., for loss sustained by expropriation of lumber and building materials at Haleiwa, Oahu, T. H., by the United States Army on and after December 7, 1941, and to allow in full and final settlement of said claim not to exceed $2,604.55. There is hereby appropriated the sum of $2,604.55, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of said claim: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES PARCEL POST BUILDING CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 159, for the relief of the United States Parcel Post Building Co., of Cleveland, Ohio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the United States Parcel Post Building Co. the sum of $4,827.06, in full settlement of its claim against the United States for rent alleged to be due for the period from July 1 to July 23, 1935, for quarters in the Parcel Post Station Building, Cleveland, Ohio, formerly occupied by the Post Office Department as a parcel-post station under lease dated October 9, 1928: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. GEORGE E. GOLDING

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 426, for the relief of Maj. George E. Golding.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George E. Golding, major, United States Marine Corps, retired, who was relieved from active duty because of physical disability on August 2, 1941, and who was returned to active duty for the period from November 12, 1941, to April 1, 1942, for appearances before a board of medical survey and a Navy retiring board, the sum of $2,161.31, representing pay and allowances for such period of active duty: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIMO GIORDANENGO AND ANGIE GIORDANENGO

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 462, for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo, of San Pedro, Calif., the sum of $1,471.31, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for damages to, and for loss of rentals from, their apartment building in San Pedro, Calif., which resulted from heavy gunfire on May 16, 1942, by Coast Artillery units located at Fort MacArthur, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANGELINE ARBUCKLE

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 626, for the relief of Angeline Arbuckle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Angeline Arbuckle, the sum of $2,500, in full settlement of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck on United States Highway No. 53, in St. Louis County, Minn., on July 23, 1937: *Provided*, That the acceptance of such sum shall be in full and final settlement of any and all judgments against Walter Mitchell, driver of the Civilian Conservation Corps truck: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH A. LASSITER

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 652, for the relief of Joseph A. Lassiter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joseph A. Lassiter, of Rockingham, N. C., the sum of $1,541, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him and for reimbursement of hospital and medical expenses incurred as a result of an accident which occurred when he was struck by a United States Army truck in Rockingham, N. C., on November 22, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAMUEL JACOBS AND HARRY JACOBS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 787, for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Harry Jacobs.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Samuel Jacobs, of Baltimore, Md., the sum of $1,743.18 and to Harry Jacobs, his son, the sum of $900, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage, medical and hospital expenses incurred by them as a result of being struck by a vehicle operated by the United States Army, at the intersection of North Avenue and Mount Royal Terrace, Baltimore, Md., on December 6, 1941, at 12:05 a. m.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. J. W. GOIN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 824, for the relief of Dr. J. W. Goin.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dr. J. W. Goin, of Albany, Oreg., the sum of $3,005, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for loss of and damage to certain livestock as the result of eating borax which had been placed by employees of the Bonneville Power Administration, as a weed deterrent, around transmission-line poles on property owned by the said Dr. J. W. Goin on or about June 24, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN T. SHIRLEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 852, for the relief of John T. Shirley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. SPRINGER objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

CLARE A. MILLER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 977, for the relief of Clare A. Miller.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clare A. Miller, of Pittsburgh, Pa., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained when the automobile in which she was a passenger was struck by a United States Army automobile on July 17, 1941, on United States Highway No. 1, south of South Hill, Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,437.05."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "sustain", insert "and hospital, medical, and other expenses resulting."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HELEN ENGELL THOMPSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1666, for the relief of Helen Engell Thompson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Helen Engell Thompson, Olympia, Wash., the sum of $2,029.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Helen Engell Thompson against the United States on account of damage to real and personal property on April 4, 1942, when a United States Army aircraft crashed into and destroyed her residence in the city of Olympia, Wash.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the figures "$2,029.50", strike out period and insert comma, then strike out the words "The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Helen Engell Thompson" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in full settlement of all claims"

At the end of the bill add: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERT FERGUSON AND OZELLE FERGUSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1973, for the relief of Albert Ferguson and Ozelle Ferguson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Albert Ferguson and Ozelle Ferguson, Joe Wheeler Dam, Ala., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of their minor child, Doris Ann Ferguson, on June 22, 1942, caused by being run over by a truck in the service of and operated by the Tennessee Valley Authority: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POSTAL TELEGRAPH-CABLE CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2340, for the relief of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co., of New York, N. Y., the sum of $1,506.81, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred in rebuilding and restoring an aerial cable line at the foot of Seventh Street in Oakland, Calif., which was demolished by the crashing of a United States Navy TBF-1 airplane, Bur. No. 00495, on December 2, 1942, while engaged in making a flight over Oakland, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with such claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,506.81 in full satisfaction of its claim" and insert "$1,501.48 in full settlement of all claims."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LILLIAN C. FERREIRA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1435, for the relief of Lillian C. Ferreira.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lillian C. Ferreira the sum of $3,000, in full settlement for injuries sustained by her late husband, John S. Ferreira, of Fall River, Mass., when he was knocked down and badly injured by a United States post-office vehicle on October 16, 1939.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Ferreira," insert the words "of Fall River, Mass."

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figure "$3,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$1,500."

Page 1, line 6, after the word "settlement" insert the words "of all claims against the United States."

Page 1, line 9, after "1939" add the words "at Fall River, Mass."

At the end of bill add: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon

conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT KISH LEE AND ELIZABETH KISH

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 915, for the relief of Robert Kish Lee and Elizabeth Kish.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to Robert Kish Lee, of New York, N. Y., the sum of $500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck by a United States mail truck driven by Vincent Amatrudi, an employee of the Post Office Department, in the performance of his official duties, in New York City, on July 31, 1939; the said Robert Kish Lee having obtained a judgment for $500 against the said Vincent Amatrudi, in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, on account of such injuries, and (2) to Elizabeth Kish, of New York, N. Y., the sum of $112.72, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for reimbursement of medical and other expenses incurred by her on account of the injuries so sustained by the said Robert Kish Lee; the said Elizabeth Kish having obtained a judgment for $112.72 against the said Vincent Amatrudi, in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, on account of such expenses: *Provided*, That the said Robert Kish Lee and the said Elizabeth Kish shall furnish to the Secretary of the Treasury satisfactory evidence of the relief of the said Vincent Amatrudi from liability for the payment of such judgments: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. DOUGLAS E. LAWSON

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 929, for the relief of Dr. Douglas E. Lawson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Work Projects is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money available for the payment of compensation to officers and employees of the Work Projects Administration, to Dr. Douglas E. Lawson, of Carbondale, Ill., the sum of $134.50, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for payment of the unpaid portion of the compensation agreed upon for the services rendered by him during the Wyoming Adult Education, Recreation, and Nursery School Workers Training Conference, held at the University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo., from August 18 to 30, 1941, inclusive: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MORRIS LEFF

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 244, for the relief of Morris Leff.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Morris Leff, of Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages and injuries sustained by Morris Leff in an accident involving an Army airplane near Farmingdale, Long Island, on December 7, 1941; said injury being incurred when Morris Leff and other bystanders were struck by said plane which made a forced landing: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", strike out "$10,000. The payment of such sum shall be" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,000."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "for", strike out the words "damages and" and insert in lieu thereof the word "personal."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT M. CRAIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 310, for the relief of Robert M. Crain.

Messrs. McGREGOR and MADDEN objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

LUTHER C. NANNY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 937, for the relief of Luther C. Nanny.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Luther C. Nanny, of Corpus Christi, Tex., the sum of $872.35, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss of a housecar-trailer destroyed on June 12, 1942, in Nueces County, Tex., by fire caused from the crash of a training plane from the Corpus Christi Naval Air Training Station.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "Luther C." and insert in lieu thereof the words "Mittie Pearl."

At the end of the bill strike out the period and add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mittie Pearl Nanny."

ESTATE OF HYMAN WIENER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1049, for the relief of the estate of Hyman Wiener.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Hyman Wiener, the sum of $25,000 in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for fatal injuries sustained by him by an airplane owned and operated by the United States Army, which plane fell on him on the Montefiore Cemetery, Suffolk County, Long Island, N. Y., on December 7, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this bill in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or directed to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the language "$7,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of Hyman Wiener, who was fatally injured when a United States Army plane fell on him at Montefiore Cemetery, Suffolk County, Long Island, N. Y., on December 7, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARKANSAS POWER & LIGHT CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1555, for the relief of Arkansas Power & Light Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Arkansas Power & Light Co., Little Rock, Ark., the sum of $3,574.81. Such sum represents the value, agreed upon by the company and representatives of the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, of facilities and equipment for the distribution of electric power which were installed by the company at former Camp Pike (now Camp Robinson), Little Rock, Ark., when such camp was a National Guard camp, under an agreement that such facilities and equipment were to remain the property of the company, and which were taken over and requisitioned by the United States on November 28, 1940.

With the following Committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the figures "$3,574.81" strike out period and insert comma, then strike out words "Such sum represents" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for."

At end of bill strike out period and add, "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN E. HAAS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2182, for the relief of John E. Haas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law John E. Haas, an employee of the Treasury Department retired under the provisions of section 8 (a) of the act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 305; U. S. C., title 5, sec. 736 (a)), shall not be required to reimburse the United States for any annuity payments received by him during the period of his employment at Hine Junior High School as the director of a boys' club, under the Community Center Department of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia, from July 1, 1935, to April 1, 1941.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 11, after the word "District" add the words "of Columbia."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REESE FLIGHT INSTRUCTION, INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2507, for the relief of Reese Flight Instruction, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Reese Flight Instruction, Inc., a California corporation, the sum of $2,975.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damage to aircraft and damage to and destruction of other property owned by such corporation when on January 17, 1942, a Civil Aeronautics Administration airplane, attempting to take off from the Metropolitan Airport, Van Nuys, Calif., struck the hangar in which aircraft and other property of such corporation were situated: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", strike out the language "$2,975.50. The payment of such sum shall be" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$2,675.50."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NELLIE STARR McCORKLE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2675, providing for payment to Nellie Starr McCorkle of accumulated leave accrued and payable to her deceased husband, Capt. John Ray McCorkle, under the act of August 1, 1941 (ch. 348, 55 Stat. 616; 5 U. S. C., sec. 61a).

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Nellie Starr McCorkle, Mesilla Park, N. Mex., the sum of $623.70, accumulated leave accrued and payable to her deceased husband, Capt. John Ray McCorkle, under the act of August 1, 1941 (ch. 348, 55 Stat. 616; 5 U. S. C., sec. 61a), by reason of his civil employment prior to his being ordered to active duty, and payment of which was withheld by reason of the fact that he was killed in the Philippine Islands shortly after the passage of the act and before he was advised of the benefits accruing to him through the provisions of said act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the figures "$623.70," insert the words "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for".

At the end of bill strike out period and add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED A. UTLEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 312, for the relief of Fred A. Utley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General shall not consider as applicable to Freda Utley the provisions of the Act of October 16, 1918 (40 Stat. 1012), as amended by the acts of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 1008), and June 28, 1940 (Public, No. 670, 76th Cong., ch. 439).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY ANGELL OR HAJM ENGEL ALIAS HENRYK ENGEL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2131, for the relief of Henry Angell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General is hereby directed to cancel forthwith the outstanding warrant of arrest in the case of the alien Henry Angell or Hajm Engel alias Henryk Engel, and is also directed not to issue any further such warrant in the case of this alien insofar as such warrant may be based on the unlawful entry of the alien into the United States prior to the enactment of this act. Hereafter, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said alien shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence at the port of New York on October 15, 1913.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIE ENGERT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2509, for the relief of Marie Engert.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Marie Engert as of July 6, 1939, the date on which she entered the United States, if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws, other than those relating to quotas. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota of the appropriate nation when such quota number becomes available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. WILLIAM LEO

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2902, for the relief of Mrs. William Leo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. William Leo, the Canadian native-born wife of an American citizen, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be admissible under the immigration laws other than those relating to inadmissibility because of racial ineligibility.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT M. CRAIN

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Private Calendar No. 244, the bill (H. R. 310) for the relief of Robert M. Crain, introduced by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS]. Being one of the objectors, I request that we reconsider the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert M. Crain, Surry, N. H., the sum of $500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert M. Crain, against the United States on account of damage to personal property and the loss by drowning of three horses on the night of March 9–10, 1942, caused by the sudden inundation of the land on which such property was located and such horses were accustomed to pasture, when the Surry Mountain Dam, owned and operated by the United States, was closed without any previous notice to the said Robert M. Crain.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after "$500", strike out the period and the following: "The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert M. Crain," and insert in lieu thereof "in full settlement of all claims."

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts tell us the program for tomorrow and the rest of the week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be very glad to.

On tomorrow the Committee on Appropriations will report out a joint resolution appropriating $18,000,000-plus for infant and maternity care of the wives of the men in the armed forces. I understand there is a unanimous report on this resolution and that it is not controversial. However, there will probably be some discussion of it while it is pending on the floor.

After tomorrow there is nothing for the rest of the week. It is my intention that the House adjourn from Wednesday to Thursday and then from Thursday until Monday.

As far as next week is concerned, I can see nothing at the present time. If anything of a controversial nature should develop next week which requires the consideration of the House I shall confer with my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and see that the Members of the House have ample advance notice, so that they can make their plans accordingly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I appreciate the thoughtfulness of the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HANDBOOK FOR SERVICEMEN AND SERVICEWOMEN, WORLD WAR NO. 2, AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report (Rept. No. 706) back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Res. 300) authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the manuscript entitled "Handbook for Servicemen and Servicewomen, World War No. 2, and Their Dependents," as a public document, and providing for additional copies thereof, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That a revised edition of the manuscript entitled "Handbook for Servicemen and Servicewomen, World War No. 2, and Their Dependents," be printed as a public document, and that 8,000 additional copies be printed for the document room of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

STEEL SHORTAGE

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, at the present time the Office of Economic Stabilization, of which Hon. James M. Byrnes is Director, is making a survey to investigate allegations that a surplus of labor exists in Pacific coast shipbuilding plants.

Whatever surplus of labor does exist in Pacific coast shipyards is due to the shortage of steel which is allocated to the yards on a quarterly basis. During the congressional recess I visited every major shipbuilding plant in California, all of which are located on San Francisco Bay, at Los Angeles, or San Diego. A shortage of steel existed at every one of these shipyards. Due entirely to this shortage of steel, the largest single shipyard on the Pacific coast, which employs over 42,000 workers, is being forced to curtail production during the present quarter to the extent of a ship and a half per month. This yard, like all other shipbuilding plants, endeavors to maintain its organization intact, anticipating an adequate allocation of steel. It is a tragic situation that there is such a shortage of steel that it must be allocated, thus creating uncertainty from one quarter to another as to how much steel will be available for ship construction.

The blame for what appears to be a surplus number of employees should not be placed upon those shipyards, but rather upon the steel masters of this country who have tried to lead the Nation to believe that they were furnishing all the steel required to carry on our war activities, including not alone the building of ships and munitions of war, but also farm machinery, normal civilian requirements for the construction of homes to house war workers, and every other use of steel. Steel is one of the most important commodities in our present-day economy, entering into an untold number of every-day uses.

This shortage of steel production by the steel masters is so great at the present time that the War Production Board has been forced to reduce the allocation of steel to the War Department to a point 14 percent below its requirements during the present quarter. The Navy Department has been cut 20 percent during this same period, while the Maritime Commission is being forced to reduce its shipbuilding because 22 percent of its requirements of steel cannot be met. At the same time, with the increased strain being placed upon our railroad facilities, the Office of Defense Transportation requirements of steel have been cut 40 percent.

The over-all shortage of steel for necessary war purposes during the 3 months of July, August, and September 1943, amounts to 6,250,000 tons, which, on an annual basis, would amount to 25,000,000 tons.

In this connection I cannot emphasize too strongly the need for increased steel production to furnish the farmers of this Nation with the necessary farm machinery to maintain and increase production. Every Member of Congress representing a rural district knows of this serious

shortage and one of the most constructive efforts they can put forth is to aid in increasing our steel production.

Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly called attention to the fact that this steel shortage has had one single cause—the centralization of the steel industry in the grip of a few steel magnates within a small geographical area here in the eastern part of the United States. Those people who are now crying the loudest have utterly failed to lend a hand to a solution of this problem. Only the decentralization of the steel industry in this country will enable us to produce enough steel for our wartime and our peacetime needs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COFFEE). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

ADMISSION OF REFUGEES FROM EUROPE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and insert a copy of House Joint Resolution 154 and such excerpts as I deem necessary in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that more of us are not present at this time, but this has been a rather trying day. I want to address the House on House Joint Resolution 154 which I introduced a few days ago. The resolution speaks for itself. It does not deal with appropriations, but it deals with human elements and relief of human suffering. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] today in speaking on the Fulbright resolution—an address which I admired very much as did others—said that we are all God's children, and that we live under the same roof, and that no one should take advantage of the light. Yes; we are all God's children, and that imposes certain duties upon us toward our fellow men who are also God's children. Can we honestly say that we have lived up to our duties and obligations toward the men, women, and children who have been and still are being tortured and murdered by the Nazi sadists?

In the changing panorama of events as they unfold before us from day to day one fact stands out more vividly than any other, the fact that the Nazi government has embarked on a policy of ruthless extermination of the European races. The foremost sufferers from this policy are the Jews, but they are not by any means the only ones to experience the full measure of Hitler's wrath.

It was because of this great urgency to rescue from the clutches of a ruthless dictator the innocent people, particularly children, and offer them some sort of haven, that my resolution, House Joint Resolution 154, was introduced.

What I propose to do under this resolution is to save as many human lives as can be saved within the framework of our present immigration laws.

A few months ago a conference was held in Bermuda to take up the refugee problem. Nothing was accomplished, however, and the conference was a great disappointment.

Nevertheless it is so much water over the dam, and it would be useless to try to point out, at this time, just why and to what extent the conference did not accomplish what it set itself out to do.

The important question is not what could have been done, but what can be done. And I believe that my resolution points to a very definite immediate program and gives us the opportunity of paying at least some of the debt, which as a great humanitarian nation we owe to those who cannot otherwise help themselves.

It has always been the boast of the United States that we furnished the asylum for the oppressed, and a sanctuary for those who were seeking to escape persecution.

About 100 years ago, in the famed year of 1848, when all of Europe was convulsed by revolutions, which sought to establish constitutional governments in those countries which stuck to the principles of absolute monarchy, it was our country which offered asylum to men like Kossuth, Garibaldi, and other great leaders of liberal thought. Later on when Europe was again convulsed by anarchy and when massacres were the order of the day in such countries as Russia and Rumania, we again opened our doors to refugees from that terror and permitted many persons to escape persecution and find homes in America.

Again in 1917, when our immigration law was amended so as to impose a literacy test on prospective immigrants to these shores, we saw fit to put in a provision in the law to the effect that people escaping religious persecution should not be subject to the literacy test, thereby again proclaiming to the world our determination to act as an asylum for persons who escaped from religious persecution.

In 1917 religious persecution was confined to Jews and Armenians. This time, religious persecution covers a more extensive area in that not only Jews but Catholics, not only Catholics but Protestants are persecuted. In general religious persecution today has developed into other types of persecution. Racial persecution is as potent a weapon in the hands of the Axis Nations as it was in the days of Czarist Russia or when a benighted Turkey saw fit to persecute Armenians and others for their beliefs.

The type of persecution which Hitler indulges in is much more cruel because it dooms to destruction many races for no other reason than that of being members of a group which Hitler believes has no right to live.

Hitler's policies were assiduously copied by his admirers and satellites, in fact, whenever Hitler succeeded in attacking or appropriating a country, he brought along with him his own ideas of racial persecution and all the countries of Central Europe, and the countries of western and northern Europe which were overrun by Hitler's military might, have adopted their own brand of religious and racial persecution.

There is, however, one difference between the type of persecution which Hitler indulges in and the type which his satellites have aped. Hitler knows no mercy. He has exterminated or is about to exterminate every non-German within his borders, except such people as he can use in performing slave labor for the Reich.

Hitler's satellites have not gone quite so far. They have denied human and political rights to their minorities, they have trampled under foot any pledge they had made in the peace treaties to treat their minorities fairly, but they have not quite seen fit to exterminate their minorities by massacres and killings. There is, therefore, this ray of hope left. We may still rescue individuals who have fallen under the tyranny of Hitler's satellites, but who have been able to escape with their lives. In fact, some of these subject countries are willing to enter into a kind of bargain with their minorities. They will let them go, provided somebody else will undertake to receive them and assume the responsibility of their removal.

This gives us the opportunity to show the fine and exalted spirit of America which has always risen to the sublime philanthropy of humanitarianism when the opportunity presented itself to rescue human beings from death.

I believe that the bill introduced by me will go a long way toward this purpose, even though we cannot possibly hope and we cannot possibly expect to save every one of the many innocent people who will be murdered if Hitler and his cohorts have their way.

We do not expect the United States to stand alone in this matter. I am sure other nations which value human rights and which have respect for human lives will join us in our program of rescue. I am sure Great Britain will do its share to help and I know that many neutral nations will likewise facilitate the rescue and survival of many, if we but point the way.

I cannot refrain, at this time, from mentioning the fact that Switzerland has already done a great deal to help the unfortunate refugees whenever it was possible for that little country to help.

I do not wish to take the time of this House in painting a gruesome picture of conditions which we are called upon to alleviate, but it will help to understand the problem if some typical instances were given of the ruthlessness and brutality which the Nazi regime has been guilty of in the treatment of its minorities, particularly in the treatment of the Jewish people.

I shall give you some eyewitness accounts which will show you how important it is for us to act if we do not wish the rest of Nazi-dominated countries—I mean the Axis satellites—to pursue the same methods and act in the same manner to cause havoc and destruction among its helpless minorities.

The place in which the most horrible destruction of human lives occurred was the old Polish capital of Warsaw. In 1939 this city withstood a siege by the Germans which lasted some 3 weeks

and only after the most thorough destruction of all of the city's streets and buildings did the Polish people surrender to the fury of the German invaders. Thereafter, Warsaw was made into a central concentration camp for the Jews from all parts of Poland.

A ghetto was established in the city, separated from the rest of the country by an 8-foot wall. Into this ghetto were crowded all the Jewish refugees from every portion of Poland and later all the Jews from Germany and other western countries were likewise shipped into this ghetto. Eventually the population of this small area was increased to a tremendous figure and almost a million people were compelled to live in the territory which was originally designed for less than 100,000. No wonder the ghetto in Warsaw became a very unsanitary and pestiferous place.

But the Germans had no intention of leaving a large aggregation of people in any particular area. The object of crowding them together was merely to be able to liquidate them sooner. By July 1942 the population of the Warsaw ghetto had dwindled down through starvation and disease to about 400,000. It was at this point that the head of the German Gestapo, Himmler, took charge. He called together a Nazi meeting at which he declared that Hitler had personally told him that the Jews should be punished, since it was only through their influence that England and France had come to the rescue of Poland. If the Jews had not induced the Western Powers to declare war on Germany, there would have been no problem in the East and Germany would have been supreme. Hitler and his henchman, Himmler, did not want the Jews to die without suffering agony and the worst possible tortures. Himmler, therefore, paid a personal visit to Warsaw, and supervised the massacres there. From October 1942 to January 1943, more than 300,000 Jews were put to death in the most horrible manner that could be devised by the minds of madmen. By February there were only 35,000 Jews left in Warsaw. Many of those who were murdered were lying about in the streets covered with newspapers, relatives frequently carried their dead outside the ghetto, and in the gutters and on the sidewalks one could see unconscious Jews left there to die. Throughout the ghetto no food was available. The Jews had to look through the refuse lying about on the streets to find any food at all, and very often even the refuse did not yield anything.

Thereafter the German authorities declared that the remnant of the Warsaw Jews should be deported from Warsaw and the ghetto closed. It was then that an order was issued directing all Jews to leave Warsaw for the East for hard labor. The aged, the sick, and those incapable of hard labor were killed before the order became effective. The Germans declared cynically that by this measure they were insuring larger food supplies for those who would remain. Five thousand persons were deported daily. Later the number was increased, and eventually, of course, all of the inhabitants of the Warsaw ghetto and other Polish ghettos were marked for destruction.

But, fortunately, there are still many who can be saved.

We, as a democracy, cannot allow the world to sit idly by and see the destruction of the untold victims of Nazi wrath. It is the boast of Hitler and his henchmen that before we shall rescue those who can be rescued, the remaining victims will be destroyed and annihilated.

It is evident that any help that is to be given should be given without delay.

In the resolution which was introduced by me, House Joint Resolution 154, I call attention to the fact that ocean transportation can be made available on returning transports, and I, therefore, feel that we should grant immediate relief to those who can be rescued from the Nazi terror. The text of my resolution is as follows:

House Joint Resolution 154

Joint resolution to provide for the temporary admission into the United States of political or religious refugees from the Axis Nations

Whereas it is common knowledge that countless thousands of innocent persons, of all racial and religious denominations, in many of the countries of continental Europe have been murdered or otherwise ruthlessly persecuted by the Axis Nations; and

Whereas it is accepted by well-informed people that unless something is done within the next few months, which months will embrace winter, countless more thousands will be murdered or otherwise ruthlessly persecuted; and

Whereas under the present existing immigration laws, unlike the limitation on the number of persons who may come to the United States permanently as immigrants, there is no such limitation on the number of those who may come temporarily; and

Whereas under present practices of administrative officials but very few persons are permitted to come to the United States temporarily or otherwise; and

Whereas ocean transportation of persons coming to the United States can be made available on returning transports: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., that it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that immediate temporary relief should be granted to those unfortunate people and it is therefore urged that an administrative policy be adopted to admit to the United States for a period not exceeding 6 months after hostilities have ceased between the Allied and Axis Nations such persons now residing in continental Europe who desire to come to the United States and who can establish to the satisfaction of any American consul before whom they may appear that they are bona fide political or religious refugees: *Provided, however*, That it is further the sense of the Congress that no persons should be admitted, in accordance with the spirit of this joint resolution, if they are afflicted with any loathesome, dangerous, or contagious diseases, have criminal records of crimes involving moral turpitude, or whose presence in the United States would endanger the public safety of the United States or otherwise be inimical to the best interests of the United States. It is further urged as being within the spirit of this joint resolution that as time is strictly of the essence in the success of the purpose of the joint resolution, the Secretary of State and the Attorney General are urged to issue their joint regulations to carry into effect the purpose of this joint resolution just as soon as it is possible following the passage of the joint resolution.

Along with many neutral countries, we are called upon to do our share in alleviating the conditions I described. I am aware of the fact that whatever can be done will by no means solve or settle the entire problem, but it will be the best that can be done under the circumstances.

Recent historical events have more poignantly shown the extreme ruthlessness of the Nazi philosophy of life and the Nazi point of view.

As you know the Italian people saw fit to surrender to our armed forces and eventually to resume their proper station in the family of nations. But such a solution of affairs does not comport with the philosophy of the Nazi "masters." When they saw themselves balked in their policy which subjugated all the nations of the world and when one of their satellites eventually adopted enough courage to throw off the yoke of their "friendship," immediately the German military might set itself to loot and destroy everything that could not be carried away, and everything that could be carried away was taken. Not an item of food was left for the starving people, and whenever the Germans were able to cart things away, they did so.

Churches have been pillaged and robbed of their treasures and the holy places were converted into means for the carrying on of warfare—even the sacred precincts of the Vatican were invaded by a ruthless army bent upon destruction. Hitler proclaimed himself the protector of Vatican City, just as he had become the "protector" of Luxemburg, Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands, and all the other European countries which he ruthlessly invaded. If nothing else this sacrilegious action on the part of the German Wehrmacht showed the character of the foe whom we are fighting and if his depredations are allowed to go unchecked, Europe will become a barren waste, and its population slaughtered to the last man.

What have we done to help the people who might be rescued from the hell of Nazi persecution? Our doors have remained closed. The State Department has not moved. The Congress has not spoken. But the American people are beginning to realize their duty and are calling upon the Congress of the United States to do something to save as many human beings as possible. They know that it could be done if this Congress would only say so, and give the green light to the State Department. I do not want to dwell upon how it should be done. Mr. Speaker, I am not seeking to open the doors to refugees to a point where they will take jobs away from Americans. I am not seeking to bring in these refugees for permanent stay. I speak for the millions of people of America who have sent me petitions asking that men, women, and children who can be saved from the Axis may be saved by letting them come to these shores for temporary haven only, and that we allow them to stay here until the war in Europe is over. Is there any Member of

Congress who can deny that request? Is there any Member of the House of Representatives or the Senate who can honestly say to himself and to his conscience and to his God that allowing a number of these unfortunate people to come here for temporary stay only would bring any harm to our country?

There are many fine American citizens who are willing to provide the food and care for them and all necessary expenses to be incurred. Give them some place, I do not care where, so that they may stay in peace until after the war is over, then they can be returned to their homes and farms. I have sent a letter to each Member of Congress, and I am looking forward to getting an answer from each Member of Congress. I have sent 48 letters to 48 Governors of our country, calling upon them to state their views on this question. I hope and pray that Congress will pass my resolution. If we do not, we certainly cannot say that we have upheld the moral and religious values we all have proclaimed at one time or another.

Bear in mind I am not only appealing for the Jews of Europe who are doomed to die but I am also appealing for the Christians who are also doomed to die at the hands of Hitler. I am appealing for all human beings who can find a haven in this country, without harming us in any way. Let us not wait until it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not attempt to go into a lot of details, but will just recite a little incident that happened in Poland. Fifty Nazi storm troopers were killed by some underground action. No one knew who killed them. It is too bad there were not 2,000,000 of them; but the decree came from the Gestapo, with the approval of the madman Hitler, that for every storm trooper who was killed, 200 Jews should be killed on the open market. So they took 200 to 1. Included in that group were many Christians, because they did not take the time to find out their religion.

I say, Mr. Speaker, it is our duty as representatives of the American people to give such help to men and women who believe in our ideals, who are always in the forefront of the fight for the preservation of democracy and democratic principles. If this is a war to make the world safe for democracy, it must also be a war to preserve as many human lives as possible, who will be fighters for our democracy in years to come.

As far as the Jews are concerned, all I can say to this House and to the American people is this: I can only refer to the words of General MacArthur, who emphasized the fighting qualities of the people of the Jewish race, so many of whom have already given their lives to our cause. I also wish to repeat the words of Admiral Halsey who said, "The Jewish heritage has been one of suffering and sorrow. Jews have always fought against oppression, seeking freedom for themselves and for all the peoples of the world. Today the whole civilized world fights against history's greatest tyrants and oppressors. We are proud to have the Jews in our ranks. Their fights furnish unshakable proof of their courage and loyalty to our common cause, the world-wide preservation of freedom."

Mr. Speaker, I say in all sincerity, in all fairness to our traditions, we Americans, who have always upheld the doctrine of helping the oppressed, should now at this time help those people.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. BYRNE. Can the gentleman tell us what our Government has done or attempted to do relative to this matter since we have been embroiled in this war?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. As far as I know, they have done nothing. There has been a lot of pussyfooting. The State Department is waiting for some expression by the Congress. The quotas have not been filled for the last 5 years or more. Last year's quota used was so little that it is insignificant. Some people can be saved—and they must be saved.

Mr. BYRNE. Then, as a matter of fact, as far as you know, and you have been in close contact with this problem ever since it started, our country has, as far as you know today, never done a single thing to attempt to save those people, either by giving them refuge here or bringing about a method by which they could find refuge. Is that correct?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is absolutely correct. There was the Bermuda Conference, which was called for the purpose of aiding refugees, but nothing came of it. Nothing has been done; nothing has been accomplished.

My dear colleagues, I just want to say this, and I am not going to keep you any longer; there is a lot more to say on this subject, but I do not want to take up too much time. Let us truly act as God's children would and should act toward their brethren. Let us, as human beings, take the leadership on this vital matter, and we are the leaders of civilization, as one of the largest Nations of the world. We have so much of its resources. We are the last hope that these unfortunate people have. We are the ones who can save them and see to it that their children may still live and be permitted to carry on the democratic principles for which we are fighting and for which they have fought and suffered so much.

What valid objections could anyone raise to permitting a number of these refugees to enter, not for permanent residence, not under the quota, but simply for the purpose of saving their lives—for the duration of the war in Europe? If we do not help them now, I am sure, from the information that I have received, and I am sure the State Department also has this information, that these people, perhaps a million or two of them, will be dead before Christmas comes around. Hitler knows he is finished; Hitler knows he is through. He cannot win, and as he is retreating—it is just like a harvest of hay—he cuts them here and there, no longer asking questions concerning religion or race.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking the expression of the Members of the House by a letter that I have written to them. I have called a hearing of the committee to be held by the first week in October. I know that this resolution has the approval of the churches of this country; I know that this resolution has the approval of all the religious denominations; it has the approval of the Democratic and Republican clubs. It is nonpolitical; it is nonpartisan; it is a human question. Are we ready to act as human beings?

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 22, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

736. A letter from the Director, National Resources Planning Board, transmitting a copy of the estimates of personnel requirements for the second quarter of the fiscal year for the National Resources Planning Board on Form No. 80–R001.1 provided by the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

737. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting a revised copy of Bureau of the Budget Form No. 80–R001; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 300. Resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the manuscript entitled "Handbook for Servicemen and Servicewomen, World War II, and Their Dependents" as a public document; without amendment (Rept. No. 706). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANGELL: Committee on Rivers and Harbors. H. R. 3145. A bill authorizing construction of a dam and dikes for preventing the flow of tidal waters in the North Slough in Coos County for the purpose of reclaiming land for farming; with amendment (Rept. No. 707). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 3288. A bill amending the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 to increase the allowance to dependent wives; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 3289. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 3290. A bill to further amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEAGALL:
H. R. 3291. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:
H. R. 3292. A bill to authorize collectors of internal revenue to receive cashier's checks of certain banking institutions in payment for revenue stamps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3293. A bill to provide that the pension, compensation, or retirement pay of veterans of the War with Spain shall not be reduced during hospitalization or receipt of institutional or domiciliary care; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TALBOT:
H. R. 3294. A bill concerning seeing-eye dogs on trains; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE:
H. R. 3295. A bill to amend section 1532 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3303. A bill to amend section 1 (a) of the Carriers Taxing Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3304. A bill to amend section 1 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3305. A bill to amend section 1 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANDIS:
H. R. 3306. A bill to authorize the conveyance of Harrison Park in the city of Vincennes to Vincennes University; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:
H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1943 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LUDLOW:
H. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent resolution to welcome the people of Italy to the family of liberated nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND:
H. Res. 304. Resolution for the consideration of S. 1242, an act to authorize appropriations for salaries and expenses, Office of Fishery Coordination; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HERTER:
H. R. 3296. A bill for the relief of R. Guy Dorsey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KIRWAN:
H. R. 3297. A bill for the relief of the alien, Dimitrios Pantelakis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MOTT:
H. R. 3298. A bill for the relief of Nels J. Pedersen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:
H. R. 3299. A bill for the relief of Victor H. Loftus, disbursing clerk, American Embassy, Mexico, D. F., Mexico; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHAFER:
H. R. 3300. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Karalis and Nicholas Kavalaris; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOWE:
H. R. 3301. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Edward Polak, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VURSELL:
H. R. 3302. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Parkinson; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2372. By Mr. ELSTON of Ohio: Petition of Melville J. Deininger and 39 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2373. Also, petition of 98 citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, urging early consideration and a favorable vote on House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2374. Also, petition of Rowland Zimmerman and 21 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, protesting against consideration of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2375. Also, petition of Frank A. Woll and 22 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2376. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of John Joyce and 19 other citizens of Fulton and Montgomery Counties, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2377. Also, petition of Oscar Grosse, of Northville, N. Y., and 20 other citizens of the State of New York, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2378. Also, petition of Leonard C. Gaylord and 20 other citizens of Schenectady, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2379. Also, petition of Joseph Slebzak and 115 other citizens of the United States, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2380. Also, petition of Francis W. Russ and 19 other citizens of Schenectady, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2381. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of sundry citizens of Kiowa, Kans., favoring passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2382. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Greenesburg, Kans., favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2383. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of M. L. Whitsel and 324 citizens of Farmington, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2384. Also, petition of Ethel McClees and 41 citizens of Kelso, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2385. Also, petition of Walter Thomas and 113 citizens of Marion, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2386. Also, petition of Mabel M. Shrum and 20 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill, 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2387. Also, petition of Myrtie E. Narner and 373 citizens of Olean, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2388. Also, petition of Ray W. Denning and 208 citizens of Dowagiac, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2389. Also, petition of Delta Rundle and 102 citizens of Colchester, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2390. Also, petition of Alice D. Schwdt and 436 citizens of Memphis, Tenn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2391. Also, petition of W. G. Ferguson and 62 citizens of Afton, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2392. Also, petition of Mrs. George Priel and 67 citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2393. Also, petition of Mrs. Perry Sand and 146 citizens of Geneseo, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2394. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of Fraternal Order of Eagles, Aerie No. 302, Zanesville, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2395. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Washington County, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2396. Also, petition of the members of Muskingum Presbyterian Church, Muskingum County, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2397. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Morgan County, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2398. Also, petition of various citizens of Washington County, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2399. Also, petition of sundry residents of Zanesville, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2400. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Mary Hagene and 16 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2401. Also, petition of Harry Troll and 41 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2402. Also, petition of Mary Jacob and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2403. Also, petition of S. M. Tiffin and S. C. Thomson of the Federated Metals Corporation, signed by 68 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2404. Also, petition of Louise Nerleth and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2405. Also, petition of Mrs. M. Grupe and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2406. Also, petition of Mrs. R. Huskey and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2407. Also, petition of the Schlueter Manufacturing Co., signed by 46 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2408. Also, petition of the American Builders Supply Co., signed by 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2409. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of Mrs. Roy O. Yeatts, of Chehalis, Wash., and 48 citizens of Lewis County, vicinity of Onalaska, Wash., urging passage of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials for winning the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2410. Also, petition of Mrs. Albert Dodds, of Olympia, Wash., and 19 citizens of Olympia, Wash., and vicinity, urging passage of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials for winning the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2411. Also, petition of F. M. Buckley, of Ridgefield, Wash., and 12 citizens of Ridgefield, Wash., urging passage of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials for winning the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2412. Also, petition of Harry Aubol, of Cosmopolis, Wash., and 23 citizens of Aberdeen and Cosmopolis, Wash., urging passage of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials for winning the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2413. Also, petition of Bernice Baker, Vancouver, Wash., and 10 citizens of Ridgefield, Wash., urging passage of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials for winning the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2414. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Myrtle M. Kimmel and 27 other citizens of Oskaloosa and McLouth, Kans., urging the passage of House bill 2082, regarding the transportation and use of alcoholic liquors in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2415. By Mr. WHEAT: Petition of sundry citizens of Champaign, Urbana, and Rantoul, Ill., requesting passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2416. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Rantoul, Ill., requesting passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2417. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Arcola, Filson, and Hindsboro, Ill., requesting passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2418. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Sidney, Ill., requesting passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2419. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Rantoul, Ill., requesting passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2420. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of sundry citizens of Pratt, Kans., protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2421. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Topeka, Kans., protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2422. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Hutchinson, Kans., protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2423. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of A. E. Gasber and other citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., opposing passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2424. Also, petition of numerous patrons of Franke's confectionery, of Wheeling, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2425. Also, petition of numerous patrons of Michael J. Kostolich riverside confectionery, of Benwood, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2426. Also, petition of members of American Legion Post, No. 5, McMechen, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2427. Also, petition of Mrs. Arthur Neiderheiser, president, the Ruth Bible Class of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Weirton and Hollidays Cove, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2428. Also, petition of Frank Miller and other citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2429. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of F. M. Schmidt and other residents of the Third Congressional District of Iowa, opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2430. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of sundry citizens of Anthony, Kans., favoring passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2431. By Mr. LAFOLLETTE: Petition of 3,055 citizens of the city of Evansville, Ind., calling upon the Congress to give full support to the following program as an essential part of the war program: (1) A rollback of prices to levels of September 15, 1942; (2) grade labeling of all packaged food products to assure consumers recognized quality at appropriate prices; (3) subsidies for small producers (including farmers) to enable them to produce more without increasing costs to the consumer; (4) dollar-and-cents ceilings on all cost-of-living items; (5) complete rent control; (6) strict enforcement of all price ceilings by Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2432. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of 38 residents of Hawarden, Iowa, and vicinity, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2433. Also, petition of 22 residents of O'Brien County, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2434. Also, of 46 residents of Cleghorn and Cherokee, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2435. Also, petition of 103 citizens of Smithland, Oto, and Ute, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2436. Also, petition of 82 residents of Sioux City, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill

2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2437. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of a number of residents of Brooklyn and Queens, concerning the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2438. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition of Mrs. R. G. Putnam and signed by 40 representative citizens of Hamilton County, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2439. Also a communication from L. T. DeFur, of Shawneetown, Ill., enclosing newspaper clipping in opposition to the Austin-Wadsworth bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2440. Also, petition presented by Mr. and Mrs. R. G. Putnam, of Eldorado, Ill., signed by themselves and 46 representative citizens of Eldorado and vicinity, urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2441. By Mr. HALE: Petition of the Propeller Club of the port of Portland, Maine, endorsing the passage of House bill 2314, legislation for the purpose of adjusting the inequalities to the personnel of the former Lighthouse Service, and opposing passage of Senate bill 1173 and House bill 2972, or similar legislation providing suspension of certain provisions of the Public Vessels Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2442. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of sundry citizens of Clear Lake, Iowa, supporting measures to further regulate the sale of intoxicating liquor around Army camps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2443. By Mr. HERTER: Petition signed by sundry residents of Massachusetts, opposing legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors on or near military reservations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2444. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Reverend Rollins and others of Ava and Douglas County, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2445. Also, petition of Margaret Johnson of Mount Vernon and Lawrence County, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2446. Also, petition of G. B. Cornelius and others of Carthage and Jasper Counties, Mo., urging the early consideration and favorable vote on the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) in order to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war, to reduce absenteeism, increase production, and eliminate sources of disorder and physical disability which are hampering our war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2447. Also, petition of W. P. Clements and others of Taney County, Mo., urging the early consideration and favorable vote on the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), in order to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war, to reduce absenteeism, increase production, and eliminate sources of disorder and physical disability which are hampering our war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2448. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of sundry residents of Waterloo, Iowa, supporting House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2449. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Rev. James Kelly and 230 members of the Methodist Church of Shippenville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2450. Also, petition of P. L. Grier and 52 citizens of Charlotte, N. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2451. Also, petition of Rev. R. Mills Gray and 80 citizens of Corning, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2452. Also, petition of Alice D. Schwdt and 70 citizens of Memphis, Tenn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2453. Also, petition of Rev. W. Harold Shaw and 215 members of the First Methodist Church of Fredonia, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2454. Also, petition of Myrtle E. Cato and 127 citizens of Duluth, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2455. Also, petition of Maud Hamilton and 150 citizens of Clearfield, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2456. Also, petition of Lora Shasteen and 272 citizens of Sullivan, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2457. Also, petition of Mrs. W. B. Houser and 60 citizens of Hollywood, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2458. Also, petition of H. W. Reinecke and 76 citizens of West Liberty, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2459. Also, petition of Dr. A. A. Swanson and 62 citizens of Espyville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2460. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Burlingame and 50 citizens of Cincinnatus, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2461. By Mr. BUSBEY: Petitions of Barbara Balis, William F. Stoecker, Mike Jaszczak, William Wassong, William B. O'Connell, Frank J. Weber, and other citizens of the Third Illinois District, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war, and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2462. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of sundry citizens of Grinnell, Iowa, in the interest of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2463. By Mr. DAY: Petition of the Republican Nationalist Revival Committee; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2464. By Mr. RAMEY: Petition of Mrs. Mark Winchester and 88 residents of Lucas County, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary to the winning of the war, sponsored by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2465. Also, petition of Rosella C. Stone and other residents of Toledo, Lucas County, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary to the winning of the war, sponsored by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2466. Also, petition of Joanne Heinold and other residents of Lucas County, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary to the winning of the war, sponsored by Hon JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2467. Also, petition of Hon. Lulu T. Gleason and other residents of Toledo, Lucas County, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary to the winning of the war, sponsored by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2468. Also, petition of Mrs. F. H. Merrell and 29 other residents of Lucas County, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary to the winning of the war, sponsored by Hon. JOSEPH

R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2469. By Mr. McCORMACK: Petition of James E. Barsi, manager, August A. Busch & Co., of Massachusetts, Inc., 222 Arsenal Street, Watertown, Mass., and sundry others, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2470. By Mr. HAYS: Petition of Mrs. Leo A. Mons and others urging the adoption of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2471. Also, petition of Arthur L. Hart and others, urging the adoption of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2472. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Yellowstone Basin Association, Billings, Mont., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Yellowstone River Valley Basin; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

2473. Also, petition of Alamo and San Antonio National Farm Loan Association, San Antonio, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 50; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2474. Also, petition of the Moorish Science Temple, of Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the great work which the Moorish Divine and National Movement of North America is doing for the benefit of fallen humanity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2475. Also, petition of the city of Ironwood, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to utilization of the National Youth Administration material; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our blessed Lord and Saviour, in Thee we have a refuge in every time of need. When temptation is nigh and human courage is at the test, Thou art near; when problems perplex and the way is uncertain, Thou dost help us to understand; when the sight is dim and the clouds low, we may be unquestionably sure that we are not alone. In unutterable quiet and as tranquil as sunlight, Thou dost lift the trusting soul beyond the clutch of circumstances.

O God, enlarge the sense of our wonderful privilege and lead us to break through all barriers of misunderstanding and prejudice, giving stimulus to all that is great and good in the being of man. How tremendous is our mission and how noble is our calling; O give us those requisite qualities of strength that will keep us true to the tasks entrusted to us. Bless and qualify us for the very best which lies before us; consider our infirmities and grant us the sweetening grace of Thy forbearance. We pray that we may never lose heaven out of our hearts, but hold us in harmony with Thy holy will and in tune with that music which will resound and reecho forever. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article from the Reader's Digest.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the American Legion of Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therewith a speech delivered recently by our distinguished Governor, John W. Bricker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include some newspaper and magazine clippings.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INSURANCE FOR EMPLOYEES OF CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. LYNCH] addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech by Mr. W. M. Carney, chief chemist of the Lion Oil Refining Co. on the subject The Possibilities for Chemical Development of Our Natural Gas and Petroleum.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by Mr. James P. Pope, a director of T. V. A., before the meeting of the Cherokee County Farm Bureau at Center, Ala., on August 13, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Chicago Sun, an article from a Washington paper, and a letter answering an inquiry that came to me.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today after the disposition of the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VICTORY GARDEN BEANS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, today I want to talk about an agricultural accomplishment which is unique, coming from the great industrial State of Pennsylvania, with its 11,000,000 people, with over a million men in the armed forces of the United States, producing today over 30 percent of all the war materials.

We are also making an amazing contribution to increase the food supply of the Nation in the Victory-garden program. I have listened to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] talk about cheese, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] talk about cattle, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] talk about wheat, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] talk about the tall corn, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] talk about peanuts, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] talk about climate, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] talk about the Irish; and so I want to take this opportunity to say that along with the great industrial accomplishments of my State, our farmers have something to talk about. I produce for you herewith a string bean grown by Win Smathers, of Clarion, Pa., in my district, one of the smaller beans off his vines, which is 41 inches long, weighing 7 pounds, and grown in 6 weeks.

This will give the farm State Representatives something to gasp about. I defy any Member of the House to produce from his district a string bean of this gigantic, monumental size and beauty. It proves to the Members of the House that when Pennsylvania goes all out for production for the war effort, whether mechanized equipment or foodstuffs, we get results.

Mr. KLEBERG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KLEBERG. The gentleman is not inferring, is he, that he is a "has bean"?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked and received unanimous consent to include certain material in the RECORD. The Public Printer informs me that this will exceed by one-third of a page the amount permissible under the rules and that the cost will be $15. I ask that this may be included notwithstanding the estimate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

DEBATE ON FULBRIGHT RESOLUTION

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in opening the debate on the Fulbright resolution, Monday, the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] resorted to some ugly name-calling and invidious charges which apparently were meant to apply to those of us who do not see eye to eye with him on certain matters of foreign policy. He said:

> The scoffers, the demagogs, the false prophets, the dividers, the bigots will operate just as they have in the past. Whether or not they will be successful depends upon an enlightened and aroused public opinion, upon the vision and courage of our people, and the decent people of other nations.

The attitude of mind expressed here is quite characteristic of the gentleman. We have heard it often before. It may not be against the rules of the House for a Member of this body to, by innuendo and without referring specifically to names, call some of his colleagues scoffers, demagogs, false prophets, dividers, and bigots. However, it seems to me it is just as unbecoming for a Member to resort to this means of abuse against those of his colleagues who may not agree with him as it would be for him to do so by forthrightly calling them by name.

I venture to say those of us who may disagree with some of the policies the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] believes in and seeks to promote, still have a right to believe we can do so conscientiously, with dignity, and full maintenance of self-respect.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] takes unto himself a position which no other Member of the House would attribute to any remark I made, and I am sorry if the gentleman has a guilty conscience which prompted him to take the floor today. I want to assure him that so far as I am concerned he need not have that guilty conscience any longer because my remarks were made to the demagogs, the false prophets, and the others, and that means that when a man is a demagog or a false prophet he is not intellectually honest. Certainly men may disagree, and if one has an honest view and expresses that view, even if I disagree with him, I would under no circumstances consider him a demagog or a false prophet. Certainly, the gentleman from Ohio I would never consider to be a demagog or a false prophet or a bigot, and so far as I am concerned the guilty conscience of the gentleman can be thrown out of this application to him.

Chamber, because my remarks had no

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

FUTILITY OF ATTACKS ON CORDELL HULL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the scavenger attacks now being made on Cordell Hull, our distinguished Secretary of State, by a little coterie of radical propagandists are having no more effect upon Mr. Hull's standing with the intelligent, patriotic people of America than the activities of the tiny termites that gnaw at the base of the Washington Monument have on the destiny of the Father of our Country.

The serene dignity with which he has ignored these scurrilous attacks is characteristic of Cordell Hull, one of our greatest living Americans.

On yesterday the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] inserted in the RECORD an article by Frank Kent, answering these scurrilous attacks. I offered it for the RECORD before I learned of its insertion by Senator MCKELLAR, and I want to commend it to everyone who is interested in seeing that one of our great leaders, who is doing a great job for the American people, receive proper treatment at the hands of every element of the American press.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after disposition of the regular business of the day and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein three short introductions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WENE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on poultry shows.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WENE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the remarks of one of our own war heroes, including a letter and a document written by Mr. Joseph Leib, and also a letter of mine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON]?

There was no objection.

PRINTING 6,000 ADDITIONAL COPIES OF BIENNIAL REPORT OF CHIEF OF STAFF OF UNITED STATES ARMY

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I present the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 43), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the biennial report of the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, July 1, 1941, to June 30, 1943, to the Secretary of War, be printed as a public document, and that 6,000 additional copies be printed, of which 4,500 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 1,500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request with respect to insertion in the RECORD of my own remarks and clippings previously made. I have an estimate from the Public Printer to the effect that the article is in excess of the amount allowed, under the rule, and it will cost $112. I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the estimate of the Public Printer, it may be included in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 144]

Allen, Ill.	Hartley	O'Toole
Andrews	Hendricks	Peterson, Fla.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hill	Philbin
Barden	Hobbs	Phillips
Bell	Holmes, Mass.	Pittenger
Bland	Izac	Poulson
Brehm	Jackson	Pracht
Buckley	Johnson,	Reece, Tenn.
Burdick	Anton J.	Rizley
Canfield	Johnson,	Sasscer
Carter	Calvin D.	Satterfield
Chenoweth	Johnson, Ind.	Scott
Clark	Johnson,	Shafer
Costello	Lyndon B.	Sheppard
Creal	Kee	Sheridan
Cullen	Kelley	Sparkman
Curley	Kennedy	Spence
Elliott	Lane	Stevenson
Elmer	McGehee	Thomas, N. J.
Fay	McGranery	Thomas, Tex.
Fish	McKenzie	Towe
Fitzpatrick	McMurray	Treadway
Ford	Magnuson	Van Zandt
Gallagher	Marcantonio	Wadsworth
Gamble	Merritt	West
Goodwin	Miller, Pa.	Whelchel, Ga.
Gore	Murphy	White
Granger	Norton	Whitten
Green	O'Brien, Mich.	Wigglesworth
Gross	O'Connor	Winter
Hancock	O'Konski	Wolverton, N. J.
Hart	O'Leary	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 338 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two addresses of my own.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE FOR WIVES OF ENLISTED MEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 159; and pending that motion, I should like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] if we can agree on time for debate.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman has suggested an hour on a side. I think that would be enough to cover it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then, Mr. Speaker, if that is agreeable to the gentleman from New York, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 2 hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York and one-half by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 159, with Mr. SIKES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we have reached a turn of the road in this war, financially as well as strategically. Practically all capital-construction expenditures have now been made. The bulk of our factories, plants, and facilities has been completed. From now on, with few exceptions, it will only be necessary to provide for maintenance, repair, and operation.

The Committee on Appropriations, in preparing the bills which financed the war program, has broken all records not only in amounts carried by the bills but in the efficiency and expedition with which they have been handled. It is an achievement which reflects credit on no one party. All parties have cooperated. We have had upon the part of both the majority and the minority the closest cooperation. As a matter of fact, hardly a dollar has been authorized for appropriations by the Committee on Appropriations on which we have not had in effect the unanimous approval of all members of the committee.

Of course, we cannot expect such unanimity of purpose and action to continue indefinitely. The national conventions convene next June. We are already on the eve of a national political campaign. In view of the fact that there is little difference either in Congress or the country on the progress of the war or on the success of the war program, and—if the vote taken yesterday is a criterion—there is little appreciable difference on the post-war program up to this time—it is to be expected that from now on in the consideration of appropriation bills criticism of minor officials and minor items in the supply bills, will be emphasized and magnified possibly on both sides of the aisle for political purposes. I trust it can be held to a minimum as the war is far from won and there is still need for unity and cooperation.

However, partisanship is inevitable in campaign years—even in the consideration of appropriation bills and if from now on we hear some minor official castigated, excoriated, and denounced on one hand or praised, lauded, and glorified on the other, when we are told in impassioned speeches that the ignorance, stupidity, and inefficiency in the administration of some particular activity is equaled only by the reprehensible duplicity and rascality of the administrator, or that the transcendent benefits accruing from its administration marks the administrator as a statesman and philanthropist of the highest order, we may smile behind our hand and recall that it is campaign year and normal American politics as usual.

There is one such subject, however, under general discussion at this time on which there may be an honest difference of opinion, and that is the impression that there are large amounts of money which have been appropriated which remain uncommitted and unexpended—large reservoirs of money appropriated for the war program but lying useless and unutilized, which should be disbursed before further appropriations are made. It is a familiar charge and one which has been in circulation from time to time practically ever since the war began. In answer to a similar representation in the last Congress I secured from the Bureau of the Budget and inserted into the RECORD on February 5, 1943, a statement from the Director of the Budget showing in full the amounts appropriated, the amounts that had been committed, and the amounts estimated to remain unobligated and those estimated to be unexpended on the 1st day of July 1943. Up to that time we appropriated for the war program, according to the statement of the Bureau of the Budget, including funds made available by Government corporations, $241,000,000,000, and there was estimated to be obligated by July 1, 1943, $233,000,000,000, leaving at that time, on the 1st of July 1943, estimated to be unobligated, only $8,000,000,000. In other words, at that time, of that huge appropriation of $241,000,000,000, something like only 3⅓ percent was estimated to remain uncommitted at the end of the fiscal year, and you must take into consideration the fact that the departments cannot enter into contracts to expend money until the money has been appropriated, and for us not to have some small reservoir, some slight latitude, means that in cases of emergency there would be unnecessary, unwarranted, and dangerous delay in providing needed facilities if there was not at least some amount available for allocation.

The figures I have given were the estimated situation on June 30, 1943, as made of February last. I do not have the data as to the actual situation on June 30 as to unobligated funds, but do recall that because of changes in War Department programs due to change in emphasis in the war abroad there was unobligated in War Department funds at the end of the fiscal year 1943 something over $12,000,000,000 instead of about $6,500,000,000, as had been estimated in the previous February. Probably the actual situation at the end of the fiscal year was something double the $8,000,000,000 estimated figure, or 6 percent. The unobligated funds of the War Department were reappropriated for the fiscal year 1944 instead of providing new money, and it is a tribute to the Department that these funds did remain unobligated and were reported to Congress for reassignment.

Since December 31, 1942, we have appropriated, in round numbers, an additional approximate $97,000,000,000 for the war program, so that up to the present time we have appropriated for the

war program something over $330,000,000,000. Our allocations have pretty well kept pace with our appropriations as the fiscal year goes ahead.

Of course, we cannot at this time tell what the unobligated balances will be at the end of the fiscal year 1944, which is June 30 next. Obligations are being incurred every day and will be so incurred all during the fiscal year, and I believe from our past experience and with better organization and systemization of our armed forces, that improvement is constantly occurring in handling the fiscal affairs of the war. One thing must be made plain to Congress and to the American people. The authorities conducting the military, naval, and other war operations cannot turn a hand or a wheel until they have in hand the funds with which to pay for all of the programs which they must undertake in advance. They cannot run deficits for these things and then come in with a bill and present it and ask for the money. They are subject to the provisions of our penal statutes if they do so. Vast as these sums are, they are assigned to planned programs; programs that are studied and arranged far ahead; programs that support a war that is world-wide in proportions; programs that seek to give to our men the arms and weapons that are the best in the quantities and at the times that they need them; programs that will give our men the best of food, clothing, medical attention, and other care, no matter where they may be required to go. To plan, contract for, execute, and administer these war operations require appropriation of the funds far in advance. We review the obligation status of these funds from time to time in connection with our hearings and will continue to do so. Congress and the American people want everything possible done to safeguard war funds, but they do not want our war programs hampered by constantly digging up the garden to see if the seed has sprouted.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman speaks of appropriations and allocations. What amount has not been expended of the amounts that have been allocated? Is the gentleman able to advise the Committee?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of the total of $241,000,000,000 that had been made available as of December 31, 1942, for the war program it was estimated as of July 1, 1943, that one hundred and one billion would be unexpended, but there are no data available to me right now which would indicate what the actual figure was as of that date. Our daily rate of expenditure has jumped up considerably since that time. In January 1943, for war purposes we expended approximately $6,000,000,000, while in August this has risen to a monthly rate of about seven and one-fourth billion, and it looks as though September will run close to eight billion.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What was the date of the figures the gentleman gave when there had not been expended—up to what date?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is merely an approximate estimate as of February 5 for the reason that no definite figures were available.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. An approximate estimate up to the present time?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. To June 30, 1943.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. If we spent $330,000,000,000 in appropriations in 1940, and the tax income has been only some $85,000,000,000, have we not approached or passed the legal debt limit?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No, we have not yet passed the legal debt limit figures, but we have reached a position where it is highly important that we take into consideration the amount of money that can be raised by taxation and by loans.

Mr. Chairman, returning to the point of interruption, this war has been fought with less waste in proportion to the number of men engaged and the amounts involved than any war in the history of the Nation. Of course, economy and war do not go together. As a matter of fact war and sound business practices have little in common. When the house is afire we cannot take time to negotiate with the firemen the cost of putting out the fire. Our house was afire; it was in imminent danger of being burned down over our heads, and we could not always take the time to follow normal business practices, with resourceful enemies liable at any moment to be over our heads destroying the factories in which we were producing indispensable materials of war. But we have lost no time reaching sound business practices at the first opportunity. Contrary to the practice in every previous war, we have not waited until the war is over to investigate and remedy. Heretofore at the close of every war we have appointed committees of investigation which have gone into the conduct of the war long after the horse was stolen and long after it was too late to lock the barn door.

In this war, from the first, our committees of investigation, both in the House and in the Senate, and in joint committees, have been searching every field and phase of the war to uncover irregularities or maladministrations—to discover errors either of judgment or action. As a result we have weeded out and are continuing to weed out as rapidly as possible, all preventable waste. As soon as we find a leak we stop it.

And we are including in every contract a clause providing for renegotiation. Of course, the making of much of this war material was without precedent. Much of the war machinery had never been manufactured before. It required new plants; new machinery; new tools. It required the training of new workmen. There was no data upon which we could base a reasonable estimate as to the cost of producing these strange engines of war. But they had to be provided, and provided immediately. Consequently it was necessary to enter into contracts under which production would start, but with the understanding that after production was underway we would send auditors and inspectors into the factories to determine the cost of production and the amount of profit. Wherever the profit was unreasonable or more than the normal profit would have been under similar circumstances in time of peace, we renegotiated. We took from the contractor any surplus profit to which he was not entitled and covered it back into the Federal Treasury, and adjusted the price paid him on future production under the same contract.

As a result you will notice in releases by the Associated Press last month, that up until July 30, 1943, we had saved the Government $4,333,000,000 which would otherwise have gone into the pockets of the contractors. It might be said that even where we were in a position to make a somewhat accurate estimate of the cost of production, new methods were introduced, and through mass production, and the installation of assembly lines, production was so speeded up that there was a marked decrease in the unit cost and in the daily output.

In every war, especially in recent wars, in the Civil War, in the Spanish-American War, and in the First World War, we created multimillionaires overnight. Men grew fat upon the profits of war contracts; but in this war, through renegotiation, we take from the contractor any profit to which he is not entitled and return it to the Federal Treasury. No one in this war is making unconscionable millions out of the blood of American soldiers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Please notify me when I have consumed 10 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

There has been some considerable discussion recently relative to the repeal of the renegotiation clause in war contracts. Let me say to those interests which are so industriously agitating the question of repeal that they might just as well forget it. This House will not vote repeal. The people of the country will not permit the repeal or material readjustment of renegotiation of contracts. It has demonstrated its value too conclusively.

When this war closes it is estimated that the public debt, to which my friend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] just referred, will approximate $300,000,000,000.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I did not get the full statement as to the date fixed when in the gentleman's opinion the debt will be $300,000,000,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. At the close of the war—provided, of course, that the war does not last too long.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman stated that the Government had recovered something over $4,000,000,000 from contractors.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Part of that is recovery which has been made by reduction of profits, which have been returned to the Treasury, and part of it has been saved on the price of future deliveries. It is about half and half. But it totals approximately $4,333,000,000.

Mr. BUFFETT. None of that $4,000,000,000 represents money transferred from the tax department back to the War Department or the Navy Department?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It represents money which has been saved by the Government through the renegotiation of contracts for war materials.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Where the Government recovers, through renegotiation, sums of money, that money is covered directly into the Treasury?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. But where the renegotiation results in a reduction in the net cost or price of the commodity or thing being manufactured, that has the effect and result of increasing the appropriation to the department, because they may purchase more of those articles for the amount of money which had actually been appropriated. Is that not true?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is right both as to method and effect.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman mentioned $4,000,000,000 as the amount of savings, of which about $2,000,000,000 represents actual recovery. Is that true?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes, approximately.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Of that $2,000,000,000 recovered, a great deal would have come in otherwise through excess-profits taxes? For instance, I have an example in my district of where the recovery ran into hundreds of thousands of dollars and the difference between that and the excess-profits tax was only $10,000. Could the gentleman give us any idea of the actual saving beyond the taxes, caused by renegotiation of contracts?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question right along the line of the point raised by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. In the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, which have now been in progress for 2 weeks, it is shown that an investigation and survey was made by the National City Bank of New York, certainly not a governmental agency, and that showed that only 70 percent of the excess profits would be collected through the application of the excess-profits-tax law, leaving 30 percent, or nearly one-third not reached by the present excess-profits-tax law.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Information has come to me on that subject that through negotiation with the Government the amount has varied from four-tenths of 1 percent on some corporations to as high as 22 percent on others. Does the gentleman from Missouri think the Congress should step in and fix a limitation within which the renegotiations between the Government could not go in order to leave private industry and business with a sufficient amount of surplus, seed money, so to speak, to undertake peacetime production?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The Government pays amply and generously for services rendered. It pays a legitimate and substantial profit on all contracts, taking into consideration every cost of production. But it provides under the renegotiation clause for the recovery of every penny above a normal and reasonable profit. The Government has been enforcing that clause and ought to enforce it, and will continue to enforce it.

Mr. Chairman, we are told that at the close of the war, we will have a public debt of approximately $300,000,000,000. That is so large a sum, its purchasing power is so great, that we cannot even approximate its size, its value, or its purchasing power. But we can reach some faint comprehension of what it means when we are told that it is more than twice the assessed valuation of all the property in the United States; and, while assessed value may be only an index of actual value, it is at least a pertinent figure.

So, taking the estimate at its face value, we will owe at the conclusion of the war, under present prospects, something like twice what we are worth.

Any individual or corporation which owed twice as much as it was worth would be considered to be in a rather precarious financial position, but there is this difference between the position of the Government and the position of such an individual. The individual might possibly, through operations of business and trade, make that sum; but the only way the Government of the United States can reduce its obligation is by taking it from the pockets of the taxpayers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will require 10 additional minutes.

The United States Government does not repudiate its obligations; it pays its debts and pays them in full. So, all of this enormous sum which has been borrowed must be paid back. And it must be paid from taxes, and for that reason, may we ask the Members of the House to scrutinize carefully from this time forward all proposals for appropriations which are not imperatively essential to the conduct of the war.

Already there are influences asking for appropriations in the annual supply bills, on which we shortly begin hearings. Many of these requests for appropriations are in themselves worthy, and that should not be the consideration governing their disposition. The Committee on Ways and Means is now endeavoring to develop plans for securing additional income—over and above the heavy taxes already levied.

The real question in the consideration of all requests for nonwar appropriations is not whether the money will be well spent, but whether it will be better spent than in the prosecution of the war and the payment of the national debt. A dollar saved is a dollar made, and every dollar unappropriated is a dollar the Treasury will not have to borrow, and a dollar the taxpayers will not have to pay back.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I should like to proceed just a little further, if the gentleman will permit. I shall then be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, we initiated the program for infant care and maternity care for the wives of servicemen last March. We provided $1,200,000 for the fiscal year 1943, which was to serve from March until the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1943. For the fiscal year 1944, we provided $4,400,000, which was expected to meet all requirements from July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944.

But so great have been the demands upon the States to which the funds were allocated that we are at this early date confronted with an extraordinary deficit of 400 or 500 percent of the amount originally estimated for the entire year. Instead of $4,400,000 taking care of the needs of the program for the fiscal year, we now find we shall require something like $25,000,000 for the year. The estimate, submitted by the Bureau of the Budget, is specifically $18,600,000 for grants to States, and $33,000 for administrative expenses.

This money is to be used to provide prenatal care, obstetrical care, and postpartum care. It involves payment for the services of the physician and the nurse, and hospitalization.

Mr. BOREN and Mr. LANHAM rose.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I will yield in just a minute.

Whereas the original law provided for grades 4 to 7 of enlisted men, and the present law provides for all seven grades, an amendment to the pending bill adopted in committee again limits the provisions of the law to grades 4 to 7. According to statistics submitted by the Children's Bureau, the average cost per case is $84.50. The $18,600,000 in addition to the $4,400,000 will take care of a total of 220,000 cases at $84.50 each; but according to the estimates of the Children's Bureau we shall have during the year 238,631 cases; so even appropriating the amount asked for in this estimate will leave a deficit of 18,631 unfinanced cases at the end of the year. It is a new program, however, one in which we have very little data on which to make an

accurate estimate and as it involves factors beyond the range of accurate planning, the committee approves the estimate of $18,600,000 for grants to the States, as submitted by the Bureau. Inasmuch as we have previously made no provision at all for administrative expenses we recommend a cut in the estimate for administrative expenses from $33,000 to $20,000; that is the elimination of two medical consultants requested and provision for the accounting services only to the amount of $20,000.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman give us the assurance that all of the money appropriated through this measure will be used for the purposes enumerated and that none of it is to be used for new services or new facilities? Will the entire expenditure be devoted to looking after these women and children, the wives and children of soldiers in the service and not diverted to any other purpose?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. In the first place the money to be appropriated is to be spent for services only. None will be spent for buildings or capital investments of any kind; it is to be used for services exclusively and will be expended as the gentleman has indicated in accordance with the plan heretofore followed and the law heretofore enacted, with the exception that the committee amendment restricts beneficiaries to wives of enlisted men of grades 4 to 7. Otherwise there will be no changes in the character of service rendered. None of the funds will be diverted to other purposes.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am sure we all appreciate the distinguished gentleman's discussion this afternoon, although we may differ with him on other matters discussed this afternoon. When we get back to House Joint Resolution 159, we accept the interpretation of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and approve the bill and the program.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I trust the gentleman does not differ with me on the importance of exercising drastic economy at this time in order to take care of heavy obligations already incurred and in order to avoid incurring future nonessential obligations. I hope the gentleman agrees with me on that program.

Mr. McGREGOR. I believe my record in Congress approves that program.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is the important matter.

Mr. McGREGOR. We are to understand that this bill simply carries an appropriation continuing the existing facilities required to take care of the present program.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; as explained to the gentleman from Texas, the joint resolution merely continues the present program and existing facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I note on page 2 that the bill provides "hospital, maternity, and infant care for wives and infants of enlisted men in the armed forces of the United States." That excludes the wives and children of officers.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Wives and children of commissioned officers are not included.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will take 10 additional minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. The lower commissioned ranks, I would say up to captain, while carrying more money than that paid to an enlisted man, yet these officers have to buy their uniforms and pay for their living expenses. My experience is that from a financial standpoint there is very little difference in pay between an enlisted man and a commissioned officer, especially in the lower brackets.

As the gentleman knows, it was my amendment that raised the pay of the enlisted men in the armed forces to $50 a month. I am rather of the opinion that a discrimination is here being made against the wives and children of the lower grade commissioned officers, especially the lieutenants. As a rule they are the ones to whom these children are being born.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The enlisted man receives $50 a month and whereas the lowest commissioned officer receives $1,800 per annum. He also receives an allowance for quarters for himself and family, and a dependency allowance which the enlisted man does not receive.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. When I was back home during the congressional recess several physicians and doctors approached me regarding this important measure and asked me if there was any danger of the various States stepping in and controlling the persons to whom these funds would be paid. In other words, they feared a tendency toward socialized medicine and that certain doctors would enjoy the privilege of this income and others would be excluded. Can the gentleman enlighten me as to what policy will be followed?

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The answer to the gentleman's question should be found in the act itself, in the Labor Social Security Act passed during the last session. There is this provision in that act:

Provided, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed as to prevent any patient from having the services of any practitioner of her own choice paid out of this fund so long as State laws are complied with.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will take 5 additional minutes to answer inquiries.

Mr. BOREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I have two questions. First, is there anything in the law that requires that application must be made before the child is born? As I understood the law, we put in a fixed date at which time this care would be given. The reason I raise this question is on account of lack of information. So far there are many mothers whose bills have not been paid because, while the child was born within the period of time, yet they did not make application before the child was born, and they are not paid.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. For the lowest grades, 4 to 7, inclusive, it is only necessary to make application and care will be authorized. In the first three grades under the law it must be shown that assistance is necesasry.

Mr. BOREN. Of course, I am for this bill. I think this is an obligation that we ought to meet but I want it clearly brought out here, and I hope it is the Committee's opinion, that merely because some individual mother of a private soldier might not know enough about the red-tape procedure to get her application in on time or know where to get an application or how to get an application, that lack of information will not militate against her in the care she will receive.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Not at all. She may apply at any time.

Mr. BOREN. Suppose she did not know this until a week before the child was born and she wrote to the bureau and they sent back word that she could not be taken care of.

That happens and we ought to make a record right here that will show the departments downtown that we do not intend for that to happen. Now, I have one other question.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. It may not be approved. If the child is first born, then an application made, I do not know what the policy of the Bureau is, I do not know what the law is. As I understand it, an application shall be made before the birth of a child.

Mr. BOREN. We have set an arbitrary date. After that time we intend to pay for the maternal and infant care of every child of a soldier in certain classes that was born after that time. In some of the States at this juncture, because some mother did not know how to go about applying, or on account of lack of information, she is being penalized. I understand also there are at least two States that are not taking advantage of this. Another thing, we do not have anything in here about guaranteeing that this money will not be paid to a midwife. I believe that we need to have some legislation on that.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I may say that all of the States have been taken in except the States of Colorado, Louisiana, and North Dakota. Pennsylvania has just recently been approved.

Mr. CELLER. Massachusetts, also.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Colorado made application on the 7th of September and will be shortly approved. North Dakota has given indication she will apply. The only State remaining is Louisiana, and as soon as it applies it will be included. When the wife of any soldier in classes from 4 to 7, makes application, care will be authorized automatically. Above that it will be authorized under the provisions of the law if it is indicated that there is a necessity, in other words that there is need.

Mr. BOREN. I understand that in the bill before us it is contemplated that it will be amended to take care of the cases committed before the date of October 1. Would the Chairman have any objection to removing that word "committed"?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I am quite sure we all wish to compliment the members of the Committee on Appropriations on bringing in this very praiseworthy bill, which is a step in the right direction. However, I notice that New York, my State, has a total of authorized cases of but 644. Would that be due, perchance, to the fact that the allotment of $84.50 is woefully inadequate when you consider the standards in New York?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; these grants are made monthly. At the first of every month an allocation is made to the State in proportion to the number of cases which it reports.

In answer to the gentleman's second question, I may say there has been no indication that the amount is inadequate to provide the nursing, medical, and hospital service. The fees vary. As reported to the committee the minimum fee for the physician is $35 and the maximum is $50. There is no information to the effect that any physician has ever failed or refused to serve because of inadequacy of the fee.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. In further answer to the gentleman from New York, I believe that the gentleman will find that, according to the testimony before the committee, New York State has just qualified for this service, consequently the number of cases up to now would be limited.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I notice that the joint resolution provides for wives and infants of enlisted men. What about the inductees under the draft? They are not excluded?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The terms are synonymous.

Mr. DONDERO. It is meant to include the inductees or draftees?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The term "enlisted men" includes inductees.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Missouri, referring again to the question I raised about excluding officers in the lower brackets, that, as I said, it is true that an officer of the rank of second or first lieutenant or captain gets more money than an enlisted man, but these officers have to pay for their uniforms and laundry, and for their own subsistence. There is very little difference in the money they receive at last.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am in warmest accord with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], the distinguished chairman of the great Committee on Veterans' Legislation, in his desire to extend the provisions of this bill to benefit every member of the armed forces in need of the service which it affords.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to make any observations whatever on the bill before us. Had not my distinguished colleague from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, indulged in a lengthy laudation of the New Deal and had he not made the observation that he did with reference to political sharpshooting from here on in, I would have refrained from detaining the House at this time.

So that the RECORD may be kept straight, it does seem to me that some observation should be made about the matter of political sharpshooting. It seems to me a coincidence that the gentleman from Missouri should have taken a maternity bill for his purposes. After all, the related subject of birth control could very easily have to do with this maternity problem, but I am afraid that my distinguished friend from Missouri was thinking of "berth" control rather than "birth" control as he spoke of the political sharpshooting from here on in.

I take this occasion to remind my distinguished chairman that it was not necessary for some of us on the minority side to wait until public opinion had crystallized and until public opinion had become vehement in its denunciation of the extravagances of the New Deal to take an economy position. Those of us on the minority side of the aisle had contended for economy in government long before the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations saw fit to sound his warning of today. I make the claim today that the minority was opposed to the extravagances which had their birth—and that is b-i-r-t-h—in the days when Harry Hopkins felt that the Treasury of the United States should be ladled out for political purposes. We cannot dismiss from our minds Harry's words "spend and spend and tax and tax and elect and elect."

Many of us are exceedingly apprehensive that the leopard has not changed his spots very much. Many of us are of the opinion that while the administration in power may be putting on a front at the present time, while the administration may be assuming a cloak of righteousness to cover the sins of omission and commission, which it now seems willing to admit, nevertheless we still believe that Harry's philosophy dominates and motivates the administration in power.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Due to the fact that my friend Hopkins' name has been brought into this debate, I think the RECORD should show that he has served notice that he is giving up his bed and board at the White House where he has been domiciled at public expense for 4 years.

Mr. DITTER. I had not intended to bring in a personality.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not want to have my motives impugned. I merely want to whitewash Harry Hopkins, and God knows he needs it.

Mr. DITTER. Of course, I would be the last one to impugn the motives of my distinguished and brilliant friend from Minnesota. I was pleading my own cause and acknowledging that inadvertently I might have brought in a personality. I had not intended to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman will admit that Harry Hopkins certainly is showing us the way to economy at a great personal sacrifice?

Mr. DITTER. I think that is commendable. After all it is the very thing I have in mind. If berths and boards are to be paid for in the future that have been free in the past, then I say I am for it, and I think that he is to be commended if the gentleman quotes him correctly. But again, to revert to my own plea, I acknowledge that I had not intended to indulge in personalities.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DITTER. Again I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. To say that I am not making that statement as a positive fact, because he has not yet moved.

Mr. DITTER. Then I assume that my friend suggests that it is a hope deferred but not yet fulfilled.

Mr. KNUTSON. Exactly.

Mr. DITTER. The New Deal has been guilty in many instances in not performing according to promise, so I suggest, lest my friend have the unhappy experience of not realizing his hopes and ambitions with reference to Harry, that he hold his ultimate decision in abeyance.

Mr. KNUTSON. It may be that this is a case where the pleasure of anticipation is greater than that of realization.

Mr. DITTER. It may be.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, absolutely.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Perhaps my colleague from Pennsylvania overlooked one

thing that our mutual friend from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] wanted to call to the attention of the House, which was that in moving out Harry may be going on his own, striking out for himself, as a person perhaps traveling the unfamiliar road of private enterprise.

Mr. KNUTSON. And certainly no one can object to that.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that the debate has taken a turn that I confess I had not intended.

Mr. KNUTSON. And I regret it.

Mr. DITTER. To get back, I had not intended any personal observation. My purpose was to emphasize the point that the philosophy of the New Deal, the philosophy of extravagance and wastefulness is now being rejected by those who entertained it in the past. My purpose in taking the floor was to say to my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that we on the Republican side, the minority group, have not waited for an election year to start sharp-shooting toward economy in government and against extravagance and waste. We are where we were when the extravagance of the New Deal started—opposed to it, and we will continue that opposition down to the end.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a very, very happy circumstance permits me today to draw into a close embrace the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. To find him as a kindred spirit today makes this a most happy privilege for me. I tell him that we welcome him to the economy fold. We shall look forward to his support in our efforts to make substantial savings for the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am certain all of us have enjoyed this delightful colloquy between the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER]. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], the chairman of the Republican congressional committee, has never been known to neglect his duties in that capacity or to fail to take advantage of any opportunity to discuss politics and in this instance has not waited for an opportunity. No mention was made in the debate of the New Deal, political sharp shooting, and there was no reference to the minority side, the Republican side, or any other side. In other words, the eloquent observations of our colleague from Pennsylvania, a very affable Member of the House, carries out fully the prophecy made in my opening remarks. I suggested that the credit for the remarkable record made in the Seventy-seventh and the Seventy-eighth Congresses by the Committee on Appropriations was shared equally by all members of that committee, on both sides of the aisle. No differentiation was made. Also that now that a political campaign was in the offing, opportunity would be taken by Members on both sides to make political capital out of minor and unimportant items in, or out, of the supply bills, and criticism of individuals in no way concerned.

Fulfilling this prediction the gentleman has had much to say about Harry Hopkins, as far away from the bill and as far away from the statements made in discussion of the bill as anything could possibly be.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. With pleasure.

Mr. DITTER. Could the gentleman suggest any closer relativity between renegotiation and maternity needs?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman rises in the name of Harry Hopkins, as far from the subject under discussion as the Antipodes.

Mr. DITTER. But I am speaking of the relativity of the two subject matters. The gentleman from Missouri seems to take exception to the use of the name I mentioned.

Is there any relativity between renegotiation of contracts and birth control or maternity, more than there is this matter we have discussed relating to Harry Hopkins? The gentleman indulged himself at great length on the subject of renegotiation.

Mr. KNUTSON. Would the gentleman define what he had in mind when he spoke?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Into a preliminary discussion reviewing the record of the Committee on Appropriations and urging economy in the coming supply bills, my very good friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] seeks to inject politics——

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I would like to make the observation, in view of the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] that in connection with the consideration of this bill it took the power of the public press, the American Legion, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars to compel the Republican Governor of Pennsylvania to make these benefits eligible to the servicemen of our State.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. My time has expired. The gentleman is recognized in his own time.

Mr. DITTER. I had hoped the gentleman would take a little more time that I might ask him a question.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. My time has expired. I shall be glad to answer the gentleman in his own time.

Mr. KNUTSON. Let us have harmony, anyway.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have enjoyed this congressional horseplay this afternoon. It adds a little levity to the situation. It seems to me though, that we are getting at it mighty early in the deliberations of the Congress. In view of the character of the questions that have been asked with reference to the pending resolution and in view of the evident misgivings as to what is contained in this resolution, while I do not criticize at all the things that have transpired, I do feel that we ought to get down to this bill and dispose of it. This bill contains an appropriation of $18,600,000, and most Members here would like to know specifically what there is in this bill; what it does; what the program is; and how the program which we inaugurated some time ago has operated.

If I may say so, I have been exceedingly interested in this program and participated to some extent in its inauguration. I have watched the progress of the work under this bill. I am rather amazed that some of the statements which have been made indicate that there is a definite lack of information in certain parts of the country with reference to the bill.

Now, let us understand right from the start this is a proposal to give to the States allotments of funds, without matching provisions. The funds are to be administered by the States themselves through their State boards of health, under programs set up by the States, subject to the approval f the Children's Bureau. Those regulations set up, which must be complied with in order to secure approval, have been limited by provisions which were inserted, as you recall, in the appropriation bill which was a part of the regular Labor Department and Social Security appropriation bill. Those two provisions were those which were the subject of debate, as you will recall, which prohibited discrimination on the part of the Children's Bureau in setting up regulations which the States are compelled to comply with, which would permit discrimination in the expenditure of these funds as between persons licensed under State law to practice obstetrics.

The other one was that provision which provided, as I read to the House a few moments ago, that there should be no construction of the act that would prevent any patient from having the services of any practitioner of her own choosing paid out of this fund, so long as the State laws were complied with.

All the Federal Government says to the States in this program is this:

> Here is a sum of money that Uncle Sam has allotted to your State to be disbursed by officers of your State to the wives of servicemen of the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades who are expectant mothers.

That is all there is to it. Now, a mother has a right, under this law, to go to a physician of her own choosing and ask to be taken care of. There are very few mothers, I think, who do not do that. They make their own arrangements. They go to the doctor and there is no physician or person licensed to practice obstetrics in the United States who is not today thoroughly familiar with the provisions of this law. The practitioner must make application in my State to the State board of health for the compensation to be paid for the pre-natal and the post-natal care of the mother

and child. He is then paid along with the hospital bill out of these funds when his claim is approved by the State board of health.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. If the physician makes application in your State for these funds, is that physician limited to the amount granted by the State?

Mr. KEEFE. Why, he is limited, of course, to the amount that is set up as the maximum by the provisions of the Children's Bureau. Necessarily so. They have limited the fees that can be paid for the services rendered. Otherwise the sky would be the limit. There would be no limitation on it at all.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. As the gentleman states, of course, the amount paid by the Children's Bureau is limited, but as I understand the Children's Bureau also forbids any further amounts being paid for the woman by her friends or relatives, so that she has to go to a ward, even though her friends or her parents could help her get a private bed, and no matter how serious her case is, she cannot do so, because if she takes this amount, she does not comply with the requirements under which she is given this assistance.

As I understand it, that is the thing the medical profession has objected to very strenuously in the operation of this law.

Mr. KEEFE. I have not known of any such objections so far as I have been able to observe in my State. I do not know whether that is the situation that exists in the State of Ohio, but I may say that if the situation does exist in the State of Ohio, it is my opinion that it is due to the action of the State authorities of the State of Ohio and not due to the action of the Federal Government. I will investigate the matter this afternoon, however, and will try and advise the House later in the debate.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know of any valid reason why the medical profession should be opposed to this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I cannot conceivably see why the medical profession should be opposed to any provision of this bill, because it guarantees to a doctor a fee for the delivery of the child and for caring for the mother and child subsequent and prior to delivery, when he might not otherwise be paid. It also guarantees the hospital that takes care of the child that it will be paid, and thus insures to the wife of the serviceman the decent care that that wife and that child is entitled to. That is all there is to it, and why there should be any medical man who should be in any way objecting to the bill is beyond me. I have never heard any medical man object, but I know that there is a movement on now among medical men to remove the limitations that are imposed on the question of fees. Certain medical men seek to establish a lump sum to cover the whole transaction, and to pay this sum directly to the wife, to be spent as she pleases. Under that proposal she could go to a doctor if she pleased, perhaps go to a hospital if she pleased, or have her baby at home.

I cannot agree with that sort of practice at this time, because in the experiences as I have been able to observe them up to date in my own State, at least, it is working splendidly and has the full and complete approval of the recognized men in the profession in my State and is also serving to meet the condition that was pathetic prior to the time the Government of the United States stepped into this picture.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to remind the gentleman from Wisconsin that in addition to what he has already said about the States, the hospital also must be approved by the State authorities.

Mr. KEEFE. Exactly. The point that I wanted to make in this matter is this: The Children's Bureau has diligently tried to take this situation out into the States and they have allowed the States to set up their procedure. And I think that is a very commendable thing.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The benefits provided under this act are payable only to enlisted men's wives and not to those of officers? Is that correct?

Mr. KEEFE. That is correct.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Would the gentleman from Wisconsin tell us, if he knows, in what way the amounts are allocated generally to the States; is there some measure or formula set up by which that amount is determined?

Mr. KEEFE. The amount is allowed to prospective mothers.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Of enlisted men?

Mr. KEEFE. Of enlisted men, so they take into consideration the prospective number of births that are to take place in the various States.

Mr. Chairman, so that the Members of the House will understand the two amendments that are to be offered to this proposed resolution which have not as yet been discussed, I shall try to explain them so we may know what we are doing when we are voting on a measure that contains an appropriation of $18,600,000. As the bill was originally passed—rather, when the original estimate was presented to the Appropriations Committee—it only provided aid to wives of enlisted men in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades.

As the bill finally came out of the subcommittee it provided for the next three upper grades—that is, to wives of men in the next upper three grades—and some difficulties have been found to exist in that situation which I do not have the time to discuss here now. At least, it was thought sufficient by the full committee, in discussing this matter this morning, to adopt an amendment submitted by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who is also a member of the subcommittee that put in the original amendment, including these three upper grades. The amendment now limits the application of this appropriation to wives of enlisted men only in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades. Those are the people who cannot afford to provide their own care. There have been some serious advantages taken of this fund that make it necessary to bring this bill back to the proposal as it originally came to the Congress.

Another amendment will be offered that provides that the appropriation may be used in the payment of commitments made prior to October 1, 1943, in the case of wives or infants of enlisted men of grades 1, 2, and 3.

As a matter of fact, allotments have been made by the Children's Bureau to the various States so as to take care of the wives of enlisted men in grades 1, 2, and 3. We could not cut this off sharply; so the amendment that will be offered by the committee provides that after October 1, 1943, there shall be no more commitments by the Children's Bureau to the States to take care of the wives of enlisted men in grades 1, 2, and 3. If this bill passes, amended as I have indicated, it will provide $18,600,000 to be allocated to the States by the Children's Bureau under the provisions of the present law, and thus provide aid to the wives of enlisted men in the lower four grades——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this bill is designed to take care of the need that has grown out of our war situation, a need that was not being met before the Federal Government stepped into the picture—at least that seemed to be the general impression. Allotments from this $18,600,000 are supposed to be made by the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor according to what the need may be expected to be. Births are running at a very high rate; for 1943 they are expected to be 3,000,000 as against a normal of 2,200,000. Of these 3,000,000 it is estimated that 600,000 will be children of men in the armed forces. Within this calendar year probably 25 to 30 percent will have been helped by this type of appropriation. The number who are asking for it is increasing. This perhaps is something to be expected with the tremendous increase in the armed forces at the present time. The program has been established and undoubtedly we must carry it on.

There are, however, some things I think I should say.

I believe the Children's Bureau is reaching out too far in this situation; I think they are attempting too much to hold the control of this situation in Washington. There must, of course, be some checking up and some auditing, but there should not be any more annoyance or interference with the operation of the State health authorities in working out this problem than is necessary. There should be fewer questionnaires than have been required to be filled in by doctors. In some cases they have come to be such a burden that the doctors are thinking they must not become involved in this service. The number of questionnaires they are asked to make out takes too much of their time and energy.

The success of this program is going to rest in the attitude the Children's Bureau takes. If it intends to reach out and make this thing as difficult as possible to administer and as cumbersome as possible with as much overhead as possible it is going to make a failure of the job. If it administers this fund fairly and squarely with as little interference as possible it will be better. I hope that as they approach this problem the Children's Bureau will contract its own administrative operations just as much as possible. They asked for a lot of extra consultants which the committee refused to give them—they have too many already passing on things and we ought to get rid of that sort of incubus.

I had hoped we might have some definite information for the House as to what was being asked. I have in front of me a questionnaire that is required by the Ohio Department of Health which does not seem to be bad. On the other hand I understand that some questionnaires prepared and used in other States are very bad and that they bother the doctors. I understand also that restrictions are being placed on the type of hospital that may be used. I am sure you realize that the success of a job of this kind depends upon the doctors more than upon the hospital if the hospital facilities are clean. It is much better to take these cases to small local hospitals than to try to carry the patient 40 or 50 miles to some other place that is too far to travel. This load should not be thrown upon certain hospitals if others with adequate equipment and facilities are available nearby.

Mr. Chairman, I am going along with this program. I feel, however, they are being provided with a great plenty of money. On the other hand it is much better that we do this than that these people be permitted to become public charges.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to ask two questions that were raised in my mind by the statements of the gentleman from Wisconsin. Do I understand that under the present law if a mother becomes very seriously ill after being confined to the hospital that she cannot be moved from a ward to a private room? Does the law prohibit this?

Mr. TABER. The law does not and I do not believe any regulation does. The law is very specific. If the gentleman will look at the bottom of page 1 and the top of page 2 he will see that it provides as follows:

> To provide, in addition to medical, nursing, and hospital, maternity care, etc., similar services otherwise available.

This indicates very clearly that it means to permit the family of the wife to be properly taken care of under any circumstances.

Mr. CRAWFORD. My other question is this: Does the present law permit the expectant mother to engage any physician she desires, whether he be an M. D., an osteopath, or some other type of practitioner provided the law of the State in which the case occurs licenses that party to practice in this profession?

Mr. TABER. It does. I do not know what the State laws provide, but the law itself, contained in the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill does so provide.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Federal law goes along with the State law, does it?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, as one of those who was admonished and reproved by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] for deriving a little enjoyment from a discussion which might not have been strictly pertinent to this bill, permit me to say in extenuation that a little relaxation is not harmful at times. Day after day, and sometimes far into the evening, some of us are engaged in the pleasurable task of trying to do something for our constituents by consulting various departments and sometimes some of us grow a little downhearted, may it be said, even discouraged, we feel a little depressed, because this department or that—one or the other—is taking away from our constituents their means of livelihood or the help which they need in storing or shipping, or on the farm, or their opportunity to get priorities for machinery or the tools which they must have if they are to carry on their business and pay their taxes. Grape, onion, celery, and apple growers are all finding it difficult to get the cost of production or to market their crops.

So I hope the gentleman will pardon some of us if sometimes we, in his opinion, lose dignity, if at times we seem to stray away for a moment from the business of the House, because we realize that we will be called back again and our noses put on the grindstone, and when the gentleman explains these bills so clearly, so completely, as he always does when he takes the floor, no harm is really done because we can follow his leadership without question and be sure that we are right.

There is no real opposition to this bill. Even one who has voted for economy so consistently as has the Member from the Fourth District, not the Fifth, the Fourth District of Michigan, I can go along with this bill and with the appropriation because it seeks to do something for the wives and for the children of our soldiers.

No one in the House would fail of the opportunity, especially, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] said, in a campaign year to vote so as to help most anyone in his district. Certainly we cannot go back on the soldiers or their wives or their offspring. For myself, it is indeed a pleasure to be able to vote once for the expenditure of some Federal funds which will go for the benefit of American citizens.

We have been giving away hundreds of millions of dollars, yes, billions of dollars, not only to those who came and asked for it but to those who by invitation and by the request of men like Hopkins and others are asked to come and get it or to sit still, and we will take it to them. Hence it is that today I am glad to be able to vote for the expenditure of American taxpayers' money for the benefit of American citizens. That is somewhat unusual for the New Deal; it is something that does not happen very often, and when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] seems to feel concerned about the chairman of the Republican congressional committee, let me say that I, too, feel for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER]. He has done a magnificent job.

The expert on figures, the chairman of this great Appropriations Committee, has evidently forgotten the figures which came up during the last election, and if our chairman has failed to do all that should be done, let us bear in mind that he has not had the Federal Treasury at his disposal; he has not had hundreds of thousands of official positions in which he could place political hack writers; he has not had the Federal Treasury where, if he wanted to sell a bond, he could put on a billboard the likeness of the candidate for the fourth term and so receive all of that political aid which the present administration gets. So do not criticize our chairman. He is doing a good job. If the new dealers will just continue to cut away, to cut out from under our home folks, the foundation upon which our whole war effort rests, the next election will produce the result we want.

That is an exorbitant price to pay; it is a ruinous price, and my fear is that, if they continue along the present lines, the country will be completely ruined, our citizens impoverished.

The objective of this bill is good. The purpose is to aid the serviceman's wife who is about to become a mother. No one will vote to deny that aid.

It does seem to me, however, that the bill should be broader, more comprehensive; that the WAVES, the WAC's, and other women in the various branches of the service should be given the opportunity for similar benefits.

Just as the soldiers and the sailors and the marines, thousands of them, will marry after going into the service, so, too, the WAVES, the WAC's, and other servicewomen will fulfill the destiny which is theirs and marry. Some of them will marry civilians, and eventually thousands of them will become mothers.

Is there any reason why the benefits carried in this bill should not be extended to those women? They, too, are in the service of their country. It is a little surprising to me that those who drafted this bill forgot that WAVES and WAC's and other servicewomen marry and have children by fathers who are not in the service.

Let us include them in this bill or let the committee send in additional legislation to remedy the oversight.

Mr. TABER. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the proposed legislation we have before us—House Joint Resolution 159—is very important, badly needed, and I intend to vote for it. However, there are some wrongs in this legislation which I should like to see corrected.

The way the present program is set up and administered is not working in the best interests of the expectant mothers and wives of the soldiers.

The Children's Bureau here in Washington must give final approval to all State plans to take care of these cases. This means virtually that the Children's Bureau sets up the whole program. This program should be completely divorced from the Federal bureaucracy. It should be entirely under the jurisdiction of the States themselves.

Furthermore, the amounts allotted for maternal and infant care should be paid to the expectant mothers directly. They should then be allowed to use the funds in the manner they think best and employ a physician of their own choice. They should be permitted to select their own hospital, so long as it is a hospital licensed to do obstetrical work, or they should be permitted to have their babies in their own homes, should they elect to do so.

The argument will be made that under conditions like this the money allotted for their care might not be so used properly—might be spent on other objects. The answer to this is we should place more trust in these women than that.

I practiced medicine for many years and I am quite sure this would work out satisfactorily and would be more practical.

Just now, when Congress is confronted with an attempt to socialize medicine and a lot of other things which the Wagner-Murray bill provides for, we should be especially careful and not grant any more powers to the Children's Bureau, or to any other Federal bureau that might use them to extend Federal control over the practice of medicine.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. As I understand, the Federal Government does not attempt to regulate and supervise a man as to the way he spends his uniform allowance or some other allowance given him by the Government. Does the gentleman know of any reason why the Federal Government has to come into Ohio and interfere with the way Ohio supervises grants for infant and maternity care?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. There is no answer to that except this: It simply provides an opportunity for a group of people to set up more bureaucratic control over our people.

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JEFFREY. Is it not true that under the existing law a mother, no matter whether or not her condition may be unusually severe, is precluded from paying anything extra and thereby getting the extra care and attention she needs?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman and colleagues, the resolution before us provides for an appropriation of $18,620,000 to help take care of the wives of our soldiers and sailors in maternity cases in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades; that would give aid to the wives of buck privates, privates first class, technicians fifth grade, corporals, technicians fourth grade, and line sergeants of the Army, and similar grades in the Navy and Marine Corps, where this aid is necessary and desired.

This program was initiated in March 1943. It was believed at that time that 52,000 wives of servicemen would take advantage of this law before June 30, 1944, and it was further estimated that there would be 300,000 wives of soldiers and sailors in these grades who would give birth to children during the fiscal year June 30, 1944, and that 25 percent of these wives would apply for this care. A later checking shows that the number of pregnant wives would be 645,000, and that about 50 percent would apply for this care, and, therefore, instead of having 75,000 in a single year, there would be approximately 300,000, and this corrected estimate makes it necessary to provide for 300,000, instead of 75,000, for the present fiscal year which accounts for the additional $18,620,000 carried in this resolution. This law will take care of the doctor bills, hospital and nurse charges, and average about $84.50 per case for both prenatal and postpartum care. This service is supervised by the State board of health of each of the respective States. Each wife has the right to select her own physician and hospital. The Federal Government merely provides the State authorities with the funds to pay the reasonable and usual charges for such services, and as heretofore pointed out the average cost for medical, nurse, and hospital care is $84.50 per case. There may be some who would criticize this expenditure. I am glad to give this resolution my wholehearted support. In my service in the House and in the Senate, I have always placed the defenders of our country and their dependents as a group of Americans first. We owe those who are now defending us on the 5 continents, the 7 seas, and the islands of the seas of the world, a debt of gratitude that we cannot fully repay. Our soldiers and sailors everywhere throughout the earth are doing a wonderful job. They have all of our enemies on the run. Their patriotic zeal, their heroism, and their skill in battle on land, sea, and in the air, have not been surpassed by the soldiers or sailors of any nation in the history of the world. They are upholding the finest and best traditions of our Army and Navy. They are far removed from their families and friends. They have given up the opportunities to make money or to advance their education and training in civil life. Millions of them are offering to give, and hundreds of thousands of them have and will give, their lives and health and their limbs for us. They should have no worries that their wives and offspring are not receiving tender and the very best scientific care in this great adventure in the lives of their wives and their new-born offspring.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. That was the fundamental ground submitted when this program was initiated last year. The Congress was sold on the idea that we were taking two, three, four, or five million soldiers across the seas; so, in order to relieve them of any anxiety as to what would happen to their wives who were expectant mothers, the appropriation was made originally of $1,200,000. It was thought that 30,000 or 40,000 needy cases would be covered by that fund.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We want them to know that they are fighting for a grateful Republic, a country worthy of their courage and patriotism. I wish to repeat that I am happy to have an opportunity to speak and vote for this most worthy measure.

CUT DOWN WASTE AND INEFFICIENCY

The debate on the resolution before us has been most heartening. Mr. CANNON, Democrat of Missouri, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House, told us a few minutes ago that the records show, and this is a fact, that Congress has appropriated approximately $330,000,000,000 for war purposes for the present World War No. 2, and that it was his opinion that when this war ends our national debt will have reached the astronomical sum of at least $300,000,000,000, and he further stated that the assessed value of all of the property of every kind and character in the United States is approximately $150,000,000,000. This statement is borne out by the records of the United States Census Bureau.

In other words, the records of the United States Census Bureau show the

assessed value in all the counties, in every State of the Union, is approximately $150,000,000,000. This includes property of every kind and character whatsoever owned and possessed by the American people—real, personal, mixed property, also all tangible and intangible property. This, of course, includes real estate, buildings of all kinds, railroads, factories, shops, mines, dwelling houses, farms, livestock, poultry, money, stocks, bonds, securities, notes, in fact, everything that the citizens, partnerships, and corporations are required under the laws of the various States of the United States to list for taxation, and these lists include exemptions of all taxpayers. The laws of the several States require that these assessment lists be sworn to, and, therefore, the distinguished Chairman points out that our national debt at the close of the war will be twice as much as the assessed value of all the property in the United States of every kind and character. The report of the Treasury Department yesterday showed that the deficit for 1 year next preceding September 20th is approximately $70,000,000,000. In other words, after deducting all the enormous taxes collected by the Government and its other sources of revenues and income during the past year, our Government spent $70,000,000,000 more than it took in. The records of the Treasury Department show that the total cost of World War No. 1 from the time it began on April 6, 1917, up to and including November 11, 1918, the date of the Armistice, was $21,000,000,000. The deficit of this Nation for the last year is nearly two and one-half times the total cost of World War No. 1 up to the armistice. This Seventy-eighth Congress met on January 6, 1943; when it recessed on July 8, 1943, after 6 months and 2 days, the Congress had appropriated more than $130,000,000,000, and we are still adding to that sum. This Congress appropriated in 6 months and 2 days nearly six and one-half times the cost of World War No. 1 up to and including the date of the Armistice, November 11, 1918.

At the close of World War No. 1, which included the debt at the time we entered the war, and the debt created for a year or more after the war, our national debt was approximately $26,000,000,000. If Chairman CANNON and others are correct in their predictions that our national debt at the end of the war will be at least $300,000,000,000 then our national debt will be nearly 12 times what it was after World War No. 1. Chairman CANNON urges the Congress to economize whenever, and wherever, possible to do so. The Republican Members of the House applaud the high purpose of the chairman. We have been urging the Congress and this administration to economize for the last 10½ years. Of course, the Republicans favor the appropriation and expenditure of every dollar necessary to win the war at the earliest moment possible. That must be the first objective of the Congress and the administration and the American people. The tax and bond money of the American people should not be wasted or spent for nonessentials, and appropriations for the civil functions of our Government should be pared to the bone This policy must be adhered to rigidly if we would preserve a sound financial policy and the credit of the Nation. We must bear in mind always the tremendous burden that is now being borne by the taxpayers of the Nation. All of our people are now paying taxes in some form. The administration is constantly seeking to find ways to impose new taxes and increase taxes. They should give more attention to find ways to cut out nonessentials, frauds, waste, inefficiency, and cut down instead of consistently increase the number of Federal officeholders which now exceeds 3,200,000, as compared to approximately 950,000 in World War No. 1, and as urged by Mr. Baruch, a high authority in the administration, to cut out the cost-plus contracts, conserve manpower, and reduce the cost of government.

Among the criticisms that I found in my district and in the State of Kentucky during the recess were the waste of the people's tax and bond money, the waste of manpower, the excessive number of persons employed by the Government, and these cost-plus Government war contracts. The cost-plus contract was found in World War No. 1 to be a fertile field for waste, fraud, and inefficiency, and the hope was expressed that this Nation would never indulge in a policy of that kind again, but we find it more prevalent in this war than in the other war. The more the contractor spends, the bigger his profits. I have heretofore denounced, and I denounce again, such a policy, and it is heartening that Mr. Bernard Baruch, this high administration official, after investigation, makes this fearless denunciation of this policy and the waste of manpower and money by the administration to the President. I have received reports from timekeepers and others in the munitions plants and other governmental agencies, and they pointed out how these wasteful and fraudulent practices were being carried on. The Truman committee and other committees of the House and the Senate rendered a splendid service in exposing the cost-plus contracts and the waste of manpower and money by the Government itself.

Another general complaint I found was the unnecessary and useless regimentation of private business and the daily lives of the people themselves. There was a general feeling that the policies of this administration and the bureaucrats were hampering free private enterprise in such a way as to put out of business hundreds of thousands of small business concerns, and to add greatly costs of operation to all others. The American people are almost a unit in their desire to do everything within their power to win the war, but they do resent bitterly the squandering of their tax and bond money, and the unnecessary, and in many cases unconstitutional interference with the conduct of their business activities and individual actions. This tremendous national debt causes many of them to inquire if these bonds will ever be paid.

I had that question propounded to me many times by patriotic citizens who have given sons and daughters in the service of our country and who are paying taxes and buying bonds to the limit. The only response I could make to them was that our Nation had never repudiated its obligations. I further urged them that I was buying bonds, and that I was sure that many of them who were buying bonds had sons and daughters in some branch of our armed forces, and that their sons and daughters, as well as my son and millions of others must have food, clothing, shelter, arms, planes, bombers, bombs, ships, and other war supplies with which to fight and win the war, and I believe that the American people as a whole who are paying taxes and buying bonds are not buying them as a matter of profit and investment but as a matter of patriotic duty, and will continue to do so provided their taxes and bond money are not squandered and wasted, but that this money is necessary and will be used in an efficient and honest way to win the war, and their activities in industry and on the farm and in their private life will not be restrained or interfered with, only to the extent that it is necessary to promote the war effort; and, furthermore, that the Government will not be the chief hoarder and waster of the manpower of this Nation. As pointed out by Chairman McNutt, of the War Manpower Commission, over 300,000 single men and married men without children within the draft age and in good health are on the pay roll of the Government as civilian employees, and at the same time the administration is insisting on drafting more fathers. Our war effort, the farms, and industry, need these able-bodied young men, especially when it is clear to everyone who has studied the situation that the Government has at least a million more Federal officeholders than necessary to carry on efficiently the activities of this Government and these defense plants. It has been asserted by persons who ought to know, and those who have made a careful investigation of the subject, that there are more than 3,000,000 unnecessary persons on the pay rolls of the Government and in these defense plants where they are operating on the cost-plus contracts, and under the policy that the more they spend in producing these war materials the more profit they make.

Let us give the taxpayers and the bond and stamp buyers a break. Our war effort should be streamlined. Production on the farms and in our factories and in the mines should be increased, and final victory hastened. Millions of servicemen whose lives have been interrupted by the war want to get the war over and be returned to their homes and loved ones, and millions of fathers, mothers, wives, and children are hoping and praying for their return.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I think I am one of the last men in the House eligible to have any

aspersions cast at him for having failed to back up every measure that has gone through for the defense of our allies and the defense of this Nation. In fact I have voted for every dollar ever appropriated for the United Nations since this war began. For that reason, I feel particularly qualified at this time to be able to support and vote for a measure which takes care of the dependent wives and children of our men in the service.

Ever since the Selective Service Act of 1940 was passed, this Congress—and I think this can be said to its credit—has stood for doing everything possible to aid and succor and abet those persons who are engaged in defending this great Nation against the aggressor.

I know of no measure which has come before the Congress more important to the lives of the servicemen and to the welfare of those who have been left behind. I for one am glad that the day has come when this House approves a measure which will take care of those dependent wives who are expectant mothers. I thank God I am here to vote for this aid to those wives of servicemen who are doing everything they can, while their husbands are away, to maintain their American homes which are the backbone of our country. All praise to those patriotic women working for the victory which is just as certain to come as that the sun rose this morning.

Doubtless, our armed forces will soon be augmented by the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. Already countless other fathers have been taken. Many of the wives who have been left behind are already expecting further additions to their families. It seems to me that those fathers who are departing for the fighting fronts all over the world will leave for the front in a much happier state of mind and have their morale greatly strengthened if they know that their wives are assured of maternity care and that their loved ones will be looked after.

I have heard several statements this afternoon by various Members expressing concern over the expenditures of a great many dollars for the war effort and for the Federal Government. Personally, I feel that during the consideration of a measure of this kind is a poor time to raise that question. I think the sky is the limit for the men in the service and for their families. If we can vote eighteen billions to foreign countries in the twinkling of an eye, it seems to me we can afford to vote eighteen millions for maternity and infant care of those wives and families of our soldiers, sailors, and marines.

I hope the Congress will continue to do its best for the great Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States. Their morale will be buoyed up if they know their families and loved ones are being cared for in their absence. In the future I cannot back the other measures that will come before the House from time to time which provide the sending of billions of dollars to nations across the sea half as enthusiastically as I have backed them unless this measure is passed today. I hope Congress will give approval to this measure, and I am sure that we will all be very glad when it has been passed, for we will be doing our duty to our men in service, their wives, and children.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to give my support to this resolution, which has for its purpose the making of additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces. The resolution carries an appropriation for this purpose of $18,600,000, $20,000 of which is allocated to salaries and expenses in administration. When this matter was up before us last year, there was no experience available upon which to base an estimate as to the amount that would be required for this worthy purpose. The armed forces have been growing by leaps and bounds and from day to day increased numbers are going overseas, and the wives of enlisted men are left here at home, without the protection of their husbands and in many cases without financial resources with which to meet emergency cases such as those covered by this bill. It has now been found that the appropriation provided for this emergency, which was in the sum of $1,200,000 for the months of April, May, and June of the fiscal year 1943, is wholly insufficient. During these three months approximately 16,300 cases were authorized to receive this care. The appropriation for the present fiscal year of 1944, commencing July 1 of this year and ending June 30, 1944, was granted in the Labor Department Appropriation Act in the sum of $4,400,000. It has been determined that the average cost per case for the entire United States is $84.50. This appropriation of $4,400,000, on this basis, would take care of 52,000 cases, and with the 33,000 cases already allowed, the funds available for September are not likely to be sufficient. The Children's Bureau estimates that when all States which have approved plans can place them in operation the number of applications per month will approximate 25,000. The committee, after having given this matter careful consideration, is of the opinion that the amount carried in this resolution will be sufficient with sums heretofore appropriated to meet the expenses to be incurred under the program.

As shown by the committee report, there are a number of States which had not yet perfected their programs by August 31, 1943, so as to bring themselves within the provisions of the act, notably my own State of Oregon, as well as Georgia, Louisiana, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Texas, as well as Puerto Rico. I have a number of communications from veterans' organizations in my own State, advising that the program has now been arranged and is all ready for putting into effect, but the State officials are advised that by reason of the exhaustion of the appropriation there will be no funds available with which to carry out the program within the State of Oregon. Under leave granted, I include the following correspondence I have received from Mr. Fritz Nissen, adjutant, American Legion, Department of Oregon, and from June W. Valiant, executive secretary of the War Veterans' Service Committee for Oregon:

PORTLAND, OREG.,
September 17, 1943.

Congressman HOMER ANGELL,
Washington, D. C.:

We are interested in the hearing before Congressman CANNON asking for appropriations for maternity and infant care, wives and infants of enlisted men. Oregon State Board of Health has just completed arrangements for handling these cases beginning October 1. If funds are denied for this purpose it will create a bad situation in Oregon because of advanced publicity given. We are already receiving many calls and many of the young wives are desperate. Please do what you can for us.

AMERICAN LEGION DEPARTMENT
OF OREGON,
FRITZ NISSEN, *Adjutant.*

WAR VETERANS SERVICE COMMITTEE,
Portland 4, Oreg., September 17, 1943.

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
United States Representative,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ANGELL: The State of Oregon, through the State board of health, has completed a plan for maternity and infant care for wives and infants of enlisted men in the armed forces which has been approved by the Children's Bureau, United States Department of Labor, and the board of Health has just completed arrangements for handling these cases beginning October 1.

The State board of health has estimated the sum of $400,000 of these Federal funds will be necessary to carry out this program in Oregon for the next 9 months. Such estimates are based upon the number of childbirths to the wives of those in the service and the number of applications for assistance on hand.

This morning the State board of health received a wire from Washington, D. C., to the effect that funds for this purpose are exhausted, so we of Oregon are to be denied this service because of the lack of funds, and I also understand the State of California will have to suspend this service after October 1 because of the failure to have funds available beyond that period.

This morning a press release indicates Congressman CANNON has before his committee a bill asking for additional appropriations and that public hearings will be held on this bill September 27. Congressman CANNON indicated every effort will be made to secure additional appropriations prior to October 1 so there would be no cessation of this service after that date.

I am writing you at this time to urge you to give serious consideration to this very worthy cause, and ask you to not only support the bill to appropriate these funds, but to urge its early enactment and seriously consider a larger appropriation. If action is not taken immediately many of the wives of these enlisted men in the service will be deprived of proper medical attention during prenatal period and will have to look to charity for funds necessary for the birth of their children.

This office is being besieged with calls for information on what is going to be done, any many of these wives are desperate.

Your assistance will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JUNE W. VALIANT,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I had the privilege of appearing before the Appropriations Committee hearing this matter, urging the approval of this appropriation, and I want to commend the committee for its wisdom in giving its approval to this appropriation and bringing the matter before us with the dispatch that it has, in order that these funds may be made available for this most worthy purpose, and I trust that the resolution will pass by the unanimous vote of this body.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, every conceivable type of red herring, from Harry Hopkins' residence in the White House to matters concerning the farm problem, has been brought into this argument. The one question before this House today is, How will you use your judgment? Are you more interested in the purse strings around the American pocketbook, or are you interested in maternity care, particularly of the wives of the soldiers carrying the battle for us today? Do you want the men at the front worried about the condition of their wives at home, or do you want to talk about what the cost of this program will be? For my part, I think this is one of the most progressive and one of the most understanding steps that we have taken in this body in a long time. We had just better get down to business and vote the appropriation.

Later, when we go back into the House, I am going to ask permission to put into the RECORD a little pamphlet that was given to the committee yesterday when this matter was very ably presented to us, The Emergency Maternity and Infant Care for Wives and Infants of Enlisted Men in the Armed Forces.

Looking after our own. Here we are with a manpower shortage all over the Nation and still giving the wink and the bypass to the birth controllers, those people who tear at the very roots of America. We hear the cry today from every housetop, we hear it from the mountains, and it rumbles in the valleys, "Give us men; give us men." Like the sentiment expressed in Joyce Kilmer's poem:

> You cannot build a tree in a day;
> Neither can you build a man.

The following is quoted from a pamphlet issued by the United States Department of Labor entitled "Emergency Maternity and Infant Care for Wives and Infants of Enlisted Men in the Armed Forces":

Maternity care for wives of enlisted men in military service, and medical and nursing care for their babies can now be provided without cost to the family through State health departments under plans approved by the Children's Bureau.

Under this program a pregnant woman may receive prenatal care. At childbirth she may receive obstetric and nursing care whether she stays at home or goes to a hospital. Complete maternity care may be provided, including a final physical examination 6 weeks after the baby is born. The baby may receive medical and hospital care during the first year of life.

WHO CAN RECEIVE CARE

In States providing these services, the wife and infant of any enlisted man serving in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard are eligible for care as long as similar services are not readily available through medical or hospital facilities of the Army or Navy. How long the wife has lived in the State does not matter. No period of residence is required. Race or color does not matter.

In expending the funds the State health agencies will make the service available to families of all men in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh pay grades who request it.

HOW TO APPLY

Forms for requesting care are made available by the State health departments through local health and welfare agencies, local American Red Cross chapters, prenatal clinics, military posts, and through local practicing physicians.

The wife fills out and signs her part of the application, including her husband's serial number. Her doctor completes and signs the application and forwards it to the State director of maternal and child health or his authorized deputy. The form includes a statement by the doctor (or hospital) that the services authorized will be rendered for the amount paid by the State health department without payment from the patient or the family.

In an emergency, care may be given by a physician or in a hospital before an application is sent in. However, the application should be completed as soon as possible and forwarded to the State health agency.

The State director of maternal and child health promptly notifies the patient and attending physician or clinic and the hospital (if the patient is going to a hospital) whether or not the care is authorized.

WHAT SERVICES THE PATIENT CAN EXPECT

In States providing these services:

Complete maternity service during the prenatal period, childbirth, and 6 weeks thereafter—including care of complications, operations, postpartum examination—and medical care for the newborn infant.

Health supervision for infants, usually provided in child-health conferences.

Nursing care, in the home, through the local health department, including bedside nursing care as necessary—for the mother, before, during, and after childbirth, and for the baby during the first year of life.

Hospital care for maternity patients and infants, paid for by the State health agency at ward rates. The funds cannot be used in part payment for more expensive hospital accommodations. A minimum stay in the hospital of 10 days after childbirth is arranged if possible. Hospital care may be authorized in any hospital, including Army and Navy hospitals, whose maternity and pediatric services have been approved by the State health agency.

Aviation cadets in both the Army and the Navy are considered enlisted men and hence are eligible for services under the Emergency Maternity and Infant Care program. In the Army they are not in the regular pay grades and are not eligible for dependency benefits or allowances. In the Army students in training to become cadets are as a rule in the seventh pay grade; they are eligible for services under the Emergency Maternity and Infant Care program. In the Navy aviation cadets are considered to be in the fourth pay grade for the purpose of allowances. The Marine Corps does not have aviation cadets and students. The Coast Guard does not have air cadets; it has a flight-training program and men in training are in the various pay grades.

For information about the program, write to your director of maternal and child health, State health department.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, under the Children's Bureau, Department of Labor, namely:

Grants to States for emergency maternity and infant care (national defense): For an additional amount for grants to States, including Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, to provide, in addition to similar services otherwise available, medical, nursing, and hospital maternity and infant care for wives and infants of enlisted men in the armed forces of the United States, under allotments by the Secretary of Labor and plans developed and administered by State health agencies and approved by the Chief of the Children's Bureau, $18,600,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "men", insert "of the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, instead of striking out some of the men in the lower grades I propose, if this amendment is voted down, to offer an amendment to include officers.

There is very little financial difference in the income of the enlisted man, especially the noncommissioned officer, and a first or second lieutenant, when you take into consideration the fact that the enlisted man gets all of his clothes, all of his board and other necessary expenses paid, while the commissioned officer has to pay for his own uniforms, his own laundry, and has to pay his own board.

I know of my own knowledge of numbers of these young officers who have gone into the service, especially young aviators, without a thing in the world. They do not have much if any more left at the end of the month than one of the enlisted men. Their wives should not be excluded from the provisions of this bill.

I think my record here will show that the enlisted men have not had a better friend in this House than I have been and am now. As I said a moment ago, it was my amendment that raised their base pay up to $50 a month. I had to fight that amendment through this House twice and then through a conference and then assist our friends in the Senate in order to get it adopted. But I think when you cut off these young officers merely because they have commissions, you are doing them a grave injustice.

Remember the commissioned officers are doing more of the real fighting in this war than they ever have before, and especially in the Air Force.

I know that some men will say that if you are going to include lieutenants and captains you ought to include majors, colonels, and generals. But those officers as a rule in the higher ranks are able to take care of this expense, and besides very few of them have children born to them because as a rule they are older men. But if you strike out these noncommissioned officers—that is what this amendment does—I think you will make a serious mistake, and if you leave out the commissioned officers in the lower ranks I think you will be making a serious mistake.

I submit that this amendment should be voted down, and then we should adopt the amendment which I shall offer to include the word "officers," in order that we may make no unjust discrimination against these young men, many of whom have wives at home who are struggling along with all the worries and difficulties that they have, trying to rear their children on the meager allowance and incomes they now receive.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be voted down and my amendment to include the commissioned officers should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I proposed this amendment to the Appropriations Committee this morning only because when we were having hearings on this particular point before the Department of Labor and Federal Security subcommittee, the question arose as to how far we should go in making these provisions for wives of enlisted men, and it was upon the earnest representations of the Children's Bureau that we included the first, second, and third grades.

The first grade would be master sergeant; the second, the first and technical sergeant; and in the third, the staff sergeant. They assured us that those cases involving these three grades would be dealt with only in cases of extreme emergency and necessity.

I was not too happy with that solution. This summer I spent some time trying to find out how it was working. If other Members have made investigations, well and good, but I assure you that I investigated a number of cases and in not one single case was there any showing of necessity. This was just something handed out again to many individuals in the armed services in direct violation of congressional intent.

I want to say to you that when a man is receiving, as a master sergeant, $150 a month, plus uniform and plus quarters, that he ought to go to a doctor and pay the bill himself. The very thing that we have been hearing about the medical profession and about the cases where we try to assist is that the men should go to a doctor and make the proper arrangements for the birth of the child when he is getting that much money. We were supposedly trying to take care of the hardship cases.

As the gentleman from North Carolina pointed out, the original legislation was based on the fact that men might be sent out of the country and might be worrying about what is going to happen to their wives at the time of the birth of the child. It was to relieve their minds of that worry that this legislation was passed. It has worked completely differently in many instances from what was intended by the committee. People have come in and tried to take advantage of this situation. It has resulted in some chaos.

I cannot argue against what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has said, because the pay of a second lieutenant and even that of a first lieutenant and the pay of a master sergeant are not really very different. But there is a problem that needs to be met. Something the Appropriations Committee and this Congress tried to do has been distorted out of what Congress wanted done, and in trying to correct that situation I have offered an amendment to put it back where it was.

I assure you it was only done after an investigation of the situation; it was only done after conferences with Red Cross representatives and discussions with them; it was only done after a full discussion with the medical profession concerning the problem we are trying to take care of, a situation that I find is being abused and which should be stopped.

The only way to safeguard the rights of the servicemen, and to make it possible for them during time of war to meet unusual demands, is to take care of the emergencies and difficulties when they arise. What I had in mind by this amendment was to bring the situation back to the true intent of Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not a fact that the men who are able to pay their own bills, as a rule, do not resort to the benefits provided in this legislation?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I want to say from personal investigation, that has not always been the case. I found cases where men have substantial means of their own, master sergeants, and were able to provide their own doctors who did not, but who took advantage of the provisions of this law. I think that is a bad situation.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not a fact that from a monetary standpoint a man might be better off financially to be a master sergeant than if he were a first or second lieutenant?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I just admitted that; but he is no better off to be a private, and the ones we are trying to help at this time are the privates and the corporals.

Mr. RANKIN. In my opinion, there is not very much difference in the amount of money that ultimately comes to either a private soldier or the officers in the lowest brackets in the commissioned grade at the end of the month when clothes and subsistence are taken out of the officer's pay; especially is this so in the case of the first and second lieutenants.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. That may be; but what I was trying to do was to get this bill back to the way we originally presented it. It came to the Congress and certain representations were made to the Congress; certain things were done by the Congress in the furtherance of that, and I think it is now our duty to put it back where we once had it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to permit me to submit a unanimous-consent request to limit debate?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield if it is not taken out of my time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman's request include all debate on the entire bill? I do not know which paragraph we are considering.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The second paragraph.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, that pertains only to the first paragraph and not the whole resolution?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The second paragraph.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. How many paragraphs are there?

Mr. TABER. Three.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

DAIRY SITUATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, there is a desperate situation in the dairy business and something must be done to adjust it, but let us get our definitions straight as to where the responsibility is in regard to that matter. If the President—executive department—should increase the price of milk, the law of October 2, 1942, could be read and the Executive accused of violating a mandate of the Congress, because in that second Price Control Act of October 2, 1942, we said that it was the duty of the President to hold the line and to stabilize the cost of living, wages, salaries, and prices as of September 15, 1942. This we are told the President is trying to do; so now if he were to take the power and authority to raise prices in individual cases critics could accuse him of violating a mandate of the Congress.

The President, through Mr. Marvin Jones, the Food Administrator, in whom we have great confidence, has offered a solution to this dairy problem, and that is to pay subsidies to take care of the dairy farmers so that the price of milk would be kept down and the mandate of Congress carried out as we expressed it in that law. I do not like subsidies,

ordinarily I am opposed to them, but in this particular case in this emergency I am willing to accept them. We must save the dairy business; we cannot afford to let these dairies go out of business, and since the executive department has offered this subsidy as a remedy those of us who do not agree that the subsidy is the right remedy but that we should have a price increase should just get together and offer a bill to increase the price of milk; then if the legislative department of our Government goes on record as being in favor of an individual price increase that is a matter for us to do. So I suggest if that is the solution that you either accept the subsidies and say that they will save the dairy business or those who are not willing to do it get together and offer a bill to increase the price of milk that would take care of it. The only other way would be to reduce and stabilize the price of cattle feed, which no one to my knowledge is advocating.

The situation is so desperate that we must do something now. The first price-control bill was based upon the theory that we could select certain commodities and keep prices down. That did not work. The next Price Control Act, that of October 2, 1942, was across the board to include wages, salaries, prices, and especially prices relating to the cost of living, and we told the President to hold the line as of September 15, 1942. If that line is not held, Mr. Chairman, what is going to happen in this country? If we let prices go up then, of course, wages and salaries must go up, and if we increase wages and salaries 10 percent that means a $10,000,000,000 annual increase. We already have $45,000,000,000 excess purchasing power floating around over the country now for this year looking for something to buy. If we increase it by $10,000,000,000 that would make the situation relative to curbing inflation a much more difficult one. We can, I suggest, if we do not hold the line in some way, but let prices go up, let wages and salaries go up, we can have ruinous inflation today in America. We know that in countries like China and Russia a half pint of milk costs $7.50, if you can buy it at all; a suit of clothes costs $400 or $500; a loaf of bread $1.25. It can happen here the same as it happened there, and then our middle class, the people who built this country in time of peace and the people who furnish the manpower to save it in time of war, will be entirely wiped out. So, in order to protect the people who really represent the backbone of this country, we have got to stop and prevent runaway or ruinous inflation. There is only one way to do it, and that is to hold the line against price and wage increases as well as wage and salary increases, and prevent this type of inflation that will be hurtful to this country. At the same time we must give the farmers a good price as a matter of justice to the farmer and to encourage production, but at the same time we must prevent inflation.

I suggest those who are not willing to agree to a subsidy present a bill for a price increase or a feed-price decrease.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have been reading what I think is the unpublished hearings on this bill, the testimony of Miss Lenroot and Dr. Eliott. In connection with what they had to say and what our colleague from New Mexico has said, I wish to ask the gentleman from New Mexico one or two questions and also the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] some questions.

If I understood the gentleman from New Mexico correctly, he is offering the amendment for this service to cover the wives and infants of enlisted men of the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades, is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then do I understand the gentleman also to say that he feels this amendment should be adopted so as to remove from present practices that which in his mind runs contrary to the intent of the law in that this class of servicemen are receiving aid in the form of, we will say, special cases?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I simply said that the original intent of Congress was to cover four, five, six, and seven, but that limitation has been taken off in the last Labor-Federal Security bill on the assurance they would be used only in hardship cases, but every case now is a hardship case. The only alternative is to remove the permission.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That clears up a big question in my mind. I was going on the assumption this amendment broadened the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. No. It restricts, and puts it back where Congress really wants it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If that is true I am certainly in favor of the amendment. May I ask the gentleman from New York this question with respect to the benefits which go to men who are commissioned officers: What do they receive in the way of family allowances which help to bring their effective pay in line where they can afford to take care of such expenses?

Mr. TABER. Of course, enlisted men are not officers. Officers receive subsistence and rental allowances which are very substantial, and while it may not be enough to pay their living expenses entirely it helps very materially along that line. I cannot offhand give the figures, but I know that those figures are very substantial.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This is a military operation with which I am not too familiar, but can the gentleman tell me whether or not these officers receive those allowances in addition to the cash pay they receive?

Mr. TABER. They do. It is paid in cash. The allowances are paid in cash and they are in addition to the regular salary and longevity pay.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the gentleman from Mississippi a question? He spoke of the pay of the enlisted men being so much and the pay of the officers being so much. Did he have in mind allowing the officers these additional allowances which are granted in the total pay?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I think the gentleman from New York is wrong. Under certain circumstances, they allow that rental pay, but when an officer is in the field, away from home, he pays his own board. I know that was the case during the last war, and I think it is the case now. Therefore, at the end of the month the average officer from the grade of captain down, I will say, has very little, if any, more money left than the average noncommissioned officer, and in a great many instances not more than the enlisted man.

Mr. TABER. They receive a subsistence allowance anyway and a rental allowance unless they are provided with quarters, and on top of that there is an additional allowance for dependents of officers, so that in the case of some officers I know, those figures run quite high, in the case of one officer exceeding $300 a month.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. For the benefit of the House, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] will be informally reported.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 2, line 6, after the period insert the following sentence: "The care provided under the foregoing appropriation shall be provided in the form of a cash allotment made directly to the wives and to the mothers of the infants who are entitled to such care."

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Will we take up this amendment now before the committee amendment is disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. No; after the committee amendment is disposed of.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARE. I suggest this amendment will be subject to a point of order on the ground it is legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, that might well be raised when the amendment is actually offered. The amendment is not before the House at this time.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is it improper for me to offer this amendment at the

present time? If so, I will withdraw it now and offer it at the proper time.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman wishes to do so he may.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That will permit me to have 5 minutes on the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] desire to be heard on the committee amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There are 5 minutes remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take issue with my good friend from Mississippi in his statement on the relative compensation of enlisted men and commissioned officers. I always agree with him. But if I may, I should like to insert here for the information of the Committee and the House data showing the relative pay of enlisted men and commissioned officers. For example, let us take the pay of a second lieutenant, the lowest commissioned rank, and the pay of the enlisted men in grades 1 and 7.

The second lieutenant draws a base pay of $1,800. In addition, he receives a rental allowance of $720, and a subsistence allowance of $511. That is the minimum. It comprises a total of $3,031 annually. He also receives an exemption of $1,500 on income tax, which means that the entire pay and allowance of a second lieutenant is exempt from all taxation.

The enlisted man of grade 7 receives $50 a month, $600 a year. In other words, there is a difference of $2,431 between the officer who receives $3,031 a year and the enlisted man who receives $600.

But here is the item that has been overlooked. While the wife of the enlisted man has never received obstetrical care at Government expense until the enactment of this law, the wife of the commissioned officer has always received such service at Government hospitals. The wife of any commissioned officer may go to any service hospital and receive free prenatal care, obstetrical care, and post-partum care. The physician's service is free. The only thing she is required to pay in the way of hospitalization is daily subsistence, which, of course, is comparatively small. In the Navy the only charge is a flat rate of $3.65 per day. In effect, therefore, the wives of the commissioned men receive free already the service we propose under this bill to give to the wives of enlisted men. In providing this appropriation, we are putting the service provided for the wife of the enlisted man on a par with the service already given the wife of the commissioned officer. So it is, of course, unnecessary to amend this resolution by including commissioned officers.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. In enumerating the benefits an officer in the lower ranks receives, the gentleman overlooks the fact that an officer is required to buy his own uniform and his own paraphernalia, and also to pay his own board. My recollection is that we had this fight up here on the emergency officers' retirement bill, and it was brought out then that the differences in pay for these officers, especially in the lower ranks, are to make up the difference between what the officer would have to pay for his uniform and other clothes, his board, and so forth, his subsistence, and the fact that these things are furnished the enlisted man free of charge.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Is it not true that any commissioned officer gets a uniform allowance of $250?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am so informed.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say again to the gentleman that I do not believe any soldier, whether a commissioned officer or a buck private, will take advantage of this allowance unless it is needed, but if it is needed, I submit that the commissioned officer in the lower ranks ought not to be excluded.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 6, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That this appropriation may be used for payment of commitments made prior to October 1, 1943, in the cases of wives and infants of enlisted men in grades 1, 2, and 3."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to carry out commitments already made. Under existing law there are numerous instances in which wives of men in these grades have already been authorized to receive help. We propose in this amendment to carry out such agreements already entered into under existing law.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I understand the gentleman correctly, this amendment simply takes care of those special cases which were obligated prior to October 1, 1943?

This applies to grades 1, 2 and 3, the so-called special cases?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It applies to all cases in which commitments have been made.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does this appropriation cover the children of WAC's, of WAVES, of other women in the service who may be married to or who may marry civilians? As I understood from the debate here, this resolution covers wives of soldiers who have children. What about the women in the service who marry civilians. Are not they covered, too?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Not if they marry civilians.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman believe they should be covered?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The law applies to wives of soldiers only and does not apply to wives of civilians.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What about the women who are soldiers, as the WAC's are now?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All personnel in the armed forces are entitled to medical treatment and hospitalization including women serving in the auxiliaries. But this particular service is by virtue of a statute providing exclusively for the wives of soldiers.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is discrimination.

Mr. RABAUT. It covers them if they are married to soldiers.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I am referring to a woman who is in the service and who is married to or marries a man in the service.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This merely provides for the wives of men in the armed forces.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Some are laughing, but I am not joking about this. In all seriousness, I can see no reason why the women who are in the service, who are soldiers now, as I understand the last regulations, should not be taken care of if they marry civilians and then become mothers.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If their husbands are in the service they would be entitled to the benefits of the law, but if they are the wives of civilians, of course, civilians are supposed to care for such family expenses. At least they cannot be paid out of these funds.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Suppose the husbands cannot care for them? Suppose they become widows. Suppose their husbands die while they are in the service and before the child is born?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They are entitled to every benefit provided for the wives of soldiers under the language of the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto conclude in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, during the discussion of the present amendment I rise to make a very brief statement on information that I have received, and to have the especial attention of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, so that he may answer the observation and point out wherein perhaps I have been ill-advised.

I am told that all enlisted men in the detached enlisted men's list in the upper three grades lose money. In explanation of that comment I point out that the D. E. M. L. men who reside in Washington, since they are not living in barracks, and are not eating, of course, in any organized mess, are paid $2.75 per day in lieu of quarters and rations. Enlisted men in the upper three grades are entitled to quarters for their dependents. When by reason of orders by competent authority, their dependents are prevented from living with them, or no Government quarters are made available to those men, such enlisted personnel are entitled to $37.50 a month to pay for dependents' quarters.

However, I am told that by an Army ruling, when an enlisted man in any of those top three grades is on the so-called D. E. M. L. list, he is not entitled to this amount of $37.50 for dependents' quarters, upon the theory that he is getting a daily allowance, in lieu of quarters.

The reason I ask the question of the distinguished chairman at this time is to say that a case in point has been brought to my attention, wherein men in the three upper grades actually lose their allotment, and a staff sergeant would get $22.50 less per month if he had a wife and children than he would have if he were strictly a buck sergeant. Would the gentleman tell me whether I am correct or in error?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from West Virginia is discussing a matter foreign to this bill. It relates to military pay, and I would be glad to yield to any member of the Committee on Military Affairs to answer the question.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have used this opportunity to bring the situation to the attention of the House during the consideration of this matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The loss in money to which the gentleman refers, as I understand it, is due to the classification of men and pay at $2.75 per diem, and the amount he would get in monthly pay. The loss of the difference between those two figures?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It could be stated in that way. I think the House in the consideration of this general subject should have its attention directed to the matter.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I trust the gentleman will take that matter to the proper committee, which is the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I shall bring it to the attention of the House and also to the committee he suggests.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri. I hope the House adopts this amendment. It is of particular importance to my own State, because it will make available funds for commitments prior to October 1, 1943. This, as I say, is of particular importance to Pennsylvania. I do not know whether the House is aware of the situation which prevailed in the great State of Pennsylvania, but for months our State administration and our Governor refused to make these benefits available to the wives of service men in Pennsylvania. With an attitude that was so callous it was difficult to understand, our Governor and his advisers persistently refused to take action to help the wives of our fighting men and their infant children, many of them born while their fathers were fighting and bleeding on Guadalcanal, in north Africa, and in the Sicilian campaign.

Only after a great newspaper campaign, initiated by one of our metropolitan dailies, the Philadelphia Record, focused the attention of the people of our State upon what was taking place, did our Governor become aroused, and then only after the American Legion in convention, the V. F. W. and other service organizations insisted that our State administration change its attitude, stop its negligence and make these benefits possible for the soldiers and sailors of Pennsylvania.

When I look over the list of the States and see the number of cases that have received benefits I am startled to compare it with the fact that up until August 31, 1943, not a single service man's wife in the State of Pennsylvania had been able to participate in the appropriation made available by Congress. The State of Illinois had 4,900 cases; the State of Kansas, 2,200 cases; the State of Kentucky, 2,200 cases; the State of Michigan, 2,800 cases; the State of Mississippi, 1,900 cases; North Dakota, 2,800 cases; Wisconsin, 2,700 cases, and so on; Pennsylvania, not one single case.

The wives of servicemen in the State of Illinois received from this fund $111,000. In Connecticut, $45,000; Massachusetts, $88,000; New Jersey, $55,000; Michigan, $88,000; Wisconsin, $57,000; Oklahoma; $83,000. Every one of those States has a population which is far less than that of Pennsylvania, and consequently they have fewer men in the armed forces, and yet Pennsylvania received out of the appropriation for the last quarter of the fiscal year not one penny. Practically every State secured an allotment except Pennsylvania. That means that the wives of servicemen in Pennsylvania to whom babies were born, because the Governor of the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania was not very much interested, were not able to participate in the appropriation made available by the Federal Government.

I hope that now that the Governor and the Republican administration in Pennsylvania have seen the light, through the pressure of public opinion, that they will take advantage of the new appropriation and that they will make up for lost time, and the soldiers and sailors of our State who are fighting in all quarters of the globe will know that their wives and new-born children will be taken care of through the foresight and wisdom of the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with this resolution. On the contrary, I am happy to be permitted to vote for it. I think it is little enough that we might do, as has been so ably said, for the wives of those in the armed services. However, I want to call the attention of the House to something of the manner in which this legislation has been administered, at least to date. I am assured by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], a member of the committee, that there is no restriction in the legislation, which provides that the attending physician shall receive no fund and no promise of any fund other than that allotted by the Government. Yet I know that that is the way it works in practice, at least in the district which I happen to represent in Ohio, a part which is very crowded by reason of war industries, and incidentally very short of physicians. So within the hour I have talked with Miss Katharine Lenroot, head of the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor, and she informs me that the restriction does exist; that it is not a matter of legislation and it is not a restriction placed there by the respective States, but rather that it is an inhibiting restriction written in by that Bureau. Just how does this work in practice? During the recent congressional recess, I had this matter brought to my attention not once but a dozen times. In at least one case that I took the trouble to investigate the wife of a soldier had a complicating kidney condition that occurred during the pregnancy, which required particular medical attention and special care. The physician was unable to receive any sum except that which was stipulated by the regulation—not a regulation of the Congress but of the Children's Bureau.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman would yield——

Mr. JEFFREY. I yield.

Mr. TABER. That regulation is entirely in violation of the specific provisions of this act.

Mr. JEFFREY. I am glad to have the gentleman say that, but in practice it still exists and is working. At least very recently it was. It seems to me that this House should have some control over the administration of the money which it votes for a cause which is as important as the cases which this appropriation is intended to cover. I rise at this time simply to draw attention to the regulation which the head of the Bureau in Washington has placed on the law which has been passed by the Congress, which is restraining and inhibiting the functioning of that act in the relief it was intended to afford at least in one State.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JEFFREY. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman's check-up was made within the last hour as to whether the regulation was still being enforced?

Mr. JEFFREY. Yes; and with the head of the Children's Bureau, Miss Katharine Lenroot. According to her information, it is in force this afternoon.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield further——

Mr. JEFFREY. I yield.

Mr. TABER. In line 10 on the first page it says "in addition to similar services otherwise available," indicating a direct intention on the part of the legislature to permit other services than those paid for under the regulations to be provided.

Mr. JEFFREY. But it is not working that way in practice.

Mr. TABER. The regulation is illegal.

Mr. JEFFREY. I agree.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JEFFREY. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do I understand the gentleman's argument to be that in approving this law we should leave open the gate so that where a situation did exist negotiations could be made and the Federal Government would have to pay the difference, whatever fee was agreed upon?

Mr. JEFFREY. Not necessarily, because in the particular case to which I refer, while the woman herself was unable to pay, some of her relatives were, but she was precluded from getting that help.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman think the Federal Government should pay whatever the fee agreed upon is?

Mr. JEFFREY. Perhaps we should not go that far, but certainly the present restriction is too rigid, and the soldier's widow, through relatives and friends, should not be prohibited from paying for and receiving special care.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It seems to me if we do that we will open up the very kind of a situation we are just now attempting to close, where you remove the so-called special cases. In other words, you will have special cases from almost everyone.

Mr. JEFFREY. I do not think we need to go that far. I think all we need to do is to say that notwithstanding the Children's Bureau has placed a regulation on the administration of this fund, which is not intended by the Congress, in the event that relatives or friends of the particular individual are willing, they shall be permitted to pay for special care.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let them pay whatever they see fit?

Mr. JEFFREY. That is the general thought.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 2, line 6, after the period insert the following sentence: "The care provided under the foregoing appropriation shall be provided in the form of cash allotments made directly to the wife and to the mother of the infants who are entitled to such care."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not need very much explanation; it is self-explanatory; it merely provides for the payment directly to the expectant mothers and wives of the soldiers the money that is allotted under this act in cash.

There is no more reason why the Federal Government should supervise the expenditure of that money than there is for the Federal Government to supervise the expenditure of the money which goes for allotments to these women, or which goes to soldiers in the form of pensions. Having practiced medicine I know that there are practical situations where provisions like we have in the law at the present time do work a hardship or at least do prevent the woman from using this money in the most expeditious and best manner.

Ask the women who have had more than one baby and they will tell you that the second baby or the third baby comes more easily than the first. That woman may feel she does not need hospital care; she may be able to save at least part of the $84 or $85, or whatever the amount is, to buy shoes for some of the children that have already been born, or to buy meat and clothing, and if she should be able to save some of that money and still take care of her confinement, why should she not be allowed to do that?

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. In these days when the hospitals are so crowded, and there is such a scarcity of help in the hospitals, it seems to me that the gentleman's amendment is a very wise one and should be adopted. For that particular reason, it seems to me, the amendment of the gentleman should be adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I just want to repeat what I said a moment ago; why should we not put more trust in the soldiers' wives? The soldiers are out fighting this war, and we are leaving it to them to fight the war. Why not put a little confidence in these women who are staying at home and going through the valley of the shadow of death?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman practiced medicine in a State that has a workmen's compensation law. May I ask him if he has ever gotten a check directly for that service, or did he get an allowance?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield any further. I do not think the gentleman's question apropos at all to what I am trying to explain. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to put my confidence in these women in the expenditure of these Federal funds. I have faith they would spend this money in the proper manner.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say again, there is no reason why the Federal Government, or any State government, should exercise such paternalistic care over the expenditure of these funds as now is the case.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; Mr. Chairman, I am entitled to recognition.

Mr. KEEFE. I understood that I had been recognized before the gentleman from Missouri got on his feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin had already been recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I am always glad to yield to my friend from Wisconsin, who always occupies the floor to far better advantage than I, but in this case the gentleman from Missouri was standing seeking recognition.

Mr. KEEFE. I am exceedingly sorry that I have been placed in the unfortunate position of causing the chairman of the committee to defer to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say to the gentleman from Ohio that I, too, have taken up with Miss Lenroot this afternoon the very question which he has raised, and I discussed with her the regulation which the Children's Bureau has invoked which applies not only to the State of Ohio but to the entire Nation. She explained that regulation to me, and I want to say to the Members of the House that while the magnificent statement made by the gentleman has a direct appeal I think you would be convinced that the Children's Bureau has taken a very wise and sensible precaution.

What was the genesis of this legislation? Was it to afford an opportunity for a grab from all directions on the Treasury of the United States? Or did this resolution have its genesis in the desire of the Congress to relieve the wives of servicemen of the United States from worry incident perhaps to inability to receive proper obstetrical care because they did not have any money?

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield at this time.

The Children's Bureau recognizing that to be the attitude of the Congress when this resolution was adopted provided in their regulations, with which the State must comply in order to receive these Federal funds, that the doctors who are to be paid out of these funds must certify when they make application for payment that the payment which the doctor is receiving out of this fund is the only amount that he is going to charge this patient. If you allowed a doctor to take the amount permitted out of this fund and then send a bill for any amount he saw fit to the woman after she has come out of the hospital how in the world would you be accomplishing the purpose we had in mind when this bill first came before the Congress?

The principal purpose of this legislation and the real reason why I supported it was to relieve these mothers of worry that they would have a great big bill to pay and no money with which to pay it. The experience is that the great rank and file of the doctors of the country have accepted this legislation and are receiving the benefits from it in the very spirit in which it was enacted. There may be special cases such as the one the gentleman indicated where there may have been some tremendous amount of other service required, but if the case is a case of luxury where the people have money, they do not have to make application to this fund; they can hire their own doctor, get any room they want in the hospital and pay it themselves. The only requirement is that they shall not make application for this money. This money is reserved for the wives of soldiers who are in a situation where they need the assistance which is provided under this law and I will say that the amount that has been set up, at least so far as the doctors tell me in my community, is in line with the general fees which they receive in this type of service and they are pretty well satisfied with the situation. If you are going to turn this money over and give it to every soldier's wife who is expecting a child, she could spend it as she pleased; then you would be no longer in line with the spirit and purpose of this act and you are just passing a bill to provide a sort of gratuitous pension to pay the wife of every soldier a stipulated amount to spend as she pleases. I have confidence in most of them, but I remember back in the days before we passed the illegitimacy statute in my State, which principle became a general law throughout the country, that case after case was settled by the mother where she got $200, $300, $500, or whatever the father would pay and she took that money and bought a fur coat, or went out and spent it, and the child became the ward of the parent, the grandparents, or a public charge; so we had to pass a law that required that before the settlement would be approved payments made in those cases would have to be turned over to a trustee to see to it that the doctor's bill was paid, that the hospital bill was paid, and that the money went for the child for which it was intended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] desire recognition at this time?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I believe the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio has considerable merit. While I was home this summer during the recess of Congress I was confronted with the very question presented by that amendment. It so happens that in one of the cities of my district the hospital is conducted by the municipality. If this law or the regulation that has been promulgated by the Children's Bureau remains on the books, it means that many soldiers' wives are not going to have the benefit of hospital care. In my State, they granted $50 at the rate of $5 a day for 10 days for hospitalization in maternity cases. The average daily cost in a hospital in my section of the country is $7.50. The municipality has no funds with which to subsidize the balance of the cost, or $2.50 per day, in these cases. What is the result? It is that the soldiers' wives may not be able to obtain a room in that hospital. That regulation works against rather than to the advantage of the wife of a soldier.

Mrs. BOLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. May I ask whether the hospitals of the gentleman's State make any allowances? In my State they do a great deal of free work for these women and I am sure they must do the same thing in Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Perhaps they do, but I do know in this particular case that was not true.

The municipality has no funds on hand or in its budget with which to subsidize hospital costs, with the result it works a hardship on the very people that we are trying to aid by this bill and appropriation.

Mrs. BOLTON. The gentleman is speaking of a municipal hospital?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes. It is operated by the municipality.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman states that the charge in the case to which he refers was $7.50 a day? The provision in this bill is for ward care only. It is not customary to charge $7.50 a day for ward care.

Mr. DONDERO. I am not familiar with the details. I do know the actual average cost is as stated by me.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If they wish a private room, they must themselves bear the additional expense. The provision in this bill is for ward service only. In the case to which the gentleman refers they evidently desired better accommodations and if so must provide that themselves.

Mr. DONDERO. I am not so sure about that. I am inclined to believe it is the reverse of what the gentleman says.

It is my understanding that when the application for the Federal funds is signed by the expectant mother and the physician that the amount provided by the regulation is all that the hospital can charge and all the physician may receive.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I never heard of a hospital charging $7.50 a day for ward care.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just assume that the soldier's wife goes along in the usual way and the fee allowed is sufficient. That ends that. But suppose she has some complications set in, then she is not permitted to pay the doctor. Is the doctor to render the service without charge for this extra, unforeseen complication or is she to go without the care?

Mr. DONDERO. I believe he would be precluded from asking any more pay when he signs the application for the fund provided in this bill.

Mr. JEFFREY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JEFFREY. That is true according to the statement given to me by Miss Lenroot this afternoon. His entire charge for the prenatal care and the care of the mother after the baby comes is included in this charge. For how long I do not know.

Mr. DONDERO. I do not think there is a Member on this floor who is against this legislation, but we want to provide legislation to really relieve the soldier from anxiety for the care of his wife. Let us place no obstacles in the way of that aid.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. The testimony submitted to the committee was to the effect that no ironclad regulation had been made as to the amount. Thirty-five dollars was suggested, not to exceed $50, perhaps, but in the case of complications, in the case of operations and in a case where expert surgery is needed, as I understand from the testimony, there is no limitation on that and it will be left with whoever is in charge of the State department of public health.

Mr. DONDERO. I am strongly in favor of trusting the honesty and good judgment of the expectant mother and the medical profession of the country to take care of this situation without putting any unnecessary restrictions around this fund.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I think it should be said that we are probably going a little far afield in the discussion of the original purpose of this appropriation. As it was originally submitted the idea

was there would be a considerable number of men who would be going overseas, leaving wives who would be expectant mothers. Many of these would be without parents, they would have no one at home to advise or look after them; and it was thought that the Federal Government—in order to keep up the morale of these young men—they should be given to understand that their wives would be furnished with the necessary medical care and hospitalization at the time of the birth of the child, thereby relieving the father of much anxiety.

It was estimated there would not be over 72,000, and it was further estimated the cost would be $4,800,000, and that amount was recommended; but since that time it has developed there will be 600,000 children born to wives of soldiers next year and that 300,000 of these wives will avail themselves of the privileges under the law. That is just 50 percent, the additional cost now estimated being $18,600,000.

Now, the proposal suggested by the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. SMITH, has been discussed before. The feeling was that under his proposal the wives of the 600,000 soldiers would ask for their part of the appropriation regardless whether they needed it or not. If his amendment passes you will have to fix a definite amount and if it is fixed at $100 that means the program will cost $30,000,000 a year more than now indicated. He does not state how much he would pay each wife. The final cost may be two or three times that much. Who knows? It is the thought that this appropriation of $18,600,000 will take care of the wife and the child of every soldier who needs it and will request it. There will be many who will not make this request. There will be many who will pay their own hospital bill and there will be many who will pay their own physicians officiating at the time of the birth. If the amendment is agreed to I suggest it will be necessary to increase the appropriation unless you are willing to discriminate against the wives of soldiers who are not going to be expectant mothers within this year. Their husbands will say: "I am in the same Army, I am in the same Navy, I am making the same sacrifice the fathers are making; why does not the Federal Government pay my wife a little money to spend as she pleases?"

That is one of the difficulties we have in this proposal. It is one that has been given a great deal of thought and a great deal of study, probably not as much as it deserves. The present appropriation will not be a compensation to the soldier himself; it was not intended to increase his salary; it was not intended to increase his compensation, but was intended merely to stimulate the morale of the father away from home by making him feel that his wife would have proper attention at the birth of his child, which is a very trying moment in the life of every young father; he would not have to lie awake at night, he would not have to worry about the need of medical care and hospitalization of his wife; and that he could look forward to the time he could return home and find a child to greet him. No doubt some of the money will be spent undeservedly, but we cannot pass upon each case here.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. It was never intended by the Congress that this should be the occasion for the Children's Bureau to attempt to regulate the standard for child care and childbirth all over the United States?

Mr. HARE. I think the gentleman is correct in that. It was intended that the State public health service would submit rules and regulations to the Children's Bureau for approval and that the State agency would administer the law. My personal view of this matter is the proper legislative committee should conduct hearings and submit a proposal stating definitely and clearly the functions of the State Public Health Service in the administration of the law and just what the powers and functions of the Children's Bureau will be; then there should be no misunderstanding or friction in the administration of the law, if approved by the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio would double the cost of this bill, and it would unquestionably require an even larger deficiency bill later in the fiscal year.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I have gone into this matter very carefully. I think it would be very unfortunate if this amendment were adopted. I feel that the State health authorities, with this money that is granted to them, should pay these bills direct to the doctors. The doctor is chosen by the expectant mother in advance. After that is done she should not have to be bothered with the payment of these bills.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is exactly right. According to the statistics submitted to the committee by the Children's Bureau, based upon their experience beginning in March 1943, only half of the wives of the enlisted men in the lowest grades—grades 4 to 7—apply for these benefits, and only one-fourth of the wives of the men in the first three grades apply. If this grant were made as a cash payment, the result would be that everybody would automatically receive it. At the start it would cost twice the amount here estimated. In addition, the present system protects both the mother and the physician. The mother is certain of being taken care of at an approved hospital and for a medical cost of from $35 and $50, and at the same time the physician is certain of receiving a stated fee.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. I may say to the gentleman that the committee thought that probably the estimate of the cost would be a little high. The physician in charge of State welfare in my own State advised me yesterday that the cost, when all bills have been paid, has averaged $55.56 per person for children delivered so far.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In addition, Mr. Chairman, any such proposition as this to pay the cash directly to the beneficiary is in contravention of the principle followed in every other governmental agency of this character. For instance, under the Workmen's Compensation Act money is not paid directly to the beneficiary, the patient, but to the physician. Under social security the money is not paid to the beneficiary but is handled by the department. Always the principle followed in agencies and activities of this kind is for the Government to make payment to the person to whom it is due.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman believe the expectant mother ought to be precluded from acquiring extra service if she desires to have it, paying for it out of her own funds if she has the funds to do so?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly not, and this would not preclude her from doing so.

Mr. DONDERO. But would not the application forbid her doing that?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Under this bill she is allowed to select her own physician and the physician is paid by the Government. This does not in any way interfere with her using her own funds to supplement the amount paid here or provide additional comforts.

Mr. Chairman, because this amendment would more than double the cost of this service and because it would positively and inevitably necessitate the passage of another appropriation bill even larger than this for the current fiscal year, I submit that the amendment ought to be voted down.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. May I suggest to the chairman that the families of the soldiers are the last groups in the world with whom we should be parsimonious because we have been very, very careless in our appropriations and in the expenditure of money, and if we could tip the scales in favor of the family without bankrupting the country we should do it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are anything but parsimonious here. We are generous beyond all precedent. The reason we did not receive applications from the other half of those who are entitled to this grant is that they prefer better accommodations; they prefer individual rooms instead of the ward service provided here. Of course, if we merely

presented a lump sum in cash acceptance would be 100 percent.

Mr. Chairman, because of the exorbitant additional cost proposed by the amendment and because of the necessity of passing another deficiency bill this fiscal year if the amendment is agreed to, I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were—ayes 8, noes 115.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, emergency maternity and infant care (national defense): For all necessary expenses of the Children's Bureau in performing the duties imposed upon it in carrying out the program for emergency maternity and infant care, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and other items otherwise chargeable to the appropriations of the Department of Labor for contingent expenses, traveling expenses, and printing and binding, $20,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the joint resolution back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the joint resolution as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for the wives of enlisted men in the armed forces, had directed him to report the joint resolution back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the joint resolution as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am opposed to the joint resolution in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Ohio moves to recommit House Joint Resolution 159 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report it back forthwith to the House with the following amendment: On page 2, line 6, after the period insert the following sentence: "The care provided under the foregoing appropriation shall be provided in the form of cash allotments made directly to the wives, and to the mothers of the infants, who are entitled to such care."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 143, noes 0.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 327, nays 0, not voting 103.

[Roll No. 145]

YEAS—327

Abernethy	Coffee	Gillie
Allen, Ill.	Cole, Mo.	Gordon
Allen, La.	Cole, N. Y.	Gore
Andersen, H. Carl	Compton	Gorski
	Cooley	Gossett
Anderson, Calif.	Cooper	Graham
Anderson, N. Mex.	Costello	Grant, Ala.
	Courtney	Grant, Ind.
Andresen, August H.	Cox	Gregory
	Cravens	Griffiths
Angell	Crawford	Gwynne
Arnold	Crosser	Hagen
Auchincloss	Cunningham	Hale
Baldwin, Md.	Curtis	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Barrett	D'Alesandro	
Barry	Davis	Hall, Leonard W.
Bates, Ky.	Dawson	
Bates, Mass.	Day	Halleck
Beall	Delaney	Hancock
Beckworth	Dewey	Hare
Bennett, Mich.	Dies	Harless, Ariz.
Bennett, Mo.	Dilweg	Harris, Ark.
Bishop	Dingell	Harris, Va.
Blackney	Dirksen	Hays
Bland	Ditter	Hébert
Bloom	Domengeaux	Heidinger
Bolton	Dondero	Hendricks
Bonner	Doughton	Herter
Boren	Douglas	Hess
Boykin	Drewry	Hinshaw
Bradley, Pa.	Dworshak	Hoch
Brehm	Eberharter	Hoeven
Brooks	Ellis	Hoffman
Brown, Ga.	Ellison, Md.	Holifield
Brown, Ohio	Elsworth	Holmes, Wash.
Bryson	Elston, Ohio	Hope
Burch, Va.	Engel	Horan
Burchill, N. Y.	Feighan	Howell
Burdick	Fellows	Hull
Burgin	Fenton	Jarman
Busbey	Fernandez	Jeffrey
Butler	Fisher	Jenkins
Byrne	Flannagan	Jensen
Camp	Fogarty	Johnson, Anton J.
Cannon, Fla.	Forand	
Cannon, Mo.	Fulbright	Johnson, J. Leroy
Capozzoli	Fulmer	
Carlson, Kans.	Gale	Johnson, Luther A.
Carson, Ohio	Gathings	
Celler	Gavin	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Chapman	Gearhart	
Church	Gibson	Johnson, Okla.
Clason	Gifford	Johnson, Ward
Clevenger	Gilchrist	Jones
Cochran	Gillette	Jonkman
Judd	Monroney	Schuetz
Kean	Morrison, La.	Schwabe
Kearney	Morrison, N. C.	Shafer
Keefe	Mott	Short
Kefauver	Mruk	Sikes
Kelley	Mundt	Simpson, Ill.
Kerr	Murdock	Simpson, Pa.
Kilburn	Murray, Tenn.	Slaughter
Kilday	Murray, Wis.	Smith, Maine
King	Myers	Smith, Ohio
Kinzer	Newsome	Smith, Va.
Kirwan	Norman	Smith, W. Va.
Kleberg	Norrell	Smith, Wis.
Knutson	O'Brien, Ill.	Somers, N. Y.
Kunkel	O'Brien, Mich.	Springer
LaFollette	O'Hara	Stanley
Landis	Outland	Starnes, Ala.
Lanham	Patman	Steagall
Larcade	Patton	Stearns, N. H.
Lea	Peterson, Ga.	Stefan
LeCompte	Pfeifer	Stewart
LeFevre	Phillips	Stockman
Lemke	Ploeser	Sullivan
Lesinski	Plumley	Sumner, Ill.
Lewis, Colo.	Poage	Sundstrom
Lewis, Ohio	Poulson	Taber
Luce	Powers	Talbot
Ludlow	Price	Talle
Lynch	Priest	Taylor
McCord	Rabaut	Thomas, Tex.
McCormack	Ramey	Thomason
McCowen	Ramspeck	Tibbott
McGehee	Randolph	Tolan
McGranery	Rankin	Troutman
McGregor	Reece, Tenn.	Vincent, Ky.
McLean	Reed, Ill.	Voorhis, Calif.
McMillan	Reed, N. Y.	Vorys, Ohio
McMurray	Rees, Kans.	Vursell
McWilliams	Richards	Wadsworth
Maas	Rivers	Walter
Madden	Rizley	Ward
Maloney	Robertson	Wasielewski
Manasco	Robsion, Ky.	Weaver
Mansfield, Mont.	Rockwell	Weiss
	Rodgers, Pa.	Welch
Mansfield, Tex.	Rogers, Calif.	Wheat
Marcantonio	Rogers, Mass.	Whittington
Martin, Iowa	Rohrbough	Wickersham
Martin, Mass.	Rolph	Willey
Mason	Rowan	Wilson
May	Rowe	Winstead
Merrow	Russell	Wolcott
Michener	Sabath	Woodruff, Mich.
Miller, Conn.	Sadowski	Woodrum, Va.
Miller, Mo.	Sasscer	Worley
Miller, Nebr.	Sauthoff	Wright
Mills	Scanlon	
Monkiewicz	Schiffler	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—103

Andrews	Gerlach	O'Neal
Arends	Goodwin	O'Toole
Baldwin, N. Y.	Granger	Pace
Barden	Green	Peterson, Fla.
Bell	Gross	Philbin
Bender	Harness, Ind.	Pittenger
Bradley, Mich.	Hart	Pracht
Buckley	Hartley	Robinson, Utah
Buffett	Heffernan	Satterfield
Bulwinkle	Hill	Scott
Canfield	Hobbs	Sheppard
Carter	Holmes, Mass.	Sheridan
Case	Izac	Snyder
Chenoweth	Jackson	Sparkman
Chiperfield	Jennings	Spence
Clark	Johnson, Calvin D.	Stevenson
Colmer		Sumners, Tex.
Creal	Johnson, Ind.	Tarver
Cullen	Kee	Thomas, N. J.
Curley	Kennedy	Towe
Dickstein	Keogh	Treadway
Disney	Klein	Van Zandt
Durham	Lambertson	Vinson, Ga.
Eaton	Lane	Weichel, Ohio
Elliott	McKenzie	Wene
Elmer	Magnuson	West
Fay	Mahon	Whelchel, Ga.
Fish	Merritt	White
Fitzpatrick	Miller Pa.	Whitten
Folger	Murphy	Wigglesworth
Ford	Norton	Winter
Furlong	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gallagher	O'Connor	Wolverton, N. J.
Gamble	O'Konski	Zimmerman
Gavagan	O'Leary	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Curley with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Spence with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Elmer.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Creal with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Furlong with Mr. Pracht.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Pittenger.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Fay with Mr. Welchel of Ohio.
Mr. Zimmerman with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Hill.
Mr. West with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Buffett.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Tarver with Mr. Gross.
Mr. Sparkman with Mr. O'Brien of New York.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Case.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Towe.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Harness of Indiana.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr Bender.
Mr. Disney with Mr. Calvin D. Johnson.
Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Granger with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Gerlach.
Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Folger with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Green with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Whelchel of Georgia with Mr. Miller of Pennsylvania.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article from the Washington Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short newspaper clipping.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I do this because I understand that legislation is to be brought up tomorrow, and I think the Members of the House should be informed of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Banking and Currency has reported out the bill H. R. 3291 unanimously. The purpose of the bill is to increase the authorization, to the amount of $400,000,000, for construction under title VI of the National Housing Act and also extend the time for which loans may be extended under title I. The bill has been reported out unanimously. Consent will be asked tomorrow to consider the bill. I am told that the bill is noncontroversial, but I want it understood that if there is any controversy about it that the unanimous-consent request for the consideration of the bill will be withdrawn.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And that the bill then probably will not come up until Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is, if there are objections.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Did I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts to say that this increases the authorization $400,000,000 or $300,000,000?

Mr. McCORMACK. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL], is present, but I understand it to be $400,000,000.

Mr. SABATH. That was originally asked for, and we have appropriated already authorization for $100,000,000.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, this bill does not appropriate anything. The bill provides for the insurance of loans and would increase the authorization in the amount of $400,000,000. There is no appropriation. This is a matter that is more or less urgent, because there is now a waiting list of applications for insurance. It is under title VI of the National Housing Act. Title VI provides for the insurance of loans for residential construction in defense areas, where it may be done by private investment, simply by insuring the loans, rather than by direct appropriations from the Treasury, as must be done under the Lanham Act, except where it is done by private investment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We have in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan an area where there are not enough defense workers. They are short of manpower. They can get the men, but the authority which would transfer those men refuses to do so until we provide housing facilities. This is just a little matter, but it does have to do with this matter of war production. They have authorized the Cleveland office to give us 100 trailers, while we are waiting to build these other houses. Is there anything that we can do about that?

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not know the situation to which the gentleman refers. It may be that what he has in mind is construction under the Lanham Act. That is emergency construction, where the money is appropriated directly out of the Treasury. Of course, I am sure the gentleman feels as I think everybody else does that where this construction can be done by private investment, it is preferable. There is a large amount of this construction. They have granted insurance in the amount of $1,200,000,000 under title VI, and this further authorization is to continue that kind of service.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman suppose if I gave him the name of a gentleman in the department down town he could call him up and ask him to do a little something so that we can get the housing facilities for these workers?

Mr. STEAGALL. The National Housing Administrator is not leaving any of this work undone where it can be justified by showing the element of permanency, which takes it out of the category of housing which must be done temporarily by direct appropriation out of the Treasury.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I wonder if I could enlist the aid of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] on that proposition? It is right across the lake from Chicago and we need those trailers to house the workers.

Mr. SABATH. This act will encourage private construction. We have many contractors and real estate operators who are willing to build. They are simply waiting to have these loans guaranteed as it is proposed in this bill. The moment that is done it will enable the contractors to go forward and build the necessary buildings that are needed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If you will bear with me, that building takes time. Those trailers are available in Cleveland and we need them.

Mr. SABATH. You make your request and they will do it. They have the trailers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole today and to include therein an extract from a pamphlet that was presented to the Committee yesterday on the subject under discussion today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include

therein a report of a livestock meeting at Kansas City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole today and to include certain short correspondence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the legislative business tomorrow and any other special orders, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders that may be entered I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Journal of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an address which I delivered recently to the American Bar Association at Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE CRUDE OIL SITUATION IS CRITICAL

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the situation with respect to supplies of crude oil and gasoline in this country is, in my opinion, reaching a most serious stage. So far as I am able to ascertain, nothing constructive is being done regarding it. Unless steps are taken to correct the problem, in my judgment, it will become critical very soon.

The President of the United States, in his message to Congress last Friday, said, and I quote:

> Since the outbreak of war in Europe we have increased our output of petroleum by 66 percent.

I have tried to secure the authority for these figures. Up to the present time I have been unable to find the source of information to confirm them. Immediately after the speech was delivered I asked the White House for this information. Up to date I have not received a reply.

If we take September 1, 1939, as being the date of "the outbreak of the war," the daily average production of crude oil in the United States during this month, according to the United States Bureau of Mines, was 3,608,000 barrels. For June 1943 the average was 3,977,000 barrels. The increase, comparing these 2 months, was about 10 percent. The most liberal figure I have been able to secure from any source is an increase of 16 percent. The small increase is caused by unusual and extra pressure on the producing wells. Even though there is a small increase in the production of crude oil over this period, this does not compare with the extra and tremendous demand of gasoline for our armed forces amounting, according to Mr. Ickes, to approximately 600,000 barrels per day, and this demand is increasing every day. Mr. Ickes also calls attention to the fact that by next year military requirements alone will be more than 37.5 percent of our present output east of the Rocky Mountains. The necessary demand for gasoline is several times what it was at the beginning of the war.

Since we entered the war in December 1941 our petroleum-production capacity has constantly been on the decline, statements to the contrary notwithstanding. We are discovering much less oil than we are using even under present restrictions, so our above-ground reserves are diminishing rapidly, and since Pearl Harbor our new production has fallen off sharply. The small recent improvement in total production showing an increase of about 6 to 10 percent will be reduced by the end of the year because it is made possible by drawing on reserves made available by our pre-war activities and will be temporary at the very best.

The Petroleum Administrator for War, Mr. Ickes, has issued a number of warnings on the critical condition of petroleum supplies and calls attention to the fact that production effort is going down and above-ground stocks of petroleum have been reduced by 13 percent since Pearl Harbor. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to some statistics from the Bureau of Mines. Since 1937, and even since 1941, new production on account of new well completions in the United States has dropped approximately 50 percent of what it was in 1937, and about 25 percent of the 1941 production.

Mr. Sumner Pike, Chief of Office of Price Administration, Petroleum Division, told a Senate committee investigating foreign gasoline shortage, that indications according to recent figures were that there was little decline in the number of new discovery wells during the last 4 years. He did not continue his statement by explaining to the committee the amount of new production from these wells. I believe it is fair that I should call attention to some further figures from the Bureau of Mines showing the number of total initial production barrels from these wells during the years mentioned in his statement. I quote from the Division of Reserves, Office Petroleum Administration for War:

1937	10,185,780
1938	8,795,660
1939	6,644,300
1940	7,076,250
1941	7,284,100
1942	2,781,540
1943 (6 months)	776,700

Replacement costs for drilling per well in 1943 is three times the cost in 1941.

Labor costs in June 1943 in the oil-production branch of the petroleum industry compared with all industries is 74 percent higher than in 1937. The average daily production of crude in the United States for the first 6 months in 1942 was 3,919,000 barrels per day. The average production from new wells computed during that period was 126,683 barrels. Producing crude petroleum at an average rate of 4,000,000 barrels and replacing it with wells having an average production capacity of about 127,000 barrels would indicate a definite shortage. This shortage is not a lack of oil reserve in the ground but a lack of oil wells from which to recover sufficient production to supply our military, industrial and necessary civilian requirements.

Mr. William B. Heroy, Director of Reserves, Petroleum Administration for War, in an address before the Interstate Oil Company Commission in April 1943 stated:

> Commencing with 1938 there was * * * a decisive change in the results of new development. In each year since 1937 the total of the initial daily production has greatly decreased * * *. When it is considered that it is the relatively young wells which yield the flush production and that we are dependent on such wells for 85 percent of our production, the decline in initial production becomes cause for serious concern.

To meet the needs of consumers of petroleum production there has been a steady decline in the stocks on hand since the latter part of 1941. This of course means more rationing of gasoline and many more cold homes this winter than last winter. There will also be a definite shortage in the supply of gasoline. I am informed the Office of Price Administration has suggested these difficulties might be solved by importing crude oil and petroleum products. One of the large companies who might import oil made the following statement:

> It is naively suggested that all our troubles will vanish if we simply "import more oil from South American countries". This suggestion ignores one sinister fact; the submarine. We are a nation at war. Our very life depends on oil; oil here on the home front as well as on the battle front. We all know that the flow of imported oil can be paralyzed over night; it has been paralyzed for months on end within the last year. Our company owns extensive oil-producing properties in South America and for many years we have brought into this country substantial imports of oil from South America. We believe this policy on our part serves the best interests of our own country as well as of our neighbors in South America. But we would never advocate that our country, in time of war, should depend on imports over enemy-infested waters for oil, a veritable "sinew of war."

While the oil producers of the United States are frozen to pre-war prices by the O. P. A. and by restrictions of the Petroleum Administration for War and material limitations by the War Production Board as well as the depleting regulations by the Treasury Department, the growing shortage of production of

crude petroleum continues to become more serious every day.

According to the Bureau of Mines, there were 22,143 oil wells completed in 1937 with a capacity of 10,185,000 barrels. In the first 6 months of 1943, 4,315 oil wells were completed with a total capacity of 776,700 barrels. On an annual basis it would be 1,551,000 barrels, which is 15 percent of the productive capacity of the wells drilled in 1937. The average daily production of crude petroleum for the first 6 months of 1943 was 3,919,017 barrels. Initial productive capacity of oil-well completions in the same period was less than 40 percent of production so our drilling operations are not sufficient to maintain current rate of production and no reserve is being maintained to offset the sharp decline in older wells that will soon drop from the flush stage and become stripper wells and be subjected to secondary recovery methods. In 1937 the average cost per barrel for each new oil well was $56.92. In 1941 it was $72.48. In 1943 the replacement cost is $207.69, which is 3 times as much as that of 1941. Mr. Speaker, the present price of oil, $1.17 per barrel, is just about the same as it was in 1937. It has not increased with other commodities. It is approximately 60-percent parity. If the price of crude oil were increased 50 cents per barrel it would still be below parity, but it would be sufficient to induce and encourage independent producers to proceed to drill new wells and discover additional oil supplies. This increase in price would increase the price of gasoline not more than 1 cent per gallon. It is my considered judgment that if the Office of Price Administration would permit an increase of 50 cents per barrel and if the War Production Board would give a little encouragement by relaxing some of its regulations on necessary equipment and machinery there would be a definite increase in the production of oil in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here to plead for the oil producer. He can take care of himself, but I am here to tell this House that in view of the tremendous increased demand for gasoline for the prosecution of the war that something must be done immediately to increase our oil reserves. We are told that it takes 600,000 barrels of gasoline every day to supply our armed forces. Under present conditions, regardless of our domestic restrictions, we are bound to be short of gasoline unless something is done in the immediate future to alleviate the situation. If there is anyone in the administration who can really justify the manner in which this situation is being handled, I wish he would do it.

Two alternatives seem to be offered by our Government advisors: One is to import gasoline from foreign countries and take the chances of sinkings by submarines. That is not practical, reasonable, or fair. Another suggestion is that we reach into the Federal Treasury and pay subsidies to encourage the drilling of new wells. This is not practical or right. The fair, reasonable, and common sense way to handle the problem is to increase the price of crude oil 50 cents per barrel which should be enough to encourage our independent producers to proceed immediately to drill additional wells so we may have a sufficient supply of oil to take care of demands of our armed forces as well as the necessary requirements for our domestic uses. With the increase I have mentioned, the price of crude oil will then be only about one-half of what it was at the close of the First World War. The point is that just as we need other critical war materials, we must have a supply of oil, and we must have it before it is too late. Let me quote from an address delivered by the Honorable Harold L. Ickes over the National Broadcasting Co. network on September 1. I quote Secretary Ickes:

> In the face of this huge war demand, crude oil productive capacity is falling off seriously throughout the important midwestern oil-producing States, and is susceptible of a substantial increase only in west Texas. On the basis of known military requirements—let alone whatever unexpected demands may develop—we will not be able, by next year, to produce enough oil in the United States to meet the needs of the military, of war industry, of agriculture, and for essential civilian purposes unless we cut down on consumption now. That is not my opinion. It is a fact, recognized by the practical oil men who have formally endorsed the gasoline curtailment in the Middle West and Southwest.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, this is not a matter of protecting the independent oil producers. They can take care of themselves by curtailment of drilling operations. They do not want to do that. They are just as patriotic as any other group of our citizens. All they need is a sufficient increase to partly offset the increased cost of drilling wells and making new discoveries.

Mr. Speaker, oil is one of the vital elements by which the war may be won. Oil is scarce and growing scarcer because the tremendous demand is depleting our reserves. Billions of barrels remain to be found right here in the United States. If we continue as we are now going, we will soon be on the verge of an oil crisis.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. In the gentleman's opinion, do you think there is plenty of gasoline in the Midwest to take care of the needs of the Midwest?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will simply give my own opinion regarding that question. We could perhaps provide more gasoline than we are at the present time. We could produce more presently, but we cannot do it very long unless we discover new crude oil. The only practical way by which that can be done, in my opinion, is by increasing the price of crude oil in order to discover new wells and bring in new and additional production.

Going back to the gentleman's question. We could so much nearer take care of the demands of our own area if we further curtailed our supplies of gasoline going to the eastern seaboard.

Mr. STEFAN. The reason I asked the gentleman to yield is because we have had several mass meetings in my district among traveling men who have been reduced in their mileage to 480 miles per month. The average travel is 1,000 miles a month. This shortage of gasoline is also affecting our sales arrangements where farmers have livestock to sell. The O. P. A. tells me that Mr. Ickes says we do not have the gasoline in the Midwest and for that reason he has asked O. P. A. to put quotas on those traveling men, who will be put out of business, because 480 miles a month is not sufficient for them to cover their territory.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the observation of the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska. He is always diligent and industrious in looking after the affairs of his people. We have a similar situation in my section of the country. It is my opinion that a much better job could be done than is being done in providing gasoline for our local people and the salesmen who need gas to carry on necessary business. But what concerns me today is the fact that our supplies of crude oil are getting lower and lower, and so very little, practically nothing, is being done about it.

And the demand for the armed forces is growing day by day. Mr. Ickes says that at the beginning of next year 37½ percent of the crude output east of the Rocky Mountains will be required for the armed forces. They are now using more than 30 percent.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows that the situation he speaks of in his area, district 2, has been very much worse in district 1 for months and months and when Mr. Ickes stated he would cut the value of the amount of gasoline issued to district 2, he did, and the O. P. A. issued more coupons so as a result we got no additional gasoline in district 1. We had a great deal of suffering last winter and had a great deal of illness as the result of the shortage of oil. District 1 has had gas rationing for a long time.

I am wondering if the gentleman has any suggestions as to how we can secure a raise in the price of oil so we can get an increase in the output? I am so tired of excuses and excuses and excuses by those in charge of the problem. And we now have the coal situation on the east coast, which is a duplicate of the oil situation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We were told last year to advise the people to convert to coal. Thank heavens I did not tell the people to convert to coal.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The only reply I can make to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is this: That unless the Office of Price Administration approves an increase in the price of crude oil the only other alternative I see is to do it by legislation—it is my candid opinion that we are not going to get more crude any other way. I do not think the subsidy

method is practical, and will not do the job.

The only effective practical method of handling it is to increase the price of crude oil, in my judgment, about 50 cents per barrel. That will result in increasing the price of gasoline less than 1 cent per gallon, but in my judgment it will stimulate the drilling of discovery wells and the development of new fields. Even then the price of crude oil would not be out of the way.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that the American people would be perfectly willing to have that done in order to secure oil and gasoline?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, I feel they would be more than willing if they understood the situation.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. I want to concur in what the gentleman from Kansas says about the necessity for raising the price of crude oil if we are going to meet the situation that is now becoming serious and emergent.

Like the gentleman from Kansas I represent an oil-producing section. I visited the oil fields of west Texas only recently. As the gentleman knows, new fields are nearly always brought in by wildcatters, or what might be called independents.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct; nearly all of them are brought in by the independent operators.

Mr. THOMASON. The price of crude oil as now fixed was set at the price of some 3 years ago, and that is entirely too low.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. THOMASON. But, in the meantime, there has been a constant rise in the price of labor, machinery, and tools necessary in the drilling of these wells, especially in the deep-test country such as I represent.

As the gentleman so well pointed out, the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, after an exhaustive study, has found that there is a shortage of oil and has recommended a reasonable increase in the price of crude and the matter seems to be tied up now with the Office of Price Administration. But in my judgment there is no solution of the matter at present except to grant a reasonable increase in the price of crude and I hope that some such step will be taken and be taken immediately, not only to provide the necessary oil and gas that this country and our armed forces and allies must have, but also to encourage production, particularly in the case of the independents. The major companies have not much to worry about because they make their big money out of byproducts. They can gamble, but independent operators of limited means cannot do that. Some relief must be provided to the independents and that very soon.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Texas, and as I indicate in my general statement, the price of crude oil now is only 60 percent of parity and if the price is increased by 50 cents per barrel, it will not be at parity.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I might say that when Secretary Ickes appeared before a meeting at Chicago the burden of his thesis was that there is a shortage of crude oil.

I have been given a memorandum from the chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission stating that they could pick up an additional 350,000 barrels in Texas without impairment of legal reserves; and the memorandum also stated that they could find an additional 50,000 barrels in Louisiana. That would have made 400,000 barrels.

I do not vouch for the accuracy of those figures except that I know the Secretary of the Interior stated that there doubtless was some crude oil that was available, the use of which would not impair the crude reserves.

If that were the case it seems to me it was scarcely necessary to decrease the value of coupons in the Middle West where such decrease has greatly reduced the amount of permissible driving, and does impair the carrying on of retail business, and that is the reason the salesmen have been complaining and emphasizing the matter so forcefully.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his contribution. I just did not extend my discussion to that last point. The situation with respect to the use of gasoline in the Middle West and in the West and Southwest is so much different from what it is in the New England States and along the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Because, as the gentleman has well pointed out, for instance, distances are greater for one thing, transportation facilities are so much different from what they are along the eastern seaboard, and then we have a great difference in occupation. We are largely farmers out there, a great many are ranchers, and salesmen have to travel greater distances.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I gladly yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. The statement of the gentleman from Illinois is true, but even with 400,000 barrels that will not take the place of the depletion that is going on in the oil that is in storage today, nor will it take care of the situation as we go along. There is a tremendous sag in the amount of oil that is above the ground now; inroads are being made on that every day, and even though this 400,000 extra barrels of oil a day are produced it is going to put a strain on these wells that a great many of the producers do not want to put on their wells. As the gentleman from Kansas well knows, coming from the oil section—and the gentleman from Oklahoma, my colleague from Texas, and others—there is a certain amount of oil that can be taken out of a well per day to preserve the longest life of the well. If the well is strained the oil left in the ground is likely to be lost because salt water will come in and then your well is gone.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. RAYBURN. What we need is new discoveries to keep up the oil reserves that we have above ground. The prospect is that the oil we have in the ground is not going to carry us many years. We need to encourage discovery; we need this injection of a 35-cent-per-barrel increase in the price of oil in order to increase drilling to find new fields and deep fields. Let me cite an instance to show what effect a small increase in the price of oil will have on new drilling. In one place in California in some way they raised the price of crude oil 25 cents a barrel. This within itself increased exploration by 50 percent.

We have got to find new fields if we are to have enough oil to serve us. Also, we have got to go deeper in the fields we have discovered, and also we may have to stop at some of the higher levels that are above the level of profitable production. I do not think we are going to have enough oil in this country unless we make new discoveries. With the price of oil static as my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], said, or with the price at what it has been for about 3 years—

Mr. REES of Kansas. In fact, since 1937.

Mr. RAYBURN. And the costs of taking oil out of the ground having gone up from 30 to 40 percent, the little man is just going to disappear from the field; that is all there is to that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I make an observation?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That question was explored in the Chicago meeting with the Secretary, may I say to the Speaker. I raised the question as to what it would cost the country if this 35 cents a barrel was allowed. The best estimate at that time was that it would cost about $600,000,000.

I raised this further question: I inquired whether we could differentiate as between established companies that were operating on a profitable basis and companies that were wildcatting so that we could get the benefit of the wildcatting and exploration at the same time. There was no practical answer for it at the time. Some thought it might very seriously interrupt the free flow of industry, and we came to no conclusion.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is exactly correct.

A subsidy has been proposed. I am not one of these fellows who run from subsidies. I think there has been a lot of nonsense uttered about subsidies with reference to farm products; but if you put on a subsidy then many who never drilled a well in their lives will go out and drill for the subsidy.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Many of them who know nothing about the business.

Mr. RAYBURN. That would be one difficulty with the subsidy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not sure you can by means of a subsidy.

Mr. RAYBURN. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that we face many practical problems with tne little fellow, the so-called independents, and the larger and major companies. I just do not know where we are going to get the relief. I cannot figure it out.

I seriously fear that unless some kind of an incentive in the way of an increased price is granted, we are going to find ourselves in this country in 5 years even, not alone 10 or 15 years, very short of the supply of oil that we need.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me direct this observation to the gentleman from Kansas. Perhaps the Speaker may have an observation also. It seems rather singular this recommendation has been made by the Petroleum Administrator to the O. P. A. on two different occasions and evidently there has been no conclusive action.

Mr. RAYBURN. There has been conclusive action by the O. P. A. because it has disproved the recommendation. It is in another division.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, there was action; but I have never ascertained the reason for the cleavage between the two responsible Government agencies dealing with the same commodity, which is a very interesting thing.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to reply to the gentleman from Illinois in this way: Mr. Ickes, I believe, is in favor of an increase in the price of crude oil. I think he has so expressed that view.

Mr. RAYBURN. He has made the recommendation. He has recommended 35 cents a barrel.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That has gone to the Office of Price Administration for consideration.

Mr. RAYBURN. It has and is out of there.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And the representation was made the second time, as I understand it.

Mr. RAYBURN. That has been disproved.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is rather singular.

Mr. RAYBURN. It is in another jurisdiction right now.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And that jurisdiction has done nothing about it.

Mr. RAYBURN. There has been no decision made there.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I agree with the distinguished Speaker. I am in accord with his views and I appreciate his constructive and forthright statement.

Somehow, somewhere, somebody in high places in the Government ought to either remedy this situation or give a reason why it is not being done. If a member of the Cabinet, who is also in charge of this particular matter, is in favor of it and has so stated and recommends it, then there ought to be some reason given him why it is not being done.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is a case where two responsible agencies take the same set of facts and wind up with an entirely diverse conclusion.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I have called attention to the fact Mr. Pike, in his testimony yesterday before the Senate committee, mentioned the number of wells that have been drilled during the last 5 or 6 years, but did not give the amount of crude oil produced during that period. He did not go on and discuss the problem of the need for increased supplies of oil by reason of the tremendous increased demand.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from Kansas, our distinguished Speaker and the gentleman from Texas spoke from the viewpoint of the producer and they have given us a very good picture of the lack of supplies of gasoline. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts, the gentleman from Illinois and myself speak from the viewpoint of the consumers, representing people who are holding mass meetings wondering what they are going to do to produce food, to cover their territory and transact a normal business in wartime a business that has a connection with the war effort. They are liable to be wiped out. A solution has been suggested by the distinguished Speaker. Something certainly ought to be done about it because the consumer is not so much interested in price as getting this bottleneck broken. I think the gentleman from Kansas has certainly brought up a very important subject before the House today, a subject in which millions of people are interested and which must be solved if it can be solved.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I am speaking on the question of our being short of crude oil and telling you that the situation is critical. It is not only the producer, everybody is interested in this problem. We must have increased production of crude oil to carry on this war and take care of absolute domestic needs. When you realize, as Secretary Ickes has said in a recent statement, it requires 600,000 barrels of high octane gasoline every day for the armed forces, add this to the additional necessary use of gasoline, you can begin to imagine that the demand is terrific.

Mr. THOMASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman from Kansas has called to the attention of the House one of the most important problems we have before the country, and it demands immediate solution, as I see it. Secretary Ickes has pointed out and has shown by substantial evidence that there is a threatened shortage. Referring again to the independent producers, I happen to know that out in my district they are anxious to drill some wells in proven territory. The Permian Basin in west Texas is ready to be developed but you cannot expect the independent operators to drill at tremendous expense and then sell their oil at a loss.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. In my district they want to drill deep wells or deepen existing ones. They go to a deeper strata, they go down now eight or ten thousand feet and it costs $250,000 or $300,000 to drill a well. That is a very expensive and speculative operation and those who take the gamble cannot and will not undertake it on a fixed price of 90 cents per barrel.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct and extremely important.

Mr. THOMASON. He would certainly operate at a loss if he does not get a higher price for his crude. Since the Secretary of the Interior has recommended an increase in price of 35 cents and the O. P. A. has refused to adopt his recommendation, it seems to me that there is nothing left for the Congress but to take action, which I think it should do.

Mr. REES of Kansas. May I add to what the gentleman from Texas has said with reference to the question of the cost of drilling wells. I have these figures from the Bureau of Mines, which should be authoritative, that in 1937 the average cost per barrel for drilling new oil wells in this country was $56.92; in 1941, $72.48; and in 1943, $207.69. The price of crude oil has been practically the same all the way along.

Mr. THOMASON. That price was frozen as of 3 years ago, whereas there has been a tremendous increase, as I pointed out a little while ago, in the price of labor and all the tools and machinery necessary to drill a well, especially one of these deep-test wells, which is very expensive. The independent operator just cannot do that at the present price and produce the oil that the country and our armed forces must have. It is an emergency situation that must have prompt and favorable action of some kind.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BISHOP. There are several sets of machinery in my part of the country which are lying idle awaiting a rise in the price of crude oil. I am sure they would start acting at once with such an increase.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to my friend from Texas that it was rather interesting to me that the Secretary in making his proposal in Chicago predicated the whole thing upon the fact that there was a depletion of oil reserves and a depletion of visible crude above

the ground, so he felt that something had to be done about it on that basis. That was on the 4th of August. It was so amazing to hear a letter read in that meeting by the gentleman from Indiana, Representative HALLECK, dated July 31, only a few days before, signed by the head of the Fuel Rationing Board of O. P. A., to the effect that rationing had to go on and this program had to be readjusted from time to time for the sake of rubber conservation. So they were proceeding on two entirely separate lines of thought. To me, that is one of the most amazing things. In response to that divergence of opinion Mr. Ickes said, "Well, I neither affirm nor deny." That is the only answer you could get. It seems to me agencies of Government ought to get together.

Mr. THOMASON. I still think that does not go to the heart of the problem, which is the production of more crude oil, and that cannot be done unless those who produce the oil receive a reasonable price that will permit the independents to go ahead with their exploration, and make a fair margin of profit.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Again, as the Speaker has so well pointed out, the only way we can increase the amount of crude oil to amount to very much is by the drilling of new wells and bringing in new production, because the wells now producing will stand only a certain amount of pressure. Too much pressure for too long a time will cause water to mix with the oil and may even cause oil producing wells to go entirely to water. They even spoil some of our good wells by pressing them too hard.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman feel that it is a case of not being willing to pay the larger oil companies a higher rate for drilling, companies which perhaps would not drill anyway, than they would be willing to pay the so-called wildcatters? Does that factor enter into the question?

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the gentlewoman from Massachusetts were familiar with the problem she would find that most new production is brought in by independent companies, so-called wildcatters.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am familiar with it. I have made a great study of the subject for months.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Not so much of it is brought in by the big companies. For that reason, in all probability the larger companies are not so much concerned from that viewpoint.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No; but I suppose they would expect the same increase in price?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Certainly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. How long would it take to get enough oil from the drilling of new wells?

Mr. REES of Kansas. This would be pretty difficult to determine. Does the gentlewoman want to know how long it takes to drill an oil well? Is that the point?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No. I know you do not always find oil when you drill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. However, I suppose the gentleman has an approximate idea.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Very likely it would have to cover a period of several months. The length of time required for drilling oil wells differs in different localities. They are required to drill deeper in some areas, than in others. Some fields are more accessible than others. Many factors enter into the situation. I believe if the price of crude were increased 50 cents per barrel, and the W. P. B. would cooperate in allowing materials absolutely needed—and that would not be very great—there would be a marked improvement in a few months.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I believe we could get oil from Tampico, Mexico, and from Aruba at the present time.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am not familiar with that situation. I had not heard it suggested. Tampico is a long way off, and way over in old Mexico.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We could get it immediately.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am not sure that could be done. Offhand, the plan would seem to be pretty full of complications. In any event, it hardly seems practical for us to import oil from Mexico, when we can have it in our own country if we will drill for it and produce it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] may have leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt from the O. P. A. Act, and certain newspaper articles, also a copy of an amendment I have introduced to restore jurisdiction of the Federal courts in review of O. P. A. regulations and restrictions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] for 15 minutes.

THE ISLANDS IN LAKE ERIE AND THEIR INHABITANTS

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber we listen to many speeches—to some with enthusiasm and interest and to others, be it admitted, rather reluctantly; often we are amused, frequently informed, and sometimes bored. We have heard it said that the press and radio do not do an entirely thorough job of reporting the proceedings of Congress. That may be because each day there is too much to cover and also because many of the solemn and weighty problems with which the Congress must deal are tedious, colorless, and technical, but nevertheless matters of great pith and moment are ably and intelligently discussed here. Frequently speeches are made in both Houses of Congress that reveal carefully gathered facts and important data, representing long, laborious hours of study and work, for which reason in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD we have a vast and valuable mine of information compiled from the speeches delivered here and the pertinent material inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, which is the work of earnest men and women seeking to illuminate and solve the problems with which we as a nation are confronted in this period of peril at home and abroad.

Recently we all have been at home—we have had opportunity to come into personal contact again with those who sent us here to represent them; all of us have received some bouquets and most of us some brickbats, too. We have heard Washington bureaucrats condemned and we have listened to justifiable denouncements of unnecessary and conflicting bureaucratic restrictions and regimentation, but we have returned to our labors here fresh from our contacts with those we are here to serve. All of us realize that we are the duly elected representatives of the people; that we are directly responsible to them; and that they look to us, and not to the appointed bureaucrats, to safeguard their inherent rights and interests.

But today I have no ponderous theme, no involved or intricate matter to discuss; rather, I want to relate the trying situation of several hundred people who are residents of the district I have the honor to represent. These people are hardy Americans, loyal to their country and its traditions, giving freely the services and lives of their sons as well as of their fortunes to the war effort.

Most of you know the Lake Erie Islands. They are located northeast of Toledo and directly north of Port Clinton and Sandusky, picturesquely dotting a great inland sea and richly endowed by a generous Creator.

On one of these islands at Put in Bay is the majestic memorial to Oliver H. Perry, who 130 years ago broke the power of the British Fleet and won for this then young Nation of ours one of its great victories. We are all familiar with this vibrant and glorious message: "We have met the enemy and they are ours." That message came to General Harrison, later President Harrison, and it eventually re-echoed throughout all parts of the young Republic, and in the 130 years since it has gone resounding down the halls of time, a symbolic battle cry, part of the warp and woof of our patriotism and a proud chapter in the saga of our country, strengthening the heart, hand, and will of the generations that have come and gone since that historic September day. Indeed, the memory of Perry's immortal victory on Lake Erie is enshrined and kept aglow in the pres-

ence of a great painting that graces the walls of this very Capitol Building.

On a map I like to look at can be seen just tiny flecks of deep blue which represent these islands that mean so much to many people, including myself. They mean the world and all the good that is in it—hope, surcease from weariness, care and sorrow, friendships, bright and sunny mornings, delightfully cool afternoons, and starlit nights. These islands were the fishing retreats of Presidents Cleveland, Taft, Hayes, and Garfield, and they were the home ports of many of the bold and colorful lake captains of sailing days, including Captains Peterson, Dodge, Schiele, Magle, and Jay Fox Tulin.

While countless thousands of people have visited these islands of Lake Erie, for generations they have been the home of fishermen and workers in the vineyard who permanently occupy them. These two callings, if you please, were the vocations from which the Saviour took his first recruits. There is something unusually substantial and enduring about a fisherman and a vineyard—lasting civilizations have been built by and on them, and so has faith and love and charity and abiding peace.

It was on one of these islands—Middle Bass Isle—that I began my career as a country school teacher and it was during those happy years that I was afforded opportunity to learn the real merit and worth of the people who occupy them—their sincerity, resourcefulness, independence, faith and patriotism that never waver; those who give the most and demand the least in return are the mainstay and backbone of our Nation, and by this measuring rod these wholesome island folk can be identified as among our most valuable and substantial citizens. While these islands have always served as a delightful recreational center for their numerous visitors, the staunch and self-sacrificing qualities of the people who permanently inhabit them can be explained by the conditions they encounter in their daily lives; deprived as they are of the comforts, diversion, and opportunities afforded those who live in more populous communities, isolated from the mainland, icebound during the winter months, these are the conditions that have made them a strong, hardy, and self-reliant people, who never complain except under the duress of justifiable cause.

The recent recess period afforded me the opportunity to visit my friends and former neighbors on these islands, and I can tell you that many of these sturdy, upstanding people are vigorously and bitterly complaining and, I can assure you, for good and sufficient reasons. These people have always stood on their own feet and made their own way—never have they looked to the Federal Government at Washington to solve their problems; never has a demand come from them for Federal aid—"give us," "we want," "how much do we get out of this or that Federal appropriation," has not become a part of their vocabulary or their thinking processes, but the long arm of Washington bureaucracy, with its interferences and restrictions, has come to them and is definitely hindering them from coping with and solving their problems. They have no complaint that practically every one of their sons eligible for military service has gone into active service—that situation they would not change if they could—but now that the fathers and mothers of these boys are left alone to shoulder the full responsibilities of their little farms and small fisheries, willing though they be to work from sunup to sundown, they do resent the ever-increasing handicaps and restrictions imposed on them from Washington. Because of the acute shortage of manpower, these people are hard pressed for additional farm machinery and for repair parts for their fishing equipment which now, when they need those supplies most, they are unable to get. Washington bureaucracy, hewing to the line and letter of restrictive regulations and directives, permits no leeway by which these island folk could continue to make their own way and at least partially solve the problems that war has created for them; instead they have reached a stalemate and economically are rapidly approaching a paralyzed condition.

Nor do they find any solace in the fact that just a few miles north of them there are other islands in Canadian waters whose inhabitants have comparatively greater cooperation and privileges; on these neighboring Canadian islands there is no drastic shortage of manpower; American-made farm machinery is available for purchase; repair parts for boats are obtainable; nor are the boats running in and out of the ports of these Canadian islands hampered by unnecessary restrictions and inspections. Comparing their own plight with the advantages of their Canadian neighbors, these heirs of Commodore Perry are ruefully contemplating the advantages of getting whipped 130 years ago in a war fought for the protection of American freedom and individual economic enterprise. Indeed, in these times the resounding proclamation of Perry—"We have met the enemy and they are ours"—is beginning to have a hollow and confusing ring to these island people of ours.

That the master planners here in Washington are hamstringing 130,000,000 Americans and working on them downright injustices is no longer any secret, but when we see a group of earnest, hard-working people, such as these island folk of mine, made the victims of artificial and unnecessary restrictions, which are rapidly crowding them to the wall economically, as their friend and Representative, I feel that it is high time to make a public protest in their behalf.

The people on these islands of ours in Lake Erie represent the highest type of Americanism—patriotic and self-sacrificing, patient and enduring, self-sustaining and unafraid—it is their kind who, unregulated, uninspected, and unregimented, have made our country great by doing well the great and small tasks which have been thrust upon them. I plead, in God's name, give them a reasonable chance.

THE OIL SITUATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half a minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Speaker of the House is interested in this very vital oil situation and has taken the floor to speak about it gives me hope that we can secure some legislation, which we have not been able to do heretofore. The urgent need for oil is generally admitted. The public is not so much interested in how we secure oil and gasoline as they are in getting it. The people have been treated badly in this matter—especially persons living in district 1. Recommendations have been made by Secretary Ickes for a raise in the price of oil. O. P. A. promptly turns it down. It then has gone to a higher authority on appeal, and it has been turned down there several times. It has been referred to our former distinguished colleague from Kentucky, Judge Vinson, several times.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), on account of illness.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1318. An act authorizing the appointment of additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 23, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

738. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the Navy Department (including separate estimates for the United States Coast Guard and United States Marine Corps) estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

739. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting a copy of the complete annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency for 1942; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

740. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter with regard to the withdrawal from the list of recommended suspension of deportation in the case of Ruby Keyes or Ruby Amelia Moriarty Keyes, now known as Ruby Amelia Norton, C. R. 1334; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 159. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the Army forces; with amendment (Rept. No. 708). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 3291. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 709). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 3307. A bill relating to court review of certain orders and regulations of the Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 3308. A bill extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3309. A bill to suspend during the present war the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 3310. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the following streams, Warroad River, both branches, and Bull Dog Run, in the State of Minnesota, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 3311 (by request). A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the hours of employment of children employed in the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 3312. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide for an annuity for total and permanent disability after 10 years' service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3313. A bill to amend section 10 of the act of March 3, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor-vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia, increase the number of judges of the police court, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3314. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds collected by District of Columbia examining, licensing, and other boards and commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3315. A bill relative to certain annuities; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3316. A bill amending the provisions of law relating to the renegotiation of war contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3317. A bill to repeal Public, No. 252, an act to prevent pernicious political activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. J. Res. 160 (by request). Joint resolution to permit members of the armed forces of other United Nations to import alcoholic beverages into the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WENE:

H. Res. 305. Resolution authorizing an investigation and study by the Committee on Agriculture with respect to poultry shows and expositions in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2476. By Mr. ANDREWS: Petition of sundry residents of Erie County, N. Y., urging favorable consideration of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2477. Also, resolution adopted by the Missionary Society of the Church of God at Niagara Falls, N. Y., having to do with the manufacture, sale, and distribution of all alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2478. By Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Petition of 103 citizens of Greene County, Ohio, favoring passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2479. Also, petition of 23 citizens of Clark County, Ohio, favoring passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2480. Also, petition of 53 citizens of Champaign County, Ohio, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization by the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2481. Also, petition of 87 citizens of Fayette County, Ohio, favoring passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2482. Also, petition of 32 citizens of Clinton County, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2483. Also, petition of 39 citizens of Washington Court House, Ohio, and vicinity, urging the early consideration and a favorable vote on the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), in order to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war, to reduce absenteeism, increase production, and eliminate sources of disorder and physical disability which are hampering our war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2484. Also, petition of 19 citizens of South Charleston, Ohio, for the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2485. Also, petition of 60 citizens of Madison County, Ohio, favoring passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2486. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Harry P. Roy, of St. Louis, Mo., and 139 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2487. Also, petition of Fred Hauser and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2488. Also, petition of A. J. Batz and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2489. Also, petition of Arthur Binz and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the pasage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2490. Also, petition of Al. Prenavo and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2491. Also, petition of Peter Schneider, of St. Louis, Mo., and 21 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2492. Also, petition of Harvey William Christensen and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2493. Also, petition of Harry H. Molkenbur, of St. Louis, Mo., and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2494. Also, petition of Casper Kovarik, of St. Louis, Mo., and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2495. Also, petition of the Baltmar Buffet, St. Louis, Mo., signed by 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2496. By Mr. SPRINGER: Petition of Col. H. E. Whitledge Chapter, No. 9, Disabled American Veterans, of Outwood, Ky., on the subject of veterans' legislation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2497. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of the members of American Legion Post, No. 2, of Wheeling, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2498. Also, petition of the members of the American Legion Post, No. 48, of Benwood, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2499. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 3592, passed by the board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco, urging re-

peal of Chinese Exclusion Act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2500. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of members of Charleston (W. Va.) Building Trades Council, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, favoring the repeal of the Smith-Connally Act and requesting that the prices of food be rolled back to May 1942 level; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2501. By Mr. BUCKLEY: Petition of John McKinley and 103 others, protesting against enactment of prohibition legislation during the war emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2502. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of sundry citizens of Osceola, Iowa, in the interest of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O brooding spirit of God, in the midst of tragedies, beset by threatening perils, give us strength to cast into the chalice of comfort those compelling ingredients of a conquering faith. O put it to the quivering lips of weeping mothers with the task of emancipating themselves when the outlook is barren and joys droop. Dear Lord, it is so easy to be overtaken by desolating calamity through a false step; do Thou help when staggered by some strange trial and when we fail to gage some situation. We pray that the sufferings of others may challenge us to greater diligence and sacrifice as we tread our smooth, though oftentimes uncertain, ways.

Grant that duty may be our watchword as these days tremble with responsibilities; teach us the wise thing to do and the right way to go that its performance may command approval and support throughout our country. O Thou who dost clothe the lily and inspire the songbird, encourage us to grow in the beauty and strength of Christian manhood and womanhood, thereby justifying our place in the service of our democracy. For life and light, Heavenly Father, and for all this great world with its infinite source of truth and hope, accept our grateful praise. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Hon. CLAIR ENGLE presented himself at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the special orders today I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on Mr. Wendell L. Willkie, the barefoot boy from Wall Street, who is recommending himself as candidate for President on the Republican ticket.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a radio speech given by the Honorable ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

SEPTEMBER 20, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to inform you that I have submitted my resignation as a Member of Congress from the Twenty-third Congressional District of Pennsylvania to Gov. Edward W. Martin, effective 6 p. m., September 24, 1943.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation for the many courtesies you have extended me.

Very sincerely,
JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I have submitted my resignation as a Member of Congress effective 6 p. m., tomorrow, September 24. My resignation is the result of my intense desire to serve my country in the armed forces as a member of the United States Navy.

I am grateful to you, Mr. Speaker, and to my colleagues for the many courtesies shown me during the past 5 years. I shall think often of you and the multitude of important issues you will be called upon to decide. Believe me when I tell you it has been a distinct honor to serve in this distinguished body, the Congress of the United States; yet I feel it is an equal honor to be blessed with good health and able to serve in the armed forces.

Naturally it shall be my ambition, when the war clouds have been dispersed, to return to Congress, richer in experience and with a broader outlook.

Until we meet again, good luck and godspeed to all of you.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I express the wishes of every Member of the House when I say we regret very much the loss of our good friend and colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]. While he has always been a loyal Republican, yet Democrats and Republicans alike appreciate his many admirable qualities and the fine service he has rendered in Congress for his district and his country. He has always zealously promoted that which he believed was for the best welfare of his country. He has been outstanding in his affection for the veterans of the country and he has always been their ready champion. A veteran of the First World War himself, interested as he has been in many patriotic organizations, he knew their needs and vigorously urged legislation which would contribute to their welfare and that of their dependents. We in the House have cherished his judgment in veteran legislation. I might say that in urging legislation he has never waited for others to take the lead. Much of the legislation which he urged was enacted into law and more of it will be in the next few months.

So, Jim, we regret to see you go, although we admire the warm patriotic urge which prompts you to serve your country on the field of battle in this critical time. We are certain your new career will bring to you even richer honors than you have won in the past. May you have the fullest measure of success; may you escape unharmed the ravages of war and may you return to this great body at some future date. When you do return with new honors and with the satisfaction of having contributed to the victory your country will win we will welcome you with outstretched arms.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, patriotism plus courage are component factors in the make-up of one who will resign a seat in Congress at this time to enter the armed forces. These factors are common denominators in JIMMIE VAN ZANDT. While we all regret exceedingly to see him go, yet we applaud his choice and wish him good luck. His path in the days immediately ahead will be over a rugged and dangerous course. He served with honor in the Navy during World War No. 1. He has had considerable active duty on the high seas during the present war. He knows the danger which confronts him and I am sure that his decision is not prompted by emotion or overpersuasion. It is just plain, natural JIMMIE VAN ZANDT, responding to what I am convinced he feels sure is his duty.

Many of us have been acquainted with this unusual man since shortly after the First World War. We came to know him well because of his interest in veterans' legislation and his association with veteran organizations. More recently, as legislative representative and national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, he has been well known to all Members of Congress. Few veterans have a Nation-wide acquaintance equal to his.

He came to Congress equipped for the work and has done a splendid, worthwhile job. JIMMIE VAN ZANDT is always most interested in the common man. It will be difficult for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania to fill his place

at this time. His experience, his industry, his ability, his integrity, his personality and, last but not least, his uniform courtesy and good nature have made him an unusual asset to his district, his State, and his country.

I am sure we all hope that this terrible war will soon come to a victorious conclusion, and that the good people of his congressional district will return him to the seat which he now holds and to the service which he performs so well.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, my friendship for the gentleman from Pennsylvania, JIMMY VAN ZANDT, who has served with me on the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation for many years, is what has been described by someone as flowers that overhang the walls of party politics.

JIMMY VAN ZANDT is a Pennsylvania Republican and I am a Mississippi Democrat. Our political views are divergent, but our ideals of patriotism and the welfare of our country are parallel.

On that committee we have had to deal with the laws, the rules, and regulations that vitally affect the welfare of the veterans of this war and of the last World War, and I want to say that those veterans who are entitled to our consideration at all times never had a better friend in Congress than the gentleman from Pennsylvania, JIMMY VAN ZANDT.

Not only has he been the friend of veterans, but he is one of them. He has a splendid record in World War No. 1, and in this conflict, and when he goes to join the boys abroad who are now marching onward to complete victory over the allied dictatorships of this world we know he will give as good an account of himself as any man who has ever followed the American flag.

It is said that the Spartan mothers, when they sent their sons to war, would hand each one a shield and say "Come back with this shield or on it."

We have no doubt but that as the gentleman from Pennsylvania, JIMMY VAN ZANDT, goes forth to fight his country's battles in this great war, that he will not only give a glorious account of himself, but that when he returns he will either come back with the American flag over him or the American flag draped about him.

Godspeed to you, Jimmy; our love, our affections, and our admiration go with you.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a statement of the services of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] and also a statement of his citations:

JUNE 28, 1933.

Subject: VAN ZANDT, JAMES EDWARD, chief quartermaster, class V-1, United States Naval Reserve (inactive duty), regarding statement of service in the case of.

SIR: The records on file in this Bureau show that JAMES EDWARD VAN ZANDT enlisted in the Navy April 30, 1917, at the Navy recruiting station, Pittsburgh, Pa., as apprentice seaman, to serve 4 years; stated that he was born in Altoona, Pa., December 18, 1898; was transferred to the Naval Training Station, Newport, R. I., April 30, 1917; was rated seaman second class, May 25, 1917; transferred to the U. S. S. *New York* May 25, 1917; to the U. S. S. *Albany*, July 13, 1917; to armed draft detail, navy yard, New York, August 28, 1917; served as a member of the armed guard on board the steamship *Aiten* from July 14, 1917, to August 15, 1917; steamship *Varalia* from August 17, 1917, to September 18, 1917; steamship *Devoneaux* from October 1, 1917, to November 8, 1917; steamship *Ninian* from November 8, 1917, to December 14, 1917; steamship *Crown of Sevloe* from December 18, 1917, to January 21, 1918; steamship *Baydoulass* from January 26, 1918, to April 3, 1918; was rated seaman February 1, 1918, and seaman signalman first class April 1, 1918; served on board the steamship *Manxman* from April 8, 1918, to May 13, 1918; steamship *Santa Paula* from June 18, 1918, to August 15, 1918; was rated quartermaster third class (s), August 1, 1918; transferred to the U. S. S. *Santa Paula*, August 15, 1918; to the Naval Hospital, Norfolk, Va., August 19, 1918; to the armed guard detail, navy yard, New York, September 17, 1918; U. S. S. *Santa Paula*, January 20, 1919; was rated quartermaster second class, March 5, 1919; quartermaster first class, April 1, 1919; status was changed to duration of war, July 25, 1919; was transferred to the Navy demobilization station, Pittsburgh, Pa., August 21, 1919; and was issued an honorable discharge, August 22, 1919, as quartermaster first class, from the Navy demobilization station, Pittsburgh, Pa., by reason of expiration of duration of war enlistment; enrolled in United States Naval Reserve force, July 29, 1921, at the Navy recruiting station, Pittsburgh, Pa., as quartermaster first class, to serve 4 years; was released from active duty July 29, 1921; reported for active duty for training on board the U. S. S. *Fairfax*, August 20, 1921; was released from active duty for training from the U. S. S. *Fairfax* September 3, 1921; reported for active duty for training on board the U. S. S. *Wolverine*, July 24, 1922, was released from active duty for training from the U. S. S. *Wolverine*, August 7, 1922, reported for active duty for training on board the U. S. S. *Wolverine*, August 6, 1923; was released from active duty for training from the U. S. S. *Wolverine*, August 20, 1923; reported for active duty, May 5, 1924, on board the U. S. S. *Reina Mercedes* in connection with Olympic try-outs; was released from active duty, June 17, 1924, from the U. S. S. *Reina Mercedes;* reported for active duty for training on board the U. S. S. *Topeka*, August 16, 1924; was released from active duty for training from the U. S. S. *Topeka* August 30, 1924; reported for active duty for training on board the U. S. S. *Topeka*, July 11, 1925; was released from active duty for training from the U. S. S. *Topeka*, July 25, 1925, and was issued an honorable discharge, July 28, 1925, as chief quartermaster, from the headquarters, Fourth Naval District, at Philadelphia, Pa., by reason of expiration of enrollment. VAN ZANDT's rating was changed from quartermaster first class to chief quartermaster effective September 1, 1923. He enrolled in the United States Naval Reserve July 29, 1925, at Pittsburgh, Pa., as chief quartermaster; was released from active duty July 29, 1925; reported for active duty for training on board the U. S. S. *Lardner*, August 15, 1925; was released from active duty for training from the U. S. S. *Lardner*, August 29, 1925; reported for active duty for training on board the U. S. S. *Dallas*, July 3, 1926; was released from active duty for training from the U. S. S. *Dallas*, July 17, 1926; reported for active duty for training on board the U. S. S. *Charles Ausburn*, July 30, 1927; was released from active duty for training from the U. S. S. *Charles Ausburn* August 13, 1927; reported for active duty for training on board the U. S. S. *Putnam*, July 28, 1928; was released from active duty for training from the U. S. S. *Putnam*, August 11, 1928; reported for active duty for training on board the U. S. S. *Brooks*, July 6, 1929; was released from active duty for training from the U. S. S. *Brooks*, July 20, 1929; and was issued an honorable discharge, July 28, 1929, as chief quartermaster, from the headquarters, Fourth Naval District, at Philadelphia, Pa., by reason of expiration of enrollment; reenrolled, July 28, 1929, at Pittsburgh, Pa., as chief quartermaster, to serve 4 years; was released from active duty July 29, 1929; reported for active duty for training on board the U. S. S. *Breckinridge*, July 5, 1930; was released from active duty for training from the U. S. S. *Breckinridge*, July 19, 1930, under honorable conditions, as chief quartermaster.

Very truly yours,

F. B. UPHAM,
Chief of Bureau.
C. B. HATCH.

By direction.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL,
Washington, D. C.

STATEMENT OF NAVAL SERVICE OF LT. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, D-V(S), UNITED STATES NAVAL RESERVE

July 29, 1929: Reenlisted as chief quartermaster at Pittsburgh, Pa.

July 5, 1930: Reported for training duty on board the U. S. S. *Breckinridge.*

July 19, 1930: Released from training duty from the U. S. S. *Breckinridge.*

July 10, 1934: Issued a good discharge, under honorable conditions, as chief quartermaster, from the Second Fleet Division, by reason of expiration of enlistment.

August 11, 1934: Reenlisted as chief quartermaster at Washington, D. C.

August 10, 1938: Issued a good discharge, under honorable conditions, as chief quartermaster, from the navy yard, Washington, D. C., by reason of expiration of enlistment. No active duty.

September 1, 1938: Reenlisted as chief quartermaster at Washington, D. C.

June 1, 1941: Issued a good discharge, under honorable conditions, as chief quartermaster, from the navy yard, Washington, D. C., to accept appointment as lieutenant. No active duty.

OFFICER SERVICE

June 2, 1941: Executed acceptance and oath of office as lieutenant, D-V(S), United States Naval Reserve.

September 3, 1941: Reported for temporary active duty at the Naval Training Station, San Diego, Calif.

September 10, 1941: Detached.

September 11-17, 1941: Temporary active duty on the U. S. S. *Saratoga*, en route to Hawaiian area.

September 18-October 4, 1941: Active duty with Pacific Fleet in Hawaiian area.

Released from active duty in October 1941.

December 1, 1941: Recalled to temporary active duty; assigned and reported to U. S. S. *Plunkett*, December 16, 1941.

January 23, 1942: Detached.

January 24, 1942: Released from active duty.

RANDALL JACOBS,
The Chief of Naval Personnel.
R. MCAFEE.

By direction.

APRIL 13, 1943.

From Commander R. E. Webb.

To the Chief of Naval Personnel.

Subject: Report on active duty performed by Lt. J. E. VAN ZANDT, U. S. N. R.

1. During the months of December 1941, and January 1942, Lt. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, U. S. N. R. (Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress), was on active duty in the United States Navy under my command.

2. He reported for active duty on board the U. S. S. *Plunkett*, and was assigned duties appropriate and commensurate with his rank.

3. He quickly made himself part of the organization and obtained a thorough grasp of the general situation, at the same time showing exceeding energy in becoming familiar with equipment and methods which had been developed since his last tour of active duty. No special consideration or privileges were accorded him because of his official position as a Member of Congress and he accepted the duties of his rank in a splendid spirit and carried them out in an excellent and seamanlike manner.

4. The U. S. S. *Plunkett* was engaged in escort of convoy duty in the North Atlantic. During this period enemy submarine contacts were experienced both during day and night and exceedingly heavy weather prevailed most of the time.

5. During this tour of duty Lieutenant VAN ZANDT performed his duties under very adverse conditions with an understanding which is considered outstanding.

6. He should have a higher rank than that of lieutenant, and should his services be of more benefit to the Nation as a naval officer than in Congress he is recommended for promotion. I consider him to be fully qualified for the rank of commander, and strongly recommend him for this rank.

7. It is requested that this report be made a part of Lieutenant VAN ZANDT'S record.

8. In view of existing orders concerning reports on operations this report is classified as confidential.

R. E. WEBB,
Commandant, U. S. N., C. T. U. 4.1.4.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include some excerpts in the RECORD about our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member who wishes to speak concerning the departure of our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] be allowed to extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have known our fine and distinguished colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, for many years. Our association began very soon after World War No. 1, in which we had both participated. He was at the time of our first acquaintance engaged very actively in veterans' affairs, and at that time I was likewise engaged in my home State of Indiana. By reason of this kindred service then, and throughout the years, our friendship ripened and it has become mature. I have been associated with him in veterans' affairs when we were working in the ranks, and I have been associated with him in this same service when he was serving as national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. He has truly been the friend of the veterans of all wars. He is a loyal and patriotic citizen.

It is with deep regret that we see him leave this Chamber to join the colors. We will miss him here; he will be greatly missed in the committees of the House upon which he served; he will be missed in all matters of veterans' legislation; and, may I say, I will miss my colleague and my warm friend of many years.

When the smoke of battle clears away and victory is ours, our colleague who leaves us today will return again to take up the work which he now leaves. It is our prayer that he may have good luck, that his journey may be a safe one, and that he may return to us both sound and strong.

My colleague, we will be awaiting you. May the days be short and the path be smooth. Our best wishes follow you.

DAVID MURDOCK

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, at this moment I wish to pay tribute to the memory of First Lt. David Murdock, the son of our colleague from Arizona, JOHN R. MURDOCK. He was recently killed in action in the battle for Sicily. The day he was killed was his second anniversary in the armed forces. He was 29 years old.

This young man was outstanding; he had not only distinguished himself in the armed forces but he had distinguished himself in civilian life before the war began. He was a musician with an enviable reputation. Some of his compositions have already attracted national attention. Those who knew him will greatly feel his loss. Our most sincere and deepest sympathies go to the father and mother.

I think it becomes our duty to see that this sacrifice and similar sacrifices shall not have been made in vain.

THE SIX SONS OF MR. AND MRS. J. A. TEINERT

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, down at Copperas Cove, in Coryell County, Tex., there live a couple of the Nation's outstanding heroes—Mr. and Mrs. J. A. Teinert, who have six boys in the armed forces of the United States. Of course, I realize that the parents with only one son are contributing their all just as thoroughly as those who have six sons in the Army, but those of us who are only risking our dollars in this war are never going to be able to match this contribution. Nevertheless, when I looked at the picture of these six brothers in the Coryell County News this morning I sent my check home for some more War bonds.

Mr. Speaker, the great Southwest has been doing its part to win this war. Cranfills Gap, a small town in Bosque County, Tex., was, I believe, the first community in the United States to oversubscribe its quota in the Third War Loan drive. I am proud of the people of Cranfills Gap. I am even more proud of the Teinert family and the thousands of others in central Texas and the other Americans throughout this Nation who are sending their sons to fight for America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a brief address delivered by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

(Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement recently adopted by the members of the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HEARING BY COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice to all Members that on next Tuesday the Committee on Rivers and Harbors will hold a hearing on the resolution (H. J. Res. 148) introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], providing for the diversion of additional water from Lake Michigan through the Sanitary Canal at Chicago. In view of the fact that this is a matter that has generally been very controversial, I desire to give this public notice of the forthcoming hearing.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the text of an address I delivered in collaboration with the Office of War Information in a broadcast to Italy shortly before the surrender of that country.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article entitled "The O. W. I. Boys" which appeared in the Morning World of September 21, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein excerpts from newspapers on the life of Judge Julian Mack who during 1917 helped write an insurance act and other legislation in the interest of our boys, and also on the life of Professor Hrdlicka who passed away only a few days ago.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, having believed in and supported the Ruml plan, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial appearing in the Record Herald of Greensboro, Pa., entitled "Simplification in Reverse."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE WEATHER BUREAU

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the Weather Bureau seems not to be immune from that disease which pervades Government agencies during wartime—namely bureaucratic bungling and aggrandizement of power. I am mortified to find that this Bureau, of all bureaus, should be so afflicted.

On the east coast, weather information is published currently and obtainable by dialing one's telephone. On the west coast it is very hush-hush and nobody must know anything, yet every meteorologist knows that weather moves generally from west to east. West coast weather comes from off the Pacific, and a Jap sub or two a few hundred miles offshore can know more about tomorrow's weather on shore than we who live there. Nazi subs in the Atlantic need only the currently published east coast United States weather reports to apprise them of the weather to come.

The Weather Bureau's cunning camouflage is back end to. They cannot be that dumb. What is their peculiar purpose?

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today after the conclusion of other special orders that have been entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

CLEVELAND EXCEEDS WAR BOND QUOTA

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to bring to the attention of the Members of the House that the great cosmopolitan city of Cleveland, whose population consists of Americans of all races, creeds, and descendants of all nationalities, has again demonstrated its patriotism and true Americanism by being the first city of a million population to reach and to exceed its quota in the $15,000,000,000 Third War Loan drive. The people of Cleveland purchased more than $242,000,000 in bonds, exceeding their quota, which was $233,000,000. They have shown, not only by production in the factories, but by their generous purchases of War bonds, that they are solidly backing up their valiant fighting men.

DISCRIMINATION BY WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, the employees of a concern which is working on 17 orders for the Navy and the Maritime Commission have been told by the War Manpower Commission that they are not engaged in an essential industry. This morning I took the matter up with the Commission here in Washington and asked them whether or not low gunners' stools for use in combat planes was an essential item and was told that it was not.

The Navy thinks it is. What does W. M. C. know about it?

The thing that bothers me is the inability to learn whether the Navy, which wants those stools for gunners, knows more about it than the Manpower Commission. In a town within 100 miles of the same place another concern making similar items has been declared to be an essential industry.

What justification can there be for that sort of discrimination? None at all.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT AS AMENDED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL].

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3291) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill briefly?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, the main purpose of the bill is to increase the authorization for the insurance of loans by the Federal Housing Administration, under title VI, upon residential construction to be used by workers in the various areas.

The need for housing for war workers must be supplied in one of two ways—either by direct appropriation for temporary construction under the Lanham Act, which calls for direct appropriations out of the Treasury and which contemplates the destruction of such houses after the war, of course, would mean the total loss of funds expended; or by loans by private investors insured under the provisions of this bill. Under the pending bill, title VI, the Federal Housing Administration would insure loans made by private investors in defense areas where they feel justified in treating such construction as permanent.

This and the extension of title I until July 1, 1947, and the extension of operations under title II until July 1, 1947, constitute the provisions of the bill.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the bill before us now relate only to insurance provisions?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Only insurance?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is right. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Banking and Currency, after hearings and thorough consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by (1) striking out "$1,200,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,600,000,000"; and (2) striking out of the third proviso "July 1, 1944" in each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1945."

SEC. 2. Section 203 (a) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out of the third proviso "1944" and inserting in lieu thereof "1947."

SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 2 (a) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out "1944" and inserting in lieu thereof "1947."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, insert:

"SEC. 4. The first sentence of section 2 (f) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out 'three-fourths of.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, it is not pleasant to strike a sour note. Whether this is called a bureau or agency of the Government does not matter. I am not objecting to the extension of title VI, and I am not objecting to the extension of title I, although we are losing money, but how long must we extend the general proposition?

They are asking us to extend title II until 1947, and for what reason? In the committee I made the suggestion that it is now time that private capital be allowed to resume the servicing of mortgages on existing structures. The banks are loaded with money. Must this Government constantly and forever hold an umbrella over these lending agencies? Will not everybody want finally to come under that umbrella?

My good old New England section takes few of these mortgages. In my own congressional district I do not think you can place one. They say that if a mortgage cannot stand on its own feet they do not want it, but they also claim they are taking good care of the mortgages available.

My complaint is in reference to the extension of title II. They now wish it so that after the war they can stabilize the mortgage market. Yes, they see the need to stabilize their own holdings, their own mortgages. I personally own many lots of land in one area and I have recently had to buy a lot of others to stabilize the market lest they be put on the market at a price which would jeopardize my investment. The more we insure the more we need to stabilize values. Finally this will be a never-ending proposition of stabilizing and we may well contemplate the many years of liquidating. These bureaus manage to perpetuate themselves.

We started this at a time when it was probably needed, but we expected it to be temporary. But what bureau, what agency, is temporary? Name one that we can get rid of. They go on for the rest of our lifetime. This may be a sour note but it needs constant repetition. I wish this measure did not extend title II until 1947. I can only say I am very glad I do not belong to that majority party that will finally have to acknowledge the full responsibility.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, asks when the service now rendered under title II of the bill is to be resumed by private business. Let me say to the gentleman, as he well knows, that no loan of any kind is authorized to be made by the Federal Housing Administration under title II or any other provision.

The Federal Housing Administration is only permitted to insure loans. They have operated since June 1934, the time of the passage of the original act, at a profit of over $50,000,000 without loss to the Government. In this particular matter of the insurance of existing construction under title II, under existing conditions such service could not be rendered by private investors without this insurance. No one could get such loans at all. Many who need loans on existing property, would be left helpless. If they were able to obtain such accommodation at all, they would be charged high interest rates, which they could not pay. As a matter of fact, this service would not be afforded.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. Is the profit of which the gentleman spoke a profit over the operating expenses of F. H. A?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes. There is a profit of something like $50,000,000. The fund was originally $10,000,000 supplied by the Treasury of the United States, and they have insured loans in excess of $4,000,000,000. The initial period of their operations has been covered, and that is the main period of risk because a man who has paid for years on a home mortgage is more likely to continue to pay, of course, than he would be the first few years of the existence of a mortgage. Interest rates have been reduced, loans upon long term basis conducive to home ownership have been afforded and without loss.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman says they have operated at a profit. Of how much?

Mr. STEAGALL. They began with a fund of $10,000,000, and they have absorbed their losses and their fund now runs above $60,000,000.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman means they made a profit?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did they get that out of the borrowers?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It was not loan-shark business, though?

Mr. STEAGALL. They reduced interest rates and gave long-term accommodations, which could not be had any other way.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not want the gentleman to give the impression that I do not understand this proposition.

Mr. STEAGALL. I know the gentleman does; but the gentleman asked when this service would be done by private investment. It is being done now by private investment. I know the gentleman did not want to mislead the House. I know the gentleman understands it full well.

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not want the gentleman to say that I am ignorant of it, because this is only the insurance provision. The gentleman does not think that we ought to keep it up so that finally all lending agencies would want to be insured by the Government before they would lend money? Does not the gentleman see the danger of that?

Mr. STEAGALL. We do not propose to continue this. This bill continues this only temporarily. No Member of the House is better informed than the gentleman from Massachusetts and no Member of the House could be further from any purpose to mislead the House than my good friend, for whom I have the highest admiration and regard.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that this increase in authorization, if it is passed, is for the purpose of insuring or guaranteeing mortgages mainly on homes for the war workers?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is what is involved in title VI of this bill, in which we ask for this increased authorization. We are not asking for any increased authorization for any other provision of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, just before the Congress adjourned for the recess just finished, we appropriated $1,000,000 for Federal public housing. At that time I made the statement that I was in favor of more private building. I am in favor of more F. H. A. housing. I am in favor of that program because it enables people with a little initiative to own a home who probably would not be able to do so under other arrangements.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 1, strike out the figures "1947" and insert "1946."

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I do not think anybody objects to that amendment. It is not destructive of the purpose of the bill. The amendment is acceptable.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I thank the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency for accepting this amendment. It is in line with the observations made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD]. I remember when we first embarked on a housing program and passed the Housing Act and, of course, the purpose was to provide employment; it was a combination of private enterprise and Government aid. I think it has done a splendid job.

I believe the Federal Housing Administration is one of the outstanding agencies in the housing field, and in my judgment it has been capably administered by Abner Ferguson and his associates. My interest in this, and the reason for this amendment which reduces the time from 1947 to 1946, is simply this: There is a provision that they will continue to insure existing structures, and that has always been something of a controversy. Many large financing institutions are fairly going around seeking an outlet for their funds, and the rates are tremendously low. I do hope, and I believe we shall reach a period when we will get out of this insurance program, insofar as it relates to existing structures, where no question of employment is involved. I think that was in the mind of the President in 1937, when he made a statement on that particular item, and also Stewart McDonald, former Administrator of the F. H. A., who made another statement, as did John Fahey, of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration. I am only seeking to cut down the time, because we will come to a period when private enterprise must in the main assume this responsibility, and there must be an outlet for this abundance of capital, and so it does seem better to make this 1946, so that if by that time all hostilities are over, and we begin to follow our normal peacetime pursuits and are seeking to give private enterprise every opportunity to carry the load in bringing about full employment in the country, this will be a step in that direction.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of all legislative business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders heretofore granted, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes on Thursday next on the subject of the drafting of fathers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include the draft of an agreement for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONRONEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] for 30 minutes.

THE NATIONAL DEBT—TAXES AND FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, my remarks this afternoon are in the nature of a report to the House on some of the problems existing in my section. I believe a good many of these problems are of sufficient general applicability to be of interest to the House, and that is the reason I have asked for this time. I shall, in the course of my remarks, try to touch briefly on the problems that I found confronting our people in southern California on the subjects of the national debt, on taxes, and finally on the question of food production, to which I shall devote most of my time.

There is a deep and universal concern among the people about the Nation's debt.

There is not the slightest hesitation on the part of the people about recognizing the necessity of spending such money as we have to spend to win the war, but they are beginning to see what the implications of $300,000,000,000 national debt really are.

I found, much to my own personal encouragement, a wide interest in and acceptance of the presentations and proposals contained in my book, Out of Debt, Out of Danger. There is, I am convinced, a growing feeling among the people that the creation of these billions of dollars of new money by the banking system for the purpose of purchasing interest-bearing Government bonds ought to be stopped. The people are beginning to realize what this process really is and to see its fundamental injustice. They are beginning to understand that a continuance of this practice will mean the fastening upon future generations of an interest burden of from seventy-five to one hundred billion dollars of debt when that interest burden is utterly unnecessary.

How, then, is it to be avoided? The best way, the constructive way, and the way that will really strike at the very heart of any inflation danger that may exist is for us to resolve to pay for the war currently out of two sources of income—first, taxes; and, second, genuine borrowing of money already in existence from the people as individuals, from nonfinance corporations, or from banks if the banks give up money which they already possess when they purchase the bonds and do not create new money, in the form of demand deposits, for this purpose. There is, however, another way in which this huge interest burden could be avoided. It has been presented to the House repeatedly by such Members as the gentleman from Texas, Congressman PATMAN, and myself. It is to use noninterest-bearing debt to the extent that taxes and savings of the people fail to meet the cost of the war. This in turn can be accomplished either by having the Congress itself draw directly on the credit of the Nation for such additional money as may be required to finance the war, or else by requiring the Federal Reserve banks to purchase non-interest-bearing certificates from the Treasury in precisely the same manner as they make purchases now of interest-bearing bonds.

I find that there is a widespread misunderstanding of the cause of inflation. The cause of inflation, as every student of the subject knows, lies in the existence of a larger volume of total active buying power than there are consumer goods to be bought with that buying power. This means either that this excess buying power will be used to help finance the war, or that it will exert a continuous pressure upon prices. Increases in wages or increases in farm prices are a result, not a cause, of the inflationary condition.

The question is whether we are going to attack inflation fundamentally at its source or whether we will continue to be possessed of what seems to me to be an unreasoning fear of, for example, a 1-cent-a-quart increase in the cost of milk or small increases in wages in cases where there exists an obvious disparity between income in one industry and another.

TAXES

I found a very widespread complaint with regard to the extreme complexity of present tax laws and the number of forms and reports necessary for the taxpayer to make up. I am convinced there would be wide support for simplified taxes even though they might be somewhat heavier than at present. To this end I would like to suggest what would seem to me to be a constructive program for the consideration of the House when it tackles the tax problem as it must do almost immediately.

First. Repeal the Victory tax, since it constitutes an utterly unnecessary complication of the present tax structure in view of the passage of the 20-percent withholding tax. Income-tax exemptions are low enough to tax every bit of income above one calculated to provide the minimum necessities of life. The Victory tax introduces different exemptions, a different basis of tax, and it itself furthermore is complicated by the provisions for securing credits for Government bond purchases and insurance payments which do not amount to much in the first place and which unnecessarily add to the confusion in the second place.

Therefore, it would be my suggestion that the Victory tax be repealed, and that we depend solely upon the withholding tax for obtaining revenue in the lower tax brackets. I have always believed Victory tax exemptions of only $624 were too low anyway, particularly where a taxpayer has large numbers of dependent children.

I think it is true that under present conditions some of the brackets of the income tax could be increased, and probably should be. I do not happen to believe that that is true of the lowest brackets.

Third. In many respects the most logical tax that could be imposed under present circumstances is a tax on luxury spending. The need for this now is precisely the opposite from a tax standpoint from our need in a peacetime econ-

omy where we are trying to expand the consumer demand for the goods that we can produce in such abundance. People who engage in luxury consumption during a war should pay well for the privilege, and such a tax would be a means of keeping consumer purchases in line with the available supply of goods. I am not talking about a general sales tax which would inevitably fall with equal weight upon purchases of a minimum amount of food by a poor family with many children and the purchase of evident luxury items by childless and wealthy couples—I am talking about a heavy sales tax or excise tax on purchases of items which are not necessities of life.

I am talking about the purchase of evident luxury items. This is the sort of consumption which does not help the Nation in this war period, the sort of consumption which, in view of the artificial shortage of many kinds of consumer goods, we should discourage. Such a tax is directly aimed, therefore, at any inflationary condition which may be present.

Fourth. There has been much talk about a compulsory savings program. I have believed for a long time we should have such a program, partly because I do not like to see the ownership of the national debt concentrated in the hands of a very few people and financial corporations as is now happening, and partly because it does no good to induce people to buy bonds if they are to be cashed in within 60 or 90 days in anything like the amounts that are now the case. Money lent to the Government ought to stay lent until after the war and the bonds should so provide. The compulsory savings program should work as follows: First set a basic exemption of sufficient amount to cover a good standard of living; then proper exemption should be provided for the purchase of War bonds and insurance payments and payments of debt and the discharge of any contractual obligations of the taxpayer. Having provided these exemptions it would be altogether practical to say that a very high percentage indeed of all income over and above that must be invested by the taxpayer in Government bonds which could not be cashed in until they matured at some period after the close of the war.

Fifth. I found a very widespread criticism of the action of the Congress in passing the compromise 75 percent abatement tax bill. There is a great deal of misunderstanding about how this bill will work out and in my judgment a good deal of the criticism is unjustified. It is true, however, that many taxpayers will receive a very considerable benefit from the passage of this bill at the time of death. Rather I should say their heirs will receive a considerable benefit. In the light of the fact, therefore, that inheritance and estate taxes have not been increased since this war began, one of the most obvious things that the Congress should do is to increase such taxes at the present time. This would be an exact and effective answer to those who charge that Congress has given an undue advantage to the big taxpayers of the country by passing the 75-percent abatement program.

Sixth. With such a tax program in effect we could in my judgment absolutely forbid the further sale of Government bonds to anybody whatsoever except for cash or preexisting money. This would put a stop to the real cause of inflation which at present is the creation of billions of dollars of new money by the banking system.

Finally, and again in the interest of simplification of the tax structure it seems to me that there is no real need of the quarterly declaration of estimated tax. The present law provides that farmers shall make one return on December 15 each year and pay their taxes on that date. I can see no reason why all taxpayers of taxes over and above what is withheld at the source should not be put on this same basis. This furthermore would get rid of the penalty provision for underestimating one's tax liability which does not seem to me to make any particular sense as long as a man pays his taxes at the close of a year.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to go back to title 1 of the gentleman's statement.

It almost makes me sad that the gentleman should preface his remarks by that constant suggestion that we should print money. He would have such a powerful influence upon public opinion if it were not for that. And I am asking the gentleman this question. Have you as yet, after these many years, gotten any backers, by any teachers or economists in the country? You say the people are beginning to come your way, to think your way on that subject. I do not know who these people are.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I did not speak about "printing money," as he puts it. I said that I thought we should cease paying interest on the Nation's own credit, which we are doing now, whenever borrowing newly created check-book money from the banking system.

Mr. GIFFORD. I understand that, but can we not dispose of that point. My question is, Have you gotten any backing from any responsible economists? You refer to the people. Who are those people?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The great rank and file of people first and most important. A great many very excellent students of these subjects, too. I will refer the gentleman to some of the reviews that have been printed of my book. Very few of them have been critical of it. And there are, of course, a good many earnest students and able economists who are in basic agreement.

Mr. GIFFORD. I would like to have their names, as I should like to take this question up with them.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will submit some of them. Former Senator Owen is one. He was one of the authors of the Federal Reserve Act. Prof. Irving Fisher is one.

Mr. GIFFORD. He has had so many theories presented before the Congress that I do not know that I have absolute confidence in him, but I would like to know some of them.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will tell the gentleman this——

Mr. GIFFORD. I am not criticizing the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I cannot give the gentleman the names of some of the people, because it is confidential, but I will say to the gentleman that I talked to highly responsible people and to some very successful bankers who have told me that fundamentally they believed that my position about this matter was correct.

Mr. GIFFORD. I would like the names of those bankers.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I cannot give their names to the gentleman; it would not be proper.

Mr. GIFFORD. May I say that if the gentleman from California would only drop that, because he is so powerful in other ways, he would be such a force.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. At the present time billions of dollars of new money are being created by the banking system against which interest must be paid by the people of this country through the years and yet at the present time, during this war, with the supplies of consumers' goods being reduced, no one ought to be creating any money, no bank or the Government or anybody else, because we do not need an additional supply of money. And if any money is to be created at any time it ought to be done by a governmental agency and the advantages from it should accrue to the people as a whole. For the power to create money, as I have said a good many times in the House, is precisely equivalent to the power to levy taxes.

Mr. GIFFORD. I would like to get into a long debate with the gentleman on that question sometime, but I would like now simply to say that the gentleman would have such powerful influence, he should be such a leader, if he would drop that idea.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would welcome such a debate. The gentleman knows I have not only sincere respect but a warm affection for him. But could not the gentleman also concede that I just might be right and that might be one of the reasons why I am able to say that I believe my position is gaining in strength? I know the distinguished gentleman does not share with me my particular view.

Mr. GIFFORD. No.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But I cannot see how anyone can say that it is any more inflationary to have the Government secure credit on the books of the Federal Reserve through the sale of non-interest-bearing obligations than it is for the Government debt to be constantly increased through the sale of interest-bearing bonds to banking credit systems. As far as the inflationary

problem is concerned, it is six of one and half a dozen of the other.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman tell us who does benefit by the reduction of the interest-bearing obligations against the national debt?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Gladly. It would be a benefit to all the taxpayers and all the people.

When you realize that the interest-bearing obligations of the United States at the end of this war will be upward of $300,000,000,000, there will be required $7,000,000,000 a year to meet that obligation, even at 2½ percent interest. If we should cut one-third off that interest-bearing debt burden, it would mean the saving of billions of dollars over a very long period of time, as the gentleman of course can see.

Mr. ROWE. Did not the gentleman just say a few minutes ago that in the end it would find its way in the hands of a few who escape taxes?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But the burden of paying that interest does fall upon every single American citizen. I referred to the ownership of the bonds; the bonds become concentrated as to ownership, and by this process. Thousands of bonds are sold, of course, and to a very large percentage of the population. But after they are bought, a short time afterward, a good many people find it desirable for some reason to cash in some of their bonds, and in a short time you will find that a great many of these bonds have been concentrated in the hands of a very few owners.

My original statement was in reference to the debt burden, not the ownership of the bonds. The benefit about which the gentleman inquires would accrue to the people of the Nation; it would accrue in the form of a reduction of taxes necessary to carry the burden incident to paying the interest on this $300,000,000,000 of national debt at the close of the war, when we will be paying $7,000,000,000 a year in interest.

I believe we can carry it, from an economic standpoint; I think it is possible to do it, but I think it is a terrific burden on the country. I think a substantial part of it is unnecessary; that part where the Government borrows money newly created from the very banks that create it. I want to save that part of it that is unnecessary.

Mr. ROWE. I think, if I may make this observation, the gentleman is attempting to defend himself when I am trying to agree with him.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am much obliged. I had an opportunity to make a couple of points there and if I spoke with some vigor I am sorry; I did not intend to. But I feel rather deeply on this subject. I am grateful to the gentleman for his inquiry.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to talk about food, but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not want to divert the gentleman's mind away from his subject but I have been giving consideration to this indebtedness perhaps in this respect: When the war is over we will say that the rank and file of the public hold $50,000,000,000 worth of Government securities and most of them will want to cash those bonds in. I have been trying to figure out who is going to buy the bonds to refinance payment of these securities held by the rank and file.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman's question, I think, more or less answers itself at the present time. If we do not find enough purchasers for the bonds what has been done is to sell them to the commercial banks. Commercial banks buy them without cost to themselves; they buy them with new credits on which they receive the interest. The only charge against it really from the standpoint of the bank is the cost of servicing the account. I do not think there is any doubt that you can go on selling more bonds to the banks if you want to, but I think it means that the banks will become more and more manufacturies of money for the Government, a job the Government ought to do, and less and less institutions for the acceptance of the people's deposits and the making of loans to business and industry, which is a proper job for the banks to do, and not primarily a job for the Government to do.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Has not that largely taken place in agricultural credits where the Government is handling the major portion of it?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think there has been particular reason to a great extent for cooperative credit in agriculture because I can remember the time when a good many of the gentleman's farmers and mine were paying 10, 12, and 16 percent interest.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Once more, then I must go on because I want to speak about some other things.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Might not a partial solution of the problem that arises from the threat of inflation come from just a stopping of waste in Government expenditures?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am glad the gentleman asked me that question. We must do the very best we can in that direction. But the Budget for the current year calls for the following amounts: Some $4,100,000,000 for so-called normal expenditures of Government, a considerable portion of which, however, is absolutely necessary to the war; $97,000,000 is for expenditure by the Army and the Navy; $3,000,000,000 is to take care of interest on the public debt, even at present. We cut the Interior Department last year some 40 percent, I believe, over the year previous. We have cut appropriations for a great many Government agencies. While I was at home I found that one result of the cut that was made in the O. P. A. appropriation was that the local ration boards did not have the help they needed to do a decent job. We have saved some money, we have abolished some agencies. I am not against that necessarily. I think the point is well taken; I think we ought to save every dollar we can save. But to deceive the American people by making them think that if we save $25,000 by cutting out the work on Japanese beetles, for example, or even a couple of millions by cutting severely the work of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics—if we lead them to think that by doing that we can save them any considerable amount of the burden of public debt which is being caused 98 percent by the war, it just is not right.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Do you want to say to the American people that there is no possibility of further savings in Government expenditures?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I should say not.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would not think so.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think I would be very foolish to say that; do not you?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right; I think the gentleman would be, too.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. There is always the possibility of further saving in Government expenditures just as there is always the possibility of further saving in every avenue of the life of the Nation. There is the possibility of tremendous saving right now incidentally if we would do something about cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts, in my judgment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak about food production. While I was at home, I found that due to certain causes the production of vegetables in my home county of Los Angeles, which had amounted to 54,288 crop-acres for this year, that of this amount some 1,500 acres either had not been harvested at all or the produce from them had been dumped at the markets. This happened largely with regard to four principal vegetables—cabbage, carrots, squash, and snap beans. The most serious situation existed with regard to cabbage and the second most serious with regard to carrots, in the case of both of which the Government had requested increased production. Why do these things happen? One reason assigned by some of the farm groups with whom I talked was that the consumer prices were actually too high so that the market for these vegetables was seriously curtailed—people buying other things instead. I believe that is true. I found in many instances a spread between what the farmer received and what the consumer paid that was unconscionable. In the case of cabbage I found the farmer getting less than a cent a pound while the consumer was paying 8 cents or more.

Undoubtedly, however, another cause of this wastage of food lies in the attempted national pricing of these vegetable products without any allowance for transportation costs which prevented the customary export of such vegetables to other parts of the country where they were needed, as a matter of fact. This

was particularly true in the case of cabbage, where a 3⅓-cents-a-pound price for the whole country was fixed regardless of shipping cost, so that while cabbage was needed in many parts of the country, it was being wasted in our section. Meanwhile, as I said, the consumers were paying 8 cents a pound for cabbage that was bringing the farmers in many instances less than a cent a pound.

I believe one of the fundamental causes of this difficulty was the absence of any floor prices to prevent the price received by the farmers for crops requested to be grown in large quantities by the War Food Administration from going even below the cost of harvesting, let alone the total production costs.

In a recent broadcast, Judge Marvin Jones, head of the War Food Administration, stated that, in his opinion, there should be such floor prices provided by the Government on farm crops where ceilings are imposed and where the Government asks for increased production. I heartily agree with this. Nor do I think such floor prices ought in any case be lower than the ceiling price of the commodity. Such floor prices should be announced before the planting season, of course. And if necessary to prevent the waste of any food, there should be direct Government purchases at the floor price.

There is another standpoint from which this is important, because in the past season it has unfortunately been true that many of the farmers who have grown the crops that were requested and were needed from the standpoint of the war needs had a much harder time, and in some cases actually lost money on those crops, whereas the farmers who did not cooperate and who grew nonessential crops made a very considerable amount of money.

May I suggest at this point, in view of the interest that the Congress has shown in trying to get people of experience into Government agencies, notably the O. P. A., that I would like to see us have some people with experience in agricultural production, in farming, brought in also. It is my opinion that the experience that most of the people have had who work in the field of food in the Government agencies is much more likely to be experience in the handling, distribution, and brokerage of food and food products than in their actual production. I think there is needed the influence of some farmers.

LIVESTOCK AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTS

Throughout the whole field of livestock and livestock products, including in our section principally milk, eggs, poultry meat, and rabbit meat, producers have been caught in a squeeze between the ceiling prices fixed for their products on the one hand and increased feed costs on the other. This is aside from the actual feed shortage against which every agency has to work with all the vigor at its command.

Increased costs of production, however, are largely responsible for the present crisis in the dairy industry. In Los Angeles County costs of production have increased 10⅒ cents per pound of butterfat to the dairyman since last April. The demand of dairymen in that area for a higher price is the direct result of this incontrovertible fact and something has to be done about it. The same case can be made with regard to other livestock producers.

I am extremely hopeful that in the very near future O. P. A. will permit an increased ceiling of 3 or 4 cents a pound on rabbit meat in view of the sharp increase in feed costs which rabbit producers have had continually to face. In view of the feed shortage it is, of course, obvious that it would be unwise policy to fix ceilings on feed at a figure which would discourage maximum production, but there has obviously got to be some relation between the price of the final product and the cost of production in all these matters. This increase in the price received by rabbit producers can be granted without increasing the price to consumers because dealers' margins have been fixed at a higher figure than is at all necessary.

While I am on the subject of our California rabbit industry, I want to vigorously protest against a proposed order of O. P. A. which would have forbidden farmers from selling this meat directly to neighborhood consumer purchasers. This is something they have done through all the years this industry has been in existence. The basic act creating the Office of Price Administration forbids the use of its powers to compel changes in business practices or means or aids to distribution established in any industry. That is in the law. This order if issued by the O. P. A. would therefore be contrary to law and an utterly unwarranted concession to the middlemen in the industry who for years have exercised an economic power over the producers which was extremely harmful. Indeed such an order by O. P. A. would have given them a complete monopoly of the situation through the action of a Government agency.

The purpose of the O. P. A. is to keep down prices to consumers, not to interfere with methods of distribution of farm commodities which are effective in cutting down the margin between the producers' receipts and what the consumer has to pay.

I am very glad to report to the House that a letter just received from Mr. Bowles assures me no such order as this will be issued. It was, however, proposed and what I have had to say regarding it is in the nature of a warning against any such unwarranted extension of O. P. A. powers.

Mr. COFFEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE. I just want to commend the gentleman for his very well-considered speech on the subject of vital problems confronting the American people today. I found in my district the same reaction as evidently he encountered, and I hope time will be accorded him to elaborate on the subject of dairy production, because I know many Members are vitally concerned with that problem.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am very much obliged to my good friend and very able colleague from Washington. I may say that the California delegation is making a study of that very question right now, and I am one of the members of the subcommittee preparing the report, which is the reason I did not go into more detail about the matter at this time than I did.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MASON. May I observe that if the gentleman's recommendation that production-experienced men be taken on in O. P. A. were followed, it would, I believe, tend to cure the trouble of establishing these prices up here and neglecting the production of the substances themselves.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think that is correct, and I thank the gentleman. I have a great deal of sympathy for the O. P. A. I think they have the hardest job of any Government agency. But I believe we need that producer influence very badly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. One thing which should be basic to all the relationship of Government agencies to the farmers is frankness and directness. For example our California poultry industry is now asking one simple question—a question that should receive a simple and prompt answer. The poultrymen have written and asked: What does the Government want us to do in the coming year, what production—whether of eggs or meat?

It is no wonder they have done so. For a year or more ago they were being urged to increase the production of meat poultry in order to help make up for the shortage of other meats. They did so, bought baby chicks, prepared to raise them for fryers and broilers. Then, all of a sudden, the ceiling price was dropped from 33 cents to below 30 cents, even on the west coast where costs are substantially higher than elsewhere. At the present ceiling only the most efficient producers can stay in the meat-poultry business. Dealers who had poultry meat on hand were allowed 120 days in which to dispose of it at the old ceiling prices. But the producer was not allowed any such time at all to liquidate at the old ceiling price the stock he was raising.

All this puzzled us very much.

But, finally, it began to leak out that the real reason for these low-ceiling prices was the feed shortage. It was an indirect way of getting people out of the meat-poultry business.

Now, that is the wrong way to do things. What should have been done was to make a frank announcement that

there just was not enough feed, that after a certain date there should be no further expansion of meat-poultry production. Then having given enough time for farmers to work out their investment in their birds a lower ceiling might have been put on—with adequate notice of such action having been given.

So, it is understandable why California poultrymen should ask this very simple question.

Government agencies should not try to accomplish things by indirect methods. They should come right out and say what the objectives and the needs are.

MIDDLEMEN'S MARGINS UNDER O. P. A.

By this time it is possible that I will have given the impression that I have no concern about keeping down prices to consumers, and am only interested in producers' income. This is not the case at all. My concern is for maximum production and also for an effective control of the cost of living. It is, however, my sincere conviction that a reexamination of the margins allowed to middlemen all down the line and a vigorous enforcement to make sure that such middlemen do not overcharge retailers would be the most effective thing that could be done toward reducing living costs. I am even convinced that in the case of many food products, living costs to consumers could be actually reduced and at the same time returns to producers could be increased if these middlemen's margins were reexamined and properly adjusted.

For example, I have already spoken of the case of cabbage where during last summer consumers were paying as high as 8 and 9 cents per pound while farmers were receiving less than 1 cent. I now come, however, to certain observations with regard to poultry. In the past the ordinary margin between the price paid to the poultryman and the price charged to the retailer on eggs was 4 to 5 cents per dozen. This margin included picking up the eggs, candling them, grading them, and taking them to market. At certain times of the year, notably in the fall, this margin ordinarily went down as low as 2 or 2½ cents. At present, however, a fixed margin is allowed by O. P. A. which includes not only the 4- or 5-cent margin but also 10 cents per case charge to the poultryman for handling and a transportation factor in addition. This means then that the margins between producer and consumer as the result of O. P. A. action are greater than they have been in normal times. Certainly that is far from desirable.

It is also true and this is one illustration of the need for some decentralization of this authority, a subject which I shall discuss further in a minute, that the poultry industry in California has for years sold its products on the basis of grades established by California law. Attempted substitution of much more complicated Federal grades has complicated the situation and furthermore has enabled middlemen to get higher prices for a couple of grades of eggs above the regular California grades, which higher prices were not reflected at all in what was paid to poultrymen.

Poultrymen are not complaining about the price schedule for eggs contained in table A of Maximum Price Regulation 333. They do feel, however, that the imposition of the increased margin to the middlemen is unjustified and they point out that whereas O. P. A. regulations are guaranteeing middlemen a wider margin than they ever had before in the fall of the year when eggs are scarce and when generally a sellers' market would pertain so that the margin would normally be reduced, nevertheless there is nothing in the regulations to guarantee that in the spring of the year when eggs are plentiful middlemen purchasers of eggs will not force down the price paid to poultrymen at the ranch and take for themselves the extra margin. In other words, they contend that if the margin is to be increased in the fall over what it normally would be, it ought to be prevented from becoming wider in the spring.

Finally, on the subject of poultry, one of the main things that is needed is an order on egg prices which can be understood by both poultrymen and consumers. The present orders are said to be so complicated that consumers do not know what they ought to be paying for eggs, nor do poultrymen know for sure what they are entitled to receive for their products at their ranches. Above all, it is important in the case of poultry, as in the case of milk, that producers should be assured that either their costs of production are going to be prevented from continually increasing or else that the prices they will receive will adequately reflect such changes in production costs.

Returning, however, to the question of middlemen's margins, I want to give the outstanding illustration with regard to this matter which is found in the case of citrus fruit.

Ordinarily in normal times it has been possible to reduce the number of middlemen handlers of citrus so as to reduce also the margin existing between returns to the grower and the price paid by consumers. Under present Government regulations, however, exorbitant percentage margins are allowed to a first and second handler of this fruit. These margins amount to 9½ percent in the case of first handlers and 21 percent in the case of second handlers who deliver to retailers. Of course, what has happened has been that whereas in the past there were many instances where there was only one such handler buying direct from producers and selling to retailers, there have now sprung up a tremendous crop of both first and second handlers.

Furthermore this method of fixing price on the basis of percentage margin to middlemen makes it utterly impossible for consumers to know what ceiling price they are supposed to pay for oranges, for example, and it is obvious that no method of price control is adequate unless the consumer knows what he ought to be paying. The fact is that on a carload of oranges bringing $3.99 f. o. b. to the grower, carrying a 1½-percent brokerage fee and costing approximately $1.25 for freight and icing, the first handler is allowed a 9½-percent mark-up, not alone on the price received by the grower, but on all these additional costs. And on top of that the second handler received a 21-percent mark-up on whatever price he pays to the first handler, which price of course includes the first handler's mark-up. Consequently, on a carload of 582 boxes it is possible for first and second handlers to receive a margin of $1,099.98. This compares with normal margins for the handling of a carload of citrus of approximately $75 to $100. And while it has, I believe, seldom happened that handlers have taken margins as large as that, they are making as high as $500 per car right along. The consequence of this is to give these handlers so large an amount of surplus profit that they can use it for black-market operations. This constitutes the most serious threat to all of our cooperative-marketing organizations upon which the growers of citrus fruit have relied for their very existence throughout the years. I shall not go into detail as to just how these operations are carried on, except to say that wholesalers are now attempting to buy out whole packing houses in California in order to be able to take advantage of the huge margins allowed.

Obviously, what ought to be done is that a definite understandable consumer ceiling price should be fixed for citrus fruit and middlemen's margins should be reduced sharply either by permitting competitive conditions to fix the amount of these margins without any fixed mark-up being allowed, or else by fixing a definite dollars-and-cents amount of mark-up per box of fruit instead of a percentage mark-up which makes possible these exorbitant profits. It is, in my judgment, unquestionably possible, if this is done, to reduce the price of citrus fruit to the consumer and at the same time to give to the farmer who produces it a better price than he is now receiving. Incidentally, the price of oranges has been kept below parity price all the way through in spite of what Congress wrote into the law upon this point.

To summarize, I have to emphasize once again that farmers recognize and accept the importance of O. P. A. as a means of controlling prices paid by consumers for food products, but that it is an indefensible situation when prices to producers are held at levels which do not always reflect cost of production, and when at the same time prices to consumers are neither understandable in all cases nor controlled to a point where they would allow only a reasonable mark-up over what the producer received.

I could go on and cite other instances of the excessive power over producers and retailers alike which is being exercised by those who control the bottlenecks of distribution. I could cite instances of retail meat dealers being forced to take, and to give points for, such things as animals' feet, bacon rind, and headcheese, if they are to have any meat delivered to them at all.

The significance of my remarks, however, can be briefly summarized. Name-

ly, that if we are to do justice to both consumers and producers there must be a readjustment of the margins allowed to middlemen, who, at certain points, control our entire food supply.

Farmers can be hurt as much by too high prices to consumers which cut down their total market, as by too low prices at the farm.

DECENTRALIZATION

In consideration of this whole problem of national food production, there is one other factor of paramount importance, and that is the necessity for a decentralization of authority out of Washington into the various regions and districts of the country. I am encouraged to find that the O. P. A. is already taking some steps in that direction.

During the time that I was at home I telegraphed and wrote to the War Food Administrator and the O. P. A. expressing my most earnest conviction that such decentralization must take place. I received a most constructive response to these appeals. But the decentralization must go to a point which is consistent with the language of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 where it says, and I quote:

That modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes, or where by reason of increased labor or other costs to the producers of such agricultural commodity incurred since January 1, 1941, the maximum prices so established will not reflect such increased costs.

In my judgment district directors of War Food Administration, O. P. A., and other Government agencies have to be given both the power and the responsibility to meet local conditions in such fashion as to avoid any waste of food products, to encourage maximum production, and to prevent profiteering at any point.

Over and over again I have found that local Government officials have seen clearly the problems existing in our section of the country and have been altogether ready to take action to correct those conditions, and that could have been done had it not been necessary for them to refer every decision back to the Washington office.

Another instance of the need for decentralization is found in the marketing of eggs. In January of this year the antitrust division of the Department of Justice secured a consent decree against the Produce Exchange of Los Angeles which required that all eggs in that market be bought and sold only on the basis of the grades established by California law. And the original price ceiling order on eggs provided for the use of grading systems which were in effect in the various parts of the country. In California the whole industry is accustomed to doing business on the basis of the State grades, and price ceilings related to them could be readily and easily enforced.

But Congress and O. P. A. have said no. Congress passed a sweeping prohibition against any grading of farm products—a measure which, if carried out, would rob poultrymen of every vestige of security they have ever had. Previously O. P. A. had come along with an order requiring that all over the country only Federal grades should be used.

This attempt to literally put all the Nation's eggs into one basket could not be effectively or fairly enforced, and confusion resulted. Meanwhile O. P. A. began to be concerned about the action of Congress and wondered whether any grades could be used at all. The consequence of all this was very great confusion.

But the solution is very simple. The O. P. A. in California should be able to simply issue an order directing the use of the State grading system in that State—just as has been done through the years.

PROTECTION OF LIVING STANDARDS

It is altogether true as the President and others have emphasized repeatedly that while America fights this war, costs of living must not be permitted to take from American families what they need for health and basic welfare. A means of assuring this has been offered to the Congress in a bill which I myself introduced along with other members of the House and Senate. It provides a national food-allotment program for all families whose incomes relative to the number of members of the family are inadequate to enable them to purchase the food needed for an American standard of diet. Rationing should work two ways, in my judgment. First to prevent anyone from getting more than his share of scarce commodities, and second to be sure that everyone does get at least a minimum share. If we establish this floor for our Nation under the food budgets of our people we could then proceed to decide questions having to do with food production on the basis of equity and the securing of maximum production of the vital element in success in war and peace.

And finally so far as the inflation problem is concerned, it must be attacked at its root cause which is the relation between the money supply and the available supply of consumer goods, rather than merely through its effects. And it must always be remembered that the one greatest guarantee against the possibility of inflation is abundant production and a market adequately stocked with the products which consumers wish to buy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I wish the gentleman would tell me how we can help raise this standard of living.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I did not talk about raising the standard of living. I said that rationing ought to work two ways, and the second way was that each American family should be able to have such food and other necessities as they need for health and decency.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is right in that. In my district we have celery, onions, and grapes for food, and we have apples.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. If the gentleman had been here during my remarks, he would have found that I discussed matters in my section, which are on all fours with his problem right there.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; but how are we going to get our stuff out?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I made some suggestions about that, too.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House previously agreed to, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] for 25 minutes.

FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], in his discussion about some of the regulations and the ceiling prices that the Office of Price Administration has placed on various groups in the country. I am going to talk today about the greatest crime ever imposed not only upon the farmers of my district, but upon the American people, and consumers. That is the ceiling price which the O. P. A. placed on corn. Among other things, this has made it impossible for the Midwest farmer to get enough corn into the East to feed the dairy cattle and the poultry flocks of my section. I say that it is the greatest crime that was ever imposed upon the American consumer for this reason, that the consumer, by October, is not going to get enough milk to drink, and he is not going to have enough eggs and other dairy products to keep him alive. Of course, if he expects to depend on all of the ham and pork and sausage and all the other products from the hogs of the Middle West to keep him alive, perhaps he can do it. But he is not going to have the most important products that he can possibly consume; milk and the rest of the dairy products, which he must have for a balanced diet. I say that due to the persistent and determined effort on the part of some of these officials—and I make bold to say they do not know any more about farming than a 3-year-old boy, nor could they be elected dog catcher any place in the United States—due to their determined effort and their regulations placed on the dairy men in my section, and in the whole country, we are going to be without food in another month.

I make that prognostication, and I say that it is the most serious situation the country has ever faced. It could easily have been averted if this House had gone along with the Senate before we took our recess in July and passed the bill which was before the Senate and which passed the Senate making the ceiling price on corn $1.40 a bushel instead of $1.06, which the O. P. A. has stubbornly insisted on maintaining.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like to offer an observation with reference to the corn situation in my own home town. The ceiling price on yellow corn to the farmer was 92 cents a bushel. The elevator can sell it under the ceiling price for $1.09. There is not an elevator that wants to make 17 cents a bushel. Three or four cents is the usual profit. They could normally pay the farmer $1.05 for corn instead of 92 cents, and still not raise the ceiling that the elevator can sell it for. There will be also the situation where the ceiling price in one town will be 20 cents a bushel lower than in a town less than 20 miles away.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Well, I have one suggestion to the gentlemen from the Middle West, who represent these corn areas, and that is for them, if they are able to do it, to get the corn to us as fast as they can get it, or they will not have enough milk to drink, and the armed forces will be out of luck, so far as food is concerned. Yesterday we passed a bill here appropriating $18,000,000 to take care of expectant mothers and infants of soldiers—men in the armed services—and we are not going to be able to supply them milk unless we can get corn from the Middle West. Whether it be the fault of the bureaucrats or the farmers in the Middle West, the situation is grave and it is high time that the country woke up to the fact that the consumer is not going to have enough milk or any other dairy product. I hope this House will take some kind of action in order that the dairymen of the Northeast—the forgotten men in this whole program—will be taken care of. I am getting sick of having farmers from my district come to me and say that the Government had better get busy or they will have to go out of business, and unless those middle western farmers give us some corn we will be out of luck, so far as feeding the dairy cattle and the poultry flocks go.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he said a moment ago that unless some change was made, people were going to be hungry, or at least there would be a lack of a balanced diet. Let me assure the gentleman that the people in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, and also I believe in the district of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] will look out for themselves. We do not intend to be hungry. This summer our people were canning everything they could get their fingers on. They canned cherries, and peaches, and pears, and corn, and beans, and tomatoes, and they are drying corn and other vegetables.

They are digging holes out in the yard and putting cabbage, carrots, beets, and rutabagas in those pits. So we are not going to be hungry; but those poor fellows in the cities who get it out of a tin can and the fellows who work in the factories, the leaders of whom are back of this plan that the President has on hand to force subsidies on us, will be hungry.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will say to the gentleman that the point I am making is that it is high time the Government saw to it that our farmers up there in the Northeast got some relief. They are the very last to be considered, no matter where you go in the country. The dairymen of the Northeast are the very last to be considered, as far as fair treatment down here goes. I do not know what the reason is. Maybe it is because we are all Republicans up there.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I disagree with the gentleman. Does the gentleman know of anyone who is getting any consideration?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Well, I know that at least you people in the Middle West have enough corn to feed your hogs. You are getting a good price for hogs.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We grow it out in the fields. You dig in the dirt and you can get it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. As far as we are concerned, they are going to drive the dairymen of the Northeast section out of business.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They are planting a milk weed out in our country to get this floss to make something for the Navy.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The whole thing is that these people who are regulating prices are not on the job and they do not understand the situation they have to deal with in the different sections of the country.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sure the gentleman does not intend to blame the farmers of the Middle West for the lack of corn up in his territory.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I do not know. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] said they do not need the ceiling price raised. If that is the case I am afraid the responsibility rests with the corn farmer.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I just want to point out to the gentleman, and he can verify it, that in the year 1943, this year, there was a restriction on the amount of corn that the farmers of the Midwest could plant. They were limited to a certain acreage. If they increased that acreage, without planting other war crops specified by the Department, they were denied any benefits under the A. A. A. They were also encouraged to raise more hogs and livestock and dairy products. But still they lived under this scarcity program and did provide feed not only for their own livestock but for the gentleman's farmers in New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I assume the gentleman knows what he is talking about, but every report I have had is that there is plenty of corn out there. We all know that all we are getting to eat now are pork products, as far as meat goes. You cannot get any beef on the legitimate market. You cannot get enough to feed your family if you have a good-sized family. It is going to be increasingly worse. There is just one situation as I see it.

Apparently the Middle West farmers are putting all this corn into pork and raising pigs, and we in the northeastern section of the country are completely out of luck when it comes to getting enough corn to feed our increased production of livestock.

Recently I think it was the head of the dairymen's association made the statement that if they could not get some corn there soon they would have to kill off a great many of the dairy animals that they had raised in their increased production quotas. I will say to the gentleman that such a thing would be disastrous as far as the food for victory program goes. It will not be serious for our section, because our farmers are going to continue to live, like the farmers out in Michigan and in Pennsylvania. They are going to continue to milk their cows and they are going to eat first hand. They are going to drink the milk and get the dairy products from their own farms first, and the consumers in the cities are the ones who will suffer over this whole situation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Certainly the gentleman from New York does not blame the midwestern farmers for all his troubles?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I do not want to blame anybody, but I understood the gentleman from Nebraska to be opposed to raising the price ceiling on corn.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman misunderstood me. I do not want to be misunderstood as saying that a raise in the ceiling price is not necessary. This thing is run by zones, and in some of the zones they have so set the ceiling that there is a 17-cent spread between what the elevator can sell it for and what they can pay the farmer. That is at least 13 cents too high. That is not true in all of the areas, but it is true in some. I doubt very much if the gentleman is correct in his statement that there is plenty of corn.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I think there is plenty, from all the information I have received. The point I am insisting upon is this: Are the dairy farmers of the Northeast going to get enough corn to feed their cattle or are they not?

Mr. CURTIS. No; you are not going to get enough.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. What is the reason they are not getting enough? I have maintained all along that the ceiling price of corn was not high enough. One of the gentlemen rises today and says I am not correct in saying that. In my opinion there is only one conclusion, and that is the middle western farmers cannot get the corn to us at that price. I want to know why it should not be made possible for them to get it to us. We want that corn because we have to feed our dairy cattle and our poultry. We are going to have to feed the cattle if we expect to get enough milk to feed these infants and the armed forces and everybody else that we are in duty bound to feed in this Food-for-Victory program.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Does not the gentleman realize that for a period of about 20 years before Pearl Harbor the farmer's dollar of the country was worth 80 cents, approximately 80 cents, and during that period consequently less—the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] reminds me that it was less than 80 cents. All right, consequently the American people, the consumers of the farmer's goods, were jumping about 20 percent of their board bill to the farmer, were they not?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot yield further; I only have a few minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman asked my why, or asked somebody why, and I am trying to give him the reason why. Now today we are getting around $1.25 to $1.30 a bushel for corn.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. But the corn cannot be had.

Mr. JENSEN. So, for the first time in 25 years, or about 20 years, or perhaps 25 years, the American farmer has got the cost of production. The ceiling price on corn in my district is 92 cents a bushel at the present time.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Then why cannot we get the corn at $1.07?

Mr. JENSEN. If you would pay $1.07 to the farmer——

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. We are willing to pay $1.07 if we can get the corn. We are willing to pay more than that. There are many people in my section of the country who cannot get corn, who need corn and must have it if we are to do our part in meeting the food demands. I say that there is a responsibility resting on the farmers in the Middle West, or the Office of Price Administration to see that we get it.

I, for one, am here representing a dairy-farmer section of up-State New York and I say that we have a situation there bordering on disaster for the entire East. Millions and millions of Americans are dependent upon our efforts to produce this food. We have got to have some corn to feed our cattle and chickens, to produce milk and eggs. I say we have got to have corn.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield? He asked for an explanation and I want to give it to him.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I have had explanations, but they are unsatisfactory.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield, so the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] can make the explanation?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot yield any further; I have got to conclude my statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said he was going to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. RAMEY. The gentleman made the statement that it was because the men who had been regulating these affairs were so inefficient and so unmindful of public affairs that they could not even be elected dog catcher in their communities.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes.

Mr. RAMEY. You put it on those who have been in Congress for a long while, all those who have left the country in this situation before we new Members arrived here.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I would say to the gentleman from Ohio that I am willing to back him to the limit in any move he makes to remedy the situation.

Mr. RAMEY. But you have referred to the Congress that we were allowing the country to be run by bureaucrats. At least the new Members are not responsible. Perhaps not the old ones either. Can Congress now save the situation, and, if so, how?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes; and I will say to the gentleman, that I will back him to the limit in any measure that he wants to bring before the Congress to curtail the power of some of these bureaucrats.

Mr. RAMEY. You say that you have a most criminal situation in regard to the farmers in your section?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. We have.

Mr. RAMEY. May I ask the gentleman if he has ever visited Middle Bass Island, Lake Erie, Ohio? Will he come up and visit our island where we have steamboats inspected by inspectors that could not run a boat as well as the islanders? Yet men who know nothing of the problems of the islands of Lake Erie or the tragic boat problem, have placed unjust fines on the mystic isle? At least your people are not in the center of one of the Great Lakes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot yield any further to the gentleman. But may I say I am in hearty agreement with what you have to say; I agree with the gentleman entirely, but I hope he does not blame me for any of these bureaucratic measures.

Mr. RAMEY. You put it on us before we came here.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am not blaming you, and I hope you will not blame me, and I will say this, that I will back any propcsal that the gentleman will bring out that will curtail the power of these individuals whom I have said, and I repeat, could not be elected dog-catcher in any section of the land. The gentleman from the West has not addressed the Chair; he just started to speak and goes right along without recognition.

I will yield for one more observation on the part of the gentleman from Iowa, then I shall have to proceed.

Mr. JENSEN. A lot of the gentleman's people want roll-backs; they want subsidies, they want the farmer subsidized, they want the Government to give them hand-outs.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. A lot of my people?

Mr. JENSEN. I do not know whether they are in the gentleman's district, but New Yorkers, some folks in the cities, anyway; they want this Government to pay the bread bill that the farmer has been kind of handing out for the last 20 years. I do not want the gentleman to blame the farmers of Iowa or any other State for the fact that he is not getting corn.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I do not want to appear to be blaming anybody when I make the statement that if the Middle West can afford to sell corn at $1.06 I think they ought to make it available to us.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman may be surprised to know that in the Middle West the farmers, feeders, and stockyard people are not able to get corn any more than farmers in the gentleman's district can get it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I do know this, that we cannot get it up in my section. We have a lot of dairy herds in my part of the country. I have been around a great deal this summer and feel that I am fairly qualified to speak for some of the people up in my district who run dairy farms. Out of the 43 granges in my district, I visited 38, and I had the same story from the lips of every good dairy farmer that I talked with, that he was unable to keep on with the Food-for-Victory program, he was unable to meet the obligations that President Roosevelt and the Government had placed upon him and that they expected of him. Every dairyman told me that since his responsibilities, according to them, had increased threefold, he did not know how he was going to shoulder them because he was unable to feed the civilian population under the present difficulty, to say nothing of the number of men in the armed forces and the number of allies that we have dedicated ourselves to feed.

The dairy farmers in the Northeast, as I have said, are the forgotten men of the entire program; they are the last to be considered whenever you bring anything here on the floor of the House, legislation of any kind which is designed to improve their situation. You meet with untold opposition from all sides, from consumer groups and from other sections of the country, whenever you try to help northeastern agriculture. I was accused not long ago of being motivated by the farm bloc in some of the proposals I made before the House—the farm bloc, mind you.

Mr. JENSEN. Who is the farm bloc?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Who is the farm bloc? I cannot say, because I have never been approached by anybody that had anything to do with this mystical farm bloc that our friends in the agencies of expression throughout the country want to discredit as pressure groups among the farmers. Frankly, I do not know who constitutes the farm bloc. It is an insult to us, to the people of my district, to the people in the granges, to the people in the farm organizations—it is an insult to call them members of the farm bloc because they are simply patriotic farmers that are trying to better the conditions of the northeastern farmers who have the great responsibility of trying to produce

dairy products for this new defense program. I will say to you gentlemen today that unless they get some cooperation, unless the Government can do something for them in the way of getting corn to them they are going to be absolutely bereft of all their dairy cattle and their poultry flocks, and they are not going to be able to meet their requirements and their responsibilities.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. I am wondering if the very able gentleman from New York is aware that one of the causes of this shortage of corn that he cannot get and our neighbors out near the Corn Belt itself cannot get is due to the commercial uses of corn.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. All I know is that you cannot buy anything but pork chops and ham bones and sausages in any market wherever you go.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Let us thank God that we are going to have that much.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Maybe we should.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Let us thank God for it. I just wonder if the gentleman realizes that one reason we cannot get the necessary feeds—and we are sympathetic with him, we would like to help him——

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I know the gentleman would.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. The truth is that up until just a few years ago a large part of corn went into alcohol, industrial and beverage. Recently, in the last few years, industrial alcohol has been distilled entirely from imported blackstrap molasses, shipped in here at a price that corn could not compete with. But they found they had to go back to grain, had to reconvert, and now the ships that brought the molasses up the eastern seaboard no longer bring blackstrap and they are taking away from us now the corn that previously they would not buy.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one more point. I desire to serve notice on the O. P. A. and all the rest who are responsible for blocking us in the Northeast, the dairymen and poultry farmers and so forth, from getting the feed necessary to meet our obligations. I am far from being a free-trader. I am probably the last man in the world who would advocate bringing in corn or anything else from foreign countries. But I am going to advocate deliberately, I may say, if we cannot get corn from the Middle West, bringing it in from South America or anywhere else that we can get it. We have got to have it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

ELIMINATION OF PRIVATE SUITS FOR PENALTIES AND DAMAGES ARISING OUT OF FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There was no objection; and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. SUMNERS of Texas, WALTERS, and HANCOCK.

PREVIOUS ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in order to approach the milk problem it should be worth while to get a picture of the milk production of our Nation. The following official table, computed by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture, shows the milk production by States:

Milk production

State	Milk production in each State as percentage of total, 1942	Sales of milk from farms or its equivalent (millions of pounds)	Average returns: Per 100 pounds milk	Average returns: Per pound butterfat	Gross income from dairy products (in thousands)
				Cts.	
Maine	0.53	513	$3.22	77	$20,104
New Hampshire	.29	308	3.18	82	10,855
Vermont	1.23	1,373	2.75	67	39,469
Massachusetts	.69	745	4.03	103	32,292
Rhode Island	.11	126	3.68	96	4,869
Connecticut	.60	656	3.84	98	26,705
New York	6.95	7,634	2.91	76	233,661
New Jersey	.86	965	3.94	104	39,860
Pennsylvania	4.21	4,419	3.13	81	153,247
North Atlantic	15.47	16,748	3.12	80.6	561,062
Ohio	4.22	4,309	2.62	64	128,325
Indiana	2.97	3,036	2.52	58	86,574
Illinois	4.63	4,775	2.33	60	125,248
Michigan	4.44	4,619	2.39	60	122,157
Wisconsin	11.94	13,264	2.10	58	289,376
East North Central	28.20	30,003	2.30	59.3	751,680
Minnesota	7.62	8,252	1.72	46	151,253
Iowa	5.82	6,100	1.66	44	111,647
Missouri	3.20	2,982	2.12	50	78,804
North Dakota	1.95	1,894	1.50	40	33,622
South Dakota	1.57	1,547	1.52	40	27,362
Nebraska	2.49	2,430	1.60	42	45,610
Kansas	2.79	2,744	1.80	46	57,746
West North Central	25.44	25,949	1.72	44.8	506,044
Delaware	.13	133	3.09	79	4,753
Maryland	.83	858	3.45	88	33,377
Virginia	1.36	939	3.02	74	47,486
West Virginia	.70	445	3.02	72	24,330
North Carolina	1.20	597	3.31	75	48,757
South Carolina	.49	237	3.87	88	22,405
Georgia	.94	424	3.41	79	37,770
Florida	.30	280	4.76	111	16,613
South Atlantic	5.95	3,916	3.38	79.9	213,491

Milk production—Continued

State	Milk production in each State as percentage of total, 1942	Sales of milk from farms or its equivalent (millions of pounds)	Average returns: Per 100 pounds milk	Average returns: Per pound butterfat	Gross income from dairy products (in thousands)
				Cts.	
Kentucky	1.80	1,333	$2.32	54	$48,888
Tennessee	1.75	1,274	2.51	57	51,767
Alabama	1.09	440	2.92	66	37,527
Mississippi	1.14	673	2.54	56	34,194
Arkansas	1.23	789	2.27	53	32,968
Louisiana	.55	340	3.29	75	21,415
Oklahoma	2.25	1,899	2.01	47	52,640
Texas	3.72	2,823	2.62	60	114,485
South Central	13.53	9,571	2.45	56.1	393,864
Montana	.63	601	1.99	51	14,491
Idaho	1.15	1,199	2.09	53	27,850
Wyoming	.26	244	2.08	54	6,147
Colorado	.91	882	2.01	53	20,947
New Mexico	.26	228	2.55	64	7,640
Arizona	.21	208	2.80	73	6,758
Utah	.52	519	2.18	57	13,059
Nevada	.10	102	2.31	61	2,561
Washington	1.78	1,851	2.55	62	52,413
Oregon	1.24	1,271	2.64	59	37,720
California	4.35	4,815	2.94	77	148,042
Western	11.41	11,920	2.58	65.5	337,625
United States	100.00	98,117	2.38	60.1	5,783,756

It will be noted that Wisconsin, in 1942, produced over one-eighth of the milk and milk products sold in the United States, or 13,264,000 pounds of the 98,117,000 pounds produced in the entire United States.

It will be further noted that Wisconsin alone produced more milk than the 11 Western States consisting of Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Washington, Oregon, and California, the combined milk production of which States was 11,920,000 pounds.

It is interesting to note that Wisconsin alone produced three times as much milk as the South Atlantic States including Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida.

Wisconsin alone produced more than 25 percent more milk than the South Central States which include Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas.

Wisconsin alone produced more milk than the New England States and include New York and New Jersey.

Since this great percentage of milk is produced in a comparatively small number of States, with Chicago as the dairy capital, it is well to pay close attention to the needs of this territory if the milk production of the Nation is to be maintained.

While in normal times 42 percent of every hundred pounds of milk produced in the United States may have been manufactured into butter, 29 percent into fluid milk distributed in the cities, 5 percent into cheese and a similar amount into ice cream and evaporated milk and the remainder consumed on the farms

and fed to calves or lost in manufacture, this relationship has been changed due to the war. This change has been the gradual increase in the fluid-milk consumption and a smaller amount of farm butter produced. There has been an increase in the production of cheese and evaporated milk.

At this point it should be stated that it is difficult for new areas to expand their milk production at this time, not only for the reasons of the handicaps of manpower shortage, but the handicaps caused by the shortage of equipment and transportation.

It then appears that the best way to maintain this national milk production is to render every assistance to the milk producers, and give special consideration and thought to the areas which have the plants, equipment, and transportation facilities for producing and handling this product.

I wish to call your attention to the following table No. 10 as issued by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. D. A.:

TABLE 10.—*Total supply and utilization of milk in the United States, 1942**

	Pounds
Milk production:	
By cows on farms	119,240,000,000
By cows not on farms [1]	2,826,000,000
Total	122,066,000,000
Utilization (milk equivalent):	
Manufactured in plants—	
Creamery butter, net [2]	35,662,000,000
Cheese:	
American	9,270,000,000
Other	1,928,000,000
Canned milk:	
Evaporated	7,655,000,000
Sweetened condensed	180,000,000
Bulk condensed milk:	
Unsweetened	278,000,000
Sweetened	181,000,000
Dried milk products:	
Dried whole	455,000,000
Other [3]	63,000,000
Ice cream, net [4]	5,312,000,000
Total factory products	60,984,000,000
Used for farm butter	7,290,000,000
Consumed as milk or cream:	
In cities, villages, etc	37,650,000,000
On farms where produced	11,783,000,000
Fed to calves	3,290,000,000
Other uses [5]	1,069,000,000

* Preliminary.

[1] Rough allowance, assumed same as in 1930.

[2] Excludes milk equivalent of whey butter.

[3] Includes dried cream and malted milk. 1942 assumed same as 1941.

[4] Excludes milk duplicated in butter and condensed milk.

[5] Residual, including other uses and inaccuracies of independently derived use estimates.

It will be noted that in 1942 nearly one-half of the milk produced in the United States was consumed as fluid milk; 43,000,000,000 pounds of the total 122,000,000,000 pounds produced in the United States is used for farm- and plant-manufactured butter, or an amount representing about one-third of the total milk production of the Nation. According to table No. 21 of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. D. A. report, 561,000,000 pounds of edible dried skim milk were produced in 1942. This would require about 7,000,000,000 pounds of skimmed milk to produce. Since some 43,000,000,000 pounds of milk are used in the manufacture of butter one can readily see that a very small percentage of this skimmed milk of the Nation is being diverted to the manufacture of powdered skim milk for edible purposes.

Now going back to table No. 1, I wish also to call your attention to the price of butterfat in the various States. The low for 1942 was North and South Dakota with 40 cents per pound average for the year. The high was for Florida with $1.11 per pound for the year. It is also noted that Wisconsin received $2.10 per hundred and 58 cents per pound for butterfat. Minnesota received $1.72 per hundredweight and 46 cents per pound for butterfat. Iowa received $1.66 per hundredweight and 44 cents per pound for butterfat. These are the three outstanding dairy States in the Nation and they received an average of 49 cents plus per pound for butterfat in 1942 in comparison to the national average of 60.1 cents per pound for the year.

Hon. Marvin Jones is now submitting to the congressional groups a suggested dairy subsidy program in which certain consumers would be subsidized, and a certain portion of the producers will be subsidized. It was presented as being a subsidy across the board and was to take some $143,000,000 to put into operation. Certain millions were to be spent as a subsidy in the larger cities. Also millions of dollars were to be used to subsidize cheese and evaporated milk and there was a proposal to increase the price of powdered skimmed milk. However, a large segment of the dairy producers would be left out of the picture entirely which would be those who are doing farm separating and do not have facilities for disposing of fluid milk. In other words only $7,000,000,000 of the $43,000,000,000 of the national income for milk would not enjoy this subsidy.

The essential requirements for maintaining milk production appear to be: First, manpower; second, adequate feed; third, price; fourth, influence of profits derived from cash crops; and fifth, elimination of irritations which harm the war food program caused by regulations and statements issued by Government agencies which are largely responsible for the increased food production program.

We are still statistically safe as far as the number of cows are concerned and are in a position to maintain our national milk production by providing sufficient feed. The national production per cow would be very much increased. Some States show five or six thousand pounds average where other States show three or four thousand pounds average yearly production per cow.

The cost of manpower and the cost of feed are two factors which will determine the price which must be paid to prevent the decline in production.

At a later date, I hope to continue this discussion of dairy problems and bring out in more detail: First, the manpower problems involved; second, the necessity of adequate feed; third, the influence of profits derived from cash crops on milk production; fourth, the relation of price of milk to the above factors; and fifth, the necessity of eliminating irritating regulations and statements by governmental agencies which are harmful to maximum food production.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman advocate curtailment of milk production by the farmers?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No; I advocate maintaining or increasing production. Milk is needed today in the form of powdered whole milk for our armed forces.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman means more milk and not less?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes. We will, however, do well if we can keep the production we now have. All the administration is asking is to maintain the present production. We are not even going to get the 119,000,000,000 pounds this year that was produced in 1942.

We are still safe as far as the number of cows is concerned in this country. We still have 25,000,000 or 26,000,000 cows. Our good friend and colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] knows the average cow of his State produces 6,900 pounds of milk a year, while the national average is only 4,600 pounds. In fact, California's average is 50 percent above the national average. With manpower and feeds in relationship to milk the production could be maintained but every day makes the problem more difficult.

Marvin Jones brought out the other day that they either have to raise the price of milk or provide the feed. That is the reason that since I have been back here I have introduced House Joint Resolution 155 to take the tariff off not only from the feed wheat but the barley and the oats of Canada during this time.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am always pleased to yield to my colleague from Wisconsin.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I think we perhaps can all agree that my colleague from Wisconsin is about the best informed man in the House on the subject of milk production. I am very anxious that his House Joint Resolution 155, which lifts the tariff for a period of 90 days on feed, should receive early and favorable consideration, because during my visit at home, sitting down with both the poultry people and the cheese makers, I found that they could not possibly keep up production unless they got feed. We are running out of feed and we need it. Therefore, we ought to adopt this resolution.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I may say to my colleague that I took this up

with the majority leader, and he said that as soon as he had time he would give the resolution attention. I have every confidence that the Ways and Means Committee and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] will give it the green light as soon as they can. Also I might say that the rumor is already out that Canada has put an export bounty on any feed coming out of Canada. However, I talked with the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, and they say there is nothing to substantiate that rumor and that it is not true. We have reason to think that the Canadians will give us a fair deal in connection with these proposed importations.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; gladly.

Mr. HOPE. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's move to temporarily lift the tariff on feed grain, but it has been my understanding that transportation has been the greatest obstacle to bringing in Canadian grain. Does the gentleman think that lifting the tariff at this time would do a great deal to bring in more grain?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would not want to pose as an authority on the subject of transportation, but I would say that just because the Commodity Credit Corporation cannot get the job done, I would not want to think that the businessmen of America would not get it done. I have very much more confidence in them than I have in the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. ROWE. But the gentleman assures us that this would remove at least one obstruction?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is correct. At least the feed dealer would be on an equal business basis with the Government.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; gladly to the distinguished Member from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Of course we have crops anyway, and let me make this observation: This thing has been considered mainly from the standpoint of the dairy farmer. It is about time that we people who live in the cities, and who have to have milk to feed the babies better get in on this job and get in quick.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. All the time that I was home during the recess I did not hear as much about the price of milk as I did the factors that were hindering the production.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. But I say that the time has come when the people in the cities who have to have milk for their babies had better get in on this job and better get in on it quick.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; I think they better do it before we lose any more production. We evidently lack dairy leadership in high places here in Washington.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. You cannot bring a cow back into production whose hide is hanging up in the tan yards.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That statement is correct. There is the question of manpower also. That is another part of this milk production. I have no reason to approach this problem from any standpoint except one that is purely factual. I have worked up some things in these tables that should be of interest to everyone that is interested in this milk problem. I think we can only expect this production in our established dairy districts. This milk problem is something that is going to come up on the floor of the House some of these days. The more all of us know about this milk problem, the better it will be for the war food program. Up to this time there has been too much of an attitude on the part of Washington of telling instead of asking the dairy producers of our country as to the best methods to follow in order to get production. The problem could be readily solved and will be when and if the producers of milk themselves are given some small voice in the proceedings that take place here in Washington.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL], who spoke a few moments ago, had consulted the dairymen in his district, I think he would have found that they are suffering from a lack of cottonseed meal, and they will continue to do so until the farmers of the South are paid a decent price for their cottonseed, and let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] and to the rest of the House that every bale of cotton has 33 bushels of seed in it, or half a ton. Cottonseed makes the finest dairy feed in the world. The farmers do not have to sell this seed. There is more food value in a bushel of cottonseed than in a bushel of wheat or corn. Yet instead of giving the farmer of the South a decent price for his cottonseed, they are trying to hold him down to $56 a ton. As a result, the farmers are hauling their cottonseed back home and putting it in their cribs and in their barns. If they should receive what it is worth, they would be getting easily more than $100 a ton for it today. As long as that condition prevails, you people in those distant States that depend on cottonseed meal for dairy feed are going to suffer for want of it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] knows very well that he is one of the most influential of the party in power, and this whole situation which might be described with a word beginning with the letter "d" is the result of the policies which the men on the majority side put into effect and are carrying on now in spite of all that we can do.

Now, I love the gentleman from Mississippi with the most intense and enduring love, but when I know things that result from the policies that he has stood for in the past, I hope, and I pray sometimes in the same building where you live, that God will sometime make you see the light and reform and come with us.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. This question of cottonseed has come up. I am a city man and I do not know much about this. Now, we are receiving a great many post cards and letters and things about the bill, H. R. 2400, that is now in the Committee on Agriculture, about taking the tax off of oleo. A part of the argument is that you can make oleo better from cottonseed and such products, and that that is better food. I would like the gentleman to give us his views on that bill and also whether or not cottonseed can produce more food in the form of oleo or in the form of milk, because we want to get this all straight.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I want to answer the gentleman first. If he can get me about half an hour additional time, I would be glad to discuss his question.

Mr. KNUTSON. Would the gentleman let us know who introduced this infamous bill 2400?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am trying to keep everybody from eating the doughnut and simply leaving the hole. I do not think we should get off on this question of oleo versus butter at this particular time. There will always be a day for that. I do think, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] said, this is not a matter of dollars and cents to the man who is milking these cows; it is a matter of public interest and it is of primary interest in connection with the war food program. I sincerely believe that with the right leadership and by people who know which side of the cow to sit down to in order to get the milk, it can be accomplished. So far no fair or practical plan has been offered by the War Food Administration. The proposals to meet this problem should be submitted to the dairy groups like the Pure Milk Products Co-op, located at Fond du Lac, Wis., that handles over a billion pounds of the 98,000,000,000 pounds of milk that were marketed in the United States last year. I have not too much confidence in the Commodity Credit Corporation, nor in its judgment as to how to increase food production or how to distribute it after it is produced, for that matter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to abolish the Commodity Credit Corporation. My bill

calls for the immediate and complete liquidation of that organization. It calls for the complete abolition of all of its powers that have been so grossly misused and abused. This course of action appears to me, after mature consideration and deliberation, the only method of protecting American agriculture from hampering interference, intolerable regimentation, and senseless regulation.

The Commodity Credit Corporation in the course of its life has done a few good things, but its virtues have been few and minor, and its vices have grown to be monstrous.

The first 3 days of this week, more than 30,000 head of cattle arrived at the doors of the slaughterhouses in Oklahoma. Today, something like 11,000 head of cattle have reached the pens, and at this moment trucks are lined up for 1¾ miles awaiting an opportunity to get to the stockyard gates. There are already in the stockyards at Oklahoma City more cattle than they can slaughter in a week. The rush to market in Oklahoma has reached and passed any previous rush to market. There has been nothing to compare with it in at least 33 years. These figures tell a tragic story. In front of this avalanche is the health of the children of America, short of milk for their diet; and in front of this stampede is the stockman, doomed to destruction because these 10,000 cattle a day in one moderate-sized market does not represent any market demand. These cattle are stockers. They are breeding cows and they are dairy cows. Only a small percentage of them is ready for market. All the rest of them represent the destruction of dairy herds essential to a fast dwindling national milk supply, and they represent the loss of breeding stock, which means the destruction of the cattle industry in the sense of a great resource, and this head-on rush of cattle to market is all due to no feed. And the responsibility rests at the door of Commodity Credit Corporation.

Commodity Credit Corporation did not cause the droughts, of course, but when the shortage existed in the drought-stricken areas and the stockman turned to the normal channels to secure feed from areas where an abundance existed, he found the gates of those channels locked and barred and he found the keeper of the keys, Commodity Credit Corporation, to be a keeper ignorant of agricultural production problems and without information concerning the livestock industry. He found the keeper to be possessed of only moronic understanding of the industry whose destiny he controls and more than that, possessed of a vicious will to be arbitrary and high-handed, if not whimsical and petulant in his consideration of the problems.

Mr. Speaker, I am not unaware of the fact that Commodity Credit Corporation has today designated certain States as drought areas and assured them of a certain percentage of their normal use of protein feeds. This action merits our commendation and it will be of some value even though it did come in the twilight hours of the day for action. Commodity Credit Corporation is responsible for the tragic rush to market of cattle that are not ready for market and of cattle that ought not to be sold. Theirs is the responsibility for a poor grade of meat on the tables this fall and for a diminishing outlook for proper meat supply in the days to come.

All of these things are in themselves more than sufficient reason to chop off the head of tyranny and to break the chains of thralldom that Commodity Credit Corporation has hung around the farmer's neck. The uncertainty alone has been a capital crime and all the hours of uncertainty have been a fear on the part of the farmer, not of what the government agencies might or might not do for him, but a fear of what Commodity Credit Corporation was going to do to him.

All the farmer and the stockman want is that interfering, hampering bureaucratic agencies quit obstructing his way. The farmer is tired of being pushed around by the bureaucrats, and my bill provides us one opportunity of getting at least one bunch of bureaucrats off of his haystack and out of his field.

You know what the farmer ought to plow up? He ought to plow up the Commodity Credit Corporation, plow it up and plow it under.

My colleagues, I want to point out to you also another crime of this millionaire prostitute we call the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Corporation seized all of the available protein in the hands of processors. When they seized it the local market price for peanut-oil meal was $41 a ton and they directed the processors to raise the price to $54 a ton and remit the balance to the Corporation. Al Capone—in fact, no racketeer has gone further than this. First, their seizure was unconstitutional. Second, their racketeering collection or confiscation of the difference between the old ceiling price and the new ceiling price was unlawful, a crime for which the guilty should pay, a crime that justifies impeachment, and such impeachment proceedings I contemplate instituting.

Are we to harbor in the breast of Government a poisonous viper?

Are we to tolerate within our own household an enemy to the American constitutional system of government? Why did they collect this money which meant several thousand a month from each of the hundreds and hundreds of mills throughout the land? They did it because they wanted to continue in power and increase their reach and grasp of dictatorial control. Congress had reduced their appropriation. Congress had refused to give them money with which to carry on these very activities, and in a deliberate and premeditated plan to thwart the will of Congress and defy all control from the constitutional authorities they set up this racketeering scheme. They sought to levy a tax of their own, a racketeering tax. They sought to defy the Congress. They expressed their contempt for the Constitution. They had their hand on the handle of the scourge that lashes the farmer's back, and the craze of sadism at his hurt saturated their minds with a concept not completely free of kinship to the depravity of governmental thought amongst the Axis Powers.

I am a freedom-loving, tyranny-hating man. I am unwilling to submit to despotism such as this agency seeks to wield, and I am unwilling for the American farmer to be in the clutches of such autocratic power.

My colleagues, we must destroy this thing.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE ROLL-BACK IN PRICES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday—and this bears directly upon the discussion to which we have just listened—the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], in speaking of the milk situation, said we would have to do something about it, and that we must go along with this proposition of subsidies or offer another plan.

Now, it is very evident that the administration has sold out, body, soul and shoes, to the politicians in these labor organizations which are demanding the roll-back and subsidies. Those who have to pay a cost for food which is out of proportion to their income have our sympathy, and it is the desire of every one of us to help them. But the roll-back with subsidies, as they want it, that is, the payment of subsidies, will never do it without breaking down our financial system and creating injustice.

Labor leaders who came to me—and there were many of them during the recess—wanted to know about the roll-back. My answer was that if they would join in supporting a roll-back such as would be brought about by the stabilization of wages and the price of things we use, that was all right. If they meant only a roll-back produced by the payment of subsidies, I could not go along, because that is an endless and vicious procedure.

There is a remedy other than the one which was called to our attention by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], and that is the one which was put forth in a bill introduced by me away back in November 1940 a copy of which follows this talk and it will furnish a base for perfected legislation. Think of it!—1940—which was a bill to stabilize the prices of all services and all things as of a date then referred to or any other date that the Secretaries of the Departments of War, Navy, Treasury, Commerce and Labor wished to select. That would have accomplished the job. A similar law will do it today. But it is too simple, too effective to meet the approval of those who want regimentation—rule by men rather than by law.

Well, we can go along every day and find faults which bring suffering and loss to the people in every single district, but that is an idle procedure unless we have some remedy. From home I gathered two or three things during this last vacation. One was that the people have absolutely no confidence whatever in those who are administering or those who formulated the policies under which we now live here at home. I venture to say that almost every member on the majority side received that same impression from his people.

Well, we are asked, "What would you do about it?" Not being one of the prominent Republicans, not being one of those who guide the destinies of our party, if anybody does guide them, let me say this, that my humble suggestion would be—and I hope the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] will listen, because I value his opinions; seldom a week goes by that he does not meet me somewhere and impart to me words of wisdom—thoughts which I can use to good advantage the next day.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman should not give me credit for saying you had no leadership.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If we would follow the leadership of which the gentleman has given notice he intends to speak today—why the gentleman from Mississippi is supporting the candidate about whom he is going to talk, I cannot for the life of me understand. He has advertised him more than any man on the floor of this House. He talks about him continuously, and never have I heard him utter a word except words of praise and commendation—or have I?

Mr. RANKIN. Well, the gentleman understands why we nominated him.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; you want two of a kind—you have your nominee and hope to give us a worse one if that is possible. I cannot yield further. If the gentleman will wait until evening I will gladly give him the usual half hour of my time.

What I was trying to say was this: The impression that came to me from my people when I was home was this: We should repeal all the legislation that we have enacted which gave the President any authority—especially blanket authority—and we should start over and parcel it all out again in driblets as needed—only as needed—take away the blanket authority and make him come before the Congress and justify each request that he makes.

We should do the same thing with all the money that is unexpended; take away from him all the billion dollars, or whatever it is, that is unexpended, on which he can draw a blank check, and which Harry Hopkins and some of the others are just throwing to the winds. You remember how we used to go into the wheat fields in the spring and sow grass seed—broadcast a handful here and a handful there, and let her go so long as the owner of the seed was not watching.

Now, we should take the money that is unexpended, recover it into the Treasury of the United States, and make the President and every single spending official come again before the Appropriations Committee and justify every request for every red cent. Then the Congress would have responsibility and the money might be properly spent.

As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] said a little while ago in his colloquy with the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]—he said we got some kicks and some squawks—and I could use other words—about the things that are going on when some of the older men in Congress gave them this power.

Now, we probably have made mistakes. They were not made by my vote, because I have not yet learned a word with more than two letters; my vote has always been no, no, when these fellows down there request something for wasting—squandering—that was not needed. Why? Well, because they are a crew of spenders and wreckers, and most of you will agree now, whatever you may have thought before, that they are spenders and wreckers. If you don't believe it, ask your home folks.

Now, what are we going to do about that? You know that we ought to take back that power, to repeal these laws which we know are bad. We ought to do away with the O. P. A., which we know is failing and has failed, and which is raising worse than heck, and start with original legislation, because you and I know that the present plan is not working. We ought to start over again.

Does not the membership of this House have enough brains to rewrite the law and profit by our previous mistakes and correct them, and get something better than what we have now? We can do it. You know we can.

Now here is another situation: We were talking about corn. The gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] was talking about corn, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] was talking about corn. Before we left for home I was trying to get these fellows down in the O. P. A. to do something constructive about it, and perhaps doing something to them a little rough, trying to get corn for a man in my community who was using 1,000 bushels of corn a day to make poultry and dairy feed. Finally they gave him a carload. What does that amount to?

Our people have known all about this mismanagement for months and yet when we come back, charged by our people with one thing, to eliminate the power of the bureaucrats, what do we do? We adjourn for a week and next week we will not do more. I am going home and tell my folks just why we do not remedy the situation. I would rather try to do something, even though it is not 100-percent correct, even though it is but 50-percent right, than to sit down in a rocking chair, call for a pipe and smoke and rock. That is not going to get us anywhere. I would do something. There are a few Republicans here on the floor but only a few Democrats, and I do not blame them for not being here. I, too, would be ashamed of what is being done by the departments like the O. P. A. and of our failure to act if I belonged to the majority party. I would rather go out into the garden and do something, even if what I did resulted in digging up some vegetables of some sort, if I really in the end got a crop. I would like action even though the plan might not be perfect, still I would rather continue to fight; I would rather die with my boots on, than sit down and not try to work out some plan—just rust out with dry rot.

I say we should change some of this legislation.

Before I came back to the Congress one of my constituents came in to see me and told me that he would like to have some tools. I asked him what he wanted and he told me he would like to have a pair of pliers and a wrench, a monkey wrench. I ought to have told him that if he wanted a monkey wrench he should come down here where he would find plenty of them in the bureaucratic departments where they have been heaving them around by the dozen, but in this little town of 4,000 or 4,500 you could not find a monkey wrench and you could not find a pair of pliers. But here is a catalog that came from Great Britain. And over here on this page you have it not only for the people in England but for the people of all the dependencies, principalities, whatever you call them, the provinces. All over the world they send monkey wrenches and pliers. The man can have three kinds of pliers, but our farmers cannot get one kind.

The boys poke a lot of fun at me because I am an American firster. I would rather have my farmer who votes for me perhaps or who might be induced to vote for me—I would rather have him get a pair of pliers and a monkey wrench than to have them offered for sale by British merchants down in some hot country to some Hottentot who might want to try to curl her hair with a pair of pliers or on the handle—I would rather that my farmer had the pliers and the wrench, but the Fulbrighters want to take care of all the rest of the world regardless of what happens to our own folks. Well, some of them, the Hottentots, have such curly hair they would not need to curl it, but they might want to try. Where is the justice? Where is the decency? The British make these for export, and the British farmer can get them; they are for others all over the world; yet when we want to get them for our farmers, we cannot. Some fellow asked, why do you not get baling wire? I ask, where can you get baling wire, how can you get baling wire, barbed wire, or any other kind of wire?

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Briefly.

Mr. RAMEY. Have not you oldsters put some of us new Members in a difficult position? We come in here and find a debt of $91,000,000,000, a great deal of which had no connection with the war effort.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not me; I never voted for any of it except for war expenditures.

Mr. RAMEY. Every cent connected with the war effort was all right, but we come here and find it necessary to inaugurate a pay-as-you-go tax program in order that it will not have to be paid for by the boys when they come back.

Instead of trying to be popular we are trying to be just; but we find that some of you have left us in that predicament. We are not trying to be popular by spending money; we are trying to be just and we are looking around for ways and means to cut things down where we can stand on our own feet for a domestic policy in order to put the country back. We cannot talk patriotism while one cent is wasted on the home front. We cannot talk liberty and deny privileges. Your boy and mine are fighting to see that governments are servants and not masters of their people. The American people should be respected, not inspected.

Government by inspection means that the inefficient rule the efficient and eventually dictatorship.

We must have the courage to be just; not seek to be popular. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for this opportunity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just asked the timekeeper how much time I had remaining and he told me I had 2 minutes. Will the Chair ascertain how my time stands?

The SPEAKER. The Chair begs the gentleman's pardon. The timekeeper informs me that the gentleman has 2 minutes remaining. The timekeeper turned to speak to the Chair. He usually does not do that unless it is to say that time has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It might have been just as well if he had spoken 10 minutes earlier, but as long as I have it and we are sort of wasteful anyway, I feel justified in proceeding.

I did not let the horse get out; I did not help steal the horse, if he was stolen; I did not have anything to do with those wasteful expenditures. I voted for appropriations for the armed forces and I expect to continue to do so. I did not vote for the New Deal program, and I do not intend to do so.

Now, if it is true that we are talking after the horse is stolen—and speaking figuratively it is true—I am trying to get the horse back in the barn once more by repealing all this legislation, by recalling the money that has not been expended, and starting over again with a new slate, do you not see, with the help of the Members who came in fresh from the people, who are willing—who are willing, who are eager—to follow out the mandate given them at that 1942 election. I will go along, and I only hope that the gentleman from Ohio will never be disillusioned as I have been; I hope he will never grow discouraged as I have grown discouraged at inability to get anything done down here that the administration does not want done.

I say to the gentleman I wish him luck. May his number multiply; and may he come back with a group that will turn this thing upside down, throw them out in the street—and I am not talking about Congressmen, because by that time the reform will have sunk in; your repentance on the majority side will be sincere and abiding. You will then be the minority, and you will go along with the constructive program, not under the leadership of Wendell Willkie, may I say, but under someone like Vandenberg, or Taft, or Bricker, or MacArthur. The bill to stabilize prices reads as follows:

H. R. 1408

(77th Cong., 1st sess., originally introduced in 76th Cong., 3d sess., on Nov. 19, 1940, as H. R. 10680)

A bill to provide for the common defense, render more effective the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, prevent profiteering, stabilize prices, raise revenue, minimize the increase in the public debt, insure a contribution from, and the participation of, all citizens in the national defense program

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Defense Act of 1941."

SEC. 2. (a) Experience has shown that inequality in the distribution of the burden of preparing for national defense creates discord and lessens the effectiveness of the Army and the Navy and the industrial structure upon which both depend for effective operation.

(b) Experience has demonstrated that preparations for national defense can only be effectively made when based upon sound economic policies and a safe financial structure.

(c) We know from experience that a people can be united, show the greatest determination, and exert their utmost power and accomplish the seemingly impossible only when they have a common objective to which each has made contributions requiring self-denial and personal sacrifice.

SEC. 3. Congress having declared that it is imperative to increase and train the personnel of the armed forces of the United States; that, in a free society, the obligations and privileges of military training and service should be shared generally in accordance with a fair and just system of selective compulsory military training and service; and that it is essential that the strength and organization of the National Guard, as an integral part of the first-line defenses of this Nation, be at all times maintained and assured, Congress does hereby further declare (a) that the integrity and institutions of the United States are gravely threatened and that, to insure the independence and freedom of the people of the United States, it is imperative that immediate measures be taken to mobilize the Nation's strength; (b) that national strength depends not only upon the possession of modern arms but equally upon adequate forces of well-trained men; (c) that, in a free society, it is just and right that the obligations and risks of national defense be shared by all; (d) that every citizen may have brought home to him his duty and the extent of his proper participation in the defense of the Nation and the preservation of its institutions; (e) that profiteering be prevented; (f) that revenue be raised for implementing all national defense measures; and (g) that the burden of national defense be equalized.

SEC. 4. Within 10 days after the date of the passage of this act, it shall be the duty of the Secretaries of War, Navy, Treasury, Commerce, and Labor to meet and, based upon the last 10 years, determine and publish, within 30 days of such meeting, a schedule of prices which shall represent the true and fair average price of all materials and services which may be needed by the Federal Government in any of its activities looking toward preparation for national defense.

SEC. 5. Any person feeling himself aggrieved by any determination made by said Secretaries may appeal therefrom to the district court of the United States of the district in which he resides, by simple petition, and such appeal shall be heard before a jury within 20 days from the taking of such appeal. From the decision of such district court and jury an appeal may, within 10 days, be taken direct to the Supreme Court of the United States, but the findings of fact of the district court jury, if sustained by substantial and credible evidence, shall be conclusive.

SEC. 6. It shall be unlawful for any person (and the term "person" shall include individuals, partnerships, associations, organizations, and corporations) knowingly to, after the date of the determination of such prices, ask or receive a greater sum for either materials or services, or a combination of the two, than the price fixed in such schedule.

SEC. 7. It shall further be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury, as long as a national emergency exists, to cause to be deducted from the compensation paid by the Federal Government to any and all individuals now in the service of the United States, or who receive compensation from the United States, other than those in the land and naval forces of the United States and other than those whose reduction of pay is prohibited by the Constitution and other than persons on relief, the following sums:

(a) From the compensation of all those receiving $10,000 or more, there shall be deducted 35 percent.

(b) From the compensation of all those receiving $5,000 and less than $10,000, there shall be deducted 25 percent.

(c) From the compensation of all those receiving $2,500 and less than $5,000, there shall be deducted 20 percent.

(d) From the compensation of all those receiving $1,000 and less than $2,500, there shall be deducted 10 percent.

(e) That all employees and all those who receive compensation from the Federal Treasury and whose salaries cannot, under the Constitution, be reduced during their term of office, shall have deducted from the compensation which would otherwise be paid to them for services rendered by them in any office or employment to which they may hereafter be elected, appointed, or employed, a sum in each case equivalent to that above specified.

SEC. 8. It shall further be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury, as long as a national emergency exists, to cause to be collected from the net incomes of all persons, other than those designated or exempted in section 7 of this act, sums equivalent to those above ordered to be deducted by him from the compensation of Federal officers and employees.

SEC. 9. All sums so deducted under section 7 and so collected under section 8 shall be recovered into the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 10. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall, upon conviction, be subject for each offense to a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment of not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 11. In addition to the penalty herein provided, every person violating this act and who has knowingly received a greater sum for services or materials, or a combination of the two, than that fixed in the manner hereinbefore provided, shall forfeit a like sum to the United States, to be recovered for the Government by action instituted by the Attorney General.

SEC. 12. It shall be the duty of the Attorney General to enforce the provisions of this act.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to

revise and extend my own remarks and to include an address I made in the House in October 1940.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

WENDELL L. WILLKIE ADVERTISES HIMSELF AS A SECOND LINCOLN

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to hear the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] in his closing remarks predict the coming of a reformation. It just shows how far he is behind the times.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. No; not now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to correct the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. I cannot yield now, the RECORD will be correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to correct the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. I decline to yield at this time.

If he will read this glorious advertisement that somebody is paying for all over the country and which contains a full-page picture of Wendell L. Willkie referring to him as "Another Lincoln"—a second coming of Lincoln—he may realize how far behind he is when he talks about a mere reformation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, now, Mr. Speaker, I demand that the gentleman's words be taken down.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield. I do not know whether the world is prepared for this second coming of Lincoln or not, but I do not believe that even an Old Guard Republican is going to be deceived by the make-up.

If Wendell L. Willkie were to put on enough make-up and paraphernalia to make him look like Abraham Lincoln did at any time, I am afraid the average Republican or the average Democrat, when they saw him, would be like the little boy who came in and told his mother he had just seen a lion on the street. He had seen a little dog sheared up to look like a lion. She said, "Now, you know that is not true. I might just as well break you of lying now as to begin later. I am going to lock you in this closet and keep you there until you pray God and get forgiveness for that lie. Now, you get in there. It will be dark, but you get to praying and just as soon as the Lord forgives you, knock and I will let you out."

She shoved him in the closet, turned the key and started away. There was a knock and she opened the door. The boy stepped out smiling. She said, "What? Has God forgiven you already?" He said, "Oh, yes." "Well," she said, "what did He say?" The boy said, "He said 'that is all right.' He thought it was a lion too when He first saw it."

Some people might have thought it was the second coming of Lincoln in 1940 until he opened his mouth and the people heard him pronounce "Amarica."

When he comes back, you Republicans may be like the Irishman was one day when a horsefly got after him. He thought it was a hornet. "Oh," he said, "you have changed your suit, but I know your voice. I have been mixed up with you before."

You have been stung once and while you might get stung again by the same hornet, yet I seriously doubt that you will be deceived at his second appearance.

This advertisement that he is having published widespread refers to an article by him in a magazine called Look. I do not know who is paying for these advertisements. I am being assured on every hand by distinguished gentlemen in the House that the Republicans of the country are not paying for it. I certainly want to assure you that the Democrats are not doing it, although we know nothing that would contribute more to our success than to have you renominate him again in 1944 as you did in 1940.

I want to show you some most interesting material in this article by Mr. Willkie in this magazine called Look. You know, in 1940 Hon. Herbert Hoover made a speech to the Republican convention after the nomination in which he appealed to the Republicans and to the country to hold an election, and not an auction. The poor fellow did not know that the auction had already been held before he got there. They had beaten you to the draw.

But I want to read you something here that is most interesting, if I can just find it in the mix-up of all of these pictures of Mr. Willkie from his physical cradle to his political grave. The one thing that amuses me most, perhaps, is the fact that according to this paper the Republican convention of 1944 has already been held. Here is an account of it. This purports to be a page from the Cleveland "Press-Dealer." Now, you have been talking about the New Deal. He is beyond that. This is a press deal. This whole thing is a press deal. This Cleveland "Press-Dealer" is dated Cleveland, Friday, July 28, 1944. It says:

> Twenty-four thousand leaders petition G. O. P. to choose a liberal.

Who do you suppose that liberal is they are talking about? I am amused when Wendell L. Willkie talks about being a liberal after being head of the Commonwealth & Southern, after he had helped plunder the power consumers of this country, and especially the people I represent. It makes me think of an old darky down at home, a colored fellow, who had been convicted of assault and battery with intent to kill one of his neighbors. They had elected a liberal judge in that district. He called him up and said, "George, under the law I am compelled to sentence you to 15 years in the penitentiary." He said, "What?" "Fifteen years in the penitentiary." He said, "Lord, Judge, I heerd all de time dat you was a liberal, but I must say you is de most liberal man wid de other fellow's time dat I ever saw."

Wendell L. Willkie was one of the most liberal men when it came to plundering the power consumers of our section of the country and of the whole United States I believe I have ever come in contact with. But listen to this. Here is an advertisement that is supposed to have appeared in this paper. the "Press-Dealer," at that Republican Convention in 1944:

> Willkie backers see stampede for Hoosier.

Of course, you know who the Hoosier is—this barefooted boy from Wall Street, Mr. Willkie, of course.

It says:

> Philadelphia story all over again, they forecast.

Then it goes on:

> The man to beat Roosevelt.
>
> Correspondents describe ideal in fictional convention preview.

Then it goes on to set out a petition that these people are supposed to have signed.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I will yield for a question only.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman not feel that the reason Look magazine has used this article on the life history and story of the performances of Mr. Willkie is that it has reader interest and the public wants to hear about it?

Mr. RANKIN. Real interest? Does the gentleman mean this paper has an interest in it? Somebody has, or they would not have paid for this advertisement.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Reader interest, such as the gentleman has now.

Mr. RANKIN. Somebody certainly has an interest in it, or they would not have paid for all this advertising.

Among other things, he says that the Democratic Party is torn asunder by conflicting forces. I wonder how he knew that. "In the past," he says, "we Republicans have also been torn."

Was that before he got into the party or was it before he jumped from the Socialist Party into the Democratic Party? Probably that rent in the Republican Party is where he got into it, maybe by mistake.

He talks about protection of minorities. You know, I have heard so much about protection of minorities in this country that I am just wondering when they are going to look out for us majority of the American people.

He says we must have "a rebirth of enterprise." Well, we had it down in my district. We had a rebirth of the power business and a proper adjustment of electric light and power rates. We are no longer paying that enormous tribute that we were paying a few years ago when Wendell L. Willkie, as head of the Commonwealth & Southern, as I said, was helping to rob and plunder the power consumers throughout that section of the country as well as throughout other sections of the United States.

He says further that—

> A corporation—

Listen to this; now, this is Mr. Willkie speaking. This is IWW; that is, I, Wendell Willkie himself, speaking. That name is significant because he goes on to say that the Democratic Party, as now constituted, is not liberal enough, but just gives lip service. Of course, we did not give the kind of lip service he did.

None of our leaders has ever kissed the barmaids of London. None of them has ever kissed the fan dancers in Moscow or orphan girls in China.

He says:

A corporation may be privately owned and still be the worst enemy of free enterprise.

No man in the country is better prepared to make that statement than Wendell L. Willkie. I will show you why. When he was mixed up with that crowd who built the Commonwealth & Southern, which, as I said before, is neither commonwealth nor southern, they got together in 1929 and took four little power companies, the Allied Power & Light Corporation, the Penn-Ohio Edison Co., Commonwealth Power Corporation, and Southeastern Power & Light Co., and threw them together and made the Commonwealth & Southern.

One reason I am kicking is that at that time we were paying 10 cents a kilowatt-hour for electricity that this outfit was buying at Muscle Shoals at 2 mills a kilowatt-hour. Last year, under the new T. V. A. system, we paid an average of 1 cent a kilowatt-hour for the same power that the city of Tupelo buys there for 4.8 mills a kilowatt-hour.

This is what they did. They took those four corporations and threw them together in 1929 and made the Commonwealth & Southern. The ledger value of the securities owned by these four companies at that time, according to the report of the Federal Trade Commission that investigated it, amounted to $340,896,260.27. They put them on the books of the new company that same day, without adding a single particle of property to it, at $872,101,612.10, watered the stock in 1 day $531,000,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. What was the 10 cents for?

Mr. RANKIN. That must have been to tip the waiter.

So Mr. Willkie is better prepared than almost any other man I know to make this statement, when he says:

A corporation may be privately owned and still be the worst enemy of free enterprise.

Then they proceeded to sell the stock in the new corporation and went on the stock exchange and boosted it up to $30 a share and induced people all over the country to buy that stock. Today it is down to less than $1 a share.

What is that $531,000,000 composed of? It represents wind, water, and Power Trust rascality. One of those men who perpetrated that outrage and later became president of the concern, and continued its operation, is not a proper person to advise Republicans on morality, much less Democrats.

He goes on to say:

The trouble with the enterprise system has never been the enterprisers but men who talked about free enterprise and then went ahead and violated all the rules of enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with that statement. Even though this article in the "Press-Dealer" would indicate the convention has already been held, and of course that the nomination has already been completed. But I say now that whatever sins this administration may have to its discredit, there is one thing that it has to its credit, to its everlasting credit, something that has redounded to the benefit of the American people more than anything else, and that is the turning of the sunlight of pitiless publicity onto this Power Trust racket, the greatest racket of modern times, and bringing down electric light and power rates to the American people.

I have no quarrel with honest Republicans, and this is no time for quarreling between Americans, but when I read that advertisement and saw this picture that went all over this country, paid for by some special interest, advertising Wendell L. Willkie as a second Lincoln, and saw this article in the "Press-Dealer," indicating that it is all over but the shouting, talking of things that have been done or that should have been done, I decided to again turn the sunlight of publicity onto that record.

I shall insert in the RECORD at this point a speech I made on this floor in 1940, which I very carefully prepared and in which I went into Mr. Willkie's record. I want you to read it. I wish every American could read it. I wish everybody in both the Democratic and Republican Parties would read it, and that every boy in the service and every mother and father could read it and understand exactly what that record means. If they could all realize what Mr. Willkie's real record is, then I submit that all this fanfare of One World, and all this bunk about another Lincoln, a second coming of Lincoln with Wendell L. Willkie as the hero, would fade away like mists before the morning sun.

The address referred to follows:

[Speech of Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, in the House of Representatives, Friday, October 4, 1940]

LET MR. WILLKIE'S RECORD SPEAK

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, of all the optimists of whom I have ever heard, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is entitled to the blue ribbon when he stands here on this floor and tells you that Wendell L. Willkie, if, when, and provided this country should ever experience the calamity of having him for President, would inspire confidence, spread prosperity, and promote the peace of mankind. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] said he would place in the RECORD later a statement his candidate made as to what he proposed to do—if elected. If he heard Mr. Willkie say anything about what he intended to do, I advise him to put it in the RECORD now, before Mr. Willkie changes his mind or reads another speech written by somebody else. [Applause.]

I have heard with amazement, and read with confusion, the speeches delivered by Mr. Willkie on his western swing. I do not believe I have read anything or heard anything to compare with it since Don Quixote, with his wooden sword and paper crown, marched across the plains of western Europe to fight the windmills and the funeral processions with which he came in contact. There has not been such a spectacle in a national campaign since Andrew Gump made his famous bid for the Presidency a few years ago. [Laughter.]

Like Andrew Gump, Mr. Willkie seems to be all things to all men. He went out West and told the farmers he was going to lower the taxes on their lands. If he was serious when he made, or read that speech, which must have been written in New York, because anybody outside of Wall Street would have known that the President of the United States could not have anything to do with the taxes on the farmers' lands. [Applause.] If he was serious when he made, or read, that statement, he showed his ignorance of the farmers' problems. If he was not serious, he showed contempt for the farmers' intelligence.

He talks about democracy, after having been connected with one of the greatest monopolies in the country—one that has been engaged in breaking down our democracy for the last 20 years.

He talks about freedom of the press, after the utility of which he was the head went down to Chattanooga, Tenn., and used the money wrung from the helpless users of electricity to destroy a local newspaper because it was appealing for justice for the power consumers in the Tennessee Valley area.

Freedom of the press. He is evidently for freedom of the utility-controlled press only.

He stood before the farmers of Indiana and waved a receipt for his electric light and power bill and said his bill was too high, that the Rural Electrification Administration was overcharging him. He was at that moment advertising to the people of Indiana the fact that they never would have had electricity on the farms of that State if it had not been for the Rural Electrification Administration created by the Roosevelt administration [Applause.]

He tells you he is for rural electrification. When did he get that way? I am one man in this House who can give you some evidence of his activities with reference to rural electrification. In my opinion, he is rural electrification's public enemy No. 1. The Commonwealth & Southern, of which he was the head, owns the Mississippi Power Co. That company built one short rural power line in the county in which I live—Lee County, Miss.—and they charged the farmers $3.25 a month "line charge," whether they used any electricity at all or not, and then charged 5 cents a kilowatt-hour for the electricity used. That made 25 kilowatt-hours of electricity a month cost a farmer on that line $4.50.

Our cooperative power association bought that line and is now charging $1 for 25 kilowatt-hours a month, and 25 cents of that $1 goes to help pay for the line, making 25 kilowatt-hours of electricity a month cost him 75 cents instead of $4.50, the amount charged by the Willkie utility when these farmers had no way of protecting themselves.

Remember it is the same line, the same farmer, and the same power. At that time the Commonwealth & Southern was buying this power wholesale from the Government at Muscle Shoals at 2 mills a kilowatt-hour, under a contract made with the Republican administration, but when a farmer on this line got 25 kilowatt-hours of it he paid Mr. Willkie's company $4.50.

Now the cooperative power association is buying this same Muscle Shoals power wholesale from the T. V. A. at 5.5 mills a kilowatt-hour, and the same farmer on the same line gets 25 kilowatt-hours a month for 75 cents instead of $4.50—or just exactly one-sixth of what he paid the Willkie company for it.

And I might add that his companies tried to kill off rural electrification by building spite lines as interferences until the farmers in some sections took their shotguns and ran the men who were building those spite lines off their lands.

Mr. Willkie stood on the banks of the Columbia River a few days ago and tried to lead the people of Oregon and Washington to believe that he was in favor of public power, after trying all these years to destroy the T. V. A., the greatest weapon the American people have ever had for their protection against the extortionate overcharges the private power companies have been exacting for electric energy.

Mr. Willkie pretends that he reduced light and power rates in the T. V. A. area, when as a matter of fact his companies never reduced rates in that section until the competition of the T. V. A. compelled them to do so; and they never reduced them elsewhere until the publication of the T. V. A. yardstick rates showed the people what electricity was worth, and an aroused public opinion forced them to lower their rates to keep down competition.

Mr. Willkie talks about common honesty in his attacks on the Roosevelt administration. In his speech at Seattle, Wash., he said:

"Nowadays it is about as hard to start a new business as it is to rob a bank, and the risks of going to jail are about as great in both cases."

The only new business organized in recent years with which Mr. Willkie has been connected that I know anything about was the super holding company known as the Commonwealth & Southern. Every man connected with the gigantic fraud that was committed when that company was organized probably ought to have gone to jail.

According to the report of the Federal Trade Commission, it was one of the most brazen acts of its kind every committed. Was Mr. Willkie one of the guilty parties? We will let the record speak.

The record of the Federal Trade Commission shows that in February 1930 the Commonwealth & Southern was formed by the merger of four small companies, the Allied Power & Light Corporation, the Penn-Ohio Edison Co., the Commonwealth Power Corporation, and the Southeastern Power & Light Co.

The day those corporations were merged into the new Commonwealth & Southern the ledger value of their securities amounted to $340,896,260.27. They were placed on the books of the new Commonwealth & Southern Corporation, the same day, at $872,101,832.19, or a write-up of $531,205,571.92.

What did that extra $531,205,571.92 represent? It represented wind, water, and Power Trust rascality!

Do not take my word concerning this diabolical transaction, but let the record speak. I quote from the report of the Federal Trade Commission, which investigated this proposition:

"A table showing the ledger value of securities owned by each of the merged companies at the date of merger, and ledger values of the same securities as shown by the records of the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation on the same date, is presented below:

1	Ledger value of securities owned as shown by books of—		Appreciation
	Merged companies	Commonwealth & Southern Corporation	
	2	3	4
Allied Power & Light Corporation	$3,573,097.65	$21,583,038.35	$18,009,040.70
Penn-Ohio Edison Co	47,301,400.22	107,341,619.23	60,040,219.01
Commonwealth Power Corporation	89,742,899.05	372,234,258.32	282,491,359.27
Southeastern Power & Light Co	200,277,963.35	370,942,916.29	170,664,952.94
Total	340,896,260.27	872,101,832.19	531,205,571.92

"The total difference shown in column 4 of the table, in the amount of $531,205,571.92, represents the appreciation in ledger values of the securities formerly owned by the four merged or consolidated companies as valued on the books of the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation immediately after the merger."

With one stroke of the pen, they inflated those values $531,205,571.92, and then proceeded to sell securities against those inflated valuations. That is what they call thievery within the law.

While Mr. Willkie and his cohorts are clamoring for law enforcement, why not enforce the law against using the mails to defraud? Every time an official, an attorney, an agent, or a representative of the Commonwealth & Southern wrote a letter, a circular, or a postal card to induce people to buy stock in the Commonwealth & Southern, or to invest in its securities in any way, with this $531,000,000 of water in its capital structure, and sent it through the mail, they violated the laws against using the mails to defraud.

The Attorney General of the United States should investigate this proposition thoroughly, and enforce the law just as rigorously against these utility racketeers as he would enforce it against the misguided individual who uses the mails to swindle his neighbor out of a few dollars.

Shall we continue the prosecution of Hopson for using the mails to defraud in connection with the misconduct of the Associated Gas & Electric Co. and at the same time permit the ones who perpetrated this gigantic steal to escape?

Our Government is being destroyed from within by these vast monopolies that disregard human rights, disregard the laws of the land in the perpetration of such misconduct, as well as by their wholesale robbery of the unprotected public.

Now, let us look back of this Commonwealth & Southern and see what we find. As I said, the formation of the Commonwealth & Southern resulted from the consolidation of the four holding companies listed in the Federal Trade Commission's report. The Penn-Ohio Edison was a holding company incorporated in 1923 under the laws of Delaware. This holding company owned all the common stock of six operating companies and 99 percent of the common stock of the Northern Ohio Power & Light Co.

These operating companies then supplied power to 800,000 people in northeastern Ohio and western Pennsylvania, and included service to such principal cities as Akron, Youngstown, Salem, Ohio, and Sharon, in Pennsylvania. The operation of these companies was contracted and placed under the supervision of the Allied Power & Light Corporation.

The Commonwealth Power Co. was also a holding company incorporated under the Maine laws in 1922. Its operating subsidiaries then served 621 communities, with an estimated population exceeding 2,360,000, located in Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Tennessee, and Georgia. The Michigan operations were conducted by 2 major operating companies, namely, the Consumers Power Co. and the Southern Michigan Light & Power, and covered about 345 cities and towns, with a population exceeding 1,525,000.

The Illinois properties then consisted of 3 operating companies, namely, the Central Illinois Light, Illinois Power, and the Illinois Electric Power Co. The first 2 companies served 48 cities, with a population exceeding 250,000, and included such large cities as Peoria and Springfield. In Springfield, Mr. Willkie's company operates in competition with Springfield's municipal plant and has had to meet the competition of the public-plant rates. The Illinois Electric Power Co. was a generating company wholesaling to the Illinois properties and to foreign private companies. The Indiana operations of the Commonwealth were carried on by the Southern Indiana Operating Co., centering around Evansville and reaching a territory with population in excess of 125,000.

The Ohio operations of the Commonwealth Co. were conducted by the Ohio Edison Co., which served 45 communities, with population exceeding 105,000, in and around Springfield.

The Commonwealth Power Co. in 1925 acquired the Tennessee Electric Power Co. Tennessee Electric Power Co. then served 139 communities in Tennessee and 5 in northern Georgia and wholesaled to other private companies servicing over 100 communities in eastern Tennessee. The population of the communities directly served by Tennessee Electric Power Co. exceeded 375,000. This original Commonwealth Co. formed the backbone of the property later sold to the T. V. A. In addition to these holding and operating companies, Commonwealth operated through the Utilities Coal Corporation coal mines in Illinois and Kentucky.

The Southeastern Power & Light was also a holding company formed in 1924 to acquire the Alabama Power Co., Southeastern Fuel Co., Georgia Power Co., South Carolina Power Co., Mississippi Power Co., the Gulf Power Co., and the Gulf Electric Co. These subsidiaries at the time of the merger served 868 communities and a population of approximately 5,000,000. The object of this organization was to get control of the power to be generated at Muscle Shoals.

The Allied Power & Light was a combined holding, engineering, construction, and supervising company. It was formed in 1928 by acquiring the business and contracts of Hodenpyl, Hardy & Co., and Stevens & Wood, and handled all the engineering, construction, and supervision for all the original Commonwealth properties and the Penn-Ohio Edison.

WILLKIE'S BACKGROUND

I trust that you have followed closely the dates of the above mergers so that we can compare Mr. Willkie's own statement of experience, as given in Who's Who. After a short tenure with the Firestone Rubber Co., in a subordinate legal position in 1919, Mr. Willkie joined the Akron law firm of Mather & Nesbit in 1919, which connection he continued until 1929. This firm were the attorneys for the Ohio Edison. In those early holding-company days, the principal work of the local attorneys was lobbying before legislatures and regulatory bodies, franchise renewals, and rate fixing.

In 1927 and 1928 Mr. Willkie was lobbying at the National Capitol against the Walsh investigation resolution, and assisting Weadock, who represented the National Electric Light Association in opposing that resolution. One of the briefs filed before the Senate committee in opposition to the Walsh resolution was prepared by Mather, Nesbit & Willkie, attorneys for the Ohio utility. Remember this was the resolution under which the Federal Trade Commission was operating when it uncovered the rascality perpetrated in the organization of the Commonwealth & Southern, in which more than $531,000,000 worth of water was poured into the capital structure.

In 1929 Mr. Willkie moved to New York to become associated with his old N. E. L. A. associate, Mr. Weadock, in the firm of Weadock & Willkie, general counsel of the Commonwealth & Southern. The records indicate that this firm's only client was Commonwealth & Southern. Mr. Willkie's New York firm continued in this capacity until Mr.

Willkie was elected president of the Commonwealth & Southern in 1933.

The Commonwealth & Southern was a Morgan-Bonbright creation. The New York Times of May 24, 1933, shows that George H. Howard, one of the Commonwealth & Southern directors was a ground-floor participant in the stock-market cuts of J. P. Morgan & Co. It will be remembered that friends of J. P. Morgan were given blocks of stock below the market price. Anyone interested in this phase of manipulation can brush up by reading the long record of the 1933 Senate banking investigation.

Anyone with realistic information on corporate practice knows that all political, public policy, financial, and franchise matters are handled by a corporation's legal counsel. The corporation counsel in one of these useless holding companies is the assistant chief of staff, who is supposed to guide the financial "big shots" so that "thievery within the law" can be accomplished without interference.

From 1919 up to the Republican convention of 1940, Mr. Willkie's entire experience (except a short initial interval with Firestone) was with the legal staff of Commonwealth & Southern and predecessor companies. He was a part of this legal staff when all these mergers and manipulations took place. At no time was he connected directly with the actual operations, or the task of making the wheels go around. The actual operation of the properties with which Mr. Willkie was associated, were handled by Hodenpyl & Hardy, Stevens & Wood, and the Allied Power, and since the dissolution of the engineering adjuncts, this phase of Commonwealth & Southern business has been handled by the operating men in these two organizations and those who came over with the Commonwealth merger.

Mr. Willkie's entire utility background, and that is the sum total of his business experience, has been in the field of legal legerdemain. He was in the set-up as an assistant chief of staff and chief of staff, during all the manipulations of the Commonwealth & Southern and its predecessors for the last 20 years. In spite of General Johnson's assertion, Mr. Willkie was in the picture when Penn-Ohio Edison was formed in 1923, and when Penn-Ohio Edison was a component in the assembly of the Commonwealth & Southern in 1929.

WATERED SECURITIES

As I have pointed out, at the time the Commonwealth & Southern was formed, the ledger value (book property account) of the companies forming the combine was $340,896,260.19. This value, according to the Federal Trade Commission, had been previously written up in the 1922–23 and succeeding combinations. Prior write-ups were found by the Federal Trade Commission, but the total prior write-ups can only be reached by estimate. The "per customer ledger value" of the four holding companies going in the Commonwealth & Southern combination indicates a write-up of around $38 per customer. The first full year's report of the Commonwealth & Southern shows 1,053,759 electric consumers. Therefore, by such an estimate the prior write-up was at least $40,000,000. This is a conservative estimate as it neglects the gas, ice, transportation, and water properties.

In addition to these prior write-ups an actual audit of the books of the Commonwealth & Southern by the Federal Trade Commission discloses another write-up, as I said, of $531,205,572 in the formation of the giant holding company known as the Commonwealth & Southern, which serves, or is served by, a population of nearly 10,000,000. Against these write-ups new securities were issued and sold. The 1930 report of the Commonwealth & Southern sets out the plant account as $1,032,252,068, and securities outstanding, plus current debt, as $1.005 per $1 of ledger value (the ledger securities outstanding and the plant value for balance-sheet purposes were practically the same).

Exclusive of the funded and current debt and preferred stock of the subsidiaries, the balance sheet shows the holding company issuing and selling $150,000,000 of $6 no-par preferred stock, $51,900,000 of Commonwealth & Southern debt obligations, 33,673,328 shares of common stock and 17,588,956 common-stock option warrants.

As is known by those familiar with holding-company manipulations, the control of the common stock of the subsidiaries is the key step in the formation of a super holding company. Accordingly in the first half of 1929, with the panic in sight, the insiders of Morgan & Co. and Bonbright started the Commonwealth & Southern vehicle upon which the public was to take an inglorious ride. The gas which started this vehicle was $15,000,000 of Bonbright cash and $13,000,000 of Morgan cash, borrowed from two Morgan utilities. This and something like $15,000,000 other cash was used to buy up substantial amounts of the common stock of the three major underlying holding companies. This initial control stock was purchased by the insiders at $19 per share.

With the common stocks in their possession, the inside manipulators then commenced negotiations to trade the remaining common shares of the underlying holding companies for Commonwealth & Southern shares at a price which ranged from $24 to $24.40 per share. The next month Commonwealth & Southern shares were placed on the New York Curb market and daily transactions ran into hundreds of thousands. Nine days after listing, trading in Commonwealth & Southern shares exceeded the million mark. The ride was on and the reluctant share owners of the subsidiaries rushed in to trade the remaining subsidiary shares for proposed Commonwealth & Southern common. This is how Commonwealth & Southern was formed and the public was coaxed for a ride. In 22 days the vehicle had been created, the insiders had a $15,000,000 profit on the original shares, and the investing public had climbed abcard. By October 1929 Commonwealth & Southern common reached nearly $25 per share.

As bait, over 17,000,000 shares of option shares were issued at $30 per share. The traders advised that the shares would reach $50 by the end of the year. The shameful fraud of this stock-jobbing manipulation can be shown by a few simple figures.

The 33,673,328 common shares at, say, $25 a share represent $840,000,000. At $50 a share, anticipated, this common would represent $1,680,000,000. The 17,588,956 options at the issuing price represent $527,000,000. On top of these huge amounts were $916,000,000 of Commonwealth & Southern and subsidiary bonds, preferred stocks, and other obligations. such as customers' deposits, and so forth. Think of the fantasy of a paper value of $2,283,000,000 to $3,123,000,000 for a legitimate ledger value of only about $301,000,000 (actual ledger value of subsidiaries of the Commonwealth & Southern, less prior write-ups, or $340,896,260.27 at the time the company was formed. I would like to ask Mr. Willkie what the rates would have to be to support such a capital structure which his inside friends and employers erected in 1929.

Did they use the mails to defraud in selling their watered stocks against these inflated values?

Today the options are worthless.

Mr. Willkie in his last balance sheet placed the common at $168,366,640, or $5 per share. The market value of the common share is now around $1.25, or $42,000,000. The paper stock and option write-down amounted to one and three-tenths billion dollars. The investors became victims. Weadock and Willkie were assistant chiefs of staff during the time of the transactions.

Even with the write-down on 33,000,000 shares of common to $5, the electric book value per customer of the Commonwealth & Southern is $672 per customer. When Mr. Willkie took over the presidency of Commonwealth & Southern, the company had the second highest per customer valuation in the country. The per customer reduction from $833 in 1930 to $672 in 1938 arose not from any substantial lowering of capitalization but from taking on more customers.

Compare these figures with $303 for Insull's Commonwealth Edison, and $264 for all the public municipal plants in America. If Mr. Willkie's company had been efficiently operated financially, as the average public plant in America, it would have $550,000,000 less securities outstanding. Tacoma, Wash., has an outstanding debt of $123.50 per customer. The average American municipal plant has through amortization, an outstanding debt of only $94 per customer. Mr. Willkie's company in spite of stock write-downs, still has securities outstanding in excess of $670 per customer.

All the magazine talk of Mr. Willkie's rate-reducing policies is pure hokum. The only way that he can reduce his company's rates to the T. V. A. yardstick level is by putting the Commonwealth & Southern through the wringer and squeezing the water out of its capital structure. Any intelligent person knows that it is impossible for Mr. Willkie's company to reach Tacoma rate levels with $670 per customer of securities outstanding compared with $123.50 for Tacoma. To argue otherwise is willful deceit. But it can be done by squeezing the water out of the capital structure and eliminating the waste, graft, and extravagance.

WILLKIE'S OVERCHARGE

In the year 1938, before the T. V. A. sale, Willkie's companies overcharged their electric consumers $60,510,000 per year based on Tacoma rates. The details of these overcharges are given in the following table:

Overcharges of subsidiaries of Commonwealth & Southern for different classes of service, calendar year 1938, based on Tacoma's filed tariffs

Operating company	State	Residential overcharges	Commercial and industrial overcharges	Highway and street lights, etc.	Other utilities and railroads	Total
Alabama Power Co	Alabama	$2,190,000	$4,865,000	$218,000	[1] $243,000	$7,030,000
Georgia Power Co	Georgia	3,310,000	7,231,200	455,000	[1] 706,000	10,290,200
Tennessee Electric Power Co	Tennessee	2,325,000	3,810,100	159,000	368,000	6,662,100
Consumers Power Co	Michigan	5,635,000	8,763,500	561,000	220,100	15,179,600
Ohio Edison Co	Ohio	3,312,000	4,515,600	356,000	754,000	8,937,600
South Carolina Power Co	South Carolina	578,000	987,300	70,900	[1] 34,900	1,601,300
Central Illinois Light Co	Illinois	1,044,000	1,812,100	293,500	168,000	3,317,600
Gulf Power Co	Florida	379,000	498,200	35,050		912,250
Pennsylvania Power Co	Pennsylvania	854,000	1,171,800	120,800	74,200	2,220,800
Mississippi Power Co	Mississippi	650,000	1,900,000	316,500	91,400	2,957,900
Southern Indiana Gas & Electric	Indiana	589,000	768,000	69,800	[1] 26,150	1,400,650
Total		20,866,000	36,322,800	2,655,550	665,650	60,510,000

[1] Below Tacoma average rate +.

In spite of these rate overcharges, Mr. Willkie operated his companies from 1933 to date by reducing guaranteed dividends on preferred stocks. Up to the date of the Republican convention, Mr. Willkie's company was in arrears to his Commonwealth & Southern preferred stockholders $16.50 per share, or $24,800,000 on 1,500,000 shares. He was only able to keep his head above water by taking $24,800,000 from his preferred stockholders and writing down the common stock from the original sale price of $24 a share to less than $5 a share, or $19 a share on 33,673,328 shares, which represents a loss to them of $640,000,000, and it has now dropped to $1.25 a share, as the daily market reports show.

With this record of Mr. Willkie's, and the record of the forces with which he trains before us, I find it impossible to follow the optimistic gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] when he tells us that Mr. Willkie is the man to elect President of the United States If we want to inspire confidence, spread prosperity, and restore the peace and happiness of mankind. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE DRAFTING OF FATHERS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of making any observation about the remarks made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. I am not interested particularly in the source of the funds that paid for that advertisement to which he referred, provided it was legally done. But let it be said at least that that is one candidate whose advertising costs are not taken out of the Federal Treasury. I am not interested at the moment in whether or not a given individual is drafted for high office in 1944. I am more interested at the moment in the proposed drafting of 446,000 fathers in the country, for military service. That is infinitely more to the point at the moment. Political expediency would perhaps dictate that one better say nothing about it, because it is not too likely that that shall ever come to the floor of this House, if the proposed bill is liquidated in the Senate, but I think I would be rather remiss to my own conviction if I did not say something about it for my people.

The question of manpower and the drafting of fathers has certainly been uppermost in the minds of the folks back home. I took down the first report of the Selective Service recently, and saw the emphasis that was placed upon the sanctity and the necessity for preserving the American home. Now it is made to appear that the drafting of the 446,000 fathers before the 1st of January is one of those inevitable and inexorable things. Insofar as I can find out, we have 7,700,000 men in the armed services, of which they expect to have 4,750,000 overseas by the end of 1944, which is still more than 15 months hence. The original estimate for our armed forces was slightly over 8,200,000.

Assuming that vessels and everything else are available to transport 4,750,000 men by December 31, 1944, we will still have an Army of 3,000,000 men in continental United States. The War Department has seemingly reduced its estimate of military manpower by 562,000. The arithmetic for drafting dads is very alluring and it is very simple. We are told that there must be 1,221,000 additional members in the armed services by the end of the year. There will be available from the reclassification and from those who become 18 years of age about 775,000; 1,221,000 minus 775,000 leaves 446,000. Therefore, it becomes imperative that 446,000 fathers be inducted into the military service. But does it? Does that conclusion follow? I think I have some other ideas about it.

I will go along with our military and naval authorities whenever they make it abundantly clear that this must be done. But I believe we are entitled to something of a case besides a mere naked statement to that effect. That is the reason I raise my voice today.

Why do they constantly emphasize this business of drafting fathers when the problem before the country today is overall manpower? Manpower for civilian industry, for the distribution services, for defense plants, for the maintenance of the civilian economy, as well as for the armed services. Let us not be deluded or kidded because this whole manpower business is in a snarl, and will grow progressively worse as the months go by. It will, in fact, involve considerations of public health and public safety and we should explore it now.

I get a little concerned every time I ride on a railroad train when my senses tell me it is going 100 miles an hour because there are so many thousands who have been siphoned out of the transportation industry already and it becomes a critical problem with the transportation enterprises of the country.

I listen to people who have made readjustments in their businesses and find now that they are just about to be shunted out of business because there is no more manpower. Is it not rather interesting that this war is not yet 2 years old for the United States and that we are already confronted with a very critical manpower problem? Suppose it lasted as long as some gloomy prophets and professional pessimists prophesy, then what? It would indicate that there is a snarl, that there has been misdirection in this whole field, and that we ought not be kissed off by just one component element of the problem, such as the proposed drafting of fathers, but that we ought to look at the whole business.

When they say "drafting fathers" to me, I say all right, if it is made abundantly clear that there are no alternatives, but it does not follow that there are not some other sources that ought to be explored.

What about the Government pay roll? It gets bigger by the month. Three million twenty-nine thousand four hundred and eighty-three civilians on the pay roll as of May 31, 1943. The administrative patterns have been pretty well established for most of those agencies. Does it take as much manpower now to operate them as it did before? Must we continue dispensable functions of government in wartime such as this board in the Department of the Interior whose business it is to find the proper geographical names for mountains and highways, where they have 110 people employed? Is it not high time that we gave some rather serious consideration to the question of streamlining and diminishing the Federal pay roll in order to meet the momentary and imminent drafting of the fathers of the country? Do we still have to have 60,000 civilians running the War Manpower Commission? That is what they have got. Do we still have to have more than 55,000 people running the O. P. A.? They have more than that now. Do we still have to have nearly 4,000 running the Office of War Information? That is what they have got. Do we still need 12,000 people in censorship? That is what they have got. Do we still need 33,000 people in wartime in the Federal Security Agency? That is what they have got. Do we still need 2,200 people to run the Federal Communications Commission in wartime? They have got more than that.

I think the time has come for us to take a little look at this Federal pay roll and see whether or not we cannot find a substantial portion of the required military manpower in that field.

We had a subcommittee to investigate, under the chairmanship of the very able Member of this House, the gentleman from California, Mr. JOHN M. COSTELLO. Here before me is the first interim report of that committee, known as House Report No. 363. Provide yourselves with a copy. It is going to be very useful later. They report that there are 840,578 people in Government who are males between the ages of 18 and 38. That means 840,578 potentially available for military service. Suppose that is broken down to determine the number who are fathers and the number who must be deferred because they pursue some critical function of government. The chances are that there are literally hundreds of thousands in that list alone who would be available for the demands of the War and Navy Departments at the present time in meeting their requirements between now and January 1, 1944. So I say there is an alternative. When they say that we must draft dads I want to say there are some other sources that ought to be explored, and the first one is the Federal pay roll. Recruitment from this source would serve two purposes. It would provide additional manpower and also reduce a staggering civilian pay roll which now costs nearly $650,000,000 per month.

There is another source. That source, of course, is the defense plants that have been built by Federal money and that are scattered through the country today. Yesterday we had a little session downstairs with a gentleman who was the substantial head of a State-wide organization under the present administration. He was telling about his brother leaving a defense plant because there was not work enough to do. They would not diminish the pay roll. He had too much

conscience to take money for services not rendered and so he quit. I heard it repeatedly out home this summer. Many people have come to me to say what their experiences were in some of these defense plants, and that the personnel could be very substantially diminished. They say there would be additional manpower eligible for the draft and eligible for the demand of the armed services at the present time.

I do not mean to imply that in the main, workingmen are not doing their jobs. In fact most of them are, and doing them in many instances under difficult housing and living conditions. But I do know what has been told to me by men familiar with the conditions at some of these Government built plants and I can only infer from this information that there is a reckless waste of manpower. We cannot afford such waste. We cannot afford waste in any line, let alone manpower. Big as we are, rich as we are, blessed as we are as a Nation with resources and talent, we are in a global conflict and neither manpower nor material can be wasted. That is one thing we better write in the hat right now.

Some investigation has been made of this matter but it was very casual. I am informed of one plant, where a foreman told some of the men to duck because the Truman investigators were to appear. They wanted to conceal, as best they could, the overstaffing of the plant. Who can defend such a practice?

So before they say to us it is inevitable that 446,000 fathers must be drafted, that the home life in 446,000 homes must be impaired, I think it is high time that there be an immediate and summary exploration just to make sure we cannot get it from some other source instead of not only impairing the homes but impairing the civilian economy of the country.

We are going to these people and asking them to buy bonds and to do everything in the war effort, and how gladly they do it, but a resistance is beginning to develop now, and there is some impairment of morale that I have noticed. I have heard people talking in the defeatist tempo, and it is high time that we give to the taxpayers and the fathers and the home owners a break in this country, and that we meticulously examine the Federal pay roll and some of these defense plants to see whether there will not be available much of this required manpower instead of taking the fathers.

I watched the offices unloading their personnel at some places like Chicago, and I have been fairly amazed and astonished at the number of young men who certainly looked like they were in the draft age, and who did not look particularly encumbered, who may be available in order to meet the very enormous problem.

So when they say to me that it is inevitable that we have got to draft the fathers, I say, like Ishmael of old, that they raise their eyes and see what we have; that we should look at the Federal pay roll and at the pay roll of a good many defense plants to see whether or not they are overstaffed and whether they will be a source of available manpower.

There is another source, and that source is right in the War and Navy Departments themselves. There is not a Member of this House who has been to the War and Navy Departments who did not come back somewhat astonished at the number of people who were there, some of whom, apparently, are not always too busily engaged. Let us take a look at what they have got.

The War Department has 897,450 civilian males on the pay roll; maybe more now. The Navy Department has 490,500 male civilians on the pay roll now. That is over 1,300,000 male civilians who are working for the War and Navy Departments.

I do not say that they are not necessary, but I do say that if 2 men can do the work of 3, if we can retrench by 100,000 or 200,000, it ought to be done now, because we owe it to the high and resurgent faith of a great people that are sweating through this war and gladly bearing the burden of taxes, buying bonds, working laboriously, all in the hope of that day when the golden V of victory shall be written in the sky.

I think we ought to look down here where there are so many men that might be taken out of these Departments and who might be made effective military and naval men in our armed services. So when they say to me it is inevitable that the long arm of selective service has got to reach into the homes and take the fathers, I say, first of all, take a look at the Federal pay roll, where there are more than 840,000 males of military age; take a look at the defense plants to see how many we can get from that source, and finally dip down right in the Departments and find out what they can spare of civilian personnel and see how close we can come to the 446,000 that are needed to bridge the gap between now and December 31, 1943.

If they will do that, and if they will come back with the answer that the exploration has been made and that they cannot be found, I shall be one of the first to hold up the hands of General Marshall, a great soldier, and Admiral King, a great sailor, and say go ahead.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there may be a fourth source, and that is the young women of the land who can serve the armed forces in an administrative capacity. WAVES, WAC's, and SPARS have already done notable work. I assume that the drive for increased membership in these contingents is still under way. Perhaps the tempo and vigor of the drive can be increased. Each young woman who assumes duties in the armed services releases a fighting man and also diminishes the need for drafting fathers.

It occurs to me that the administration and the Congress owes it to the patriotic, robust, and uncomplaining soldiers on the home front who carry on our civilian economy, who pay taxes and buy bonds, to manage the war effort on a sound, unselfish, and economical basis and that where sacrifices in manpower must be made, the people's own Government should lead the way.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. I also ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until Monday, September 27, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, September 28, 1943, to begin hearings on H. J. Res. 148, providing for the diversion of additional water from Lake Michigan through the Sanitary Canal at Chicago.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

741. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey, on behalf of the United States, to Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building, known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building, located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage Townsite; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

742. A letter from the Director, Committee for Congested Production Areas, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Committee for Congested Production Areas for the period October 1, through December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

743. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriations of $302,779 for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943, and supplemental estimates of appropriations of $524,800 for the fiscal year 1944, in all $827,579, for the Post Office Department (H. Doc. No. 286); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

744. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the National Housing Agency in the amount of $200,000,000 for war housing (H. Doc. No. 287); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3037) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Esther A. Karr, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 3326. A bill directing the immediate liquidation and dissolution of the Commodity Credit Corporation and abolishing its powers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H. R. 3327. A bill relating to employment in civilian positions under the Government of the United States of persons found mentally deficient for training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 3328. A bill authorizing employment of engineers in private practice for Government projects; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution urging the institution of Americans-All—Immigrants-All Program; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution to create a joint congressional committee for the purpose of recommending a Pacific Charter to the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the president of the National Council of the Republic of Poland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, expressing its sentiments of deepest joy, through the liberation of Italy from the alliance with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 3318. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo Thomas Sullivan, deceased; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. R. 3319. A bill for the relief of A. J. Sprouffske; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 3320. A bill granting an increase in pension to Floyd L. Green; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 3321. A bill for the relief of Warde A. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3322. A bill for the relief of Lee Harrison; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 3323. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William M. Watson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEOGH:

H. R. 3324. A bill for the relief of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHWABE:

H. R. 3325. A bill granting an increase of pension to Roxie Fellows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3329. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles H. Morhouse; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3330. A bill for the relief of R. B. Walker Funeral Home; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3331. A bill for the relief of Harry L. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3332. A bill for the relief of Spencer Meeks; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2503. By Mr. FISH: Petition of Poughkeepsie Pythian Club, Inc.; E. Nichols; Carl Bain, president, Local No. 86, United Federal Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations; Polish-American Citizens' Club, Group No. 368, of Polish National Alliance, Inc., and 193 citizens of Poughkeepsie, Dutchess County, N. Y., protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, contending that professional prohibition organizations are attempting to force its consideration and passage, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war; that prohibitionists are also sponsoring legislation which would bring back prohibition by banning the sale of beer to our fighting forces in and near military camps as well as to civilians in zones around such camps; that the object of all such legislation is to reestablish complete national prohibition in the United States during the absence from their homes of more than 8,000,000 citizens in the military service of their country; that such legislation is opposed by the War and Navy Departments as well as by the great majority of our soldiers, sailors, marines, and civilians; that national prohibition, during a test of 13 years from 1920 to 1933, brought upon the Nation the uncontrollable evils of the speakeasy and the bootlegger, the degradation of teen-age girls and boys, Nation-wide home manufacture of illegal liquor, widespread vicious crime, official corruption, and disrespect for law, all of which so outraged public decency that the eighteenth amendment was repealed by a majority of 10,000,000 votes; and that the enactment of any such legislation would completely destroy all legalized control and cause the loss of Federal revenues of more than $1,500,000,000 a year and local revenues of $500,000,000 a year without any compensating benefits to either State or Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2504. By Mr. RAMEY: Petition of members of Harry E. Pond Post of the American Legion, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary to the winning of the war, sponsored by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2505. Also, petition of Frank Vargo and 19 residents of Toledo, Curtis, and Cleveland, Ohio, and Temperance, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary to the winning of the war, sponsored by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2506. By Mr. ELSTON of Ohio: Petition of Gustav Pfeiffer; Harry Fritsch; Edna A. Mueller; Paul E. Frederick; Norwood Eagles, Aerie No. 449; Charles Harding; Louis J. Kessner; John Wesler; Fred Kirchner; Walter Ramsey; Paul Kraft; Mrs. E. Kist; David Huber; William C. Stoes; William Tice; and 428 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2507. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of Cal Collentine of the Green Tavern, Charles City, Iowa, and 60 other residents of the Third District of Iowa, opposing enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2508. Also, petition of F. T. Nockles and 39 other residents of Charles City, Iowa, opposing enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2509. Also, petition of W. F. Bohneman, of Riceville, Iowa, and 19 other residents of Iowa, opposing enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2510. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of M. R. Mandeville and other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2511. Also, petition of Joseph J. Houser and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2512. Also, petition of the Corrugated and Fiber Box Makers Union 22330, signed by 119 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2513. Also, petition of Adam B. Ofenstein and 60 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2514. Also, petition of Ed Traft and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2515. Also, petition of Emil E. Bussen and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2516. Also, petition of the Anheuser Busch Post, No. 229, of the American Legion, signed by 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2517. Also, petition of H. G. Rahn and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2518. Also, petition of G. A. Anderson and six other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2519. Also, petition of A. S. Preusch, signed by 180 citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2520. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of the teachers of El Paso County, Tex., endorsing Senate bill 637, a bill proposing to extend Federal aid to public schools; to the Committee on Education.

2521. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of the members of the American Legion Post, No. 1, of Wheeling, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2522. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Sons of Confederate Veterans, commending the administration's foreign policy with regard to the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, strong to save, amid the shifting forms of the ephemeral, give us eyes to discern the shining truth of the eternal. Forgive us that so often we have forgotten that above our hollow pride and our easy vanity is the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is holy. Thy mercy on thy people, Lord! Thy pity on our blindness! Thy light on our darkness! Thy grace to heal the broken life of mankind!

Make our America a nation Thou canst trust and bless. Make her beautiful in righteous love and in humane service. May our democracy, purged of its failings and confessing its failures, be an inspiring and emancipating power for world security and stability. We beseech Thee so to order and dispose the issues of this crucial conflict, raging in its mad fury around the globe, demanding our all, that we may be brought through strife to lasting peace, through sacrifice to the song of the redeemed. We ask it in the name of Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, September 21, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 883) providing for an assistant secretary of commerce for small business.

The message announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 135. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the General State Authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

S. 159. An act for the relief of the United States Parcel Post Building Co., of Cleveland, Ohio;

S. 332. An act for the relief of Velma Pikkarainen;

S. 426. An act for the relief of Maj. George E. Golding;

S. 462. An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo;

S. 626. An act for the relief of Angeline Arbuckle;

S. 652. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Lassiter;

S. 787. An act for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Harry Jacobs;

S. 789. An act to provide for the mailing of annual notices to owners of tax-exempt properties in the District of Columbia;

S. 824. An act for the relief of Dr. J. W. Goin;

S. 915. An act for the relief of Robert Kish Lee and Elizabeth Kish;

S. 929. An act for the relief of Dr. Douglas E. Lawson;

S. 1223. An act to fix the compensation of the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia and the Superintendent of the National Training School for Girls; and

S. 1224. An act to designate the Public Library of the District of Columbia a public depository for governmental publications.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 881) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SUMNERS of Texas, Mr. WALTER, and Mr. HANCOCK were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress with respect to participation by the United States in prevention of future aggression and the maintenance of peace; and

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the biennial report of the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, July 1, 1941, to June 30, 1943, to the Secretary of War, as a public document, and providing for additional copies thereof.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 244. An act for the relief of Morris Leff;

H. R. 247. An act for the relief of Richard P. Beale and Eva M. Beale;

H. R. 273. An act to authorize settlement of individual claims of naval personnel for damage to private property shipped from Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, to San Francisco, Calif.;

H. R. 310. An act for the relief of Robert M. Crain;

H. R. 312. An act for the relief of Freda Utley;

H. R. 400. An act for the relief of Sigurd J. E. Wallstedt;

H. R. 438. An act for the relief of Eleanor McCloskey, also known as Evelyn Mary Mikalauskas;

H. R. 550. An act for the relief of Mrs. Renzie Graham;

H. R. 937. An act for the relief of Mittie Pearl Nanny;

H. R. 938. An act for the relief of Mrs. Robert C. Anderson;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of Clare A. Miller;

H. R. 1049. An act for the relief of the estate of Hyman Wiener;

H. R. 1317. An act for the relief of Premier Insurance Co.;

H. R. 1388. An act to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the construction of a scenic parkway to provide an appropriate view of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park from the Tennessee side of the park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1434. An act for the relief of Anna M. Kohler;

H. R. 1435. An act for the relief of Lillian C. Ferreira;

H. R. 1555. An act for the relief of Arkansas Power & Light Co.;

H. R. 1665. An act for the relief of Joseph Paste, Anna Paste, Rose Paste, and to the legal guardian of Doris Paste, and to the legal guardian of Evelyn Paste;

H. R. 1666. An act for the relief of Helen Engell Thompson;

H. R. 1769. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ina Mae Shipman;

H. R. 1809. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Cross to George F. Thompson;

H. R. 1887. An act for the relief of Harold E. Dalton;

H. R. 1915. An act for the relief of Carl W. Bucey;

H. R. 1918. An act for the relief of Edward A. Silvia;

H. R. 1920. An act for the relief of Marcus O. and Faye D. Rowland, the parents of George L. Rowland, deceased;

H. R. 1973. An act for the relief of Albert Ferguson and Ozelle Ferguson;

H. R. 2131. An act for the relief of Henry Angell;

H. R. 2134. An act for the relief of Paul Szeliga;

H. R. 2182. An act for the relief of John E. Haas;

H. R. 2244. An act for the relief of Frank and Nancy Foglia, parents of Frank Foglia, a minor, deceased;

H. R. 2340. An act for the relief of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.;

H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of Reese Flight Instruction, Inc.;

H. R. 2509. An act for the relief of Marie Engert;

H. R. 2675. An act providing for payment to Nellie Starr McCorkle of accumulated leave accrued and payable to her deceased husband, Capt. John Ray McCorkle, under the act of August 1, 1941 (ch. 348, 55 Stat. 616; 5 U. S. C., sec. 61a);

H. R. 2734. An act for the relief of Kathleen B. Maier;

H. R. 2824. An act for the relief of Alice Stamps and Henrietta E. Stamps;

H. R. 2886. An act to provide for the removal of oysters from the waters of York River and Queen Creek, Va., affected by sewage disposal emanating from the construction battalion training camp, at Camp Peary, Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2902. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Leo;

H. R. 2915. An act for the relief of the Pacific Construction Co.;

H. R. 3208. An act to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 3291. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

REPORT ON INTERTERRITORIAL FREIGHT RATES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Board of Investigation and Research, under the Transportation Act of 1940, transmitting, pursuant to law, its report on interterritorial freight rates, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE ARMY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 43, which was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the biennial report of the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, July 1, 1941, to June 30, 1943, to the Secretary of War, be printed as a public document, and that 6,000 additional copies be printed, of which 4,500 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 1,500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

ELIMINATION OF PRIVATE SUITS ARISING OUT OF FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. VAN NUYS, Mr. MCCARRAN, and Mr. DANAHER conferees on the part of the Senate.

MEMORIALS

Mr. JOHNSON of California presented memorials numerously signed of sundry citizens of Placer County, Calif., remonstrating against the release and return to the Pacific coast during the war emergency of Japanese, both citizens and aliens, and requesting that all Japanese wealth be held and used for the support of the Japanese during the time they are retained in war relocation centers, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF GEORGE A. CUNNINGHAM POST, NO. 295, CHENEY, KANS.—DRAFT OF NONESSENTIAL SINGLE AND MARRIED MEN WITHOUT CHILDREN

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by Post No. 295 at Cheney, Kans.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHENEY, KANS., *September 22, 1943.*

Hon. CLYDE REED,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:

At a regular meeting of our post the following resolution was adopted: "Resolved, for immediate benefit of war effort and the future of our country we recommend that all nonessential single and married men without children, of selective service age, now employed in defense plants, Government agencies, and other business, be placed in armed forces before fathers are drafted."

GEORGE A. CUNNINGHAM POST, No. 295,
Cheney, Kans.

CONTROL OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present a petition which I have received from Mrs. J. J. Ballinger, secretary of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Winfield, Kans., in which the women ask that bills for the effective control of the liquor traffic be given the best attention of the Senate. I ask that this appeal be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WINFIELD, KANS., *September 6, 1943.*

Mr. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Topeka, Kans.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: We, the women of the W. C. T. U. of Winfield, over 100 members, wish to go on record as wanting to ask you to continue to do everything in your power to get through any of the bills on liquor legislation that will give us and our boys in camp a dryer and cleaner condition than we now have. We go on record as favoring the Sheppard bill, the Bryson bill, the Capper anti-advertising liquor bill, and any others designed to free us from this terrible situation.

We do not object to sugar rationing except when we think of the Government allowing the breweries 135,000,000 pounds to make that which demoralizes the boys and our citizens. We seem to be doing without the sugar we need in order that the brewers may make more money off the weaknesses of men.

Please try to influence Congress to bear down on the O. P. A. They are howling about the drastic necessity for more corn; and no doubt it is needed for food, but tell them to quit turning over corn to the breweries.

How do we like tire and gas rationing? Yes, its hard on us, but we would gladly submit if we did not know the liquor industry (and that includes beer) was getting tires, gas, and shipping space for their detrimental products.

Please ask Congress to step on the W. P. B. needed manpower! How de we like having fathers all over this country compelled to break up their homes in order to "save" their homes? Strange paradox! But even that would be much tempered if we did not know the Government is permitting the liquor business that is wasting more manpower days than any other one thing. Not only the 2,000,000 men engaged in this worse than worthless business, but the days lost from drunkenness, the machinery wrecks, and a large percentage of airplane wrecks caused by alcoholic nerves, a terrible toll of life and lost manpower—and the young fathers of our Nation now must pay the price! Please let all these alphabetical agencies know that we resent this.

We could go on and on telling of these glaring inconsistencies allowed, even encouraged by Government officials, allowing the brewers and distillers to get us by the throat and not only the W. C. T. U., but every Christian citizen, is resenting this.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. J. J. BALLINGER,
Secretary, Winfield W. C. T. U.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS BY FOREIGN GROUPS—LETTER FROM WASHINGTON METHODIST MINISTERS' MEETING

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter in the nature of a memorial from the Methodist Ministers' Meeting of the District of Columbia, remonstrating against S. 1338, a bill on the Senate Calendar.

There being no objection, the letter in the nature of a memorial was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 20, 1943.

To the Members of the United States Senate:

The Methodist Ministers' Meeting of the District of Columbia respectfully protest bill S. 1338, as reported by the Senate District Committee, to provide for additional outlets for the sale of alcoholic liquors by foreign clubs for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter, and modifying the condition of issuance, or under any other condition, as inimical to the war effort.

Since such clubs are to be denied the privilege of having a bar for the sale of alcoholic liquors 6 months after the war, we can see no good reason why they should be given a special privilege for the sale of intoxicating liquors for the duration of the war.

We ask that this protest be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,
H. R. DEAL, *President,*
WILLIAM E. FIRTH, *Secretary,*
For the Methodist Ministers' Meeting of Washington and Vicinity.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation of 18,261 petitions, from 22 States and the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States.

There being no objection, the petitions were received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Alabama: Birmingham	79
California:	
Berkeley	18
Oakland	43
Pasadena	1
Paso Robles	64
San Miguel	3
	129
Colorado: Brush	59
District of Columbia: Washington	1
Florida:	
Bradenton	68
Jacksonville	63
Lakeland	37
	168

Illinois:	
Abingdon	181
Albion	60
Aledo	119
Alma	47
Arcola	84
Aroma Park	51
Astoria	256
Athens	27
Aurora	101
Barrington	143
Bible Grove	115
Bloomington	159
Brownstown	97
Canton	143
Carbondale	179
Carlyle	46
Casey	101
Centralia	41
Chicago	736
Cissna Park	27
Coffeen	34
Cowden	46
Colchester	116
Dahlgren	62
Danforth	81
Decatur	105
Des Plaines	99
Donnellson	53
Downers Grove	159
Edwardsville	108
Effingham	79
Eldorado	42
Emden	12
Fairview	107
Farmington	132
Findley	41
Fithian	102
Flat Rock	17
Flora	190
Franklin	104
Galesburg	12
Geneseo	159
Gibson City	17
Gorham	22
Granite City	46
Greenview	88
Greenville	118
Hartsburg	13
Henning	45
Hillsboro	84
Hutsonville	22
Illiopolis	76
Industry	87
Jacksonville	24
Joliet	45
Kankakee	23
Laurenceville	135
Lebanon	22
Lewistown	76
Liberty	81
Litchfield	125
London Mills	192
Macon	23
Marissa	61
Marseilles	155
Maywood	45
McNabb	31
Metropolis	136
Middlegrove	45
Minonk	73
Moline	12
Monmouth	54
Mount Carmel	46
Newton	114
Niota	77
Normal	70
Oakford	1
Oak Park	96
Odell	37
Odin	47
Orangeville	23
Oreana	83
Oregon	23
Paris	58
Payson	102
Peoria	249
Peoria Heights	23
Petersburg	48
Pocahontas	143
Polo	84
Princeville	20
Potoka	36
Prairie View	26
Ridgefarm	65
Rock Island	136
Saunemin	48
Saybrook	79
Sharpsburg	27
Shattuc	65
Sorento	85
Springfield	4
Sterling	106
Streator	23
Sullivan	74
Tallulah	7
Tilden	93
Tremont	23
Vergennes	62
Villa Grove	75
Viola	22
Waggoner	60
Warrenville	22
Washburn	66
Washington	46
Watseka	16
Weldon	102
West Frankfort	23
Wheaton	119
Wood River	142
Wyanet	23
	9,573
Iowa: Correctionville	82
Maine:	
Bridgewater	37
Clinton	33
Eliot	29
Gardiner	20
Presque	48
Presque Isle	279
Round Pond	20
Springvale	177
Washburn	52
	695
Maryland:	
Baltimore	150
Brookville	33
Chestertown	66
Denton	27
Finksburg	2
Hurlock	50
Port Deposit	35
Rising Sun	52
	415
Massachusetts: Boston	56
Minnesota:	
Anoka	26
Belview	37
Benson	46
Bricelyn	144
Cambridge	29
Duluth	244
Ellendale	34
Erskine	79
Faribault	20
Fertile	53
Glenville	18
Hampton	25
Hawley	35
Hines	47
International Falls	22
Jordan	37
Lafayette	24
Little Fork	9
Mankato	33
Marshall	34
Milaca	40
Minneapolis	91
Moose Lake	45
Monterey	20
Mora	28
Mound	28
North Branch	25
North Redwood	14
Peterson	74
Princeton	30
St. Paul	19
Spicer	37
Solway	18
Sturgeon Lake	20
Virginia	2
Walnut Grove	10
Waseca	52
Wyoming	21
	1,570
Michigan: Columbiana	18
New Jersey:	
Cape May	22
Leesburg	40
Mickleton	55
Newfield	21
Salem	444
Woodbury	583
	1,165
New York:	
Cincinnatus	18
Fredonia	202
Harrisville	50
Panama	60
Perrysburg	63
Ripley	22
Sinclairville	40
	455
North Dakota:	
Anamoose	40
Flasher	1
	41
Ohio:	
Ashtabula	30
Cleveland	31
Killbuck	30
Mansfield	34
Montpelier	1
Westerville	20
Wooster	30
	176
Oregon: Salem	16
Pennsylvania:	
Apollo	57
Coalport	32
Corry	255
Edinboro	123
Erie	1,113
Espyville	52
Fairview	44
Fredonia	104
Greenville	82
Harborcreek	43
New Bethlehem	101
New Castle	125
New Wilmington	38
Northeast	104
New Salem	90
Oil City	44
Pittsburgh	50
Ridgway	65
Sharpsville	60
Townville	70
Waterford	232
Wattsburg	66
Wesleyville	56
Williamsport	11
Windber	20
	3,037
South Carolina: Sumter	1

Texas:	
Dallas	52
Edinburg	70
Harlingen	20
	142
Virginia: Weyers Cove	169
West Virginia:	
Barrackville	62
Fairmont	13
Rivesville	1
	76
Wisconsin:	
Ashland	11
Bay City	31
Washburn	66
	108
Total	18,261

CONTROL AND REGULATION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC DURING THE WAR—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation of 843 petitions, from 4 States, favoring the enactment of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war.

There being no objection, the petitions were received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Illinois:	
Chillicothe	41
Danforth	44
Granite City	41
Greenville	18
Makanda	19
Mount Carmel	32
Streator	26
	221
Iowa: Correctionville	26
Maryland:	
Baltimore	150
Brookeville	33
Chestertown	66
Denton	27
Hurlock	50
Port Deposit	35
Rising Sun	52
Takoma Park	182
	595
Ohio: Montpelier	1
Total	843

PROTESTS AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF PROHIBITION MEASURES

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, at the request of Mr. I. C. Zimmerman, of El Paso, Tex., I present memorials from 720 citizens of Texas remonstrating against consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress, and ask that one of the memorials be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached thereto.

There being no objection, the memorials were received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and the body of one of the memorials was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETITION PROTESTING AGAINST THE ENACTMENT OF ANY AND ALL PROHIBITION LEGISLATION

Whereas the professional prohibition organizations are attempting to force the consideration and passage of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war; and

Whereas these same prohibitionists are also sponsoring legislation which would bring back prohibition by banning the sale of beer to our fighting forces in and near military camps, as well as to civilians in zones around such camps; and

Whereas the object of all such legislation is to reestablish complete national prohibition in the United States during the absence from their homes of more than 8,000,000 citizens in the military service of their country; and

Whereas any such legislation is opposed by the War and Navy Departments as well as by the great majority of our soldiers, sailors, marines, and civilians; and

Whereas national prohibition, during a test of 13 years from 1920 to 1933, brought upon the Nation the uncontrollable evils of the speakeasy and the bootlegger—the degradation of teen-age girls and boys—Nation-wide home manufacture of illegal liquor—widespread vicious crime, official corruption, and disrespect for law—all of which so outraged public decency that the eighteenth amendment was repealed by a majority of 10,000,000 votes; and

Whereas the enactment of any such legislation would completely destroy all legalized control and cause the loss of Federal revenues of more than $1,500,000,000 a year and local revenues of $500,000,000 a year without any compensating benefits to either State or Nation; Therefore

We, the undersigned citizens of the United States, protest against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress and herewith request our Senators and Representatives to vote against any and all such proposed legislation. We further respectfully request that this petition be referred to the proper committees and listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR ORDERED PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 244. An act for the relief of Morris Leff;

H. R. 247. An act for the relief of Richard P. Beale and Eva M. Beale;

H. R. 273. An act to authorize settlement of individual claims of naval personnel for damage to private property shipped from Pearl Harbor, T. H., to San Francisco, Calif.;

H. R. 310. An act for the relief of Robert M. Crain;

H. R. 400. An act for the relief of Sigurd J. E. Wallstedt;

H. R. 550. An act for the relief of Mrs. Renzie Graham;

H. R. 937. An act for the relief of Mittie Pearl Nanny;

H. R. 938. An act for the relief of Mrs. Robert C. Anderson;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of Clare A. Miller;

H. R. 1049. An act for the relief of the estate of Hyman Wiener;

H. R. 1317. An act for the relief of Premier Insurance Co.;

H. R. 1435. An act for the relief of Lillian C. Ferreira;

H. R. 1555. An act for the relief of Arkansas Power & Light Co.;

H. R. 1665. An act for the relief of Joseph Paste, Anna Paste, Rose Paste, and to the legal guardian of Doris Paste, and to the legal guardian of Evelyn Paste;

H. R. 1666. An act for the relief of Helen Engell Thompson;

H. R. 1769. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ina Mae Shipman;

H. R. 1887. An act for the relief of Harold E. Dalton;

H. R. 1915. An act for the relief of Carl W. Bucey;

H. R. 1918. An act for the relief of Edward A. Silvia;

H. R. 1920. An act for the relief of Marcus O. and Faye D. Rowland, the parents of George L. Rowland, deceased;

H. R. 1973. An act for the relief of Albert Ferguson and Ozelle Ferguson;

H. R. 2182. An act for the relief of John E. Haas;

H. R. 2244. An act for the relief of Frank and Nancy Foglia, parents of Frank Foglia, a minor, deceased;

H. R. 2340. An act for the relief of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.;

H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of Reese Flight Instruction, Inc.;

H. R. 2675. An act providing for payment to Nellie Starr McCorkle of accumulated leave accrued and payable to her deceased husband, Capt. John Ray McCorkle, under the act of August 1, 1941 (ch. 348, 58 Stat. 616; 5 U. S. C., sec. 61a);

H. R. 2734. An act for the relief of Kathleen B. Maier;

H. R. 2824. An act for the relief of Alice Stamps and Henrietta E. Stamps; and

H. R. 2915. An act for the relief of the Pacific Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 312. An act for the relief of Freda Utley;

H. R. 438. An act for the relief of Eleanor McCloskey, also known as Evelyn Mary Mikalauskas;

H. R. 1434. An act for the relief of Anna M. Kohler;

H. R. 2131. An act for the relief of Henry Angell;

H. R. 2134. An act for the relief of Paul Szeliga;

H. R. 2509. An act for the relief of Marie Engert; and

H. R. 2902. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Leo; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 1388. An act to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the construction of a scenic parkway to provide an appropriate view of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park from the Tennessee side of the park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 1869. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Cross to George F. Thompson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 2886. An act to provide for the removal of oysters from the waters of York River and Queen Creek, Va., affected by sewage disposal emanating from the construction battalion training camp, at Camp Peary, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 3208. An act to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia; to the calendar.

H. R. 3291. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) declaring the sense of the Congress with respect to participation by the United States in prevention of future aggression and the maintenance of peace was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces; without amendment (Rept. No. 413).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

S. 970 A bill authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably; without amendment (Rept. No. 414); and

H. R. 2250. A bill to extend the provisions of the Reclassification Act of February 28, 1925, to include custodial employees in the Postal Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 415).

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 2888. A bill relating to the application of the excess-profits tax to certain production-bonus payments; without amendment (Rept. No. 417).

ACTIVITIES AND OPERATIONS OF THE FEDERAL FARM BOARD—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY (REPT. NO. 416)

Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, pursuant to Senate Resolution 137, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, agreed to June 30, 1941, submitted a report relating to the financial operations of the Federal Farm Board, with some references to transactions of allied organizations and of the Farm Credit Administration, which succeeded the Farm Board, which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. STEWART introduced Senate bill 1370, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1371. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1372. A bill to authorize the purchase of certain interests in lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1373. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico for school purposes a certain building and lot known as the Mayaguez Barracks Military Reservation now under the jurisdiction of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1374. A bill to provide for promotion of certain American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. 1375. A bill to provide for certain payments to States and their political subdivisions as compensation for loss of revenues occasioned by the acquisition of real property by the United States for military purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TUNNELL:

S. 1376. A bill to amend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1377. A bill for the protection of the investigative personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on Civil Service;

S. 1378. A bill to limit compensation for services in connection with certain claims against the United States;

S. 1379. A bill for the relief of Harry L. Smith;

S. 1380. A bill for the relief of the dependents of Dr. Arthur B. Wyse, Dr. Charles R. Hoover, Dr. Lawrence S. Moyer, and Mr. Israel H. Tilles;

S. 1381. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles H. Morhouse; and

S. 1382. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. TYDINGS introduced S. J. Res. 81, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

SLEEPING QUARTERS FOR SOLDIERS VISITING WASHINGTON

Mr. LANGER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19), which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, notwithstanding any existing public law or resolution, the Architect of the Capitol, subject to the joint direction of the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, shall suspend all permits for the parking of privately owned vehicles in the legislative garage, situated under the Senate terrace, for the duration of the present national emergency, and offer the floor space therein released to the armed forces of the United States as temporary sleeping quarters for military personnel on furlough or traveling under orders or temporarily sojourning in the Nation's Capital. The armed forces of the United States, or such public agencies as they may designate, shall install suitable facilities and accommodations to carry out the purposes of this concurrent resolution and shall be responsible to the Architect of the Capitol for the orderly operation of these quarters.

It is hereby authorized a joint payment of expenses incidental to carrying out the purpose of this concurrent resolution, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives and of the Senate of the United States.

WORLD-WIDE CONDITIONS TODAY—ADDRESS BY ASSOCIATE JUSTICE DOUGLAS

[Mr. VAN NUYS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "World-wide Conditions Today," delivered by Associate Justice William O. Douglas of the Supreme Court of the United States at San Francisco, Calif., on September 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE UNITY OF INTEREST OF WEST AND SOUTH—ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR ARNALL, OF GEORGIA

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Unity of Interest of West and South," delivered by Gov. Ellis Arnall of Georgia before the Western Governors' Conference at Denver, Colo., on September 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS TO AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION BY ROBERT M. HUTCHINS

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered at the last meeting of the American Bar Association by Robert M. Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY MAYOR WALTER CHANDLER AT DEDICATION OF KENNETH D. McKELLAR AIR FIELD

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Walter Chandler, mayor of the city of Memphis, Tenn., on the occasion of the dedication of the Kenneth D. McKellar Air Field at Jackson, Tenn., on July 5, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN BRETT

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Memorial Day address entitled "Lest We Fail Again," delivered by Hon. John Brett, assistant district attorney for the western district of Oklahoma, at Bristow, Okla., on May 30, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

A CHALLENGE TO AMERICANISM—ADDRESS BY HENRY J. TAYLOR

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Challenge to Americanism," delivered by Henry J. Taylor, author of Men in Motion, before the Indiana Republican Editorial Association at French Lick Spring, Ind., on September 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

IN DEFENSE OF FREEDOM—ADDRESS BY ROBERT LEE BROKENBURR

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "In Defense of Freedom," delivered by State Senator Robert Lee Brokenburr, of Indiana, at the dedication of a plaque to men from Highland Place neighborhood in the armed forces of the United States, on September 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE VALUE OF A JOB—ADDRESS BY ROBERT LEE BROKENBURR

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Value of a Job," delivered by State Senator Robert Lee Brokenburr, of Indiana, on September 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEAR VERSUS FAITH—EDITORIAL FROM SATURDAY EVENING POST

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Faith Versus Fear," written by T. E. Murphy, and published in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post, which appears in the Appendix.]

HANDLING CAMP FOLLOWERS—EDITORIAL FROM SHREVEPORT (LA.) TIMES

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Handling Camp Followers," published in the Shreveport, La., Times, of

September 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. WILLKIE'S PROGRAM—EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA RECORD

[Mr. TUNNELL (for Mr. GUFFEY) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Has Willkie Signed His Own Death Warrant?" published in the Philadelphia Record of September 22, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RICH GET RICHER—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW REPUBLIC

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Rich Get Richer," published in the New Republic of September 20, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SLEEPING QUARTERS FOR SOLDIERS VISITING WASHINGTON

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, September 20, 1943, remarks by Representative TOLAN, of California, together with a resolution by him, calling attention to the fact that a great many of our soldiers, sailors, and marines, when they come to Washington to view the sights of this great city, find it necessary to sleep in the Union Station on floors, benches, and so forth. Representative TOLAN suggested that the Senate garage could conveniently be utilized to provide sleeping quarters for such soldiers, sailors, and marines.

I realize, Mr. President, that the personnel of the Senate is concerned with the problem of doing the square thing, the fine thing, and the necessary thing for our visiting brethren of the forces of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. After reading the remarks of Representative TOLAN, I had occasion to ask one of the men in my office to look into this matter. He went to the Union Station between 3 and 4 o'clock in the morning. There he interviewed military police, soldiers and sailors, Army officers, and men at the information desk. He investigated the matter personally, so far as he could, and this is the picture as he found it: According to his count, on that occasion there were between 50 and 75 soldiers and men from the other branches of the service sleeping around the station. There were not, of course, the number claimed by Representative TOLAN. He talked to a captain of the Quartermaster Corps, who suggested it would be far better and would provide greater comfort and convenience if the Government would build temporary barracks close to the station. He also indicated it would be cheaper to do that than to attempt to convert the Capitol garage into sleeping quarters. The garage, as Members of the Senate know, is built below the level; it is a sort of basement. A medical lieutenant agreed that the sanitary problem if many men were quartered in the garage would be serious. The military police said that most of the congestion incident to soldiers and sailors sleeping in the depot is caused by servicemen en route home on leave and spending the time between trains in the depot.

It was also commented that if 10,000 beds were provided in the city for servicemen, soldiers and sailors would still be found sleeping in the depot and probably on benches in the nearby parks. The quartermaster captain who was interviewed seemed to feel that taking over the Capitol Park Hotel, which has recently been done to accommodate the soldiers, would solve the problem. It will be opened October 15. Failing that, he said temporary barracks could be erected in 2 weeks, and would afford more desirable quarters than would the garage.

Mr. President, we are all interested in meeting this problem head-on. I was particularly somewhat outraged, so to speak, because in one newspaper I read the heading "Senator silent on housing plan for soldiers." I thought that particular article and its heading did not indicate correctly the mental attitude of the Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, in last night's Washington Evening Star there was a very significant article, which was headed "Johnson supports plan to turn the Senate garage into sleeping center."

It appears from reading the article, that—

Winfree Johnson, chairman of the Servicemen's Lodging Committee, today announced the committee's support of a proposal by Representative TOLAN, Democrat, of California, that the Senate garage be converted into a sleeping center for servicemen waiting for trains at the Union Station.

In a letter to Mr. TOLAN, however, Mr. Johnson stressed that servicemen already are being provided with adequate overnight lodging here. Many still sleep at Union Station while waiting for trains, he admitted, but this problem will be largely relieved through the opening, on October 15, of the United Nations Service Center on Union Station Plaza, in quarters formerly occupied by the Capitol Park Hotel.

RESOLUTION SPONSORED

Mr. TOLAN, who said he found about 1,000 servicemen sleeping on the floors, benches, and counters when he visited the Union Station early Sunday morning, is sponsoring a resolution which would convert the Senate garage into a sleeping haven for service personnel.

We are primarily interested in these boys of ours, these servicemen. We want them to be comfortable when they visit the Capital City of their country Nothing is too good for them. It appeared, when a man from my office visited the Union Station a few nights ago, that somewhat less than a hundred were then sleeping in the station.

Right next to the station is the Plaza, the park, which has been referred to. According to the testimony of the individuals who know something about the subject, if the Capitol Park Hotel does not provide the solution, temporary barracks should be erected on this Plaza to handle the overflow.

The article continues:

Mr. Johnson, who planned to confer with Mr. TOLAN today on garage-conversion proposal, said he wished to correct the Representative's impression that little or nothing is being done now to house visiting servicemen.

It continues:

More than 250 beds were vacant in the Memorial Bridge recreation area—

On the evening that this inspection was made by Mr. TOLAN—

while at the Christ Church Center, 3100 O Street NW., 28 of the cots were unoccupied. A truck stopped at the Union Station every hour Saturday night to transport any servicemen who wished to sleep at the Memorial Bridge center, Mr. Johnson added.

The article proceeds:

Mr. TOLAN said he understood some men had been taken to the Memorial Bridge area from Union Station Saturday night—

Saturday night was the night when Mr. TOLAN investigated this situation—

and had returned to the station because there was no room. Mr. Johnson, on the other hand, reported that only 49 men accepted the offer of transportation from the station and that cots were available for several times that number.

Mr. President, in view of all the agitation on this subject, and in view of the statement that the Senate does not seem to be interested, or, as the newspaper headline said, "Senators silent on housing plan for soldiers," which is nothing but a slander on Senators, I am about to submit a resolution. It proposes that the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate shall be instructed to investigate the situation relating to the housing of our visiting servicemen and report on the feasibility of using the Senate garage, and on the best means of handling the situation.

My own theory is that the best means of handling it is what I have suggested heretofore, that in the contiguous park area there should be made available as sleeping quarters for the boys, not damp garage locations, not subbasement locations, such as a garage affords, but that there should be erected dry barracks, with sanitary facilities. Everything to which servicemen are entitled should be afforded.

In the investigation I am suggesting I think the committee could well contact the medical authorities of the Army, as well as the health authorities of this city, and they could well have special investigations made in relation to the numbers of men who want to sleep out, and those who want to have cots furnished them. All such facts would be found significant.

Therefore, Mr. President, I submit a resolution providing that the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate be instructed to investigate the situation and report on the feasibility of utilizing the Senate garage and the best means of handling this situation.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The subject which has been so ably discussed by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, of course, is of the utmost interest, not only to the members of the Committee on Military Affairs, but to all the Members of the Congress. We are desirous of providing every possible comfort and convenience for our men in uniform. We are all aware of the fact that many hundreds of soldiers in transit from day to day congregate at the Union Station in

this city. We should be distressed if we were to learn from authorities that any of our soldier boys were not provided comfort when they reached this, the Capital City of the Nation.

How many soldiers are arriving and departing at the Union Station daily I have not been able as yet to ascertain; as to how many soldiers arrive here and have occasion to remain several hours, morning or afternoon, or to remain overnight, I am not in a position to say; but I venture the opinion that certainly not over several hundred soldiers are occasioned, in the line of duty, which would include vacation periods, to remain here overnight.

It has been suggested that utilization be made of the Senate garage. The Senate garage is some considerable distance from the Union Station. We are now in the early portion of the fall, soon the midwinter season, with rains and cold and snow will be upon us and it would be difficult for many of the servicemen to make their way from the Union Station to the Senate garage. In addition to that, it would entail the expenditure of quite an amount of money to make the garage livable, or at least comfortable. In view of the fact that there are unquestionably a limited number of men in uniform who must of necessity, as the result of train schedules, remain here overnight, I am of the opinion that the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from North Dakota would be satisfied if a more convenient and a more comfortable place than the Senate garage could be provided for such men.

As a result, instead of going to the very great expense of using the Senate garage, which is some distance from the Union Station, I respectfully suggest that these two of my colleagues, who evidenced initial interest in this matter in the Senate, give consideration to the use of floor space in the Union Station itself.

In the Union Station there is available space of more than 11,000 square feet, which is sufficient to provide for more than 400 cots. This morning I made a personal tour of the premises in the Union Station of which I speak, and learned that by an expenditure of only $10,000 it will be possible to provide rest and sleeping facilities in the station building. Within the next 2 weeks, space there can be placed in condition to take care of more than 400 soldiers who may want to spend all or a part of the night there, and afford them sleeping comfort.

In view of that situation, Mr. President, I suggest to my very able colleagues who have particularly interested themselves in this matter that they make a trip to the Union Station, introduce themselves to the superintendent of that establishment, and look over the floor space available for the placement of cots for the soldiers, as well as the housing facilities already provided there.

The space to which I have referred is not now being utilized. It is empty. I am sure that within 2 weeks, and certainly within 30 days, that space can be made available for soldiers; that cots and all other facilities and comforts necessary for these men can be installed; and all the walking they need do, after taking the elevator a part of the way, is up one flight of stairs. A man designated for the purpose can place at the head of each cot every night a card containing a notation as to the hour the man occupying the cot is to be awakened so as to give him sufficient time in which to dress, walk downstairs, and take his train. Such facilities can be made available to and can be used by the soldiers without any inconvenience or expense whatsoever to them.

In this connection, Mr. President, it should be remembered many of the servicemen necessarily must carry with them packs weighing anywhere from 25 to 100 pounds. If the space in the Union Station were utilized for this purpose it would obviate any expense which it would otherwise be necessary for the soldier to incur in connection with finding a place to sleep. It would also make it unnecessary for the soldier to walk across the Plaza in order to find a place to sleep in the Senate garage.

Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Wisconsin, for the time being, to defer making the motion that the Senate Military Affairs Committee make an investigation of the situation, in view of the fact that I have been reliably informed that service organizations and several branches of the Army have investigated the matter of space for sleeping quarters. I believe utilization of the space now available in the Union Station itself will really provide the solution to the problem. It will provide comfort and convenience to our servicemen, as well as eliminate loss of time, and obviate the expense which would necessarily be incurred by the soldiers if they themselves were obliged to find sleeping quarters. Thus we would afford a considerable service to the men in whom we are naturally all interested.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina kindly state to the Senate the particular portion of the Union Station which he thinks could be utilized for the purpose indicated?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall be glad to do so. I was there this morning. The space in question is on the top floor of the Union Station, and is a part of the Union Station building itself. A serviceman who stayed there overnight would be in immediate proximity to the train on which he expected to depart. In order to reach the train he would merely have to walk down a couple of flights of stairs. If he were heavily loaded down with baggage or luggage he could take an elevator part of the way up and then walk only a few steps farther to reach the sleeping quarters.

The space in question was formerly utilized as a gymnasium and an entertainment hall for the employees of the terminal itself. I am confident that the superintendent, who is a very courteous gentleman, will be very happy indeed to take the time to show other Senators exactly what he showed me this morning.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from North Carolina for the contribution he has made to the matter under discussion. His statement to the effect that service organizations are already working on this problem is borne out by the fact that last Sunday morning when investigation was made by Mr. TOLAN he found that 2,340 beds were available in the city of Washington for servicemen, only 2,201 of which were being utilized; in other words, that sleeping space was already available, but that the entire space had not been taken up.

Mr. President, the suggestion that there is available in the Union Station space which might be turned into bedrooms for our soldier boys and marines and men of the Navy seems to me to be a very practical one. I should judge that the distance from the Senate garage to the interior of the Union Station is from 900 to 1,000 feet.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Approximately that, or perhaps a little farther.

Mr. WILEY. In addition to the bedroom space already available, which has heretofore been called by me to the Senate's attention, one of the hotels on the Union Station Plaza is being taken over and will be open on the 15th of October for use by the servicemen.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The Capitol Park Hotel?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; the Capitol Park Hotel. If the facts which are now being developed in the Senate can be gotten out to the country they will serve as an antidote to the suggestion that Members of the Senate and of the House have been asleep concerning the needs of our servicemen. Apparently someone has suggested that we might be selfish with respect to the utilization of the garage by our servicemen. I do not think there is a Senator who would hesitate one moment to surrender the garage if it were merely a question of making a contribution to the comfort and pleasure of servicemen. That, however, is not the question. The question as I see it, is: How can we best render the service to which these boys are entitled? The distinguished Senator from North Carolina has suggested utilization of space in the Union Station. A member of the Quartermaster Corps has suggested that adjacent to the Union Station there is ground available on which temporary barracks could be erected, to be used by servicemen without charge, which would be a far better place for the men than a cement structure built partly below the level of the street. That is all I have to say on the subject.

Mr. President, in line with the suggestion made by the Senator from North Carolina, I now ask that the resolution which I submitted lie on the table, and that action with respect to be it deferred for the time being.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Chair understand that the Senator from Wisconsin does not wish to have the resolution referred to the Military Affairs Committee?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, permit me to say a word. I think the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs instead of being ordered to lie on the table and let the

committee consider whether informally it can look into the matter, without any action now being taken on the part of the Senate.

Mr. WILEY. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The resolution (S. Res. 181) was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

Whereas there appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, September 20, 1943, remarks of Congressman TOLAN, of California, together with a resolution calling attention to the fact that a great many of our soldiers, sailors, and marines when they came to Washington to view the sights slept in the Union Station on the floor, benches, etc.; and

Whereas said Congressman suggested that the Senate garage could conveniently be utilized to provide sleeping quarters for such soldiers, sailors, and marines; and

Whereas the Senate is concerned about the welfare of our servicemen and desirous of doing that which will best serve their interests: Be it

Resolved, That the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate be instructed to investigate the situation and report on the feasibility of utilizing said garage and the best means to handle the situation.

RETIREMENT OF COL. E. W. STARLING

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I rise at this time to call attention to the impending retirement of Col. E. W. Starling, who has for some 30 years acted in a very confidential and important capacity among the officers attached to the White House. I think it is true that Colonel Starling has served in that capacity under five Presidents of the United States.

Regardless of the political persuasion of the President of the United States, Colonel Starling has shown—as, of course, he would, and as he would be expected to, but he has done it in an outstanding way—equal devotion in the performance of his duty and in the protection of the President, without regard to any other consideration except the high standard of duty which he has nobly performed. Of course, as he is from my State, I have been more or less intimately acquainted with Colonel Starling and have watched his career during the past 30 years because we both came to Washington in different capacities at about the same time. I knew him in Kentucky before he became associated with the service at the White House and in Washington. No more honorable, patriotic, high-minded, conscientious, or efficient man has ever served in that capacity. I express my personal regret at his approaching retirement; but he has undoubtedly earned it. I am sure I speak for all my colleagues when I say that we wish for him many years of active life and vigorous health wherever he may go or whatever may be his interests or his activities. I cannot refrain from expressing the feeling that it will not be easy to find a man who has all the qualities possessed by Colonel Starling for the important position which he has so ably and honorably filled.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I, too, have known Colonel Starling for approximately 32 years. I wish to say that I fully endorse every word the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has said about Colonel Starling. To what has been so well said by the Senator from Kentucky, I desire to add that Colonel Starling is one of the most courteous and kindly gentlemen I have ever known.

As to his politics, I do not even know what his politics is; I do not know whether he is a Democrat or a Republican; but I do know that he is a faithful, patriotic, and splendid man and deserving of the highest praise for the work he has done in the Executive Office.

Mr. DAVIS subsequently said: Mr. President, I expected to follow the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] in paying my respects to Col. Edmund W. Starling.

During the past week, Colonel Starling, a distinguished Kentuckian, a man whose friendship and ability I have enjoyed and recognized for more than a quarter of a century, announced his retirement from the United States Secret Service. During his career in the public service, Colonel Starling served this Nation and its people effectively and well. The competence and ability which he showed in guarding the physical safety of five United States Presidents, under three of whom I served in the Cabinet, ranks as an achievement unparalleled in our history.

Colonel Starling was not only a competent and capable public servant; he was a companionable and friendly man as well. The wealth of his life represented by his fast and enduring friendships and the vast number of his personal acquaintances defies enumeration. His retirement from the public service will be received with a deep sense of regret by all those who know him.

Colonel Starling has announced that he will spend the remainder of his years basking in the warmth of the sunshine and angling for the ever elusive dweller of the deep. In these pleasant pursuits, I for one wish him well, for Colonel Starling is one public servant who is deserving of a rest of full contentment.

Mr. President, as an indication of the esteem in which Colonel Starling is held by those who know him, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial entitled "Well Done," which appeared in the September 22 issue of the Washington Post. This editorial is a fitting tribute to this worthy servant who has, during his years of service, built up a record of distinction and honor which will stand as an inspiration and challenge to all those who come after him.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELL DONE

The career of Col. Edmund W. Starling has been an expression of the dream of every American boy who aspires to be a policeman when he grows up. Colonel Starling began by tracking down train robbers. For the past 30 years he has been a member of that silent, efficient corps, the Secret Service. He has been charged with the heavy responsibility of keeping five Presidents safe from harm. Since the beginning of Mr. Roosevelt's first term he has been top man of the White House protective staff. Now, at 67, he has decided to retire—"for warm sunshine, fishing, and loafing." He has earned his rest.

Colonel Starling will have some rich experiences to mull over in his retirement. He traveled to Europe with President Wilson and stood behind the World War leader in the mirrored hall of Versailles. He was with Warren Harding when that tragic hero of "normalcy" died in San Francisco. He accompanied Mr. Roosevelt to Rio de Janeiro. Despite the exacting cares of his extraordinary assignment, Colonel Starling managed always to be poised, affable, and friendly to newspapermen and other White House callers. He will be missed in the Capital by both the lowly and the great and will carry with him a multitude of affectionate good wishes.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senate will recall that 4 or 5 years ago a bill was introduced granting independence to the Philippine Islands. The provision of that bill for complete independence was to be effective on July 4, 1946. We are all familiar with the fight in the Philippine Islands, and with the heroic defense of the Philippines by both the Filipinos and the American troops under General MacArthur.

However, since the Japs have had more or less unmolested control over the destinies of the islands, they have told the Filipino people that our promises of independence are not truthful and genuine; that we never intended to give them independence; and they are proposing to give the Filipino people immediate independence, through actions of a puppet government which they are attempting to set up. Of course, the purpose of that is to turn the Filipinos against the United States, if that is possible—I do not believe it is—in order, when the day comes for the landing of our forces in the Philippines, to have the Filipinos fighting side by side with the Japanese against our own forces. It would be unfortunate if this attempt of the Japanese were to be crowned with any measure of success. In my own opinion, I do not believe many Filipinos will be influenced by it. Those who are apparently influenced are actuated more by personal ambition than they are by the welfare of the people of the Philippine Islands. However, this matter has reached a point where we do not want any question at all about our good faith made or raised.

I recently talked over the matter with President Roosevelt and also with President Quezon; and the leaders of the United States and the Filipino peoples are both in accord that it would be salutary now if we were to give the Filipinos their independence completely and forthwith as soon as Congress has a chance to consider the measure, draw it up in the best form, and pass it.

With that thought in mind, and with the complete acquiescence of the Filipino Government in Washington, of Secretary of State Hull, and, of course, of President Roosevelt, all looking at the international picture, I have designed a joint resolution to accomplish immediate independence for the Philippine Islands and people.

Certain provisions of the original law would remain unchanged—those giving

the Filipinos every advantage they had under the original act; but generally the purpose is to move up the independence date from July 4, 1946, to approximately the present time, as soon as legislation to that end can be enacted. I make this brief explanation because, without one, people might question why there was a change in United States policy.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let me inquire to what committee the Senator thinks the joint resolution should go.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think it should go to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, but I have no objection to having it go wherever the Vice President may send it.

Let me say that in the House of Representatives, Representative BELL, of Missouri, chairman of the Insular Affairs Committee, is introducing, so I understand, a kindred joint resolution. As it deals with only the Philippine Independence Act, amending it slightly, the original committee which considered the act would, in my judgment, be the proper committee to consider the amendment of the act.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Does the very able Senator recall the joint resolution introduced by the former Senator from Missouri, Mr. Hawes?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do.

Mr. McNARY. That resolution went to the committee to which the Senator desires his joint resolution to be referred; did it not?

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, yes; it went to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

Mr. McNARY. Let me ask what happened to the resolution introduced by the former Senator from Missouri?

Mr. TYDINGS. It went to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs; and I may say, with all due deference to the Senator from Oregon, that the proper committee to consider the joint resolution I am about to introduce, it seems to me, would be the committee which considered the Philippine Independence Act. So far as I know, it is my understanding that the committee and the Senate would be in full accord with the purpose of the joint resolution.

Mr. McNARY. My only comment is that I understand the resolution is in accordance with the resolution formerly referred to the committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. And has the same purpose as the previous one.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. I share the hope that the resolution will be referred to the committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Maryland. I thank him for yielding to me.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr President, I introduce the joint resolution and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, and be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 81) to provide for the independence of the Philippine Islands, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, and was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, as follows:

Whereas on December 8, 1941, while the Philippines was peacefully engaged in preparing itself for the independence granted by the United States to be effective July 4, 1946, the country was wantonly attacked by Japan and the people of the Philippines, standing loyally by the side of the United States, heroically resisted the aggression of the enemy; and

Whereas the people of the Philippines have established, by their wisdom in peace and gallantry in war, their right to take an equal place in the family of free nations; and the United States has, in practice, regarded the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines as having relatively the same status as the governments of other independent nations: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the United States should immediately recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as a separate and self-governing nation and to that end, having due regard for the changes that have come about in the international situation since the enactment of the act entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," approved March 24, 1934, that the procedure for recognition of Philippine independence and withdrawal of American sovereignty set forth in such act of March 24, 1934, as amended, should be modified in the manner provided in this resolution.

SEC. 2. In order to speedily effectuate the policy declared in section 1, the President of the United States is hereby authorized and empowered to enter into negotiations with the President of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands for proclaiming the independence of the Philippine Islands as a separate and self-governing nation, not later than 30 days after the enactment of this resolution.

SEC. 3. Following proclamation by the President of the United States under section 2 of this resolution he is authorized and empowered to enter into further negotiations with representatives of the Government of the Philippine Islands, for the determination of matters having to do with prosecution of the war in the Philippine Islands, the adjustment of property rights pending the final defeat of the invader of Philippine territory, and such other matters as are properly the subject of negotiation by the sovereign governments and as may not be disposed of in the manner contemplated by the act of March 24, 1934.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of such act of March 24, 1934, the provisions of section 6 thereof governing relations with the United States pending complete independence shall continue in force up to July 4, 1946, so far as practicable with respect to the trade regulations between the United States and the Philippine Islands both before and after their complete independence has been attained pursuant to this resolution.

SEC. 5. Section 13 of such act of March 24, 1934, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 13. There shall promptly be held a conference of representatives of the Government of the United States and the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, such representatives, on the part of the United States, to consist of three United States Senators appointed by the President of the Senate, three Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House, and three persons appointed by the President of the United States, and on the part of the Philippines, to consist of nine representatives to be appointed by the President of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, for the purpose of formulating recommendations as to future trade relations between the United States and the independent Philippine Republic, including all questions affecting the post-war economy, defense, and relationship of the two Governments."

SEC. 6. Meanwhile the resources of the United States, both men and materials, are pledged for continued use to redeem the Philippines from the invader.

THE CLOSED SHOP—ARTICLE FROM RAILROAD WORKERS' JOURNAL AND EDITORIAL FROM SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in the September 12 issue of the Saturday Evening Post the leading editorial, entitled "From the Horse's Mouth," covered in a very interesting manner an article which appeared in the Railroad Workers' Journal. I have also been advised that the same article has been commented on by leading newspapers in many parts of the country, among them being such newspapers as the New York Times and the Providence Journal. I feel certain that Members should have an opportunity to read this article. I therefore ask that it be printed in full at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, to be followed by the editorial appearing in the Saturday Evening Post. The editorial appearing in the Railroad Workers' Journal is signed by Maurice R. Franks, editor. He is known as an influential leader in labor circles. Some may not fully agree with his ideas, but apparently they come from a man of experience and are stated in utmost sincerity.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Railroad Workers' Journal]

THE CLOSED SHOP IS DICTATORIAL

The United Nations are engaged in this war against the Axis powers to free the world from dictatorship; a vicious system of force compelling the masses to do the bidding of the masters.

The closed-shop fight is also a war being waged by the opponents of this system who believe it to be a system of force in the hands of a few dictators of labor, who are at times as ruthless as the Axis dictators. There is little distinction between dictators, whether they be political or economic. Their system is to rule by force. Therefore the closed-shop controversy is vitally important to every American because it affects our democracy which, to be successful, must operate void of dictatorial tendencies.

The founding fathers of our country must have had premonitions of ideas such as the closed shop while drafting the Bill of Rights guaranteeing life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Certainly life cannot be assured without the right to work, liberty enjoyed while one is shackled, or the pursuit of happiness attained against the dictates of one's own conscience.

President Roosevelt, addressing the Seventy-seventh Congress, January 6, 1941, hit the nail right on the head when he said, in part:

"The 'four freedoms' of common humanity are as much elements of man's needs as air and sunlight, bread and salt. Deprive him of all these freedoms and he dies—deprive

him of a part of them and a part of him withers. Give them to him in full and abundant measure and he will cross the threshold of a new age, the greatest age of man."

The "four freedoms" that our President refers to guarantee (1) freedom of speech and expression; (2) freedom of every person to worship God in his own way; (3) freedom from want; (4) freedom from fear.

The closed shop challenges three of the "four freedoms." How can the worker have freedom of speech and expression if forced to join a labor union without expressing willingness to do so? How can he have freedom from want if he does accept the principles of the closed shop? Unless he subscribes, he is automatically deprived of earning a livelihood, and this brings immediate want. How can there be freedom from fear when there is constant fear of losing the means of making a livelihood?

Organized labor itself has, in the past, knowingly or not fought the closed shop system practiced by employers in the recent past, but under a different guise. The writer refers to the so-called open shop which, in reality, was a closed shop. This system forced workers to sign contracts not to join unions for the right to work. This legalistic mockery became known as the yellow-dog contract when a certain worker with intestinal fortitude was asked to sign such a contract. Upon examining same, he retorted, "I would not ask a yellow dog to sign such a contract!"

Samuel Gompers and many labor leaders of his time spent considerable effort in arousing public opinion against the yellow-dog contract on the premise that it was not only unfair but un-American to deprive workers of their right to earn a living because of union affiliation. Therefore, by the same token it becomes unfair to deprive them of a living for not joining a union.

The treatment meted out to workers by employers under the yellow-dog contract stands out in history as repugnant. This system denied certain citizens their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The closed shop of today will stand out in history as equally distasteful.

Call it what you may, closed shop or union maintenance, this system, when carefully examined is the "yellow dog" contract in reverse, only now the leash is in the hands of labor leaders instead of employers.

It is understandable why some labor leaders favor the closed shop since it automatically eliminates the necessity of any great effort to attain their personal objectives. It places them in the position of a dictator. Their slightest whims must be satisfied or their wrath felt through dictatorial discipline such as depriving a worker of his right to earn a living if he does not wholly accede to their demands.

The closed shop is beneficial only to labor leaders. It places them in supreme authority—even more authority than employers. It eliminates the employers' natural prerogative of employing competent and discharging incompetent, unworthy, or unneeded workers. It makes the union leader sole judge of who shall or shall not be employed or shall or shall not be entitled to union membership. If a worker is not admitted or if he is expelled from a union, even through no fault of his own, he is deprived of earning a living.

Records disclose instances where workers, under a closed shop, were deprived of employment for having courage to voice opinions contrary to their leaders. Jobs were lost through failure to pay tribute in the form of exorbitant initiation fees, dues, assessments, and many more unjust reasons. Yes, the closed shop is truly named. It is closed to everyone not in the good graces of the powers that be.

Unionism will never succeed until all entry barriers are torn down. Every worker, irrespective of his occupation, must be allowed the benefits of unionism without encountering hardships. Unreasonable initiation fees, dues, and assessments must be eliminated. Unionism is beyond the embryonic stage. There is no need for workers to pay exorbitant toll for the right to earn a living.

When unions operate respectfully and responsibly there will be no dearth of good men and women willing to give their all to promulgate this worthy movement. Unions have a great bill of goods to sell to all workers; a bill of goods backed up by actual achievements and, since they have, should progress without resorting to force through the closed shop, union maintenance, or any dictatorial process whatsoever.

Frankly yours,

MAURICE R. FRANKS,
Editor, Railroad Workers Journal.

[From the Saturday Evening Post of September 11, 1943]

FROM THE HORSE'S MOUTH

People unfamiliar with the conflict now raging in labor circles must have rubbed their eyes when they read in the New York Times an editorial from the Railroad Workers Journal, organ of the Railroad Yardmasters of North America, an editorial called The Closed Shop Is Dictatorial. Nevertheless, there it is, and the text of the editorial lives up to the title: "Call it what you may, closed shop or union maintenance, this system, when carefully examined, is the 'yellow dog' contract in reverse, only now the leash is in the hands of labor leaders instead of employers."

This, in language more emphatic than we have been using, is just what the Saturday Evening Post has been saying these many months. To be sure, out of deference to Dean Morse, of the War Labor Board, who attributed to employer-sponsored propaganda the idea that union maintenance has anything to do with the closed shop, we have avoided the expression "closed shop," and employed the circumlocution which the W. L. B. likes better. But on the point at issue we stand shoulder to shoulder with the Railroad Workers Journal. We agree that labor leaders prefer the closed shop, since it automatically eliminates the necessity of any great effort to attain their personal objectives. It places them in the position of a dictator. Their slightest whims must be satisfied or their wrath felt through dictatorial discipline such as depriving a worker of his right to earn a living if he does not wholly accede to their demands. Conceivably, the workers have a right to put themselves on this spot if they want to, but when a closed shop is imposed by the Government, that's a new-colored horse.

The Journal goes on to say that "the closed shop is beneficial only to labor leaders. It places them in supreme authority—even more authority than employers. * * * It makes the union leader sole judge of who shall or shall not be employed, or shall not be entitled to union membership. * * * Records disclose instances where workers, under a closed shop, were deprived of employment for having courage to voice opinions contrary to their leaders. Jobs were lost through failure to pay tribute in the form of exorbitant initiation fees, dues, and assessments."

In short, some workers are finding out what a few criers in the wilderness have been predicting they would find out some day—that is, that when the Government hands over the custody of millions of workers to labor leaders, from whom no evidence of responsibility is required, the victory for the workingman is a hollow affair. Even the W. L. B. came to see the point fairly early and began looking into the conduct of union leadership before making union-shop awards.

A few more pieces like this and it will be possible to discuss labor policy and its relation to efficiency, social welfare and simple justice without being denounced as "anti-labor," Nazi-Fascist or just plain dumb.

POST-WAR FOREIGN POLICY—EDITORIAL COMMENTS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to two editorials—one entitled "Senate Prestige," which was published in the New York Times of September 23, 1943, and the other entitled "The Senate Should Act," published in today's Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. They have to do with House Concurrent Resolution 25. I shall forego the opportunity of discussing the concurrent resolution at this time, but I shall desire to do so later.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of September 23, 1943]

SENATE PRESTIGE

It is predicted in Washington that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations may decide to scrap the Fulbright resolution, just approved in the House by an overwhelming vote, and write a new resolution of its own on the subject of American post-war foreign policy. This new resolution would say essentially the same thing, but it would say it in somewhat different words, and the theory is that by this device the Senate would preserve its prestige as the branch of Congress invested by the Constitution with power to ratify treaties.

We hope that there is enough good sense in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to prevent it from following this course. There is no prestige to be gained in this way. There is only prestige to be lost. The Fulbright resolution is a good straightforward declaration which says what needs to be said at this time. It has received strong bipartisan support in the House. It deserves the same kind of strong bipartisan support in the Senate. The only effect of rewriting it will be to give our allies precisely the impression that ought not to be given, namely, that for reasons of prestige the Senate is never satisfied with any job it does not do itself and that, for these reasons, it will proceed to rewrite any treaty or agreement that is submitted for its approval.

In this important matter the Senate committee has had its chance and muffed it. Twenty-five weeks have passed since it created a subcommittee to write a resolution of this kind. For 25 weeks, when the world was waiting to hear the voice of Congress, that subcommittee never peeped. The best way to recoup the Senate's prestige now is for the full committee to approve the Fulbright resolution and strongly recommend its adoption.

[From the Washington Post of September 24, 1943]

THE SENATE SHOULD ACT

The Fulbright resolution, which would pledge the United States to a positive policy of post-war international collaboration for peace, is now in the hands of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. That body has three courses open to it. It can report out the measure unchanged and thus give the Senate the opportunity of following the lead of the House, which approved Mr. Fulbright's resolution by an overwhelming vote.

The Foreign Relations Committee may, on the other hand, adopt one of the dozen post-war foreign policy proposals sponsored by Members of the Senate. Some of these, among them the famous Burton-Ball-Hatch-Hill resolution, go much further in the direction of committing the United States to join hands with other nations in keeping the peace than does the Fulbright resolution. Or, the committee may keep the House-approved resolution on ice, as it has thus far done with all similar proposed statements of foreign policy.

Continued inaction would, however, be inexcusable. Up to now there may have been reason for the Foreign Relations Committee and the administration to fight shy of bringing up any resolutions on post-war policy. One such reason was that it would stir up such violent argument as to make for disunity within the Nation as well as between this Nation and its allies. But that argument no longer holds water. In view of the fact that the House has acted, the Senate can no longer refuse to act without giving rise to the suspicion that it is unwilling to do anything. The choice before it really narrows down to voting on the Fulbright resolution or voting on some substitute. Whatever it does, it can only be hoped that it will show the same measure of unanimity and good judgment that the House has shown.

INCOME TAX ON WAR BONDS AND STAMPS

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, on September 22, I received from Mr. Peter Tracy, of Hartford, Conn., a letter which raises a most interesting question, and one to which I intend to seek an answer, as to the attitude of the Treasury. Mr. Tracy is secretary of the Capitol City Lodge of the International Association of Machinists, and has written to me from time to time submitting views which mark him as a man whose judgment and comment are entitled to respectful consideration. He points out that many individuals are investing in War Savings stamps and bonds. He wants to know whether or not the income tax on this type of investment should be levied before those who hold the stamps or bonds turn them in for cash. He feels that when Americans make loans to their Government for a period of some 10 years they ought to have the option of receiving non-interest-bearing bonds which would become subject to income tax at the time the Government repays the loan.

The point involved, of course, is fundamental and very interesting. Before the matter is submitted to the Treasury, in order that it may appear of record, I think it would be well to have the entire letter printed in full in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent to that end.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MACHINISTS,
CAPITOL CITY LODGE, No. 354,
Hartford, Conn., September 21, 1943.

Hon. JOHN A. DANAHER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Our Treasury Department stresses the point that we will get $4 for every $3 we invest in War bonds.

If a dear friend asked us for a loan necessary for the treatment of some sickness and that friend offered to return $4 for each $3 we loaned, our friendship would be dealt a mortal blow.

And if that same friend asked us to give him a bonus for having made him a loan we would feel that whatever else ailed him his nerve was not in need of hospitalization.

The point I wish to make is that many of us do not want $4 for each $3 we loan our Uncle Sam. And we question the fairness of having to pay an income tax on a part of our income before we have personal use of that income, the part of our income we loan to our Government for 10 years.

We have members who will not take interest on the money they loan our Government. They are buying War Savings stamps. Is it fair to charge an income tax on this type of a loan before those who hold the stamps turn them in for cash?

Would it be possible for Americans who wish to make the above type of loan to get non-interest-bearing bonds that would be subject to whatever income tax prevailed at the time our Government repaid the loan?

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

PETER TRACY,
Secretary.

SELECTIVE SERVICE DEFERMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to section (c) of Public Law 23, enacted by the Seventy-eighth Congress, which reads as follows:

(c) Beginning 60 days after the date of enactment of this act, the Director of Selective Service shall make monthly reports to the Congress showing, as near currently as is practicable, the names and positions of the persons who have been deferred or placed in any class or subdivision of a class under such sections 5 (c) (2) or 5 (e) because of their employment in or under the Federal Government, and showing whether or not requests for the deferment of such persons have been made in accordance with such Executive order or subsection (b) of this section; and such Director shall obtain from the selective-service local boards, and from the several departments and agencies of the Federal Government, such information as may be necessary for this purpose.

Mr. President, my reason for calling attention to that law at this time is the conflicting reports which I have read in the newspapers as to the number of Government employees who have been deferred. Colonel Keesling testified extensively at page 240 of the hearings, and other statements have been made on the subject. Last spring when this law was enacted it was my understanding and belief that the reason for the law was to provide a record so that the people of the United States would know exactly who was deferred, who asked for his deferment, and why he was deferred.

The President of the United States issued an Executive order. The Congress of the United States passed a law and, in turn, set up a deferment committee for the Senate and the House. Being a member of that committee, I wish to say that, except in two instances, to the best of my knowledge, the committee has never been requested to grant a stay of induction for even a short time.

Mr. President, my desire is that the people of the United States may know the exact facts in the situation. The reports have been made to the Congress. During the summer recess, of course, they were not laid before the Senate or the House. However, I earnestly hope that soon every deferment which has been asked for by any Government agency will be reported to us so that the name of the individual, as well as the name of the person asking for the deferment, may be printed in the RECORD. In this way complete information concerning the situation may be had. Many have not asked for deferment. Many Government employees are doing work which is absolutely essential to win the war; for example, Government employees in Alaska working under the Civil Aeronautics Authority in the Commerce Department. In justice to every one of them, the information to which I have referred should be published, particularly in view of the bill which is now before the Senate, to which I am opposed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina a question. I did not clearly understand him. In the information which he requests, does he ask also for the type and nature of the duties performed?

Mr. MAYBANK. Exactly. The purpose of my request is that the public may have, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the true facts concerning every individual. There has been much criticism, some of which is perhaps justified and some of which is not. The facts should be made known for the good of all concerned.

UNIFORM FREIGHT CLASSIFICATION AND SCALES OF RATES

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I have been given a copy of the news release concerning the report on freight rates made by the Board of Investigation and Research, which is an agency created by the Transportation Act of 1940. The report was laid before the Senate today by the Vice President. I desire to make brief comment upon the report at this time. Within the next few days I hope to be able to discuss the matter much more at length. The news release states, in part:

Recommending that Congress declare a policy for guidance of the Interstate Commerce Commission in establishing a uniform freight classification and a uniform scale of class rates throughout the country, the transportation Board of Investigation and Research today submitted its complete report on interterritorial freight rates to the President and Congress.

The report analyzes the differences in freight rate levels which have for years been the subject of severe criticism in the South and West and concludes that the Interstate Commerce Act should be amended directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to classify all commodities shipped by railroad into a uniform number of groups of classes and to establish a uniform scale of rates to apply on such classes throughout the United States. The Commission would be required to make the new classification and rates effective within 3 years.

And so forth. The Board of Investigation and Research—Transportation has found that the Congress should declare a policy for the guidance of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the making of freight rates. That causes me

to turn to the debate which took place on the floor of the Senate on May 22, 1939, when the Transportation Act of 1940 was under consideration. At that time the act was more or less in its formative state. It required practically 2 years, or almost a full session of Congress, to complete the hearings and studies which were necessary on the part of both Houses before the act was finally formulated. The act was known among the Members of the Senate prior to its passage as S. 2009. On the occasion when the bill was debated—and the debate, of course, was led by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce—numerous Members of the Senate took part. When that bill was enacted, I thought a policy had been established; I thought the Congress had fixed a policy for the Interstate Commerce Commission; I thought the act clearly stated that the policy of the Congress required an equalization of freight rates. I should like to read a few words from the statements made by the Senator from Montana during the course of that debate after he acquired the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, before the Senator proceeds to that, will he yield to me?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand that a policy was provided. The President himself made a statement recently in connection with freight rates.

Mr. STEWART. I have heard that such a statement was made by the President within recent weeks, but I have not seen it.

Mr. MAYBANK. There was in the newspapers a statement coming from the President.

Mr. STEWART. I so understood, but, unfortunately, I did not see it. On other occasions, however, I think the White House has made public statements which recognize the need for elimination of discrimination.

We know about the conditions involved in the freight-rate structure of this country. I have been more or less active since I have been in the Congress in regard to this question, because I have recognized the existence of a condition which I believe should be corrected, and which must be corrected before the States in the South and the West can be given an opportunity to grow industrially.

Recently, during the recent summer recess of the Congress and somewhat preceding that time, I took it upon myself to write letters to men prominent in public life, who had made a study more or less of this subject in their public careers in years past, among others our own Vice President, and the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, who have expressed themselves publicly. I asked for a statement of their views. They wrote me and gave me permission to quote from their letters. They stated that there should be a correction of the freight-rate evil in this country, and that until there had been brought about an equalization of freight rates the States of the West and the South would never be able to compete on an equal basis with the States in the industrial East, because, until such an equalization was brought about, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to locate any manufacturing industries in the Southern and Western States.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STEWART. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am, indeed, glad to have the distinguished Senator's observations, not only concerning the intention of the Congress but also of the views of the executive branch of the Government who have, in my opinion, tried to help the sections of the country which have been discriminated against.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

I was saying that I thought the Congress had adopted a policy with respect to freight rates. Of course, the Congress of the United States is the policy-making body of this Government. Section 1 of the act known as the Transportation Act provides, under the heading "National transportation policy":

It is hereby declared to be the national transportation policy of the Congress to provide for fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation subject to the provisions of this act, so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each; to promote safe, adequate, economical, and efficient service and foster sound economic conditions in transportation and among the several carriers—

And with particular emphasis on the freight question—

to encourage the establishment and maintenance of reasonable charges for transportation services, without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices.

The declaration of policy proceeds further, but I conclude the quotation at that point for the reason that what I have read directs itself strictly to the question as to the policy concerning freight rates. Let me repeat the portion of the declaration of policy which I think covers the freight-rate question:

To encourage the establishment and maintenance of reasonable charges for transportation services, without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices.

In that statement I admit that possibly the word "encourage" is a kind of weak word, but it seems to me that this declaration embodies a statement of policy which is or should be clearly understood by everyone.

The debate continued on the occasion to which I have referred pretty well all day, as I recall. Touching upon the question of policy and freight rates, from time to time many observations were made by various Members of this body. At that time there was in the Senate from Arkansas John F. Miller, who is now a Federal judge in that State. Entering into debate he made this observation:

Assuming that this is true, I think probably we are all agreed that the basic trouble of our railroads is the rate structure of the Nation.

Mr. WHEELER. That is true.

Mr. Miller, later along, says:

We cannot have shippers unless we have such rates that the shipper can pay them in the first place, and the consumer can play them on the other end.

This is the fear that I have about this bill, to be perfectly frank.

The argument made by the learned Senator as to the reason for the regulation and coordination of the carriers of the country into one transportation system is sound, to say the least, in theory; and I am aware of the provision in the bill which undertakes to put a limitation upon the rates that may be fixed for water carriers. I am fearful, however, that when the water carriers are put under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission it will not result in leveling rates, but it will result in freezing rates at the highest points now in existence, and that instead of permitting the water carriers to have the effect upon rates that they now have in some instances, the rates will be raised by the Interstate Commerce Commission. That is the fear I have.

To that, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] replied:

Of course, that is a fear that some persons have; but if they take that position they have to say that they do not trust the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. MILLER. To be perfectly frank, I do not.

Mr. WHEELER. All right; but I have more faith in them than the Senator has.

Mr. MILLER. I mean that with all due respect; not personally in any way.

To which the Senator from Montana replied:

Certainly. Let me say to the Senator, however, that I trust the Interstate Commerce Commission just as much as I trust the Congress of the United States. It was the Congress of the United States which in 1920 passed the Transportation Act and said to the Interstate Commerce Commission in effct, "Fix rates so as to protect the railroads." We should not condemn the Interstate Commerce Commission. We should take the responsibility and say, "The responsibility rests upon the Congress of the United States and not upon the Interstate Commerce Commission." We do not like to do it, of course.

The debate continued. I shall not go into it at length, but I should like to point out a few more statements which were made at that time. Prior to doing so, however, I may say that in addition to the provision in the declaration of policy which I have quoted which affects freight rates, the act contained two other provisions, a portion of one of which I shall read. In section 6, as it was then known, it was stated:

It shall be unlawful for any common carrier to make or give any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any particular person, company, firm, corporation, association, locality, port, port district, gateway, transit point.

The Senator from Montana, after reading that, said:

Then we have added the words "region, district, territory," which are to be found at the bottom of page 26 and the top of page 27.

Following that, a section which is still in the law, and was in the measure when it finally passed, read in this way:

The Commission is hereby authorized and directed to proceed immediately, in such manner as it deems advisable in the interest of a correct ascertainment of the facts, to investigate the rates on manufactured products and raw materials between points in one classification territory and points in another such territory, and to like rates within any of such territories maintained by common carriers engaged in transportation subject to this act, for the purpose of determining whether such rates are unjust or unreasonable or unlawful in any other respect in and of themselves or in their relation to each other, and to enter such orders as may be appropriate for the removal of any unlawfulness which may be found to exist: *Provided*, That the Commission in its discretion may confine its investigation to such manufactured products and raw materials and the rates thereon as shippers thereof may specifically request to be included in such investigation.

Those two provisions are substantially like those which went into the act, and were carried in the act in its final passage.

Mr. President, those provisions followed the declaration of policy. They were provisions which were made in pursuance of, with respect to, in conformity with, and because of the declaration of policy in which the Congress of the United States sought to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to correct unequal and unjust freight rates. These provisions were placed in the act because it was the sense of the Congress at the time that there should not be any unjust or unfair discrimination by the Interstate Commerce Commission. It even went so far as to make it unlawful for a common carrier to propose a freight rate, or a "tariff," as it was then called, I believe, which would give a preference to one territory, one district, one company, or one concern, over another.

The matter was debated in full at the time. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] interjected to inquire why it was necessary to ask the Interstate Commerce Commission to make a study of the question to determine whether there were any preferences or not, when his belief was that the Commission already knew of the existence of these unlawful rates. Even that was debated, and it was said that a study should be made, that that was an orderly manner in which to proceed, a regular order, so to speak.

Then, after the declaration of policy had been discussed, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] interjected and called attention to the two provisions which I have just read, one which defined what was unlawful in the making of freight rates, the other directed to the Commission, stating that they should make a correction of any unlawful rates. So the debate continued. The then Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. Lee, who was a member of this body at that time, interrupted the Senator from Montana and asked permission to read certain matter into the RECORD, quoting from some of the hearings which had been held on this very bill a statement by a witness named Mr. Bee, who the Senator from Oklahoma said stated as follows:

In the territory east of the Mississippi River the rate is 87 cents per 100 pounds. For a similar distance in zone 1, which is central and northern Missouri, the rate is $1.06 per 100 pounds.

In zone 2, which comprises southern Missouri and eastern Kansas, the rate is $1.22 per 100 pounds. In central Oklahoma, which comprises zone 3, the rate is $1.34 per 100 pounds. And in that portion of Oklahoma and Texas west of the one hundredth meridian, roughly speaking, the rate is $1.53 per 100 pounds.

I direct specific attention to the fact that in eastern territory the rate was 87 cents, while in western Oklahoma it would be $1.53 for an equivalent haul.

That is what they were discussing, differences in freight rates, discriminations in freight rates, lack of equalization of freight rates. They were discussing the policy which was carried into the act. They were discussing the provisions of the act which were placed in it in pursuance of and because of the declared policy of the Congress. Now we are told by the Board of Investigation and Research, in the report which is being made public here today, that we do not have any policy. Perhaps they are right about it, perhaps the words used in the act are not strong enough, perhaps they are a little too weak; but certainly the purpose and the intention of the Congress at the time the act was passed was to declare a policy, which I and almost everyone else connected with the bill, and those who debated the question on the floor, felt was a sufficient directive to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

If we have not a policy that is adequate for the purpose, I wish to see one adopted that will be sufficiently strong. It is utter foolishness to undertake to use words in the enactment of a law which mean nothing—which have no purpose in the act except perhaps to fill in or to take up space. It is not the purpose of the House or of the Senate to do such things.

Mr. President, I am glad the Board of Investigation and Research have called our attention to the fact that a sufficiently strong declaration of policy has not been provided. They say to us that that is probably the reason why unlawful and discriminatory freight rates have not been corrected after 4 years or more, for this debate took place on May 22, 1939.

If the law does not now contain a declaration of policy that is definitely clear, and unambiguous, then I want to see the Congress adopt one, and to that end I am today introducing a bill to amend the declaration of policy in the national Transportation Act. If enacted, I believe the bill will strengthen the words, so far as freight rates are concerned, make them more definite, and make them unambiguous. I hope that at a later time the Congress will adopt my proposal. It will be my purpose in a few days, with the permission of the Senate, to make some further observations along this line.

I now ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1370) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

BIMETALLISM AN INTERNATIONAL POST-WAR NECESSITY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, much has been said, and said in many ways, with reference to post-war policies and post-war plans. Regardless of many fine-spun theories which have been thought out or thought up, and which have been given publicity in many ways, I am one who happens to be of the turn of mind which believes in the strength of this Nation. The measure of the strength of America in the post-war period will be a larger factor in world stability and world peace than any plan or program, on the broad scale, that can be worked out by way of theories at the present time. And the strength of our monetary system, now and in the post-war period, will mean more to a world which is trying to work itself out of the semichaos, hampered by the exigencies of war and reconstruction, than anything save and except perhaps a faith in an omnipotent God.

No one can say what the moneys of the subjugated countries of Europe, or even of its few free countries, will be worth at the close of the war.

Countries fortunate enough to have a little gold and silver will be in a more advantageous position than the others, but all will face depreciation of currencies, if not actual inflation.

The United States, on the other hand, on the basis of its present holdings of both gold and silver, will be in an outstandingly powerful position in connection with settlement of post-war currency problems. To the extent that such holdings of gold and silver are depleted, this country's ascendancy in dealings with post-war monetary matters will be reduced; but it appears unlikely that any monetary arrangements on a world scale can be made effective without the cooperation of the United States.

World-wide monetary distribution of both money metals will prove to be a vital post-war necessity.

National entity and international amity will rest more firmly on a foundation which has a secure, safe, and sound monetary policy, because trade among men and between nations and between points of the globe means a great deal to every nation, and especially to this one which is now called upon to save the world if civilization is to prevail.

So, Mr. President, I am interested in what will be our monetary policy following the war.

We have passed through various stages in the matter of monetary policies. We have had our monetary policy dealt with, during the century and a half we have been in existence, in many ways and by many agents; so many that it is strange to say that we have followed a sound course, in recent years especially.

The Silver Purchase Act of 1934, which was sponsored and put through by my beloved colleague, the late Senator Key Pittman, now is receiving the plaudits of the world, and when I say of the world

I mean that exactly. The fact of the matter is that today our treasure of silver is being called upon by the peoples of the world as it was never expected, when it was set up, that it would be called upon. The peoples of the world are increasingly dependent upon silver today for monetary purposes.

Great Britain, despite its enormous buying power throughout the world, has found it necessary to again appeal to the United States Government for substantial quantities of silver for coinage purposes. All of the nations at war, including the United States, have had to utilize portions of their silver reserves for war industrial purposes. It is particularly interesting to note that the demand for coinage throughout the world today is much greater than the demand for silver as an industrial metal. That great and powerful nation, Great Britain, is today calling upon us for millions of ounces of silver per month, and by an agreed policy we are furnishing to Great Britain, as our ally, under the lend-lease principle, about 2,500,000 ounces of silver per month from the Treasury of the United States. We are furnishing that silver without regard to its monetary value, without regard to its place in the monetary system of this country. We are furnishing it to Great Britain on the promise and obligation on the part of Great Britain that she will return the silver in kind, ounce for ounce, within a reasonable period, not to exceed 5 years, after the conclusion of the war.

Mr. President, there is a reason for that. There are in fact two reasons why Great Britain, Australia, India, and other countries of the world are calling upon us for silver. Silver from our Treasury, which is today worth $1.29 per ounce in every American dollar, is being transported to countries abroad. Why? First of all, the peoples of the world, especially those in the conquered nations, but including peoples who belong to the United Nations, realize what the world has gone through before at many times in its history. They realize the conditions which prevailed after the First World War. They realize that it took a million marks in some instances to buy a loaf of bread following the First World War. But they know that a piece of silver as big as your thumbnail would buy the loaf of bread; that one silver coin would buy more than a bale of depreciated paper currency. So they are looking forward today to a condition which might arise and in some cases, indeed, is arising, all over the world. The paper money of the governments of the world is being looked upon with suspicion, and this is only natural.

Bitter experience is the teacher from which the nations of the world have learned their almost universal distrust of paper money. Examples of the deterioration of paper moneys abound throughout history. Mankind always has preferred "hard money" and in time of war this demand always has increased while the acceptance of paper money has declined.

Today we pay our soldiers in north Africa largely in silver because the natives with whom they deal are loath to trade for paper money, but accept silver eagerly. When this war is over, not only Africa and Asia, but all of continental Europe will be clamoring for hard money.

It will not be enough to reserve silver for subsidiary coinage, without making it a part of the monetary base at an appropriate price fixed by international agreement. To do so would leave silver coins in no better position than coins of other metal, or paper money; the price of silver, if used solely for subsidiary coinage, and unfixed by any international system of bimetallism, would vary with commercial demand for the metal, falling far short of satisfying the demand for a hard money of reliable value.

The silver-purchase policy was criticized, severely criticized, when my beloved colleague put through the measure known as the Pittman Silver Purchase Act. Criticism has continued to be directed at those of us who have sought, as he then sought, to retain that silver in the Treasury of the United States and at a stabilized price. Articles were published in magazines some months ago under such headlines as "Twelve men against the Nation." These headlines were flashed out so as to arouse condemnation, but those who knew and understood the policy were determined that silver should not be reduced in value or degraded in the monetary policy of this country, because if it were, then silver would find itself reduced all over the world, and, silver being reduced and degraded, then the monetary systems of the world would deteriorate.

And so today, Mr. President, there are those who are thinking in terms of what will be a sound monetary policy after the war. I make this prediction, that any national or international banking system, which is set up after the war, based on anything other than a monetary system founded on gold and silver is destined to failure. The peoples of the world are looking to the precious metals. They are looking to the things that have carried civilization forward from time immemorial, and they will continue to look to those metals to be the stabilizing force for the monetary systems of the world in the years to come.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a little pamphlet issued by the Mexican Bankers' Association, entitled "Suggestions on the Silver Problem."

The pamphlet is short, but it is full of cogent facts. Strange to say, it applauds the policy of the United States with reference to silver. It applauds our Silver Purchase Act of 1934, and it applauds the fact that we are looking forward to bimetallism. Anything short of bimetallism for the monetary system of this country in the future is to my mind a colossal mistake.

International bimetallism long has been advocated by the United States. Congress in 1893 passed an act, still in effect, which provides that the declared policy of the United States is "to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money, and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchange value, such equality to be secured through international agreement." This act specifically directed that the efforts of our Government should be constantly aimed at "establishment of such a safe system of bimetallism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States, in the markets and in the payment of debts."

Early attempts by our Government to implement this declared policy were frustrated by the British Empire, then at its very height of world influence and power. England had adopted the gold standard in 1816, had little interest in the production of silver, and declined to cooperate.

Today the respective positions of the two countries are substantially reversed. The United States is the outstanding monetary power in the world and England is a debtor nation. Now is the time for this country to revive and insist upon its demand for international acquiescence in the monetary policy which has been on our statute books for 50 years.

I send to the desk and ask to have printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks the little pamphlet which I mentioned, namely, the pamphlet entitled "Suggestions on the Silver Problem, Presented by the Mexican Bankers' Asscciation."

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUGGESTIONS ON THE SILVER PROBLEM PRESENTED BY THE MEXICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION

Among the monetary topics of the last hundred years the most debated has undoubtedly been that of the metals employed in the currencies, or, to put it in a more concrete way, the question of the expediency of abolishing gold and silver bimetallism in favor of gold monometallism.

Bimetallism, which had reigned unchallenged for so many years in Europe and America, received its first blow with the introduction of gold monometallism in England in 1816. During the next 26 years, however, this innovation met with serious difficulties, owing to the variations in equivalency between gold bullion and current gold coin, and it was not until 1844 that the Bank of England, in obedience to a law enacted by the British Government, assumed the obligation of fixing that equivalency by unlimited buying and selling of gold at fixed prices, calculated in current coin.

In that year the struggle between the two monetary systems, monometallism and bimetallism, may be said to have begun, but it was not until the close of the Franco-German War that events came to a head with the successive adoption of the gold standard by several European nations, and the defeat of bimetallism culminated with the adoption, in 1900, of the same system by the United States, following on an agitated political and economic campaign which lasted from 1893 to 1900.

In after years, other and less important nations found themselves compelled to adopt gold monometallism, so that by 1910 this problem was thought to have disappeared, and the triumph of monometallism was considered as assured and definite.

In effect, the champions of monometallism then believed that the question of bimetallism was dead and buried, and that on its tombstone they could inscribe the epitaph, "Here lies silver currency; silver now survives only as a mercantile commodity."

This solution of the problem has appeared to be definite. Nevertheless, every time that a world economic crisis has arisen there has been a resuscitation of the phantasm of bimetallism, which has never lacked defenders, either in the conclaves of famous economists or in the political spheres of several countries, more especially in the United States.

A decade ago we saw a revival of this nature, in which men of great prestige in banking and economic circles, both in Europe and America, devoted themselves to the discussion of the endlessly debated problem, some frankly propcsing a return to bimetallism, and others, the majority, temporizing with gold monometallism, while demanding legislative and economic measures which should prevent a collapse in the price of silver in the market.

We are now in the throes of the most colossal war in history, and we foresee that at its close a no less colossal economic struggle is coming for the restoration of peace and tranquillity in all the countries that have been scourged by this most devastating conflict. And it is quite certain that in the postwar period, this dreaded phantasm will once again make its appearance, and there will not be lacking those who advocate that silver should be reinstated, to play once again its part in monetary affairs.

With such a situation looming ahead, we are of the opinion that this question should be given careful study, and, while refraining from hasty judgments on the fundamental monetary problem, we would advise that adequate measures be taken to secure for silver a determinate value, which would allow its being employed in any program of economic recuperation that may be adopted at the close of the war.

That epitaph on the tombstone of the supposedly dead and buried silver does not enshrine any absolute truth, for if silver were simply merchandise, its fluctuations in price would not merit the concentrated attention of statesmen and economists. There are a great many different mercantile commodities necessary to human activities, such as cotton, wheat, meat, etc., each one of which represents values greater than that of the total production of silver, and yet the daily fluctuations of these have never taken up the attention of entire periods of the American Congress.

This fact demonstrates that the importance of silver does not depend simply on the part it plays as merchandise. Something more potent is involved, and this something is that the metal in question constitutes the basis of the daily transactions affecting more than a thousand millions of the inhabitants of our globe. And these daily transactions, although they concern only individuals of limited economic means, add up to an important total in the world markets by reason of the vast number of people involved; thus, the part played by silver as a monetary medium continues to arouse considerable interest.

As we have already stated, in the years prior to 1933, owing to the economic crisis that affected the world in general and the United States in particular, the problem of silver was again brought up; and engaged the attention of the economists who came from all countries to attend the World Economic Conference in London in the autumn of 1933.

The partisans of monometallism, who dominated that conference as much by sheer weight of numbers as by their political representation, would not sanction even a statement of the case for bimetallism; all that was permitted was a discussion on the desirability of enacting measures which should impede a collapse in the price of silver. This ended in the approval of the measures recommended by the American Senator Key Pittman, which provided for an agreement between the silver-holding and silver-producing countries, with the object of restricting sales of silver and of controlling a certain proportion of its production. The principal supporter of this plan was the United States Government, which assumed the responsibility of absorbing the major part of the silver produced.

In the United States Congress, discussions were continued for the purpose of determining what would be the best means of carrying into practical effect the obligation thus contracted, and finally, in May 1934, a measure was approved by virtue of which the American Treasury would undertake to buy silver at a price above $0.50 per ounce until the Government's metallic reserves of silver should reach a proportion of 25 percent of the gold reserves or the price should reach $1.29 per ounce. All purchases were to be suspended when the price of silver in the world market should reach the stipulated monetary value of $1.29 per ounce.

The lack of a determinate monetary equivalent for silver provoked active speculation, and a rise in the price of the metal; the American Treasury, having followed for some months the tendencies of the market, finally adopted a firm attitude and proceeded to fix prices without direct relation to those prevailing in the market, since in point of fact the Treasury had now become the sole buyer.

In recent years the American Government has sustained the price of $0.7111 per ounce for silver produced within the country, and has paid lower prices for that which has come from outside. In any case, it has given important support to the production of the metal.

These protectionist measures have become the object of sharp criticism and of attacks by a multitude of economists and businessmen who consider such measures as an unjustifiable subsidizing of silver mining, to the detriment of taxpayers who have to foot the bills for such subventions.

Practically 10 years have elapsed since the measures referred to were first put into force, and it is therefore now time to examine their scope, their effect, and importance.

The importance of such legislation is evident in two sectors: First, in that of silver-producing countries, since a price which is high, or at least is little subject to fluctuation, has enabled them to keep their mines in production, with the consequent and undeniable advantage to their interior economy, and at the same time to maintain their international trade. Second, and in a similar way, the silver-holding countries, especially China, have been benefited by this measure.

What we have just said refers to the price of foreign silver. Now, to the people of the United States, a stimulus thus applied to the internal economy of silver-producing and silver-holding countries might appear of secondary importance, but subsequent events have justified this policy in a very striking manner. Since the outbreak of hostilities between the United States and Japan, it has been thanks to those purchases of silver that the Chinese people have been able to sustain, and are still sustaining, their heroic resistance to the dominion of the Jap invader.

If this had been the only result of the measure we are now considering, the policy of the Roosevelt administration would have been amply justified, since, beyond any doubt whatever, our yellow enemy is rendered far less formidable to us by reason of the enormous attrition he suffers in the Chinese campaign, and of his being compelled to sustain the struggle on that front instead of being able to concentrate all his strength against the United States.

If all this is, as we have already intimated, of such magnitude, the importance of the measure in its bearing on the interior economy of the United States is probably of yet greater scope, even though this may be less apparent.

In the waging of any war, but more particularly in the present one, three metals are of paramount importance—copper, lead, and zinc. Hence the great interest that the democratic governments have shown in intensifying the production of these metals, more especially since at the commencement of the war their reserves of the metals in question were small, and the organization in the mines that produced them was deficient. Notwithstanding this situation, the rise in price of the metals named has not been extraordinary; the rhythm of production has been maintained, and even increased, while prices have been little higher than in normal times.

If we examine the statistics of silver production in the United States, we will find that the greater part of the metal does not come from purely argentiferous deposits; the silver so obtained does not amount to more than 10 percent of the total production; the remaining 90 percent comes from mixed ores, which yield a low and limited proportion of silver.

In world production, the proportion of industrial metals, in whose ores silver, at the price of $0.7111, represents more than 15 percent of the total value, is as follows:

	Percent
Copper	5.2
Lead	52.7
Zinc	37.4
Tin	16.0

Now, if that silver legislation had never been enacted, the producers of the industrial metals I have mentioned would never have received this important aid, and that would have meant a rise in price of the metals vital to the war effort, and at the same time an enormous diminution in the reserves that could possibly exist of the same, since deposits of relatively low-grade ore would never pay for working.

We thus find that the so-called subsidizing of silver producers turns out to be a real and effective subsidizing of producers of war metals, so that, in fine, we should regard that apparently protectionist measure, which to all outward appearances was benefiting only a small and privileged group of producers, as a plan that has had beneficent and far-reaching results, since it has permitted us to keep in production, in times of peace, mines whose ores yield a relatively low proportion of industrial metals, and has thus enabled us to face our vast war needs, simply by the intensification of such exploitation.

In short, the legislation of May 1934, so heatedly contested, stands revealed today as a very important factor in the triumph, which we are now happily witnessing, of the Allied arms.

All the foregoing is a simple presentation of facts, which constitute an ample and well-deserved eulogy of those statesmen and legislators who, putting aside selfish points of view, and withstanding the criticism of men of limited vision, brought into being the legislation which has helped heroic China to stand up to the unwarranted and grossly unjust assault of powerful Japan, and at the same time has helped the Allied democracies to count upon plentiful supplies of metals which are indispensable to their war effort.

If that legislation had never seen the light, many mines which actually produce these industrial metals would not have paid for working; the outbreak of war would have found them idle, which means that the Allies would have faced a shortage of these vitally necessary materials.

Happily, the triumph of the democracies is at last in sight, and it now becomes incumbent on the statesmen and economists of this group to study and to make their preparations for the post-war situation. To this end, it will be necessary to examine this question, and decide which of the monetary and economic systems will be the best to adopt.

As we remarked at the outset, the contest between monometallism and bimetallism will once again be brought up before us, and while we do not consider this to be an opportune moment to go deeply into these problems, we do think that it is our duty to clear the ground so that when the time comes for the discussion of the case, the experts may have at their disposal sound materials with which to set about the construction of the new economic world which they will have to build. So that—

Whereas silver is still the favored medium of exchange among nearly half of the inhabitants of the globe, the devaluation of that metal would bring about a tremendous upset among all these millions of people;

Whereas there is a universal desire for investment in the firmest and most tangible of those which are considered monetary metals; and

Whereas in the labor of reconstruction in the countries devastated by the war, vast quantities of industrial metals will be needed; if silver is devalued, these metals will go up in price, and reconstruction will thus become more difficult and costly; and

Whereas American legislation, by a stroke of the pen, succeeded in maintaining without fluctuations the value of silver, and at the same time increased the production of industrial metals; and

Whereas such attitude has up to now maintained and encouraged the capacity of the silver-producing countries to compensate their purchases of merchandise to other countries, thus helping the international trade; and

Whereas the extension of that measure of sound economic policy to other countries outside the United States would augment its beneficent effects, and that above and beyond the direct material results there will come into play an influence of psychological character we hereby propose:

I. To recommend to all the central banks of America the building up of their reserves in gold and silver, with the proportionate values of 75 percent and 25 percent, respectively.

II. That to this end, they should institute purchases of silver at prices equivalent in their own national currencies to that paid by the American Treasury.

III. To request the American Treasury not to alter the established price without having previously consulted the American central banks.

IV. That the valuation of those reserve metals shall be made at the equivalent in national currency of $35 for gold and $1.29 for silver.

V. To provide for ample sales of silver to private purchasers, either in bars or in silver certificates, at prices slightly higher than those of purchase.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, coming, as I do, from the West, I have been greatly interested in the remarks of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and also the remarks of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me say that I listened with great interest to the remarks of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. To my mind, his remarks are timely, and his analysis of the record is correct. His analysis impresses one who has listened to it that there can be no question that the Congress of the United States emphatically established a policy, but it appears as if there are some who will not follow that policy, but who should be required to follow it.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HATCH. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Sundry persons for appointment to, or promotion in, the Foreign Service of the United States, to positions to which they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

By Mr. GILLETTE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment, or promotion for temporary service, in the Navy; and

Several officers for promotion for temporary service in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Joseph A. Ziemba, of Chicago, Ill., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 39, with headquarters at Chicago, Ill. (Reappointment.)

Martin R. Bradley, of Hermansville, Mich., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 38, with headquarters at Detroit, Mich. (Reappointment.)

Bernice Pyke, of Cleveland, Ohio, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 41, with headquarters at Cleveland, Ohio. (Reappointment.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The Chief Clerk proceed to read sundry nominations of United States attorneys and United States marshals.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, unless there is objection, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of United States attorneys and United States marshals be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HATCH. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. HATCH. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, September 28, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 24 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

Amos E. Taylor, of Pennsylvania, to be Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Oliver F. Hopkins, of Maryland, to be Assistant Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Raymond C. Miller, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 24 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Albert J. Tully to be United States attorney for the southern district of Alabama.

G. Douglas Crozier to be United States attorney for the Territory of Hawaii.

William W. Hart to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois.

Howard L. Doyle to be United States attorney for the southern district of Illinois.

Harold Maurice Kennedy to be United States attorney for the eastern district of New York.

George L. Grobe to be United States attorney for the western district of New York.

Frederick V. Follmer to be United States attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Walter Bragg Smith to be United States marshal for the middle district of Alabama.

Felipe Sanchez y Baca to be United States marshal for the district of New Mexico.

Jesse Jacobs to be United States marshal for the northern district of New York.

Edney Ridge to be United States marshal for the middle district of North Carolina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed be Thy holy name, O Thou Most High, for Thine infinite condescension, for Thy power and mercy which Thou dost manifest toward all Thy creatures. In deep wonder and beyond our understanding we praise Thee for the intimations that we are the sons of God. It cheers above all earthly glory and transcends the measure of our minds and experience. Out of faith and hope we would draw spiritual nourishment and learn to carry ourselves in the spirit of love and universal benefaction.

In honor seated in the councils of state, enable us to assert our everlasting obligations and swing our country on the right side of every question. When the load is heavy and we bend to its burden, may we lift up our heads and rejoice that

we have duties to perform, allowing no loss or suffering to impede us. O Thou who didst cross the red seas of affliction and the gray wastes of despair, be Thou the inspiration of living thoughts like great voices within. In the throes of this changing world may we be as persuasive as truth and as uncompromising as justice, following the light until its faintest beam falls on our path and it broadens into a perfect day. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 23, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the biennial report of the Chief of Sta.' of the United States Army, July 1, 1941, to June 30, 1943, to the Secretary of War, as a public document, and providing for additional copies thereof.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 1203) entitled "An act to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. VAN NUYS, Mr. MCCARRAN, and Mr. DANAHER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to insert a newspaper item.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the question of the transfer of Victory and Liberty ships to foreign countries and to include therein letters from Admiral Land.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein the text of a resolution I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders already entered I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, JR.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House at this time for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., as Under Secretary of State, is a master stroke. There is a universal regard for this able man. In his many appearances before the Deficiencies Subcommittee on Appropriations Mr. Stettinius has won the complete confidence and respect of all of our members. He is a rare combination of energy, common sense, and business ability. His high idealism has never caused him to lose sight of the practical side of life. In everything he undertakes he is unostentatiously efficient to the ultimate degree. His diplomatic qualifications meet all requirements but he is more than a diplomat. His appointment may be hailed as a recognition of the value of a splendid business mind in dealing with world economic relations of transcendent importance, instead of entrusting such vital concerns entirely to professional diplomats. His candor and forthrightness are needed in the State Department, which has been too much afflicted with diplomatic refinements and ambiguities. Because of the experience he has had, the acquaintanceships he has formed, and the good will he has created as Administrator of Lend-Lease he is especially well qualified to deal with the delicate Russian problems which are looming up as of first importance. The President is highly to be commended for the appointment of Mr. Stettinius as Under Secretary of State and I predict that the appointment will give general satisfaction, not only to the people of America but to our allies as well.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Maumee Advance-Era of September 24, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DRAFTING OF FATHERS

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, it seems quite definite, from the trend of affairs over in the Senate, that the Members of that body, after considerable investigation with reference to the drafting of fathers, may not take a vote on the Wheeler bill which would delay such a move by the Selective Service until January 1, 1944.

It seems quite obvious that if the Senate decides not to take a vote on the Wheeler bill that the House will regard such action as final. Consequently, the Congress of the United States, the direct representative of the people, because of the great effort made by the administration and the military leaders will in deference to their testimony and leadership, give up the fight. However, before making this decision a great many Members of this House and of the Senate have shown courage in opposing the drafting of fathers, have made speeches against such action and have seriously questioned the military leaders who claim it is necessary. For my own part I have felt so strongly about the matter, and still do, that I want to go on record again as being opposed to such action and expressing the hope, even at this late date, that it will not be taken.

There is not a Member of this House but who is so keenly interested in the winning of this war that he is ready now and has been for the drafting of fathers, if those advocating such a policy could make it clear that such action was necessary, and furthermore, that they could convince the Congress that it was impossible to get sufficient military manpower among the men who do not have children.

They have not convinced me, with all of their testimony, on these two points and it is my opinion that they have failed to convince the majority of the Members of this House.

When I was home among the people of my district I found almost unanimous sentiment against the drafting of some 446,000 fathers into the military service between now and January 1, as those in charge of the Selective Service have indicated was necessary.

I found at home on the farms, a shortage of manpower; in the oil fields, a shortage of manpower; on the railroads, a shortage of manpower; in the stores and restaurants providing essential service in the distribution to the people, a shortage of manpower. Then I thought of the military and naval forces which those in charge of our Government are trying to raise of some 11,000,000 men. I thought of millions of young men in the cantonments who have been trained until they are becoming stale for want of action, of the hundreds of thousands of them riding the trains being shunted from one part of the country to the other, and then I turn to the testimony of our military leaders who say, in substance, that at the peak of this war they expect to have possibly 4,750,000 men overseas and on the battle fronts of the world by the end of 1944.

Assuming that they can get the vessels they will need to get 4,750,000 men on the various battle fronts of the world for the crucial test at the peak of this war, according to their own figures, they would still have 3,000,000 men left in continental United States.

The testimony of our military leaders is to the effect that we need 1,221,000 additional men in the armed service by the end of the year, of which 775,000 will be obtained through reclassification and 18-year-olds and that it is imperative that we draft 446,000 fathers to secure the balance.

Assuming that the Army should be pushed to the high level requested by the military leaders, it is my opinion that this can be accomplished without the drafting of these fathers.

I think it can be done and should be done and that it can be done in this way. Investigation of the Costello committee into the manpower situation of the Government bureaus and the investigation in the Senate by an able committee headed by Senator BYRD, of Virginia, came to the conclusion and published in their committee report that the Federal pay rolls were overstaffed by some 300,000 people. There are approximately 3,000,000 Federal employees. The recent committee of the House investigating manpower under the able leadership of the gentleman from California, Congressman COSTELLO, in its first report, known as House Report No. 363, states that they have found that there are 840,578 single men in Government positions who are between the ages of 18 and 38.

I believe before fathers are drafted that the Chief Executive, who in the last analysis is the one man charged with the responsibility of directing all of the vast multiplicity of Federal bureaus, should demand that a careful search be made by Selective Service of all these political appointments and that every single man whose services are not indispensable to the Government in the job he now holds, who is physically qualified to enter the Army, should enter the service. There is no question but what there are hundreds of thousands out of these 840,578 single men between 18 and 38 who are not indispensable to the Government and who should be drafted before fathers are taken.

Countless thousands of these Federal positions, the total of which is costing the taxpayers of this Nation $650,000,000 per month, should and could be dispensed with forever and the Government would gain thereby. Senator BYRD, one of the leading Democrats of the Senate, in his committee report, says that the Government could and should dispense with some 300,000 of these political jobs. If when the Federal pay rolls were compelled to give up those eligible for military service referred to and there could not be found 446,000 available, then I would suggest that if they would make an investigation of the war plants of the Nation where hundreds of thousands of young men have gone because of the large salaries and in order to remain out of military service, that out of these plants, without impairing or reducing their production for the Army and military uses, there could be found an additional supply of men which would push the mark to over 446,000. With these cost-plus contracts, the contractors have thousands of men on their pay rolls loafing on the job in order to increase the cost.

There are those who will say, "Do not question the military leadership or the judgment of the President, but give them all of the manpower and all of the money they want without question." That is what the Congress and the people have tried to do. In their loyalty to the soldiers and to our country they have worked long hours; they have bought bonds and will continue to sacrifice to buy more; they have given their sons by the millions; they have been willing for the Congress to appropriate more money for the expense of this war than has ever been contemplated by any nation—a debt against them greater than all of our allies combined—but they are coming to the place now where they have largely depleted their manpower, where it is freely predicted that the national debt may reach twice the real-estate and personal-property wealth of this country at the end of the war. They cannot be here in Washington to speak, and their only voice here in Washington must be the membership of this House and the Senate. They sent us here to speak for them, to act for them, to spend their money to prosecute the war, but they do not want us to go along with a program that will likely slow down the winning of the war, bankrupt the Nation financially, destroy the American way of life, and bring to them in the end Nation-wide poverty and the loss of representative, constitutional government that their boys are fighting and dying for on the battle fronts of the world.

If the Congress thinks we are approaching the point where we have inducted, or shortly will have inducted into the military force men up to the saturation point of our ability to put into the service and carry on with a sufficiently strong civilian and economic home front to sustain both the military and home fronts, then it is the duty of the Congress, as the Representatives of the people, to seriously raise these questions as to How far shall we go? How great is our responsibility to the world?

It has been the contention of many Members of Congress from the very beginning that America can only make the greatest contribution to the winning of this war and the world in the future by keeping our military force, our supply force, and financial force in balance at all times, because the Members of this Congress have realized that it takes three necessary component parts to win this war and all of them working in harmony—food and military supplies, finance, and manpower. If any of these three elements are disregarded it weakens the entire structure.

The figures indicate that there are 1,200,000 fathers in the armed forces now. Suppose we add 446,000 more. The drafting of these fathers demands we consider the financial picture. Assuming the fathers that are drafted would leave a wife and 3 children each, the expense would be as follows:

The average base pay between $50 and $60 would doubtless be about $55 for the soldier, and for his wife and three children the Government would send a check each month for $82. That means you are paying $137 a month with board and quarters for the married man who is serving in the Army. Then add to this the fact that the Congress has recently appropriated $22,000,000 for hospital and medical care for the wives of soldiers who give birth to children while they are in the Army. Then take into consideration the fact that a bill has already been introduced to increase the allotment to the wives and children of married men in the Army. This bill will most surely pass. When all of this expense is taken into consideration you will find that for the married men in the service, the Government finally will be paying each of them with their families included, $200 a month. It raises the question, How much can the Government afford to pay its fighting men? No salary paid them would be enough. I am only making the point in favor of using single men as much as possible.

They say you cannot measure the sacrifices of this war in dollars. That is quite true. But you may get to the point where you measure the freedom of this country in the price of dollars plus the price of hundreds of thousands of the lives of our young men. You reach the point where you measure the price of the winning of this war in both the blood of American soldiers and dollars because of the waste and extravagance of this Government in prosecuting this war. After they have made this sacrifice they may find that their families at home have lost their freedom and we may then understand why our freedom, to some extent, at least, must be measured both by lives and by the financial yardstick.

It is long past time when those directing the affairs of the Nation should be thinking only of the general public welfare of the people rather than to the building up of a political machine at the expense of the people to perpetuate themselves in office. Certainly the acute manpower emergency now demands that the administration clean house and dismiss from the pay roll every person not urgently needed so that those eligible for military service may be inducted and those who are not eligible may go into the fields, factories, and civilian life and become producers for the Government rather than consumers at the expense of the Government.

The Government is and has been the greatest hoarder and waster of manpower in the Nation. The investigations of the Truman committee, the Byrd committee, and the Costello committee all directed by congressional leaders of the Democratic Party, prove this statement.

The over-all policies clung to by the Chief Executive for over 2 years now have brought about this manpower shortage.

The Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission, due to the overstaffing in civilian employees, have contributed to this serious situation.

In my judgment, there is no question but that the homes of this country should not be raided any further, for the present, at least, separating husbands from their families while hidden away in the Federal bureaus of the Nation and on the Federal pay rolls generally are enough single men to furnish the available manpower for military purposes that those who are directing our military efforts insist are necessary.

THE CANADIAN FEED GRAINS SITUATION

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the possibilities of securing additional feeds from Canada, I wish to call your attention to two letters from Mr. L. A. Wheeler, Director of Foreign Agricultural Relations, U. S. D. A. First, you will note that the 1943 Canadian wheat crop is but one-half the 1942 crop. Second, you will note after allowing for domestic requirements in Canada, plus overseas shipment, and providing a safe carry-over, there should be a surplus of some 400,000,000 bushels of wheat that could be shipped to the United States as feed wheat. Third, you will note in the second letter a detailed explanation of the equalization fee system as operated in Canada.

This equalization fee program is no doubt responsible for the statements that Canada has placed an export duty on grain exports.

If House Joint Resolution 155 is passed allowing Canadian feed wheat, oats, and barley—if exports are allowed on barley—whereby the duty is removed for 90 days, we can then see if the equalization fee is increased to equal the reduction in duty.

It appears that Canada fixes a maximum price of 51½ cents per bushel or 46.8 cents per bushel, United States money, on oats for Canadian consumption and when and if fed in Canada, but that a fee is added to exports, making the price per bushel nearly equal to the price of these grains on the American market.

Since a large proportion of the pork, cheese, and other farm products that are shipped through lease-lend go or have gone to England, it would appear that it would be only fair to expect Canada to assume a reasonable, sensible, and just attitude in these transactions.

If Canada cannot process these grains into milk, meat, and eggs and has not the ability to transport its grains to a world market, it should at least be eager to cooperate with the United States in its war-food program. This is especially so when you realize that the American farmer has not only been asked to feed the United States armed forces, the domestic civilians, but also asked to ship large amounts of the national food production under lease-lend to England, Russia, and our other allies. If and when House Joint Resolution 155 passed, it is sincerely hoped that Canada will not increase the equalization fee further as a result of the removal of the duty. The duty on feed wheat is 5 percent ad valorem; on hay, $2.50 per ton; on barley, 15 cents per bushel; and on oats, 8 cents per bushel. In 1942 Canada produced 652,000,000 bushels of oats, and an estimated 500,000,000 bushels in 1943. In 1942 Canada produced 259,000,000 bushels of barley, and an estimated 223,000,000 bushels in 1943.

This Canadian grain production does not appear very impressive when we compare them to the United States estimated production of 1943, which is 2,985,000,000 bushels of corn, 834,000,000 bushels of wheat, 1,145,000,000 bushels of oats, and 333,282,000 bushels of barley.

However, the parts of the United States close to Canada could under the right conditions be materially benefited by having access to these feeds. They are closer to them than similar feeds produced in the United States. I am advised by the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations that Canadian wheat and oats are now being stored at Duluth because of congested storage conditions prevailing at Fort Williams. I am certain it is for the best war-food effort, as well as of public interest, that we make every effort to provide every ton of feed we can obtain for the livestock producers of America.

As long as transportation is being found, according to the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, for a hundred cars a day for Canadian wheat, oats, and barley to come into Duluth for storage, it would appear that House Joint Resolution 155 should be immediately passed, and thus give the American farmer this added source of feeds. Transportation may or may not be the problem it has been pictured by the C. C. C. The immediate passage of House Joint Resolution 155 would soon indicate the facts.

You can also use your own judgment as to whether or not the equalization fee is a polite expression for an export bounty.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE, FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS,
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1943.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: Reference is made to your telephone call of yesterday regarding certain information which you desired in connection with the operation of the import quota on wheat, Canadian wheat supplies, and feed-grain prices. I am setting forth below the facts of the situation as they are available at this time.

Annual import quotas on wheat and wheat flour were imposed by Presidential proclamation effective May 29, 1941. We are now in the third quota year. In 1941, the Bureau of Customs announced that the wheat quota was filled during the week ended September 20—in other words, the filling of the wheat quota covered the period May 29, 1941, to September 20, 1941. In both 1942 and 1943 the Bureau of Customs has indicated that the annual wheat import quotas were filled on the opening day of the new quota year.

In connection with the import quotas, however, I would like to point out that on April 13, 1942, a Presidential proclamation amended the quotas to permit additional imports under specified conditions, for experimental purposes, for seed and for distress shipments resulting from war developments. Further, on April 29, 1943, the quota regulations were amended to permit imports made by the War Food Administrator or his designated representative. As a result of this amendment, the Commodity Credit Corporation is actively purchasing and importing Canadian wheat for feed purposes to the extent that transportation facilities permits. Such wheat is imported duty free as it is a Government purchase, and it is being sold at corn parity. Accordingly, the duty on wheat is not a factor in the price of wheat sold for feed to farmers by Commodity Credit Corporation, nor is the quota a restricting factor in the wheat feed sale program.

With regard to the present wheat supply as compared to the past 2 years, the following tabulation may be of interest. Figures are given in millions of bushels:

[In millions of bushels]

	1941	1942	1943
Carry-over	448	405	586
Crop	315	593	[1] 296
Total supply (in Canada)	763	998	882

[1] September estimate.

In connection with the indicated Canadian crop-supply figure of 882,000,000 bushels for this season, I would like to point out that domestic requirements in Canada plus overseas exports and an allowance for a minimum operating carry-over would leave a maximum indicated surplus of around 400,000,000 bushels of wheat, much of which is on farms.

Prices of feed grains available to the United States are for all practical purposes the same as United States grain prices at Buffalo, Minneapolis, or other comparable markets. This is due to the fact that while oats and barley prices in Canada are held down by ceiling-price regulations, the Canadian Wheat Board collects an equalization fee at the time an export permit is granted which is approximately equal to the difference in price between Canada and the United States, allowance being made for transportation and the United States tariff on such grains. I presume that your interest in the comparison of Canadian and United States feed prices is to know whether or not feed grains could be purchased in that country more advantageously as regards price than in the United States.

If you would like to discuss the particular aspects of these questions in further detail, also some of the current Department activities as regards importing of Canadian grains, I will be glad to have you talk with Mr. Boals, of this office, who is following the situation very closely.

Sincerely yours,

L. A. WHEELER,
Director.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE, FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS,
Washington, D. C., September 24, 1943.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: Reference is made to your telephone conversation with Mr. Boals, of this office, regarding the equalization-fee system now in effect in Canada.

Attached you will find a statement which he has prepared on this subject. You will note that it covers various pertinent points about the equalization-fee system.

I hope you will find the statement helpful; and if you have any further questions, this office will be very glad to give all possible assistance.

Sincerely yours,

L. A. WHEELER,
Director.

THE CANADIAN EQUALIZATION-FEE SYSTEM

1. WHAT IS IT?

The equalization fee is, as its name implies, a fee established with the aim of equalizing, or narrowing the price spread between Canadian oats, barley, and their products, when entering into export, and United States prices for these grains.

2. WHEN ADOPTED AND WHY?

The Canadian Minister of Trade and Commerce announced the new policy in the House of Commons on April 6. The first

equalization fee was placed on oats on April 19 and on barley on May 28. The scheme was adopted as an alternative to increasing or removing the ceiling prices on oats and barley which action, it was feared, would jeopardize the domestic livestock feeding program. Maximum prices had been set on grain of the 1942 crop at 51½ cents for oats and 64¾ cents for barley, or the equivalent of about 46.8 and 58.9 cents, respectively, in United States money. There was an increased demand in the United States for Canadian feed grains during the fall and winter months and prices advanced until they reached the ceiling. The equalization fee was then introduced as a mechanism for bridging the gap between the demand for feed grain for export from Canada, and United States prices of these grains, while at the same time retaining the ceiling price structure for feed grains sold for use within Canada.

3. HOW DOES IT OPERATE?

The fee is collected by the Canadian Wheat Board at the time the export permit is granted and the money is put into special funds set up for that purpose. (The funds for oats and barley are kept separately.) The Canadian Wheat Board announces daily the equalization fee to be charged, after determining the approximate difference between the domestic ceiling price and the net price in the United States—that is, the cash price in the United States less transportation, handling charges, and import duty, taking into account also the exchange rate. The plan, as originally adopted, provided for one rate for all shipping points. Later, however, different rates were established for eastern and western areas, with Fort William as the division point.

To illustrate: On September 14 barley was being offered for sale in Buffalo at $1.19 per bushel. The Canadian ceiling is approximately 59 cents (United States money) basis Fort William. Freight charges to Buffalo amount to 6 cents per bushel and the United States duty is 15 cents per bushel making a total fixed cost of around 80 cents, basis Buffalo, outside of handling charges, etc. The spread between the United States price of $1.19 and 80 cents is 39 cents. The equalization fee was set at 42 cents (Canadian) or about 38 cents (United States) with a small allowance being made for handling charges.

4. WHO BENEFITS FROM THE FEE?

Western Canadian farmers get the full benefit of the system. At the end of the effective period the amount of the fund (less operating costs) will be prorated among western growers who delivered their grain during the period of operation.

5. COMMENTS

Shipments of oats from Canada to the United States during the crop year August 1942 to July 1943 are reported to total around 57,000,000 bushels and of barley around 35,000,000 bushels. Shipments from May to July, or during the period since the establishment of the fee system, are indicated at around 26,000,000 bushels of oats and 21,000,000 of barley. A considerable part of this movement, however, was grain without the equalization fee. This is due to the fact that the shipments included much grain which was licensed for export before the fee was adopted. Transportation difficulties have caused the lag in the movement of the grain. As a result, the rate currently announced for the equalization fee considerably exceeds in most cases the fee paid on the grain actually being imported. Several million bushels of barley and oats purchased months ago and on which export permits were granted and the equalization fee paid are still awaiting boat space and rail cars for movement to the United States.

On September 21 the Canadian Wheat Board announced that no more export permits would be granted for barley for the present at least. In turn, the equalization fee for barley becomes only nominal inasmuch as no exports can be made without a permit. The reason for the action is the acute feed-grain situation in eastern Canada and the current need for movement of supplies from the west to that area.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein two letters from the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article on silver from the Reno Evening Gazette of September 18, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FORMS AND QUESTIONNAIRES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, our people are considerably concerned by the mounting number of questionnaires and forms which they are required to fill out from time to time. About 2 years ago we passed a measure which placed the responsibility of passing upon the necessity of each form and questionnaire to be submitted to the public under the supervision of the Budget Bureau, which as we all know is directly under the President. These questionnaires are, however, like "the cat with nine lives," and there does not seem to be any way of permanently killing them.

I was very much disappointed recently in the statement of our able, distinguished, and beloved chairman of the Ways and Means Committee that no action is to be expected from his committee until next year in the matter of reducing the requirements for questionnaires, tax estimates, and tax returns. I realize that this great committee has many matters of urgent importance before it which call loudly for immediate attention and solution. At the same time, I know that the people of the United States are crying for and expect us to relieve them of much of the work which they are compelled to do on these numerous blanks and forms to be compiled and filled out. The elimination of the unnecessary red tape, tax forms, estimates, and returns then should be a prime work of our Committee on Ways and Means; and it is with respect that I am submitting to the great chairman of this committee a suggestion that he proceed with this matter as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that some parts of these tax estimates and tax returns are submitted to the people of the United States for the purpose of assembling data for future use by the Bureau of Internal Revenue. This is a very laudable purpose, and in ordinary times perhaps would receive commendation from everyone. At the present time, however, this country faces its most acute shortage of manpower. To the average businessman and to the average worker every minute of the day counts, and counts much, toward victory. I think this is the wrong time to burden our taxpayers throughout America with questions requiring many weary hours of work for solution unless this information is absolutely necessary and required by law.

I have heard of no one where I have been, complaining of the heavy and burdensome load of taxes which the people of the United States are cheerfully carrying at the present time. The taxpayers of the Nation are patriotic and are willing to do their full part to back up the men in the armed services. There is no complaint as to the payment; but there is complaint, and properly so, throughout this entire country against the processes of Government which requires many hours of useless work, compiling tax data and general information at a time when every moment counts.

It is my opinion that the tax-estimate questionnaire of September 15 could have been eliminated without affecting tax collections throughout the United States under the pay-as-you-earn law, and it is my opinion that the December estimate may perhaps be eliminated with no adverse effect upon collections.

Useless and unnecessary questionnaires must stop. We must insist that the departments reduce the number to one-tenth of what they exact at present. We must go further, Mr. Speaker. We must ourselves eliminate the necessity and excuse for such questionnaires and red tape in legislation, and if necessary, we should provide legislation further reducing this useless, vexatious, and unnecessary burden upon the business of this country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include editorials concerning our former Postmaster General.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MERRITT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM]?

There was no objection.

THE AMERICAN LEGION AND PEACE

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion national convention's most timely expression upon the subject of post-war collaboration in the interest of a lasting peace represents the soundest and, by far, the most sensible approach to this overshadowing problem that has yet been suggested.

How different is its advocacy of "an association of free and sovereign nations to maintain world peace" from the all-powerful "international machine with power adequate to establish a lasting peace" which the little understood Fulbright resolution would superimpose upon the world.

In one—the American Legion's formula—our freedom, independence, security, and national dignity are carefully and painstakingly preserved. In the other—FULBRIGHT's loose and ambiguous pronouncement—all these would be subordinated to the edicts of a superinternational organization which would be invested "with power adequate" to enforce its idea of a lasting peace upon the nations of the world.

Under one, the United States stands proudly erect, conscious of the righteousness of its intentions, confident in the nobility of its purposes, determined in its will to wield its power and influence in support of that which is just and fair. Under the other, the Goddess of Liberty, shackled, cringes before an international Frankenstein, a godless, soulless, nationless nondescript "with power adequate" to impose its will upon all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, which is it to be? Is it a just and lasting peace among the nations which the American Legion would insure through an association of free and sovereign states or is it to be a supercollossal global government, an international federation of the world, which some would build among the ashes of our highest hopes, the ruins of the Republic?

The Legion has given its answer in no uncertain terms. The voice of the American people will yet be heard. And it will not be raised, Mr. Speaker, in support of those who would float another flag over the Stars and Stripes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an excerpt from the great New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT]?

There was no objection.

REALISTIC COURAGE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the doom of two powerful and brutal tyrants, Hitler and Mussolini, will soon be sealed. It is the verdict of history that tyranny arrayed against the laws of God and the realistic courage of freemen cannot long prevail. This truth has been effectively portrayed by Pierre van Paassen:

It is told of the Roman Emperor Julian, who was surnamed the Apostate, that on the road to the East he stopped for a month in Antioch, the city of his youth, to rest and reequip his legions before their arduous campaign into Persia. Donning the cloak of a philosopher one day, the Emperor strolled into the city to mingle with the crowds, to listen to the gossip in the taverns and to hear the comment of the public orators in the forum.

On the way he, it is said, observed with satisfaction that his decrees against the new religion of Galilee had been strictly enforced and the cult of Mithra had everywhere been restored to honor. Dirt and refuse lay heaped against the walls of the Christian chapels, and their doors and windows had been boarded up.

Continuing his stroll, the Emperor walked into one of the populous quarters, where he espied a certain merchant by the name of Agathon, whom he had known in his youth. Now, Agathon was one of the few in Antioch who had remained Christian. Julian engaged the merchant in conversation, and as they stood talking together they saw the festive crowds streaming by to the marble temple of Mithra. "Tell me, Agathon, what has become of the Carpenter of Nazareth? Is He still around?" And pointing to the temple and the joyous multitudes, the Emperor added: "Has He any work at all these days, your Carpenter? Are there still some little jobs coming His way at least?"

For a moment Agathon was still. Then looking the Emperor in the face, he said: "Yes, Julian, the Carpenter of Nazareth is very busy these days. He is nailing together a coffin for your Empire!"

Six months later Julian was no more. The Galilean had conquered. Realistic courage foresees the doom of tyranny and envisions the coming victory of man!

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to speak for 20 minutes on the subject The State of the Nation From a Congressional Standpoint.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]?

There was no objection.

UNWARRANTED CRITICISM OF THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman from Michigan is present because I would like to address a portion of my remarks to him. I read with a great deal of alarm last Friday an article in a local newspaper attributed to the gentleman from Michigan.

As far as I could gather, the article—and I read it very carefully three or four times—was based upon some information second degree removed that the gentleman from Michigan had in his possession. It purported also, in my opinion, to attack the integrity of the Commander in Chief of our armed forces.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, there is no one in this Congress on either side of the aisle who can, deep down in his heart, attack the integrity or the patriotism of our Commander in Chief's conduct of this war. Surely if anyone does attack that integrity it ought to be based on fact. It is this sort of thing that shakes the morale of the soldiers and when their leaders are accused it ought to be on factual ground. If the gentleman from Michigan has facts—and I do not say that he has not—I think there is a proper place to present them. In all justice to the Commander in Chief and the boys who fight this war, those facts ought to be presented to the proper committee of this House—that is, the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on September 22, I submitted a unanimous consent request to include a speech of former Senator James Pope in my remarks but I failed at the time to submit an estimate. The estimate of the Public Printer is $101.25. I renew the request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES]?

There was no objection.

VICTORY FLEET DAY

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago today we thought we were accomplishing great things in shipbuilding when we launched 2 ships, 1 at Chester, Pa., and 1, a Liberty ship, at Baltimore, Md. The latter ship was the steamship *Patrick Henry*, first of the hundreds of Liberty ships that are coming from American shipyards and still performing a great service. In September 1941, 7 ships totaling 64,450 dead-weight tons were delivered into service. Today, September 27, 1943, shipbuilding, management, and labor are working toward delivering at least 170 ships, aggregating more than 1,700,000 dead-weight tons. If this goal is reached and shipbuilders are confident that it will be, September

1943 will be another great shipbuilding month.

The *Patrick Henry* was true to form. Her career has been remarkable. She has been always in keeping with the impatience and energy of her namesake in his impatience, energy, and consistent courage in his fight for freedom.

Even on the day she first entered the sea she manifested the impatience of her namesake in Old St. Johns Church, in Richmond, who reminded the Virginia Convention that while they continued the debate on the action that we should take, the sound of arms was to be heard in the field. The ship could not endure the time accorded at Baltimore for speeches, and by a coincidence before Admiral Land concluded his speech proceeded before the time fixed for her launching to proceed down the ways. When the time came for action, Patrick Henry believed in deeds not words.

It was that speech of Patrick Henry which he concluded with those immortal words, "Give me liberty or give me death."

I extend as a part of my remarks a release of the Maritime Commission for this second anniversary of the launching of the *Patrick Henry*.

Survivor of prolonged German efforts to sink her by attacks from the air and under water, the S. S. *Patrick Henry*, first of the hundreds of Liberty ships that are pouring from American shipyards, is still proudly plowing the oceans. Built at Baltimore, Md., for the United States Maritime Commission by the Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipbuilding Co., she was launched just 2 years ago today.

Where the *Patrick Henry* is on this third Victory Fleet Day cannot, of course, be disclosed, but since she slid down the ways she has been up and down and across the Atlantic several times. To Russia, the British Isles, and the Mediterranean theaters of war she has carried many thousands of tons of weapons and other military supplies. Returning she has brought cargoes of strategic materials.

It was on her second long voyage a little more than a year ago that the *Patrick Henry* got her baptism of fire. And it was no random shot. The vessel was a target in sustained attacks on a convoy to Murmansk and also while in port at Archangel. But both Nazi planes and the U-boats failed to get her.

Typical logbook entries, covering almost a month on that out-bound voyage No. 2 to carry help to the Russians, are these terse items, dated at all hours of day and night: "Attack stations manned during air alarm." "German observation plane spotting convoy." "Vessel under submarine and air attack." "Torpedo plane and high-level bombing." (Such entries appeared for several days running.) "J. Parsons, able seaman, wounded by machine-gun fire. Rescue ship alongside." "J. Parsons transferred for medical attention." "Planes on forward deck damaged by shrapnel and machine-gun bullets." "Concussion of depth bomb explosions caused bomb pit to open one plane." "Arrived Archangel. Port under enemy air attack." "All discharging ceased. All lights out. Ship in total black-out."

After her adventures in the Arctic zone the *Patrick Henry* took part in the north Africa invasion last November. Still unscathed save for machine-gun bullets and minor damage from depth bomb concussion and near misses by plane bombs, she pushed steadily on her war errands.

The pioneer Liberty ship's maiden voyage, covering nearly 5 months, took her around the Cape of Good Hope to Alexandria, via the Suez Canal, the Mediterranean being not yet opened to United Nations shipping. Subsequent voyages have taken her across the Atlantic several times.

Upon her delivery from the builder to the Maritime Commission December 30, 1941, the *Patrick Henry* was turned over to the Lykes Bros Steamship Co., Inc., of New Orleans. As her first master the company selected its veteran, Capt. Richard Gallard Ellis, who remained in command until early this year, when he was assigned to another ship.

The Lykes Co. is enthusiastic about the continuously fine performance of the *Patrick Henry*, sister ships of which have been in mass production. Concerning her the company says:

"Those who had the opportunity of inspecting the *Patrick Henry* upon delivery were much impressed with her size and suitability for carrying a variety of cargo, as well as the simplicity of her machinery. Upon completion of the first voyage, those of us who had access to her performance records were still further impressed with her good performance, which has continued throughout her operation to date.

"Her machinery, with the exception of a few minor adjustments customary in the case of the operation of every new vessel, has required no general overhauling, and her performance as to speed and fuel consumption has been even better than was anticipated. On her first voyage the average speed was 11.19 knots, with a daily fuel consumption of 177 barrels of fuel oil."

Mrs. Henry A. Wallace, wife of the Vice President, was the sponsor of the *Patrick Henry*. Present at the launching on that first Victory Fleet Day, several weeks before Pearl Harbor, were descendants of the Virginia patriot whose name was selected for the first Liberty ship.

On that occasion President Roosevelt said:

"This is a memorable day in the history of American shipbuilding—a memorable day in the emergency defense of the Nation. Today from dawn to dark 14 ships are being launched on the Atlantic, on the Pacific, and on the Gulf, and among them is the first Liberty ship, the *Patrick Henry*.

"While we are proud of what we are doing, this is certainly no time to be content. We must build more cargo ships and still more cargo ships, and we must speed the program until we achieve a launching each day, then two ships a day, fulfilling the building program undertaken by the Maritime Commission."

In a few weeks the Japanese attacked at Pearl Harbor and under the impact of war immediately declared on the Axis, shipbuilding in the United States expanded rapidly. Completed merchant vessels now are being delivered at the rate of considerably more than five a day. More than 2,100 oceangoing ships have been delivered and placed in service during the last 2 years, 1,700 of them the war-tested Liberty's.

Supplementing the above release, I wish to add the following:

SHIPYARD EXPANSION

Three liberty ships, of which the *Patrick Henry* was the first, were launched in September 1941. The keel of the *Patrick Henry* had been laid 151 days before her launching. It took an additional 94 days of outfitting and testing before she finally was delivered into service 245 days after the keel was laid. This month more than 116 liberty ships will be delivered into service, in an average of less than 45 days from the time their keels were laid.

On September 27, 1941, some 200,000 workers were employed on about 100 ways, and in the shops of about 21 yards. Today, almost three-quarters of a million workers are turning out ships on more than 300 ways in approximately 70 shipyards which are scattered along the coast lines of both oceans, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Great Lakes.

ASSEMBLY-LINE METHODS

The amazing story of America's ship production, however, cannot be found in the shipyards alone. Its keys are three words: "Standardization," "centralization," and "prefabrication." Standardization of design brought about the centralization of procurement and control of material flow from factory to shipyard. Then, when production was centered on the simply designed liberty ship, all the power and speed of prefabrication were brought into play so that today the shipyards' ways are no more than the end stations of a massive assembly line stretching into more than 1,200 factories and dipping into the natural resources of every State in the Union. Manufactured articles from war plants in 35 States, along with raw materials from all the States and many foreign lands, are poured by more than a million workers upon this vast ship production line as it stretches and winds its way from one end of the Nation to the other.

THE FEMININE TOUCH

Women's only direct contribution to the *Patrick Henry* when she slid down the ways in September 1941 was supplied by Mrs. Henry A. Wallace, who swung the bottle at the ship's christening. In those days the shipyard was man's unchallenged domain. Today, however, overall-clad, helmeted women make up almost 12 percent of all shipyard labor. Their skill as burners, welders, tackers, riveters, and in dozens of other shipyard jobs is successfully challenging the best men have to offer.

Women shipyard workers now draw the same pay as their shipbuilding brothers. They are expected to and they deliver the same quality and quantity of work. And, with the exception of work on the actual ways and aboard ship, they can be found in all of the shipyards' many departments and shops. It should be noted that once the gates were opened to them, the percentage of women workers has increased steadily at a rate of about 1 percent a month.

YARDS PRODUCING OTHER VESSELS, TOO

While much has been written and said about production of the famed Liberty ship, the Nation's shipyards have been busy delivering other vessels as well. More than one-third of the ships produced in the last 24 months have been vessels other than Libertys. These categories have been divided between oil tankers, C-type freighters for the long-range program, and all other types combined, such as special auxiliaries, coastal cargo ships and tankers, and barges.

VICTORY-SHIP PRODUCTION ON SCHEDULE

Liberty-ship production will be still further curtailed in the near future when many of the Nation's yards begin pro-

duction of the new, speedy Victory ship. The first Victory keel is scheduled to be laid next month and yards are under contract to deliver 339 of the new-type vessels by the end of 1944.

While the Victory, like the Liberty, is an emergency vessel, it will be far superior in design and speed to its forerunner. Equipped with a turbine engine as compared to the steam reciprocating engine of the Liberty, the Victory will be of about the same dead-weight tonnage, 10,800 tons, but will have a speed of 15 to 17 knots, or 4 to 6 knots faster than the Liberty. Important is the fact that the Victory will be much more capable of taking its place in competitive post-war shipping trade.

TONNAGE TO COME

The wartime-shipbuilding program calls for the production of 50,000,000 dead-weight tons of ships by the end of 1944. This means that from the time the *Patrick Henry* was launched until the end of 1944, American shipyards will have delivered a greater dead-weight tonnage of new ships than that of the combined pre-Pearl Harbor merchant fleets of Great Britain, United States, Germany, Japan, and Norway. There appears to be no doubt that the 50,000,000 goal will be reached with time to spare. Shipbuilders reached an average of better than 5 delivered ships a day in April 1943 and have continued about that average. Deliveries in 1943 alone will total approximately 20,000,000 dead-weight tons and that tonnage can be equalled or surpassed in 1944.

Present delivery schedules for 1944 call for the following:

Victory ships	339
Liberty ships	820
C-type cargoes	300
Tankers	340
Total	1,799

A month-by-month production summary for the last 2 years follows:

Month	Number of ships	Dead-weight tonnage
1941		
October	7	75,714
November	12	133,744
December	11	115,469
1942		
January	16	197,628
February	26	289,549
March	26	291,473
April	36	401,632
May	57	619,779
June	67	743,654
July	71	791,667
August	68	752,774
September	93	1,016,112
October	81	889,737
November	84	892,536
December	121	1,197,191
1943		
January	103	1,007,689
February	130	1,235,891
March	146	1,513,244
April	157	1,603,307
May	176	1,782,836
June	167	1,670,442
July	158	1,669,341
August	164	1,697,400

Very accurately the record of the United States Maritime Commission has been declared to be the world's most outstanding accomplishment in shipbuilding. Nothing in maritime history even approaches that achievement.

All honor and glory to the United States Maritime Commission, all of its officials and employees, to American shipbuilders and all employees and laborers in American shipyards who have translated patriotism into deeds and who have nobly followed the call of Patrick Henry for deeds and not words. May all of us follow their example.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two respects, in one to include a statement presented over the radio "Palestine—Roadway to Rescue," and in the other to include an article by Wheeler Sammons entitled "The Great Books Are Being Closed." The Government Printer informs me that the cost of the latter will be $165.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and such legislation as may come before the House, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes following the gentleman from New York, who I think is the only one to precede me in that request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Roane Waring, the national commander of the American Legion, on September 17, 1943, to the Southern and Western Governors' Conference at Denver, Colo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

THE FALLACY OF THE MILK SUBSIDY

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, milk producers and other farmers do not want to be subsidized by the United States Treasury. All they ask is to receive a fair price in the market places to cover production costs.

The Roosevelt proposal to pay a 90-day subsidy on milk is a political move on the part of the New Deal to make dairy farmers believe they are getting something from the administration, and to fool consumers that they will get an abundance of milk at a low price. This subsidy will cost the taxpayers $70,000,000 for the next 3 months, and if continued for the next 12 months, the cost to the Treasury will be over $250,000,000.

I am convinced that a subsidy payment of from 25 to 40 cents per 100 pounds for milk will be a miserable flop. It will not produce any additional supply of milk for civilian needs, as the proposed payment is not sufficient to cover additional costs of manpower and feed for dairy farmers. Tens of thousands of dairy farmers throughout the country are now selling their herds because they cannot compete with wages paid in war industries, and for the lack of feed.

Furthermore, consumers, who believe that this subsidy will pay part of their grocery bill, are only fooling themselves. They will be called upon to pay this and other subsidies in the form of increased taxes. The milk subsidy for 1 year will increase the normal tax rate ½ percent—from 6 to 6½ percent. Subsidies on milk, butter, and meat totaling $660,000,000 will increase the normal tax rate from 6 percent to 7½ percent, and the wage earner will pay the bill in taxes. The Administration is asking for $1,000,000,000 to pay food subsidies. This amount will increase the normal tax rate to 8 percent. We had better face this issue now without fooling the people longer, if the people want milk.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech made by H. Alexander Smith, Republican national committeeman from New Jersey, and further to extend my remarks and include therein an address by Julian S. Myrich, vice president of the Mutual Life Insurance Co., of New York, on the subject of catching up with the American radical.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

REFUND OF THE 49-CENT WHEAT PENALTY

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, a petition has been placed on the Speaker's desk in support of a bill I introduced several months ago to refund the penalty of 49 cents a bushel collected from farmers who raised more wheat than was allocated them under Government control. They call it excess wheat.

The Government has collected over $17,000,000 from farmers who raised approximately 39,000,000 bushels of this extra wheat and which after all was so badly needed. Do not forget this money was collected in 1941 and mostly in 1942. The Department of Agriculture saw its error in February 1943 and took the penalty off for those who still held their wheat but not for the farmer who had sold it. The Department is now asking our farmers to increase their production from fifty-two and sixty-eight million acres which is more than 30 percent, yet it refuses to pay back $17,000,000 to farmers who raised wheat that helps to take care of a shortage of food that is impending.

The House committee has not seen fit to act on this bill. I trust the Members of this House will support consideration of this bill by signing the petition. The farmers who paid these penalties are entitled to these refunds. Let us pay it to them.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the Chenango County Board of Supervisors.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PRODUCTION OF CHEESE

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, in January or February of 1941 a delegation of Wisconsin Representatives met with the Honorable Claude Wickard to discuss the production of cheese so badly needed in the war effort. At that conference we warned Mr. Wickard of what would take place unless certain provisions were made to do away with discrimination in this industry. Those discriminations were not removed. The very thing that we prophesied would happen, did happen. Some months ago we had a session with the Office of Price Administration, advising of what took place before and predicting what would happen again. Nothing has been done about it. As a result, the production of cheese has decreased.

The outstanding Democratic paper of the State of Wisconsin, the Sheboygan Press, of which Charlie Broughton is publisher and editor, who has been national committeeman for years for the Democratic Party in our State, has published an outstanding editorial criticizing what is being done in relation to the cheese industry and what harm it is doing, and the lack of production. This editorial is as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION HAS A DUTY TO PERFORM

We do not believe that O. P. A. would intentionally strangle the cheese industry here in Wisconsin, but this is happening as a result of discrimination under order MPR 289.

Instead of encouraging the production of cheese, a loss of $3,000,000 has been sustained when compared with the price paid for Cheddar cheese just over the State line in Minnesota, Iowa, Illinois and Michigan. Just how long the producers of milk can stand this burden is a question that time will determine. It has a tendency, however, to slow down production and a number of cheese factories have closed or sold out.

The objections have been brought to the attention of O. P. A. on several occasions, but no action has been taken up to this time, and every day and every week more and greater damage is being done to cheese producers when the need becomes more urgent for greater production. How can you have greater production when a stifling hand is at the throat of the producers who in turn see a great dairy State laid on the altar of sacrifice? It is time that an awakened Washington, whether it be O. P. A. or Senators and Representatives—the lawmakers—offer assistance, if war production is to be maintained and encouraged. The cheese industry of Wisconsin is penalized by the Plymouth-plus provision of 289.

This can and should be remedied by a simple provision raising the ceiling on Wisconsin Cheddar cheese one-half cent per pound which will partially compensate the sharp price break at the State line. This will not interfere with the Presidential "hold the line" order nor will it create any enforcement problem for O. P. A.

Another objectionable provision of the order is slowly but surely removing natural American cheese from the market by placing a ceiling price on small styles—Daisies, Longhorns, etc.—the same as the price on large styles. When MPR 289 went into effect in December 1942, the production of small styles in Wisconsin was 30 percent of the total, while in August (last month) small styles were only 7 percent of the total. Increasing the ceiling price on small styles one-half cent per pound will not cause an unwanted shift in production, but will permit the manufacture of small styles by many factories which have discontinued their manufacture during the past few months. It will give the domestic consumers some natural cheese instead of completely taking it off the market.

Increased manufacturing cost is the basis for the Wisconsin Cheesemakers' Association's request for one-quarter cent per pound for cheesemakers.

The association's requests are not selfish because the requested one-half-cent increase on small styles and the one-quarter-cent manufacturer's allowance will be national in its application, although the adjustment of the Plymouth-plus provision would apply only to Wisconsin Cheddar cheese because it is the only State directly discriminated against.

The Wisconsin Cheesemakers' Association has called attention time and again to the increased production costs. It has filed with the O. P. A. a statement that "price ceilings on Cheddar cheese were established prior to December 1942, and the cost of milk production from December 15, 1942, to June 15, 1943, increased 12 percent. This increase in the cost of production and the ceiling price have brought about a condition that has worked injury to the industry as a whole."

The association, and it represents Wisconsin as a whole, asks that these inequities promulgated in the order issued by the Office of Price Administration be removed. It is a fair and a reasonable request, that O. P. A. could not have foreseen when the order was issued.

Four recommendations have been submitted and none of these will cause any additional policing and will be a source of equity and justice upon which our laws are based. The four points recommended are as follows:

"(1) The removal of inequities in MPR 289, which the record shows, are interfering with the industry's ability and desire to meet the production goals deemed necessary for the food-for-war program.

"(2) The adjustment of price inequities up instead of down because of increased production costs since the establishment of price ceilings.

"(3) Avoiding violation of the Executive 'hold the line' order.

"(4) Avoiding interference with the balanced production of other necessary dairy products, by recommending only price changes sufficient to remove inequities and maintain production of Cheddar cheese, without creating a price attraction resulting in unwanted diversion."

We would like to see the Office of Price Administration step out in front and perform this meritorious service in the interest of a State that has cooperated to the fullest extent in its war effort, whether it be men and women for the fighting fronts, or men and women on the production fronts. This is the kind of justice that we must practice if we are to enter upon a successful campaign of post-war planning. This editorial is written at some length because all my years have been spent in Wisconsin, and I know what it

means to see the corner cheese factory eliminated. It is the cross-road section where problems are discussed by the dairy farmer as he brings his milk to the receiving station. How long do you think he will support producing cheesemakers when his check diminishes, and how long do you think the cheesemaker will take a loss without giving up? This is a question that we submit to O. P. A. confident that a delayed wrong will be righted.

C. E. BROUGHTON, *Editor.*

Mr. Broughton lives in a territory that produces a lot of cheese. He is not dealing in petty criticism. He is trying to be helpful. We are all trying to help, irrespective of parties. This is not a political question. It is an economic question which has much meaning, not only for the producer but also for the consumer. So let us got together on it in a calm, sensible way and solve this problem, so important to the economy of Wisconsin.

The criticism has been made that certain large dairy interests have control of the cheese market and fix the price of cheese. Indictments have been brought against certain officers of large dairy companies, charging that a monopoly exists and that this trust establishes the price of cheese. These indictments were laid 2 years ago and no action has as yet been had. Why not try these cases and find out what is wrong? The criticism has also been made that some of these interests are writing the regulations and orders affecting the cheese industry, in order that they may advertise and enhance their own business and discourage the independent producer.

Wake up, O. P. A., and heed Mr. Broughton's advice.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some remarks made by me in Springfield, Mass., on August 19 past.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

POLITICS IN THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington has just accused me of attacking the Commander in Chief in connection with remarks I have made regarding politics in the war effort. I am sure that if the gentleman will read the remarks referred to he will find that no mention of the Commander in Chief was made.

I have made no charges that have not appeared previously in newspapers and authoritative Army publications. I am today inserting in the RECORD an article on the subject written for the International News Service which will enlighten the gentleman.

And one more thing, Mr. Speaker. I say to the gentleman from Washington that any time I hear of politics being played in connection with the war effort I shall tell the world about it.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last, in the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] made this statement:

I have seen a blueprint of a plan which would presumably streamline the War Department, but in reality its intent is to convert that great Department into a New Deal political organization. In my opinion, the activities of the men behind this plan are nothing less than treasonous.

Do you mean to say, sir, that sitting here as a Representative in this great Congress you dare not or will not name the men you charge are treasonable? Are they men that are in the administration of the affairs of this Government, or are they some outsiders? Do you mean to charge that the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, has a part in it?

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Or that Judge Patterson has a part in it, or that the President has a part in it, or that General Marshall has a part in it? Why do you not name your men?

Mr. SHAFER. The men I named are given. There is no need for all this oratory. They are named.

Mr. BULWINKLE. They are not named in this speech, there is not a single name that you have given at all, and I challenge you, upon your responsibility as a Member of this Congress, to name your men.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a copy of the remarks made by Brig. Gen. James A. O'Connor, commanding Northwest Service Command, and by Col. J. B. Bush, chief of staff of that command, at the dedication of the Peace River Bridge on the Alaska Highway on August 30 of this year.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial published in the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press, entitled "O. P. A. Has a Duty to Perform."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement, an excerpt from the RECORD, and letters from General Hines and other data explaining the effect of the bill H. R. 2703, reported by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, passed by the Congress and signed by the President July 13, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SECRETARY OF STATE CORDELL HULL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the American people cannot know all the facts back of these attacks on Cordell Hull. Secretary Hull has won a great moral victory in the elimination of Sumner Welles from the State Department, and the substitution of Mr. Stettinius. If everyone in the United States, if everyone in our armed forces, knew the facts back of it they would applaud the courage of Cordell Hull in demanding this change.

The American people are sick and tired of these left-wing crackpots continuing their scurrilous attacks on Cordell Hull at this time in order to try to prevent his participation in the conference now being arranged with the Soviet Government. If any man in this country should be sent to Moscow to try to straighten out our international affairs with Russia at this time, that man is Cordell Hull.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHAFER. I believe I have a point of personal privilege as the result of the remarks made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] and I wish to be recognized, but I should like to have that delayed until tomorrow, if possible. Will the Speaker recognize me at that time?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman is able to state language that would justify his being recognized on a question of personal privilege, the Chair will certainly recognize him tomorrow but in the meantime the Chair will appreciate it very much if the gentleman will state to him the objectionable words, so that the Chair can look them over before tomorrow.

Mr. SHAFER. May I submit that to the Speaker tomorrow after the RECORD is published?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appreciate it if the gentleman will submit it before the House meets.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the business on the Speaker's table is disposed of and all other special orders tomorrow I may have permission to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address made by Col. Edward A Fitzpatrick, the cost of which will be $67.50.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SUBSIDIES

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I was very much disappointed to see the milk subsidy announced yesterday. The milk subsidy has been played around with for almost a year now and the result has been a continuous decline in dairy production and a continuous decline in the things that we need. It should be apparent to the War Food Administration and to the O. P. A. that in continuing this subsidy performance we are promoting the doctrine of scarcity and that that is going to result in uncontrolled inflation. I wish that those people could go along with what is the manifest idea of Congress and get rid of the subsidy business and pay a fair price to the farmers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therewith an address delivered by our colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] over the Columbia Broadcasting System on September 14 on the subject of the proposed drafting of fathers.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last I received unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on the production and distribution of meat. I find the article is half a page more than the usual extension allowed and the total cost will be $112.50. Notwithstanding that additional cost, I ask unanimous consent to insert the article in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include certain excerpts and statements.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE PEACE WE HOPE FOR

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, last week, on Tuesday, September 21, 1943, the House of Representatives agreed to the Fulbright resolution, giving its approval of the principle of participation by the United States in an appropriate international organization for the preservation of peace. I voted for that resolution as the Representative of the Twentieth District of California. I did so in hearty accord with its principle and with the understanding that when a plan for the preservation of peace is submitted, that the Congress, representing the people, shall then determine the question of its appropriateness. My vote for that resolution is not intended as a blank-check endorsement to any particular future plan or is it intended as an authorization for the President to bind this country to a plan that he may deem appropriate, without further legislative approval. The Fulbright resolution is solely the statement of a principle which I approve.

While I realize that much of the negotiations preliminary to the presentation of a plan for the preservation of peace must necessarily be carried on elsewhere than in a public forum, nevertheless when that time comes I shall expect the American people to be kept apprised of the steps being taken. There must be no secret commitments.

Mr. Speaker, graven in the granite base of the National Archives Building on Pennsylvania Avenue are the words, "What is past is prologue—study the past." Therefore, in preparation for consideration of the negotiations to come, I believe that every Member of this Congress and as many of the people as will, should study the history of Versailles and the writings of those who represented us in that peace conference. In this way we may recall to mind the conditions which surrounded that conference and note the right courses and the wrong courses taken by our representatives there. In this way we may perhaps prepare ourselves for things to come. "What is past is prologue."

Let us contemplate the world of the future. Let us think not only of the immediate future but of the distant future. The problems of Europe are manifold. We must stand for right and justice in Europe. The problems of the Pacific have been of lesser concern to us in the past but they loom as large, if not larger, on the horizon of the future. Today I desire to direct my remarks to the Pacific and to recall to your minds some history.

THE PEOPLE OF THE PACIFIC

Let us be reminded that the Pacific Ocean, while vast in extent, is an ocean that aviation has made much smaller, a far less difficult barrier. Let us be reminded that over there on the far side of it are hundreds of millions—yes, almost a billion Asiatic, Malay, and Indian people. They will be there a long time. They were there long before we were here. Millions of them will become industrialized as have the Japs. They are smart and industrious for the most part, although education in the formal sense has not been generally available. Their ideas and ideals are very different from ours as they and we do not have a common ancestral heritage of culture, history, or language. But there they are and there they will be, and here we are and are determined to be.

I do not intend to attempt to forecast the future—I am no crystal gazer—but if what is past is prologue, may we not base our thinking concerning the Pacific on the great feeling of friendship that the people of our country have for the Chinese? We have attempted to demonstrate that feeling on many an occasion and in many ways. Today we carry a sympathetic and deep feeling of righteous wrath for the wrongs done to China by the Japs.

But how many of us realize that we ourselves are partly—yes, more than partly—responsible for making possible those wrongs, that treacherous butchery and bestial treatment of China's people by Japan? You have forgotten—just as I had forgotten—the details of the peace that was made after the last war and especially that part which had to do with Asia. The dragon's teeth were both planted and watered at Versailles.

I had forgotten, as no doubt you have, that in the peace treaty made at Versailles Japan was given control over that great maritime province of China known as Shantung—given control over 30,000,000 Chinese—and that in wounded protest China had refused to sign—and walked out.

THE PEACE NEGOTIATIONS

A friend of mine in Pasadena, Calif., Mr. E. B. McLaughlin, while browsing in his own library came across that volume published in 1921 entitled "The Peace Negotiations—a Personal Narrative," written by Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of State, Robert Lansing, and was so startled and shocked by the reading of it that he brought it to me. Robert Lansing, as you know, was one of our commissioners to the peace conference. The American commission was composed of Robert Lansing, our Secretary of State, Henry White, and Gen. Tasker H. Bliss, plus the ever-present personal representative of President Wilson—the Harry Hopkins of that day—Col. Edward M. House—as a supernumerary.

And of great interest to the Members of the House, I have just had my attention called to the fact that the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, a Member of this body, was the secretary to that commission.

To summarize much interesting reading in Mr. Lansing's book, you will remember that in 1898 Germany had taken Kiao-Chau by force from the weak and unorganized Chinese and had obtained a number of important concessions in Shantung Province.

In the peace negotiations at Versailles in 1919, Japan, as one of the victorious allies, claimed all of Germany's illgotten rights to China's Shantung Province. China naturally objected, saying that Germany's rights had been established by force and were illegal, and therefore the treaty makers could not lawfully give a piece of China to Japan. In fact, China had been fighting Germany to regain those same rights.

Japan then said that if they could not have Shantung Province they would not join the League of Nations. Woodrow Wilson was dead set on his League of Nations, and in order to put it over and to obtain Japan's signature as a member, he gave in to Japan and agreed to

Japan's taking Shantung Province of China in exchange for Japan's agreement to sign up with the League of Nations. Do I say that? No; Robert Lansing says that. He was there in Versailles at the time.

Let me read you what Robert Lansing wrote in his book, The Peace Negotiations:

Mr. Wilson said * * * that, in his judgment, the signatures could not have been obtained if he had not given Shantung to Japan, and that he had been notified that the Japanese delegates had been instructed not to sign the treaty unless the cession of the German rights in Shantung to Japan was included.

Our peace commissioners were so upset over President Wilson's sell-out of the Chinese to Japan that they got Gen. Tasker H. Bliss to write a formal letter to the President, in which they all joined. Let me read you the last few lines of it:

If we support Japan's claims, we abandon the democracy of China to the domination of the Prussianized militarism of Japan. We shall be sowing dragon's teeth. It can't be right to do wrong even to make peace. Peace is desirable, but there are things dearer than peace—justice and freedom.

Now let me read to you Robert Lansing's memorandum of the affair, written the day after that letter to the President was sent. This memorandum was written May 1, 1919, by our then Secretary of State, Robert Lansing:

China has been abandoned to Japanese rapacity. A democratic territory has been given over to an autocratic government. The President has conceded to Japan all that, if not more than, she ever hoped to obtain. This is the information contained in a memorandum handed by Ray Stannard Baker under the President's direction to the Chinese delegation last evening, a copy of which reached me through Mr. ———, of the Chinese delegation.

Mr. ——— also said that Mr. Baker stated that the President desired him to say that the President was very sorry that he had not been able to do more for China but that he had been compelled to accede to Japan's demand "in order to save the League of Nations."

The memorandum was most depressing. Though I had anticipated something of the sort 3 days ago. (See note of April 28 previously quoted.)

I had unconsciously cherished a hope that the President would stand to his guns and champion China's cause. He has failed to do so. It is true that China is given the shell called sovereignty, but the economic control, the kernel, is turned over to Japan.

However logical may appear the argument that China's political integrity is preserved and will be maintained under the guaranty of the League of Nations, the fact is that Japan will rule over millions of Chinese. Furthermore it is still a matter of conjecture how valuable the guaranty of the League will prove to be. It has, of course, never been tried, and Japan's representation on the council will possibly thwart any international action in regard to China.

Frankly my policy would have been to say to the Japanese, "If you do not give back to China what Germany stole from her, we don't want you in the League of Nations." If the Japanese had taken offense and gone, I would have welcomed it, for we would have been well rid of a government with such imperial designs. But she would not have gone. She would have submitted. She has attained a high place in world councils. Her astute statesmen would never have abandoned her present exalted position even for the sake of Kiao-Chau. The whole affair assumes a sordid and sinister character, in which the President, acting undoubtedly with the best of motives, became the cat's-paw.

I have no doubt that the President fully believed that the League of Nations was in jeopardy and that to save it he was compelled to subordinate every other consideration. The result was that China was offered up as a sacrifice to propitiate the threatening Moloch of Japan. When you get down to facts the threats were nothing but bluff.

I do not think that anything that has happened here has caused more severe or more outspoken criticism than this affair. I am heartsick over it, because I see how much good-will and regard the President is bound to lose. I can offer no adequate explanation to the critics. There seems to be none.

And so it was that we, the people of the United States, through a deal made by our then President, Woodrow Wilson, gave over to Japan a piece of China, gave Japan a foothold on Chinese soil wherein dragon's teeth were sown.

THE ISLANDS OF THE PACIFIC

Not only that—remember the islands of the Pacific. In 1899 we had defeated Spain in a war and taken the Philippines. Spain also owned by discovery and occupation the Marshalls, the Carolines and thousands of other islands flung far and wide over the great Pacific. We did not want those islands then; they seemed small and inconsequential. A few years afterward Spain sold those islands to Germany for $4,000,000. Think of it—$4,000,000 Germany paid for those thousands of islands.

Under the Covenant of the League of Nations it was agreed to give those islands as a mandate to Japan—who wanted them badly. Japan agreed not to fortify them and to maintain the open door.

Did they maintain the open door? Japan did not. Japan slowly, quietly, and firmly closed the door tight and proceeded to develop and then fortify those islands until she had an almost impregnable line of naval bases and stationary aircraft carriers all over a couple of million square miles of the Pacific between us and the Philippines. And thus was war in the Pacific nurtured.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Is the gentleman informed as to the distance from Guam to the nearest of those islands?

Mr. HINSHAW. No; I am not, as to the exact figures.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. It is a matter of 26 miles.

Mr. HINSHAW. The distance is not great, I know.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Yes, 26 miles; and I think anyone having the information that you are now giving to the House and to the country will agree that the proposition to fortify Guam would have been anything but a safe and sound program, for the reason that Japan not only could have taken Guam at the time she did, but if we had fortified the island she could have taken it at any time she wanted to.

Mr. HINSHAW. Of course, the gentleman from Michigan knows there was no legislation ever presented to the House of Representatives which provided for the fortification of the island of Guam. I understand that the Navy Department wanted it, but evidently the State Department or the President decided that we should live up to our earlier promise and not erect fortifications west of Hawaii. Therefore that provision was probably deleted from the naval authorization bill before it reached the House.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I understand that, but I will say to the gentleman that many people in the country did believe there was.

IN THE PEACE TREATY WAR WAS BRED

Mr. HINSHAW. The sacrifice of the freedom of the 30,000,000 Chinese in Shantung Province to the drooling jowls of a saber-tooth tiger was the price paid for the tiger's signature to a principle of peace. Having tasted blood the tiger lusted for more blood. He has grown fat and feeds upon his kill. He has attacked us after the manner of tigers. We must now kill him or be killed. Our lads who have met him know that.

WHAT ABOUT THE NEXT PEACE?

Let us get that tiger's skin nailed to the wall. You cannot make peace with a saber-toothed tiger and peace treaties merely give him a breathing spell.

Now let me read to you portions of Secretary Lansing's memorandum of May 8, 1919:

The terms of peace were yesterday delivered to the German plenipotentiaries, and for the first time in these days of feverish rush of preparation there is time to consider the treaty as a complete document.

The impression made by it is one of disappointment, of regret, and of depression. The terms of peace appear immeasurably harsh and humiliating, while many of them seem to me impossible of performance.

The League of Nations created by the treaty is relied upon to preserve the artificial structure which has been erected by compromise of the conflicting interests of the great powers and to prevent the germination of the seeds of war which are sown in so many articles and which under normal conditions would soon bear fruit. The League might as well attempt to prevent the growth of plant life in a tropical jungle. Wars will come sooner or later.

It must be admitted in honesty that the League is an instrument of the mighty to check the normal growth of national power and national aspirations among those who have been rendered impotent by defeat. Examine the treaty and you will find peoples delivered against their wills into the hands of those whom they hate, while their economic resources are torn from them and given to others. Resentment and bitterness, if not desperation, are bound to be the consequences of such provisions. It may be years before these oppressed peoples are able to throw off the yoke, but as sure as day follows night the time will come when they will make the effort.

This war was fought by the United States to destroy forever the conditions which produced it. Those conditions have not been destroyed. They have been supplanted by other conditions equally productive of hatred,

jealousy, and suspicion. In place of the triple alliance and the entente has arisen the quintuple alliance which is to rule the world. The victors in this war intend to impose their combined will upon the vanquished and to subordinate all interests to their own.

It is true that to please the aroused public opinion of mankind and to respond to the idealism of the moralist they have surrounded the new alliance with a halo and called it the League of Nations, but whatever it may be called or however it may be disguised, it is an alliance of the five great military powers.

It is useless to close our eyes to the fact that the power to compel obedience by the exercise of the united strength of "The Five" is the fundamental principle of the League. Justice is secondary. Might is primary.

The League as now constituted will be the prey of greed and intrigue, and the law of unanimity in the Council, which may offer a restraint, will be broken or render the organization powerless. It is called upon to stamp as just what is unjust.

We have a treaty of peace, but it will not bring permanent peace because it is founded on the shifting sands of self-interest.

THE IRRECONCILABLES

Why did we not join in that League of Nations? Why did a minority in the United States Senate block our ratification of it? Were they wrong or right? What about the next League of Nations—will it be founded on justice and right or on the shifting sands of self-interest?

Mr. Speaker, in the course of debate on the Fulbright resolution, we have heard much about the League of Nations and some about the Treaty of Versailles. Out of the past, Robert Lansing speaks, to warn us against "sowing dragon's teeth" at the next peace conference. However appropriate may appear a plan for the maintenance of international peace, let us make certain that our plenipotentiaries at the peace conference make no such mistake as was made when Woodrow Wilson, no doubt under the influence of Lloyd George and Clemenceau, and overanxious for the signature of Japan to the Leage of Nations covenant, sold out the future peace as the price for that signature to what was supposedly to be the instrumentality of permanent world peace.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I quote as follows, the articles of the Treaty of Versailles relating to the Shantung Province in China.

EXCERPTS FROM THE PEACE TREATY OF VERSAILLES

ARTICLE 156

Germany renounces, in favor of Japan, all her rights, title and privileges—particularly those concerning the territory of Kiaochow, railways, mines, and submarine cables—which she acquired in virtue of the Treaty concluded by her with China on March 6, 1898, and of all other arrangements relative to the Province of Shantung.

All German rights in the Tsingtao-Tsinanfu Railway, including its branch lines, together with its subsidiary property of all kinds, stations, shops, fixed and rolling stock, mines, plant and material for the exploitation of the mines, are and remain acquired by Japan, together with all rights and privileges attaching thereto.

The German State submarine cables from Tsingtao to Shanghai and from Tsingtao to Chefoo, with all the rights, privileges and properties attaching thereto, are similarly acquired by Japan, free and clear of all charges and encumbrances.

ARTICLE 157

The movable and immovable property owned by the German State in the territory of Kiaochow, as well as all the rights which Germany might claim in consequence of the works or improvements made or of the expenses incurred by her, directly or indirectly, in connection with this territory, are and remain acquired by Japan, free and clear of all charges and encumbrances.

ARTICLE 158

Germany shall hand over to Japan within three months from the coming into force of the present Treaty the archives, registers, plans, title-deeds, and documents of every kind, wherever they may be, relating to the administration, whether civil, military, financial, judicial or other, of the territory of Kiaochow.

Within the same period Germany shall give particulars to Japan of all treaties, arrangements or agreements relating to the rights, title or privileges referred to in the two preceding Articles.

Mr. Speaker, since preparing the address just presented I find that opposite page 256 of the book, the Peace Negotiation, by Robert Lansing, which I hold in my hand, there appears a reproduction of a photograph entitled "The Delegates of the American Peace Commission," and on the left appears Henry White, next comes Robert Lansing, the Secretary of State, sitting at the desk, and by his side our colleague of today, Hon. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, of Massachusetts, who was then secretary to the Commission, and on his left appears Tasker H. Bliss, the General of the armies of that day.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] has had a long and distinguished career filled with important experiences. To have him as a Member of this body is to have the living voice of the secretary to our American Peace Commission at Versailles to counsel with us today when the delegates themselves can no longer speak. His advice to us will be worthy of our keenest attention.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is recognized for 20 minutes.

DOWN TO EARTH

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I would like, if I could, to make this speech a tremendous appeal to America to get down to earth. On the foreign front things are going magnificently; on the domestic front they are not going so well. We have wandered too far from the principles of Jefferson and Lincoln. We need to retrace our steps—to get down to earth.

There is a meaningful expression which all of us have heard many times, "The good earth." That expression connotes the reverence of the human race for the earth as the kind and good mother of us all, the beneficent source of the things that sustain life and contribute to the comfort and well-being of members of the human family. Those who stick close to the earth and cultivate it are assured of its abundant perennial blessings.

This expression "the good earth" comes to us from out of the shadows of antiquity. Mythology has many references to it. It is related that Hercules in his journeyings after the golden apples, came across a giant named Antaeus, son of Terra, the earth. Antaeus was a great wrestler. A fierce struggle ensued. Even the mighty strength of Hercules could not avail to overcome his antagonist. As the battle proceeded, however, Hercules noticed that each time the giant came into contact with the ground he arose with renewed vigor. Acting on this cue, Hercules lifted Antaeus and held him high in a crushing embrace until—

Back falls his fainting head and clammy hair.
Writhe his weak limbs and flits his life in air.

In the field of economics and government there also is "a good earth" and that good earth is the Constitution of the United States. When we leave that good earth and get up among the clouds of experimentation and fallacies, where we mistake unsubstantial theories and scintillating visions for beacons, we are headed for trouble. We get trapped in midair like Antaeus was trapped. We need to get back to earth to revivify ourselves at the source of fundamental wisdom.

BACK TO THE CONSTITUTION

The enterprise of greatest moment to the American people at this time is winning the war. Next to it and hardly secondary in importance is the need of a concerted movement back to the Constitution and to the principles of government which were laid down by Jefferson, the founder of the great American democracy, and passionately fought for by that other great commoner, Abraham Lincoln.

When therefore I refer to getting back to earth in the governmental sense I mean getting back to the Constitution, to the matchless democratic form of government that Jefferson created and Lincoln saved.

I speak as one who does not have a scintilla of patience with captious criticism. I speak as a friend and not as a foe of those in charge of the administration of the government at Washington. I believe there is universal approval, and properly so, of the conduct of the war. I appreciate all of the good the administration has done and I would like to be constructively helpful and cooperative in dealing with the domestic evils that now need attention, many of which are an outgrowth of the national emergency and the abnormal conditions under which we are living. In times like these when our people are distraught as never before, worried and distressed and beset beyond all description with apprehension and fear, we should reason together and present our constructive suggestions as to how improvements in conditions may be brought about, but whoever indulges in mere nagging criticism solely to harass those on whom responsibility rests is, in my opinion, a despicable performer, far below the level of a patriot. For his malactivities public contumely would be a just reward. My plea is that in this time of our country's extremity we shall cast all partisanship aside; that as Americans and not as

partisans we shall take note of malevolent and harmful trends of government and try to correct them before it is too late. I speak not as a Democrat but as one who believes that patriotism is universal and transcends all narrow partisan confines. I speak as an American to Americans. I will be happy if my feeble efforts to point out danger signals and remedial measures will have some constructive value.

DANGEROUS TRENDS THAT NEED CORRECTION

High up among the dangerous trends of government, as I visualize them, is the trend toward bureaucracy. Perhaps I would be more accurate to eliminate the word "toward," for bureaucracy in an aggravated form already is with us and is functioning in high gear at Washington. We are afflicted with the very kind of domineering bureaucracy that Jefferson repeatedly warned posterity to avoid as a blighting curse which, if it once became thoroughly entrenched, would smother individual liberty and stifle free enterprise. Our superbureaucracy at Washington already has gone far toward doing that very thing.

Professors who are loaned temporarily to the Government and beardless boys with academic degrees, including a considerable sprinkling with communistic tendencies, who never were inside a factory or on a farm, are telling our hardheaded, experienced businessmen what to do and how to do it, and are regimenting the poor farmers of America until they do not know whether they are farmers or guinea pigs. One of these bureaucrats said recently to the spokesman of a large and important Indianapolis company who had gone to the bureaucrat seeking relief:

You represent a rich company, but it will not be so rich after a while. Capitalism in this country is doomed.

In a time of war certain controls are necessary, and no reasonable objection could be made to them, but it is difficult to understand the thousands of bureaucratic exactions imposed upon our people; the innumerable and complicated forms to be filled out when fewer and simpler forms would answer the purpose; the interminable red tape and the unexcusable and ridiculous delays which keep our businessmen eternally on tenterhooks.

OUR LOPSIDED BUREAUCRACY

Government at Washington has become terribly lopsided. The lop is the bureaucracy. There was a time back in the days of Jeffersonian simplicity when Government consisted of three equal coordinate branches. There are still three branches, but weights have shifted. Our bureaucracy now pulls more weight than the other branches combined.

I am not going, here and now, to try to account for this lopsided bureaucratic growth, except to say that in my opinion the blame does not rest any more on the President for asking for power than it does on the Congress for conferring on the Executive powers that should never have been surrendered by the lawmaking body. A courageous and daring President, perhaps overly willing to assume responsibilities, too often found Congress cravenly willing to surrender its responsibilities to him. Too often I have heard Members of Congress say thoughtlessly:

If he wants to stick out his neck, let him do it.

Only recently Congress, without his asking it, voted to the Executive the most sweeping powers to seize manufacturing plants and write labor contracts. I doubt whether any totalitarian ruler in any country has broader powers over industry than have been voluntarily conferred by Congress on the President of the United States.

GOVERNMENT BY EXECUTIVE ORDER

Students of government will find the evolution of our bureaucracy a very interesting study. The time was when an Executive order was a rarity and the issuance of such an order was something to be talked about. Only on the most infrequent occasions and for very special purposes in those days did Presidents exercise the authority to issue Executive orders. Let us see how this practice has grown. During the 10-year period from 1933 to 1942, inclusive, 3,565 Executive orders were issued and Congress in the same period passed 4,304 public laws. The following table is of interest: Showing the number of Executive orders issued and the number of laws enacted each year during the 10 years mentioned:

	Executive orders issued	Number of laws enacted
1933	658	93
1934	472	446
1935	390	482
1936	275	505
1937	257	494
1938	249	425
1939	287	454
1940	309	551
1941	382	397
1942	286	457
Total	3,565	4,304

Executive orders mainly originate in the bureaus and are expressions of bureaucratic minds. They often embody the whims of bureau chiefs. They have the effect of laws. Thus we have an anomalous situation where the bureaus are enacting nearly as many laws as the Congress of the United States, the branch of government that was set up by the Constitution to write the laws of the land.

The American people are a patriotic and cooperative people. They are united in support of the war and they want to do their part. The one thing that grates on their sensibilities is that they are so often ordered instead of being asked. They find it hard to become reconciled to so many bureaucratic directives, issued by inexperienced persons in Washington, without consulting the individuals and interests affected. Such things are breeding widespread discontent which could be avoided by the exercise of more consideration and diplomacy. The other day, when I was out in the district I represent, I came across a very indignant storekeeper who owns a truck that he wanted to dispose of, as he found it superfluous under war conditions. The truck being in good condition, he found a ready market. Three persons offered him $500 and a third $600, but the Office of Price Administration stepped in and told him he could not sell the truck for more than $361. This was not only disappointing to him but to the would-be buyers, as well. He rolled his truck into a garage for the duration and he is now expressing strong opinions about such bureau orders. It is difficult to understand how the national effort is improved any by taking that truck out of circulation.

This vast expansion of bureaucratic authority over both legislation and administration bodes ill for the country.

The President and the Congress should cooperate in deflationary measures. We need to get down to earth by applying some effective curbs to our bureaucracy.

SOUNDER PRACTICES NECESSARY TO MAINTAIN SOLVENCY

We need to get down to earth, also, in the matter of our governmental expenditures. Sounder appropriating and taxation practices must be adopted if our country is to remain solvent. The drain of war on our financial resources, which cannot be avoided, makes it all the more necessary that our nondefense expenditures shall be put on a sound and economical basis. Such unconscionable money-spending schemes as the Florida ship canal, the St. Lawrence seaway, and the fantastic idea of harnessing the New England tides should be thrown out of the window for all time and take their place on the scrap heap of discarded things along with the crazy proposals for killing little pigs and converting them into soap grease, plowing under every third row of cotton, and paying farmers for crops they do not raise. When we really get down to earth we will wonder that anybody ever was foolish enough to harbor such cracked notions.

It will always be to me a blessed recollection that as a member of the Appropriations Committee I was privileged to take a leading part in killing the Florida ship canal in committee, at the recent session, for there is no doubt that it alone would put a drain of a billion dollars on the taxpayers of America without justification. It was my happy lot to make a motion to give it the coup de grâce. Still we should not congratulate ourselves too hastily. That unthinkable project has nine lives and it may bob up again. I think the scheme to harness the tides is dead, but we may expect another push behind the St. Lawrence seaway. The interests backing that unconscionable scheme are powerful and resourceful.

If we are true to our country we will get down to earth and banish all such Treasury-raiding projects to the limbo of forgotten things; likewise all other boondoggling, big and little. The people will be willing to reconcile themselves to the horrid memories of the past if they can only be assured that these looney ideas will not recur. Years ago in the heydey of the leaf-raking days I was

the sole passenger on a bus riding across Lawrence County, Ind. The driver looked lonesome, so I sat up on the front seat with him. On the way we passed a large group of men leisurely at work on a revetment. He laughed immoderately.

That is a Government project—

He said—

Those men have been at work all summer building up levees to prevent that farm from eroding. The farm won't raise beans and the most fanciful estimate of what it is worth is $3 an acre. The Government has already spent 10 times the value of the farm on that job.

There seemed to be something wrong with that picture, and in it a warning that it was high time somebody was getting down to earth.

THREE HUNDRED AND THIRTY THOUSAND MILLION DOLLARS

Since July 1, 1940, as a member of the Appropriations Committee I have assisted in the day-to-day toil of drafting legislation that appropriated $330,000,000,000 for national defense. It is a prodigious, an inconceivable, amount—three hundred and thirty thousand million dollars. It is the equivalent of far more than three-fourths of the total wealth of the United States, as shown by the last survey. The entire wealth of the State of Indiana, as shown by the last census figures, is less than one thirty-seventh of the amount appropriated for war since July 1, 1940. On June 30, 1943, $110,000,000,000, or one-third of this enormous total already had been spent, showing how voraciously war consumes the resources of the people.

With a willing conscience I have voted for all the billions necessary to save civilization and to protect our homes and firesides but could not help but gag over relatively insignificant appropriations of the boondoggling type which seemed to me to be wasteful and illogical and to threaten our American way of life. That line of reasoning led me to vote against the National Industrial Recovery Act and its large appropriation, for which I never have had any regrets. And I most certainly believe that instead of assuming that further increases of taxes are inevitable we should be looking around for ways to reduce expenditures, so as to make further taxes unnecessary. The great middle class of our taxpayers—what is known as the white-collar class—is caught between the millstones of fixed salaries and rising costs of living and is in a most precarious position. Any substantial increase of taxes on the white collar class would bring results that would be simply tragic. The poor are taxed up to their capacity to pay and there is the danger that heavy additional levies on business will reduce revenue by driving to the wall many concerns that are hanging on the edge of insolvency. There is such a thing as killing the goose that lays the golden eggs. The people have got about all the taxes they can stand.

NO CORRELATION BETWEEN RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES

One of the rare inconsistencies of our Federal system is that there is no correlation between the spending and the revenue activities. The appropriations Committee and the Ways and Means Committee operate with absolute independence of each other. Appropriations are made without the slightest idea of where the money is coming from to pay for them. To my mind this is not sound, or businesslike. I do not believe there is a competent businessman on earth who would buy or commit himself to buy, a bill of goods without some idea, at least, as to whether he would have the money to pay for them.

I believe that a long step toward getting down to earth in our national economy would be to have a balanced nondefense budget. To strive for such a balance is not only possible but practicable.

TAXES TO PAY THE BILL

To that end I recommend that the Budget Bureau, that is to say the President, send two budgets instead of one to Congress every session—a nondefense budget and a defense budget. I would have all items in the nondefense budget gathered together in one bill, under one enacting clause, instead of a number of separate measures, as at present. I would give the House ample time, weeks if necessary, to debate the bill and I would permit absolute freedom of offering amendments. When this general appropriation bill is finally perfected I would allow the Ways and Means Committee a few days to bring in tax legislation to cover the expenditures in the appropriation bill, and I would attach this tax clause as a rider to the appropriation measure, so that every Member who voted for the appropriation bill would have to vote the necessary taxes to carry it into effect. This would be disconcerting to Members who are traditionally supposed to vote for every appropriation and against every tax bill, but it certainly would promote solvency and be in the interest of sound national economy. Until the national emergency is over, appropriations for war and national defense necessarily would have to be dealt with in a separate budget.

COST-PLUS CONTRACTS A CRIME AGAINST TAXPAYERS

We can take another long step toward getting back to earth in our governmental economy by abolishing the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system of Government contracts. I do not know everything the cost-plus contracts cover. I do not know the complete extent of the wrongs they commit against our long-suffering taxpayers, but I do know that for one thing they cover a salary grab that is as glaring as the midday sun.

I challenge anybody to tell me how it happens that when an employee is happily and contentedly working for a certain salary in private employment and he is transferred to work under a Government cost-plus contract his services suddenly become, in the twinkling of an eye, worth 50 percent, 100 percent, and up to 700 percent more than he has been receiving before he got under the Government's umbrella. Let someone explain that.

The Comptroller General of the United States, whose duty it is to audit payments under these contracts, sent me 38 single-spaced typewritten pages of names of employees whose salaries were boosted all the way from 30 to 700 percent. I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD those names and the names of the employing companies and although this information was definite and specific, there has not been a single denial or contradiction.

SAMPLES OF THE SALARY GRAB

Sample increases which miraculously occurred when the employees made the switch from private to Government work were as follows:

A superintendent from $3,000 to $7,800 a year.

A superintendent from $100 to $325 a month.

A comptroller and acting general manager from $18,000 to $24,000 a year.

A cashier from $125 to $310 a month.

A factory manager from $7,200 to $12,000 a year.

A construction engineer from $175 to $400 a month.

A timekeeper from $600 to $2,080 a year.

Seventeen officials in one company whose salaries had previously ranged from $125 to $300 a month were all increased to $450 a month.

Nearly 600 in one company received an increase of more than 30 percent.

Salary grabs like these make me wonder what hidden items there may be that are charged up to the Goverment—that is to say, the taxpayers—under the head of cost in these contracts. I do know that in a good many instances the taxes paid by the private operating companies are charged to the Government as part of the costs.

I think that in a vast majority of cases the men have not asked for the increases of salary and would be willing to work for less.

CUT IN PERSONNEL DEMANDED

Excessive personnel goes hand in hand with bureaucracy. That many of the Government agencies are overstaffed there is no doubt. According to the Civil Service Commission the number of Government employees is now 3,029,483 as against a peak of 917,760 during World War No. 1.

WHY SHOULD THE CIVIL ROLL BE THREE TIMES LARGER NOW THAN IN THE FORMER WAR?

An Indianapolis girl who called at my office in a tearful mood said that on the day of her visit she had been employed at a certain Washington bureau 3 weeks, but had not yet been given a single thing to do. She was distressed and wanted to go home. For years I was called upon to render assistance to a certain malcontent, a ne'er-do-well with an acidulous outlook on life, who spent a great deal of his time abusing the Government. He moved to a far-away State where he and his family continued on the ragged edge of starvation, and I had many a battle with the relief authorities there in trying to assist him. The other day I was amazed when I received this letter from him:

You need not worry about me any more. I have a job in a defense plant at $100 a week.

By the widest stretch of the imagination that particular person is not worth $25 a week in any man's job.

I recall another case where a girl who started to work in a Government agency at $1,800 a year soon found herself pushed upward to $4,200 a year. Instances of that sort are too common.

Many millions of dollars might be saved without impairing efficiency by cutting the Government's personnel 15 percent. Some activities, such as the postal service, would not stand any cut, whatever, while others might be cut as much as 30 percent, or more, without adversely affecting vital operations. If there is to be a personnel cut, Congress should charge the Director of the Budget with deciding where and how the cut should be applied, since he is more familiar than anyone else with all governmental operations, and should hold him responsible only for seeing that a total 15-percent reduction is made covering the entire governmental personnel.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR GETTING DOWN TO EARTH

Well, what are we going to do about all of this? Is the situation hopeless? My answer is that in my opinion the situation is salvageable and we can make conditions on the domestic front compare satisfactorily with conditions on the foreign front if we will eschew politics and will work unitedly as Americans along certain definite lines for the good of the Nation. Summing up, I would submit these specific recommendations:

First. Congress to recognize and live up to its constitutional responsibilities and as rapidly as possible recapture its powers, to the end that the original balances of government may be established and permanently maintained.

Second. Adopt all practicable means to bring about a return to a simplified form of government and the abandonment of confusing and dictatorial practices that embarrass business and infringe upon private enterprise.

Third. Cut to the bone all nonessential expenditures and lay aside all further social and fiscal experimentation.

Fourth. Pass legislation making it unlawful for any governmental establishment to enter into cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts and effectively curbing unconscionable profits on war contracts.

Fifth. Establish a separate balanced budget on all nondefense appropriation items by including as a part of every such bill a tax clause to raise the necessary revenue to defray its cost.

Sixth. Pass legislation making a 15-percent cut in Government personnel and direct the Director of the Budget to apply the cut.

We have been living in tragic times when vital decisions had to be made in a hurry and men of equal patriotism differed widely in their views in regard to means and methods to be employed. Without criticizing anyone or imputing improper motives to any living soul, the fact remains that it is a condition and not a theory that now confronts us. All of us—the President, the Congress, and the great unofficial body of patriotic Americans—should cooperate in correcting these unwholesome trends of government. We need to get down to earth and the suggestions I have made would, I believe, help us to get started in that direction.

In proceeding, as best we can, to direct our ship of state past the dangers that beset us, let us bear unceasingly in mind that the Constitution of the United States is the greatest chart of government that ever came from the brain of man and that we must not allow anything to be done that will dim or tarnish it, or in any way restrict its full and free operations.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article which appeared in the Athens (Ga.) Banner-Herald in respect to the posthumous award of the Legion of Merit to First Lt. John Coffee Braswell, for outstanding conduct in the performance of service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial recently appearing in the San Francisco Examiner entitled "War Efficiency at the Pacific Ports."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests. First, to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an excerpt from an article appearing in the Outdoor American.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article which I wrote for the Republican Magazine of the September issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] is recognized for 10 minutes.

DEFENSE HOUSING AND UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I deem it appropriate to give notice of investigations being made by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives with reference to two very important matters. The first is manpower and its maldistribution. We have heard a great deal about the hoarding of labor. One in authority, if the papers quoted him correctly, recently said that by reason of the hoarding and the maldistribution of labor we are lacking 25 percent of our maximum efficiency in our industrial war effort.

This matter naturally affects questions which come up for discussion and consideration before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. It is our obligation to authorize the necessary housing for in-migrant workers in these congested areas of defense to the extent that housing is not available, and private capital cannot afford to take the risk of such temporary construction. Workers have been taken from one coast to another in carrying on many of these defense plants, and necessarily that increases the amount that must be authorized to give living quarters to those workers in their new places of abode; and so, in order to reduce as much as possible the authorizations and the expenditures for such war housing, we held a meeting of our committee on the 15th of September and agreed to undertake a comparative study of the man-hours that are being used in making comparable articles of equipment in the various plants and to determine where efficiency or inefficiency exists in order that contracts may be canceled, if necessary, where the work is inefficient and in order that new commercial organizations may be given an opportunity to share in this work, if they can prove themselves efficient. In other words, to the extent of our ability we want to reduce this 25 percent of inefficiency in the use and the distribution of our manpower. We are constantly urged to stimulate our production, and the most important way to stimulate it is to use to its full efficiency the available manpower.

We have had conferences already with representatives of the Army and the Navy and we are seeking to get through the various procurement agencies of the Government detailed information with reference to this situation in various parts of the country. I believe it is going to be helpful, that it will be of assistance in eliminating waste and extravagance, and in getting full performance for the dollars we expend.

The other matter which is being investigated by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has to do with the disposition of surplus property of various characters when the war is over. There are pending before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds four or five different bills relating to this subject. It seems of prime importance to establish some definite policy with reference to the disposition of surplus land and buildings and various articles when this war is over; otherwise they may be dumped speedily upon the country and disrupt our commercial operations, and they may give opportunity through wholesale sales to designing persons to make fortunes at the expense of the Government and the people. Some policy should be determined that will result in a logical and orderly distribution of this surplus property when the war is over in order that it may not interfere with private enterprise and in order that they who have disposed of their lands to the Government may, if possible, have an opportunity to reacquire those lands on

reasonable terms and go on with their operations of civil life.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. On the question of checking up various plants engaged in war production, I think it is a wonderful suggestion. In my own district is a very large coal-mining operation. They have from 20 to 30 or more general foremen in charge of bringing the coal out of the ground and then they have a general superintendent. Every day the record made by the various sections of the mine is brought to the attention of the superintendent. In a few years by this system of comparison and competition they have nearly doubled the production of coal per man. If one section is falling behind, the general superintendent will call the foreman in and ask him what is the reason for it—tell him what General Foreman Jones has done in his section, what General Foreman John Brown has done in his.

Mr. LANHAM. The American people like the spirit of competition, and I think because of their interest in games and competing in good sportsmanship one against another we may, through the information we are seeking to obtain, inspire them to competitive effort that will result in full production.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We have observed, and I assume the facts are true as reported, that in some large plants with comparable conditions the output of one is nearly double that of the other. There is a reason for that, and I think the gentleman is rendering a very real service to the country in securing that information and bringing it to our attention.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Varying factors, of course, are involved in each of these plants. The number of man-hours required is not always an accurate basis for judgment; nevertheless, it is a very comprehensive one that should enable us to determine what is lacking in bringing about full production.

With reference to the latter investigation I mentioned, that of a post-war policy concerning the disposition of surplus property of the kind I have indicated, a special subcommittee of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has been appointed, of which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO] is chairman and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RODGERS] are the other members.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. ROLPH. I am very much interested in the proposition of what is going to be done with these plants after the war and have had several communications from San Francisco about it. I suppose the gentleman's subcommittee will hold hearings and those who are interested will be given an opportunity to appear.

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct, and those hearings will be begun very shortly.

Mr. ROLPH. There is one other observation I would like to make to the gentleman and that is in connection with substandard housing. The gentleman's committee very wisely authorized the construction of a number of substandard buildings throughout the country. In San Francisco you have authorized some buildings for war workers. As I understand the situation, it is the definite policy of the gentleman's committee and also the Federal authorities that these buildings be demolished within 2 years after the war?

Mr. LANHAM. The law so states in definite terms, that they shall be salvaged in that length of time.

Mr. ROLPH. May I say to the gentleman that we had the experience in San Francisco in 1906 after the fire of a number of temporary shacks being built. Those shacks were with us in some instances for 30 years, and we do not want a repetition of that.

Mr. LANHAM. We are seeking, by the provisions in the law, to prevent a recurrence of that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say further that not all of these plants, not all of this land, and not all of these articles of equipment will likely be surplus after the war, because in carrying on our program of permanent defense it is quite probable that some of them will be retained for that purpose, but I do think that a very definite policy should be established with reference to the disposition of such property as may be surplus, and that it is wise well in advance of the termination of the war to begin the consideration of that policy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Going to the question the gentleman from California asked with reference to the demolition of these houses. That provision was not in the original act, was it? That came in a subsequent enactment?

Mr. LANHAM. It came more definitely in a subsequent amendment, but the policy from the beginning has been that the Housing Act that emanated from the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee had to do simply with the duration of the war and that the houses should be disposed of when the war is over.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. What I am thinking about is this: A good many of these houses are permanent or semipermanent in their nature and could very well be used in a great many places when the war is over. Are they of necessity going to be torn down or may they be continued if the community needs them?

Mr. LANHAM. The law provides they shall be sold and the law provides further that any building of that permanent character where such construction is necessary must be done after consultation with the municipal authorities in order that such building may fit in with the planning and traditions of the particular locality. Such structures may be sold under the law, but all of the property has to be disposed of in one way or the other within the time limitation set in the act.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But that disposition will depend upon the circumstances at that time?

Mr. LANHAM. To be sure it will, because some of the housing will likely be necessary for quite a while in proximity to plants that will be kept in operation beyond the termination of the war.

Mr. ROLPH. Do I understand from what the gentleman says now that after the war the question of demolition of these substandard houses will be subject to approval by the local municipal authorities in conjunction with the Federal authorities? I do not know as I quite understand the gentleman.

Mr. LANHAM. I made my statement to the gentleman from Alabama with reference to the permanent houses that had been constructed under the act. But all of the housing for which appropriations have recently been authorized is to be temporary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

COST OF NATURAL GAS IN WAR PLANTS—DETROIT AND PITTSBURGH

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the keystone of America's industrial greatness, and a decisive weight in the scale of this global war, is freedom of competition. More than just a clause in our Constitution, that principle has been the mainspring of our independent enterprise, and its denial was an incitement to the Revolution. Today, as evidence of that freedom, are the war plants of Detroit. They are the epitome of American spirit and a stout enforcer of mankind's liberties everywhere. Their tremendous output of armaments is rooted, however, not merely in the necessities of war, but in their freedom over the years to learn, through competition, the secrets of mass production.

For example, no one has successfully told Mr. Ford, "You cannot sell, except here." Nor shall anyone today be permitted to inform Detroit war plants that "you may not buy, except there." I am

wondering, nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, whether or not Detroit war production is being confronted with just such a challenge. If true, the consequence is an additional burden upon all the Nation's taxpayers, generally, and deserving our consideration. I say this because I have before me some statistics prepared by the Federal Power Commission at my request, on comparative prices paid by war plants at Pittsburgh, Cleveland and Detroit for a basic war commodity—namely, natural gas.

The city of Detroit has been engaged for nearly 10 years in a relentless effort to bring down its gas-utility costs, and it is disheartening now to learn that, for a city which is potentially the largest consumer of natural gas in the world, and where natural gas has been in use since 1936, the very heart and center of our war effort must pay half again as much for industrial natural gas as is paid by other war plants at Pittsburgh. The Federal Power Commission table shows that, where an industry uses 10,000,000 cubic feet per month, the cost at Detroit averages 61 cents per thousand cubic feet, compared to only 40 cents at Pittsburgh. It seems that a second company at Pittsburgh—where competition exists—charges only 44 cents, while the price at Cleveland is 46 cents. If industries at Pittsburgh may locate where the gas price is lowest, why should not similar competition be instituted at Detroit, where a vast area is not even under franchise?

About 13 years ago a group of Detroit's largest industries agreed to buy natural gas from a competing seller which proposed to bring gas to Michigan from Kentucky. About the same time a third competitor from the southwestern gas fields appeared, and shortly even a fourth rival—the State of Texas—sought Detroit's business. Two of these proposals were never realized, but one of the three proposed pipe lines has established its terminus in the Detroit area. Although natural gas service started 7 years ago, no competition has developed; our war plants are still told where they must buy, and the taxpayers throughout the Nation foot the bill for the excessive costs. The Government, meantime, has claimed it has broken up a monopolistic conspiracy among the pipe-line interests. Is it not about time that its victories show in our war-plant tax bills? Or is there even now a secret arrangement between pipe-line and gas distributors at Detroit, whereby local war plants must pay 50 percent more for their fuel gas than is paid at Pittsburgh, where a competitive balance prevails? Certainly I am not ready to believe that Detroit war plants are complacent about this unnecessary burden on the Nation; if so, we should know it here.

Because this is not solely a Detroit issue, I present herewith the information provided me by the Honorable Leland Olds, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, dated September 10, 1943:

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Royal Oak, Mich.

DEAR MR. DONDERO: This will acknowledge your letter of August 17 and also your previous letter of July 8, requesting certain statistical information relative to the consumption of natural gas in Detroit and Cleveland.

With respect to paragraphs 1 and 2 of your letter of July 8, the annual consumption amounts for 1942, in the case of Cleveland, of customers of the East Ohio Gas Co., taken from that company's application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity in Docket No. G-458 before the Federal Power Commission, are as follows:

List of large industrial users in Cleveland area

Customer	Location	1942 use (m. c. f.)
Aluminum Co. of America.	Cuyahoga Heights.	928,350
Chase Copper & Brass Co.	Euclid	307,658
Cleveland Graphite Bronze Co.	Cleveland	179,894
Ferro Machine & Foundry Co.	do	149,895
General Electric Co.	do	1,286,766
John Harsch Bronze Co.	do	120,103
Jones & Laughlin Co.	do	1,499,843
National Bronze & Aluminum Foundry Co.	do	364,523
National Malleable Castings Co.	do	114,986
Thompson Products, Inc.	do	326,409
Republic Steel Co.	Various, Ohio	5,343,378
United States Steel Corporation.	do	1,754,526

The actual 1941 sales figures and estimated figures for 1942, for Detroit customers, taken from a report filed by the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. on April 2, 1942, in response to a national survey of natural-gas supplies and requirements conducted by the Commission are as follows:

List of large industrial users in Detroit area

Customer	Location	1941 use	Estimated 1942 use (m. c. f.)
General Motors Corporation.	Detroit	1,926,367	1,700,000
Chrysler Corporation	do	1,011,564	900,000
Packard Motor Car Co.	do	193,475	240,000
Eaton Manufacturing Co.	do	161,954	150,000
Detroit Steel Products Co.	do	158,812	170,000
Bohn Aluminum and Brass Corporation.	do	149,091	242,500
Ford Motor Co.	Dearborn	135,539	110,000
Briggs Manufacturing Co.	Detroit	127,596	370,000
Kelsey-Hayes Wheel Corporation.	do	113,871	200,000
Hudson Motor Car Co.	do	109,393	60,000
Great Lakes Steel Corporation.	Ecorse	182,720	95,000

With respect to paragraph 3 of your letter of July 8, it is understood that by trend of national gas costs, respectively, in Cleveland and Detroit, for industries using an average of 70,000,000 cubic feet monthly, for example, is meant comparison. Using "firm industrial" rates published in the American Gas Association Rate Service, effective in Detroit September 20, 1941, and in Cleveland January 20, 1939 (which are, insofar as the American Gas Association service indicates, the present effective rates), for a monthly consumption of 70,000,000 cubic feet, the average rate per thousand cubic feet in Detroit would be 51.4 cents and in Cleveland 40.9 cents. In Pittsburgh, Pa., the rates of two companies serving gas result in averages for the same sized consumption of 40 cents and 39.4 cents. A monthly consumption of 70,000,000 cubic feet is considerably above the average for even large industrial consumers in Detroit and Cleveland. For this reason average rates for other monthly consumption have been calculated to cover the range of the customers listed above as follows:

City	Monthly consumption in millions of cubic feet		
	10	30	70
	Cents per thousand cubic feet		
Detroit	61	54	51
Cleveland	46	42	41
Pittsburgh	40	40	40
Do	44	41	39

Sincerely,

LELAND OLDS,
Chairman.

It will be noticed that because the price or cost of natural gas to Cleveland war plants is lower than in the Detroit area, the consumption of natural gas is larger in volume. It will further be noticed that in spite of the increase in the war effort, there is an estimated decline in the use of natural gas by some of the largest users of natural gas in the Detroit area.

Mr. Speaker, the subject of the transmission and sale of natural gas is one with which I am not very familiar, but if automobile owners in Detroit had to pay 30 cents per gallon for gasoline while the owners of cars in Pittsburgh only paid 20 cents per gallon for the same kind of gasoline, a storm of protest would be made and inquiry demanded to explain or justify the difference. That example is analogous to the present natural gas rates to the war plants in the two cities named.

While the war continues, the cost is added to the contracts, and the taxpayers of the Nation must bear the burden. For that reason Congress has an interest and also an obligation to the people. Inquiries should be made why the difference in cost exists and whether or not there is competition in this field at Detroit and whether or not agreements or understandings exist between competitors, if any, in restraint of trade, or sale of this commodity.

I am of the opinion that it would be most helpful if further inquiry into this situation be made by the Military Affairs Committee of this House which has already studied other phases of the natural gas supply problem in wartime.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PEACE AIMS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, believing that everyone should contribute his utmost to the bringing about of a more harmonious relationship between the nations of the world and as a step toward world peace, I introduced a resolution this morning that proposes to call a preliminary meeting to have the United Nations to submit in writing their peace aims. This resolution is as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Congress hereby petitions the President of the United States to invite representatives of the United Nations

to a meeting to be held in the United States, where peace aims of their respective countries will be submitted in writing as a basis for formulating a program for world peace.

That the peace aims of the United States be determined and written by a committee, consisting of an equal number of Democrat and Republican Members of the Senate, in consultation with representatives of the Department of State and the President of the United States and/or his representatives.

In order to build a house and carry it to completion, and one that will endure, it is exceedingly important that we first build a firm foundation. It is of great importance that the United Nations be brought together at the earliest possible date to openly state their peace aims, that the peoples of the world know exactly for what the United Nations are fighting. We should have the courage to meet this problem immediately and not wait until after the war is over, when seated at the peace table will be many invisible, un-Christian representatives, including greed, animosity, hate, and revenge.

Such a preliminary meeting should do much toward eliminating misunderstandings after the war has ended, because many nations, I am afraid, will be inclined to try to see how much they can grab if we wait until then. I think it is especially important that the four major nations of this war, namely Great Britain, China, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, and the United States, not only state their aims but arrive at a basis of understanding as soon as possible.

This is a great opportunity to demonstrate to Germany and Japan that the United Nations are united in fact in our determination to win the war as well as cooperate toward a lasting world peace.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for 2 weeks, on official business.

To Mr. GALLAGHER (at the request of Mr. SCOTT), indefinitely, on account of death of wife.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 135. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the General State Authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

S. 139. An act for the relief of the United States Parcel Post Building Co., of Cleveland, Ohio;

S. 332. An act for the relief of Velma Pikkarainen;

S. 426. An act for the relief of Maj. George E. Golding;

S. 462. An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo;

S. 626. An act for the relief of Angeline Arbuckle;

S. 652. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Lassiter;

S. 787. An act for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Harry Jacobs;

S. 789. An act to provide for the mailing of annual notices to owners of tax-exempt properties in the District of Columbia;

S. 824. An act for the relief of Dr. J. W. Goin;

S. 915. An act for the relief of Robert Kish Lee and Elizabeth Kish;

S. 929. An act for the relief of Dr. Douglas E. Lawson;

S. 1223. An act to fix the compensation of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia and the Superintendent of the National Training School for Girls; and

S. 1224. An act to designate the Public Library of the District of Columbia a public depository for governmental publications.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 28, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, September 28, 1943, to begin hearings on House Joint Resolution 148, providing for the diversion of additional water from Lake Michigan through the Sanitary Canal at Chicago.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 12, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m.

At that time consideration will be given to the following bills:

H. R. 3257. A bill to amend subtitle—insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to affirm and clarify the authority of the W. S. A. to agree to a waiver of the statute of limitations in connection with claims arising from insurance agreements in case of missing vessels, in order to provide for prompt settlement of both marine risks and war risks involved.

H. R. 3258. A bill to prevent double recovery on claims under section 1 (a) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to seamen employed by the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to limit the possibility of double or overlapping recovery on account of death or injury of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the W. S. A. The possibility of such overlapping recovery arises in cases of seamen who are entitled to sue under the law of the United States in case of death or injury and may also be entitled to sue under foreign law on account of the same casualty.

H. R. 3259. A bill to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to exclude from consideration for the purposes of old-age and survivors' insurance benefits, services of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the W. S. A. on foreign flag vessels or contracted for and performed wholly outside the United States, so that the coverage for such benefits for seamen employees of the W. S. A. shall be in line with the coverage in case of similar services by seamen employed by private shipping operators.

H. R. 3260. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for requisition or purchase of vessels owned by subsidiaries of American corporations.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the requisition or purchase under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, of vessels owned by American concerns through foreign subsidiaries but which are not owned by United States citizens within the terms of the Merchant Marine Act and which are not idle foreign vessels within the terms of the act of June 6, 1941—Public, 101, Seventy-seventh Congress.

H. R. 3261. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is, by amending Public Law 44, Seventy-eighth Congress, to authorize the return of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less which are owned by the United States under the procedure of Public Law 44 for the return to private ownership of vessels to which the United States has title which are no longer needed in the war effort.

H. R. 3262. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to expressly authorize the waiver of recovery of seamen's insurance payments by the W. S. A. particularly in cases where insurance has been paid to beneficiaries on the assumption that the missing seamen were dead, but later are found to be alive. The bill follows a similar provision with respect to recovery of benefits paid by the Veterans' Administration.

House Joint Resolution 158. A bill to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The purpose of the resolution is to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy similar to that provided for the United States Coast Guard Academy.

House Joint Resolution 161. A bill to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities.

The purpose of the resolution is to authorize the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration to pay cash awards for suggestions received from employees to increase efficiency or improve the functioning of the agencies.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

745. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, for the Navy Department and naval service, amounting to $750,000,000, together with proposed provisions affecting certain existing naval appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 (H. Doc. No. 289); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

746. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $3,232,808, and a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation, for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 290); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

747. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $948,000 (H. Doc. No. 291); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

748. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report of audit of the transactions of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation from July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1941; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

749. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, making it a misdemeanor to stow away on aircraft and providing punishment therefor, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

750. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Employees' Compensation Commission for the fiscal year 1944, in the amount of $3,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 292); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

751. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the General Accounting Office for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $231,000 (H. Doc. No. 293); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

752. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $300,000 (H. Doc. No. 294); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

753. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting four supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1944, totaling $6,560,000, including an authorization directing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to advance an additional $37,500,000 to this Department (H. Doc. No. 295); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

754. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate for the appropriation "Foreign Service pay adjustment, appreciation of foreign currencies, 1944," amounting to $300,000 (H. Doc. No. 295); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

755. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $28,801,300, a deficiency estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1941 amounting to $2,600, and drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to expired and existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 297); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

756. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision increasing the limitation on administrative expenses in the fiscal year 1944 under the War Shipping Administration revolving fund from $9,650,000 to $14,600,000 (H. Doc. No. 298); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

757. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $67,600 for the judiciary (H. Doc. No. 299); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

758. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental and deficiency estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1944, and prior fiscal years, amounting to $5,800,875, together with drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations and proposed authorization for the expenditure of $14,000 from Indian tribal funds (H. Doc. No. 300); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

759. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed general provision pertaining to appropriations for the executive departments and independent establishments for the fiscal year 1944 (H. Doc. No. 301); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

760. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting the fifth report of the Office of Price Administration, covering the period ended April 30, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 302); to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

761. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico for school purposes a certain building and lot known as the Mayaguez Barracks Military Reservation now under the jurisdiction of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

762. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Investigation and Research, transmitting report on interterritorial freight rates (H. Doc. No. 303); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 755. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, so as to give protection to persons in military service, and their dependents, as to certain mortgages; without amendment (Rept. No. 710). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. R. 3333. A bill amending the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, to increase by 50 percent the Government's contribution to dependent wives with children; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 3334. A bill to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3335. A bill to amend section 105 (b) of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 for the purpose of increasing the Government's contribution to the family allowance of servicemen having wives and children; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 3336. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, with respect to the manner of the exercise of the power of condemnation by the Tennessee Valley Authority and to require the receipts of the Authority to be covered into the Treasury; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROWAN:

H. R. 3337. A bill to prevent the pollution of the waters of Lake Michigan; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 3338. A bill relating to Government and other exemptions from the tax with respect to the transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHELCHEL of Georgia:

H. R. 3339. A bill limiting working hours of custodial service employees to 8 in 10 hours a day; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PACE:

H. J. Res. 163. Joint resolution to amend a joint resolution approved May 26, 1941, entitled "Joint resolution relating to corn and wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BELL:

H. J. Res. 164. Joint resolution to provide for the independence of the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ZIMMERMAN:

H. J. Res. 165. Joint resolution to amend a joint resolution approved May 26, 1941, entitled "Joint resolution relating to corn and wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution proposing a preliminary meeting for submission in writing of peace aims of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. Res. 306. Resolution authorizing an investigation with respect to waste in the procurement, handling, and use of food by the various agencies in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 3340. A bill for the relief of Joseph Moret; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 3341. A bill for the relief of the city of Council Bluffs, Iowa; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 3342. A bill granting a pension to Nellie M. Crum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2523. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of Hasenpusch Bros. and 84 other residents of Contra Costa County, protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill, imposing prohibition during period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2524. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Loveta Belshaw and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2525. Also, petition of Eugene Stoll and 23 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2526. Also, petition of A. S. Preusch and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks

to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2527. Also, petition of R. M. Reed and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2528. Also, petition of Fred Hassen and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2529. Also, petition of Joseph Farreh and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2530. Also, petition of William Esselburegge and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2531. Also, petition of Alfred Erhardt and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2532. Also, petition of Peter Crist and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2533. Also, petition of Charles H. Frey and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2534. By Mr. FORD: Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, urging the Congress to amend the Immigration Act of 1924 to permit the Chinese a quota in accordance with the principle followed with respect to all other friendly powers and that any Federal acts in conflict be amended or repealed; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2535. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Grandview, Yakima, and Ellensburg, Wash., urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2536. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of Rev. Gustav E. Landen and 14 other residents of Spokane, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2537. Also, petition of C. F. Erickson and 27 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2538. Also, petition of Mrs. Hans Verdick and 27 other residents of Garfield and Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as it purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2539. Also, petition of Fred F. Rankin and 27 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2540. Also, petition of Thomas B. Looce and 30 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2541. Also, petition of Harold R. Fielding and 28 other residents of Spokane, V'ash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2542. Also, petition of F. N. Davis and 28 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2543. Also, petition of A. H. Meyers and 28 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2544. Also, petition of J. A. Keiner and 30 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2545. Also, petition of Don C. Brown and 28 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2546. Also, petition of Eugene Pautre and 31 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2547. Also, petition of Carl Swenson and 29 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2548. Also, petition of Harley E. Johnson and 29 other residents of Olympia, Spokane, Dishman, and Veradale, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2549. Also, petition of C. A. Flanigan and 30 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2550. Also, petition of Mrs. H. C. Foley and 30 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2551. Also, petition of John Jones Farmer and 28 other residents of Almira and Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2552. Also, petition of J. W. Fetsch and 28 other residents of Spokane and Opportunity, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2553. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of Sumner E. Davis, of Vancouver, Wash., and 66 other citizens of the United States, urging early consideration and favorable vote on House bill 2082 in order to bring about a suspension of th- alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war, to reduce absenteeism, increase production, and eliminate sources of disorder and physical disability which are hampering the war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2554. Also, Mrs. W. S. Peters, of Olympia, and 13 other citizens of the State of Washington, urging favorable consideration and passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2555. Also, petition of Mrs. G. W. Kildow, of Olympia, and 14 other citizens of the State of Washington, urging favorable consideration and passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2556. Also, petition of R. H. Bolender, of Olympia, and 27 other citizens of the State of Washington, urging favorable consideration and passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2557. Also, petition of L. H. Olmsted, of Olympia, and 27 other citizens of the State of Washington, urging favorable consideration and passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transoprtation of alcholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2558. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by J. C. Christensen and 90 other citizens of Gaston, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2559. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the State bar of California, San Francisco, board of governors, expressing approval of House Joint Resolution 149, pending in the Congress of the United States and providing for an increase in salary of the United States district judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2560. Also, resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco, protesting against establishment of Federal housing project in either Calvary or Laurel Hill Cemetery; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

2561. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Albert Kress, of Wheeling, W. Va., and others, opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2562. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 3597, passed by the Board of Supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco, protesting establishment of Federal housing project in either Calvary or Laureal Hill Cemetery;

to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

2563. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the county of Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Chinese, and urging amendment of the Immigration Act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, with our burdened lives tense and strained in a violent world, we seek that peace which is the gift of Thy grace to all those who yield their wills to Thy will, their minds to Thy truth, their hearts to Thy obedience. O God, our God, Thou hast fashioned us so that we faint and fall without the breath of Thy presence. Thou art the desire beneath desire. When upon our mortal days there is lifted the light of Thy countenance even trivial rounds and the common tasks are arched with the aura of infinite peace and power and joy. In the brightness of Thy throne we become sure of the vital and eternal things that are stronger than the noise of the world and against which the gates of hell cannot prevail.

Make us such ministers of Thine to this stricken generation that the golden dream of the ages may transfigure a cleansed and chastened earth as the waiting continents and the isles of the sea are linked in a new fellowship for the promotion of Thy glory and the good of all mankind. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF A PRESIDING OFFICER

The Secretary (Edwin A. Halsey) read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., September 28, 1943.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. CARL A. HATCH, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HATCH thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, September 24, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were subsequently signed by the Vice President:

S. 135. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the General State Authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

S. 159. An act for the relief of the United States Parcel Post Building Co., of Cleveland, Ohio;

S. 332. An act for the relief of Velma Pikkarainen;

S. 426. An act for the relief of Maj. George E. Golding;

S. 462. An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo;

S. 626. An act for the relief of Angeline Arbuckle;

S. 652. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Lassiter;

S. 787. An act for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Harry Jacobs;

S. 789. An act to provide for the mailing of annual notices to owners of tax-exempt properties in the District of Columbia;

S. 824. An act for the relief of Dr. J. W. Goin;

S. 915. An act for the relief of Robert Kish Lee and Elizabeth Kish;

S. 929. An act for the relief of Dr. Douglas E. Lawson;

S. 1223. An act to fix the compensation of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia and the Superintendent of the National Training School for Girls; and

S. 1224. An act to designate the Public Library of the District of Columbia a public depository for governmental publications.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Radcliffe
Andrews	Gurney	Reed
Austin	Hatch	Revercomb
Bailey	Hawkes	Reynolds
Ball	Hayden	Robertson
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Scrugham
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	Kilgore	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McClellan	Tobey
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Mead	Wallgren
Davis	Millikin	Walsh
Downey	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Murdock	Wherry
Ellender	Murray	White
Ferguson	Nye	Wiley
George	O'Daniel	Willis
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gillette	Overton	
Green	Pepper	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent as a member of the special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

GOVERNMENT FOR PUERTO RICO—AMENDMENT OF ORGANIC ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

When sovereignty over Puerto Rico was transferred from Spain to the United States in 1899, the Treaty of Paris did not settle the exact position of Puerto Rico in the orbit of American sovereignty. It left that for determination by the Congress of the United States. After a brief interval of military government, the Foraker Act in 1900 established a framework of colonial government. Under it the legislative assembly was given rather limited powers; and the Governor and an appointed executive council held the real substance of authority. The inhabitants were to be citizens of Puerto Rico—American nationals, but not citizens.

In 1917, the Puerto Ricans received full American citizenship. At the same time the Congress, by the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, created a full-fledged legislature, and provided for a much greater participation by Puerto Ricans in the executive department of the Government, reserving to the President the power of appointment of only the Governor, the attorney general, the commissioner of education, the auditor, and the justices of the supreme court. This action of the Congress in 1917 bound Puerto Rico much more closely to the United States and provided a substantial advance in local self-government.

During the 45 years which have passed since the occupation of the island by the United States the economic situation of the Puerto Rican people, although materially improved in some respects, has not changed in essential character. Instead of development toward economic self-reliance, there has been a steady tendency to become more dependent upon outside markets for disposal of the

single great crop, sugar, and upon outside sources for food, clothing, building materials, and most of the other necessities. Partly because of economic and geographical factors and partly because of tariff preferences and shipping laws, these relationships are, by now, almost wholly with the continental United States.

The population of Puerto Rico has increased from 950,000 to about 2,000,000, making this one of the most densely inhabited areas on earth. Depending upon the obligation implied by our active participation in their development, Puerto Ricans have been encouraged, insofar as they could, to try to attain American standards of life. Wages in Puerto Rico, for instance, are several times as high as those in nearby islands not under our flag; literacy is much higher than in other Caribbean islands; the percentage of those who speak English has grown progressively in every decade; our agencies of public health have made inroads on diseases endemic in the island; and serious attempts have been and are being made to provide better housing and to raise the levels of nutrition.

During the 45 years of our sovereignty, the elements of world military and naval strategy have changed also. When the island was first brought under our flag, the Panama Canal had not yet been dug, and the airplane had not yet been invented. The Caribbean was something of a backwater in the broad current of world affairs. When the present war became imminent, however, it was obvious that the chain of islands running in a great arc from Florida to the shoulder of South America, enclosing the Caribbean Sea, formed a vast natural shield for the Panama Canal, suited in distance and conformation to the uses of the military plane. And of this island shield, Puerto Rico is the center. Its possession or control by any foreign power—or even the remote threat of such possession—would be repugnant to the most elementary principles of national defense.

It has long been the policy of the Government of the United States progressively to reinforce the machinery of self-government in its territories and island possessions. The principles for which we are now fighting require that we should recognize the right of all our citizens—whether continental or overseas—to the greatest possible degree of home rule and also of participation in the benefits and responsibilities of our Federal system.

Puerto Ricans of all political parties, however divergent their views as to the political future of the island, are united in asking for the right to elect their own Governor. I believe that they are entitled to it.

The Congress will recall that on March 9 of this year, I recommended to it "that it consider as soon as possible an amendment of the organic law of Puerto Rico to permit the people of Puerto Rico to elect their own Governor and to redefine the functions and powers of the Federal Government and of the government of Puerto Rico respectively." In order to assist in framing the required legislation, in case the Congress should decide to grant this power to the people of Puerto Rico, I appointed a committee composed of an equal number of Puerto Ricans and continental residents. I requested them to make a study of the amendments to the organic act necessary to authorize the election of a Governor and to redefine the relationships of the Federal and Insular Governments affected thereby.

That committee met in Washington almost daily for 3 weeks this last summer. It has sent me a full report of its recommendations in the form of a proposed bill and a summary statement of such bill.

I am forwarding this report of the committee to the Congress for consideration by them. The legislation was drawn by the committee itself, and I am submitting it as a possible guide for such action as the Congress may decide to take.

Under this bill the people of Puerto Rico would be given an opportunity for the free exercise of the powers of local self-government in all three branches of government—executive, legislative, and judicial. There would be reserved to the President the power to veto only such measures passed by the legislature as were beyond the proper field of local self-government. There would be a United States Commissioner General in Puerto Rico upon whom would devolve the responsibility for the execution of the laws of the United States, and for the coordination and supervision of the activities of Federal civilian agencies, and their correlation with the activities of insular agencies. He would also have authority to require reports of all activities of the insular government for transmittal to the President through the Secretary of the Interior. The fiscal relationship of the insular government to the Federal Government would not be altered, nor would the ultimate power of Congress to legislate for the territory. The people of the island would, however, be given assurance of the intention of Congress to obtain the concurrence of the people of the island before imposing upon them any further changes in the organic act.

There is no reason why their Governor and other officials should continue to be appointed from without. At this stage of Puerto Rican development, the withholding of this right is no longer necessary. There is no question of the Puerto Ricans' ability now to administer their own internal affairs and to assume the attendant responsibility.

It is recommended by the report of the committee that this fact be recognized at once. I agree that this should be done, and suggest that the Congress should consider it as a matter of right and justice for Puerto Ricans.

As to the future, it is not proposed that the political development of Puerto Rico be left to chance. On the contrary, it is recommended by the committee that a continuing joint advisory council, under the chairmanship of the Secretary of the Interior, be appointed to conduct continuing economic and political studies of all the elements of the Puerto Rican situation and of American necessities, to guide us for the future. This council must report at least once during the life of each Congress.

In addition to the Secretary of the Interior, the council would consist of the Governor of Puerto Rico and the Commissioner General, who shall serve ex officio, and also four persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, and five persons to be appointed by the Governor of Puerto Rico.

The government of Puerto Rico should not be static; it should be changed and developed as conditions warrant. It is equally important that the economic situation of the Puerto Ricans should be improved. I am confident that with patience and cooperation both these objectives can be attained.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 28, 1943.*

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES—LETTER FROM PHILIP MURRAY, PRESIDENT OF THE CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., September 15, 1943.

Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE,
President of the Senate,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WALLACE: With the return of the Members of Congress from their recess contacts with their home districts, it is my sincere hope that Congress will have found the recess fruitful in terms of a fuller and sounder understanding of the needs of a Nation at war.

In the days just preceding the recess both Houses of Congress, acting in haste, rushed through the passage over the President's veto of an ill-considered piece of legislation which has come to be known as the Smith-Connally Act. At that time the responsible labor organizations of the country warned in the light of their long experience that the bill was ill-advised and was actually calculated to interfere with the progress of American war production. We pointed out that at a time when the responsible bodies of organized labor had given and were fulfilling, as they are today, their no-strike pledge, the bill proposed to set up legalized machinery whereby irresponsible elements might force strike votes and thereby give the appearance of legal sanction to interference with war production.

In our judgment at that time we were supported by the heads of every Government agency engaged in work related to war production and labor relations. The warnings of these officials were repeated in the veto message of the President. In the face of these warnings, however, a group in Congress succeeded in maneuvering the enactment of the measure within minutes after receipt of word of the President's veto.

It is an unfortunate fact that even the few months which have elapsed since the passage of the bill have proved our fears to have been well-founded. The responsible bodies of organized labor have reiterated their determination to stand firm on their no-strike pledge. The new statute, however, has in practice rendered performance of that pledge

even more difficult. Those difficulties have been further increased under the act by virtue of an interpretation rendered by the Attorney General which permits any minority group, however slight, to utilize the machinery of the statute, to bring about a strike vote in any plant, however large. Under the Smith-Connally Act now 2 workers in a plant of 20,000 may force a strike vote among the 20,000 workers.

In the light of the experience of these last few months a very serious duty falls on the shoulders of congressional leaders. The situation does not permit of arguments as to whether error is to be admitted or as to where blame is to be placed. This Nation is at war and cannot permit such considerations to stand in the way of a policy which will mean the removal of obstacles to victory. The Smith-Connally Act has proven itself to be such an obstacle. Spokesmen for large business groups and prominent metropolitan newspapers throughout the country have recognized this fact and have urged Congress to repeal this legislation.

I trust and hope that the leadership of this Congress will prove its stature by undertaking the task of removing the Smith-Connally Act from the statute books, so that organized labor in America may move forward unimpeded in its consistent and devoted drive to ever-increased war production.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP MURRAY.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

RUBY KEYES OR RUBY AMELIA MORIARTY KEYES—RUBY AMELIA NORTON

A letter from the Attorney General stating that on March 1, 1943, there was forwarded a recommendation that deportation should be suspended pursuant to the provisions of section 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, in the case of Ruby Keyes or Ruby Amelia Moriarty Keyes, now known as Ruby Amelia Norton, CR 1334, and also stating that subsequent to the submission of the case the alien's conduct has been found to be not that of a person of good moral character and upon a full investigation the Attorney General is satisfied that she is one who is not entitled to the provisions of the act and therefore he wishes to withdraw her name from the group submitted to Congress for its determination during this session; to the Committee on Immigration.

DONATION AND CONVEYANCE OF TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH BUILDING, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey, on behalf of the United States, to Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building, known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building, located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage Townsite (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

FIFTH REPORT OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifth report of the Administration covering the period ended April 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REGISTRANTS DEFERRED FOR OCCUPATIONAL REASONS UNDER SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

A letter from the Director of the Selective Service System, transmitting adjusted schedules of registrants deferred by the Selective Service System for occupational reasons, containing information received subsequent to his letter of September 17, 1943, transmitting his last report in response to law (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF A DEPARTMENT AND VARIOUS OFFICES

Letters from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, Director of the National Resources Planning Board, Director for Committee for Congested Production Areas, and the officer in charge of the American Battle Monuments Commission, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; and also letters from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency and the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, submitting revised estimates for the quarter ending September 30, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO THE LEVYING AND COLLECTING OF TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS IN THE DISTRICT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 881) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938, which was, on page 1, to strike out all after line 6 over to and including line 15 on page 2 and insert:

SEC. 12. Annually and subsequent to July 1, the assessor of the District of Columbia shall mail to the record owner of each lot or parcel of land upon which a real-estate tax has been levied by the District of Columbia as of July 1 of the same year, a notice of the amount of such real-estate tax, and of the manner in which the amount of such real-estate tax is payable according to law; and such notice shall state whether there were any delinquent real-estate taxes unpaid on July 1 of the year in which such notice is sent: *Provided*, That if the address of the owner be unknown, such notice shall be mailed to his agent, if known; and if there be more than one record owner of any lot or parcel, notice mailed to one of the owners shall be deemed compliance with this section: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall affect in any way the provisions of section 3 of this act: *Provided further*, That failure of the property owner or his agent to receive such notice shall not relieve the property owner of the payment of any penalty or interest as required by law for the delinquent payment of real-estate taxes.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Council of the City of Waukegan, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation to prescribe a measure of diversion which would be permissible at Chicago when the waters of Lake Michigan are at a mean level which is deemed higher than the safe conduct of interstate commerce and navigation and the rights of the riparian owners warrant; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of McLouth, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS BY FOREIGN GROUPS—RESOLUTION OF MINISTERIAL UNION OF WASHINGTON

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and referred to the District of Columbia Committee, a resolution adopted by the Washington Ministerial Union at its first fall meeting on Monday, September 27, remonstrating against S. 1338, a bill to permit the granting of beverage licenses in the District of Columbia to service clubs of other United Nations.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Ministerial Union of Washington and vicinity having learned the purpose and procedures of Senate Resolution 1338 and House Joint Resolution 160, hereby records its unequivocal opposition to both these proposed enactments and instructs its officers to convey this opposition in writing and in person to the proper committees of the House and Senate, and respectfully request that both of these bills be referred back to its District Committee by both Senate and House, and that public hearings be held before they are reported to the respective Houses of Congress.

ARMAND T. EYLER,
President.

UNIFORM FREIGHT RATES AND CLASSIFICATION—LETTER FROM KANSAS CITY LIVESTOCK INTERESTS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present an important letter in the nature of a petition signed by R. A. Willis, president, Kansas City Livestock Exchange; J. C. Cash, president, Kansas City Stock Yards Co.; and Lester Metzger, president of the Kansas City Traders Live Stock Exchange, speaking for the livestock producers patronizing the Kansas City market, and urging the defeat of the following bills and resolutions: House bills 2378, 2391, 2435, 2436, 2519, 2547, 2645, 3172, and 3183; Senate bills 947, 1030, and 1124; Senate Joint Resolutions 46 and 75.

I believe the livestock organizations strongly oppose these bills and joint resolutions as they undertake to establish uniform freight rates and classification for application throughout the Nation. I ask that the letter in the nature of a petition be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter in the nature of a petition was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS CITY LIVESTOCK MARKET,
Kansas City, Mo., September 8, 1943.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Kansas City Livestock Exchange, the Kansas City Stockyards Co., the Traders Livestock Exchange, and the livestock producers patronizing the Kansas City market respectfully urge your help and cooperation

in defeating the passage of the above bills and joint resolutions. They propose to establish uniform freight rates and classification for application throughout the Nation. We believe the proposals to be economically unsound and adverse to the best interest of the agricultural sections of the West and Southwest, particularly the livestock grower and feeder.

You will recall freight rates, rules, and classification regulations now in effect in the West and Southwest were established as a result of the Hoch-Smith resolution, and have been in effect since January, 1932. The first decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission regarding livestock as a result of the Hoch-Smith resolution is recorded in volume 176, I. C. C. 1. In establishing these rates Congress specifically directed the Interstate Commerce Commission to put into effect on agricultural products, including livestock, "the lowest possible freight rates, rules, and classification regulations compatible with the maintenance of adequate rail transportation service." It was after years of public hearings and investigations by the Interstate Commerce Commission our present basis of livestock rates was established.

At present cattle are raised in Texas, pastured in the Osage country and Flint Hills, fattened in the feedlots of the Corn Belt States, and transported to the packing centers in the West and East, and the meat distributed to the consuming centers. Cattle originating in Texas, moving as described above, are transported on one through rate from their point of birth to the packing establishment. There are in effect intricate transit rules and regulations, particularly adapted to the nature of the business, that have proven entirely satisfactory to the livestock and meat-packing industry of the Nation, and these should not be disturbed. We should not lose track of the fact this basis of rates and transit arrangements was established as a result of the Hoch-Smith resolution, and, as stated by the Interstate Commerce Commission, they are the lowest possible freight rates and classification regulations that can be established compatible with adequate transportation service.

The proponents of the above bills would break down our western basis of rates merely for the sake of uniformity. It is unreasonable and economically unsound to tear down our Hoch-Smith basis of rates merely for the sake of uniformity. Here in the West and Southwest livestock is transported in trainload lots, whereas in the East and Southeast a single carload is considered a large consignment. It is evident that if the rate on cattle from New York to Boston (where there is no movement) is reduced, there must be an increase in the rates from Emporia, Kans., to Kansas City in order to offset this reduction. Who would benefit from a reduction in cattle rates from New York to Boston? But think of the disastrous effects that would result in an increase from Emporia to Kansas City. And think of the disastrous effects to the Flint Hill and Osage sections were the transit privileges canceled or made uniform with the cattle transit privileges from New York to Boston. Uniformity as proposed can have but one effect, and that is increases in the livestock rates in the West and reductions in the Southeast and East.

If the proponents of this legislation are seeking adjustments in the cattle rates from Atlanta to Nashville, or Atlanta to New York City, there are avenues open for such an adjustment with the Interstate Commerce Commission. It seems to us wholly unfair and unjust to involve rates in the West and Southwest merely to seek an adjustment in the South or in the East.

The rates, rules, and classification regulations now in effect in this section of the Nation are adaptable to the movement of the livestock that is produced and slaughtered in this section. We urge you to use your good offices with a view of seeing that this basis of freight rates and classification is not disturbed merely to bring about uniformity with some section of the country that has no need for such a basis of rates or transit arrangements.

Yours very truly,

KANSAS CITY LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
R. A. WILLIS, *President*.
KANSAS CITY STOCK YARDS CO.,
J. C. CASH, *President*.
KANSAS CITY TRADERS
LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
LESTER METZGER, *President*.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 3291. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 418).

GRANTING OF BEVERAGE LICENSES IN THE DISTRICT TO SERVICE CLUBS OF OTHER UNITED NATIONS—RECOMMITTAL OF A BILL

On motion by Mr. MCCARRAN, the bill (S. 1338) to permit the granting of beverage licenses in the District of Columbia to service clubs of other United Nations was taken from the calendar and ordered to be recommitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCK:

S. 1383. A bill to provide for the withdrawal from circulation of 1-cent pieces coined after December 23, 1942, and to prohibit the coinage of 1-cent pieces not readily distinguishable from coins of higher denomination; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BURTON:

S. 1384. A bill to provide for the inspection and registration of bicycles in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1385. A bill to provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence basin in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1386. A bill making it a misdemeanor to stow away on aircraft and providing punishment therefor; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1387. A bill to extend the time within which the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming may negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1388. A bill to extend the time within which the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming may negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 1389. A bill for the relief of Jesse V. Craig; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. DAVIS introduced Senate bill 1390, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1391. A bill for the relief of W. R. Jordan and Mabel Jordan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 1392. A bill for the relief of Dewey H. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1393. A bill for the relief of Walter R. Jones;

S. 1394. A bill for the relief of Reverend R. E. McKinney; and

S. 1395. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Norma S. McKinney and Mrs. Ella Swenson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1396. A bill for the relief of Isidor Blanc; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1397. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma," approved January 27, 1933; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to create the War Shipping Field Service; to the Committee on Commerce.

ALLOWANCES TO OFFICERS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I have recently been informed that the administration and interpretation of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 are resulting in certain discriminations and hardships which I am certain are not consistent either with the intent or the purposes which the Congress sought to achieve by enacting this law.

I refer specifically to the fact that commissioned officers in the armed forces of the United States have been denied the payment of rental and subsistence allowances for dependent parents, in those cases when such parents are the adopted parents of the officer concerned.

The Comptroller General has so ruled on these cases, because in all other sections of the law, the Congress specifically stated that the term "parent" should include "parents through adoption," whereas the Congress failed to include that definition in the section of the act dealing with the pay and allowances of commissioned officers.

I need not recount the undesirable and discriminatory effects which the present application of this law is having upon all commissioned officers in the armed forces whose adopted parents are now dependent upon them for their principal means of support.

I am certain that my colleagues will be most anxious to correct this situation, and I am, therefore, introducing a bill making appropriate amendment to the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, together with a letter which I received from Mrs. Mary Tierney, of Pittsburgh, Pa., setting forth the serious effects which the present operation of this law is now having upon dependent mothers whose adopted sons are now serving in the United States armed forces.

I also ask that both the amendment and the letter cited be referred to the

appropriate committee for early study and consideration.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1390) to amend section 4 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided further*, That the term 'father or mother' shall be held to include a father or mother through adoption."

SWISSVALE, PITTSBURGH, PA.

Senator JAMES J. DAVIS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your help is sought in correcting an injustice concerning the refusal of the Army to pay increased allowances to my adopted son, Capt. James E. Loughran, now serving in the United States Army.

It is my understanding that the Finance Office of the Army will not pay any rental and subsistence allowances to him for my support, because the Congress, in writing the pay act for officers, did not specifically state that the word "parent" was intended to include "parents through adoption"; and the finance officer believes the Congress intended that such parents as myself were to be excluded from such benefits.

During the past years I have stood in the place of his mother since her death, and I contributed substantially toward his college education. But, at the present time, I am dependent upon him, and nearly all my income consists of the money which he sends me each month out of his pay.

I am sure that you will appreciate the inconsistency of the present situation:

Were James an enlisted man, instead of an officer, the Army would recognize me as his mother without any question, for all purposes, and pay the established allowances. The Army does accept me as his mother in connection with his Army insurance policy, and I am told that if he should die while in service, the Army would acknowledge me as his mother and, as such, declare me eligible for death payments.

It seems unfair that he should not be allowed to obtain whatever benefits have been provided by law. I am sure that it cannot have been your intention or that of the other Senators, that the few mothers who find themselves in my position, should be excluded from the help extended through the payment of allowances to our officer sons, merely because we are parents through adoption. There cannot be many of us, but there is probably some hardship involved in each case.

I will certainly appreciate your investigation, and any assistance which you may give in correcting the present condition.

Sincerely yours,

MARY TIERNEY.

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT—AMENDMENT

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, for the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and myself I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by us jointly to Senate bill 763, the pending bill. The amendment has been printed and is on the desks of Senators, so I take it that it is unnecessary to have it read at this time, but I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will lie on the table, and be printed, and printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BAILEY and Mr. CLARK of Missouri to the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, viz: Strike out lines 6 to 11, inclusive, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"(1) After the beginning of the second calendar month following the date of enactment of this subsection and until the termination of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President—

"(1) no registrant between the ages of 18 and 38 shall be permitted to occupy or continue to be employed in or be appointed to any civilian position in or under the Federal Government unless (A) such registrant was married prior to December 8, 1941, and has a child or children under 18 years of age, or (B) such registrant is deferred from training and service by reason of physical disqualification or has been honorably discharged from the land or naval forces, or (C) the services of such registrant in such position are certified by the head of the department or agency within which such registrant is employed or appointed to be indispensable to the operations of such department or agency; and

"(2) no man between the ages of 18 and 38 who is serving as a commissioned officer in the land or naval forces of the United States shall be stationed or assigned to duty in the District of Columbia or Arlington County, Va., for a period or periods in excess of 30 days in the aggregate during any calendar year unless (A) such man was married prior to December 8, 1941, and has a child or children under 18 years of age, or (B) such man is physically disqualified for active combat service, or (C) the services of such man in the District of Columbia or Arlington County, Va., are certified by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, to be indispensable to the operations of the land or naval forces of the United States.

"Any certification made in accordance with the requirements of this subsection shall contain a statement of the reasons for determining that the services of the individual with respect to whom such certification is made are indispensable, and a copy of any such certification shall be transmitted to the Congress within 30 days from the date such certification is made.

"Sec. 2. The provisions of this act shall not be construed to repeal or modify the provisions of the act entitled 'An act relating to the selective-service deferment, on occupational grounds, of persons employed by the Federal Government,' approved April 8, 1943."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to prevent the use in civilian Government positions, or in certain positions in the military service, of men who are qualified for active combat duty."

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS IN TRIBUTE TO DEFENDERS OF POLAND

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator LUCAS at the Tribute to Poland Day meeting in East St. Louis, Ill., on September 26, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS AT MEETING OF INDIANA DEMOCRATIC EDITORS

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator LUCAS at a meeting of Indiana Democratic Editors, held at French Lick, Ind., on September 25, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BASTILLE OF TYRANNY IS FALLING—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Bastille of Tyranny Is Falling," delivered by him before the National Society of the Ahepa at Cincinnati and printed in the September–October 1941 issue of the Ahepan, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY TO THE CATHOLIC KNIGHTS OF WISCONSIN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him before the Catholic Knights of Wisconsin at their convention at Beaver Dam, Wis., September 9, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOW FAR CAN WE GO IN ORGANIZING PEACE?—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BURTON

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "How Far Can We Go in Organizing Peace?" delivered by him in Christ Church, New York City, September 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONFUSION AND UNCERTAINTY AMONG BUSINESSMEN

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article, letters, and an address by him relating to the supply of automobiles and confusion among businessmen, which appear in the Appendix.]

POLICING THE AXIS: THE GERMAN PHASE—ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Policing the Axis—The German Phase," prepared by him at the request of the Washington branch of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, which appears in the Appendix.]

INCREASED FOOD PRODUCTION—AVAILABILITY OF FARM MACHINERY

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from R. A. Lathrop, secretary-treasurer of the North Dakota Implement Dealers' Association, regarding the availability of farm machinery, which appears in the Appendix.]

GENERAL MARSHALL'S RELIGIOUS BELIEFS AND PRACTICES—LETTER BY RAY D. BROWN AND ARTICLE BY WILLIAM L. STIDGER

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Ray D. Brown, adjutant and public-relations and welfare secretary of the Salvation Army, and an article entitled "The Christian General," by William L. Stidger, published in the September 25, 1943, issue of the War Cry, which appear in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR PLANNING

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Russia Is Forcing Issues as We Delay Post-War Plan," by James B. Reston, from the New York Times of September 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POULTRY AND DAIRY FEED SITUATION IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from

Charles R. Hopkins, of Greenfield, N. H., enclosing minutes of the meeting of the New Hampshire Feed Mixers and Dealers, together with a letter addressed to the feed mixers supplying feeders in New Hampshire, and a table of estimated feed requirements of livestock in New Hampshire, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE O. P. A. AND THE CHEESE INDUSTRY OF WISCONSIN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "O. P. A. Has a Duty To Perform," written by C. E. Broughton, editor of the Sheboygan Press, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL BIMETALLISM—ARTICLE IN THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article headed "Bimetallism held needed by world," published in the New York Times of September 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

LAND-USE PLANNING

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from E. J. Haslerud, director of extension and chairman of the North Dakota Agricultural Advisory Council, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 10, after the word "act", it is proposed to insert "until January 1, 1944", so as to read:

That section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(m) Every registrant who was married prior to December 8, 1941, who has maintained a bona fide family relationship with his family since that date, and who has a child or children under 18 years of age shall be exempt from training and service under this act until January 1, 1944."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, during my 20 years of service in the Senate I have never risen to speak upon a more important piece of legislation, with the possible exception of the time when I sought to keep the country out of this war, than that which is now pending, nor have I ever spoken in the Senate upon a more just piece of legislation or one which would more materially affect the welfare and the future of the United States of America.

The pending bill was introduced by me in February of this year. It was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. In May the committee held a hearing on it. In July the bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs by a vote of 11 to 3.

At the time when Congress took the summer recess, I was informed by reliable administration authorities and by others that the drafting of fathers probably would not be necessary this year. However, while Congress was away on vacation, in August the order was issued that fathers would be drafted October 1. I immediately telegraphed the Democratic leader of the Senate and the Democratic leader of the House, asking that Congress be reconvened, because at that time I foresaw exactly what would happen upon the reconvening of the Congress. However, in the telegram I received from our distinguished Democratic leader, he said there would be plenty of time to act upon the matter, if Congress saw fit to do so, after the reconvening.

Immediately upon the reconvening of Congress, our Democratic leader and others said they did not know the facts and had not had time to learn them. They asked for a hearing before the Committee on Military Affairs. At the hearing testimony was given by the Under Secretary of War, General McNarney, General Marshall, Admiral King, and numerous representatives of the Selective Service System. Finally, when the newspapers carried conflicting stories as to whether Mr. Baruch was to be called before the committee, I insisted upon his being called. I did so because of the fact that he had written a report which to a large extent substantiated the statements which have been made with reference to inefficiency and to waste of manpower in both government and industry.

Mr. President, I have said that no father in the United States should be called, and I repeat the statement that no father should be called, until the slackers are taken out of the Government bureaus. Fathers should not be called until the slackers are taken out of the industries where they are hiding today. I say "slackers" because that is exactly what they are. Before American homes are broken up, before children are driven into the streets, let the slackers in the Government bureaus, the bureaucrats who are demanding sacrifices on the part of American businessmen, American mothers, and the babies of the country—let the slackers, I say, be driven out of the bureaus and into the Army where they belong.

Let any Member of the Senate stand up and say, if he chooses to do so, that he wants to drive American children into the streets, that he wants to drive fathers into the Army, while the slackers are permitted to remain in hiding—some of them single men and some of them married men whose wives are working in Government departments. Let any Member of the Senate stand up and state that he wants that done, and then let him go home and tell his people that is what he stands for in the Senate.

O Mr. President, I am told I should not press this measure because it might bring disunity in the country. I am for unity in the war effort; but I am not for unity in behalf of inefficiency in government. I am not for inefficiency and waste in government; I am not for inefficiency on the part of a lot of spendthrifts who are throwing away the taxpayers' money like drunken sailors, and I am not for unity in permitting many men who have cost-plus contracts to hoard their employees, to assemble large groups of single men, if the fathers of children are to be drafted, and if their wives and mothers are to be forced into industry.

I am told that I am trying to substitute my judgment for the judgment of General Marshall. Nothing of the kind. There is not a scintilla of evidence in the RECORD to that effect. General Marshall does not say that he wants to leave slackers in the Government service. General Marshall does not say that he wants industries to hoard labor. General Marshall said, in answer to a question by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], that he prefers single men to married men. He said that if a man's wife were left with small children to live upon the pittance allowed her when her husband went to war, and he were worried as to whether or not his family had proper housing and proper clothing, and whether or not they were going to have enough food, that man would not make a good soldier.

I know that a distinguished lady said the other day, "My boys are fathers, and they are in the Army." There are many married men in the Army who are officers. I am not talking about fathers who are leaving home to become officers. I am not talking about fathers who are the sons of Senators or Representatives, or who are the heads of great corporations, and who have money enough to provide the proper care for their families. I am talking about the man in the street, the working man, the little fellow. I am talking about destroying the small business man of this country by taking him from a business which he has built up, while slackers remain behind the lines.

I know that some of the leaders tried to put words into General Marshall's mouth. They tried to get him to say that he had to have fathers, but he refused to say so. They tried to get General McNarney to say it, but he refused to do so. They tried to get Admiral King to say it, but he refused to do so. General Marshall said that he wanted a certain number of men, but that it was up to the War Manpower Commission to find them.

Let us see where that leads us. To repeat, I introduced this bill last February. Was anything done to see that slackers in the Government were put into the Army? Was anything done by the Government of the United States to prevent hoarding of labor, and to see that slackers who were hiding in industry were taken out and placed where they should be? Nothing at all.

Upon whose shoulders rests the responsibility? Mr. President, it rests upon this administration, and this administration alone. We cannot escape the facts. If there is inefficiency in government—and we all recognize it—is it the fault of the Congress? We have given the administration the money. We have given it the power. Then whose responsibility is it? The responsibility for inefficiency in government, waste of manpower, and waste of money can rest upon the shoulders of only one person in this Government.

Mr. Baruch pointed out in his report that the bureaus were pulling and hauling, trying to build up more power. Whose responsibility is that? Is that the responsibility of the Congress? Is that the responsibility of General Marshall? Is it the result of the complacency of the American people? The American people are not complacent about the war effort, but they have been entirely too complacent about inefficiency in government. They have been too complacent about the waste of money by the Government. They have been entirely too complacent about many things which have been going on in Washington.

My statement about inefficiency in government is not the only one which has been made. There have been such statements by the chairman of the Truman committee, by the Costello committee, and by the Baruch committee. The condition is known to every Member of this body. But because of the mistakes which have been made by the Government, because of inefficiency, because of the squandering of money, and because of the waste of manpower, the children of this country are to be punished by having their fathers taken away from them and their homes broken up. Let Senators go back home and tell their people that that is what they stand for. That is the reason we are asked to take fathers, and that is the only reason we are asked to take fathers.

In a statement in the New York Times the other day, Mr. LaGuardia pointed out that if married men with children are to be taken away from their homes there will be 37,000 children whose homes will be broken up. I notice a great many children in the galleries. If we take their fathers away from them and make their mothers go to work in industry, what will become of the American home? What are we fighting for? Are we fighting to preserve the American home or are we fighting to break up the American home? Are we fighting for the future of America or are we fighting for some European idealism?

Let me read what Mr. Stimson said:

> No legislation is needed to impress upon the War Department the importance of preserving the institution of the American home. It ranks first and foremost in the American way of life that this war is being fought to preserve.

That is what he says we are fighting for. Six months later we are asked to break up the American home. The administration has told the American people that one thing for which we are fighting is the future welfare of the children of America; and yet now, because of inefficiency and waste of manpower, the children of America are being told that their homes are to be destroyed and that their mothers must go to work in industry. The President has said, "Let the fathers go to work in industry." What is he saying? Suppose a young man is a lawyer or businessman. He is being told to give up his business, which he has built up over the years, and go into industry, in order to do what? In order to avoid the draft—in order to avoid being taken into the Army. Those men are being told in effect, "Be slackers, so that when the war is over someone may point his finger at you and say, 'I was out there fighting in the hellholes of Guadalcanal or New Guinea, but you went into industry to hide.'" When the boys in the Army come back and see the waste and extravagance resulting from cost-plus contracts and the hoarding of labor, much of which consists of single men, what will they say to us?

I shall now read some letters, and I hope that Senators will listen to them. I hope that Senators have not made up their minds because of some editorials which have been published, or because of some headlines which have appeared in the newspapers. I hope Senators will listen to the evidence I shall produce, not on my behalf, but on behalf of children whose fathers are to be taken away.

A Senator said to me, "I am not going to vote for your bill." After making an outstanding speech, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] said, "I am not going to vote for your bill because it is class legislation." Class legislation! The whole Selective Service Act is class legislation. Mr. President, when the President of the United States exempted from military service men over 38 years of age, or between the ages of 38 and 45, many of whom were physically fit to enter the Army, he was by edict applying class legislation to that group of persons. The Army released approximately 275,000 men who had been trained. They were men who perhaps could not engage in combat duty but could do the work of and relieve hundreds of fathers from being put into the Army, or relieve many men for combat service.

I have spoken concerning one of the aspects of the situation to which I wish to call further attention. I invite the attention of the Senate to letters from Protestant ministers from all over the country, and from leaders of the Catholic Church. Let me read an editorial from the Pilot. If I am not mistaken, this was one of the first publications of its kind in the United States. It was established in 1829, by the second Bishop of Boston, Mass. I quote:

> IS THIS DANGEROUS MEASURE NECESSARY?
>
> A part of the burden borne by civilians is the hesitations and the contradictions from "above" which make planning useless. Last autumn the people were urged to convert to coal. Then the wave of strikes set in, and there is talk now of rationing coal. The lifting of the ban on driving has been announced a half dozen times and as many times postponed.
>
> But the most serious uncertainty, the one which cuts deepest at the values we treasure, is the impending induction of the so-called pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. The last official word is that the induction of these men will begin October 1. And yet just at this time the warning is issued that these responsible heads of families must get into essential work or submit to draft before October. So the draft is being used as leverage. One might say it is being used as a threat.
>
> It is an extremely serious step our Government is considering. The family is in a bad enough way now. There is no need of rehearsing the figures on juvenile delinquency—obviously there never was a time when it was so important to save what is left of family life in America. In God's plan, every child is provided with a mother and a father. Both are needed.
>
> Now, these men who stayed at their accustomed jobs, who for the sake of their loved ones refused the gamble of fantastic salaries, which will vanish when the war ends, are to be penalized for the very qualities which support a nation's fabric—industry, prudence, loyalty to sacramental promises.
>
> The Government will support their dependents. Who is, or what is, this enigmatic personality we call the Government? And what constitutes support? Will this mean that mother will have to leave her home and eke out Government support by her own exertions in a war plant? Which would signify, of course, more children running wild on the streets, new recruits to the ranks of juvenile delinquency.
>
> Is this desperate recourse absolutely necessary? What about the hundreds of thousands of men who have been training in this country for a year and a half, who are still here? And if it is not strictly necessary, Why is it being done? Can it possibly be that some of our officials, for doctrinaire reasons of their own, prefer the Government nursery to the home?

Mr. President, I also wish to invite attention to the fact that when the American Legion, Department of Maryland, recently met in Baltimore approximately 1,000 delegates went on record against the drafting of American fathers. I read from an Associated Press article:

> A resolution opposing the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers was adopted by the approximately 1,000 delegates to the annual convention of the Department of Maryland, American Legion, in the closing session today.
>
> The legionnaires also adopted a resolution favoring the publication of the names of persons seeking deferment from selective service.

The article then refers to the newly-elected State commander of the Legion.

The American Legion is one of the most patriotic societies in the country. Is it taking a stand against General Marshall? Are those 1,000 delegates saying that they are putting their judgment against that of General Marshall?

I invite attention to an Associated Press release under date of September 27, 1943, concerning the Maryland members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It reads as follows:

> BALTIMORE, September 27.—Maryland members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars are scheduled to make an effort to have the national organization go on record at its convention, opening in New York tomorrow against the drafting of fathers until all other classes of eligibles for military service have been exhausted.
>
> A resolution to this effect, adopted by the State V. F. W. at its annual encampment, will be submitted to the national convention by Charles J. Peters, former Maryland V. F. W. commander who is chairman of a Baltimore County draft board.
>
> Speaking, however, as a member of the national resolution committee, Mr. Peters said the resolution should not be misunderstood as seeking to block permanently the drafting of fathers.
>
> He said that "I am going to make a fight for the resolution and voice opposition to the way selective service is being conducted with respect to the drafting of fathers.

Here is a letter from a selective-service board. I have received more than 5,000 letters since this question arose. I shall

read a few of the letters which give facts. They are not letters which merely state opinions, but they present facts.

I invite attention to a letter from the chairman of the local selective-service board of King William County, Va., enclosing a copy of a letter which he received from one of his board members. I should like to read both letters.

The chairman of the local board writes:

In my humble opinion, no system or department, could be more thoroughly honeycombed with chaos and confusion and a thorough lack of decision and policy. The local boards are daily flooded with a mass of regulations and memoranda from National and State headquarters, which add up generally to the sum total of nothing minus. The "buck" is always passed to the local boards and it is most remarkable that they have been able to induct as many men in the armed forces as are now there when operating under a system which has no policy and, daily through the press, are inviting men to secure employment which will exempt them from service in the armed forces of their country. Very recently Mr. McNutt issued a statement giving the fathers one more week to secure employment in, what he termed, essential industry. Should all fathers avail themseives of his invitation then there would be none left to be called into the armed forces and I do not know where the needs, as outlined by General Hershey, would be met.

From the letter which was enclosed, written by a member of local board No. 1, King William County, West Point, Va., I quote as follows:

I realize that it is not for selective service to determine the type of men that are to be used by the Army or Navy, but I have certain opinions founded upon the observations of the employment of personnel in the armed forces which preclude my voting to classify a pre-Pearl Harbor father for induction into the armed forces. An obvious fact is that individuals with defective physical or mental equipment are unfitted for combat duty, but there is, so far as I can observe, no good reason why an individual with slight physical handicap who is qualified to carry on in banking, insurance, transportation, or other business, could not be utilized in the armed services for duty within the bounds of the United States. By a means of simple multiplication, taking the husky able bodies whom I know in the Army and Navy that are carrying out assignments that could be efficiently handled by one-legged men and multiplying by vast possibilities in the Nation, it can be estimated that there are now a staggering number of men capable of combat assignments who could be replaced from the tremendous pool of power dammed up in 4-F classification.

General Hershey said that there were in excess of 3,000,000 men in the IV–F classification. Of that number the Army is taking into the service about 5 percent. In addition to that, after the Army takes men in the IV–F classification it is discharging them every day by the thousands from the camps throughout the United States. The writer of the letter says further:

Until such time as this condition has been corrected it would be impossible for me to vote, and maintain a clear conscience, to classify for inductance any pre-Pearl Harbor father.

Holding the view that I now have, it appears to me that further service with the board would hardly be consistent practice, and you are at liberty to request the appointment of someone to replace me.

I read from a letter signed by Nathan H. Kaufman, chairman, Appeal Board No. 3, State of Maryland, from Baltimore, Md. He says:

I am very much interested in the fight you are making on the drafting of fathers and following are excerpts from a letter I wrote to General Hershey. I think this is the answer to the problem.

"In my opinion the date of recognized marriages should be changed from December 7, 1941, to September 16, 1940, the date when the Selective Service Act became law, and that no registrant should be considered for selective-service purposes as 'married men with children' if the children were born later than 9 months and 9 days after September 16, 1940.

"The following reasons are in support of the suggestion made above. First, all married men knew on September 16, 1940, that they might be called for military service; thus, if they acquired dependency after that date, they did so in the light of the 'imminence of their induction.'

"Second, most of the men who had been made eligible for service if the 'marriage with children' date were moved forward from December 7, 1941, to September 16, 1940, would be between the ages of 18 and 25, and would thus very likely make the most desirable soldiers.

"Third, the number of men made available under the suggested change of dates would be drafted in place of at least some of the men now being drafted out of war plants. In this regard I was asked by some of the persons present to state that we have been approached by many responsible officials of war plants located in Maryland, who have stated that they are not, and will not in the future, be able to work at a maximum efficiency with so many of their skilled workers being taken away from them.

"Fourth, the phrase 'imminence of induction,' as applied by local boards to the classification of married men, was frequently the cause for the difference of opinion among local boards and appeal boards, the result being that some boards emphasized certain dates as the basis for induction, while other boards used other dates for the same purpose. If my plan was followed, all of these instances would now be equalized.

"Fifth, general confusion exists regarding the whole subject of drafting married men with children, and as a result of the many conflicting statements made by various officials of Selective Service, Congressmen, and Senators, the efficiency of such men is being badly curtailed, resulting in the falling off of production of such men both in war producing plants and other plants necessary to the carrying on of essential industries."

I next refer to a letter from the local board of Wythe County, Wytheville, Va., from which I quote the following:

I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your stand, with reference to drafting fathers for the armed forces. I happen to be a member of the Wythe County local board and feel that I am qualified, to a small extent at least, in being able to appreciate the unjustness and unfairness of such procedure. You are probably aware, of course, that there have been thousands of single men deferred for a great many reasons, and, in my humble opinion, it is unfair and unjust to take fathers into the service as long as these single men remain at home. I sincerely trust that you will be able to block this step on the part of the Selective Service officials and get a bill through the Senate prohibiting the taking of fathers as long as there are single men available. It is my understanding that such a bill has passed the House.

I also wish to state that I have disagreed with your views on a great many public questions. However, I am with you on this question 100 percent, and if through your efforts you can keep the drafting of fathers from taking place until childless married men and single men have been called, you have rendered your country a great service.

Here is a letter addressed to Claude C. Earp, State director, Selective Service, Jefferson City, Mo., by the chairman of the Henry County local board. I quote from the letter as follows:

We received a bulletin some 2 months ago which stated industries must give up all single men between the ages of 18 and 25 by October. We were told that the replacement schedules would end a lot of uncertainties, that when Selective Service headquarters and industry are agreed on a certain date, draft boards could depend on having registrants at that time. Also that industry knew when the replacement schedule was made that they would have to release men on that date.

But now, in some cases they are allowing longer time.

Further on the writer of the letter says:

But the most confusing thing of all is the order to take married men with children in nondeferrable industries. We received this broadening of lists Saturday, August 14, 1943. If we would start Monday morning to reclassify these men it would be September 15 before we could induct them as it takes considerable time to go over 2,500 to 3,000 files.

I also think it is a darn shame to draft married men with children until married men without children and single men are called.

I ask that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The entire letter is as follows:

AUGUST 20, 1943.

CLAUDE C. EARP,
State Director, Selective Service,
Jefferson City, Mo.

JOHN G. CHRISTY,
Assistant State Director, Selective Service,
Jefferson City, Mo.

DEAR FRIENDS: I am writing a few lines in regard to Selective Service's new rulings. I have always tried to keep up with the new regulations and have tried to follow instructions as near as possible and I wish to state that we have received wonderful cooperation from the State office, and you two, Colonel Earp and Colonel Christy, have been wonderful in trying to help us over the rough spots.

But there is so much confusion and uncertainty at present that I, for one, hardly know where we are.

We received a bulletin some 2 months ago which stated industries must give up all single men between the ages of 18 and 25 by October. We were told that the replacement schedules would end a lot of uncertainties; that when Selective Service headquarters and industry agreed on a certain date, draft boards could depend on having registrants at that time. Also that industry knew when the replacement schedule was made that they would have to release men on that date.

But now, in some cases they are allowing longer time. We have been told that when a company had a 6-month deferment on a

man they must make proof that they had tried to get a replacement through every means possible before they could get another deferment for their employee. This has not held good.

But the most confusing thing of all is the order to take married men with children in nondeferrable industries. We received this broadening of lists Saturday, August 14, 1943. If we would start Monday morning to reclassify these men it would be September 15 before we could induct them as it takes considerable time to go over 2,500 to 3,000 files.

I also think it is a darn shame to draft married men with children until married men without children and single men are called.

I realize that a draft board is to carry out regulations as made by higher ups and men that are supposed to be smarter than the draft board. I also know that we live in a democracy and a democracy is where the people rule and Congress helps dictate the policies of this country. I also think the large part of the people believe married men should be called when the supply of married men without children and single men is exhausted.

I have always thought that a person should be proud to serve his country and ashamed to run to some other job to keep from going to the Army. Now the Government encourages people to run back to the farm and to defense plants. Of course, I am not saying they are not needed, but it certainly is making a lot of people call them draft evaders and a lot of them are.

Wouldn't it be better to draft labor that is not eligible for military service outright, rather than use selective service as a club?

Again, let me say State headquarters has been wonderful, and there is no criticism on them, and I, for one, want to do my duty, but I feel that instructions should be in plain English so that all draft boards can act alike.

I also think quotas should be fixed on a basis of registration and not on a basis of available class I–A men. By quotas being on available I–A men, the counties and districts where a board grants few deferments have to send a greater percent of men.

I am hoping that when Congress meets they face this problem squarely and bring things to a place where draft boards like us can really know what are regulations.

Your friend,

C. C. JONES,
Chairman, Henry County Local Board No. 1.

Mr. WHEELER. Here is a letter from Brooklyn, N. Y.:

After 3 years work as the chairman of a local selective service board, I have reviewed the files of thousands of registrants, spoken with them and with various members of their families and with many of their employers. I believe that most members of other boards have had similar experience.

In more recent months, our task has become more difficult since we have practically exhausted most available registrants for induction into the armed forces of the United States.

* * * * *

The problem of inducting pre-Pearl Harbor fathers has been a matter of serious concern to us. We have discussed the problem at great length and from all angles and particularly in face of our varied experience as a result of 3 years of service in selecting men for the armed forces we are familiar with the hardships encountered by various families and feel that it would not be unwise if Congress or its duly constituted committees would get the views of members of local boards, who are more directly in touch with the subject of selective service from the viewpoint of the registrant, than those who are at the head of selective service.

* * * * *

My own views and those other members of selective service local boards directly connected with the selection of men for the induction into the armed forces and with whom I have discussed this matter, are that pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, if they must be selected for service, should be limited to service within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States, at least until such time as the heads of the various branches of our armed forces, in their good judgment deem it necessary to do otherwise, and thus avoid the hazards and risk that go with active duty overseas, since physical injury or death resulting in such service to pre-Pearl Harbor fathers would necessarily create greater hardships on a greater number by reason of the large families left behind.

They may be used to relieve the great number of physically fit men without dependents who are now extensively engaged throughout the United States in doing guard duty, m. p. duty and various other duties which are not strictly combatant work and who are less indispensable.

Much time, effort and expense is incurred in maintaining the morale of the home front. I believe that to deprive many a large family of its head and sufficient support, would seriously affect the morale of the home front.

Mr. President, why is it that the selective-service boards are resigning? They are the men, Mr. President, who have knowledge of what is going on in the United States. They know the men who are hiding behind industry. They are resigning because of their disgust.

Mr. President, a few days ago some Senators were saying they could not vote intelligently because they did not know the facts, and they wanted to get more information. How many of them are in the Senate at the present time willing to listen in order that they may get the facts? The truth is, they do not want the facts, or at least they do not act as if they wanted the facts. They are willing to let the administration crack the whip, and are willing to vote as the administration tells them to vote, regardless of the facts.

I now read a letter from Jackson Barracks, New Orleans:

I want to express my thanks to you for trying to put some sense in the draft laws.

At the present time the Army is releasing about 500,000 limited service men and at the same time asking for more men in the draft. It seems to me a waste of money and manpower to release trained men and at the same time drafting more new men.

I hope that the Congress will see fit to end the era of blank checks both in money and manpower that the military has been using so lavishly.

This comes from a private in the Army, and I shall not give his name, because I do not want him to get in trouble.

Now, I wish to read a statement from Houston, Tex. I am sorry the Texas Senators are not present to hear it. The statement is as follows:

Officials of many Houston war industries are guilty of labor hoarding; employing more men and women than they need to run their plants, Burr Pearson, manager of the United States Employment Service here, charged Thursday.

"Employers are holding a cushion in anticipation of a more stringent labor situation in the future," the United States Employment Service manager said. "If we knew how many workers are being hoarded and how many nonworking women are available to take jobs, we probably would have enough to man another shipyard.

"Of course, I have no proof of how much labor hoarding is going on, but I am certain there is a large amount of it."

Mr. Pearson made his statement after Claude E. Belk, area director of the War Manpower Commission, estimated 15,000 additional workers—10,000 of them women—would be needed in local industry in the next few months.

Mr. Pearson admitted that housing is scarce here to the extent where the city probably could not take care of any sizable net increase in the manpower field.

"But the war industries are experiencing a terrific turn-over, and the number of new workers coming to Houston each month is about the same as the number that leaves here for other war-production centers," he said.

Is it right to draft fathers in the face of statements of that kind?

I shall now read a letter from the wife of an officer in the Air Corps, and she states facts; this is not fiction. We have before us one of the most important questions facing the American people, facing not only 6,000,000 fathers, for they are not the only ones involved, but there are involved the children of these fathers, the mothers of the children, the grandparents, and their other relatives. Listen to what this lady says:

DEAR SIR: I am writing this because I am interested in the fight you have been waging for the sensible use of our manpower. My husband is an Army officer and the conditions I am going to mention are not unusual nor confined to the field located here. We have been in enough different places to say with truth that these same conditions are general throughout the camps and stations in this country.

This demonstrates efficiency, if you please, the businesslike operation we hear mentioned.

Here are some facts. The post engineers employ many young civilians who are supposed to be engineers. Here are two examples of work they have performed. One has charge of answering a telephone and dispatching trucks to different parts of the field, certainly a job a half-wit could perform. Another's job is to count the fire extinguishers, lamp shades, etc., whenever buildings are transferred from one organization to another. Civilians drive trucks all over the field accompanied by soldiers, who could drive, who point out the way.

Soldiers are sent along with the truck drivers to point out the way. The letter continues:

In Air Corps supply warehouse civilian help is almost entirely used though just a stone's throw away the Quartermaster Corps operates warehouses just as valuable with soldier help. Hundreds of civilians, some of them women, but many of them men, are engaged in many simple tasks which could be done by the hundreds of limited-service soldiers who are here for training they are unable to take. Although a company of WAC's is now on the field, there has been no cut of permanent personnel nor has there been any cut in the number of civilian employees. Thus you see that the addition of WAC's released no men for combat duty nor no civilians for war work. These facts are true throughout the Army Air Force and they should be brought forcibly to the attention of the citizens. I trust that you will trust my confidence and keep this letter secret because of my husband's position.

I have before me a letter from a professor in Connecticut College, in which he states:

This is to express my interest in your effort to secure legislation which would delay the drafting of fathers. (I am beyond draft age.)

In line with your contention that there is an adequate manpower if properly used, I would like to submit the following:

1. The Electric Boat Co., builder of submarines, is said to have more than 3,000 unmarried keymen which it manages to keep exempt from military service. The company is pretty well understood among people of the community to be a draft-dodger's paradise.

Some say to me, "You have not made out a case about these draft dodgers." How can I make out a case against these slackers except by submitting the evidence that is given to me by people from one end of the country to the other, not from crackpots, but from people such as this professor of the Connecticut College, who says:

Every man I know in the plant makes the flat assertion that the same number of submarines could be built with approximately half the present number of employees.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. Last January I reported to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs my observation, while in the Oregon section of the country, of wastage of manpower and materials, and at my request the Truman committee sent out an investigator to ascertain the facts, to verify or disprove what I had reported. When the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] handed me the report of the investigator, for my confidential information, he remarked, "Senator HOLMAN, the situation is worse than you represented it to be." In spite of repeated attempts, I have not been able to have this report released and made available to the Senate and to the public.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say in answer to the Senator from Oregon that Members of the Senate of the United States may not be interested in the subject. They may be more interested in some social function than they are in protecting the fathers of the United States. They may be more interested in following the lead of someone else than they are in taking some responsibility upon themselves. Some Members of the Senate say to me, "But I do not want to take this responsibility." I say to them, "What are you here for if not to assume responsibility? If you do not dare to assume the responsibility of acting to correct the waste and the extravagance which is now in effect in this country before you take fathers into the armed service, then you do not deserve to be in the Senate of the United States."

I shall read again the last sentence I read from the letter:

Every man I know in the plant makes the flat assertion that the same number of submarines could be built with approximately half the present number of employees. In spite of this, the company is now advertising for 2,000 more.

3. The last submarine launched at the company's victory yard was not accepted by the Navy, though it was supposedly built under close Navy supervision. This resulted in the loss of the Electric Boat Co.'s E, a fact which has never been made public, and which even very few people in this area know.

The above information is supplied for whatever use you may wish to make of it. I have reason to believe that it is entirely reliable, all of it having come from men who work in the plant. These particular men are thoughtful and hard-working; they bear a grudge against no one, and hope some day to see the manpower problem handled efficiently. They, in common with the writer, deplore waste * * * whether of time or materials.

Mr. President, in the face of such waste and extravagance it is asserted that married men, fathers, must be taken before such slackers are taken into the armed service. In the face of such waste and extravagance it is asserted that the taking of fathers cannot be deferred for 3 months until the whole manpower situation is investigated, and such slackers as those referred to in the letter I have just read are taken into the service. The Senate of the United States may not be interested in that situation, but the people of the United States are interested in it.

I read now from a copy of a letter written by the legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen addressed to Mr. A. F. Whitney, president, Grand Lodge Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

DEAR BROTHER WHITNEY: I believe we should do all in our power to help Senator BERT WHEELER put through a law to do away with this 10-percent plus that the war industries are enjoying. The cost-plus 10 percent paid by our Government to these industries encourages them to waste $1 to get another 10 cents in profit.

You have conditions in these war plants where men are idle—

Mr. President, this letter is not written by someone who hates labor; it is not written by a labor baiter. I continue to read from it:

You have conditions in these war plants where men are idle, in fact here in Buffalo I have spoken to a party, he claims that 16 men are employed to do the work 2 men could do with ease. I feel this information is reliable, as the source from whence it came is.

The work done by Curtiss-Wright and Bell Aircraft are very essential and the same, as they both make airplanes. But if this same amount of work can be done by at least 30 percent less manpower, by all means let's do it. These are just two of the many war plants here, the other plants are perhaps doing the same.

* * * * * *

Lodge 224's membership of 700 are very interested in Senator WHEELER's effort to make this a law.

So, Mr. President, when I make complaint with respect to labor hoarding, I may say that it is based on complaints which I receive not from haters of labor but from labor unions themselves.

I shall now read from another letter addressed to me by a committee of the C. I. O., Chevrolet Local 659, International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America:

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, a committee elected by the membership of Chevrolet Local, No. 659, U. A. W.-C. I. O., to investigate the rumors prevalent in the Flint Chevrolet plants that management has appointed mere boys (who are the sons of Chevrolet superintendents and other high officials) foremen for the sole purpose of enabling them to evade being inducted into the armed services.

After investigation, we find that unquestionably this has been done and that circumstances make it appear that there may have been collusion between certain corporations and the W. M. C. in this matter.

Sometime ago Major General Hershey stated publicly that the only thing that would drive the draft dodgers out of the plant was social indignation.

Waiting for social indignation to drive the draft dodgers out? Where is the power of this Government when it lets draft dodgers and slackers hide in war plants? Yet, in spite of that situation, it is desired to take fathers into the service, and, I repeat, put the little businessman out of business and drive him into overcrowded war plants. What is back of it? Do some of the new "brain trusters" want to put the little businessman out? Do they want to drive him into the big industries? Do they want only big industries to continue in operation because they feel that it would be easier to regulate them and take them over when the proper time comes? Is that the purpose of it? What other purpose could there be for what is now going on in the United States?

Mr. President, does anyone think for one moment that I am standing here placing my judgment against that of General Marshall? Some Members of the Senate say they do not want to assume the responsibility in the matter. The responsibility rests upon the administration and the bureaus involved, and when they will not assume it, when they will not exert the power they have, when they will not correct the situation that exists, then the people of the United States have only one recourse, and that is to appeal to their elected representatives in Congress; and if their elected representatives fail them, then government in the United States—in this democratic Republic—is gone, and, Mr. President, you know it and I know it.

I continue to read from the letter:

A short time ago, State Director of Selective Service Pearson stated that corporations who had requested deferment for certain employees had been given sufficient time to replace them and must do so at once.

A few days later management appointed these 22-year-old employees to foremanships, and almost immediately thereafter the W. M. C. issued a list of deferable occupations, which included foremen in industry converted to war production.

I have here another letter from the C. I. O., Local No. 24, Aluminum Workers of America, Bridgeport, Conn., addressed to me:

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned committee, duly appointed by Local Union No. 24, Aluminum Workers of America, to investigate discrimination in deferments, hereby request that you present the following evidence before the Military Affairs Committee:

We have been investigating deferments for several months, and we find that many single men, working in the United States Aluminum Co. plants in Bridgeport and Fairfield, including the magnesium plant, are given deferments, and married men were drafted.

We have also found that men working here came from other States, and were given indefinite deferments by their local boards.

We also found that officials of the Aluminum Co. have sons or relations who have been sent to the Fairfield and Bridgeport plants and placed in positions that could be classified as essential to the war effort. However, we find these men walking around with pads and pencils in their hands, or sitting at a typewriter. These men are single and should be drafted.

Yet there are those who would say, "Let this go on. Do not take the responsibility. Let it go on and on and on, and build up the supplies of such workers. We are going to take the fathers; we are going to take them out of their homes, by the backs of their necks, and throw their children into the streets."

Shame on anyone who takes that position.

I read further from the letter:

We would also recommend that Congress make it compulsory that a committee be appointed in each plant to work in conjunction with management relative to requests for deferments, and making up of replacement schedules.

Mr. President, the deferments are allowed to go on and on, for 6 months, just so long as the company says, "We must have them; we cannot replace them."

I read further from the letter:

We also find that many men who are single have had five or six deferments, and many married men are refused deferments.

We believe that 200 to 275 single men could be taken from these plants. This does not include marriages before Pearl Harbor. Hardship cases are rarely given consideration by local boards. We have a case of James Lewis Martino, order No. 1633, local board 8B, New Haven, Conn. He is a core maker; married November 27, 1941. He was told by his local board that he could not appeal, as he was going in October. We are contacting State selective service headquarters for a deferment. The United States Aluminum Co. has applied for a deferment and it was denied. Refusing the man the right to appeal is a violation of the Selective Service Act.

We have complained to General Hershey about the discrimination in deferments, and were referred to the State selective service board at West Hartford, Conn. We contacted this board and they promised to investigate, but nothing has been done. The replacement schedules as submitted by employers are a joke. These schedules are made up and sent to State selective service headquarters by the employer, listing the names, etc., of employees, and when they can be released for service. This list, we believe, is unfair to the men, because it can be used to get rid of them, if management should consider them undesirable, regardless of experience.

We therefore suggest that drafting of married men is uncalled for at this time, and should be stopped.

If this committee can be of further assistance to you, we will be glad to furnish names of men, etc., for your information.

Here is another letter from a C. I. O. local. Mind you, Mr. President, one of the letters I have read is from Connecticut, one is from Flint, Mich., and the one I now read is from Rockford, Ill.:

DEAR SIR: Local 225, U. A. W.-C. I. O., Rockford, Ill., has had a committee appointed in the last several months which has protested the deferring of single men and the drafting of husbands and fathers. We feel that the older men and women should replace the single men in industry so that all single men could be inducted into the armed services.

This committee wishes to commend you on your stand in regards to the drafting of married men.

We hope that you are successful in your coming bill in the Senate and would appreciate a copy of same if possible.

Continue your good work for victory, I remain,

Fraternally,

A. W. KEENE, Jr.,
President, Local 225, U. A. W.-C. I. O.

Here is a letter which comes from a man who was an insurance-company agent:

DEAR SENATOR: I have been much interested in your efforts to prevent the drafting of fathers into the services, and hope you will keep up the fight, for under existing conditions I believe it would be a crime to resort to this, for it is certainly not necessary.

If you will investigate the conditions at the war plants I am sure you will find enough evidence to support your contention. I will give you some details now. Take my own case. I am the father of three sons, all in the service, so about 18 months ago, believing I should do something to help, I gave up my business which I had followed for 15 years, to work in the Elco Boat Works at Bayonne, N. J., building PT boats. I was under the mistaken impression that the idea was to build boats as fast as it could be done, but how mistaken I was.

The writer of the letter is a worker in the plant, a man who gave up his little business. He is not a labor baiter. As I have said, I have here a letter from the railroad brotherhoods, letters from various locals of the C. I. O., and I also have letters from soldiers, which I shall read to the Senate.

The letter continues:

They don't want this war to end; too many men there are getting good money, they want it to last just as long as possible.

Here is a plant that could and should turn out at least six PT boats per week, with the help and facilities they have there, it is a crime the way they work it. The most they have ever turned out is two and one-half per week. There are three men doing one man's job all the time, and when one tries to work he is disliked. I tried very hard to do my job but was always told to go easy; finally I got so fed up with it all, that I resigned about 2 weeks ago.

As I said, they had been turning out two and one-half boats per week, now they are changing the model. They knew 6 months ago they were going to do this, but did not do a thing about it till they reached the place where it was to be changed. Now all is stopped; they have not put a single boat into the water in 2 weeks, nor will they put one in for another 2 weeks. Yet they are advertising for all the help they can get, asking their employees to bring anybody they know can use tools down there and they will employ them, and this all being done when they already have at least twice as many workers as they can possibly use. Why?

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the Senator yield so as to permit me to quote at this point in his remarks an 8-line stanza which I think apropos of the manpower-wastage situation?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I am informed that the stanza was composed in desperate earnestness by a marine in combat in the southwest Pacific area, under the general command of General MacArthur:

And if our lines should form, then break
Because of things you failed to make—
The extra tank, or ship, or plane—
For which we waited all in vain
And the supplies which never came
Will you then come and take the blame?
For we, not you, will pay the cost
Of battles you, not we, have lost.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

The letter from which I was reading continues as follows:

And, by all the Gods, Senator, what is so complicated about a PT boat that it should cost one-quarter of a million dollars to build?

When I kicked about not having enough to do I was told to mind my own business, and now that I have left them they are so mad that they will not give me my release, so here I am, perfectly able and wanting to work, yet I have to sit home while they advertise in all the papers and radio to help the war effort by getting a job in a war plant, and also buy bonds. If it were not for my boys being in service I can tell you I would not buy a single bond, for they are just pouring money down the gutters of our fair country.

At this plant there are leadmen, commonly known as snappers, one for about every four persons, and the only thing they are used for is to hinder the men from working. I have seen more work stoppages and delays caused by snappers than from any one thing. Snappers indeed. On top of this is assistant foremen, then foremen galore, none of them doing a day's work, but all of them drawing down top money.

That is the result of the great number of cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts.

I read further from the letter:

I could tell lots more but cannot write it, but hope you will see that this situation is remedied, and that when you have investigated, it will, I am sure, be found that at these plants they have scores of men who could be spared who are not fathers.

I read now from a letter from a worker at Baltimore, Md.:

SIR: I am a pipe fitter at the largest shipyard here. Put on your overalls, come in and see for yourself.

There are many, many young men there just to dodge Army. They stand around, do no work of value. Too many, by far.

Many Senators are opposed to delaying the drafting of fathers. They are opposed to passing my bill and to delaying the drafting of fathers for 3 months so that the situation can be cleared up before fathers are drafted, homes are broken up, and little businessmen are put out of business.

Here is a letter from Birmingham, Ala.:

I am chairman of local draft board No. 10 and have been since the inauguration of selective service in September 1940. Therefore, I am thoroughly familiar with its rules and regulations, and throughout the 3 years that I have served my reputation is that of giving very few deferments. I am on the other hand just as reluctant to induct the so-called fathers.

It occurred to me that perhaps you would be interested in having me tell you that I know it to be a fact, that there are numbers of boys in this section who should be called

for military service before the drafting of fathers. Only recently the State director of selective service in Alabama insisted that two young college students, who the draft board and appeals board both had classified I–A should be given deferred classifications and permitted to remain in college, but the State director evidently prefers the drafting of fathers before young college students. In my opinion, the two large colleges in this State are crowded with students hiding behind various artifices to evade military service.

The writer further states:

Do not let anyone make you believe that many draft boards cannot fill quotas for a long time if they will take men out of deferred classifications that are now in II–A and II–B and not necessary to the war effort.

Here is a letter from the pastor of the First Congregational Church at Braintree, Mass.:

Please continue your gallant fight to prevent drafting of fathers. Juvenile delinquency is already an alarming problem. We already have a large army.

The letter is signed by the pastor of the church.

Here is one from the Monroe Avenue Methodist Church of Rochester, N. Y.:

Please continue your fine American stand in preservation of the American family.

The very core of our American culture and industry is the American family. Moral and social principles are at a low ebb throughout our Nation. To reach further into the fabric of the American family and thus destroy another basic fiber from our homes will be fatal.

Here is one from a lawyer in San Antonio, Tex.:

I listened with much interest to your discussion of the manpower problem, as the same relates to the question of drafting fathers. There can be no doubt in the minds of right-thinking men that you are eminently correct in your position.

The sacrifices required of the people of this Nation, due to the war, are monumental. The consequences of the war, even if carried on with the greatest consideration with regard to the future, will be terrific, and, if great care is not exercised, they will be disastrous; that the effect upon the moral standards has been damaging, there can be no question, nor that the home life has been detrimentally affected.

* * * * *

Let me add, that you did not touch upon one material fact, unless it was covered by the category of men employed in Government bureaus, this fact is, we are told, that in the departments operated by the Army itself, and where civilians are employed, such as Kelley Field, Fort Sam Houston, and other places surrounding this city, where possibly 100,000 civilians are on Government pay rolls, that there is a tremendous waste of manpower. I have been told by people so employed, that one-third of the personnel could be discharged without loss of production; in fact, that the efficiency would be largely increased by so doing.

Here is one from the Franciscan Fathers:

We heard with much interest your radio address and we pray that you will be successful against the diabolical forces who are trying to wreck our American, nay, Christian, institution of the home. We shudder to think of the responsibility these men are willing to assume in order to further their own selfish aims. God save our fathers and thereby protect our homes.

May God bless you and your noble work. Let us pray for a more Christian America.

Here is one from the local selective service board at Strawberry Plains, Tenn.:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
LOCAL BOARD NO. 1, JEFFERSON COUNTY,
Strawberry Plains, Tenn., September 25, 1943.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: I listened to your address last night, and I wish to advise that I agree with you 100 percent.

I am 44 years old, and have been the chief clerk for Local Board No. 1 of Jefferson County, Tenn., for the past 3 years. During this time I have seen many men rejected at Fort Oglethorpe who immediately returned home and secured positions in industry, which positions required strenuous physical labor. I have also seen deferments claimed for single men without dependents for 3 years, with the company claiming the deferments apparently making no effort to replace these men. These men were not skilled workers, as they had only a high-school education and had been employed as apprentices, and deferment was claimed for them while they were serving as apprentices.

While you did not mention the replacement schedules filed by industries, I wish to advise that this board has learned the following from dealing with the replacement schedules:

A company will state that they will release a certain single man, or a married registrant without children, on a certain date, say, on September 1, 1941, and when that date arrives they will file a supplementary replacement schedule, and the Selective Service Headquarters will accept same, and they will then ask for these same men to be deferred for another 6 months. If the local board does not agree with industry, the Director of Selective Service will take an appeal, and the board of appeal will place the registrant in class II–B for another 6 months.

I wish to also call to your attention the fact that when a registrant is released by a company on a replacement schedule, before a draft board can give him all the necessary notices about the reopening of his classification, 5 days notice to appear for physical examination, and 10 days to appeal his classification, the registrant will secure employment with another company, and they will claim deferment on him. When a registrant follows this procedure, it is impossible for a draft board to get him in the Army, as the new employer will put him on a replacement schedule, and he will stay with them until he is released for military service and then secure employment with another concern. Cases such as this have happened several times with this local board.

This local board has had registrants leave their jobs after they have been placed in 1–A, and go to shipyards, airplane factories, and the like, and these companies would employ them and claim deferment on them. If the 10 days allowed for appeal had expired, they would write the State director of selective service, and he would request the local board to reopen the case.

While you did not mention deferments in agriculture, I wish to advise that this board has approximately 175 men deferred in agriculture, and, to the best of my knowledge, I do not believe that there are 10 tenant single men that the farm owners have claimed deferments for; however, it seems that every farmer that has a son wishes to get rid of his tenant farmers in order to claim deferment for the son. The Army has released several men for farming, to my personal knowledge, and that, to my personal knowledge, these soldiers who were released were not engaged in farming at the time of their induction or enlistment.

This local board is faced with the situation of drafting fathers when there are single men who have been deferred in industry for 3 years; single men deferred in agriculture that this board did not think had sufficient production and refused to classify in class II–C, but who appealed to the board of appeal and were placed in class II–C as necessary men, although their production did not equal 10 units per worker on the farm.

All the statements made above are facts, and you can use them in any way you see fit, and I will be glad to point out to you or any other person the cases as outlined above.

That is the same story that I get from one end of the country to the other.

In the face of those facts, it is proposed to take fathers, without investigating these cases. We do not want to take 3 months' time to investigate them.

It is said, "You are creating a crisis." Bless my soul! We have had nothing but crises from 1932 to the present moment. We are now facing a real crisis. We are facing the crisis of whether we shall break up the American home. We are facing the crisis of whether we shall destroy democracy in this country while it is said we are fighting for the "four freedoms" across the water.

This summer a very reputable gentleman told me that he had talked with a Russian officer. I will not state the particular place at which the conversation occurred, but I know where it was. Allow me to say that my informant is a very reputable man. He said, "This Russian officer who was here this summer said to me, 'I do not see very much difference between your government and ours. The only difference I see is that we shoot men for inefficiency. We call it sabotage. You promote them.' "

Here is a letter from Pueblo, Colo. It states in part as follows:

Am sending you a clipping taken from the "Open forum" column of the Denver Post.

"Why draft fathers when soldiers loaf?" is the title of the clipping to which the letter refers. The clipping reads as follows:

To the Open Forum:

We represent a group of permanent party soldiers here in Denver who read recently an item in the Denver Post under the headline: "Find a war job or fight." This was addressed to married men. Now three of us are married and have children and we enlisted in the Army to do just that—to fight. Most of us have been here since we enlisted. Now, why should any man who is married be inducted into the Army just to hang around Lowry Field or any other Army base for the duration of the war?

Before the drafting of married men, especially fathers, is carried out why is it not first advocated sending overseas the men who are already in the Army and are only too anxious to go over there and fight?

PVT. (1st cl.) ROBERT E. DALY.
Sgt. H. L. STEINBOCK.
Staff Sgt. GUY SWANNEY.
Staff Sgt. WILLIAM BONNER.
LOWRY FIELD.

Here are four men, three of whom are married and have children, who read the article "Find a War Job or Fight." They enlisted in the Army to fight. They now say in effect, "We are lying around the field with nothing to do."

Here is a letter from an engineering contractor. It is from Los Angeles, Calif., and reads in part as follows:

Your statement that a considerable amount of the defense-plant labor is wasted is absolutely true, but I doubt if your statements are strong enough.

I am a successful contractor, 64 years of age, with 40 years' construction experience.

A registered Democrat.

For 6 months I worked in and along Lockheed and Vega aircraft plants and observed the way a lot of their employees wasted their time.

I also picked up a lot of the employees going to and from work, and the majority of them would brag as to what a small amount of work they did that day. Several times young men and their wives—both working in the same plant—would discuss what they had done all day, and invariably they would comment as to how little they had actually produced.

A man told me this morning that his son-in-law is employed by one of the plants as an expert, drawing over $600 a month, but he has not done a particle of work for over 6 weeks. He reports daily at the plant, then goes back home for the rest of the day.

As to the shipyards.

A construction superintendent who worked for us several years is now employed at one of the local shipyards. He made this statement to me: "It is a crime the way the men loaf on the job. If you had a contract for these ships, you would fire over one-third of the men and then get more work done." He has also stated that he knows he could do the work of four men, the way the average employee worked.

He thinks 10 percent of the men do not actually work over an hour a day, 25 percent do not work over 2 hours a day, and not over 25 percent actually try to produce.

What few that do try to earn their wages are continually "ribbed" by the loafers.

The cure for this inefficiency is to put the defense plants on a straight contract basis.

You may rest assured if this is done the man shortage will be relieved considerably as the plants will then lay off the "drones."

I hope you succeed in your efforts to defer pre-Pearl Harbor fathers as there will be plenty of orphans and dependents after this war.

Mr. President, that is the kind of reports which I receive.

Senators may go into any community in my State, I care not where, and they will see men such as carpenters and others who had been employed in defense and became so thoroughly disgusted that they returned to their homes. They will state that thousands upon thousands of men are employed in those plants. Last Saturday a man in the War Department said to me, "We sent a very well-known and very prominent man out to visit and inspect one of the war plants. He came back and said that everybody was working there." The man in the War Department then said to me, "I talked to some of the workers and they told me how the management put it over on the man who came to visit the plant." He said they told him they had not been working for several days, but when they knew the visitor was coming there the management shot the workers in to do some work.

I received a letter from a very prominent man in my State giving me similar information with reference to what was taking place in some of the plants engaged in defense work in my home State of Montana where first-class efficient employees were lying around with nothing to do. The men cannot be blamed when the industry itself, because of war contracts on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis, are employing large numbers of men for whom there is no work. We cannot blame the men. It is human nature. Many of them have said that they have a softer job than they had on W. P. A. and God knows that was soft enough for most of them. Who is to blame for it? Is the Congress of the United States to blame for it? Are fathers to blame for it? Are their children to blame for it? Who is to blame for it? The blame rests right here in the city of Washington. It rests right on the heads of various departments.

The assertion is often made, "You ought to go along with the administration; surely you desire unity." Certainly that would imply that I and all of us should simply permit this waste and inefficiency to continue to go on, and we ought to keep our mouths shut. We should not say anything because we ought to trust these departments. We ought to let the military service take fathers and break up homes. Well, others may do so but I am not going to do it. Others may do it because they have read headlines and editorials in some of the newspapers, the writers of which did not know or have the facts, and do not have them today. Let me say that Mr. Baruch did not have the facts; he could not have had the facts; Mr. Byrnes has not the facts, and no other heads of the departments have them. Mr. Baruch has done everything he could, and I think Mr. Byrnes is trying to do all he can; but what they ought to do is to dismiss some of the heads of the departments who have let these contracts; they ought to kick them out because of inefficiency and incompetence.

The War Manpower Commission admits 5-percent waste in manpower utilization; yet they, who have permitted this waste to go on, say it is necessary to draft fathers and break up homes. Does that make sense to anybody? We are told we must not vote to stop it; that we must vote to let it go on.

I read from an article by Ben W. Gilbert in the Washington Post:

War Manpower Commission officials yesterday frankly admitted that the country's labor could be used 25 percent more effectively than at present.

Here is a letter from Birmingham, Ala.—and I am sorry the Senators from Alabama are not present. The writer of the letter says:

My work carries me on many trips throughout the State of Alabama. I can assure you that in large cities and small villages, not only the pre-Pearl Harbor fathers but every citizen who can think two jumps ahead of the present hour, heartily endorses your fight to ban the drafting of heads of families.

In the event that the Army and Navy chieftains prevail, and it does become necessary to call us fathers to service, can't some provision be made to have the calls made in order of number of dependents, instead of by draft number? It appears obvious that the draft of a father with one child will in the great majority of cases work less hardship on innocent parties than will the drafting of a man who must leave a wife with two, three, or four children. And it does seem so pointless to have a man leave a family and three or four children while a father with one child in similar financial circumstances stays home, merely because the Godess of Chance smiled upon him when the order numbers were drawn in this draft lottery.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Has the Senator at hand and does he intend to place in the RECORD the Gallup poll on this issue?

Mr. WHEELER. I have not got it, but I understand that it showed, before any facts were brought out, that 66 percent were against drafting fathers.

Mr. DOWNEY. I may say to the distinguished Senator I think it was even stronger than that. I think about 75 percent of those who expressed an opinion, or 68 percent of the total number who were interviewed, were opposed to drafting fathers. A substantial minority did not express any opinion.

I should like to make a further comment. I have not a copy of the poll, but I think it ought to be placed in the RECORD, because, in my opinion, it is a clear indication that in the villages and cities of America where men are talking to their own boys in the service and know what men are doing in factories and on the farms, out there where the facts are known, our people know there is no excuse for the drafting of fathers. I think the Gallup poll should be in the RECORD.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator. I do not know whether we have it or not.

Mr. DOWNEY. If the Senator will further yield, I inquire if he would like to have a quorum called?

Mr. WHEELER. No, not just now.

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator has been talking for quite awhile.

Mr. WHEELER. Here is a letter from Dallas, Tex., in which the writer says:

Your heroic fight to preserve the United States of America, with its institutions and traditions, has caused many people to think, and to remain uninfluenced by fine phrases, promises, and threats.

He says further:

The writer realizes well that the General Staff and the War Department must have a free hand in the strategical and tactical battle plans. This policy is in no way related to such plan, and seems to be a mere whim of the War Department and General Staff to satisfy those who seek quick and frequent promotion. I would not ask you to interfere in the movement of troops or ships, or to have you suggest at which point our armed forces should strike. But I do feel that the personnel policies of the War Department—the relieving of these officers being only one—are not in the best interests of our country.

Hoping you can make your views heard in this matter, as you have made them heard in many other matters, I am—

Here is a letter from Indianapolis, Ind., written by the clerk of the city court, who says:

In my position as city clerk I come in contact with many people and naturally hear expressions of opinion on subjects of national interest I am taking this opportunity to pass on to you a few observations obtained from discussion on the subject of selective service as it applies to drafting of fathers which is now being considered by Congress.

The consensus of opinion seems to be the shortage of manpower, both in the armed forces and in defense industries is not due so much to the failure to draft fathers but the failure on the part of the Selective Service Bureau and the War Manpower Commis-

sion to coordinate their forces to their full extent.

He goes on to say:

The percentage of rejections and returns to civilian life in the bracket over 30 is now very large. It would undoubtedly be much larger if fathers were drafted.

In this connection let me call the attention of the Senate to the fact that there are in this country today over 3,000,000 men in the IV–F classification. Of that number the Army is taking 5 percent, and, according to all the reports I get, it is constantly releasing IV–F men after they have been taken into the service. These men are returning to civil life and are going to work in various industries in positions whicl. require strong, husky men.

Mind you, Mr. President, Russia, as everyone admits, has one of the best fighting forces in the world today. They have demonstrated that fact. I called the Russian Embassy and asked them what Russia's requirements were as to age and physical fitness. They said that from the northern part of their country the Russian Army takes men up to 50 years of age. In the southern section of the country the Russian Army does not take men up to 50 generally, because they are not so strong and so healthy and husky as those in the north.

Mr. President, there have been released from the service 275,000 men who are between the ages of 38 and 45, who passed every test given them by the local doctors and then by the Army, and who were inducted into the service. They have been discharged after having been given a year's training. Those are not my figures; they are the figures of the Army.

Now fathers are to be called. While the 275,000 men are not capable probably of undergoing severe training, yet the Army says that it is necessary to have one-third of those in the Army do what is called housekeeping work.

Mr. McNutt has been very severely criticised and General Hershey has been blamed for many things. Let me call attention to the fact that General Hershey stated that if the military services would reduce their standards and take some of the men from IV–F, they could get 2,000,000 more men for the Army and Navy.

I dare say Senators think that the British have a pretty good navy. The British boast of the fact, and everyone admits that the British have a pretty good navy. I called up the British Embassy and asked them for some figures, and I received a letter, from which I read:

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: I am sorry not to have been able to send you sooner the particulars about the physical standards in the British services for which you asked, but we have very little on the subject here and what we have is not very accessible.

Royal Navy: Neither before the war nor now were there any rigid physical standards laid down. Before the war the standard actually applied varied according to the supply of and demand for recruits. Today any man in a reasonable physical condition is accepted for general service on the principle that he can be fitted in somewhere. Certain physical standards are laid down for specific duties, such as aviation or the submarine service, and I understand that these are roughly comparable with those in force by the United States Navy. Men suffering from curable diseases are accepted and are treated after admission to the service. Only in tubercular cases are the standards quite uncompromising. The general principle is that if a man has been released for war service he can be fitted in somewhere, the substandard relieving a better man for a more active job.

Mr. President, if our Army and Navy would follow that principle there would be no excuse for taking the fathers of this country into the armed services. Yet we are letting many husky young men leave the Army and Navy day after day.

I might say that I went to my office Sunday to open the mail because I did not want it so cluttered up when we resumed our session in the Senate. One of my clerks was there helping me, and we worked from half-past 3 in the afternoon until 9 o'clock at night just opening the mail that came in upon the subject I am now discussing.

While I was in the office two men called me up, one from my home State, and one from the State of Louisiana. One of these men can speak English, Spanish, French, and German. He had been a school teacher when he enlisted in the Army. He wished to get an officer's commission, and the Army sent him around from pillar to post, and finally he wound up in Richmond, where they let him out because, they said, he had a slight defect in one of his eyes. He told me he never knew that he had a defect, but he stated that he could read perfectly without glasses. This young man said, "I am going to Canada and enlist in the Canadian Army, because I want to get into the war."

A man from my State also came to my office. He has been in the Army, and has been under training for nearly 2 years, but they are discharging him because he had been treated in the hospital for some slight disorder of the stomach. He said, "I am perfectly capable of going on and doing the kind of work I am doing now. I am not capable of going out into combat service or taking hard physical training, but I am perfectly capable of doing the work I am now performing." I think he has been stationed at Pittsburgh.

A very well known businessman of this city said to me Sunday morning, "You are absolutely right in the position you take. I have two sons in the Army. One of them is a big boy, who stands 6 feet 2, who could play baseball or football or any other game, but they were about to discharge him from the Army because it was said he had some physical defect. He wanted to stay in; so I went down and insisted and made a fight to have him stay in. The authorities finally had a board in Washington pass upon him, and the board said he was perfectly sound physically."

Mr. President, it is not a question between General Marshall and me; the question is, Do gentlemen want to be governed by the facts, or do they want to let people lead them around by the nose in order that the authorities may drive fathers into industry regardless of whether they should go into industry or not?

The letter from the British Embassy continues:

Army: The position here is rather more complicated. Before the war there were certain definite standards of height, age, chest measurement, etc. I am enclosing a copy of the Regulations, and you will find these standards given on pages 73 to 76. The principle today is rather different. The old standards have been given up, and men who are released for service are graded into a number of categories according to their physical fitness. I am enclosing a statement giving these categories and some particulars about them. Would you be so kind as to return to me these papers and the booklet of Regulations, as these are the only copies we have here?

I hope this gives you the information you wanted.

Believe me,

Very sincerely yours,

Maj. J. G. LOCKHART,
Private Secretary.

Mr. President, what are some of these categories? I read from the data furnished me by the British Embassy:

(1) Army category	(2) Army standard as regards physique and capabilities	(3) Locality in which men may normally be employed
A.1	See to shoot or drive. Can undergo severe strain without defects of locomotion, with only minor (remediable) disabilities.	Any area in a theater of war.
A.2	See to shoot or drive. Can undergo severe strain with slight defects of locomotion, with only minor (remediable) disabilities.	Do.
A.3	See to drive. Can undergo severe strain with or without slight defects of locomotion, with only minor (remediable) disabilities.	Do.
B.1	See to shoot or drive. Can undergo considerable exertion not involving severe strain without defects of locomotion, with moderate degree of disabilities.	L. of C., base or garrison service at home or abroad.
B.2	See to shoot or drive. Can undergo considerable exertion not involving severe strain, with defects of locomotion, with moderate degree of disabilities.	Do.
B.2a	See to drive. Can undergo considerable exertion not involving severe strain, with or without slight defects of locomotion, with moderate degree of disabilities.	Do.
B.3	See for ordinary purposes but not shooting or driving. Can undergo severe strain without defects of locomotion, with only minor (remediable) disabilities.	Do.
B.4	See for ordinary purposes but not shooting or driving. Can undergo severe strain with slight defects of locomotion, with only minor (remediable) disabilities.	Do.
B.5	See for ordinary purposes but not shooting or driving. Can undergo considerable exertion not involving severe strain with or without defects of locomotion, with moderate degree of disabilities.	Do.
B.6	Physique and standard of vision are good enough for a higher category but the man is placed in this category because of defective (standard 3) hearing.	Do.
C	Standard of vision is good enough for a higher category but the man is placed in this category because of marked defects of locomotion or marked physical disabilities or evidence of past disease, or combinations of these.	Home service only.

Mr. President, compare those with our standards. If we should lower our standards in a comparatively slight degree we would not have to take blind men or deaf men, but if we would lower the standards of the Army and Navy, as General Hershey stated, we could get 2,000,000 more men out of class IV-F.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I do not like to interrupt the Senator's speech.

Mr. WHEELER. That is all right.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has repeated two or three times that General Hershey said that 2,000,000 men could be obtained from class IV-F.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. On the basis of General Hershey's statement to the effect, as the Senator from Montana has said, that 2,000,000 men could be obtained from class IV-F, one could just as well say that 3,000,000 men could be obtained from class IV-F, because there are 3,000,000 men in IV-F.

Mr. President, I have before me part 2 of the hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs of September 15, 16, and 17, 1943. On page 190 of the hearings let us see just what General Hershey did say. General Hershey was testifying.

Senator WHEELER. The next question I wanted to ask you was: If these standards were lowered——

The Senator was talking about physical standards; if the physical standards were lowered.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. I read:

If these standards were lowered and a full check was made of the available single men in this country, and if the Army and Navy standards were lowered to take in some of the classifications you have named today, you would not have to take married men at least for a long time, would you?

GENERAL HERSHEY. That is right. We have 3,000,000 men, approximately, in IV-F, or a little more. If you could lower the standards to the place where you could take 2,000,000 of them, obviously you would put it off.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Of course that would result in putting off the drafting of married men. But that does not mean that General Hershey was advocating that we should go into class IV-F and take physically disqualified and disabled men. If it were desired to take all the men who have been disqualified for physical disabilities we could take 3,000,000 men, including one-legged men, one-eyed men, tubercular men, and men with all sorts of physical disabilities.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have not at any time contended that General Hershey advocated that such a course be followed, but what I shall say now, in view of the fact that the Senator from Alabama has brought up the question, is that Commissioner McNutt has advocated to the Army, and so has General Hershey, that the physical standards be lowered by the Army.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Montana is exactly correct in his statement. Governor McNutt and General Hershey both said that they had talked with Army officials, and I will even use the word "argued"—that they had perhaps argued with the Army officials and Navy officials about both branches lowering their physical standards.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. HILL. But let us see what General Hershey has to say about that. I have before me his testimony appearing on the same page from which I have just read, page 190. The Senator from Montana was interrogating General Hershey.

Senator WHEELER. As he said—

The Senator from Montana in his question has reference to Governor McNutt—

As he said, he or his War Manpower Board has disagreed with the Army and Navy with reference to the standards which they have had, because it did disturb or interfere with them getting the necessary single men and the married men without children.

General HERSHEY. That is correct. The procurement man must try, if he can, to sell what he has on hand. It is my business to sell every last man that the Army and Navy can possibly use.

Senator WHEELER. You have tried to the best of your ability to do that, but the Army and Navy have disagreed with you with reference to that.

General HERSHEY. They have come down some, but obviously they have not come down to the seller's market yet.

Senator WHEELER. They have not come down to the point where you think they should come down as a seller?

General HERSHEY. As a seller, I will try to sell every available man.

Senator WHEELER. I think you are doing the right thing. Not only that, but I think when you are doing that you are doing something that the country will thoroughly approve of before you take married men with children, because if anybody has seen the mail that is coming to me, there is no question at all but what the overwhelming majority of the people of this country, in my judgment—some of the Senators may disagree with me—but what the overwhelming majority of the people of this country is opposed to taking these fathers and breaking up the American home until all the other available people are taken into the Army and Navy.

Senator HILL. General, you spoke about being a salesman and selling your product. If you were a division commander at the front, you would be in a different position, would you not?

General HERSHEY. Obviously.

Senator HILL. And your views might be entirely different?

General HERSHEY. There is no question about that. If I were a battery commander, I probably would not want these people, but I am not a battery commander today.

Senator HILL. You are trying to sell your product?

General HERSHEY. Yes, sir; I am trying to sell my product.

Mr. HILL. Then General Hershey continued:

Yes. I tried to get people that I thought would actually stop that—

That is, stop drafting married men—

On the other hand, if General White—

General White is Assistant Chief of Staff, G-1 (personnel), War Department General Staff—

if General White would come to me and say, "If you were a member of my division, what would you advise me on this?" obviously my advice would have to be different because it is a different viewpoint.

General Hershey said he was speaking as a salesman, and was trying to get the Army and the Navy to take all they could.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course. That is exactly what I have been saying. There is no dispute about that matter. General Hershey and Mr. McNutt both stated that they felt the Army and the Navy should lower their physical standards.

Mr. President, Col. J. E. Nelson, State director, Selective Service System, Minnesota, appeared before the committee and said that the armed services had from time to time changed the physical standards, and complained bitterly with respect to the way the local boards had to handle the manpower situation in view of the changes which were made from time to time. Here is his testimony:

Colonel NELSON. I might say, to begin with, that the local boards are constantly combing over the IV-F's, and as new changes are made by the Army, as far as standards are concerned, we at our board have a medical officer and it is his job to work in conjunction with the local board, to see that those standards are followed by the local board.

Senator WHEELER. How many times do they change the standards?

Colonel NELSON. Senator, I believe, roughly, we have had standards changed around six to eight times.

Senator WHEELER. That is what I understood, that they changed the standards six or eight times. That has been of itself extremely confusing to many of the local boards.

Colonel NELSON. That is true, but the change in standards is almost immediately reflected by the local board, because their efforts may be in that direction. They realize there is a lot of manpower in there, or they feel there is a lot of manpower in that group that ought to be in the armed forces, and they are very anxious to get them out.

Mr. President, what is true of the draft boards in Minnesota is true with respect to practically every one of the draft boards throughout the United States. Who knows best the conditions which exist in a State? We have on the local draft boards responsible men, who have been picked because they are substantial citizens in their particular communities. Yet from time to time they are resigning their jobs. A few moments ago, in the absence of the junior Senator from Alabama, I read a letter from a local draft board in the State of Alabama. The writer complained with respect to what was happening in the great State of Alabama concerning single men and fathers.

I continue to read from the statement of Colonel Nelson:

Senator WHEELER. I know in my State many of the local boards were extremely confused. They hated to send a man up and then when he was turned back to send him up again. They said they would change so

often it meant they would have to keep calling this man up and sending him over there. They just did not like to be calling the fellow up and sending him over and having him come back and then sending him over again, because it upset his business, it upset him, it had a very confusing effect not only upon the man himself but upon the industry, upon the businessmen, and everybody else.

Colonel NELSON. Both confusing and embarrassing.

* * * * *

Senator BARKLEY. As to these six or eight changes in the standards that you speak of, were they made with the view of increasing the men drawn into the service from the pool, or were they made with the view of making it more difficult to get them in?

Colonel NELSON. I believe the Army ought to answer that, but I would say offhand, from the administration of the selective-service standpoint, that it works both ways. Some have been in the interest of getting more manpower for the armed forces, and others have been as the result, in all probability, of the difficulties they encountered in the service through certain physical deficiencies, and, therefore, it was necessary to change the standards.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has referred to Colonel Nelson, of Minnesota. General Hershey described himself as a national salesman, and just as General Hershey is a national salesman, so, to use General Hershey's expression, Colonel Nelson is the salesman in the State of Minnesota. Colonel Nelson makes it clear that even if some men could be squeezed out from the physically disabled group in class 4–F, and some additional men could be picked up here and there, still it would be necessary to draft fathers.

On page 151 of Colonel Nelson's testimony the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] asked the following question of Colonel Nelson:

I should like to ask you whether, as director of the selective service of Minnesota, you would be able to fill the quotas without drafting the fathers that are involved in this bill?

Colonel NELSON. I would say "Decidedly 'no.'" We have approximately 8 percent of our registrants that are in 4–F.

Of course, as we know, the men in 4–F are the men who have been rejected because of physical disability.

Colonel Nelson then said:

We have approximately 450,000 registrants from 18 to 38. Therefore, there are roughly around 36,000 or 37,000 in that classification.

Meaning the men in the 4–F physical-disability classification.

While we feel, if the Army and Navy would reduce their standards to some degree, we could produce probably a small fraction of that number for service in the armed forces, that it would be helpful in lowering the number of fathers we should ultimately have to call.

Senator BARKLEY. In other words, then, if I understand you, in your State, after you have rescreened—

That is, after the men in the physical-disability class have been reexamined, and after just as many of them as possible have been squeezed out of that class—all those who are in the other categories, whether illiterates, defectives, or any other categories, after you have taken in all those you expect to take in, you still are required to induct fathers in order to meet the quota?

Colonel NELSON. If the armed forces remain steadfast in what they must have in the forces, I see no other alternative.

No other alternative than to draft fathers.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, Mr. President; but that testimony does not change the situation in the slightest degree, because Colonel Nelson went on to say how the men in his State are healthier and stronger. But the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama talks about these men being silly. The men take an examination. Those who give the examination know the men from their own communities. They see them and understand them and feel that they should be in the Army. They see them go to the various induction centers, for instance to the one at Missoula, Mont., and then learn that sometimes 30 percent of those who have taken the first examination have been sent back, after having traveled 300 or 400 miles. I have seen that happen in own State time and time again. I have seen instance after instance of men who have been rejected subsequently going to work on the railroads or in factories, and demonstrating that they are just as strong as men in the services.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Colonel Nelson in his testimony takes the position that, although the Army and the Navy do not take some men who should be taken, even if such men were taken the Army and the Navy would not be able to reduce materially the number of fathers who ultimately must be taken.

Furthermore, let me say that the inductee receives only a cursory examination at the hands of the Selective Service. He does not get a really thorough or complete examination until he arrives at the induction center, where the examination is given by the Army.

Mr. WHEELER. The inductees certainly are given more than a cursory examination when they are sent to Missoula, Mont. I submit one can go into any local community in the country and can obtain the facts and will find men who have been rejected at the induction centers but who are good, strong, husky men.

Of course, the total number of fathers involved, according to the general, is 446,000. If from the more than 3,000,000 men in class IV–F it is impossible to obtain a sufficient number of men to take the places of some of those who are needed in the combat service, when one-third of the Army will not be in combat service but will be doing housekeeping work, as the Army terms it, or work in the Services of Supply, or work in guarding bridges, then something is radically wrong.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall suggest one instance, which possibly can be multiplied many thousand times, of what the Senator from Montana has in mind. I know of a young man in my State who is in as good physical condition as possibly any young man in the Army. He is unmarried; but early in life, when he was 2 or 3 years of age, he had the unfortunate experience of having a small, two-by-four operation on his jaw, and he has a little disfigurement in his lower jaw. Aside from that disfigurement, he is in perfect condition. His heart, his lungs, his whole physical make-up are in perfect condition. Not only that, but he is very well trained. However, he is working for one of the agencies of the Federal Government because he cannot fit into the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize how easy it is for any of us, I suppose, to see or hear of some individual case and then multiply it by any number of multiples which we may imagine would fit the situation. The Senator from Montana spoke about the sending of men to Missoula to be examined. I presume that is the induction point.

Mr. WHEELER. It was. I think perhaps it has since been changed.

Mr. BARKLEY. They had gone through what the Senator from Alabama called a cursory examination by the draft board in the county; is that correct?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. And then they were sent to Missoula for induction. The Senator from Montana says that many of those men who were rejected and who came back home, were physically strong and able to be in the Army, and that subsequently they worked on the railroad tracks or engaged in other labor. How does the Senator know that of his own knowledge?

Mr. WHEELER. How do I know that?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. Because I have seen it with my own eyes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me ask the Senator about that. The Senator was not at Missoula, and did not see the men examined there, I presume?

Mr. WHEELER. No; but I have seen the men who came back.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did the Senator see them working on railroad tracks?

Mr. WHEELER. I did not see them working on railroad tracks, but I have seen them.

Mr. BARKLEY. But the Senator mentioned railroad tracks.

Mr. WHEELER. It is not a question of my seeing each and every one of them, because I do not imagine the Senator from Kentucky is able to see all the people of Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; and I am not going to imagine the condition of all the people of Kentucky whom I cannot see.

Mr. WHEELER. That is not necessary; but in many instances I have talked to the boys, and have talked to those in the services. If for one moment the

Senator does not believe what I am saying, let him go into his own State or into any other State of the Union, and he will find that the facts I am stating will be confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have serious doubt about whether it would be possible to go into any or all the States and to have confirmed the statements the Senator has made as facts. I am sure the Senator is serious in stating his belief of whatever the facts may be; but there are not enough Regular Army physicians to examine all the men. Many of the physicians, now in the Army, who examined the men are physicians who, until the war, had been in civilian life and in civilian practice. They do the best they can to pass upon the physical fitness of the men they examine, in accordance with the regulations and the standards fixed by the Army. They have to do that. It may be that now and then they reject some one about whom they have doubt, some one who might turn out to be a good soldier. However, I do not think it is fair to indict all the doctors of the country who have gone into the Army and now are examining the men who may be drafted by saying that they reject from the Army men who may merely have some slight physical defect. Those doctors are just as sincere and honest and patriotic as the rest of the Army; and I do not think it is fair to speak as the Senator from Montana has spoken, of all the doctors who have gone into the Army service from the practice of civilian medicine.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me say it is perfectly ridiculous to make such a statement as that, because I have not said anything of the sort.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has talked about the rejection of men by doctors, and they are rejected by doctors who have been taken from civilian life.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand that; but I do not intend to let the Senator from Kentucky put such words in my mouth.

Mr. BARKLEY. What did the Senator intend to infer? He spoke of the men being rejected.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course; but if the Senator had listened to what I have said this afternoon——

Mr. BARKLEY. I have listened to all of it, and I have read all the hearings at which I was not present. I was present at most of them.

Mr. WHEELER. What I said was that it is not the fault of the local doctors, but the fault lies in putting the men in Class IV–F.

Mr. BARKLEY. The men put in class IV–F were not necessarily put there by local doctors who were in the locality when the men came before the draft boards, but they were put in that class by Army doctors, most of whom were taken from local, civilian practice, as we all know.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no. The Senator is entirely mistaken.

Mr. BARKLEY. No one else could examine them.

Mr. WHEELER. They were examined in Missoula, Mont., by local doctors.

Mr. BARKLEY. Those doctors may have been local doctors, but I dare say that they were part of the Army staff of examiners.

Mr. WHEELER. They were not. The Senator does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have a good example in following the Senator from Montana in that regard.

Mr. WHEELER. When the Senator makes such a statement, he is entirely mistaken.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not talking about the local draft boards. The men at the induction centers are examined by doctors who are charged by the War Department with responsibility.

Mr. WHEELER. That is a different thing.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is talking about Missoula. That is an induction point.

Mr. WHEELER. Let us get this matter straight. First, they were screened in a certain place. They were passed upon by the local doctors in the local community.

Mr. BARKLEY. That was before the draft board.

Mr. WHEELER. That was before the draft board. Then they were sent to Missoula, Mont.——

Mr. BARKLEY. Which is an induction point.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know whether it can be called an induction point or not; but at that time doctors from Montana examined the men. The system may have changed.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would not be necessary to go outside Montana to obtain good doctors. However, they would conduct such examinations as a part of the Army examining board.

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly; but they were not in the Army. They were not Army officers.

Mr. BARKLEY. They are charged with moral responsibility.

Mr. WHEELER. But they are not Army doctors.

Mr. BARKLEY. They may not have been in uniform.

Mr. WHEELER. Those doctors, of course, were doing what they had to do because of the physical standards of the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course; and any doctor who is charged by his Government with the responsibility of passing upon the physical qualifications of a man who is about to be inducted, whether the doctor has on a uniform or wears civilian clothes, is going to perform his duty to the best of his ability. I dare say that even the physicians who are in the Reserve, but who may be called upon to examine draftees, are just as conscientious in the performance of their duties as though they were in uniform.

The Senator may have unwittingly done so, but it seems to me that by his illustration he left certain unfair inferences. He stated that many drafted men had been sent to Missoula and examined there. Missoula is one of the larger cities in Montana, and it is a center where men come from the draft boards. The Senator made the statement that many men who should have been kept in the Army were being sent home. Whether they were examined by local physicians or Army physicians, or by reserve physicians, it seems to me that to say that many of them who ought to have been kept in the Army were rejected is a reflection upon the skill and ability of the physicians who examined them. The Senator may well contend, as he has done all along, that the Army standards are too high. That is a matter which is, of course, subject to debate; but I would not be willing to substitute my judgment or the judgment of Congress as to the physical standards of the men who are to do the fighting, for that of the Army and Navy. We must leave the decision of that question to the Army and the Navy.

Mr. WHEELER. First of all, the Senator is in error in his statement of facts, and he is in error as to what I said. I believe that the doctors of Montana know me at least as well as does the Senator from Kentucky, or perhaps better.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say that if they know the Senator as well as I do, they know him pretty well.

Mr. WHEELER. They do. I have lived there a long time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have known the Senator for a long time, and I have enjoyed that privilege. I hope the Senator and I can disagree honestly and sincerely, without in any way reflecting upon each other's good faith in the matter. I certainly have no such intention.

Mr. WHEELER. What I said was that many men were being rejected for military service because of the high standards adopted by the Army. That is the only excuse. I assume that the doctors were doing their duty. I believe they were; but I am saying that a great many men in this country, who should be in the Army, are being rejected for military service. I repeat that statement, notwithstanding the fact that some Army officer may say to the contrary. I do not believe that because a man puts on a uniform we must take his word for everything he says. If that situation should arise in the United States, our Government would be gone. The Senator is setting up a straw man, and saying that because someone wears a uniform he is perfect, and that we must not question anything he says or does.

I have called attention to what the Russian Army does. It takes men up to 50 years of age. Russia has the best fighting force in the world. I have called attention to what the British Navy does. It takes men from all classes. What I am saying is that, in my judgment, before the Army takes fathers and destroys the homes of the United States, it ought to take some of the IV–F men. I say further that we ought to drive the slackers out of the Government departments and out of jobs in industry, where they are hiding from the draft.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Under the rules of the

Senate, occupants of the galleries are not permitted to indulge in manifestations of approval or disapproval. The Chair respectfully requests that the occupants of the galleries respect those rules.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. During the course of his remarks the Senator from Montana referred to slackers in the Government service. He also did so during the examination of the witnesses who appeared before the Military Affairs Committee. I am just as anxious as the Senator from Montana could possibly be to weed out of the Government departments any so-called slackers who are hiding behind desks in order to escape military service. However, it seems to me unfair, without designating who the slackers are, to hurl a general charge against everyone in the Government service because there may be some. I wonder if the Senator from Montana, on his responsibility as a United States Senator, is willing or able to give the name of a single man in the Government service who ought to be in the Army instead of where he is.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, I cannot particularize.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator think it is fair to say that there are hundreds of thousands of such men in Washington? I should like to have the Civil Service Commission, the War Manpower Commission, or some other agency, conduct a census in Washington in all the departments to find out how many men there are of military age who could pass a physical examination and go into the Army. There may be some, and if there are any they ought to be weeded out; but I do not think it is fair to condemn all the departments in Washington as being honeycombed with men of that type, unless the Senator can give their names and tell what jobs they hold.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me give certain figures from the Costello committee report with respect to the selective-service status of Federal employees between the ages of 18 and 37. There are 197,656 single men without children.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator know how many of those 197,656 single men without children have been examined for military service, how many have been accepted, and how many have been rejected?

Mr. WHEELER. No; but I do know that many of them have been deferred by the departments, because of the fact that it is said that they are considered necessary in the Government.

Mr. BARKLEY. That may be. Some of them have been deferred.

Mr. WHEELER. I know that some of them who have been deferred have wives working in the departments.

Mr. BARKLEY. That may be; but some one ought to get the exact information and give it to the Senate.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. It ought not to be said that there are hundreds of thousands of them, without identifying a single one of them.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree that some one ought to get the facts; but it is not my duty. It is not my duty to weed them out of the Government service, or out of industry. That is the duty of the Government, and the Government bureaus.

Mr. BARKLEY. General Hershey testified before the committee that such men are being weeded out every day. They are being reexamined every day. I think that any Senator who makes the blanket charge that there are hundreds of thousands of men in the departments who ought to be in the Army, owes some responsibility to the Senate.

Mr. WHEELER. I say that there are hundreds of thousands of men in the Government service, both married and single, who should be in the Army. Many of them have been deferred. The departments have no right to ask for their deferment, because they are not essential to carrying on the services of the Government. The Senator asked me to point out a single individual. I am not going around as a snooper to find out such things. That is not my duty. That is the duty of the heads of the departments.

The Senator and I know of one man who was deferred because of the fact he was in one department drawing down $10,000 a year, while his wife was working in another department.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator may know about it, but I do not know it. I do not know who the man was.

Mr. WHEELER. The facts have not been made public. I do not care to give his name.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator says he does not care to give his name.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not care to give names on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know how easy it is for Senators—we are all guilty of it now and then—to make blanket charges against groups of persons, but sometimes when we do that we create the impression throughout the United States that here in Washington the heads of various bureaus and departments deliberately hoard men because they want to protect them from being called into military service. However, I submit that when we refer to them we owe it to the country to name them. If I should make a charge of some kind against individuals or a group of individuals I should feel that I should name at least one of them.

Mr. WHEELER. If I should name one of them it would be said it was unfair for me to name him.

Mr. BARKLEY. Instead of naming one, the Senator blankets all of them in his statement.

Mr. WHEELER. What the Senator is seeking to do is to have called married men who are fathers of children and to cause children to be put into the street without first requiring an investigation to be made in various departments, and calling those who are not fathers, and then drafting into the military service the slackers in industry.

If the Senator wants names and statements, I will say to him that I have been reading for the past 2 hours statements and communications from professors, and representatives of labor organizations, and I have given names. I read communications from the C. I. O. in an aluminum factory, when the Senator was not present in the Chamber. I read a statement received from workers engaged in the automobile industry at Flint. I read statements from representatives of the C. I. O., and certainly the C. I. O. is not antiadministration. I read a statement from the C. I. O. at Rockford, Ill.

Mr. BARKLEY. We all receive letters.

Mr. WHEELER. But these letters give facts.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to say——

Mr. WHEELER. Just a moment; I will yield in a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana refuse to yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. WHEELER. No; I do not refuse to yield. I will yield in a moment. I never refuse to yield to the Senator from Kentucky, but I should like to finish my statement.

All I am asking in the pending bill is that fathers be deferred for 3 months so that we may investigate the charges which have been made by representatives of organized labor, representative businessmen, representative lawyers, and representative doctors from one end of the country to the other. Many complaints have come from them, as well as from leaders of the Catholic Church, the Methodist Church, the Lutheran Church, and every other denomination in the country.

Why the haste? What is the emergency which warrants the Government starting Friday to draft fathers?

I invite attention to the fact that the pending bill was introduced in February of this year, and not a thing was done about it for some time.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Montana did not come before the Military Affairs Committee until the 5th of May.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, yes; I went before the Military Affairs Committee, but the Senator asked that the bill be sent back to the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. What Senator made the request?

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was not reported out of the Military Affairs Committee until July 2, 1943.

Mr. WHEELER. I was about to offer the bill on the floor of the Senate as an amendment to a bill then pending, and it was referred to the Military Affairs Committee and I consented to it being sent there. After it was referred to the committee the committee requested reports from the War Department and the Navy Department, both of which sent letters to the committee. I went before the committee in May and was heard with reference to the bill. That was the first time I appeared before the committee. I appeared before

the committee again, because nothing was done about the bill after the first hearing. I went before the committee in July, and in July the committee reported the bill by a vote of 11 to 3. During all that period of time the administration and the various departments to which reference has been made had the matter before them. They knew it was scheduled to come up for consideration, and they could have appeared before the Military Affairs Committee with their generals, their admirals, and everybody else, but they did nothing.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I will yield in a moment. After the bill was reported nothing was done about it until the reconvening of Congress following the summer recess. A few days before Congress reconvened I telegraphed the Senator from Kentucky and asked him to reconvene the Senate in order to take up the bill, because I foresaw exactly the condition which would confront us.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Since the Senator has referred to the history of the bill, allow me to say that the Senator introduced his bill in February.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct; in February.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator went before the Military Affairs Committee on the 5th of May. The committee heard him, and subsequently submitted a report to the Senate.

Mr. WHEELER. They heard Colonel Keesling.

Mr. BARKLEY. They received letters from the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War, both of whom opposed the bill.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator again went before the Military Affairs Committee, not in a hearing, but to ask them to report the bill, and he stated that if they would do so he would not ask to have the bill taken up on the floor of the Senate until after the summer recess.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was understood on the part of the Senator from Montana that the bill would not be taken up until after the summer recess. The Senator telegraphed me and asked that under the terms of the joint resolution authorizing the summer recess I take steps to reconvene the Senate in order to take up his bill. I declined to do so, for reasons which I set out in a telegram to him. We then returned after the recess. Practically every Member of the Senate had felt there had been no hearings held upon the bill commensurate with the importance of the subject. Consideration of the bill was delayed so the Military Affairs Committee could hear testimony. Hearings have been held during the past 10 days or 2 weeks.

So if there has been any delay in consideration of the bill, the Army officers and the Navy officers are not responsible. It was not their duty to rush to the Capitol unless they were invited by the committee to come. The committee asked for a report from two Departments—namely, the Navy Department and the War Department—as it always does when considering legislative proposals of this character. The committee made its report, and when the bill was reported the report consisted only of the letter of the Secretary of the Navy and the letter of the Secretary of War. They did not give any facts whatever on which the committee reported the bill. I do not say that in criticism of anyone, but the report contained only the letters from the Secretary of War and from the Secretary of the Navy.

Allow me to return now to the Senator's statement that letters and protests have come from different persons. We all receive letters in protest of something nearly every day. We give them consideration, and, so far as I am concerned, I always answer them in my office. Have the persons who have written to the Senator about individuals who they believe should have been inducted into the Army instead of being rejected gone to the local boards and made their protests there?

Mr. WHEELER. Some of them have.

Mr. BARKLEY. Have any of them gone before the State boards and lodged their protests with those bodies? They have a right to do so. Have they been to their State board and called attention to the fact that, for example, some man who had been examined and rejected appeared to be sufficiently strong and robust to be in the Army? Have the persons who have objected to various things which have taken place gone before the authorities in their local communities and lodged their protests with them. Or have they merely contented themselves with protesting to the members of the Senate, who have no authority to act locally, who do not know anything about the men involved, and cannot have the facts regarding their physical qualifications, so as to enable them to say whether they should be in or out of the Army? It seems to me that any protest about someone in a particular neighborhood being rejected should be taken before the board which has the responsibility of acting.

Mr. WHEELER. If the Senator from Kentucky had been in the Chamber and had listened to me he would have heard me call attention to a number of letters which bear upon that subject. I will read from one of them again.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not care to hear the Senator's speech again.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator asked for it, and I want to give him the information. Here is the letter from the——

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the letter to which the Senator is about to call attention a part of the printed hearings?

Mr. WHEELER. It is. I will give the name of the organization writing the letter. It is from Local No. 24, Aluminum Workers of America, Fairfield, Conn.

Mr. BARKLEY. On what page of the hearings does the letter appear?

Mr. WHEELER. On page 386. I read:

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned committee—

This is the Aluminum Workers of America. It is not an antilabor group, or an antiadministration group. This is a group from whom the administration receives some of its chief labor support.

We, the undersigned committee, duly appointed by Local Union No. 24, Aluminum Workers of America, to investigate discrimination in deferments, hereby request that you present the following evidence before the Military Affairs Committee.

We have been investigating deferments for several months, and we find that many single men, working in the United States Aluminum Co. plants in Bridgeport and Fairfield, including the magnesium plant, are given deferments, and married men were drafted. We have also found that men working here came from other States, and were given indefinite deferments by their local boards.

The information we received was to the effect that some States compel their citizens to repay the State, county, or municipality for any relief received during depressions, etc. These men came to work in various defense plants in Connecticut, with indefinite deferments, and each pay day money was sent home to repay the debt. Our local boards, having no jurisdiction over these out-of-State men, could not call them into service. This information was given me by a member of local board 22 B. Our local men were called into service, and although they were experienced men, were replaced by these men with indefinite deferments, who had little or no experience.

We also found that officials of the Aluminum Co. have sons or relations who have been sent to the Fairfield and Bridgeport plants and placed in positions that could be classified as essential to the war efforts. However, we find these men walking around with pads and pencils in their hands or sitting at a typewriter. These men are single and should be drafted.

We have complained to the State selective-service board and given them many names. However, nothing is being done about it.

The Senator asked if complaints had been made. Here is one, and it is stated that nothing has been done about it.

We therefore condemn the practice of selective service in calling married men when single men and men who married since Pearl Harbor were deferred.

We would also recommend that Congress make it compulsory that a committee be appointed in each plant to work in conjunction with management relative to requests for deferments, and making up of replacement schedules.

We would also request that all records of draft boards be open to the public for inspection. This will stop discrimination.

We also find that many men who are single have had five or six deferments and many married men are refused deferments.

We believe that 200 to 275 single men could be taken from these plants. This does not include marriages before Pearl Harbor. Hardship cases are rarely given consideration by local boards. We have a case of James Lewis Martino, order No. 1633, local board 8 B, New Haven, Conn. He is a core maker; married November 27, 1941. He was told by his local board that he could not appeal as he was going in October. We are contacting State selective service headquarters for a deferment. The U. S. Aluminum Co. has applied for a deferment and it was denied. Refusing the man the right to appeal is a violation of the Selective Service Act.

We have complained to General Hershey about the discrimination in deferments, and were referred to the State selective service board at West Hartford, Conn. We contacted

this board and they promised to investigate, but nothing has been done.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator if that is not a letter written to the Senator from Montana by Mr. Clifford S. Unger?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The State selective service boards deal with cases that have come up from the local boards on appeal. Either the man who is inducted can appeal to the State selective service board or the Government itself can do so. The question I ask the Senator is whether, according to this letter, this committee had gone to the local board and pointed out the individuals they thought ought to be drafted and not rejected, because to go first to the State selective service board is to go over the head of the local draft board in each county. Therefore, it seems to me that before resort to the State selective service board, either on appeal or otherwise, there ought to be some effort made to bring these particular cases to the attention of the local draft boards, who are on the ground and who have a right to investigate every one of them if it is brought to their attention.

Mr. WHEELER. I will venture the assertion, without knowing it to be true, that the committee went to a local board first, but I do not know.

Mr. BARKLEY. It does not say that.

Mr. WHEELER. It does not say that, but they went to the State selective service board and then they took it up with General Hershey. What more could they do?

Mr. BARKLEY. In that particular case if they did not go to the local board they ought to have done so. The State selective service board passes upon the questions that come up to them. Either side then can appeal to General Hershey under the law Congress enacted. If they have gone over the head of the local board in regard to individuals who live in the county and concerning whom the local board could have ascertained information, probably they may not have known all the details and minutiae of bringing such matters to the attention of the proper board, but it seems to me that any committee or any individual is acting inadvisedly in overlooking the local board and taking individual cases to the State board without bringing them to the attention of the local board who can investigate the facts.

Mr. WHEELER. Then what the Senator says is if some of the single men were deferred, and they did not go to a local board but only went to the State board, and then went to General Hershey, we ought immediately to hasten to take fathers and break up homes before we have a general investigation and check upon whether other men can be taken. That is the effect of the position the Senator is taking at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not the effect of the position I am taking.

Mr. WHEELER. I will let the facts speak for themselves.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say that if we do not raise an army in the United States until all complaints have been investigated the war will be over before we ever get down to the point where we find out what the facts are.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no, that is not any excuse. We have an army at the present time of 7,300,000 men and we can possibly send overseas, according to the Army itself, more than 5,000,000 men at the end of 1944.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me correct the Senator there. Army officers, including General Marshall and all the others, testified that they propose, according to their plans which have been worked out over a period of months, a net of 5,000,000 men in the Army overseas at the end of 1944. That means, according to their testimony, that they must take over 5,750,000 men in order to have a net 5,000,000 at the time, because the replacements amount to about 75,000 men a month even now, and that number will increase as we become more active on the battle fronts and as casualties increase. So, in order to get a 5,000,000-man army at the end of next year it will be necessary to transport five-and-three-quarters million men.

Mr. WHEELER. That is not what General Marshall said.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will read the hearings he will find that that was the testimony.

Mr. WHEELER. I have read the testimony. What General Marshall said, at any rate, was that we had an army of 7,300,000. I read from the statement of General McNarney:

Senator WHEELER. Now, I did not quite understand one figure you gave. I may have misunderstood you. My understanding is that you said that you expected to send overseas 5,000,000 by the end of 1944.

General MCNARNEY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will follow on further in the hearings——

Mr. WHEELER. Wait a moment. I am reading from the testimony of General McNarney:

Senator WHEELER. And by the end of 1943 you expect to have in the Army 7,700,000 men.

Genera MCNARNEY. Correct.

Senator WHEELER. That would leave something like 2,700,000 men in the United States, if you didn't take anyone else in the Army, by the end of 1944?

General MCNARNEY. By the end of 1944; yes.

Senator WHEELER. You have 2,700,000 men in the United States.

General MCNARNEY. That is correct.

I do not know what could be plainer.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will read further from the testimony—whether it is on that page or not I do not know—not only General McNarney, but General Marshall himself——

Mr. WHEELER. I read General McNarney's statement, and that is what he said.

Mr. BARKLEY. In my own time I shall read his answer to my question if the Senator does not want to do it.

Mr. WHEELER. I am willing to read it, but I am reading now from the statement made by General McNarney.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. WHEELER. Before yielding I desire to call attention to another statement, because it has been suggested that no one called the facts I have mentioned to the attention of anybody. Here is another complaint from the United Automobile, Aircraft and Agriculture Implement Workers of America, dated September 17, 1943:

United States Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, a committee elected by the membership of Chevrolet Local No. 659, United Automobile Workers—Congress of Industrial Organizations, to investigate the rumors prevalent in the Flint Chevrolet plants that management has appointed mere boys—who are the sons of Chevrolet superintendents and other high officials—foremen, for the sole purpose of enabling them to evade being inducted into the armed services.

The committee was appointed for this purpose.

After investigation we find that unquestionably this has been done and that circumstances make it appear that there may have been collusion between certain corporations and the W. M. C. in this matter.

Some time ago Major General Hershey stated publicly that the only thing that would drive the draft dodgers out of the plant was public indignation.

Who said "draft dodgers"? General Hershey said it.

A short time ago, State Director of Selective Service Pearson stated that corporations who had requested temporary deferment for certain employees had been given sufficient time to replace them and must do so at once.

A few days later management appointed these 22-year-old employees to foremanships, and almost immediately thereafter the War Manpower Commission issued a list of deferable occupations, which included foremen in industry converted to war production. This is what makes it appear as if there may have been collusion.

We would like to point out that it is only necessary for a corporation to request a deferment on Form 42a without explanation, and draft boards have no alternative, but must grant deferment without question as to whether or not the man in whose behalf the request is made is entitled to deferment.

We are confident that these conditions also exist at Buick, A. C. Fisher, and other Flint General Motors plants.

We have also turned over to the local officials of the Federal Bureau of Investigation evidence of gross irregularities in the use of manpower at a time when admittedly a serious manpower shortage exists, but no action has been taken as yet.

Hundreds of women have been hired at Chevrolet to replace men in recent months, yet management of Chevrolet is in the habit of drafting war workers from the shops to work on their private estates and conveying them back and forth to the plant, where they punch in and out, in company cars.

Equipment has also been removed from the plant and transported to the homes of officials of Chevrolet for their private use.

We would respectfully call your attention to the fact that, because of these conditions, the membership of Local No. 659, United Automobile Workers—Congress of Industrial Organizations—Flint, Mich., by secret ballot, voted more than 2 to 1 to repeal the no-strike pledge, and proceeded to set up a strike committee and a committee to investigate draft evasion in the plant.

A virtual state of fascism exists at Chevrolet, and collective bargaining has broken down almost completely.

Most of the men on this committee are veterans of World War No. 1, and we have the word of several hundred veterans that they will not work longer with these draft dodgers, and the sentiment of the rank and file of our local is reflected in the vote to repeal the no-strike pledge.

We request that the Government investigate conditions here without delay for the purpose of keeping Chevrolet-Flint in operation.

Many of our members are being prepared for induction, some of whom have as many as seven children. We ask that the necessary steps be taken to insure that the induction of fathers be halted until these draft dodgers are inducted.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield in order that I may call attention to General Marshall's testimony upon the question of the 5,000,000 men, on page 284 of the hearings?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes, but I was reading General McNarney's testimony.

Mr. BARKLEY. General McNarney answered at another place the same question which I propounded to General Marshall, but if the Senator will permit, I should like to read what General Marshall said, as it is found on page 284 of the record, about the middle of the page:

Senator BARKLEY. Would you be able to estimate the number above 5,000,000 that you will have to send over, in order to have a net army of 5,000,000?

General MARSHALL. Seven hundred and fifty-thousand.

Senator BARKLEY. So that you would really have to send over a total number of 5,750,000 men, in order to have an army, a net army, of 5,000,000 at the end of next year?

General MARSHALL. Yes, sir.

Senator BARKLEY. And those 750,000 would have to be drawn into the Army from those not now in, except as it would involve men already in the Army who had been sent back?

General MARSHALL. That is correct.

Senator BARKLEY. And you think that the shipping, the increase in our shipping facilities, as we understand them to be, will be sufficient to create the momentum from day to day or month to month that will enable you to send that many men overseas?

General MARSHALL. That is according to our calculations.

Mr. WHEELER. That is, according to his calculation that he wants to have 5,000,000 men overseas, but according to his own figures, he is still going to have about 2,700,000 men in the United States at the end of 1944.

Mr. BARKLEY. A large number of them will still be in training, because they will be taken in at the end of this year.

Mr. WHEELER. If they are still to be in training, then there is no excuse whatever for taking 446,000 fathers before 1946, because we would still have over a year to train them.

Mr. BARKLEY. We undertook, when we passed the draft law, to provide that men should not be sent overseas until they had had a year's training, and that is what the Army has attempted to do when they have trained them in units. They have made exceptions to that rule where they have to put men in existing units as replacements, because they can train a man who goes into an old unit more rapidly than they can train a whole new unit, on the same theory that we who were raised in the country understand that if we train a young horse we can train him faster if we put him in a team with an older horse than if we put two young horses together.

Mr. WHEELER. It does not make any difference; if we take 446,000 fathers and put them into the Army tomorrow, and ship them overseas at the end of 1944, we will still have 2,700,000 men left in the United States. I do not think for a moment that the Army is going to take these 446,000 men and ship them overseas and put them into the various units, when they will have available men who have been trained for 2 or 3 years, and who are still in the United States doing guard duty around bridges, and performing other work of that kind. When someone who happened to put on the uniform a year or so ago now comes forward and says, "We have to have these men, and we cannot have anyone but first-class combat soldiers to do guard work," it just does not make common, ordinary sense, and I refuse to follow some statements which have been made merely because they are made by some Army officer, if they do not make sense.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator know how many bridges are being guarded in the United States?

Mr. WHEELER. No; but I know the testimony was that about one-third of the Army is needed for noncombat service.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is mistaken in that. The testimony was that about one-third of the Army is required for what they call housekeeping. I do not like that word, because it creates a misinterpretation of what the men are doing.

Mr. WHEELER. That is what the Army used to call it.

Mr. BARKLEY. That includes truck drivers who take ammunition up to the front; it includes engineers who prepare roads and bridges; it includes everyone who is not actually carrying a gun or operating a tank or an airplane. So when we say that it takes a third of the Army to perform these other duties in order to keep the Army moving, and we call that housekeeping, it creates the impression that all they are doing is sweeping and cooking.

Mr. WHEELER. I have not called it housekeeping; that is what the Army calls it. But the British are taking and have been taking men who, while perhaps unfit for combat duty, can drive trucks, and the British have been putting them into the Army. If the British Army can do it, then there is no reason why the Army of the United States should not do it before we break up American homes. That is the very thing for which I am contending. In order to be a truck driver a man does not have to be physically fit enough to be a combat soldier, and when the Army discharges 275,000 men between the ages of 38 and 45, 275,000 in one crack, will anyone tell me they could not be used as truck drivers? Will anyone tell me that when such men pass the highest physical examination of the Army before they are taken in they cannot drive trucks and do housekeeping duty, but should be discharged from the Army, while the father is to be taken from his children and his wife compelled to go to work in a factory, as the wives are doing in many instances, in order to support themselves and the children, thus destroying the American home?

There used to be a Federal judge in Montana, one of the very best judges we ever had, who used to say, "Ordinarily you know by the weight of the evidence what the facts are, but if a man comes in and tells you he saw an elephant climbing a telephone pole, you do not have to believe it." When some one says that men between the ages of 38 and 45, who have passed a physical examination, could not drive trucks and do some of the "housekeeping" work, it does not make good sense, particularly in view of the fact that the Russian Army, the greatest fighting force in the world today, takes such men up to 50 years, and in view of the fact, as I stated a moment ago, that the British Army and Navy both take such men, and the English boast that they have the greatest navy in the world.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In reference to truck drivers, some truck drivers in the Army have to have just as much, if not more, stamina as the men in the front line, in combat duty. Truck drivers in theaters of operations ofttimes have to drive hours on end, 36 hours, 40 hours, without rest, without sleep, perhaps without food, and with but little water, over all kinds of roads, under all kinds of shelling and other fire, and under all kinds of conditions.

I did not rise to ask the Senator from Montana particularly with respect to truck drivers. I did have this thought in mind, and I wanted to ask the Senator about it. To hear the Senator's remarks one might draw the conclusion that the Federal Government was a refuge for draft dodgers, or an asylum for slackers. Can the Senator from Montana tell us how many men now employed in the Federal Government are deferred because of their employment in the Government?

Mr. WHEELER. I have already stated that I cannot give the figures. I have seen the figures but I do not know what they are. There are committees of Congress, however, the Costello and other committees, who are investigating the matter.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator bear with me a moment?

Mr. WHEELER. I should like to continue my speech.

Mr. HILL. I think this is important.

Mr. WHEELER. Very well, I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator made a statement to the effect that there were hundreds of thousands of men between 18 and 38 in the Government service. That may be true. I do not know. But, Mr. President, it should be remembered that there are some 3,000,000 men who have been deferred because of physical disability because they have not met the physical standards of the Army and the Navy. Naturally, of that number of

3,000,000 there are some who are in the Government service. But they are not deferred because they are in the Government service. They are deferred because they do not meet the physical requirements.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Today more than five and a half million men are deferred because they are fathers. Naturally some of those five and a half million fathers are in the Government service, but they are not deferred because they are in the Government service. They are deferred because they are fathers.

The Selective Service advises us that there are 112,399 men deferred because of their employment in the Government service. Because they occupy positions in the Government service on this occupational basis, boards have deferred them. Of those 112,399, 96,658 are either with the Civil Aeronautics Authority, with the Navy Department, with the War Department, the Panama Canal, the War Shipping Administration, or the United States Maritime Commission. The 96,000 men who are employed by the Navy Department, the War Department, the Shipping Administration, and so forth, include men who are in Government arsenals, who are today making guns of all kinds. They include men who are in the shipbuilding plants.

Not long ago I went to the navy yard at Norfolk to witness the launching of the battleship *Alabama*, one of our greatest and finest battleships. That ship had been built by Government employees; it was not built under contract. A number of the men in that plant today are deferred just as men would be deferred in a private shipbuilding plant on the west coast.

Outside the Army and Navy and shipbuilding plants, how many are deferred? In the many other governmental agencies, 15,741 men are deferred, and of the 15,741 who are deferred in all the other agencies of the Government, according to the estimates of the Selective Service, only about 7,500 could qualify and meet the physical requirements.

So, Mr. President, the statement that the Government is a haven for draft dodgers and an asylum for slackers simply is not true.

I could give the Senator a break-down now, but I shall do so later in my own time, of how many men are deferred in every agency in all the departments of Government; all of them, including the shipyard workers and ordnance men, and workers for the Civil Aeronautics Authority as aeronautical engineers, some of whom were with General Clark at Salerno. The whole number is 15,741.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator says that of the 15,000 only 7,500 could qualify.

Mr. HILL. According to the Selective Service; yes.

Mr. WHEELER. How can the Selective Service know that?

Mr. HILL. By knowing the percentage who have qualified in the past. They know that so many men have been examined, and 3,000,000 have already been disqualified for physical reasons.

Mr. WHEELER. That is simply a guess upon their part.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHEELER. No, Mr. President.

Mr. HILL. The Senator ought to have this information; I know he wants it.

Mr. WHEELER. Very well; I yield.

Mr. HILL. Let me advise the Senator and the Senate of the United States, that under the provisions of the act of June 8, 1943, introduced by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Selective Service has filed each month with the Vice President, the presiding officer of the Senate, and with the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the name of each person in the Government service deferred under the Selective Service Act, the position he holds, his age, and the draft board which deferred him. When the first list was filed, June 8, 1943, it included every man who had been deferred under the Selective Service Act because of his being employed in the Government. Since then each month every other deferment has been listed. Here is one of the most recent reports, if Senators would like to look at it, containing the names and the positions of the men deferred. So there is no secret about who has been deferred. Anyone who has any question as to whether a person ought to have been deferred, what work he is doing and how important his job is, the list is here, filed with the Senate of the United States, for anyone to search and see.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an observation?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield for a question; not for a speech.

Mr. MAYBANK. I simply wish to make the suggestion, which I have made before, and I hope will be followed, that the names be listed as soon as possible in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am glad to see that only 134 persons from South Carolina are listed as being deferred. I think the people of South Carolina are entitled to know that only 134 persons from my State are deferred by reason of being in Government service.

Mr. HILL. The Senator speaks of 134 persons from his State being deferred.

Mr. MAYBANK. Excluding those employed in the navy yard.

Mr. HILL. Excluding those employed in the navy yard?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes. Two thousand one hundred and sixteen persons from my State are employed in the navy yard.

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad to have the Senator from South Carolina tell us that so small a number of persons from his State are deferred. But I wish to say that in my judgment one of the greatest hoarders of manpower is the War Department itself. A stenographer from my State, employed in the War Department, came to see me. She said she had been in the War Department for 6 months and had not had to do a day's work while she had been there. Not only that, but she told me other girls were quitting their jobs in the War Department because they were ashamed to take the money; that some of them had gone to work waiting on tables in the city of Washington. Senators can defend Government bureaus all they want to, but I say that there is more waste, more extravagance of manpower in the various Government bureaus in Washington than any other place I know of.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WHEELER. No, Mr. President.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has talked about the War Department. I think the Senate is entitled to information with respect to it.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I am trying to make a speech.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Montana has quoted a young lady who is a stenographer in the War Department. Let us see what the picture is in the War Department. Let us see what the facts are.

Mr. WHEELER. I refuse to yield.

Mr. HILL. Will not the Senator yield so I may make a statement with respect to the War Department?

Mr. WHEELER. No.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has talked about the War Department.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not going to be interrupted every minute. I should like to proceed with my speech.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Montana does not contend that the girl who spoke to him, or any other girl in the War Department, ought to be taken out of the Department and placed in the Army?

Mr. WHEELER. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator include them when he is talking about persons who are idle in the Government departments?

Mr. WHEELER. No. As a matter of fact I thought much waste would result from taking into the service a great number of WAC's and WAVES. I may be wrong about that. I do not think they are relieving as many men in the armed forces as it was contended they would when it was urged that they be taken into the service. I do not think they have relieved anyone.

Mr. President, I think a number of men in IV–F should be taken into the service to drive trucks, watch bridges, and so on before married men who have children are taken into the service. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] does not agree with me. Other Members of the Senate may not agree with me. They may feel that we should proceed to take fathers before we look into and examine all other possibilities. They may feel that before we do that we should take the married men, thus breaking up their homes. I say to the Senate that its Members may not believe that the married men should be deferred until other means have been exhausted, but the American people do believe it.

Now, let me proceed.

So far as my statements are concerned, let me say that what I have said is nothing more than what the junior

Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] said in his speech about the hoarding of manpower in industries, nothing more than what Mr. Baruch himself said, nothing more than what was said in the Costello report, nothing more than what every investigating committee has reported—identically the same thing.

Here is a letter from Hiram H. Owens, attorney and counselor at law at Barbourville, Ky. The letter is dated September 16, 1943:

DEAR SENATOR: You are entirely correct in your position that the greatest waste of manpower is in our Army. Everywhere one sees men in uniform loafing, coming, going—on furlough. It would require 10 years to transport and equip properly at the battle front the men now in service. Ask them; they will tell you how useless their time is spent.

No father should be forced into the Army—too many in now—for efficient service. We need more men on farms, in mines, in war plants.

It will cripple our war effort to put more in, than leave them employed profitably.

Here is a letter from Paducah, Ky. I do not know just where that is, but I have heard of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is my home town, and I am very proud of that fair city.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand it is a fine city.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am almost as proud of Paducah as the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is of Asheville.

Mr. WHEELER. The letter is from a Dr. Jones, of Paducah:

DEAR SENATOR: We note in the daily press, in questioning General Hershey before your committee, you have been trying to find ways and means of avoiding sending fathers to the Army, which is very commendable. There is a great deal of adverse comment and criticism in this part of the United States about General Hershey's rule of letting many young men escape the draft, around 18 to 20, by allowing them to go to technical schools for special training such as study medicine, dentistry, engineers, etc. In this county alone (which is an average county in population), there have been around 150 to 200 of these stout, healthy, able-bodied single young men who have been sent by the Government to medical schools, engineering training, etc., giving them free tuition, upkeep, and paying them $50 per month while they are getting this special training, and by so doing they have been exempted from the draft, escaping doing their duty toward their Government. We all know, and General Hershey should realize that by the time they complete this training, the war will likely be over, and they will not only escape doing their duty to their country but get paid by the Government and at the same time get this training free, while their neighbor boy friends are having to render real service by going into the draft.

As an illustration——

Then he states the name of a boy. I shall not repeat his name.

Further on in the letter Dr. Jones states:

You multiply the above 150 by the 120 counties in this State and thousands of counties in the United States, you will readily see the number of boys in these technical schools avoiding the draft, which will probably run around 100,000 or more.

We sincerely trust you will use your influence to have General Hershey abolish this unjust rule, as I feel that I am voicing the sentiment of every patriotic citizen everywhere.

The writer was in World War No. 1, and when a schoolmate entering the draft sees his classmate escaping same, as per above, it naturally makes him sore at the injustice and feels like he is not getting a square deal. This unjust rule should by all means be abolished so that every healthy, single boy should be made to serve his country alike.

We hope General Hershey will see the justice of the above.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is that Dr. F. A. Jones?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; Dr. F. A. Jones.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know him. Of course, I do not know about the instance of injustice to which he refers, but I do know the members of the local draft board of McCracken County, and I do not think a finer group of men could be found anywhere. They are men who serve their country without pay, as we all know, and as the members of all other draft boards do. I would not say that draft board or any other draft board is perfect, and I would not say that draft boards have not made some mistakes, just as everyone else makes mistakes, but I would say that board and all other draft boards in the country on the whole have done a fine job in the effort to pass upon every individual case which comes before them under the selective-service law.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I said that a moment ago; but I also say that some of them are resigning.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator know how many draft boards there are in the country?

Mr. WHEELER. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think there are 6,500 of them. Does the Seantor know how many of them have resigned?

Mr. WHEELER. I cannot tell, but I know I have letters saying that some are resigning.

Mr. BARKLEY. Perhaps two or three have resigned.

Mr. WHEELER. Two or three? Mr. President, I have in my files letters saying that draft boards have resigned, and stating the reasons why they have resigned.

Now I want to read a letter from a soldier:

SEPTEMBER 15, 1943.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: I thought you might be interested to know that us boys in the Army feel that the drafting of fathers is one of the most stupid things that has ever been forced upon the American people. Every single day we see manpower being squandered and wasted and when the scandals of this war are uncovered, one of the biggest will be the way the Army has thrown away manpower at the expense of the war effort.

Facts are wanted. There are some. I continue to read:

We don't need fathers, in fact we don't need any more until the men we now have are efficiently utilized. It is a national crime against our country and against the relatives of dying men for the Army to waste manpower the way it is doing. By having such a huge surplus of men in camps in this country the Army is encouraging loafing because there is not even enough "made work" to keep them busy. I entered the Army from a farm where I worked from 14 to 16 hours a day; now in the Army I'm lucky if I get 2 hours of work a day. And I don't mind saying that I dislike it very much. A lot of us have a lot of energy and we'd like to work hard to help win this war, but the Army forces us to sit around doing nothing just trying to impress the enemy by quoting a certain-million-man Army. I have bad eyes which keep me out of combat or I might be lucky enough to go overseas where there is action, but just because I am kept in this country I'd like to ask very frankly why the Army is allowed to waste me and hundreds more like me. I actually feel guilty when I get paid each month because I know I haven't earned it; there is no work to do. And yet the Army insists on taking fathers into the Army.

I hope you Members of Congress can figure this thing out because us fellows can't understand why the Army is allowed to misuse and waste its manpower the way it does. We feel that everybody, including the Army, should cooperate in the winning of this war as quickly as possible.

Very sincerely yours for a better country.

Signed by a sergeant at a proving ground in Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure that if the Senator will turn that letter over to the War Department, that young fellow will have plenty of work to do afterward.

Mr. WHEELER. I am sure that if I were to turn the letter in, he would be put in the guardhouse.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the sergeant say whether he is married?

Mr. WHEELER. He does not.

Mr. LUCAS. I wondered whether he was one of the 750,000 married men, who have wives and children, who now are in the Army.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know whether he is or is not one of them; but let me say that a great many of the married men who already are in the Army are young officers.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the Senator how he differentiates between a father who had a child 1 day before Pearl Harbor and a father who had a child 1 day after Pearl Harbor.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know that such a differentiation should be made. I notice that the President said he did not see any difference between them, and I think possibly he is right. I do not differentiate between them. Possibly no one can make such a differentiation; but I fixed that date because it is the date which was talked about so much and was put in. If the Senator would vote for the bill with such an amendment, I should be glad to amend it, to that extent, in order to meet with his approval.

Mr. LUCAS. The point is not whether the Senator from Illinois votes for the bill or against it. That is not the point.

Mr. WHEELER. The point is that the Senator wants to pick out some little detail in it so that he can have some excuse for voting against it. Is not that the real reason?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Montana is absolutely mistaken. I am not looking for any excuses one way or the other. I will take my chances on whatever I do with respect to the vote on the bill and will vote according to my conscientious conviction, and in line with

what I believe to be the best for my country in the greatest crisis through which we have ever passed.

Mr. WHEELER. I am sure the Senator will.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Army has been right up to this time and I think the Senator from Montana has been wrong up to this time.

Mr. WHEELER. I know the Senator does, but the Senator's constituents in Illinois may think I am right.

Mr. LUCAS. That may be true. What my constituents in Illinois may think is one thing and what the Senator may think is another thing. Let me say to the Senator and to the Senate that my own political future is of no consequence, if that is what the Senator is referring to. I am attempting honestly as a Member of the United States Senate, looking far into the future, to do what is best for my country. When General Marshall, General McNarney, General Hershey, Mr. Baruch, and others appear before the Military Affairs Committee and testify as they do, I am duty-bound to follow them. They testified that a certain timetable must be met. When they tell me that if they are not able to go through with this program it may mean the prolongation of the war—and the sacrifice of additional lives of fine American boys—what am I to do, follow those men or follow the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not ask the Senator to follow me. I do not expect him to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. That is a serious question with me. I ask the question in good faith.

Mr. WHEELER. I know the Senator is asking it in good faith. When Congress returned after its recess, the Senator said that he was not familiar with the facts.

Mr. LUCAS. I was not. Neither was the Senator familiar with the facts. He did not know anything about them at that time.

Mr. WHEELER. In the Senator's view I never know anything about anything.

Mr. LUCAS. I have great respect for the Senator from Montana. I say that in all sincerity. I like the Senator from Montana. He makes a persuasive argument on any question he presents, and I usually listen to him; but because I disagree with him and because I make my argument, I do not want the Senator to try to humiliate me.

Mr. WHEELER. I would not try to humiliate the Senator for anything in the world. I have not the slightest intention of doing so. I have a very deep affection for the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I believe the Senator has. I was never more serious in my life than I am now, because, God knows, I do not want to do anything to break up a home and turn children into the streets. That is the emotional plea which the Senator has been making here all afternoon, and he has repeated it a dozen times. If my emotions were to control me, I would not send anybody into the Army; but, as I see it, there is something involved besides emotion.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct. There is something more involved. I have said this repeatedly, and if the Senator cannot see it, it is not my fault. We have manpower hoarding in industry, and we will not take for the Army any men classified as IV–F. The British Navy takes great numbers of men who would be classified as IV–F under our system. The British Army also takes many men whom we would classify as IV–F. So does the Russian Army. The Government of the United States released from the Army 275,000 men between the ages of 38 and 45, after they had passed the strictest physical examination. If the Army will take some of the men classified as IV–F, and take single men between the ages of 38 and 45, it will not need to take a single father at this time.

I am not responsible for what has been done. I am not responsible for the delay. Congress is not responsible. The responsibility rests upon the administration, because of the confusion and inefficiency which have been charged to exist by many committees of Congress which have investigated the situation. The charges are made by both Democrats and Republicans. Because of such inefficiency it is said that we must take fathers. I say that we should not do it, and must not do it, because to take fathers would be to break up the homes of America. Let me repeat that I will not consent to sending fathers overseas.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator keeps talking about breaking up homes. Of course, that is one of the most serious things we can contemplate. War is one of the things that breaks up homes. The point that bothers me is what General Marshall and General McNarney testified with respect to the possible prolongation of the war. Those are cold, hard facts. No one knows whether they are right or not, but for the purpose of this vote I must assume they are correct.

Mr. WHEELER. They did not say that they wanted fathers.

Mr. LUCAS. They said that they had to meet a timetable.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator——

Mr. LUCAS. They said that they had to meet a timetable, and they had to have men.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; they said they had to have men. They can get the men without taking fathers. The opponents of the bill tried to get General Marshall, Admiral King, and General McNarney to say that they wanted to take fathers. When General Marshall was about to testify, and motion pictures were being made, he was asked about turning on the lights. Someone said something to the effect that, "If you say you are going to take fathers, we will not take any more pictures."

Who was doing it? Why was it being done? The effort was being made to get General Marshall to say that he had to have fathers. He refused to say it. Admiral King refused to say it and General McNarney refused to say it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The only thing I am seriously considering in connection with all this debate, in all of its importance and its many ramifications, is what those witnesses testified with respect to prolonging the war. That stands out pretty clearly in my mind. I sat there and listened to them. They said that if the time table were broken at this hour, and the program were delayed for a period of 3 months, it would probably cost the lives of thousands upon thousands of additional American boys; and not only that, but it would probably mean the drafting of additional fathers after January 1, 1944.

Mr. WHEELER. Does the Senator think for one moment that the 275,000 men between the ages of 38 and 45, who passed every physical test of the Army, and who were trained by the Army, some of them for a year, some for 2 years, and some for a longer period, could not be used to guard bridges, electric light plants, the Senate Office Building, the White House, and other places throughout the country? Does the Senator think that they could not drive trucks, and to that extent be used instead of fathers, when the taking of fathers would mean the breaking up of homes?

Will the Senator answer that question?

Mr. LUCAS. I am frank to admit that I do not know anything about the condition of those men; but I am willing to make a guess, as the Senator has been doing many times this afternoon, as to the possibility of using many of those men. I dare say that many of those men between the ages of 38 and 45 could perform the duties about which the Senator is talking. There is no question about that. But that is water over the dam. We sat by here and permitted those men to be released from the Army.

Mr. WHEELER. What did we have to do with it?

Mr. LUCAS. We could have enacted legislation——

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no.

Mr. LUCAS. Wait a moment, if the Senator will further yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. We could have enacted legislation providing for what the Senator is now attempting to do, but we did not do it. Neither have we done anything with respect to the drafting of fathers. We have sat by until now, at a time when an attempt is being made to break up the timetable of the American Army, a timetable which has been planned by General Marshall and his subordinates for months.

Mr. WHEELER. I did not sit idly by. I introduced this bill last February.

Mr. LUCAS. This is the first time we have heard anything about it on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WHEELER. This is not the first time we have heard about it. The Senator probably did not hear about it, but I made two speeches on the floor of the Senate on this very subject, on two different occasions. I appeared before the Military Affairs Committee twice. Now, because of the fact that the Military Affairs Committee did not report the bill earlier, and because of the fact that the

Congress, as the Senator says, sat idly by and permitted men between the ages of 38 and 45 to be released, and because of the fact that there is hoarding of labor in industry, it is said that we must break up American homes. If that be good logic, then I do not know what good logic is.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator can draw any conclusions he desires as to my intentions. Let me repeat what I said previously with respect to this very serious matter. I know that today 750,000 fathers are now in the American Army. Many homes have been broken up. Wives and children have been left behind. I know that some of the fathers have already made the supreme sacrifice in Italy and the southwest Pacific in fighting for this country and the preservation of liberty. I am more concerned about the preservation of the 750,000 family men who now are in the Army facing the foe than I am about the 350,000 men about whom we are talking, who may be subject to the draft. I doubt that 5 percent of this group will ever see any overseas service.

Mr. WHEELER. Allow me to say to the Senator——

Mr. LUCAS. If I may be allowed, I should like to proceed, and then I shall not say any more upon this subject.

I have followed the evidence, and I have attempted conscientiously to reach some kind of an honest conviction upon the troublesome problem now before the United States Senate. Much as I dislike to do so, I am duty bound to follow our high Army and Navy officials who say that at this particular time they must have these men in order that the war effort may not be delayed or impaired.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me say that that is not the testimony. Of course, the witnesses did say they had to have the men.

Mr. LUCAS. They said, too, that if they did not get them, the war would be prolonged.

Mr. WHEELER. They said they thought it might prolong the war. However, let me say that, after all, the question is not whether we get the men.

Mr. LUCAS. The question is whether getting them will shorten the war.

Mr. WHEELER. Please allow me to finish. Some have said they would rather take General Marshall's word than my word. The question is not one as between General Marshall's word and my word concerning whether we get the men. The question is whether, because of the inefficiency and stupidity, if we want to call it such, of those who conduct the program, we shall force the draft boards to take married men if men cannot be obtained from some other source, as they could be if the standards were reduced to the level of the English and the Russian standards. If that were done, we could get the men, and that could be done. It could be done tomorrow or the next day and we could get the men if we wanted to do so.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Some question concerning what General Marshall did say seems to have been raised here.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I hope the Senator will not object to my reading from the printed record on that point.

Mr. WHEELER. Very well.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think that by doing so we may put the question at rest. The following question was asked by me of General Marshall:

> Is this conclusion correct, general: That the Army needs a number of men, and it makes no difference to the Army whether they are men with children or without children; is that correct?

General Marshall's answer was as follows:

> That is correct. Our interest is that we get men of a certain physical state and a certain mental ability; and we are concerned at the same time that it does not cut production.

Then the following question was asked:

> The order in which men shall be taken from civil life into the armed forces through the selective service is a matter for determination by the War Manpower Commission?

General Marshall's answer was:

> That is correct, sir.

Then the following question was asked by me:

> Then, in the final analysis, on the bill that is before the Congress today, it is a matter as to whether or not the Congress is going to approve the plan that has been brought forth by the War Manpower Commission? That is correct, is it not?

General Marshall replied:

> I think that is correct.

I then asked:

> It is not a question of a quarrel with the Army or a difference with the Army on its requisitions for men; it is more or less a question of whether the Congress will approve the order in which men are to be taken from civil life as laid down by the War Manpower Commission?

General Marshall's answer to the question was:

> Yes, sir; so long as we get the men, and the production of military material is not affected.

In other words, General Marshall said directly in answer to those questions that it made no difference to the Army whether the men who were taken had children or did not have children, that the question, and the sole question, arising on this bill is whether Congress shall approve what has been taking place under the rules of the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct. Allow me to quote further from the printed hearings. In regard to the drafting of fathers, General Marshall said:

> As to the drafting of fathers, that is a moot question. It seems to me that you start off with very young men as a natural component of our Army, but as to what point men may actually be relieved from their responsibility of defense of their country—I do not know what the answer is—that is a matter more for you gentlemen to determine than it is for me.

The junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] asked this question:

> Well, General Marshall, let me put it to you this way: Do you believe, other things being equal, that a man who leaves behind a wife and one, two, or three children, who must perhaps live on $50 or $75 a month, and perhaps go hungry doing it, and break down their former standard of living—do you believe that that man with that worry and burden constantly in mind about his wife and children will make a good soldier?

What was the answer, Mr. President? It was as follows:

> No; I do not believe, if that is the condition that is to be imposed, that you would have. You would have a very unhappy soldier with a very low state of morale, and he would not be a very effective soldier for us.

I have read from General Marshall's testimony.

As I have said, at no time did General Marshall, or any other general, or anyone else in the Army or in the Navy say they wanted married men, but their whole trend was that they preferred young single men to married men. Of course, the whole burden of the administration and the whole burden of certain newspapers has been to the effect that I am disagreeing with General Marshall. I submit there is not one scintilla of evidence anywhere in the record that I have had any disagreement with General Marshall upon any of his statements. There have been prominent men who have stated that the Army is too large and that manpower is being wasted.

As a matter of fact, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], chairman of the Senate Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, has said, as I recall his statement, that he felt that the Army was too large, or that they were wasting manpower. Other Senators have said so. I have never at any time stated that I thought the Army was too large, because I did not know what the facts were. However, I do say that it is little less than criminal, in my judgment, to break up homes and drive the children into the streets, when delinquency is on the increase. Mr. Hoover, of the F. B. I., has said that in the United States it has increased 64 percent in the last 6 months, among boys and girls under 18 years of age. Clergymen of every denomination in the country have said they are shocked at the increased delinquency which is occurring among the girls and boys of the country, and particularly among the girls. Delinquency among the young girls has increased to a greater extent than it has among the boys. Yet, Mr. President, Senators seemingly disregard that development, and say that because some Army officer has said, "We cannot use men with minor defects to drive trucks," and perform noncombatant duties, such men must not be used. It is said that we must not question the judgment of any general or, if you please, of any corporal, sergeant, or anyone else. How ridiculous.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has stated in his remarks that "they" have tried to get General Marshall and other persons to say certain things. I do not know to whom the Senator referred when he said "they" tried to get General Marshall to say that they had to have the married men.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator may draw his own conclusion as to whom I was referring.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has said "they" tried to get General Marshall to say that they had to have these married men, and that "they" tried to get General McNarney to say this, and that "they" tried to get other persons to say that. I do not know to whom the Senator referred when he said "they."

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator may draw his own conclusions.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suppose the Senator means the members of the committee, or all the Senators who were at the committee meeting and asked questions.

Mr. WHEELER. I said the Senator may draw his own conclusions.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well; I will draw my own conclusions. However, I should like to point out General Marshall's conclusion, as he stated it in his testimony.

Mr. WHEELER. Very well. I have read it.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; the Senator read a part of it, but not all of it.

I asked General Marshall some questions, as I was permitted to do by the committee, and as I did of other witnesses.

Mr. WHEELER. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. I said this to General Marshall:

> You, of course, hesitate to get into the manpower question and into the function of the Selective Service.

General Marshall all through his testimony emphasized the fact that he would have to have this number of men, but that if he did not obtain that number of men, it would be necessary to reduce not only the timetable of the war, but reduce the plans for the war overseas, and that to do so would slow up the operations, and might result in prolongation of the war and, ultimately, the loss of more lives.

That was his attitude but he insisted, all the way through, that it was not his function to run the Manpower Commission or to determine where these men should be obtained though he had to have them in the Army. I asked him this question:

> You, of course, hesitate to get into the manpower question and into the function of the Selective Service. But what you do, after all of your consultations, day by day, and probably several times a day, as to the size, make-up, and character and standard of the Army, you submit your requests or requisitions, whatever you may call them, to the Selective Service or Manpower Commission.
>
> General MARSHALL. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator BARKLEY. It is their job to furnish these men.
>
> General MARSHALL. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator BARKLEY. It is their job to furnish the type of men, physically and mentally, and I imagine in some cases morally—I don't know to what extent that cuts a figure.
>
> General MARSHALL. That is hard to determine.
>
> Senator BARKLEY. At least the physical and mental standards of the Army, after long deliberations as to what is necessary.
>
> General MARSHALL. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator BARKLEY. In order to make it the most efficient Army possible.
>
> General MARSHALL. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator BARKLEY. Now, if it is true, as the Manpower Commission and the Selective Service have both testified here, if it is true that they cannot obtain the Army that you require—and the Navy too, all of this comes now through the Selective Service, except enlistments under 17 in the Navy, I believe and some over 38, but I suppose they are not large in numbers—if they have testified that it is impossible to obtain these men without the drafting of 446,000 married men, and we should say to the Selective Service, and to the War Department, that you shall not draft that 446,000 men, so that that would be postponed either until January, or they would be exempted or deferred permanently, assuming, however, that the number cannot be obtained, according to the Manpower Commission and Selective Service, without these 446,000, and assuming that we would exempt them or defer them until January 1, your statement is, and your position is, that it would make necessary such a slowing-up of your program, which has been arrived at over a long period of months—it would be a very dangerous enterprise upon which to embark?
>
> General MARSHALL. That is my view of the matter, sir. Not only would it be dangerous but we would immediately have to wreck units in order to meet what we consider the imperative demands of the next 3 months.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me analyze that statement. Assuming that men cannot be obtained from any other place, assuming this and assuming that, of course, General Marshall, with all these assumptions, would say the Army would have to take married men or it could not get the number of men it wanted.

Mr. BARKLEY. In my question I was assuming that the Manpower Commission and the Selective Service were telling the truth.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator was assuming that they were a hundred percent right, and that some other commission was a hundred percent right. Assuming they could not get men out of industries for the draft, assuming the facts given to me today by the C. I. O. as to conditions in factories were not correct, assuming this and assuming that, assuming there were not any more men to be obtained, and that the Army could not get back the 270,000 men who were let out, assuming not only that, but that it could not use the thousands of men in the IV-F classification, who, according to the information coming from one end of the country to the other, have been let out of the Army after having been taken in—assuming all these things, of course General Marshall could only answer the question as he did.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator continues to talk about 275,000 men. As I understand, in the hearings he referred to 395,000. I wondered if the Senator would not let me make a statement on this question? I think we ought to have the other side of this issue.

Mr. WHEELER. I think so, but the Senator can make the statement in his own time. I have been on my feet 4 hours, and I should like to proceed further and not be interrupted by a reading of figures. I think I have been generous in yielding to questions and also in letting Senators make statements as I have proceeded. I have great respect and love for the Senator from Alabama, but I should like to have him make his statement in his own time.

Mr. HILL. When the Senator says he loves me—and I know the feeling is mutual—I cannot insist on his yielding at this time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield, but not for a speech.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator knows there will not be a speech from me.

Mr. WHEELER. I should like to have a speech from the Senator in his own time.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should merely like to know from the Senator from Kentucky who propounded the question that he read from the record?

Mr. BARKLEY. I did.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from Kentucky representing the administration. Is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not saying whether I represented it or not.

Mr. WHEELER. As Democratic leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suppose I could not be condemned if I admit that I represent it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not think the Senator could be condemned in his own mind.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the mere fact that I represent the administration here would not condemn me in the mind of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. I hope not.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me read from a letter from a boy living in Fairfield, Ill., who says:

> This manpower situation seems to be giving Congress a great deal of trouble at the present time. Speaking for myself and thousands of men in my category, may I offer the following:
>
> Approximately a year ago I was rejected by the Army because of a minor spinal ailment. Since that time I have appealed to my local board several times for another chance; but as you know they act indirectly upon your orders.
>
> Yes, I'm supposed to be doing my part for the war effort. Some days I work a little, other days I sit around and wait for the whistle.
>
> He is a worker in industry.
>
> If this is helping to win the war, then I offer my sincere apologies for this letter.
>
> I feel that somewhere there is a more important job for us. Couldn't a bill be introduced into Congress to draft IV-F men with minor physical ailments? Maybe we wouldn't be fit for combat service; but couldn't we relieve some men in this country for actual combat? Fellows like myself feel it is our duty and responsibility to do all in our power to help preserve the freedom and way of living that we Americans love so much.

I realize that you receive many letters each day regarding such problems as the one I have discussed; that it would be utterly impossible to act upon each one.

The letter is addressed to a Representative in Congress from Illinois.

Here is a letter from the Office of Strategic Services. I wish to call it to the attention of the Senator from Alabama who has asked me to give names. The writer of the letter says:

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: I have been following the debate between yourself and the advocates of the bill to draft fathers. It is best that I state here I have no interest in whether or not the bill is passed or defeated since it will not affect me one way or the other because even though I am a father, I am already in the Army. What does concern me, however, is the fact that after volunteering for the armed forces to help get rid of our enemies, I find myself pushing a typewriter around in the Office of Strategic Services.

I know some one must do this type of work, but why they picked on me is something I will never understand. After reading my typewriting you will understand what I mean. To make matters worse there are thousands of young men in this Office, and for that matter hundreds of other offices, who are within the combat age and who are disgusted with their present assignments but cannot do a thing to remedy their predicaments. If the War Department or the Selective Service Board needs more men I suggest they look in the Q building of the office on the letter head.

Without exaggerating there are enough Brass-Hat Commandos in this office to replace every warrior injured in the Sicilian campaign.

There are more deferred civilians doing nothing of importance than all of the other departments of the Federal Government.

P. S.—Please keep my name confidential.

He signs the letter, but asks that his name be kept confidential, and the Senate can understand why.

I have here a letter from the Center Chamber of Commerce, of Center, Tex. It is marked "Personal," and I shall not give the name of the writer. He says:

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: A Democrat throughout life, born and reared in Texas—a member of the draft board in the First World War and until recently a member of the so-called Selective Service Board of Shelby County. Resigned more than 60 days since and that resignation was due to the vacillating policy and incompetency at Washington and State headquarters at Austin. Hot air broadcasting out of Washington not understood either by the broadcaster or the people, causing confusion and unrest amongst the people and needless trouble for the boards.

Am not in the habit of writing even Texas Senators, yet I want to add my endorsement to your stand on the induction of fathers into the armed forces. The issue is not the induction of fathers so much as it is making fatherless children at the most critical period of the child's life, second making wholesale disruption of business, practically destroying the home front, vastly decreasing the source of revenue so badly needed and this at the behest of Army officers, a majority of whom hadn't the imagination to conceive, even in part, the magnitude of aircraft in wars and then even after Germany struck Poland. Again, what could tie us closer to Mexico, Brazil, and other South American countries than for their armies to fight side by side with the armed forces of the United States? This war has dispelled the idea that we are the only pebble on the beach and that when properly trained and equipped the Chinese is a better fighter than the Jap.

Cost plus is the most damnable business proposition ever perpetrated on the American people. At several shipbuilding plants on the Gulf coast of Texas and not more than 175 miles of this place are at least 2,500 Shelby County farmers drawing ungodly wages and most of them home oh week ends and joke about the vast number of unnecessary men employed by these plants—the bigger the pay roll the more the "pluses" and the more for the racketeer labor leader. As Baruch says, that if these plants were on contract basis and forced to organize their manpower the manpower situation would clear up in a jiffy.

I now wish to quote from a letter written by a man who lives in New York City:

I have been employed in a secondary war plant and in said plant there was employed about 20 refugees, all single, and well within the draft age. About 3 days a week a lawyer was in the factory making out deferments for these boys. I had charge of a certain department and the boss brought in a young man to me and said I had to give him a job as he was in the draft, and his father was a personal friend of said boss.

All of the work done by these young men could be done by older men, a better job with a little more money, but the company could not see it that way.

Now I shall read an article concerning an incident in Spring Valley, N. Y.:

Charles W. Hawkins, president of the First National Bank of Spring Valley, has resigned as a member of the Ramapo Selective Service Board in protest against drafting any fathers unless more adequate provision is made for their families and until what he calls the "rat file" of available single men is cleared.

"If we have to take the married men, which is indicated will be the practice," Mr. Hawkins said today, "we must have more relief. The wife of a married man with 3 children now gets $82 a month and she can't make it with having to pay the rent, food, and clothing, not to consider illness.

"The married men in the services with children are constantly worrying about their families. If our people are willing to place the responsibility on a fellow citizen to select fellow citizens for the armed services, why not let that person determine what adequate compensation should be for the families of married draftees with children?

"It might cost a few dollars more but the soldiers at least would be relieved of the worries they are now going through which I as a banker and as a member of the draft board know they are suffering."

Turning to the "rat-file" cases, Mr. Hawkins said it was composed mostly of single young men "who put everything in the path of the draft board not to be inducted." He said this file is not over large but too big.

He spoke of one man who obtained deferment as a "farmer" because he had "a few fruit trees" in his yard although he actually has a job in New York. He said there are a good many who hide behind the farmer clause who are not farmers.

Why did we pass a law exempting farmers? It is said that fathers should not be deferred because they have no organization; but we deferred farmers, although the War Department was opposed to it, and the Navy Department was opposed to it.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The War Department and the Navy Department did not oppose the Tydings amendment, which was enacted into law. The Selective Service drafted the amendment. The Navy Department did oppose the so-called Bankhead bill, which did not become law, which died in the House of Representaives, but the Tydings amendment, under which agricultural workers are today being deferred, was not opposed by either the Army or the Navy. On the contrary, it was prepared by the Selective Service.

Mr. WHEELER. The Army and the Navy came here and opposed the proposal before the Committee on Agriculture, and General McNarney testified against it.

Mr. HILL. Agricultural workers are deferred under the Tydings amendment, and the Army and the Navy did not oppose that amendment, and the Selective Service prepared the language of the amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. General Hershey and General McNarney appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and opposed the deferring of farm boys, and testified against the bill.

Mr. HILL. Not the Tydings amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Just a moment; later on, when the matter passed out of the committee, where there was not a single vote against it, and came onto the floor of the Senate, the officers of the Army came here and as a compromise agreed, as I understand, to take the Tydings amendment, but they were unalterably opposed to the proposal before the Committee on Agriculture, and testified before that committee against it.

Mr. HILL. Their testimony before the Committee on Agriculture was after January 1, and we enacted the Tydings amendment the year before, at the time when we considered the drafting of 18- and 19-year-old boys. Their testimony was subsequent to the adoption of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have here a telegram from Holyoke, Mass., reading as follows:

SEPTEMBER 21, 1943.

The following article appears in tonight's Holyoke Transcript under a Springfield date line:

"SPRINGFIELD DRAFT BOARD MEMBER QUITS IN PROTEST

"SPRINGFIELD.—Joseph E. Kerigan, Springfield lawyer, resigned from draft board No. 143 today in protest against what he termed the repeated draft deferments of young unmarried men on the ground that they are essential to industry

" 'I feel that I can no longer serve in a system which permits repeated draft deferments of unmarried men in their twenties and early thirties while we are being forced to induct married men and, worse still, married men with children,' he said in his letter of resignation to Gov. Leverett Saltonstall.

"Kerigan said the system in effect in Massachusetts permits employers to select single men whom they desire to retain. This, he said, has built up a situation where young men who never had any industrial experience 'suddenly become indispensable men, either through the desire of the employer to keep hold on or by obvious covering up by influential relatives or friends in the plant.'

"The picture, Behind the Rising Sun, is now showing at one of the local show houses. General Marshall can select from 200 to 500 young men from 18 to 25 years of age any evening by walking down the street on inspection. These young men are in line trying to get into the theater.

"Joseph Kerigan, as mentioned above, has the correct analysis, and, beyond a doubt, a congressional investigation would show that the same condition exists in every State and city. Let us not be too hasty in upsetting the family life of 475,000 additional young American. homes just because some Army general makes such a demand."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator from Montana know anything about what has become of the inventory which is supposed to be made all over the country, which will not, as I understand, be completed until September 30, and under which, according to the evidence of some of the draft boards which have written me about it, they are picking up many men who have been improperly classified or whose status has changed?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have a letter from the chairman of a voluntary organization composed of all the draft boards in St. Louis County, Mo., in which he writes:

The 1st of this month we started an inventory of the first two registrations. That inventory is to give a complete history and also in that inventory will be listed the number of children that each married man with children has according to our records.

That record will not be complete until September 30, if then. Instructions are to send the original direct to Hershey at Washington and a copy to State headquarters.

In the inventory we are taking the boards are finding an opportunity for quite a few pick-ups of men who have probably been missed or have been classified incorrectly or whose status has changed or any of many things that can occur. This all over the country with a check-up of that type should be able to pick up quite a few men.

Mr. President, it seems to me the picture we have been given here may not be a correct one until that inventory has been completed and an effort made to find men who are possibly not in classification I–A who ought to be in classification I–A. It seems to me no effort has been made to establish a national pool of men who should be in class I–A, as has been done in the case to which the letter refers with respect to a local pool of men in class I–A, and we cannot know, until such inventory is completed, who should be in class I–A.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his contribution. He is entirely correct in his statement.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I may say that I have received similar observations from members of draft boards in my State who are certainly in a better position to know the situation, being in the field, than is anyone in the War Department.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that I have received at least a hundred letters, which are now in my file, from various draft boards throughout the country, many from outside my State, and many within my State, complaining about the drafting of fathers because there has not been a check-up, and for that reason they are opposed to the drafting of fathers.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I wish to say that I personally know Mr. Kerigan, whose name was mentioned in the telegram the Senator has just read. He is a very honorable and high-class citizen, and a lawyer of marked ability of the city of Springfield.

In view of the fact that the Senator is presenting evidence from members of draft boards, I should like to have the Senator request that the clerk read a letter which I have received from a member of one of the draft boards of my State which deals with the same subject matter the Senator has presented.

Mr. WHEELER. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the letter from a member of a draft board in Boston, Mass., and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Without objection the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

UNIVERSAL TEXTILE CORPORATION,
Boston, Mass., September 23, 1943.

Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: On the question of drafting fathers, the issue is not that the requirements of the armed services should be met, rather should fathers be drafted while so many single men are deferred. As a member of a local board from the start of selective service, I would like to present my concern in the matter, and these are my own personal views and not necessarily the view of the board to which I belong.

If, and when, the single men are inducted who could be used with the least amount of dislocation to the family unit and industry, then and only then should fathers be taken. I submit that you can't in conscience take fathers until you have exhausted the following groups:

1. The 18-year-olders who ducked into college last spring indicating that they were to major in a science and who thereby, at the insistence of national headquarters, gained a deferment until July 1, 1945.

2. The 18 to 28 single men in war industry who entered their present employment with no particular qualifications for the jobs they now hold and about whom now there exists serious question as to both their necessity and irreplaceability. "Replacement schedules" have not solved this, and in reality we have almost double these deferments since State headquarters took this over from the local boards. Include here governmental employees.

3. The single men IV–F, psychoneurosis, anxiety type, rejected at the induction station, should be utilized by the services in other than combat service or released to war work only, in the manner of the older men being released. This group in civilian life has a demoralizing effect to civilian life also, because the anxiety is not too apparent.

In addition to the above groups, I believe the services are at fault in their educational program which in itself we believe is a good thing but untimely. When it becomes necessary to substitute fathers, particularly those in their thirties for these young men, I submit that a father is called upon to pay a pretty high price for the education of some youth, particularly where the education is general in character and not tied in closely to the requirements of the armed services. In view of the statements with reference to the immediate requirements of the services for manpower, I question seriously the propriety of such a program now.

I do not believe that the figures released by General Hershey to prove the necessity of drafting 446,000 fathers are convincing. The figures as of July 1, 1943, showed available in class I, 1,566,000, and they state this would result in only one-half being accepted, or 783,000. The total rejects in IV–F for all reasons, including rejects at induction, only amounts to 27 percent, and I doubt very much that the experience of any of the induction stations results in a 50-percent rejection.

I list below some of the points which bear indirectly on the subject of drafting fathers:

1. A strict interpretation of the regulations as they now stand would preclude the shifting now of fathers from nonessential civilian employment to essential work because they could not qualify under the definition of "necessary man." If draft boards are to be lenient the regulations should so state.

2. The method of reclassifying fathers by order numbers only, without regard to the degree of hardship involved, dependency, age, dislocation of civilian economy, etc., is wrong. The varying degrees of dependency have been scrapped except where utter destitution would result and a registrant could qualify for III–D. Is it not desirable to take first the father where little or no dependency exists before the father of a large family, the employer of many people, the older fathers, etc.? Why not use some selectivity in considering fathers.

3. We are drifting away from the original aims, purposes, and set-up of the selective-service laws. More and more encroachment is made upon the authority of the local board to select. The administration was to have been civilian in character. Such phrases as "maintenance of the family as a unit" are being discarded. Coercion by manpower (called "voluntary cooperation") through selective service, undermines.

I was prompted to write to you because in reading of the hearings now in progress, it seemed that the real issues were not being brought out. Further, I thought that the views of one actively engaged in the administration of the selective-service laws might furnish you with ideas not commonly presented.

I trust that you are very well and with kindest regards.

Very truly yours,

JAMES A. WALSH.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I desire to read into the RECORD a telegram, at the request of the American Legion. It is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 28, 1943.*

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The American Legion at its national convention held at Omaha last week adopted a resolution with respect to manpower army, reading as follows:

"The Chief of Staff has stated that 7,700,000 men are needed by December 31, 1943. As this figure has been based upon a definite strategic plan and worked out by the experts, any authority who undertakes to change this figure, recommended as a minimum for the plan envisaged, must assume the responsibility for the effect upon the plan which may result from such change."

I feel certain the Senate would want Legion's viewpoint on this vital subject. Would appreciate your inserting our resolution in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
Executive Director, National Legislative Committee, the American Legion.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, because of the interruptions which have occurred this afternoon, I shall need considerably more time in order to complete my statement with reference to the pending bill. I felt I probably should be able to finish this afternoon; but because of the interruptions I have not been able to do so. I promised the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] that I would let him bring up a measure in which he and other Senators are vitally interested. So at this time I shall conclude, but with the understanding, I hope, that I may proceed tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is entirely agreeable so far as I am concerned.

EMERGENCY MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE FOR WIVES OF ENLISTED MEN

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 159.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution. I desire to ask the able Senator in charge of the joint resolution if it is a replica of the joint resolution which passed the House.

Mr. MCKELLAR. It is. My recollection is that the Senate committee was entirely unanimous in its recommendation of the joint resolution. So far as I know, there are no objections to it. Certain amendments were added by the House.

In explanation, let me say that the Senator will recall that a provision similar to that proposed by the joint resolution was included in the 1943 deficiency appropriation bill. At first only $1,200,000 was appropriated. Later, an additional $4,400,000 was appropriated. All that money has been used by the various States for the purposes provided in the bill, which is for emergency maternity and infant care of the wives of enlisted men now in the armed forces.

It is now reported by the Department that for the remainder of the fiscal year $18,620,000 will be required, to be allotted and turned over to the various State boards of health for administration. The administration work is done almost entirely by the boards. Only $20,000 will be for administration by the central office in Washington. The Federal Government furnishes all the money to the States, and it is administered by the States.

The measure is one which I think we all feel should pass. The purposes of the joint resolution are very worthy. In addition, let me say that I think the service is being very fairly and justly provided throughout the country.

Mr. President, I hope that the joint resolution may pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, the purpose of the joint resolution is one in which I have had considerable interest, and of which I am definitely in favor, and so stated in connection with the previous appropriation when it came before the Senate. However, I should like to address one or two questions to the Senator in charge of the measure, if I may do so.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. BURTON. As I understand, the theory is that the Government will provide the actual care for the wives of enlisted men, and it is not a matter of providing them with the actual money. It was thought that in following that policy we would thereby cut the expense approximately in half. Is that correct?

Mr. MCKELLAR. The Senator is entirely correct. I think the savings are greater than that. I think the actual total expense for each patient is $84.50; and, from what I have heard, to my mind that is a very reasonable price for the service performed.

Mr. BURTON. As I understand, there has been some difference of opinion as to whether that was the right way to approach the matter. However, that is the way we approached it in the first instance, and the pending joint resolution merely provides a continuation of the policy already adopted; is that true?

Mr. MCKELLAR. That is true. The joint resolution merely provides for a continuation of the policy; it would not change it in the slightest. The matter is entirely in the hands of the several States, and the plan is working admirably, according to the reports, and as stated in the hearings.

Mr. BURTON. Let me ask a further question. Is it the opinion of the Senator that the appropriation provided by the joint resolution will be sufficient to carry on the work through the entire year? Let me add, before the Senator answers that question, the following estimate: As I understand, it is roughly estimated that there will be approximately 600,000 cases of births to wives of enlisted men, and it is estimated that approximately one-half of those would come under the joint resolution, which would make approximately 300,000 cases for the remainder of the year.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. I notice that in many of the larger States, such as Pennsylvania, Texas, Oregon, North Dakota, and Louisiana, by the end of August no applications whatever had been made; and in such States as Ohio and New York the applications were still in small numbers. Is it the estimate of the Senator that there will be a sufficient amount to take care of the great increase which will come about as the States begin to make their applications?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, all I can say is that in the opinion of those in charge of the national administration of the service, in the Department of Labor, the amount carried in the joint resolution will be sufficient. However, when we realize that we started with $1,200,000 and then added $4,400,000, which total sum has lasted less than 6 months, we cannot say positively about it. We shall have to take our chances. I hope it will be sufficient.

Mr. BURTON. It is for that reason that I wish to urge this point on the Senator: If there are to be 600,000 cases, and if the appropriation carried by the joint resolution will cover only approximately 300,000 cases, as a maximum, for the year, if there were applications for more than one-half of the cases, to be handled under these funds, it then would be necessary to increase the appropriation. Would the Senator then proceed on the same theory, that it should be done?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I certainly would. I think it is nothing but humanity. I do not see how the Congress could afford to turn down an appropriation of this kind.

Mr. REED and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from Kansas, and then to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, as I understand the theory of the measure, it is to provide assistance to the wives of servicemen in bringing their babies into the world.

Mr. MCKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. REED. That being the case, notwithstanding the great talent and wide experience of the Senator from Tennessee, I wonder if the ranking bachelor of the Senate is fully qualified to handle a measure of this character. [Laughter.]

Mr. MCKELLAR. I doubt it very much. I want to say that, not having any personal experience in such matters, I can handle it in only an impersonal way. However, I think it is a great humanitarian service. The fathers of the children who are being born are away fighting for their country, and I think the Congress ought to appropriate the necessary money to carry the mothers through their ordeal.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. REED. Notwithstanding the great dereliction in the Senator's duty to humanity and to his country in all the

years of his existence, he is doing a good job now. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator for that compliment. It is not my fault, but merely my misfortune. I have courted many women, and they all had the good sense to turn me down. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I dislike very much to challenge the statement made by my good friend the Senator from Tennessee, but at least three women have specifically and definitely denied that statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sorry I did not know about it sooner. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have received only one complaint about the way in which this fund and this service are being administered. I have received a letter from a prominent county officer in my State, who explained that when the wives of enlisted men are taken into the hospital they are taken in as charity patients, and are so regarded in the hospital. Probably he was referring only to his county, and perhaps only to one case. At any rate, it seems that his attention has been directed to what he thinks is a mistaken policy in the administration of the fund. I do not know under what conditions that would be true. The fund is being administered locally by the State, I suppose, under regulations worked out through the State authorities.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under regulations worked out through the State authorities, and approved by the Board here.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not understand why any soldier's wife who is going to a hospital for the birth of a child should be received as a charity patient. It seems to me that if there is any such practice as that it ought to be corrected, because the wives of soldiers ought not to come in that category. In a very real sense of the word, they are not charity patients. We are rendering the service as a matter of justice. We are doing it because we think they and their husbands in the Army are entitled to the service, just as they are entitled to compensation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course.

Mr. BARKLEY. If there is anyone in the Federal Government or in the State government who is shortsighted enough or casual enough, or for any other reason, designates these patients as charity patients, that practice ought to be corrected.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think the correspondent of the Senator must be mistaken. I have never heard of such charges before, and it must not be correct. The service is part of the compensation to the soldier who is fighting for his country, and in no sense should it be regarded as charity.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. It is a fact, is it not, that any wife of an enlisted man may obtain this service, entirely regardless of her financial situation? She has only to file an application, and the service is then granted. The service does not depend in any way upon a showing of the need for charity, and she is not required to show that the service must be given to her because she is short of funds.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think the misunderstanding has arisen because, as I understand, the service given in hospitals is only ward service. It is not private-room service. However, that has nothing to do with the question whether it is charity or not. It may be that in some cases the patients have been placed in wards with charity patients.

Mr. McKELLAR. That depends entirely upon the rules laid down in the particular State, and approved by the department in Washington.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, in Ohio the service given is only ward service, and there are included the services of a physician, up to $40. If a patient wishes to employ a doctor who charges more than $40, she does not have the advantage of this particular service. At least that is the fact in Ohio.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the various State authorities take the greatest care to see that each of the patients receives the very best care and attention. The Senate and the country should know that to be a fact.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. As I understand, this service covers prenatal service as well as service at the time of the birth, and also care of the child during the first year, so far as it may need medical care.

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe that is correct.

Mr. BURTON. For that reason, because of the value of the service and the soundness of the principle, it seems to me quite likely that long before the year has passed, there may be more than one-half of the wives of enlisted men applying for this service, and that may result in an additional request for appropriations. I think the Senate should be ready to grant the request if additional applications are made.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no doubt that that will be done. I hope that additional appropriations will not be necessary, because our obligations are growing very rapidly, and we hope to save all we can, but not in this connection, because whatever the needs of this particular service are, I have no doubt that Congress will furnish the necessary money.

Mr. BURTON. Let me ask the Senator to confirm these inquiries also:

May the patient choose her own doctor?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is my understanding.

Mr. BURTON. And in case of serious illness arising in connection with the birth, is she able to obtain the benefit of additional specialized services?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not sure about that, but I believe that is correct.

Mr. BURTON. And that is also included in the expense which the Government assumes?

Mr. McKELLAR. My attention is directed to a statement concerning the program. I wish to read a portion of it:

> The program provides for complete maternity care and care for the infant during the first year of life. In all States, the wives of servicemen may select their own physicians; decision with respect to hospital care rests with the physician and the patient. Any hospital may be used provided it has been approved by the State health agency. If during the period when a wife of an enlisted man is receiving maternity care there is need for the consultation of specialists, including surgeons, for blood transfusions, X-ray examinations, special nursing or prolonged hospital care, these services may be paid for under the program.
>
> This program is administered by the State health agencies and every effort is made to assure all possible care for each wife of an enlisted man during pregnancy, delivery, and the postnatal period. In the same way special care for the newborn baby can be provided if needed and also throughout the first year of its life.

That answers the question of the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire statement printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The emergency maternity and infant-care program provides that payments for medical service to the wives and infants of enlisted men be made by the State health agencies to physicians, hospitals, and others providing care. In passing the act providing for this service, the Congress made clear that the purpose of the program was to provide this care in order to assure the enlisted men that their wives and infants would be cared for in their absence. It is important, therefore, that no modification of the program be written into the appropriation act that would remove this assurance.
>
> Forty-seven States, including Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia, are cooperating. The four other States are expected to have programs soon.
>
> The program provides for complete maternity care and care for the infant during the first year of life. In all States the wives of servicemen may select their own physicians; decision with respect to hospital care rests with the physician and the patient. Any hospital may be used provided it has been approved by the State health agency. If during the period when a wife of an enlisted man is receiving maternity care there is need for the consultation of specialists, including surgeons, for blood transfusions, X-ray examinations, special nursing, or prolonged hospital care, these services may be paid for under the program.
>
> This program is administered by the State health agencies and every effort is made to assure all possible care for each wife of an enlisted man during pregnancy, delivery, and the postnatal period. In the same way special care for the newborn baby can be provided if needed and also throughout the first year of its life.
>
> PROPOSAL TO CHANGE FROM A PROGRAM OF PROVISION OF MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICES TO FLAT ALLOWANCE OR GRANTS DIRECTLY TO THE WIVES OF ENLISTED MEN
>
> Such a proposal to change the plan of providing care from one of payment for services

to one of flat allowances to the wives of servicemen was proposed in the House of Representatives and an amendment offered by Congressman SMITH of Ohio. This amendment (see p. 7767), CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 22, 1943) was fully discussed and defeated by a vote of 8 to 115 (see p. 7770). Should a money grant or cash allowance for purchase of maternity and infant care be adopted, the purposes of the program as passed by the Congress could not be effectively carried out for the following reasons:

1. There would be no assurance that such a cash grant or allowance would be expended by the wives of servicemen for the purpose for which the program was initiated by Congress, namely, medical and hospital care for the wives of enlisted men. In many cases such grants would be expended by the recipient to meet immediate needs at the time the cash is received and adequate care by physician and hospital at time of delivery might no longer be possible.

2. The cost of the total program would be far greater than under the present plan. It is estimated today that some 645,000 wives of enlisted men will have babies during the current fiscal year, and that approximately half of this number will apply for care under the program. Were the plan for money grants to be adopted, all wives of enlisted men in grades 4, 5, 6, and 7 would presumably be entitled to receive them. This would mean, if a grant of approximately $100 was made to each wife, that the program would cost at least $30,000,000 more than is estimated at the present time.

3. A flat grant would necessarily be made without regard to individual medical need or the cost of care. In many cases a grant would not be sufficient to cover extraordinary medical expenses, either for the mother or infant such as are being provided under the program today.

4. Under such a plan of grants, though an individual wife might have money with which to purchase medical service, she still might be unable to obtain the necessary care where there is no public agency responsible for making services available. This would be true particularly in communities suffering from the impact of war and consequent shortage of personnel and medical facilities. Under the existing plan it is the responsibility of State health agencies to see that care is made available to the wives of servicemen through the development of appropriate plans.

5. The flat grant would be available for the wife to apply on her medical and hospital bills but there would be no assurance that the rates charged by doctor and hospital would be within the cash grant.

Mr. BURTON. I have a further inquiry:

In cases in which a State or community has built up a special prenatal care service for young mothers, may they still make use of this governmental service at the time of the birth?

Mr. McKELLAR. That may be done.

Mr. BURTON. Finally, as I understand the joint resolution, the service will not be available to all enlisted men, as was provided in the previous measure. It will be limited to the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades, thereby eliminating the three higher grades, the first, second, and third grades. However, even a person in one of those grades who has made application for the service and whose application has been approved, will be permitted to continue with the service. Is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I notice from page 3 of the report that there have been no cases in the State of North Dakota. If the joint resolution is passed, will it be retroactive?

Mr. McKELLAR. The State may take advantage of the service at any time it wishes to do so. Let me read from page 2 of the report:

> Louisiana and North Dakota have not submitted plans, but North Dakota has indicated its intention to do so.

I am sure it will do so, and it will receive all the benefits of the act.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand, there is no rule or regulation which would prevent any child previously conceived in North Dakota from receiving the benefits of the act, in case North Dakota should later qualify under the act.

Mr. McKELLAR. The service is not based upon the time of conception, but upon the time of birth. I am quite sure that all cases will be taken care of as they occur, if North Dakota should ask for the service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendments to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BACK THE ATTACK ARMY SHOW—ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on Sunday, September 26, at the closing performance of the Back the Attack Army show held at the Monument grounds here in Washington, Hon. James Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, a distinguished son of South Carolina, was asked to make the concluding speech. I shall later ask that this excellent speech be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. At this time, Mr. President, I wish to say just a word about the Back the Attack show itself. It was sponsored by a newspaper which has been prominent in American life for many years—the Washington Post. The owner and editor of that newspaper, Mr. Eugene Meyer, and the managing editor, Mr. Alexander F. Jones, are to be greatly commended for their patriotic endeavor to bring to the attention of the people of Washington and the visitors here at least a few of the many outstanding things the Army is doing in connection with the war.

It was a most enlightening show and exhibition. It was not only entertaining, but very instructive. Exhibitions were given by soldiers, and their performances were exceedingly well done. Anyone not having seen this show can hardly comprehend the vast activities of the Army in this war effort. The effective and material activities of the Army were well represented—great guns which can be easily transported and maneuvered; large tanks which are none other than land battleships, and which can be moved with swiftness and effectiveness, and so forth. Whether the activities are on foot, wheels, horseback, or dog team, they are being handled most efficiently. The Medical Corps is most expertly managed, and all facilities for the comfort of the soldier are streamlined to the *n*th degree. It is a show that the whole country should have had an opportunity to witness. I again compliment the Washington Post for conceiving the thought of such a worth-while undertaking. I am sure that I speak for the more than 1,700,000 people who witnessed this show and its exhibits when I say that it was worth while, instructive, enlightening, and from every angle beneficial in educating the public on the Army war activities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by Mr. Byrnes be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> I am authorized to announce that the sale of bonds during the Third War Loan drive through last night totaled $13,300,000,000. Of this amount individuals have bought $2,800,000,000. This represents 56 percent of the goal set for individuals.
>
> Tonight my appeal is directed to individual Americans—the average American citizens who, as they work in shipyards, munitions plants, airplane factories, on our farms, or elsewhere, are making more money than ever before. With an increasing amount of our available manpower going into the war effort we are unable to produce for civilian use as much goods and services as we did before the war. We have more money but less goods. If we scramble to get more than our fair share of the available goods, our efforts to hold down the cost of living will fail. Prices will rise, and the money we earn will buy less and less of the things we really need.
>
> Wars are won by sacrifices. Unless you are making some sacrifice here at home to help win the war you are not keeping faith with those brave Americans who are fighting and who are making the supreme sacrifice in Italy, in New Guinea, and on our far-flung battlefields.
>
> Buying bonds in itself is no sacrifice. Only when you deny to yourself every-day pleasures and comforts in order to buy bonds do you make any sacrifice. But then the sacrifice is only momentary, because in the long run you profit by putting your money in War bonds. They pay interest, and there is no better investment than the bonds of your own Government. Purchases by big financial institutions prove that. When the men who manage these institutions put their money in bonds you know it is a good investment for you to make. When you really need your money you will get it back with interest.
>
> More important, these bonds in the hands of individual Americans will serve as a cushion against any shock which our national life may experience as we convert from a war economy to a peace economy.
>
> Foolish indeed is the man who when the sun is shining does not save money for a rainy day. As never before, the sunshine of high wages and spendable income is bearing down throughout this land. Our national annual income is approaching the all-time high level of $150,000,000,000.
>
> It is estimated that in the coming year after buying all available goods and services, and after paying all personal taxes, individual Americans will have over $40,000,000,000 to invest or spend. If we spend this surplus money, bidding up prices in an effort to get more than our fair share of the available

goods, it will be impossible to hold ceiling prices. We will make black markets. We will start an inflation spiral that will impoverish the people.

It is only common sense to invest a large portion of this $40,000,000,000 in War bonds and hold them for the rainy day. If, when the war is over, we have a business depression, the bonds will insure you against want. If—as all of us hope—good times continue, the bonds can be used to purchase those things which will make for a higher standard of living.

You cannot go wrong. You cannot lose. You can only profit by investing every spare dollar in the bonds of your Government. It is the least sacrifice a patriotic American can make to help win the war.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Leslie E. Given, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of West Virginia, vice Lemuel R. Via, term expired.

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

J. Henry Goguen, of Massachusetts, to be United States marshal for the district of Massachusetts;

John J. Farrell, of Minnesota, to be United States marshal for the district of Minnesota; and

James H. Patterson, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 3, district of Alaska.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Guy T. Helvering, of Kansas, to be United States district judge for the district of Kansas, vice Richard J. Hopkins, deceased.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Harry E. Pratt, of Alaska, to be United States district judge, division No. 4, district of Alaska; and

Ellen K. Raedy, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John J. Boyle, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin.

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Frank E. Flynn, of Arizona, to be United States attorney for the district of Arizona.

By Mr. MURDOCK, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Charles E. Cassidy, of Hawaii, to be third judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Harold E. Stafford, deceased.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Rear Admiral DeWitt C. Ramsey to be Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

Sundry officers for promotion, for temporary service, in the Navy;

Sundry officers for appointment and/or promotion in the Navy;

Sundry officers for promotion, for temporary service, in the Marine Corps; and

Sundry citizens and meritorious noncommissioned officers for appointment as second lieutenants in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Foreign Service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph A. Ziemba to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 39, with headquarters at Chicago, Ill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Martin R. Bradley to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 38, with headquarters at Detroit, Mich.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Bernice Pyke to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 41, with headquarters at Cleveland, Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William H. Rupertus to be major general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from September 28, 1942.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Colonel Lemuel C. Shepherd, to be brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from September 16, 1942.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

THOMAS L. GATCH—NOMINATION REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. WALSH. From the Committee on Naval Affairs, I report favorably the nomination of Rear Admiral Thomas L. Gatch to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

In connection with the Naval Affairs Committee recommendation to the Senate that the nomination of Thomas L. Gatch to be a rear admiral and Judge Advocate General of the Navy for a period of 4 years be confirmed, I desire to state that he is a graduate of a distinguished law school; an attorney admitted to practice in the courts of the United States and of the District of Columbia, and has spent many years of duty in the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy.

Prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor, he was Assistant to the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, stationed in Washington. Very shortly thereafter he was assigned to command one of the newest and finest battleships in our Navy. In October 1942, while his ship was escorting one of a group of carriers seeking the enemy, it was attacked by 3 waves of attacking planes, dive bombers and torpedo bombers in large numbers. When the last wave had passed, the guns of the battleship had 32 Jap planes to their credit and the ship had suffered only comparatively minor damage.

For his service in this battle Captain Gatch was awarded the Navy Cross. The citation accompanying the award states:

> For distinguished service and for gallant and intrepid action in the line of his profession as commanding officer of a United States battleship during the Battle of Santa Cruz Islands October 26, 1942. While the task force to which his ship was attached was under heavy and sustained air attack, Captain Gatch boldly maneuvered his ship close to a United States aircraft carrier in order to carry out more effectively his mission to assist in the defense of the carrier, and so continued until he was so seriously wounded from the explosion of an enemy bomb as to have to turn over his command.

Despite his wound, Captain Gatch wanted another shot at the enemy, and this was not long denied him. In the middle of November 1942 he fought with his ship in the victorious night battle of Savo Island. Here he earned the award of a Gold Star, in lieu of a second Navy Cross, for service described in the citation as follows:

> For extraordinary heroism as commanding officer of a United States battleship during action against enemy Japanese forces off Savo Island on the night of November 14–15, 1942. Although partially disabled and suffering acute pain as a result of a previous wound, Captain Gatch, with bold determination and courageous zeal, gallantly fought his ship through a concentrated bombardment of hostile fire. His calm coolness in the

face of great danger and inspiring leadership contributed to the high combat efficiency which enabled the ship to sink at least one Japanese cruiser and to assist in the destruction and damage of other enemy vessels.

Among the officers and men who fought that engagement under Captain Gatch was a fine young naval officer whose proud father is the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS].

On another occasion in these Halls my distinguished colleague retold the story of this great battle as told to him by his son, and I take the liberty of quoting from the account he then gave:

What a sterling leader this Captain Gatch. What a gallant captain he, who built up within his brave crew such a profound respect, such an abiding confidence, that they would sail willingly with him into the jaws of lurking death. Such leadership as this must not go uncited and unsung.

In consequence of his wound, Captain Gatch is perforce again on shore, at the important post of Judge Advocate General of the Navy.

In view of the distinguished record of Rear Admiral Thomas L. Gatch it is an honor for me to ask that the Senate suspend its rule and confirm his nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Admiral Thomas L. Gatch to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

NOMINATION OF GUY T. HELVERING TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, KANSAS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, some time ago the President nominated, to fill a vacancy caused by the death of the sitting judge in the district court in Kansas, Guy T. Helvering, the present Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The nomination was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and a subcommittee reported the nomination unanimously, and the full committee has reported today favorably upon the nomination. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Guy T. Helvering to be United States district judge for the district of Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the junior Senator from Kansas? The Chair hears none, and the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, before the Senate votes to confirm the nomination of Mr. Guy T. Helvering as Federal District Judge for Kansas, I desire to comment briefly on both Mr. Helvering and the Kansas judgeship.

In the first place, I want to say that I can and will vote for Mr. Helvering's confirmation, and will do so gladly. Mr. Helvering is not of the same political faith as myself; he is a Democrat. But he is a high-class man in every respect, one for whom I have had a very high regard for many years past. When he was nominated to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue more than 10 years ago, I actively supported his confirmation before the Senate Finance Committee and on the floor of the Senate. I said then he would make good as Internal Revenue Commissioner, and he has done so. I have no hesitation in saying that the President could have made no better choice among Kansas Democrats in the appointment of a district judge. Now as to the judgeship situation, for a number of years I have consistently opposed attempts to have an extra district judge for Kansas, on the ground that one able judge is sufficient to handle the cases that come under Federal jurisdiction in Kansas. The late Judge Richard J. Hopkins proved that by keeping up his docket in every respect. I feel confident that Judge Helvering will do the same thing.

Therefore I want to make it plain that my wholehearted support of Mr. Helvering for this high honor—an honor to which I believe his record of public service entitles him at the hands of the administration—is based in part upon the assumption that his services on the district bench will be such that there need be no more talk of a second Federal judicial district in the State of Kansas.

I express the hope and belief that Mr. Helvering will be confirmed by a unanimous vote.

Mr. President, I call attention to the following excerpts from an editorial by Mr. William Allen White in his Emporia Gazette:

JUDGE HELVERING

The President has named as successor to Judge Hopkins, Guy Helvering, who, for nearly a dozen years, has been the national collector of internal revenue. The Senate will quickly confirm him. It has been nearly a quarter of a century since Judge Helvering left the law and went into banking and graduated into politics, and finally into public service. Nevertheless, he was a good prosecuting attorney for 4 years, and has enough common sense and common morals to make a decent judge No other Democrat in Kansas has such distinction as Guy Helvering and no other Democrat, on the whole, could fill the office with more credit to the Democratic Party and its traditions.

In the meantime, there should be no Democratic talk of a second judicial district in this State. One district is enough. Our Kansas Senators, in voting to confirm Guy Helvering, should give full and fair notice that in due and proper time they will oppose any attempt to make another district in Kansas.

In the meantime, citizens of Kansas of both parties should be glad that the judgeship in Kansas did not develop into an unnecessary fight and that as wise and honest a man as Guy Helvering has been appointed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be forthwith notified.

ORDER FOR RECESS

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I understand the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] desires to address the Senate for a few moments. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of his address the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

FIRE PREVENTION IN THE WAR PROGRAM

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the President of the United States has issued a proclamation designating the week beginning October 3, 1943, as Fire Prevention Week. In his proclamation the President points out that "this Nation's war program is menaced by an alarming increase in preventable fire losses." The President's proclamation reads as follows:

FIRE PREVENTION WEEK, 1943—BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION

This Nation's war program is menaced by an alarming increase in preventable fire losses. Since Pearl Harbor the destruction caused by fire in the United States has been comparable to the damage caused by all enemy bombing over England during the first 2 years of the war. The loss to this Nation is just as real as if the destruction had been wrought by enemy bombers over America, or by saboteurs.

These preventable fires are being measured in thousands of workers killed and disabled; vast destruction of critical raw materials, food, and other vital supplies for our armed forces and civilian population; the ruin of war plants, factories, homes, and machinery—in many cases for the duration of the war. Fires are bringing costly delays in the production and transportation of airplanes, ships, tanks, and guns—delays that mean a postponement of victory and the lives of many of our men on the fighting fronts.

Today it is vitally necessary that we prevent destructive fire. Every State in the Union shares this responsibility. Every community must make an extra and thorough effort to detect and eliminate fire hazards. Only by this united endeavor can America guard her productive power against fire and eliminate a major hazard that threatens seriously to reduce supplies of war materials, food, clothing, and other essentials required by our fighting men overseas and by our civilians at home. The cause was never so clear; the need was never so great.

Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning October 3, 1943, as Fire Prevention Week. I earnestly request the people of the country to take unusually active measures during that week, and throughout the year, to conserve our human and material resources from destruction by fire. I call upon State and local governments, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the National Fire Waste Council, upon all business and labor organizations, the pulpit, educators, civic groups, the press, the radio, and the motion-picture industry to initiate programs that will vividly bring home to all our people the dangers of

fire and the methods of controlling it. Further, I direct the Office of Civilian Defense, the Department of Agriculture, the War Production Board, the protective services of the War and Navy Departments, and other appropriate Federal agencies to lend their active support and assistance to the attainment of these objectives.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this thirtieth day of August in the year of our Lord, nineteen hundred and forty-three, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and sixty-eighth.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

By the President:
CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State.

Mr. President, America's fire losses for the first 6 months of 1943 amounted to approximately $190,514,000, as against a total loss for the year 1942 of $314,295,000. Fire losses are increasing, and according to the National Fire Protection Association, the greater part of that increase is taking place in the Nation's war industries. At the present rate, the 1943 fire loss total may well exceed $400,000,000.

These figures alone are a challenge to industry and labor to cooperate in the observance of Fire Prevention Week. But these figures alone do not begin to tell the full story of the meaning of fire losses in America.

Even if all this loss could be repaid in insurance, the money could not replace valuable war equipment; it could not restore the lives of workers lost in flaming buildings; it could not bring back the man-hours of labor lost on essential jobs; and it could not replace stock piles of rubber, lumber, or other critical materials which had been reduced to rubble.

Much has been said about the U-boat menace, and the tragedy of cargoes of munitions and foodstuffs being sent to the bottom of the seas. Such supplies—vital to the success of the war on all fronts—are just as irretrievably lost when they are destroyed anywhere along the line. Food, burned in barns or in warehouses; munitions, destroyed in the plant, in the railway terminal, or on the docks awaiting shipment, are a total loss to the United Nations. And the tragedy of such fire losses—as opposed to the losses directly traceable to enemy action—is that the great majority of them are preventable.

Fire protection in industry must be a cooperative effort between employees and management. Carelessness on the part of workers in the cleaning of machinery or in the handling of cigarettes or matches or in the segregation of materials has caused many costly fires. Management must maintain automatic sprinkler systems, fire extinguishers, and other fire-fighting equipment in and around industrial plants. Similarly, management must provide structural safeguards, which will help limit the destructive effects of fire—safeguards such as fire doors and fire-resistant roofs.

Cooperation is more essential today than ever before, because certain hazards, always incident to factories, have been increased by war. New workers are operating machines and handling materials. Stocks are being concentrated in areas too confined to house them properly, and many plants have been expanded so rapidly that it has been almost impossible to provide them with adequate fire guards. Constant care and vigilance on the part of worker and management are, therefore, the first requisite to reducing industrial fire losses.

To the worker, to industry, and to the Nation, the reduction of industrial fire loss is essential. It means little for a plant to swing rapidly into maximum war production, if its facilities are later to be consumed by fire.

Mr. President, there were more large-loss industrial fires in 1942—our first year at war—than in any year of our history. And there were more large-loss industrial fires in the first 4 months of the present year, 1943, than in all of 1942.

While American and Allied troops rain their own brand of fire on the enemy abroad, American civilians have on their hands another kind of fight—a fight with fire on the home front. In spite of the fact that there has been remarkably little sabotage, and in spite of the fact that our cities have been free of incendiary bombing attacks, fire losses in our war industries have soared far beyond those of any similar period in our history.

Fire continues to take a yearly toll of thousands of lives and millions of dollars worth of food and equipment on our farms. Fire prevention is essential to conservation on the farm. Pointing out that America's fire losses are on the upgrade, and that farm fire losses—even in peacetime—amount to millions of dollars worth of materials and equipment annually, David J. Price, president of the National Fire Prevention Association, urges the complete cooperation of all farmers in the observance of Fire Prevention Week. And as Dr. Price points out, "Food burned in the barn is of no help to the fighting men overseas. The destruction of equipment by fire reduces the Nation's food-producing capacity," and thus delays the day of our ultimate military victory.

Today our residential fire loss is likewise appalling. The United States is burning its homes faster than they are being built. In 1942, approximately 350,000 dwelling units were constructed, in an all-out effort to solve this Nation's acute war-housing problem. During the same period, 395,000 dwelling units were attacked by fire—many of them totally destroyed. The great majority of these fires are the result of carelessness.

The elimination of fire hazards and the prosecution of a vigorous home-front war against fire destruction are the objectives of Fire Prevention Week. The control of fire is essential to the success of the war effort in all its phases—in attack, in supply, in conservation, and in the preservation of human lives.

Such common hazards as defective heating and electrical equipment, the misuse of gasoline and kerosene, careless disposal of matches and cigarettes, and the accumulation of flame-breeding rubbish, present no insuperable obstacle. But as long as such conditions are permitted to exist, the danger of fire loss will likewise exist.

Fire Prevention Week is an appropriate time for all Americans to enlist in the struggle against fire—that sinister and deadly enemy which has infiltrated the home front. But after the battle is won, constant vigilance must be maintained, for fire is such a foe that it returns again and again, whenever the defenses against it are relaxed. It is up to the boys in uniform to start fires "over there" on the territory of the enemy. But it is up to us right here at home to stamp out our appalling fire losses, and in so doing to keep the wheels of our war effort moving along at maximum, uninterrupted speed.

I join with the President in calling upon every citizen in America to do his full part toward realizing these essential objectives, and toward making this National Fire Prevention Week a week of complete and effective fire-prevention accomplishments.

Let us join forces with those many thousands of our gallant citizens—the fire fighters of America—who by day and by night undergo the risks of pain and peril to protect America against the thrusts of fire. Let us strive to make a record contribution to the success of Fire Prevention Week.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order previously adopted, the Senate will now stand in recess.

Thereupon (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 29, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 28 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John W. Bailey, Jr., of Texas, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, and a consul general of the United States of America.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL WITH RANK FROM 30 AUGUST 1943

Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Richard C. Moore, appointed major general, Regular Army.

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL WITH RANK FROM 30 AUGUST 1943

Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, vice Major General William H. Wilson, retired.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE LIEUTENANT GENERALS

Maj. Gen. Hugh Aloysius Drum, United States Army, now invested with rank and title of lieutenant general by virtue of his assignment to command the First Army.

Maj. Gen. Ira Clarence Eaker (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Barton Kyle Yount (colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Harry John Collins (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Douglass Taft Greene (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Ray Edison Porter (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. William Elmer Lynd (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. George Wesley Griner, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. David McCoach, Jr. (colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Stephen J. Chamberlin (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Robert Walker Grow (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Shelley Uriah Marietta (colonel, Medical Corps), Assistant to the Surgeon General.

Brig. Gen. John Alden Crane (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Nicholas Dalton (lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. George Fairless Lull (colonel, Medical Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Stanley Eric Reinhart (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Albert Walton Kenner (colonel, Medical Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Lloyd Edmonstone Jones (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Charles Paul Stivers (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. David Norvell Walker Grant (colonel, Medical Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Robert Lily Spragins (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. James Luke Frink (colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Robert Hilliard Mills (colonel, Dental Corps), assistant to the Surgeon General.

Brig. Gen. Robert LeGrow Walsh (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Thomas Francis Hickey (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Stuart Cutler (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Eric Spencer Molitor (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Edward Barber (major, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Paul Edmund Burrows (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Hubert Ward Beyette (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Morris Ankcorn (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Laurence Carbee Craigie (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Victor Vaughan Taylor (lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Merrick Gay Estabrook, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Hamilton Hinds (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. John Sheridan Winn, Jr., (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Thomas Francis Bresnahan (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Dale Vincent Gaffney (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Curtis Emerson LeMay (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States), Army of the United States, Air Corps.

Col. Emer Yeager, Field Artillery.

Col. Edward Montgomery, Chemical Warfare Service.

Col. Morris Berman (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. William Robert Nichols, Coast Artillery Corps.

Col. Edward Julius Timberlake, Jr. (captain, Air Corps; temporary major, Army of the United States; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, Air Corps.

Col. Harold Rufus Jackson lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Ralph Francis Stearley (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Albert Francis Hegenberger (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Henry Anson Barber, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Leo Thomas McMahon (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. George Jacob Nold (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Edwin Thomas, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Macaulay Eager, Field Artillery.

Col. David Marshall Ney Ross (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Nathaniel Alanson Burnell 2d (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. George Godfrey Lundberg (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Earl Hamlin DeFord (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. David Lewis Ruffner (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Harold Lyman Clark (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Raymond Whitcomb Bliss, Medical Corps.

Col. Thomas Raphael Phillips (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Kenneth Perry McNaughton (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Edward Chambers Betts (lieutenant colonel, Judge Advocate General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Otto Paul Weyland (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Raleigh Raymond Hendrix (major, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. William Howard Arnold (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Roland Glenn, Medical Corps.

Col. Garrison Holt Davidson (captain, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. William Carroll Christy, Cavalry.

Col. Frank Charles McConnell (major, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Y. York, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. David Myron Schlatter (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Ralph Pulsifer (major, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Donald Weldon Brann (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Vincent James Meloy (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Mervin Eugene Gross (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. George Craig Stewart (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Russell Alger Osmun, Quartermaster Corps.

Col. Herbert Slayden Clarkson, Field Artillery.

Col. Roland Francis Walsh, Quartermaster Corps.

Col. Francis Henry Lanahan, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Merle Weir (lieutenant colonel, Judge Advocate General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Julian Wallace Cunningham (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. James Maurice Gavin (captain, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. James Bryan Newman, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Thomas Harry Ramsey (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Will Coffey (lieutenant colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Paul Hyde Prentiss (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Malcolm Cummings Grow, Medical Corps.

Col. John Trott Murray (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Frederick Henry Osborn, United States Army, Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Leonard Fish Wing, National Guard of the United States.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Stella E. Martin, Plantersville, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Benjamin L. Edmonds, West Blocton, Ala., in place of B. L. Edmonds. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

CALIFORNIA

William R. McKinnon, Livermore, Calif., in place of W. R. McKinnon. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Gertrude S. Adams, Livingston, Calif., in place of V. H. Adams, deceased.

Mayme Lea Jory, Manor, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Meneva S. Latham, Palm City, Calif., in place of E. J. McBride, resigned.

Henry I. Marshall, Ross, Calif., in place of M. R. Braun, resigned.

COLORADO

Wesley A. Simmer, Blanca, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Victor C. Baker, Fairplay, Colo., in place of F. E. Lilley, resigned.

Roxie R. Broad, Wheat Ridge, Colo., in place of R. R. Broad. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

CONNECTICUT

Francis H. Whelan, Darien, Conn., in place of P. F. Sherran, removed.

Arthur H. Forst, Seymour, Conn., in place of W. B. Johnson, retired.

Paul F. Cassidy, Woodbury, Conn., in place of W. A. Mansfield, deceased.

DELAWARE

Alexander P. Gallagher, New Castle, Del., in place of C. J. Dougherty, deceased.

FLORIDA

Stanley V. Buss, Vero Beach, Fla., in place of J. J. Schumann, Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

GEORGIA

Ola H. Bradbury, Bogart, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Clarence L. Persons, Eastman, Ga., in place of M. L. Burch, retired.

Frances Catherine Wingate, Ellijay, Ga., in place of W. B. James, retired.

John Marcus Stubbs, Savannah, Ga., in place of Marion Lucas, deceased.

Annie Lee Baker, Shannon, Ga., in place of D. K. Houser, resigned.

Eloise G. Flanders, Swainsboro, Ga., in place of D. E. Flanders, resigned.

HAWAII

Francis Hughes, Lanikai, Hawaii. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

IDAHO

Lloyd R. Dyer, Worley, Idaho, in place of C. H. Hoag, retired.

ILLINOIS

Mary L. Brennan, Elkhart, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Leonard L. Riegel, Galatia, Ill., in place of J. A. Gill. Incumbent's commission expired May 11, 1942.

Emily M. Cole, Glenview, Ill., in place of E. M. Cole. Incumbent's commission expired May 3, 1942.

Anna E. Sullivan, Grand Tower, Ill., in place of A. E. Sullivan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Paul T. Hartline, Hillsboro, Ill., in place of A. H. Bartlett, resigned.

Lenora B. Dickerson, La Fayette, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Paul F. Lewis, Lawrenceville, Ill., in place of H. C. Johnson, deceased.

Edward J. Shunick, Monmouth, Ill., in place of A. D. Irey, deceased.

Bertha M. Paris, Montgomery, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mary Convery, Raymond, Ill., in place of Mary Convery. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Otis M. Lamar, Rosiclare, Ill., in place of O. M. Lamar. Incumbent's commission expired May 11, 1942.

Fannie E. Smith, San Jose, Ill., in place of L. M. Cross, resigned.

Walter G. McEwan, Sheldon, Ill., in place of E. M. Snow, resigned.

Ira Dezouche, Wayne City, Ill., in place of Ira Dezouche. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

INDIANA

Charles E. Hull, Columbus, Ind., in place of C. A. Thompson, deceased.

Flossie L. Waterstraat, Earl Park, Ind., in place of J. J. Hartman. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Closs D. Samuels, Greensburg, Ind., in place of M. M. Carter, deceased.

Paul E. Byrum, Milltown, Ind., in place of P. E. Byrum. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ethel Williams, Odon, Ind., in place of John Nichols, deceased.

IOWA

Gertrude Hunter, Floyd, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Lillian V. White, Manilla, Iowa, in place of F. E. H. Proescholdt, resigned.

Wilbur G. Flam, New London, Iowa, in place of H. E. Chichester, removed.

Ella L. Klopping, Underwood, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

KANSAS

Regina Cannon, Beattie, Kans., in place of J. G. O'Neil, transferred.

Clara Sainer, Bison, Kans., in place of Vaclav Sajner, retired.

Mina Short, Concordia, Kans., in place of W. H. Danenbarger, deceased.

Mary E Carpenter, Goddard, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Herbert E. Walter, Kingman, Kans., in place of A. G. Long, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Charles B. Cox, Benton, Ky., in place of C. B. Cox. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Kenneth T. Marquette, Falmouth, Ky., in place of H. L. Cummins, deceased.

LOUISIANA

Gussie Long Harris, Athens, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Girtherine Evans Lloyd, Grambling, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Willie B. Killgore, Lisbon, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MAINE

Earl L. Garland, Carmel, Maine, in place of E. L. Garland. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1941.

Evangeline L. McKenney, Clinton, Maine, in place of A. P. Galusha, transferred.

MASSACHUSETTS

James H. Monahan, Clifton, Mass., in place of L. H. Thorner, resigned.

Wilma L. Foster, Hamilton, Mass., in place of H. A. Daley, resigned.

Bertha S. Nelson, Raynham, Mass., in place of A. M. Lincoln, resigned.

MICHIGAN

Ernest R. Brodeur, Cadillac, Mich., in place of Henry Miltner, deceased.

Harry Kramer, Holland, Mich., in place of L. J. Vanderburg, deceased.

Frank W. Weilnau, Ida, Mich., in place of E. J. Weipert, removed.

George J. Carlton, Mackinaw City, Mich., in place of L. M. Wheeler, removed.

Bruce S. Trace, Royal Oak, Mich., in place of G. H. Davis, resigned.

MINNESOTA

John G. Hawley, Sandstone, Minn., in place of J. F. Hawley, resigned.

Benjamin C. Moe, Wanamingo, Minn., in place of O. W. Hennings, deceased.

MISSISSIPPI

Eloise G. Stephens, Artesia, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

John W. Lunday, Jr., Biloxi, Miss., in place of J. R. Meunier, retired.

Alice R. Alexander, Lexington, Miss., in place of M. L. Beall, removed.

Iowa S. Boswell, Sanatorium, Miss., in place of Henry Boswell, removed.

Effie Abernathy, Shannon, Miss., in place of R. E. Gryder, retired.

MISSOURI

W. Lloyd Wiley, Crane, Mo., in place of B. F. Carney, transferred.

Parks Bacon, El Dorado Springs, Mo., in place of V. D. Washington, deceased.

Lewis A. Newkirk, Everton, Mo., in place of G. T. Barker, retired.

Cecil E. Schwartz, Hannibal, Mo., in place of F. J. Schaul, deceased.

James R. Daily, Schell City, Mo., in place of W. B. Maus, deceased.

Ernest C. Buehler, South St. Joseph, Mo., in place of E. C. Buehler. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Gorda L. Preston, Stockton, Mo., in place of H. E. Church, resigned.

MONTANA

Allen S. McKenzie, Philipsburg, Mont., in place of A. S. McKenzie. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEBRASKA

Joyce Hubbard, Ashby, Nebr., in place of Joyce Hubbard. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Claude J. Wright, Aurora, Nebr., in place of C. J. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Alma E. Rumsey, Bancroft, Nebr., in place of A. E. Rumsey. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Fred C. Buhk, Beemer, Nebr., in place of F. C. Buhk. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Clair Grimes, Chambers, Nebr., in place of Clair Grimes. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ferdinand S. Bogner, Crofton, Nebr., in place of E. L. Talcott, removed.

Inez G. Britt, Doniphan, Nebr., in place of R. M. Britt, deceased.

C. Arthur Scism, Edgar, Nebr., in place of C. A. Scism. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Helen W. Schneider, Elmwood, Nebr., in place of H. W. Schneider. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Jeptha D. Bishop, Gibbon, Nebr., in place of I. R. L. Taylor, resigned.

Charles Hynek, Humboldt, Nebr., in place of Charles Hynek. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John J. Burns, Scotia, Nebr., in place of J. J. Burns. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Eric Fredrickson, Wakefield, Nebr., in place of Eric Fredrickson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Orley E. McCallum, Wauneta, Nebr., in place of O. E. McCallum. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Charles Conrad LaLiberte, Claremont, N. H., in place of W. P. Nolin, deceased.

William F. Keating, Hill, N. H., in place of W. F. Keating. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1942.

NEW JERSEY

Francis D. McHugh, Chatham, N. J., in place of L. R. Ress, deceased.

Karl D. Alexander, Cliffside Park, N. J., in place of J. F. O'Toole, deceased.

John A. Wheeler, Monmouth Beach, N. J., in place of J. A. Wheeler. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William J. Ledger, Stockton, N. J., in place of A. D. Wilson, deceased.

NEW MEXICO

Robert F. Fisher, Cuba, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW YORK

Frank C. Timm, Attica, N. Y., in place of E. J. Seagert. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1942.

Agnes D. Buckley, Boonville, N. Y., in place of F. M. Buckley, deceased.

Mary B. Sherry, East Patchogue, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Alma H. Jones, East Quogue, N. Y., in place of Isabelle Floege, resigned.

Jennie W. Jewell, Fishkill, N. Y., in place of J. W. Jewell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Agnes Rourke, Gansevoort, N. Y., in place of H. J. Rourke, resigned.

Samuel J. Hand, Genoa, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Joseph P. Wilson, Manhasset, N. Y., in place of R. J. Watrous, removed.

Milton S. Smith, Mayville, N. Y., in place of M. S. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

S. Erle Dodge, Newfane, N. Y., in place of T. A. Banta, deceased.

Frederick G. Newell, Niagara Falls, N. Y., in place of E. V. Canavan, deceased.

Sylvester J. Krasniewicz, Pine Island, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Wilbur A. Gruhn, Sea Breeze, N. Y., in place of Margaret Van Auken, resigned.

Josephine Westphall, South New Berlin, N. Y., in place of H. E. Morrell, resigned.

Walter Rossen, Vestal, N. Y., in place of H. E. Dean, resigned.

Parke Higgins, Warsaw, N. Y., in place of F. J. Taylor, resigned.

J. Austin Howe, Weedsport, N. Y., in place of E. D. Guyder. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Myrtle M. Freeman, Windsor, N. Y., in place of Ward Kilpatrick, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Edgar M. Martin, East Bend, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

James C. Swain, Plymouth, N. C., in place of G. W. Hardison, deceased.

Gertrude B. Speir, Winterville, N. C., in place of N. R. Hunsucker, transferred.

NORTH DAKOTA

Edwin H. Naumann, Kramer, N. Dak., in place of T. J. Naumann, resigned.

Curtis L. Wright, Michigan, N. Dak., in place of Anthony Hentges, retired.

Nick F. Schammel, Tolley, N. Dak., in place of C. E. Mulinex, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Maude A. Cumming, Adair, Okla., in place of J. W. Wright, transferred.

James E. Terrell, Elmore City, Okla., in place of J. E. Terrell. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

PENNSYLVANIA

Florence M. Armstrong, Allenwood, Pa., in place of Richard Armstrong, deceased.

George F. Purpur, Danville, Pa., in place of H. C. VanKirk, deceased.

Armena Blumette, Harmarville, Pa., in place of Michael Mcroff, resigned.

Willard K. Allison, Hickory, Pa., in place of W. K. Allison. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Alice M. Prascsak, Indianola, Pa., in place of V. M. Burrell, resigned.

Chester M. Fies, Laureldale, Pa., in place of E. S. Warmkessel, resigned.

Mary B. Marr, Norristown, Pa., in place of B. J. O'Rourke, deceased.

Ethel C. Ufema, Slickville, Pa., in place of J. E. Franklin, resigned.

RHODE ISLAND

Elton L. Clark, North Scituate, R. I., in place of E. L. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ray E. Young, Due West, S. C., in place of R. E. Young. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Andrew M. Blair, Rion, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

William F. Griffin, Travellers Rest, S. C., in place of J. H. Coleman, transferred.

TENNESSEE

Sadie P. Omohundro, Donelson, Tenn., in place of J. F. Moore, removed.

Thomas D. Walker, Kerrville, Tenn., in place of T. D. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Henry G. Simpson, Middleton, Tenn., in place of Maurice Wilson, retired.

TEXAS

Otto M. Naegelin, Castroville, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Rosa A. Haynes, Eden, Tex., in place of Edna Williams, transferred.

Anna Jo Wilson, Gunter, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Leonard B. Baldwin, Huntsville, Tex., in place of L. B. Baldwin. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Russell B. Cope, Loraine, Tex., in place of R. B. Cope. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Hattie M. Welch, Meadow, Tex., in place of A. C. Finley, transferred.

Clarence M. Maney, Natalia, Tex., in place of C. G. White, deceased.

Mary Elizabeth Graves, Port Isabel, Tex., in place of R. S. Wait, resigned.

Paulin J. Fowler, South San Antonio, Tex., in place of P. J. Fowler. Incumbent's commission expired April 6, 1942.

Charles M. Palmer, Vickery, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

VERMONT

Mary A. Weleher, Bethel, Vt., in place of M. A. Keleher. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Earle J. Rogers, Cabot, Vt., in place of E. J. Rogers. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Gertrude L. Cutler, Cambridge, Vt., in place of G. L. Cutler. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Hollis S. Johnson, Castleton, Vt., in place of H. S. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Rutherford D. Pfenning, Forest Dale, Vt., in place of R. D. Pfenning. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Harriette R. Wilson, Greensboro, Vt., in place of N. L. Heidger, resigned.

William T. Johnson, Hardwick, Vt., in place of W. T. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Frank J. Donahue, Middlebury, Vt., in place of F. J. Donahue. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mabel R. Turner, Rupert, Vt., in place of M. R. Turner. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ruth A. Randall, Wells River, Vt., in place of R. A. Randall. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ruby C. Gauthier, Wilder, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Margaret M. Flower, Woodstock, Vt., in place of M. M. Flower. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1942.

VIRGINIA

Carrie F. Patterson, Greenwood, Va., in place of C. F. Patterson. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1942.

Lexie M. VanDyke, Jewell Ridge, Va., in place of B. P. Nearhood, resigned.

Harris Hill Gee, Meherrin, Va., in place of M. E. Gee, deceased.

WASHINGTON

Jehu O. Patterson, Pullman, Wash., in place of J. O. Patterson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John O. Mills, Woodland, Wash., in place of R. H. Mitchell, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

John B. Puryear, Jr., Holden, W. Va., in place of J. B. Puryear, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Martha J. Snyder, Shepherdstown, W. Va., in place of W. B. Snyder, deceased.

WISCONSIN

Arthur H. Klingbeil, Brodhead, Wis., in place of A. N. Lawton, resigned.

Harold C. Krentz, Westfield, Wis., in place of Samuel Dewar, retired.

WYOMING

Carl W. Hornbeck, Shoshoni, Wyo., in place of L. M. Blackwell, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 28 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Guy T. Helvering, to be United States district judge for the district of Kansas.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Joseph A. Ziemba to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 39, with headquarters at Chicago, Ill.

Martin R. Bradley to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 38, with headquarters at Detroit, Mich.

Bernice Pyke to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 41, with headquarters at Cleveland, Ohio.

FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

PROMOTIONS

Consul generals

Maurice L. Stafford
Henry M. Wolcott

Consuls

Walter W. Hoffmann
Reginald P. Mitchell
Rollin R. Winslow

Foreign Service officers of class 1

Maynard B. Barnes	Joseph F. McGurk
William P. Blocker	Edward L. Reed
Richard P. Butrick	H. Earle Russell
Felix Cole	Rudolf E. Schoenfeld
Frederick P. Hibbard	Harold H. Tittmann
Robert F. Kelley	Orme Wilson

Foreign Service officers of class 2

Ellis O. Briggs	Sydney B. Redecker
Parker W. Buhrman	Laurence E. Salisbury
Herbert S. Bursley	Harold Shantz
William E. De Courcy	Ashley B. Sowell
Dudley G. Dwyre	Edwin F. Stanton
Walter A. Foote	Christian T. Steger
Waldemar J. Gallman	Howard K. Travers
George D. Hopper	Fletcher Warren
Charles A. Livengood	

Foreign Service officers of class 3

Wainwright Abbott	Thomas McEnelly
Charles A. Bay	John R. Minter
Hiram A. Boucher	John J. Muccio
Clarence C. Brooks	Earl L. Packer
George H. Butler	Austin R. Preston
Harry E. Carlson	Benjamin Reath Riggs
Owen L. Dawson	Joseph C. Satterthwaite
Samuel H. Day	James T. Scott
Hocker A. Doolittle	Samuel Sokobin
Fayette J. Flexer	George Tait
Raleigh A. Gibson	Marshall M. Vance
Julian F. Harrington	Jesse F. Van Wickel
Frank Anderson Henry	
Karl deG. MacVitty	

Foreign Service officers of class 4

Charles E. Bohlen	John J. Meily
Russell M. Brooks	Harold M. Randall
John H. Bruins	James W. Riddleberger
John M. Cabot	William W. Schott
A. Bland Calder	Edward J. Sparks
Leo J. Callanan	Maurice L. Stafford
Archie W. Childs	Alan N. Steyne
Walton C. Ferris	Harry L. Troutman
George Gregg Fuller	Frederik van den Arend
W. Perry George	James R. Wilkinson
Franklin C. Gowen	Miss Frances E. Willis
Robert Y. Jarvis	
Edward B. Lawson	
Edward P. Lawton	

Foreign Service officers of class 5

Ware Adams	Charles H. Heisler
Burton Y. Berry	Hervé J. L'Heureux
Lee R. Blohm	John H. Madonne
James C. H. Bonbright	Erik W. Magnuson
Daniel M. Braddock	Horatio Mooers
James E. Brown, Jr.	James K. Penfield
Homer M. Byington, Jr.	Edwin Schoenrich
Everett F. Drumright	Horace H. Smith
Elbridge Durbrow	Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr.
Peter H. A. Flood	Edward T. Wailes
Richard B. Haven	Carlos J. Warner
	Thomas C. Wasson

Foreign Service officers of class 8

Theodore C. Achilles	Edward Page, Jr.
Garret G. Ackerson, Jr.	George W. Renchard
Roy E. B. Bower	Henry E. Stebbins
Montgomery H. Colladay	Francis Bowden Stevens
John Davies, Jr.	Laurence W. Taylor
William S. Farrell	Robert F. Woodward
Heyward G. Hill	James H. Wright
J. Winsor Ives	Lloyd D. Yates
Robert G. McGregor, Jr.	

Foreign Service officers of class 7

Hector C. Adam, Jr.	Donal F. McGonigal
William K. Ailshie	J. Graham Parsons
E. Tomlin Bailey	Marselis C. Parsons, Jr.
Russell W. Benton	John C. Pool
Roswell C. Beverstock	George F. Scherer
Glen W. Bruner	William P. Snow
Richard W. Byrd	Carl W. Strom
Glion Curtis, Jr.	Earle C. Taylor
Andrew B. Foster	T. Eliot Weil
Owen W. Gaines	Ivan B. White
Norris S. Haselton	Arthur R. Williams
Douglas MacArthur 2d	
Elbert G. Mathews	

Foreign Service officers of class 8

William Belton	Robert Grinnell
Lampton Berry	Theodore J. Hadraba
William O. Boswell	Robert F. Hale
Charles R. Burrows	Parker T. Hart
Robert T. Cowan	Franklin Hawley
Leon L. Cowles	Martin J. Hillenbrand
H. Francis Cunningham, Jr.	John Evarts Horner
	Outerbridge Horsey
Philip M. Davenport	Hungerford B. Howard
Richard H. Davis	William L. Krieg
Arthur B. Emmons 3d	Carl F. Norden
Vernon L. Fluharty	R. Kenneth Oakley
Fulton Freeman	Robert W. Rinden
A. David Fritzlan	George Lybrook West, Jr.
Ralph C. Getsinger	
John Goodyear	Randolph A. Kidder

IN THE NAVY

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL

Rear Admiral Thomas L. Gatch to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

APPOINTMENTS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE IN THE NAVY

Rear admiral

Roscoe E. Schuirmann to be rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service to rank from May 16, 1942

To be commodores in the Navy, for temporary service

Edward J. Moran	Edward J. Foy
Henry S. Kendall	Frederick G. Reinicke
Giles E. Short	William A. Sullivan
Leslie E. Gehres	Andrew F. Carter
Thomas S. Combs	

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Brig. Gen. William H. Rupertus to be major general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from September 28, 1942.

Col. Lemuel C. Shepherd to be brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from September 16, 1942.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who are the Lord of life, like the wise one of old, we pray for wisdom that we may not go astray in the wilderness of selfish ambitions. Out of the gates of Thy throne flow the streams that sweeten the bitter waters of human experience; help us to acquire pure hearts and contented minds. When weariness of heart threatens, strengthen us; when petty vexations distract, refresh us with the benediction of Thy grace.

Almighty God, we would repeat it over and over again that it is the unseen life which is real and eternal, that which is seen is temporal. O consider our hopes, our yearning spirits, our unspoken prayers and our quivering faith which so often in silence and loneliness look up to Thee, too sacred for speech. Be not blind to the virtues and graces which live in many a human breast, not set on selfish ends. As Thou dost look down upon the martyrdom of man, bearing the whips and scorns in pain and in sorrow, O let the burning truth steady all souls that brutal force and power cannot survive. They that mourn are blessed and Thy comfort and triumph are reserved for them; the peacemakers shall yet see the children of God destined to inherit the earth. In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a communication from the Clerk of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1943.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-eighth Congress from the Second Congressional District of Kansas, to fill a vacancy in that district, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,
SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Representative-elect ERRETT P. SCRIVNER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LIVING COSTS IN ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and my colleagues the gentlemen from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER and Mr. MILLER], who, like myself, represent part of the city of St. Louis, I present to the House for reference to the proper committee petitions signed by the citizens of our city, containing 54,607 names, urging a reduction in the cost of living.

These petitions are addressed to the Congress of the United States asking for a roll-back of prices to September 15, 1942, as outlined in the following measures:

First. Subsidies on a differential basis to cover the special burdens of small business and high-cost producers.

Second. Grade labeling.

Third. Dollars-and-cents ceilings on all cost-of-living items at their September 15, 1942, level.

Fourth. Continued rent control.

Fifth. A strong Office of Price Administration—staffed with loyal supporters of price control, given adequate funds for enforcement, with full power to enforce ceilings and to compel delivery of supplies by the food processors.

An organization which is known as the United Labor Committee of Greater St. Louis, representing the A. F. of L., the C. I. O., the railroad brotherhoods, and other unions in cooperating with other citizens and organizations, circulated the petitions and secured the signatures. By no means are all the signers of the petitions members of labor organizations. Thousands of the signers are housewives. Volunteer workers set up booths in the neighborhood shopping areas calling those who passed to the attention of the petitions, the purpose of preparing them, and urging signatures provided the citizen was in favor of the effort. It fairly represents the opinion of the citizens of St. Louis, especially those whose earnings place them in what we commonly call the lower brackets.

It is admitted that there has been some increase in wages but for a long time few increases have been made while the cost of living has steadily increased. I am not talking now about luxuries but the necessities of life—food, clothing, medicine, and so forth. I feel confident if the cost of living could be put back to September 15, 1942, there would be practically no demands for increase in wages, but when the wage earner finds that his weekly earnings are not sufficient to properly care for his family, naturally there is dissension. We do not want black markets nor do we want the people of this country bidding for such commodities as are available.

I have never been enthusiastic about subsidies, but if subsidies are necessary in order to maintain the standard of living to which our citizens are accustomed, then serious consideration should be given to the efforts of those administering the various laws who advocate subsidies.

The Office of Price Administration has been giving attenion to a program for rolling the cost of living back nearly 5 percent, or to that which prevailed Sep-

tember 15, 1942. Recently the general manager of the Office of Price Administration announced a three-way program. It is to be hoped that those administering the laws can grant the relief desired by these petitions, but in the event that they cannot, then I urge that Congress give serious consideration to the entire question.

The officers of the United Labor Committee that forwarded these petitions are Joseph P. Clark, president; William Sentner, first vice president; William Anderson, treasurer; Oscar A. Ehrhardt, secretary.

Executive board: Victor Boggs, Richard Brazier, John J. Church, Ben Gilbert, Lloyd McBride, Harry Mertz, James Pfaffenbach, Louis Renschen, John I. Rollings, Lloyd Weber.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, these petitions which have been prepared by the United Labor Committee of St. Louis, constitute an expression of many thousands of St. Louisans who are alarmed by the failure of O. P. A. to control the increases in the cost of living. The objective of these petitions is to hold prices down, to prevent any further inflationary price rises. That is a worthy and most necessary objective.

We all do not agree on the practical steps which may be used to correct a situation which has already been allowed to get out of bounds. I do not agree that all of the steps advocated in these petitions are either sound economically or workable, but I think we can all agree that the Price Control Act, as amended by the Congress in 1942, did give sufficient power to the Office of Price Administration to accomplish worthwhile results. It is regrettable that administration of that law has been such as to cause failure in many price fields.

Congress should continue diligent efforts toward the objective expressed in these petitions.

REDUCING THE COST OF LIVING

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN and Mr. PLOESER], in presenting to the House for reference to the appropriate committee the petitions bearing the signatures of 54,607 citizens of St. Louis urging the Congress to aid in reducing the cost of living.

The United Labor Committee of Greater St. Louis, comprising representatives of the A. F. of L., the C. I. O., and the railroad brotherhoods, have rendered a splendid public service in circulating and securing the signatures to these petitions. In this effort they have succeeded in bringing more forcibly to the attention of the citizens of St. Louis the grave situation not only confronting them but the people of the Nation in the matter of the cost of living.

The rising spiral of prices, with the attendant threat of inflation, has been felt in every home. The time has come, not only to put an end if possible to any further rise in the prices of the necessities of life, but especially foods, but to turn these prices back to the levels of September 15, 1942.

Congress has increased the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation by $350,000,000 in an effort to hold the line and turn back the prices of certain foodstuffs. In my judgment it would have been best had the price on all necessities been frozen the day war was declared—this the Congress was not asked to do—and those in charge of our Government at Washington failed to do.

I cannot conscientiously subscribe to the belief that subsidies are the proper means to stabilize and roll back prices. If I thought this would do the job, I would back such a proposal to the limit. On the contrary, subsidies will only aggravate what is already a bad situation, due to the bungling and incompetence of the policies and personnel of the O. P. A. Everyone is agreed that prices must be kept down and where out of line turned back to reasonable levels. Subsidies will not prevent inflation—they will contribute to it by giving more people more money with which to bid in the black market for the things that they want and need. A hungry man with hungry children at home will not debate the price of meat or bread, nor where or how, or how much he will pay for it. He will demand and obtain these things at the risk of his own life.

We must remember that the consumer is also a taxpayer who has an added interest in food subsidies. He and his descendants must repay not only the principal but the interest and administration cost of subsidies. And what does this mean in terms of dollars and cents? It is estimated upon good authority that a total subsidy program upon foods would cost no less than $450,000,000, with an additional $50,000,000 for administration—making a total of $500,000,000. To pay this subsidy the Government must sell bonds maturing in, say, 50 years, bearing interest at the rate of 2.9 percent. The interest on these bonds alone would amount to $725,000,000, and this added to the subsidy of $500,000,000 would mean that it would cost the taxpayers a minimum of $1,225,000,000, which, in simpler terms, means that each individual who saves $3.92 on his 1943 grocery bill would be obliged to pay back in interest and cost of administration $9.15.

What right have we to saddle upon the returned soldier, who now receives $50 per month and risks his life for us, an unpaid portion of today's grocery bill while some of those at home earn $400 and $500 per month? It is as my distinguished colleague from South Dakota, Congressman MUNDT, observed, like putting a tax on the chauffeur's beer to help buy champagne for the owner of the automobile. Shall today's food be paid in cash by me or partly in I O U's tomorrow by the soldier who is fighting to make my job and our form of government secure?

Our present problem is one not so much of price as it is of production. It is one of scarcity and not of surplus. The demands of the armed forces and those of our allies have created a scarcity of those commodities which are essential to our existence, and which we have become accustomed to believe were always abundant.

The answer to this important question does not lie in sugar-coated subsidies but in production and more production of the very things that we seek to subsidize. The days of planned scarcities as advocated and practiced by the New Deal are at an end. The answer now and hereafter should be to develop and practice a philosophy of plenty.

It would not be proper to condemn subsidies and expose the fallacies of such a program without being able to offer a plan to solve the difficulties of the present situation. It is my firm belief that we need a program which will encourage rather than discourage maximum production of food and fair distribution at equitable prices. I propose: First, effective coordination through a single head of our Government activities affecting food production, distribution, and price control. Second, a manpower program for the farmers which will enable them to produce the maximum of foodstuffs and feed. Third, provision for adequate supplies of farm machinery and the necessary fuel for carrying out such a program. Fourth, simplification of the operation of price controls with greater utilization of the experience of those engaged in producing and marketing food and farm products.

It seems to me that adequate provision has been made to enable O. P. A. to effectively test its control over the price of certain foodstuffs during the coming year. Should O. P. A. continue to bungle, and should the program of price controls flounder and fail in a maze of mistakes, then it is imperative that we proceed at once to remove the cause of the present deplorable condition; that is, lack of production of essential foodstuffs.

I am delighted to unite my efforts with those of my colleagues from Missouri in bringing these petitions to the attention of the Congress with the fervent hope and sincere prayer that a solution may be found of the difficulties which they depict. The Congress is truly the voice of the people and to it should they always be able to come and find redress.

THE MILK SITUATION IN NORTHERN OHIO

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter this morning from one of my constituents, and I think it might be well to read it to the House. That letter is as follows:

> Mr. ROWE: If the Government wishes to help the dairymen of northern Ohio, something should be done quickly. I realize that you belong to the minority party and cannot get much attention from the O. P. A.
>
> Yours,
>
> KARL H. SWAN.
>
> P. S.—You need not take your valuable time to acknowledge this squawk.

Enclosed with the letter is the following advertisement:

NOTICE!

With much regret, on Saturday, September 11, we will discontinue our retail delivery of milk.

Due to O. P. A. ceiling on milk prices, scarcity of feed, and labor conditions, it becomes necessary we make this decision.

We wish to thank all our customers for their patronage and hope that some day we will be back to serve you again.

Sincerely,

HARLAN DALE FARMS.

At a later date, 103 head of registered Holsteins and Jersey cattle will be offered for private sale.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of shipbuilding and merchant seamen, and include a statement by Rear Admiral Emory S. Land; also a release from the War Shipping Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by my colleague [Mr. PLOESER].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a proclamation by the President designating the week of October 3 as Fire Prevention Week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MISSOURI RIVER FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, flood damage on the Missouri River can be ended for all time. I do not say that as my own opinion; I say it as the result of reading a report approved by the United States Army engineers. Last Saturday afternoon I went to the office of the Chief of Engineers and read the report of the division engineer made in response to a resolution by the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives. The report was prepared by Col. Lewis A. Pick, who has just left the division for an overseas assignment. It has been approved by the Board of Engineers and is now under review by the Federal Power Commission and the Bureau of Reclamation.

The report is not released, as yet, and of course, will not be until transmitted to the Congress, but Members can read it and can draw conclusions or make observations on it as I am now doing. For the benefit of those who have not yet had an opportunity to read it, let me say this: The report and recommendations follow the analysis of Missouri River flood problems made by Colonel Pick in the series of addresses he gave at meetings arranged this summer by Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, chairman of the Eight-State Committee. Downstream below Sioux City, where the flood plain is wide, the report calls for levees on the main stem of the river and dams on the tributaries. Above Sioux City, where the bluffs are closer together and reservoir sites abound, the report recommends multiple-purpose storage reservoirs in sufficient number to impound and put under control the entire flow of the river for the largest flood on record.

The cost of this program is less than 10 times the popular estimate of direct and indirect damages of last year's floods. In other words, 10 floods like those of 1943 would cost as much as what both the division engineer and the Board of Engineers describe as complete protection for the flood plain below Sioux City for all floods of past magnitude.

I trust that all Members interested will do what they can to expedite transmission of the report to Congress and action on it here.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix on two subjects and to include in one a resolution passed by the Oil Workers' Convention and in the other an editorial from the Pacific Rural Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of today's business and any other special orders that may be on the calendar, I may be granted permission to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CLARA CITY, MINN., LEADS NATION IN WAR BOND DRIVE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, Clara City, Minn., is a village containing only 844 people. Today it stands out as the No. 1 community in the Nation in the Third War Loan drive. This small village with a loan goal of $43,000 went over the top even before the drive was officially opened.

In recognition of Clara City's accomplishment a captured Japanese submarine was rerouted in its tour of Minnesota, and as a consequence over $14,000 additional in bonds were sold in a 3-hour period in this patriotic community.

The following article from the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of September 19, 1943, illustrates what a small village can do in a war loan drive, and I personally am proud of having in my congressional district, the seventh of Minnesota, the Nation's No. 1 leader in this respect:

DOUBLE QUOTA LOOMS AS SALES BOOM

(By Willmar Thorkelson)

CLARA CITY, MINN.—Salute the No. 1 community on the Nation's bondwagon.

It's this alert Minnesota village of 844 persons.

Beating to the punch the rest of the State and Nation, Clara City hustled to its Third War Loan goal of $43,000 even before the drive officially opened.

And today this town's citizens had good reason to believe they would double their own quota for cash-in-the-bank War bond sales at close of business Saturday totaled $74,384.73.

This is 173 percent of their quota.

Going over the top ahead of the Third War Loan's start is a tribute to the energy and organization of local War bond officials, who decided as long ago as last April this village would be first in this drive.

The feat was accomplished, too, because almost 100 percent of the families bought bonds.

These people, more than 80 percent of them of German descent, attained their goal largely in small denomination E series bonds.

Only 16 of the bonds bought were $1,000 or larger, and the biggest individual purchase was $4,000, made by Dr. H. T. Foshager, the town's physician.

In recognition of Clara City's accomplishment, the captured Jap submarine was rerouted in its tour of Minnesota and was brought here Thursday. No other community so small has been visited by the sub.

Appearance here of the enemy vessel of destruction resulted in the sale of $14,193.75 in bonds in 3 hours Thursday morning.

In addition, youngsters at the village's public and parochial schools bought $112 in War stamps as their admission.

About 1,200 persons, including scores of farmers from this center's rich trade area, viewed the sub during its half-hour stay.

Yeoman Eddie Gallaher, of Navy Public Relations, Minneapolis, traveling with the sub in Minnesota, congratulated Clara City on behalf of Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau.

The village's 68-year-old mayor, John Barney, Sr., who came from Germany 50 years ago, reminded the audience how fortunate they were to be "living in the good old U. S. A."

He urged his citizens to buy even more War bonds, "so when the war is over and our boys come back, we can look into their eyes, shake their hands, tell them they won the war for us and that we at home tried our best to help them win it."

Backing up the 134 men in service from Clara City and vicinity was one of the indirect objectives of the campaign.

Fred Prekker, State highway employee and a regular bond buyer, said he didn't know a better way to support his only three sons, Donald, Willard, and Leslie, all in the service, than by buying bonds. "I don't know of a better investment, either," he declared.

Village War-bond chairman is E. G. Weflen, manager of Farmers Cooperative Elevator Association, who is a World War veteran and has a son, Arnold, who is a marine lieutenant.

Weflen credits success of the drive to the splendid cooperation solicitors received from the village's citizens and to the excellent help of the town's two banks and Postmaster Laurence Voight.

Dr. R. A. Merrill, veterinarian and member of the Chippewa County war finance committee, insists Clara City made its record because it is "the garden spot of western Minnesota and can produce the 'kale' needed to buy War bonds. Besides, this community is noted for its frugality."

Emil A. Swanson, editor of the Clara City Herald, suggests the reason is that the town is "the home of good organization," which happens to be its motto.

During the Second War Loan drive last April, the village had a goal of $23,000, which it exceeded the first day. It ended that campaign with $41,995 in sales.

That response encouraged Weflen and Gordon A. Yock, merchant and area war-bond chairman, to try to reach Clara City's September quota even before the drive started.

They wired early for pledge cards which were distributed at a solicitors' meeting September 1. The 29 solicitors each were assigned a list of prospects and by the evening of September 7 sufficient pledges had been redeemed in cash bond purchases to exceed the quota. This was 36 hours before the drive was launched in Minnesota.

In organizing the campaign, Weflen and Yock worked closely with W. D. Grashuis, president of Citizens State Bank of Clara City, and B. A. Behrends, cashier of Clara City State Bank.

Besides these four men, others responsible for Clara City's war-bond successes as solicitors included: John Andresen, William Andresen, Henry Koester, E. J. Thein, Peter DeGrote, John Caspers, F. P. Schulte, C. H. Steffens, Dr. R. A. Merrill, August Mohr, John Thein, Emil Swanson, J. B. Stager, Adrian Haen, George Tammen, Elso Davids, A. L. Thissen, W. E. Lynam, Dr. H. T. Foshager, Louis Tammen, A. E. Prekker, Sr., Mrs. Daniel Jaenisch, Charles Wulling, and George Thein.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] has asked me to request that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors be permitted to sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MRUK] be permitted to extend his own remarks under the title "Army and Navy Electronics Production Agency."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter I recently received from the Danciger Oil Refining Company of Fort Worth, Tex.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article by Walter Lippmann.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON GASOLINE RATIONING AND OIL PRODUCTION

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I take the time of the House to announce that the Special Committee on Gasoline Rationing and Oil Production, of which I have the honor to be chairman, will meet tomorrow, Wednesday morning, in the caucus room in the Old House Office Building at 11 o'clock. Members of the executive committee from each State are especially urged to be present, and, of course, all other Members of the House, both from the Midwest and from the East, will be very welcome.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a set of resolutions of the Commercial Club of Albia, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATIONS, LEO CROWLEY

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, recently the President announced two changes in his official family—the appointment of Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., and Leo T. Crowley to new positions of trust and responsibility. Both appointments have been received with generous and favorable comment by the Washington newspapers.

I do not know Mr. Stettinius but judging from his past record and the favorable comments made by those who do know him, it would indicate that the President made an excellent choice.

Mr. Crowley comes from my home city at Madison, Wis., and has been a personal friend since childhood. It is, therefore, with extreme gratification and pleasure that I read of Leo's elevation to increased responsibility and trust on the part of the President of the United States during its most trying period since the Civil War. Mr. Crowley's increased responsibilities are the result of the efficient and satisfactory manner in which he has discharged other duties entrusted to him by the President.

He came to Washington from Madison, Wis., as Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which office he has filled with exceptional skill and the least possible amount of friction. So well was the President satisfied with Mr. Crowley's conduct of this agency that he placed additional burdens upon him.

The next post of trust was the Office of Custodian of Alien Property. This Office meant the taking over of hundreds of millions of dollars worth of property and thousands of patent rights. It also meant that President Roosevelt did not want any of the scandals arising in the administration of these properties which grew out of the custodianship of alien property in the last World War. That Office has evidently been administered with the usual skill with which Mr. Crowley has administered the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Next came the difficult task of taking over the functions of the foreign economic activities that had been the subject of a controversy between Vice President WALLACE and Secretary of Commerce Jones. This was a difficult task to undertake because of prominence given by the newspapers in regard to this controversy, and the fact that newspapers and magazines were taking sides on the questions involved. In the face of these facts, Mr. Crowley presided with his usual unassuming tact and diplomacy to iron out the difficulties and get this office functioning in a proper manner. Undoubtedly a satisfactory result was achieved because the President would not have again entrusted him with additional burdens and responsibility unless he had been certain that a satisfactory job was being done by Mr. Crowley.

Now comes the latest burden and responsibility placed upon Mr. Crowley's shoulders—that of administering the billions of dollars passed out to the United Nations under lend lease and also the relief program originally placed in the hands of New York's former Governor Lehman.

To the thousands of friends of Leo Crowley back home, there is genuine pleasure in the honors heaped upon him, and there is every confidence that these offices of trust will be ably and efficiently administered, and there is one thing of which all of us will be absolutely certain: there will be no scandals growing out of any of these functions because Leo Crowley is scrupulously honest and will not tolerate the suspicion of dishonesty on the part of any of his subordinates.

Many who come to Washington and achieve high honors become afflicted with the disease known as "Washingtonitis." In the case of Leo Crowley, there is not the slightest change in his manner or attitude toward the thousands of people whom he has always known. On the streets of Madison, in the barber shops and wherever men gather, he is still just Leo to everyone. The thousands of his friends in all walks of life, including the old, the young, the rich and the poor, men, women, and children, all rejoice that he has been elevated to a high place, and all of them have every confidence that the trust reposed in him will be faithfully carried out.

Kind and generous to everyone, his sympathetic and gentle nature breeds affection and loyalty in the hearts of those with whom he is associated.

Congratulations, Leo; and the best of luck.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

GEN. JOHN L. DEWITT

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks to include a resolution adopted by the San Francisco Down Town Association with reference to Lt. Gen. John L. DeWitt and the distinguished service he has rendered both to the Pacific coast and the Nation in his administration of the Japanese question and all other military matters which have been under his jurisdiction as commander of the Fourth Army and western defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, in all Pacific coast history there has never been a more capable military officer assigned to duty on the Pacific coast. He has won the support, good will, and hearty approval of every civic, labor, church, and fraternal organization by the superb manner in which he has handled every problem of military significance affecting our civilian population and national security. His very presence and demeanor have helped build civilian morale and gave a deep sense of security to every man, woman, and child during the days immediately following the cowardly Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. As a tribute to this outstanding man I present the following resolution recently adopted by the Down Town Association:

D'WITT COMMENDED FOR CONTROL OF JAPANESE

The following resolution was adopted by the board of directors of the Down Town Association today, Wednesday, September 15, 1943:

Whereas since the black-out nights and the anxious days following Pearl Harbor, Lt. Gen. John L. DeWitt has rendered distinguished service as commander of the Fourth Army and western defense, and California has felt secure under the protection of his wise leadership and the policies he has adopted and enforced; and

Whereas that sense of security has rested in large part upon his understanding, courage, and vigor in promptly excluding all persons of the Japanese race, whether native or foreign-born, from the Pacific coast area; and

Whereas Gen. John L. DeWitt has been assigned to higher command at the Army and Navy Staff College at Washington, and Lt. Gen. Delos C. Emmons succeeds to the heavy responsibility of commander of the Fourth Army; and

Whereas the Down Town Association of San Francisco has heretofore gone on record and directed a communication to the Secretary of War opposing, in the interest of public security, the return of any persons of Japanese ancestry to the Pacific coast area during the war period: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Down Town Association of San Francisco hereby expresses to General DeWitt its sincere appreciation and compliments for the outstanding service which he has rendered to his country and especially to California and the entire Pacific coast area, in the performance of his duties as commander of our armed forces charged with the protection of the exposed western borders of our country; and be it further

Resolved, That to his successor, Gen. Delos C. Emmons, we convey a welcome and the expression of our confidence that his past distinguished services can be accepted as an assurance that the security which we have felt under his predecessor will be continued under his command and that the wise policy of excluding Japanese from the Pacific coast area will be maintained throughout the war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LABOR LAWS—AND LOGIC

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial that appeared in the September 11, 1943, issue of Business Week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks of today in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial which appeared in the September 11, 1943, issue of Business Week, published by the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., I would like to make this observation.

This publication, as everyone knows, speaks the mind of business. It appears from this editorial that since business has had a chance to see the results of the Connally-Smith Act, it realizes it was bad legislation.

When the Connally-Smith war labor disputes bill—the so-called antistrike bill—was before the Congress, we were informed by various means, and from numerous sources, that organized labor opposed the bill.

In view of the fact that business is now opposed to the Connally-Smith Act, as well as labor, and it is universally recognized it is a bad law, there should be no hesitancy on the part of Congress to correct this innocuous situation by repealing the Connally-Smith Act at once. I sincerely hope every Member of Congress will read every word of this editorial very carefully.

UNADJUSTED VETERANS' CLAIMS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain figures from the Veterans' Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there is a matter that has been troubling me for some time and I am sure that it is also troubling the Members of the House, and that is the backlog of unadjudicated cases of World War No. 2 veterans pending in the Veterans' Administration offices. In Boston alone the unadjudicated cases are increasing at the rate of 600 a month approximately.

In the Boston office, on September 22, of this year, there were pending 4,300 cases unadjudicated of World War No. 2. On September 1, 3,900 cases were unadjudicated. It is an inexcusable situation. The officials should have thought of this problem in time to provide sufficient personnel and if they did not have them within their own department they should have asked for such personnel in departments where their work is not so necessary. The matter was brought to the Veterans' Administration's attention on numerous occasions, but no action was taken, although the Administration had all information needed from the War Department regarding cases.

The Veterans' Administration advises me they have asked to have additional rating boards and additional personnel to go to the district and regional offices. I am not at all convinced that they will send enough. Requests were made some time ago for personnel with no results. I know that every Member will join with me in seeing that that is done because the least we can do is to see that these returning men who are disabled receive proper care and the compensation to which they are entitled. The matter of hospitalization facilities is one that I have been working on. They are inadequate. Most of these cases are men who have been discharged from the service because of service disability. It is of little use to pass legislation for the veterans if the laws we pass are not put into action promptly and employed for the veteran's benefit. It is either highly inefficient on the part of the Veterans' Administration or worse.

The following resolutions have been received from the One Hundred and First Infantry Veterans' Association:

Whereas by bitter experience, we learned that those veterans who served overseas and bore the brunt of battle were among the first to enter and among the last to be discharged from active service; and

Whereas we found most of the positions with real remuneration had been filled by those who avoided war service altogether or who had served a very short time in the armed forces in World War No. 1; and

Whereas history appears to be about to repeat itself;

We, therefore, the One Hundred and First Infantry Veterans Association, A. E. F., in convention assembled in historic Boston, September 11, 1943, hereby duly resolve that we respectfully petition the President and the congressional delegation from Massachusetts individually, to work for and provide the necessary laws that the men who actually do the fighting and bear the real brunt of the present World War No. 2 shall be adequately protected and be given at least an equal opportunity for such positions as may be open at the close of the present conflict, to those who may be honorably discharged from the armed forces of the United States.

And we do hereby further resolve that copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to the President, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, to the congressional delegation from Massachusetts, to the Governor of Massachusetts, to the President of the Massachusetts Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in Massachusetts, and to Commissioner Rae Long, chairman of the commission to study employment problems for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Whereas it has been found to be increasingly more difficult to obtain hospitalization for veterans with service-connected disabil-

ities and practically impossible to obtain such hospitalization in United States Government hospitals for non-service-connected veterans of World War No. 1, and,

Whereas our National Government has by various laws provided that such hospitalization should be made available to such veterans,

We, therefore, the One Hundred and First Infantry Veterans Association, A. E. F., duly resolve in convention assembled in historic Boston on September 11, 1943, to respectfully petition our President and the congressional delegation from Massachusetts to work for and provide for such adequate hospitalization facilities at once.

And be it further resolved that we respectfully petition the Governor and the legislative bodies in Massachusetts to provide for the proper extension of present hospital facilities in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts so that the present increasing need and the future hospitalization requirements of all war veterans may be fully arranged for in proper time, with courage and vision, based on past experience, to the end that the veterans of World War No. 2 will not be subjected to the overcrowding and to being cared for in places and under conditions not fit for human habitation as were numerous disabled veterans of World War No 1.

Respectfully submitted by John W. Coughlin, K Co.

JOHN W. COUGHLIN,
South Boston, Mass.

COST OF LIVING

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of my distinguished friend and colleague from Missouri prompt me to make this statement.

I understand from Mr. Byrnes that the national income is now flowing at the rate of $150,000,000,000 per annum. I also understand from the Department of Commerce that industrial wages and salaries will be paid for this calendar year to the tune of about $101,000,000,000. It seems to me that if we continue to finance the war activities to the extent we are at the present time through commercial banks and continue to hesitate in enacting a tax law that will bring into the Treasury a much greater part of the funds that we are not now spending, that prices must continue to rise and bring greater disturbance and dissatisfaction among those people who are living on a fixed income and who are not participating in the flow of the war billions throughout the country. I personally believe that prices will continue to rise at a rather disastrous rate, and, therefore, it seems to me that this House should get down to the matter of passing a tax bill and getting it into operation before the end of this year. Now is the time for us to act.

GENERAL MARSHALL

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me reasonable that we, the Allies, may well have reached the military phase when direction of the Supreme Allied Command should be vested in one man of military stature. In fact, I believe it to be essential to a successful prosecution of the war from now on.

If that man is to be General Marshall—and I consider him preeminently fitted—he should have as much freedom of command as possible. Certainly this in a broad sense should include both the British and American Navies and he should be able to consult with the military heads of the Chinese and Russian Governments.

The question of location of his post of command, to my mind, is secondary. That would be up to him to best determine, and if the selection of a new United States Chief of Staff or Deputy, is necessary it should be made upon his recommendation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quote General Marshall as of this morning in saying that he greatly resents all references that have been made to his keyman, General Somervell, on the floor of this House, and in the newspapers, and that he considers it harmful to Army morale and grossly unfair to a truly great American officer.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the statements made by the ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] in his reference to General Marshall and the high-ranking officers of the War Department.

General Marshall called me at my residence this morning to express regret and deep concern at some of the statements that have appeared in local papers and also on the floor of this House. He said it was seriously affecting the war effort and authorized me and other members of the committee to quote him and to express the hope that such statements not be repeated.

He expressed the greatest confidence in General Somervell and also stated that there is complete harmony and cooperation between him and General Somervell and all the other high-ranking generals who have been mentioned on this floor and in the newspapers during the last few days. In this crucial hour I want to express my confidence in General Marshall whom I regard one of the great military leaders of the world today, and I am sure the other Members feel the same way about him. He is entitled to our full confidence, support, and cooperation. He expressed the very fervent hope that in this critical hour our statements be tempered with fairness and tolerance and above all with truth based upon official facts. General Marshall says the appointment, promotion, or assignment of any and all Army officers is without political consideration or influence. The President accepts the recommendation of himself and the Secretary of War.

General Marshall is willing, although a very busy man, to appear before any committee or to speak to any Member of this House about it and he denies the base political charges that have been made, and as the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] states, resents the untruths and exaggerated statements that have been made on this floor and in the press. I think it is time to cut out the bickering and little stuff and back up our great Chief of Staff and get this war over with and our boys back home.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, along the line of the discussion that is now taking place with respect to numerous remarks about the War Department, let me say that I spent something like a quarter of an hour in conference with General Marshall this morning, from 7:45 to 8 o'clock. We went over this whole situation thoroughly.

He authorized me to say to anybody interested or in answer to any inquiry that there was complete harmony among the high officials of the War Department and the administration, and that anything that was done was done with his approval.

I think he should have made that statement and I heartily concur in the idea that General Marshall should be permitted to run the War Department as long as he is Chief of Staff. To my mind he is the ideal man for that position. To me he is the most capable man we have had in years as Chief of Staff of the United States Army, and at this time when the Army is expanding so rapidly, when its responsibilities throughout the world are momentous, and when our men are fighting to the death on all world fronts, I know of no man in public life more qualified to head the General Staff of the Army of the United States. The way Gen. George C. Marshall has handled the affairs of the Army in this crucial time gratifies me. In my judgment as long as General Marshall is the Chief of the General Staff of the United States Army we are in safe hands. I have found it wise in the past to follow the advice of this great military leader and for the duration of this war and until we achieve victory as we surely will, I shall continue to feel that we are fortunate indeed in our leadership of our armed forces.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, every one of us, every American, have great responsibilities imposed upon us during this particular crisis. Each and every one of us is a Member of a body of 435 persons honored by the people of a district to represent them in the National House of Representatives—435 out of 133,000,000 persons. We in particular have a grave responsibility imposed upon us because we occupy a position of direct responsibility and trust.

Mr. Speaker, I have been very much concerned about some of the statements made lately. I am not going to criticize, because to recriminate would not do any good; but I hope that statements made in the future will be with a tolerant regard for our responsibility as American citizens and as Members of the National House of Representatives.

This morning I had an interview with Secretary of War Stimson, not on this matter but on another matter, and during the interview I took occasion to call to his attention certain statements which appeared in the press recently. Secretary Stimson—and he is an honorable gentleman, a fine American, and, although we may not agree with him in all things, every one of us respect him as a gentleman and as a fine American and a fine public official—Secretary Stimson stated this, and I quote him:

> The President has absolutely refrained from interfering in any way with the War Department and in the choice of any generals of the United States Army, and in their assignments to duty. The President has followed the advice of his military advisers in the consideration of all questions of strategy which have governed the war, and so far as his intrusion in any political or personal way it has been absolutely nonexistent.

He also said I was authorized to say that the President—and I know this personally, so I did not have to get this information from Secretary Stimson, but he said this to me and I know it personally:

> The President has a very high regard for General Marshall and profoundly respects him and his ability.

Let us hope that in the future we shall have no more intolerant expressions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests.

On yesterday, I secured permission to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert an analysis of veterans' legislation passed at this session of the Congress, which is very far-reaching and involves questions that are daily being propounded to every Member of Congress. This analysis has been prepared by the Veterans' Administration. The Government Printing Office informs me it will cost $420. Under the circumstances I think it is well worth it and I ask unanimous consent to include it in the RECORD under those conditions.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MARSHALL FIELD—THE MOST FAVORED CITIZEN IN AMERICA

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, while practically everyone in the United States is being taxed to the limit to help finance the war, while we are calling upon everyone to buy bonds and make sacrifices, and while mothers and fathers throughout the land who are shedding tears and offering prayers for the safety of their sons in the service are digging into their meager purses and depriving themselves of many of the mere necessities in order to aid the war effort, we have one citizen of this country who is today favored beyond the dreams of avarice. I refer to Marshall Field 3d, the Chicago playboy. Today he comes into possession of between $70,000,000 and $75,000,000 on which he will pay not one cent of income or inheritance taxes.

I have tried for months to reach that estate through a bill which I have prepared and introduced, but have failed to get results. It is not only escaping taxation entirely, but just think of the purpose for which it is being used. It is being used to finance the publication and distribution of PM—that uptown edition of the Communist Daily Worker that is waging its daily scurrilous attacks on Cordell Hull, our great Secretary of State, and one of the outstanding statesmen of the world.

This money is being used to finance this publication that is continually attacking and attempting to smear the Members of the Congress of the United States, and stirring up race trouble throughout the land, and it is today encouraging the Negroes of Washington to storm the white restaurant in this Capitol.

All this is being paid for by Marshall Field, the most favored citizen in America, who today comes into possession of this additional amount of $70,000,000 or $75,000,000, of which he never earned a nickel, and on which he will not pay one cent of income or inheritance taxes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include in my remarks two telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE]?

There was no objection.

DIVERSION OF COTTON LINTERS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time of the House briefly to call attention to the fact that the Northwest Furniture Manufacturers' Association, representing all of the furniture factories in that area, is very much concerned at the prospective or projected order to be issued by the War Production Board diverting all cotton linters produced in this season not required for chemical and ammunition purposes to the paper and pulp trade on the ground there is a grave shortage of wood pulp for paper manufacture.

The effect of the diversion of cotton linters from the Northwest industries will mean they will have to utilize substitutes which are not practical and which would give the public a poor article. The Northwest furniture manufacturers are engaged almost 100 percent in the manufacture of mattresses and varied furnishings for the armed services. The diversion of cotton linters would have a very deleterious effect on the industry.

The following are two telegrams I have received relative to the subject:

TACOMA, WASH., *September 28, 1943.*

JOHN M. COFFEE,

Congressman, Washington, D. C.:

The Northwest Furniture Manufacturers Association representing majority of furniture factories this area vitally interested in meeting being held today conducted by Harold Boeschenstein, War Production Board, room 3006, Railroad Retirement Building, Washington. This meeting held to consider delivery all cotton linters produced this season not required for chemical munition purposes to paper-pulp trade in view of shortage wood pulp for paper manufacture. We were unaware of this meeting until today and if not watched closely may lead to possible contract by Government agency of entire season's production of linters for one or both purposes if decision is rendered permitting all linters not going to chemical munitions industries to paper-pulp trade it would result in no linters being available for bedding and furniture trade, thereby greatly increasing existing difficulties involved in furnishing thousands of war housing units and bedding for armed forces in this and other areas. We believe that contemplated action entirely unnecessary and unfair to furniture and bedding manufacturers who are doing their utmost to furnish essential furniture for war housing and bedding for armed forces. Your support in preventing unfavorable action will be greatly appreciated as it is evident immediate action necessary.

NORTHWEST FURNITURE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
RUFUS T. DAVIS.

TACOMA, WASH., *September 28, 1943.*

JOHN COFFEE,

Representative, Washington, D. C.:

Understand meeting being held by Harold Boeschenstein, 3006 Railroad Retirement Building, to secure use of cotton linters while making pulp for paper industry. Such diversion of linters from mattress and furniture business will greatly increase the cost of mattresses to the public and the Government and will interfere with an established practice. Trust you will oppose this move as it will force the use of waste and other substitutes in our business which are not as practical and gives the public a poor article.

LEO GALLAGHER,
Owner, Sound Mattress and Felt Co.

MARSHALL FIELD

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] call attention to the fact that Mr. Marshall Field will today come into possession of many millions of dollars. May I say to him that the money is an inheritance that accumulated and was made possible by reason of the business policy and farsightedness of his grandfather many, many years ago, who had confidence in the future progress of Chicago. I further say to the gentleman that the opportunity of

accumulating wealth in Chicago is still there today.

As to the tax upon this inheritance, I will say to the gentleman that every dollar of payment called for by law—whether it be from a city, county, State, or Federal tax office—will be paid. I can assure him that Mr. Field is an honest man and at no time has he been charged with attempting to evade payment of taxes. That cannot be said of many other men who have accumulated wealth.

From time to time Mr. Field has suffered criticism at the hands of the gentleman from Mississippi because the newspapers which he publishes—the New York PM and the Chicago Sun—are fearless in their criticism of persons whose activities warrant the searchlight of publicity and an exposé of conditions inimical to the best interest of the people of our country and to the country itself. Mr. Field has stood foursquare behind that policy. However, I do not wish to infer that I approve of everything that is carried in these papers because I cannot subscribe to some of their articles relative to our great Secretary of State, whom I have had the honor to know for 37 years. He has proven an honest and efficient official in every position in which he has served.

It is also true that PM has criticized some Members of the House, especially those whom it believes have not fully cooperated in the war effort. Both newspapers devote a great deal of space to the colored people of our country and other peoples who have been discriminated against and it is this, perhaps, to which the gentleman from Mississippi mostly vents his resentment. I do not have many colored people in my district and I do not call attention to this matter for political reasons. It does appear, however, that most of them are still being misled in voting the Republican ticket. It is my observation, Mr. Speaker, and I am pleased to stand here today and say that the colored people in Chicago have conducted themselves properly, they are law abiding, and there have been no such disturbances as have occurred in other cities, and I trust there never will be any.

Mr. Speaker, Chicago for years had only one Chicago morning newspaper which was extremely antagonistic to the New Deal and to the President. To bring home a true and factual presentation of news to the people of Chicago, Mr. Marshall Field, believing in fair play and because of his interests in Chicago, established a Chicago morning newspaper—the Chicago Sun. While I was hopeful that it would be a Democratic daily, it is really independent in its policies and editorials. It prints the truth regardless of who it hits. Yes, it has even published that my record in answering House roll calls is low. I owe nothing to Mr. Marshall Field, but being from Chicago and knowing well the splendid reputation enjoyed by the Field family over a period of many, many years, I feel that the criticisms on the part of the gentleman from Mississippi are unwarranted and not in keeping with a spirit of fair play. I am confident that if he were to read not only the New York PM, but the Chicago Sun as well, he would come to the conclusion that it is disseminating impartial and unbiased news to the people.

AGAINST THE DRAFTING OF FATHERS

Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that my statements made on the floor and given to the press have been misinterpreted, especially the misquoting of letters which I directed to General Hershey, of the Selective Service System, and the replies which I received from him, relative to what I believed to be unfair draft exemptions and opposing the drafting of fathers.

On September 17, 1943, I addressed a letter to Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, in which I enclosed a letter which I received from Mr. Harry Alexander Ash, of Chicago. To correct the misquoting of my position, I refer to the letter addressed to General Hershey which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD together with the letter of Mr. Ash which appears in the Appendix of the RECORD on page A3881.

My statement was to the effect that all unmarried men should be drafted, married men without families up to 30 years of age, and men who have married since the beginning of the war up to 25 years of age, and, later on, if necessary, to extend the age limit of this class to 30 years.

I voted for the conscription bill and the selective-service draft bill, but I do not set myself up above the efficient and experienced officers of the Army who know what our soldier requirements should be, and there is no endeavor to force my views upon them. After all, it is their duty and responsibility—and we know it is a grave one—and we must depend upon their knowledge and experience to decide what is required to win the war.

I regret that people do not seem to be aware of the fact that the House voted favorably on the Kilday bill, which provides for the drafting of single men before fathers are drafted into the service. This bill passed the House on April 12 and has been in the Senate for the past 5 months, and I cannot understand why, at this late hour, certain Senators are making such an issue of this matter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a poem written by William Stanley Dunford.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] the majority leader, at a meeting of the Dorchester Board of Trade, Dorchester, Mass., on September 9.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an extract from an address made by the Reverend W. W. Judd, on the subject of the church and racial relations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ELLISON]?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, first, I should like to suggest to our friends from St. Louis that if they are interested in seeing that their people are adequately fed, it might be well these days, when we do not seem to have so very much to do here in the House, that they could first get behind the Christian Herter bill, that revives the stamp plan for the low-income groups; second, that they help the rural areas to get out of the clutches of the rulings of the O. P. A. and the Food Distribution Administration and other governmental agencies that evidently are not interested in the spirit of the law or in the word of the law; third, provide a food-production program that will produce food in abundance instead of the one we have had up to this time; and, fourth, help pass House Joint Resolution 155, that will, or should, help provide additional feeds.

With that constructive idea in mind, I have written today to Chester Bowles, evidently Director of the O. P. A., as follows:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1943.

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES,
Director, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: Assuming that you would welcome constructive suggestions in connection with the operations of the O. P. A. I am taking this opportunity of expressing to you some of the suggestions which I obtained during the 2 months of close contact which I had with the county O. P. A.'s and the citizens of the Seventh Wisconsin Congressional District.

The public seems to feel that the O. P. A. has shown signs in the past of being more interested in making America over than it is in making our country strong and have lately shown more desire to put over their schemes and controlling profits than they have been in helping to produce and distribute equally the food of the Nation. However, there is a prevailing sympathy for, and support of, the objectives of the O. P. A. The public feels there is a need to protect the weak from the strong and the man without the price from certain individuals and groups who have the price.

If the O. P. A. were properly administered it could command the respect, cooperation, and admiration of the people.

A few of the suggestions obtained in a district largely agricultural, where the rural people have not had any E flags for their most excellent contributions to the war effort, are as follows:

1. Much more satisfactory results would be obtained if the spirit of the law, as well as the word of the law, were followed by the most numerous employees of the O. P. A.

Section 2, paragraph (h) of the Price Control Act is as follows: "The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act."

It is more apparent each day that the war effort would be helped if all O. P. A. employees in high and low places, showed more familiarity with this section of the law.

You no doubt are familiar with the pressure groups that tried to have the O. P. A. enforce grade labeling in spite of the above mentioned paragraph of the Price Control Act. You no doubt are familiar with the fact that high policy making officials of the O. P. A. itself, like Dr. Galbraith, appeared before the Agricultural Committee of the House and tried to justify grade labeling in spite of this section of the law.

2. The county O. P. A. in rural sections feel, and it apparently is in keeping with the facts, that the O. P. A. rulings were formulated largely from the urban standpoint. For example, no adequate provision is made for emergency needs and demands for meat for threshing, silo filling and potato digging. Sugar for these same emergency needs has not been provided equally in adjoining counties, resulting in unnecessary ill feeling. Country butchers and farmers have been harassed by illegal, senseless rulings by letter from minor officials on the pay rolls of other Federal agencies and your organization is being held responsible and being criticized when it had no part in the high-handed, nonsensical performances of these little people in big places.

3. While the O. P. A. is supposed to be distributing food equally to all groups of our citizens, this is not being done. The way it is being handled now is, for the lack of a more expressive and permissible term, most ridiculously unfair. The man with the price gets about what he wants. The average man with a family has to pay points for the cheap meats such as bologna, side pork, sowbelly and even a lowly soupbone, while the man with the price can provide himself with the choice meats of the land. As long as the man with the price can obtain his fill of the choicest meats without points, it would appear that since these cheaper cuts are largely consumed by people doing manual labor, it would be only fair to remove these points from the soupbones, bologna, side pork, and sowbelly. Why does the O. P. A. support a program that allows people with the price to buy unlimited quantities of fluid milk, but rations evaporated milk, cheese, and butter, which are made from fluid milk?

4. My fourth suggestion is to immediately amend the ruling in regard to farm butchering where the farmers live in villages and cities and who supervise their own farms. Mr. Maurice Wolk of the O. P. A. advises me that such a change in rulings is under consideration. The sooner this amendment is made the better.

5. The roll-back of butter is having and will continue to have a harmful influence on the war food program. Production of butter is not being maintained. This roll-back of butter has resulted in less powdered skim milk so needed at this time. The O. P. A. and the W. F. A. will have to answer to public opinion for the disruption of the war food program. There is a very evident desire to roll back the bureaus here in Washington.

6. There is still too much of a demonstration of the passion to ration instead of a correct approach to attain the real objectives of the O. P. A.

7. My contacts with the county O. P. A.'s convinces me that the county O. P. A. boards can be depended upon for a more practical approach than the rulings handed down from Washington. There is too much of an attitude that all integrity and all intelligence eminates from Washington when the facts are that the county O. P. A. boards are composed of men with much more practical experience and business experience, than most of the men giving them the orders from Washington.

8. The rural people feel there has been altogether too much emphasis put on inflation as far as the food producers are concerned. They feel that their gross annual incomes are not such a threat to inflation. They feel that the only time inflation is mentioned is when the low income groups are involved or when the American farmer is in the picture. They know that Federal employees receiving from $2,900 to $12,000 a year had an increase in salary to meet the increased cost of living without a word of publicly recorded protest from James Byrnes, Marvin Jones, Fred Vinson, the O. P. A. or the W. L. B., so they can see no reason to be overly disturbed as to the effect of their meager net incomes on the inflation spiral. Since only 40 percent of the farm homes even have electric lights and since only one out ten of the farm homes has a bath tub, they are rather tired of hearing people with five to fifty times their net incomes, and with two to five times their hourly wages, accusing them of causing inflation.

9. While some citizens seemed to feel that the O. P. A. was increasing its pay rolls for political purposes, most thinking people realize that this cannot be done without an unfavorable public reaction. There are so many sons and daughters in the armed forces, the public will not tolerate cheap political activities.

I note in the press that a prominent office holder from Oklahoma has written you advising that the O. P. A. is liable to lose the election in 1944. I am not so interested in the influence of the O. P. A. on any political party, as I am interested in seeing it used as an agency to help win the war. It is for that reason that I oppose the activities that are so harmful to the war food program.

10. The O. P. A. is blamed for situations that are the result of rulings by other Federal agencies. In fact the most irritating, unlawful rulings and proposals I observed during the recess of Congress recently, were issued by the War Food Administration and other governmental agencies, and the O. P. A. was being blamed for them. I realize that you have inherited the responsibilities of the O. P. A. and none of these suggestions are written with any personal reference to any individual.

We should have a coordination of agencies or we are apparently not going to live up to our obligations in producing the food for the war and distributing it fairly to our own people. The war food program needs the cooperation of all groups. It needs this cooperation very, very badly.

I trust you will accept this letter in the spirit in which it is meant and hoping to have the privilege of making your acquaintance, I am

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I deem the occasion an appropriate one to express some approbation of another great servant of the people of the United States. I have listened with great pleasure to the defense, as you might call it, of General Marshall and the great group of generals that surround him and other officials; and, representing the people of one of the 435 districts of this Republic represented here, and, I believe, a majority of the people of the United States, I want to say, God bless the Commander in Chief of our armies and navies, the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, the greatest leader that ever carried any people through a great conflagration in all history.

PUERTO RICO—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 304)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

When sovereignty over Puerto Rico was transferred from Spain to the United States in 1899, the Treaty of Paris did not settle the exact position of Puerto Rico in the orbit of American sovereignty. It left that for determination by the Congress of the United States. After a brief interval of military government, the Foraker Act of 1900 established a framework of colonial government. Under it the legislative assembly was given rather limited powers; and the Governor and an appointed executive council held the real substance of authority. The inhabitants were to be citizens of Puerto Rico—American nationals, but not citizens.

In 1917 the Puerto Ricans received full American citizenship. At the same time the Congress, by the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, created a full-fledged legislature, and provided for a much greater participation by Puerto Ricans in the executive department of the government, reserving to the President the power of appointment of only the Governor, the attorney general, the commissioner of education, the auditor, and the justices of the supreme court. This action of the Congress in 1917 bound Puerto Rico much more closely to the United States, and provided a substantial advance in local self-government.

During the 45 years which have passed since the occupation of the island by the United States the economic situation of the Puerto Rican people, although materially improved in some respects, has not changed in essential character. Instead of development toward economic self-reliance, there has been a steady tendency to become more dependent upon outside markets for disposal of the single great crop—sugar—and upon outside sources for food, clothing, building mate-

rials, and most of the other necessities. Partly because of economic and geographical factors and partly because of tariff preferences and shipping laws, these relationships are by now almost wholly with the continental United States.

The population of Puerto Rico has increased from 950,000 to about 2,000,000, making this one of the most densely inhabited areas on earth. Depending upon the obligation implied by our active participation in their development, Puerto Ricans have been encouraged, insofar as they could, to try to attain American standards of life. Wages in Puerto Rico, for instance, are several times as high as those in nearby islands not under our flag; literacy is much higher than in other Caribbean islands; the percentage of those who speak English has grown progressively in every decade; our agencies of public health have made inroads on diseases endemic in the island; and serious attempts have been and are being made to provide better housing and to raise the levels of nutrition.

During the 45 years of our sovereignty the elements of world military and naval strategy have changed also. When the island was first brought under our flag, the Panama Canal had not yet been dug, and the airplane had not yet been invented. The Caribbean was something of a backwater in the broad current of world affairs. When the present war became imminent, however, it was obvious that the chain of islands running in a great arc from Florida to the shoulder of South America, enclosing the Caribbean Sea, formed a vast natural shield for the Panama Canal, suited in distance and conformation to the uses of the military plane. And of this island shield, Puerto Rico is the center. Its possession or control by any foreign power—or even the remote threat of such possession—would be repugnant to the most elementary principles of national defense.

It has long been the policy of the Government of the United States progressively to reinforce the machinery of self-government in its Territories and island possessions. The principles for which we are now fighting require that we should recognize the right of all our citizens—whether continental or overseas—to the greatest possible degree of home rule and also of participation in the benefits and responsibilities of our Federal system.

Puerto Ricans of all political parties, however divergent their views as to the political future of the island, are united in asking for the right to elect their own Governor. I believe that they are entitled to it.

The Congress will recall that on March 9 of this year, I recommended to it "that it consider as soon as possible an amendment of the organic law of Puerto Rico to permit the people of Puerto Rico to elect their own Governor and to redefine the functions and powers of the Federal Government and of the Government of Puerto Rico, respectively." In order to assist in framing the required legislation, in case the Congress should decide to grant this power to the people of Puerto Rico, I appointed a committee composed of an equal number of Puerto Ricans and continental residents. I requested them to make a study of the amendments to the organic act necessary to authorize the election of a Governor and to redefine the relationships of the Federal and Insular Governments affected thereby.

That committee met in Washington almost daily for 3 weeks this last summer. It has sent me a full report of its recommendations in the form of a proposed bill and a summary statement of such bill.

I am forwarding this report of the committee to the Congress for consideration by them. The legislation was drawn by the committee itself, and I am submitting it as a possible guide for such action as the Congress may decide to take.

Under this bill the people of Puerto Rico would be given an opportunity for the free exercise of the powers of local self-government in all three branches of government—executive, legislative, and judicial. There would be reserved to the President the power to veto only such measures passed by the legislature as were beyond the proper field of local self-government. There would be a United States Commissioner General in Puerto Rico upon whom would devolve the responsibility for the execution of the laws of the United States, and for the coordination and supervision of the activities of Federal civilian agencies, and their correlation with the activities of insular agencies. He would also have authority to require reports of all activities of the insular government for transmittal to the President through the Secretary of the Interior. The fiscal relationship of the insular government to the Federal Government would not be altered, nor would the ultimate power of Congress to legislate for the Territory. The people of the island would, however, be given assurance of the intention of Congress to obtain the concurrence of the people of the island before imposing upon them any further changes in the organic act.

There is no reason why their Governor and other officials should continue to be appointed from without. At this stage of Puerto Rican development the withholding of this right is no longer necessary. There is no question of Puerto Ricans' ability now to administer their own internal affairs and to assume the attendant responsibility.

It is recommended by the report of the committee that this fact be recognized at once. I agree that this should be done and suggest that the Congress should consider it as a matter of right and justice for Puerto Ricans.

As to the future, it is not proposed that the political development of Puerto Rico be left to chance. On the contrary, it is recommended by the committee that a continuing joint advisory council, under the chairmanship of the Secretary of the Interior, be appointed to conduct continuing economic and political studies of all the elements of the Puerto Rican situation and of American necessities, to guide us for the future. This council must report at least once during the life of each Congress.

In addition to the Secretary of the Interior, the council would consist of the Governor of Puerto Rico and the Commissioner General, who shall serve ex officio, and also four persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, and five persons to be appointed by the Governor of Puerto Rico.

The government of Puerto Rico should not be static; it should be changed and developed as conditions warrant. It is equally important that the economic situation of the Puerto Ricans should be improved. I am confident that with patience and cooperation both these objectives can be attained.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 28, 1943.*

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FREE SPEECH IN AMERICA

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to take this time today to speak upon the farm problem. I had intended to urge that the ceiling price upon corn of $1.07 a bushel be removed so that the farmers in the East, the poultrymen and the dairymen, might get some of the middle-western corn. We have a very desperate situation in the Eastern States, particularly in New York and in my section, and I propose to speak upon that issue next week.

Instead, today I want to answer a resolution which was adopted by the American Legion at its national convention in Omaha, criticizing me for allegedly abusing my franking privilege.

No one is a more loyal supporter of the Legion than I am and will continue to be in spite of this action, which is totally erroneous upon its part, and which was taken without affording me any opportunity to answer these false charges and implications.

Since, however, the American Legion has inadvertently permitted persons who have been engaged in a concerted smear campaign against me and other pre-war noninterventionists to use that organization for their own political purposes, and caused the adoption of a resolution based on an utterly false premise, wherein I was censured for "abuse of the congressional franking privilege," I wish to take this opportunity to give the facts to the House.

In the first place I want to state again, and again, and again that I have never permitted anyone to use my frank to send out any speeches that were prepared by someone else; only my own speeches have been distributed, and they have always been 100-percent American.

My outspoken opposition to Gestapo methods in America, and my efforts to uphold the Bill of Rights and the Constitution has invoked the enmity and animosity of certain persons who would destroy every vestige of freedom of speech in America. I consider it an honor to be attacked by such sources as Walter Winchell, the Washington Post, the Communist Daily Worker, and PM, but deplore the fact that such a great American organization as the Legion can be made use of to smear it own members without a hearing. However, since these persons

have now infiltrated into one of our greatest veterans organizations, and have used its great prestige for their own purposes, I feel I should again present the facts to the Congress and the American people.

I emphatically deny the alleged abuse of the franking privilege as set forth in the American Legion resolution. Had there been any opportunity to present the facts to the Legion committee, I am confident that I would have easily convinced them of the falsity of these manufactured charges; but no such opportunity was afforded me. The resolution was sponsored by yet-unknown individuals and aimed against me and other Members of Congress who happened to oppose our entrance into war before Pearl Harbor, and who have been unafraid to stand up and fight for freedom of speech in America, while supporting all war measures since war was declared.

It is a sad commentary that such an organization as the American Legion—of which I have been proud to be a member since World War No. 1 and was chairman of the subcommittee which drafted the preamble to the American Legion constitution which has never been changed one iota to the present time—should permit itself to be used even inadvertently for political and smear purposes. It is even more to be deplored that it should permit its great name to be linked with any effort designed to destroy free speech in America and to deny to American citizens the rights guaranteed to them under the Constitution.

I also want to reply to an editorial appearing in the Washington Post. In its editorial, dated September 25, 1943, the Post, as usual, distorts the facts concerning a speech I sent out last summer in behalf of the freedom of speech, on which the American Legion resolution was based, and quotes section 335 of the United States Code, that—

> It shall be unlawful for any person entitled under the law to use of a frank to lend said frank or permit its use by any committee, organization, or association, or permit its use by any person for the benefit or use of any such committee, organization, or association.

By this inference, it is claimed that I used my frank for such purposes, which is contrary to the fact. No person, organization, committee, or association has ever used my frank in this manner, and I do not even know the individual C. Leon De Aryan to whom the Post refers, nor do I know of any organization or association with which he may be connected.

I did make a speech in the House in behalf of the preservation of the freedom of speech in America—mind you, not in time of war but in peacetime—as was clearly set forth in this speech—April 6, 1943, in behalf of H. R. 2352, proposing amendments to the Alien and Sedition Act and to make it conform to the Bill of Rights and the Constitution in time of peace.

My position is that if anyone desires to send out my speeches and wishes to join in combating the efforts of any Federal agency to deprive American citizens of their privileges under the Bill of Rights and the Constitution, I shall welcome their support and am always glad to have them quote from or send out any speeches I have made on that vital issue. I had several thousand copies of my remarks printed, at my own expense, and sent them out to anyone who requested copies, already inserted and sealed in envelopes, in accordance with the time-honored practice and custom of Members of the House and Senate.

Anyone, white or colored, Protestant, Catholic, or Jew, Republican, Democrat, New Dealer, Socialist, or Communist, arrested, indicted, or convicted, in jail or out, may, as far as I am concerned receive or send out any of my speeches, because they are good American doctrine, in the interest of the United States, and 100-percent American.

There is not one word—and I challenged anyone to prove otherwise—that is even by indirection subversive or un-American.

I want to quote from the speech that the American Legion, the Washington Post, the Daily Worker, and the PM have objected to, as I do not know of any speech of which I am more proud or believe is more needed at the present time. I only wish I had enough money myself to send out a million copies in the Nation. If there was ever a 100-percent American speech, it is this one. It refers only to peacetime and does not apply after war has been declared. It in no way prevents the prosecution of persons for unlawful acts, and merely endeavors to protect the right of free speech and of a free press in America in time of peace.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent to insert extracts from that speech which I delivered in the House on Tuesday, April 6, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. The extracts to which I refer—and I only wish I had time to read the entire speech—are as follows:

> The peacetime sedition law of 1940 was aimed specifically at preventing the distribution of handbills and propaganda to cause disaffection and mutiny on board warships and disobedience and desertion in our armed forces; and should not, by any stretch of interpretation by the Department of Justice, be applied to editorials or to statements and speeches by American citizens exercising their constitutional right and ancient fireside privilege of commenting on or criticizing the administration, the President, the New Deal, the foreign policies of the President and of Congress prior to Pearl Harbor, or racial or religious issues, or the conduct of the war. * * *
>
> It is utterly preposterous to attempt to twist and distort the 1940 act into indicting and bringing to trial opponents of the administration's foreign policies or of President Roosevelt, or anti-New Dealers, anti-Communists, or anti-Semites.
>
> * * * * *
>
> In a letter written to Mrs. John Adams, written at the end of his first term in the Presidency, Thomas Jefferson stated:
>
> "I discharged every person under punishment or prosecution under the sedition law because I considered and now consider that law to be a nullity, as absolute and as palpable as if Congress had ordered us to fall down and worship a golden image, and that it was as much my duty to arrest its execution in every stage as it would have been to rescue from the fiery furnace those who should have been cast into it for refusing to worship the image." (Thomas Jefferson, by Albert Jay Nock, p. 230.)
>
> The golden calf in the present instance is the foreign policy of the New Deal administration prior to Pearl Harbor, and those who failed to fall down and worship it before Pearl Harbor are being charged, and in some instances, indicted under the provisions of the present-day Sedition Act, 1940.
>
> Fair-minded Americans, regardless of party affiliations, will never remain silent and permit freedom of speech or a free press—without which free America ceases to exist—to be curbed and gagged, or opponents of the foreign policies of President Roosevelt prior to Pearl Harbor—who numbered 100,000,000—sent to jail through bold distortion of the peacetime sedition law and the intent of the Congress.
>
> If American citizens, clergymen, editors, writers, and crackpots or cranks from all parts of the Nation can be brought to Washington and tried for expressing their noninterventionist and anti-New Deal views prior to Pearl Harbor, half of Congress and 80 percent of the American people could be sent to prison under such a Gestapo procedure.
>
> * * * * *
>
> I am informed that there is a group of anti-Semites among the 34 Americans indicted. I do not approve of their words or actions, as I believe there should be no religious test under the Constitution, and that all American citizens, regardless of race or color, have a right to their own religious convictions. But while anti-Semitism is un-American, I know of no Federal law or constitutional provision that prohibits freedom of discussion of racial and religious issues, as much as I deplore them. It certainly was not the intent of Congress to write any such restriction or limitation into the Alien Registration and Sedition Act of July 28, 1940.
>
> * * * * *
>
> This issue is so important that it far exceeds all party lines. It is a great American issue, involving the most fundamental and precious of all American rights and liberties—that of freedom of speech. No sacrifice is too great to safeguard freedom of speech and of the press—symbols of freedom in America. We are fighting a war all over the world for these very principles and must not permit them to be destroyed here at home.

To sum up, this speech and the legislation I proposed coincides very closely with an amendment offered by me on the floor of the House to another bill, which was adopted, and reads as follows:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent any citizen or citizens, or any newspaper or other publications, at any time, from freely discussing or openly criticizing the domestic or foreign policies of the administration or the Federal Government, or any public official, or from discussing or criticizing any existing or proposed law, regulation, directive, or Executive order.

The following resolution passed by the Judson P. Galloway Post, No. 152, the American Legion, of Newburgh, N. Y., the largest post in my district, was adopted by a unanimous vote, with one single exception. That post has sent its resolution of protest through the channels to the national organization. I did not see it until it appeared in the Newburgh News. I knew nothing about it except as I read it in the local newspaper and as

it was handed to me afterward, because I was not in my district at the time.

The resolution reads as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
JUDSON P. GALLOWAY POST, No. 152,
Newburgh, N. Y.

"Whereas the American Legion, in national convention assembled, at Omaha, Nebr., has passed a resolution questioning the patriotism and loyalty of one of our post members; and

"Whereas the said target of this attack, HAMILTON FISH, has proven that his patriotism and loyalty to his country in war and in peace are beyond reproach; and

"Whereas the said HAMILTON FISH was one of the founders of the American Legion and coauthor of the preamble to its constitution; and

"Whereas the record will prove that he was one of the first of our national legislators to fight the subversive groups forming the Communist Party in the United States, and that he further did much to crush their early attempts to defame and disrupt our form of government and in so doing he did expose their plans and purposes: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the members of Judson P. Galloway Post, No. 152, the American Legion, Newburgh, N. Y., wish to be recorded in protest to this action, and we further resolve that no such action should be taken in a free and democratic organization like the American Legion against one of its members without first giving the said member a hearing. Loyalty and service to the American Legion and the United States of America deserves fairer treatment, and this action appears like an attempt to cooperate with those elements which are spreading disunity in the Nation in time of war, and with those groups which would smother free speech and thus create in the United States of America the very type of dictatorship which the war is being fought to destroy; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded through the necessary channels to the national commander of the American Legion for consideration and appropriate action."

The above resolution was adopted at a regular meeting of Judson P. Galloway Post, No. 152, the American Legion, Newburgh, N. Y., on Thursday evening, September 23, 1943.

IRVING NESS,
Commander.
JAMES M. FLANAGAN,
Adjutant.

I have received other resolutions from war veterans' organizations along the same line. After I read in a New York newspaper the resolution adopted by the Legion at Omaha, I gave out the following statement which I propose to read in full to the Members of the House of Representatives, as it involves the right of free speech and the use of the franking privilege of every Member of Congress.

It is more in sorrow than in anger that I have read in the newspapers that the Legion, a great American organization, of which I am proud to be a member, has inadvertently been used to carry on a political and partisan smear campaign by repeating charges more than 3 years old, that I permitted my congressional frank to be used to spread un-American or subversive propaganda by the America First Committee, and George Sylvester Viereck, without one iota of evidence or any hearing on my part whatsoever. Both these charges are completely and totally false, and I denounced them as manufactured lies years ago. Neither the America First Committee nor Mr. Viereck ever asked to use my congressional frank, or ever used it to send out any subversive speeches, nor did either write or suggest any speeches for me. I think everybody knows that I write my own speeches, and there is not a subversive or un-American thought in any speech I ever made in Congress or elsewhere. I never met nor have I seen Mr. Leon de Aryan, of San Diego, who is alleged to have addressed and sent out one or more of my speeches in April of this year entitled "Making the Peacetime Alien Sedition Law Conform to Bill of Rights and the Constitution," dealing almost entirely with the preservation of free speech and free press in time of peace and not affecting the situation in any way after war has been declared. I challenge anyone to find a single un-American word, thought, or ideal in that speech. I sent one to every Member of Congress, and as soon as I can get more printed I will send a copy to every American Legion delegate to the Omaha Convention, and will eat my hat if there is anything subversive in it unless free speech has become un-American. The Legion evidently did not know that my proposed free-speech bill was not effective in time of war. We are fighting a war to maintain free speech all over the world, and the sole purpose of my bill was to maintain it in America in peacetime. That is the fireside privilege of every American citizen. I do not know without checking up how many of these speeches on free speech and a free press were mailed out, but there were not very many as I recollect that the printing bill was under $50. There were some favorable editorials and comments on it throughout the Nation at the time, and I received numerous letters of commendation. I hold no brief for Mr. De Aryan, as I know nothing about him except that under American jurisprudence no American is guilty of any unlawful act until convicted. I am told that his newspaper, the Broom, which I do not subscribe to and have no connection with, is still being published, and if it were subversive it would have been closed by the Government long ago.

It would be interesting to know, and I propose to find out, who originated this false and scurrilous attack. I have my own ideas now, but will take steps to ascertain the facts and to act accordingly.

I shall be glad to cooperate with the American Legion to prevent any abuse of the franking privilege. I doubt if there is a single legionnaire who has more openly and more consistently opposed subversive and un-American activities during the 22 years I have been in Congress, and will continue to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Under previous order of the House heretofore agreed to, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] for 15 minutes.

REALITIES CONCERNING THE POST-WAR WORLD

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there are 12 fundamental points upon which it is important that we be advised concerning our foreign policy. It is important that we be advised of these 12 fundamental points, because we, the American taxpayers, will have to pay the bill. We and our children and our children's children will have to toil and sweat, sacrifice, deny ourselves, and endure privations in order to meet even a comparatively small part of the post-war plans of some who would impose upon us those which they have in mind.

These 12 fundamental points require our careful study because they vitally affect our future and the fate of coming American generations.

The first point is that, of course, the United States will fulfill all of her proper and actual responsibilities in and to the post-war world. Those obligations will not necessarily be what some group, seeking world power, may say they will be, or what some individual, seeking world renown, may want to make them.

The second point is that it is too early to blueprint in detail what those responsibilities will be. We do not yet know what kind of a post-war world will confront us. We do not know whether the war both on the Atlantic and the Pacific will end simultaneously, or whether there will be a year or two years or a longer period between the terminations of the war across the Atlantic and our war on the Pacific.

We do not know what conditions of destruction, of epidemics, of internal revolutions, of possible disagreements as to peace objectives between the Allies themselves may develop.

The third point is that the American people, 132,000,000 of them, manifestly cannot undertake to provide a post-war United States W. P. A., unlimited, for all the ill-fed, ill-clad, and ill-housed millions of the rest of the world. There are more than 2,000,000,000 people in the world—World Almanac, 1943—and, outside of America, probably more than half of them would come within the category of the ill-fed, ill-clad, and ill-housed.

The fourth point is that the people of America cannot force the Atlantic Charter and its "four freedoms" down the throats of the other peoples of the world, even though we have the financial resources, the will, and the power to seriously attempt it. We do not definitely know what Joe Stalin, the dictator of Russia, thinks of the "four freedoms." He has never explicitly stated his views but we do know it is his intention, when the war is ended, to incorporate in the Union of Soviet Republics the so-called Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, together with part of Poland, without regard to the wishes of the peoples thereof. This is hardly in keeping with the spirit of the "four freedoms." However, we do know that the British do not want the "four freedoms" under the terms of the Atlantic Charter extended throughout India nor in many other

areas of the British Empire. Prime Minister Churchill made this very clear when he said in London on September 9, 1941, I quote:

> The joint declaration does not qualify in any way the various statements of (British) policy which have been made from time to time about the developments of constitutional government in India, Burma, or other parts of the British Empire.

Also, when the Prime Minister stated to the Lord Mayor of London on November 10, 1942. I quote:

> Let me, however, make this clear, in case there should be any mistake about it in any quarter. We mean to hold our own. I have not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire.

The fifth point is that not we alone, but we and our allies, including valorous, suffering China, will have to determine what the needs of the post-war world are, both from the standpoint of the victorious Allies, and of the defeated Axis peoples. It must be obvious to anyone thinking clearly on this subject that there may be wide differences of view to be reconciled, there may be a wide diversity of interests to be reconciled, and there undoubtedly will be a wide diversity of hatreds and prejudices which will have to be composed before we can have a post-war world of peace. That means, not some summary decisions on the part of these self-appointed, little-understanding planning groups in the United States, but compromise between the conflicting and bitter differences which existed among and within certain nations of the world before the beginning of the war.

The sixth point, what any enlightened American citizen already knows, is that only a safe, sound, free, solvent America can help the rest of the world or any part of it back to peace, sanity, and prosperity. No one ever saved a drowning man by jumping in and drowning with him.

The seventh point is that the greatest service we can render to the cause of democracy is to prove to the world, in the case of our own country, that democracy can stand up and operate effectively, and continue to exist under the stresses of war, as well as in the blessings of peace. If we fail to do this, then government of the people, for the people, and by the people will have failed in the world.

The eighth point is that any attempt on the part of the United States and the other Allied Powers to compel the American or the British form of government in the smaller countries would be imperialism. It is imperialism that our men and women on the fighting lines all over the world are now struggling to resist and destroy. Why emulate Hitler?

The ninth point is that we can aid other peoples in the world in securing an opportunity to adopt and adapt our American way, only insofar as it may be suited to their cultural and economic viewpoints and conditions. Beyond that we cannot go without departing from democracy and entering the field of imperialism. We must not forget that imperialism may be attempted or promoted through bribery by means of goods and services, as well as by force of arms and aggression.

The tenth point is that the extravagant and irresponsible promises now being made by these self-appointed post-war planners, that the United States will undertake reformation of their economic and cultural conditions in the other countries of the world, to prescribe their methods of government, to regulate their wages and working conditions, their living conditions, their educational systems, and so forth, cannot possibly be carried out by the United States. Such irresponsible promises can and will result in leaving the other peoples of the world disappointed, angry, and with their faith in the integrity and stability of American promises and policies seriously impaired or destroyed. In which case we would emerge from this terrible war with only the enmity of the other nations of the world as our return for our vast sacrifices in human lives and happiness, and in financial treasure. This condition we must avoid.

The eleventh point is that Congress must move to set up some sort of supervision, perhaps by a Joint Congressional Council, or Commission, to investigate for and to advise the Congress as to its proper course of action in the final determination of this Nation's post-war policies.

The twelfth and final point is that the designs of these self-appointed post-war planners to continue, after the war, to spread billions of dollars' worth of American goods and services—American sweat, toil, and resources—among the other peoples of the world, would, if permitted, bankrupt America, enslave our own people, denude us of the necessities by which we support our own American cultural and living levels, and encourage the other peoples of the world to look to us as a paternalistic provider for all the improvident of the world, instead of exerting their own ingenuity and energy in providing for their own necessities.

America—a free, sound, solvent America—can help the other peoples of the world to help themselves. It is impossible logically to conceive that our responsibilities to the post-war world could possibly go beyond that point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for 15 minutes.

ELIMINATION OF GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose most Members of the House had an experience similar to my own during the Congressional recess, when we were privileged to sojourn at home for a period of 60 days and ascertain the temper and the general attitude of the people over the impositions of government. I am satisfied that the admonitions that came to you were similar to those that came to me. The people would say, "I hope when you return to Washington that you will get some action about a good many of these regulations, these rules and procedures that weigh down so heavily upon the American people." We have now been in session a little while, and nothing has eventuated. I feel just a little disappointed over our inaction. I do not know what you, as Members of this House, are going to do, but I know what I am going to do. I am going to make some effort at it at least, and before I come to the conclusion I want to reach in the 15 minutes that are at my disposal, I think I ought to begin in a rather roundabout fashion and first remind you that the departments are already preparing their estimates for the Budget Bureau, for appropriations for the fiscal year 1945. There is no great magic about that. Every agency, every department of government is now working and has probably concluded its preliminary draft of estimates of what money they will need for the fiscal year 1945. They will then proceed to present these estimates to the Bureau of the Budget. Experts will be assigned by the Bureau, and they will go over these estimates very carefully.

When they are finally completed they will go to the White House and the President will be consulted, and when they are put into final form they will be ready for inclusion in the printed Budget of the United States, with some 1,100 pages that will be submitted to us in January. When the estimates are submitted, the appropriation bills will also be submitted therewith. Then hearings will begin in the Appropriations Committee so that the Congress may determine how much or how little shall be allocated to the different agencies of Government for the next fiscal year, which begins on July 1, 1944.

I have tried to summarize the general attitude of the Appropriations Committee, and the general attitude of the House as those measures are presented and it appears to be about like this: Our attitude generally with respect to appropriation bills is an attitude of protest. We find there that we have an instrumentality whereby we can discipline agencies of government when we cannot contrive it in any other way. If O. P. A., for instance, indulges in excesses and abuses and gets out capricious regulations of one kind or another, invades the sanctity of a man's business and seizes his books and papers, there are only two or three different approaches we can take. We could try to get the act repealed. You know and I know the difficulty of getting an act repealed when it has been established on the statute books and has been placed there pursuant to the demand of the people to do something about controlling and regulating prices. Nor is such an approach the answer as a general thing, the act itself cannot be repealed. So we voice and we articulate our protest when the appropriation bills come in. I certainly expressed my views early this year in the form of an amendment to strike $35,000,000 from the O. P. A. estimate. It was approved by the House. I also expressed my protest early in the year by submitting an amendment to the House to require that every price director have 5 years of experience, which amendment passed this House and was later modified in the Sen-

ate, but which is receiving some attention from the O. P. A. at present.

So the thing I want to point out first of all is that we appear content to wait until January 1, when the appropriation bills come on the floor of the House, and then bespeak our protest and seek to exercise some kind of discipline over these agencies either by writing restrictions into the bills, or by amending them so that they will not have as much money to spend.

Well, it is all very interesting as an attitude, but why not some action now? It is all very interesting to protest in that fashion, but I sometimes wonder whether or not we get anywhere, whether or not there ought not be some far more basic approach. I say the people in the country have been rather hostile about a great many things. Every day divulges new experiences with the regulatory agencies of government. I have one that came to me this morning. Sometime in June, I happened to be in Minnesota and there I saw a chap who wrote me this week with reference to an experience with O. P. A. He had a refrigerator to sell and he inserted a classified ad in the newspaper. The next morning before he got out of bed his telephone began to ring and there were several people who wanted to buy that electric ice box. The price he quoted was $125. A gentleman who used to live in Illinois called him and said, "Don't sell it until you see me. I will see you at the office when you get there." When the prospective vendor came to the office here was the prospective vendee. He said, "I will give you $100 for the box." He said, "I will take $125." So they finally made a deal at $110. Now, he used the ice box for 66 whole days and it was quite satisfactory, and then the O. P. A. called up. They said, "Did you know you had violated the law?" He said, "In what respect?" They said, "You charged $110 for a used electric ice box and the O. P. A. regulations require that you should charge only $21."

So he consulted with the vendee. It may be that the buyer reported to O. P. A. He said, "I guess you will have to send that ice box back. I have got two of them but I will not sell it for $21, so you send the box back and I will give you your check for $110."

He said, "No, I propose to keep the box and you can give me the difference between $110 and $21."

So now he is being cited to the legal section of his State for having violated an O. P. A. regulation.

I have another that came in the mail this morning, in response to a little news article that went out with reference to an amendment I introduced the other day for judicial review of O. P. A. proceedings. This gentleman lives in Austin, Tex. He is in the business of making and selling fence posts. He said, "In Austin, Tex., the ceiling is 10 cents." He said, "Across the Arkansas River, just across the river, the ceiling is 16 cents. How do they expect me to stay in business?" That is a fair question.

That can be multiplied a thousand times to indicate the fractiousness of the people at the present time with the regulations that are in effect. You know and I know when we came away from home they said to us, "Now, you go down to Washington and do something about it." I have been here since the 14th of September and we have done nothing about it yet.

So I propose, first of all, to make my very articulate protest, and then come to what I think is a conclusion and a remedy on the matter. Now, when you put together the growing controversy that has been in the air in recent months, and for that matter in recent years, what is it? It is a controversy between the lawmaking power of the Government and those to whom we delegate that power, who have engaged in the excessive exercise of the power. When all is said and done, that is the whole story. We are amenable to and responsible to the people, because they can discipline every last one of us at the polls, but you cannot discipline any Federal administrator at the polls, because he is an appointive officer and is not directly responsive to the electorate. The people look to us for aid in matters of this kind.

The people have only one place to go in order to secure some redress from their grievances and that is here, and we must do something about it unless we are going to confess our remissness to the country. They expect us to be alert to this whole business and they expect the Congress to retrieve its powers and to set up any delegation of power within a framework that is controllable, that is supervisable, and that is understandable to the people.

Mr. Speaker, that is just about the gist of this whole business that presents itself to us as a real problem.

I had an experience, as recorded in a letter very recently, from a very fine representative business in Peoria, when, without any search warrant, without any legal weapon of any kind, three agents of the Office of Price Administration walked into that office and seized the books, and let it appear that he was in violation of his sugar quota. A terrible thing, as a matter of fact, and it is only indicative of the fact that Congress is going to have to deal with this thing summarily and deal with it now.

I propose to file that letter with my friend, Raymond McKeough, the district director of the Office of Price Administration in that section and ask for some kind of corrective action.

But, Mr. Speaker, we cannot dispose of all these people who are exceeding their authority. It requires a sound, basic remedy. For instance, at the moment there have been developed facts before the Smith committee concerning rent control through the O. P. A. It appears from the interim report of that committee that O. P. A. had been encouraging people to file suits against landlords for the purpose of collecting damages and for the purpose of developing greater friction throughout the country. That is certainly a horrible state of affairs; it does not make for unity; it only develops and increases and aggravates friction in the country and it is going to have to have some kind of action and must receive that attention soon.

What do we propose to do about it? How can the Congress meet that problem, a problem that grows out of the abuse of power that it has delegated to administrative agencies. Some suggest that we should not delegate those powers. I think, however, that the administrative management is here to stay. The delegation of some power to an administrative agency is absolutely necessary, in my judgment. Let us consider that for a moment. How could the Congress itself make freight rates? We have to give that power to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

How could we police all the fair-trade practices in industry? Since the Congress could not do it we delegate that power to the Federal Trade Commission.

Congress, of itself, cannot administer the Price Control Act and so there must be a price-control agency.

Our failure lies initially in not carefully delimiting and spelling out the delegated power which an administrative agency shall exercise; secondly, we are not staffed or equipped to follow through and make certain that the intent and spirit of any act is properly carried out; third, we have permitted the free exercise of judicial review to be limited and made ineffective. Thus, when abuses creep in and the rights of people are often ignored, we exercise the only remedy available to us other than the complete repeal of the act and that is to curtail funds and place restrictions on appropriations as a kind of discipline for such an agency. But when all is said and done, it is an unsatisfactory process and does not meet the problem.

What weapon is there; what are we going to do about it? We tried to do something about it once before. A good many of you will remember the efforts of the Congress in enacting the Walter-Logan bill. I am sure the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER], who is a member of the Judiciary Committee, recalls that committee reported a bill, which passed the House and went through the Senate and was vetoed by the President. And, as a result they set up this committee in the Department of Justice in order to explain this whole business of administrative law and make a report.

They did make a report. They sent me their documents. My desk was piled that high with them, and if I read them all it would take me 4 years, I suppose, to read all of the exhibits that have come to me.

Where are we going to find time to do that?

You and I know that the Walter-Logan bill had merit. It started out beautifully, and it wound up in the setting sun of a veto and nothing more has been done about it. We must stop kidding ourselves about it and really do something one way or the other, and I think it is necessary that we start right now.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 2 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes, if it is agreeable to the gentleman from Michigan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If there is no objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We all know how important this whole matter of delegated power and the careful supervision of that power by the Congress is going to be when the war is over.

One of the first things to be suggested will be to determine on a public-works program to meet the problem of demobilized veterans and demobilized defense workers, after free enterprise has done its utmost in providing full creative employment. Such a program means the appropriation of public funds and the creation of an administrative agency to administer such funds and the expression of such a program. Will there not be the same business over and over again of coming in here with joint resolutions from the Appropriations Committees delegating broad powers to agencies and giving them several billion dollars and saying, "Let her go, Gallagher." If we do that, we must be responsible for the fruits, and the bitter fruits, that may emanate from that kind of an approach.

What about surplus goods?

We are told that there will be $50,000,000,000 of surplus war goods. What is going to happen? I assume there will be some kind of an agency to administer their disposition. Under what kind of power? The kind of power that we shall give such an agency here in Congress. So we are going to delegate. Within what limitations? And what rights of review will there be when controversies arise? Consider for a moment the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill on social security. There is one provision in that measure which intrigues me greatly. That is the one to federalize the whole program of unemployment compensation. We have a State-Federal system now. If that bill should prevail in its present form it would mean that there would be a completely federalized compensation system. And then what happens to the rights of review, to the adjudication of controversies that may arise where an employer may be on one side and an employee on the other?

What about all these defense plants that we have built—$15,000,000,000 of your money and mine that is invested in plants that have been constructed by the Defense Plants Corporation? How will they be administered? I suppose some authority will be set up. Then there must be a delegation of power. What kind of delegation? How broad shall it be? And how far shall it go? And then there comes this whole problem of review all over again where controversies arise. So I am only pointing out to you that as we get into the postwar period this problem of administrative discretion, of administrative latitude is going to be infinitely greater than it is at the present time. Continued friction between the legislative and executive branch is neither wise nor healthy. Nor was it intended by the founders of this Republic. We must work out a technique which will make the administration of congressional enactments more efficient with a minimum of friction. Let me make this suggestion since my time is running out in order to get the thing crystallized. We had a situation in the city of Peoria recently where three Federal judges heard a case involving O. P. A. Judge Adair, who was once a Member of this House; Federal Circuit Judge Major, who was once a Member of this House; and Judge Briggle. It was a petition for a restraining order. The three-man court listened attentively to the petitioner's counsel and then respectfully and informally advised the petitioner that by a long series of acts Congress has gradually divested the regular Federal courts of jurisdiction and that they could offer no remedy. The O. P. A. Act clearly recited in section 204 that all jurisdiction on regulations and price schedules had been vested in a special court and that this three-man court hearing the case was powerless to afford relief. That is a rather tragic spectacle.

That was the language of Federal Judge Briggle not so very long ago, fairly reproaching the Congress for having divested the regular Federal courts of their jurisdiction.

What did we do in the O. P. A. Act? We set up a special emergency court. What a lure it was and how persuasive was the argument. I reread Mr. Ginsburg's memo to the Banking and Currency Committee in connection with this proposal. He said in effect, "We want a court of experts."

> We want to relieve the Federal courts of congestion.

All right. He said:

> We are going to make it possible for this court to operate in divisions to make justice accessible to all sections of the country, to every litigant, rich and poor alike.

That was the memorandum filed by O. P. A. with the Banking and Currency Committee when the O. P. A. Act was under consideration. We wrote into that emergency act this provision:

> No Federal, circuit, or territorial court shall have jurisdiction over any controversy involving a price regulation or a price schedule.

That went through this body. I voted for it like other Members, although we did make an effort to secure the adoption of the proposal by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] to retain this power in the regular Federal courts. We had the memo from O. P. A. expressing its faith in the emergency court which it proposed. But it has not worked, and people with grievances have a difficult time securing redress of such grievances. We can still retrieve that mistake and make a vigorous effort to restore judicial review to the regular Federal courts so that in truth and in fact, any citizens who is aggrieved by the actions of an administrative agency of Government will have his day in court. Is that asking too much? Is that not the proper and basic way to meet the excesses of administrative agencies of Government?

Recently I introduced a bill to meet this problem. It is in the nature of an amendment to the O. P. A. Act to restore jurisdiction to Federal courts to review all actions, regulations and schedules of O. P. A. It is now pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency. I am not advised as to whether a hearing will be held or not. Moreover, time is of the essence. Why not get action on this matter without delay.

If no hearing will be held, there is another method open.

I do know there is a bill pending that was introduced by my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], H. R. 2705. It was introduced May 13, 1943. This bill contains a provision reading like this:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of any law, order, directive, regulation, finding, or determination the right of any person to a judicial review of grievances resulting from the promulgation of any order, directive, regulation, finding, or determination under this act shall not be denied.

That is the section of the Wolcott bill in which I am interested. How can we get action on it? If we cannot get a hearing from the Committee on Banking and Currency there is still one other way. I am going to file a discharge petition on Mr. WOLCOTT's bill, H. R. 2705, yet this afternoon and if you want to help restore judicial review to the regular Federal courts of the country and give the people their day in court in the third branch of Government all I can ask is that you march up to the Clerk's desk at the proper time and affix your signature to the petition. If we discharge the committee it can come to the floor for action. Whenever we deny to the people, an opportunity to go into court for relief from the encroachments of government agencies, we abridge the last best hope of this Nation. Adequate judicial review is after all the answer to the controversy between the Congress and the bureaus.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was delayed in reaching the House today. I should like to have heard the barrage that was laid down regarding the subject I am to speak on.

Mr. Speaker, about 2 weeks ago an authoritative Army publication contained an editorial alleging that powerful political forces had laid careful plans to take over the War Department following the appointment of Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, to the post of global commander in chief.

During the following days many newspapers discussed this alleged plot and it was brought out in some detail on the floor of this House by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER]. It was a

matter of common discussion in the Capital.

I point out these facts for the purpose of showing that it had been well aired before I came into the picture last Thursday.

I take the floor today in connection with this matter because I cannot permit administration apologists to put words in my mouth and to misrepresent my position.

At the outset, permit me to make perfectly clear that:

First. I have never directed any criticism, nor linked with any plot, the reportedly proposed appointment of General Marshall as global chief of staff. I have understood for sometime that General Marshall has been the accepted choice of the leaders of the United Nations for the post of supreme commander when the final blow is to be struck against the Axis Powers.

Second. I have made no criticism of the Commander in Chief of our Army in connection with this proposed promotion of General Marshall. In fact, I said in my remarks on Thursday:

I prefer to think his promotion is a fine recognition of General Marshall's ability.

Now, after the matter had been thoroughly discussed by newspaper and radio commentators and editorial writers, I took the position that where there is smoke there is usually fire, and, with another Member of Congress, who is seated on the floor of the House here today, and whose identity will be made known at the proper time, conferred with a high official of the War Department, whose name and rank must obviously be held in confidence.

I was furnished substantially the same information as was contained in an article written by William K. Hutchinson, for the International News Service, which I caused to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD on page A-4001.

Now let us get right down to the essence of this thing. The information contained in this story has never been denied by anyone in high authority. A flat denial would be simple and easy if there is no basis for the report. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] took the floor yesterday and attempted to place me on the defensive. The usual tactics of those in this administration is to attempt to question the patriotism of anyone who criticizes or reveals any questionable activities of the New Deal politicians.

It was obvious that these two gentlemen had but little information regarding the subject. If anybody thinks that by throwing out a smoke screen or attacking me personally I can be scared, somebody had better guess again. As I said yesterday, any time I am convinced politics are being played in connection with the war effort, jeopardizing the lives of millions of American boys, I intend to tell the Nation about it regardless of what may happen to me politically. And I permit no man to question my patriotism.

Let it be thoroughly understood, I do not want New Deal politicians running the War Department. There are too many capable men to carry on General Marshall's program if he is appointed supreme commander of the United Nations, without turning the job over to a political general, or giving control of the War Department to politicians. The Nation—the fathers and mothers, the brothers and sisters, the wives and children of the men and women in the armed services—want this war won as quickly as possible, with minimum loss of life and casualties, and any political manipulation of the conduct of the war would be a betrayal of our Nation, and might lose the war for us.

I feel that if by any word or deed I can prevent those in the cabal mentioned in the Hutchinson article from taking over the War Department and building it into a political machine, I will have rendered our armed forces and the Nation a service. Unless there are definite, complete denials that such a plot exists, I shall insist upon keeping this Congress and the people of the United States informed of any facts I can secure.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr ROLPH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today to commend two soldiers who, in my opinion, have made outstanding records in the war effort. Both of them have been stationed in my district in San Francisco and both have contributed greatly to the defense of our country. I refer to Lt. Gen. John L. De Witt and to Maj. Gen. Frederick Gilbreath.

The House will remember after Pearl Harbor the delegations from California, Oregon, and Washington urged that the Japanese in all three States be evacuated. You will further recall that due to the resolutions passed by our group the President issued his directive whereby approximately 120,000 Japanese were evacuated from three Pacific Coast States. When that directive was issued, I think I reflect the sentiment of practically every layman in the country when I say we thought it was going to be an extremely difficult job. I want to say here and now that I was absolutely amazed and agreeably surprised that those Japanese were evacuated from the three Pacific Coast States without any untoward incident of any kind, without any confusion, and without any disturbance to our economy. Great credit is due General De Witt for the splendid way in which he handled the problem. As the Representative from the Fourth California Congressional District, I want my countrymen everywhere to know how much the people in my district appreciate General De Witt's excellent work.

During the recent recess I had the privilege of visiting the different supply depots that go to make up the San Francisco port of embarkation. With General Gilbreath I inspected the different depots and it was remarkable the way embarkation in the San Francisco port has been carried on. I visited the docks where the ships are loaded. I went to the warehouses where the goods are accumulated and stored. I went to the yards where the automobiles, trucks, jeeps, and different motor vehicles are assembled and where they are prepared for embarkation. It was particularly impressive how smoothly and efficiently every detail was worked out. No confusion anywhere; no disorder. Everything so spick and span, shipshape. As a matter of fact, I do not believe that there are many mercantile establishments of long standing in the United States better organized and better operated than are the depots comprising San Francisco's port of embarkation.

It may interest my fellow colleagues to know that San Francisco for many months was the leading port of embarkation in the United States. With the step-up in the tempo in the Pacific war area it may easily be the most important port of embarkation in months ahead.

On yesterday my colleague from San Francisco, Representative RICHARD J. WELCH, introduced in the RECORD an editorial from the San Francisco Examiner of September 24, 1943. The article is entitled "War Efficiency at Coast Ports" and tells of the service being rendered by General Gilbreath. It appears on page A4011 of the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to have the opportunity of congratulating two great Americans, Lieutenant General De Witt and Major General Gilbreath.

PRICE CONTROL NECESSARY—ATTACKS HAVE WEAKENED LAW—LATEST PROPOSAL WILL DESTROY THE LAW AND CAUSE RUINOUS INFLATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is one of the ablest men in this House. He is a very sincere Member and he is a very effective Member. He made a statement awhile ago that I do not think should go unchallenged. I inferred from his statement that the House must have been fooled or misled—I hope he did not mean it that way—in the passage of the Price Control Act in that a provision was written into the law that the Federal courts in the country could not have anything to do with restraining its operation and enforcement.

As a member of the committee that assisted in the writing of that bill may I say that it was well known why that provision was put in there. There was no secret about it. Everyone knew it. The provision was put in there for a good purpose, a purpose without which the price-control law would not be worth anything at all. If you were to pass a Price Control Act, and then allow any Federal judge in the United States to restrain price control, you would always have an injunction against price control. You would not have price control

at all. You know, we have Federal judges of different faiths and beliefs and they have their hates and their prejudices. If we permitted any Federal judge to grant an injunction against price control you would always have an injunction against price control. So you would have no price control at all.

The answer is, If you really believe in price control you should have a law that is very drastic, something that we would not stand for in peace at all. I would not stand for this law in time of peace willingly and you would not either. It was a question of adopting drastic, radical, and an arbitrary means of preventing ruinous inflation in this country, that is all. So if you want to destroy price control and not have any price control at all, the best step that you can possibly take is to sign Mr. DIRKSEN'S petition and bring out the bill, then pass it and allow any Federal judge in this Nation to restrain the operation of that law. In that event you will have no law at all.

So if you believe in a ruinous, runaway inflation, let the prices go to the sky, and have no control over them, that kind of a law is the kind of law you should pass.

The last Congress was an inflationary Congress. We not only crippled O. P. A. by reducing the appropriations to where they could not do an effective job but we also reduced and eliminated an appropriation for O. W. I., the only agency that was selling the people of this country on the reason why inflation should be prevented. Yet, we come here with this body blow. Why, it is equal to the repeal of the O. P. A. law. If you are going to pass a bill like that, you might just as well face the issues squarely and say, "I do not believe in price control or rent control, I want to repeal the law absolutely." I do not think the people of this country are ready for that.

I know the O. P. A. has done some awfully foolish things, a lot of things I do not approve of at all, and things that I condemn; but at the same time the over-all picture is that we must have price control and rent control or we shall wipe out entirely and destroy the middle class of the people in this country who are dependent upon wages and salaries and fixed incomes for support.

In some places in the world today they are paying a dollar and a quarter for a loaf of bread. In Russia and China they are paying $400 and $500 for a suit of clothes, just a common ordinary suit of clothes such as we are wearing now. They are paying $7.50 for half a pint of milk. That is happening over there now. It can happen here. Do you want it to happen here? Do you want ruinous inflation? Do you want to pay a wheelbarrow load of printing press money for a loaf of bread? If you do, repeal the O. P. A. law. If you repeal the price control and rent control, you will have that type of ruinous inflation.

Regardless of the mistakes that have been made price control generally has been worth a lot to this country. It has absolutely saved the country. Did you know that the basic materials that go to make up this big war machine of ours, copper, brass, steel, and other metals, have not increased in price 1 penny in 3 years? Why? Because the O. P. A. has held down the price, that is why.

Did you know that we have been saved tens of billions of dollars in the cost of the war because the prices of the things we are having to buy in this war have been fixed, and it was impossible for them to be raised? Certainly that is true.

I could name a lot of things whose prices have not increased one penny, by reason of O. P. A. So all in all, regardless of the irritations and the annoyance that we have had in connection with it, it is a thousand times better than having runaway or ruinous inflation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I must say I am quite astonished by the gentleman's argument.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is no more astonished than I am astonished by the gentleman, because he has always been against inflation, I thought.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What the gentleman's argument amounts to is that he does not want the people to have access to the regular Federal courts for redress of their grievances. That is the whole argument.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman knows that if you allowed any court in this Nation to restrain the operation of this law you would not have any law, because we have judges who have their hates and dislikes and prejudices just as do Members of Congress. It would be just like leaving it to any one Member of this House, and the gentleman knows what that would amount to.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. In spite of the mistakes that have been made, does not the gentleman believe that the picture in the control of inflation is much better than it was in the last war?

Mr. PATMAN. It is a lot better.

Although the regular Federal courts do not have the jurisdiction the gentleman from Illinois wants them to have those who are charged with violating the O. P. A. Act are protected in their rights by a court set up for that purpose and appeals allowed even to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Section 203, subsections (c) and (d) of the Price-Control Act setting up the court to deal with O. P. A. cases provides:

(c) There is hereby created a court of the United States to be known as the Emergency Court of Appeals, which shall consist of three or more judges to be designated by the Chief Justice of the United States from judges of the United States district courts and circuit courts of appeals. The Chief Justice of the United States shall designate one of such judges as chief judge of the Emergency Court of Appeals, and may, from time to time, designate additional judges for such court and revoke previous designations. The chief judge may, from time to time, divide the court into divisions of three or more members, and any such division may render judgment as the judgment of the court. The court shall have the powers of a district court with respect to the jurisdiction conferred on it by this act; except that the court shall not have power to issue any temporary restraining order or interlocutory decree staying or restaining, in whole or in part, the effectiveness of any regulation or order issued under section 2 or any price schedule effective in accordance with the provisions of section 206. The court shall exercise its powers and prescribe rules governing its procedure in such manner as to expedite the determination of cases of which it has jurisdiction under this act. The court may fix and establish a table of costs and fees to be approved by the Supreme Court of the United States, but the costs and fees so fixed shall not exceed with respect to any item the costs and fees charged in the Supreme Court of the United States. The court shall have a seal, hold sessions at such places as it may specify, and appoint a clerk and such other employees as it deems necessary or proper.

(d) Within 30 days after entry of a judgment or order, interlocutory or final, by the Emergency Court of Appeals, a petition for a writ or certiorari may be filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, and thereupon the judgment or order shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court in the same manner as a judgment of a circuit court of appeals as provided in section 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 28, sec. 347). The Supreme Court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of all causes filed therein pursuant to this subsection. The Emergency Court of Appeals, and the Supreme Court upon review of judgments and orders of the Emergency Court of Appeals, shall have exclusive jurisdiction to determine the validity of any regulation or order issued under section 2, of any price schedule effective in accordance with the provisions of section 206, and of any provision of any such regulation, order, or price schedule. Except as provided in this section, no court, Federal, State, or Territorial, shall have jurisdiction or power to consider the validity of any such regulation, order, or price schedule, or to stay, restrain, enjoin, or set aside, in whole or in part, any provision of this act authorizing the issuance of such regulations or orders, or making effective any such price schedule, or any provision of any such regulation, order, or price schedule, or to restrain or enjoin the enforcement of any such provision.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Boston Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Commissioner

Flemming, of the Civil Service Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, September 30, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold public hearings at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, October 6, 1943, on H. R. 2701 and private bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 12, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m.

At that time consideration will be given to the following bills:

H. R. 3257. A bill to amend subtitle—insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The purposes of the bill is to affirm and clarify the authority of the W. S. A. to agree to a waiver of the statute of limitations in connection with claims arising from insurance agreements in case of missing vessels, in order to provide for prompt settlement of both marine risks and war risks involved.

H. R. 3258. A bill to prevent double recovery on claims under section 1 (a) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to seamen employed by the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to limit the possibility of double or overlapping recovery on account of death or injury of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the W. S. A. The possibility of such overlapping recovery arises in cases of seamen who are entitled to sue under the law of the United States in case of death or injury and may also be entitled to sue under foreign law on account of the same casualty.

H. R. 3259. A bill to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to exclude from consideration for the purposes of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, services of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the U. S. A. on foreign-flag vessels or contracted for and performed wholly outside the United States, so that the coverage for such benefits for seamen employees of the W. S. A. shall be in line with the coverage in case of similar services by seamen employed by private shipping operators.

H. R. 3260. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for requisition or purchase of vessels owned by subsidiaries of American corporations.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the requisition or purchase under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, of vessels owned by American concerns through foreign subsidiaries but which are not owned by United States citizens within the terms of the Merchant Marine Act and which are not idle foreign vessels within the terms of the act of June 6, 1941—Public, 101, Seventy-seventh Congress.

H. R. 3261. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is, by amending Public Law 44, Seventy-eighth Congress, to authorize the return of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less which are owned by the United States under the procedure of Public Law 44 for the return to private ownership of vessels to which the United States has title which are no longer needed in the war effort.

H. R. 3262. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to expressly authorize the waiver of recovery of seamen's insurance payments by the W. S. A. particularly in cases where insurance has been paid to beneficiaries on the assumption that the missing seamen were dead, but later are found to be alive. The bill follows a similar provision with respect to recovery of benefits paid by the Veterans' Administration.

House Joint Resolution 158. A bill to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The purpose of the resolution is to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy similar to that provided for the United States Coast Guard Academy.

House Joint Resolution 161. A bill to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities.

The purpose of the resolution is to authorize the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration to pay cash awards for suggestions received from employees to increase efficiency or improve the functioning of the agencies.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

763. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting adjusted schedules regarding number of deferred employees credited to several agencies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

764. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1944 (H. Doc. No. 305); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

765. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $11,306,200 (H. Doc. No. 306); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

766. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $4,189,000 (H. Doc. No. 307); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

767. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1944, in the amount of $135,000 (H. Doc. No. 303); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

768. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment, House of Representatives, fiscal year 1943, $40,000, and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the legislative establishment, United States Senate and House of Representatives, fiscal year 1944, in the amount of $19,359, in all, $59,359 (H. Doc. No. 309); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 3343. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr KUNKEL:

H. R. 3344. A bill to extend the time for securing allowance of credit against Federal unemployment taxes for the calendar years 1941 and 1942; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr O'CONNOR:

H. R. 3345. A bill to authorize the leasing of Indian lands for business and other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 3346. A bill to authorize the leasing of the segregated coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 3347. A bill to authorize the execution of leases in behalf of Indians serving in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr COLE of New York:

H. R. 3348. A bill to enable soldiers to vote by proxy; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 3349. A bill relating to the taxation of the grantor of certain discretionary trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to provide for the disposition of the proceeds to accrue as a result of the interlocutory judgment of the Court of Claims in the suit brought against the United States by the Menominee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FURLONG:

H. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. Res. 307. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as a whole or by subcommittee, to study and investigate matters related to air commerce and air navigation; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 308. Resolution to provide for the payment of expenses of conducting the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 307; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 3350. A bill for the relief of Miss Olga Wahlstrom; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 3351. A bill for the relief of Howard L. Pemberton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 3352. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Edward Gray, Sr., Edward Gray, Jr., Bertha Mae Gray, Bertha Patom, and Lindsay Gardner, all of the city of Hamtramck, Wayne County, Mich.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 3353. A bill for the relief of Frank D. Howells, treasurer of the city of Richmond, Ind.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 3354. A bill for the relief of Mabel R. Woodfall; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2564. By Mr. ANDREWS: Petition containing the names of 142 residents of Niagara County, N. Y., favoring the favorable consideration of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2565. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Elsie Wheeler and 180 citizens of Waverly, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2566. Also, petition of 59 citizens of Reisterstown, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2567. Also, petition of Rev. Earl G. Lee and 28 members of the Church of the Nazarene, Kingston, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2568. Also, petition of 29 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Duluth, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2569. Also, petition of Mrs. W. I. Randle and 25 citizens of Cockeysville, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2570. Also, petition of the Westminster Mexican Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Westminster, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2571. Also, petition of Rev. Robert B. Hamilton and 70 citizens of Knoxville, Tenn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2572. Also, petition of George W. Stith and 120 citizens of Atterberry, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2573. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles W. Parsons and 50 citizens of White Plains, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measuse to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2574. Also, petition of Mrs. Clara M. Evans and 57 citizens of West Milton, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2575. Also, petition of 60 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Wilkinsburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2576. Also, petition of K. H. Ladman and 169 citizens of Esther, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2577. By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Petition of Mrs. R. M. Dixon, of Winfield, Mo., and 19 citizens of Lincoln County, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2578. Also, petition of Mrs. C. D. Howard and 19 citizens of Winfield, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2579. Also, petition of Mrs. A. C. Walters and 25 citizens of Troy, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2580. Also, petition of Mrs. John Boborosky and 25 citizens of Pacific, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2581. Also, petition of Gertrude Sawtelle and 21 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., urging passage of House Resolution No. 117, to aid the starving children of occupied Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2582. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of Mrs. R. M. Reynolds and 18 other citizens of Richwood, W. Va., requesting enactment of House Resolution 2082, to remove one of the chief causes of absenteeism, to conserve shipping space, and to prevent the waste of untold amounts of money and huge quantities of food, coal, iron, rubber, and gasoline, by stopping the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2583. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of Mrs. W. Walter Wilson, of Traer, and other residents of Tama County, Iowa, supporting House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2584. Also, petition of Chloie Y. Frisbie, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and other residents of Eldora, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2585. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of the Racine Association of Commerce, Racine, Wis., with reference to House bill 3183; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2586. By Mr. BURGIN: Petition of the Forester Beverage Co., signed by a number of citizens of Wilkes County, N. C., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2587. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of Alice J. Burnside and other citizens of Oelwein, Iowa, urging the passage of House bill 2082 in order to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed the production of materials necessary for winning the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2588. By Mr. LEFEVRE: Petition of Rainbow Lodge, of Greenville, N. Y., protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2589. By Mr. HAYS: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. J. B. Hasley and others of Little Rock, Ark., urging the passage of House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed the production of

materials necessary for wining the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2590. By Mr. COCHRAN (on behalf of himself and his colleagues from Missouri, Mr. PLOESER and Mr. MILLER): Petitions signed by sundry citizens of St. Louis and addressed to the Congress of the United States, containing 54,607 names, urging a reduction in the cost of living, and asking for a roll-back of prices to September 15, 1942, as outlined in the following measures: (1) Subsidies on a differential basis to cover the special burdens of small business and high-cost producers; (2) grade labeling; (3) dollars-and-cents ceilings on all cost-of-living items at their September 15, 1942, level; (4) continued rent control; (5) a strong Office of Price Administration—staffed with loyal supporters of price control—given adequate funds for enforcement—with full power to enforce ceilings and to compel delivery of supplies by the food processors; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Merciful Father, whose faithfulness is constant with all our fickleness, whose forgiveness outlasts all our transgressions against Thy holy love, we bemoan the delusions which have led us to mistake shadows for substance; we confess that by the opiate of our own achieving we were lulled into cushioned optimism. Now with jarred and jolted minds we see the whole circle of the world grown somber and terrible with the fires of battle and the smoke of a judgment which envelopes us all. We behold in the torture and rubble and dust of this conflict Thy righteous sentence on our godless lives. We but reap the ghastly and costly harvest of our careless years.

Help us in this hour which reveals our desperate state, with contrition for past mistakes, with their tragic consequences; renouncing all cynicism, all disbelief in the innate splendor of humanity, that we may be empowered to fill with satisfaction to ourselves and benefit to the world the solemn role to which we have been deputized by destiny. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, September 28, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Pepper
Andrews	Guffey	Radcliffe
Austin	Gurney	Reed
Bailey	Hatch	Revercomb
Ball	Hawkes	Reynolds
Barbour	Hayden	Robertson
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Scrugham
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	Kilgore	Taft
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McClellan	Tobey
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Mead	Wallgren
Davis	Millikin	Walsh
Downey	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Murdock	Wherry
Ellender	Murray	White
Ferguson	Nye	Wiley
George	O'Daniel	Willis
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gillette	Overton	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent as a member of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is necessarily absent.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has been confined to a Madison hospital since September 13.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF LUTHER M. SWYGERT TO BE DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing of the committee will be held on the morning of October 7, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Luther M. Swygert, of Indiana, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Indiana. At that time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make representations to the committee.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on September 28, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 135. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the General State Authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

S. 159. An act for the relief of the United States Parcel Post Building Co., of Cleveland, Ohio;

S. 332. An act for the relief of Velma Pikkarainen;

S. 426. An act for the relief of Maj. George E. Golding;

S. 462. An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo;

S. 626. An act for the relief of Angeline Arbuckle;

S. 652. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Lassiter;

S. 787. An act for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Harry Jacobs;

S. 789. An act to provide for the mailing of annual notices to owners of tax-exempt properties in the District of Columbia;

S. 824. An act for the relief of Dr. J. W. Goin;

S. 915. An act for the relief of Robert Kish Lee and Elizabeth Kish;

S. 929. An act for the relief of Dr. Douglas E. Lawson;

S. 1223. An act to fix the compensation of the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia and the Superintendent of the National Training Schools for Girls; and

S. 1224. An act to designate the Public Library of the District of Columbia a public depository for governmental publications.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on September 28, 1943, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 462. An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo;

S. 626. An act for the relief of Angeline Arbuckle;

S. 652. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Lassiter;

S. 915. An act for the relief of Robert Kish Lee and Elizabeth Kish; and

S. 1224. An act to designate the Public Library of the District of Columbia a public depository for governmental publications.

AUDIT OF TRANSACTIONS OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of an audit made by the General Accounting Office of financial transactions of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the period from July 1, 1939, to June 30, 1940, which with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 2649. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missi ippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn., approved April 20, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 419).

By Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1255. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission; and authorizing said Commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark., and for other purposes," approved May 17, 1939; with an amendment to the title (Rept. No. 420).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

H. R. 123. A bill to authorize a per capita payment of $10 to the members of the Santa Clara Pueblo of New Mexico from funds on deposit to their credit in the Treasury of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 421).

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. BARBOUR introduced a bill (S. 1398) to further implement the convention for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded and sick of armies in the field signed at Geneva July 27, 1929, and proclaimed by the President of the United States of America August 4, 1932 (Treaty Series No. 847), which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

UNITY AT HOME—VICTORY ABROAD—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WAGNER

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Unity at Home—Victory Abroad," delivered by him on September 1, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FREIGHT RATE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE SOUTH AND WEST—ADDRESS BY SENATOR STEWART

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on freight rate discrimination against the South and West, delivered at Nashville, Tenn., by Senator STEWART, on August 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY BRIG. GEN. FRANK T. HINES BEFORE JEWISH WAR VETERANS

[Mr. BARBOUR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, at the 48th national convention of Jewish War Veterans of the United States, at Kiamesha Lake, N. Y., on September 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR PLANS—ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN BIGGS, JR.

[Mr. VAN NUYS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a luncheon address on the subject Post-War Plans, delivered by Hon. John Biggs, Jr., senior judge of the United States Court of Appeals, Third Circuit, before the Federal Bar Association, of Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

PLAN FOR POST-WAR GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY W. L. GLEESON

[Mr. DOWNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the condensed form of a broadcast by W. L. Gleeson, on the subject Post-War Government, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEGRO AVIATORS—STATEMENT BY LT. COL. B. O. DAVIS, JR.

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Lt. Col. B. O. Davis, Jr., on September 10, 1943, dealing with the Ninety-ninth Fighter Squadron, which appears in the Appendix.]

MARSHALL TO SUPREME COMMAND—EDITORIAL FROM GALESBURG (ILL.) DAILY REGISTER-MAIL

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Marshall to Supreme Command," published in the September 23, 1943, issue of the Daily Register-Mail, of Galesburg, Ill., which appears in the Appendix.]

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. DOWNEY obtained the floor.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], because I wish to read a telegram I want him to hear. The telegram is from Fredericksburg, Va., and reads:

FREDERICKSBURG, VA.,
September 29, 1943.

Senator BURTON WHEELER,
Senate Office Building:

Understand that Senator BARKLEY desire that you name a Government employee who is trying to dodge the draft. This board would be glad to have him inspect the files of this office and will be glad to furnish the names and also show him the man, and he is not a rare bird. Am sure that the chairman of King George board would be glad to accompany us on a trip to the naval proving ground at Dahlgren and allow him to see a place which should have its name changed to Dodger Breeding Ground. Would also be glad to show him the efforts put forth by Army, Navy, and marine officers to have single men 18 to 25 deferred. Some of their efforts and statements are so fantastic that considering the gravity of the present situation Baron Munchausen's tales sound like quotations from the Bible.

With slackers run out of Government jobs there would be sufficient men without calling fathers, either pre- or post-Pearl Harbor, if married before receiving their questionnaire, or even men whose wives are entirely dependent upon them for support.

This city has under the above conditions 10½ percent of its entire population in the armed forces. This board does not propose to turn these women and children out in the streets with a paltry $62 per month for wife and baby with these dodgers making fabulous salaries, and you can tell that to the President, Congress, and the whole world, including the marines. We are not going to make paupers out of them, and that is what we would do with living costs at present level.

CECIL L. REID,
Chairman, Selective Service Board for City of Fredericksburg.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, in view of the gravity of some of the statements which I shall make in my argument today, I have believed it proper to reduce my address to writing, something which I have seldom done in a long life of speaking.

I would now for a moment particularly invite the attention of the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and likewise of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. In view of the gravity of the charges which I shall make in my address, I shall be most happy to be interrupted if any of the distinguished Senators present believe I make a misstatement of fact, or draw an improper conclusion. I shall be anxious to be interrupted for the purpose of having determined the correctness of the statements which I am about to make. Consequently I shall deeply appreciate the attention to this address of the two or three of the leaders who are opposed to the pending measure, so that they may have the opportunity of denying exceedingly serious statements which I intend to make.

Mr. President, the pending Wheeler bill to defer the drafting of fathers is a meritorious measure and should be passed because of two distinct reasons, each sufficient in itself and each independent of the other.

If we assume our Army requires more men, then we must determine how many and whether it is necessary to draft fathers to secure them, or whether we should find these men in other groups.

This issue I shall cover later in my address, and I am in agreement with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] in his contention that there are plenty of single men in the Government service, in industry, and elsewhere, upon whom we could and should call before demoralizing the homes of America by the recruitment of their fathers.

But first I shall argue that the Army is already too large, that we now have more men under arms in the continental United States than we can ever reasonably hope to use elsewhere. Particularly I shall attempt to show, by what I consider undeniable authority, that Germany now weakens so fast and our air power grows so rapidly that efficient use of our bombers and fighters will reduce the Nazis to quick surrender or terrible destruction, and that a larger land army is a wasteful burden and a tragic futility.

Mr. President, many Senators believe it is unwise to deny the demands of our military leaders for the continued building of a great land army. They argue sincerely, and very plausibly, that military decisions should be left to military leaders—that whatever they propose, Congress should accept. I cannot agree.

I cannot agree because I am certain, after the most careful investigation, that our high command has consistently failed to recognize and effectively utilize the supreme capacity of the American people to create a destructive air power which might have brought Germany to dust and to defeat months ago. Up to 1943, at least, the high command had diverted the Nation's resources and manpower principally to a vast land army, most of which never can, and never will, be used. Until this year we have only grudgingly and meagerly provided for air power.

But "truth crushed to earth shall rise again" and though up to now, measured in cost of production, less than 30 percent of our military power has been in aircraft, of all the injury inflicted on our

enemies, more than 90 percent has been accomplished by bombers and fighters.

Mr. President, I stated to one of my distinguished colleagues yesterday what I have just said, and asked him to check the validity of that statement, which, if true, should be wholly conclusive in this hour. If 90 percent of all injuries inflicted on our enemies up to date have been from aircraft, why continue to build a greater land army?

Mr. President, I have checked the figures of destruction since I made that statement to one of my associates. I find I was wrong. Yes; I was wrong. I find that up to date at least 95 percent of all injury inflicted upon the Axis Powers by our armed forces has been by aircraft. Later on, Mr. President, if no Senator desires to call for an explanation now, I wish to present the specific figures showing how valid that statement is.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Are the figures given by the Senator true of the Navy as well as of the Army, or do they simply apply with respect to the Army?

Mr. DOWNEY. No, Mr. President; I am referring to the total injury inflicted on all the enemy forces by our own forces. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who knows the story much better than I do, that in the three great naval battles of Midway, the Coral Sea, and the Bismarck Sea, in which we stopped the eastern and the southern drives of the Japanese, all injury was accomplished by aircraft and none by any other means.

Mr. WALSH. I thought the Senator perhaps had some figures as to our own losses; that is, as to the percentage of losses in the various arms of the service.

Mr. DOWNEY. I have. Here is one fact in connection with that which we should now consider: We inflicted a tragic and terrible loss on the Japanese in the Bismarck Sea, which forever ended their domination there. I think we lost only 10 or 12 brilliant, brave young fliers. We destroyed 15,000 Japanese and many great naval vessels of the enemy.

In the Buna campaign the armed forces of the United States and Australia, fighting through the jungles and the mud and the mire of the South Sea Isles, lost in casualties 12,000 men and did not destroy as many of the enemy as a handful of our fliers destroyed. That is the story of the entire war, and I shall read from War Department records later to prove it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator, as I understood him a moment ago, said that so far as the Navy was concerned all the damage that had been done was done from the air. Is that a correct summation of the Senator's statement?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; that is not correct. I made the statement in respect to the three great naval battles of Midway, the Coral Sea, and the Bismarck Sea. I will qualify that statement in this way. In the titanic battle of Midway I think antiaircraft guns on our naval vessels destroyed two or three Japanese airplanes, but outside of that, as I read the story of the battles, all the damage in those three great battles was totally accomplished by aircraft, and aircraft alone.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I, of course, would not wish to detract from the part performed by any branch of the service in attacks upon the enemy, and the destruction of their property, or their armies, or their morale, or anything else, but as I understood the Senator's remarks, I thought he had overlooked, perhaps unintentionally, what I regard as the great service of the marines in Guadalcanal and other of the Solomon Islands, as well as other places in the Pacific where they have fought. The marines did not destroy as much property as was destroyed by aircraft.

In the very nature of things, as I understand, when one army goes out to fight another, the object is to destroy the army of the enemy, and property damage is incidental thereto. So that it would probably be true that, so far as the destruction of property and damage is concerned, air raids and bombings are more destructive than an onslaught by any army upon another army. But I wanted to be sure that the Senator from California was not overlooking the great part performed by the marines in the South Pacific, and in the driving back of the enemy after airplanes had softened the situations so that they felt that they could successfully make an attack.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, that I may make my own record and opinion entirely clear, nothing that I am saying here is in any way a reflection upon the bravery and the courage and the accomplishments of our soldiers and marines in the South Seas. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky has missed my point. In the Buna campaign the Australians and Americans had about 12,000 causalties. Those men were obliged to conduct against the Japanese the most terrible type of battle that probably any troops have ever had to wage. They were brave men. Many of them died or were crippled in fighting a desperate enemy in the jungles of the South Pacific. I am not minimizing what they did. But that group of men killed less than 15,000 Japanese. We had 12,000 casualties. When the Japanese attemped to reinforce their men the battle of the Bismarck Sea resulted, and our land-based aircraft sank Japanese transports and killed 15,000 Japanese, as well as destroying great naval vessels and merchant ships. So while 12,000 men were lost by our land forces, a few hundred of our flyers employed in the Bismarck Sea destroyed more enemy soldiers than did our land forces, and probably a hundred times as much property as did our marines and soldiers battling against the Japanese. In our land fighting we lost a thousand compared to one lost in our air fighting, and far less was accomplished.

Mr. President, when we know fully the story of all the battles of this war—land and sea alike—I think we shall find them all to be the same, that in everyone air power was the great factor in winning victory. But I repeat, Mr. President, the part played by aircraft cannot successfully be denied. Anyone who wishes to attempt to deny it may request that a meeting of the Military Affairs Committee be called, where the question can be determined. At a cost of 30 percent of our productive power our airplanes today have done 95 percent of all injury inflicted upon the enemy, at least that is my opinion.

Mr. President, if the European invasion is to come, I make the prophecy that 95 percent of all injuries which will be inflicted upon the enemy will be by aircraft, but that 95 percent of the boys who will be killed, crippled, diseased, and shell-shocked will be from land troops. The tragedy of Salerno will again be repeated. Mr. Churchill said about that operation, that we were walking on the narrow edge of a precipice. Yes, we were, and Mr. Churchill should have added that only by calling for prodigious and heroic and titanic efforts on the part of the aircraft did we save General Clark's desperately driven army on the beaches of Salerno. So, Mr. President, that is the entire story.

Mr. President, we might illustrate this whole argument by a reference to the German battleship *Bismarck*. The *Bismarck* escaped from Bergen into the North Sea and past the British Navy. Aerial reconnaissance picked her up and aircraft chased her and fatally struck her. Then, Mr. President, as the *Bismarck* lay a helpless, derelict victim, wallowing in the seas, the aircraft were withdrawn, and British naval vessels came in and shot her to the bottom of the ocean.

Mr. President, I shall later attempt to show that if we were to concentrate upon Germany all our available bombers, within 60 days we could ruin at least 25 percent of her cities and her production, and within 4 months at least 50 percent; and if that were not sufficient to force surrender in a comparatively short time longer we could pound to rubble and to dust almost every city, factory, and building Germany possesses. After that, if our high command desired, we could march to the ruins of Berlin a few hundred thousand of the millions of Allied soldiers now stationed in Africa and Britain, and, if it made our leaders happier, transport abroad a few token thousand of the many millions who would still be left in continental United States.

Mr. President, do my conclusions strike you as exaggerated, or perhaps totally unsound? Do you think me presumptuous in uttering them in opposition to the wishes of our military chiefs? If that be so, let me reply that my statements are supported by every aircraft expert and air officer with whom I have had the opportunity to talk, and by everything I have been able to read, except the official or semiofficial releases of

our high command. Air Marshal Sir Arthur Travers Harris, commander in chief of the Royal Air Force Bomber Command, was reported by Drew Middleton, in the Washington Star of June 18, 1942, to have declared:

> If I could send 20,000 bombers over Germany tonight, Germany would not be in the war tomorrow; if I could send 1,000 bombers every night it would end the war by autumn.

Let me say at this point that all air officers know that a thousand bombers over Germany for 90 days would end her; and every official of this Government should know that we now have the aircraft production and the men to do that very thing.

It is my opinion that Mr. Churchill's recent statement in Parliament amply corroborates my contentions. I shall cite his remarks later and let the Senate judge for itself.

The pending program further to increase the size of our land army involves one of the most important and tragic issues ever before this body. I say that because we now have the certain airpower, if it is concentrated, to conquer Germany by the services of a few thousand American flyers. The pending program to increase still further an already oversized Army seems to indicate quite clearly that the high command still plans to emasculate and to divert our airpower away from German bombing, to aid far-reaching land campaigns which may involve millions of American casualties and possibly bring starvation and ruin to hundreds of millions of Europeans.

The fury of combat which now ravages Naples and Italy may soon spread to Greece, France, and the Balkans, and perhaps over most of Europe, leaving behind a bloody harvest where the dead will be the fortunate, and the living most to be pitied. Many Americans have lost their lives at Salerno. Their numbers will be multiplied many times if our land campaigns extend over the next year, and to other countries. To me it seems apparent that our military leaders are preparing to offer a terrible sacrifice of human life and body which is not necessary and never can be justified.

I recognize, of course—and partly by reading the Washington Post of today—that the plans of our high command for an invasion of Europe may never be realized even though we do not use our maximum air power on Germany. Aircraft pressure on the Reich is less than one-quarter of what presently can be developed, but even that amount is hurting Nazi morale and production so cruelly that her people may not be able to endure it long. German production may collapse under the weight of present bombing, comparatively light as it is. Such a collapse would end any chance of an invasion, and would prevent countless casualties which otherwise will develop if the invasion plans of our staff are consummated.

Mr. President, this controversy cannot be wholly comprehended unless we consider the history of aviation and the long and bitter argument over the value of military air power. It is almost exactly 40 years since two young American brothers profoundly affected all subsequent history by perfecting a machine which traveled through the air, driven by an internal-combustion motor. That epochal flight occurred in December 1903. No respectable newspaper printed any news of the flight at Kittyhawk until after the lapse of 5 years. One of our noted reporters, who, by chance, was present in North Carolina when the age-long dream of mankind became a reality, thought he had in his possession the greatest scoop of all time. But his newspaper, one of the important New York dailies, peremptorily rejected his report as neither good fiction nor fact.

What moral should be drawn from the experiences of Wilbur and Orville Wright with a prejudiced and skeptical world must be left to the philosopher and psychologist.

While the airplane in America was becoming a reality, in Europe another cataclysmic event, World War No. 1, was slowly generating explosive power. In that war, in 1914, man first began to use air power for military purposes, and a rapid aviation development took place. But even at its end the aircraft were still so vastly inferior to the planes of today that most of our military were unable to comprehend how potentially all-powerful was the new weapon that had been launched upon the skies of the world.

While the stereotyped military mind was unable to grasp the vital significance of coming air power, strangely enough the common sense of the common man consistently and continuously sensed it and after World War No. 1 accepted as a matter of fact the fearful and destructive possibility of air bombing. Manifestly it would be unfair to indict all military men for lacking a realistic understanding of the possibilities inherent in aircraft.

The story of Billy Mitchell is too well known for repetition. His talented mind clearly perceived the possibilities of air power. First by persuasion he sought to convert his military superiors to a rational concept of modern war, and having dismally failed, he passed from argument to indignation, invective, insult, indictment, and, finally, insubordination—with disgrace and court martial at the end.

Since then, history has exalted him as an American martyr and a military genius. His air theories have been vindicated, and his prophecies proved. A large majority of his fellow citizens were always in agreement with him. They believed his vision was right, the understanding of our generals impaired and faulty.

Billy Mitchell not only had the support of his fellow citizens; he likewise had the assistance of many of the then subordinate officers in the military forces of the United States. There are today scores of these men, some of them grown old in their long struggle to make this Nation invulnerable in the air. Today, in spite of the opposition of their superiors, these officers, against heavy odds, have developed a transcendent air power which is rapidly becoming more powerful than all the other aircraft of the world. These men should have the gratitude of our people; and I hope it will be understood that nothing I shall say hereafter will in any way reflect upon their credit and their courage. Generals Arnold, Kenney, Eaker, Chennault, and many of their associates have clearly perceived the worth of air power and have worked mightily for its full and effective use.

By 1938 it had become apparent that gigantic forces of passion and militarism were again loosed in the world and that another European war was possibly imminent. I had spent the better part of that year campaigning over the State of California, and I had discovered almost everywhere an awareness of the possibility of war, and likewise I had learned that our citizens generally believed that in future battles air power would be the decisive factor. My own experience as a passenger on commercial planes had converted me to this opinion, and I had been amazed that most of our military chiefs remained blind to the realities of modern warfare.

My views were accurately stated in the San Francisco Chronicle of December 13, 1938, in the following language:

> Yesterday, at Washington, Senator-elect DOWNEY announced his satisfaction with President Roosevelt's foreign policies. He said the Nation should have two strong fleets, one for each ocean, and should build 100,000 airplanes in order to assure preservation of the Monroe Doctrine against any combination of war powers.

I still remember, with some amusement, my discussion with various governmental leaders of the proposal that the United States should build an air fleet of 100,000 units. Among some of the younger officers I found response and support. But among the older and more important leaders, I found only impatience and even resentment that any Member of Congress should intrude upon them with such a proposal.

Among the Senators with whom I was thereafter associated, I found, as with laymen almost everywhere, a strong belief in the importance of air power, and the opinion that in the next war fighters and bombers would largely determine the outcome. I have little doubt that if the Senate of the United States had been polled in 1939 as to the importance of air power, an overwhelming majority would have supported Billy Mitchell and opposed the strategists, who then controlled, and still control, our military policy.

Be that as it may, 1939 and 1940 passed and our Government was formulating our international policy along lines that made our entrance into the war certain, but only a feeble effort was made to develop air or other military power to implement our directives. I can perhaps most effectively portray the continued development of the aircraft controversy by quoting from the opening chapter of the Fight for Airpower, by W. B. Huie, written in 1942, in which he describes our almost total failure to develop air power.

On the September morning in 1939 when Adolf Hitler cast the dice for the world or nothing, the United States had 19 poorly equipped heavy bombers. Our attack aviation—the light bombers which attack tactical targets—was confined to a sound theory and a few models; and what little pursuit aviation we had was inferior, even in quality, to that of 3 other nations. By official report the entire Army combat Air Force in continental United States numbered less than six hundred fighting planes. Yet that was a year after Munish; it was 2 years after the President had defied the dictators in his quarantine speech at Chicago; it was 3 years after the dress rehearsals in Spain; it was 5 years after the air-mail fiasco; and it was 14 years after the crucifixion of Billy Mitchell.

On May 12, 1940, 9 months after the Luftwaffe had pulverized Poland, one of the press associations reported: "Political maneuvering in Washington has slashed the Army Air Corps program calling for 6,000 new fighting planes to a mere 57-plane quota for 1940." Yet that was the year of Dunkerque. While that sort of maneuvering was going on in Washington, the Germans were using clouds of screaming planes to maneuver through the old mass armies of France.

In the summer of 1941, while the phraseology of the Atlantic Charter was being debated, somewhere, significantly, on a battleship, a group of American Flying Fortresses arrived in England. Within a few days many of them had gone down helplessly under enemy guns, and the rest had been consigned to the aerial junk heap. On the other side of the world a tactical genius named Claire Chennault addressed recruits for his Flying Tigers. "Remember, boys" he said, "you've got to be good out here. When you tackle one Jap Zero in an American P–40, you are already outnumbered 3 to 1."

It is now the fall of 1942. The hour for men who would be free is growing very late. From the catacombs of Chungking, Chinese eyes are looking hopefully upward for more of the American instruments of freedom. The Russians are pouring their blood into the Volga. The British are dying at a place called the Hill of Jesus. American Marines are defending the beaches at Tulagi. All are echoing the old familiar cry: "Planes Planes! God, give us more and better planes." Three years of retreat and defeat has left us wailing to one another: "Why, oh why, didn't we listen to our air prophets?" Yet at this late hour, with air power our chief remaining hope for victory, we have not yet struck the withered hand of yesterday from our war command; we are still beating previous plowshares into battleship hulks; we have not yet converted air strength into unified air power; we are still requiring our pursuit pilots to substitute skill for speed; and we have not yet turned to our air generals for a strategy to win the war.

We have pinned a medal on the ghost of Billy Mitchell; yet we allow the archaic systems which Mitchell denounced to remain intact, and we allow Mitchell's disciples to remain prisoners under the command of some of the very men-of-little-vision who crucified him.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I was informed at the time that at the beginning of 1941 we did not have a single solitary airplane which had all three of the requisites for fighting overseas. In other words, they did not have great fire power, self-sealing tanks, and armor plate. Some of them had one of these features, and some had two, but at that particular time, we did not have a plane which had all three of them.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator for his comment.

I believe that historians will stand in amazement as they read the record of this era. The technological power and capacity of the American Nation is such that now, as of today, we are producing far more airplanes, and of higher quality than are being produced by all the rest of the world combined. From 1938 or 1939 on we had been formulating a policy which made our entrance into the war almost inevitable. Yet, as the distinguished senior Senator from Montana has pointed out, in the one field in which we could have been preeminent, and in which we have now become preeminent, we had accomplished almost nothing. We had failed to strike the dead hand of yesterday from the living world of today.

Since Mr. Huie wrote the language which I have just quoted, the military policy of our Government has wholly changed. Soon we will be spending almost one-half of our war chest on aircraft. An accurate picture of the changing attitude of our Government may be seen by reviewing our war expenditures over the past 3 years and observing the increasing percentage devoted to air power.

In 1939 those officers of the Army and Navy who believed in the airplane as a major weapon of war wanted to expend as high as 50 percent of all war funds on their production. The majority of our ranking military insisted that such expenditures should not exceed 10 or 15 percent of the total. Air advocates lost the argument, but gained some concessions.

The first major war expenditures was made in the last 6 months of the calendar year of 1940, when 23 percent of all expenditures for munitions were disbursed for air power. In 1941, this 23 percent jumped to 26 percent; in 1942 to 30 percent; in 1943 to 34 percent, and Donald Nelson now estimates that in the calendar year of 1944 aircraft will absorb from 40 to 50 percent of all disbursements for munitions.

Crusaders for greater air power could not win their argument in 1939, but even the most fossilized die-hard militarist of the ancient school was later convinced as navies, armies, factories, and cities disintegrated and disappeared under the bombs and machine guns of a few thousand comparatively inferior airplanes.

It is now plainly apparent that if in 1939 we had given the green light to airpower; if we had then apportioned to it 40 to 50 percent of our war expenditures, as we now are doing, Germany long since would have been forced to total surrender. Those who have opposed airpower as a major weapon of war may not like that statement; those who still believe we will some day need our vast land Army may disagree; but I believe it is easily demonstrated by the widely known facts of this war.

In the last few months it has been my good fortune to talk to many airmen from both the Atlantic and Pacific theaters of war. Some of them have been high ranking officers. Without one exception, they were certain that air power alone could destroy Germany and Japan, and they were impatient at our staff for their slow approach to the task.

Mr. President, I want to make my position clear. Of course, we undoubtedly need a great Navy and a substantial Army to assist in these operations, and nothing that I am saying should be understood to indicate that I do not believe in as great or a greater Navy than we have and a substantial Army. I do think that 5,000,000 men instead of 7,700,000 would be ample.

It is my intention to quote from a few magazine articles the opinions of their authors on our present ability to defeat Germany by increased bombing. I have found not a single publication denying the theme of these writers. There may be some, but I could not locate them.

But, Mr. President, before we cite minor prophets, let us call as a witness one of those who sits in the seats of the mighty, whose testimony, unpalatable though it may be to the opponents of the pending measure, must be accepted, I presume, by them. I refer to Winston Churchill and to his recent address in Parliament, and I wish to read excerpts from an article by Harrison Salisbury as published in the Times-Herald on September 21, 1943, in which Mr. Churchill is reported to have said to the British Parliament:

> Allied air domination of Germany might well be complete in 1944 with profound consequences since the R. A. F. alone has in action almost 50 percent more aircraft than Germany can maintain and the available Allied planes exceed German planes by four to one, opening the possibility of methodical destruction of every available building of the enemy.
>
> Churchill referred to almost unbroken successes by land, sea, and air during the last year, and revealed that last May he and President Roosevelt decided that the principal objective was knocking Italy out of the war this year.

May I so interpolate this comment of my own? In view of a 400-percent Allied plane superiority, constantly and rapidly accelerating, it seems amazing that Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt did not consider the possibility of concentrating airpower on Germany and knocking her, instead of poor Italy, out of the war.

Returning now to Mr. Salisbury's article, he reports that—

> The Prime Minister said that the Allies, including Russia, had displayed increasing mastery of the air.
>
> The weight of bombs discharged by the R. A. F. on Germany in the last 12 months is three times that of the preceding 12 months, he reported. "The weight of bombs discharged in the last 3 months is half as great again as the preceding 3 months. Percentage losses during the first 8 months of 1943 are less than in the same period last year."
>
> Churchill pointed out that the German Air Force had been driven increasingly on the defensive.
>
> "The R. A. F. is at present maintaining in action nearly 50 percent more aircraft than

Germany. In addition, the United States Air Force is already in action on a great scale."

Churchill estimated that the increase in available Allied planes now exceeds the German supply by more than 4 to 1. "This opens the possibility of saturating German defenses on the ground and in the air," Churchill explained. "If the growth continues, we should with very small loss"—

With very small loss, let me repeat—

"Be in a position where the actual methodical destruction of every available building of the enemy would be possible."

He said that the Russian Air Force is now in many ways superior to that of Germany.

In the Gulf of Salerno, said Churchill, we were at extreme range for shore-based fighters from Sicily until refuelling stations were gained. We could not go northward of Naples unless we dispensed with any aid from shore-based aircraft.

And, Mr. President, no army and no navy today wants to get out of the reach of its air support.

These considerations must have been known to the Germans. They could counterattack within a few hours with forces which, at each stage, were at least equal to our own.

"I am bound to make this admission: That it looks as if we cut it very fine indeed. You have to run risks. There are no certainties in war. There is a precipice on either side of you—a precipice of caution and a precipice of over-daring."

Churchill said that German hopes "of driving us into the sea in a bloody mop-up on the beaches (of Salerno) must at times have risen high."

Almost 2,500 airplane sorties were flown during 24 hours at the height of battle and 1,400 tons of bombs were dropped by the Allies, he said.

Let me here interpolate, so that the Senate may understand the meaning of 1,400 tons of bombs, that 250 tons of bombs dropped from the air by German planes demolished Coventry, and we had to use 1,400 tons and 2,500 flights to assist and protect Clark's gallant and desperately driven army who were caught in a dangerous situation on the bloody beach at Salerno. Possibly not a single man, or very few of them, would have been alive today except for the prodigious, titanic, and heroic action of our air pilots.

"We must consider this episode of landing on the beaches at Salerno as an important and pregnant victory, deserving a definite place in the records of the British and United States armies," he continued.

That ends the quotation from Mr. Churchill.

It is not my contention that Mr. Churchill deduced from his data the conclusions that I personally believe imperatively flow therefrom. The English Premier in his address to Parliament apparently corroborates the opinion of our military leaders that Germany can be conquered only by large land armies with huge fatalities and only after a long period of time.

Mr. President, later on I shall read from the Washington Post a statement in which Mr. Churchill anticipates the very fearful possibility of a great land war in Europe with huge casualties.

I may say that in the same Washington Post is a description of injuries inflicted upon Germany and Japan so titanic and cruel that when we analyze them in order to know how rapidly Germany is losing her production and her cities, we can then understand how very certain it is that the last hour is approaching for Mr. Hitler.

Just how Mr. Churchill can reconcile his declaration of an overwhelming air superiority sufficient to destroy every German city with the proposal to invade Germany with millions of soldiers remains to me an inexplicable and, I might say, a sad mystery. If the contentions I am making were not supported by air experts and the leaders of our air forces, I would think the heads of the Allied governments knew of some mysterious and portentous fact which might lead to conclusions totally different from the apparently obvious one, that Germany is fast weakening, and may be thoroughly destroyed in a short while by heavy and concentrated airplane attack.

Of course, as I shall later show, if we divert from the bombing of Germany the great fleet which we have there to the support of our land army, then indeed Germany may last for an indefinite period.

Let me emphasize that Premier Churchill estimated a presently available Allied superiority over Germany on a basis of 4 to 1 and further estimated that the increase in Allied planes now exceeds the German supply by this same ratio of 4 to 1. Mr. Churchill then added the obvious and imperative deduction:

This opens the possibility of saturating German defenses on the ground and in the air. If the growth continues, we should with very small loss be in a position where the actual methodical destruction of every available building of the enemy would be possible.

It must be understood from Churchill's remark that we now have a superiority of air power by which we could methodically destroy every German city and all Nazi production and this destruction, the Premier emphasizes, could be accomplished with "very small loss."

The English leader qualifies his conclusions in only one way. Referring to the 4 to 1 ratio of comparative plane production, he prefaces his final conclusion of the possibility of complete destruction of the German nation by saying, "if the growth continues," referring, I assume, to the present increasing strength of Allied aircraft over the Axis.

Mr. Churchill may be guaranteed that American industry is constantly improving the quality of their planes and almost monthly accelerating the weight of production. Personally I have no doubt from confidential information which has been handed me, that plane production in the United States now exceeds that of Germany five times over. With our rate of production increasing and Germany's decreasing, we shall probably within 4 months have a ratio of superiority of 10 to 1.

Donald Nelson has furnished me with confidential data revealing our program to increase the construction of airplanes and all their auxiliaries in 1944 by approximately 70 percent over the present calendar year. Nazi output constantly decreases as our precision and area bombing disorganizes her cities and workers and guts her factories and production centers.

It is difficult to understand how Mr. Churchill can question our ability to maintain and increase our present ratio of superiority over the enemy. If the statements of the English Premier are correct—and they are verified by every authority that I know—then the conclusion is inescapable that our ever-growing air power will soon make possible the destruction of every German city and all her production, at a comparatively negligible cost in Allied lives. And if that be true, how wasteful, improvident, and cruel, and tragic, it is for our Army chiefs to call from their homes a half-million, or perhaps as I shall later suggest, a million or a million and one-half, of the young fathers of this Nation, who cannot admittedly be used for any European invasion until 15 or 18 months from this present day.

In order that the record may be conclusive, let me present to the Senate a summary of the latest report by Donald Nelson on the production of combat planes. The short article which I shall read is by Ben W. Gilbert, Post staff writer, and is headed "Amazing advances reported in combat plane production" and appeared in the Washington Post of September 23, 1943:

War Production Board Chief Donald M. Nelson's monthly munitions report yesterday revealed amazing advances made by the aircraft industry in producing superior combat planes for the United Nations.

Highlights of the report included:

The average air-frame weight of each plane accepted in August was 7,800 pounds, as against 5,600 a year ago and 3,800 in August 1941. Within a year the average weight per plane is scheduled to rise to 10,000 pounds, a figure that emphasizes the tremendous size of many of the new aircraft, since thousands of light trainer planes combine to cut down the average weight.

Production of the planes most urgently needed by the armed forces doubled in the past 5 months, with a total of 7,612 produced in August, an increase of 3 percent in numbers and 7 percent in weight over July.

Production of types marked as preferred by the armed forces made up one-half of the total monthly weight for August, compared with one-fourth a year ago. This was interpreted as an indication that the program to reduce the number of types of planes has proceeded apace with a number of less satisfactory models going by the Board.

During August, production of top-preference models increased 4,500,000 pounds, largest monthly increase yet recorded. Production of each of the top-preference models including all types of heavy bombers, increased in August.

Simultaneously, it was learned that production of aircraft and related munitions represented more than 30 percent of the total war production program—approximately double a year ago. The aircraft program is expected to make up 42 percent of the total next year, it was learned.

The report commented that the aircraft industry's labor productivity has increased 25 percent during the past 8 months.

Nelson stated that August aircraft production would have been greater but for design changes.

"Our production rate has now grown to a point where interruptions for design changes

can be made without seriously threatening the flow of planes to the fighting fronts," the report said.

The report was finally cleared through the Office of War Information after Nelson had departed for London to confer with British production officials. Final clearance had been delayed because War Department officials contended it was too optimistic.

Perhaps as a cautionary note to satisfy the military, the report pointed out: "In spite of this production progress, we are still short of current aircraft schedules. Employment shortages continue to hamper production."

Commenting on the over-all record—a 4-percent increase in production over July, Nelson said "the performance of August indicates that production appears to be getting its second wind. The movement away from the level of the spring months started in July, but the August showing indicates that production is regaining its momentum."

The production index climbed 25 points, the average monthly climb before the spring slump. Signal equipment increased 30 percent, naval ship construction 4 percent, merchant ships 1 percent, self-propelled artillery 32 percent, antiaircraft guns and equipment 4 percent.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The only sound position which can be taken by those who are opposed to the delay of drafting the fathers for 3 months while the manpower problem is studied, must be based upon just one statement that was made by General Marshall, to the effect that we had to have a certain number of men in the Army by the end of this year. When he was questioned by the Senator from California as to why that was necessary, he said it was necessary because some men were needed to fill up some of the units.

The Senator has been a member of the Committee on Military Affairs for a long time. I am sure that he knows of the large number of men, physically fit for combat service, who are today doing guard duty, and performing other duties of that kind. Is it conceivable to the Senator from California that the Army will take the 446,000 fathers whom they intend to induct into the Army between now and January 1, and send them overseas during the next year?

Mr. DOWNEY. I might answer the distinguished Senator by saying that I suppose it is conceivable that a few thousand unusual men, unusual because they have some particular talent, might be sent overseas as replacements, but the Senator will recall General Marshall's statement that if we did not make the addition to the Army which requires the use of fathers, there would be no loss affecting manpower until late next fall.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. DOWNEY. I might say to the distinguished Senator that I have checked very carefully the figures of the Army and their expressed view that we can have 5,000,000 men abroad by the end of January. Other and more authoritative governmental agencies are very skeptical about that statement. It is my own opinion, and I think the opinion of the authorities of the Government, that of the men who will be drafted in the last 90 days of the year, no appreciable number will be used in combat for 18 months from now. I think that is a fair statement judged by the pattern of the past, as the Senator from Montana will recall.

Mr. WHEELER. If that be true, of course then there can be no reason under the sun why fathers should be taken into the armed services, and homes broken up, until such time as the whole manpower question has been checked, and we have found out where men are being hoarded, as reports which come in from every State of the Union indicate is being done, and also where some men can be obtained from among men now classified in IV–F. It seems to me that ordinary common sense and a decent regard for the homes and the children of America would make clear that there cannot be any excuse for rushing in hastily and breaking up 446,000 homes between now and January 1 simply because the Government agencies have failed to do their duty.

Mr. DOWNEY. I may make this statement to the distinguished Senator from Montana. It is my opinion that the leaders of the Government have not been candid with him; that their statement of the issue, as we are debating it here on the floor of the Senate, is not the true statement of the issue involved.

Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from Montana will recall, the Army expressed the need for 7,700,000 men by January 1, 1944. That figure is to be a net figure, so that if the Army were maintained at that net strength it would be necessary to have perhaps millions of replacements if we should become involved in great land operations in Europe. I do not know whether the distinguished Senator has noticed it, but at no time would any of the military officials make the statement that they would not take more men to increase the net size of the armed forces after January 1. General McNarney rather weakly expressed the hope that such would not be the case and that we would not have to build our armed forces greater than that figure.

Assuming the figure of a net army of 7,700,000 by January 1, it was the contention of the Selective Service System and the War Manpower Commission that such a number could only properly be secured by taking 446,000 men who were in the status of fathers. Consequently this argument has proceeded upon the basis that what we are talking about is 446,000 fathers. I may very positively say to the Senator from Montana and to any other Senators who may be interested that in reality it is being considered that in the first 90 days of 1944 we may have to take 1,000,000 or one and a half million more men beyond the figures we have been discussing. As a matter of fact, I may say to the distinguished Senator, the Selective Service System and the War Manpower Commission and the Army and Navy are now very fearful that the number of men they want during the first 3 months of next year cannot even be secured by exhausting all the qualified fathers.

Further, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Montana that many of the officials in authoritative positions in the Government will in private conference admit the obvious—it simply cannot be denied—that we could get 446,000 more men without taking the fathers. Of course, the distinguished Senator from Montana elaborated upon that at length yesterday. Leading men in our Government say, "Yes; we know that by a proper reappraisal of occupational deferments, by more strategic use of the men in the Army and in the Navy, by recombing the IV–F's, by the Navy taking substandard men"—as every department in the Government, I may say to the Senator, says should be done—"we would have an amplitude of single men to provide the 450,000."

The Army and the Navy and the Selective Service System do not want that, because they now want to have the power to take probably 2,000,000 of the fathers of the Nation, practically exhausting the whole pool. The War Manpower Commission, on the other hand, takes the position that the 446,000 men can be obtained out of other pools of single men.

It is very probable and almost certain the Army never can transport this great Army abroad. But they have a totally different argument. What is it? It was hinted at by our Chief Executive recently. When the gentlemen from the War Manpower Commission talk frankly, they will admit that the pending bill has only one just motivation. What is that motivation? It is that by using the measure as a club they may force perhaps 2,000,000 men who are now fathers out of nonessential industry into war industries.

Of course those two arguments become totally inconsistent, because if the Army in reality wants a million and a half or two million fathers, instead of 500,000, then they simply must take the fathers, because no more physically fit men are left. So if the Army and Navy are determined, as I am very positive from what I know they are, after January 1, to take a far greater number of men than they have yet indicated, the whole plan and process of the War Manpower Commission, and I suppose of our Chief Executive, to use the pending bill as a measure to force fathers out of nonessential industry into essential industry, fails.

Let us assume that as a compromise the Army would take only a million fathers. Let us assume that we could not ever utilize those men outside the continental United States because they would not be ready for 15 or 18 months or 2 years. Let us assume that at the very maximum we would drive 2,000,000 fathers, by great sacrifice to themselves, out of nonessential industries into essential industries. See into what a position our leaders would then have taken us. For each man in the Army there must be in the civilian economy 3 men supporting him. So, with an Army of 10,000,000 men, we may roughly expect we shall need 30,000,000 for manu-

facturing and transportation and other activities, to support the Army. In addition to that, let me say to the distinguished senior Senator from Montana that for the first year of a soldier's service he must have at least one other soldier training him, waiting on him, providing for him.

So, Mr. President, if we take 500,000 or a million or 2,000,000 fathers into the Army, we must immediately allocate for each man of that great group four persons who, so long as that man is in the Army, must wait upon him and provide for him. As a matter of fact, let me say to the distinguished senior Senator from Montana that my figure of three or four men for every man in the Army—three in civilian life and one in the Army—is more conservative than other figures which have been stated.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. As a matter of fact, it has been estimated that between 10 and 20 men are required to support each man in the Army, if we consider his training, his transportation overseas, and his maintenance there.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes. Mr. McNutt made that statement. The only trouble is that in the United States we do not have a population of 500,000,000 people to provide service and care of the kind we should like to provide for our soldiers. Unfortunately for the rest of the world, only approximately 37,000,000 of our people are doing such work. Incidentally, those 37,000,000 are outproducing all the rest of the world, individually and collectively, in the production of equipment of all categories. I cannot recite the exact figures at this time. They excite me and astound me. Last year our people built 20,000,000 tons of cargo shipping. The rest of the world built less than 5,000,000 tons of cargo shipping, of which Britain and Canada built approximately 3,000,000 tons. So our superiority over Britain and Canada, in terms of construction of cargo shipping, is in the ratio of 6 or 7 to 1.

In aircraft production we now are outbuilding Britain at a ratio of 4 to 1, and are outbuilding all the rest of the world combined. In the production of food, ordnance, shot and shell—in every category, so far as I know—we are out-producing all the rest of the world. Taken collectively, I would say, too, that we are producing 150 percent as much as all the rest of the world. Yet Mr. Mitchell, of the War Department, today has scolded the American people for being inferior to any other major nation in their military contributions and their services to the Allies.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. With reference to what Mr. Mitchell said about those in the services who maintain we can get the 446,000 men, let me say I am just in receipt of a letter from a man connected with one of the great magazines of the country. I shall not quote him because, although we have talked about the "four freedoms," I am sure the distinguished junior Senator from California will agree with me that when he has talked with businessmen, with soldiers, with lawyers, with doctors, and with other people throughout the United States, he has found they have a tremendous fear of the Government in Washington, and that anyone who dares criticize the administration or the various departments is fearful lest he be dragged before some grand jury. That would be an outrageous proceeding, but some such incidents have been occurring.

I call attention to the letter:

BOSTON, MASS.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: A naval officer told me yesterday that if the Army and Navy would lower their physical requirements just a little bit they would find 700,000 or more men available, and a lot of these men would jump at the chance of getting into the service because their morale is hard hit because of their rejection for some minor ailment.

I send this along just in case you need any further ammunition.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Montana that I am heartily in accord with the sentiments expressed in that letter, and I will go further than that: I do not believe the letter states the issue in the strongest way it can be stated for the very aspect of the problem which the distinguished senior Senator from Montana stated yesterday, and that was our Navy. Our marines are probably the finest type of men, physically, in the whole world. They are young and vigorous, and the highest and best type of mental standards have been applied to them. When our Navy is complete we shall have about 400,000 marines. About 13½ percent of the Navy, which is estimated at a total of 3,000,000, will be marines. Otherwise, the standards of the Navy, taken as applied to each individual, are far higher than the standards of the Army, because the Navy took men by voluntary methods, and took young men. Every official in Washington knows that the Navy could utilize enough of the men who are qualified for limited service without affecting its efficiency at all, to make up the whole 446,000 men; and, as will be recalled, before the Committee on Military Affairs I embarrassed one of the generals who was testifying, by asking him if he did not believe the Navy could take a large number of limited-service men—I have forgotten the exact language which was used. Of course, he answered affirmatively. Everyone in the Government knows that to be the case.

I have visited many of the naval bases in the United States, and the commandants themselves will so state. So, while we are on the subject, I shall divert from the main theme of my address. Let me go further. The distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], by virtue of knowledge and information on this subject, is probably better qualified to speak than any other Senator. Not only has he established the confidence of the American people in his own committee but he has helped to save the prestige of the United States Senate. During the past months he has had working for him many of the ablest young men in the Government service.

It will be recalled that the Senator from Missouri, chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, stated that in the Army and Navy alone—I am referring now to the military personnel, and not the civil-service workers—the military personnel being wasted was sufficient to make up the proposed draft of 446,000. We now have more than 10,000,000 men in the military service. Everyone outside Washington knows that there is a waste of at least 10 or 15 percent in the military personnel of this Nation. Every colonel and every commodore will admit it.

I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] that substitutes can be found for at least 10 or 15 percent of the men who are deferred for occupational reasons. I refer now to the single men who have been deferred on occupational grounds. I have gone into the factories and shipyards, and I know what I am talking about. I think the Selective Service System knows that among the one and a half million men who have been deferred for occupational reasons, there are from 150,000 to 200,000 for whom replacements could be found, even assuming something which is not true, namely, that all of them have been justly deferred. I should say that at least 10 percent of the men who have been deferred have not been justly deferred, but let us pass that point.

Where could we find substitutes for the men who have been deferred on occupational grounds? Mr. President, every month between 25,000 and 30,000 young high-school boys who are not up to the physical standards of the Army or Navy become 18 years of age. They are potentially the best workers and the best mechanics in the world. So while the Army and the Navy may take 70 percent of the boys who are now coming out of the cradle, so to speak, there is a great source of supply left.

Mr. President, there is another source of supply. At the height of our military construction program we had more than 2,000,000 men working in construction industries. That number has now been reduced to 1,100,000 or 1,200,000, because the great job of military construction has been completed. Between now and next February—and if the distinguished Senator from Montana is not familiar with these figures they will interest him—we are going to release from the group of 1,200,000 who are now doing the construction job between 600,000 and 700,000 men. On the average, those men are so far superior to the men in factories who have been deferred on occupational grounds that there is literally no comparison. New England alone has a great corps of such men. They are trained, conservative, rugged, fine workers.

Out in the aircraft factories of California we are so bereft of high-class mechanical workers that it is amazing to me that we can do what we are doing. Our job out there is largely being done by women, elderly men, IV-F men, and men

who have been deferred on occupational grounds. Many of the men who have been deferred on occupational grounds are not trained or skilled in their jobs.

All over the United States, in the next 4 months, 600,000 or 700,000 of the most highly skilled mechanics and workers will be released from the construction industry. Most of them are married and have children. What are we to do? Are we to take them into the Army, or are we to use some energy and vision and utilize them as replacements for young, vigorous men who have been deferred on occupational grounds?

Mr. President, this procedure is one of the saddest displays the American Government has ever seen. The bureaus of this Government are too lazy to work out this problem by finding replacements, by compelling the Army and Navy to use physically substandard men, or by recombing the three and a half million IV-F men, among whom are hundreds of thousands of men who can be cured of whatever sexual disease they may have, or the trouble with their teeth, or who can be taught to read well enough to get into the Army in 90 days.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. A moment ago I asked the Senator how many men were required to support a man in the Army. I asked the same question of General Marshall. I have just received a letter signed by Bryce N. Harlow. I wish to read it:

1. On Monday, 20 September 1943, Senator WHEELER inquired of General Marshall, "How many men it takes on the production front to supply, say, 100 men on the fighting front." The following is submitted in reply to Senator WHEELER's inquiry:

An accurate figure on this subject cannot be obtained. While accurate information as to the number of personnel in the armed forces is available, the determination of the proportion of workers on the production front supporting the personnel of the armed forces is impossible for the following reasons:

(a) Many factories producing war matériel are also producing civilian goods.

(b) Certain of our productive capacity is utilized for the production of lend-lease material.

(c) Agriculture produces for the armed forces, our civilian population, and for lend-lease.

(d) Transportation requirement facilities must meet the needs of the armed forces, the civil population, and lend-lease.

(e) Considerable quantities of war matériel are procured locally by our armed forces overseas.

(f) Requirements are subject to frequent change as the result of experience gained in combat.

(g) The armed forces have been provided with a certain amount of "capital equipment" and the proportion of total production required for maintenance purposes rather than initial use is increasing.

(h) The general participation of the American people in the war effort makes it impossible to secure a general agreement as to just where the line should be drawn between war workers and nonwar workers.

Mr. President, the War Department, which for years has had a staff of experts, cannot give any better answer than this:

However, as a general approximation it is believed that the ratio of men and women on the production front to those on the fighting front is 1.4 to 1.

Merely upon the face of it, that statement is ridiculous. In the first place, if a man is taken out of production and put into the Army he has to be replaced in production and that requires one man. It requires men to supply him with equipment. He has to be supplied with food. But for the Army to send a statement to the Senate of the United States to the effect that it requires only 1.4 persons to supply equipment and food for one man in the Army demonstrates the ridiculousness of the figures on their face.

Mr. DAVIS. What is the name of the officer who made the report?

Mr. WHEELER. The report is from Bryce N. Harlow, major, General Staff Corps, assistant executive.

It has been said that we must accept anything that the Army tells us. Some officer of the Army sends a report to us and we are told that we must follow it because he has given us the information. We are told to do so even in spite of the kind of statement which was sent to the Senate of the United States, when we asked the Chief of Staff how many persons in civilian life were required to support one man in the armed forces.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, did the Senator from Montana quote General Marshall as saying that the ratio was 1.4 to 1?

Mr. WHEELER. No; General Marshall did not say that.

Mr. DOWNEY. May I ask the Senator to repeat the statement?

Mr. WHEELER. The statement reads:

However, as a general approximation, it is believed that the ratio of men and women on the production front to those on the fighting front is 1.4 to 1.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is less than one and one-half to one.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the Senator was very moderate in his language criticizing the statement as being absurd. We know, Mr. President, almost exactly the number of men and women who are now employed in producing necessities for our military forces. It is not at all difficult to determine the number of our agricultural workers which is about 11,000,000, and then consider the amount of canned goods, corn, and dairy products which the military forces and lend-lease will require. The gentleman, whoever he is, who made the statement that such information could not be worked out is stating something which is not true. Likewise, we know there are 20,000,000 men engaged in manufacturing—almost totally producing for the war—and there is no difficulty in allocating their civilian production. For example, we know that in the steel mills we are now producing annually ninety or ninety-five million tons of steel, which is almost half of the total production of all the world. We know the military forces are taking 85 percent of that production. So it is not difficult to figure it out.

Mr. WHEELER. We know that practically all the copper which is being produced in the country is being taken by the armed forces.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is true of every metal.

Mr. President, we have many ways to figure this out, and I will refer to what seems to me to be the easiest and quickest way.

At the present time, in very general terms, we have in the military force approximately 10,000,000 people. We have in the civilian service for them approximately 30,000,000, of whom almost 20,000,000 are engaged in manufacturing or in the production of raw material for manufacturing. In addition, there is a large group which has to be allocated for agriculture and food processing.

After inducting men into the Army we have to allocate at least one man during the first year of the recruit's life for training service and care. So the men we are asked to have inducted into our military service during the next year or 18 months will require the services of approximately four men in civilian life to one man in military service.

We have an interesting set of figures which tells the story very beautifully, and I am glad to see present on the floor and listening to the debate the very brilliant, able, and distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who is intensely and effectively interested in the finances of the Nation. I had decided that in this debate I should forego any comparisons of production—military contributions of the people of the United States—with that of our allies. I have said before that comparisons are odious and may be misleading.

Mr. President, we are producing five or ten or twenty times as much in war goods as the Japanese per person. Of course, the Japanese are not mechanically inclined. They do not have anything to equal our great mass industries, such as the epic and tremendous truck and automobile industry which was built up in Detroit. There has been nothing like it in all the history of the world. The machines in Detroit have all been utilized in our great war effort, as well as the steel mills of Pittsburgh, and the great manufacturing resources of all the Atlantic coast and the Gulf States.

There is but one just comparison that I can make, and I regret that I have to make it.

Here is Mr. Mitchell, who was formerly the head of a department store, I believe, in New York and who now is the key man in the War Department over labor. I had his statement somewhere on my desk but apparently have mislaid it. However, this morning Mr. Mitchell scolds and condemns the American people for making a smaller percentage of contribution to the military forces than that of any other major nation, and that we have a far greater proportion of people in this country who are idle. That statement is not true. Categorically I deny it, and I only wish that some representative of the Government were here

so that he could secure the figures to support the statement if there are any available. I say categorically that the statement is not true. If the members of the Military Affairs Committee wish to convoke the committee in confidential session and allow the figures to be elicited, they will be surprising to the Senators of the United States.

However, Mr. President, we do have certain other figures. The only fair comparison that I know of which could be made is a comparison with Great Britain and the British Empire. I wish to say that I have no prejudice against Great Britain. I have nothing but British blood in my veins. I think Great Britain has been a gallant and fine ally. I respect and admire the gallantry of Winston Churchill as one of the outstanding personalities of all time. What the British have done is transcendent.

But, Mr. President, leaders of the Government of the United States should not by propaganda and false information depreciate and unfairly criticize their own people in comparison with the people of Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and the British Isles. It has been constantly done for the last 20 or 30 years. I hope and pray that we are going to make some kind of a compact with the great Russian Nation, with the English people, and with China that will forever prevent wars, but it will never be done upon the basis of propaganda and misinformation, comparing what Britain is doing, with what the United States is doing, because, ultimately our people are going to find out the facts.

Mr. President, I, being a trial lawyer for many years, like definite figures. So I should like to place some in the RECORD. Great Britain, which includes England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland, has in excess of 47,000,000, almost 48,000,000 people. The great Canadian people comprise 11,000,000. They have done titanic things, and while their figures will not bear comparison with many of our own, either in contributions to the military or to production, there is this to be said: that Canada, with 11,000,000 people, has approximately the same area as the United States, and, of course, to carry on great operations by 11,000,000 people over a vast area involves extreme difficulty. I admire the Canadian people. They are a strong, virile people, and I hope we will always deal fairly and justly with them, just as we should like to have other nations and our own governmental leaders deal fairly with us.

Canada, as I have said, has 11,000,000 people plus; Australia has nearly 8,000,000 people; New Zealand about 2,000,000. That totals approximately 70,000,000 people, with one other dominion still to be taken into account, namely, the Union of South Africa, which I am not going to include. I will include its output and its men, but I will not include the factors of its population in this computation. The Union of South Africa as over 10,000,000 people, three or four million of whom are Europeans and the others natives.

Mr. President, in the Negro group in our own country alone there could be obtained 446,000 troops. If it were not for the maladjustment of our social thinking and our society there could be found in that group from four to five hundred thousand of the finest physical specimens in all the world, men who would be devoted and patriotic.

We have aliens in this country in great number. The British are practically a homogeneous people, with almost no aliens. But let us strike the Union of South Africa off the scale and take Britain, the greatest manufacturing land, supposedly, in the world; take Canada and Australia and New Zealand, all great agricultural States. Excluding South Africa, Great Britain and her Dominions have a little over 70,000,000 people. As we have about 137,000,000, we have slightly twice as much as our British friends, and I say it is fortunate for them and for us that we do have.

Let us give another slight factor of advantage to our good friends, our English cousins. Say their population, for rough computation, is just one-half ours. It is a fact, Mr. President, that our military contributions are more than double those of the different countries and dominions of which I have spoken.

When the distinguished Under Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, for whom I have only the highest affection and respect—I hope he remains in his present position, for I think he is vitally needed there—led astray by this unhappy propaganda, suggested that if we would only make the same percentage of contributions that the English had made we would have to go much further than we have gone, the statement was not true. I challenged Mr. Patterson, and he could not make good his statement.

The people of my own State, who have not given any greater proportion than the States from which other Senators come, have provided approximately 630,000 men for the armed services. Beyond that, California has furnished almost 200,000 people for military installations, the merchant marine, and stevedoring. But forget all that. I think that the most men Canada has given is 675,000, although one set of figures I believe shows 725,000. Canada is 50 percent greater than the State of California in population, and, on the same basis, should not be giving 675,000 or 700,000 or 750,000, but approximately more than a million men.

For those reasons, Mr. President, I am shocked and disgusted when I read such statements of Government officials. It may be we are not doing as much as we can. I do not think we are doing as much as we should.

Mr. President, I regret there is no representative of the administration, of the opponents of the pending bill on the floor, but I hope the statement I am about to make, and which I do not like to make, will be checked. While the available population of the countries I have mentioned is approximately half that of the United States, we are producing four times as much goods as are those same people. Our per capita production of war goods is two or two and a half times that of the British, and I am not even taking into account the colossal quantities of food we send to our allies; I am dealing only in what we term "munitions."

Think of our merchant ships. What has been done in the States of this Union in building the merchant marine is an epic of which every American should be proud. Instead of that, there is depreciation and criticism, almost hate of our workers for doing their job.

Mr. President, if our workers in the shipyards are slackers, I feel sorry for those in Japan, Britain, and Canada.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. DOWNEY. Not at this time; I should like to complete these figures first, then I shall be happy to yield.

We have now reached the peak of our production of merchant ships, practically 20,000,000 tons a year. I could startle my colleagues with comparisons as to what that means when we consider prior years, but I shall not do so. The rest of the world is producing substantially less than 5,000,000 tons; Canada less than a million tons; Britain, the great shipbuilding nation, with her trained men, about 2,000,000 tons, and I think that is rather a large estimate; Japan probably less than a million tons, and all the other nations probably not over two or three hundred thousand tons. But we can say that in merchant ships the people of the United States are outproducing the rest of the world four times over.

I know what the shipbuilders on the Pacific coast are doing. They travel an hour or 2 hours going to and from work. They are living in miserable conditions generally. Of course the absentee rate and the turn-over are high. Of course, there is some slacking. Of course, unfortunately, there is some union labor slow-down. But I hope and think our own labor leaders are clearing that away. If any labor leader has a son in Africa, or on the bloody sands of Salerno, or in Australia, who would not be willing to give up labor restrictions in order to increase production, to me he would be a strange father indeed.

So, Mr. President, I know that we on the Pacific coast can do better than we are doing, and I hope for increased efficiency up to 20 percent, even with the present miserable living conditions. Very well, if we are slackers in the production of the merchant marine, where does that put the rest of the world, I ask?

Mr. President, in the matter of airplanes, as I have already said, we are producing as much as all the rest of the world combined, and, specifically, approximately four times as much as the British people are producing. That is figured in number of planes. Figured in weight, I think it would go a way over that. When anyone figures the end results in the production of planes here and abroad, let us remember that we furnish substantial parts of steel, engines, propellers, and materials for aircraft building elsewhere in the world. But in aircraft building, as I have said, the ratio is 4 to 1. We are now producing at the rate of about 7,700 planes a

month, or approximately 100,000 a year. Mr. Nelson has told me that next year we will produce 70 percent more of aircraft than we have been producing this calendar year, while the rest of the world will either stand still, or, as in the case of Germany, decrease so rapidly she will not have a fighter or bomber left within 4 or 6 months, and no factories in which to produce them.

Mr. President, in ordnance the story is just about the same. I have not the figures as to naval construction in England. I understand the comparison in that regard is more favorable to the English, but I can not make it. I do know, however, by the growth of our Navy compared with the growth of the British Navy since Pearl Harbor, that we are out-producing them.

Before I conclude, I yield to the Senator from Montana to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHEELER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senator answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Pepper
Andrews	Guffey	Radcliffe
Austin	Gurney	Reed
Bailey	Hatch	Revercomb
Ball	Hawkes	Reynolds
Barbour	Hayden	Robertson
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Scrugham
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	Kilgore	Taft
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McClellan	Tobey
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Mead	Wallgren
Davis	Millikin	Walsh
Downey	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Murdock	Wherry
Ellender	Murray	White
Ferguson	Nye	Wiley
George	O'Daniel	Willis
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gillette	Overton	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I was drawn into a rather long argument and into rather devious paths by the extraordinary statement read by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], to the effect that only 1.4 percent men in civilian life were required to support each soldier in the Army. We have approximately—I am speaking in very general terms—10,000,000 men in the military services. On that basis, 15,000,000 persons would be required in all forms of industry and service to take care of the Army—or a total of 25,000,000 persons who would be engaged in the war enterprise. I do not know how anyone could have made a statement so absurd. We have in the labor force of the United States, in contradistinction to what we term our manpower, 50,000,000 persons. Our manpower is about 60,000,000 persons. Our military personnel is 10,000,000 persons, with 50,000,000 persons now working. Let me say for some other Senator that the percentage of workers to the total population is—at least in my State—substantially higher than in the case of some of our allies. Nevertheless, if it be true that we would have 15,000,000 persons in industry supporting 10,000,000 persons in the armed services, with a total labor force of 60,000,000 persons, that would mean that those 25,000,000 persons should receive substantially less than one-half the national income; because with 60,000,000 persons working or in the armed services, if only 25,000,000 of them were in the armed forces and in productive industry of course we would expect that the amount of money spent by the Government on its war bills would be approximately 40 percent or 45 percent of the total national income.

Now I come to some figures which I hope will bring the people and the leaders of America to a clear comprehension of just what we are doing in the war effort. I have already said that while the British people, including their dominions, have substantially more than one-half as many people as the United States, our production is four times as much and more, so that, in terms of finished munitions, our per capita production is twice as large as that of the British nations. Again, Mr. President, let me say that if any leader of the administration doubts the accuracy of the figures I am reciting, I hope he will have them checked.

Now I desire to call the figures to the attention of the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]; because he, as a distinguished leader of the Senate, the man who may very greatly guide us in the stormy post-war era, may be greatly intrigued by them.

Mr. CONNALLY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARAWAY in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DOWNEY. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very thankful to the Senator for his generous reference. However, I desire to assure him that he has greatly magnified the possibilities of the activities of the Senator from Texas. Nevertheless, I shall be very glad to hear the figures and to listen to the Senator. I always listen to him, when I am in the Chamber, with a great deal of pleasure.

Mr. DOWNEY. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Texas for his comment. Let me qualify my remarks by saying that I know his leadership will probably be the most important in the Senate. How important it may be, as judged over the whole field of our Government, I do not know, because none of us knows quite how important the Congress of the United States is today.

However, I repeat to the distinguished senior Senator from Texas the figures I have already given, in order to make the matter clear: Britain, with her Dominions, has over twice as large a population as our country has. We are producing over four times as many war goods as Britain and her Dominions are producing. Our production capacity per individual is twice as much.

When we turn from actual physical production—the production of airplanes, merchant ships, ordnance, and naval vessels—to the matter of expenditures, we find that the expenditures by Britain and her Dominions for munitions are approximately one-quarter of our expenditures for the same purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. Madam President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the distinguished junior Senator from California that I realize there can be questions in the minds of various Senators about whether Great Britain is doing her share, or whether she is producing enough munitions or whether our other allies are producing supplies and making contributions comparable to their ability, relatively speaking, as compared to our ability. I do not personally care to make any observations about my own opinion as to whether they are doing their share. My view is that we cannot gage our own efforts by what someone else is doing or is not doing, if this is our war—and I think it is our war. If it is our war, it is our duty to do everything we can to crush the enemy, regardless of whether our allies do as much as we think they should do. Of course, we want them to do all they can do, but at the same time we cannot sit back and wait, and say, "Well, the next move should be made by one of our allies. If he will not move, I will not move."

It is our war. We have declared it, and we are resisting a treacherous and savage attack upon our safety, our citizenship, and our territory. So long as that is true, it is our war; and I am in favor of doing everything we can in the production line, on the battlefield, on the sea, in the air, and under the water, to bring victory from the enemy. I hope our allies will do the same thing; but, whether they do or not, it does not change my attitude that it is our duty to our people to pursue that kind of a course. I do not say that in contradiction of what the eminent Senator has suggested; but since he addressed his remarks to me, they seemed to call for some reply.

Mr. DOWNEY. Madam President, the distinguished Senator has just said, much more eloquently and forcibly than I could say it, exactly what I have said today. I want the distinguished Senator—because I value his good will and confidence—to understand that these figures are not given in disparagement or criticism of any of our allies. They are given because of the almost continuous statements of governmental leaders, the latest of which was uttered by an important man in the War Department today, greatly depreciating and minimizing our own people for our great slackness and failure to compare, as he said, with the other three major nations. He says that we make the poorest showing of any.

I further agree with the Senator that we are not doing all that we can do. I

think we should do everything within our power. Consequently, these figures are presented for the RECORD by me, reluctantly, unhappily. If it is true that our people are producing twice as much per capita as are our allies, to me that is a fact which our people ought to know, in order to appraise the arguments of our War Department as to what further we should do.

Mr. CONNALLY rose.

Mr. DOWNEY. Madam President, I shall be very happy to hear from the Senator further, but first I should like to place in the RECORD the final set of figures. It is a long way around Robin Hood's barn, but these are the figures which I wished the Senator to have.

Speaking very generally, the Government of the United States is spending on munitions approximately four times as much as Britain and her Dominions; and for that four times as much we produce four times as much goods. I believe our wages and salaries are higher, but our greater factory capacity, ingenuity, and mechanical ability make up the difference.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator that I asked the Treasury Department to give me an estimate of how much money the Government of the United States expects to spend in this fiscal year. The sum is approximately $110,000,000,000, almost all of which is to be spent for the war effort—a few billions for maintaining the Government and a few billions for interest upon the accumulated debt. This $110,000,000,000 is not quite four times as much as the British expenditures, but almost. As I recall, the British expenditures are approximately $32,000,000,000 or $33,000,000,000—perhaps $35,000,000,000. When I said that the British were spending one-quarter as much, I meant in the production of munitions. The last figures refer to our total governmental expenditures. The British are spending a little more than a quarter as much as we are spending.

I now come to the final set of figures, the meaning of which I think we in the United States should all begin to appreciate.

I called upon the Treasury Department to give me an estimate of the increase in the debt of the United States Government this fiscal year. I must say to the distinguished Senator that I do not know how these figures are arrived at, whether on the basis of what Congress may do, or upon the basis of what the Treasury wants to do. In any event, the Treasury Department sent me a memorandum to the effect that the people of the United States must expect in this fiscal year an increase in the public debt of $69,304,000,000.

When we stop to think that that amount of money almost equals the total disbursements for war of all the other nations of the world, we have some gage of what we are putting on ourselves. I asked our Treasury Department to give me an estimate of the increase in the debts of the United Kingdom, Canada, Union of South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand, which have a combined population of about 80,000,000. It is estimated that the United Kingdom will have an increase of $11,500,000,000; Canada, $2,535,000,000; Union of South Africa, $180,000,000; Australia, $974,000,000; and New Zealand, $162,000,000. The Australian and New Zealand figures are for the fiscal year 1942–43, and not for the current year.

So we see that the debt of the United States will increase almost five times as much, by the colossal, titanic, prodigious, mammoth sum of approximately $70,000,000,000.

Mr. CONNALLY. Madam President, will the Senator yield——

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no disposition to argue with the Senator. Those figures are astounding. I am aware, as I am sure the Senator and all other Senators are aware, that undoubtedly there is much waste in both the naval and military departments in awarding contracts, and in the installation of facilities. No doubt exorbitant profits are made in some cases. As a member of the Senate Committee on Finance, let me say that it has been our purpose, and will continue to be our purpose, to reclaim exorbitant profits wherever possible through excise-profits taxes and through all other forms of taxation; but we shall not be able to recover them all. Some of them will escape; but I doubt whether, even through the renegotiation law, the Navy and the Army will be able to reclaim all the exorbitant profits which many contractors are making. I realize that there is waste. Haste makes waste.

Mr. DOWNEY. I have no doubt that there is substantial waste in our governmental operations at the present time; but, of course, I am not presenting these figures to support that argument. While it is true that we are spending four times as much as the British Government and the Dominions, and going into debt almost six times as rapidly, we are producing more than four times as much finished war products. So, compared to our allies, we are really getting more for our money than they are getting for theirs. So I do not at all differ with the distinguished Senator, but I should like to have my figures considered for the purpose for which I have stated.

Today a distinguished member of the War Department, Mr. Mitchell, who heads the labor division, published a supercritical scolding of the American people for not contributing their percentage of the military forces and not doing their work in production. Before the Senator entered the Chamber I had presented figures showing that our percentage of contribution to our military is greater than that of Britain and her Dominions, and that our war production is four times as great. Again I wish to say that I make these statements only in answer to the derogatory and inaccurate criticisms of the American people.

Mr. CONNALLY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Allow me to say to the Senator that I regret that I was not present earlier to hear all his remarks. I was with a friend who has had a death in his family, and I was precluded, on that account, from being here all the time. I would not intervene at this time were it not for the fact that the Senator did me the honor of referring to me and propounding figures to me, and that seemed to call for some reaction.

I agree with what the Senator has said. I agree that we have performed almost miracles ir the field of production. According to the last figures which I have seen, we have produced over 115,000 airplanes. Of course, that transcends the production of any other nation in this war, whether it be a nation of our allies or of our enemies. I believe we have done magnificently.

I saw the article to which the Senator has referred. I think it is the acme of presumption for some civilian—is he not a civilian?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes, but he has a really important military position. I understand that the distinguished gentleman had been the head of a department store in New York. He is not old enough to hold a general's commission, commensurate with the importance of his office, so he remains in a civilian capacity at the present time. I understand that he is the head of the labor division of the War Department. I refer to Mr. Mitchell.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know anything about the details of his employment, but it would seem to me that a man who made the kind of a statement which is accredited to him would necessarily have to possess a great deal of knowledge in order to make it and justify his figures.

Recently, I had a conversation with one of the distinguished Senators who has lately returned from a world tour of the battle fronts. I am not at liberty to state his name, but he told me that the committee of which he was a member was astounded and amazed at the progress our country had made on all the battle fronts with respect to military installations, and provisions for carrying on the war. Notwithstanding the fact that they had participated in making the appropriations, yet the progress the United States Government had made along production lines—the very subject to which the Senator is addressing himself—absolutely amazed and astounded them.

I am not indifferent to the suggestions the Senator has made relative to comparisons between this country and other countries. While I am not at liberty to discuss the subject fully, I will say to the Senator that in rather high quarters I have already expressed to responsible parties in the Government my own views along those lines, and I shall express them in the future very insistently. My primary concern in this war is, of course, America and bringing about victory. The situation is such, however, that we cannot ignore our allies and our associates. It is a war of all nations who are engaged in it, but from our standpoint it is our war, and, regardless of

what other nations do, we have got to win it.

Madam President, I repeat that I am in sympathy with the Senator's general views.

Mr. DOWNEY. Madam President, I believe this is a good opportunity for me to say something which I had intended to say in my remarks. It is the theme of my speech that our high command and staff are making one of the most apparent and tragic military blunders of all time, in the continued building of a great land army, and in their failure to utilize all the power of aircraft, which every air-power expert in the world of whom I know says could end the war in 4 months.

From the standpoint of organization and operations, I believe that our Army and Navy have done a fine job. I think that what they have accomplished is titanic. However, I believe they have made a blunder of military policy that will be recognized by all.

What I am saying here on the floor of the Senate is the belief of military experts. Within 6 months everyone in the United States may know it. I have come in contact with Under Secretary of War Patterson, with Assistant Secretary McCloy, and with Mr. Ralph Bard, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, as well as other officials of the Navy. I have found them to be fine men, anxious to cooperate with civilians, and especially with those engaged in industry. Madam President, I believe that General Marshall has done a noteworthy job from his viewpoint. I think that where the colossal and terrible failure has been—and I say that time will reveal it, and it is being revealed today—is in expanding the land army at the expense of enlargement of the Air Forces. In Germany the synthetic rubber factories, octane gasoline plants, and submarine-building plants are today crumbling before the R. A. F. and the Flying Fortresses.

I desire now to point out to the distinguished Senator from Montana that our total national income for this fiscal year will approximate $150,000,000,000. That is what we term net national income, available for production or consumption. Of this amount approximately $100,000,000,000, or two-thirds, is going directly into the war effort. In other words, the United States Government is either borrowing from its banks and people, or securing from taxation, two-thirds of the total national income to expend in the war effort.

The problem which I should like to present to the distinguished economist who wrote the letter to which the Senator from Montana referred, is this, if only 40 percent of our people are engaged in the war effort, how does it come that the war effort requires two-thirds of the total national income? The truth is that of 60,000,000 people in the total manpower reserves of the United States there are 10,000,000 in the military service and 30,000,000 engaged in war production. So that two-thirds of our total income is being spent for war and two-thirds of our people are directly engaged in the war effort.

Mr. WHEELER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I called attention to the letter written by an officer of the General Staff Corps to show the complete absurdity of saying that we must follow anything and believe anything that some Army officer may send here. Today it takes only 1.4 men and women combined for the purpose of taking care of, feeding, supplying, and arming the men in the Army, is the height of absurdity, to say the least. A man who would make such a statement certainly is not worthy of having the confidence of the Members of Congress when he makes it.

Mr. DOWNEY. The statement the distinguished Senator read can be proved unsound and absurd in so many different ways that no one in any responsible position should ever have allowed it to be issued.

Mr. WILEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have been listening with a great deal of interest to what the Senator has had to say. His last remarks, as I recall them, went to the point that he thought the General Staff had made a mistake in setting up its requirements in the war effort, a mistake going to the question of the size of the Army we should have. Am I right in that conclusion?

Mr. DOWNEY. Certainly; I have repeated that about 10 times so far.

Mr. WILEY. If that be the case, I am asking now what percentage of the men who are to be inducted into the armed forces between now and January 1 are to be utilized in the Air Corps. Does the Senator know?

Mr. DOWNEY. I may say to the distinguished Senator I do not know; but I might answer his question in this way: Unfortunately, these things lead into a good deal of explanation; but of the 7,700,000 men that our Army now desires by January 1, General McNarney stated about 3,200,000 would be in the combatant service and about 2,800,000 or 2,900,000 in the Air Force, leaving, of course, additional men for other groups.

As I stated this morning, during the fiscal year, or, rather, the next calendar year, as Mr. Nelson told me, we will probably spend of the Nation's money from 40 to 50 percent on aircraft; but I should like to make myself clear on this point. It is my very firm conviction—and I think time will vindicate my opinion—that an Army of 3,000,000 men would be ample and sufficient to provide for our Air Forces and the necessary engineering and Ground Forces to support their operations. Instead of 7,700,000, I am convinced that 5,000,000 would be a proper figure. In this connection, while we have been talking about the Army, I wish to say that our Navy alone probably now has a far greater and more potent Air Force than any other major nation. I have no doubt that today our Navy has an Air Force two or three times as great as that of Japan, for our Navy has about 18,000 or 19,000 planes, and they are constantly being improved.

Mr. WILEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is injecting into the discussion a new question, for until the hearings, which I attended, I understood there was no question raised as to the size of the Army or the number of men who were to be required. Now, for the first time, there is being injected into the discussion of the Wheeler bill the question as to whether or not the Army or the strategy board should not revamp their figures so that more men would go into the Air Forces. That is now the issue the distinguished Senator is injecting into the debate.

Mr. DOWNEY. Partially so. I will develop it as I proceed further with my remarks. I might state to my distinguished friend and associate that I made the statement this morning that according to every air expert and every air officer in the world, as well as writers, today we have within our hands the aircraft power to destroy Germany in 60 days or 4 months, if we will use it. So let me again repeat that if anybody is out of step here with the generals who know about air power, it is not the Senator who is speaking. Air Marshal Harris over a year ago contended exactly what I am urging upon the Senate today, and every air expert admits, that if Air Marshal Harris, General Kenny, General Arnold, General Chennault, General Eaker, and General Spaatz had been able to make the policies, such a course would have been followed. But I should like to get to what is really the heart of my discussion, because I have here the specific figures from the experts of the world, and when they are once heard they must be accepted; they are so convincing that no one can deny them. I should like to get along with those figures.

Mr. WHEELER. Madam President—

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I merely wish to say that probably the Senator got that impression because I have stated repeatedly that, so far as I was concerned, I did not know what the size of the Army should be. The Senator from California and other Senators have made a much more careful study of that problem than I have, but I call attention to the fact that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], chairman of the so-called Truman committee, in his speech on the floor of the Senate a few days ago stated that, in his opinion, the Army should not be any larger and no more men should be inducted into the Army, regardless of whether they were fathers or not. I have not said that, but other Senators repeatedly have made that statement.

Mr. WILEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. What I want to have made clear is this: Is it the Senator's contention that there should be approximately the number of men for the armed

forces that General Marshall and others have stated but that more of that group should be put into the Air Forces of the Navy and the Army?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; I may say to the distinguished Senator that is not my contention, but I am of the opinion that, with our present Air Force personnel along the lines we have programmed it, which calls for the training of bombardiers and pilots, it will prove amply sufficient to smash both Germany and Japan when they are given the opportunity. However, I shall qualify that remark in this way, that for the million, or two or three additional million men we are going to take into the Army and Navy in the next 6 months, we will require three civilian workers for every man who is taken in, and we need those civilian workers to meet our aircraft schedules.

Air Marshal Harris said that if he could send a thousand bombers over Germany for 4 months, Germany would be destroyed. We clearly possess the capacity to send not only a thousand bombers a month, which calls for about 15 flights a month, incidentally, but we do require these civilian workers in the titanic task of implementing and supporting the air force.

When a thousand bombers of the R. A. F. and of the American air forces destroyed Hamburg in 3 hours by the dropping of 10,000 tons of bombs, back of that lay months of the most careful planning, taking the octane gasoline from the United States or elsewhere to Great Britain, having the explosives there, having the crews there, having the planes there, having the airdromes. Men who built the great steel industry of the United States really had a comparatively simple job compared with what our men have in the titanic air attack that is underway today. So what I am attempting to show is that we are now going to burden our civilian economy almost to the breaking point by taking a million or two or three million more civilians into the Army, and then having the civilians compelled to produce trucks and tanks and jeeps and rubber and clothes and food, and furnish transportation and services for them. If that body of men could be used to implement our aircraft, we would roll over Germany like a tide of destruction, and would follow over Japan very rapidly. But what I am so fearfully apprehensive about is that with Germany almost prone and defeated, not by our Navy or our Army—we have not accomplished anything against Germany by the Navy or the Army, but by our air power—we may have to draw that air power off Germany to lead and save and guide and protect a great land invasion, perhaps in the Balkans, perhaps in France, perhaps in Norway.

Madam President, the only thing that can save Germany today is the very thing the General Staff is planning. That is the only thing that can save her, and I want to verify that statement, not as coming from me, but as coming from every air expert in the world today.

In the earlier part of my remarks I have said that Mr. Churchill, in his last appearance before Parliament, stated the figures from which the conclusions I am deducing inexorably flow. He stated there was a 4 to 1 Allied superiority in aircraft over Germany, with Germany's constantly weakening, and ours constantly increasing. He said we have the profound possibility, with this increase of our air power, of the destruction of every available building in Germany.

He qualified that in only one way. His language is somewhat ambiguous, but apparently he meant that we could either maintain that ratio of 4 to 1 or increase it, as we have been increasing it in the past. We are increasing the ratio. Constantly the fighters and bombers of Germany weaken in numbers and performance, and their pilots are poor. Constantly the people of the United States are rolling out these giant birds of destruction.

I wish I could give to this group the figures I just received from the War Production Board as to our present production of bombers and fighters and what we are going to have 90 days or 6 months from now. If Germany and Japan had any idea of the titanic flow of power and destruction that is now coming out of the United States, they would know they had no chance.

It is generally conceded that a thousand of our great bombers, the R. A. F. machines and the Flying Fortresses, the Liberators, the Billy Mitchells, and the Marauders, carrying from 1 to 4 or 5 tons of explosives per plane, loosed for 2 months or 4 months or 6 months, 15 trips a month, would result in the destruction of all Germany. We are actually destroying Germany with one-quarter of that amount today.

When we read that some German city has been bombed 5 or 10 or 15 times, we must remember that many times they were bombed by 5 bombers or 10 bombers or 50 bombers or a hundred or three hundred, or a thousand, as in the case of Hamburg. Our experts say, "Concentrate the bombers. We are giving only one-fourth or one-fifth of the destruction we could give Germany." And the facts clearly indicate that.

I have introduced into the RECORD, without reading, a written statement of the estimates by Donald Nelson showing the present and the future production of aircraft in the United States, with all the auxiliaries, the signal equipment, guns, ammunition, and bombs. I have talked with Mr. Nelson and with his associates, and I can assure my colleagues, and I can guarantee to the Premier of England that we not only are going to be able to maintain the present ratio of superiority, but we are going to move away so fast from Japan and Germany that within a year we may have 10 or 15 times the amount of production they have.

In numerical production of all types of aircraft, Germany is probably down now from a peak of thirty thousand to ten or twenty thousand. She has given her first priority to fighters. Submarines had it for awhile. She is producing no bombers at all. Basing my figures on estimates I have received from the War Production Board, we are now out-producing Japan 10 to 1 in aircraft, Germany 5 to 1, and England 4 to 1.

Mr. WILEY. Madam President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Then from the statement of the Senator I draw the conclusion that it is his opinion that the Government is following out the very policy he would suggest, but is only making the mistake of not concentrating the bombers and what we produce in one place; that we are spreading them too generally throughout our fighting fronts.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is a fair statement, and I shall go into that in detail later. It is believed we are only applying to Germany at the present time one-fourth or one-fifth the force we could apply. By opening up great combat areas we continually prevent the application of enough power to Germany to destroy her. As I shall later read here, when we started the North African campaign, Flying Fortresses and Liberators were just getting into good action, and we had to transfer the great bulk of them to the protection of the convoys, and the Army that was taking over north Africa. The same thing was true in the invasion of Sicily.

Now apparently there is a feeling abroad that we are about to begin three gigantic land invasions, one through the Balkans, one through France, and one in the vicinity of Norway. To keep all the men involved in those invasions from being killed would take practically all our bombing power, just as in Salerno we had to call for aircraft power to save Clark's army. As I stated earlier today, no navy dares go out to sea any more without aircraft protection. No army dares make an invasion without aircraft protection. If either naval forces or ground forces make a move they are immediately destroyed if, without aircraft protection, they come within reach of enemy aircraft.

Madam President, I believe the statement by Mr. Nelson, Chief of the War Production Board, which I have placed in the RECORD, but have not read, should finally satisfy the mind of the British Prime Minister, and I trust also, of our own governmental officials, of the capacity of American industry to continue the production of such an amount and quality of aircraft as will permit, in the words of Mr. Churchill, the methodical destruction of every available German building. Thereafter if our high command could be persuaded of our ability to saturate German defenses and cities by overwhelming bombing power, they might be willing to discontinue the further enlargement of a land army already so great that there is little possibility that any large part of it will ever be employed in any European invasion, and, I may also say, Japanese invasion.

The extent to which Nazi airpower is failing as the Allies grow stronger is described in the Times-Herald of September 20 in an article under the byline of Clark Lee and comes from northwest Africa air force headquarters. I quote it in part only:

An allied air force spokesman declared today that German air strength is steadily decreasing, with the quality of Nazi pilots and their tactical handling of their planes deteriorating.

Meanwhile the effectiveness of our air attacks is on the upgrade as our pilots become more experienced, he said.

The German air effort against our landing at Salerno reached a very low point while our air power had risen to such an extent that September 14 was the biggest day in the history of the northwest Africa air force, he added. On that day allied warplanes poured a concentration of 1,200 tons of bombs into a 16-mile enemy front in a total of 2,600 sorties by planes of the tactical and strategic air forces.

OUTSTANDING DAY

But, the spokesman declared, even that tremendous tonnage fails to depict the intensity of the air forces' efforts on September 14, "a day which will stand out in the history of aerial bombing." Every available plane was massed for direct support of our ground troops and they succeeded in smashing German counterattacks at a critical moment.

German counterattacks in the air? Oh, no, on the ground. If the German army had had air forces at Salerno where they could have attacked our landing forces, whether any American boys would have been saved we do not know. But by titanic and heroic efforts on the part of our fliers—and some day their achievement will be written on the pages of history as one of the greatest achievements of our Air Forces—General Clark's desperately driven army was saved.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course the reason we had the Air Force over there was to aid General Clark's army when it got into that desperate struggle.

Mr. DOWNEY. I might say to the distinguished Senator that I think that is a pertinent comment, and I wish to make my position clear. I do not have the military knowledge, or the knowledge of what has happened, properly to pass any opinion on whether or not our African campaign and our Sicilian and Italian campaigns have been necessary and wise. I am expressing no opinion with respect to that subject, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois. But I will say that practically all the experts in air warfare contend that if we had not diverted our air power away from the bombing of German cities and production centers, before this Germany would have surrendered or would have been destroyed. But I am not expressing an opinion. I merely wish to point this out.

Mr. LUCAS. I am very happy that the Senator from California is not expressing that kind of opinion. I was rather led to the conclusion, from what the Senator has heretofore said, that he was more or less opposed to what has happened in connection with the strategy and the tactics of the General Staff insofar as the north African invasion and the Sicilian invasion are concerned, and I thought the Senator was leading up to the point where he probably would have said that, had we concentrated everything on the island of Britain, so far as bombers are concerned, we probably would have shortened the war. I do not know whether or not that is the Senator's conclusion.

Mr. DOWNEY. No; I do not say that, and I do not pretend to know. I am not enough of an expert. I will say, however, that most of the air experts——

Mr. LUCAS. Who are they?

Mr. DOWNEY. I am going to read from their statements.

Mr. LUCAS. Who is such an expert in the United States of America? That is the one I am primarily interested in. Who is making this comment or argument to which the Senator now refers?

Mr. DOWNEY. I may say, if the Senator will permit me, I would prefer in logical form to read the statements of the different experts. I have already placed in the RECORD the statement of Air Marshal Harris, who said over a year ago that if he could have a thousand planes for bombing Germany for 4 months, he would defeat Germany. That was before our own Air Forces were in Europe in any number. I may say that that number of bombers could have been provided Air Marshal Harris.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator from California mean to say that a year ago a thousand bombers could have been provided to bomb Germany from England every night for a month?

Mr. DOWNEY. No. I will say to the Senator that the plans most widely discussed do not call for a thousand planes every day. They call for about eight flights of a thousand bombers each by the R. A. F. over Germany during a month.

Mr. LUCAS. Of a thousand bombers?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; a thousand bombers 8 nights in every month. They provide also for 7 flights every month of our precision bombers during the day. That would be a total of 15 flights of 1,000 bombers each over Germany every month.

It is my opinion, by calculating the amount of destruction to German cities resulting from the bombs we have dropped, that in 4 months we could destroy Germany or force her submission. Also I may say to the distinguished Senator I am positive that we could have provided those thousand bombers. I do not want to be drawn into any argument on this particular issue now, because I am not saying that the very great benefit which flowed from the north African campaign, which gave us the control of the Mediterranean, and of Sicily, and Italy, might not have been justified. I am positively saying it is my opinion that from now on any further great land campaign that will in any way tend to reduce our bombing effectiveness against Germany would be a tragic mistake.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has told the Senate and the country about the vast number of fighting planes and bombers this country is producing. Our potential power for production of planes is unknown at this moment by the best experts. The planes are being produced for some good reason, and that good reason, so far as I am concerned, is to destroy Hitlerism and Japism forever. That day is coming, and if Mr. Hitler and Mr. Tojo do not know it then they do not know very much about what is going on in the world.

I am very happy that the Senator from California is not taking the position that the General Staff has made any mistake in the conduct of the war insofar as the north African and the Sicilian campaigns are concerned. There has never been a time in the history of this Nation when there were so many real military experts in the Navy, the Army, and the Air Force as there are at this hour. I am talking about men who have had actual combat experience in World War No. 1.

While I am on my feet let me say that in the humble opinion of the Senator from Illinois, Gen. George Marshall will go down in history as one of the greatest, if not the greatest, of the global military strategists the world has ever produced. Notwithstanding the great work George Marshall has done, notwithstanding the great patriotism which runs through his blood 24 hours a day, notwithstanding the great American he is, there have been a few small, puny souls high in public life—what I say is no reflection on the Senator from California—who have attempted to smear General Marshall, when in fact he is being given the greatest honor an American soldier can receive.

Madam President, if the Senator will yield to me for a moment more, let me say I should like to elaborate on what I have just said. It is difficult for me to understand how people can do such things without any facts. Oh, of course, they may have what someone from some department has told them. Almost every day someone comes to my office and gives me some quiet, secret information about something which is going on in this or that department. He may be honest in his statement. However, nine times out of ten, I cannot follow such a person at all. I do not mean to say that I do not consider the information. However, if I were to follow every rumor which comes to my office about what is wrong in this or that part of the War Department or the Navy Department, I would be making speeches against the War Department or the Navy Department during the most critical time in the history of our Nation. In view of what has occurred since we got into the war, how anyone could do that to General Marshall or to the Army or the Navy, how anyone could constantly criticize the conduct of the war, is difficult for me to understand. With what we had on December 7, 1941, we have performed nothing less than military miracles in every corner of the globe.

Mr. DOWNEY. Madam President, will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me ask the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois a

question which very fairly admits of a categorical answer, "yes" or "no."

Mr. LUCAS. I do not want to be put on a witness stand.

Mr. DOWNEY. I know how able and astute the Senator is, and I am familiar with his eloquent language, so I shall simply ask a question which he can answer by saying "yes" or "no." If by January 1, let us say, Germany will have crumbled, and surrendered as a result of the destruction of her cities, and if such collapse is brought about by the use of one-quarter or one-fifth of the air power we could have brought to bear against her, would the Senator then still contend that the military policy of our staff was correct in building up a greater land Army?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has asked me a hypothetical question which of course no one could answer. I will not make any statements on the basis of a hypothetical question as to what might happen to Germany 4 months from now. I pray to God that what the Senator has said will prove to be correct. I sincerely hope that within 4 months Germany will be pulverized, to the end that the war will be no more. I admit there is that possibility. I do not think the air forces, the military forces, and the naval forces of our country have overlooked any possibility of doing just what the Senator has suggested. However, when the timetable was made up for our American Army which went to Europe a year or a year and a half ago, or possibly longer ago than that, we did not have anything to compare with what we now have in the way of production of planes or the capacity to produce them.

I recall that when the President of the United States made his speech before the joint session of Congress in 1941, in which he predicted that in the next year we would have approximately 50,000 airplanes, some newspapers of the country and some prominent persons, including some prominent military and naval officials and some aircraft experts, said it simply could not be done, and I myself thought it was almost impossible to think that our country could build that many airplanes in 1 year's time. But we did it.

Now as we proceed, we are producing more and more and better and better planes and the most powerful bombers the world has ever seen. There is nothing to compare with our bombers, and the enemy knows that. It may be possible to do exactly what the Senator has suggested.

However, insofar as I am concerned, in view of what has happened—the greatest victories any American Army has ever had, one after another, both in the southwest Pacific and in Europe—I shall not stand in the Senate, neither shall I talk in the corridors or lobbies of the Senate, and tell the General Staff what it should do.

I have said before, and I now repeat the statement, as a member of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, that I have complete confidence in the men who at the present time are running the Navy; I have complete confidence in the men who are running the Army; I have complete confidence in the men who are running the Air Force. I know they have made mistakes and that they will make them in the future; but with all the mistakes they have made, they have produced victories, and they have done it with little loss of life, as compared with the losses which have attended the great victories of the past.

Mr. DOWNEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has the floor.

Mr. DOWNEY. Unfortunately the Senator was not in the Chamber earlier in the day, because I made the statement, and partly corroborated it by figures—I shall be glad if the Senator will wait and hear the figures—that according to our experts, of all the injuries inflicted upon our enemies, 95 percent have been caused by aircraft.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; I desire to continue. Let me say that likewise, as to the operations of the Army, for the injuries it has inflicted, 100 or 1,000 lives have been taken for every man who has been lost in aircraft operations. Later I shall give the specific figures.

Before I yield to the distinguished Senator, I desire to say I certainly agree with him that too often we operate on the basis of rumors, misinformation, gossip, and ex parte statements. I agree with what the Senator has said in that respect. I try never to do that. So I may say to the distinguished Senator that when I wanted to know how many and what type of bombers we were producing this month and what it was anticipated by the War Production Board we would produce as of January 1st, and what we would produce 6 months from now, I spent an hour with Donald Nelson and three of the members of his staff. They gave me all the figures, but in confidence, and I cannot give them out. I wish I could. Any other Senator can have them; I shall be glad to give them to any other Senator, because Senators are entitled to have them, of course.

I have before me figures as to the number of B–17's, or Flying Fortresses, which we are to produce this month; the number of B–24's, or Liberators; the number of the larger Flying Fortresses, or B–29's, one of which would almost devastate a small city, and the number of B–32's, or larger Liberators, which are just getting into production. I have before me figures of the production of medium bombers, Marauders, and Billy Mitchells. I have figures as to the number of patrol bombers, attack bombers, crash bombers, and dive bombers. At my office I also have figures as to the number of fighters and transport ships. I also have figures as to the number of pilots who will be available and the amount of ammunition. All the plans have been carefully worked out.

I doubt if the Senator is entitled to reproach me, as he has done. I have not cited a single fact in this argument which I have not verified and checked with the best governmental agencies. I received figures from one source concerning our merchant-ship production, which is more than four times that of the rest of the world. I simply could not believe the figures, so I checked them with four different governmental bureaus. I have carefully calculated figures as to the number of bombers which could be applied against Germany without depriving other combat areas of bombers which they need. I admit I do not know—I wish I did—what amount of bomber and fighter capacity we shall have left with which to destroy the production centers and gut the cities of Germany if we engage in great land campaigns. Let me say to the Senator that while this is not my figure, and I am not sure it is correct, apparently the terrible punishment now being inflicted upon Germany, when we have been using only a quarter or a fifth of what we could use, has already cut her productive capacity at least 20 percent. The latest devastating raid was upon Hanover, one of the important manufacturing cities of Germany. It also included Emden, Brunswick, and several other cities.

There are certain statements which I should like to repeat that have been made to me, but I cannot, as they have been said in confidence, but I have talked with every air officer of the United States force with whom I could talk. I have talked with some of our ranking men. I believe they will corroborate what I am saying. If the Chief of Staff had called before our Military Affairs Committee the men who know most about air power—such men as Arnold, Chennault, Kenny, Spaatz, and Eaker—assuming that those men would not be afraid of meeting the same doom which Billy Mitchell met, we would have an entirely different story.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. What would be the different story? The Senator made a very serious statement when he said that there would be an entirely different story. I have thought, and I believe the American people have felt, that the war has been going along pretty well up to date. I should like to know what that story is. The Senator has made a pretty serious statement, to the effect that there would be an entirely different situation. I glean from the Senator's remarks that probably the war would be over. I do not know.

Mr. DOWNEY. Madam President, I realize the grave import of what I am saying. For that reason I ask any of my dear friends here or any leaders of the administration to correct me on any facts. I admit that, after I have spent months in gathering the best evidence I can, I do not like to have a Senator rise and intimate that I am acting on the basis of rumor. I do not enjoy that. But let me say to the distinguished Senator that if I make a single misstatement, I hope the Military Affairs Committee will take steps to have the facts shown.

I do not wish to embarrass any man, but I have spent hours talking with young commissioned officers who have returned from the European and Pacific theaters.

I have also talked with some of the highest ranking airmen in the United States, men who know much more about air power than does General Marshall or other members of the high command who have not developed in the Air Forces. They are the true experts. As I have stated, I shall read later from statements by civilian authorities. I do not know of one air-power expert who has written a book or magazine article who does not corroborate what I am about to say. I shall read from the statement of Mr. Courtney, which was sent to Collier's by radio, from the Reader's Digest, and from other standard publications, purporting to state the opinions of men who are considered to be the major experts in aircraft. I am not out of step with air-power authorities in what I am contending.

Mr. LUCAS. I did not say that the Senator was out of step. I think he has been in step all afternoon, and I appreciate what he has said. I am not attempting to embarrass the Senator in the colloquy I am having with him. I could not do so if I so desired. The Senator is too good in debate for me to embarrass him if I so desired. I would not do it.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am not the equal of the distinguished Senator from Illinois in debate or persuasiveness when we are equally armored. I have spent months gathering these facts. I have talked with scores of air experts, so I feel well armored in this particular debate.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is always well armored. I shall not try to pierce his armor. I do not wish to do so. The only thing I was attempting to do was to try to uphold the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps, in view of the great record which they have made. I do not wish the Senator to think that I am attempting to condemn or criticize his position. He can take any position he desires. He stated in the beginning that he has no criticism of the Army or the Navy and what they did in the conduct of the Sicilian and African campaigns. In his last statement the Senator indicated that had the Chief of Staff done something different so far as air power is concerned, something else would have happened. Perhaps so. I asked the Senator to give us his conclusions as to what might have happened.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me answer that statement directly. I believe that our high command has made a serious mistake by diverting the major part of our manpower and resources to a great land army which never can be used, and never will be used. Time will test this issue between us. Our manpower and resources are being diverted away from a more rapid and potent expansion of air power. The issue is not between the Senator and me, or between the air experts and me, but between the high command and me. In my opinion we have given far too much of our resources and manpower to a land army which can never be used, while to the same extent we have further reduced our air power.

Mr. LUCAS. To whom are we to leave the decision of that question?

Mr. DOWNEY. I would leave it to Air Marshal Harris, Generals Arnold, Eaker, Chennault, Kenny, Doolittle, and men like them who are recognized authorities in the use and value of air power. If they were to say to me, "Give us a thousand bombers for 4 months, for 15 raids a month over Germany, and we will knock Germany out of the war," I would believe them.

Mr. LUCAS. When did General Doolittle say that? The Senator says he would leave the decision to Doolittle, Chennault, and others.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes, I would; and I should like to read from statements of the civilian air experts of the Nation in which they purport to state the opinions of our own military men. I know the opinions of some of these Army men, because I have talked to them, but I cannot quote them.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sorry to have taken the time of the Senator.

Mr. DOWNEY. I appreciate the courtesy and kindness of the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'DANIEL in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has been a chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs which has been investigating the subject of manpower. As I recall, the Senator was chairman of that subcommittee and held hearings some months ago; and then, before Congress took its recess, the committee was given additional funds with which to conduct the investigation, and carried it on during the last several months, I believe. Am I correct in that belief?

Mr. DOWNEY. Our subcommittee was almost constantly in session during the recess, in fact was in session most of the time when I was on the Pacific coast.

Mr. HILL. And it had been in session for some months before that; am I correct?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct. It, or a similar committee, has been in session for almost a year.

Mr. HILL. For over a year.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; one subcommittee or another.

Mr. HILL. Yes; for over a year the Senator and his subcommittee have been investigating this subject. Has the Senator brought before that subcommittee any of the experts on air power he has quoted today?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; I have not. Our subcommittee was formed for the purpose of investigating manpower shortages.

Mr. HILL. Yes; but of course——

Mr. DOWNEY. I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Alabama be candid with me, because we are, I hope, friends.

Mr. HILL. I am trying to be as candid as possible; but in the final analysis the whole matter revolves around the question of manpower and the proper and wisest use to be made of available manpower. The Senator now has told the Senate that for over a year he has been the chairman of a subcommittee investigating the whole subject of manpower. Yet, on the floor today he has presented all kinds of statements, charges, opinions, and views; but also he has said that in none of the hearings did he adduce testimony upon which he bases the charges and the statements, and the opinions. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator is very definitely correct. The authority of the subcommittee of which he spoke was limited to a consideration of the manpower shortages in the Western States. To the consideration of that subject, I applied myself assiduously. I can tell the Senator the effect of the shortage of manpower in preventing the full and maximum production of aircraft; but our subcommittee had nothing to do with any consideration of military issues or the propriety of what the General Staff was doing in the use of bombers and fighters.

The distinguished Senator from Alabama has probably been more conscientious in his attendance upon the meetings of the Committee on Military Affairs than have I, but I cannot recall a single issue or proposal or suggestion made by the Army and the Navy which our Military Affairs Committee has not accepted.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

Mr. DOWNEY. Perhaps these gentlemen are right in their judgment; perhaps they do not have to be checked, but I know of not one proposal or suggestion to the Committee on Military Affairs by our Army which has not been accepted by a majority of the committee.

I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. I wish to add to what the Senator has said about the Committee on Military Affairs, that his statement is applicable to the Committee on Naval Affairs. Not a single suggestion has been made by the Navy which has not been approved by that committee and approved by the Senate.

Mr. DOWNEY. I appreciate the Senator's statement, and before I conclude I wish to offer this comment to my distinguished friend from Alabama, for whom I have the highest admiration. I can understand how a Senator can take the viewpoint of Barney Baruch and say, "Well, if you don't think General Marshall is doing the right job, dismiss him." In other words, I can understand what I believe is the philosophy of the majority of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, that they are laymen, that they are dealing with a very technical matter, and that it would be imprudent and ill advised for them to assert their own judgment or conclusions against the distinguished men who now sit in the seats of the mighty.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I merely wish to state it as my opinion, for what it may be worth, that some of the suggestions which the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the Congress itself, have accepted from these departments have been very poor suggestions, notably, the inauguration of the cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts, which have been almost the ruination of our manpower situation.

Mr. BARKLEY rose.

Mr. DOWNEY. I can agree with the statement of the Senator from Missouri. In a moment I will yield to the majority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator. I had been informed that he would like to suspend at this time.

Mr. DOWNEY. I should like to conclude with a further statement.

I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama that I have for him only the highest affection and admiration, and that I do not censure him in any way.

Perhaps I approach this problem from a somewhat broader philosophical viewpoint than does the noted Senator, because I am somewhat older than he is. I do not know why it is true, but through all the pages of history, in the centuries and thousands of years of history, the men who are bred in a profession or trade, while they are the most skillful in evaluating and using the tools to which they have been born, they are the slowest in the world in evaluating and applying new methods and new tools. The psychologist and the philosopher can discuss the innumerable martyrs of history, such as Billy Mitchell, and tell us why that is true. I do not pretend to know. It is the lawyer who sternly resists the modernization and the streamlining of the law. It is the banker who cannot see any possible monetary reform.

Let us take one or two tragic and noted instances, because they typify human nature throughout the ages. Let us consider Pasteur. Pasteur was a chemist, not a doctor. He was an able man. In his experiments he finally worked out a totally new principle of antiseptic surgery. He brought down upon his head the wrath and anathema of almost all the doctors of Paris, and I think of France and of Europe. He had proved that surgeons in childbirth, by not sterilizing their hands, their clothing, and instruments were killing more women than should have died in childbirth many times over.

Mr. President, today all the doctors in the world would bitterly resist anyone who attempted to use a dirty glove or a dirty knife with staphylococcus germs. But with hate and fury and passion the doctors of the world pommeled and ridiculed Pasteur before they finally accepted his theories.

I do not know why but it always follows, as judged by history, that the last men who should be asked about the use of a new weapon are the men who have been born and bred to the use of other kinds of weapons.

Mr. President, earlier in the day I read a short excerpt from something which should appear in one of Mr. Ripley's Believe It or Not columns. It told of the reporter who was at Kittyhawk, and by chance saw the first flight of a heavier-than-air, power-driven airplane. That man thought—and rightly so—he had the grandest and greatest scoop of all the ages. For centuries men had dreamed of the day when they could leave the surface of the earth and fly; and there at Kittyhawk were two boys who at long last had developed a machine capable of doing just that, and a reporter happened to be there on a hunting trip, and saw it finally accomplished. However, his newspaper would not even print the story. It simply made the comment, "It is neither fact nor good fiction," and rejected it.

Mr. President, in my remarks earlier in the day I stated that not one respectable, important newspaper in the United States had printed a single statement about the invention of the airplane until 5 years after it was perfected and had been flying. One of the very able young ladies in my office corrected me on that point. I still think I was correct. But it is true that one of the widely circularized journals on beekeeping had given that event wide publicity, and the Dayton Journal, I think it was, had printed a few lines on it. So I am willing to admit that my secretary, Betty Marelius, was more nearly right than I, but no one can fail of astonishment as he reads of treatment of the Wright brothers and other men of genius, who were ridiculed and persecuted.

Mr. President, I do not want to take more of the Senate's time today, except to say that before we in the United States commit ourselves to a policy of developing a great land army, with all that the ratification of such a policy will mean, we had better, for a few minutes, leave our generals who have grown gray with their visions of great land armies, and listen to the men who fly airplanes, who understand true concepts of modern war and the true worth of air power.

Mr. President, I have supporting material and other arguments which I must put into the RECORD, because I have not yet reached the most important part of my speech. What I think about this matter is unimportant; the question is what the greatest experts of the world think about it. So I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader if he contemplates moving that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow, if it may be understood by unanimous consent that I may have the floor when the Senate meets tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no objection, and I am sure no other Member of the Senate will have.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'DANIEL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

Several captains to be commodores, for temporary service, in the Coast Guard while serving as district Coast Guard officers.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY—JUDGES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry E. Pratt, to be United States district judge for division No. 4, District of Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ellen K. Raedy, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles E. Cassidy, to be third judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts of the Territory of Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE JUDICIARY—UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leslie E. Given, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John J. Boyle, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank E. Flynn to be United States attorney for the district of Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE JUDICIARY—UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James H. Patterson to be United States marshal for division No. 3, District of Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Henry Goguen to be United States marshal for the district of Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John J. Farrell to be United States marshal for the district of Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Marine Corps nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, September 30, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 29 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Elvin Seibert, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Luther M. Swygert, of Indiana, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Indiana, vice Hon. Thomas W. Slick, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Jack R. Caufield, of Oregon, to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon, vice Steve Franklin Hamm, deceased.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Edwin C. Kelton, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as president and member of the California Debris Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Debris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," vice Brig. Gen. Warren T. Hannum, to be relieved.

Col. Rufus W. Putnam, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as a member of the California Debris Commission, provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Debris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," vice Col. Clay Anderson, Corps of Engineers, to be relieved.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, September 29 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Harry E. Pratt to be United States district judge for division No. 4, District of Alaska.

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Ellen K. Raedy to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Charles E. Cassidy to be third judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Leslie E. Given to be United States attorney for the southern district of West Virginia.

John J. Boyle to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin.

Frank E. Flynn to be United States attorney for the district of Arizona.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

James H. Patterson to be United States marshal for division No. 3, district of Alaska.

J. Henry Goguen to be United States marshal for the district of Massachusetts.

John J. Farrell to be United States marshal for the district of Minnesota.

CHIEF, BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Admiral DeWitt C. Ramsey to be Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be vice admirals

Arthur B. Cook
John S. McCain

To be rear admirals

Edward W. Hanson
Ernest G. Small
Thomas L. Gatch
Ralph O Davis
Lloyd J. Wiltse
Henry M. Mullinnix
Robert B. Carney
Arthur W. Radford
Van Hubert Ragsdale
John Wilkes
George F. Hussey, Jr.

To be commodore

Samuel A. Clement

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR SERVICE

(The nominations of Jack G. Campbell et al., for appointment or promotion in the regular service of the Navy, were confirmed today. A complete list of the persons whose nominations for appointment or promotion in the regular service were confirmed today, may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 21, 1943, beginning with the name of Jack G. Campbell on p. 7700 and ending with the name of John E. Rutherford on p. 7702.)

IN THE MARINE CORPS

FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be lieutenant general

Alexander A. Vandegrift

To be major generals

Keller E. Rockey
Allen H. Turnage

To be brigadier generals

Earl C. Long
Pedro A. del Valle
Oscar R. Cauldwell
Alfred H. Noble

FOR REGULAR SERVICE

To be major

Lester S. Hamel

To be first lieutenant

Peter D. Lambrecht

To be second lieutenants

Frederick M. Rauschenbach
George C. Axtell, Jr.
Raynold G. Tomes
George B. Woodbury
Samuel L. Grigsby
Frank M. Platt, Jr.
Howard G. Gunter
John F. Skorich
James R. Galbreath
Joe B. Griffiths, Jr.
Robert V. Perkins
James P. Prowell
Robert L. Scott, Jr.
Stephen D. Ryan, Jr.
Harry Wollin
Paul J. Brown, Jr.
Irvin J. Gershen
James F. Hovey
William S. Brewer
Harris H. Barnes, Jr.
Archie B. Norford
Thomas M. Brown
Robert J. McKirnan
Philip T. Kujovsky
James L. Cullen
Richard H. Jeschke, Jr.
John E. Shepherd, Jr.
James T. Pearce
LeRoy Bald
William L. Dick
Eugene C. Swift
Serge S. Gorny
Robert S. Stubbs 2d
James K. Roberts
John P. Sawyer 2d
Harry B. Persinger, Jr.
Robert D. Thurston
James B. Ord, Jr.
Louis G. Nickell 3d
Richard F. Ladd
George F. Lewis
Herbert E. Roser
Wilford L. Stone
Frank H. Griffin, Jr.
John B. Green
Maurice S. Dampier
Eugene J. Adams
Bidwell C. McClelland, Jr.
Benjamin W. Dulany
Frederick Knoth, Jr.
Benjamin H. Sweney
Alexander Kositch
Warren A. Butcher
Donald R. Hall
Odia "E" Howe, Jr.
Paul M. Hupf
Robert A. Heath
Hugh C. Kiger
James P. Jacobson

SENATE

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in this testing day 'stablish Thou our hearts as we battle not in enmity against men, but against the evil which enslaves and degrades them. Remember our sons and daughters in their perils on land and sea and in the air. Keep love's banners floating o'er them; smite death's threatening wave before them. Give them and us the calm assurance that those who are absent from each other are still present with Thee. Deliver them from temptation. In lonely hours grant them strength and courage for the ordeal which has separated them from the shrines of their love. Comfort them and us by the steadfast faith that they cannot be where Thou art not, on any sea or shore.

O Thou great Shepherd of our souls, when on some far field looking up at the silent stars there seems nothing left but God and prayer, may a familiar voice out of the unseen whisper to their listening hearts the deathless song in the night: I shall not want. E'en though I walk through the valley of the shadow I will fear no evil. Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me. Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of my enemies. If it be Thy gracious will, bring them in safety back to the loved homes they defend and to loyal hearts that hold them dear. Bring us all to the homeland of Thy eternal love and in peace to gates ajar in our Father's fair abode. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, September 29, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on September 29, 1943, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 787. An act for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Harry Jacobs;

S. 789. An act to provide for the mailing of annual notices to owners of tax-exempt properties in the District of Columbia;

S. 824. An act for the relief of Dr. J. W. Goin; and

S. 1223. An act to fix the compensation of the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia and the Superintendent of the National Training School for Girls.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Radcliffe
Andrews	Gurney	Reed
Austin	Hatch	Revercomb
Bailey	Hawkes	Reynolds
Ball	Hayden	Robertson
Barbour	Hill	Russell
Barkley	Holman	Scrugham
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Brooks	Kilgore	Taft
Buck	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McCarran	Tobey
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Wallgren
Danaher	Mead	Walsh
Davis	Millikin	Wheeler
Downey	Moore	Wherry
Eastland	Murdock	White
Ellender	Murray	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Willis
George	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gerry	Overton	
Green	Pepper	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is necessarily absent.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has been confined to a Madison hospital since September 13.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

EMPLOYMENT OF ENGINEERS AND ECONOMISTS ON RECLAMATION WORK

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of his determinations during the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944 as to the numbers of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the executive departments and agencies (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Civil Service; and also

Letters from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency and the Senior Deputy Administrator, Office of Lend-Lease Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the Public Health Service for the quarter ending September 30, 1943, and the Lend-Lease Administration for the quarter ending December 31, 1943, respectively (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

SUSPENSION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC DURING THE WAR—PETITIONS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference various petitions signed by sundry citizens of Canton, Thomaston, Auburn, Kennebunk, Kennebunk Port, West Paris, and other communities all in the State of Maine, praying for the enactment of pending legislation to bring about suspension and prohibition of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war and the sale of liquor to our servicemen.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petitions presented by the Senator from Maine will be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF ROTARY CLUB OF PROVIDENCE, R. I.—INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Mr. GREEN presented a resolution by the board of directors of the Rotary Club of Providence, R. I., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the cooperation of the United States is essential to the establishment of conditions of a peace which will be fair, just, and lasting; and

Whereas it is a constitutional obligation of the United States Senate to advise the administration with respect to international understandings or treaties; and

Whereas the absence of any prior advice from the Senate as to its attitude toward international cooperation results in uncertainties which are inimical to the development of international cooperation; and

Whereas if we fail to establish the basis for international order and justice as we failed after the last war, we may again be faced with the necessity of making the same terrible sacrifices which are now being made by our armed services and by all of our citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Rotary Club of the City of Providence, R. I., That (1) a clarification and statement by the Congress of the United States expressing its sentiments with respect to international cooperation should be the first order of business of Congress; (2) that this should involve a commitment of future international cooperation, and indicate that we do not favor a policy of returning to isolation; and (3) that Senate Resolution 114, now pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, represents a reasonable statement, and that it, or some similar resolution, should be acted upon promptly by the United States Senate.

ACTIVITIES OF BUREAUCRATS—LETTER FROM H. V. MERING, OF GREAT BEND, KANS.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a short letter I have received from H. V. Mering, a leading businessman of Great Bend, Kans., protesting against the bureaucrats and inspectors who, he says, are a great hindrance to the war effort.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MERING & SON,
Great Bend, Kans., September 10, 1943.

Hon. Senator CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: We have been in business here in Great Bend for the past 35 years. We were one of the first oil jobbers in the State of Kansas and in the last 15 years we have added tires and tire recapping to our business.

As a businessman representing this farmers' community, I feel that this bureaucratic setup in Washington having bureaucrats, such as inspectors, etc., running around our State harassing businessmen and farmers is a great hindrance to our war effort. Besides, these businessmen and farmers are getting very tired of this.

We are asking you that when these bureaucrats ask for the next appropriation, to use your support and influence in seeing that it is cut in about half. We feel sure that this would help do away with these inspectors who are harassing the good people in our State who are trying to help win this war. Also with this cut in appropriation to these bureaucrats it will save the taxpayers a lot of money which they could use to buy bonds, and thus having the money go where it is justly deserved.

Thanking you for your loyal support in this matter, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

H. V. MERING.

RESOLUTION OF YAVAPAI COUNTY COUNCIL ARIZONA SMALL MINE OPERATORS, ASSOCIATION—PRODUCTION OF CRITICAL MINERALS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution of the Yavapai County Council, Arizona Small Mine Operators Association, adopted at a regular monthly meeting held at Prescott, Ariz.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas this association is devoted to the furtherance of the interest of all small mine operators, and this council of the association is bending its every effort toward the betterment of the condition of small mine operators, particularly as regards the simplification of the methods of procedure in obtaining loans of Federal funds to be used in development and production of strategic minerals and the obtaining of premium prices for such minerals; and

Whereas it appears that small-mine operators are greatly and unduly handicapped in both these particulars and the contribution to the war effort which small mine operators are prepared and anxious to make is to that extent retarded; and

Whereas it appears wholly unnecessary that long periods of delay should be experienced in action on applications for loans and in the payment of premium prices for strategic minerals already produced and marketed; and

Whereas notwithstanding the great contribution which small mine operators are prepared to make to the war effort at large it appears there is a movement under way to close down all small mines under the mistaken belief that labor will thereby be diverted to the so-called large mines and producers of strategic minerals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Yavapai County Council, Arizona Small Mine Operators Association, does hereby go on record as opposing and deeply deploring all thought and effort toward closing any mine, however small, engaged or capable of engaging in the production of minerals critically needed in the prosecution of the war effort, and we do brand as fallacious and pure sophistry the notion that much-needed labor will thereby gravitate to the larger metal mines. In this connection we call attention to the fact that such has not been the experience as a result of the order closing down gold mines, and such a result cannot rationally be expected if small mines producing the baser metals are ordered closed.

Further resolved, That the best interests of the United States and the most efficient prosecution of the war effort requires and demands that methods of acting on applications for mineral loans be liberalized and simplified, to the end that small miners may be enabled to get into production with a minimum of that which has for so long and so aptly been called "red tape," and so to contribute their full share to the preservation of democracy, as we know it, and the spirit of free enterprise which has made this country great and its peoples truly free.

Further resolved, That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, War Production Board, War Manpower Commission, Office of Price Administration, Premium and Quota Committee of the Metals Reserve Company, and other Government agencies be called upon to take notice of the great utility of the small-mine operator in the furtherance of the war effort and urged to take all measures designed to facilitate the granting of loans, the availability of needed materials, the noninterference with local labor, and accelerate the payment of premium prices, and to do all else which may be conducive to mineral production by the small miner at a reasonable margin of profit.

ACCOMMODATIONS FOR TRANSIENT SERVICEMEN IN WASHINGTON

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to read at this time a letter I have just received which speaks for itself. It is as follows:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
WASHINGTON, *September 29, 1943.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Since I share your concern over the immediate lack of adequate accommodations for transient servicemen in the Union Station area, I believe you will be glad to know that the Federal Works Agency is well on its way to correct the conditions which you recently brought to the attention of the Congress.

We became aware some time ago that sleeping and other facilities were urgently needed for servicemen in Union Station, some of whom were sleeping on benches, in telephone booths, and in some instances even on the floor of the station. Believing that immediate action was imperative, we acquired the Capitol Park Hotel, directly across Union Station Plaza, for conversion into a sleeping and napping center, equipped with restaurant, canteen, lounge, showers, and other conveniences and necessities. It is to be operated by Recreation Service, Inc., operating unit of the War Hospitality Committee of the District of Columbia. All possible comforts and conveniences are provided, among them arrangements to call sleeping servicemen so they may be on time for their trains.

I have issued orders that the converted hotel must be ready for occupancy by servicemen before the end of October. To this end I have authorized double work shifts wherever sufficient workmen can be obtained. This facility will take care of the transient hotel requirements of 400 to 500 service people.

The course of action we have followed commended itself as the quickest and most effective way of dealing with the situation which you and I alike deplore.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Major General,
United States Army, Administrator.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1315. A bill providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy of certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina; without amendment (Rept. No. 422);

S. 1336. A bill to authorize the transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 423);

S. 1349. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York certain lands within the Brooklyn Navy Yard in the city of New York; without amendment (Rept. No. 424); and

S. 1351. A bill to amend the act of May 27, 1908, as amended, authorizing settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 425).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1399. A bill for the relief of Frank Knowles; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1400. A bill for the relief of Robert H. Wilder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1401. A bill for the relief of Leo Patrick Frawley; and

S. 1402. A bill to authorize the removal of Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve officers from the honorary retired list under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 1403. A bill for the relief of the surviving dependents of Richard O. Hunnam; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. ANDREWS also introduced Senate bill 1404, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 1405. A bill for the relief of Joseph Kenney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 1406. A bill for the relief of the Contracting & Sales Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

REPEAL OF CHINESE EXCLUSION ACTS

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce a bill to repeal the Chinese exclusion acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes. I have discussed this matter with Congressman MAGNUSON, of the State of Washington, who introduced H. R. 3070 on June 29, 1943, which is pending before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. My bill is a companion bill.

I have gone over the provisions of the bill carefully. It will be observed that section 1 would repeal all existing statutory provisions excluding persons of the Chinese race from entry into the United States. Section 2 would apply the immigration quota provisions to Chinese and would allocate all Chinese persons entering the United States as immigrants to the quota for China. Section 3 would extend the existing naturalization laws to include Chinese persons and persons of Chinese descent.

The fact is that no useful purpose is now being served by retaining these exclusion laws in effect since under the quota provisions the Chinese quota would be only 105 persons annually.

The heroic accomplishments of the Chinese people as one of the United Nations in the present global war against totalitarianism make it very appropriate that China should be treated on a par with other countries. The United States has already entered on this policy by voluntarily relinquishing extraterritorial jurisdiction over Americans in China and abolishing the United States Court for China which for many years exercised jurisdiction over such cases.

The maximum immigration permissible under the existing quota laws for all nations is 153,774 persons annually. Whether the existing quotas should be increased or decreased involves a profoundly important question of policy which should not be covered by a bill dealing with the particular problem involved in repealing the Chinese exclusion acts, as is proposed in this measure.

As a member of the Senate Immigration Committee, it is my purpose to try to get a favorable report on this bill as early as possible.

I dedicate my efforts in this matter personally to the First Lady of China, Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, and her heroic husband, recently made President of

China, in an effort to aid in a continued friendship which I trust will be everlasting.

As a part of my remarks I desire to have inserted at this point a splendid editorial entitled "America, Asia, and the Future," which appears in the October 9 issue of Collier's magazine.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1404) to repeal the Chinese exclusion acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Immigration; and the editorial presented by Mr. ANDREWS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Collier's of October 9, 1943]

AMERICA, ASIA, AND THE FUTURE

In 1882, American railroad builders had for some years been importing Chinese coolies in unrestricted numbers to help forge the rail network which now, along with our roads, waterways, and air lines, holds this Nation together.

The Chinese could and would work harder for longer hours and for less money than American laborers could or would. American living standards in the west were already threatened, and in time a Chinese tide might have engulfed the country.

In 1882, therefore, Congress enacted the first Chinese Exclusion Act, forbidding Chinese labor to immigrate to the United States.

A similar Japanese threat blew up a little later. President Theodore Roosevelt negotiated the so-called gentleman's agreement with Japan, for strict limits on this immigration without an actual law, in 1907. That lasted till 1924, in which year Congress, over the protests of President Coolidge and various Cabinet members, added a prohibition of Japanese immigration to the Chinese Exclusion Act. The only exceptions are doctors, ministers, teachers, and students.

That, in brief, is the historical background of the current agitation for repeal of the act as regards the Chinese. The Chinese are now our allies in World War No. 2—and extremely valuable allies.

Against the proposed Chinese exclusion repealer are the same old facts and the same old (but now, as we shall see, shrunken) threat: That the Chinese workingman can outsweat and undereat the American; and that, therefore, unrestricted Chinese immigration to this country might some day eat away the entire structure of high living standards, high pay, and short workweeks which American labor has struggled to build during the last 50 years.

We can see no use in minimizing these facts and this threat, or in ridiculing the numerous and influential people who still take them seriously. New facts, however, have come into the picture; and these new facts are flanked by some appetizing post-war possibilities.

One of these new facts, of course, is that the Chinese are our allies in this fierce war. Another is that their present-day leaders bitterly resent the Chinese Exclusion Act as an insult to China.

How bitter that resentment is may be gleaned from a glance through Dr. Lin Yutang's latest book, Between Tears and Laughter (John Day Co., New York, 1943, 216 pages, $2.50).

Through Asia, indeed, is spreading a revulsion against the once accepted idea of the military and commercial supremacy of west over east. Fewer and fewer Orientals have any respect for the proposition that a Britisher, American, Dutchman, Frenchman, German, or Portuguese has a divine right to stake out a claim wherever he pleases in the Orient and exploit the natives. The leaders of China appear to be fully as determined as the leaders of Japan to have no more of this after the present war.

Another fact in this connection is that repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act, as planned by the advocates of its repeal, would not abolish immigration bars as to the Chinese. It would merely put them on the same quota footing as British, French, and so forth, now are. Mathematically, it would work out to admission of 105 Chinese immigrants a year—which can hardly be called an Oriental flood.

As to the appetizing post-war possibilities: they are connected with the fact that China has about 450,000,000 people, that it is very sketchily industrialized as yet, and that its leaders are determined that it shall become highly industrialized. It is estimated that China needs at least 60,000 miles of railroads as a transport foundation for an industrialized China. It has very few of those miles now. After an Allied victory in the war, China will be wanting to build and equip those railroads, at an estimated cost of $50,000 a mile.

In the United States when Pearl Harbor "whooshed" down upon us, there was one car for every 5 inhabitants, so that it was often boasted that we could all go for a ride at once. In China there is one car for every 5,000 persons. We have one telephone for every nine persons; China has one for every 1,500.

These are only the highlights of the opportunities which post-war China should offer to business emissaries from countries which treated China with reasonable respect and good will during the war. If we can do anything now to line up a fair share of that business for Americans, the post-war benefits to us all should be—well, considerable, at the least, and phenomenal if we get some good breaks.

That is the cold, commercial, materialistic aspect of the matter. There is another aspect. It is bound up with this new rise of self-respect and self-esteem all over the Orient. The Japanese are trying to capitalize on that development to gain their own aim of rulership over, first, the East and, later on, the world.

We can ride with this tide. Thereby, we have a chance to benefit both West and East. Or we can buck this tide—whereby we may set in motion forces which will culminate in World War No. 3.

An honest repealer of the Chinese Exclusion Act—meaning simply the placing of the Chinese on the same restricted quota basis as other races—looks like one safe and inexpensive move toward riding this new tide in world affairs.

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT—AMENDMENT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I submit an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by me to the pending bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, which I ask to have printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment submitted by the Senator from Ohio will be received, lie on the table, and be printed.

FOREIGN WAR RELIEF OPERATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 99)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on July 7 the President transmitted by message to the Senate a report from the American Red Cross relative to obligations under the appropriations for foreign war relief consolidated and extended by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1942, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations. I now ask that this message and report be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH ON PLANNING FOR OUR RETURNING SOLDIER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled 'Let's Plan Now for Our Returning Soldier," delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah on September 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BOOK, "CHRISTIAN BASES OF WORLD ORDER," BY THE VICE PRESIDENT—REVIEW BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a review by him of the book entitled "Christian Bases of World Order," written by the Vice President, which appears in the Appendix.]

PLEA FOR STOPPAGE OF SUBVERSIVE PRACTICES RETARDING THE WAR EFFORT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOLMAN

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address prepared by him to be broadcast relating to the stoppage of subversive practices which are retarding the war effort, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BALL

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him on post-war planning, delivered at the New York Times Forum on post-war foreign policy, in Times Hall, New York, September 24, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

GALLUP POLL ON INTERNATIONAL POLICE FORCE

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the report of the Gallup poll on the question of an international police force, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE PRESIDENT AND HIS ADMINISTRATION

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an advertisement from the Washington Times-Herald of September 26, 1943, paying tribute to the President and his administration, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHORTAGES IN NATIONAL MILK SUPPLY

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation in opposition to subsidies and calling attention to impending shortages in the national milk supply, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEW 1-CENT PIECE—LETTER FROM THE DIRECTOR OF THE MINT

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated August 9, 1943, addressed to him by Mrs. Nellie Tayloe Ross, Director of the Mint, in relation to the new 1-cent piece, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXPERIMENT IN WORLD FREEDOM—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TIMES

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Experiment in World Freedom," published in the September 26, 1943, issue of the

Chicago Times, which appears in the Appendix.]

MANPOWER—STATEMENT BY JAMES P. MITCHELL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on "Manpower," delivered by James P. Mitchell, Director of Industrial Personnel Division, A. S. F., on September 28, 1943, and a statement of Mr. Mitchell's background, which appear in the Appendix.]

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

[Mr. DOWNEY resumed the speech begun by him yesterday. After having spoken for about 1 hour and 10 minutes, he said:]

Mr. President, at this point in my address I desire to say that it will be my purpose to ask first to submit to the Senate a resolution, and to ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. I hope the leaders on both sides will consent to the adoption of the resolution, but I should not like to present it and to proceed with respect to it in the absence of distinguished Senators who are not now present, so if any Senator wishes to suggest the absence of a quorum the suggestion will be gratefully received by me.

Thereupon, the following occurred:

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it is the purpose of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to ask the Senator from California to yield so he may make a statement at this time. Does the Senator from California yield for that purpose? If so, I will suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DOWNEY. I do not desire to yield the floor, I will say to the distinguished minority leader. I shall be very happy to have a quorum call and then to yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who has a most important and interesting message for us all, if it may be understood that after the Senator from Massachusetts shall have completed his address I may then complete my address.

Mr. McNARY. That is very satisfactory.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I appreciate very much what the Senator from California has said.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Brooks	Clark, Mo.
Andrews	Buck	Connally
Austin	Bushfield	Danaher
Bailey	Butler	Davis
Ball	Byrd	Downey
Barbour	Capper	Eastland
Barkley	Caraway	Ellender
Brewster	Chavez	Ferguson
Bridges	Clark, Idaho	George
Gerry	Maloney	Taft
Green	Maybank	Thomas, Idaho
Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Gurney	Millikin	Thomas, Utah
Hatch	Moore	Tobey
Hawkes	Murdock	Tunnell
Hayden	Murray	Tydings
Hill	O'Daniel	Vandenberg
Holman	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Johnson, Calif.	Overton	Wagner
Johnson, Colo.	Pepper	Wallgren
Kilgore	Radcliffe	Walsh
Langer	Reed	Wheeler
Lodge	Revercomb	Wherry
Lucas	Reynolds	White
McCarran	Robertson	Wiley
McClellan	Russell	Willis
McFarland	Scrugham	Wilson
McKellar	Shipstead	
McNary	Stewart	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

REPORT ON VISIT TO THE FIGHTING FRONTS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am very much obliged to the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] for yielding to me. As I think he knows, I left Honolulu Tuesday night and arrived in Washington this morning. I believe there is advantage to the Senate in hearing as promptly as possible a report of the kind which I propose to make.

As the Senate knows, I was one of the group of Senators who made a tour of the American war theaters. I shall first sketch the route which was followed, and then present various phases of the war situation. Because of considerations of military security, nine-tenths of the lessons which I learned cannot be discussed in public. I shall gladly talk these matters over with Senators individually, or with the Senate as a whole in executive session, if that should be desired.

I should like to be very careful to state at the outset that a rapid trip around the world does not make a man an expert. I do not pretend to speak as an authority. Luckily for me, I was a working newspaperman for many years, which has given me some training in asking questions, and my military service has given me a wide personal, first-name acquaintance with members of the Army. Being a Member of the Senate, of course, I had access to all the higher military leaders; and being a civilian and a public servant, I had access to the enlisted personnel on a more intimate and franker footing than an officer would usually have. I speak to the Senate today, therefore, as a reporter.

Upon my appointment as a member of the Senate group I decided to address myself primarily to the following matters:

First. The welfare of the troops, involving not only their food, clothing, equipment, medical care, and dependency allotments, but also the leadership which they were receiving, and, if possible, the fighting qualities which they displayed in combat and the obstacles which they had to overcome.

Second. The broad strategic problems in the various theaters, as they affect the conduct of the war and particularly as they point the way toward the problems which will face us after the war.

Third. Wherever time permitted, to look into the work of our civilian agencies abroad. I should say that this latter phase was especially and thoroughly studied by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who are members of the Truman committee, and I believe they have a report in preparation which will be of the most intense interest and value to the Senate.

It became evident to me that knowledge can be obtained from talking with the men on the spot which cannot be obtained anywhere else. That is because they are imbued with the problems of the areas in which they are serving to a degree which does not exist even here in the Capital. Those men are making life-and-death decisions, and consequently the area in which they live and the significance of it to them is something very real. I should say, of course, that no thorough survey was possible in the time available; and, of course, much time was consumed in transit. But I hope that one good result which may flow from this tour will be the many leads and suggestions which became apparent, and which might well be followed up by committees of the Senate.

In many places I made what is known as a "spot" check regarding the food, post-exchange, and recreation facilities of the soldiers. I shall not burden the Senate with such details, important as they are to the individual concerned, but I have put this specific information at the disposal of the War Department, and I am advised that it will receive prompt attention.

All of us made visits to hospitals wherever it was possible to do so. In the course of the trip almost 2,000 soldiers, I think from every State in the Union, requested me, as they did other Senators, to write to their families and tell them that they were well.

Now for the route itself.

We left Washington on July 25, and went to the United Kingdom via the northern route. While military secrecy prevents me from giving the names of any of the places, I feel that the importance of this north country should be emphasized. It is, for example, possible for relatively small planes to cross the ocean by going from Maine to Newfoundland to Labrador to the west coast of Greenland, then to the east coast of Greenland, to Iceland, and to Scotland. The limiting factor is the weather, which is bad in the winter. This route is, of course, most advantageous to those who want to cross oceans, and disadvantageous to those who want to prevent such crossings.

Newfoundland is an area of especial significance to the North American Continent. When we left there our pilot said, "We have enough gas to get either to Prestwick in northern Scotland or to Marrakech in northern Morocco." That is approximately correct. They are the same distance.

The mercator projection of the world which most of us learned in school is very misleading as to the position of Newfoundland. Broadly speaking, Newfoundland and Bermuda in the Atlantic are comparable to Alaska and the Hawaiian Islands in the Pacific. Bermuda,

like the Hawaiian Islands, is closer to the American Continent than to any other.

The serious obstacle to flying in this northern country is the fog. Since the destroyer deal was made whereby we acquired a 99-year lease on the naval base of Argentia, fields have been discovered which are free from fog. American dollars have built huge runways in some of these places. It is absolutely indispensable that we have rights of access to those fields after the war.

The feature of the stay in the British Isles was the time spent with the fighting men of the Eighth Air Force and the courteous reception accorded us by British officials, for which I desire at this point to express my appreciation. It was a matter of real satisfaction to see the splendid way in which Lt. Gen. Jacob L. Devers was solving his many problems. He is a man of great energy and determination.

The Eighth Air Force can make the proud statement that never since it began operations has an American plane returned before completing its mission because of any action by the enemy. I wish I could convey something of the atmosphere in which they live. Some of it can be indicated by the notices which are posted in a routine manner on the walls of their buildings. One of these notices read, "Remember, when you bail out, don't give out information."

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Are we to understand that the effect of the statement which the Senator has just made is that, so far as his information is concerned, every American plane which had gone upon a mission had accomplished that mission before being destroyed or returning to its base? Is that the effect of the statement?

Mr. LODGE. The effect of it is that no American plane has ever been forced back by enemy action before completing its mission.

Mr. DOWNEY. Does the Senator mean to include in that statement the statement that no American plane has ever been destroyed before completing its mission?

Mr. LODGE. No; I do not include that statement.

Mr. DOWNEY. None has been forced back to the base by enemy action?

Mr. LODGE. None has been forced by enemy action to return to its base.

Due to the generous consideration of the other members of the group, it was my privilege to represent them in Sicily, where fighting was in progress on the north coastal road in the vicinity of Cape Orlando. The American Seventh Army, under the gallant leadership of Lt. Gen. George S. Patton and under the high direction of General Eisenhower, is a most formidable ground striking force. The gains of territory which this army made and the rapidity of their advance, which culminated in their entrance into Messina, constitute a brilliant page in our history. I flew to Palermo in a B–25 and went forward to the vicinity of Cape Orlando along the northern road by automobile. This road is like a shelf cut out of the steep side of mountains with frequent bridges traversing dried up river beds. All bridges had been blown and the stream beds had been heavily mined. It is at all times in view of the sea, and the country was so rough that it was impossible to travel off the road with any type of vehicle. General Patton did not use any frontal attacks because of the tremendous losses which this tactic entails. Instead, he maintained a constant succession of flank attacks. If he wanted to go around the left flank, he used boats. He made three flank attacks from the sea. If he wanted to go around the right flank, he used mules, which he found in Sicily and on which he mounted American saddles which he had brought with him in November. The German troops were fighting hard, but General Patton never gave them a chance to rest or reorganize and these constant flank attacks proved to be deadly. It was a typical American way of fighting.

The operation was conducted on a large scale and with a momentum and drive which continued to the knockout. General Patton's naval and air support were effective and complete and in every way cooperative.

Senators will also be interested in the fact that the ground in Sicily was most highly organized. There were mine fields on the beaches, barbed-wire entanglements at all the approaches, and a railroad running around the perimeter of the island, equipped with railroad artillery which could be brought to bear quickly at any point. There were pillboxes of ferro-concrete construction, with walls and roofs one and a half feet thick, which dominated the defiles and principal crossings in the roads.

It may have taken at least 2 years to build those works, and I do not know how much money was expended in their construction. A determined enemy could have made a prolonged resistance. Yet none of these fortifications were used, except in the German-held northeastern corner of the island.

The explanation of this apparent paradox lies partly in the fact that the Italian troops did not have their heart in the struggle. It is also due to the pace, mass, and momentum of our landing. Due to our excellent amphibious equipment, it was possible to unload steamers at sea and carry the loads directly up to road junctions 8 to 10 miles inland. The steamships were loaded in Africa with 1½-ton loads. When the ships got off the shore these amphibious 2½-ton trucks, pictures of which Senators have undoubtedly seen, came alongside. A whole net full of material would be lowered down into the amphibious truck. The truck would go inland 8 or 10 miles, and there the unloading would begin. The movement from ship to shore approximated a movement from one ground point to another. No time was taken to stop and organize. Our boys plunged right in.

It was my privilege to be with one of our infantry companies early one morning in a small Sicilian village. The death and destruction which were everywhere close at hand are hard to describe. These men had been days and nights without adequate food or sleep. All of the smells and dirt which set ground fighting apart from air and sea fighting and the most gruesome sights of war were surrounding them. They were dead tired, but there was a grimness and determination about these boys which I cannot forget. One regiment marched 60 miles with full pack in 48 hours. Perhaps that will give some picture of the fortitude and determination of those boys.

The medical service even at these extreme forward points was excellent. Young doctors were at hand to administer opiates to our wounded and 10,000 casualties were evacuated to Africa by air, being ministered to on the way by our gallant flying nurses.

In north Africa I had the pleasure of a visit with Lt. Gen. Carl Spaatz, a sincere and effective leader. I also heard fine reports on the services rendered by Col. Elliott Roosevelt.

Another place of especial interest is Basrah, at the head of the Persian Gulf, where our soldiers are overcoming unbelievable obstacles in moving equipment up into Russia. There was a temperature of 162° in the sun on the day we landed, and of about 115° in the shade. Living conditions are among the worst I have ever seen. Yet the morale of the troops was high and the work was going forward at a tremendous rate under the able leadership of Maj. Gen. Donald H. Connally and his staff, who are typical of the high quality of performance which we have come to expect from our Army engineers.

From Basrah we flew to Karachi in northwestern India, which is a big port for the unloading of American supplies for the China-Burma-India theater which is commanded so faithfully by General Stilwell. Even at that distance there were air-raid shelters and a system for protection against bombing. This was due to the possibility, which at one time had seemed imminent, that the Germans would thrust through Persia and subject western India to bombardment. Karachi may therefore be called the easternmost limit of the German threat. Somewhere in India one passes into the area threatened by the Japanese.

From Karachi we proceeded to northeastern India at the foot of the southern end of the Himalaya Mountain Range. Some day the full story will be written of the many deeds of heroism which have been performed in making the flight over this route which is now the only method of transportation into China. Every drop of gasoline, every bomb, everything which our fighters use, has to be flown up over the hump as it is called, 20,000 feet into the air, requiring the use of oxygen in order that the men in the planes may breathe.

In southwestern China is located the headquarters of Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault, a great flying leader with an uncanny ability to read the Japanese mind. He is one of those unusual men who at

one and the same time are creative and brilliant, yet thorough and sound. The story of what he has accomplished with very limited means will also be told after the war, and should inspire every American who reads about it.

I shall not forget a visit to our most advanced airfield in China and the high spirit and energetic performance of our boys who were way out on the end of a limb, it might be said, if ever anyone was in such a position.

From China we went to southern India, passing through the famine-stricken area of Calcutta, which is indeed a city of abject misery. The human suffering in that city is undoubtedly on a par, if indeed it is not greater than, the sufferings of war. Famine, cholera, and death are omnipresent. From southern India we made the jump to Australia, 3,200 miles in length, which was an adventure for us but a tremendous achievement for our crew. I wish to pay my tribute to them. The crew consisted of Maj. Henry Myers, the captain, a wise, resourceful leader; his capable copilot, Lt. Elmer Smith; the phenomenally accurate navigator, Capt. T. J. Boselli; the radio operator, Sgt. Charles Horton; and the engineer, Sgt. Frederick Winslow. They measured up to the highest standards of the military profession. I also extend my appreciation to Brig. Gen. George Schulgen, and to Brig. Gen. Frederick Rankin, a fine doctor and a delightful traveling companion. My thanks also go to Capt. Stephen Leo, who had charge of the arrangements when the party was on the ground.

I ask Senators to reflect for a moment on the implications of such a flight which was made so easily and so smoothly. Certainly, if it is so simple to make such flights in the year 1943, it should be easier to fly even greater distances in the near future. The situation has implications for the future security of our country which no responsible American can ignore.

Another memorable episode was the visit to Gen. Douglas MacArthur's headquarters whence I was later privileged to visit some of the forward airfields which are being constructed so effectively by the Army engineers under incredily difficult conditions.

Allow me to describe the way in which warfare of this character is frequently conducted. When an American plane, usually of the type being used by the Allies, attempts to land in regions of this character, and contains small parties of engineers and infantry, it tries to pick out a place which is naturally flat. They try to pick out a place where the grass is fairly dry. It grows 10 feet high in this part of the country, and it is necessary to burn it before they land. They then come in and land in this unimproved place. The engineers get out of the plane, and the infantry deploy in the event there should be any Japanese lurking around. The engineers, with the small tools which they have brought along, carry on the important grading operations and get the rocks and other obstructions out of the way. Another plane comes in and brings a section of a bulldozer. Another plane comes in and brings other sections until the bulldozer is complete and ready for operation. Before long the crew is at work and the bombing area is advanced that much farther. In a short time another fighter strip would be in operation against the enemy under the dynamic leadership of Lt. Gen. George Kenney.

Perhaps the most telling statement that can be made about General MacArthur's theater is that, although he was given the mission of holding Japan, he has actually cut off and pushed back the spreading tentacles of Japanese imperialism. This is an indication of what can be expected when the main effort swings to the Pacific. I might give a curbstone opinion and say that I think that effort is going to increase greatly very soon.

Another inspiring leader of men, with a strong fighting heart, is Admiral William H. Halsey. Like General Patton, he goes to the most forward areas, where the enemy positions can be seen with the naked eye. He is utterly indifferent to personal danger. He thinks nothing of racing through a narrow channel in a PT boat between two islands strongly held by the Japanese. He enabled me to get a view of warfare in the Solomon Islands which was entirely beyond anything I had imagined. The dangers and difficulties confronting our boys in those remote islands must be seen in order to be appreciated. Looking at the islands from a plane or from a boat, one is struck by their beauty and their rich green vegetation rising from white coral reefs, set in a clear and brilliantly colored sea.

Some of the islands are fairly flat and some are of volcanic origin. A purple haze rises over them, and in the white coral reefs are lagoons here and there in which the water is as clear as crystal. But when you go ashore and try to walk through that jungle you encounter not only physical problems but psychological dangers which only a strong effort of will can overcome. To fight on the ground in those islands is like trying to fight in a dark room. Thick foliage is always pressing in on you. No one knows where or when the blow is going to fall. There the soldier has not the comfort he usually has of knowing where his support on the right is and where his support on the left is. You can see nothing, and the chance of getting lost is very great. It takes a brave man to fight in such a country, and the foot soldiers who do it are entitled to the same praise which we properly accord to the boys in the ships and the planes and in the tanks, whose exploits are perhaps better known.

The problems of supply in that endless chain of islands are difficult in the extreme. Incessant flights by enemy bombers every night make consecutive sleep impossible. On one island the men of one of the Navy construction battalions were working 14 to 16 hours a day, clearing the jungle, building an airfield, and constructing all the utilities that must go into an air base, but they could never get more than 3 hours sleep a night. I hope everyone appreciates the fine work done by these construction battalions, who are volunteers, recruited from the skilled trades of the United States, including carpenters, plumbers, electricians, road builders, and steam-shovel operators. They have established a record of which American labor and the whole American people must be forever proud.

I do not know why their work has not been made better known. I saw one flying field 6,000 feet long, 200 feet wide, with a surface as smooth and hard as a billiard table, which had been completed in 10 days. It was comparable to the finest landing strips at the National Airport, although it was built in a jungle, a coconut forest, where the trees had to be pulled up, and on coral rocks which frequently are so hard that it is necessary to use a drill. The boys told me that it had actually taken 9 days, because on the ninth day a plane crash-landed on the field, but the official count is 10 days to prepare and place in operation an airfield such as that.

It was also my privilege to go to sea on one of our PT boats. These boys live a dangerous life, operating at high speed at night in a sea full of reefs. Their self-assurance and competence makes one proud.

Our flyers are doing sensational things. At 3:30 on the morning of my departure from the Solomons, I witnessed one of the most spectacular sights of my life. A Japanese bomber was caught in the beams of five searchlights. He was at 20,000 feet, but stood out clearly against the vast inky blackness of the sky. An American P–38 went after him, firing 20-mm. tracer ammunition, which made a red chain of fire, which struck the Japanese and set his left engine on fire. The American made another pass. This time a huge sheet of flame came from the enemy plane. He remained airborne for 30 seconds and then started to fall. As he went down, the American fired another round of bullets into him, and he crashed to the ground. I learned later this was the third Japanese bomber that particular American boy had shot down during the night. That is the kind of boys we have out there.

I do not want to paint too discouraging a picture of the fighting in this theater. It creates a false impression, I believe, to talk about island-to-island fighting. It is more accurate to think of the war in this area as one which progresses from weak point to weak point, bypassing and containing the areas of enemy strength. Certainly the spirit of our men and the results achieved so far with comparatively slender resources gives ground for tremendous optimism, and for the belief that with increased resources it will be possible to make this bypassing operation on a larger scale and still more effective.

It is also reassuring to observe that our men are well satisfied with the weapons they have received, that the food on the whole is as adequate as the tactical situation permits, and that the higher commanders function effectively. So far as food is concerned, of course, there are always exceptions, and I have told the War Department about the exceptions,

but I think that the food, on the whole, is good. I heard especially enthusiastic comments about the planes and the ordnance with which they were furnished. It is noteworthy that the light tank was employed very effectively on New Georgia, and of course our medium tank was used by the Second Armored Division when it went from the coast of Sicily to Palermo, and made an end run, so to speak, around the Germans in those areas.

So much for the chronological account of my trip. I would now like to mention a number of separate items which came to my attention and which are sufficiently important to justify careful investigation and study by the Congress. This information came to me from American sources which I believe to be reliable. It was obviously impossible to make a detailed survey of any one of these topics. They do, however, provide leads for further study.

First. The question of oil. It is a matter of common knowledge that we are exhausting our own domestic resources and that all of our people, particularly those on the eastern seaboard, are experiencing a shortage of petroleum. Yet the information was repeatedly conveyed to me that the United States with less than 25 percent of the oil resources of the world was furnishing over 60 percent of the oil being used to fight this war.

But in Algeria and Morocco, for instance, there is no system of rationing comparable to ours. There are many cases of civilians in these two areas who have more gasoline than civilians in our Eastern States. All the gasoline is American. I was advised that in the city of Algiers, for instance, civilian vehicles consumed 42,000 barrels a month. Surely the war has progressed far enough to justify our treating these civilians like civilians in other Allied countries. It is also noteworthy that at Abadan at the north end of the Persian Gulf is a vast refinery which produces 100-octane gasoline. Yet, I was told, and we were all told, this vast enterprise is only working at 60 percent of capacity. The layman finds it hard to understand why western Australia should not be supplied from this point instead of depending upon the distant and unfortunately dwindling oil resources of California.

Second. Wherever the opportunity presented itself I inquired into the overseas operations of the Office of War Information. I may say that the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] have devoted even more time to it than have I, and will make a contribution more complete than mine. I mention it only because I think Senators will recall that last June I took the position that we should not reduce the amount of appropriations for the overseas operations of O. W. I. I did so on the ground that psychological warfare is an essential weapon of modern war.

Frankly, I now wonder whether I was right. The overseas operations of O. W. I. can be divided into two categories. The first is psychological warfare against the enemy which is carried on in close conjunction with Army and Navy Intelligence. I understand that this is being well done and should continue unchanged. The second category consists of propaganda in friendly foreign countries. To my mind this is a very dubious undertaking, which was certainly never contemplated by Congress and for which no clear-cut executive policy exists. I found the men administering this activity to be sincere and honest administrators. But they were necessarily confused. In India, for example, propaganda is made available to the press in order to tell the people of India what the average American is like. That is the purpose of our propaganda. The people of India, of course, are interested in what the American thinks about India. How this type of propaganda contributes to the war effort is somewhat a mystery. In Australia mimeographed material is sent to editors to be used as background. Senators who have been working members of the press appreciate the limitless capacity of the editorial wastebasket for matter of this kind. I was told that in New Caledonia the O. W. I. distributes match boxes with the "four freedoms" printed on them but without any mention of the United States. These few instances speak for themselves. I also ask Senators to reflect on the reaction in these countries when the war comes to an end and these activities suddenly stop.

On the whole the personnel of our civilian agencies seemed to me to be of a high caliber and there was a harmony and teamwork among them which might well be emulated in Washington. I believe that more information would be useful on the Middle East supply center which operates in Cairo and allocates materials as well as export and import licenses for American supplies in that area. It is a joint American-British enterprise and its structure should be better understood at home than it is now.

Third. I was able to see the A. M. G. O. T. in operation in Palermo. Lt. Col. Charles Poletti is coping energetically with the many acute problems. I have here a specimen of the money put out by the A. M. G. O. T. This particular bill is for 500 lira and is supposed to be the equivalent of 5 American dollars. On its face it carries the words "500 lira," but contains no promise of any kind. On its reverse are the "four freedoms," printed in English, although this money circulates among Italians. What the face of this bill promises I do not know. I hope the reverse will not be construed as a promise which the already overburdened American people are neither rich enough or numerous enough to keep.

On so rapid a trip dependable information about foreign opinion is best secured by talking to Americans who have lived in the country a long time. Conversations with these persons lead me to believe that there is very little fear abroad that the United States will not discharge its international obligations or take advantage of its international opportunities. Insofar as foreign opinion about the United States is concerned, there seem to be two impressions. One is an expectation of gifts and favors from the United States which are far beyond our capacity to confer. The other is a fear, which I think is unreasonable, of the expansion of our foreign trade and of our world-wide aviation. Again, I was impressed with the dangers of overstatement and of making promises which are impossible of fulfillment. I submit once again that a clear, frank statement of national aims, based on national interest and guided by justice, would accomplish more good for the world and would cause less hatred and disillusionment later on.

This brings me to my fourth point. There is much real dissatisfaction among our men abroad with what they conceive to be the censorship and propaganda policy of the Government. What appears to them to be unwillingness to put out information which is not favorable and laudatory is completely out of tune with the realistic attitude which our young men have toward this war. When they come out of a situation in which they have been pushed around a bit, it can be imagined how they feel when they get the reports which make no mention of the possibility of their being normal human beings. Comments which I heard range all the way from criticism of the cigarette advertisements which always portray field soldiers as clean-shaven and neatly pressed, to disagreement with the practice of portraying all our allies as being perfect. Our boys know that we are not perfect; that no one is perfect and that our allies are not perfect either. The good cooperation achieved between the Allies to date can only be evaluated at its true worth if it is realized that there are frequent, and natural, differences of opinion. The dangerous results of sugary and overdrawn propaganda should be apparent to us all. Look back for a moment over some of the hallucinations which have been widespread. Do you remember the generally accepted statement that the French Army was unbeatable? Do you remember the belief that the Russians would collapse in 6 weeks? Do you remember the statements that the Japanese Navy was made of cardboard? We must not perpetrate any more of these false notions. We invite ultimate cynicism, disillusionment, and even hatred of our allies if we do so.

I have seen small signs of this already. Many of our young men, for example, come to China imbued with the idea that China is a great modern democracy with millions of men fighting with their backs to the wall. Upon arrival they find this is not the case. With the impetuousness of youth they thereupon go to the other extreme. They overlook the industry, good humor, and democratic attitude of the individual Chinese once they have discovered that the Central Government is not like ours. They overlook the fact that due to the Chinese Army 15 Japanese divisions are in China, in spite of the fact that the Chinese Army, to put it mildly, is not comparable to ours. They overlook the advantage to America in having a strong China. It would be

better for China and for us if a true picture were given to the American people. When Oliver Cromwell had his portrait painted he said to the artist, "Paint me as I am, the wart and all." The truth about China is in many ways inspiring, and China as she now stands is a real military asset to the United States. Her achievements can be more accurately measured if her difficulties are more clearly realized. It is written that "the truth is mighty and shall prevail." It will prevail in this case. I do not want to see a wave of cynicism and disillusionment following in its train.

Fifth. The question of a post-war military policy will some day be before the Senate and I thought it of great interest to see the lessons which were being learned in the white heat of actual combat experience. The fact which is most striking is the close integration of forces in land, sea, and air. None can exist without the other. At General MacArthur's headquarters, land, sea, and air are separate entities under general headquarters. In Admiral Halsey's theater, Army, Navy, and Marine officers are so intermingled that it is difficult to know to what service a man belongs. One outfit in this theater is commanded by a major general of the Army with a captain in the Navy as chief of staff, and a Marine Corps colonel as operations officer. All three, it should be noted, are flyers. Senior officers of both the Army and the Navy are deeply impressed with the need for unity of the services when our new military policy is framed. There is a surprising amount of sentiment among these older men for a single department of war, with autonomous land, sea, and air services coordinated at the top by a joint staff, with each branch free to pursue its own personnel and matériel policies. There is a strong feeling that it would be unwise to build up a large Reserve Corps in our Air Force because of the necessity of having such a large number of men between the ages of 18 and 25 in this particular arm. It is thought that a college training program which keeps a man in the Air Force until the age of 25 would assure us a steady supply of youthful flyers. There is also much talk about having the same commissioned officers' insignia for all men who fight for the United States.

Sixth. Perhaps one of the most striking physical phenomena to a modern world traveler are the huge airfields which have been constructed with American money and American labor, at the farthest corners of the earth. Most of these have not been constructed in territory belonging to the United States, and military secrecy forbids my stating just where they are. Estimates of the amounts expended on these airfields run as high as $500,000,000. So far as I could learn we have no post-war rights of access to any of them. We do not seek dominance; we abhor imperialistic domination over native people; all we want is an even break. But in the islands of the Pacific and in other places there are many points which are essential to the military security of our country in this new air age. As we conquer the island possessions of Japan there will be more. We want no dominance over other peoples or races. The places I have in mind can be secured for us without violation of this principle, because they are all so sparsely populated. I should not say can be secured for us. We will secure them in this war, because that is an American theater. American blood has been shed to get these places. American boys are buried there now. Some of these places must remain in American hands. I devoutly hope for effective international cooperation to keep the peace. I shall do everything I can to that end. We cannot, however, assume that this relieves us of the responsibility of maintaining an adequate, a model, and a forward-looking military establishment.

Seventh. The question of international communications is of the first importance. There are large areas of the world where our British allies have complete control of the cable system. I do not know how many of our higher commanders overseas spoke to me on the need for parity in this matter and suggested that it seems like a fitting subject for reverse lend-lease. I talked with high British officials about it, and was pleased to find that they thought it was definitely a subject for negotiation.

Eighth. I now come to a topic of great delicacy but of such importance to the American people that, having seen some of the sad sights I have seen, I feel I must mention it. I refer to the questions raised by Russia's relation with Japan. Certainly all of us who have admired the courage of the Russian people in fighting a dangerous enemy to the death can understand her unwillingness to open a war on other fronts. Certainly no one is more deeply interested than the parents of our American boys in the success of Russian arms over Germany. But it is also true that the whole character of the Pacific war would change if the United States had access to the Pacific coastal area of Russia. For reasons of security I shall not say how many American lives would be spared if we receive this aid. I can say that it is a major factor in the whole Pacific picture. It is one of the biggest military facts staring us in the face.

Ninth. Wherever we went we found a demand for a definite policy of relieving men overseas after they have served a certain length of time. In some of our smaller islands and in certain Air Force units such a policy exists already. There is no doubt that after a man spends a certain amount of time in an overseas theater his efficiency decreases. Shipping problems and the danger of submarine attack have made it impracticable to send men home. I hope that as the situation improves a dependable policy for the relief of troops overseas can be worked out.

Before I close I wish to pay my tribute to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of our group. He was always considerate and courteous, made a most intelligent contribution to our work, and on many occasions represented the Senate with dignity and force. The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] worked indefatigably in the performance of his labors for the Truman committee, and was serene, fair, and genial under all circumstances. My colleague of the Military Affairs Committee, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], with his interest in military matters, brought his cheer and personality to American boys in camps and hospitals and made many friends wherever he went. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] expended his apparently inexhaustible energy and used his quick discerning mind to gather information which will be of great value to the Senate. They were all delightful traveling companions and I look back on my fellowship with them with lasting satisfaction.

Mr. President, it is a matter of interest to the Senate, I think, to be told that one of our former Members, Senator Gibson, of Vermont, is a lieutenant colonel in the Army. I saw him in New Georgia. He had been struck in the head by a shell fragment, and if it had gone a little bit farther he would have been killed. As it was he escaped with a scar.

I saw the brother of our friend the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who is in the Army.

I also saw the brother of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

One word with respect to the work which women have done in the war theater. It has a priceless value. The Red Cross workers have done more for the happiness and good spirits of our soldiers than I can describe. They endure the heat and dust of Africa and the cold of Iceland. They work long hours and are always cheerful. The accomplishment of our Army and Navy nurses should always be remembered. They have saved many lives and unselfishly and tirelessly perform their errands of mercy.

I also saw certain colored units which had rendered conspicuously distinguished service. I hope that some time the names of these units will be published.

In a voyage of this rapidity and magnitude, impressions are so numerous and so various that it might seem hard to single out any one impression as the major one. My most lasting impressions were formed in the field and in the hospitals, where I saw the kind of boy America produces.

I think of one boy in Sicily whose back was broken and who had just been placed in a plaster cast which reached up over his chin. Steel clamps were in his skull in order to exert traction on his spinal column. He was destined to lie this way for 6 months and then his recovery was not sure, but when I spoke to that boy he answered me with a joke. I think of another one whose face was horribly burned—there are a great many horrible burns in this gasoline war—whose eyelids had to be lifted up for him by a nurse and who only had a hole for a mouth. But out of that hole came the strong voice of courage.

I think of a Lieutenant Miller, of Alabama, who was washed up on a beach in the South Seas. He felt so weak from the explosion of the ship he had been

on that he could hold nothing in his stomach, and thought he was going to die. So he took off his shoes and gave them and his equipment to brother officers, thinking that they might need them to save their own lives. He lay down on the beach. In the morning he drank some rain water and he found he could hold it in his stomach. He concluded he was not going to die. He stripped a Japanese corpse that was washed up on the beach and, gathering some Japanese hand grenades, made a camp for himself in some thick bushes on the island. When a Japanese party sought him out he destroyed them with the grenades and armed himself with their pistols. After 42 days he was found, but declined to leave the island until his captured Japanese documents, which he felt were necessary for the Naval Intelligence, as well as the weapons, had been safely removed. That is the kind of boy I think of.

I think of Lt. Jack Kennedy, of Massachusetts, son of our former Ambassador to Great Britain, whose PT boat was cut in two by a destroyer, who drifted for 18 hours on the hull, and finally reached a small island. Every night that young man would swim out to the channel, and, supported by his life preserver, would signal with a flashlight all through the night to attract the attention of an American boat. He finally succeeded in doing so; and thus, by means of his brave conduct, the other members of his crew were rescued.

I think of a gunner in a B–24, a boy from Pennsylvania, whom I saw in Port Moresby. His whole right side was a mass of gunshot wounds. He had been wounded at 3 o'clock in the afternoon. I saw him at 10 o'clock the next morning. He had lost his right eye. We know what happens to a man in civilian life who loses an eye. He is seriously weakened, if not prostrated in both mind and spirit. But when I spoke to that boy, his voice came back as strong as mine is now, and he said, "The thing that bothers me is that they probably won't let me fly any more"

I think of Lionel Pelletier, of Fall River, who was a member of the crew of a plane from Iceland which came down in Greenland, and of all the places in the World, Greenland is the most appalling one. He was the only boy in the party who did not drink salt water, and he was the only one who lived. The crew escaped in a rubber boat. Of the eight members of the crew, seven died. He was found with one dead body which he had been too weak to throw overboard. Because of his self-discipline and his self-control, he survived. When I saw him at the hospital he had complete mental and emotional self-control—an astonishing thing, considering what he had gone through.

I think of Bernt Balchen, a great aviator, who went up in a plane and made a search for the crew of another plane which had been forced down on the Greenland ice cap. When he finally located them, they were in a very remote spot, and it was obvious that immediate rescue was necessary if their lives were to be saved. At that time Bernt Balchen was flying a seaplane. The only place where he could possibly land was in a slight depression in the ice cap where the ice had melted just enough to form a thin film of water. Of course, any aviator would realize that in landing in such a spot the chances were that the plane would crash and possibly the aviator would be killed and, furthermore, even if a successful landing could be made, it was obvious that there was only the slightest chance of being able to take off again from such a small area of melted ice. Nevertheless, without hesitation, he landed his seaplane there, and kept circling it on the surface of the water so that the plane would not stick in the slush ice which lay immediately below the few inches of water. Each time he went past the group of marooned men he reached over the side of his plane and pulled in one of them. Only his extraordinary strength enabled him to perform the feat of pulling into his plane, while it was in motion, men who were so weakened that they could not help themselves. One by one, he pulled all of them into his plane, and, by the exercise of his great skill, was able to lift the plane off the water, and fly the men back to the base.

I think of a party of newspapermen whose plane crashed in Burma, leaving a number of them severely injured, and I think of the Army doctor, Colonel Flickinger, of California, who, with two Medical Corps enlisted men, took off in a plane, flew over the spot where the other plane had crashed, and parachuted down, in order to take care of the men who had been injured.

I could speak of many other instances of similiar heroic conduct.

How can one explain such bravery? Those boys do not die with any slogans on their lips, the way the Japs and Nazis do. They are freemen who do not need any infusion of political oratory. They fight and die so superbly for something much deeper than any catchwords. Their courage springs from individual self-respect; and it can occur only in a country where the individual is the master of his Government. It is far more powerful than any urge instilled by propaganda. A country which produces individuals of that type is indeed worthy of a mighty struggle. Today those boys do not take America for granted. When they come home they will have as much civic consciousness as any other group of citizens we have ever had. They will never again be apathetic about their country. War is horrible, but war also brings out heroism and bravery which are magnificent. We can see the justification of the United States in the men it sends into battle. Their conduct is a peremptory command to us to leave no stone unturned in order to be worthy of their sacrifice. [Applause.]

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I deem it a rare honor that I have had the opportunity to yield the floor to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I have not heard in the Senate any address more inspiring, more important, and more valuable to us than the one which just now was delivered by the Senator from Massachusetts, and I hope we shall have an opportunity in the reasonably near future to hear from the other Senators who were on the same trip.

I have sent to the desk a resolution which I should like to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 182) authorizing the Committees on Naval Affairs and Military Affairs to hold joint hearings with respect to the use and effect of Allied air power against Germany and Japan, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committees on Naval Affairs and Military Affairs are authorized and directed to meet in a joint session or sessions and to hold hearings as quickly as possible to investigate, and to determine and report back to the Senate as rapidly as possible upon, the following questions:

(1) What is the present and potential airpower production of the Allied and Axis Nations?

(2) To what extent does the continued building of a larger land army tend to curtail the production of aircraft and their supplies and auxiliaries?

(3) How much airplane bombing will be required to destroy the cities, railroads, utilities, and production centers of Germany and Japan?

(4) How long would it probably take with whatever bombers are available to force the surrender of Germany?

(5) What will be the effect upon our present and potential injury to Germany by air power if new combat areas are opened and large invasions of Europe are begun by the Allied forces?

(6) What will probably be the Allied casualties if Germany is conquered by air power, and what will probably be the casualties if there is a further invasion of the European continent and the actual destruction of the German Army and fortresses?

The Committees on Naval and Military Affairs of the House of Representatives are hereby invited to attend and participate in such hearings. At the hearings the committees shall call for advice and information from such governmental officials and military experts as they shall deem advisable and shall request the advice and judgment of General Arnold and General Kennedy, if it is possible to have their presence without injury to our war effort; and if they are unable to be present, then the committees shall secure the appearance of such senior air-power officers as may be available. So far as possible the hearings shall be open and only if it clearly appears that the publication of any information would be opposed to public interest shall it be considered confidential.

Upon the passage of this resolution, the bill S. 763 shall be laid aside and shall be made a special order of business for further consideration by the Senate at noon of the second calendar day upon which the Senate is in session after a report has been made pursuant to this resolution. The author of the bill S. 763 shall be invited to attend and participate in any meetings or hearings held pursuant to this resolution.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, it is my intention a little later to request the unanimous consent of the Senate that I may submit the resolution, have it immediately considered, and agreed to by unanimous consent. If that can be accomplished I shall not at this time place in the RECORD the additional material which I think it is necessary to have in order to have an understanding of the problem, but I shall await an opportunity to present the material to the committee which would be formed pursuant to the resolution.

I feel most fortunate in seeing in the Chamber at this time the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs; the distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs; our distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]; and the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who has been very active as an opponent of the pending bill. I am led to be encouraged, by what the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts said last night, to believe that it may be possible to secure unanimous consent for consideration and adoption of the resolution.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 881. An act to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938; and

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, yesterday during the course of the debate I placed in the RECORD certain figures showing the comparative productivity of the people of the United States with that of the other Allied Nations and Axis Nations. I showed our war expenditures compared with those of other nations, I showed our increased public debt in proportion to that of other nations. As I stated at that time, I have no desire to criticize or derogate the efforts of any of our allies; I believe that both Britain and Russia are doughty and worthy allies, and I have no criticism of them; but the material I placed in the RECORD was merely in answer to American leaders who repeatedly criticize and derogate the efforts of the Americans themselves. I said that Mr. Mitchell, head of the Labor Division of the War Department, had made a statement which was grossly inaccurate and unfair, and it was in response to this and many other similar statements, that I was placing the figures in the RECORD.

The quotation is a follows:

James P. Mitchell, director of the Army's industrial personnel division, asserted that a national service law is "badly needed" if labor supply is to match labor demand for war purposes.

"The American people are not mobilized for war," Mitchell said, defending the War Department's persistent advocacy of a compulsory labor draft.

"A far smaller proportion of our population of working age is either at work or in the armed forces than in any other major nation at war. We have hardly touched the vast reserve of potential war workers in nonmanufacturing construction, trade, and services, or in agriculture, which has increased its employment."

Mr. President, I categorically say that that statement is inaccurate and incorrect, and I challenge the man who made it to present to the Senate of the United States any specific figure upon which he claims it to have been based.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure that every one appreciates the fairness of the able Senator from California in the comment he has made as to the purpose of putting figures in the RECORD showing the amount of our debt, and our expenditures in this war so far as compared to the expenditures, for example, of Britain and Russia. Of course, the Senator with his customary fairness would be one of the first to admit that if we are to establish a balance sheet of total sacrifice in the war it would be impossible to leave out the number of lives our allies have contributed thus far to the common struggle.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for that comment.

I desire to say now that in order to be able to present the material I have and to complete my speech I shall be unwilling to yield any further for comments and questions unless any Senator believes that some statement of fact I am making is incorrect, in which case I shall be anxious to have a rectification made.

I wish to reply to the Senator from Florida in this respect, that there is only one of the Allied Nations that has suffered any considerable loss of men. That is Russia. In my figures I did not compare the productivity of the people of the United States with that of the Russian people, which would manifestly be unfair. No other nation amongst the Allies has suffered any great loss. As a matter of fact 80 to 90 percent of the losses of the Allies have been sustained by the Russian people, and a negligible amount by the Americans and by the British, terrible as those losses are to us and to the homes which have been devastated by the men who have left them forever.

Mr. President, yesterday I argued that we should not draft fathers because there yet remained a sufficient number of qualified single men available for the proposed increase of our Army who could be taken without injury to our production, and I contended that in no event should we further increase our armed forces under present conditions because there is little reasonable chance we will ever be able to use the major portion of our present land forces; that the continued recruitment for the army tends to take away critically needed material and men from the production of our aircraft; that in our fighters and bombers we have a supremely cheap and supremely effective instrument of war which can force the surrender of Germany with little loss of American life and with no further injury to Europe outside of Germany.

I made the statement that Mr. Churchill recently stated in Parliament that Allied plane superiority over Germany is presently at 4 to 1; that Germany continues to weaken while we grow stronger, and that if such conditions continue they will present the possibility of methodical destruction of every building in Germany by air bombing with small losses to the Allies.

English Air Marshal Bomber Chief Harris was quoted to the effect that sufficient bombing of Germany would take her out of the war within a few months, and yesterday I placed in the RECORD the latest release from Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, showing our huge and accelerated aircraft production, and I then stated that I had secured authoritative confidential governmental data on our fighter and bomber production and that we presently and potentially have ample aircraft for the Japanese war and enough beyond that to assure the destruction or surrender of Germany by concentrated air bombing within less than 6 months. I asserted that, so far as I could ascertain, every air-power expert was in agreement with my opinion that Germany could be fatally stricken within a few months by continued and concentrated air bombing and that a large invasion of Europe was totally unnecessary and unjustified and might waste and sacrifice millions of British and American soldiers with colossal injury and destruction in the European countries in which the land engagements might be fought.

I also referred to a spokesman who explained that his reference to deteriorating German air power applied only to Nazi fighter planes, since the Germans' bombing always was poor, bearing as much relation to proper use of air power as a chariot to a tank. He said the Germans made their major effort in the air over Italy before the Allied invasion, when the Nazis concentrated fighters along the Naples-Foggia line, but our air strength overwhelmed them.

Mr. President, with Nazi air power thus failing, if our bombers are now concentrated over Germany, how long can she resist? We have presently a 4 to 1 superiority, our production is rapidly increasing, the number of Hitler's airplanes is constantly decreasing. Can such a combination of causes result other than

in the quick surrender or destruction of the German Nation? Apparently it cannot if our high command can be brought to see that in our air power we have a supremely effective and supremely cheap instrument of overwhelming force.

Constantly now, over the German people hangs the fear and threat of terrifying, destructive bombing—no comfort, no hope any longer in the blue sky of a summer day or the starry silence of a summer night. Only the dread of fearful sudden death—of mighty monsters roaring overhead.

Hamburg, the second largest city of Germany with a population of over a million—about the size of Detroit—and almost its equal in manufacturing production—lies today a scarred and broken monument to the destructive power of the R. A. F. and American bombers which passed like a cloud of death over her people in four raids between July 24 and August 2, leaving behind them a burning, bleeding wreck of a once mighty city. In her shipyards the *Leviathan* and *Bismarck* had been built. Brahms and the great Jewish composer, Mendelssohn, were born there and it was one of the foremost centers of music, culture, and architecture that the world has known.

A realistic comprehension of the potentialities of aircraft as a weapon of war may be gained by reading an article in the Washington Post of September 20 by Henry B. Jameson, Associated Press staff writer, dated at London, Monday, September 2, headlined "R. A. F. says 77 percent of Hamburg lies in ruins." The article is as follows:

Seventy-seven percent of sprawling Hamburg, formerly Germany's second largest city and chief port, lies in ruins as a grim and smouldering example of what is in store for Berlin and other cities when allied air power cuts loose in its full and awful fury.

The full story of the unprecedented devastation produced in the one-time industrial center by 4 R. A. F. and 2 American Flying Fortress raids between July 24 and August 2 at a cost of 87 bombers was disclosed by an R. A. F. commentator today after weeks of study of photographs and intelligence reports.

They show the once flourishing city of 1,800,000 population has, for the time being at least, almost ceased to exist.

Altogether between 5,000 and 6,000 acres—about 9 square miles—were devastated.

That is nearly 100 times Coventry's similarly damaged area, and nearly 60 times greater than the principal area of devastation in London (105 acres) at the peak of the German aerial attack to knock Britain from the war in 1940.

The "built up" area of Hamburg which was destroyed includes the city proper and its suburbs.

The R. A. F. dropped approximately 7,000 long tons (7,840 United States tons) of bombs on Hamburg, but the additional tonnage dumped by the Fortresses has not been revealed.

In their biggest raid on Coventry 400 German planes dropped 450 tons in 9 hours—a rate of almost a ton per minute.

In the last big raid on Hamburg the R. A. F. dropped 2,350 long tons in 45 minutes—a rate of more than 50 tons per minute, or more than 50 times the intensity of the largest Coventry raid.

The Hamburg photographs reveal an almost uniform expanse of gutted buildings. Fire swept through street after street for miles, particularly in commercial and port areas, destroying everything.

Light patches measuring up to 125 yards across dot the city, where big block busters leveled even big steel-and-concrete buildings.

The official damage list, which scrupulously includes hospitals, churches, and other institutions which could not escape the holocaust, includes as "almost entirely destroyed" 8 shipbuilding yards, 3 oil works, 6 nonferrous metal works, 20 armament and steel works, 11 chemical works, 8 textile plants, 21 foodstuff plants, 31 miscellaneous factories, 16 gas and electric plants, 14 administrative buildings of a large Army camp, 419 warehouses, the city's main railroad station, and 5 suburban stations.

Mr. President, a spectator horrified at the ruin and wreck of a once great city might well say with William Blake—

I travel'd through a land of men,
A land of men and women, too;
And heard and saw such dreadful things
As cold earth wanderers never knew.

The waste and ruin of one of the Reich's greatest cities was accomplished by a few thousand young men in a few hours of battle. Any allied military commander would have been willing to sacrifice 10 or 20 divisions to raze a port and production center like Hamburg, but in this raid only 87 bombers were lost. Yet, though our military leaders must know that we in the United States have the capacity for producing aircraft beyond that of all the rest of the world combined, we burden our production and waste our manpower in building and maintaining great land forces whose futility will be constantly more apparent as time passes on and airpower steadily accumulates.

The science of aerial warfare is probably still in its pioneering stages. Yet one important principle already has been developed by American flyers. I refer now to our precision bombing by virtue of which in daylight raids we can drop a great weight of bombs onto definite targets. Precision bombing stands in contrast to the R. A. F. saturation or area bombing. German sleep, courage, and morale are now under the strain of raids which extend over both day and night. In the darkness the roar of the R. A. F. is heard and the explosion of bombs devastating impartially great areas of the metropolitan districts. In the light of day, our Liberators and Flying Fortresses rush through the skies, dropping their earth-shaking explosives on submarine yards, railroad centers, factories, dams, bridges, and military installations. Air experts universally accord to complementary day and night attack an effect so destructive and gigantic that no nation can long endure it.

We have considered the case of Hamburg, which crumbled under the combined blows of English and American flyers. Let us look now upon the ruinous effects of American precision bombing as it strikes directly at the production centers, the utilities, and the transportation of an enemy country. The Office of War Information has sent me a description of the results of American precision bombing. I think it will be found interesting and I believe it will be agreed that no nation long subjected to such bombing can long continue to wage a total war.

Not yet half of the 60 cities of the old Reich with 100,000 and more inhabitants have been bombed severely and only a few were subject to "saturation" raids (like Hamburg and cities in the Ruhr district).

DIRECT RESULTS

Direct results differ according to the type of raid, either daylight precison or night mass bombing.

Examples of daylight precision bombing are the raid of the Moehne Dam on May 17, the attack on the rubber factory of Huels on June 27, and the Ploesti raid of August 1.

The bombing of Huels eliminated a considerable part of Germany's synthetic rubber production. The raid on Ploesti destroyed oil refineries which supplied the German Air Force with large amounts of high-octane gasoline. The bombing of the Moehne Dam had far-reaching effects on the entire area between Essen and Hamm. Blast furnaces in the vicinity of Dortmund were flooded and destroyed, coal dumps were set afire, pit heads blocked, railway tracks carried away, tunnels obstructed, and highways destroyed. The consequences for the water economy of the whole area will be felt for months: Water regulation on rivers and canals as well as water supply for industry and homes are badly disorganized.

The consequences of night mass bombings are more widely felt. It is the concentration of raids on a particular area which creates most havoc. Each additional raid adds to the disorganization of air-raid protection, repair, and salvage work.

The Ruhr district presents an ideal target for this type of bombing. There, over two-thirds of Germany's total output of certain basic materials are produced (67 percent of hard coal, 80 percent of coke, 60 percent of pig iron, 59 percent of steel ingots and castings, 60 percent of special steels).

No detailed reports on the amount of damage done to this area are, of course, available. According to reliable sources the steel output of the Ruhr at the end of May was only 65 percent of the scheduled output.

INDIRECT RESULTS

Even more important than the direct results are the indirect consequences of bombing. They affect almost every way of German life.

Most obvious is the diversion of German military strength: hundreds of fighter planes, thousands of antiaircraft guns, hundreds of thousands of soldiers must be kept in the Reich for air-raid defense. Such diversion is of great help to the Russians and in the Mediterranean area.

No less spectacular are the consequences in the economic field. Bombing is internal blockade with all its far-reaching effects.

The lack of manpower, Germany's most serious deficiency, is severely aggravated. Hundreds of thousands are kept busy with A. R. P. services, salvage, and repair work. In addition, the nervous strain caused by repeated bombing greatly affects the working efficiency of workers and employees.

Another consequence of mass raids is economic and administrative disorganization. Germany's total war economy is so highly complicated that obstruction of one part results in frictions on the whole. Mass raids like those on the Ruhr and Hamburg districts impair the entire system of civilian supplies and services resulting in disorganization of rationing, serious break-downs in all public services, destruction of records and documents in public and private offices, as well as disrupting the monetary system of the country (more cash is needed, less taxes are paid).

Evacuation and evacuees spread these difficulties over the whole of the Reich. Exact figures of the total number of evacuees are unavailable. Estimates oscillate between 1,250,000 and 4,000,000. Housing and food problems in evacuation areas are aggravated by the wild flight of people trying to escape from air danger, government controls, and regimentation of evacuees. Where to send these millions becomes more and more difficult. Recently evacuees were sent into Polish areas and temporarily housed in camps formerly occupied by Jews. Our advance into Italy will more and more restrict areas in Germany which can be considered safe.

EFFECTS ON MORALE

Last but not least the effects of bombing on general morale do not concern only the bombed areas, but also the threatened districts. Sometimes the fear of bombing is worse than the bombing itself. In addition, there are indirect results of bombing which are often overlooked. Bombing affects not only the morale of the home front, but also that of the fighting fronts. The German soldier no longer can maintain the illusion that by his fighting he can protect his home. The German industrialist may escape bombings, but must worry constantly that his capital assets may be destroyed at any time. Thus, for the first time, the German industrialists feel the horrors of war.

Evacuation from bombed districts into Austria has done much to alienate Austrians and Germans.

The Germans know well that they now receive what they gave to the British. There is a word going around in Germany: "Hitler has started the total war, but the Allies carry it out."

Mr. President, one of the latest articles considering the possibility of defeating Germany by air power alone is in the Reader's Digest for October, written by Francis Vivian Drake, a veteran fighter pilot of World War No. 1, authoritative spokesman for air power in World War No. 2, author of The Air Plan and Vertical Warfare. This short article which I am about to read is entitled "Smash the Luftwaffe and End the War":

[From the Reader's Digest]

SMASH THE LUFTWAFFE AND END THE WAR!

(By Francis Vivian Drake)

The Nazis' loss of fighter planes on all fronts has lately been averaging a minimum of 700 and 800 per month which is roughly equal to their rate of fighter production. If this loss rate remains constant, the Luftwaffe will be breaking even. If, on the other hand, the Allies should step up their air offensive to a point where they were destroying 1,200 or more of the German fighters monthly, the Luftwaffe would literally sink out of sight within 90 days for lack of planes and pilots.

With the Luftwaffe annihilated Germany would be deprived of any practical means of preventing every city in the Reich from suffering the fate of Hamburg.

I should like to say to the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] that many of these heroic young men who are now saving the world come from the great State of Texas. I am not surprised. Texas has always produced virile men. She has produced great football teams. She has produced magnificent fliers, almost unrivaled in the world. The fliers from the southern part of the United States are of extraordinary efficiency and valor. Let me say to the Senator that I am reading an article by one of the great air experts of the world. His statements are consistent with those of every other expert. He says that within 90 days these gallant, heroic men could end the whole titanic conflict with the loss of a few thousand lives, saving millions of casualties.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator for his generous comment with respect to the young men from my State. Without making any invidious comparisons, I may suggest at this time that both before the actual outbreak of the war, while we were in preparation for it, and since the war began, there has been a greater percentage of men from Texas in the armed forces than from any other State in the Union.

Speaking of aircraft, and the training of men for the air service, I wish to suggest to the Senator from California that in Texas we have greater aviation training facilities for the Navy than are located in any other part of the world, and that each year the magnificent training institution at Corpus Christi, Tex., is training thousands of capable flyers. The State is dotted all over with aviation training camps for the Army. Speaking of aviation, I have no doubt that Texas is providing not only from its own sons but from the sons of other sections of the entire United States, the great bulk of the pilots and the daring spirits who will carry on the kind of war which the Senator has been so eloquently advocating.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am very happy to have that comment from the distinguished Senator from Texas. He may justly take great pride in what he has stated.

I will make a further comment which may be of interest to the Senator. In the State of Texas there is located a naval aviation school which is training personnel of the highest quality. Our Navy alone has aircraft exceeding 18,000 in number. The aircraft of our Navy are now rated at approximately twice the efficiency and fighting power of that of the entire Japanese Navy.

I continue to read from Mr. Drake's article:

Such is the magnificent opportunity now within our grasp—if only we would concentrate the bulk of our big fighting bombers at once against Germany, instead of scattering them over so many fronts. The public is inclined to believe that they are already concentrated, that a decisive air offensive is already under way. This is not true. We are still withholding bombers already produced; we are still hitting Germany with only one-third to one-fifth the power available and necessary.

If a real attack were made, the German General Staff would be up against a problem unprecedented in history. It would have to decide whether to "stick it out" until industrial Germany had become one horrifying ruin, or to surrender immediately and save what it could of Germany's working assets—upon which depend all Germany's hopes for post-war recovery.

A variety of facts support the case for concentrating our bombers and stepping up air war against Nazi targets now. As the intensity of Allied strategic bombing has risen, the percentage of Luftwaffe losses has increased. Furthermore, Luftwaffe replacement power is being undermined by American precision bombing of Nazi aircraft production and repair centers.

The commanding officer of an American bomber station in England recently estimated that our Flying Fortresses alone had "knocked out plants producing 50 to 75 percent of the FW-190 fighters." Since then the Me-109 fighter plants at Wiener-Neustadt and Regensburg have been blasted. Imagine what might have happened during the Blitz of Britain if the Luftwaffe had extinguished even 50 percent of the Spitfire and Hurricane production.

The Luftwaffe's strength in combat planes and combat reserve is today reduced to 5,000 from 6,000 peak of 1941; while its general reserve, once 3,000, is known to have melted away.

No doubt about it, the Luftwaffe is in pretty bad shape; now, if ever, is our golden chance to knock it out of the skies. If our hard-pressing airmen can be reinforced at once, they will seal the fate of Germany as inevitably as they sealed the fate of north Africa and Sicily when they eradicated German air power in those theaters.

The trouble is that the British bombing offensive is still less than half the size considered necessary to make it decisive—but their production of big bombers is not sufficient to permit any increase. In the United States we are turning out more than enough big four-engined bombers to do the job, but these bombers are still being squandered in heroic but relatively small-scale attacks all over the map, instead of being massed for repeated and overwhelming raids on the industrial heart of our German enemy. For instance, the number of American precision bombers sent on each European mission this summer (between 200 and 300) has been only one-third the number needed—and potentially available—both to smash ground objectives most effectively and exterminate Luftwaffe fighters in the process.

Even as it is, our Fortresses and Liberators have made the Luftwaffe pay a bitter price for every attempt to resist them. Here is their box score over northwestern Europe alone for the first 7 months of 1943:

	United States bombers lost	Nazi fighters destroyed
January	14	22
February	17	47
March	16	141
April	27	148
May	69	348
June	80	321
July	108	500
Total	331	1,527

(This table does not include 1,206 fighters "probably" destroyed or damaged, nor any shot down by the 331 bombers lost, which are believed to have accounted for at least 1 or 2 enemy planes apiece.)

As a result of their losses in the British-American bombing offensive, the Germans have been forced to switch their production priorities to fighter planes. And this is very significant, because it indicates that, for the time being at least, Germany has been obliged to abandon plans for any heavy aerial offensives. At this critical stage of the war, such a defensive policy is a policy of desperation.

That is why American and British airmen are impatient to exploit their present terrific opportunity.

Mr. President, Mr. Drake is confident that we possess the air power, if we would but use it, to rapidly force the surrender or destruction of Germany. He is not so confident of the intention of our generals

to employ our bombers for that purpose. Had he been present at recent hearings of the Military Affairs Committee on the pending measure, his hopes would not have been increased. We turn now to another writer who is entirely optimistic both about our power to destroy Germany and about the purpose and will of our high command to accomplish that end. The writer to whom I now refer is W. B. Courtney, speaking by radio from London, in the Collier's magazine of September 25. While all of Mr. Courtney's article is most valuable and interesting, I shall quote only limited excerpts:

[From Collier's of September 25, 1943]

THE DESTRUCTION OF GERMANY

(By W. B. Courtney)

You will shudder many times in the days just ahead, though you may be safe at home thousands of miles away. The inability of your eyes to see or your ears to hear across the Atlantic will not exempt your sensibilities from sickening thunders and visions.

You will behold the sad and horrifying but wholly justifiable and inescapable tragedy of a great, modern nation being literally crumbled upon the face of the planet, and the sins of vicious men being scoured from their land by its rubble. Rome will be repeated a hundredfold and London a thousandfold in the cities of the Reich.

Air bombardment will so pulverize Germany in the next 6 months that a generation of diligent rebuilding will scarcely restore her. The sum total of all the world's earthquakes of recorded times concentrated upon the Fatherland couldn't raze and burn and convulse it more thoroughly.

This is the definite, measurable, terrible promise now given by allied air power as it grows swiftly toward full strength. Merely routine work remains to be done in cooperating the bombers of the R. A. F. and the Eighth United States Air Force, aided by their fighter and tactical commands, backed by the workers and the resources of our aviation industry.

Such a triumph has been quickened by a victory within victories, the vindication of daylight precision bombing which is America's greatest single contribution to the application of air force upon our enemies. This victory has been won by the Eighth United States Air Force, not over Germans, Japs or Italians, but against the home front critics of our equipment, leadership, and methods.

A HOME-FRONT VICTORY

Fighting airmen here believe that when the post-war summing up takes place, the winning of American and British faith to our Air Corps' long-cherished theory of daylight precision bombing will loom as the initial major achievement of Maj. Gen. Ira C. Eaker and his combat kids.

Just a year ago four-engined Yank-built and Yank-operated "heavies" first opened their bomb hatches over the Nazi-infested continent. They were planes of the Eighth Air Force, which is the aviation section of ETOUSA—that European Theater of Operations, United States Army. It was a very small air force then. It has grown impressively—from 12-plane jabs to 300-plane haymakers. In its first year the Eighth spewed almost 16,000 tons of explosives upon more than 100 targets, brushed 1,728 enemy fighters from the skies and damaged about 900 more, carried out 82 attacks in the full light of day. But even as you read this the Eighth will be sluicing as many bombs over Germany in a single month as it did all last year.

At any rate the Eighth—having won its two-edged victory—now flies and fights as it was designed, trained, and meant to fight; independently, precisely, and by day.

The story behind this great war drama you are now watching—the biggest air show of all time—goes back to the last war. The astonishing growth of the flight arm within the space of that one conflict, plus the development of aeronautical science in the historic post-war decade, enlivened by Billy Mitchell and climaxed by Lindbergh, made it apparent to all except die-hard land-and-sea-bound militarists that air power would be decisive next time.

On the professional military side, pressure to absorb its forces seems to be something the United States must always expect in one form or another from international allies. You will recall Pershing's fight to preserve the integrity of the A. E. F. as a strictly American undertaking. The Eighth Air Force had a comparable fight against a few British and Americans who thought it should abandon its independent daylight existence and join its personnel, equipment, and production to the R. A. F.'s

On the lay side, the English public had good reason for lacking faith in the daylight technique of their new allies. Just 3 years ago the English people watched the daylight bombers of the Luftwaffe hosed from the skies over Kent and Surrey by English fighters until the survivors were glad to scurry back to the continent with their rudders between their wheels.

However, such authoritative English leaders as Air Chief Marshals Portal and Harris saw the different values of the American theory of daylight precision bombing and perceived at once a war chance that's little short of providential. That is the manner in which daylight precision or spot bombing and night area or saturation bombing complement, fill out and complete each other.

That both types of bombing should be available to our side, making possible a round-the-clock 24-hour-a-day thrashing of our common enemies, is the most felicitous discovery within Allied power in this war. It is literally a miraculous gift of heaven that guarantees victory.

The third cause of delay was that the Eighth, after slowly gathering its strength over half a year, was robbed for north Africa. Thenceforth, the Eighth was really acting in support of the north African expedition, a matter hitherto unrevealed. In bombing U-boat nests, it was protecting the flank of great convoys to Africa. That those convoys had no losses from U-boat action was due in large measure to the shellacking of the submarine pens by the Eighth.

Latest figures show about 6 German fighters destroyed for every 4-engined Yank. Merely as figures, these are not in our favor. In crews they mean 9 or 10 American specialists downed for every 6 German pilots. In money, the Germans can probably build 20 of their fighters for the price of 1 Fortress.

However, the overwhelming strength of American production redressed the balance in our favor. American industry works without fear of bombs. German industry struggles under the handicaps of a disorganized nation, constant raid interruptions, the killing of workmen. It is likely that for every German pilot dead in combat, scores of skilled aviation workers are killed in raids. So Germany cannot afford her losses, whereas we could afford 10 times as many as we have. The Luftwaffe is compelled to come up and meet the American heavies, for home morale, if for nothing else. Our crews say they do so with courage and resolution.

The Luftwaffe is trapped by the law of diminishing returns, with a battered home front that cannot keep up with its losses. This is the reason Allied casualties have been diminishing. So pressed is the Luftwaffe that its black-painted and thinly armored night fighters now go up with the sturdier day fighters against the Eighth.

Yet it is not the virtues of American heavies fighting alone, but the cooperation with the night-flying R. A. F. that counts most. In a sense they are like two knight-doctors working on Hitler's fetid dragon. The R. A. F. the anesthetist that slugs the body into unconsciousness and paralyzes it. Then the Eighth comes along and with surgical precision cuts off the limbs and extracts the poison fangs.

The R. A. F. does not bomb in formation. Every plane shifts for itself over the target. In their hundreds they confuse and spread the defenses, burn and crush and devastate the whole military or industrial area in hour-long earthquakes.

The Eighth Air Force bombs in formation, all letting go at the same instant at specific things like docks, small factories, airplane plants, hangars, utilities—targets too circumscribed to be found at night. A formation of say 100 Yank heavies will lay all its bombs from 30,000 feet by this method within a circle, the diameter of which is about the length of three football fields. The roar, the jar, the terror of hundreds of tons of heavy explosives going off in a single cataclysm in a space not much larger than the Yankee Stadium is for you to imagine.

The R. A. F. is still dropping three or four times as many bomb-tons as the Eighth. The Eighth will catch up. But the present difference in tonnage is evened by the exactness, the intense focusing of the Americans' smaller deliveries. The R. A. F., for instance, could not have done the Rome job nor the Eighth that at Remscheid.

For the first time in the history of air power, a complementary bombing was done on a mature scale upon the late city of Hamburg. That erstwhile greatest seaport of the Reich was the sixteenth largest city in the world, exceeded in size by only 3 American cities and second to Berlin in population. The late Essen was in the first 75 of the earth's greatest cities.

The ordeals of Hamburg and Essen are over for this war. Their lines in the atlas are blank. Soon I think we can refer to the late Berlin—or Hanover or Bremen or Frankfort or Leipzig. Today there's surplus evidence—from aerial reconnaissance photos, from intelligence sources, and from the "Rhine whine" seeping to neutrals—that human existence as we've known it is now utterly impossible when air force in great proportions is applied round the clock. If men continue to live in German cities listed on the allied master plan for destruction they will have to crowd out the deepest-burrowing moles and worms.

Day and night bombing has many advantages, but the greatest of all is its theft of all ease and order and familiarity of daily life. Londoners knew that, although their nights would be tough, day would bring respite when the R. A. F. fighters cleaned the skies. Germans have no such assurance. They have neither day nor night—only the bleakness of unmeasurable time. Never to leave home and family in the morning knowing they'll be there that night. Never to know, when they start the day's work, if they'll be alive to finish it. Never to have complete rest. Never to be without fear. Never to be clean. Never to have normal, decent social contacts or comforts or recreations. Civilians never with time to rebuild what's knocked down, to put together what's been torn apart, to heal bodies that have been hurt. Soldiers and airmen alerted 24 hours a day, all victims of desperate weariness and the neurosis recognized by doctors of Europe as worse than the shell shock of the last war—they are "siren happy."

Our Air Corps now has left hemisphere defense far behind. We've high altitude fighters. Soon we'll have heavy bombers capable of ranges and loads double, perhaps triple, those of the Fortresses and Liberators. Even the present heavies can be fixed with wing racks to carry three times as many bombs for special jobs. And our tactical commands are shoving the enemy's favorite weapon, the dive bomber, down his throat with a venegance.

But war is the least predictable of the arts. There's never been an unanswerable weapon. Our airmen know the Germans may turn up a counter to day-and-night complementary bombing or to daylight precision bombing. They'll have to hurry.

Berlin's numbered days as a real place upon the map promise something beyond an ultimate demonstration of the power of round-the-clock bombing. Berlin in modern times came to be more than the capital of Germany, more than the heart, brains, and nerve center of the monster. It was the false-front showcase that Hitler erected upon rotten national morale left by the defeat and revolution of the last war and the inflationary years of aftermath. In it he displayed his successes and sold the Germans his bill of goods. The decayed foundations are still there and will be revealed when Berlin passes from reality into dust. Not only German courage but that most important thing, German hope, will then collapse.

BERLIN WILL MARK THE END

Based on what I know from years of work as a correspondent in Germany, from sitting in air-raid shelters with German people and being in the field with German soldiers, I am taking bets without qualifications, without "on the other hands" and "we shall sees," that with the end of Berlin will come the end of the Nazis. Whether it will also mean the end of the European war depends on diplomatic and political fronts as much as military.

And this bombing you are now seeing holds an even further promise. Killing of men has not stopped wars. The spectacle of utter devastation of a homeland might. That's the wish, at any rate, of your flying young men who are now visiting history's greatest reign of terror on Germany—where live the only people who'd really like to see the Eighth United States Air Force abandon daylight bombing.

[At this point Mr. DOWNEY yielded to Mr. McNARY, who suggested the absence of a quorum, and the roll was called, after which Mr. DOWNEY yielded to Mr. LODGE, who addressed the Senate, and whose remarks appear earlier in today's proceedings.]

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I wish now to present to the Senate an article by Cy Caldwell from the authoritative Aero Digest of August 1943. From the data and the conclusions presented by Mr. Caldwell we must believe he is of the opinion Germany could be rapidly conquered or destroyed by a concentration of Allied air power, but while Mr. Courtney in his Collier's article happily assumes such a policy of the high command, Mr. Caldwell is rather dogmatically confident that our generals and admirals will never be willing to admit the futility of navies and land armies and will insist on their utilization in far-flung ventures by land and sea even though the surrender of our enemies could be forced at small loss by the use of air power exclusively.

In advance, I wish to declare that I am not in agreement with Mr. Caldwell's conclusions that our high command will refrain from crushing Germany by the use of available air power so that they will not lose the opportunity to play the game of war with far-flung armies and navies. I am rather of the opinion that ancient concepts of military strategy so influence the thinking of our high command that it has been impossible for its members to comprehend that major war power has passed from the land and sea to the skies above and that final decisions may now be forced by the total destruction of cities, transportation, utilities, and production centers without which no people can exist; no defense can be made; no army can be maintained.

But whatever the motivation of our high command, if they much longer continue to absorb huge amounts of our production in futilely building a land army beyond our ability to use it, if they continue thereby to hamper the building of our air power to maximum capacity, if they longer delay to force the surrender of Germany by the full use of our bombers, then the day will not be long delayed when the voice of America will be raised in horror and indictment, proclaiming the waste and sacrifice inherent in the strategy of our high command. I hope and pray that, before it is too late, our Government will review and replan our military program so that it may be made consistent with rational principles of modern warfare that should now be patent to all; and to that end, I urge that Congress by the passage of the pending Wheeler bill, will indicate to our military leaders their desire to force the destruction or surrender of our enemies with the smallest possible loss of our young men and the least possible injury to the peoples of Europe.

Herewith are excerpts from the Caldwell article and let me repeat I do not agree with all of his statements:

AIR POWER WITH LAND AND SEA FORCES

(By Cy Caldwell)

Controlling factor in American war effort has been the necessarily long lines of communication to war fronts, requiring production of vast shipping services and huge naval building not only for their protection but to counterbalance Japan's naval strength.

Expansion of ground forces in artillery, tanks, and enough infantry to help air and naval forces seize control of such bases for future operations, as Sicily, is never questioned. What airmen, in general, take exception to—and declare to be an old-fashioned concept of warfare—is the production of a huge ground army, evidently intended for the invasion of the Continent itself. Airmen claim, and with reason, that this is an expensive way to fight a war, from the standpoint of loss of life. An air force of 50,000, say the air enthusiasts, or perhaps even 100,000, with their attendant ground crews and supply services, can accomplish what an army of a million men on the ground cannot accomplish, without the loss of more than half of their strength.

COSTLY JOB

This may or may not prove to be true. Indications are that invasion of the Continent, even preceded by tremendous air-force preparation, will be costly in life. Investment and blockade by air, on the other hand, would seem to be relatively inexpensive in life loss. It is, for instance, conceivable that a force of heavy bombers numbering some 3,000 in all, with the power to drop 40,000 tons a month upon German industry and lines of communication, might have a decisive effect within a period of 6 months or a year.

This plan was advocated some 10 months ago by armchair strategists and editors. In brief, this air plan calls in its first phase for the use of a total force of 3,000 United States-British heavy bombers, with 1,000 operational and 2,000 in combat reserve. Planes available for each attack, 1,000, losses 3 to 5 percent. In 8 day and 10 night attacks per month, losses would be 370 in combat, or say 500 from all operational causes. Such a force could drop 40,000 tons of bombs per month; could continue indefinitely.

Present estimates indicate that there are 1,500 heavy bombers available for this task—United States and British. In 2 months 3,000 could be available. It might be, and probably would be necessary to skimp deliveries of heavy bombers to other fronts. But this would be sound, following the age-old military policy of concentration of force. It has been pointed out that the loss rate would drop with the increase in Allied air strength. Taking the present rate, as demonstrated by the war, of 5 German fighters destroyed for the loss of 1 American bomber, the first 60 days of operations would result in the loss of 1,200 German fighters, to our loss of 240 bombers. German fighter strength might be expected to grow progressively weaker; our and British bomber strength progressively stronger. If German forces did not come up and fight, our American-British losses would be cut to a fraction, and our forces could proceed unopposed except by antiaircraft fire.

SECOND PHASE

In the second phase, the Air Force would be brought up to a strength of 4,000 bombers—2,000 operational, the balance in combat reserve. Average loss now would be 3 percent per raid; replacements necessary, 560 per month. Tons dropped per month would be 80,000; in 60 days, 160,000. Total casualties over Germany are estimated at 20,000, many of whom would escape death by parachute, as they do now. A total of 4 to 6 months has been set from the beginning of the first phase to the final collapse of Germany, always provided that the intensity of the attacks be maintained.

Now, this has all the earmarks of a well-reasoned, logical plan. From the remarks of such experienced airmen as General Spaatz, General Eaker, and Air Marshal Harris it seems evident that it would find ready acceptance in the controlling air minds of the United States Army Air Forces and the Royal Air Force. That, of course, is a guess, based on casual statements these officers have made from time to time to the press, but it's a reasonable guess. Do the General Staff accept the air plan as being feasible? They don't say.

Let us suppose that the controlling war council of the United Nations, which includes the political heads of our countries as well as the top military leaders, accepts this plan in its entirety. Let us suppose that, appalled by the loss of life in various landing operations around the globe, the council decides to try to reduce Germany by air power alone, succeeds in smashing that nation's will to continue the war, and forces it to sue for peace. In that event, the ground forces would simply sit comfortably by while air power won the war. Not a single life need be lost in the ground armies—provided the air plan were successful. The armies would simply march in to the wrecked continent and accept surrender.

Better still, General Eaker or General Spaatz or Air Chief Marshal Harris might simply parachute to some convenient spot such as Unter den Linden, and accept the

surrender of Germany personally. In that event, the huge ground army that we have built would look rather foolish, sitting in Sicily or England or north Africa, waiting patiently until the bold airmen assured them that the war was over, and they could go home, after having enjoyed a nice trip to Europe and a rest on the shores of the blue Mediterranean.

HUMAN NATURE

Does it not at once appear that no general, British or American, could for one moment entertain such a prospect? Does it not also appear that old sea dogs of the British and American Navies would sooner lose their right arms and all their teeth rather than permit such a calamity to occur? Here we consider not war forces alone but that unchangeable force, human nature. This observer submits that it would be humanly impossible for generals and admirals, who have spent up to 40 years learning their professions, to sit down tamely on some safe shore or in some quiet harbor, while the new blue-sky buccaneers of warfare showed them up as mere auxiliaries of air power. It is a safe prediction, even amid war's uncertainties, that armies and navies will fight right through the war, and right to the end. They will not be permitted to sit back while the airmen demonstrate a cheaper and more effective way of winning.

This is not to blame the generals and admirals for taking that stand. It is simply to point out that wars are run by human beings, and that generals and admirals are just as human as the rest of us, and have no intention of sitting calmly on the sidelines while a relatively small number of airmen—small, that is, compared to the numbers of men in the ground armies and in the navies—proved that so far as modern war was concerned the general and the admirals could go join the dinosaur and the pterodactyl, taking their places as just so many mere fossil remains. Generals and admirals are made of sterner stuff than that. Until war's end, they will hurl their men against every obstacle, drop them by glider and parachute behind every fortified line—and give them a bayonet and a hand grenade to use when they come to personal grips with the enemy.

If this reasoning proves to be correct, then we may expect to see all forces used concurrently in the invasion and conquest of continental Europe. This is not to say that the independent bombing of Germany will be neglected. On the contrary, it undoubtedly will be intensified, for the generals are well aware by now that without adequate air softening no army can land on a hostile shore against an enemy only half as strong but firmly entrenched in fortified positions. However, there seems to be no doubt whatever that the independent bombing of Germany will not be given priority in British-American high command thinking, but will be meshed into the great strategic plan, which obviously includes concurrent ground invasion.

Irrespective of what air plans are advanced, what books are written, what editorials are composed, the generals will hurl their forces in, let the loss of life be what it may.

Mr. President, Mr. Caldwell, in discussing a hypothetical plan to bomb Germany out of the war, assumes the availability of 3,000 Allied bombers for a 60-day period and 4,000 thereafter for another 60 days and uses as an index the current rate of losses in bombing operations over Germany. We could expect in this 4-month period a loss of almost 2,000 Allied units. These would be replaced during the operations. Such bombers would drop a total of 240,000 tons during the 4 months, which should be plenty, it would appear, to force Nazi surrender.

Have the English and American forces sufficient aircraft and flying personnel to implement the proposed program? We have indeed, and a safe margin beyond that. But have we enough flyers and fighters and bombers for the destruction of Germany and to supply the needs of MacArthur and China at the same time? We quite certainly have, and, while the data showing present bomber production is not for publication, it is available to any Senator and plainly indicates a present and potential sufficiency not only for the destruction of Germany but likewise for every other essential purpose.

It is true, of course, that if our bombing strength is diverted to opening new combat areas and to support a great European invasion, the proposed program against Germany could not be carried out. Indeed, it is possible that under such circumstances the current rate of operations necessarily would be reduced.

Would the dropping of 240,000 tons of bombs on Germany in 4 months be sufficient to conquer or destroy her? To secure an answer, let us weigh comparative figures.

Coventry was struck and destroyed by 250 tons; London was badly shaken in the Battle of Britain by the weight of 6,600 tons delivered over a 3-month period. Hamburg, in a few hours, was crumbled to the earth by the explosive power of 10,000 tons. Before anyone argues that Germany cannot be destroyed by bombing because London was not, he should recall that 10 percent of what we could now hurl on Germany within 4 months, that is, 24,000 tons, would have blasted and burned the English metropolis from the face of the earth.

It is doubtful that the Reich could endure even 60 days of saturated and precision bombing as proposed and not the slightest chance that she could withstand such terrible destruction for 2 months beyond that.

The 20 largest cities in greater Germany contained, before this war, an aggregate population of 16,700,000. Here they are:

Berlin	4,242,501
Vienna	2,091,541
Hamburg	1,675,703
Munich	773,095
Cologne	756,605
Leipzig	715,668
Essen	654,461
Dresden	642,129
Breslau	625,198
Frankfurt	555,857
Düsseldorf	498,600
Dortmund	540,875
Hannover	444,926
Stuttgart	420,533
Duisburg	306,895
Nuremberg	412,745
Wuppertal	408,602
Königsberg	328,241
Bremen	323,331
Chemnitz	350,734
Total	16,700,240

Nearly all of these cities already have been cruelly hit and hurt by precision and saturation bombing, and Hamburg, Essen, Cologne, and Hannover have been largely depopulated as a result. It will be noted that their aggregate population before this war was approximately 16,700,000, and that Hamburg had about 10 percent of the total number; that is, 1,675,000. Since Hamburg was crumbled by the explosive power of 10,000 tons of bombs, we might reasonably expect that 100,000 tons would be sufficient to disintegrate nearly all the larger cities of greater Germany.

While future bombing raids may average longer trips than in the past, let it be noted that German defenses in the air and on the ground constantly weaken and that a substantial part of the task of destruction already has been accomplished. Certainly the suggested 240,000 tons would be amply sufficient for its allotted task.

After careful and considered checking and many consultations with air experts, I am convinced that Nazi surrender can be forced almost immediately by concentrated bombing and at a negligible cost. Why our high command does not seek an immediate decision remains to me a deep and perplexing mystery.

Over a year ago, Air Marshal Harris proclaimed the possibility of bombing the Nazis out of the war within a few months. De Seversky, Huie, Williams, in fact every airpower expert, so far as I know, has been in agreement. And our own ranking air officers are emphatically of this opinion.

Mr. de Seversky adds his voice to the other airpower experts by an article in the American Mercury of October 1943. It is as follows:

THE MYTH OF "FORTRESS EUROPE"

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky)

Orthodox military writers assume that Nazi Germany, having lost the initiative in the war, may elect to fight it defensively. It will shorten its lines wherever possible and dig in for a prolonged siege. And German propaganda has accepted this assumption. The very phrase Festung Europa—fortress Europe—now so prominent in Dr. Goebbels' new threats and alibis, implies a siege behind impregnable walls. According to the Nazi version, the enemy's successes in the Mediterranean and on the Russian front have not really breached the fortress within which the Germans can survive against the entire outside world.

The whole idea, however, is nothing more than a hang-over from the past. If Goebbels expresses serious German military opinion in the talk of Festung Europa, then such opinion is as backward as the view—held in Germany and by some of our own commentators after the Battle of Britain—that strategic bombing is of no military value. But more likely German propaganda is puffing up the possibilities of defensive warfare to bolster a tottering morale, without real faith in it.

Because the fact is that air power has forever ended the concept of impregnable fortifications. In the epoch of surface warfare a strong wall was enough to keep out an enemy. The Maginot Line is the last great monument to that epoch. Since the advent of air power, a wall is not enough. A roof, too, is required, otherwise destruction will rain down on the besieged area from overhead.

The question, therefore, is whether the Germans can provide their European fortress with a roof of defensive air power; whether they can establish what some refer to as a "vertical front." And the answer is that they cannot do it. Bombers will always crash through, and given an attacker with adequate air power of the proper types, an effective roof over the fortress is out of the question.

It has always been a sound military principle that the most effective defense is a vigorous offensive.

In aerial warfare this principle amounts to a law to which there are few if any exceptions. To make its "fortress" hope come true, Germany must ward off Allied demolition from the skies—the kind of round-the-clock bombardment of which it has already had substantial samples. But this it can do, in the final analysis, only by stopping the air offensive at its source, which means an offensive against Allied airfields, factories, fuel concentrations, and other sources of air power.

There are those who cite the Battle of Britain as proof that successful defensive action on the home grounds is possible. The Royal Air Force, they point out, succeeded in defeating the Luftwaffe in a battle fought over the British Isles. Why could not German defensive aviation in the same way defeat the Allied onslaught from above, thus adding a roof to its fortress walls?

Theoretically that is conceivable. Practically, we know that the Battle of Britain was unique. The attacking aircraft were so deficient in military characteristics that, looking back at the episode, we can only marvel at the military stupidity of Marshal Goering and his aviation associates. They sent in swarms of bombers that were virtually unarmed in broad daylight, against British Spitfires and Hurricanes armed to the teeth. The qualitative gap between the invaders and the defenders was so wide that it was almost like a mob of savages with bows and arrows attacking a contingent of white men armed with guns. What is more, German strategic ideas in the Battle of Britain were all false. Instead of concentrating for a knock-out blow against the opposing air power, in the air and on the ground, Goering squandered planes and lives on blasting population centers and other morale targets.

Given a discrepancy in weapons and strategic good sense such as saved the British Isles, it is possible to throw a cover of air power over an area. But Germany today cannot hope for any such discrepancy in its favor. Both sides have learned a lot from the Battle of Britain and a score of other engagements since then. Neither side can count on mistakes of major proportions by its opponents. Today the forces are technologically more or less evenly matched, even if we give Germany credit for maximum strength. Under those conditions there can be no such thing as an impregnable defense. Bombardment aviation will penetrate, even if losses are heavy, and for all practical purposes the Germans will be trapped in a fortress without a roof.

The logic of modern air power forces us to a specific conclusion: If the Germans go over to a purely defensive strategy, their doom will be sealed. Such strategy is today a myth, and those who preached it only a few years ago seem as anachronistic as if they belonged to the era of Caesar or Napoleon.

II

The only plan, from the vantage point of air power, is to ignore this fortress. We must continue to bomb across its walls and to demolish the core of Axis strength, which is the complex of industries, communication lines, and other strategic objectives in Germany proper As in the case of any territory under artillery bombardment, the more concentrated, continuous, and thorough this bombardment the smaller will be the total effort and sacrifice needed to cause a collapse.

However, it should be remembered that from the point of view of the old surface strategy, Europe is still a fortress—and that many Allied military men still see the scene primarily from that point of view. If we accept the Goebbels fiction and proceed to storm the European ramparts instead of ignoring them, then the myth will suddenly become a deadly reality. Then we shall no longer be fighting on our terms but on Germany's terms, and the Germans will be able to fight back.

There may be any number of valid political reasons why an invasion of western Europe—a storming of the fortress—should be undertaken. There were other occasions in this war when political considerations were at variance with strictly military good sense. The British attempt to defend Holland and Belgium, for instance, was essentially a political obligation, without much hope of improving the military position and with a huge risk of disaster. The British defense of Greece, likewise, was largely the fulfillment of a moral and political obligation, undertaken with the knowledge that in splitting the small British forces the entire African position was endangered.

Furthermore, the top leadership of our war effort today is composed for the most part of men of an old military school, considerably set in its ways. They are responsible for the channelling of an overwhelming portion of our national wealth and labor power into surface weapons. Quite naturally they are itching to employ those accumulated weapons—the great navies, the millionfold armies, the mountains of equipment.

Despite the accomplishments of air power in limited doses with inadequate planes, such men are sincerely worried by an honest lack of faith in all-out aerial strategy—except as an "extra" method on an experimental basis. An unshakable faith in surface procedures, plus the desire to justify in dramatic and victorious operations their former decisions in building what is essentially a surface war machine, therefore impel them to plunge into an old-style mile-by-mile frontal attack on Festung Europa.

By the time these words see print indeed, it is not impossible that the frontal attack may have been decided upon. Even if successful, it will involve a high price in allied lives and matériel. The enemy will then retreat and contract its "fortress." Every contraction, by shortening the lines to be defended, will tend to strengthen the walls of the "fortress." Under the most favorable circumstances, it will be a long and costly enterprise; the experience in Tunisia, where nearly everything was stacked in our favor, is proof of how slow surface operations necessarily are. Those who are impatient with air power, which has had only an inadequate opportunity with retarded equipment, will face a more harrowing test of their patience when a full-parade invasion gets going.

Should Germany succeed in repelling a major invasion on the western coast of Europe, the game will not be up. The Allied cause would suffer a terrific moral blow. But "Fortress Europe" will be as accessible as ever to third-dimensional strategy aiming directly at Germany's solar plexus. We would then have to undertake out of necessity, and after the expenditure of myriad lives, the kind of war that is now open to us as a matter of intelligent choice.

Should the German Festung be stormed and overwhelmed, at a hideous price in casualties, the myth of surface strategy of the preaviation epoch would be perpetuated. It would then be solemnly attested by old-style military leaders and writers that this war, like the previous one, was won by the man with the bayonet and the man in the tank. The victorious nations would continue to pile up surface weapons and maintain immense standing armies, despite the fact that they have been made largely superfluous, except as follow-up and auxiliary services by the air weapon. History might then repeat itself tragically. Because the First World War ended in the trenches, France staked its life on a supertrench, the Maginot Line. Should this war be ended by surface operations, there would be the same danger that the victors would maintain faith in two-dimensional strategy, leaving it to others to exploit air power to the full.

To airmen, judging the picture solely from the military angle and without reference to political factors, it seems entirely unnecessary to accept the fortress concept. They believe that only a small fraction of the industrial potential and manpower represented by a full-parade invasion, if translated into true air power and given full opportunity to operate in line with its own strategy, could knock out Germany from above. The surface forces would then enter Festung Europa as occupying forces rather than invasion forces.

Mr. President, so far in this address I have not mentioned the Russian front. I hope no one will conclude from that omission that I do not grant to the Russian nation the major credit for having helped to bring Germany to her present plight. It is probable that of all the punishment inflicted on the Allies 90 percent has been absorbed by Russia. Her resistance and recuperative power have amazed the world and her sledge-hammer blows against the Hitler hordes have helped to weaken the whole of Germany so that she is now prone for the fatal and final blow by our air power.

If it is argued that Russia may soon drive through to her own frontiers and rest there, and perhaps even make peace with her enemy, and that anticipating the possibility of such an event we should continue to create a greater land army, then I reply that such a possibility should but energize us to seek the quickest possible destruction of Hitler and that by powerful and ruinous air blows. If a Russian peace should release the millions of Nazi soldiers now on the eastern front so that they could be thrown against the British and Americans on the western, then, indeed, would our invasion of Germany be most hazardous and the most fearfully destructive to our own forces.

The military hordes of Hitler might so well defend their European fortress that we could never shake it by ground attack; certainly the magnificent German Army could exact a price of American and British lives that would be appalling. And if it should happen in an invasion, when we were prepared to meet only a portion of the German forces, suddenly the whole weight was thrown at us, then national tragedy and terrible disaster might well ensue.

Even if peace on the eastern front should release millions of the Reich soldiers for use against us, they would be of little value against our aircraft. German airpower, of course, now held on the eastern line, if freed to defend German cities against air attack, would make our operations more difficult. For that very reason a decision should be forced and

gained by air blows and at once. Too long have we waited now; further delay cannot be justified.

Mr. Churchill in his latest address suggested the possibility, or even probability, of new and more destructive German weapons to be employed against our air forces. Would the probability of a more potent Nazi defense against our bombing justify the delay of concentrated air blows or of great additions to our present land forces which it is admitted cannot add to our striking power against Germany for 12, 15, or 18 months?

In every war there is always the possibility of novel methods, new equipment, more potent weapons, that might increase the power of one side or another. This very fact should have energized our high command to have sought the destruction of Hitler by air long before this as recommended by Marshal Harris. Our military leaders will now be guilty of most extreme neglect if with the present probability of new German antiaircraft weapons, as suggested by Mr. Churchill, we do not apply to her the crushing power which we now have in overwhelming abundance.

Mr. President, if I may address myself to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky at this stage of my address, I wish to ask unanimous consent that I may submit my resolution and that it may be immediately considered and adopted. I desire to say to the distinguished majority leader that the minority leader [Mr. McNARY] told me he would raise no objection to that procedure; the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, made the same statement; the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], whose bill is pending before the Senate, and which will be affected, made the same statement. I regret that they are not on the floor to speak for themselves.

Mr. BARKLEY. Much as I respect all the gentlemen named by the Senator from California, it has no bearing upon my attitude and no influence upon my attitude whatever. I do not think the pending bill ought to be laid aside for the purpose of considering a resolution which has not been considered, which involves possibly calling here important Army and Navy officers, holding an indefinite investigation and submitting a report. The resolution itself undertakes to say when consideration of the pending bill shall be again resumed. It seems to me to be very unwise to pursue that course, and I shall have to object.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I then wish to offer to our distinguished majority leader to strike out of the resolution the provision which would attempt to defer action on the pending measure until the committee had made its report. Likewise, if the Senator will not otherwise consent to the adoption of the resolution by unanimous consent, I will agree to strike out the provision suggesting that we should call high ranking air officers for this investigation. Then, I understand from what the majority leader has said that by making the resolution acceptable to him by these last two qualifications, he would be willing to have committees of the United States Senate inquire into this rather tragic and important issue.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not going to consent that the resolution shall be considered now in any form. It is not the logical and orderly way in which to proceed. There are many objections to giving consent to the consideration of a resolution of that sort at this time, a resolution undertaking to instruct two standing committees of the Senate to hold joint sessions, and to make a joint report, and all that; I cannot consent to it. I shall insist that the resolution go to the Committee on Military Affairs for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been made.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the sincerity of the Senator from California, but we have got to proceed in an orderly way, and it seems to me it is not conducive to orderly legislation to interrupt the consideration of a bill which has been debated by the Senate for 2 or 3 days in order to adopt a resolution of any kind providing for holding another investigation before we can proceed further with the subject under consideration. I think we ought to proceed in the regular way.

Mr. DOWNEY. If the distinguished Senator will defer to me for a moment let me say I can understand and perhaps concede that the attitude of the Senator in respect to deferring a vote upon the fathers' draft bill while this investigation was being made is correct.

He probably very sincerely and honestly believes what our Army chiefs say, that we need these fathers for essential military purposes. I cannot agree with that, but, of course, the Senator's viewpoint is different, consequently I can understand why he would want action taken upon the Wheeler bill at the earliest possible time. But I must admit I stand in some amazement that he objects to the resolution as I have offered to amend it. For 2 days I have submitted the statements of air experts and of the high ranking air-power men in England and the United States. I have submitted here the statement of Donald Nelson, and other data, all of which reveal, so plainly that anyone should be able to understand their meaning, that if our high command goes through with its present plans, American boys and British and Canadians by the hundreds of thousands, without justification, will be crippled, killed, scarred, and burned. If it were merely the junior Senator from California talking, I could understand the Senator from Kentucky would think that what I said was not of enough importance to set in motion the machinery of this body; but I have quoted here from Winston Churchill, who, in effect, says almost identically the same thing. From the head of the British bombing command, and in magazine articles purporting to speak the opinions of our own air chiefs, I have still in my files statements of every important air-power expert that I know to the same effect.

I say to the distinguished Senator that if under those conditions he is not willing to help me in my effort to have a full, candid, and complete investigation of this issue, I, of course, must abide by what he says, but if history shall write and record that through a tragic blunder as to our air policy the lives of hundreds of thousands, or millions, of American, Canadian, and British boys are wasted and destroyed, I should never like to feel that I had not been willing at least to have the facts fully revealed in the light of day by a congressional investigation.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will yield to me, I should like to make one simple observation. I do not wish to enter into any controversy at this time with the Senator from California over his theory that the war can be won in the air alone. Of course, that would contribute nothing to the real winning of the war, no matter how long he and I might indulge in a controversy of that sort.

I do not believe the strategy of this war can be worked out on the floor of the United States Senate. Nor do I believe it can be worked out by an ex parte resolution sponsored by a single Senator.

We have spent millions upon millions of dollars educating our military and naval leaders. Throughout the whole history of this Nation we have maintained at West Point a training center for the training of military officers, and at the Naval Academy at Annapolis a school for the training of naval officers. After those men get their academic education in those institutions, they spend the remainder of their lives in the uniform of their country, studying warfare, the history of warfare, and the strategy of warfare. If after the expenditure of all that money and time we cannot trust those men, upon whom rests the responsibility of winning the war where the fighting is and will be, then we are sunk.

I frankly say that, much as I respect the Senator from California and much as I respect the Senate of the United States, I should not be willing to stake the victory of the American Nation in the war upon strategy which could be worked out here, either by a single Senator, or by us all together.

Whether such an investigation as the Senator proposes would result in anything, I do not know, I am not saying. Certainly I should not be willing to accept as conclusive, or even as persuasive, the suggestion that General Arnold, head of our Air Corps, or General Marshall, who enjoys the unlimited confidence of the American people, and I believe of all the world, because of his military ability, or that Admiral King, Admiral Leahy, and all our other military and naval officers, have not given consideration to this whole subject and all the possibilities involved in the type of warfare necessary to be adopted and the instruments with which it has to be fought in order to win the war as completely and as promptly as possible.

Even in his address to the joint session of the two Houses of Congress, as I recall, Prime Minister Winston Churchill stated that he did not know, or was not in a position to assert, whether Germany

could be defeated by air, but that they were feeling the situation out, and that there was no harm in trying to see, so far as they could, what could be done in the air. They are alert to that situation. They are informed about it, not only from the standpoint of the training of men, but also from the standpoint of the production of airplanes. They are familiar with all that. They know what the situation is. They know what they can depend upon, they know how many planes they can get and where they can get them, and it seems to me it is a mistake for us here to assume that these men who are charged with the responsibility of conducting the war, literally and actually, have not given consideration to every possibility and every probability, and have not explored all the avenues of approach to this subject.

I feel that it would cause a serious hiatus, in all probability, if the Senate of the United States should now interrupt the program being followed in order to try to find out whether our military and naval commanders have been wrong about their whole theory of the war, and whether they are proceeding upon a false basis. I do not assume they are. I would not concede it. I do not believe it.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I think perhaps a large part of the difference between the distinguished Senator from Kentucky and me is due to the fact that we do not understand the facts in the same way. The distinguished Senator just finished saying that he thought we could rely upon the statement of General Arnold and General Eaker and General Kenney and other air power military leaders. I do, too. I agree with the Senator. Evidently the distinguished Senator was too busy with his conferences when I read magazine articles purporting to state the opinions of these very men as believing that a great land invasion is not necessary and that the war could be won in the air. Likewise perhaps the distinguished Senator did not hear me read the quotation from the leader of the English bombing forces, Air Marshal Harris, by many men considered the ablest expert in air warfare today.

Mr. President, we are now confronted here by an issue which I shall state, and if the distinguished majority leader will utilize his high degree of intellect upon the facts, I believe he must admit it. This is the situation. We have a group of rather elderly men who now are in control of the high command of the Nation. They went to West Point or Annapolis, if they attended those military academies at all, before the last war. I do not think any one of them has ever flown a plane. They apparently have no idea of the modern concepts of air war.

In any event the young men who have come out of West Point or Annapolis in the last 5, 10, 15, yes, and 20 years, are saying that we are guilty of stupidity in not using this weapon of power and destruction which a great technological civilization has given into our hands. We have here then a few men in high command apparently determined on great land invasions, and to use the air power to advance those armies, and we have on the other hand many of the ranking officers of the air power in both the British and American services supported by civilian experts who say that the high command is wrong. If the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives of the United States, when an issue of this kind is presented, are not willing to begin an immediate investigation, then indeed we have ceased to be the representatives of our people.

Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Kentucky, whom I admire so deeply, and for whom I have such a deep affection, would not say that I on the floor of the Senate am attempting to dictate military strategy. That statement is not justified. It is unfair. I have been quoting here from data and from statements made by experts merely as a basis for asking this administration more carefully to consider and to investigate what should be done under the conditions which exist.

Mr. President, I would not even be here, as certain as I am of the righteousness of my cause, unless I was supported by the able air-power authorities of this Nation. I realize that air officials and air experts are human, like the rest of us. If Seversky becomes a crusader for air power, he ceases to become disinterested. When Generals Eaker, Chennault, Arnold, and Kenney become leaders of the Air Force then surely from then on they are prejudiced in favor of their own field of power. Of course, any Senate committee, as well as the Congress of the United States, should weigh that human factor of prejudice which undoubtedly exists in their minds, in determining whether or not experts are right or wrong.

But, Mr. President, I wish to say this: It seems to me that no Senate committee could sit down for a few hours with Donald Nelson and learn what bombing capacity we have, and then could see what destruction bombing capacity is now accomplishing in Germany, without knowing that Germany right today totters toward wreck and ruin.

Mr. President, Hamburg was destroyed by 10,000 tons of bombs. London, in the Battle of Britain, received only 6,600 tons. In 4 months we can pour upon the cities of the Reich 240,000 tons of bombs.

Mr. President, does the distinguished majority leader desire me to yield further to him?

Mr. BARKLEY. Not necessarily.

Mr. DOWNEY. I did not know. The Senator seemed desirous of speaking.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought I understood the Senator from California awhile ago, when he asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of his resolution, to say that he had concluded his remarks, and that upon my objection he intended to yield the floor. Perhaps I was misinformed.

Mr. DOWNEY. No, my statement was to the contrary; that I still have reports of noted experts on air power and much data which it is my intention to place in the RECORD.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection to that, I will say to the Senator, although I had received information from the author of the bill which is pending, who has temporarily left the floor, that the Senator from California intended to conclude his remarks this afternoon, and that the Senator from Montana would resume tomorrow.

Mr. DOWNEY. I must admit that that had been my expectation. I could not conceive that any Senator would not immediately want a prompt and fair consideration of this issue.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have objected to consideration of the resolution, and I have objected for reasons which I think are sufficient. I do not care to enter into any controversy over the reason for my objections. They are effective. If the Senator from California desires to debate that question further he is at liberty to do so.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say to the distinguished leader that he is just as effective in sabotaging what I should like to do as the British bombs are in destroying the city of Berlin. I realize that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the use of that term is unjustified.

Mr. DOWNEY. Very well, Mr. President.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have done what I think it my duty to do in the orderly, parliamentary procedure of the Senate, and if objection to a resolution to go out on a wild-goose chase in order to suspend legislation on the subject which we have before us is to be termed as "sabotaging," the Senator from California is welcome to his terminology.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished majority leader that I was speaking facetiously in using the word "sabotage."

Mr. BARKLEY. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the newspapers of the country do not deal in "facetiosity." [Laughter.]

Mr. DOWNEY. Very well. Then I hope the press of the United States will carry my sentiments this way, that the Senator's objection to my resolution is just as effective in stopping what I am attempting to do as the bombing by the Allies might be in stopping the German war effort. I wish to strike out of the RECORD the word "sabotage." It was used facetiously. I regret if it seems offensive to the Senator that I used that word.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, the Senator——

Mr. DOWNEY. I was simply attempting to say that by what the distinguished Senator had done he had effectively stopped consideration of my resolution. That certainly he did have the effective power and he was using it to stop consideration of the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, and any other Senator would have the same effective power.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to say, since the Senator has brought in the name of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, that I consulted the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs as to where this resolution should go, and he

agreed that it should go to the Committee on Military Affairs. Other Senators whom I consulted agreed. If the Senator feels that I have deprived him of some parliamentary rights by insisting that the resolution take the regular course and go where it ought to go, I am sorry, but I cannot change my course in order to accommodate his views about that. I say that with the greatest deference and the greatest affection for the Senator from California. I think there is no Senator for whom I have a greater affection than I have for the Senator from California whose cooperation I frequently appreciate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] asked unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution. Objection was made to that request, and under the rule the resolution goes over.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, in view of the lateness of the hour and the apparent impossibility to have these arguments and the presentation of the data heard by enough Senators to make it worth while, I would now ask unanimous consent that I may do something which I think will afford great relief to the majority leader, and, I am sure, to the minority leader, who is always kind to me, also. I shall ask that I may include in the RECORD, without reading, the additional data and material and statement I have, and that they may be carried in the RECORD as a part of my speech. That will satisfy me. Under those conditions I will be glad to conclude now.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not urging the Senator from California to conclude. I have probably been misinformed.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may include as a part of my remarks, without reading or statement, further data and material I have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution submitted by the Senator be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOWNEY. First, Mr. President, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry. To what other committee could the resolution be referred?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It could be referred to any committee. However, request has been made that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. Without objection, that will be done. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. DOWNEY. I ask the Presiding Officer to postpone putting that question until I have received certain parliamentary information. Under the normal procedure of the Senate, to what committee would one expect such a resolution to be referred?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would go to the Committee on Military Affairs, but could be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. DOWNEY. Very well. Of course, under those conditions, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution (S. Res. 182) is referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further reports of committees?

NOMINATION OF UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE AND DIPLOMATIC NOMINATIONS REPORTED

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report the nominations of Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of State; the nomination of Elvin Seibert, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America; and the nomination of John W. Bailey, Jr., of Texas, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, and a consul general of the United States of America.

In this connection, Mr. President, because of the present posture of international relations and the probable absence from the country of the Secretary of State at an early date, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination of Mr. Stettinius to be Under Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, my attention has just now been called to the request of the very distinguished senior Senator from Texas. I desire to ask some questions of him about the nomination.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be very glad to be interrogated.

Mr. McNARY. Is the report from the committee, and in the committee did it meet with unanimous accord?

Mr. CONNALLY. I was about to state that the committee had an unusually large attendance at its meeting this morning. There were four absentees: The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who is absent because of illness; the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], who sent a proxy asking that he be recorded in favor of a favorable report on the nomination; the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], who also sent a proxy, so the clerk has advised me; and the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Other than that, the report was absolutely unanimous. The candidate was available in the committee room; and, after the proceedings, he came before the committee, and was subject to interrogation, and there was a very pleasant session with the committee.

Mr. McNARY. That is very interesting to know. Did the committee authorize the chairman to request the consideration of the nomination be had today?

Mr. CONNALLY. No. Frankly, I do not think I propounded that matter to the committee. After the committee adjourned, representations were made to me about the urgency of the situation because of the fact that the Secretary of State is to be called abroad at an early date, and that it was desired that the Under Secretary be inducted as soon as possible, so as to be able to familiarize himself with the duties of the office which will devolve upon him in the absence of the Secretary. That is the only reason why I make the request.

I see present in the Chamber a number of Senators who are members of the committee, and I am sure none of them will object to the present consideration of the nomination.

Mr. McNARY. The practice of having all nominations go to the calendar is so old and so justified in experience that I hesitate to agree to a request of the kind which has been made, even though such a request comes from one of my most distinguished companions in the Senate. Criticism often comes to a Senator for permitting consideration to be given a nomination without having had the nomination first considered under the practice and rules of the Senate. Sometimes I have yielded to such a request, but only in the event there was some unusual condition surrounding the attitude of the chairman of the committee who made the report.

I know the Senator from Texas does not want to be criticized; I know I do not want to be criticized, and neither does the able senior Senator from Kentucky, the majority leader. Many times Senators who are absent from the Chamber would like to be present when matters of this kind come before the Senate. Hence, we would not have a rule if we did not have a reason for it. I have always been very careful to consider the rules of the Senate and all other matters which pertain to the procedure of this body. I have to object to consideration of the nomination before tomorrow, unless some very substantial reason is given for action on it today.

I observe that the very able senior Senator from Texas has reported three nominations, for one of which he requests present consideration.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am perfectly willing to have consideration of the other two nominations postponed. Two for one is a fairly good proportion.

Mr. McNARY. I do not think that would be very creditable to the other two. I think they would rather have three to nothing, or nothing at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNARY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course the Senator knows that under the rule, which is a justifiable one, the nomination would be placed on the calendar, and go over until tomorrow. In all likelihood there will be no larger attendance of Senators tomorrow afternoon than there is now, so that part of the ground of the Senator's objection is probably not the most important.

As the Senator knows, Mr. Stettinius is now and has been for some time the head of the lend-lease agency. He is going from that office to the office of Under Secretary of State. I suppose, in an informal way, he could go over to the State Department tomorrow and begin to familiarize himself with his new duties, on the assumption that his nomination will be confirmed; but men hesitate to do that.

In view of the urgency of the international situation and the fact that even now the Secretary of State is absent on a brief vacation, it seems to me that the Senator might forego his usually well-grounded objection in order that this nomination may be acted upon today. Because of the situation I hope the Senator will withdraw his objection, although I realize the importance of it.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have very great admiration for the nominee. I also have a very strong desire to carry out the rules of the Senate and protect Senators who are absent. To repeat, if any reason could be given why we should act today, and there were no other objection, I should probably withdraw my objection. I wish to have it understood that if I consent to action today on this appointment, it will not mean a relaxation of the rule.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me state further to the Senator from Oregon—and I am sure the Senator from Texas will agree—that if this nomination is confirmed today, and any Senator objects tomorrow, we will be willing to have the nomination reconsidered.

Mr. McNARY. That would not do. I usually give consent to have the President notified. If the President is notified, the matter goes beyond the jurisdiction of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

Mr. McNARY. I am not dealing in mere attitudes. The question was once decided by the Supreme Court in a case arising in my own State.

In view of the situation, and my very great admiration for the nominee, and in view of the able speeches made by my distinguished friends, the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Texas, I shall make no objection at this time to the immediate consideration of Mr. Stettinius' nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon very much. I realize that he is entirely within his rights in objecting. I would not have made the request, and I had no intention of doing so, except that it was made rather clear to me that it was highly important to have prompt action on the nomination. I hope I shall not soon have to call upon the Senator again to make a sacrifice of his convictions.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I take this occasion to express my great gratification at the appointment of Mr. Stettinius to this important position. As we all know, Mr. Stettinius does not come from the diplomatic service. He comes from the outside; but his conduct in office, his conduct as a citizen and as an American since he has been in Washington in charge of important activities connected with the war, his background of education, and his broad-minded views upon the questions which affect our country admirably fit him for this high position. His more recent activities in connection with the Lend-Lease agency, of which he has been the head, have given him an intimate knowledge of the military and economic conditions of other countries which I think admirably fits him into the situation at this particular time.

I feel that the President and the country are to be congratulated upon the selection of Mr. Stettinius and his willingness to serve. He has given up his business, financial, and industrial connections to serve his country, which he has done in a peculiarly outstanding way. I feel also that Mr. Stettinius is to be congratulated on the recognition of his high qualities by his appointment to this important position.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Since the Senator is making the record, I think he would be happy to have me add that from the minority side of the Foreign Relations Committee the sentiment totally reflected the statements which the Senator now makes regarding Mr. Stettinius.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that fact, and I thank the Senator for calling it to my attention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Coast Guard be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Coast Guard nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, October 1, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 30 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Frank C. Squire, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 29, 1948. (Vice M. Roland Reed.)

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named assistant surgeons to be temporary passed assistant surgeons, to rank as such from August 1, 1943:

Alfred L. Holloman	George W. Comstock
Kenneth Grant	Anthony J. Lund
James Lloyd Elliott	Herbert Tabor
Herbert E. Pedersen	Robert M. Thomas
Joseph L. Bryant	Spurgeon M. Wingo

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be temporary surgeons, to rank as such from August 1, 1943:

Romeo J. Gentile	Hugh L. C. Wilkerson
George K. Massengill	Charles M. McGill
David J. Zaugg	

The following-named surgeons to be temporary senior surgeons, to rank as such from August 1, 1943:

Frank S. Fellows	Jacob P. Eberhardt
Elmer A. Carberry	Anthony P. Rubino

The following-named assistant surgeon, to be temporary passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 1, 1943:

William C. Lewis

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be temporary surgeons, to rank as such from September 1, 1943:

Alfred L. Holloman
Kenneth M. Joye
John A. Lewis

The following-named surgeon, to be temporary senior surgeon, to rank as such from September 1, 1943:

Joseph A. Bell

The following-named senior surgeon, to be temporary medical director, to rank as such from September 1, 1943:

Robert H. Onstott

The following-named passed assistant sanitary engineer, to be sanitary engineer, to rank as such from September 1, 1943:

Elmer J. Herringer

The following to be officers in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective date of oath:

Gordon E. McCallum to be passed assistant sanitary engineer.

Edmund J. Schmidt to be assistant surgeon.

George Shipman to be assistant surgeon.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be temporary passed assistant surgeons, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

John B. Spriggs	Emery F. Word
Carruth J. Wagner	Lyman C. Burgess

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be temporary surgeons, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

Curtis R. Chaffin	Eric C. Johnson
Erwin C. Drescher	Earl L. White
Paul T. Erickson	Joseph S. Spoto
John B. Hozier	

The following-named surgeons to be temporary senior surgeons, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

Leroy E. Burney
Robert H. Felix

The following-named sanitary engineers to be temporary senior sanitary engineers, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

John J. Bloomfield
Judson L. Robertson, Jr.

The following-named surgeon to be temporary medical director, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

Raymond A. Vonderlehr

The following-named passed assistant surgeon to be surgeon in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the date set opposite his name:

Calvin B. Spencer, October 8, 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 30 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., to be Under Secretary of State.

COAST GUARD

COMMODORES, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, IN THE COAST GUARD WHILE SERVING AS DISTRICT COAST GUARD OFFICERS, TO RANK FROM JUNE 1, 1943, FOR THE NAVAL DISTRICT INDICATED AFTER EACH NAME

Wilfred N. Derby, First Naval District.
Gordon T. Finlay, Fifth Naval District.
Joseph F. Farley, Eighth Naval District.
Philip F. Roach, Twelfth Naval District.

POSTMASTERS

MICHIGAN

Ernest R. Brodeur, Cadillac.
Harry Kramer, Holland.
Frank W. Weilnau, Ida.
George J. Carlton, Mackinaw City.
Bruce S. Trace, Royal Oak.

TENNESSEE

Sadie P. Omohundro, Donelson.
Thomas D. Walker, Kerrville.
Henry G. Simpson, Middleton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou who takest thought of the humblest life which falls to the ground, we pray Thee to humble our lives before Thy infinite mercy. Thou knowest the vows we have registered and as the divinest conquest is of one's self, enable us to qualify to see visions and share spiritual victory in our own souls. O lift the curtain of the higher world and reveal Thyself to be glorious and holy as Thy voice bids us go forward to the things which survive the wrecks of iniquitous war.

Vouchsafe, blessed Lord, to make these moments free from weakness and uncertainty; make us an inspiration to every patriotic movement. In the presence of our country's crisis may we frown upon that which darkens, upon every murmur of false criticism, upon every gesture of unjust dissent. Direct all citizens to turn and see the groaning and the travailing, the misery and the captivity endured by our own dear soldier boys—all to make our homes happy and free. Give our land a release from the confusion of tongues and to all eager, restless, doubting ones, let come the challenge of the ages, that in the restoration of this beaten world, America is in the hands of a good God to save the exiles and share its lofty mission with all who mourn. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, September 28, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint Resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 881. An act to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were closed.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 146]

Andrews	Capozzoli	Fay
Baldwin, Md.	Carter	Feighan
Baldwin, N. Y.	Celler	Fenton
Barden	Chapman	Fernandez
Barry	Clark	Fish
Beall	Cooley	Fitzpatrick
Bell	Creal	Flannagan
Bender	Crosser	Ford
Bland	Cullen	Gale
Bloom	Curley	Gallagher
Bolton	Davis	Gamble
Bradley, Mich.	Dawson	Gavagan
Buckley	Delaney	Gerlach
Buffett	Dickstein	Gifford
Burch, Va.	Ditter	Gillette
Burchill, N. Y.	Domengeaux	Goodwin
Butler	Douglas	Graham
Byrne	Eberharter	Granger
Canfield	Ellis	Grant, Ala.
Cannon, Fla.	Ellison, Md.	Gregory
Gwynne	Kilburn	Randolph
Hall, Leonard W.	Kleberg	Rizley
Hare	Klein	Rogers, Calif.
Harness, Ind.	Kunkel	Rogers, Mass.
Hart	Lane	Satterfield
Hartley	LeFevre	Scanlon
Hébert	Lesinski	Scott
Heffernan	Lewis, Colo.	Shafer
Hendricks	Ludlow	Sheridan
Hess	McKenzie	Sikes
Hill	McMurray	Smith, W. Va.
Hinshaw	Merritt	Snyder
Hoffman	Michener	Somers, N. Y.
Holmes, Mass.	Miller, Pa.	Stefan
Jackson	Morrison, La.	Stevenson
Jennings	Morrison, N. C.	Sumner, Ill.
Jensen	Myers	Sundstrom
Johnson, Anton J.	Newsome	Taylor
Johnson, Calvin D.	Norton	Tibbott
Johnson, Luther A.	O'Connor	Treadway
Jones	O'Leary	Troutman
Judd	O'Toole	Vincent, Ky.
Kearney	Peterson, Fla.	Wadsworth
Kee	Pfeifer	Welchel, Ohio
Keefe	Philbin	Weiss
Kelley	Pittenger	Wene
Keogh	Plumley	West
Kerr	Powers	Whelchel, Ga.
	Pracht	Winter
	Rabaut	Wolfenden, Pa.
	Ramey	
	Ramspeck	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 281 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

REPRESENTATIVE EUGENE E. COX

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I never gave my heart and my hand to another in friendship but that they were his forever, and nothing has delighted me more than hazarding injury by going to his aid in time of stress. This sweet manner of receiving me with such gracious applause evidences to me that the Members of the House have this same devotion to this highest of human relationships.

Mr. Speaker, for more than a year, now, I have been the object of bitter and scurrilous attacks.

Day after day the poisoned shafts of slander have been driven through my heart. Every effort to tear down and to destroy a reputation I have spent a lifetime in building has been put forth. All this is something that I have been compelled to endure in silence. My hands have been tied—tied by the chairmanship of the select committee of this House to investigate the F. C. C.

This chairmanship has compelled me to maintain a judicial attitude which cannot longer be done in the face of the insults and the slander being hurled at me from day to day.

Mr. Speaker, that which is being dealt out to me is a sorry wage for a service I have tried to render in the interests of my fellow men.

It is a difficult thing—a terribly difficult thing—for a man to sit silent under the lashes of slander and falsehood such as have been laid upon me. But so long as silence appeared to be in the best interest of the operations of the select committee of which I am the chairman, it was the part of wisdom and good administration for me to do so.

The first consideration must be the integrity and effectiveness of the work

of the committee of which I am chairman. The utterly baseless personal attacks upon me have beclouded the real issue of whether the Federal Communications Commission has been guilty or not guilty of the acts of maladministration with which it has been charged, and which this committee was directed by the House to investigate. The House and the country are deeply concerned to ascertain the facts about the F. C. C. without prejudice, and free of personal controversies.

As long as I am connected with the investigation it is obvious that the effort will be made to divert public attention from the real issue of alleged maladministration of the affairs of the F. C. C. to a personal controversy.

In my judicial career when a case arose in which my own personality was involved or my impartiality was questioned, it was my practice to eliminate myself from the trial of the case. While such a custom does not prevail in investigations by legislative bodies, I have, nevertheless, reached the conclusion that in the light of the circumstances and the nature of the controversy in this instance, I may well follow that course.

The truth of this personal controversy and my complete vindication will come at another time and in another way. It cannot be attempted on this floor in the limited time I have at my command and this is not the time for such an effort.

I do want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I face my colleagues in the House—those who have known me and who have been my warm and cherished friends over the years—with an absolutely clear conscience. The work the committee has begun must be completed. The evils at which the inquiry is directed must be eradicated. Unless this is done, one of our most cherished freedoms will become but an empty phrase.

Mr. Speaker, this is a hard thing for a man to do. It is an unhappy thing for a man to have to do, and if my own interests alone were at issue I could not do it. But, Mr. Speaker, the first duty of every Member of this House is to consider the welfare and the effectiveness of the House itself. Its interests are incomparably greater than the interests—even the right of justice—attaching to any individual Member. The next duty of a Member of this body is the welfare of the various instrumentalities it creates to carry out its will—whether those instrumentalities be independent agencies or standing or select committees. Any Member who loves this body as we all love it, who takes pride and deep satisfaction in being a part of its honored membership, must put before himself, before his own interests, before even justice to himself, the best interests of the House. Consequently, the action I take today is based solely upon my conscientious and deep desire to live up to the most sacred obligations of this body and to my oath as a Member of it.

Mr. Speaker, moved by these considerations, and fortified by the concurrence of friends in this House in whose friendship and judgment I have the utmost confidence, I tender you my resignation as chairman of the Select Committee to Investigate the Federal Communications Commission. Its work thus far has been well done. Its membership is excellent. Its staff is composed of men and women who are able, conscientious, and skilled in the work they have undertaken. This committee must continue its work under a new chairman, freed of any possible embarrassment of my personal problems or controversies. I thank you for the honor of having named me chairman of the committee, and for your expressed confidence in my administration of its affairs. I urge the House to support, to continue and to stand solidly back of the work of the committee under its new chairman, whoever he may be.

So far as I am personally concerned, my love and admiration for this House, my devotion to its ideals, make it a matter of pride with me that I, as one of its Members, efface myself so that the work of one of its committees may go forward. Let no man mistake me. I shall continue to make the fight where I find it. I leave the Well of this House today with my head unbowed and with my devotion to my duties undimmed.

The SPEAKER. The resignation of the gentleman from Georgia is accepted.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the announcement just made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] indicates his high courage and unselfishness. No enemy could have compelled him to relinquish his special committee assignment. Threats and vicious abuse would have been shrugged aside with disdain and contempt. Vilification and slander he has ignored. Yet, his nobility of character would not permit him to continue in a place that might cause embarrassment to the House, to his colleagues, and his friends. It is apparent to all of us that unselfishness and a high regard for the sensibilities of his colleagues in this House have been the only motives which prompted the gentleman from Georgia to follow the course that he has taken. The people of the district the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] so ably represents, I know are proud of his services. His unselfish act of today will make them feel prouder of him, and of his high and noble character, and of his courage.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to me?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMASON). Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my distinguished colleague in applauding the unselfishness of our colleague from Georgia [Mr. Cox]. He has the courage in a situation difficult to him personally to be big enough in mind and in heart to efface himself, and to leave a position because he thinks that the thing that is near to his heart may be jeopardized by his presence upon this special committee. And I say to this House, after 20 years of intimate association with the gentleman from Georgia, GENE Cox, during which he has had my friendship and my love and my confidence, that today that love and that confidence in his honor and in his integrity is unshaken.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the utterances of the Speaker of this House contribute one of the finest compliments that any Member of the House has ever received in the constitutional history of our country, or that any Member ever will receive in the future. The Speaker is the presiding officer of this body. The gentleman from Texas, Speaker RAYBURN possesses the confidence and respect of everybody, without regard to party. No fairer man has ever presided on the rostrum of this House than our present distinguished and beloved Speaker, and his words carry force and weight, not only in this body, but throughout the length and breadth of this country, because the people of this country have confidence in the gentleman from Texas, SAM RAYBURN, the Speaker of the National House of Representatives.

One of the elements of greatness is willingness to make sacrifices. Today we have witnessed one of the finest acts of sacrifice that has ever taken place, particularly in this chamber.

As to the honesty and integrity of our distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. Cox] there is no question. He is above reproach. Any attempt to besmear or besmirch his name will be defeated because it is impossible, no matter how cheap the efforts might be, to prevent the people of this country from knowing the truth on the question of the honesty of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia. His honesty and integrity are clearly evidenced to the people of America by the splendid, spontaneous, and unanimous reception that he has received on this occasion.

I hesitate to proceed further and I will conclude by making this short statement. You and I, my colleagues, have today witnessed the greatest act of personal sacrifice that any man has ever made who has ever been a Member of this distinguished body. Great as he has been as a Member of this body in the past in the estimation of his colleagues and his friends, the gentleman from Georgia, EUGENE COX, has risen today to a greatness that impresses itself not only upon the Members of our body but of the people of the entire United States. He has made a great personal sacrifice in order that the integrity of this great body might be maintained in the minds and in the eyes of the Americain people. I know I express the thoughts and sentiments of every one of my colleagues when I convey to the gentleman from Georgia, EUGENE COX, our deep feelings of appreciation and our profound thanks for the great personal sacrifice he has made today.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read by the Clerk:

SEPTEMBER 29, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign my membership on the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Very respectfully,
CHRISTIAN A. HERTER.

The SPEAKER. With objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk several resolutions and ask for their immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 309

Resolved, That EDWARD O. MCCOWEN, of Ohio, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 310

Resolved, That the following Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives, to wit: HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr., of Pennsylvania, and CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, of Massachusetts.

The resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 311

Resolved, That JAMES GALLAGHER, Sr., of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 312

Resolved, That ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, of Kansas, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and the Committee on Claims of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include certain editorials about the late editor of the New York Sun, Frank M. O'Brien.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ABRIDGING FREEDOM OF SPEECH BY RADIO OR WIRE COMMUNICATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House joint resolution to amend the Constitution. When that amendment is adopted, and I hope it is adopted in the very near future, it will be known as the twenty-second amendment to the Constitution. It has to do with freedom of speech on the radio.

Radio has become such an important factor in the shaping up of public opinion that there has been a tendency by Government officials, broadcasting officials, and various organizations to impose a direct or indirect censorship on radio discussions. Such censorship is not in the interests of the development of a free American public opinion.

The American people are able to formulate their own judgments. They must have their information brought to them without interference from those who do not entertain the true value of the public mind, established by our successful history founded on the judgments of all Americans after free public debate on the numerous issues solved during the course of this country's life.

The more serious tendency toward censorship lies in the efforts to make our courts lean toward censorship restrictions on radio communications because broadcasting for physical reasons is necessarily subjected to a licensing or a franchise system.

There really should not be any question but that the provisions of the first and fourteenth amendments to the Constitution apply to radio. But, because of the tendency to differentiate speech through licensed communication from ordinary speech, as far as freedom is concerned, it has become imperative that Congress and the people speak more pointedly on this question through a referendum in the form of my proposed amendment.

I have purposely refrained from attaching directly new language to the first and fourteenth amendments because these two amendments are so sacred to the American people and now so succinctly express the basic American creed that any tampering with their form might be viewed as a profanation.

Freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and a free press not only are the great objectives of our system but are, as well, the guaranties of its continuance.

Americans are not a namby-pamby people. They can take strong stuff over the air just as they can give strong medicine to our enemies on the field of battle. The forthright leaders of the past—those men who guided America to its present high position—were never mollycoddles in the use of language and there is no reason for the belief that leaders on the air today should pull their punches in castigating inimical movements.

If a speech on the air offends a listener, the dial can always be turned away from the broadcaster who is offending as far as a particular listener is concerned. We want our broadcasting to be forthright and we want our facts accurately reported. We will pass our own judgments.

At present, through a filter system, composed of the Federal Communications System and those who control the licensed broadcasting systems, our broadcasting has been diluted to the degree where it has become so neutral as to be ineffective. We want strong speech from strong men on the air, not synthetic understatements from pulpiteering puppets. An example of the worth of strong free speech is in the broadcasts of Walter Winchell. He helped to awaken America to the danger of the fifth column and his sharp attacks on it over the air did much to destroy it. He aroused public opinion to such an extent that the work of the enemy in our midst has been ineffective. Censorship that would have stopped Winchell in these attacks would have been disastrous to the country.

There are other able commentators on the air who have fearlessly pointed out to the people things that were destructive and these men should not be hampered because higher-ups do not share their views or approve of their methods of expression.

America can only live while speech is free and the most important of all speech is speech by radio.

Following is a copy of my resolution:

House Joint Resolution 168

Joint resolution—Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech by radio or wire communication

Resolved, etc., That the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended by adding the following article:

AMENDMENT 22, SECTION 1. Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech by radio or wire communication.

SEC. 2. The provisions of any law, license, or contract in violation of section 1 hereof are hereby declared inoperative.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by my colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] at the dedication of a river terminal at Guntersville, Ala.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS RELATIVE TO INVESTIGATION OF THE PROGRESS OF THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 716) back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. No. 38) authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the resolution (H. Res. 30) authorizing and directing an investigation of the progress of the war effort, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,500 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the first session of the

Seventy-eighth Congress on the resolution (H. Res. 30) authorizing and directing an investigation of the progress of the war effort.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article written by me and which appeared in the September issue of the Reader's Digest.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous consent requests: First, that I may extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

THE GASOLINE SITUATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I know of no study made in reference to the gasoline situation that has found that there is not sufficient gasoline in the United States to take care of those individuals who must have it to carry on their lawful occupation.

A great many salesmen, a number of cream and poultry buyers and others are and will be forced out of business because of the recent cut in their gasoline rations. All of these individuals are carrying on a part of the important necessary work of our country. Some of these individuals are well along in years. They cannot go to the factory or the farm. They are just out of business.

To limit a salesman to 120 miles of travel a week might be all right in some territories, but out in the wide open spaces of our agricultural States, it is not enough. Is there any good reason why, after the military needs are met, the individual who must have gasoline to stay in business should not be taken care of next?

One traveling man has sent me the following letter, which, in my opinion, carries a great deal of truth:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: While the O. P. A., under orders, of course, from the New Deal, is starving traveling salesmen to death by cutting their gas to 120 miles a week, the World Herald, of Omaha, of this date, had on its sport page an item telling of the Lowry Field, of Denver, football team being taken to Fort Riley in six—count them—six bombers to play football there today. Why, they will use enough gas to run all the salesmen in Nebraska a week, if they were permitted enough gas to cover their entire territories. Of course, I am not mentioning anything at all about Eleanor wasting gas all over the face of the earth.

Among the salesmen and others who must have gasoline to carry on are found some of our finest citizens. They are paying taxes, buying bonds, giving their sons, husbands, and fathers to the armed services. They are not receiving the consideration that they should have in the rationing of gasoline. They have been discriminated against since gasoline rationing first began. Those officials who make the rules and regulations for gasoline rationing should get acquainted with the work that these men are doing, or somebody else should take their places.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that our salesmen and others who must travel can be given more gasoline.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by Mr. George W. Vaught, notwithstanding the fact that it contains two and a half pages, and I am advised by the Government Printing Office that it will cost $105.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by own remarks in the RECORD and include therewith an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by the dairy industry of my State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article by former Ambassador William C. Bullitt, which appeared recently in the Polish Catholic Press Weekly Review.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(Mr. OUTLAND asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the life and history of the Navy of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

(Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the other special orders heretofore entered I may address the House today for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MILITARY LEAVE

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word in behalf of our soldiers who are not in position to have furloughs or leave.

I wish to point out that with members of the armed forces stationed all over the world some in training in this country, others on active fighting fronts, and still others in strategic locations which have not yet become combat areas, it is impossible for the Army and Navy to grant uniform leaves of absence or furloughs. Of necessity the decision of the commanding officer in the light of particular circumstances has to govern what, if any, leaves or furloughs can be granted. Accordingly, some members of the service might receive 30 days leave or furlough a year and others none at all.

It seems only fair that members of the armed forces who, because of the particular nature of their assignment are prohibited from taking leave, should at least receive compensation for the unused leave to which they are normally entitled. The accumulation of leave is directly conditioned upon length of service rendered. Under a bill I have today offered, the members of the armed forces upon discharge from service will be credited with accumulated leave and paid a lump sum payment in settlement of unused leave. It will represent an earned personal savings fund that will be available to the individual to use in any manner he or she may choose.

I wish to emphasize that in no way is this accumulated leave pay to be considered a part of or substitute for whatever general termination pay or benefits the Congress might decide should be given to members of the armed forces at the termination of the war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a soldier.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I have received from Mr. N. V. Duncan, of Fairfield, Ill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the officers of the Farmers' Union of Peake, Local No. 1541, of Pleasanton, Nebr.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to adress the House for 10 minutes today following the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two short articles.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GASOLINE RATIONING AND THE WAR BOND CAMPAIGN

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, recently and during the Third War Loan Drive, in Delaware County, in the Tenth Congressional District of Indiana, which I have the high honor to represent, the director and chairman of that war-loan drive found it necessary for members of his organization to drive automobiles over that county in making personal solicitation for bond sales, and this required gasoline in excess of the coupons which those solicitors had.

The local War Price and Ration Board was contacted in an effort to secure extra coupons for gasoline in order to effectively carry on this campaign for the sale of War bonds but this request was refused by that board.

Then, in a frantic effort to secure some extra gasoline coupons, for the purpose of completing the sale of War bonds in that county, the chairman and director of the drive made a request to the State director of the war price and rationing, and he, likewise, refused to grant this very reasonable request.

The good people of that county continued their efforts to sell Government bonds by walking—many of them walking great distances to contact prospective purchasers—but they finally completed their quota, and sold all bonds allotted to that county. That is the spirit of the people in Indiana.

While the people in my district were walking and selling Government bonds to aid in the prosecution of this war, many bureaucrats in Washington, who will draw their wages and salaries from the very money those people were collecting in the sales they made of bonds, were riding in large automobiles, purchased by the Government with an unlimited supply of gasoline, paid for and provided by the people of this Nation. This policy is entirely unfair, and these people will have something to say on this subject in the future.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today following the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REMOVE THE O. P. A. CEILING PRICE ON CORN

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a resolution to remove the O. P. A. ceiling price of $1.07 a bushel on corn, effective November 1, 1943, and let it seek its own level and open the road for the sale of middle western corn to the farmers in the Eastern States. Unless this is done immediately, there will be practically no corn for eastern poultrymen and dairymen, seriously affecting the production of these vital food commodities.

The poultry and dairy herds in the East cannot live on continued alibis, excuses, and promises of relief from the Federal Government. It must be obvious that there will be very little sale and shipment of corn from the Western States unless the ceiling price of $1.07 is taken off and corn permitted to reach a level whereby it will be profitable for the growers in Iowa and other Middle Western States to sell to eastern farmers and industries.

The responsibility rests upon the Congress, now that the commitment made by Chester Davis, former War Food Administrator, that there would be no advance in the price of corn before October 31, 1943, is about to expire, to remedy this situation by legislative action. It would have, perhaps, been unfair to do so prior to that date, as a definite commitment had been made by the Department of Agriculture. But the Congress should now act immediately to remove the ceiling price as of November 1, and start corn moving to the East. We must have corn for our poultry, our dairy cows, and our industries, including vital war industries, now, and not 6 months from now.

The situation is critical, and unless Congress acts to afford immediate relief to the eastern farmers by providing them with corn and feed grains, many of them, particularly the poultrymen and dairymen, will be forced to either curb production or go out of business. The handling of the farm problem has been the greatest blunder and most colossal failure of all the New Deal experiments, and has all but wrecked and ruined our eastern farmers. What a tragedy it is, in view of the Government's urging the American people to raise poultry and then, when they have complied, corn is not available through New Deal blundering. The production of milk, butter, and eggs is rapidly falling off, and the supply of poultry will also next year. We are facing a food shortage which is becoming more acute every day, and it is the duty of the Congress to act now to prevent a more serious situation from developing.

The resolution I introduced today is as follows:

Joint resolution removing the ceiling price on corn

Resolved, etc., That the order placing a ceiling price on corn by the Office of Price Administration, at $1.07 a bushel, is hereby removed, effective November 1, 1943. No ceiling price on corn shall be placed in effect by any agency of the Government without the consent of the Congress.

ADJOURNMENT OVER AND PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF OCTOBER 4

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman tell us what the program for next week will be?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no program for next week, and there will be nothing as far as I know except such matters as may come up by unanimous consent. Should anything arise unexpectedly I will see that the House is given sufficient notice, but I do not know of anything that will come up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman realizes that the Committee on Military Affairs is conducting hearings on the soldier allotment bills. May we expect such a bill to be reported at an early date?

Mr. McCORMACK. I see the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], a member of the committee, here. Perhaps he can tell us.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say that we started the hearings on yesterday and will probably conclude them tomorrow. I understood from the announcement of the chairman that the matter would then be referred to a subcommittee to complete the drafting of a bill, and we should finish it sometime next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And may we expect it to be brought to the floor at an early date?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know the gentleman's views, and I know that the gen-

tleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] knows my views; we are in harmony.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I appreciate that fact.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think something should be done.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I appreciate the kindly cooperation of the majority leader in giving the green light to House Joint Resolution 155, which is now in the process of being whipped into shape and I should like to ask the majority leader if he will give us the same timely cooperation on the bill of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] that revives the stamp plan for furnishing food to the low-income groups in the hope of getting this through immediately to take care of those people who are being pinched by the increased cost of living.

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be only too glad to look into it. It is difficult for me to resist the charm of my distinguished friend, but when he also includes the other distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] he makes it practically irresistible, but I will look into the matter gladly and cooperate to the extent I can.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the distinguished majority leader, with all his great ability and influence, may possibly persuade the Military Affairs Committee to look into the fact that a quarter of a million colored boys have been rejected by the Selective Service because they cannot read or write or because something might be the matter with their teeth or that they might have flat feet. If he did so, he might find a reservoir of manpower to put into our Army in the present emergency. Does the gentleman think he could use his influence to ascertain those facts so that we may have them at the proper time?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am positive, the gentleman having made his observations, that the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee will take cognizance of the fact and give it consideration.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, my attention has been called to the fact that the calling of bills on the Consent Calendar is due for Monday. They will be called as usual?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I am glad the gentleman from Massachusetts has reminded me of that, as did the Parliamentarian. The bills on the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar will be called next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a short article from the Columbus (Miss.) Commercial Dispatch, containing a letter of Lt. J. D. Franks, Jr., who lost his life in the raid on the Rumanian oil fields.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE STATE OF THE NATION FROM A CONGRESSIONAL VIEWPOINT

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I believe I am safe in saying that the 10 years between 1933 and 1943 will go down in our history books as the "rubber-stamp era," because it was a decade high-lighted by a subservient Congress; it was a decade in which "must" legislation predominated; it was a decade when all important bills were tailor-made in the executive departments and sent to Congress for passage. Every piece of legislation and every power asked for by the President during those 10 years, with the exception of two, were granted him. Congress did not even take the trouble to scrutinize the language nor the scope of the legislation. As a result, much loose, vague, ambiguous legislation was passed.

The two refusals during this "rubber-stamp era" were the Supreme Court packing proposal and the scheme to reorganize the Government departments—a scheme to make the executive department of the Government supreme. Both of these proposals were defeated, as you know, because an aroused people made their fears and opposition felt through a barrage of letters and telegrams of protest. I credit the newspapers of the country for the job they did at that time in arousing the people to the dangers that threatened our form of government.

I know at first hand how discouraging and disappointing this "rubber-stamp era" was, because I had to live with it and take part in it. All my campaign speeches during this "rubber-stamp era" had for their theme, "We need men, not mice, in Congress."

Then came the election of 1942, in which many "rubber stamp" Congressmen were defeated and new men with backbone elected in their place. This gave the country an independent-minded Congress, a well-balanced Congress, a Congress that insures a healthy, desirable condition in the legislative halls of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, last December while home for the Christmas holidays, I was bold enough to predict what the new Congress would do. I said the Congress:

First. Would pass no more New Deal legislation.

Second. Would grant no additional powers to the Executive unless actually needed for war purposes.

Third. Would clarify and speed up the war effort.

Fourth. Would reduce or do away with all subsidies.

Fifth. Would see to it that all future legislation would be specific and definite so there could be no chance for misinterpretation.

Those predictions have become established facts. The rubber-stamp Congress of the 1933–43 decade became by the election of 1942 "The Rebellious Congress;" and now it begins to look as though it might become "The Cooperative Congress," because today New Deal bureaucrats are on the way out in Washington as a result of the legislative rebellion of the last 6 months, and businessmen who believe in the American system of free enterprise are now being placed in responsible positions. Cooperation therefore between the executive branch and the legislative branch of the Government can become the order of the day. I sincerely hope it will.

LEGISLATIVE HIGHLIGHTS

Mr. Speaker, I have listed a few of the accomplishments of the "rebellious Congress," that I want to bring to your attention—perhaps I should call them legislative high lights:

(a) The repeal of the $25,000 salary limitation edict of the President. That salary limitation has been a plank in the platform of the Communist Party of America during the last 10 years. It is now an avowed objective of the C. I. O. Such a provision limiting salaries had been expressly prohibited by the Congress when drafting the price-control bill. The President chose to disregard that prohibition when he issued his order. The edict was repealed by attaching a rider to the debt limitation bill in order to avoid a veto. The repeal of this edict was made an issue by Congress to discourage future arbitrary edicts not authorized by law.

(b) The Hobbs antiracketeering labor bill was passed in the House by a two-to-one vote. This measure was opposed by the White House, by the C. I. O., and by the A. F. of L. The passage of this bill was a real test of the independence of Congress, because in voting for it Members disregarded the greatest labor lobby ever mustered, paid no attention to their threats, nor did they give in to White House pressure. A two-to-one vote in the face of these things is something to write home about.

(c) Congress again proved its independence by the passage of the Smith-Connally antistrike bill over the President's veto in record time. As you know, the President has finally decided to make use of the provisions of that bill as a club to force John L. Lewis into line.

(d) Being economy-minded, this rebellious Congress liquidated four New Deal agencies, the National Resources Planning Board that had hatched out the cradle-to-grave security program, now dubbed "womb-to-tomb program"; the National Youth Administration, a special pet and protégé of Mrs. Roosevelt, with "parlor pinks," such as Aubrey Williams, at the head of it; the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation that provided crop insurance at taxpayers' expense, a program neither sound nor practical; and the Bituminous Coal Division of the Interior Department, a New Deal scheme to establish coal prices and costs of production.

(e) Congress also slashed appropriations for O. P. A. and made a drastic cut in O. W. I. appropriations, especially

its domestic propaganda branch. Besides that Congress pruned the Office of Civilian Defense, and many other New Deal useless expenditures. To be exact, this economy-minded rebellious Congress lopped off altogether $1,000,000,000 from Uncle Sam's annual budget.

Summing up the record of the Congress for the last 6 months, I would say it has put quite a crimp in the New Deal, has reasserted its authority over the legislative processes, and has reestablished itself once again in the eyes of the people as an important arm of our Federal Government. Teamwork with the Executive is a very desirable thing, but subservience to him is something else again.

OUR TAX PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most constructive act of the new Congress was the passage of a pay-as-you-earn tax plan. A change in our method of collecting personal income taxes had become absolutely necessary because during the last 2 years Congress lowered the income-tax brackets so that instead of some 4,000,000 taxpayers filing returns and paying taxes we now have 44,000,000 taxpayers, most of whom know little about budgeting their expenditures, do not save ahead, and so must be placed upon a pay-as-you-earn basis. Uncle Sam, therefore, had to reach into the pay envelopes of these 40,000,000 new taxpayers in order to make certain of his tax money.

At this point I want to give you an idea of what to expect in the future tax picture. The Federal tax bill for 1943 will be about $35,000,000,000, eight times the load it was when the New Deal took over. The administration now plans to make the tax load about fifty billions for 1944, an increase of one-third over the present load. As these are astronomical figures, a few comparisons might help.

Before the New Deal era the entire cost of the Federal Government ran around $4,000,000,000 a year, and the interest on our public debt was about one-quarter billion dollars per year. Today the cost of the Federal Government is about $8,000,000,000 per year, twice what it was, and the interest charge alone upon the public debt is two and one-quarter billion dollars, or nine times as much as it was in pre-New Deal days. At a conservative estimate, after the war is over the interest charges on our public debt will be over $4,000,000,000 per year, more than the entire cost of running the Government 10 years ago.

Our total direct appropriations so far this session amount to $115,000,000,000, which, when added to reappropriations and authorizations, make a total of about $150,000,000,000 that Uncle Sam has available to spend during this fiscal year. Regular post-war appropriations are expected to top twenty-five billions a year. This amount will be needed to cover an enormous public works program, a greatly expanded social security program, and our enlarged national defense program. After the war is over it is proposed to appropriate $5,000,000,000 per year for the Army and Navy, as against a pre-war appropriation for the Army and Navy of less than $1,000,000,000 per year. Anyone can readily see from these figures that our tax load will be a very heavy one for generations and generations to come. I need not tell you what a handicap that will be to business and industry.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. Speaker, I have just read a new book upon United States foreign policy by Walter Lippmann. It is written in newspaper style and expresses good sound common sense. It is well worth reading and studying. Because I agree quite thoroughly with Lippmann's thesis and arguments, I want to brief the book for you.

Lippmann says when we adopted the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, we assumed our first obligation or commitment to protect and preserve interests outside of our own boundaries. We undertook under the Monroe Doctrine to be the guardian and protector of the Western Hemisphere from Greenland on the north to the Straits of Magellan on the south. Because England had interests that paralleled ours in this hemisphere, she agreed to underwrite our commitment and become a cosigner of our obligation, pledging the use of her Navy to back up that obligation.

When we bought Alaska in 1867 we made quite an extended commitment in the Pacific—but did not take any steps to cover that commitment. We acted then, and we have been acting ever since, in much the same way that short-sighted people do who go to the bank and make financial obligations or commitments but never prepare to meet those financial obligations when they come due.

Then, in 1898, after the Spanish-American War, we took over Guam, Wake, and other Pacific Islands, and became responsible for the Philippines, taking over an obligation or commitment to protect lands 7,000 miles away, and we still did little or nothing to prepare ourselves to live up to that obligation, when and if it ever became necessary. Theodore Roosevelt was one man who realized the responsibility and seriousness of this commitment in the Pacific. He advocated a strong Navy and stretched his authority until it cracked in order to build the Panama Canal, trying to avoid the necessity of having to build a two-ocean Navy.

Mr. Speaker, after reading Lippmann's book, one is bound to agree that the interests of England and the United States in both the Atlantic and Pacific areas are complementary, are inseparable, are mutual, and parallel to each other. Also that the long chain of islands in the Pacific that we are obligated to protect and defend must be anchored upon bases in Asia—China, India, Australia, and the Dutch East Indies—to enable us to live up to our commitment. In this connection perhaps we should point out that our whole campaign against Japan today is being conducted, and necessarily so, from British and Dutch bases, and that we must recapture Rangoon and open up the Burma Road before we can use China as a base for offensive operations against Japan. So, in view of the commitments in both oceans, that we have made voluntarily and with our eyes open, a realistic foreign policy for us must mean:

First. That we recognize and acknowledge the commitments and obligations we have assumed outside of the United States proper and prepare ourselves to cover those commitments;

Second. That we should make alliances with those nations whose interests are mutual and complementary; and

Third. That we make our armed forces, air, sea, and land, so strong that we can when necessary carry out our obligations whenever the same are challenged.

Until we do this our foreign policy will continue to be, as it has been since 1867, in a bankrupt condition, because we have never been prepared to live up to the obligations we have assumed.

POST-WAR FUTURE

Now, what about our post-war future? What may we expect in the post-war period? What can business expect? What can the farmer expect? What can industry expect? I frankly confess I do not know because I do not know who is going to plan that post-war future, nor do I know who will have the task of managing that post-war future. If new dealers such as WALLACE plan it and have charge of carrying out their plans, that will be one thing. If that happens we might then predict what to expect, because we are supposed to judge the future by the past, and the past 10 years under the New Deal show a definite trend toward national socialism.

Mr. Speaker, there are two schools of thought in Washington concerning our post-war future. The first is the socialistic school, headed by Frankfurter, Wallace, Judge Rosenman, Hopkins, Corcoran, Cohen, Henderson, and others. Their program is based upon Government control of all business and industry. This school of thought advocates a Government program of made work, another boondoggling era, to tide us over the slack period they expect after the war. They believe we should tax away all the profits of industry, renegotiate or cancel all war contracts, in order to get the money to pay for the proposed boondoggling program.

The other school of thought is headed by Jesse Jones, Byrnes, Vinson, Hull, and others. They believe we should preserve the American system of free enterprise, should look to and expect American Industry to reconvert from wartime production to peacetime production with the least possible loss of time, and while doing so keep employment at a high level. This reconversion of industry would be made possible by reserves that industry had been permitted to build up during peaktime production for that very purpose. This school of thought bases its program upon a huge reservoir of consumer demand that has been dammed up during the war period; an immense purchasing power that will be accumulated as a result of high wages and forced sav-

ings to implement that consumer demand; and adequate industrial reserves that should be allowed to accumulate, large enough to tide over the industrial reconversion period. At least 98 percent of the Republican Members of both House and the Senate belong to this second school of thought and are supporting its post-war program.

I was very much encouraged when I read that the executive council of the A. F. of L. went on record recently at a meeting in Chicago in favor of this second view of our post-war program and against another boondoggling era. The executive council declared that private industry when the war is over must provide the jobs to take care of the returning soldiers, and must also be ready to give peacetime jobs to the millions now engaged in wartime work. The council was equally insistent that capital be encouraged to make possible industrial expansion. In expressing this view it used these very significant words:

> The Government should not only permit but it should stimulate opportunities to make a reasonable and fair profit for business firms that are willing to increase production and employment. These business firms must be given assurances that they will not be taxed to death.

Mr. Speaker, when American business and American labor team up and insist that the Government should encourage and not discourage business expansion; that the Government should permit a fair profit to capital, and that the Government must not tax business to death, then the post-war outlook can be considered encouraging indeed. The executive council of the A. F. of L. is to be congratulated upon its constructive pronouncement covering the post-war future.

Summarizing, I have tried to give you a bird's-eye picture of the state of the Nation from a congressional viewpoint. I want to close by repeating and by reemphasizing my slogan during the last four national campaigns and by recommending that slogan to Members on both sides of the aisle for use in next year's campaign, "We need men, not mice, in Congress."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman in his opening remarks referred to the fact that in the past 6 or 8 months the Congress has given evidence of a greater independence than it has in the previous 10 years. I wonder if the gentleman will agree that the reason the Congress has become independent is that there are 40 or 50 more Republican Members in this Congress than there were in the Congresses of previous years, so that the balance of power between the minority and majority party hangs by the small number of between 10 and 15.

Mr. MASON. Yes; I think I would agree with that. That has brought about a well-balanced situation here which, of course, helps materially. I also wish to say that I have noticed many more signs of independence on the right side of the aisle during the last 6 or 7 months than I noticed in the 6 previous years that I sat in this Chamber.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman agree that if the public of this country want the Congress to be still more independent than it is even now they should send here about 50 more Republican Congressmen?

Mr. MASON. I hesitate right there because I want at this point to reiterate and emphasize the slogan I have used in the last four national campaigns, and I appealed to both Democrats and Republicans: "We need more men and fewer mice in Congress." You can take that on both sides of the aisle if you want to.

Mr. COLE of New York. Just one more question, and this is more in the nature of a correction. When the gentleman referred to the fact that as a result of the Spanish-American War this country acquired certain islands in the Pacific, he included the Hawaiian Islands. I am sure he did not intend that.

Mr. MASON. No; they were annexed before that.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman has emphasized the importance of private industry being permitted to retain part of its income, to lay something by.

Mr. MASON. To accumulate reserves.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Can that be accomplished under the policies we have been pursuing for a number of years?

Mr. MASON. It cannot. That can be accomplished only by changing the policies we have been pursuing for at least 10 years.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman recalls that only a few years ago we amended our Revenue Act and compelled private businesses to dispose of their surplus. If they did not, they were penalized heavily.

Mr. MASON. That is where we made our mistake. We are now making the same mistake when we force renegotiation upon most of the industries of the country, when only three or four are guilty and need it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman says "We." Of course, he means the majority.

Mr. MASON. I mean the party in power.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman means the party in power, because I did not vote for any such measure, to penalize private industry for undertaking to build up a reserve to protect itself and protect the jobs of its employees.

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. At the opening of the gentleman's splendid statement he referred to the Congresses of the past 10 years as being rubber-stamp Congresses.

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I wish the gentleman would make it clear that there was a minority that opposed that rubber stamping, even though the minority was small at times. The entire Membership of the Congress should not be condemned. The gentleman should put the blame where it belongs for yielding legislative and constitutional authority to the Executive.

Mr. MASON. When I made that statement I was not distinguishing as between the majority and minority parties. I said that as a whole it was a rubber-stamp Congress. Now I think it is a rebellious Congress, on both sides of the aisle. It is because of the work of this rebellious Congress that the New Deal autocrats and bureaucrats are on their way out and businessmen are being placed in positions of power who believe in preserving the American system of free enterprise.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I hope that demonstrates that the work of the minority for the past 10 years has finally had its effect upon a majority of the citizens of the country.

Mr. MASON. I think that is probably true. I would say that the work of the majority has become more effective now that we have a pretty well-balanced Congress.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman referred to the air bases in other countries of the world. We note with a great deal of interest that a group of Senators has visited these bases. I do not notice a similar group from the House going around to see the various bases where we are spending millions of dollars to help in the war effort, to find out what is going to be done. I think we should have a committee from the House, from the Committee on Naval Affairs and from the Committee on Military Affairs, go around to see where we are spending our money and what is being done with it.

It seems that when a group of Senators or Representatives goes to the battle fronts of the world they are criticized, but on the other hand certain columnists and news commentators and others use Government airplanes and hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of dollars are being spent to transport them back and forth and dine and wine them and give them material for their columns and broadcasts. Does not the gentleman believe that in preference to financing these people to visit the battle fronts of the world we ought to send some of our responsible committees over there to bring back the information to us, so that we could take some part in shaping the post-war policy?

Mr. MASON. Personally, I am willing to accept the information the group of Senators brought back if the sample I saw in this morning's paper is a good sample of the information they have brought back. I approve wholeheartedly, and I for once am convinced without seeing.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. DEWEY. I have been very much interested in the gentleman's remarks

in regard to the post-war effort. I wonder if the gentleman has given consideration to the possible necessity of the overhauling of our income-tax laws, as they regard risk capital? This country of ours was built up by people willing to take a risk, but today, under the Internal Revenue laws, anybody who takes a risk, if he gains, all his gain is taxed from him, and if he loses, there is no compensation. I think that in the future when peace comes, the committee on Ways and Means of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate should give consideration to the taxes on risk capital. We have here today over $65,000,000,000 of savings in one form or another in the hands of the people, and I think if they will go out and help develop new industries it will put many men to work and give employment to our returning soldiers.

Mr. MASON. I agree, but I insist that the only way to do that is to support that second school of thought that I discussed so briefly.

Mr. DEWEY. I am in hearty accord with the gentleman.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. ROWE. In the gentleman's opening remarks he spoke something concerning the amount of money that has been appropriated, and that had not been expended, but remained to be reappropriated, and said that it amounted totally to some $150,000,000,000.

Mr. MASON. That is correct.

Mr. ROWE. There being approximately $35,000,000,000 left in last year's fiscal appropriations for reappropriation. Does the gentleman believe it is humanly possible for this administration to expend that amount of money in a year?

Mr. MASON. Do I understand the question to be whether or not I believe it is humanly possible for this administration to spend $150,000,000,000 this year?

Mr. ROWE. Yes.

Mr. MASON. I would say yes, judging the future by the past. They have spent about $100,000,000,000 this year, and they are just getting started. It ought to be very easy for them to increase the amount by $50,000,000,000, providing WALLACE and his kind have the handling of it.

Mr. ROWE. One other question. Being a new Member of Congress, sometimes I have been a little nonplussed that we approach many serious problems, but seem to be bereft of pertinent information respecting them, and I think I heard our colleague from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] remark something about specialists being employed by this Congress to give proper information so that it may be available for us with which to approach this question of spending money more intelligently in the future than in the past. Does the gentleman believe, as an older Member of this body, that such a body of experts should be available to the House?

Mr. MASON. I certainly do, and I think this body has been remiss in the past in not insisting on that; I think at least 10 or 15 years ago, when our budget sprung above $5,000,000,000.

Mr. ROWE. Does the gentleman think they would contribute in some degree to the solution of the query just raised by another Member about the expenditure of money for persons dissociated from the Government to travel over the face of the earth, spending money for purposes I am sure this Congress never intended it to be spent?

Mr. MASON. I agree to that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] I think refers to the House concurrent resolution that I introduced earlier, to create a joint House and Senate committee for efficiency in expenditures. I think about 5,000 copies of that resolution have been produced over the country thus far, but we have not been able to get any action by the Rules Committee. It does bring up this collateral thought. We have been so apt to accept so many of the things that are brought before us by the bureaus of the governmental agencies and nowhere is that quite so true as it is in respect to military expenditures. For instance, if the Quartermaster General says that we have to buy 65,000,000 pairs of socks, we act upon the theory that he actually needs 65,000,000 pairs of socks, and that the money should be appropriated with which to buy them. I believe the time has come for this Congress not only to scrutinize the expenditures on the home front, but the military and naval expenditures as well, because the Truman committee aptly indicated that some money could be saved in that direction. It would give, I think, enormous aid in the necessity for amortizing at some time in the future the huge service charge that will amount to $5,000,000,000 on the basis of current interest rates, and we have to put our shoulders to the wheel of economy and efficiency on every front, if we are going to save this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COURTNEY). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

PROPAGANDA HAS NO PLACE IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I propose to speak on the subject that political propaganda has no place in our public schools. I wish to refer in that connection to a publication entitled "My Part in This War," on which subject I spoke some time ago.

Mr. Speaker, on the 17th day of May 1943 it was my privilege to address the House on the important subject Propaganda Has No Place in Our Public Schools, and it appears the effort to distribute propaganda in our schools is still continuing. The booklet which was published by the Consumer Education Study, which is apparently a branch of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, a department of the National Education Association, with offices at 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., under the title of "My Part in This War," is creating much comment among the teachers and school men and women throughout the country.

The title of this publication, My Part in This War, is very attractive, because every American has a part in this war; yet the contents of this publication should be carefully scrutinized and analyzed in order to get the full import of its meaning and purpose.

Mr. Speaker, quite recently I have been informed that Mr. Thomas H. Briggs, who purports to be a director of consumer education study, made a statement that at the time I spoke on this subject it was before I had seen and inspected this booklet, My Part in This War. I hereby refute that statement made by Mr. Briggs. At the very time I spoke on this subject in the House of Representatives I had one of these books in my possession, and when I spoke I had with me a copy of such book, which I showed to the Members of the House during my discourse. Prior to the time I spoke on that subject, I desire to enlighten that gentleman by saying I had carefully studied this propaganda booklet, and I copied extracts from it, which parts were used in my address at that time. I was fully advised and I knew whereof I was speaking when I addressed myself to this subject. The copy of this much-publicized booklet which I then had possession of, and which copy I still retain, was purchased by me from the National Education Association, at its office, at 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Would the gentleman enlighten the House as to whether or not this National Education Association is a private association or is it financed by the Government, or whether it has any connection with the Government?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not know whether it is financed by the Government or not. I know that Mr. Thomas H. Briggs, who is a part of it, has been connected with the Government, and to that extent, at least, he has participated in the publication of this booklet, as you will observe as I proceed further in this discourse, and a Mr. Marcus Rosenblum, of the O. P. A., rewrote the manuscript, according to a statement which is contained in this book.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield for a clarification?

Mr. SPRINGER. I shall be happy to yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The National Education Association is chartered by Congress. It has nothing to do with the administration or the Government but is supported by contributions from teachers all over the United States, as members of the association.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is exactly what I knew and I wanted the RECORD to show that it is not a Government organization.

Mr. SPRINGER. Thanks for those contributions. However, Mr. Rosenblum, of the O. P. A., had his part in the preparation of this publication. Now, may I proceed with my statement?

Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I must report that this organization, or group, or some one of them, still persists in its efforts to place this booklet in our public schools as a textbook. In my own State of Indiana, many efforts have been made to place this book, My Part in This War, in our public schools as a textbook. The success of this effort is unknown to me, but I have received letters from school men and women entirely disapproving of this book as a textbook in our public schools. They rejected it because it was filled with propaganda on controversial political issues, which they deemed improper for dissemination among the boys and girls in our public schools. The book is especially prepared for use in our schools, because instructions are set forth in it to the teachers, and many questions have been prepared for the students, of which the following are but a few:

What new courses are being offered to your school as a result of the war?

How has your school contributed to the war effort besides by revising its curriculum?

Survey the war-time activities of your teachers.

Many other like, and similar questions, are propounded which leaves no doubt in our minds regarding its ultimate purpose. It is intended as a textbook in our public schools, and this fact is causing great concern among our people.

The question naturally comes, Why should the people be concerned about this publication?

After making a careful study of this book, the method of presenting the propaganda therein contained and the cunning method of establishing a definite conclusion is completely revealed. The most lasting impression on the mind is created during the formative age of youth, and these are apt to become the definite conclusion of the adult. Are we to sit idly by and permit future national policies and economic philosophies to be planted in the minds of our school children? Should we permit a resort to the methods of exploitation contained in Mein Kampf in this country? Will we permit the curriculum in our public schools to include political propaganda? Remember, if we stand by and permit this character of propaganda to be spread through our public schools we may be lending our aid to a complete change of our standards, to a reorganization of our domestic economy and even to a change of our form of government.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced our people are not ready to abandon our American way of life. However, if we fail to counteract this character of propaganda the time may come when we will find ourselves helpless to prevent such a change.

Let me refer to a few of the pertinent paragraphs of this propaganda, which are contained in this book, My Part in This War.

I praise the F. S. A., which is a very controversial issue of political character.

There is contained in it an article wherein grade labeling is urged. This is another highly controversial issue, and one which is recognized as political in nature.

It refers to the collection of taxes and it pays particular attention to the pay-as-you-go plan, by negative suggestion, and concludes with this statement:

Perhaps the most important consideration to think about in regard to such a proposal is that it must not be used as a means of decreasing the total taxes to be paid.

We well remember some of the arguments presented on the tax bill, recently passed.

The frequently proposed spending tax is extolled by the writers of this book.

This propaganda production also speaks of strikes in wartime, stating they are not bad, it advocates against the enactment of a sales tax, it denounces the Ruml plan as being wrong, and it states that the President's directive fixing the top salary ceiling is still the law regardless of the action of Congress.

Some of the most pertinent questions contained in this book may be found on page 89, question 8, which are addressed to the school children, and are as follows:

What effect do the President's messages and statements have upon the people?

What is your personal reaction to them?

Many other controversial issues are presented in this book—many of which are issues presented by the New Deal.

The Indianapolis Times, one of the outstanding newspapers in Indiana, says:

There is some doubt as to how much the National Education Association actually had to do with the preparation of this booklet, since it appears under the imprint of a subdivision of a subdivision of that organization. There is a clear trace of Columbia University Teachers College, noted stronghold of leftist educational theory, across its background.

While there is no objection to a private organization distributing such booklets, if it so elects, there is every reason to object to the preparation of such a publication by a Federal agency, or by Federal employees, at public expense for a private group in time of war; and there is certainly a most serious objection against the distribution and use of this publication as a textbook in our public schools.

The foreword of this booket makes the following statement:

In this crisis education as usual is no more justifiable than business as usual.

Can anyone deny the charge of propaganda in the face of that positive statement?

During the period of an all-out war effort we know that education suffers. The normal processes of education, business, and agriculture suffer. Yet, although education suffers now, that is no just reason for the distribution of vicious and intriguing propaganda among our boys and girls in the formative period of their lives to chart their trend of thought for the future years.

Mr. Speaker, our school children should be taught the fundamentals of government, together with a rigid course on our Constitution, with the other usual subjects pertinent to their course of study. This should continue throughout their proper grades in the public schools. These boys and girls will only too soon be called upon to assume the responsibility of guiding the Nation. They will then determine those policies which will chart the course which will guide our destinies. They are the very ones in whom there should be instilled the concepts of government that their forefathers created, builded upon, and fought to protect and preserve. The school children of today must continue to be taught that the American way of life is soundly based on a government of the people, by the people and for the people, that our Government is a system of checks and balances, divided into three coordinate branches—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial—that one cannot function without the support of the others, and, most of all, that if one is permitted to become paramount and independent of the others, democracy is dead.

Mr. Speaker, wartime economy is transient. It is like the shifting sand. If and when the individual liberties must be temporarily surrendered in time of war they must be recaptured and returned when peace comes. All wartime policies must be only temporary. Otherwise they will become a permanent national policy and economy under which our liberty and freedom will be lost forever.

While education must continue in time of war, just as in time of peace, yet there must be no substitute promulgated and no far-flung leftist idealisms promoted in our public-school system under the guise of war necessity.

May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that our public schools must not be permitted to degenerate by turning them into propaganda agencies, regardless of the position taken on any controversial political issue by any group, organization, or governmental agency

In the end, the people will stop this present policy, I am certain. The parents of the school boys and girls will not hesitate to urge all school authorities to critically scrutinize this and all other questionable publications offered as textbooks for use in our schools. They will question any proposed propaganda publication offered as a textbook, no matter where published, or by whom published. The theory of any group attempting to place before the youth of our land, through the medium of our public schools, any kind of controversial political propaganda is unthinkable and unconscionable.

Mr. Speaker, the people expect the full and complete cooperation of their Government in placing our public schools upon a high plane—far higher than that exemplified by the sinister propaganda contained in the book My Part in This War—and they expect their Government to aid in stopping all attempts to disrupt the normal processes in our public schools by injecting vicious propaganda therein by placing unfit textbooks before the American youth.

Our schools must be kept free from politics.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my distinguished friend from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe the gentleman from Indiana is entitled to the thanks of the House for exposing to the curative light of day this propaganda sheet which might affect adversely our common-school system. I wish to compliment him for his timely utterances on this very important subject.

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to thank my friend for that fine observation.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPRINGER. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. For the information of the gentleman, let me say that in my congressional district in the city of St. Louis there are several very large high schools. They discuss political questions every week in the auditorium. They have debates upon issues that are before the public at the time. Further than that, when the national campaign is on they discuss the issues in the campaign, the platforms, and the candidates, and in the week before the election they have an unofficial election and they vote for President, Senator, Congressman, and Governor. I might say they are extremely intelligent, because in the last election the vote that those children cast, something over 2,000 of them, the result was reflected by the vote that was cast on the following Tuesday. I might say further they were intelligent because they gave me a great majority over my Republican opponent, and I was elected by a great majority over my Republican opponent.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to my distinguished friend from Missouri that it is all right for the children to debate those questions, but when you take a textbook and teach them one side of an issue, that is part of their education; they get only one side of the issue and that is all they know when they are presented with a text book, such as this one which I hold in my hand.

Mr. COCHRAN. Upon that I fully agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. That policy should not be permitted in our public schools, under any guise or pretense whatsoever.

Mr. COCHRAN. I fully agree with the gentleman. I might further say that I urged upon the principal that whenever they did have a debate or whenever they had anyone come to address the children, that they have people to address them on both sides of the question pending.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct in that position. That is the only way a political matter should be handled in our public schools. All of us disapprove of the program of teaching our school children but one side of a political issue in our public schools.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If I understand, this book is a textbook?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And they are forced to study that textbook and the teachers are forced to teach that textbook, and that presents just one side of the question?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct. They get but one side of the political question, and they would have presented to them, by way of a textbook, that plan which is presented by the publication to which I now refer. This, in my humble opinion, is most vicious propaganda imaginable. This book should not be permitted to be used as a textbook in our public schools.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of all other business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FOUR MAJOR TASKS BEFORE THE COUNTRY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is good to see such a large and enthusiastic attendance in the Chamber this afternoon and I am going to suggest to my colleagues that they move over into the mourners' benches where we can enjoy this fellowship with the least amount of physical exertion.

I am deeply grateful to you. I want to visit a little while about a number of things. I want to go back to the general things that I discussed with my people this summer. It was a good, arduous sojourn back home, and there were many, many meetings every day. I presented to them this kind of an outline: I said we had four major tasks before the country. The first one was to win the war. The second was to win the peace. The third major task was to embark upon an immediate program for the preparation of the post-war period, when probably 10,000,000 in the armed forces will be demobolized and when perhaps 20,000,000 in the defense plants of the country will have to find other creative employment. The next major proposal that I discussed with people this summer was the salvation and the preservation of freedom in our own country.

You know that sounds a little academic, but it is not so academic after all, and certainly the boys in the armed services are beginning to exhibit some anxiety and concern about it.

I had a letter recently from a lieutenant colonel in Africa. He had been in the big show. He wrote rather informally. He said:

> We are hearing so many stories from back home about the rise of bureaucracy, about the invasion of the freedom of the people.

He said:

> Is that the thing we are coming back to after arduous foreign service in the armed forces of our country?

And so it is a problem with which we are going to have to be concerned. I felt a little distressed about an hour ago when an inquiry was addressed to the majority leader as to what the program will be next week and the answer is that there is no legislative program for next week. I reaffirm what I said earlier this week when I asked why they got us back on the 15th of September if we are going to do nothing. We had just as well make up our minds after all that there is a job to be done and the people expect us to do the job; that we had better shuck off this inertia, we had better slough off this lack of diligence in the public business, if we want to call it that, and get down to brass tacks and start addressing ourselves with vigor to the major problems that are on the American horizon today.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. That strikes me as rather perplexing in that I have heard not only the Speaker, who is now in the Well of the House, but many other Members who are in this body, when asked what is before us and the answers are that we have nothing. The question I want to pose is this: Who does the initiating of action—and is the progress of this body dependent upon someone who can dam away some of our rights?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say to my good friend from Ohio that I cannot very well comment on that, of course, but I can say for myself as a Member of this body, enjoying the same prerogatives as every other Member, that if there is no program I propose to make the best kind of program I can for myself, notwithstanding the fact that I may fail in so doing. And, I will come back to that in just a moment.

I want to go back to this whole question of freedom and to show how necessary it is for us to be diligent and energetic about it right now. When I come from my office every day my eyes unconsciously go to the top of the Capitol on which there stands that lady we know as Freedom. She is a little unlike any other lady you and I have ever seen. She is inanimate. She is different from most ladies we see because she weighs 7 tons. She was placed there the second of December 1863.

I presume she was already in place when Abraham Lincoln was standing on the knoll at Gettysburg on the 19th of November, just 2 weeks before Miss Freedom was dedicated, and she could hear him say, by implication at least, what he did say at Gettysburg when he posed the question which has been going

up and down the corridors of time ever since, when he asked whether a Nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure; "whether a Nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are equal can long endure." That was the text of his eternal challenge.

Now then, for me, freedom is always synonymous with a responsible devotion to the government that was laid out by freedom such a long time ago; a Government consisting of three branches.

There was one branch to which those wise men, with great vision, gave the power of the sword; to another branch they gave the power over the purse, and to the third branch they gave the judicial authority to hear and to determine controversies. To the executive the power of the sword; the legislative with the purse, and the power to the judiciary to repell any invasion of the rights of the people. On that broad structure and basic foundation have the freedoms that made this country the greatest country on the face of the earth rested. Those wise men who gave us this form of government had a lot of experience behind them. They knew that their judges were dependent long ago upon the will of a king.

They noted that judges in King's Bench Court or in Queen's Bench, as they used to term it in English legal history, held their offices too long by sufferance of the sovereign and they got their pay only through the will of the sovereign. Knowing that, they made our judiciary quite independent. They said the judicial power shall be reposed in a supreme court and such inferior courts as Congress shall create; but they went further than that. They said: "Judges shall hold office for life conditioned on good behavior." They went further. They said: "Their salaries shall not be diminished during their continuation in office." That whole framework of our judicial system emanated from the fact that they saw how judges were influenced and were dependent upon the will of the king, and they wanted to create an independent judiciary that would hear controversies of law and fact between individual and individual, between the country or the sovereign and the individual, and so stand there as a great sentinel of the basic freedoms. Jefferson recognized it.

This morning I looked at a great facsimile of the Declaration of Independence, and there in the list of grievances he pointed out just that thing, that the judges were dependent upon the will of the sovereign; so they gave us a three-branch government which is the very essence of the freedom that we enjoy. What has happened to this three-branch government?

We have certainly been at fault in our duty in this body in bargaining away the independence of the judiciary. Go back and look at section 204 (d) of the Price Control Act. It was enacted by this body, it was enacted by the Senate, it went through conference and was signed by the President and then went out through the country:

> No State, Federal, or Territorial court except the special emergency Court of Appeals shall have jurisdiction of any question that relates to a price regulation or to a price schedule.

This very solemn body of which you and I are Members put that on the law books. Is it any wonder then that a three-man court in Peoria consisting of two former Members of this House and one other should, after they heard an appeal for a restraining order against the O. P. A., state to all the world:

> This is but the culmination of a long series of acts by the Congress which have deprived the Federal courts of their jurisdiction.

A rather amazing thing.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Briefly.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the gentleman intend to have the RECORD indicate that all the Members of this body approved that section of the Price Control Act?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If they voted for it, they approved it.

Mr. CURTIS. Many of us, of course, did not vote for the act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well, that makes an exception for those Members.

Mr. CURTIS. I did not vote for that act, but even some of our colleagues who may have accepted price control as a necessity may have been——

Mr. DIRKSEN. May have accepted it, I take it, as a necessary evil?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The fact of the matter is that the damage was done, and the thing I allude to is that that is but one of a number of acts through which we have impaired the power of the judiciary and the independence of the judiciary as one of the bulwarks of freedom in this country.

Mr. CURTIS. I will try to be brief if I may ask one more question along that line.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. We also placed in the act a prohibition against changing the course of doing business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is right.

Mr. CURTIS. That was called to the attention of certain O. P. A. officials not long ago; they smiled and said: "We do not proceed under the Price Control Act; we proceed under directives from the President."

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. What difference does it make what we put in the law if no bureaus have any respect for it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We shall see. It does make some difference what we put into the law about the judiciary, because if any citizen had been able to get a hearing in that court and could have gotten approval of a restraining order that would have put an end to that kind of business on the part of O. P. A. I discussed this matter the other day. The thing I want to emphasize here and now is that we are not wholly clean in the matter of impairing the authority of the judiciary in restraining the bureaucracy that treads upon the sacred rights of the people. That is No. 1. The other thing I want to allude to is this: The executive branch is now doing by indirection, it would seem, what long ago used to be done by a species of polite intimidation. Do you remember in 1937 when the celebrated Court-packing matter was being ventilated in the Senate? I remember people writing me with stubby pencils on pieces of wrapping paper: "Dear Mr. DIRKSEN, do not let them pack the Court." In some instances they could hardly spell, and yet there had been drilled into them a great and sacred respect for the institutions of the country which made this a great country.

So the Court-packing scheme came along in 1937. It failed because of the great reverence that was drilled into the people in the little old red schoolhouses of long ago.

But now what is happening? How many Federal judges are today in the executive branch of the Government? How many have been taken from the Supreme Court of the United States? How many have been taken from the special courts right here in Washington, D. C.? Only one so far as I know has actually resigned his position, and that is Justice Byrnes. I notice that the others are on leave. And when this business is over what happens? They go back to the Federal bench from the executive branch.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Judge Vinson resigned.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not notice that he resigned. He is carried in the May 1943 edition of the Congressional Directory as still being on the court.

Mr. PATMAN. He was required to. The others are not required to resign because they are members of statutory courts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have looked as nearly I could for the record. There are some on leave from the judiciary working in the executive branch and they will go back.

Will they disqualify themselves when they go back on the bench to pass on matters that came before them when they were a member of the executive branch of the Government? It is rather singular, is it not? While we have been impairing the jurisdiction of the courts, members are being taken from the benches of the country, their ability duly appraised, and asked to handle jobs of major import in the executive branch.

I am wondering how long that is going to continue and if they are going to preserve their places on the Federal benches of the country. I allude to that because you see here we begin to make little assaults upon the independence of the three branches of government that were set up in this structure long ago and that still constitute, I think, the best guarantee of a continued freedom in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield my 20 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 20 additional minutes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman is referring to what will happen if these judges go back to their own courts. The gentleman is no doubt familiar with a situation which is represented by legislation now pending in the Judiciary Committee where our Supreme Court has been by Presidential appointment so thoroughly packed with former Federal administrators that there is grave danger that the Court will not have a quorum qualified to sit, a majority of the Court in many cases being disqualified to sit because they are passing on acts in which they took part as administrators.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is correct. How serious is all this? It is pretty serious. The other day when I made some observations on this floor, my friend from Texas for whom I have a genuine affection and whose high ability as a public servant I recognize, took time to follow me and to say that if the proposal I made to discharge the committee considering the Wolcott bill so that we can restore jurisdiction to the Federal courts should prevail, it would kill the O. P. A. That, as anyone knows, is an obvious exaggeration and overstatement.

Here is what he said:

> If you were to pass a price-control bill and then allow any Federal judge in the United States to restrain price control, you would always have an injunction against price control. You would not have price control at all. You know, we have Federal judges of different faiths and beliefs and they have their hates and their prejudices.

He has no faith in the Federal judiciary of the country. He wants to put it all in this emergency court of appeals and keep it there. They have done most of their business in Washington and they have not been accessible to the litigants, rich and poor in the country, as Mr. Ginsburg tolk the Banking and Currency Committee when the price-control bill was before that committee in 1941.

So my friend from Texas, who is a very able lawyer and one of the most astute Members of this House, says it would not do to put this jurisdiction in the Federal courts of the country. I would never make that confession on this floor. If I am going to confess that I have no faith in the Federal judges of the country, a good many of whom have been appointed by the leader of his own party, then I would confess my lack of faith in our democratic processes and say that they are about to dismember the very integrity and sanctity of this great institution known as our Republic. You might as well then give it back to the Indians. It is a rather singular thing.

When an able lawyer like the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] says that it would not do to intrust this power to the Federal judges of the country, what happens to our faith in the judiciary and the three branches of government as contemplated by the framers of the Constitution? I say I am alarmed about it, for when the courts are divested of jurisdiction and the citizen can no longer go to an accessible, untrammeled judiciary for a redress of his grievances, the power of bureaus and administrative agencies will be complete and the disintegration of the Republic is well under way.

Let me give you a quotation that appeared in this morning's paper, and this comes from the State of our distinguished friend, namely, the State of Texas. They had some abuse down there in connection with gasoline coupons. One of the O. P. A. hearing administrators went down to hold a hearing. What did he do? Was he content to find the operator of this filling station guilty and fine him? Oh, indeed not. Was he content to discipline or to admonish him? Oh, indeed not. He went infinitely further. He decreed that they had to go out of business.

So they appealed. To what instrumentality in the country? They appealed in this particular case to a Federal judge, because it is one of the few remaining things that you can still bring before a judge under O. P. A. That judge's name is Atwell. Here is what Judge Atwell had to say about this O. P. A. administrator, since it was an administrative hearing:

> The hearing administrator, unknown to and unprovided for by Congress, presumes to conduct a court.

That is evidently all right with the gentleman from Texas, because he believes in O. P. A. just as it is, and that it is getting along all right with this special Emergency Court of Appeals. The Federal judge goes on further and says:

> He acts without fear of consequence for his malfeasance or misfeasance. If he can suspend for 2 weeks, he can suspend for 2 years. He is not only unknown to the Congress but he is unknown to the Constitution. What the hearing administrator thinks is beyond the reach of Executive forgiveness. He himself is beyond reach of any constitutional removing group. He is a modern instance of pure dictatorship.

That was by a judge in the great Lone Star State of Texas, a very substantial portion of which is so ably represented by the gentleman from Texarkana. If it is all right for a Federal judge to pass on controversies involving violations of O. P. A. regulations, why should he not also have authority to pass on regulations which threaten the very life and existence of a citizen's business and livelihood?

You wonder when these things come to light as to what is going to happen to freedom in this country. When these administrators issue rules and regulations and somehow we abet their actions by making it impossible for people to get into an accessible Federal court, and then a great many of our judges are then merged in the executive branch, having not even resigned their positions on the judiciary, what happens to the pillars of the Constitution about which Webster so ably and so eloquently declaimed long ago?

So I am concerned about freedom as one of the great major problems before the country, even as it is now seeping into the consciousness of the boys who are in the armed services and who write back to their Congressmen, their friends, their Senators, and say, "What kind of strange metamorphosis is taking place back in the old home country at the present time?"

What a tragedy if some day they come back and we must make confession as to how we failed to hold the ramparts of freedom on the home front. You see, they are coming back some day. There is going to be a great homecoming. Why, there will be a homecoming in every community, large and small, throughout this broad land. Can you not imagine it? I imagine it in terms of my own discharge from the Army a generation ago, when I telegraphed my mother from Camp Dodge, Iowa, and said, "Mother, I will be home on a certain day."

I knew what was going to happen. She was going to be there. Why, a hero was coming home. Every soldier is a hero. So heroes are coming home, many million strong. The house will be cleaned from cellar to garret. There will be a chocolate cake on the kitchen table. His girl's picture is going to be there on the little table in the front room, right alongside of the Holy Bible. His mother is going to start looking out of the kitchen window days before he ever arrives.

Then comes that day, and he is going to hop up those steps of the old home and put his arms around her, and her loving arms will encircle him as she says, "Oh, my son, you are back." "Yes, Ma, I am back." So there will be tea and there will be chocolate cake, and there will be that great homecoming when the crystal tears of the mother drop upon the shoulders of the soldier son.

Then he is going to tell where he has been. Why, he left Peoria and they sent him to a classification center. Then they sent him to San Diego or Camp Wolters or some other camp, and after a while he landed in Guadalcanal. Maybe he was in the battle at Salerno, or he was in the battle of Naples, or he was in that group that went into Berlin and Tokyo when that great day comes. He is going to give a great running recital of his accounting as a member of the armed services, of how he fought for the four freedoms. Oh, what a great homecoming that will be.

Then when that recital is all over he is going to say, "Ma, what has been happening back home while I was gone?" Maybe he was in the Army a year, 2 years, 3 years. So then he will ask for an accounting of our stewardship. What have we been doing? That is going to be the great question, and there is going to be no dodging it. You and I and all the other millions on the home front are going to have to answer that question. If we must confess in that day that we have become the victims of the bureaus, that notwithstanding the solemnity of this body and its independent part in the constitutional structure, the only thing we can do is raise our voices in protest and chop out appropriations and tie restrictions onto appropriation bills, and make a feeble and ineffectual protest, it is going to be a pretty sad accounting. So something must be done

on the home front of freedom so that there will be no frustration.

I have said so often that the most frustrated man in all history was Moses. You remember he led the children of Israel through the wilderness. Forty years he was their spiritual leader. He did everything. Remember when they came to the spring with the bitter water, and the Lord pointed out and showed Moses the tree from which to take a bough and put it in the spring that the waters might be sweet? All those things he did. And at the end of 40 years, there out yonder was the promised land. Here was this great old man, this great leader, sitting up on that little mountain looking out into the distance, because there was the lush verdure of Judah, there was the place to which he had been directing their energies for 40 years. He wanted to go there so badly, as the culmination of a great ambition.

Then the Lord spoke out of the vaults of the heavens, and what did he say? He said, "Moses, I have caused thee to see it with thine own eyes, but thou shalt not go over thither." Listen to me, Moses. It is the Lord speaking. Lift your eyes and look out yonder. There is the promised land. You have been moving out to that objective for 40 years. There it is, Moses. You cannot go there now. But no. "I have caused thee to see it with thine own eyes, but thou shalt not go over thither."

Will there be frustrations like that when the boys come back, when they have battled in all the corners of the earth for freedom? Will they come back home and lift their eyes like Ishmael of old and say, "That gracious freedom under which we had free enterprise, under which people moved along voluntarily to do the chores of government when they were called upon to do so, that freedom under which they sacrificed so willingly and so gladly, that freedom that builded here this great country, the greatest republic in all the earth, could it be that from its shores freedom should either have vanished or be badly impaired, first at the hands of Congress, charged to preserve it, second, at the hands of the Executive, charged to enforce and uphold it, and third, at the hands of the bureaucracy, that would sabotage it?"

Can we not do something about it? Let us make a little start. I filed a discharge petition yesterday on the Wolcott bill, on which we voted as a substitute or an amendment, when the price control act was before us in November 1941. I probably cannot get a hearing on my bill over in the Banking and Currency Committee. This bill has been in that committee more than 30 days. That is why I am filing a petition to discharge the committee. I am interested in one paragraph of that bill, paragraph 2 (a)—that notwithstanding any power that is conferred upon O. P. A., the right of the citizen to go into a Federal court to secure redress of his grievances shall not be denied. That is the message that America wants to hear. They have got their fighting clothes on in the country today. They want us to do something about it, but there is not going to be any legislative schedule next week. You better go and sign petition No. 13 on the Clerk's desk and let us get going, in the interest of the people of this great Republic who still have faith in the institutions of this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the other regular orders, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some letters written by myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore granted, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] for 10 minutes.

ALUMINA FROM CLAY

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the great hydroelectric plants in the Columbia River Basin, Bonneville and Grand Coulee, are supplying the cheapest hydroelectric power in the United States. This vast reservoir of power is now being used for the production of aluminum and the providing of other war facilities to win the war. Over one-third of our aluminum supply for airplanes is coming from this one area. In one of these plants, the Vancouver plant of the Aluminum Co. of America, there has been produced enough aluminum to build 90,064 modern fighting planes.

The Federal Government has a combined investment in Bonneville and Grand Coulee, including distribution lines and facilities, of approximately $400,000,000. There is also invested by the Government and private investors in the Pacific Northwest electro-process plants the sum of approximately $171,000,000.

We are now importing most of the bauxite from which aluminum is made from South America, at heavy expense, both in dollars and the use of valuable shipping facilities which should be used for other war purposes. Furthermore, this supply is subject to hazards by being cut off by enemy action, which would almost completely stop aluminum production in the United States.

There are immense deposits of aluminum-bearing clay in the Northwest adjacent to these huge electric plants. The aluminum content is not as heavy as bauxite but new processes have been developed for utilizing these clays for the production of alumina, otherwise known as aluminum oxide. Such production would provide an adequate supply of material from within our own borders for the production of this most strategic product needed to win the war. A semicommercial and pilot plant of 50-ton capacity for location in the Pacific Northwest was heretofore approved by the Alumina Committee of the War Production Board, the Young Coordinating Committee, the Aluminum and Magnesium Division of the War Production Board, the War Department, and a preliminary approval by the Defense Plant Corporation.

This plant would only employ approximately 150 men, who, according to official surveys made, are available in the territory immediately adjacent to the clay deposits to be developed. These men would not be taken from existing war industries but are local citizens not otherwise employed in war activities. This project has now been refused the "green light" to proceed with construction on the alleged ground that there is a manpower shortage in the Pacific Northwest area. As a matter of fact, proceeding with the construction of the plant as heretofore authorized, will not in any way interfere with war production, will not take one single man from any existing war activity, and will not take any men who are otherwise available for war industries. It is believed by all of the people of the Northwest, including the delegations in Congress of all these States, that to jeopardize the successful operation of this huge investment of the Federal Government, as well as private investors, of this great industry of the Northwest by failing to take the proper steps now to utilize the local deposits of aluminum-bearing clay, is not only unwise but will jeopardize our ability to produce the much-needed aluminum for our air forces. Furthermore, the Government is vitally interested in protecting its huge investment in this great industry and providing a source of raw material which will insure its successful operation, not only in wartime but in the post-war period which will need this most useful product—aluminum. The dwindling supply of bauxite in the United States makes it necessary to take steps at once to provide adequate supply from other sources. By utilizing local clays in the vicinity of the aluminum plants, we will save valuable railroad transportation so much needed in our war effort. It is estimated that each year 16,000 freight cars will be conserved by using Northwest aluminum instead of Eastern bauxite for aluminum making. We will also save valuable cargo space on shipping from South America to our shores, greatly in demand for other war products.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As a matter of fact the War Manpower Commission order on this aluminum is based on a shortage of manpower, and a survey out there will show that for the construction of this plant there are actually ample men available for employment in the construction

industry because of contracts being canceled, and there are plenty of contractors. I have checked this in my district, and the gentleman has in his. I wonder if there is anything underneath this? I wonder if we are not treading on the feet of that eastern Aluminum Trust that does not want aluminum developed on the western coast.

Mr. ANGELL. That is absolutely correct with reference to the manpower situation. I have made inquiry myself of the officials in my State, whose duty it is to know with reference to the manpower situation, and as I said in my previous remarks, only 150 men are needed to operate the plant and three or four hundred men for its construction, and they are to be found in the locality where the plant may be constructed, from groups of citizens who will not be taken from war industry, which will not interfere in the prosecution of other war industries.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And I commend the gentleman and the other members of our delegation from the Pacific Northwest. We are not concerned with where they put this plant, just so they utilize the things we have in the Northwest, whether they be in the gentleman's State or my State, or in some other State in the Northwest.

Mr. ANGELL. The gentleman is correct. The entire delegation is in accord with that thought.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And that we may develop the power that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has been talking about for so many years.

Mr. ANGELL. And may I say that the delegation of the three Northwestern States are agreed on that. There is no controversy as to where the particular plant shall be located. The only idea is that it be located in proximity to the hydroelectric power in the Northwest area, so that we may use the local clays without being compelled to bring bauxite from South America.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. There is a process known to manufacturers of aluminum for extracting aluminum from clay, and from 25 to 40 percent of all clay is aluminum.

Mr. ANGELL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Aluminum is infinitely the most abundant metal in the earth. In order to utilize that process it is necessary to have an abundant supply of cheap electric power. Today we are in this position. About 66 percent of the high-grade bauxite in the world is now in enemy country. Probably 15 or 20 percent is in South America. We have not enough high-grade bauxite in the United States to supply our demands for another year, and in order to meet the demand, we are going to have to develop and utilize this process of extracting aluminum from clay.

The Aluminum Trust has done all it could to prevent the utilization of that process, because when it is put into operation it will mean the death knell of the aluminum monopoly.

I have been trying for some time to get one of these pilot plants established in the Tennessee Valley area. I am willing to join the gentleman from Oregon, who is now addressing the House, and my distinguished friend from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] in their efforts to get this process put into operation along the Columbia River, because our great supply of hydroelectric power now comes from the Tennessee River and the Columbia River. By developing this process they cannot only meet our war demands, but free the American people from the clutches of the Aluminum Trust and give us an abundance of that metal for all purposes throughout all time to come.

Mr. ANGELL. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, this entire subject was discussed in a very informative article by Merlin Blais, a staff writer on the Portland Oregonian, appearing in the September issue of Mining World. I include this article as a part of my remarks:

ALUMINUM—FUTURE OF INDUSTRY IN THE NORTHWEST RESTS WITH W. M. C.

(By Merlin Blais)

(Already producing nearly a third of the Nation's light metal, blessed with cheap power and alumina-bearing clays, the Pacific Northwest is fighting for the opportunity to develop a fully integrated industry after the war.)

In the Pacific Northwest aluminum has become the foremost metal industry, with an investment of $125,000,000. Five new war plants in Washington and Oregon are spewing forth more than a half billion pounds of the fabulous light metal a year. Ten thousand men and women are advancing the war effort on the industry's pay rolls.

These five reduction plants operated by Alcoa at Vancouver, Spokane, and Troutdale, by Reynolds at Longview, and by Olin at Tacoma—are turning out fully one-third of all the pure aluminum made in the United States. Two years ago the Northwest was producing none. Today this region stands in the forefront as war ushers in a dazzling new light-metals era.

But, large as the Northwest's aluminum output now is, prospects for a permanent peacetime industry have been cloaked in doubt. Only recently have these prospects justified definite optimism. Natural resources offer an essential key to the future.

Bonneville-Grand Coulee power, cheapest electricity in the Nation, is responsible for the aluminum industry already established in this region. Power costs alone have been estimated at $30 per ton of the metal cheaper here than in the Eastern States. This advantage will prove a potent incentive for continuing the industry at war's end.

The future may depend also upon the fortunes of a proposed $4,000,000 alumina-from-clay plant, which, far from being built, is still in the hands of several war agencies on Capitol Hill, where it has been buffeted about among a multitude of plans to further the war output.

EDICT FORCED CANCELATION OF PLANS FOR PLANT

More vital than it might seem, the long-sought plant would extract aluminum oxide from clay mined at Hobart Butte or Molalla in Oregon or at Castle Rock in Washington. After much delay, the clay-treating unit gained approval by the War Production Board for critical materials. Then, with a trench mortar's impact, the War Manpower Commission more recently ditched the hard-won concession with a sweeping Northwest ban on new industries.

Oregon, Washington, and Idaho spokesmen have lifted hopes anew with a fighting comeback in which W. M. C. has been advised that the proposed aluminum oxide plant would need only 300 laborers for construction and 150 or fewer for its operation—none to be needed before well into 1944. Senators CHARLES L. MCNARY, RUFUS HOLMAN, and MON C. WALLGREN, among its most potent champions on Capitol Hill, picture the latest prospects with obvious optimism.

Donald M. Nelson, war production czar, has acknowledged merits of the project in a letter to Gov. Earl Snell, of Oregon, in which he commented, "We recognize there are advantages in placing an aluminum plant in that area and are therefore hopeful of finding some location which will be able to meet the necessary construction and operational requirements."

Now, why is a new $4,000,000 plant so important to an industry which already has a half dozen operations which cost $125,000,000? The answer concerns all 3,500,000 residents of the Pacific Northwest, particularly as chances for its realization stand high.

Besides the huge ingot-production plants already in operation, the advocated unit would add hardly a trickle to the stream of aluminum. Its 50-tons-per-day capacity of aluminum oxide—popularly called alumina—can contribute little to satiate the ravenous, 2,000-ton daily appetite of the region's busy reduction pots.

TWO POUNDS YIELDS ONE POUND OF VITAL METAL

A 50-ton plant is not even considered a full commercial operation, but, strange as it seems, the post-war fate of the entire aluminum industry in the Pacific Northwest may hinge upon whether it is built and successfully run or not built at all. For it will utilize the Northwest's own resources—its clays, its coal and hydroelectric power, its water, and its human labor, but particularly its native clays.

Aluminum is made from aluminum oxide, or alumina. Two pounds of this white powder yields one pound of the pure metal when subjected to reduction by electricity. Richest source of alumina is bauxite ore, which contains about 60 percent. Most bauxite comes from Dutch Guiana, on South America's east coast; some is found in Arkansas and adjacent States. Alunite is another but scarcer source.

High-alumina clays contain as much as 40 percent or more, but the yield of aluminum oxide is only 30 percent or slightly less on the average. To the Northwest's aluminum industry, however, clays offer definite advantages.

Every pound of alumina now fed into the reducing pots of this region's five pig aluminum plants must make a rail journey of 2,500 to 3,000 miles from ore-treating plants in the Southeastern States. Most of the ore already has come from the Southern Hemisphere, taking much precious cargo space on freighters which might have been carrying supplies to American fighters on foreign soil.

Then more than half of the ingot or pig aluminum takes another cross-country joyride to eastern rolling mills, some of it again moving west to become bombers at Boeing's in Seattle. The new rolling mill constructed at Spokane, after a change of site from Fairview, can process about two-fifths of the Northwest's aluminum output, eliminating to that extent the wasteful round-trip haul to Eastern States.

As it operates now, the industry in Oregon and Washington has but one major advantage—its access to a vast cheap river of elec-

tricity, large blocks of which are essential. When the war's production pressures pass with the coming of peace, can this industry survive?

Metallurgists point out that, first of all, a cheaper source of aluminum oxide is practically imperative. Expanded manufacture and expanded consumer markets also are needed, but these will hark only to the call of low-price aluminum. A key to the future lies in the Northwest's own soil.

Five likely clay beds have been discovered in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. The Federal Bureau of Mines has studied all five, making its most thorough test-holing at two sites in western Oregon and one in western Washington. Findings have not been announced, but it is understood that the richest deposit is at Hobart Butte, 12 miles due south of Cottage Grove, and the largest lies a few miles southeast of Molalla. The third clay bed, also of considerable size, with an estimated 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 tons, lies along the Toutle River east of Castle Rock.

The other principal deposits are situated near Spokane and in Latah County, northern Idaho. Improbable locations for the initial experimental plant, these will figure strongly for any expansion of clay-treating facilities.

The Northwest's struggle for an alumina-from-clay industry has confronted more than its share of obstacles and final authorization of a plant, though it may not be large, will be truly a major triumph. In the metallurgical sphere the problems were: Is there a practical process for reducing clay to aluminum oxide? And, is there enough accessible clay in the region to justify an industry?

Processes have not been lacking in number and variety. Sixty of them passed through the hands of the W. P. B.'s subagency, the Office of Production Research and Development. One of these, the Hixson process, cost two eastern concerns $20,000 to develop to the pilot-plant stage.

WET CLAY MINED AND CRUSHED BEFORE TREATMENT

Among the more likely methods named for this area are the sulfuric acid process of Kalunite, Inc., a subsidiary of the Olin Corporation which runs the Tacoma reduction unit; the ammonium bisulfate process of the Chemical Construction Company, a subsidiary of the American Cyanamid Corporation, and a modified ammonimum bisulfate process developed by the United States Bureau of Mines.

The initial $4,000,000 plant, after W. P. B. approved it and before W. M. C. shelved it, was awarded by the Defense Plant Corporation to the Columbia Metals Company and the ammonium sulfate process was to be utilized. The clay is wet when mined and must be dried and crushed before being treated. Then, in this process ammonium sulfate and clay are heated to convert the aluminum oxide in the clay to soluble aluminum sulfate. The insoluble silica is filtered off and the iron is removed.

Ammonia is used then to precipitate alumina as aluminum hydrate, which is filtered and washed, then dried in a kiln where it becomes powdery white aluminum oxide This alumina is shipped to a reduction plant, such as those operating in Longview or Troutdale, for transformation into the pure light metal. The sulfate is recovered as ammonium sulfate and reused.

Alkalis are used to reduce bauxite ores, but acid reagents appear necessary for the alumina clays. Cost of treating the latter in commercial quantities is not known definitely, but admittedly it will be much higher than for bauxite. To begin with, more clay is needed. Four tons of bauxite will yield two tons of aluminum oxide, which in turn can be reduced by power to one ton of aluminum. Eight to ten tons of clay will be required to produce this amount.

Clay must therefore be accessible in large quantities which can be mined at low cost. The deposits must lie close to the surface and be handy to cheap transportation. Generally, the clay must not lie beneath a surface soil overburden which is thicker than the clay stratum itself.

Does the Northwest meet this requirement? A satisfactory industry, metallurgists estimate, would need about 3,000,000 tons of clay per year. Reserves of 75,000,000 to 100,000,000 and more tons would be essential to an industry with a life span of 25 years or longer.

This is a huge quantity of clay, but mining men believe the Northwest has it. The Bureau of Mines and Geological Survey has been test drilling the principal known deposits for the past year. Its findings, not announced, were a major influence in the War Production Board's approval for a pilot plant and it is believed that the Hobart Butte, Molalla, and Castle Rock deposits together contain the minimum 75,000,000 tons, at least.

Extent of the Spokane and Latah clay deposits is not known definitely, but these might justify their own plants. Other high-alumina clay beds of unknown size exist in Oregon and Washington. In northwest Oregon, for example, the richest clay yet found is in the Macleay district, 7 or 8 miles east of Salem. Another promising deposit lies near the lower Columbia River, 6 miles west of Rainier.

What about other raw materials? Second needed resource is fuel, used for furnaces, steam generation, and kiln drying. Fuel oil is the preferred heating source. A pilot plant such as that planned for the Northwest would use an estimated 6 to 8 barrels of fuel oil per ton of aluminum oxide produced.

BONNEVILLE PLAYS IMPORTANT ROLE WITH LOW-RATE POWER

Northwest coal can be substituted for oil in some operations and hogged fuel from the area's hundreds of sawmills can also be used. Coal from Coos Bay is suggested for use at the Hobart Butte site and Oregon authorities have given assurance that this soft coal will be laid down by rail at cheap rates by the time a plant there would need it. Coal mines of the Centralia district might supply a plant located at Castle Rock.

Low-cost Bonneville power, already a boon to ingot plants and rolling mills, offers cheap motive power and also a substitute for fuel in some operations, particularly if such a plant were located at Troutdale, Canby, or Salem, and other possible sites. More than 5,000 kilowatts are the estimated requirements for the 50-ton unit.

This alumina-from-clay set-up also would need about 100,000 gallons of water per ton of output, to be used in chemical processes and in the alumina bath which precedes kiln drying. West of the Cascades, this raises no great problem except as to water rights. The amount of ammonium sulfate needed is not known definitely.

About 150 men would be employed for regular production, it is estimated. Larger plants, of course, would need proportionately fewer men. The W. M. C.'s blanket ban on new Northwest industries interrupted the clay-plant project because of its manpower requirement in the face of an apparent labor shortage in the area.

Why the W. P. B. limited the initial project to a capacity of 50 tons per day has been a question for conjecture. First application to the War Production Board sought a 200-ton plant. This was halved to 100 tons, then slashed again to 50 tons. The region's needs for alumina exceed 2,000 tons per day.

Several commercial plants producing from 200 to 500 tons daily will be necessary if the Northwest is to become independent of distant sources of aluminum oxide. A 50-ton plant would appear puny and disappointing, indeed, but W. P. B. has explained that a modest start is best so that "bugs" found in new processes might be worked out quickly and inexpensively.

The danger, however, would lie in the chance that those opposed to an alumina-from-clay industry would point to the costs of a small, semicommercial plant as evidence that cheap production is impossible on any scale.

VISIONARIES WILL BE VICTORIOUS IF W. M. C. YESSES PLANT

If the Northwest wins final approval of its first clay-treating unit, that will constitute victory of the visionary over the reactionary. Its delay in spite of the war emergency reflects the sharpness of the behind-the-scenes conflict. The most public phase saw ex-Congressman Walter M. Pierce tilting his elocutionary lance repeatedly against the Aluminum Co. of America, which, before war needs prompted expansion beyond Alcoa's aegis, enjoyed a virtual monopoly in this light-metal field.

Fortune magazine, in an article of May 1943, asserted that one of the clay-treating processes was retarded by veto of a National Academy of Sciences committee, which was "heavy with big-metal-company technical men."

O. P. R. D., the article went on, displayed the stated attitude that "there is enough United States bauxite for a 4-year war and its jobs is to put a completely worked-out alumina-from-clay process on the shelf ready for the next war."

SUB CRISIS EXPOSED DEPENDENCE ON VULNERABLE IMPORTS

The shipping crisis in the Caribbean sea of some months ago, however, shocked many economic leaders into a realization of the Nation's present utter dependence on an aluminum source which is vulnerable to enemy attack. Freighter losses have not been fully announced, but Axis submarine attacks were pressed with the knowledge that the sea lane from Surinam led into the air lane over Berlin, that its traffic was essential to the Allied war effort.

The Caribbean crisis lent belated impetus to the Northwest's fight in Washington for an alumina-from-clay industry. The campaign had its beginnings in the first report on western Oregon's refractory clays, prepared by Hewitt Wilson, University of Washington engineer, and Ray C. Treasher, geologist, for the Oregon department of geology and mineral industries.

This report, published in 1938, and similar State of Washington studies then furnished the basis for persistent plugging in the Nation's Capital. Of utmost import to this struggle has been the continuous support of Bonneville's market development section, keynoted by the 1939 report of the section's director, Ivan Bloch. His statement on the Northwest's industrial possibilities stressed the prospects for local clays as a source of aluminum oxide.

The Northwest's own private capital became interested. The Columbia Metals Corporation, composed mostly of Northwest businessmen, has long had its application before the Government for a clay plant. The W. P. B.-approved unit was to be operated for a time by the Chemical Construction Corporation and later taken over by Columbia Metals, it was understood.

Its leaders, Charles F. Clise, board chairman, and J. O. Gallagher, president, both of Seattle, have indicated that whether the initial plant went to a Washington or to an Oregon site made little difference to them.

When larger clay-treating plants proved feasible, they could be built in both States, and possibly Idaho as well.

With an eye to the future, the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers urges the stock-piling of critical minerals as soon as this war ends, to further preparedness for any possible prevention of a World War No. 3.

The Pacific Northwest, however, does not want merely an aluminum stock-pile industry. A full-fledged economy capable not only of creating the light metal from clay, but also of processing it and fabricating it into a multitude of articles is the region's ambition.

ENGINEERS BELIEVE PLANTS MAY BE SAVED FOR POST-WAR USE

After the war some of the federally financed plant capacity may be scrapped, but engineers believe that most of it can be saved if aluminum's possibilities for civilian use are really developed. Aluminum architecture, combination of aluminum and plastics, new alloys of great strength and lightness offer vast possibilities. Aluminum aircraft and trains are accepted. Aluminum ships and motor vehicles are considered early certainties.

Of importance also are other uses of aluminum oxide in the chemicals and abrasives industries. Before war production began, aluminum was priced at 20 cents a pound. It has dropped to 15 cents and will go lower. Skilled aluminum artisans now number in the thousands and they will want to make aluminum a life work.

Engineers, including those of Alcoa, are plotting a major role for light metals in the post-war world. In fact, C. C. Carr, Alcoa's public relations head, opined quite recently that the aluminum industry here will be permanent. He explained that the power cost in the ingot plants figured at only 7 cents a pound of metal produced.

The Pacific Northwest now boasts one-third of the Nation's aluminum reduction capacity. The three States possess a large source of the metal in their alumina clays, a domestic source which only invasion can cut off. Bonneville and Grand Coulee generate the cheapest power in the land. Ample skilled manpower will be available at war's end. A vast potential market lies across the Pacific, and the west coast itself has become the new population mecca.

If the aluminum industry is to flourish in this promised land, it must be expanded on the balanced aquarium principle. Several plants to process clay from Northwest mines, the present reduction facilities, perhaps another rolling mill at tidewater to augment the big Spokane mill, then numerous factories to turn out a multitude of articles from ice trays to truck bodies for household and highway—these would assure the Pacific Northwest a fabulous aluminum empire.

APPEALS TO THE JUDICIARY FROM DECISIONS OF THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I did not have the privilege of hearing the able address delivered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], but I did hear some of his statements relative to what I had said on this floor concerning the judiciary. The gentleman from Illinois left the impression that I was not willing to trust the judiciary of the country, and for that reason I was in favor of a special court to pass on cases involving the Office of Price Administration.

I am willing to trust the judiciary. I have the utmost faith and confidence in that branch of our Government. I trust them collectively, as I trust the 531 Members of the House and the Senate. I trust the Congress. I know that what Congress does, generally, will be right, and if it is not right it will be corrected. But that does not mean that we would trust any individual Member of the House or Senate on any national problem or to deal with the whole of that problem. Not at all.

The judge to whom the gentleman referred, Judge Atwell of Texas, is a fine example of what might happen if you permitted any district court judge to grant an injunction and stop the operation of the Office of Price Administration law. In the first place, it would take months to decide the case, and during that time inflation would get out of control and we could not get it back under control after the case had been passed on.

Judge Atwell is a good man. He is, conscientiously, a Republican. He believes that way. Lawyers differ about their interpretations of the Constitution, and he sees the Constitution as he believes, conscientiously so. Now, we have about the same number of Federal judges that we have Members of the House and Senate. It is not the exact number, but approximately the number. Let us say that half of them are Democrats and half of them are Republicans. Somewhere among those 531 men you could find some judge who would grant an injunction against the enforcement of any part of the O. P. A. law. You would have it stymied all the time. You would never be able to enforce it. So if you believe as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] believes, you just could not believe that we should have an O. P. A. law at all. I cannot take issue with those who do not believe in price control. That is their judgment; but I think we must have it and I think it has saved this country from ruinous inflation. I think without price control we would have had unlimited expansion of the currency and credit and prices so high that only the very rich could exist. We would have had a spiral of inflation that we could not have stopped, and our dollars would not be worth 10 cents today.

Now, do not be swept off your feet by arguments that people are all making so much money on the inflation question. It is true that many of the war workers are making enormous sums of money, several times as much as they have made in their lives before; doubtless too much in some instances; but that does not mean that this great middle class in our country, the people who really built this country in time of peace, and those who furnish the manpower to save it in time of war, who work on fixed salaries or live on old-age assistance checks, dividends, interest payments, rents, and fixed incomes of that nature, are getting the benefit of those large wages. It is harmful to them instead of helpful. There are millions who have not had their wages or salaries raised at all. Let us not forget them. Therefore it is necessary that we have some control over prices. If we were to allow judges all over the country to stop this law any time they wanted to, we might just as well repeal the law and go to no trouble at all, because it would always be stopped. This is war. Things happen too fast to allow certain things to take a normal course.

The gentleman from Illinois is so solicitous of the welfare of the judiciary. If you were to pursue his argument to its logical end, you would have to say in every case that we should have the judiciary of this country pass upon it. After all, they are not elected by the people. They are appointed. But even if they were elected, it makes no difference as far as this argument is concerned. There are certain cases where it is all right for other boards and courts to pass upon the matter. I cite as an outstanding example the Veterans' Administration. Many veterans who have shed their blood and almost given their lives in defense of this country have compensation and pension claims against their Government. Can they go to the judiciary? No. They cannot go to the judiciary. They must go to the Veterans' Administration. The Congress passed the law. If they want to appeal, can they appeal to the Federal courts? No. They cannot appeal to the Federal courts. They appeal to special boards or commissions acting as courts that are set up by this Congress. It is a case absolutely on all fours.

If you want to follow the force of his logic, you can say that Congress was entirely wrong when we voted to oust certain people from the pay rolls of the Government. A man by the name of Dodd, another man by the name of Watson—I do not recall the name of the other man—were ousted from the pay roll. We passed an amendment to an appropriation bill here putting these three employees off the pay roll entirely because we did not like what they believed and advocated.

Now, if we are to follow entirely the logic of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] why do we not follow it completely and give these men a trial, an opportunity to be heard before the Federal judges, whom the distinguished gentleman from Illinois commented on so highly. There is a place where it is perfectly proper for the Congress to assume the jurisdiction it has assumed in the case of the Office of Price Administration, in the administration of veterans' matters, and other matters of that kind.

CAUTIOUS CONGRESS

This Congress, I think, is to be commended as well as the last Congress. Never before in the history of this country has Congress been so cautious about the granting of great powers, almost unlimited powers, to the Chief Executive of our Nation. And as you will recall, every major law that has granted powers to the Chief Executive, along with these tremendous powers you will find what we may call in the language

of the street, a cut-off period. For example, the law creating the Office of Price Administration will expire next year, June 30, 1944. It will be a good time to determine whether Congress wants price control or inflation right during the political campaigns. All of these laws, containing these vast powers, will expire at a fixed date.

The majority of these laws affecting the conduct of the war, containing the tremendous powers given to the Executive, contain a cut-off period under which the law will expire at the end of the war, within 6 months after the war is over, or upon the passage of a concurrent resolution by the Congress of the United States.

No Congress has been more watchful than this Congress and the preceding Congress on that question. We have made sure that the people's rights were protected and not granted to the Executive for an unlimited period of time.

I join with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in expressing the opinion that the three branches of the Government—each one should respect the other—and I think it is very necessary that comity exist between the different branches of the Government. We should have good feeling existing between the Congress and the judiciary; we should have good feeling between the Congress and the Executive. But I think also there is something we could do in that respect. We cannot always just jump on the efforts of the President—administration—and never be willing to point out a single constructive action taken or to make a single constructive suggestion; just condemn and expect to have a very fine feeling of comity, or to expect a good feeling to exist between these two branches of the Government. I feel that sometimes we are a little bit too critical, that many times we are too ready to find fault.

May I suggest to my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that I think that this country is in favor of keeping down inflation, that it is opposed to higher prices, to the extent that wages and salaries are not able to bear; that it is opposed to paying $1.25 for a loaf of bread, the price that exists in some of the countries of the world today; that it is opposed to people paying $400 or $500 for a suit of clothes like the ones you and I are wearing that would cost from $25 to $50 here; that it is opposed to people paying from $60 to $90 a pound for butter, as is being paid in some countries; that it is opposed to paying $7.50 for a half pint of milk, as is happening in some countries.

Are we for inflation or are we against inflation? If we are against inflation we have got to place the tools that are needed to whip inflation in the hands of the Chief Executive. When we have placed those tools in the hands of the Chief Executive, I think we should assume the policy of cooperation and trying to get mistakes corrected, errors corrected, and where wrongs are committed, to get them corrected, rather than trying to make a body blow or attack as is now being made upon the O. P. A. law.

ARE REPUBLICANS FOR PRICE CONTROL OR INFLATION?

I think that the efforts made by the gentleman from Illinois to try to turn the O. P. A. law over to the Federal judges in this country would be one of the worst steps that we can take at any time with respect to the inflationary move that has been made in this Congress. To my knowledge it would mean unbridled inflation, it would result in printing press money and we will reach the time, if we adopt such a program, that it will take a wheelbarrow load of printing-press money to buy just one loaf of bread. We will be met with all the troubles of inflation. If prominent leaders of the Republican party like the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] continue to advocate measures that will destroy price control efforts the party cannot long escape the charge that it is the inflationary, printing-press money party. Do the other Republican leaders agree with Mr. DIRKSEN that we should destroy price control and have runaway prices? They talk more about doing things to destroy O. P. A. than they do offering constructive suggestions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, October 7, I may address the House for 20 minutes after the conclusion of the business on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MAGNUSON for 7 days, on account of special naval business.

To Mr. FENTON (at the request of Mr. ROGERS of California) indefinitely, on account of serious illness in family.

To Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON (at the request of Mr. THOMASON) for today and balance of this week, on account of death in family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 881. An act to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution making appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 59 minutes), the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, October 4, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, October 5, 1943, at 11 a. m., to begin hearings on projects being considered for inclusion in an omnibus river and harbor bill.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold public hearings at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, October 6, 1943, on H. R. 2701 and private bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 12, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m.

At that time consideration will be given to the following bills:

H. R. 3257. A bill to amend subtitle—Insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The purposes of the bill is to affirm and clarify the authority of the W. S. A. to agree to a waiver of the statute of limitations in connection with claims arising from insurance agreements in case of missing vessels, in order to provide for prompt settlement of both marine risks and war risks involved.

H. R. 3258. A bill to prevent double recovery on claims under section 1 (a) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to seamen employed by the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to limit the possibility of double or overlapping recovery on account of death or injury of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the W. S. A. The possibility of such overlapping recovery arises in cases of seamen who are entitled to sue under the law of the United States in case of death or injury and may also be entitled to sue under foreign law on account of the same casualty.

H. R. 3259. A bill to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to exclude from consideration for the purposes of old-age and survivors' insurance benefits, services of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the

U. S. A. on foreign-flag vessels or contracted for and performed wholly outside the United States, so that the coverage for such benefits for seamen employees of the W. S. A. shall be in line with the coverage in case of similar services by seamen employed by private shipping operators.

H. R. 3260. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for requisition or purchase of vessels owned by subsidiaries of American corporations.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the requisition or purchase under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, of vessels owned by American concerns through foreign subsidiaries but which are not owned by United States citizens within the terms of the Merchant Marine Act and which are not idle foreign vessels within the terms of the act of June 6, 1941—Public, 101, Seventy-seventh Congress.

H. R. 3261. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is, by amending Public Law 44, Seventy-eighth Congress, to authorize the return of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less which are owned by the United States under the procedure of Public Law 44 for the return to private ownership of vessels to which the United States has title which are no longer needed in the war effort.

H. R. 3262. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to expressly authorize the waiver of recovery of seamen's insurance payments by the W. S. A. particularly in cases where insurance has been paid to beneficiaries on the assumption that the missing seamen were dead, but later are found to be alive. The bill follows a similar provision with respect to recovery of benefits paid by the Veterans' Administration.

House Joint Resolution 158. A joint resolution to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The purpose of the resolution is to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy similar to that provided for the United States Coast Guard Academy.

House Joint Resolution 161. A joint resolution to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities.

The purpose of the resolution is to authorize the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration to pay cash awards for suggestions received from employees to increase efficiency or improve the functioning of the agencies.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m. on H. R. 3334, to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

769. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year 1944 in the amount of $2,300,000 (H. Doc. No. 310); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

770. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $10,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 311); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

771. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the estimates of personnel requirements for the Post Office Department for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

772. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

773. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending September 30, 1943, for the Division of Venereal Diseases of the Public Health Service, "Community Facilities, Defense Public Works, Office of the Administrator, Federal Works Agency (transfer to Federal Security Agency, Public Health Service)"; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

774. A letter from the Senior Deputy Administrator, Office of Lend-Lease Administration, transmitting a copy of the Bureau of the Budget form entitled "Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements" and accompanying justification material which present the personnel requirements of the Office of Lend-Lease Administration for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1944, ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 38. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the resolution (H. Res. 30) authorizing and directing an investigation of the progress of the war effort; without amendment (Rept. No. 716). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COSTELLO: Special Committee on Un-American Activities submits a minority report and views on Japanese War relocation centers; without amendment (Rept. No. 717). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3236. A bill to provide aid to dependent children in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 718). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBERTSON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3309. A bill to suspend during the present war the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 719). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBERTSON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3333. A bill relating to Government and other exemptions from the tax with respect to the transportation of property; without amendment (Rept. No. 720). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1042. A bill for the relief of Mary T. Reedy; with amendment (Rept. No. 711). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1144. A bill for the relief of Fred A. Flanders; with amendment (Rept. No. 712). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MURPHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2190. A bill for the relief of Marguerite R. McElroy; with amendment (Rept. No. 713). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2304. A bill for the relief of Harry Tansey; without amendment (Rept. No. 714), Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2459. A bill for the relief of Carl Oplinger, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 715). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3355. A bill to define the terms "line of duty" and "willful misconduct" as used in any law or regulation administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 3356. A bill to provide for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service-incurred disability and to widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H. R. 3357. A bill to provide for the burial in the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3358. A bill to provide for the appointment of female pilots in the Air Forces of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 3359. A bill to provide for local taxation of real estate owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DEWEY:

H. R. 3360. A bill to extend to members of the armed forces certain privileges with respect to accumulated leave; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 3361. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to pro-

vide for a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence," approved September 16, 1942; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

H. R. 3362. A bill to fix the annual compensation of the Secretary of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 3363. A bill extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 3364. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3365. A bill to amend the joint resolution approved May 26, 1941, entitled "Joint resolution relating to corn and wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended," and to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the sale of cotton held by or on behalf of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 3366. A bill to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint rates of freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEWART:

H. R. 3367. A bill to provide for the national defense and to improve the flood control of the Red River by the creation of a corporation for the operation of Government properties near Denison in the State of Texas and within the States of Texas and Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. J. Res. 168. Joint resolution amending the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H. J. Res. 169. Joint resolution removing the ceiling price on corn; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 3368. A bill for the relief of the Contracting & Sales Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 3369. A bill for the relief of Harry V. Hearn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURGIN:

H. R 3370. A bill for the relief of R. W. Crews; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R 3371. A bill for the relief of the dependents of Dr. Arthur B. Wyse and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3372. A bill for the relief of Knapstein Brewing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3373. A bill for the relief of Dewey H. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2591. By Mr. BUCKLEY: Petition of Martin J. Ryan and 45 other persons, protesting the current campaign of the prohibitionists; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2592. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of 55 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Shelbyville, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2593. Also, petition of 202 citizens of Kirkwood, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2594. Also, petition of Lizzie M. Hutchinson and 39 citizens of Batavia, N. Y. urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2595. Also, petition of Mrs. P. A. Tate and 63 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2596. Also, petition of Paul C. Hartzell and 48 citizens of Greenville, Tenn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2597. Also, petition of Mary E. Bridsone and 21 citizens of Riverside, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2598. Also, petition of 72 citizens of Dunkirk, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2599. Also, petition of 33 citizens of New Castle, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2600. Also, petition of Isabel Lovering and 95 citizens of Lansdale and Providence, R. I., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2601. Also, petition of 52 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Seattle, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2602. Also, petition of Mrs. A. B. Shepard and 66 citizens of Frankfort, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2603. Also, petition of Mrs. Gordon Conrad and 50 citizens of Kenka Park, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2604. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Ed Berger and 79 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2605. Also, petition of E. L. Mankel, of St. Louis, Mo., and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2606. Also, petition of Edward Wedel of St. Louis, Mo., and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2607. Also, petition of Dominic Streff and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2608. Also, petition of the Conrad Motor Sales Co., signed by 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2609. Also, petition of Henry Levison, of St. Louis, and 341 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2610. Also, petition of Ben Schnetzer and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2611. Also, petition of Berlin Giles and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2612. Also, petition of John Rohrbach and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2613. Also, petition of Local No. 6, Brewers and Malters Union, signed by 80 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2614. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of sundry residents of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting

against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2615. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication from Morrison and Noah Oil Operators, of Albion, Ill., urging the enactment of House bill 3203 providing for an increase in the price of crude oil; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2616. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Neva Piland and others of Foil and Ozark Counties, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2617. Also, petition of T. W. Endicott and others of Hocomo and Howell Counties, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportatoin of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2618. Also, petition of Jennie E. Hovey and others of Howell County, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2619. Also, petition of Mrs. G. J. Ragain and others of Marionville and Lawrence Counties, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2620. By Mr. POULSON: Petition of Mrs. F. Brooks and others favoring passage of House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2621. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Leah Sterling, of Eagle Rock, Calif., and others, approving House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2622. Also, petition of Rev. E. Dow Hoffman and others, favoring passage of House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2623. By Mr FOGARTY: Memorial of the New England Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc., relative to care of returning disabled veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2624. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of J. A. Fisher and 21 other citizens of Weston and Buckhannon, W. Va., favoring enactment of House bill 2082, to remove one of the chief causes of absenteeism, to conserve shipping space, and to prevent the waste of untold amounts of money and huge quantities of food, coal, iron, rubber, and gasoline, by providing for the stoppage of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2625. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Mrs. G. T. Dickinson and 49 other citizens of Salem, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2626. Also, petition signed by J. C. Gearhart and 25 other citizens of Willamina, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2627. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Rev. T. M. Gladden and 65 members of the First Methodist Church of Chester, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2628. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of sundry citizens of Garden City, Kans., favoring the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2629. By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Petition of H. J. Dickherber and 30 other citizens of St. Charles County, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2630. Also, petition of Morris Care, of Silex, Mo., and 43 other citizens of the ninth district, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2631. Also, petition of C. E. Schuchman, American Legion Post, No. 323, and 14 citizens of Wentzville, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2632. Also, petition of Joe H. Sachs, of Flinthill, Mo., and 28 citizens of the State of Missouri, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2333. Also, petition of Becker's Service Station, Flinthill, Mo., and 41 citizens of the State of Missouri, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2634. Also, petition of Theo. Becker, of Flinthill, Mo., and 23 citizens of the State of Missouri, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2635. Also, petition of Victor Becker, of Flinthill, Mo., and 69 other citizens of the State of Missouri, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2636. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Sunnyside, Thorp, College Place, and Outlook, Wash., urging favorable action on House bill 2082, a bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2637. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman, committee on radio, American Civil Liberties Union, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Select Committee on Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Rules.

2638. Also, petition of the Cumberland United Baptist Association, Portland, Maine, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to liquor advertising in newspapers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2639. Also, petition of the city of Waukegan, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Lake Michigan when it is at a mean level which is deemed higher than the safe conduct of interstate commerce and navigation; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everliving God, all things wax old as doth a garment; but Thou art the same. Thy years shall not fail. Change and decay in all around we see, but Thy mercy endureth forever.

Give us the untroubled calm which illumines a faith in the final triumph of every true idea let loose in the world. May we see and know Thy word as the power of a growing seed hidden in the cleft of the rock, which presently it will split to pieces. In the light of Thy presence may we know that we live only as we love; that we are strong only as we are pure; that we succeed only as we are just and merciful and good. In this tumultuous day when the highways for Thy conquering truth are being paved even by the wrath of man, we pray not that Thou shouldst help us carry out our plans, but that we may be the willing channels for Thy redemptive purpose for all mankind. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, September 30, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LAND IN UTAH TO BE RESERVED FOR ADDITION TO GOSHUTE INDIAN RESERVATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Goshute Indian Reservation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF A DEPARTMENT, COMMISSION, ETC.

Letters from the Postmaster General, the Acting Director, Office of Strategic Services, and the Chairman and Administrator of the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the Post Office Department, the Office of Strategic Services, and the United States Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration for the quarter ending December 31, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

BOXCAR SHORTAGE IN NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, telegrams and letters received by me from citizens and corporations of North Dakota dealing with the boxcar shortage, which is seriously interfering with the war effort.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIGNITE, N. DAK., *September 17, 1934.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Present railway order on boxcars discriminates against co-op elevators. This order has not been used since 1923. No reason for digging it up now. I ask only a fair distribution of cars on a basis of historic volume of business. Please carry this protest to the Office of Defense Transportation and see that A. R. A. Order C. S. C. No. 10 is rescinded.

RALPH NOTMAN,
St. Anthony & Dakota Elevator Co.

GOLDENVALLEY, N. DAK.,
September 17, 1943.
Hon. Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

The grain-car situation remains critical. Those few cars available are equally distributed between the elevators regardless of volume handled. This is an unfair practice, and some of our members' patrons are forced to haul their grain to the line elevator. We would appreciate very much if you could do something to correct this unfair practice.

FARMERS GRAIN CO.

WHITMAN, N. DAK., *September 10, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you do all possible to relieve grain-car shortage. Our crop only half threshed. Need cars badly.

WHITMAN CO-OPERATIVE ASSOCIATION.

ROCKLAKE, N. DAK., *September 11, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

Car situation is terrible. Anything you can do to get more cars to move this crop should be done at once.

CROCUS FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR.

EDMORE, N. DAK., *September 10, 1943.*
Senator LANGER:

I urge release on boxcars for grain.

FARMERS SHIPPING & SUPPLY CO.,
G. P. DAVIDSON, *Assistant Manager.*

ANETA, N. DAK., *September 10, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

Thirty percent of grain threshed. Elevators and farm granaries filled to capacity. Grain will have to be left in open if empty cars not furnished.

FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR ASSOCIATION.

KLOTEN, N. DAK., *September 10, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

We are not getting enough cars up here. Situation very bad. Have same corrected.

KLOTEN FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR CO.

MICHIGAN, N. DAK., *September 10, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

Boxcar situation very critical. Something has to be done or situation will become disastrous.

MICHIGAN FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR CO.

ROCKLAKE, N. DAK., *September 10, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

Urgent cars be provided for grain. Threshing only starting this area and elevator filled. Ouly four cars received last 10 days. Three per day needed for normal shipment.

A. O. SOLBERG,
ROCKLAKE FARMERS UNION
ELEVATOR ASSOCIATION.

NOONAN, N. DAK., *September 15, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

Urge fair distribution of cars on basis of volume of business. Have A. R. A. Order C. S. C. No. 10 rescinded.

FARMERS CO-OP. ELEVATOR CO.,
A. M. PAULSON, *Secretary.*

BERLIN, N. DAK., *September 15, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

A. R. A. Order C. S. C. No. 10 discriminators to large volume grain elevators should be rescinded. Order has not been used since 1923. Why use it now? We are depending on you to enter protest with Office of Defense Transportation. We want only a fair distribution of cars on a basis of historic volume of business.

BERLIN FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR CO.,
GEORGE MCNALLY, *Manager.*

PARSHALL, N. DAK., *September 15, 1943.*
WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

We urge you to get railroad to rescind A. R. A. Circular C. S. C. No. 10, which discriminates against our cooperative elevator and have cars allocated on basis of historic volume. Our association has a membership of about 350 members.

PARSHALL FARMERS UNION
CO-OP. ELEVATOR CO.

KRAMER, N. DAK., *September 15, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please use your influence to rescind A. R. A. Order C. S. C. No. 10. It discriminates greatly on our normal volume of business. In the past we have used four cars to our competitors' one. Please protest this discrimination to O. D. T.

KRAMER EQUITY ELEVATOR CO.
E. F. TROTTER, *Manager.*

TAYLOR, N. DAK., *September 15, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

We want fair distribution of grain cars on a basis of historic volume of business. Have A. R. A. Order C. S. C. No. 10 rescinded.

FARMERS ELEVATOR CO.,
R. INGOLD.

TOLNA, N. DAK., *September 15, 1943.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate Office Building:

Have received only five cars for grain shipment in past 6 weeks. Must have A. R. A. Order C. S. C. No. 10 rescinded at once. Protest O. D. T. unfair to Co-op elevators.

TOLNA FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR CO.,
F. T. PATTERSON.

SOUTHHEART, N. DAK., *September 15, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

Boxcar distribution for grain. We want fair distribution of cars on basis of historic volume of business for all elevators.

FARMERS COOPERATIVE ELEVATOR CO.

ADRIAN, N. DAK., *September 15, 1943.*
Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Because of the present system of boxcar distribution by the railroads, we are filled to capacity on grain and have had only three cars so far this month, while to the west of us our line-house competitors on the Midland Continental Railroad are getting all the Northern Pacific cars they want. Even though the Midland doesn't own any cars of their own, we who are on the Northern Pacific suffer. Our Co-op elevator stands to go under from this year's discrimination, because our customers are forced to go where they can get rid of their grain, namely, the Midland Continental Railroad. In previous years the distribution of cars depended on the volume of business done by an elevator. Now we are all equal, every one, and farmers are forced to do business and haul their grain to elevators, even against their wishes, in order to get rid of their grain. Under the present set-up of car distribution we stand to lose customers, and no doubt will wind up in the "red" We would like to have you use your honorable and good offices to have A. R. A. Order C. S. C. No. 10 rescinded, and protest to the Office of Defense Transportation to have the distribution of cars put on the basis of past volume of business. Thank you.

ADRIAN EQUITY ELEVATOR CO.,
E. R. LUEDTKE, *Manager.*

POWERS LAKE, N. DAK., *September 15, 1943.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Car situation is extremely serious here. Thousands of bushels of grain are piled on the ground because our elevator is blocked. Appreciate your effort for relieving this critical situation.

LUNDS VALLEY FARMERS ELEVATOR CO.

KILLDEER, N. DAK., *September 15, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Enter protest with Office of Defense Transportation against A. R. A. Order C. S. C. No. 10. Have same rescinded. Letter follows:

KILLDEER EQUITY ELEVATOR CO.

MEDINA, N. DAK., *September 15, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

We protest against the boxcar discrimination against the cooperative elevator. Railroads refuse to give cars on basis of past volume of business. We want nothing unfair but we ask for our share of boxcars according to the volume of business we have had in the past years.

MEDINA FARMERS UNION GRAIN CO.,
FRED KLEIN, *President.*

RAY, N. DAK., *September 15, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Present railroad boxcar order discriminates against cooperative elevator companies. This is an old order last used in 1923, which does not apply to us today. All we ask is a fair distribution of cars on a basis of historic volume of business. We are asking you to protest to the Office of Defense Transportation on this unfair car distribution and that you do everything in your power to have A. R. A. Order C. S. C. No. 10 rescinded. Under present order a company with one house which did not operate last year is able to obtain same number of cars as we do when we have three elevators and handled over 700,000 bushels of grain last year. We vigorously protest against this kind of dictatorial ruling and are depending on you to do all in your power to abolish this order.

RAY FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR CO.

CLIFFORD, N. DAK., *September 14, 1943.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You have already received information in regard to the boxcar situation our cooperative elevators find themselves up against. It seems queer that when our elevator is chuck full and Cargill is not full that Cargill should get two empties to every one ours gets. The situation is becoming desperate.

We need action and now. Put all you've got behind this and help us out.

Sincerely,

CONRAD I. RYGG.

WILLOW CITY, N. DAK., *September 15, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Present railroad order on boxcars discriminates against cooperative elevators and this order has not been in use since 1923 and no reason for digging it up now. We want nothing more than a fair distribution of cars on basis of historic volume of business. Urging you to contact Senator WHEELER to have A. R. A. Order C. S. C. No. 10 rescinded.

WILLOW CITY FARMERS ELEVATOR CO.

EPPING, N. DAK., *September 16, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

We feel it very unfair that present ruling of the American Railway Association, allocating empty freight cars for shipment of grain equally to all elevators regardless of volume of business. We, as a board of directors of a cooperative elevator, respectfully ask your wholehearted aid in having this order rescinded to the former method of allocation according to volume of business.

AUDRY YOUNG.
MAURICE ARCAND.
JORGEN HAUG.
JOE THEIGE.
ALVIN ANDERSON.

BOTTINEAU, N. DAK., *September 16, 1943.*
Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Honorable Senator, would appreciate you doing everything possible to have railroads rescind order on allocation of boxcars. We are unable to handle patrons' grain as long as this order is in effect. Thank you.

CARBURY FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR CO.

FARMERS ELEVATOR OF HAZEN,
Hazen, N. Dak., September 14, 1943.
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You are no doubt aware of the seriousness of the boxcar shortage in this area. While we realize that not much can be done to increase the total number of cars we can get here, I am writing you to acquaint you with certain factors that are resulting in inequitable distribution of the cars we do receive in this community.

One line elevator company operating here and in nearby towns has apparently convinced the Northern Pacific Railway that a fair distribution of cars would be based strictly on the number of elevators—if eight cars were available here, two should be assigned to each of the four local elevators. This would not appear too unreasonable if it were not that this line company has two elevator buildings here, one in operation and one used for storage. Even so these two buildings have a total storage capacity of only 80,000 bushels as compared to the 160,000-bushel capacity of our one elevator including annexes.

If storage capacity is not a satisfactory basis for car assignments, perhaps volume of business for the past few years might be considered. Our volume every year has been at least double that of the line house elevator.

For these reasons we believe that assignment of cars on a one-for-one basis is decidedly unfair to us. It has already resulted in great loss of business to us since grain can be now taken only when it can be shipped out. The line house with a previous volume of less than one-fourth the local business in the past is now being handed exactly one-half the local grain by virtue of the arrangement.

We are asking your immediate consideration of this problem and we urge action that will restore to us the right to do our just share of grain buying.

Respectfully yours,

FARMERS ELEVATOR OF HAZEN,
GOTTLOB FROESCHLE, *Manager.*

BEULAH, N. DAK., *September 16, 1943.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As a cooperative elevator with over 150 producer stockholders, we hereby appeal to you to do all in your power to have the railroads discontinue their present basis of distributing box cars under a ruling known as C. C. S. No. 10 first issued in 1923, but not having been used until this year. Under this rule all cooperative elevators are discriminated against because they have in past years handled the bulk of the grain at local stations but their stockholders are now being forced to deliver their grain to rival elevators. We ask for distribution of cars on basis of volume handled and not elevators owned.

BEULAH FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR CO.,
ERNEST R. HAFNER, *Secretary.*

BEULAH, N. DAK., *September 17, 1943.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Mercer County Farmers Union appeals to you to do your utmost in regard to the unfair distribution of grain cars by the railroads under ruling known as CCS-10 first issued in 1923 and not used until present time. Stockholders of cooperative elevator are being forced to deliver their grain to competitive elevators. We ask for distribution of cars on basis of volume handled and not according to the number of elevators.

MERCER COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
MAURICE PETERSON, *President.*

FINGAL, N. DAK., *September 15, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Our farmers' elevator at Kathryn, N. Dak., is having a hard time this fall because we do not get enough freight cars.

We have been informed that an old law is followed in the distributing of cars to elevators whereby the elevators all get an equal number of cars regardless of volume handled in the past, and regardless also, I presume, of the size of trade territory and number of patrons involved.

Whatever may have been the purpose back of this law when it was passed 20 years ago, (and has been disregarded in later years) it works out to the disadvantage of our company, and I presume that this is largely true of every cooperative elevator in the Northwest.

The Farmers Mutual Elevator is the only elevator at Kathryn. We have a large trade territory and a great number of stockholders and patrons. * * *

This fall we are losing a lot of grain because we are not in position to take it all, as at times we are filled to the brim and have to wait for cars—sometimes several days. Some of our competitors who formerly did not handle a very large volume of grain must this year be sitting pretty. Ordinarily we would not begrudge them this business if it was obtained through free competition, but giving them as many cars as we get makes it a sort of a "forced feed" affair.

* * * * *

Yours very truly,

KATHRYN FARMERS MUTUAL ELEVATOR CO.,
A. C. NELSON, *President.*

FARMERS SHIPPING & SUPPLY CO.,
Edmore, N. Dak., September 14, 1943.
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I, as a voter and a friend of the farmers, urge you as our Senator to help enforce a law to the effect that all railroad box cars be distributed according to historic business.

The ruling that the American Railway Association has dug up from their ancient files, known as Circular C. C. S. No. 10, is crippling our business. This order discriminates against us; it diverts our business to a rival, a detriment to our cooperative. You, Mr. LANGER, as our Senator, I would like you to get in touch with Senator WHEELER, who I believe is the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, and ask him to investigate this procedure at once.

You as our Senator, Mr. LANGER, I would like to have you ask the O. D. T. to act. Joseph Eastman, who is chairman of the O. D. T. I believe, is a fair man and one who will act promptly when the facts are given to him.

The time to kill this order is now—not next year—and I will be writing to you and wiring you until we have accomplished our aim.

Yours truly,

G. H. DAVIDSON.

BURNSTAD FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR CO.,
Burnstad, N. Dak., September 14, 1943.
Hon. Senator LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are up against a very serious problem in North Dakota this year. We have a large wheat crop and it seems as though the railroads are discriminating against the cooperative elevators in the northwest territory.

It would seem to me that the railroads should distribute grain cars according to the amount of grain that was handled by each elevator the past year. I have here before me a record of grain that was handled by all the elevators in Logan County the past year.

I will cite you one example at Lehr, N. Dak. They have three elevators and they are privately owned. They handled 257,000 bushels of grain the past year, and we handled 209,000 bushels, and we have only one elevator. Our elevator is owned by the farmers in our territory. These elevators at Lehr, N. Dak., had five grain cars on September 13, 1943, and we only had one car on September 14, 1943. I would think, considering the amount of bushels that we handled in comparison with those elevators at Lehr, N. Dak., we would be entitled to four cars to their five.

* * * * *

Very truly yours,

BURNSTAD FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR CO.,
By PETER GRESS, *Manager.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

H. R. 2859. A bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 426).

By Mr. WALSH (for Mr. DAVIS), from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 714. A bill for the relief of the commissioned officers of the United States ship *St. Louis* during the Spanish-American War, May 18, 1898, to September 2, 1898; without amendment (Rept. No. 427).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1008. A bill for the relief of Gerald G. Woods; without amendment (Rept. No. 428);

S. 1293. A bill for the relief of Cleo Pickrell; with amendments (Rept. No. 429); and

H. R. 305. A bill for the relief of Howard Morgan; without amendment (Rept. No. 430).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 862. A bill for the relief of the Grafton Boat Works; without amendment (Rept. No. 431); and

S. 1309. A bill for the relief of Pan American Airways, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 432).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 950. A bill for the relief of the Milford Trust Co. and Blanche R. Bennett, as administrators of the estate of Charles E. Reed, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 433).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1246. A bill for the relief of Ervin S. Finley; without amendment (Rept. No. 434); and

H. R. 304. A bill for the relief of J. E. Martin; without amendment (Rept. No. 435).

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy; without amendment (Rept. No. 436).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on September 30, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 881) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

A bill and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1407. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Puerto Rico, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1917, as amended, and known as the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution providing for the retirement of Harry Colder, an employee in the Senate restaurant; to the Committee on Rules.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, on September 14, at the request of the Navy Department, I introduced a bill (S. 1353) to further amend the act of February 14, 1931, relating to allowances for travel by automobile; to permit of allowances for transportation in excess of minimum first-class accommodations; and for other purposes. I find that the bill deals with all civilian employees in all departments of the Government, and, in my opinion, it is therefore not a matter for the Naval Affairs Committee to handle. I therefore ask that the Naval Affairs Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which I understand deals with civilian employees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT—AMENDMENT

Mr. REVERCOMB (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by them jointly to the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NAVY DAY

Mr. WALSH. I ask consent to submit a concurrent resolution asking the President to designate October 27 of each year as Navy Day.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) was received and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Whereas the Navy League of the United States traditionally designates October 27 as Navy Day; and

Whereas October 27 is the birthday of the late President Theodore Roosevelt, who was a stanch advocate of an adequate Navy; and

Whereas Navy Day is observed on this date because it marks the birthday of President Theodore Roosevelt; and

Whereas the Navy Department officially recognizes October 27 as Navy Day and the Navy League's sponsorship thereof: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That October 27 of each year is hereby recognized by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America as Navy Day, and that the President of the United States is requested, as Commander in Chief, to order naval units throughout the United States to assist civic bodies in appropriate observance to such extent as he may deem advisable, to issue a proclamation each year declaring October 27 to be Navy Day, and in such proclamations to invite the Governors of the various States to issue Navy Day proclamations: *Provided*, That in the event October 27 falls on Sunday, the following Monday shall be recognized as Navy Day.

LINCOLN COUNTY, TENN., OVER THE TOP IN WAR BOND PURCHASES

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I have received a telegram of some importance from R. A. Largen, chairman, Lincoln County (Tenn.) War Bond Sales Committee, which I desire to read into the RECORD. It is as follows:

FAYETTEVILLE, TENN., *September 30, 1943.*

Senator TOM STEWART,
Washington, D. C.:

Lincoln County, Tenn., with a population of 27,000 people, with September bond quota of $888,000, with several districts unheard from, we have gone over the top with a total sale of $1,083,621, which is an average of $40 for every man, woman, and child in Lincoln County. We just wired you to let you know we are with you.

R. A. LARGEN,
Chairman, Lincoln County War Bond Sales.

INDEPENDENT BANKING—AN AMERICAN INSTITUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the world likes plain-spoken, straightforward language.

Recently an American from Spokane, Wash., Eric A. Johnston by name, talked straight from the shoulder to the Association of British Chambers of Commerce.

He bluntly told his audience the differences between our two countries, and then he told of the resemblances and how we could cooperate after the war for a good world purpose.

It is about one of the differences he stressed—centralization of all power in the Federal Government—that I am now concerned.

Johnston calls attention to the fact that in Britain the financial system is practically a unit, the great banks having branches all over Britain, whereas in this country our banks are independent banks, National and State.

Recently Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in an address in Cincinnati before the bank-supervising authorities of 48 States, spoke of a "unified banking system" coupled with "well-regulated branch banking limited to trade areas."

All this means that apparently, in Mr. Eccles' judgment, we should become British-minded in our banking methods, or that our State and Federal banking supervisions are no longer functioning effectively together, and that our system of dual banking must be eliminated, with State authority supplanted by a strongly centralized authority.

It cannot be denied that a single centrally controlled national banking system would wipe out one more aspect of our traditional democratic economy. In every totalitarian country one of the first steps was the taking over of the banking and financial institutions. The control of money and credit has always been a prerequisite for a strong centralized government.

We base our Government on duality—a federation of autonomous States. Here the people are sovereign. They have given to the State governments the powers they possess. They can retake those powers. The Federal Constitution provides that all power not specifically delegated to the Central Government shall be reserved to the States.

I call attention to Marriner Eccles' statement because I do not believe that the National Government should have exclusive power in the banking field

In other words, the States should not be deprived of their right to charter and supervise banks which are designed to look after local needs.

Marriner Eccles' idea is just another indication of the thinking of some people who believe that by centralizing more power in Washington, a better job can be done in the hinterland.

There is no better example of the fallacy of such thinking than in banking itself. The independent country banker has been one of the great stalwart forces of our country. He has been father confessor in connection with all the financial troubles of the community. To him have gone the troubled in spirit and in mind, and they have received aid and assistance. By and large, he has been faithful to his trust.

In most instances, he has grown up in the community. He knows every man, woman, and child of the community. He is in touch with the heartthrobs of the town and the village. He is interested in the economic, social, and moral growth of the town because it is his town. He is more than a money lender. He is a community builder. He is interested in church, school, and community life. He is interested in the old folks and the men and women in business, and he is interested in the youngsters who are going to school. This is his home town. Without all these ties and knowledge, without the sympathy and understanding which flow therefrom, he could not render the service he does.

Now it is proposed that his bank should simply be a branch institution, not a local home-bred institution, and, of course, the banker would be considered to be out of date, so a manager would come from some distant city. That is what Eccles was talking about.

I stress this matter at this time because in the opinion of the average American, centralization in government has gone too far. I believe that the next nominee for President on the Republican ticket will "ring the gong" if he emphatically tells the American people that, when the war is over, he will pledge himself to demobilize department after department to the extent of at least 50 percent, and in many instances more, and get rid entirely of useless agencies in government.

The people's experience with the O. P. A. and other agencies of government has been such that when the war is over they want to get rid of government interference, which after all is simply the result of centralization in government of matters which should be handled locally.

Our banking system in America is entirely different from the British system. We want to keep it different. We question all centralized dominance in government.

PRESIDENT VERSUS PRESS—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "President Versus Press," published in the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I inquire if the Senator from Ohio is going to discuss the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. TAFT. Very well.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Radcliffe
Andrews	Hatch	Reed
Bailey	Hawkes	Revercomb
Ball	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Hill	Robertson
Barkley	Holman	Russell
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Brooks	Kilgore	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McCarran	Tobey
Caraway	McClellan	Tunnell
Chavez	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Van Nuys
Connally	Maloney	Wagner
Danaher	Maybank	Waligren
Downey	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Murdock	White
George	Murray	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Green	Overton	
Guffey	Pepper	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is detained on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] is absent because of illness.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has been confined to a Madison hospital since September 13.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, yesterday I submitted an amendment intended to be offered as a substitute for the pending bill. I wish at this time to explain the intention of the proposed substitute amendment. We have been dealing with three questions. We have been dealing with deferment of registrants under the selective-service system, first, for industrial occupations; second, for dependency; third, for health. Those subjects are all dealt with in paragraph (1) of section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, which was last amended on June 23, 1942. It seems to me that if we are going to deal with the subject comprehensively it should be done by a redrafting of that particular section. I have attempted to do so, and to rewrite that section in accordance with the various principles which I think have been developed in the discussion here. Some parts of the amendment, which Senators will find on their desks, are simply rewritten from the existing section and are the same; the first part, for instance:

> (1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act, in the land and naval forces of the United States, of any or all categories of those men whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose activity in other endeavors, is found in accordance with section 10 (a) (2) to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

Under that section there have been deferred approximately 1,500,000 men, and it has been thought that those deferments are too numerous. I have added only one proviso to that section. In conferring with various members of the Senate we have repeatedly discussed the problem of industrial exemption; the question of whether the authorities have gone too far in that respect; the question of feather-bedding of labor; the question of employers being allowed to hoard labor which should be in the Army. Some of the Members of the Senate with whom I have discussed the question feel that industrial exemption should be entirely abolished, at least with respect to men under 25 years of age, or even under 30 years of age. On the other hand, I have discussed the question with other Members of the Senate who think that would be going too far; that there are men who, even though they are under 25 and unmarried, are more essential in industrial occupations than in the Army, particularly in the airplane plants. Therefore I was unwilling to go so far as to say that we should absolutely cut off those exemptions with a broadax. Amendments of that kind will be offered, however, and I think the Congress should consider them.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Upon the point being discussed by the Senator from Ohio, it will be noted that the deferments of registrants under 30 years of age will begin after January 1, 1944. I should like to inquire why the deferments should not begin immediately upon passage of the pending measure. It seems to me that if deferments are to be made, they should be effective as soon as possible. It would be unfair to men with dependents to take some of them until January 1 and then start deferring them. Why delay the deferments until January 1, 1944?

Mr. TAFT. This is the only restriction I have been able to convince myself should be made on the deferment of men for essential industrial occupations:

Provided, however, That if the registrant is under 30 years of age on October 1, 1943, he shall not be deferred under the authority given by this first sentence of paragraph (1) after January 1, 1944, unless such deferment is approved by the local selective-service board where the registrant is registered—

That is the present law—

by the local selective-service board having jurisdiction over the locality where the registrant is working, and by the Director of Selective Service.

That would mean that while the local board where the individual is registered would have final say with respect to deferment, in addition to that local board's deferment he would have to get the local board in the place where he is working to say that he should be deferred, and he would have to have the deferment approved by the Director of Selective Service in Washington.

With respect to the delay in deferments until after January 1, 1944, concerning which question has been raised, I do not object to making the provision apply sooner, but a review by the Director of Selective Service of approximately from 500,000 to 600,000 individual cases will be necessary with respect to the men under 30 years of age. It seemed to me that that was such a gigantic job that probably it could not be done before January 1. However, I think we could speed it up somewhat by providing that no further deferments should be granted at this time without the approval of the Director of Selective Service.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I should prefer, if the Senator from West Virginia does not mind, to finish my explanation of these subjects. I will be very glad to yield later on.

One of the reasons for providing that deferment also must be made by the local board where the registrant is working was suggested by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. He pointed out that in many cases men are deferred by their home boards; then they go to a big city and become employed by, let us say, the Curtiss-Wright Aircraft Co., and they send back certificates stating that they are employed by the Curtiss-Wright Aircraft Co. They may be employed at sweeping out the floor, or they may be performing wholly unessential work, and the local boards in the towns from which they come are wholly unable to determine the essentiality of that work.

The language of the amendment provides that a registrant must also obtain the approval of the local selective service board having jurisdiction over the locality where the registrant is working, the local board which can judge of the essentiality of the work, which can ascertain if the registrant is performing essential work, which can call before it officers of the plant and ascertain whether the registrant is really performing essential work. That board shall pass on the question of deferment.

Finally it has seemed to me that the Director of Selective Service should assume all responsibility for this job. We are asking him now to determine that there shall not be too many men deferred for industrial employment. It would place the Director of Selective Service also over all the Government officials. He could determine whether a man deferred in the Department of the Interior was essential.

I do not see how we can prevent the delegation of some discretion to somebody. The trouble today is that we are delegating discretion to thousands of individual boards scattered throughout the United States, many of them without the facts upon which to base their opinions, guided by very general and rather ambiguous rules as to who should be deferred and who should not be deferred. I believe we should place the responsibility on the Director of Selective Service, so if 500,000 men under 30 years of age are deferred, they are deferred only because he says they should be deferred. That first part of the amendment deals with the question of industrial deferment. I feel that it will force back into the service a considerable number of men who are now deferred for industrial occupation. I think the Senate should debate whether we should go further; whether we should say that no man under 25 years of age shall be deferred. I am afraid we would find a great many essential men who should be deferred. I do not think we should deal with the question with a broadax.

The second part of the provision deals with the question of dependents. It would do two things. First, it would put the whole matter on a national basis, on the basis of a national pool.

It is provided that notwithstanding the section of the Selective Service Act which requires State quotas and local quotas, hereafter no person shall be taken until the class which is prior to him is substantially exhausted throughout the entire Nation. It seems to me that perhaps that is the most essential thing we can do; because, although the system was all right in the beginning, today every State has made approximately the same sacrifice; but there has been so much migration—men have wandered away from the agricultural States, for instance, to the industrial States—that the result has been that many more married men are called in the States from which the single men have migrated. It seems to me we have reached the point where we should have a national pool. That is what the amendment provides.

The categories which would be set up are categories only of men who have dependents.

The first category is that of those who have collateral dependents.

The second category is that of those who have a wife but no children.

The third category would be made up of married men with pre-Pearl Harbor children, men who are under 25 years of age on the 1st of October 1943.

Category 4 would be made up of those men between the ages of 25 and 30.

Category 5 would be made up of those men over 30 and up to 38 years of age.

Category 6 would be made up of those whose induction into the service would cause extreme hardship or privation to the wife, child, or parent with whom the man maintained a bona fide family relationship in their home. Those words are the words now used by the Selective Service System in determining who shall be considered to come within the category of extreme hardship and privation cases.

It is then provided that no man shall be taken in category 1—that is, the category of men who have collateral dependents—until substantially all the single men throughout the Nation are taken; that no man shall be taken in category 2—that is, the group of men with wives but no children—until substantially all the men with collateral dependents have been taken. That is substantially the rule of the Selective Service, except the amendment would put the matter on a national basis instead of on a State basis.

Second, the amendment provides that no man with children—in other words, no father—shall be drafted until all single men who have been deferred are taken, throughout the Nation; that no man over 25 years of age shall be taken until all men under 25 years of age are taken; that no man over 30 years of age shall be taken until all those under 30 are taken.

Finally, we have the extreme hardship cases. In a few minutes I shall speak about the reason for making the age distinction; but at this point I desire to pass on for a moment to the reason for making the physical-disqualification deferments. We have heard much criticism of the Army and Navy standards. I believe that criticism is largely justified. On the other hand, I do not see how Congress can undertake to prescribe the standards, and I do not see how we ourselves can do anything to change the result. However, we can indicate to the services and to the President that we think the question should be given the most serious consideration.

So the amendment would insert in existing law a provision that—

In order to enable the President to perform his duties under the sentence of paragraph (1)—

Incidentally, the Army and the Navy are not now given the power; but under

the Selective Service Act the power is given to the President of the United States. He could have determined those standards; he could have delegated the task to General Hershey. Personally, I myself think he should have delegated it to General Hershey. However, instead he delegated it to the Army and the Navy.

It is provided that—

In order to enable the President to perform his duties under this sentence of paragraph (1), and to delay as long as possible the induction of men living with their families, the President shall forthwith appoint a commission of five qualified physicians of whom at least one shall be an Army officer and one a Navy officer, who shall examine the physical qualification requirements for admission to the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and recommend to the President any changes therein which they believe can be made without impairing the efficiency of the armed services. The commission shall especially consider the establishment of special standards for men who will be inducted only for limited service. The Director of Selective Service shall cause to be reexamined those men who may qualify under any new standards established.

Mr. President, it seemed to me that was about as far as we should go in indicating our belief that there are many men who have been put in category 4–F who should be returned and used by the Army and the Navy. Three million four hundred thousand men have been classified in 4–F, and it seems reasonable to believe that a considerable number of them may be taken.

Therefore, Mr. President, I have attempted to deal constructively with each of the three deferment questions. My feeling is very strong that there should be an age differential as between younger married men with children and older married men with children. At the request of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and some other Senators, I have provided for an additional category to include men under the age of 25. My original plan was simply to provide for separate categories for men under 30 years of age and those over 30 years of age. It seems to me perfectly clear that what we want to do is to get the best men for the Army. That is our whole job. This is drafting. We are not considering the general manpower question. The Selective Service Act is not qualified to deal with the general manpower question. If we are to deal with it, we should do so comprehensively, in comprehensive legislation for that purpose.

However, so far as the Army is concerned, it would seem to me that the men under 30 make more desirable soldiers than those over 30, particularly because we have already obtained most of the officers needed for the war. Today, we are dealing, practically, with privates. The chances of a man being promoted to be an officer before there is substantial fighting are rather remote. Today, we have plenty of older men available to be officers, if that is what we want; but now we are dealing substantially with privates.

Last week General Marshall testified relative to the matter of the younger men. He was asked the following question by the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]:

General, in view of the experience of the Army with younger men, the success of the younger men as contrasted with older men, do you think it would be practical to limit the father draft, we will say, from fathers between 18 and 30 rather than going up from 30 to 38 and thus get into an age class that has not been too successful?

General Marshall replied:

Well, I will say the younger soldiers are better for us to handle. Just what effect it would have in the manpower problem if you eliminated fathers over 30, I do not know. But we find it a simpler matter and quicker business to train and prepare the younger men.

So, Mr. President, if we are looking for what the Army wants, it does not want fathers over 30. It wants fathers under 30. Incidentally, there are over 550,000 under 30, so we can see there never would be need to draft fathers over 30.

There are a number of reasons why I feel differently about fathers under 30 and fathers over 30. First, I think fathers under 30 are very loath to stay at home. I think most of them feel that a certain discredit is cast upon them if they stay at home.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I did not understand how many fathers the Senator said were under 30 years of age.

Mr. TAFT. There are approximately 2,000,000, but the Selective Service estimate that out of that group they would get approximately 550,000, and that is considerably more than they say they need for the present.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. In other words, I think fathers under 30 are probably rather more anxious to go than not. I do not think we shall find from them any great objection to being drafted. Certainly, Mr. President, all the protesting letters I have had seem to be with reference to fathers over 30, men who have reached a substantial position in life. After all, the men under 30 have not made very great progress, as a rule—with very rare exceptions—in their business or profession or whatever they are doing; so they would not be sacrificing so much as would those who have attained higher positions. Furthermore, they have not achieved positions in which they are so important to the business or profession they are serving. The men over 30 have reached such positions.

In other words, I do not believe we would be upsetting industry any, as a rule, by taking men under 30, rather than those over 30, because if they are essential to industry they will be deferred, anyway; and we are talking now about the fathers who are in the less-essential industries. Today I think practically everyone is essential. There are very few places where a man can be taken out without the necessity of filling his place. There is hardly a civilian activity left which cannot be said to be essential for the civilian population. It is true that many of the fathers we will take will be in businesses, but it is unlikely that the taking of those under 30 will seriously disturb the operation of the civilian machine.

Furthermore, as a rule, the taking of younger fathers will not involve as much financial hardship, because the older fathers have usually built up a considerably greater expense. Many more of them have bought houses of their own and have to maintain those houses. Generally they are likely to have more children. They are likely to have assumed a great deal more expense than the men under 30.

It is said that the wives of the men under 30 are more likely to have very young children and cannot work, but we have made very liberal provision for the treatment of wives with very young children. We are providing day nurseries for children. We are providing care for the wives during the period of confinement.

Most of the younger wives have families. Their fathers and mothers are still maintaining homes to which they can return. That is true in most cases. One of my sons, who is a pre-Pearl Harbor father, has been in the Navy for nearly 2 years. His wife is living with her mother and father. I know of many cases in which young wives are able to return to families in which the parents are still living.

Furthermore, so far as children are concerned, the problem of delinquency, which is one of the most serious problems, relates almost entirely to the children of fathers over 30. There are few fathers under 30 with children old enough to get into the delinquent class. They can be dealt with by day nurseries and various social organizations which have been set up. If there is extreme hardship, the fathers are deferred, anyway, in category 6. That question would be determined by the local boards. So I feel very strongly that there is a marked line of distinction between fathers under 30 and fathers over 30.

I take it that the chief argument against a measure of this kind is the War Manpower Commission. To a large extent, the so-called draft of fathers is not intended to be a draft of fathers. It is intended to force fathers out of so-called nonessential occupations into essential occupations. Frankly, I think it is a very indirect way of doing it. If we are to have a labor draft, we had better set up a labor draft. Personally I am opposed to it. Personally, I do not think that the business of trying to determine what is essential and what is not essential is one which can be successfully done by the War Manpower Commission. I think of two cases of which I know personally. I know of a colored janitor of an apartment house in Georgetown, who is 36 years of age. He operates the whole apartment house, which has 50 or more Government workers living in it. He is a very competent janitor.

If he is taken away, someone else will have to be found to carry on his job. It is an essential job. I cannot see the point of forcing him to go to work in the Navy Yard making guns, something at which he would be no good and about

which he knows nothing, and putting in his place, to operate the apartment house, someone who probably would not be any good at it.

I have a partner in a law firm which is doing a very large amount of business in connection with naval ordnance. I believe he has three or four children. He is 36 years old. Someone must do that work. The work must be done by some competent person. Knowing his general physical make-up, I feel very strongly that he would be a very poor man to have in any of the so-called essential industries into which he might be forced. I do not think he would be any good as a machinist in an airplane factory. Yet that is the kind of thing which the War Manpower Commission is trying to force by using this indirect power on fathers over 30 and under 38. Incidentally, it does not deal very largely with the problem, because the problem relates to men over 30. Under the law it cannot get any hold on men over 38, who represent more than half the men with whom it is necessary to deal. I do not think it is an effective way to deal with the manpower problem.

I believe that we should deal specifically with the problem of taking men into the Army. I do not claim that my amendment would absolutely prevent the draft of fathers. I do think that it would substantially postpone such draft. If such a measure were passed by both Houses, I think the Selective Service agency would be very loath to go into the question of drafting fathers. In effect, we set out two other methods.

If it is desired to change the date from January 1, 1944, to an earlier date, I think that could be done; but so far as the general problem is concerned, I feel confident that the passage of this measure would accomplish as much as we can hope to accomplish in a legislative way. It is difficult for me to see how we can take away from the administrative authorities the final discretion to pass on the principles which we have set up as a proper basis for the deferment of registrants.

Mr. President, earlier I objected to interruptions. I am now glad to try to answer any questions as to the problems which I have discussed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As the able Senator from Ohio knows, the provisions of his amendment have been discussed with a number of other Senators, including myself. A difference arose as to a part of the amendment, in particular, as to the authority for deferments of men under 30 years of age. Because of that difference, there was submitted today an amendment in the nature of a substitute, changing only a few lines in the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

At this time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the printing of the substitute submitted by me today, lines be drawn through the language of the Taft amendment proposed to be deleted, and that the language proposed to be substituted be printed over it, so that Senators may more easily see the difference between the two proposals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. He provides in his amendment that men under 30 shall not be deferred unless such deferment is approved by the local selective-service board where the registrant is registered, and also by the local selective-service board where he is working, as well as by the Director of Selective Service. Has he not left us just where we are today? The deferments which are granted today are granted by the selective-service boards under the Director of Selective Service.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think I have left the situation where it is today. I do not claim that my amendment is a substantial revision of the principle, but I do say that today the local selective-service board has the absolute right to defer any man, and many of them are deferring men. The local selective-service board where the registrant is registered does not always know the situation. It may think that some war plant is doing a very necessary war work. It may not realize that in the whole picture it is not really so essential. The Director of Selective Service can do practically nothing about it when a man is deferred. There is provision for an appeal, but appeal is seldom taken, and the power is seldom used. If the deferment had to be approved in Washington, I believe there would be a substantial difference in the number of deferments. Furthermore, the responsibility would be placed on the Director of Selective Service, and he would have to meet the problem. I have found the Director of Selective Service generally very favorable to the deferment of fathers. So far as his own acts are concerned, I feel that he would prefer not to draft any fathers. I went to him soon after this question arose and discussed the whole subject with him. He was the one who set up this dependency deferment based on family relationship. In general, I have found him loath to resort to the drafting of fathers. He has been forced into it by the fact that many men are deferred. He has very little to say about whether or not they should be deferred. He makes general regulations. I think he should have made more definite regulations, but I believe that his general approach to the problem does not permit him to make definite regulations. However, in my amendment we absolutely put the question up to him. I believe that if the proposed legislation is enacted he will favor, so far as possible, the checking of deferments. I think he is opposed to deferments rather than otherwise. I also believe that if the responsibility is placed squarely upon him, he cannot say that he has to follow the decision of the local board. Congress has expressed a very definite policy up to this time to the effect that the decision of the local board shall be final. That is the congressional policy, and he can rightfully claim that he is not responsible for the deferments. What the proposed act does is to say that he shall be responsible, and I believe the amendment, if adopted, would accomplish some substantial results. It may not go so far as the Senator would like to go, because I fear to go that far.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. May I say that I do not agree with the Senator that the language which he is suggesting could relieve the situation at all? At the present time the Director of Selective Service has over-all control of the selection and deferment of men. Rules for deferment are made in the selective service department under his direction, and to this very day we have a situation which is calling for correction. If the authority to say who is to be deferred under 30 years of age is placed in the local boards and the Director of Selective Service, I see no hope whatsoever for correction of the present situation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator the alternative? The alternative seems to me to be the possible wrecking of such industries as those engaged in airplane production. Nothing is so important today as the production of airplanes by this Government. Yet, if we should take every single man under 30 from the west coast airplane plants, for example, I should not want to assume the responsibility for the resultant checking of the production of airplanes. That is what would occur if we were to follow such a course without giving someone discretion to say what men should be taken. Take the copper mines; we have to have copper as well as airplanes. I do not want to assume the responsibility of saying, "That is all very well, but so many of your men must come out of the mines or out of the airplane factories and go into the Army tomorrow." I do not want to assume the responsibility for such procedure.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Unless Congress is willing to take the responsibility of saying that so many men must go, whoever they are, there will be no relief from the hoarding of labor which we have had described to us day after day and month after month.

I do not wish to debate this question until the proposed substitute has been printed and made available to Members of the Senate for examination. However, I say that unless Congress is willing to face the situation squarely instead of leaving in the hands of draft boards the responsibility for determining the exemptions with respect to men under 30 years of age, we shall allow the situation to continue as it is today, with no opportunity for relief.

I wish respectfully to invite attention to the very able argument which has just been advanced by the Senator from Ohio to the effect that men under 30 years of

age have not progressed so far in life and have not become as settled in their occupations as men over 30 years of age, and that whenever men are called from the plants they should be called from among those under 30 years of age to serve in the military forces. That same argument applies to the taking of men below 30 years of age without dependents as it applies to those with dependents. If the decision on this point of deferment for occupation is left entirely to the draft boards, as it is at present, we cannot hope for any relief in the situation. We must be definite in saying who cannot be deferred. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio is not definite. The substitute I shall offer is definite.

Mr. TAFT. I do not agree that we cannot hope for any relief. I think that substantial relief is provided in my amendment. Personally, I hesitate to go further than the amendment provides. If the Senate wishes to go further it can vote to do so. It is a very simple matter to amend the amendment in the nature of a substitute, or adopt the Senator's proposed substitute in order to make a broadax cancelation of exemption of certain groups which we might wish to designate.

Mr. DANAHER and Mr. CLARK of Missouri addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Ohio. I should like to say to the Senator from Missouri that I had been on my feet earlier awaiting the opportunity to speak with reference to this particular point. I should like to press it with this thought in mind:

On page 2 of the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, in lines 4 to 12, inclusive, we find a proviso. Is it the purpose of the Senator from Ohio that all three agencies mentioned in lines 8 to 12, exclusive, must concur before an applicant may be deferred?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. That would apply after January 1, 1944. I feel that it would take some time to set up the system, and that it would probably require some personnel to recheck about 600,000 cases. However, all agencies must concur. If a man desires to be exempted from military service he must "sell" his board at home, as well as the board nearest to where he is working, which may examine into the conditions of the plant where he is employed, and determine whether he is really an essential worker in the particular plant. The board at home usually cannot do so. Third, the exemption must be approved in Washington or by some agent of the Director of Selective Service.

Mr. DANAHER. Let us assume that a board in Maine, for example, says that Joe Doe is now earning $150 a week in an airplane plant in Connecticut, which is a great deal more money than he used to earn in a month in Maine. Let us assume further that he is sending $140 of his pay to his home and living on the remaining $10 of his salary, and some are living on just about that amount.

Mr. TAFT. From what the Senator is saying, it must be cheaper to live in Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. It is, the way some of them are living. The local board says, "We are going to grant that man deferment, because certainly he is an essential worker." The board in Connecticut says, "This man never saw a grinder, a polisher, or a planer; he does not know a mill machine from a broom handle, and he never worked in a factory in his life until a month or 6 weeks ago, and we know that he is not an essential worker." Under those circumstances does the Senator from Ohio mean to say that by the proposed amendment he would impose on the respective boards the administrative burden of adjusting and reconciling the matters involved in the man's application for deferment?

Mr. TAFT. No; if any board should veto the application, the man would not be deferred, or if the selective service vetoed his application he would not be deferred. In other words, if he wished to be deferred he would have to obtain the consent of all the agencies involved before he could be deferred. If any board says, "No," he is through. That is the intention of the language.

Mr. DANAHER. If the call in any given month is for 25,000 men, is it the purpose of the Senator that the Selective Service may go wherever the 25,000 men can be found and take them into the Army?

Mr. TAFT. At the bottom of page 3 the Senator will see the following language:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, induction into the armed services shall be upon a Nation-wide basis.

The intention of the clause which I have just read is that section 4 (b) is not to be repealed. It would remain. The quotas would remain. But if the quota of men in category I is exhausted a board cannot be called upon for any more men, in spite of the general provisions of the act, until all the other boards in the country have exhausted their quota of men in category I.

Mr. DANAHER. Taking that explanation of it, does not the Senator see that the administrative burdens will be so vast that a man may properly say, "You have no right to induct me into the armed services of the United States until proof is established that Colorado, Ohio, or Indiana cannot meet these requirements?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think any court would stop on that ground. If the Selective Service Bureau can say that substantially all the men in that group have been taken I do not see how there is any chance of holding up deferment. The amendment does not say "all." It says "substantially all."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to a further question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. There is so much that is fundamentally reasonable and logical about the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio that I should hesitate to be thought to reject it. I should like to know, though, whether or not he has given any consideration to accomplishing this general result on a State basis rather than on a Nation-wide basis.

Mr. TAFT. I have found in talking to Senators that one of the things they are apparently most set on is the establishment of the quotas on a Nation-wide basis. I think the system ought to be on a Nation-wide basis today. I do not know that it should have been in the beginning, but today I think it will be found that in one State, for instance, it will be necessary to take a great number of married men, while in another State there are single men left. That situation has gradually developed by the migration of labor and by many other circumstances. I believe that the draft ought to be on a Nation-wide basis, and I may say that, so far as I can discover—and I have tried to talk with as many Senators as possible—that is the view of most of the Senators. I have not been particularly trying to present my own views on this question but I have been trying to get the consensus of the views of the Senate in order that we might approach this whole problem from a constructive standpoint without interfering with the men whom General Marshall says he needs.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In connection with what the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] has said, it seems to me that the objection raised by the Senator from West Virginia is very largely cured by the provisions of the substitute of the Senator from Ohio, first, that there shall be established a national pool; and, second, that not only the local board of the place of residence of the man claiming deferment but the local board where the man is proposing to work shall also be required to grant deferment.

This situation has come to my attention many times; I have called attention to it on 2 or 3 previous occasions; am very familiar with it, and it seems to me that it constitutes one of the greatest loopholes in the Selective Service. For instance, in the St. Louis metropolitan area there are some 590 industrial concerns engaged in war work for whom the deferment of employees engaged in essential work is entirely proper. But we have the situation of people coming into St. Louis from rural Missouri, southern Illinois, Arkansas, Tennessee, and, in some cases, from away down in Mississippi, who get a certificate, say, from the Curtiss-Wright Co.—I am simply using that as an example—that they are in the employment of the Curtiss-Wright Co., and they send it back to the local board and get a deferment, when, as a matter of fact, they may be engaged in mowing lawns, sweeping floors, or as timekeepers, or some other work entirely

unessential. The local board might say they were not doing essential work and might be replaced by old men or boys or women. It seems to me that the provisions of the substitute would cure that sort of a situation. I am informed and believe that the number may run into many thousands who might properly be inducted into the armed forces.

I think the best feature of the substitute is the provision for a national pool. It may have been entirely proper originally that the Government set up the theory of a local pool, but I think that time has passed and the local pool theory has exhausted its usefulness. I think everybody is agreed that if married men have to be taken, if it is necessary to have married men for the successful prosecution of the war, they simply have to be taken, and if it is necessary to take men from 50 to 60, they also ought to be taken; there can be no controversy about that. The only question is as to whether the quota of men who ought to be in 1-A has been exhausted; and it seems to me the men in 1-A ought to be exhausted before married men with children are taken. But the provision of the substitute of the Senator from Ohio creating a national pool and the provision requiring a check-up by the board at the place where the man is employed will go very far to straighten out the situation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield again?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am in hearty accord with the statement of the Senator from Missouri that selection of men for the service should be from the Nation at large for the Selective Service Act is national in its scope. Furthermore, I am in thorough accord with the view expressed that there should not be exemption from the service of men who are needed. The question involved is on the taking men from civil life and placing them into the armed services in an orderly manner and in a way best suited to the welfare of the country.

But I do not agree with the position that having two selective service boards pass upon deferments is going to relieve the situation that exists today. Most of the deferments granted by selective service boards are upon the request of the employer. If one board will grant it on request of the employer, why will not the other board likewise grant it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is a great deal of difference between a board in Arkansas, Tennessee, or Mississippi taking a blanket certificate of an employer and a board in St. Louis that can go to the plant and see what a man is doing.

In that connection, I want to say another loophole I have discovered in the administration of the Selective Service Act, if the Senator from Ohio will permit me—I do not want to make a speech in his time, but am rather thinking out loud—grows out of the lack of personnel and the lack of machinery for checking these things. For instance, as I said a moment ago, in St. Louis five-hundred-and-ninety-some plants are located, and from those plants perhaps 30 percent of industrial deferments in the State of Missouri arise. Such deferments have to be passed on, and, so far as any check from the Selective Service itself is concerned, the requirements of the various companies as to what they should have in the way of deferments is in the hands of one officer. He happens to be an excellent officer; he used to serve in the same outfit where I served, and I know him very well; but one officer comes down from State headquarters on Tuesday and stays in St. Louis until Friday, and then goes back to State headquarters; he has one stenographer, and it is absolutely impossible for him to make an adequate check of the requirements of all those industrial plants. Congress has never been niggardly to the Selective Service in giving it money and machinery to carry out equitably and fairly the provisions of the act.

Mr. TAFT. The trouble is not so much that. The Congress has said that the Selective Service may appeal from the decision of the local boards but that the local boards shall be really the determining factor.

The effect of this amendment is to put the responsibility on the Selective Service. We have got to give them the money they have said they need in order to check these things. Every case has got to be checked—there cannot be a "spot" check—and the requirement is on the Selective Service Director himself that every case must be checked, and he is going to be able to do so the better if he has more personnel.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, let me see if I correctly understand the position of the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Ohio. Take the case from St. Louis which the Senator from Missouri speaks about. Undoubtedly there must be many men under 30 years of age in the plants of St. Louis who reside and work there and who would be affected by only one draft board under the plan of the Senator from Ohio. In such cases there would be no change from the present law. In fact, I do not think there is any practical change even in those cases where two Selective Service boards pass upon whom may be deferred for industry.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from West Virginia, if the Senator from Ohio will permit me, that in that particular instance there has been organized a body formed of all the draft boards in the St. Louis metropolitan area, which includes a considerable territory outside the confines of the city of St. Louis. The board meets once a week, agree so far as they can as to uniform methods of taking men, and they have been very assiduous in their check of the essentiality of the men they have deferred. I have attended meetings of that organization. I attended one at which I suppose 300 members of draft boards were present, and they all stated instances that came to their notice of men who were working in an essential industry but not engaged in doing essential work, over whom they had absolutely no jurisdiction and no right, I think, to make any check or to change their deferment status.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, let me say that my whole point is that more men are needed, and that it would be better to take from the plants and the mills men under 30 who have no dependents, who are physically and mentally qualified, than it would be to take men with dependents and families. That is the whole point that is involved.

I oppose the plan of the Senator of Ohio, because I want the Selective Service officials to be required to first take men under 30 who have no dependents before taking men with dependents into the Service. And to that end I will introduce a substitute for the bill.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I think the Senator is wrong in saying that the local boards pass upon the cases. I read from the hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs:

> Senator WHEELER. Now, Mr. Baruch, I was in one of these plants in California where the president of an aircraft factory told me that the average man in that plant was 24 years old. Now what happened? When the draft came on these young men who were about to be taken into the Army, these single men, flooded into those factories. They were attracted by high wages, and they were attracted by the fact that it would enable them to evade the draft. I know that from many things.

The general word went out to all the young men in this country, when the draft law was passed, that if they went into essential industry they would not be taken into the armed forces. That was the general word which went out all over the country. I stated at the hearing:

> Whereas the married man with a family stayed home and stayed on his job.

He was not to be taken, but the young unmarried man was to be taken. I read further from my inquiry of Mr. Baruch at the hearing:

> It has been called to my attention, and Senator JOHNSON of Colorado has also had it called to his attention, that married fathers couldn't get jobs because of the fact——
>
> Mr. BARUCH (interposing). There was no general deferment in the aircraft factories until recently.
>
> Senator WHEELER. You say there was not any deferment until recently?
>
> Mr. BARUCH. Not until recently, because that was the chief thing manufacturers were objecting to. If they do get deferment, they are supposed to move as fast as they can——
>
> Senator WHEELER (interposing). I think you are wrong about that, Mr. Baruch, and I would like to ask Colonel Keesling. How long has it been that single men in aircraft factories have been deferred?
>
> Colonel KEESLING. Right from the start, provided they were irreplaceable.
>
> Mr. BARUCH. Provided they were irreplaceable.

Senator WHEELER. Yes, exactly; but every one of these boys, every one of these men, when he goes into that plant gets an order from his boss saying that he is irreplaceable.

Mr. BARUCH. That is a lot of nonsense, because the local board ought to see that he is replaced. He gets his deferment from his local board; he can't get it from anybody else.

Senator WHEELER. But the practice has been, Mr. Baruch, that if the manufacturer and the mine operator go to the local board and say that these men are essential—

I know of innumerable cases in Montana where young men have gone to Los Angeles and other places on the Pacific coast. They are told by their local boards, "If you want to be deferred, the thing to do is to get into a war industry." They return with letters from their boss or someone else saying that they are working for a war plant, and they are deferred. That is exactly the situation, and my position is supported by Colonel Keesling, who has said that has happened from the beginning.

Mr. TAFT. There is no doubt that, under the law, the local boards have deferred men who were supposed to be essential. I have no doubt that a very large number of local boards have been very stiff, and that the Senator himself, if he were on a board, would have granted the deferments the boards granted. On the other hand, there are many others which are careless, and there are others which should be checked and controlled much more than they are today; and that is the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. The point I make, however, is that the local boards were told from Washington to defer the men if they went into war industries; and they were deferred. It was not the local boards which wanted to defer many of these men. They were told, and the word went out all over the country, that if a young man went into a war industry, he should be deferred. The result has been as I have stated, for instance, in the factory to which I referred, the largest airplane factory in the city of Los Angeles, which I visited.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is wrong, because I have had protest after protest from industrial employers that men who they thought were essential have been drafted anyway. I do not believe there has been any general rule that anyone who went into an essential industry should be deferred.

Mr. WHEELER. The word went out.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know where it went out, but it did not reach most of Ohio, because in Ohio man after man has been drafted from essential industry. I think reliance is placed on the boards. Some boards are stiff and some are not. I think we can stiffen up the system, but at least I am not prepared to abolish it.

Mr. WHEELER. Colonel Keesling said, "Right from the start, provided they were irreplaceable," and the decision was with the employers as to whether the men were irreplaceable. If they said the men were irreplaceable, the boards had nothing to do except to accept them.

Mr. TAFT. I have but one final word to say. The amendment I have offered presents three or four points, and I think there will be agreement in the Senate on most of them. The only point of controversy will be over industrial deferments, and I think that will be worked out and an agreement reached. If so, I am very hopeful this approach to the problem may be taken by the Senate.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that he would put the matter off until January 1. If the present policy is to be carried out, between now and January 1, 446,000 fathers will be drafted. General Marshall has said that as of January 1 he hopes not to have to take any more men, but my information is that the Selective Service thinks that if something is not done to change the situation, if the standards are not lowered, every father who is physically fit will be taken either into the Army or the Navy.

INVESTIGATION OF WAR MANPOWER PROBLEM

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 183), as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the entire war manpower problem, to consider all reports thereon and information with respect thereto, and to assemble and submit to the Senate in compact form all pertinent data and information in order that the Senate may have a composite picture of the manpower problem, and be in a position without undue delay to devise and pass necessary legislation to meet this problem, thereby removing existing confusion and improving the effectiveness of our war effort. Such committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, in considering the pending bill, which provides for exempting from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 certain married men who have children, we are confronted with the testimony of General Marshall, Admiral King, General Hershey, and other prominent members of the armed services, as well as the testimony of other men, notable among whom is Mr. Bernard Baruch, who urges that we either support General Marshall's request or remove him from his present position.

I have great confidence in General Marshall and Admiral King. If I were in the service I should be proud to serve under either of them and should certainly carry out their commands and orders implicitly. I know the duties of a soldier—I have been one—but as a Member of the United States Senate I have a duty not only to the generals and the admirals and all the men and women in our armed services, but to all the people of the United States, including approximately 125,000,000 not in uniform.

It is the duty of the heads of the armed services to wage war, and because of the global nature of this war, the distances, and the difficulties of transportation of men, material, and supplies, and the fierceness of our enemies, from the very outset the heads of the Army and Navy have made extravagant requests for every kind of materials and supplies. As a result, we are overproduced in many things. We are overbuilt and overexpanded in many facilities for producing munitions in this country. Countless instances have been disclosed where the armed services needlessly hoarded strategic materials which up to this time have not been used, and quite likely never will be used.

Now comes the request for additional men for the armed services. The controversy hinges around whether or not we should immediately, and without further investigation or survey, allow the drafting of men who have fixed responsibilities incurred by marriage and the birth of children before December 8, 1941. I do not criticize General Marshall for his demand for every available physically and mentally fit man to wage war under his command. As a soldier, he frankly admits that his duties are those of a soldier, and when asked whether he would recommend the drafting of married men, his reply, in substance, was that whether married men were drafted or not was a problem for another branch of the Government, namely, the Manpower Commission; and, of course, the Manpower Commission will decide, under their present attitude and intention, to take the married men, because General Marshall says he needs a given number of men.

I believe, and I have always believed, that it is the duty of every man in the country, once his Nation has been attacked by a foreign foe, to defend his country in every possible way, even to the extent of laying down his life in battle. That is not only my personal view—it is the view of my family which has a record of 100-percent voluntary service for active front-line duty.

However, because this war is so vast, carried on at such great distances on so many fronts, there will come a time when we must decide as free people the amounts of money, materials, or men we will supply in the best interests of our country to bring about ultimate victory

and the best results that can be obtained thereby. When it was stated by General Marshall during his testimony that every person in Russia is in the war, we commend that as being admirable. Few events in all history command more genuine admiration than the heroic fight waged by the Russian armies and people against the formidable military machine of Adolf Hitler. But we might, with good grace, I believe, remember that Russia was an ally of Germany at one stage of this war, and every man in Russia is fighting now because Germany has attacked and invaded Russia. I am sure that if an enemy were invading and occupying part of our country and threatening our very existence, every man, woman, and child in America would be fighting—even with pitchforks, if necessary.

I can readily see that if we were invaded, we might, to a large extent, all be brought under the control and commands of military necessities and leaders. That time, thank God, has not yet arrived, and I believe, therefore, it is the solemn duty of the Congress of the United States to perform its constitutional functions of raising and maintaining an Army in the name of the people; and that includes the determination of who shall serve at any present moment in the Army.

Everyone will agree that fathers have a great responsibility the moment their children are born. That responsibility is that of a father in peacetime as well as in war, and the home provided by that father is the backbone of the civilization we are defending at the present moment.

I agree that fathers have more to defend than those who have no such parental responsibility, but the thing for us to consider what will be the effect on the morale and morals of this Nation at the present time of breaking up 446,000 additional homes where there are fixed expenses and definite obligations which cannot be met under any stretch of the imagination on the salary of a private soldier and the allotments the Congress has thus far seen fit to provide.

Certainly, all our people cannot be transformed or converted into an armed force; some must be left at home to maintain the production lines and support the elements of our governmental and civil functions.

Remembering that General Marshall demands a given number of men, I call to the Senate's attention the survey made by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who, after careful study, recommends at once the reduction of the employees in the vast bureaucratic Government by 300,000 persons. I call to the attention of the Senate the statements made by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] of the flagrant hoarding of labor in industrial plants throughout the country. I call attention also to the reports which have come to each of us, in various forms, of the lack of efficient employment of the millions of men already in the armed services within the confines of the United States. I believe it is the responsibility of Congress now to conduct an exhaustive and complete survey of the bureaus, industrial plants, and of the men in the armed services in the camps of the country at the present time, to determine within the next 3 months whether there are not available an adequate number of men who do not have the additional responsibilities of supporting wives and families.

General Marshall testified that there are some 700,000 fathers serving in the Army now. Admiral King testified that there are approximately 170,000 fathers in the Navy. We have now close to 1,000,000 fathers serving in our armed services. God bless them.

If the time ever comes when an intelligent and efficient defense of this country cannot be maintained and victory cannot be assured without the drafting of the remainder of the fathers, no one could reasonably object to that being done. But upon the showing thus far made, I believe it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to make a complete survey of the manpower problem before we break up 446,000 additional American homes.

The statement that the Congress should blindly follow the advice of our military leaders on any matter which so vitally affects both the home front as well as the military front, has no more weight, in my judgment, than the statement that the courts of our country should cease to function and let the military leaders determine the justice that is to be meted out to our citizens. We should consider expert military and naval advice, of course. We should weigh it and then perform our responsibility of determining for ourselves whether the demands for men for active military service cannot be adequately filled from the available men not having wives and children to support.

I realize that we cannot measure liberty in terms of dollars—and those who face their death in front-line service to defend those of us who remain safely at home can never be adequately compensated in money—but prudent men must determine how much our Government is going to pay for the military service of any individual soldier. The supply of officers is already adequately met, in fact, many of the services are reducing the number they have already started to train. Consequently, there is little need for these fathers to become officers, and at this late hour there is much less chance for them to advance in the early stages of their service to the position of a commissioned officer. Therefore, they will be required to accept $50 a month as a private soldier's pay, and a man with a wife and three children by making his $22 a month allotment for his wife and children will receive from the Government $82.

We are already besieged by labor which, while making the highest wages ever known in history, is demanding that we appropriate vast sums of money to roll back by subsidies the cost of its living. If at its high wages labor complains, how, then, can we expect a man's wife and three children to maintain even a semblance of decent living conditions on $82 a month.

Already both Houses of Congress have passed a bill providing for over $18,000,000 in additional appropriation for the minimum care of the pregnant wives of the men who are now in the service. There will be an immediate demand, and in my judgment a justifiable demand, for greatly increased allotments for the wives and children and other dependents of servicemen; and on the basis of cost per man alone, we have a responsibility to determine just how much we should pay for the services of any one man in the ranks of the Army of America.

I understand that our devoted friend and most desirable neighbor to the north—Canada—has not yet drafted married men for overseas service. I understand that only one of the South American countries even contemplates raising an army for overseas service. I understand that Australia limits, in the main, the services of her men to the immediate area of their own land.

Notwithstanding the fact that we have been generous beyond all imagination to all of these countries in our lease-lend program, plus the fact that we have millions of our men now overseas defending all of these countries, as well as our own, I believe that it is now, at long last, time for us, as the representatives of our people, to resurvey the entire manpower question of this country, as it relates to the efficient prosecution of the war. Then, as Congress—not as military men, but as the representatives of all the people of America—we should lay down the definite and positive rules for the future selection of the manpower of this country for the military services, and thus end the unconscionable confusion which is being imposed upon our people.

I yield to no man in my willingness to lay my own life upon the altar of our country's defense. I do not pretend to be a military strategist or expert. I do not pretend to tell General Marshall what size Army can be most profitably utilized. But I do say that we, as Congress, in representing all the people, have a positive and definite responsibility to see that when we scrape the bottom of the barrel to get the available men for military service we send the best men for that purpose, and at the same time safeguard the homes of America. While I respect the advice of our military leaders, they are not infallible. They requested that in the Selective Service Act we provide for the drafting of men between 38 and 44 years of age. Later they found that was a mistake. They took such men for limited service, but, after 2 years of training and service, many of them are being discharged.

I could speak for an hour upon the blunders thus far committed in the prosecution of this war, but in the main they have caused only the depletion and loss of money, materials, and jobs. But if we blunder now, we shall certainly disrupt almost one-half a million homes, and that will have its lasting effect upon the

future generations of America. Such a blunder I do not believe we can afford.

It is apparent that as we go forward with the war our military and naval leaders will demand the maximum of available men, and military men in charge of our Selective Service will continue to issue the orders. Industrial plants, headed by men seeking to meet their schedules, and anxious for further contracts, will keep men, even to the extent of hoarding them. The vast bureaus of our Government will continue to keep as many men as they possibly can. There will be increased demands for labor to make up for the constant depletion of the groups engaged in our food production. Never in history has there been such a strain and drain upon the material and human resources of America; never in history has the Congress, elected to represent all our people, had such a tremendous responsibility as that it has now. We should immediately create a committee to coordinate the splendid and outstanding work and discoveries of other committees, and to recommend, after careful study, definite over-all rules for the utilization now of the manpower of our country within the ages set by our present Selective Service Act. If we do not do that, we shall soon find that we shall have failed to such an extent that we shall be confronted by new and unprecedented demands for the control of the entire population of America. That, too, will undoubtedly be recommended by the solemn testimony of military and naval leaders as being absolutely necessary. Congress has a desperate responsibility to perform now concerning the conduct of our over-all war effort.

After sending $15,000,000,000 worth of war materials, munitions, and superior weapons of every type to every battle front, followed by millions of our fighting men, I think the time finally has come for us to determine how far we should go in breaking up an additional one-half million American homes, to dispatch men with troubled minds to the far corners of the earth, leaving at home inadequately provided for families.

Mr. President, I ask that my resolution be referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). The resolution submitted by the Senator from Illinois will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs as the proper committee handling the manpower question.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that matter was presented to me today. I think the Committee on Interstate Commerce would have equal jurisdiction. While it is true that the Committee on Military Affairs has treated this subject largely, yet the matter of manpower has now become more or less of a national, interstate, and State problem.

The only purpose in having the resolution referred to one of the regular committees is to have such committee consider whether the resolution should thereupon be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate for the purpose of having it provide the funds for the committee to be appointed by the Vice President. So no question of jurisdiction is involved there, insofar as concerns the matter of dealing with the problem of manpower. The question of jurisdiction applies only to the matter of the reference of the resolution to one of the standing committees, which, in turn, would have the duty, if it saw fit to report the resolution favorably, of referring it to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. Therefore, Mr. President, when the resolution reached the floor a while ago I requested that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and also so specified in the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois requested that the resolution be referred to the appropriate committee; and, by vote of the Senate, the appropriate committee has been designated as the Committee on Military Affairs. Does the Senator from Oregon make a motion?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Chair does not understand my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator's position; but there is nothing before the Senate unless the Senator makes a motion.

Mr. McNARY. My point is that it is not necessary to do so; I am not bound by the attitude of the Senator from Illinois. I am speaking for myself. I specified, in my own right, that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the Senator so specify in the resolution?

Mr. McNARY. It is in my own handwriting. I asked that the Vice President appoint a special committee. All that the regular committee to which the resolution might be referred would do would be to refer it to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. It is for that reason that I requested the specific assignment. I shall not be insistent as to that, but I know whereof I speak. That is why I asked that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to be referred from it to another committee. If that is done, the resolution will subsequently be referred to the special committee to be appointed by the Vice President, under the resolution of the able junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has not yet been recognized.

Mr. WHEELER. I thought I had.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I desire to say that I find myself in disagreement with the able minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY]. I think the Chair is correct in his reference of the resolution to the Committee on Military Affairs. That committee has had jurisdiction over resolutions and proposed legislation dealing with manpower. The committee has had many hearings on the subject of manpower. As the Chair has reminded the Senate, some months ago, during the present session of Congress, in January or February, the question arose as to whether the Committee on Military Affairs should handle certain matters with reference to manpower, or whether the Committee on Education and Labor should have jurisdiction over such manpower matters. In the previous Congress the Committee on Education and Labor had held very extensive hearings on the manpower problem. In spite of the fact that the Committee on Education and Labor had held such hearings, extensive though they were, the Senate, by vote, decided that the question should be referred, not to the Committee on Education and Labor, but to the Committee on Military Affairs. All matters dealing with manpower have been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. It seems to me that the Chair is absolutely correct in sending this resolution to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, my very able and distinguished friend from Alabama misunderstands the philosophy involved. The resolution does not pretend to ask any standing committee of the Senate to make the investigation. Authority is conferred upon the President of the Senate to appoint a special committee for that purpose. So his argument is wholly without foundation. The only question involved is whether the resolution should go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate for authorization of an expenditure of $2,500. That is all that is involved. The question has nothing to do with jurisdiction. It has nothing to do with the study which the Military Affairs Committee has heretofore made. If the resolution provided that some standing committee of the Senate should make the investigation, properly it should go to the Committee on Military Affairs; but that is not what we are discussing. The investigation, if it is made at all, will be made by a special committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that the resolution has been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator who submitted the resolution asked that it be referred to the appropriate committee, and the Chair has ruled that the appropriate committee is the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, of course, it is within the discretion of the Chair to make the appropriate reference. The question is not very important; but I was trying to make the distinction between a matter referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate and then rereferred, and a matter referred to a special committee having jurisdiction. How-

ever, the Chair does not understand, so I will not proceed further.

The resolution (S. Res. 183) was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 38) authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the resolution (H. Res. 30) authorizing and directing an investigation of the progress of the war effort, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, first of all let me say that the only reason for introducing my resolution at the outset was the fact that in February of last year, when the question arose with reference to drafting fathers, I introduced a bill to prevent the drafting of fathers. After that time I frankly stated that what I wanted was to have an investigation by the various departments of the Government of the question of deferring the fathers of the country until such time as the various departments themselves, realizing what the situation was, could investigate the manpower problem and take draft dodgers and slackers out of industry and out of the Government bureaus and put them into the Army, where they belong. Nothing was done about it.

The other day the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]—I am sorry he is not now present—made the statement that I was wrong in my views before Pearl Harbor, and that I am wrong now.

Mr. President, I am willing to let history determine whether I was wrong before Pearl Harbor, when I said that when we voted for lend-lease we were voting for war. Mr. Churchill said, "Give us the tools and we will do the job." I am willing to let history say whether I was wrong in saying that they would first say, "Give us the tools," and then would say, "Give us the men." Now it seems that they not only want the boys, but they want the fathers.

The other day I received a letter from a prominent industrial leader, the president of a railroad. He said, "They not only want the fathers, but they will probably want the mothers as well."

I am willing to let history determine whether I was right in the statements which I made. I am willing to let history decide whether I was right when I said that we should defer the fathers of this country because so many men in industry have been deferred. They are deferred for two reasons. Fortunately, some labor unions are opposed to the deferment of young unmarried men in industry and the induction of the fathers of the country; but some labor organizations have worked hand-in-glove with industrial leaders in hoarding labor, because the more men who are on the pay roll the more dues will go into the treasuries of the labor organizations. I am glad to see that some of the labor unions are beginning to realize what it means to the labor unions themselves if they pursue the policy of hoarding labor, particularly young single men, when boys are dying on the battlefields all over the world.

What will the boys who come back, some of whom will be wounded or dying, say when they see young men whose average age is 24 being hoarded in one of the largest airplane factories in this country, where they went for the specific purpose of avoiding the draft? What will those boys say when they see other young men hiding in the Government service and in industry? What will they say to the industrialists who are hoarding labor? What will they say to some of the labor leaders who are standing by and permitting it to be done?

Let me call attention to General Hershey's appeal last night. General Hershey is finally saying exactly what I have said on the floor of the Senate. It is an admission that I was right. I read from an article in the New York Times of October 1. The headline is, "Hershey appeals in deferment cut. Fears breakdown of public morale unless employers release single men."

I have stood on the floor of the Senate and said that when we draft fathers and let single men hide behind draft deferments in industry and in the Government service, we break down the morale of the people of the United States and the war effort as nothing else under the sun could do. Why is it that I am receiving letters from members of draft boards from one end of the country to the other, saying that they are resigning from the draft boards? Why is it that they are saying that they are going to quit entirely? Some of them are saying that they defy the Government to take them. It is because of the fact that they know that in their particular communities, from one end of the country to the other, the morale of the people is breaking down when they see what is going on right under their noses.

I read from the New York Times article of October 1:

> With the father draft on its way, a breakdown in public morale is likely unless employers stop asking for occupational deferments for single men merely because it is convenient for them to do so, Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey declared yesterday. His warning was addressed to 2,000 personnel executives at the closing session of a 3-day conference on manpower stabilization conducted in the Hotel Pennsylvania by the American Management Association.
>
> Taking management to task for flagrant abuses in asking for occupational deferments for single men, General Hershey called upon employers to make superhuman efforts to see that no deferment is requested for any man capable of rendering military service unless the job must be done and can be done by no other available person.

If General Hershey had taken that position, if the War Manpower Commission had taken that position, and if the district draft boards of the country had taken that position at the outset, and said to the local draft boards, in effect, "You cannot defer these single men," and if they had made a check-up on the various industries from one end of the country to the other, we would not be in the position we are in today, and fathers would not today, October 1, 1943, be inducted into the armed services.

Members of the Senate of the United States have said to me, "Well, it has already been done, and what can you do about it? We have to draft fathers." They have said, "We do not want to assume responsibility in connection with this matter." They do not want to take the responsibility for it. Well, whose responsibility is it? When Senators speak of not assuming responsibility, I admit that the responsibility rests with the various executive departments of the Government from the President down. If the President has serving under him incompetent men who have not done their duty, he, not the Congress of the United States, is responsible for keeping them in office. So the responsibility for the break-down in the manpower situation in the United States today rests squarely upon the shoulders of the President of the United States, and it cannot be placed anywhere else.

Allow me to invite the attention of the Senate to the colloquy which took place in one of the hearings at which Mr. Baruch testified. When Mr. Baruch was on the witness stand I called his attention particularly to a letter which I received from the United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, in Flint, Mich. I called his attention to the statement in the letter:

> We, the undersigned, a committee elected by the membership of Chevrolet Local No. 659, United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, to investigate the rumors prevalent in the Flint Chevrolet plants that management has appointed mere boys (who are the sons of Chevrolet superintendents and other high officials) foremen, for the sole purpose of enabling them to evade being inducted into the armed services.
>
> Some time ago Major General Hershey stated publicly that the only thing that would drive the draft dodgers out of the plant was social indignation.

Mr. Baruch said:

> Do you mean to say that Hershey admits he is interested in the matter and that he can't do anything about it?

The discussion continued:

> Senator WHEELER. I am just reading what they say.
>
> Mr. BARUCH. Of course, that is absurd.

Mr. Baruch later said:

> Well, I don't know what Mr. Hershey has actually said and what someone thinks he

has said, but if Mr. Hershey admits that he can't do anything about it, the thing to do is to get somebody who can. I can't imagine Hershey saying any such thing and I am sure he is anxious to look into all such complaints.

Mr. President, the truth is that these complaints are coming from one end of the country to the other, and Gen. Hershey himself, in his speech last night, called upon employees—

To make superhuman efforts to see that no deferment is requested for any man capable of rendering military service "unless the job must be done and can be done by no other available person."

I read further from a newspaper account of his speech:

"It is realized that there are many reasons for the presence of young men in industry," he said. "It is understood that many of them have acquired a very considerable amount of 'know how' during the time they have been in the plants. Regardless of these facts, however, a great many of our people believe the time has come when these young single men should be in the service and that industry should find others to do this work or get more work out of those already in the plants."

I agree that industry should get more work out of the men, and I assert that in my judgment no labor organization in the country can justifiably contend that it should have such rigid rules with reference to employment that fathers will be forced to be inducted into the armed forces.

The newspaper article from which I have just read continues to quote General Hershey, as follows:

"There were those in industry who combined in pressure groups to descend upon Washington and who attempted to frighten us into amending our regulations," he continued. "They presented briefs which set out in no modest manner the importance of their activities and the essentiality of their men. We tried to be reasonable, but all too often when we consulted our local boards we found that those boards knew many facts which were not included in those briefs and which did not substantiate their contentions.

"There were others who for months believed that their prominence was so well established that any stationery bearing their name would be sufficient to give a registrant permanent exemptions."

Mr. President, General Hershey had it in his power to make rules so that draft dodgers would not be permitted to remain in various industries, if he had wanted to do so.

I invite attention to the fact that simultaneously with the statement of General Hershey the Veterans of Foreign Wars, in its convention held in New York on September 30, 1943, adopted a resolution decrying—

the hoarding of youth labor by the large war plants in the country, and their failures in innumerable instances to attempt to replace physically fit young men of military age with older men beyond military age.

The newspaper article, with reference to the resolution, stated:

The resolution asserted that 85 percent of the work in war plants can be done by inexperienced workers, and continued: "Every available, physically fit, youthful, unmarried man who is without special skill, as well as those who were unmarried at the time of the enactment of the Selective Service Act of 1940, should be removed from the war plants and inducted into the armed services."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Montana that I am in complete sympathy with his objective and what he seeks to accomplish. I assert that the Senator from Montana has rendered a great public service in arousing the thought of the people of the country on this most important question. Later I expect to take the floor in my own right to discuss the subject now under debate.

I am one of the group which has been working with the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in preparation of an amendment which will bear upon the matters to which the Senator from Montana is addressing himself.

Begging the Senator's pardon for interrupting him, I invite attention to a letter addressed to me from Wichita, Kans., dated September 16, 1943, in which my friend, the writer, states as follows:

I would suggest that a thorough investigation be made of these so-called essential single men in the defense plants.

It may interest the Senator to know that Wichita is one of four or five largest centers of aircraft manufacture in the country, and is the largest center of such manufacture in the whole central West.

My friend continues as follows:

From my own observation in the Wichita airplane plants, and I have worked at several of them, I would say that a great many young men are needlessly deferred. I am certain that they could be replaced by IV-F's, fathers, women, and older men.

In one large plant, great numbers of young men, foremen and assistant foremen, sit for hours with their feet on the desks with very little to do. I am telling you the things I have seen.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator very much. I am glad that there are at least one or two Senators who are sufficiently interested in the country, and sufficiently interested in the drafting of fathers, to obtain and to listen to facts.

When I returned after the recess of Congress some of my Democratic colleagues said they did not know anything about the bill or about the facts and that they wanted some facts. Now when we propose to give them some facts they will not even listen.

Mr. REED. I may say to the Senator from Montana that during the recess of the Senate, from the middle of July until the middle of September, I spent the time entirely in my own section of the country. In the 5 years I have been a Member of the Senate, in all the trips combined I have made home, I do not think I have talked to so many people as I talked to during the recess. Kansas and Colorado, where I spent a couple of weeks, happen to have a very large number of defense plants, a very large number of air bases, and other Army camps. Everywhere I went, without exception, in Kansas, Missouri, in Colorado, I heard constant discussion and statements made by people of conditions that come under their own observation in their own localities, dealing, for instance, with the excessive number of men in the camps, indicating that the Army really had more men than it knew what to do with, and dealing also with the very definite factor that the defense plants had been used with the approval, and in fact, by the management for the purpose of accumulating young manpower to help them in avoiding the draft. I can make that statement after the most thorough and satisfactory contacts with my own constituents in Kansas and in other midwest States in the 2 months I was home.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator.

As I was saying a moment ago, my Democratic friends on this side desired to have hearings before the committee because they wanted to get the facts; they were not familiar with them. All that it is necessary to do is to take a look on the Democratic side today and see how many of them are interested in obtaining the facts. The truth about the matter is that if they want to get men for the Army without taking fathers they can get them; they do not have to take a father; but, apparently, the Senate of the United States or at least my Democratic colleagues, prefer to take fathers.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further at this point?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REED. I happen to have another letter that touches upon a different factor, but a very important factor, in this situation. I read from a letter addressed to me from a town in western Kansas, in which this statement appears:

If the Congress does not assert itself, this country is going to be in a hell of a shape. I have a good friend who is county chairman of a bond drive in the eastern part of Kansas, who made this statement recently: "It takes a hell of a lot of guts for me to ask people to buy bonds when we all know that about three-fourths of all the money obtained from these bonds will be wasted in the administration of the war and the Federal Government."

I may add at this point, having read the letter, that when I was at home many people inquired of me, "Now, if we buy bonds, may we have some assurance that the money we invest in the bonds will not be wasted?" I will ask the Senator from Montana what kind of a reply he would suggest I make to such inquiries which were addressed to me a hundred times, and which show the temper of the people? If that kind of a situation continues, there will be a break-down in the morale of the people of this country.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that the same question propounded to him was asked me hundreds of times by farmers and others all over the country. Not only have such questions been asked me, but the people have come to see me. I have repeatedly pointed out that if this waste of manpower, of materials, and of money continues in this country, we are going to have a complete break-down of the morale of the people. One of the reasons why more small people are not buying bonds, one reason why more of the bonds have to be taken by bankers, insurance companies, and others, is the waste of manpower, the waste of materials, and the waste of money going on all over the country.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REED. I might add to what I said a moment ago that those who ask me this question are not slackers; they are not unpatriotic; they are as good Americans as can be found in this country. They are mostly people I have known all my life. They are earnest people, good people, patriotic people who want to help, but they are in despair over the extravagance and inefficiency and tremendous bureaucracy and waste of money under the policies which have been followed and which continue to be followed by the present administration.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that I have invariably said to those who asked me similar questions that, notwithstanding the waste of manpower, notwithstanding the waste of materials, and notwithstanding the tremendous waste of the taxpayers' money, we have got to go ahead, now that we are in the war, and buy bonds and more bonds. But let me say to the Senator and to the Senate of the United States that, in my judgment, this colossal waste and extravagance, and their aftermath, are going to have a harmful effect upon the Army and upon the Navy and on the morale of the people generally and upon the Government.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I may say that I agree entirely with the Senator from Montana. That is about the only kind of an answer that a responsible person could make.

I may add at this point, lest someone may feel that I have not sufficient concern about the welfare of the Army, that I have a son in north Africa now; I have a son-in-law at the Pendleton air base in Oregon; I have another son-in-law at Wright Field at Dayton; I have a grandson in one of the camps in Mississippi; I have another grandson attending school under a scholarship from the Army. I do not want anybody to question my patriotism unless he can equal my record.

Mr. WHEELER. Many of those who are questioning the Senator's patriotism or my patriotism or the patriotism of someone else are the very ones in some of the Government bureaus who are themselves getting out propaganda and evading the draft.

I quote from a statement issued by William Green:

BOSTON, September 30.—President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, said today that labor hoarding is common and has resulted in apparent shortages.

Arriving here for the sixty-third annual A. F. of L. convention that opens Monday, Green said managers of many plants have accumulated labor by asking for more workers than actually are needed.

"A situation of apparent labor shortage can usually be relieved by developing a community program," Green said.

The way to do it is for the Government of the United States to check up on these plants and to take these young men.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Montana if, in his opinion, 90 percent of the conditions which are being discussed and complained of could not be cured by proper administration by the administrative authorities?

Mr. WHEELER. There is no question about that, in my mind, and it is not only my opinion, but it is in accordance with the report of Mr. Baruch, the adviser to Mr. Byrnes. I shall come to that later on and read a portion of the report.

I quote from a news dispatch dated Harrisburg, September 8, under the heading "Plenty of men available."

Clifford A. Gnau, Harrisburg, adjutant of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Pennsylvania Department, was on record today with the assertion that the huge Army air depot at nearby Middletown is overstaffed with draft-age men "whose presence is unnecessary to its efficient operation."

Declared that more than 30 percent of present personnel could be lopped from the depot's pay roll, Gnau said:

"Congress talks about drafting pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. Such men are expected to leave their families and enter the armed services while hundreds of thousands of dollar-patriotic Americans—many of them at Middletown—hide behind a so-called essential wartime job, aided and abetted by young Army officers."

Mr. President, I could call attention to any number of letters I have received similar to those I have read, and before the day is over I expect to do so.

I have here a letter from a man residing in Baltimore, Md. He is with the Weyerhauser Sales Co., the district representative of the company. He says in his letter:

I am a member of local draft board No. 7 of the city of Baltimore, Md. What I am writing is my own personal feelings, and is not to be considered as an expression of the board as a whole.

I am and have been very much opposed to the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers until a thorough examination has been made of all single men, etc., presently deferred. In other words, I heartily concur in your present efforts along this line.

* * * * *

Local board No. 7 has already observed several cases which are just the opposite to the idea expressed above. On recent 42-A's submitted from the manning tables of certain Baltimore war industrials, we have found cases where these married men are to be replaced in from as little as 2 months to 4 months from the effective date of the schedule.

He says further:

I decided some time ago to resign from Selective Service unless your proposed bill or one along similar lines is passed by Congress.

I have here a letter from a man in the air service, who says:

I hope this reaches you because what I have to say is important—important to me—, not just because it's what I feel but what I'm sure thousands of other men in the service feel.

I am a fully trained soldier—by the Air Corps' standards, at any rate—qualified and physically fit for overseas combat duty. I have been in that status for some time now and will probably remain in my present stagnant state for some time to come unless, of course, the Army I know changes to a businesslike, efficiently operated organization. Until I am allowed the privilege of fighting for my country, which I thought was my right as a soldier, I'll never consider it anything but outright folly to take family men into the service.

There seems always to be a lot of talk about a soldier's morale—the one thing that will give my morale the bolstering it needs is the chance to do the job I came into the Army to do; I'm sick and tired of doing absolutely nothing.

When the trained Army already in existence is put to some worth-while use, I doubt that a single father will object to wearing a uniform.

Whether or not my ideas are of any importance to you, the writing of this has given me the opportunity to get off my chest what I feel so strongly.

I thank you for your time.

That is signed by an officer in the Air Corps, but I shall not give his name.

Next is a letter from St. Louis, Mo. The Senator from Kentucky a few days ago asked me to give names. This letter is dated September 29, 1943, and the writer says:

I think I can furnish you with one or two examples of draft dodging by a Government agency—or perhaps I should say by a clique of officials within a Government agency.

Then he gives the name of the deputy administrator, who, he says, "put in by Agriculture has signed deferments for two of his henchmen." He says further:

Mr. ———, chief of the personnel division, a Mr. ———'s orders, made a special trip to Washington, D. C., to make sure the deferments go through. I think it is a shame to waste the taxpayers' money on such grossly unnecessary travel for such an unpatriotic gesture.

* * * * *

P. S.—The R. E. A. Veterans' Association was so mad when they heard of the deferments they passed a resolution to make it public that it was not their policy to ask deferments for anyone. They are going to send their resolution to all division chiefs in R. E. A. I understand.

I have here a letter from another writer, who says:

I am employed in a large aircraft plant in St. Louis.

I wonder if you know that many of those (key) positions of importance that they speak of, to get deferments for their pets, are made especially for deferment purposes. One of the many cases, from office boy to foreman

overnight, age 22 years, healthy, strong man; another general foreman, age 26; assistant general foreman, age 24.

It is common gossip you don't have to go to the Army if you know the right guy.

Many of us fume and are very dissatisfied with this set-up, not that we dislike these young men, but feel that they should take their turn to serve when it comes, just like our sons do.

Wish we had more men with your views. Good luck and success to you.

The correspondent signs her name and gives her address.

Mr. President, I desire to discuss now the Baruch report, and to call attention to the fact that, in general, Mr. Baruch has agreed with everything I have said on this subject on the floor of the Senate. Mr. Baruch made a first report months ago. That report has not even yet been released by the Government. While I do not know what is in the report, we all know that it was suppressed. Had this report been brought out at the time it was prepared, the possibility is that we would not be in the present manpower muddle, and the question of drafting fathers at this time would not have arisen.

Mr. Baruch's second report, just released, has not been released voluntarily, but was forced out by the pressure of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. This report shows that the manpower muddle is not new, that it has existed for a long time, and the question is, What is responsible for it, the complacency of the people, the Congress, or the War Manpower Commission?

In his report Mr. Baruch states:

Proper handling of manpower has been made impossible by the failure of Government agencies to work as a team with a clearly defined program.

Stop and think of that:

Proper handling of manpower has been made impossible by the failure of Government agencies to work as a team with a clearly defined program. Measures undertaken by one agency have been undone by conflicting actions or inactions of other agencies.

Because of the "failure of Government agencies to work as a team with a clearly defined program," we are faced with a situation in which fathers are to be taken into the Army, homes are to be broken up, and children are to be put out into the street.

According to Mr. Baruch's report, there are three root causes for our manpower difficulties:

First. Bad planning.

Second. The attempt to do the job from Washington, and

Third. The failure to enlist the services of the best men available.

In the first respect the report states:

The second root cause of our manpower difficulties has been that production has been planned, new facilities built, and contracts awarded without adequate regard to the supplies of labor available locally.

This is, in fact, the primary reason we have critical areas at the present time. Had production been properly planned geographically and had orders not been concentrated in the hands of the few at the expense of the small businessmen and other localities, there would be far fewer critical areas today, and there would have been much less labor hoarding of young men in factories, and we would not have been in the muddle we are now in.

Mr. President, let me ask, Who is responsible for this bad planning? Is it due to the complacency of the people? Is the Congress responsible? Or are the Federal bureaus responsible?

As to the second cause of our manpower difficulties, the attempt to do the job from Washington, the report states:

If this labor budget plan is to work, there must be adequate delegation of power from all Washington agencies to their west coast representatives, and the communities themselves must get on the team. The job cannot be done from Washington.

This, of course, is the truth and fact of the matter.

The report states further:

An immediate survey should be made of the possibilities of subcontracting in nearby communities.

Had this been done earlier, fewer small businesses would have had to go out of business.

Who is responsible for this failure to decentralize power? Certainly that is not the fault of the people of the country; it is not the fault of the Congress; but again I say the fault rests entirely upon the Federal bureaus in Washington.

As to a third cause of our manpower difficulties, the report states:

Too much emphasis cannot be laid on the importance of selecting the best man possible in the community to serve as chairman of the local priorities committee and the necessity for giving him the fullest community support.

The principles there laid down are unquestionably sound, and they could and should be applied on a national scale so that here in Washington we would find, especially in time of war, the best men possible heading the departments and the bureaus, able, public-spirited citizens, but, as the report states, instead we have heading these agencies men "spending their energies battling to build up empires."

Who is responsible for this? Certainly not the Congress of the United States. Certainly it is not due to the complacency of the people. Certainly the responsibility rests nowhere except with the bureaus in Washington.

At the conclusion of the report, it is stated:

Our study of this problem also emphasizes anew the necessity for your constant review of military and lend-lease requirements to see that all different parts of the program are in balance with one another and that the program as a whole is balanced against the essential needs of the civilian economy. We have reached the stage of our war economy where there is not much to spare. Something gained in one direction means a loss in the other direction.

There are, then, three main needs which must be balanced so far as this general manpower problem is concerned:

First. Military needs.

Second. Production needs—which is subdivided, in turn, into needs for ourselves and lend-lease; and,

Third. Needs for carrying on the civilian economy.

Whose business is it to do this balancing?

This, obviously, is not purely a military question. What the military say they need is one consideration; what producers say they need is another, and the need of the civilian population of the country is another, so that the morale of the people, which Mr. Hershey speaks of, will not break down.

It is the obligation of the Government, and, Mr. President, the Government of the United States includes the Congress, to determine on the evidence submitted what the true facts are and to act accordingly. So when Members of the Senate stand on this floor and say that they do not want to take the responsibility, in the face of the responsibilities which are given to them, they are shirking the responsibility which the Constitution of the United States imposes upon them.

Mr. President, for Congress simply to say, "Well, the military men say they want this; let them have it" is, to state it plainly, for Congress to shirk its responsibility. When Members of Congress say that some Government official or Army official—I care not who he may be—wants this or that, and so they are going to give it to him, they are not acting in the spirit of the principles upon which the Government is based. When a Government official comes to Congress and says "I want this" or "I want that," and Members of Congress say they will grant the request simply because it is made, that, Mr. President, is merely acting in the spirit of fascism. That is what was done in Italy, that is what was done in Germany, and that is what brought fascism and nazi-ism to those countries.

I continue to read from the Baruch report:

The manpower needs of our Nation are so intertwined that to permit excess labor to remain anywhere may force the closing of business, the drafting of fathers—

And so forth. These principles apply with equal force to the over-all picture. So that if the military are wasting men now, we will permit them to waste more men by the additional drafting of men, or if men are being hoarded in industry it will only aggravate the whole situation. It follows that the Congress should examine into the use to which our manpower is being put, both in the Army and in industry; it should be carefully considered before consenting to further drafts of fathers or anybody else.

Army officials have testified that the Army will have in this country January 1, 1944, over 5,000,000 men. That of these 5,000,000 the Army cannot move overseas for fighting purposes during the whole of the year, 1944, up to January

1, 1945, over half this number, and that the Army will have in this country, in uniform, January 1, 1945, in excess of two and a half million men. Yet, General Marshall has previously testified that 500,000 men were sufficient for the defense of this country.

There is no question that the men who are drafted come out of the labor pool, and the more taken the more serious the labor shortage will become.

It follows, if we are to get any stability into the manpower situation at home, that we must begin by getting some stability into the Selective Service System and the military demands.

The fact is, the Army should have not all it wants but all it can effectively use.

The determining factor should be what the Army can use, and what the country can support, considering lend-lease, rather than a purely arbitrary figure greatly in excess of it. Also, we must consider the effect upon the morale of our people.

It stands to reason, the larger the Army, the larger the labor force needed to supply it, and the less the available supply of labor for munitions, lend-lease and other essentials of war as well as of our civilian population.

I have tried to find out from the Army and again from Mr. Baruch, but without success, how many men it takes on the production front to supply a given number of men in the Army stationed in this country. Obviously one man is taken when he goes into the Army. The Army takes other men who are needed for the purpose of supplying this man who has been removed from production.

Furthermore, the men who are so used to furnish supplies to the inducted men must in turn be supplied by the men then remaining; so that every time a man is inducted into the Army, there is, in fact, a triple drain on manpower.

Yet, Mr. President, the other day when I asked General Marshall for the figures, he said he could not give them, but that someone would furnish them to me. They were sent to me yesterday. The statement made is:

> However, as a general approximation it is believed that the ratio of men and women on the production front to those on the fighting front is 1.4 to 1.

Let me read now from an article entitled "Is Our Army Too Large?", by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, published in the November 1942 issue of the American Mercury:

> In the days of archery, one artisan could make weapons for 20 soldiers. In Napoleon's time, every man in the ranks called for one man behind the lines to keep him armed. A century later, in World War No. 1, it took 6 civilians to provide weapons for one soldier in action. In the present war, it is estimated that about 18 civilians in agriculture and industry are needed to keep one soldier continually supplied and equipped. The Selective Service goal, therefore, implies labor support to the tune of 234,000,000.

That was when they were talking about an Army of 13,000,000 persons.

I quote further from the article by Major de Seversky:

> Brig. Gen. Robert M. Littlejohn, chief quartermaster in the American European theater of war, recently told the press that the maintenance of one American soldier in Britain requires 1½ tons of shipping monthly, even in this period of lull, and despite the fact that Britain supplies one-third of the necessary food, all the necessary coal and a variety of other goods. Obviously, this British contribution to the pool of supplies must diminish as our forces in Europe increase.

Then, in speaking about the Army, Major de Seversky said:

> No one can blame Army leaders for insisting on the largest possible mass of land force, with all that this connotes in weapons, motorized equipment, auxiliary aviation. In the nature of the case, Army heads plan and act on the assumption that the war will be won or lost in hand-to-hand combat on terra firma. They live by the dictum that wars are won at the point of a bayonet.
>
> The Navy command is no less certain that the global conflict will be decided on the high seas. As a matter of fact, every enlargement of the land forces predicates an equivalent enlargement of naval forces to place these soldiers on distant shores and to keep them continually provisioned and armed.
>
> In short, every branch of the armed services, and every civilian group entrusted with vital tasks behind the lines, strives patriotically to increase its own share of the national potential. As one raises the ante, the others necessarily follow suit. What if certain contingents of men and production are not needed now? They may be needed in the future and must, in view of the departmental administrator, be husbanded for that coming need. Hence, battleships which cannot be finished until 1948, additional millions of soldiers who cannot conceivably be transported and put into action until 1945 or later, mountains of equipment for tasks which cannot even be started until the skies overhead are cleared of hostile air power. Hence, the ludicrous and dangerous pyramiding of armed forces and types of production without reference to what comes first, what can be postponed, what can be kept down to a minimum. In effect, every service, in uniform or in mufti, is hoarding manpower and materials.

Yet, Mr. President, as I say, in the face of the statement of some men that everything the Army and Navy says should be done is what we must do, is there any Senator on the floor of the Senate who thinks for one moment that only 1.4 men and women are required to keep each soldier in action? If that be true, then, instead of needing all the 30,000,000 or 40,000,000 people who are engaged in the production of war equipment alone, we could do with about one-fourth that number. Then we could do with many less men in agriculture and with many less men engaged in working on the railroads, and we could do with many less men in the shipbuilding industry and in other industries.

I venture the assertion that there is not a Member of the Senate who does not recognize the fact that there has been a tremendous waste of manpower in industry—a hoarding of manpower in industry—from one end of the country to the other, and that in industries single men are being deferred. As a result, married men will have to be taken. I doubt if there is a Member of the Senate who does not know there is extravagance and waste of material and manpower in industry, and I doubt if there is a Member of the Senate who does not know there has been a tremendous waste of manpower in the Army itself. Certainly every congressional committee which has passed upon the question has said so. Every Senate committee and every House committee which has looked into the matter has pointed that out. Yet, in the face of all that, it is said that because someone says, "We must have these men now, at this moment, and if we do not we will lose the war," they must be taken.

As I listened to General Marshall's testimony the other day, I gathered that the 200,000 men who are about to be taken into the Army—because approximately half the men taken will go into the Army and half will go into the Navy—will be used for replacements, if I correctly understood General Marshall's testimony. If those men are to be used for replacements, that means that, instead of using as replacements the men who have been trained for 1 year, 2 years, or 3 years, or sending them overseas to do other tasks or to fill up the divisions which the Army tells us must be completed, the fathers will be used for those purposes. I do not see how anyone can study General Marshall's testimony—to which I shall call attention a little later—without coming to exactly that conclusion.

Reading further from the article by Major de Seversky:

> The swift disintegration of the magnificent French Armies under the pressure of Hitler's superior mechanized strength tells a story.

We said the French had the finest and greatest Army in the world, the best equipped and best maintained, and that her soldiers were among the best fighters. Yet, with a comparatively small mechanized force, the Germans went through them and ground them to pieces, and that also in the face of the Maginot line.

Major de Seversky further said:

> So do the cumulative Russian disasters, despite the country's almost inexhaustible manpower and heroic morale. Neither can we ignore the fact that the most decisive single engagement of the war to date, the Battle of Britain, was fought and won by a handful of British airmen, while great armies on both sides and a great Navy on the British side were wholly immobilized and reduced to the status of impotent onlookers. Crete was conquered by a navyless enemy in the face of immense naval forces massed for the defense.
>
> If there is one thing that this war has proven beyond doubt, it is that the decision will not be scored by sheer volume of men and metal, but by superior weapons and superior strategy. Whenever we sacrifice quality for bulk, brain power for manpower, we are playing into the hands of the enemy. In the final analysis, America's principal assets are its natural resources and productive genius. Insofar as we weaken or handicap these assets, we are unwittingly undermining our own strength.
>
> The implication that this is still an old-style, trench-and-bayonet war simply doesn't jibe with elementary truths obvious to any lay observer. The most diehard of old-line strategists no longer contend that armies can

operate under skies dominated by the enemy; he thus admits, in effect, that conquest of the skies must come first.

I might read further from De Seversky. I quote him only to point out the absurdity of the position of the man who says that only one and a quarter persons on the home front are required to take care of a man in the armed forces; and secondly, to point out the absurdity of building up a huge army which we can not possibly use effectively unless we have the airpower to drive the enemy out.

So I say that the determining factor should be, What can the Army use, and what can the country support, considering lend-lease; and what is the effect going to be on the home front? rather than a purely arbitrary figure greatly in excess of our requirements. It stands to reason that the larger the Army, the larger the labor force needed to supply it, and the less the available supply of labor for munitions, lend-lease, and other essentials.

The fact is that the Army, if it asks for more men than it can use, not only takes out of the labor pool the men actually drafted, but also takes away from the number of men who must be employed to support them. It would seem wiser for the Army to time the induction of these men in accordance with the ability to place them in effective action rather than in accordance with some arbitrary figures based on the size of some other army, friend or foe.

It has been reported by the British high command in Egypt, and not denied, that the surrender of Italy has already eliminated from the Axis side 65 divisions, or approximately 1,000,000 men. If we can believe the newspapers, those men have now joined our side, which would make a total change of approximately 2,000,000 men in our favor; yet this fact does not seem to have been given any serious consideration in determining what the size of our Army should be at this time. It was taken into consideration by the Canadians, because the Canadians said that because of this situation they were releasing some of their men.

I have already called attention to the statement by the Canadian Minister of National Defense, Colonel the Honorable J. L. Ralston. I read again from the press release in that connection:

> The Canadian Minister of National Defense, Colonel the Honorable J. L. Ralston, announced today that a plan has been approved for the reorganization of the Canadian Army in Canada under which the Seventh and Eighth Divisions now on duty in Canada will be disbanded and the Sixth Division will be partially disbanded.
>
> The plan particularly affects that portion of the Army in Canada which is allotted operational tasks. It will result in a reduction in the number of troops required to carry out those tasks. It will also have consequential effects in reducing the number of personnel required for servicing operational troops. The plan is made possible by the improved strategic position on both coasts of Canada resulting from the eviction of the Japs from the Aleutians; the military victories in the Mediterranean and the Russian successes; and the striking betterment in antisubmarine activities in the Atlantic.
>
> The scheme will involve a readjustment downward of local defenses on both the east and west coasts.
>
> The Minister's statement is in part:
>
> "Events of recent months have greatly improved the general strategic situation in respect to the defense of both coastal regions of Canada.
>
> "In the Pacific there has been the eviction of the Japanese from the Aleutians and the increasing scale of operations in the southwest Pacific."

Yet, Mr. President, in the face of what the Canadians are doing, and in the face of the fact that it has been stated that no man in Canada may be sent out of the country unless he volunteers for that purpose, we in the United States are proposing to break up American homes and say that the war will be lost unless between now and the 1st of January 446,000 fathers are inducted into the Army. I ask any reasonable man if that makes common ordinary sense, particularly in view of the fact that we have 7,300,000 men in the Army, and at the end of 1945 we shall still have approximately 2,500,000 or 3,000,000 men in the United States who will have been trained for more than a year, some of them for more than 2 years.

The Italian Navy has also surrendered, and has been added, to a large extent, to our side. With both the French and the Italian Navies now accounted for, it would seem possible for our Navy to make some reduction, in turn, and not ask for an increase at this particular time. Yet, after the first of the year the Navy will ask for a large number of men, to continue building up our Navy, when there is no navy on the face of the globe, with the exception of the Japanese Navy, which can interfere with us. Germany has no navy to speak of, and the combined British, American, Italian, and French Navies are in the possession of the Allies.

No one knows, neither the Army generals nor civilians, the number of men who will eventually be required to finish the job; but from time to time we do have exact figures from the Army as to the number which can be fed, equipped, and transported. No matter how the fortunes of war go, whether we lose thousands of men or whether we do not, the fact is that we cannot transport more men than the Army estimates can be transported. Under those circumstances, would it not be sounder to time the induction of these men in accordance with the actual schedules of ability to use them effectively, rather than in accordance with some preconceived idea of the Army as to the number of men who will be eventually needed, which, being speculative, is subject to change from time to time?

Looked at from another angle, first, there are the men actually in the armed forces. Then there are the men who are engaged in war industries. Both classes of men must be supported by the remaining population. So the burden on the civilian economy becomes increasingly greater with each man drafted and each man taken for industry. The standard of life under this pressure is of necessity constantly reduced; yet it is because of this standard of life that we are able to outstrip the whole world in production. From the evidence, we are approaching the limit, the fair minimum to which this standard of life can be reduced without seriously affecting the productivity of the worker and upsetting the national morale.

With respect to industrial waste, the Baruch report speaks for itself of the great wastage of labor, and labor hoarding, which, if relieved, would go a long way toward correcting any local labor shortage, and would go a long way toward preventing the drafting of fathers. Speaking of cost-plus contracts, the Baruch report points out:

> Not alone on the west coast, but all through the country, much labor is being hoarded and poorly utilized.

How can anyone insist upon taking fathers and breaking up American homes when Mr. Baruch admits, first, that the situation is the fault of the various bureaus in Washington; second, that labor is being hoarded in industry; and third, as everyone knows, that labor is being hoarded in the Government by every department in Washington and throughout the country?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REED. At that point I should like to add to what the Senator from Montana has said that when I was at home I visited three airplane-manufacturing establishments in Wichita. One of them employs 5,000 men, another 11,000 men, and the third 26,000 men. There are 45,000 men engaged in the airplane-manufacturing business in that one city in Kansas.

A representative of one of those factories told me that their first contract was a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract. They did not like that. It meant a waste of labor. So they changed their contracts, and they are currently operating upon fixed-price contracts. Under those fixed-price contracts they offered what, for want of a better term, we may call incentive wages, which had some relation to the productivity of the employees as a whole. Under the present arrangement that factory has increased the production per man 25 percent. That is the experience of one very efficient airplane manufacturing concern in my own State. I visited the plant when I was at home.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator for his observation.

I have in my files a letter from a large contractor in my State, who has been building and is now building Army bases and doing other construction work throughout the country. He has written to me saying that the idea of renegotiating contracts is the greatest incentive to hoarding labor there could possibly be.

They take contracts at huge prices with the idea they are going to renegotiate them. That is what has been done in a great many instances. Contracts

have been made at exorbitant prices in some instances with the idea they will be renegotiated. As the writer points out in this letter, it is the greatest incentive to the hoarding of labor that could possibly be given. He says:

If you eliminate that and put them on a regular basis you will find out how much labor will immediately be freed and will not be hoarded.

I quote further from the Baruch report:

Such wasteful practices are encouraged, among other things, by prevailing cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. Under these contracts the Government pays all costs—whatever they are. Since the Government is footing the bill, there is no incentive for manufacturers to economize in the use of materials, facilities, or labor. More workers are hired than are needed. Workers may stand idle—it costs the manufacturers nothing. Much labor is wasted.

Mr. President, I inquire, who is responsible for that situation? Is it due to the complacency of the people of the country? Is it the fault of the Congress of the United States, or does the fault lie in the administrative departments of the Government? Unless we solve this problem, what responsibility do we have? I do not wish to, and would not, interfere with the executive departments if it were not necessary. But when the executive departments themselves have completely broken down and have not done their job—as is said by Mr. Baruch in his report—then whose responsibility is it to take charge and do something about it? If the administration will not do anything about it, the only place left for the people to come to is the Congress of the United States.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REED. I am sure the Senator from Montana and myself share the view which he has expressed. Both of us have had long public life and many contacts. I venture the assertion, with which I believe the Senator will agree, that not in my lifetime have I seen such a profligate waste of money, so much inefficiency, so much confusion, and such a lack of a sense of proportion with regard to costs as related to production, as exists at the present time. If the morale of the country breaks down under that kind of a situation it is the fault of the administration and the administrative policy.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator. In his report Mr. Baruch states:

In the early stages of war production when manufacturers were asked to produce things they never made before, there might have been some justification for cost-plus arrangements. By now, Government and industry surely have had sufficient experience in the manufacture of many munitions for fixed prices to be agreed upon.

However, there are only comparatively few industries of that kind.

With reference to Government waste, the report of the Byrd committee, Senate Document No. 66, page 4, of June 18, 1943, states:

With 55 percent of the Federal employees not engaged in direct war production—

Fifty-five percent, the report states—

it is obvious that cuts may be made in Federal personnel without hindering direct mechanical war production. Consequently a drastic reduction can be made in the number of Federal employees without harmful effect to the war-production effort.

This morning I received a letter from a lady engaged in Government service in the Middle West. In her letter she said:

Keep up your fight.

She said:

Already, because of the speeches you have made, some of the people who have been hiding and have been deferred because they are essential to the departments have been told that they must leave the departments, and have been getting into the war.

I continue reading from the Byrd committee report:

That is to say, nonessential employees may be removed from Federal pay rolls by the Budget Bureau, which already has the power to make such reductions in over one-half of the Federal personnel pursuant to the authority contained in the Byrd-Langer amendment to the Overtime Pay Act.

Other portions of the report show that the efforts of the 55 percent of the Federal employees who are not engaged in mechanical war-production work have not been fully utilized because of the lack of a vigorously administered war-transfer program, and the failure to establish an effective Federal employee manpower pool.

The report shows an alarming increase in personnel and in the monthly pay rolls to meet it. It sets forth a table showing the Federal employment increase which, through the activity of the Byrd committee, has been brought up to date.

It reads as follows:

Year	Personnel	Monthly pay rol
Nov. 11, 1918	917,760	
August 1939	933,386	$141,733,064
August 1940	1,039,451	159,260,975
August 1941	1,444,985	217,772,054
August 1942	2,450,759	391,502,171
March 1943	2,878,824	638,926,265
August 1943	3,063,379	646,372,969

So the Government personnel has jumped from 917,760 on November 11, 1918, to 3,063,379, in August 1943, and the monthly pay roll has expanded from $141,733,064 in August 1939—and the Lord knows it was high at that time—to $646,372,969 in August of 1943. It has been constantly increased every month. From August 1942, when the Government personnel was 2,450,759, to August 1943, the personnel increased to 3,063,379. From August 1939 to August 1943 the pay roll increased from $141,733,064 to $646,372,969.

The total number of civilians in the War Department alone, according to the July figures, was 1,355,515. That covers the War Department alone, for July.

In the Navy Department, according to July figures, the civilian employees alone numbered 697,475.

These figures have not been broken down to show the number of nonfighters and single men, nor do they show the extent to which the Army and the Navy have simply replaced civilian employees with military personnel. They do not show the male noncommissioned and enlisted personnel between the ages of 18 and 35 years who are physically fit for active service. Data as to both these classifications and the number of men in them engaged in purely clerical work have been requested of the Departments, but so far the Departments have failed to furnish the information.

Here is a copy of a letter which was sent by the Byrd committee to the Secretary of the Navy—and I understand that a similar letter was sent to the Secretary of War:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is requested that the enclosed form be filled out and returned to the committee at your earliest convenience.

Items 1, 2, and 3 should include all naval personnel, except those attached to task forces or combat units, training units, and supply units servicing those task forces or combat units and training units; unless such naval service personnel is located outside a permanent shore establishment, in which case they should be included.

Items, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 should be mutually exclusive of each other, and should apply to all naval personnel.

If there are any questions in connection with providing this information, please call the committee's staff at National 3120, branch 1187.

Cordially yours.

Then there is attached a list of the questions. Up to yesterday, at least, no answer had been received in reply to that request.

If the War Department were really conducted on business principles, they would have this information at their fingertips. The plain truth about the matter is that the War Department has not been operated on a business basis, and I do not know of anyone in Washington who thinks it has been. General Marshall testified the other day about conducting the Army on a business basis; but certainly the War Department has not been conducted on a business basis. I think others have had the same experience I have had. A number of employees—not one, not two, but a good many, such as stenographers and others—have come to me and stated that they did not have anything to do in the War Department.

I was shocked when the Army officials advised the committee that it would take at least 10 days in which to report the number of men in this country who had been in the service for a year or longer, for 2 years, for 3 years, or for over 3 years. They, apparently, do not even know the number of fully trained men they have.

But to return to the Byrd report, there would seem to be no reason, in the nature of things, why there should not be a drastic curtailment in nonwar

agencies. This took place in the last war. Is there any possible excuse, when they talk about drafting fathers, for it not taking place in this war?

I understand that when the Byrd committee makes its new report it will recommend that there should be a reduction of at least 200,000 in the clerical category now employed in the War Department.

There would seem to be no excuse for the delay in liquidating those agencies which have been ordered to liquidate and whose liquidation would release manpower. The least the Government and the War Department can do before they undertake to draft fathers and break up American homes is to clean their own house.

The Baruch report states:

> In any drive against the hoarding and poor utilization of labor Government-operated plants should set an example.

What applies to Government-operated plants applies with greater force to nonessential Government bureaus and the waste of manpower in those bureaus which are essential to the conduct of the war.

I pick up a Boston newspaper and note that charges are being made that in the navy yard in that vicinity, there are several times as many men as are needed, and some of the great newspapers of that city are calling for an investigation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REED. At that point, if I may break in upon the Senator from Montana, I wish to read a letter which was received at my office today and brought over to me by my secretary, who knew the Senator from Montana had the floor, and that from time to time I was interrupting the Senator from Montana for the purpose of illustrating the conditions which prevail the country over. The letter is dated Augusta, Kans., September 27, 1943, and reads:

> Just heard a broadcast where the speaker seems in great fear that the Third War Loan drive will not be filled and in a nice way he considers the home people a bunch of tightwads and slackers. I wonder how many bonds he has and what he received per minute for that talk. He really is no worse than some newspaper writers.
>
> In regard to such people, I wonder if in their shriveled one-track minds they can have the intelligence to know that there are very few of us who would not give our last dollar or bite to one of those boys over there but that we are getting d——— sick and tired of buying bonds and seeing the money go for such things as the Office of War Information, Commodity Credit Corporation, Office of Price Administration, and a hundred other bureaus that the country would be better off without. Yes; and money for the radio corporations for fireside chats.
>
> Get rid of these bureaus, take the personnel in them that are of draft age and put them in the Army and stop this draft of fathers not to speak of the saving to the taxpayers.
>
> As for the draft, it is nowhere near as bad for Secretary Ickes to lose his secretary as for Jim Jones to lose his hired man when he is trying to raise beef for the soldiers.
>
> I have a son in the Air Force and am proud of it but I hate to see him fight to protect some rat hiding in a Government job, and there are still plenty of single and nonfathers in the defense plants; believe me I am not quoting hearsay.

And the writer underscores the word "hearsay"—

> Senator, I hate to be a crab, but take a tip from Senator WHEELER and the more h—— you can raise about anything that does not pertain directly to the war effort, the more we folks at home are going to back you.

I think that letter is quite apropos to the remarks of the Senator from Montana at this point, and, if I may do so, I should like to add that while the writer of the letter makes a rather extreme and impatient statement, yet he reasonably reflects the attitude and sentiment of 90 percent of the population of the Middle West.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree with the Senator entirely. I have said since I came back from the West that I have never known so much bitterness and resentment on the part of people in my section of the country as there are at the present time over the waste, extravagance, the misuse of manpower, and also the waste by industries in the hoarding of labor, slow-downs, and so forth.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me for a further interjection, I have lived a long time, and have had a long public experience; I have been Governor of my State in addition to the honor I have received at the hands of the people of Kansas who voted to send me as one of their representatives to the Senate, but in a long public life I have never seen public sentiment so inflamed, public indignation so aroused, and people so incensed over waste, inefficiency, and extravagance in governmental administration—whether county, State, or Federal—as they are now.

Mr. WHEELER. I want to say to the Senator, in response to his statement, that if the Government in Washington does not wake up to what is the real feeling of the people in the Middle West and West, I fear for what is going to happen.

As I suggested Tuesday when I was speaking, some have said that I was wrong, but I want to tell Senators who do not want to listen to the facts, Senators who are not interested, apparently, in saving fathers, but are willing to break up the American homes, that when they come up for election and return home they will find out the feelings and sentiments and temper of the American people.

What applies to Government-operated plants applies with greater force to nonessential Government bureaus and also to the waste of manpower in those bureaus which are essential to the conduct of the war.

Mr. President, I now wish to call attention to another report. I may say that this report is marked confidential, but nothing I shall read from the report is of a confidential nature, because it applies only to a survey of the congested war-production areas for the Army and Navy Munitions Board. There is not anything stated in the report except what has been stated by Mr. Baruch, but this report was gotten out by Mr. Robert Moses, of New York. It is Survey of Congested War Production Areas for the Army and Navy Munitions Board, by Andrews and Skidmore and Madigan-Hyland, under the direction of Robert Moses, and it is dated January 15, 1943.

I wish to call attention to a few things in the report. First it is said:

> The civilian labor turn-over and absentee percentages in the Norfolk Navy Yard and Newport News shipyards in every month last year were excessive. Unaccounted absences indicate that many employees simply take a short vacation when they get a pay check. It is interesting to note that in Canada, a recent production drive at one of the big war plants reduced absentees last December to a low of 1.1 percent for all causes, including illness.

Why can we not bring about a similar condition in this country generally? It will not be brought about because of the hoarding of labor, because the men in the plants who see the wastage and extravagance feel that if money is being wasted, what difference does it make to them whether or not they waste their time? There cannot be effective employment and there cannot be good morale among employees when they see money being poured down a rat hole, and wastage and extravagance on every hand throughout the Government of the United States.

I read again from the report:

> In the face of these conditions, the commandant of the Norfolk Yard has asked for thousands of additional civilian personnel, and some representatives of the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. also seek many more employees.
>
> It is a curious fact that the president of the Newport News shipbuilding plant does not agree with his own assistants as to the need of additional workers in his plant. He states without qualification that if excessive turn-over and absences can be stopped, he can fulfill all present and anticipated production schedules and contract obligations without bringing new workers and their families into the community.

Is the Government doing anything about that? Again I say, that because these conditions exist and because the Government, either on account of political reasons or otherwise, does not do anything about them, it is going to be necessary to take the fathers of the country into the armed services.

I read further from the report:

> The usual union affiliation and prevailing rate difficulties stand in the way, and the tendency is for these men to look for work in their trade elsewhere. Plant expansion and other construction is being rapidly curtailed all over the country, because this stage has been passed and because of shortage of material. Under these circumstances construction workers should be steered into local war production plants by persuasion. If this

fails, more drastic steps should be taken by the War Manpower Commission.

The report further states:

These men have all sorts of family and other personal problems to meet, and they can't be expected to be reasonably satisfied and sufficiently free in their minds to do their work well if they are kept in constant anxiety. The major employment problems can be traced straight to Washington.

The report further states:

Uncertainty as to draft and manpower policies has contributed largely to the problem of steady employment, morale, and production. The graphs in this and other companies show that there has been a noticeable drop in employment and efficiency whenever announcements, orders, and rumors were current of wholesale drafting of war workers. It is foolish to argue that patriotic workers are not affected by conflicting policies and regulations affecting their draft status.

The report discusses the destroyer base, and says:

Work is being done in the expansion of this yard which seems to us highly questionable, including among other things, reclamation and filling for the storage of landing boats which probably should never be stored at San Diego anyway, and certainly should not be lugged to and from the water front to filled land in the rear as an intermediate operation on their way to shipment overseas from San Francisco.

I read further:

The housing situation at San Diego is precisely like that in the other congested areas. The work was not properly laid out by the proper authorities, has never been coordinated, and is still in various stages of construction.

Who is responsible for that? Certainly not the people of the country.

The report says further:

The captain at the head of the Naval Torpedo Station wants more help. The turnover and absentee figures are too large for a plant in which it takes months to train substitutes. The explanations given by employees who leave are of doubtful value here and elsewhere. The facts, however, speak for themselves. Employment should be stabilized.

The report further states:

The Maritime Commission working through the old management of the south Portland yard is in the midst of constructing 922 units for single men and couples in the face of the fact that no one in the yard even attempts to explain who will live there. There are trailers at Cape Elizabeth supplied by the Farm Security Administration and operated by the National Housing Agency.

The report states:

The conclusions to be derived from this report may be summarized as follows:

No more workers should be brought into these areas.

Employment should be stabilized by providing decent community facilities.

In every area, frequent contradictory announcements as to draft, and manpower policies, by equally authoritative officers, have confused, frightened, and discouraged workers in war plants. As a result they have been driven to enlist, resign, move, and make all sorts of personal and family adjustments, often contrary to the best public as well as private interests.

* * * * *

Housing, sanitation, transportation, health, school, recreation, and other community facilities authorized and begun but not yet completed, should be speeded up, and glib excuses should not be accepted as a substitute for action.

The report lays the blame for these conditions on Washington.

Mr. President, it would seem to me, as it must seem to anyone else, for that matter, that to ask for more men, when the supplying of those men will involve the calling of fathers with children into the armed services, and the breaking up of American homes, puts it up to the Army to show two things: first, that they are making the best possible use of the men they now have, and, second, that men in other categories will not answer the need as well as if fathers were drafted.

On the general proposition of whether the Army would prefer single men to fathers, I asked General Marshall—page 282 of hearings:

Now, if you could get more men out of where they are hoarding men, either for industry or for the Army, that would fit your picture, you would prefer that to taking fathers, would you not?

General MARSHALL. If they are hoarding men who are unmarried men or young men, I would say that would be desirable.

It would follow that what the Army really wants is young single men.

I have already introduced or will introduce evidence to show that there are many men today in the Army fit for line duty who are being utilized for necessary "housekeeping" duties. If these men were replaced by an equal number of men with lesser physical qualifications, it would, of course, furnish additional young men for combat service without detriment to the Army as a whole.

If no further men are drafted, other than the 18-year-olds, it has been testified that owing to shipping conditions there would be in the Army in this country on January 1, 1945, 2,300,000 men, and if the Army is increased from 7,300,000 to 7,700,000 men there would be in the Army in this country on January 1, 1945, 2,700,000 trained men. The question arose in the testimony whether, under these conditions, a reduction of 500,000 in the total asked for would make any difference in the ultimate outcome. The questions and answers on this point follow:

Senator DOWNEY. If at this time the armed forces were to be cut approximately 500,000 under present plans, would it not be possible to rearrange the plans so that there would be no loss of effective power—I mean by that power outside the United States—until January 1, 1945?

General MARSHALL. I do not think so, sir.

Senator DOWNEY. Will you explain why not, General?

General MARSHALL. Because by the end of 1944 we will have moved out of this country practically all of the fighting divisions and special troops, and we will be engaged within this country in operating a huge base for operations extending all over the world for the supplying of matériel and personnel and for the small security detachments that will still be required over here.

That, of course, is a very general statement. Obviously, when General Marshall says, "We will be engaged within this country in operating a huge base for operations extending all over the world for the supplying of matériel and personnel," he does not refer to the Army alone but to the Nation as a whole. It is the productive organization of the country which supplies the matériel and it is the Navy and merchant marine which moves it.

It is, then, necessary to revert to the testimony of General Marshall's Deputy Chief of Staff, General McNarney, to find out the purposes and uses to which these 2,700,000 men are to be put.

General McNarney, in his prepared statement, page 26 of the hearings, set out the following:

Original allotments for the 1943 Army provided in round numbers for:

(a) Air forces and supporting arms and services	2,800,000
(b) Defense of continental United States, Panama, the Caribbean bases, Alaska, and Aleutians	530,000
(c) Defense of our lines of communication to include Australia, the numerous islands of the Pacific, maintenance of our Pacific bases, and the defense of Hawaii	350,000
(d) Zone of the interior activities—ports, prisoners of war enclosures, depots, etc., in the continental United States	400,000
(e) Men in schools—replacements, training centers, replacement depots, colleges (Army Specialized Training Program), and in hospitals recovering from sickness or wounds	650,000
(f) Overhead in the United States. These men furnish the housekeeping troops for all training stations. They provide medical care, operate utilities, perform local guard, and do all the necessary chores so that field force units can devote their time to intensive training	400,000
(g) Ground striking force—combat divisions and supporting units	3,118,000
Total	8,948,000

It will be noted, Mr. President, that the above is based on an Army of 8,200,000, as distinguished from the present request for 7,700,000. The above figures have been reduced, according to General McNarney, so far as (b) classification above is concerned, by 98,000, and so far as the (e) and (f) classifications are concerned, by 80,000, and because of shipping difficulties the War Department revised its troop schedules and reduced the planned strength of the Army by a total of 562,000. (See page 27 of hearings.) That would leave the figure of 7,700,000 by December 31, 1943, as the total force required; or, in other words, an increase of some 400,000 over the 7,300,000 which the Army now has.

Of the additional number demanded, General McNarney says—page 35:

We hope to get 70,000 women.

On page 42 of the hearings General McNarney answered the following question asked by me:

Senator WHEELER. Now, how many men, General—how many men do you figure on for the other services, such as loading of ships, unloading of ships, and manual labor—service of supply?

General MCNARNEY. Services of Supply in the zone of the interior—that means continental United States of America. Well, there are 400,000, plus about an additional 400,000 for other overhead, which permits the units who are in training to spend all of their time on training.

On page 49 Senator WALLGREN asked:

Well, just what is the over-all picture? How many men are engaged in "housekeeping" for the Army in all theaters of war as well as the United States?

General MCNARNEY. The figures will run nearly a third of the Army.

It follows from the above, on General McNarney's own testimony, so far as the continental United States alone is concerned, that 800,000 men of limited qualifications could be utilized in the Services of Supply and Allied services. It is a well-known fact that much of this work is now being done by men qualified for combat service. General McNarney's figures also show that class (e), comprising 650,000 persons of limited qualification, might perform services of this kind. There are, then, it would seem, positions in the Army in the continental United States alone, amounting in all to approximately 1,450,000, where limited-service men could be used to advantage.

But let us take the over-all picture. General McNarney states that so far as the over-all picture is concerned it is necessary to have at least one-third of the total armed forces doing "housekeeping" and related duties.

One-third of a total army of 8,200,000 would be approximately 2,700,000 men.

One-third of a total army of 7,700,000 in turn would be approximately 2,500,000 men.

But it has been stated in the evidence that at no time has the Army taken in excess of 10 percent for limited service, and last April or May this was cut to 5 percent.

Not only is the above true, but the actual cut in the Army this year of 562,000, according to General McNarney—page 127 of hearings—does not come in the men to be used for limited service or Services of Supply but in its troop schedules; in other words, in the ground troops. Only the limited number of 98,000 of this total reduction of 562,000 came out of class (b)—defense of continental United States—and 80,000 came out of classes (e) and (f). In other words, there was an actual reduction of 384,000 in the number of ground troops, combat troops, if you please.

Where is there need for more ground troops in the face of this statement?

Continuing, General Marshall said in his statement, beginning at page 261:

Now if we administer a cut of the nature you describe, that would mean offhand, I will say, that approximately that many divisions will not sail in the fall of 1944.

It is difficult to follow the reasoning behind that statement, since the reason 2,700,000 men will remain in this country is not for lack of trained men but for lack of shipping facilities necessary to move them.

As General Marshall in another place in his testimony has said, if we had the shipping facilities we would move overseas at once the 5,000,000 who will be on hand January 1, 1944.

The fact is that regardless of whether he gets those men, and even if he moves the men abroad as fast as he can, he will still have 2,300,000 men in this country on January 1, 1945, without any present increase in the Army.

Continuing with General Marshall's statement, we find that he says:

You would be speculating on the war coming to a conclusion as rapidly as has been implied in some of the press and radio statements.

The truth is that the only thing of which we seem to be sure is, not the ultimate size of the Army needed to do the job, which is a speculative figure, but the limited number of men who from time to time can be moved to the front, due to shipping restrictions. It would seem, then, that inductions into the Army should be gaged in accordance with the Army's ability to use men effectively, as determined by the shipping restrictions, rather than by any preconceived figure as to what the ultimate size of the Army should be, and that the timing of the inductions should relate to those known figures, rather than to the speculative figure as to the number of men ultimately needed.

General Marshall also said:

You would have to go to work and demobilize divisions right now—right now, this week, this month—to provide men we must have between now and the end of the calendar year.

That statement cannot be separated from the whole answer of the general at that point. When read in their context, it is obvious that those words were used in conjunction with a discussion of a particular problem then before the general, a problem which called for immediate solution and which he did not see how he was going to solve without breaking down divisions right then, to wit, September 20. The general was stating a problem, as I say, which called for immediate solution, to wit, the supplying at that particular time of specialized troops needed for a particular purpose at the front. He obviously did not plan to solve the problem by utilizing men who have not even yet completed their basic training. He certainly could not solve it, since the problem was immediate, through the utilization of men which had not even been drafted at that time. His statement, then, had no direct connection with the problem which is facing this body, to wit, the drafting of fathers. It was simply the statement of a problem which then was very much on his mind, and gives merely an insight into some of the difficulties which beset a chief of staff. It is impossible to come to any other conclusion; General Marshall said he had to do it "right now, this week, this month." However, we are considering the matter of the drafting of fathers in the months of October, November, and December.

The one distinguishing feature of the present Army, as the general repeatedly stated throughout his testimony, is that no man has been or is going to be sent abroad for service until he has been fully trained and prepared at home.

As a practical matter, if the Army had been run on the businesslike basis on which General Marshall says it has, he would have no difficulty in supplying the men at the time when he spoke.

In order to furnish replacements of specialized troops or others, there have been set up in this country, on paper at least, replacement depots. The replacement depots are presumed to have on hand men purposely sent there to meet sudden demands for replacements. But before a man is sent to a replacement depot he is presumed to have had 17 weeks of basic training.

Apparently, however, the Army had fallen down in that regard, and was unable to provide from the replacement depots the men who then were on demand from abroad.

That, however, has nothing whatsoever to do with the problem we are facing today, to wit, the drafting of fathers—a question which General Marshall says is one for Congress and for the War Manpower Commission.

Certainly, Mr. President, it cannot be the purpose of General Marshall to take married men into the Army, place them in the replacement depots, and then send them overseas with less than 17 weeks of training, when everyone knows, and even the Army concedes that it has trained troops and trained divisions in the country—men who have had training for at least 2 years, and some of them 3 years.

In addition to that, today many of the fathers could do the work which is being done by thousands of men who are doing so-called housekeeping work in the United States—guarding bridges and other places located in various sections.

This morning I received a letter from Walter B. Wanamaker, judge of the Summit County Court of Common Pleas, Akron, Ohio. The letter reads, in part, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing an article from the morning paper which is self-explanatory. What I can't understand is why this youngster has been deferred all this time when old men with families have been taken.

The article enclosed in the letter is a clipping from the Cleveland Plain Dealer. The article reads, in part, as follows:

LAYS DOWN SHEARS TO ENTER SERVICE

Latest Plain Dealer employee to enter the Nation's armed services is Jason Rouby, 20, editorial department copy cutter, who was inducted into the Army this week. He will report for active duty October 19.

Mr. President, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, one of the greatest newspapers in the country, a newspaper which had been calling for war, writes that one of

its 20-year-old employees has been inducted for service in the Army; and yet Judge Wanamaker writes that he cannot understand why that youngster has been deferred until this time, when older men with families have been taken.

I read further from Judge Wanamaker's letter:

May I be so bold as to criticize opposition to the fathers' draft as one of emotional appeal rather than the appeal to reason.

The real test is: Do our transportation and training and equipment facilities, which we now possess, assure us the exhaustion of the present supply of men on hand in this country. If the General or anybody else would be so bold as to say that we will have transported, equipped, and have the capacity in transportation to supply the men already in the armed service by a year from now, then these fathers are needed now.

If they cannot say this, then these fathers will not be needed until the year before the present armed supply is exhausted.

I have read all of the testimony before the Senate Military Affairs Committee by the various generals who testified to the conscripted army. None of them estimated that more than 8 months was required to make a thoroughly trained soldier out of a raw recruit. I have used the figure of 12 months for an abundance of safety.

However, if we need these men, the drivel and sentimentality about them being fathers is pure emotionalism. If we do not need them, the drivel of General Marshall that the failure to take them would strike a worse blow than the Japs or Germans could do to our war effort is likewise pure emotionalism.

May I further add, that to assume that anyone working for Franklin D. Roosevelt is expressing his own personal good judgment instead of the opinion of the President is a violent assumption.

I have heard over the radio this morning an announcement of the various States where the fathers draft was to begin immediately to operate. In these States, however, certain cities have been excepted where the population is dense, such as Chicago, from the rest of the State of Illinois. If there are men still in the city of Chicago to fill the draft quotas without the need of taking fathers and the same thing applies to New York City under this announcement, then certainly those men who are not fathers should be exhausted first.

Very cordially yours,

W. B. WANAMAKER.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Preferential Draft Treatment for Young Married Men," by Dr. Constantine Panunzio, of the Department of Anthropology and Sociology, the University of California, Los Angeles.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Scientific Monthly of April 1943]

PREFERENTIAL DRAFT TREATMENT FOR YOUNG MARRIED MEN

(By Dr. Constantine Panunzio, department of anthropology and sociology, the University of California, Los Angeles)

In former wars nations generally considered only the emergency of the moment and drew upon all men of military age regardless of marital status and without considering the effect on future manpower. In general, this haphazard practice is still being followed. However, the experience of the last war plus recent studies of population furnishes evidence which indicates that calling men of certain ages may produce very serious results in terms of future military power.

The outcome of diverse policies may perhaps be best illustrated by recalling what happened during the First World War in France and England. France, in response to the urgency of the moment, recruited from all the men of military age, regardless of their marital status or the reproduction-age to which they belonged. The result was that France had 1,040,000 fewer births during 1915–19 than it would have had if it had not been at war. This, of course, had no apparent result at the time. But 20 years later the loss did have a profound effect. When in 1940 France called its men to arms, it found itself with approximately 700,000 fewer men, 20 to 25 years of age. Germany also had fewer births—about 2,900,000—as a result of the First World War, but Germany was able to make up the loss by its larger and rapidly-growing population, whereas France, with a smaller and stationary population was unable to do so. At least one scholar foresaw the potential danger of that difference. In a remarkable statement, penned in 1918, Savorgnan, an Italian student of population, said that it would be between 1935 and 1940 that "the shadow of that loss in births" would hang most heavily over France. What that loss did actually mean to France in the crucial hour of 1940 no one can measure. There is documentary proof, however, that German officials were well aware of the fact and they seem to have timed their attack to coincide with the very moment when France was weakest in manpower.

England, on the other hand, employed a far-seeing policy. Utilizing the knowledge available at the time as to the high proportion of children which the younger segments produce, England adopted a recruitment method which made possible the maintenance of a relatively high birth rate during the war period. Briefly stated, England's policy generally encouraged child-bearing: (1) it deferred married men until the end of 1916, (2) it provided family allowances for men who married after enlistment, (3) it granted generous allowances to the wives of enlisted men and for each child, and (4) later, it made similar provisions for drafted married men. Largely as a result of this recruitment policy, the United Kingdom was able to sustain its birth rate to a remarkable degree. Consequently, while France lost 1,040,000 births during the war, the United Kingdom, with a population greater by more than four million persons, had only 650,000 fewer live births than it might have had. Moreover, with a faster-growing population, England was able to repair the loss while France was not. Inasmuch as these differences bore results in terms of effective manpower 20 years later, or between 1935 and 1940, they gave England a greater manpower than it would have had if it had not followed that policy. And this extra strength may have been a decisive factor in the resistance England was able to give Germany in 1940.

In order to realize the effect on future manpower when youthful married men are called to arms, it is necessary to bear in mind that in the United States the younger mothers give birth to a very large proportion of all children. In 1930 (the 1940 census data are not yet available), mothers between the ages of 20 and 34, inclusive, produced 72.6 percent of all live births. Moreover, within this group, it was the mothers between 20 and 24 who contributed the largest proportion. Since males on the average are 3 years older than females at first marriage, about three-quarters of all births occur roughly when the fathers are between 23 and 37, and within that group the greatest contribution is made by men between 23 and 27 years of age. Or if we take into consideration a more significant fact, age of conception, the men would be 22 to 36 years old for the entire group and 22 to 26 for the more productive element.

In terms of future manpower, then it is a very serious matter to call any considerable number of the married men between 22 and 36, and even more so to call married men between the ages 22 and 26. It is true that some of these men are urgently needed; still, the future strength of the Nation makes it imperative to give some consideration to deferring them, whenever possible. It is a striking fact that Germany, though facing a far more difficult situation, is doing everything in its power to maintain or even raise the birth rate in the midst of war.

For the United States the problem is even more acute because our military forces are stationed far away, which in most cases renders it impossible for men to return home even though on leave. Because of this fact, the withdrawal of men of the specified ages cuts down births at a greater rate and creates more of a loss in future manpower than in countries close to the scenes of operations.

Likewise, the withdrawal from home of married women between the ages of 20 and 32, even for essential war industry and service, is a matter of great concern, since such a procedure inevitably decreases the reproduction activity of these women.

Our situation is even more serious because the population of this country is fast becoming stationary, while the populations of some rival countries are still growing rapidly. Our present rate of increase is barely enough for replacement, while that of Japan, for example, is considerably above it. By 1970, Japan's total population is expected to increase by about 30,000,000, while that of the United States will add 18,000,000. And since the age structure of the two nations is markedly different, Japan will have an appreciably greater proportionate increase in manpower than will the United States. Any loss in births at present on the part of the United States will, therefore, be far more serious than that which Japan can experience. In view of these facts, the United States and Japan will face a manpower situation somewhat similar to that which France and Germany faced in 1940. This statement is intended to create alarm, but even more to stress the full import of the situation. Even if we should deal Japan a knock-out blow now, in the next generation we may be obliged to confront a nation with an even greater manpower than it now possesses.

As one authoritative voice has expressed it, "With a large element of our able-bodied men in the armed services—and the consequent disruption of family life and postponements of marriage—the effective fertility of the American people is likely to fall below the level required to maintain a stationary population. Evidently our population policy must be given serious consideration in the councils that are guiding the Nation through its problems in these difficult times."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, in commenting on the article by Dr. Panunzio, the Washington Post, in an editorial in its issue of July 6, said:

LOST GENERATION?

The induction of married men into the Army appears to be proceeding steadily, but the discussion as to the wisdom or unwisdom of this policy also continues. In all the discussion an aspect of the question has up to now been pretty generally overlooked. And that is the effect of the policy on the national birthrate. The relationship of the national birthrate to the national manpower

is, or should be, self-evident. It is also pretty obvious that the present manpower crisis is to a large extent a consequence of the steeply declining birthrate of the past 2 decades.

In the June issue of the Scientific Monthly, Dr. Constantine Panunzio, sociologist of the University of California, points out that the age groups from which married men are now being drafted into service are precisely the ages which represent the period of maximum fertility. "In terms of future manpower," observes Dr. Panunzio, "it is a very serious matter to call any considerable number of the married men between 22 and 36. * * * For the United States the problem is even more acute because our military forces are stationed far away, which in most cases renders it impossible for men to return home even though on leave. * * * Likewise, the withdrawal from home of married women between the ages of 20 and 32, even for essential war industry and service, is a matter of grave concern, since such a procedure inevitably decreases the reproduction activity of these women."

Long before Pearl Harbor the net reproductive rate in the United States had fallen below the replacement level, and the country was approaching the point of a stationary population. Dr. Panunzio evidently fears that the mobilization of so many young men and women in the most fertile age groups may make even a stationary population impossible.

At the same time the birthrate of exactly those nations which seem most likely to become our rivals in future is steadily rising. By 1970, Dr. Panunzio points out, for example, Japan's population will have increased by 40,000,000, while ours will have increased at best only 18,000,000. Not only that, but because of the much more favorable distribution of age groups Japan will have "an appreciably greater proportionate increase in manpower" than we. Japan, indeed, may be decisively defeated this time, and so be deprived of sustenance at home and abroad for a thriving population. But so were the Germans decisively defeated in 1918, and look what happened to them. There is no assurance that a generation hence we may not have to confront a Japan "with an even greater manpower than it now possesses." That also applies to the Germans, who are now building up future reserves of manpower by forced breeding and by drafting the young men of the occupied countries. It looks as if they are bent upon trying again to win the peace as the prospect of winning the war becomes overcast.

History, we think, might possibly show that this matter of national birthrates may have a good deal more to do with deciding the political destiny of the world than any number of peace plans, charters, or vice presidential speeches. Anyway, however much we may hope for permanent peace, it would not be the part of statesmanship to ignore utterly the possibility that 25 years from now we may have to fight yet another war of survival. If so, let us hope the manpower and Selective Service authorities of that war will have no reason to curse the short-sightedness of their predecessors, as the British are now cursing the haphazardness in manpower policy of their rulers in World War No. 1.

From the social angle, the fact is that when we draft American fathers we jeopardize the existence of the American home. The wife and mother is left with bewildering and cruel alternatives. She must either depend upon her parents for support, always supposing her parents are able to help her, or she must place her children in an institution while she looks for work—if she is able to work—in order to help support them. It is impossible for a mother to support herself and her children on the allotment she receives from the Government; and each day of rising prices for foodstuffs makes the task more impossible. But even if the allotment were doubled or tripled, the chief problem would not be met; that is, the problem of making American children wards of the state and of breaking up the American home.

It is unthinkable that an administration which has talked more about building and making secure the home should unwittingly countenance policies which will destroy the very essence of American democracy. Today, we have the Social Security Act, the home owners' loan, Federal housing law, and many others, all aimed at strengthening the family.

No administration in the history of this country has ever talked more about preserving the American home and about humanitarian policies than has the present administration; and yet the act of taking fathers into the Army when it is not necessary is having a worse effect upon the future of the country and upon American homes and children than have the evils sought to be corrected by all the social legislation which this administration has sponsored, and which has been enacted by a Democratic Congress. We are undoing everything that has been done to help American homes and to help the children of the country. We are not only destroying what we have done but we are completely breaking down the moral standards of our young people, as has been pointed out time and time again by ministers of the gospel from one end of the country to the other, by workers in child-welfare organizations, by school teachers, professors, and many others, even including J. Edgar Hoover.

So much for the social angle. Now, for the economic angle. It is a known fact that the key men in most war plants are married men and the single men hold the less important and replaceable jobs.

Second. The turn-over in those plants, as I have previously stated, runs as high as 300 percent; and it is stated that turn-over is the biggest problem. I have tried to get, without success, figures broken down to show whether or not the men involved in the business of turn-over are single men or married men. It stands to reason, however, that men with wives and children cannot move with the rapidity of single men; and it is my belief that when these figures are obtained they will show that this turn-over applies almost exclusively to single men and nonfathers.

Thirdly. From the financial angle, allotments will have to be substantially increased in the event of the drafting of men with families, and in case of disability from service the Government would be called upon to pay out greatly increased sums of money for the support of families, as compared with similar disability allowances in the cases of single men.

Lastly, from the businessmen with whom I have talked I believe it will be found that if we draft these men we will undermine the whole civilian economy of the Nation, which is today dependent upon the continued ability to use these men.

From the strictly military point of view, I have already stated General Marshall's preference for single men. In this connection Lieutenant General McNarney had previously testified that, all things being equal, the Army would prefer single men and nonfathers to fathers with children. This, it seems to me, should be self-evident.

From all angles—social, economic, financial, and military—there seems to be no question in anyone's mind that the drafting of single men and nonfathers is preferable to the drafting of married men with children. The adoption of an opposite policy would run counter to the long-term interests of the Nation. I do not believe that anyone will dispute that conclusion.

Mr. President, I now wish to take up some questions dealt with by the Truman committee report. When the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] spoke it was late in the day. I wish to call attention to some of the things which he said. He had made a long study of the whole manpower situation. In a recent address he said:

> It is only by actually engaging the enemy in combat that victory can be achieved. The enemy is not impressed by news that we are inducting more men into the Army. He is only impressed by the soldiers that he is forced to meet in combat. For these reasons it is idle and foolish to talk of mere numbers in our Army or to seek to have as many men in the Army in this country as there are in the Army inside Japan.
>
> In theory our job is to induct men into the Army at the rate and at the time that will enable them upon completion of their training to go abroad, either for actual combat or as reserves to support those in actual combat in case of need.
>
> We should not induct men before there is a reasonable expectancy that they can be sent abroad at the end of their training. For these reasons I strongly urged about a year ago in Boston that the Army should exercise the utmost care in determining its size and the rate of induction, so as not unnecessarily and carelessly to increase our manpower shortage, which even then was our greatest single limiting factor.
>
> I am glad to note that the Army has reduced its original estimate of requirements of 8,248,000 men by 562,000, part of which was achieved by reductions in its overhead and in the replacement and school programs. But even with these reductions (the reductions from 8,248,000 by 562,000 men) and even assuming that the Army is successful in its efforts to transport abroad 4,750,000 men by the end of 1944, we still would have almost 3,000,000 men in uniform within the continental limits of the United States at the end of 1944. The great majority of these would have been in the Army from 1 to 2 years.
>
> I am well aware that we need many men in essential activities at home such as housekeeping at the numerous Army posts, defense of Continental United States and guard duties over prisoners. * * * But I do question whether we need 5,000,000 men in the Army this month in Continental United States and whether the Army needs this year an additional 630,000 men, so that even if we achieve our hoped-for goal of 4,750,000

men abroad by the end of 1944, we shall still have 3,000,000 men left in this country.

The fact is that the number of men who have been in the Army for 12 months or more and are still in the United States has been steadily increasing until today we have many hundreds of thousands of men in the Army who are impatient to be sent abroad or home. The other members of the committee, of which I am chairman, and myself have inspected a large number of Army camps and have had the privilege of talking with hundreds of the men in the ranks about their work.

Over and over again we have been told that the soldier is doing now the same thing that he was doing 6 months or a year or even 2 years ago and that he is learning nothing new.

The boys themselves and their relatives and friends are fully aware of this situation, and they properly resent it.

That statement was not made by me. It was not made by an individual who has not visited the Army camps. It was made by the chairman of the Truman committee, the Senator from Missouri, who has investigated war plants and Army camps from one end of the country to the other.

I continue to quote from the address delivered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]:

There are many reasons for this waste of manpower by the Army itself. But, after making full allowance for all these things, the fact still remains that many who have been inducted into the Army are not being productively employed. If and when they are productively employed, the total requirements of the Army can safely be reduced very substantially. The same is true of the Navy. Surely it is the duty of the Army before disrupting families and civilian industries to make sure that it is effectively utilizing the men it already has and that it can effectively utilize those that it still seeks to induct.

Mr. President, all I have asked for and all I am seeking is that the men who now are in the Army be utilized, that the men in the camps be properly utilized, that the military authorities use the manpower they can obtain before they take married men who are fathers.

Mr. President, I would be the last one to stand on this floor and say that if the Army needed married fathers, I should want to prevent their being taken. I know of no member of the Senate who would say such a thing. However, I submit there is no one who has investigated the situation, including Mr. Baruch, who admits he has not visited a single Army camp, but has had other persons visit camps for him, and there is not a Senate committee which has investigated the situation, who does not know that the manpower of the United States is not being properly used.

Again, the Senator from Missouri said in his address:

There is a most serious question as to whether the attempt to take more than a million more men during the next 3 months will not do more harm than good. The induction of fathers must stand or fall on its own merits, and it is my opinion that before undertaking that very serious step with all the disruptive consequences that would be entailed, it is up to the Army and the Navy to demonstrate that they have reduced their requirements to the bare minimum by efficiently utilizing all the men that they now have. I believe that by so doing they can reduce their requirements by several hundred thousand men without impairing their striking power.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the remaining quotations from the address delivered by the junior Senator from Missouri printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURTON in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If and when they are productively employed the total requirements of the Army can safely be reduced very substantially. The same is true of the Navy. Surely it is the duty of the Army before disrupting families and civilian industries to make sure that it is effectively utilizing the men it already has and that it can effectively utilize those that it still seeks to induct. We are engaged in total war. The armed services have properly been accorded a first call upon the Nation's manhood, but it is not and cannot safely be a blank check. To win this war mass production is essential. We must have an uninterrupted flow of materials from the mines and quarries, forests and farms, on through to the finished products. We must not only have the materials needed for our armed forces, but we must have those needed to supply our essential civilian requirements. We must maintain our transportation industry and provide the railroad, truck, and bus companies with the facilities to continue their vital work. We must provide the farmer with machinery to enable him to raise greater crops with less labor. In short, we must maintain a sound, healthy economy, so that the fearful burden of the greatest war in history can be sustained, not for months or for a year or so, but for as many years as are necessary to achieve total victory. The more that can be left for civilian use the stronger we will become. After we have won the war we must have a foundation on which to rebuild and make secure the American way of life. Any frittering away of our resources of manpower or materials, whether by the armed forces or by civilians, will weaken us, and if carried too far, will sow the seeds of discord and dissatisfaction that might make us a prey to overtures for a stalemate peace

Nearly a year ago the committee of which I am chairman, in its report on manpower, warned that a serious manpower shortage existed, and pointed out a number of simple and practical means of alleviating the shortage by the efficient utilization by industry and the armed services of the men available to them. Huge blocks of manpower are still being hoarded or wasted by the continuance of practices which management and labor have a clear duty to end. It has been suggested that the way to abolish these evils is to pass a national service act, and the Under Secretary of War has frankly admitted that a major reason for the Army's desire to induct fathers is to force them into war work. Such proposals are attractive because of their simplicity. But, unfortunately, it is not possible to end these problems by legislative fiat, especially where that action simply sets up a huge, unwieldy bureaucratic organization with a direction to make literally thousands of important determinations. Our prior experience with such bureaus and with the existing manpower agencies does not warrant any confidence that the benefits would equal or exceed the decided detriment of trying to get production out of forced labor.

There is no substitute for efficiency. It is efficiency that we must seek, and not more complex and unworkable controls. Certainly the draft of fathers is not warranted as a mere scheme to force a shift of manpower.

* * * * *

This was recognized by the Under Secretary of War, who stated that he realized that men in aircraft plants should be deferred. Work in aircraft plants is by no means the only essential occupation. A truck driver moving important freight may be even more necessary, even though on first impression he appears to be engaged in a strictly nonwar activity.

* * * * *

At the same time I believe that both industry and labor are under obligation to stop practices that hoard and waste manpower, and that every man, including fathers, who hopes for deferment should be very certain that he is actually engaged in the type of work in which he can make the best contribution to the war effort. The lessened pressure on local draft boards to meet stiff quotas should enable them to exercise a careful discretion, so as not to take men where great hardship would be involved, who are already usefully employed in work which, although not always war work, is essential to the country.

We must not permit hardship and suffering by drafting men whose families will be left without support and will become a burden on the public, just because we lack the courage and ability to force the armed services and industry and labor to utilize efficiently a supply of manpower that is adequate to do all that needs to be done.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that anything I may say upon this subject will not change any votes in this body. I appreciate that my Democratic colleagues are apparently not particularly interested in ascertaining the facts. I wish to say, however, in all seriousness, that the time will come in the not far distant future when they will be interested. If they follow blindly——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield there, I should like to call attention, for the RECORD, inasmuch as the Senator from Montana has singled out his Democratic colleagues, that there are as many Democratic colleagues present in the Senate as there are Republican colleagues.

Mr. WHEELER. Well, Mr. President, there have not been all afternoon. If there are now, it is the first time there have been. However, the time will come, whether they are Democrats or Republicans, when they will be interested in the subject; because it is one which affects not only 446,000 fathers, but also 446,000 mothers, countless children, and grandparents and other relatives. If any Members of the Senate do not believe for one moment that the people of the United States are interested in endeavoring to prevent the breaking up of American homes and the throwing into the streets of children, and if Members of the Senate do not think the people of the country believe it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to stop the waste of manpower in the Government bureaus and the hoarding which is taking place

in various industries throughout the country, whether such Senators are Republicans or Democrats, they will be sadly mistaken. If they do not believe they are breaking down the morale of the American people in the war effort by inducting fathers into the military service they are sadly mistaken.

Anyone who examines the mail I have received cannot fail to be impressed by the recital in the letters of the facts upon which the writers base their opinions and conclusions. I refer not merely to persons who have written to me "I agree with you," but to specific instances of Army officers and privates who, in writing about such matters are violating the rules of the service but who, nevertheless, are writing to me because they are distressed because they are lying around doing nothing—not untrained men, but men who have been trained. I have also received letters from labor organizations pointing out the waste of manpower, the hoarding of young men who are being deferred while fathers are being taken into the service. I have received letters stating that draft boards all over the United States are resigning because of resentment over the drafting of fathers. I have received letters from ministers of the gospel, lawyers, doctors, and businessmen.

As I have said, I am not interested in any particular piece of legislation. I should like to see the problem worked out by the departments, by the Government itself. There is no excuse under the sun why it has not been worked out before. However, after making a very brilliant speech with reference to the matter, and after criticizing the situation more severely than I have criticized it, my distinguished friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], has said that legislation which would defer the drafting of fathers would be class legislation, and that the matter should be left to the departments. Of course, Mr. President, the whole Selective Service Act is class legislation. When by Executive order the President of the United States exempted 275,000 men between the ages of 38 and 45, that was class legislation. So the whole thing is based upon class legislation, and of necessity, so.

Mr. President, at this point I desire to read for the RECORD, whether anyone is interested or not, a newspaper article concerning draft board 20B. The headline reads:

Draft board 20B, made to defer 28 EB Co. men by higher-ups, will not induct men in their places

The article reads as follows:

STONINGTON.—The selective service board at Stonington, covering district 20-B, and long known as opposed to any plan to send fathers to the front so long as there are single men in defense plants who could be replaced, was forced last night to change its idea of fairness in the matter of deferments, according to the chairman, Col. Bourdon A. Babcock, of Pawcatuck.

The board has been at odds with the State and National selective-service headquarters on the subject for some time, but no open break came until last night, when it received instructions from the headquarters of the State selective service in Hartford to reverse its decision and attitude on the manning-replacement table.

More specifically, the order concerned 28 single men in the employ of Electric Boat Co. who have been ordered to report for induction on May 18, but who now can count on further deferment.

Members of the draft board indicated through a spokesman following the meeting that they were bowing humbly to influence from Hartford and Washington, but their "forced" decision is not going to put 28 married men or men with dependents 28 steps nearer the Army, as it would appear, for they voted not to call an additional 28 men to replace those given deferments. Thus when the May 18 contingent leaves, it will be 28 men short.

Under the manning replacement table, every man who has a defeirment because of war industry activity has a date set against his name when his deferment ends. The State board gets a copy of this deferment, and they order the local boards to defer the man until that date, when he will again be placed in I-A.

Members of the board in Stonington have steadfastly maintained that this was not binding upon them. Colonel Babcock said the matter came to an issue March 11 when the board refused to defer 28 employees of the Electric Boat Co. and placed them all in I-A. The manning table would give them deferment anywhere from 2 to 12 months.

SUBMIT UNDER COMPULSION

The State ordered them reclassified. Colonel Babcock said his group reopened the cases, considered each one of them and refused to change the classifications, and on April 22 sent notice to each one to report for induction on May 18.

This action was taken by the local board because of commitments and agreements previously made by the Electric Boat Co. officials releasing these men for induction during April, Colonel Babcock said.

Friday, April 23, according to the Stonington board, Col. George Sturges, executive officer of the selective-service board in Connecticut, and Col. George Morin, who is in charge of occupational deferment, attended the meeting of the board in Stonington town hall. They were quoted as making a personal appeal to the 20-B officials to go along with the manning plan "as advocated in Washington." The board refused by unanimous vote to grant the request.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator cited an instance in Connecticut of a local board refusing to fill its quota by inducting married men. I am informed that in a number of States that practice has been followed for some time, while in other States when the quota has been assigned and the local boards have used up the single men, then they have taken married men. Now I should like to ask the Senator a question. Has the local board plenary power in that respect? Has it the complete power to refuse to induct married men to meet the quota, as the board in Connecticut has done, until all boards have reached the position where they have no single men to induct?

Mr. WHEELER. I will say, in answer to the Senator's question, that many persons say that it is all up to the local boards, but I noticed the other day that in one place where a draft board refused to take married men they were ousted from their positions by the National Selective Service Board. I think that will answer the question.

Here is another case. I quote from the Harrisburg (Pa.) Telegram of September 27 under the heading "Base overstaffed with young men eligible for Army, G. A. Gnau asserts." The article reads:

Clifford A. Gnau, quartermaster-adjutant of the Pennsylvania department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, today delivered a broadside against alleged practices at the Middletown Air Depot and asserted that he is in full accord with statements of Congressman FOREST A. HARNESS, Indiana, regarding deferments at the air post.

Gnau is also chairman of Harrisburg City Draft Board No. 1, which he says alone has two to three hundred registrants employed at Middletown.

"The depot is over staffed with young men whose presence is unnecessary to its efficient operation," declared Gnau, "and from reports received women at the depot perform more work per capita than the young 'heroes' who virtuously proclaim to all who will listen that they are performing a vital service to their country."

Gnau, a veteran of World War No. 1, wounded in action overseas, added, "I further believe most of the Army officers stationed at the depot will sign any request for deferment placed on their desk by a subordinate, inasmuch as a considerable number of the officers have no conception of what it is all about and should be assigned to combat duty, instead of fighting the 'battle of Middletown'."

Here is a letter which comes from headquarters, Camp Tyson, office of Post Engineer, Camp Tyson, Tenn., September 28, 1943:

I read in the morning paper that you charge that the Army is not making full use of its manpower. You state that there are at present experienced pilots in the Army that are driving jeeps and doing menial tasks, while the Army proceeds to spend millions of dollars training inexperienced men.

Let me say that I agree with you 100 percent on this statement. Only I say that you do not state the truly full extent to which the Army is wasting these men.

I know that you are very busy, but if you care to have additional information, sworn to, I will be glad to do what I can.

Many men that are in the Army now, doing menial tasks, were in the Royal Canadian Air Force. They returned to the United States with the idea that they would get a fair chance to fly, only once they were here they were told that they were physically unqualified and all this time Canada had been training these men for combat flying. Certainly no one can object to the record of the Royal Air Force, and the Canadian Air Force in this war. They have set an enviable record, a record which this country has not touched even if given the same amount of time in comparison with the time element under which the R. C. A. F. and the R. A. F. have operated.

I say that there are many pilots in the Army who could be used for less exacting duties than combat flying. These men would right now, for the most part, qualify in the R. C. A. F. as combat pilots. I have logged 180 hours, I was in the Air Corps last year, I was finally disqualified because of so-called faulty color vision. The odd part is that 2

months earlier I had passed a combat physical examination in Montreal, Canada. When I was enlisted in the United States, they were aware of this, but I was told that I would obtain a waiver in consideration of my flying hours. Of course, I never received it. At present I am doing drafting work for the post engineers here at Camp Tyson, Tenn. I assure you that in the last 3 months I have made but one drawing. All we do is to sit around day after day. I would like to see combat duty, but I have experience in flying, and I will only fight when I am given a fair chance to fly. There are many fellows like myself who grew up with aviation in the past 10 years. These fellows are no better treated than I was. Flying means all to fellows that have grown up with it, and the last 10 years have been the fastest that aviation has ever experienced.

The other day I quoted a statement that there were several thousand—I think the number was between three and five thousand—capable of flying who were doing other things. That information was given to me by a high Government official who was in a position to know what he was talking about. Obviously, he told me he could not let me use his name; but he said it was costing $35,000 to train a flyer; that, scattered from one end of the country to the other, they had men who had flown all the way from 160 or 180 up to 1,000 hours who were now doing menial work. That may be a businesslike way to conduct such affairs.

I read now from a letter from Green Bay, Wis.:

Just recently our local chapter, Fort Howard, No. 164, Military Order of the Purple Heart, sent a resolution to the two Wisconsin Senators and to our Congressman * * * opposing the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers until all single men of military fitness, regardless of their station in life or position, were given the opportunity to serve in the armed forces.

Next is a letter from New York regarding draft board No. 2 in Union, N. J., and I read the following clipping:

Vincent deP. Slavin, chairman of local board 2 in Union Township, today called upon Congress to investigate the "unfair conditions" within the Selective Service System.

Declaring abuse of the replacement schedule has reached a point where industry is controlling the local boards, Slavin said War Manpower Commissioner McNutt's recent order to call fathers October 1 would be unnecessary if deferments were taken away from available single men. Slavin asked the legislators to "upset McNutt's plans until the system operates fairly."

Slavin said a conference with Erwin L. Meisel, his board's secretary; Frank J. Ott, a board member, and Harrison B. Johnson, Government appeal agent, resulted in a decision to classify all fathers in 3–D so long as the board has one unmarried man deferred.

LETTER TO ROOSEVELT

Slavin, who recently stirred Nation-wide comment by posting a list of his board's deferred registrants and the reasons for their deferment, revealed he has sent letters of protest to State and Federal authorities, declaring his board is "disgusted and discouraged in an apparent unfairness in the operation of the Selective Service System." The letters, mailed last night, went to President Roosevelt, each Senator and Representative, Secretary of War Stimson, McNutt, National Selective Service Director Hershey, and New Jersey Director Bloomer.

From Tacoma, Wash., comes the following letter:

When you say the shipyards in Tacoma are overstaffed you are right. Three men for every job. Young single men being deferred every 6 months under the pretext of necessity.

I talked with a single man 23 years of age yesterday. He is supposed to have a key position. He gets a deferment every 6 months. I asked him whether he could be replaced. He laughed and said, "Hell, yes. I could break in a man in 2 weeks' time on my job. All I have got down there is a perpetual vacation."

That is signed by E. C. Carlson, Tacoma, Wash.

I have received the following telegram from Nashville, Tenn.:

Have Gilbert Biron, chairman, local draft board No. 4, Mobile, Ala., testify during the present manpower hearing. He recently resigned in protest over blanket deferment being given new workers in his district. Make the committee hear both sides.

I read the following from a letter I have received from Gulfport, Miss.:

I am 43 years old. I enlisted April 27, 1943. At the time of my enlistment I was making approximately $135 per week. I have went through boot training and I am now ready to sail overseas. Many men younger than I am are getting out of the armed forces on account of their age. That, sir, is a condition of their mind rather than a condition of their bodies. Truthfully speaking, sir, can't this age limit be raised? Let's have less orphans; let's have more men my age in this thing.

The writer adds, "I am a Democrat."

I have here a letter from the past commander of Furniture City Post, No. 258, of the American Legion, in which he states:

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: I am very much opposed to the drafting of fathers until a thorough investigation of all occupational deferments is made. There are too many doubtful deferments in this community, and they have been too freely resorted to. Why not purge the selective service lists so that all available manpower can be taken before drafting fathers?

Who is going to take care of the families of drafted fathers?

Frankly, this is the opinion of a majority of the World War No. 1 veterans and the man on the street.

Respectfully yours,

THORNE J. BROWN,
Past Commander.

That is from Grand Rapids. I read now from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of September 29:

Expressing indignation at exaggerated claims of young men in war plants concerning their essentiality, three members of the five-man draft board in St. Charles County, just out of St. Louis, resigned yesterday rather than draft fathers instead of these men.

"We have been hesitant to take this action," a letter signed by the three and sent to State selective service headquarters pointed out, "but have felt for some days that our usefulness to the Selective Service has definitely been curtailed."

The following appeared in the Boston Herald on September 28:

NAVY YARD LABOR WASTE IS CHARGED—MANY DO NOTHING, CITY COUNCIL TOLD

If Boston has become a critical labor shortage area, the Federal Government has made it so by permitting or helping to foster "intolerable" conditions at the Charlestown Navy Yard, City Councilman Michael L. Kinsella, of Charlestown, declared at yesterday's council meeting.

Kinsella, himself employed at the navy yard as a clerk for a private contractor, asserted that a great wealth of manpower was being wasted through mismanagement both at the Charlestown yard and its annex in South Boston. Directing his criticism largely at the Navy officers in charge of the yard, he said that "because of mismanagement, some 56,000 workers are employed in Charlestown and South Boston when 30,000 could do the work."

CHARGES OVERMANNING

"Go in the navy yard and you'll find the men stumbling all over each other," he said. "Go by the admiral's house, and you'll find able-bodied civilians—some in their early 30's—doing nothing but keeping the admiral's hedge in good condition."

He said that among the naval officers are some "who make their betters defer to them, and they have a great talent for countermanding the orders of high-ranking civilian employees who in many instances have 25 to 30 years experience in the yard."

He declared that among the personnel at the yard are "the worst frauds and fakers, starting with the naval officers and going down the line to the last man employed, that this city has ever had to tolerate."

"STANDING AROUND"

"Go through the yard and you'll see hundreds of male employees doing nothing but standing around and chewing the fat with good-looking girls who also are stalling," he said.

"You'll find two able-bodied men carrying a piece of steel six to eight feet long—one of them at each end—because of some silly yard rule that in the case of a piece of steel over a certain length, two men must be used to carry it.

"They want gardeners there to take care of the admiral's lawn, and laborers to take care of the captains' lawns. Some of the officers still have their tennis courts. They didn't convert them into Victory gardens."

He said that in his "honest opinion," not less than one-fourth of the 30,000 employed in the yard from 7 a. m. to 3:40 p. m. are "unproductive for eight hours of the day because they cannot possibly work in such numbers; the space is not there."

"They say Boston is a critical labor shortage area," Kinsella said. "If this is true, the Government has made it so. They should survey the labor situation at the navy yard, and when they start kicking out the fakers and phonies, they should throw out some of the 'brass hats' with them."

I call the attention of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] to the following telegram from his State:

Check Brookley Field about draft dodgers. It's full of them. It takes 10 men to do 1 man's job.

BURT SHERMAN.

The following is a letter written to a Member of the House of Representatives from St. Louis, Mo.:

As you know I have been here at Curtiss-Wright for the past 5 months and I am taking advantage of our past friendship to write you this letter.

Our plant here, and I imagine it is true of most plants, has an unbelievable number of single and just married men in their early twenties, who could be replaced to good advantage by any normal girl. These boys are out-and-out draft dodgers and in most cases when I talk to them they laugh and admit it.

I read a telegram from Jacksonville, Ill.:

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

You are right. We have dozens of 4–F slackers in this town. Some have no children. Some are single, never been examined.

Dr. AUSTIN C. KINGSLEY.

I read another sent to me from San Francisco by E. C. Nelson:

I agree with your position in the manpower situation, particularly with respect to cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. As a practicing certified public accountant, engaged principally in work for contractors handling war contracts, I have observed that this type of contract encourages the hoarding of manpower as well as tying up thousands of Government auditors who are engaged in the detail of auditing of costs under these contracts. The Government could obtain a huge pool of manpower and better results by granting lump-sum contracts subject to renegotiation for excessive profits and, at the same time, encourage competent contractors by providing for higher profit incentives based on low costs.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a sworn statement of conditions on war jobs in California from which I read as follows:

DINUBA, CALIF., *September 17, 1943.*

I, the undersigned, Claud Columbus Smith, 34 years of age and an American citizen, do hereby swear that the following is a true statement of facts and conditions:

That I was employed as steamfitter at $1.75 per hour on September 7, 8, 9, and 10, 1943, on the construction of an Army hospital in Van Nuys, Calif. Work conditions were so lax that actual work accomplished could have been done in half the time if there had been proper supervision, and I attribute the poor supervision to the cost-plus practice of doing business. Here is an example: I asked the foreman for permission to send my helper for a piece of 2-inch pipe, 7½ inches long. He would have had to have gone a distance of 450 yards which would have consumed about 5 minutes. The foreman said, "No. The boss doesn't want you down there, because you are supposed to be out in the field working. If he sees you or your helper down there, he knows you are not working." So we did 15 minutes' work that day and 20 minutes' the next. On the third day, the needed piece was delivered by truck. In the meantime we were trying to catch this truck driver to deliver it for us. When the delivery was made by a ton-and-a-half truck, this one piece, weighing about 8 pounds, was all that was on it.

I have three brothers with the armed forces, and was too disgusted with the job to continue. I quit of my own free will. In fact, I haven't gone around for my check yet. The idea that someone was making 10 or 20 percent—through various subcontractors—on the $17.33 a day I was receiving, and stabbing the taxpayers in the back at the same time, was too much for me to take. The Army needs this hospital, more beds for wounded Americans, and contractors encourage stalling around so their profits will run higher.

I have worked on various construction jobs in California during the past 2 years, and I have seen blueprints put out by rookie engineers that were all wrong. And when we knew they were wrong, we had to use them anyway. Later, some of them had to be broken out, others that were welded had to be cut out and thrown in the scrap pile.

Then the man making the statement proceeds to give other illustrations.

I read from a letter addressed to me from Madison, Wis., by a sergeant in the Army:

I am a soldier at Truax Field, Madison, Wis. I heard your address the 24th of September on Deferring Fathers.

* * * * *

I heartily agree with you that fathers should be deferred from military service, and I term they would be useless to us even as common supply men. Their spirit would be low because of their constant worrying over their families; and a low morale can cause discontent among other members of the service.

* * * * *

The Army needs clear minds and capable men for the many changes in assignments given to the men daily.

Then the writer describes some of the Army personnel.

The Government was just paying out a lot of wasted money by having this type of personnel in the service.

* * * * *

My duties here are those of shipping and receiving men. I am always in contact with men, so I know many of their problems. They are constantly complaining because they were not classified for the job they are best qualified to do in the Army.

* * * * *

May I state another example of waste. A large group of men classified as aircraft mechanics were shipped to Lincoln, Nebr., to become mechanics. There was no room for them, so they were sent here at Truax Field to learn radio code. As they were not classified as radiomen, 90 percent of the total group was washed out within 1 month, this idea costing the taxpayers a lot of folish dollars. These are the things I object to; so if General Marshall thinks he needs more men, let's give him those men in the Air Corps, who are traveling from one camp to another in search of something to do.

Here is another letter addressed to me by an officer in the Army:

It has been my duty to examine for the final physical examination a great number of the men from 38 to 45 which the Army has released over the past many months. I can recall but one man who wasn't tickled to death at the prospect of getting out of the Army. They all had the same opinion—the Army was not training them for a useful role; there were unbelievable bottlenecks in the training program; the Army was wasting manpower on a scale that would not be believed by anyone not actually a witness to it. There is a lack of feeling and understanding in the army of democracy that would do credit to a Hitler. * * *

In a given set-up in a hospital, for instance, if at one time of the day four men are needed for, say, an hour, they have four men all day, and probably two all night. None of them put in a good day's work, with rare exception, where, like as not, some poor devil has more work than two could do. Army men will admit to Army men that the whole business is more of a rest than they have ever had in their whole life, and this at a time when our national existence hangs in the balance. I am not in favor of making men do a lot of work that amounts to "leaf raking" a la W. P. A., of which there is already entirely too much in the Army as it is. If forms and statistics could win the war we would have had it won long ago. The amount of records and red tape required when a soldier develops a sore throat keeps three people busy for a week.

I have a letter from the chairman of a draft board at Carthage, Miss., from which I read as follows:

You are right when you say stop the draft for awhile and you will correct the manpower shortage. Give the millions of idle men that we already have in uniform a chance to do something.

I am chairman of the draft board of my county, above 45 years of age, and don't have any relatives to be drafted into the armed forces, but I have sense enough to see that the drafting of manpower in the armed forces of this Nation is about 12 months ahead of everything else of the war effort.

Best of luck to you.

W. H. WHITE.

Mr. President, I have an article published in the Philadelphia Record, a newspaper which certainly is not anti-administration. I shall read only a portion of the article. The heading is:

Record man slept as much as he worked.

Then a subheading:

Long found all "beds" in bombers filled; craps games and checkers helped kill time.

The article, in part, is:

The night shift bomber line at the Brewster plant in Johnsville is a wonderful place for people who "can go to sleep any time."

A considerable number of my coworkers had that trait—or had acquired it in self-defense after a few nights of boring idleness.

Several times I myself slept more hours than I worked. That wasn't hard to do, because usually my gang got only enough parts to keep us occupied for 2 hours of the 10-hour shift.

There are three good "beds" in every bomber, the front and rear cockpits and the tail. The cockpits have a maximum capacity of four and the tail of one—five sleepers to a plane.

One difficulty was you couldn't use the cockpits of the planes nearest the timekeeper's "crow's nest" over the stockroom. The foreman climbed up there every now and then and might catch you.

As I figured it, there were only 62 safe beds on my section of the line.

On Tuesday, September 7, I ran out of parts at 3 a. m. and started looking for a bed. I got a board and mat, intending to make a bed in a plane tail.

At the first plane I found three girls asleep in the rear cockpit. I went on down the line. Every cockpit was filled to capacity.

I couldn't get into a tail without climbing over the cockpit sleepers, and I didn't want to disturb them. Besides, I might find the tail occupied when I got there. One night when I was dozing in a tail another worker crawled in on top of me, begged my pardon, and crawled out.

Mr. President, can anyone tell me how we are to have good morale in this country when conditions of that sort exist in the factories which are being overstocked with young single men, and when it is then proposed not only to draft fathers but to break up homes and to put out of business many little businessmen?

I read now from a letter received by me from a naval petty officer now stationed at San Francisco:

TWELFTH NAVAL DISTRICT,
San Francisco, Calif., September 17, 1943.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: This may be a little unusual but I want to speak my little piece. I have been reading in the papers about your fight against the father draft, and I wholeheartedly agree with you on your stand. As you may surmise, I am a sailor, storekeeper, first-class, to be specific, married, and the father of a 2½-month-old baby. I want to take the opportunity to point out a few pointed facts in regard to the present draft problem. First: The fathers and the family men of the country are the backbone of the Nation. Solid, dependable, and planning for the future of the families and the welfare of the Nation. If a man with three or four children is drafted into the Army or Navy, receiving a low salary which naturally means a lower standard of living for his family, he wants to feel, and should feel, that his being drafted is because the country really needs his services in the armed forces. However, if such a man is drafted, and, after he is a part of the service, this man cannot help but feel bitterness if he sees many, many young single men with no dependents still in civilian life at good salaries, enjoying all the benefits of a civilian because those men are receiving deferments. By that I mean there is no shortage of men for the services if a great many of the draft deferred were exempt from deferments. May I quote a case or two. In the Navy on Treasure Island we have single, draft-deferred men who are pulling down good wages. Those men are deferred because they are engaged in vital war industry. So what. We sailors are holding down the same types of jobs but we have a uniform. Those men could do the same job in the same degree of efficiency if they were also wearing the uniform. The same holds true in Army and Navy shore establishments all over the country. Why should those men be deferred? Another point is the fact that many men have been turned down because they could not pass a strict physical examination. True, they are not fighting material, but they are working material. Put those men in a special branch of the service where they would be eligible for positions that do not require physical fitness. If a man has flat feet that should not rule him out from doing office work or work that does not require him to be on his feet.

Lately, here on the coast, there has been a big hullabaloo about the shortage of labor. It would make any true American sick to go through the shipyards and see thousands of men standing around, doing little odd jobs to fill in their time. Ten men engaged in a certain piece of work that 2 men could handle. The colleges are filled with young men 18 to 21 taking up social science, history, ancient history, and other subjects that in wartime are silly. If they are not educating themselves along a line that is helpful to their country in time of war they should be pulled out and allowed to finish their education after this mess is over. Take the single men first, there are plenty of them if they would be ferreted out. The trouble with the whole labor situation is that thousands are being used where, before in peacetime (when they were being paid out of the pockets of the employers), hundreds were engaged. And, by God, I'll bet my last nickel that when the war is over and the victory parades are marching up the main streets you will find the slackers riding the white horses at the head, taking all the credit for winning the damn thing. I had better quit now because my blood pressure is going up. This may not make a lot of sense, but I hope you will be able to grasp the general idea. Let them call you a troublemaker and an opportunist, but get the single men who are hiding out before you let them take the fathers.

I am a Montana boy, 26 years old, who has voted for you before and will do it again (if you go after them). I was formerly the State purchasing agent for the National Youth Administration, and was also procurement officer of the proposed winter training camp at West Yellowstone. You have known my father, United States Treasury State procurement officer (formerly) for many years. I have applied for my commission as an ensign in the Supply Corps based on my purchasing experience, but so far have not heard as to whether or not I have received it. I quote the above to show you that I am an average young American. I really have no resentment or rancor against the young civilians, but I do believe that we can win this war without disrupting the families of our country.

I am not sure if this letter will get me in trouble with the Navy, and I am leaving it up to your best judgment as to whether or not you wish to reveal that I wrote it. I do not believe that it contains anything detrimental to the service, but I am still an American with an American's privilege of free speech. Go get 'em.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter coming to me from the State's attorney of Tazewell County, Ill., be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAZEWELL COUNTY, ILL., *August 5, 1943.*
Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senator, Belton, Mont.

DEAR FRIEND: May I congratulate you on your stand against McNutt. There can be no doubt that the people are behind you and they want Congress and not Mr. McNutt or any other administrator to determine the selective-service policy of the country. It seems to me that Congress and the people were lulled into the belief that fathers would not be drafted until later, and that this order of Mr. McNutt's is intended to prevent congressional action on the matter.

I hope you may be given strength in your courageous fight to prevent the drafting of fathers. To further threaten the home by taking fathers seems to me would be disastrous.

Besides the harm to the moral fiber of our country, it is monstrously unjust to draft fathers when single men in such countries as Canada, South Africa, and even Australia are not compelled to leave the shores of their homeland.

I have witnessed the moral degeneracy of the people in my community in the administration of the affairs of my office since this war began, and I know the average citizen has no idea of the magnitude of it, and to what extent the absence of married men and fathers has contributed to it.

Was not the plan for a 10,000,000-man Army devised when we were at our blackest hour? It looked like Russia would collapse then, but now she is on the offensive—and look what has hapepned in north Africa, Sicily, Italy, and the submarine warfare.

May God give you strength to continue to preserve this great Nation.

Sincerely yours,

CLIFFORD E. SCHMIDGALL.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Jesuit Catholic weekly, America, the issue of September 4, 1943, be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Biologically," writes a correspondent, "every child has two parents, but in daily life most of them only one. The father has disappeared." Not completely like the vanishing Indian, but in his capacity as father. Not the least difficult part of any program of family rehabilitation is the task of driving home to fathers the realization that their vocation in life, their essential occupation is, in cooperation with their wives, the building of a home, the raising of a family. Working at a job to supply roof and food and clothing is only part of this essential occupation. Provider and father are not synonymous.

Life in a highly specialized industrial system renders real fatherhood extremely difficult. The very struggle for existence makes the father in many cases a stranger to his family, little more than a frequent or not so frequent guest. At best, the hours he may work at being a father are severely limited. And now comes the draft of all fathers who do not immediately find their way into essential war occupations. Mere fatherhood, the mere responsibility and service of raising a family, is not to be any longer a reason for deferment. Still less the need that the children have of him.

We wish that Washington had found a better way of phrasing that order. If being a father and raising a family is not an essential occupation in war or peace, then what is? We wish, too, that we could feel more certain that this draft of fathers is really what it should be, the last resort of an army that cannot possibly fill its absolutely necessary quota in any other way. It will do us little good to fight this war to victory if at its end family life should have been destroyed.

Already alarming reports from all over the country tell of the evils consequent upon mothers in war work. Some of them have to work, but while they work little children are locked in parked cars all day long, spend lonely hours seeing the same movie over and over again while waiting for mother's return, and worse still, are falling in frightening numbers into ways of crime from which there is seldom any escape. Shall we now add to working wives those 400,000 more whose husbands are to be drafted? It is not a pleasant prospect.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me read now a letter written by a resident of Portland, Oreg. In the letter the writer quotes a letter he received from a soldier. The letter reads as follows:

AUGUST 9, 1943.
Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I note with appreciation your effort to protect the pre-Pearl Harbor fathers from the designs of the great politician from Indiana—Paul McNutt.

I wonder how many of these men, with this plan in mind, were reared in homes without a father; do they know the unbalanced home life this situation brings upon a growing family of boys and girls. No woman can rear a family, educate it, give them all the moral support they require and earn a living for them. Whether the family is large or small. Such families are cheated in many ways. I know, I was one of six reared without a father.

When one goes to an orphanage to adopt a boy or girl, will that orphanage let that child go into a home where there is no father, or no mother; they will not.

Then, why is this demented group trying to make a law to do just that?

There is something that the people working in defense work know, that if every man and woman on the job, put their shoulder to the wheel and did a real day's work, they could run the plant on about one-half the personnel. The waste in money and man-hours is a disgrace, but with cost plus—who cares. In some Army camps, I do not know that this applies to all, but I understand there is one man in the medical division to every seven soldiers, and a lot of people think that there are a lot in this part of the service to avoid combat duty, more wasted men. Why all the men in the Ordnance, and just look who they are, people have a lot of opinions about that too, and they are not complimentary to the Ordnance Department.

When we Americans are called upon to ruin America, we begin to wonder why.

A man is put in the air division, and after 6 months or so of training, at enormous expense to the taxpayer, and a loss of his time, he is given a physical, and at a long last it is discovered that his eyes do not cross properly over the bridge of his nose. Why was not this physical given before he started such training, and all this waste in time and money prevented?

Here is an excerpt from a letter just received from a soldier, "the Army has so many men they don't know what to do with them. I used to say the shipyards were inefficient and wasteful, but this Army takes the prize. There are millions of man-hours wasted that could be used in defense plants." One hears things like this on all sides.

Then the administration wonders about why the riots.

One in Vancouver, Wash., last week.

One really wonders how long Americans will be pushed around by a bunch of sadistic nitwits.

And then they ask children to give up their fathers.

Having been one of a family reared without a father I am bitterly against it.

With the greatest respect for the Senate and Congress of the United States of America, may they now represent the people and protect them from a frankenstein executive.

Respectfully,

J. A. STARR,
Portland, Oreg.

Mr. President, I next ask to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter received by me from a resident of Baltimore, Md.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BALTIMORE, MD., *September 17, 1943.*
Senator WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been following up your plan on the subject to defer fathers from draft and place unmarried men in position to be drafted. I heartily endorse your plan as I consider your viewpoint the only true and best one.

For the past 6 months I have tried to enlist in the Army Air Corps, but was told by my employer that my services were essential to the war effort and that I could not be replaced. Due to a change in operating conditions the company now has a replacement for my job but still refuses to release me.

I am single, 23 years of age, have no dependents and have passed both the mental and physical examinations of the Army Air Corps. I applied for immediate voluntary induction at my draft board but was refused on the ground that I have no release from my employer.

At the present time my draft board is inducting fathers. This action is not justified!

I have resigned my position at the Glenn L. Martin Aircraft Co., therefore I'll have plenty of spare time on my hands.

I am willing to appear in Washington at any time to give you the details on this case if you so desire.

Yours truly,

JOHN W. ZGUD.

Mr. WHEELER. I ask unanimous consent that a letter received by me from the president of the Maywood Electric Co., Maywood, Ill., be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAYWOOD ELECTRIC CO., INC.,
Maywood, Ill., September 18, 1943.
Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In sympathy with your efforts in connection with the draft, I have some information which might help you. A relation of mine is working on aircraft motors at the Melrose Park Buick plant and finishes his consignment of work before his lunch period and has no work to do thereafter. This condition exists in other plants in this section, but would be hard for an outsider to detect as the foreman has a signal by which he signals the men when a stranger or a higher-up approaches and the men then become active at any old thing.

I know that in the end we are paying for this waste and hope that it will do some good to uncover the waste and help the war effort, and help to show that the plants do not need all the draft-exempt single men.

Very truly yours,

DON ZUGENBUEHLER.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter received by me from Harry J. Ferguson, of Philadelphia, Pa.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, *September 20, 1943.*
Senator WHEELER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: The writer wishes to inform you that he is 100 percent behind you in your fight against the drafting of fathers and breaking up of American homes, unless absolutely necessary.

As you are well aware, the Government, the arsenals, and navy yards, besides shipbuilding corporations, and airplane factories all claim exemption for single men, most of whom never worked at the occupations they are now employed at until the war or draft came along.

Keep up the good fight, and I know that plenty of my friends feel that you are doing something that will pay dividends to the country as a whole in many years to come.

Yours very truly,

HARRY J. FERGUSON.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I read now a telegram received by me from St. Petersburg, Fla.:

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA., *September 15, 1943.*
Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Associated Press story August 22, 1943, from London quoting Brazilian ambassador stating Brazil has army of 300,000 and expeditionary force ready to fight and awaiting orders from Allied high command to proceed to battle front. Can't 19 other New World nations provide enough men to prevent drafting fathers? They, too, have something to safeguard. Drafting fathers is definitely a job for Congress.

THOMAS G. GREENE,
President, National Policy Association.

Incidentally, Mr. President, when questions were asked about what South American countries were furnishing men or were to furnish men, I thought it was stated that such information was a military secret and could not be given to the public. However, now we find that a man in St. Petersburg, Fla., has obtained the information from an article by the Associated Press, coming from London.

I read now a letter from the pastor of the Methodist Church at Hiltons, Va.:

MARSH FELLOWSHIP GROUP,
Hiltons, Va., September 20, 1943.
Senator WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for the stand you have taken in drafting fathers.

You are not fighting alone.

We are with you in sentiment and with our prayers, in the common sense demand to investigate the hoarding of manpower in so many of our plants.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. WILLIAM MARSH,
Pastor, Methodist Church, Hiltons, Va.

I read now a telegram coming to me from an official of a radio station at St. Joseph, Mo.:

ST. JOSEPH, MO., *September 15, 1943.*
Senator BURTON WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:

I believe sentiment strong against draft of fathers. Let the rest of the world help fight its own war. Favor drafting Canadians and South Americans. Would like to know if only Russians and Americans have the heritage to die on a battlefield for democracy.

LEE BARRON.

I read now an extract from a letter coming to me from Mr. Sam Clark, of Winston-Salem, N. C.:

What does the Army need with the fathers of our country when it is releasing thousands of men every day that have only minor defects?

* * * * *

I know that every father in our country would consider it an honor to serve his country if they were needed, but we want to be sure of it before we break up our homes.

Mr. President, I have received the following letter from C. F. Lacy, of Tyler, Tex.:

TYLER DAD'S CLUB,
Tyler, Tex., September 15, 1943.
Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: Your efforts toward preventing the drafting of fathers is greatly appreciated by the membership of this organization and also by other fathers the country over.

One of our members works in the finance office at Camp Fannin, Tex., and has talked with the 702 enlisted men of that camp who were discharged last month as they received their final pay from him. Having previously worked at the east Texas induction station in Tyler, he knows that fully 75 percent of

these 702 men discharged from Camp Fannin last month are physically better fit than are many men now being drafted at the Tyler station.

Can these discharges be the Army's way of building up figures to help defeat your proposal? We think so.

Very sincerely yours,

C. F. LACY,

(For the 257 members of the Tyler Dad's Club.)

The following is an extract from a letter written to me by Mrs. Perry Eakes, of Sevierville, Tenn.:

Here in this town there are still single boys that have war jobs, but they could be replaced. So until all the single and childless married men are taken, please try your hardest to keep the fathers with the families.

A letter has been forwarded to me by a resident of Fairfax, Va., whose brother is a soldier stationed in Arizona. The following is an extract from the soldier's letter:

I think they may be saving us for a parade in New York when the war is over. Well, you said we should be good soldiers now, after being in so long; well, here's the truth, we have a couple of thousand men in the hospital and about 1,600 A. W. O. L. right now, so I don't think we could fight our way out of a paper bag We don't even have any rifles and being in 18 months and we used wooden ones on maneuvers. That's a good laugh.

The following letter has been sent to me from Tulsa, Okla.:

TULSA, OKLA., *September 19, 1943.*

Senator WHEELER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: From what I hear, which I think is correct, thousands of people in this and other States are wondering why the Army turns away big husky and healthy men who have a little trouble with their feet and men with punctured ear drums and single men and those with wives only, some married after Pearl Harbor, in order to draft fathers who were married and buying homes and have children. We want to know, too, who can buy War bonds and support their families any better or as well as these fathers. These young husky and healthy young fellows with flat feet, etc., can walk and hear as well as anyone. Why cannot they serve as M. P.'s and put those boys in the ranks? I am certain a great percent of the people of this country stand with you on your position in this regard.

Very respectfully yours,

J. H. ELLIOTT.

The following is an extract from a letter sent to me by a soldier stationed at Hamilton Field, Calif.:

Naturally being a member of the Armed Forces, I cannot speak from any other point of view on the subject of the father draft than that which meets my eye from day to day. My observations have led me to believe that if the present number in the Army Air Corps were used as any going concern would use their men, the present number now in the Army would be sufficient for some time to come.

The following is an extract from a letter addressed to me by Mrs. Don Marsh, of Bristol, Tenn.:

I know from personal observation that labor is being hoarded in cost-plus Government plants. Their actual work is not more than 2 or 3 hours a day. I know, too, that most fathers are not going to make the best soldiers and when they are taken our country will be disrupted beyond repair.

The following is an extract from a letter received by me from a resident of Glen Gardner, N. J.:

NEW JERSEY SANATORIUM
FOR TUBERCULOUS DISEASES,
Glen Gardner, N. J., September 18, 1943.

Senator B. K. WHEELER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In support of your efforts to keep pre-Pearl Harbor fathers at home, may I point your attention to the fact that thousands of single men hide in so-called essential jobs. These young men must be drafted first, as nobody is so essential that he cannot be replaced.

Myself, being a 4-F, like millions in the same classification, could be used more effectively, too.

I agree with you, all should be done to preserve the homes of married people.

Wishing you success in your efforts,

Truly yours,

WALTER RAAB, M. D.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article by Dr. Pitirin A. Sorokin, of Harvard University.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARVARD EXPERT HITS FATHER DRAFT—DR. SOROKIN SEES DROP IN BIRTH RATE, DELINQUENCY, DIVORCE RISE RESULTING

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In the following dispatch, Dr. Pitirin A. Sorokin, chairman of the sociology department at Harvard, describes the biological, sociological, and moral dangers involved in the proposed drafting of 446,000 pre-Pearl Harbor fathers.)

(By Dr. Pitirin A Sorokin)

Drafting of fathers will affect families in many diverse ways. In black and white, the main effects can be cataloged in the following manner:

Biologically: Drafting will tend to decrease the birth rate in many families if fathers are away for a long time. Sickness, accidents, and deterioration of health—especially of children—will increase in some cases, due to a lowered standard of living.

Psychologically: The draft will spread sadness, sorrow, anxiety, and insecurity among most families. Various psychoneuroses will result in a portion of these families. However, the grace of duty and sacrifice for the common good will alleviate this condition.

Economically: The income of a greater part of the families involved will be decreased. Their material standard of living would be lowered. Material hardships would increase. The drafting of fathers would force members of the family to separate to hunt for additional jobs. The work burden of mother and children would increase.

Morally and religiously: For good families with a strong love, devotion, and loyalty, the draft will intensify and deepen moral stamina, religiosity, sense of duty and devotion. In loose and weak families the results are likely to be opposite.

Drafting of fathers in weak families is apt to cause demoralization, irreligiosity, even criminality—especially of the youth and children.

"Loss of dad" has different effects upon children of different families and in different conditions. When children lose their father through divorce (which implies a weak family), a higher juvenile delinquency results than when they lose their fathers by death. In weak families, the draft would increase the neglect of children in many ways, also contributing to an increase in juvenile delinquency.

Finally, the effects of drafting will also be different in the unity, cohesion, and stability of the family itself—in the union of husband and wife, parents and children. The sacrifice of drafting will reinforce and cement the unity of good families. In families devoid of the grace of love and devotion, conscription will contribute greatly to their disintegration and dissolution.

In such families, we shall expect an increase of marital infidelity on the part of parents, eventually resulting in an increase in divorce, separation, and desertion. Children in such families will scatter and go astray. A portion of these will become "wild," demoralized, and delinquent.

Of these contradictory effects, the negative ones mentioned probably will prevail somewhat in the Nation as a whole over the positive ones. For this reason the drafting of fathers of many and young children must be resorted to only when all the other sources of manpower are exhausted.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, the following is a letter received by me from Mr. Tyrus Hillway, dean of the Evening College, Hillyer Junior College, Hartford, Conn.:

HILLYER JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Hartford, Conn., September 15, 1943.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: The radio commentators today are saying that the severe fighting at Salerno is causing "many opponents of the father draft to reconsider their positions." If this is true, it reflects a stupidity which I cannot believe characteristic of the Members of Congress.

If our leaders change their long-range plans at every turn of the wind, we are in a desperate position indeed. Certainly, the induction of fathers could not affect the war situation for at least a year. It seems to me that the executive branch of our Government is in dire need of some intelligent guidance from Congress.

American fathers are not opposed to being inducted if the need actually exists, even though it means great suffering for wives and children. They do insist, however, upon fair and honest dealing which it is quite apparent they are not receiving now at the hands of the administration.

Very truly yours,

TYRUS HILLWAY,
Dean, Evening College.

The following is an extract from a letter received by me from Mrs. Ella Burgnes, of Chuckey, Tenn.:

Could you find out why the married men with children are being wanted when able-bodied single men are being sent back home?

Here is one from Caddo, Tex.:

Why doesn't the Army call the Reserves (enrolled as of about June) from such slacker havens as Bruce Field, Ballinger, Tex.? It is not fair for a bunch of newly wed mechanics definitely of draft age to work there as civilians while cadets risk their necks there to learn to die for their country at Army pay. These cadets don't get time and a half for overtime, either.

Here is a telegram from a lawyer of Syracuse, N. Y.:

Canada does not require even single men to be drafted for European service without consent. Ought American fathers be sent to Europe while Canadian single men are permitted to stay home?

Here is a letter from Newport, Ky.:

Irreparable damage to the morale of citizens will certainly follow this apparently unnecessary move.

What kind of spirit can a father married for years display when his constant thought will be at home with his small children? Scores of homes will be broken up permanently, delinquencies will be increased manyfold, and human misery will be at its peak.

Here is a letter written from Orlando, Fla., by a salesman connected with the Brown-Williamson Tobacco Co., of Louisville, Ky.:

God speed your bill on this, but make it 50 years of age instead of 45 and start with single men first; married, no children, next, and so on, etc. The day you do I shall be one of the first to leave this nonessential job I am on for the armed forces, as I had started to when all came up some time back and with which I have so many times been discouraged at my age of 42 years and A-1 health.

Here is one from a soldier stationed at the Army airfield at Amarillo, Tex.:

Men in the Army assigned to do clerical work are made up of inexperienced 20- to 25-year-olds who do nothing but blunder, and consequently each job or operation has many more men than are actually needed. To make an estimate, I should say that at least one out of every four men under the age of 30 now doing clerical work could easily be sent to more important theaters of operation without the slightest loss to the efficiency of the organization.

Here is one from Ohio Northern University, Ada, Ohio:

I congratulate you upon your stand against drafting fathers at this time. There are thousands of unmarried men literally loafing in war plants who should go to the Army first. An investigation by Congress would show that in many of these plants as much work or more could be done by one-half the force. These men do not have sense enough to know that they, their children, and their grandchildren will pay for this loafing at the people's expense.

Here is one from Birmingham, Ala.:

In this district 18- and 19-year-old boys are being employed in industry, listed as "chemists" and granted exemption from the draft for occupational reasons. At the same time applications for employment from older men with equal or superior training are being ignored.

Here is one from Lexington, Ky.:

I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for your efforts in trying to protect the family life of America by preventing the drafting of fathers.

The necessity of drafting fathers, in my opinion, has not come.

When one sees big husky men from 18 to 30 and single, walking the streets and hanging around the beer and pool parlors, he wonders just what the idea is anyway.

Here is one from Savannah, Ga.:

I hope you will get enough support on your bill prohibiting drafting of fathers until it is necessary. It is not my belief that is necessary yet with so many young men walking the streets exempt from some technicality.

I personally know three unmarried young men here in Savannah under the above category, there must be lots more here I don't know about, and millions over the whole country. I also know that one of the above young men is a good mechanic, one is doing clerical work in a shipyard, the other in school under some pretense. As long as conditions like this exist, I am bitterly opposed to drafting fathers.

Here is one from New Orleans, La.:

In your admirable fight to get the Army to quit hoarding men, you might ask General Marshall why is it that the post exchanges of the Army are run by combat age men instead of older men that cannot go to the front. I call on post exchanges and most of the personnel is composed of younger men, an older man here and there, but in the main they are all young officers.

Here is one from Birmingham, Ala.:

I am 21 years of age, single, in good health, and am not in service because of a minor eye defect. I feel I should have been in service long ago, and know I am better qualified to perform duties in service than some already in. I want to get in very much. I went for a physical examination a few months ago, was turned down and told I would be called back. On the second day of last month, I was given a blood test and reclassified 1-AL. It has now been over a month since this took place and they keep telling me the limited service order has not come in.

Here is one from Maplewood, N. J.:

Ask any of your colleagues, who seem to be faltering under the "upstairs pressure" that is being used on them, the following question: What did the boys who have gone overseas, who have died or been injured, go for? Did they go to protect their counterparts hiding in so-called essential jobs or dubiously referred as 4-F's, who the "pressure" seeks to protect by defeating your bill? Or did they go to protect the American way of living—which is the family and all this responsible way of life represents?

Here is one from Spartanburg, S. C.:

We have thousands of 4-F men and others who were called prior to Pearl Harbor that should be reclassified, and I am sure thousands of these men would now be accepted and should be before the drafting of fathers. I am an old "war one" veteran and I know there are many who were rejected on minor physical defects such as slight eye sight vision, and even flat feet, who could be used in noncombat service and replace thousands of others who could be used in combat service, therefore eliminating the drafting of fathers until it becomes absolutely necessary.

The letter is signed by A. F. Williams.

Here is a telegram from Minneapolis:

Drafting fathers means war is lost on home fronts.

Here is a letter from Asheville, N. C., signed by the owner of the Dr. Pepper Bottling Co.:

DR. PEPPER BOTTLING CO.
OF ASHEVILLE, INC.,
Asheville, N. C., September 21, 1943.

Senator WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This letter is not written with any idea of protesting the drafting pre-Pearl Harbor fathers but to call to your attention the fact that the War Manpower Commission is wasting lots of men.

We are on the nondeferable list and in hiring men we have hundreds of them come in to see us that have been working on defense work and cannot get a job. The employment office will not let them work for us and they cannot place those men. As a result, these men must loaf or be moved to the west coast.

Men are returning to this area every day by the hundreds because they have been cut off of jobs. A few weeks ago they cut off 11,000 men at the shipyards in Wilmington, N. C., and about the same time a large number were cut off the yards at Savannah, Ga. These are facts, as I have known these men for years. They cannot go to work for me or 99 percent of the businesses in this area.

It seems to me that men that have been trained in defense work for a year or two should not be sent back home without any work but should be sent to places where they are needed. These men left the home jobs for the big pay and should not be allowed to come home now and do nothing.

There are more men available for work in this area than at any time in the past 2 years. These things should be corrected, and if you do not believe me send someone down and let me run an ad in the paper for help and see how many men come in and what they say.

Yours very truly,

JACK BARFIELD, *Owner.*

Here is one from the Switchmen's Union of North America, Local No. 296, at Westweo, La.:

I apologize that I burden you, but I cannot refrain from commending your press statement in substance: "Why continue to draft Americans while we lend-lease billions to European countries that have not contributed one soldier to fight."

Here is one from Dalton Brothers, of Pocahontas, Ark.:

I speak the sentiment of thousands of folks in my section of the South when I say we highly appreciate the stand which you have taken in regards to the drafting of prewar fathers.

It is the general opinion of the people that we have enough men in the armed forces now. The crying need at the present time is not more men but more equipment and supplies.

Here is a letter from Stephenville, Tex.:

It is widely believed here that a second front has not been opened before because Churchill insisted that the invasion force be composed of 70 percent American and 30 percent British troops, the population ratio.

If this is true our paying tribute to the British Empire has not yet ceased. Must we do the bleeding, the feeding, and the paying?

Let me say that that is not the first time I have heard that statement. I invite attention to an article entitled, "What's Happening in Washington," published in the Accountants Weekly News Letter, section 2, under date of August 30, 1943. As I understand, this news letter is widely read by businessmen.

It is widely believed here that a second front has not been opened before because Churchill insisted that the invasion force be composed of 70 percent Americans and 30 percent British troops, the population ratio.

I certainly hope that nothing of that kind happened, because I am sure it would raise a great deal of bad feeling if it had happened.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from a man who signs himself "Thomas Edgar Bussey, a Cleveland Democrat."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BALTIMORE, MD., *September 18, 1943.*
HON. BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Relative to drafting of fathers for the armed forces, may I suggest that generalities and very sketchy statements of needs should not be made the basis for inducting more men or women. Congress most certainly should have facts if we are to believe anything we hear.

There are millions of men and women in uniform scattered all over this vast country. Colleges, hotels, camps are overrun. Also there are vast unused contingents in England, Ireland, and Persia. Besides, every island in the Atlantic, from Iceland to the lower tip of South America, has its quota. And do not overlook Alaska and the adjacent islands.

What is the purpose of building up this tremendous body of fighting men? Do we contemplate fighting Russia and helping England keep India in servitude?

Respectfully,

THOS. EDGAR BUSSEY,
(*A Cleveland Democrat*).

Mr. WHEELER. Here is a letter from the Brown Shipbuilding Corporation, of Houston, Tex.:

The Brown Shipbuilding Corporation, of this city, has 60,000 men on their pay roll just to keep 20,000 men at work. Ten thousand of these men are married men without children or single men which have been given deferments due to their jobs. If this condition exists all over the country, I can't see why we should have to draft men with children and break up homes.

Here is one from an English professor at the New Jersey State Teachers College at Montclair, N. J.:

In your campaign to prevent induction of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, suggest you call attention to the Army's systematic release of many thousands of single men, already trained at Government expense, on the ground of disabilities they had when they were inducted. These are the so-called 1-B or limited-service inductees. They were taken in, in great numbers, a year ago, and all were trained to do things a limited-service man can do Now they are being bounced, and the Army wants fathers of families.

Here is a letter from an official of a firm engaged in defense work in Brillon, Wis.:

Receiving continued expressions on the operation of labor at the shipyards, where a cost-plus contract prevails, makes the writer, together with the general public, feel that Washington does not intend to make any corrections and we will have to continue to suffer due to the lack of manpower, and pay excessive taxes due to conditions of this kind existing throughout the country. We feel satisfied that if all labor is properly utilized in this territory, several thousand men could be released from some of these plants.

Here is a letter from Brownwood, Tex.:

With newspapers all over the country harping on child delinquency, with medical shortage, the nursing shortage, the father is needed at home to take care of these children.

I now read a telegram which I have received from Robertsville, Ala.:

Stick by the ship on draft question. Drafting fathers unnecessary this year. Ask any intelligent businessman with experience and you will find them all with you. We must carry on at home to back up soldiers abroad.

Here is a letter from Reverend Owen, of the Presbyterian Church, Long Island, N. Y.:

As a clergyman calling on the homes of my parishioners, I hear so many mothers asking "What am I going to do if my husband is called into the Army? I cannot go to work and leave two, three, or four children to carry on as they please."

It seems to me that this thing is going to undermine the whole structure of the home life of our country; we know how difficult it is to manage the children today. With the father's care, guidance, and authority removed, the childlife throughout our land will be a chaos.

Another thing, a father dragged from his home, longing and pining for his children, will make a very poor soldier.

I live only a few minutes' ride from Long Beach, Long Island, N. Y. I went there to spend a couple of hours on Labor Day.

I wish some of our draft boards and Congressmen could see the young men sprawling on the beaches whilst other young men of our land are bleeding and dying in Europe and the Pacific.

I now read from a letter which I have received from the pastor of a Baptist Church in North Wales, Pa.:

You may like to hear from one of the many ministers who have the task of maintaining morale on the home front where the drafting of men for the services is felt so keenly. You may be sure that the country is solidly back of you in your fight against the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers.

A man from Pocahontas, Ark., says he thinks that 95 percent of the people in that State would state frankly and emphatically that they were unconditionally opposed to the drafting of pre-war fathers.

He adds this note:

I am a public official myself and also occupy responsible positions, and I assure you that I will stand behind my statements in this matter before any man or set of men.

A dental surgeon from Raleigh, N. C., says:

I am a life-long Democrat, but not one with a ring in his nose, and I am writing to you to tell you that I believe the South is with you wholeheartedly in your effort to wipe off the slate this defenseless plan to draft fathers.

He adds this postscript:

I am very much beyond the draft age; 60 years old.

I now read from a letter received from the director of a child-care center in Rochester, N. Y., one of the largest cities of New York State:

I am poignantly aware of the problems already created by mothers going to work. How much these problems will be multiplied when any large numbers of fathers are taken out of the homes one prefers not to contemplate. A father draft would most quickly destroy that for which we are ardently fighting, the safeguarding of the American home.

I now read from a letter received from Dallas, Tex. The letter was written by a representative of electrical manufacturers, and states in part as follows:

With our very much "covered up" system of socialized education going on right under our noses, the total number of men now in colleges and schools all over this territory would certainly swell the useful Army a lot.

I know of several cases of young men who were drafted and sent to some college over a year ago and have done nothing but loaf since that time. If they, Selective Service, are so worked up about their being properly educated, set up a plan whereby they could go to school after the war.

Here is a letter from the Irish War Veterans of the United States, Hill Post No. 39, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

We, war veterans of the United States, desire to protest against the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers in the present war, while hundreds of thousands of single, able-bodied young men of draft age continue to occupy "bombproof" Federal positions throughout our country, and particularly in Washington.

I now read from a letter received from the president of the Catholic Women's Club of Rochester, N. Y.:

Twelve hundred members of the Catholic Women's Club of Rochester, N. Y., wish to go on record as opposed to the drafting of men who were married and the fathers of children born previous to Pearl Harbor.

Here is a letter received from an attorney at Raymondville, Tex.:

If it were necessary to draft fathers, their feelings in the matter, and those of the people in general would be different, for you won't find any better Americans than the Texans. But the sentiment of the people in general is that it is not necessary at this time, and that there are too many men in the service now.

Here is a letter from an insurance man at Cranford, N. J.:

Nothing that has happened thus far in this war is more demoralizing to this country than this unnecessary agitation. I do not believe that we are in such a bad way that this needs to take place.

A great many men that I know feel the same as I do on this matter of drafting fathers. I am myself 64 years of age and a member of a draft board in New Jersey.

Here is a letter from the Indianapolis Star:

I'll swear that a married man past 38 (I'm 42) without children can put his mind more on war than can a younger man who has a bunch of kids at home to worry about.

I now read a telegram received from Columbia, Tenn.:

Investigate Tennessee draft board single men and men with no children plentiful. No need to draft fathers. Compromise on 30 years so won't deprive many children of fathers.

Here is a telegram from the Evangelical Ministerial Association of Mobile, Ala.:

You have our sincere appreciation and hearty applause for your stand against drafting fathers of children which sacrifices and jeopardizes our American homes.

Here is a letter from Atlanta, Ga.:

I sincerely appreciate your efforts in delaying the drafting of married men with children under Selective Service until this move is absolutely essential, if ever.

There are many thousands of other persons who feel this same appreciation and who hope that your efforts will continue to be successful. We are all loyal Americans, wanting to help the war effort in every necessary way, but not wanting family life completely disrupted if this is not necessary.

I now read from a letter received from the editor of a church paper, the Evangelical-Messenger, Harrisburg, Pa.:

Only under extreme necessity, which apparently does not presently exist, should homes be broken by the induction of fathers into national service and their wives and children be made to face the privations and sacrifices which would inevitably follow.

Here is a letter from a teacher who is now a private in the Army stationed in Maine:

FORT WILLIAMS, MAINE,
September 15, 1943.

The Honorable BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my thanks for the view you have taken regarding the Army manpower problem. I thoroughly agree with your statement that "the Army is the greatest waster of manpower in the country." I am sure that I am expressing the views of many soldiers when I say that lying around in camps after the basic training has been completed is very detrimental to the morale of the boys.

I am describing briefly my situation, not because I am complaining but because I feel that it is a typical situation of the average soldier in this camp.

Prior to induction I was a high-school teacher in a small Iowa town, and I could have been deferred for several months to finish the school year. However, I felt that my college training and experience would enable me to contribute something useful to the service. After successfully completing my basic training I was assigned to the Coast Artillery, and since then I have been fighting the "battle of Casco Bay" with brooms and mops. The old National Guard men have taken up most of the ratings and apparently are entrenched here for the duration.

The men laugh about the "Boy Scout camp." It is also known to us as "officers' paradise," with the main emphasis being put on "spit and polish."

I could be filling one of the 30,000 teaching vacancies that exist throughout the United States. However, I am going along day after day working at K. P. and other flunky work. My college degree isn't doing me much good.

Last week was the first time that a number of the boys had fired a rifle since 1941.

Again I repeat, I'm not complaining—just wondering.

Yours very respectfully.

Here is a letter from a court reporter of the fourteenth judicial district of the State of Minnesota, reading in part as follows:

What is to become of my family on a soldier's income? Are they to be forced to become dependent on charity? My income as a private plus the Government dependency allowance will only pay my rent and grocery bill. Who is going to furnish clothing, fuel, light, water, medical, dental, recreational, and other necessary items?

I now read from a letter received from Austin, Tex.:

As one of thousands, I merely want to express my feelings about the induction of fathers, knowing full well that my letter will be only a straw trying to stem the tide. It is a known fact—stressed daily by radio, press, and lecture platform—that juvenile delinquency is increasing by leaps and bounds. J. Edgar Hoover and others are placing most of the blame at the doorsteps of homes, especially of broken homes. When you take the fathers, will not the homes be broken just the same—if not by divorce, by separation nonetheless?

Here is a letter from an attorney in Greensburg, Pa.:

Since the size of the armed forces was numerically fixed several months ago, favorable developments have occurred within recent weeks which should have the effect of revising downward the original statistics. Important strategic bases have been seized by the Allies at the cost of only negligible casualties. France has an Army ready to go of at least 300,000; and, over the past week end, Brazil has offered 300,000 well-trained soldiers for overseas service.

I now read from a letter which I have received from Columbia, S. C.:

I believe the drafting of fathers into the armed forces would be a national calamity, necessitating, as it will and must, the complete disruption of family life and the consequent burden upon our country's social and economic structure.

Here is a letter from Margaret, Ala.:

I don't believe I would miss it very far to say 90 percent of the people would vote against the drafting of fathers. The question would then be, Why not?

Here is a letter from the Union Memorial Hospital, Baltimore, Md.:

Might I suggest that all men rejected at induction for minor ailments be reexamined? For instance, 2 weeks ago I was rejected for a small hernia which I never knew that I had. A minor operation with 2 weeks' hospitalization would remedy this. I have heard of many other men with similar ailments who have also been bitterly disappointed as I was to find that they were rejected.

I now read from a letter received from Long Beach, Calif.:

I am an orphan, 1917 vintage. My father died somewhere in France, leaving my mother, my twin sister and I. We were 18 months old when our dad left us. I've cried many long, weary nights all through my childhood and even yet for my dad.

Here is a letter received from Columbus, Ohio, enclosing a clipping from the Washington Whirligig.

SEPTEMBER 16, 1943.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing a clipping taken from the Ohio State Journal, Columbus, Ohio, which I believe substantiates your position relative to drafting fathers. I thought this might give you some clue as to the War Department's position when again matters do not seem consistent in Washington.

It certainly is time that men in Washington become more consistent in making statements and not one thing today and something else tomorrow. Many of my friends feel the same way and we are hoping your continued efforts will form a definite plan.

Very truly yours,

H. D. EPLER,
Columbus, Ohio.

The clipping reads as follows:

WASHINGTON WHIRLIGIG—NO NEED FOR DADS—ICKES BURROWS IN—DEWEY HAS A PLAN

(By Ray Tucker)

The War Department's private personnel files reveal that there is no need for drafting pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, according to insiders. Without tapping this reservoir, the military can obtain all the recruits necessary to wage the conflict to a finish.

Selective Service has mobilized 11,000,000 men for land, air, and sea forces. Approximately 1,500,000 have been rejected for mental or physical reasons, leaving a fighting strength of 9,500,000.

Messrs. Stimson and Knox want another 1,000,000 or thereabouts to fill their quotas. They can muster that number without trouble or calling up newlyweds, who often do not make good soldiers and sailors because of loneliness and emotional upsets.

Secretary Stimson's spokesmen have told Capitol Hill committees again and again that the Army opposes conscription of young fathers. But for some unknown reason President Roosevelt insists upon it and his yeomen have had to bow to his wishes.

Selective Service officials, however, may outwit the man in the White House. The Hersheyites have ruled that if they cannot get another 1,000,000 warriors by October 15, they will induct parents. They fully anticipate that Congress will block such a movement by enactment of specific legislation.

I ask that portions of a number of letters which I have received be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, the parts to be inserted being those on the red slips accompanying each letter. By doing so the time of the Senate, as well as space in the RECORD, will be saved.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

An official of the Combs College of Music in Philadelphia suggests:

We hear a great deal about the size of our armed forces necessary to properly prosecute this war. I think it would be a good idea if we knew something about the size of the armed forces of our allies. Of course, we must figure that Russia has a great Army by what they are accomplishing. We do not hear about the size of the British forces. Early in the war someone in England said, "Give us the tools and we will do the job," and that they did not want our men.

The writer adds:

My opinion is impartial, because none of my family are affected. My two sons have children, quite young, but they (the sons) are both over 45.

From my own State of Montana comes this letter:

Captain Lindstrom (the writer's husband) enlisted in December 1941, and has served in the battle fronts of New Guinea and is now back in Australia.

I am proud of his doing his part, but I do know what it means to have the daddy away from the children and the home.

Captain has had malaria three times and how I do hope and pray that he can be replaced and brought back to the States where he can regain his strength.

This one is from Little Rock, Ark.:

You are correct. There is entirely too much politics during this emergency. In fact this is a weakness of this administration. Politics motivates about every move and not the welfare of the Nation.

If the Constitution is followed, major policies should be decided by Congress, in war as well as in peace, and the President should carry out the wishes of the Congress.

This one is from the United Spanish War Veterans of Friars Point, Miss.:

We have more men now than we can put on the fighting front for at least 3 years

with all the transportation we have in sight, so why take more men out of civilian life to put in the Army?

The other evening I contacted a husky captain of about 34 years at French Lick Hotel, who was recruiting WACS with a nice looking WAC lieutenant and who were paying $15 a day each at that swanky hotel, and the taxpayers were meeting the bill. I am sure (I am a soldier of two wars) that we have too much social affairs in our Army and a lot of hurrah stuff that can be done away with and if men are needed, let's take some of these nonessential ducks and make 'em fight in place of taking the fathers out of civil life and away from their children.

From a West Virginia State senator:

Your efforts in opposition to the drafting of fathers is entitled to, and I believe will, receive universal approval.

From an official of the Franklin School in West Allis, Wis.:

The people of this section of Wisconsin admire your stand regarding the drafting of fathers. Should it be necessary to tear apart the American families whose integrity forms the backbone of our fine country?

From an attorney of Neosho, Mo.:

It seems like with an Army as big as it is, and all the help we have given the European people, we surely ought to be doing enough.

From a retired Methodist minister of Hampden-Sydney, Va.:

Why not raise the age of the single and childless? Are not fathers already serving their country just as needfully in bringing up a family? Let's have a show-down of the numbers England, Ireland, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and Africa have in the armed forces.

This is from a Decherd, Tenn., merchant:

There is a great hue and cry about juvenile delinquency all over the country, and one wonders how much greater this will become with so many mothers working and fathers taken into the service. The sanctity of our homes is one of the reasons our boys have for fighting this war and to have our homes so upset will be, in my estimation, ruinous.

Here is a letter from Chillicothe, Mo.:

I have not changed my original idea in that I feel that it will be disastrous to draft fathers and break up the American homes, and I feel that, if this is done, thousands of these homes will never be reestablished. I also feel that if this matter is left up to the Army and Navy that they will have every man, woman, and child in the armed forces or defense plants, and I feel that it is just as necessary that we keep the home front going, and I feel that the home front has contributed about all that it can to the cause.

From Haworth, N. J.:

There is little doubt that manpower is being squandered in many of our most important war industries. One case was reported to me just recently where an individual, after working for a period of 2 days on a job at one of the largest airplane factorie in the country, was instructed to slow down because he did an honest, average day's work. I have been told that in this same plant five carpenters spent all of 1 day to hang an ordinary screen door.

While these are isolated incidents there is every reason to believe that it is indicative of general conditions. An honest investigation of the country's manpower situation is urgently needed, not merely in connection with the drafting of fathers but also to curb the terrific waste of money that is being imposed on the American people.

From Los Angeles:

My purpose in writing this letter is to make you forcibly aware of the fact that however inarticulate these people may be, however unable to express their fear and resentment at the treatment dished out to them by this administration, nevertheless they await with great anxiety the outcome of your struggle. For they know it is, in a very deep way, their struggle. A struggle to preserve the only remaining bulwark against the flood of bureaucratic ukases—the home.

From Weldon, N. C.:

Your recent remark, "playing politics with American lives" struck a true note of accord with the convictions of my heart. As one in a group of thousands, I fail to see the urgent need of drafting fathers into the armed services when there are thousands of young single men like myself who are eager and willing to go.

From Lookout, Okla.:

It is my understanding that Brazil has a trained army of 300,000 men that they have offered us. If our need is so great why don't we accept all soldiers our allies can furnish, or is it a question of politics?

From an attorney in Newark, N. J.:

As a lawyer, I am from time to time subjected to the trials and tribulations of various of my clientele who are affected by the draft. I wish to endorse unqualifiedly your untiring efforts on behalf of the fathers of this Nation who would be torn from the side of their beloved children in the event that the legislation you are sponsoring does not succeed.

From the Federation of Civic Associations, Washington, D. C.:

Both the War Manpower Commission and the Selective Service Headquarters have been apprised of the opinion of the Federation of Civic Associations, particularly as class 4–F which excludes, as one sub class, those who have been convicted of felonies.

We take the position these men should not be completely excused from duty while the cream of manhood is called upon to lay down his life, if need be, for his country.

Class 4–F should be revised, those whom the armed forces feel are morally unfit should be given duty building roads, camps or placed on farms.

From Hapeville, Ga.:

Please keep up the good work and rest assured that when the single boys and men married who do not have children are all exhausted then we fellows with children will be ready to do our part.

From Chicago:

If only the single men and men who reach the age of 18 years were taken as replacements, we would soon have 10,000,000 men. The administration knows that we can't transport all of these men or anything like all of them to the fighting front for many months or years to come.

The Army and Navy high officials mapped plans for a goal of 10,000,000 men in uniform at a time when the fortunes of war for the Allies were at a low ebb indeed. Today Russia is definitely on the offensive and Italy is on the ropes.

From Gaffney, S. C.:

The stand which you have taken against hoarding or protecting the thousands of draft dodgers is most heartily applauded by every soldier and parent of fighting men in this country.

This is from Pueblo, Colo.:

Smashing the homes of fathers will at this time smash the hopes of small business to survive. It will also, in my opinion, take fathers away from business operations that are more essential and helpful to the Government than they would be in the Army.

From Waco, Tex.:

All of my relatives who are eligible are in the service, some in the Pacific, some in the Continent of Europe. However, the morale of this country will be shattered and shaken if the homes are allowed to be broken up. The home is the foundation of this country, and in my opinion it is unnecessary.

From Baltimore:

The American home must not be broken up until all other means have been exhausted, and the thinking public is far from convinced that the country has reached that point.

From the president of a lumber company in Alexandria, La.:

Putting more men in the armed forces than are absolutely required is a strain upon industry, disrupts entire organizations that are vital to the war effort. It increases Government taxes by putting more men in there to pay, train, feed, and equip than the country has need for in many cases.

From Bastrop, La.:

From a military standpoint it is bad policy to draft heads of families, as their minds are so absorbed in worries over their families that they could not possibly make a really dependable soldier. Therefore, they would neither add efficiency nor morale to the fighting Army.

From an attorney in Escondido, Calif.:

In the First World War over half of the men enlisted never went outside the borders of the continental United States, and after this war is done the same will be shown to be the fact in this war.

From an attorney in Erie, Pa.:

I believe there is general public agreement with your proposal to prevent as far as possible the drafting of fathers. However, if the draft age for fathers is to remain at the present level, something certainly should be done to get the younger, more physically fit and single men out of replaceable industrial jobs and into the armed services before fathers are called.

From Elkin, N. C.:

Although I am a minister, and although my specialty is theology, and not politics, I, nevertheless, because of my Anglo-Saxon background, cannot help being concerned with what happens in the political field. More specifically, I must say that I am glad to see you take up the fight to save fathers of children from the draft. No doubt we must go ahead in the direction of military victory and no doubt there are many sacrifices which lie ahead of us which we must uncomplainingly make, but to draft the fathers of children is to leave thousands of families without a bread winner, without any moral authority or example, is to bring despair, bleak and dark into the hearts of many, is to go a long way toward destroying the home in this country.

From Louisville, Ky.:

Why is it necessary for a father to throw away his wife and children to face these perilous times alone when the United States is already carrying the biggest load of any other Allied nation?

From San Antonio, Tex.:

I wonder if fathers are taken why it is not the men who have married since Pearl Harbor and many of such whose purpose it was to keep out of the war; how about the thousands married with no children who are exempted when men of more mature age could do all they are doing as good and in many instances better; how about the many single men in Washington, stool sitters who are left out and why have we so many young men in colleges and who have been there for several years.

From Amarillo, Tex.:

God knows the American family is already disintegrating with mothers at war work and then to draft fathers or husbands of these mothers, no quicker way could be found to send the parentless child to hell.

From Sulphur, La.:

I have two small children, aged 5 and 2 years. Their father is an essential worker in shipbuilding. That's where the fathers are needed. Why half orphan our children until it is absolutely necessary. They are needed behind the man with the gun.

I am patriotic and wish to do everything in my power to hurry and win this war, but I don't see where fathers should be taken now as there seems to be more soldiers around now than they know what to do with.

From Memphis, Tenn.:

My reading and sources of information indicate that all available transportation to and in the necessary theaters of war are already congested, impossible or unnecessary, and that normal replacements are adequate. So, this clamor for fathers' induction is not only unnecessary at this time, but will so further deplete the home front that industry and production will be jeopardized throughout our Nation, and actual suffering be the result in many homes.

An attorney from Pittsburgh writes:

In my opinion, we shall be doing irreparable harm to society if we break up the thousands of homes which the present program of the War Manpower Commission would make inevitable.

From Syracuse, N. Y., comes this telegram:

Your bill to defer drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers deserves full support and consideration of every person interested in maintaining the United States home and preventing growth of juvenile delinquency. While the Army and Navy should be permitted to run the war they do need a system of check and balance. Before breaking up homes should they not be forced to use every physically fit single man 38 to 45 for noncombatant service?

From the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., Thurmond, W. Va.:

Have been much interested in your efforts to delay induction of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers and am heartily in accord, but it looks like the manpower officials won't play ball. I can't see the benefit either for regardless of age, a father is going to make a poor soldier; constantly recurring thoughts of his family and their problems at home are going to make a "defensive" type out of him—no punch, nor the aggressiveness needed for the present warfare.

From Springfield, Mo.:

I am writing to commend you for the fight you are making against the drafting of fathers into the armed forces. Too much destruction is being done to our democratic form of government by the innumerable experimental bureaus of the New Deal.

From Tulsa, Okla.:

I have followed you along in your ideas for a long time. I wholeheartedly agree with you on the question of drafting fathers. There is one thing I am opposed to, all these boys left in college at the taxpayers' expense.

I know many, many boys who should be serving their country, who are in college.

Thank God my boy isn't that kind of boy, he left school and enlisted in aviation, is training for a bomber pilot.

From Baltimore, Md.:

The strength of a nation is vested in the home. No nation can be more powerful nor more formidable than that nation whose homes are stably founded upon a solid foundation of absolute surety.

Our nation can do no greater thing to bolster the Allied cause and to win the peace, as it must surely be won; if we are even to dare hope for a lasting peace after this conflict, then to take steps to ascertain the home life of its people and keep alive those Christian principles for which our Nation was born and by which our homes are founded.

From Chanute, Kans.:

Better draft grandfathers than fathers with small children, and even now there are quite a number of single men who are not in the Army.

From a New York City attorney:

May I say that many folks in my community are absolutely opposed to drafting men into the armed services who were married prior to Pearl Harbor.

One of the higher officers in the Farmers and Mechanics National Bank in Frederick, Md., says:

Civilian services are being handicapped because of the continued loss of manpower and if many of the remaining men could be left for civilian work until the need for military service is more acute, it would be better for those of us who wish to carry on at the home front.

Here is a telegram from Burlington, N. C.:

If drafting of fathers actually necessary to successfully expedite war program, believe all Americans more than willing, but this should be proven beyond doubt, as such will affect our civilian economy perhaps more than anything since beginning of war. Too many men already in Army camps state their full time and ability not being utilized. Many industrial plants not engaged in direct war production. Will be forced to close because of loss of keymen.

From Oklahoma City, Okla.:

There is not a shortage of manpower, but there does seem to be a shortage of manpower in the right places. If unintelligent drafting continues, it will certainly mean disaster on the home front. But with intelligent drafting of those men left, production and morale on the home front will continue to be high, and there will still be plenty of men in the service.

From St. Cloud, Fla.:

I am fully aware of the fact that if such a purpose should be successful, it would mean the breaking and wrecking of millions of homes to the lasting disgrace of our Government. I have a son age 35, with 2 little babies and the mother wearing herself out to care for them. Mortgage, $3,850. Salary, $2,700. Should he be drafted, his wife would receive $72 per month and go on relief for the rest.

From Sedalia, Mo.:

What kind of men and women will the world of tomorrow produce with a vast amount of mothers in war plants and fathers in uniforms?

A Tulsa (Okla.) businessman writes:

In my business I have occasion to talk to numerous people about this question and I find them uniformly of the opinion that the National Selective Service System under Messrs. McNutt and Hershey have bungled more than any other governmental agency.

From Smithville, Tex.:

I guess you will be surprised to hear from folks here in Texas.

We are for you one hundred percent in your draft bill, and we are wondering if you can see that our teen-age boys get their year's training before they are sent overseas, as was promised us.

From Covington, Ky.:

With so many single men and childless married men working under deferments why take any father? Why not immediate cancelation of the above deferments?

No man 18 to 25 can be irreplaceable at such a young age. I know the conditions exist as I have been in contact with them for the past 1½ years.

From Joplin, Mo.:

I am sitting here in my home tonight. My children are snug in bed and I have been thinking of the effort you have been making these past few days.

I feel that if my husband goes to war it will ruin our home. I will have to work and my children may turn out to be problem children. Now it takes every minute of my time to care for them.

From Tampa, Fla.:

We are very glad to know of your action in the drafting of fathers even though it doesn't affect us at all. What many of us wonder is how and why so many escape the draft who should be in it.

The president of a bank in Nebraska writes me:

I have talked with military officers and they tell me that a very few fathers over 28 years of age can take the rap.

From Salina, Kans.:

Time will vindicate your position on the drafting of fathers, and what you say about the size of the Army and the number of men who will be left in training in this country at the close of the war because of inadequate transportation.

From Brookhaven, Ga.:

I hope you will get on the radio and tell us about those countries which have not contributed any soldiers to the Allied armies.

From Cresco, Iowa:

Millions of us have no faith in the doings of the present powers that be, nor do we believe that we should play politics with other people's lives by drafting all the manpower of the United States for the purpose of impressing Joseph Stalin or any other foreign peoples.

Telegram from Miami, Fla.:

Your attention is called to ruling of War Department, effective September 30, 1943, retiring all officers 60 years old. The services of these men, the result of long experience and devotion to duty, are needed now at this critical stage of war. This is no time to discard such valuable help.

From Parsons, Kans.:

My husband is a chemist, working at the Kansas ordnance shell-loading plant in the capacity of head ordnance inspector in the chemical and physical laboratories. Last week he got his 1–A classification. We are taking out 14 percent of his salary in bonds. That is all we have saved since we came here. Now, with him in class 1–A, do you think we can put anything more in bonds, with a possible expensive move coming up for us? We have a child 5 years old. I cannot find anyone to care for her so that I can work. I will have to go back to live with my parents in a small town where there isn't much work. If he is taken in the Army we will no doubt have to cash some of the bonds we have.

From Lexington, Ky.:

Yes: I am 50, and I was in the other war to save England's shipping, and England itself; was wounded, and am told I am no good for this war because of disabilities, but I know plenty able-bodied men who are able to do any of the jobs of recruiting, guard duty, and thousands of other jobs held by the younger set who should be doing some of the fighting. Yes; I am able to and could do the same job held by some of the able-bodied men in recruiting service at the present time.

From Arlington, Va.:

Congratulations on your fight to keep the fathers in the homes, where they belong.

We have already more men under arms than we can possibly use for 2 years.

The Army would take 20,000,000 men if they could get away with it.

From Pawtucket, R. I.:

These fathers are the backbone and supporters and the workers and producers of America and the builders of the present and future America.

If their homes are broken up by being drafted at any time, there is no telling what will happen to the little children and the wife and the home.

A worrying dad in the war would be a detriment, a very bad one, and a big expense to the Government. I am American born and in my 70th year, and not in the draft. I represent about 1,500 local families.

From San Antonio, Tex.:

It seems to me that the Army is one of the greatest hoarders of manpower that we have. If and when the Army and other Governmental agencies can correct these conditions it will not be necessary for them to draft me, just let it be known I am needed.

From Beauty, Ky.:

I am a welder 35 years old, work in a war job, have a wife and 7 small children. I am expecting to be drafted any day. Will you please ask why they release men over 38 who have no dependents and take me away from my family?

From Olympia, Wash.:

You may be interested in an informal discussion that I had with a group of about 10 fathers, all of whom are eligible for the proposed fathers' draft. They were almost unanimous in their opinions that they would be more than willing to go into the immediate service of the Army or Navy provided there was some way of providing for the care and maintenance of their children.

You will find the fathers of this country just as patriotic as anyone else, but they do not cherish the thought of their families suffering because of the lack of funds to provide the bare necessities of life while they are in the service, when everyone else is enjoying an era of financial prosperity.

From Atlanta, Ga.:

No one wishes to deprive our armed forces of men and material that are needed to win the war as quickly as possible. On the other hand, the services could correct many of their ways and use their resources much more efficiently and economically. A reasonable utilization of present men in work which would permit the utilization of their training, both prior to their induction and subsequent to it, would in my opinion help to amply provide for the needs of the armed forces.

This is a letter written by J. H. Bond, deputy executive director, War Manpower Commission, in reply to a letter written by a ship fitter in Brooklyn complaining that he could not get work. Bond's letter is dated August 31. It states in part:

We realize that there is a great deal of labor waste and poor supervision in war industries throughout the country and are taking steps to correct this situation.

From Ames, Iowa:

I have no objection to the drafting of any man or any woman that can help in finishing up this war quickly, but it makes me ready to bite nails when I think of 3,000,000 payrollers working for the Government in perfectly safe jobs when certainly some of them ought to be out where the shooting is going on. This reduction in the Federal pay roll might well result in increased efficiency all the way round.

From Rome, Ga.:

There are hundreds of enlisted trained men in the service now who are doing work and jobs that civilians could just as well do. This sort of thing should not be. These men should be used first before calling men with children into the service.

From Gilman City, Mo.:

I want to heartily endorse your amendment to stop the induction of fathers indefinitely. There are still hundreds of single men and married men without children in Harrison County, Mo., and adjoining counties in civilian life while many fathers with children in this county are now in 1–A to be taken October 1, unless it is stopped.

An official of an insurance company in San Diego says:

If the future citizens of our country are to amount to anything, and if we are to have a country worth fighting for when the present generation of children grow to be adults, it is imperative that the family unit be protected now. To deprive families with children of the father's influence and financial support now will simply mean that in most instances, the mother will have to find a job to earn enough for the family to live on, with the obvious result that the children will be forced to shift for themselves or be regimented in child-care centers. Serious difficulties will be bound to develop.

Telegram from Robertsdale, Ala.:

For the sake of America and American homes both present and future, prevent the drafting of fathers into the Army, if possible.

From Portland, Oreg., an attorney writes:

I would like to send you a copy of the front page of our Journal, smeared with crime, even vieing with the war news for front-page headlines. The break-down in morals—the gambling, wildness of women, burglaries, murder, suicide, etc.—is terrible. Even the juvenile officers are making a kick as to the fact whether they would continue with their work.

From Corpus Christi, Tex.:

I am 100 percent opposed to this unnecessary action that would disorganize and totally disrupt our home front, not to mention the wrecking of millions of American homes, the backbone to our future America.

From Memphis, Tenn.:

Allow me to congratulate you on your stand regarding the drafting of fathers.

I am one of the many men between the ages of 38 and 45 who have no dependents, and I certainly think that we should be inducted before men with children.

There are thousands of men between 38 and 45 who are very sound physically who would make excellent soldiers, sailors, and marines.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have concluded my statement with reference to this question. I am interested only in these propositions: First, the manpower in the War Department and in the Army should be properly utilized before married fathers are drafted.

Secondly, the manpower in the various bureaus where men are being deferred should be used before fathers are drafted.

Thirdly, before fathers are taken the young single men who are being hoarded in industry for the purpose of avoiding the draft should be taken.

If any legislation could be worked out along these lines, or if the Government departments themselves would do what they should do, I would have no objection, and would not be interested in pressing legislation merely because it bears my name.

I am not interested in whose name any particular piece of proposed legislation may bear. I am interested, as I believe the great bulk of the American people are, in not having fathers inducted into the service unless it is absolutely essential. I submit that from the facts which I have presented it is not essential. It is not necessary to draft fathers this month, next month, or the following month if there can be brought about a proper utilization of manpower in the United States. In my judgment the morale of the people of this country will be very severely affected if, under existing conditions, fathers shall be drafted.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a list of registrants deferred, the list having been prepared by the Selective Service. It gives in detail the age groups, as well as the various branches of the Government which have asked for the deferments. It also goes into detail by States.

Next week, the Selective Service will have available the names of each and every individual who has asked deferment, so that the public may have the benefit of this knowledge, in keeping with a bill which the able and distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and I introduced and sponsored through the Congress last spring.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Age of registrants deferred for occupational reasons by selective service local boards because of their employment in or under the Federal Government, by branch or agency of the Government by which employed, Sept. 15, 1943, registrants 18 to 37, inclusive, United States and Territories

[Preliminary]

Agency [1]	Total	Age				
		18 to 21	22 to 24	25 to 29	30 to 34	35 to 37
All agencies, total	115,397	15,812	19,933	36,939	28,974	13,739
Legislative establishments [2]	5				3	2
Senate	1					1
House of Representatives	2			1		1
The Judiciary	13	1	1	2	5	4
Department of Agriculture	1,509	16	133	535	530	295
Department of Commerce	3,230	173	494	1,180	941	442
Civil Aeronautics Board	3			1	1	1
Department of the Interior	1,056	30	174	387	304	161
Department of Justice	4,431	175	632	2,217	1,116	291
Department of Labor	30			5	18	7
Navy Department	51,875	7,343	9,827	16,415	12,571	5,719
Pearl Harbor [3]	2,070	364	491	651	415	149
Post Office Department	241	1	6	87	88	59
Department of State	430	1	59	150	127	93
Department of Treasury	99	1	4	32	35	27
War Department	30,423	2,649	4,876	9,943	8,600	4,355
Panama Canal [3]	1,594	64	236	602	478	214
Federal Security Agency	193	1	10	90	53	39
Federal Works Agency	302	15	42	82	94	69
National Housing Agency	7				5	2
The White House Office	1				1	
Board of Economic Warfare	79	1	2	19	29	28
Bureau of the Budget	16			3	6	7
National Resources Planning Board	5			1	2	2
Office of Censorship	52		1	19	19	13
National War Labor Board	22		1	5	9	7
Office of Alien Property Custodian	1					1
Office of Civilian Defense	17	3	1	3	4	6
Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	27		1	7	7	12
Office of Defense Transportation	14		1		5	8
Office of Lend-Lease Administration	23	1		3	13	6
Office of Scientific Research and Development	387	35	85	163	79	25
Office of War Information	219	3	13	70	84	49
War Manpower Commission	148	8	14	37	53	36
National Youth Administration	18		1	2	9	6
War Production Board	145	1	5	33	52	54
War Relocation Authority	8			1	2	5
War Shipping Administration	7,409	2,529	1,314	1,701	1,247	618
Office for Emergency Management [2]	67	4	7	28	15	13
Office of Price Administration	61	1	1	14	24	21
Office of Strategic Services	29	1	1	10	17	
Petroleum Administration for War	38		1	7	20	10
National Capital Housing Authority	1				1	
Civil Service Commission	47	3	6	16	13	9
Employees' Compensation Commission	2	1				1
Federal Communications Commission	345	27	37	150	96	35
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1					1
Federal Power Commission	13			2	5	6
General Accounting Office	8		1		6	1
Government Printing Office	8			1	2	5
Library of Congress	7			3	4	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	805	153	277	239	98	38
National Archives	1				1	
National Gallery of Art	1					1
National Labor Relations Board	5				3	2
Railroad Retirement Board	1					1
Securities and Exchange Commission	4			1	2	1
Tariff Commission	2				1	1
United States Maritime Commission	4,309	1,900	675	910	609	215
Veterans' Administration	19			7	8	4
Executive Office and independent establishments [2]	13	5	1	2	3	2
Federal Reserve System	6				3	3
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	95		4	20	32	39
Tennessee Valley Authority	446	8	64	147	148	79
Government corporations and credit agencies [2]	37		1	6	12	18
District of Columbia government	436		29	152	174	81
Government agencies [2]	2,485	294	404	777	672	338

[1] Does not include the following agencies for which no employees were reported classified in II–A, II–A (H), II–B, II–B (H): Office for Emergency Management Division of Central Administrative Services, American Battle Monuments Commission, Bituminous Coal Consumer Council, Board of Investigation and Research—Transportation, Federal Trade Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, National Mediation Board, Smithsonian Institution, The Tax Court of the United States, Export-Import Bank.

[2] Not elsewhere classified.

[3] Includes employees of the Panama Canal, a division of the War Department, and may also include employees of other agencies designated by location.

Source: Report of Occupational Deferment of Federal Government Employees (DSS Form 38) and Changes in Occupational Deferments of Federal Government Employees (DSS Form 39).

National Headquarters, Selective Service System, Oct. 1, 1943.

Age of registrants deferred for occupational reasons by selective service local boards because of their employment in or under the Federal Government, by State, Sept. 15, 1943, registrants 18 to 37, inclusive

[Preliminary]

State	Total	Age group				
		18 to 21	22 to 24	25 to 29	30 to 34	35 to 37
Total	115,397	15,812	19,933	36,939	28,274	13,739
United States (continental)	109,885	14,036	18,888	35,630	27,959	13,372
Alabama	1,451	210	236	448	393	164
Arizona	213	13	25	80	63	32
Arkansas	372	57	48	114	107	46
California	12,249	1,014	2,134	3,959	3,435	1,707

Age of registrants deferred for occupational reasons by selected service local boards because of their employment in or under the Federal Government, by State, Sept. 15, 1943, registrants 18 to 37, inclusive—Continued

State	Total	Age group				
		18 to 21	22 to 24	25 to 29	30 to 34	35 to 37
Colorado	723	59	93	237	248	86
Connecticut	809	137	190	292	198	82
Delaware	98	8	10	29	31	20
District of Columbia	5,384	620	991	1,820	1,316	637
Florida	1,488	154	180	465	453	236
Georgia	1,513	247	235	459	384	188
Idaho	636	45	110	219	184	78
Illinois	4,118	412	669	1,440	1,093	564
Indiana	960	141	152	336	226	105
Iowa	1,076	98	199	375	281	123
Kansas	574	61	83	179	170	81
Kentucky	556	48	67	199	161	81
Louisiana	1,071	134	177	325	289	146
Maine	799	111	110	260	211	107
Maryland	2,044	230	344	635	543	292
Massachusetts	5,461	423	1,040	1,665	1,426	607
Michigan	1,809	235	277	583	468	246
Minnesota	1,015	180	160	337	246	92
Mississippi	460	60	53	125	132	90
Missouri	874	42	132	312	248	140
Montana	553	27	75	216	193	72
Nebraska	457	65	65	165	109	53
Nevada	184	6	13	62	68	35
New Hampshire	467	24	76	159	148	60
New Jersey	2,895	361	493	756	751	334
New Mexico	300	26	39	82	95	48
New York	14,954	1,386	2,476	5,320	3,937	1,835
North Carolina	1,170	190	189	392	269	130
North Dakota	229	14	52	68	67	28
Ohio	3,609	439	626	1,223	874	447
Oklahoma	1,096	116	126	361	339	154
Oregon	943	91	123	296	288	145
Pennsylvania	10,202	1,370	2,111	3,366	2,294	1,061
Rhode Island	1,115	109	123	336	371	185
South Carolina	3,256	788	699	857	660	252
South Dakota	262	19	33	93	89	28
Tennessee	1,266	138	175	426	343	184
Texas	4,848	728	807	1,494	1,183	636
Utah	757	218	122	226	132	59
Vermont	116	9	9	45	37	16
Virginia	7,271	1,669	1,333	1,933	1,581	755
Washington	6,275	1,315	1,204	1,685	1,368	703
West Virginia	649	105	96	218	160	70
Wisconsin	971	75	147	397	247	105
Wyoming	167	8	21	61	50	27
Off-continent	5,512	1,776	1,045	1,309	1,015	367
Alaska	331	24	31	98	111	67
Hawaii	4,988	1,723	975	1,147	855	288
Puerto Rico	193	29	39	64	49	12

Source: Report of Occupational Deferment of Federal Government Employees (DSS Form 38) and Changes in Occupational Deferments of Federal Government Employees (DSS Form 39).

State of registrants deferred for occupational reasons by selective service local boards because of their employment in or under the Federal Government, by branch or agency of the Government by which employed, Sept. 15, 1943—registrants 18 to 37, inclusive—United States and Territories

[Preliminary]

Agency [1]	Total	United States (continental)	State							
			Alabama	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	District of Columbia
All agencies total	115,397	109,885	1,451	213	372	12,249	723	899	98	5,384
Legislative establishment [2]	5	5						1		1
Senate	1	1								1
House of Representatives	2	2			1					
The Judiciary	13	12	1		1	3	1	1		2
Department of Agriculture	1,509	1,474	58	10	20	147	41	5	3	51
Department of Commerce	3,230	3,153	37	20	16	219	41	16	1	270
Civil Aeronautics Board	3	3								3
Department of the Interior	1,056	1,023	11	16	8	109	44	9	1	65
Department of Justice	4,431	4,417	45	24	50	220	49	70	4	588
Department of Labor	30	30	1			1		1	1	5
Navy Department	51,875	48,155	222	35	62	5,903	137	309	34	2,944
Pearl Harbor [2]	2,070	2,051	6	1		412	1	1	4	40
Post Office Department	241	228	4	1	2	35	2	6		8
Department of State	430	428	2	2	1	28	1	5	1	156
Department of Treasury	99	96				15		2		14
War Department	30,423	29,080	575	64	139	3,394	238	171	34	402
Panama Canal [3]	1,594	1,593	19	4	6	166	23	9	2	38
Federal Security Agency	193	190	5		1	10	3	3		26
Federal Works Agency	302	291	3	6	5	46	18	4		20
National Housing Agency	7	7	1			1				
The White House Office	1	1								1
Board of Economic Warfare	79	78				10	1	1		8
Bureau of the Budget	16	16	1							5
National Resources Planning Board	5	5				1				
Office of Censorship	52	46	1	1		2	1			2
National War Labor Board	22	22				4	1			
Office of Alien Property Custodian	1	1								
Office of Civilian Defense	17	17	1			1				

Footnotes at end of table.

State of registrants deferred for occupational reasons by selective service local boards because of their employment in or under the Federal Government, by branch or agency of the Government by which employed, Sept. 15, 1943—registrants 18 to 37, inclusive—United States and Territories—Continued

Agency	Total	United States (continental)	State							
			Alabama	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	District of Columbia
Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	27	27				4				
Office of Defense Transportation	14	14				2				
Office of Lend-Lease Administration	23	23						1		4
Office of Scientific Research and Development	387	387	1			30	6	3		6
Office of War Information	219	219		1		41	2	4	2	7
War Manpower Commission	148	148	1			14	1	1		10
National Youth Administration	18	18				1				
War Production Board	145	145	1	1		6		2	1	8
War Relocation Authority	8	8				3				2
War Shipping Administration	7,409	7,281	151	9	7	822	47	110	3	91
Office for Emergency Management [2]	67	67				14				3
Office of Price Administration	61	61		1		8	1			1
Office of Strategic Services	29	29				7	2			1
Petroleum Administration for War	38	38				3	1		1	1
National Capital Housing Authority	1	1								1
Civil Service Commission	47	47	1	1		5				1
Employees Compensation Commission	2	2								
Federal Communications Commission	345	337	3	4	4	27	2	3		4
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1	1								
Federal Power Commission	13	13				1	2	1		1
General Accounting Office	8	7							1	2
Government Printing Office	8	8								6
Library of Congress	7	7								3
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	805	805	3	1	1	59		5		10
National Archives	1	1								1
National Gallery of Art	1	1								1
National Labor Relations Board	5	5								
Railroad Retirement Board	1	1								
Securities and Exchange Commission	4	4								
Tariff Commission	2	2				1				
United States Maritime Commission	4,309	4,302	84	4	29	232	32	146	3	134
Veterans' Administration	19	19	1			1		1		
Executive Office and independent establishments [2]	13	13								1
Federal Reserve System	6	6				1				
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	95	95	2		1	7	3	1		13
Tennessee Valley Authority	446	446	158		4	1		2		
Government corporations and credit agencies [2]	37	37	4			8				2
District of Columbia government	436	436							1	401
Government agencies [2]	2,485	2,399	48	7	14	224	22	5	1	19

Agency	State									
	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland
All agencies, total	1,488	1,513	636	4,118	960	1,076	574	556	1,071	799	2,044
Legislative establishments [2]											3
Senate											
House of Representatives											
The Judiciary		2									
Department of Agriculture	13	42	33	79	12	35	25	11	32	10	35
Department of Commerce	50	70	43	144	50	58	69	18	37	14	67
Civil Aeronautics Board											
Department of the Interior	6	1	20	36	5	4	14	8	10	8	21
Department of Justice	41	67	26	181	64	163	49	72	47	9	58
Department of Labor				1				2	1	1	
Navy Department	662	515	234	789	241	150	94	104	253	473	580
Pearl Harbor [2]	31	13		140	6	1	2	4	1	1	2
Post Office Department	1	3	1	13		2	1	1	2	2	3
Department of State	7	7		10	2	2	2	3	2	2	6
Department of Treasury				4				3	1		1
War Department	468	474	178	1,826	340	515	207	218	355	119	502
Panama Canal [3]	29	24	5	105	32	13	21	20	45	12	30
Federal Security Agency	4	2		7	1	3	1		4		9
Federal Works Agency	4	1	6	4		3	6	3	1	2	9
National Housing Agency				1							
The White House Office											
Board of Economic Warfare		1	1	6	1				1		
Bureau of the Budget											1
National Resources Planning Board		1		1							1
Office of Censorship	2			4	1				2		
National War Labor Board				4							
Office of Alien Property Custodian											
Office of Civilian Defense				1	1	1		1			
Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs				1							
Office of Defense Transportation		1									
Office of Lend-Lease Administration	2				1					1	
Office of Scientific Research and Development	1	1		38	7	3	2	2	1		9
Office of War Information	2		1	7	2			1			1
War Manpower Commission	1	1		23	1	2		1	2	1	3
National Youth Administration		1	1	1	1	1	1		1		
War Production Board		1	1	14	2				2		5
War Relocation Authority			1								
War Shipping Administration	85	68	42	227	62	42	47	24	157	104	159
Office for Emergency Management [2]				2		1					1
Office of Price Administration		1		3	2	4					2
Office of Strategic Services				2							
Petroleum Administration for War				2			1		3		
National Capital Housing Authority											
Civil Service Commission	1	1		7	1			1			1
Employees Compensation Commission											
Federal Communications Commission	7	11	3	21	4	1	4	1	7	5	9
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation									1		
Federal Power Commission											1

Footnotes at end of table.

State of registrants deferred for occupational reasons by selective service local boards because of their employment in or under the Federal Government, by branch or agency of the Government by which employed, Sept. 15, 1943—registrants 18 to 37, inclusive—United States and Territories—Continued

Agency	State										
	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland
General Accounting Office				1							
Government Printing Office											1
Library of Congress											
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	9	23		17	14	10	3	4	5	2	13
National Archives											
National Gallery of Art											
National Labor Relations Board											
Railroad Retirement Board							1				
Securities and Exchange Commission				1							
Tariff Commission											
United States Maritime Commission	33	141	22	251	83	32	12	32	46	23	46
Veterans' Administration		1	1	1							
Executive Office and independent establishments [2]				5	1						
Federal Reserve System				1							
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	4	1	2	4		2		2	5		3
Tennessee Valley Authority	2	13		10	6	1	5	9	7	1	2
Government corporations and credit agencies [2]		1		5							1
District of Columbia government							1				8
Government agencies [2]	23	24	15	118	17	27	6	11	40	9	51

Agency	State										
	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico
All agencies, total	5,461	1,809	1,015	460	874	585	457	184	467	2,895	300
Legislative establishments [2]											
Senate											
House of Representatives										1	
The Judiciary											
Department of Agriculture	24	21	44	21	21	23	11	2	4	19	16
Department of Commerce	58	65	42	26	97	81	35	31	10	58	57
Civil Aeronautics Board											
Department of the Interior	33	18	16	6	26	20	11	11	4	13	13
Department of Justice	186	120	162	51	134	19	87	5	3	108	14
Department of Labor	2		3							1	
Navy Department	3,692	346	212	81	197	229	80	67	363	838	49
Pearl Harbor [2]	9	9	2	7	4	1	1		18	7	1
Post Office Department	2	16	2	3	1	2	3	1		6	
Department of State	19	4	4		6	2	1	1		12	3
Department of Treasury		7	1							2	
War Department	953	590	221	148	272	138	117	44	45	987	109
Panama Canal [3]	56	29	22	16	31	4	10	4	7	41	5
Federal Security Agency	3	4		1	3					1	
Federal Works Agency	4	5	9	3		5				3	4
National Housing Agency										1	
The White House Office											
Board of Economic Warfare	4					2	1			3	
Bureau of the Budget		1									
National Resources Planning Board											
Office of Censorship	1	1	2							2	1
National War Labor Board	3										
Office of Alien Property Custodian											
Office of Civilian Defense	1	1		1							
Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs			1				1			1	
Office of Defense Transportation	2	1			1		1				
Office of Lend-Lease Administration	1	1									
Office of Scientific Research and Development	81	6	7		4	1	2			16	4
Office of War Information	6	1			2					7	
War Manpower Commission	11	3	3	1	4				1	2	1
National Youth Administration		1	1								
War Production Board	6	5			2				2	12	
War Relocation Authority											
War Shipping Administration	106	234	90	26	20	32	15	7	1	391	2
Office for Emergency Management [2]	1	2								3	
Office of Price Administration	1	3	2		3		1			3	
Office of Strategic Services	5	2	1							1	
Petroleum Administration for War		1								5	1
National Capital Housing Authority											
Civil Service Commission	1		1	1						1	
Employees Compensation Commission							1				
Federal Communications Commission	26	10	14	1	6	2	6			10	2
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation											
Federal Power Commission	1		1				1				
General Accounting Office		1									
Government Printing Office											
Library of Congress											
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	19	17	14	2	1	1	4	5	2	7	1
National Archives											
National Gallery of Art											
National Labor Relations Board											
Railroad Retirement Board											
Securities and Exchange Commission											
Tariff Commission	1										
United States Maritime Commission	40	192	121	32	17	7	60	5	4	144	5
Veterans' Administration	1	1			1						
Executive Office and independent establishments [2]											
Federal Reserve System	1		1								
Reconstruction Finance Corporation			1	1	1	3				7	
Tennessee Valley Authority	2	3	2	18	3	2	1			1	1
Government corporations and credit agencies [2]			1		2	1					
District of Columbia government										1	
Government agencies [2]	99	88	12	14	15	8	7	1	3	180	11

Footnotes at end of table.

State of registrants deferred for occupational reasons by selective service local boards because of their employment in or under the Federal Government, by branch or agency of the Government by which employed, Sept. 15, 1943—registrants 18 to 37, inclusive—United States and Territories—Continued

Agency	State										
	New York	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	Rhode Island	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee
All agencies, total	14,954	1,176	229	3,609	1,096	943	10,202	1,115	3,256	262	1,266
Legislative establishments [2]											
Senate											
House of Representatives											
The Judiciary	1										
Department of Agriculture	52	28	7	35	22	61	66	2	28	19	19
Department of Commerce	246	43	31	90	46	46	134	9	27	21	52
Civil Aeronautics Board											
Department of the Interior	87	4	5	22	17	40	66		1	10	17
Department of Justice	372	66	20	149	116	14	150	8	28	28	78
Department of Labor	2						2				1
Navy Department	6,846	571	56	653	165	212	4,644	906	2,708	58	323
Pearl Harbor [2]	271	9		190	4	17	358	4	119		2
Post Office Department	13	1	1	17	6	3	24	2	2		2
Department of State	46	3		10	3	4	8		2		4
Department of the Treasury	21			11	1		6				
War Department	3,769	192	66	1,494	552	235	3,352	70	163	10	370
Panama Canal [3]	198	21	7	91	17	6	153	6	14	5	33
Federal Security Agency	62	4		7			9		1		3
Federal Works Agency	9	6	2	2	4	6	15	1	2	1	6
National Housing Agency						1					
The White House Office											
Board of Economic Warfare	20			2	1		4		1		2
Bureau of the Budget	1			1			1				1
National Resources Planning Board	1										
Office of Censorship	12			2			2				2
National War Labor Board	2	1				1	2				
Office of Alien Property Custodian											
Office of Civilian Defense	1	2		2							
Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	14			1			2				
Office of Defense Transportation	2			2				1			
Office of Lend-Lease Administration	11										
Office of Scientific Research and Development	73			18	1	9	19	2			2
Office of War Information	109			7			8				
War Manpower Commission	20	1		6	1	2	12	1		2	2
National Youth Administration				1			2		1		
War Production Board	30	2		10	1	1	15		1		
War Relocation Authority					1						
War Shipping Administration	1,600	116	14	276	62	212	509	47	52	6	69
Office for Emergency Management [2]	28	1		3		3	4				1
Office of Price Administration	9	3		5			3	1			1
Office of Strategic Services	5						1				
Petroleum Administration for War	6						4	1			
National Capital Housing Authority											
Civil Service Commission	3			3			2		2		2
Employees Compensation Commission											
Federal Communications Commission	39	1	3	5	4	8	15		1	6	1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation											
Federal Power Commission	1						1				1
General Accounting Office				1							
Government Printing Office											
Library of Congress	4										
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	69	6	6	84	2	1	31	6	2		7
National Archives											
National Gallery of Art											
National Labor Relations Board	2			1			1				
Railroad Retirement Board											
Securities and Exchange Commission	1										
Tariff Commission											
United States Maritime Commission	668	53	4	310	57	40	403	47	64	5	98
Veterans' Administration	5			1		1	2				
Executive Office and independent establishments [2]	2						1				
Federal Reserve System				1							
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	9	1	3	2	1		5				3
Tennessee Valley Authority	12	15	1	3	1		8		2	1	136
Government corporation and credit agencies [2]	1			2			1				1
District of Columbia government	2	1					1				
Government agencies [2]	197	19	3	89	31	20	156	1	35	10	22

Agency	State								Total off-continent	Alaska	Hawaii	Puerto Rico
	Texas	Utah	Vermont	Virginia	Washington	West Virginia	Wisconsin	Wyoming				
All agencies, total	4,848	757	116	7,271	6,275	649	971	167	5,512	331	4,988	193
Legislative establishments [2]												
Senate												
House of Representatives												
The Judiciary									1		1	
Department of Agriculture	58	16	2	38	76	12	53	12	35	5	2	28
Department of Commerce	197	38	8	112	172	22	39	20	77	64	11	2
Civil Aeronautics Board												
Department of the Interior	44	30	2	15	79		13	4	33	26	4	3
Department of Justice	307	44	7	110	59	44	95	6	14	4	4	6
Department of Labor				2	2		1					
Navy Department	523	81	41	5,795	3,682	307	239	50	3,720	15	3,681	24
Pearl Harbor [2]	62	1	1	103	184	1			19		19	
Post Office Department	13			10	6		4	1	13	1	11	1
Department of State	25	1		21	3	2	5		2			2
Department of Treasury	1		3	1	2				3	1	2	
War Department	2,480	455	31	263	1,150	128	329	48	1,343	126	1,129	88
Panama Canal [3]	106	3	1	43	17	9	29	1	1		1	
Federal Security Agency	4	1		6	2				3			
Federal Works Agency	5	11	2	23	9	2	8		11	7	1	3
National Housing Agency	1			1								

Footnotes at end of table.

State of registrants deferred for occupational reasons by selective service local boards because of their employment in or under the Federal Government, by branch or agency of the Government by which employed, Sept. 15, 1943—registrants 18 to 37, inclusive—United States and Territories—Continued

Agency	State								Total, off-continent	Alaska	Hawaii	Puerto Rico
	Texas	Utah	Vermont	Virginia	Washington	West Virginia	Wisconsin	Wyoming				
The White House Office												
Board of Economic Warfare	3			3	1		1		1	1		
Bureau of the Budget	1			3								
National Resources Planning Board												
Office of Censorship	3			1	1				6			6
National War Labor Board				1	2		1					
Office of Alien Property Custodian							1					
Office of Civilian Defense	1			1			1					
Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	1			1								
Office of Defense Transportation	1											
Office of Lend-Lease Administration				1								
Office of Scientific Research and Development	2	2	4	7	9	4	4					
Office of War Information	1	1	1	3	1	1						
War Manpower Commission	2	1		1	4	4	1					
National Youth Administration	1					3						
War Production Board	3	1		7			3					
War Relocation Authority					1							
War Shipping Administration	283	39		179	528	45	53	10	128	26	86	16
Office for Emergency Management [2]												
Office of Price Administration	1			1	1							
Office of Strategic Services	1						1					
Petroleum Administration for War	8											
National Capital Housing Authority												
Civil Service Commission	7			1	2		1					
Employees' Compensation Commission				1								
Federal Communications Commission	19		1	6	21	6	4		8	2	3	3
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation												
Federal Power Commission						1						
General Accounting Office				1					1			1
Government Printing Office				1								
Library of Congress												
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	5	1	1	311	8	7	6					
National Archives												
National Gallery of Art												
National Labor Relations Board				1								
Railroad Retirement Board												
Securities and Exchange Commission				1	1							
Tariff Commission												
United States Maritime Commission	231	16	8	112	98	30	55	11	7	5	2	
Veterans' Administration	1											
Executive offices and independent establishments [2]	1						2					
Federal Reserve System	1											
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	2			2	1	1	2					
Tennessee Valley Authority	3			5		2	3					
Government corporation and credit agencies [3]		1		2	3		1					
District of Columbia government		1		19								
Government agencies [3]	440	13	3	56	150	18	16	1	86	48	31	7

[1] Does not include the following agencies for which no employees were reported classified in II-A, II-A (H), II-B, II-B (H): Office for Emergency Management, Division of Central Administrative Services, American Battle Monuments Commission, Bituminous Coal Consumer Council, Board of Investigation and Research—Transportation, Federal Trade Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, National Mediation Board, Smithsonian Institution, the Tax Court of the United States, Export Import Bank.

[2] Not elsewhere classified.

[3] Includes employees of the Panama Canal, a division of the War Department, and may also include employees of other agencies designated only by location.

Source: Report of Occupational Deferment of Federal Government Employees (DSS Form 38) and Changes in Occupational Deferments of Federal Government Employees (DSS Form 39).

CLAIM OF GENERAL STATE AUTHORITY OF COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 100)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 135, a bill "to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the General State Authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania."

On June 21, 1937, an allotment of $20,000,000 was made by the Public Works Administration with my approval to the General State Authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. A portion of the allotment was an outright grant while the balance was a relief-labor grant based on a specified percentage of the amount of wages paid to workers on the projects involved. Subsequently, the State of Pennsylvania requested a modification of the allotment so as to increase the amount of the outright grant. The Public Works Administration declined to modify the grant on the basis of an opinion of its general counsel that there was no legal ground on which the request could be granted. The bill under consideration would permit the State of Pennsylvania to bring suit against the United States, presumably to secure the payment which would have been made had the allotment been modified in accordance with its request.

The statutes under which the Public Works Administration was operating did not create any vested rights in the States, or in anyone else, to obtain any money thereunder. The matter was entirely within the discretion of the United States. Consequently, a denial of a request for an allotment or a refusal to modify an allotment previously made does not create any justiciable issue that may be appropriately determined by the courts.

In view of the foregoing circumstances, I feel constrained to return the bill without my approval.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 1, 1943.*

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sundry officers for promotion in the Public Health Service.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Commerce:

Amos E. Taylor, of Pennsylvania, to be Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Oliver P. Hopkins, of Maryland, to be Assistant Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate; and

Raymond C. Miller, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Elvin Seibert to be consul of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John W. Bailey, Jr., to be Foreign Service officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess until Monday, October 4, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 1 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier generals with rank from September 1, 1943

Lt. Gen. George Smith Patton, Jr. (colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Henry H. Arnold, appointed major general, Regular Army.

Lt. Gen. Brehon Burke Somervell (colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Henry C. Pratt, appointed major general, Regular Army.

Lt. Gen. Joseph Taggart McNarney (colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Walter K. Wilson, appointed major general, Regular Army.

Lt. Gen. George Churchill Kenney (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Ernest D. Peek, appointed major general, Regular Army.

Lt. Gen. Carl Spaatz (brigadier general, Assistant to the Chief of the Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Frederic H. Smith, appointed major general, Regular Army.

Lt. Gen. Omar Nelson Bradley (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Philip B. Peyton, appointed major general, Regular Army.

Lt. Gen. Ira Clarence Eaker (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Adna R. Chaffee, appointed major general, Regular Army.

Lt. Gen. Millard Fillmore Harmon (colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Clement A. Trott, retired.

Lt. Gen. Robert Lawrence Eichelberger (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Delos C. Emmons, appointed major general, Regular Army.

Maj. Gen. Thomas Troy Handy (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Edmond L. Daley, retired.

Maj. Gen. Walter Bedell Smith (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Joseph M. Cummins, retired.

Lt. Gen. Mark Wayne Clark (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. John N. Greely, retired.

To be major general with rank from August 31, 1943

Lt. Gen. Jonathan Mayhew Wainwright (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. Walter S. Grant, retired.

To be major general with rank from September 1, 1943

Lt. Gen. Joseph Warren Stilwell (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. Walter C. Short, retired.

To be major general with rank from September 2, 1943

Lt. Gen. George Smith Patton, Jr. (colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. Philip B. Peyton, retired.

To be major general with rank from September 3, 1943

Lt. Gen. Brehon Burke Somervell (colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States), vice Maj. Gen. Ernest D. Peek, retired.

To be major general with rank from September 4, 1943

Lt. Gen. Joseph Taggart McNarney (colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. Daniel Van Voorhis, retired.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. Robert Leonard Colligan, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 11, 1943.

First Lt. James Gleason Foley, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from September 1, 1942.

First Lt. Emil Franklin Hawes, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1943.

Second Lt. James Erwin Crosby, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1941.

Second Lt. Oliver Morton Legg, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1942.

Second Lt. Richard Concklin Snyder, Corps of Engineers, with rank from June 1, 1943.

Second Lt. Roscoe Barnett Woodruff, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 11, 1941.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be first lieutenants with rank from October 12, 1943

Second Lt. Robert Emmet Kennington, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. William Trabue, Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. William Love Latta, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. John Bangs Corbett, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Alfred Martin, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Carl Kenneth Warren, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. John Barwick Strahan, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Richard Greenwood Thomas, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. William Michael Delaney, Cavalry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Francis Marion Smith, Infantry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Theo Wallace O'Brien, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 1, 1943.

Lt. Col. William Charles Munly, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 1, 1943.

Lt. Col. George William Rice, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 7, 1943.

Lt. Col. Robert James Platt, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 13, 1943.

Lt. Col. James Neal Williams, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 17, 1943.

Lt. Col. Rollo Preston Bourbon, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 29, 1943.

Lt. Col. Wesley Cintra Cox, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 30, 1943.

Lt. Col. Floyd Vern Kilgore, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 30, 1943.

Lt. Col. John Christopher Woodland, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 30, 1943.

Lt. Col. Walter Leslie Perry, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 31, 1943.

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. Richard Emmons Elvins, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 8, 1943.

To be major

Capt. Joseph Pease Russell, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 16, 1943.

To be captain

First Lt. Edwin Stow Chapman, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from October 5, 1943.

First Lt. Carl Zeigler Berry, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 10, 1943.

First Lt. Other Franklin Speaker, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 14, 1943.

First Lt. Joseph Raymond Henry, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 15, 1943.

First Lt. Walton Merideth Edwards, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from October 15, 1943.

First Lt. George Vernon Potter, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from October 15, 1943.

First Lt. Harold Leslie Robinson, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 19, 1943.

First Lt. William Todd DeVan, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from October 21, 1943.

First Lt. John Philip Harney, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 24, 1943.

First Lt. Harvey George Tousignant, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from October 24, 1943.

First Lt. James Howard Smith, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 24, 1943.

First Lt. Vernon David Pettit, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 24, 1943.

First Lt. John Nicholas Furst, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 24, 1943.

First Lt. Lee Frank Ferrell, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 24, 1943.

First Lt. John Lynch Dixon, Medical Corps, (temporary major), with rank from October 24, 1943.

First Lt. Walter Anthony Butkus, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from October 24, 1943.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Walter Davis Vail, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt Col. Clement John Gaynor, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Walter Andrew Rose, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Alvin Ellsworth Anthony, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt Col. William Burns Caldwell, Dental Corps, with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Lewis Walter Maly, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt Col. Glover Johns, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Leslie Dean Baskin, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Dell Stuart Gray, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. William B. Stewart, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt Col. Boyd Lee Smith, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Avery Giles Holmes, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943, subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. George Robert Kennebeck, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Joseph Lyon Boyd, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Richard Foster Thompson, Dental Corps, with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. William Swann Shuttleworth, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 19, 1943.

CHAPLAINS

To be colonel

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) John Oscar Lindquist, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from October 10, 1943, subject to examination required by law.

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Frank Meredith Thompson, United States Army, with rank from October 10, 1943.

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Joseph Burt Webster, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from October 11, 1943.

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Alfred Cookman Oliver, Jr., United States Army, with rank from October 24, 1943, subject to examination required by law.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 1 (legislative day, September 15), 1943:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Elvin Seibert to be consul of the United States of America.

John W. Bailey, Jr., to be Foreign Service officer of class 3, a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, and a consul general of the United States of America.

POSTMASTERS

COLORADO

Wesley A. Simmer, Blanca.
Victor C. Baker, Fairplay.
Roxie R. Broad, Wheat Ridge.

CONNECTICUT

Francis H. Whelan, Darien.
Arthur H. Forst, Seymour.
Paul F. Cassidy, Woodbury.

DELAWARE

Alexander P. Gallagher, New Castle.

GEORGIA

Ola H. Bradbury, Bogart.
Clarence L. Persons, Eastman.
Frances Catherine Wingate, Ellijay.
John Marcus Stubbs, Savannah.
Annie Lee Baker, Shannon.
Eloise G. Flanders, Swainsboro.

INDIANA

Charles E. Hull, Columbus.
Flossie L. Waterstraat, Earl Park.
Closs D. Samuels, Greensburg.
Ethel Williams, Odon.

MASSACHUSETTS

James H. Monahan, Clifton.
Wilma L. Foster, Hamilton.
Bertha S. Nelson, Raynham.

MONTANA

Allen S. McKenzie, Philipsburg.

NEW MEXICO

Robert F. Fisher, Cuba.

NORTH CAROLINA

Edgar M. Martin, East Bend.
James C. Swain, Plymouth.
Gertrude B. Speir, Winterville.

OKLAHOMA

James E. Terrell, Elmore City.

VERMONT

Mary A. Keleher, Bethel.
Earle J. Rogers, Cabot.
Gertrude L. Cutler, Cambridge.
Hollis S. Johnson, Castleton.
Rutherford D. Pfenning, Forest Dale.
Harriette R. Wilson, Grennsboro.
William T. Johnson, Hardwick.
Frank J. Donahue, Middlebury.
Mabel R. Turner, Rupert.
Ruth A. Randall, Wells River.
Ruby C. Gauthier, Wilder.
Margaret M. Flower, Woodstock.

VIRGINIA

Carrie F. Patterson, Greenwood.
Lexie M. Van Dyke, Jewell Ridge.
Harris Hill Gee, Meherrin.

WISCONSIN

Harold C. Krentz, Westfield.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who art the hope of all the ends of the earth amid the tragedy of a broken world, in deep humility of spirit at noonday we ascend the altar stairs of this hallowed temple of our faith and hope. Before we talk of the Nation's good we would lift our needy hearts to the nations' God. For in Thee we trust. When for this dedicated moment we blot out all but Thee in a world of rising and falling empires, we crave the strengthening vista of Thine eternal kingdom whose sun never sets.

Give unto us that greatness of spirit which shall match the vast patterns of this creative day. Save us from setting narrow limits upon our responsibility to our fellow men. May no pettiness in our patriotism rob us of the habitual vision of greatness. May we never hesitate when the choice is between honor and calculation. Beyond the strategy of war may we see the depth and scope of this historic drama of the centuries, and may that vision turn its blood and sweat and tears into glory. We ask it in the ever-blessed name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, October 1, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Davis	McCarran
Andrews	Eastland	McClellan
Austin	Ellender	McFarland
Bailey	Ferguson	McKellar
Ball	George	McNary
Barbour	Gerry	Maloney
Barkley	Gillette	Maybank
Brooks	Green	Millikin
Buck	Guffey	Moore
Burton	Gurney	Murdock
Bushfield	Hatch	Murray
Butler	Hayden	Nye
Byrd	Hill	O'Daniel
Capper	Holman	O'Mahoney
Caraway	Johnson, Calif.	Overton
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Clark, Idaho	Kilgore	Radcliffe
Clark, Mo.	Langer	Reed
Connally	Lodge	Revercomb
Danaher	Lucas	Reynolds

Robertson	Thomas, Utah	Wherry
Russell	Tunnell	White
Shipstead	Tydings	Wiley
Stewart	Vandenberg	Willis
Taft	Van Nuys	Wilson
Thomas, Idaho	Wallgren	
Thomas, Okla.	Wheeler	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is detained on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Conditions on the West Coast.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has been confined to a Madison hospital since September 13.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent on official appointments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE NAVAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON PROGRESS OF THE WAR EFFORT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 38), which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,500 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress on the resolution (H. Res. 30) authorizing and directing an investigation of the progress of the war effort.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF THE TARIFF COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, submitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of personnel requirements for the Commission for the quarter ending December 31, 1943, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

SUSPENSION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC DURING THE WAR: PROHIBITION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING—PETITIONS

Mr. GREEN presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Rhode Island, praying for the enactment of the bills (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, (S. 569) to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes, and (S. 682) to prohibit the paid advertising of alcoholic beverages by radio in certain circumstances, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. J. Res. 54. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1943, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; without amendment (Rept. No. 437).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S 932. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; without amendment (Rept. No. 438).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1408. A bill for the relief of the surviving directors of the Chesboard Co., a dissolved Maryland corporation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. 1409. A bill for the relief of Howard L. Pemberton (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1410. A bill to amend section 4 of the act approved June 13, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 1411. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims for damages to private property in the vicinity of Camp Forrest, Tenn.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 1412. A bill for the relief of Guy Albert Wheaton; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma introduced Senate bill 1413, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. WILSON introduced S. J. Res. 84, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

PROMOTION OF PERMANENT PEACE—CONSULTATIONS WITH FRIENDLY NATIONS

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution for appropriate reference and also request that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 84) requesting the President to invite friendly nations to enter upon consultations with delegates of the United States with a view to the promotion of permanent international peace, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Congress requests the President of the United States to call upon the nations not engaged in warfare against the United States to enter immediately into deliberations looking toward the promotion of permanent international peace.

There is hereby created to participate in such discussion a committee of six delegates from the United States, two to be appointed by the President, two to be elected by the Senate, and two to be elected by the House of Representatives, which delegates shall take oath as prescribed for public officers.

Upon receipt by the President of notification of the willingness of other nations to enter into such discussions, the committee shall begin consultations with the representatives of such other nations, and shall continue until the delegates are recalled by resolution.

The committee may, or shall, upon written request from the President or from the Congress, or from either branch thereof, report and make recommendations jointly to the President and the Congress.

The President of the United States is requested to do all things necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this resolution.

MAXIMUM PRICES FOR CRUDE PETROLEUM

During the delivery of Mr. HILL's speech, which appears later in today's proceedings, the following occurred:

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill, and also to place in the RECORD some statements in support thereof. I send the bill to the desk, and ask that it be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1413) to fix standards for establishing maximum prices for crude petroleum and its products, was received, read twice by its title, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That effective as of the date of enactment of this act, in establishing maximum prices for crude petroleum under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or the act entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, approved October 2, 1942, as amended," or under any other provision of law, consideration shall be given to the necessity for finding, developing, and producing additional crude petroleum, and, to parity as indicated by the relationship between the index of crude petroleum and the index of all commodities as reported by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, under the title of "Average Wholesale Prices and Index Numbers," in its wholesale commodity price index, based on the year 1926; provided, however, that such ceilings shall not be fixed or maintained at less than 35 cents per barrel above the present respective price ceilings for crude petroleum of any and all gravities and qualities throughout the United States wherever situate.

SEC. 2. Concurrently with the establishing of maximum crude petroleum prices as provided in section 1 hereof, maximum prices for petroleum products shall be increased sufficiently to compensate for additional prices paid for crude petroleum.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee.

The bill just introduced proposes to fix the standards for establishing prices for crude petroleum and its products. In order that some of the facts upon which the bill is predicated may be set forth, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a few questions and answers with respect to the need for an increase in the price of crude petroleum.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Question No. 1. Why is an increase in the price of crude oil necessary?

Answer. (1) To stimulate exploratory drilling, thereby increasing our oil reserves, thus making more oil available for military, industrial, and civilian needs.

(2) To stimulate secondary recovery.

(3) To prevent the premature abandonment of stripper wells, of which there were 293,000 at the close of 1942 which produced 15 percent, or 203,000,000 barrels, in 1942, and they constitute three-quarters of all producing wells in the United States. Ten thousand five hundred of these wells were abandoned in 1942, resulting in an estimated loss of 44,000,000 barrels of reserves. In 1942 stripper wells employed 52,000 workers with a pay roll of $93,000,000.

(4) Because the cost of producing crude oil has risen 53 cents per barrel since the price-freeze order became effective (see answer to question 15).

Question No. 2. Why is there a shortage of crude oil?

Answer. (1) It is the result of insufficient price, which has produced the following effects:

(a) Continuous decline in the results of exploratory effort.

(b) Decline in above-ground stocks of crude petroleum.

(c) Decline in total petroleum stocks.

(d) Decline in total well completions.

(e) Increase in percentage of dry holes.

(f) Decline in the productive capacity of the new wells drilled.

(2) The subnormal price has resulted in constantly declining discoveries with less oil found than consumed each year. Not since 1938 have discoveries equalled consumption.

Question No. 3. Is Mr. Pike's statement true that more new fields are being found? Does his statement tell the full story?

Answer. It is true we found more "pools" in 1942 than in any one of the previous 5 years. Mr. Pike failed to reveal the fact that we found less oil, as shown by the following table:

Year	New pools found	Estimated reserves found
1937	221	928,742,000
1938	256	810,493,000
1939	254	340,667,000
1940	304	286,338,000
1941	341	429,974,000
1942	348	260,051,000

Question No. 4. Are we finding as much oil as we are producing?

Answer. No. In the first 6 months of 1943 we found 473,000,000 barrels of new oil. In the same period we produced 709,000,000 barrels.

Question No. 5. Are oil-producing companies making more money this year than in the last few years? Why?

Answer. Theoretically yes, where profits are computed on oil produced which was found at a low cost in prior years; but actually no, if computed on present-day replacement cost. Published statements for the first half of 1943 of some companies when compared with the same period in 1942, indicate increased earnings; however, when compared with 1941 results are less favorable. The thousands of small producers whose operating statements are not published are not making as much money this year in comparison with the last few years.

Question No. 6. Has the cost of finding oil increased since the price freeze order of October 1, 1941?

Answer. Finding costs have nearly doubled in that period of time and are "roughly four times the indicated per barrel cost of finding oil prior to 1938."

Question No. 7. Have the prices of other raw materials risen more than the price of crude petroleum?

Answer. While prices of raw materials have increased 12½ percent since October 1941 the price of crude oil (a raw material) after giving effect to the minor price ceiling adjustments, made by O. P. A., has increased only slightly more than 1½ percent.

Question No. 8. What would be the effect of a 35-cent per barrel increase in the price of crude oil on the cost of living?

Answer. Fifty-eight one-thousandths of 1 percent, raising the index on cost of living from 124.8 to 124.846, an increase so insignificant that it would not cause any change in the United States Bureau of Labor statistics published index figure.

Question No. 9. Can we increase our production of crude petroleum?

Answer. With the exception of west Texas and New Mexico, we are now producing oil in excess of good conservation practices. Until the rate of drilling new wells is substantially increased, production of crude oil will decline. By the time transportation is made available to move additional west Texas and New Mexico crude the decline in domestic crude production may offset any increase from these areas.

Question No. 10. Are we drilling as many wildcat wells as we did in 1941?

Answer. No. The average number of wildcat wells drilled per month is as follows:

1941	272
1942	268
1943	262

Question No. 11. What is the crude-oil price index according to Labor Department statistics using 1926 as a base, and how does it compare with all-commodity price index on the same basis for 1943?

Answer. Crude oil, 62.2; all commodities, 102.8. To bring the national average price of crude up to an index of 102.8, the price per barrel should be $1.93, which would require an increase of 76 cents per barrel over the present national average price of $1.17 per barrel.

Question No. 12. Have our labor costs increased since the price-freeze order?

Answer. Our labor costs have increased 31 percent, based on Bureau of Labor Statistics average weekly earnings for crude-petroleum production.

Question No. 13. Is the statement correct that the output of oil has increased 66 percent since the beginning of hostilities? What are the facts?

Answer. No. Using September 1, 1939, as the date of the outbreak of hostilities in Europe, average daily production of crude petroleum for September 1, 1939, based on total productions for that month per Bureau of Mines, was 3,608,000 barrels. Indicated daily average production for August 1943 was 4,217,000 barrels—an increase of between 16 and 17 percent.

Question No. 14. How much has production increased since the announcement of the price freeze on crude petroleum?

Answer. For the 19 months since the O. P. A. price freeze was imposed on crude oil, the total production in this country was only 1½ percent more than for the 19-month period prior to the price freeze on crude.

Question No. 15. Is the Tariff Commission's report on cost of producing crude petroleum for the years 1939 and 1940, and the 9 months ending September 30, 1941, a proper basis upon which to maintain the price freeze placed on crude petroleum by the O. P. A.?

Answer. No. That report includes the production data of only 13 percent of the oil producers in this country, who owned only one-half of the wells producing crude petroleum. It does not provide for the recovery of capital invested in the drilling of wells prior to 1931. It failed to include an adequate amount for dry holes. It made no allowance for interest on borrowed money. The calculations of production costs as shown in that report did not include the cost of exploring for, discovering, and developing new reserves of crude oil to replace the oil currently produced. Sales at present ceiling prices of crude oil which was found and developed in previous years at low cost, result in a profit, but the cost of finding and developing new oil to replace the oil currently produced, is greater than the present ceiling prices. Production of new oil found is at a loss. This condition encourages liquidation of oil reserves; it discourages exploratory effort and the development of new reserves, resulting in a failure to maintain and make available adequate supplies of crude petroleum for future essential requirements.

Question No. 16. What is the relation of net additional oil wells put into operation to the average price of crude oil?

Answer. In 1916 we put approximately 10,000 additional wells into operation. The prevailing price was $1.10. In 1920, when the average price of crude petroleum rose to $3.07, we drilled and put into operation 40,163 producing oil wells. In 1931, when the price of oil dropped to 65 cents per barrel, there was a reduction of 15,220 in the total number of operating oil wells.

Question No. 17. What are the percentage war demands for gasoline?

Answer. Based on data available for P. A. W. districts I, II, and III, the increasing percentage of total gasoline that goes to the military are:

	Percent
In 1942	12.5
First quarter, 1943	21.4
Second quarter, 1943	23.1
Last half, 1943 (estimated)	30.6
In 1944 (estimated)	37.6
In 1945 (estimated)	39.6

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement with respect to the cost of production of crude petroleum.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Subcommittee on Cost of Production has been meeting for the past 2 days for the purpose of determining the cost of finding, developing, and producing crude oil as of June 30, 1943. Also, to consider the effect that the 48-hour week will have on future costs and to determine the increased costs since Octber 1941, which was the date of freezing the price of crude oil.

The Tariff Commission report on cost of Producing Crude Petroleum for the years

1939-40, and the 9 months ended September 30, 1941, is not a proper basis upon which to maintain the price freeze placed on crude petroleum by the Office of Price Administration.

It is historical and does not provide for replacement costs.

It does not include any provision for the cost of financing exploratory and development work. Interest on borrowed funds is a substantial amount.

It does not include any allowance for the thousands of operators whose individual production is small, and whose average production costs are substantially higher than the production costs of the few major companies and other large companies whose volume of production enables them to produce crude petroleum at a lower cost than the average producer and whose figures dominate the results shown by the Tariff Commission.

The finding and developing costs are based on the cost of the finding of discoveries and extensions of pools for the first 6 months of the year amounting to 437,963,000 barrels of oil. The operating costs are based on the cost of producing 709,342,000 barrels. It is estimated that the extensions and discoveries are 272,000,000 short of equalling the production for the first 6 months of the year. We realize that it would very likely cost more to find and discover the additional 272,000,000 barrels necessary to maintain reserves than it did to find and discover the 437,963,000 barrels, but no allowance has been made for this point.

We have estimated that the cost of finding, producing, and developing a barrel of crude oil as of June 30, 1943, was $1.244 which is an increase of 48 cents per barrel over the cost of the third quarter of 1941, as reflected by the Tariff Commission's report. We further estimate that the 48-hour week will increase the cost at least 5 cents per barrel. This would bring the cost at the present date to $1.294, exclusive of interest for capital.

The costs are summarized below:

Finding costs	$0.578
Development costs	.320
Production costs	.388
	1.286
Less gas and miscellaneous revenue	.042
Estimated June 30, 1943, cost	1.244
Estimated additional costs caused by increased hours at overtime rate	.050
	1.294
Tariff Commission report, third quarter 1941, cost	.764
Increased cost since the freezing of crude oil prices	.53

The margin above cost should be sufficient to provide for:

(a) Funds for the exploration needed to find adequate new reserves.

(b) Funds to cover replacement cost.

(c) A reserve fund for secondary recovery or other conservation measures.

(d) A fair return on borrowed and invested capital, taking into consideration the extreme hazards involved in searching for and finding oil.

(e) To maintain the industry as a healthy, going concern.

(f) For Federal and State income taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). The bill will be referred to the committee——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma asked that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee. I do not happen to know what the appropriate committee is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was about to announce that the bill will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. HATCH. Before the bill is referred I wish to make a request, perhaps of the Chair, and also of the Senator from Oklahoma. There was appointed by the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys a subcommittee, headed by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. That subcommittee made quite an extensive study of this entire subject. I wonder if the bill might be referred to that committee, to be studied by the subcommittee of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am entirely willing that the bill go to any committee to which the Chair may see fit to refer it. The question of what committee the bill shall be referred to is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Chair.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the bill deals with price ceilings which have been effected under the Price Control Act, and it seems to me the bill should go to the committee which dealt with that subject.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I wish Senators would turn this way when they speak. I could not follow anything that was said by the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Kentucky, or the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say to the Senator that the discussion has related only to the committee to which the bill should be referred. The Chair was about to announce that it would be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, which had sponsored the price-control legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. That is by reason of the fact that it proposes to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, which was considered originally by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. McNARY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3291) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INVESTIGATION OF SLUM CLEARANCE AND HOUSING PROGRAM IN THE DISTRICT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 184), which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia investigate the slum clearance and housing program now being administered or proposed by the National Capital Housing Authority, with a view to recommending a sound program for meeting the needs of the National Capital for the same, both during the present emergency and in the post-war period, and for financing the program.

AMERICAN LEGION STAND ON SIZE OF ARMY

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I read a telegram from Francis M. Sullivan, executive director of the national legislative committee of the American Legion, dated September 28, addressed to me:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 28, 1943.*

Hon. WARREN R. AUSTIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The American Legion, at its national convention held at Omaha last week, adopted a resolution with respect to manpower army reading as follows:

"The Chief of Staff has stated that 7,700,000 men are needed by December 31, 1943. As this figure has been based upon a definite strategic plan and worked out by the experts, any authority who undertakes to change this figure, recommended as a minimum for the plan envisaged, must assume the responsibility for the effect upon the plan which may result from such change."

I feel certain Senate would want Legion viewpoint on this vital subject.

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
Executive Director, National Legislative Committee of the American Legion.

NUMBER OF ENLISTED MEN IN THE ARMY IN THE UNITED STATES ON SEPTEMBER 1, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have before me a letter from the War Department dated October 2, 1943, signed by Brig. Gen. Edward W. Smith, Deputy Chief, Legislative and Liaison Division. The letter is addressed to me as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, and reads as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, October 2, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Senate Military Affairs Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: There is herewith submitted for the record of the proceedings of S. 763 the following information, which was requested for the record:

The Army has in the United States (as of September 1, 1943) 1,172,000 enlisted men with 1 to 2 years service, 510,000 enlisted men with 2 to 3 years service, 84,000 enlisted men with over 3 years service.

NOTE.—Figures are based on carefully controlled sample survey.

Sincerely yours,
EDWARD W. SMITH,
Brigadier General, G. S. C., Deputy Chief, Legislative and Liaison Division.

DISCHARGES OF LIMITED-SERVICE MEN AT CAMP CLAIBORNE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have before me a memorandum from the War Department signed by Maj. Bryce N. Harlow, General Staff Corps, on the subject Information Requested of the Chief of Staff. The communication reads:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, September 29, 1943.

1. On Monday, September 20, 1943, Senator BURTON K. WHEELER asked General Marshall to justify an alleged discharge of 5,000 limited-service men from Camp Claiborne during the previous 30 days.

2. Between August 15 and September 15, 1943, 1,127 discharges took place at Camp Claiborne. These discharges were for all

causes, not for limited-service personnel exclusively. During this period, Camp Claiborne was used as a reclassification and discharge center—for the stations of the Eighth Service Command, the Army Air Forces, and the Army Ground Forces units in the Louisiana maneuver area. Individuals who could not be absorbed in their units were transferred to Camp Claiborne for screening and reassignment. No man was discharged merely because he was "limited service." On the contrary, men whom the Army could utilize in station complements or service units were transferred thereto.

For the Chief, Legislative and Liaison Division:

BRYCE N. HARLOW,
Major, General Staff Corps,
Assistant Executive.

RICHARD L. RIEDEL

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, for more than 25 years Richard L. Riedel, a young employee of the United States Senate, has served as contact man between Senators and the representatives of the press, the various photographic units, and the radio representatives assigned to this branch of the National Government. Richard is known to every Member of the Senate. He is a young man of only 34 years of age; nevertheless, he has been in the service of the Government, engaged in the Senate, for more than 25 years, having begun his service during the administration of Woodrow Wilson.

I am sure that every Member of the Senate deeply appreciates the excellent and courteous service Richard has rendered the Members of this body from time to time. Being one of the Members of the Senate who appreciates very deeply his courteous attention and service in bringing us in contact from day to day and time to time with members of the press, the radio, and the photographers, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD of today a very interesting, truthful, and excellent article in regard to Richard L. Riedel. The article appeared in the Evening Star of Tuesday, September 28, 1943, and is entitled "R. L. Riedel, Liaison Man at 34, Marks Twenty-fifth Year on Senate Job."

During my service in the Senate I have never found any employee of the Senate more courteous, affable, or agreeable than is Mr. Riedel.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

R. L. RIEDEL, LIAISON MAN AT 34, MARKS TWENTY-FIFTH YEAR ON SENATE JOB

Richard Langham Riedel is only 34, but he began today his twenty-sixth year as an employee of the Senate.

Mr. Riedel, starting his long service as a page, now is chief liaison man between the Senators and the press, radio, and photographers. For years he has been a familiar figure to correspondents in the Senate Gallery who sought emergency interviews with Senators, and usually it was he who called them off the floor to meet reporters in an anteroom.

When Mr. Riedel began work at the Senate September 27, 1918, Woodrow Wilson was President; Thomas R. Marshall, Vice President; and Champ Clark, Speaker. The last Union veteran in the Senate, Francis E. Warren, of Wyoming, father-in-law of General Pershing, still was in office, and so was the last Confederate veteran, John H. Bankhead, Sr., of Alabama, father of the late Speaker, William B. Bankhead, and of the present Senator, John H. Bankhead. Five of the first Senators from newly admitted States were sitting.

Only three men who then were in the Senate and have served consecutively since remain in the Chamber. They are Senators SMITH, Democrat, of South Carolina; MCKELLAR, Democrat, of Tennessee; and JOHNSON, Republican, of California. Minority Leader MCNARY had been in the Senate, but was out from November 6 to December 18, 1918, awaiting the start of a new term. Senator GERRY, Democrat, of Rhode Island, was a Member when the youth signed up, but later his tenure of office was interrupted for several years.

Mr. Riede. is a ready reference on all the present Senators, their affiliations, and backgrounds. He also knows every newspaperman, radio commentator, and photographer who visits the Senate regularly and many who appear occasionally. In the early days of talking pictures he helped persuade some doubting Senators that it was safe for them to speak into the new camera.

He plans to celebrate his silver anniversary under the Capitol dome by giving a series of lectures on Washington illustrated with motion pictures and slides he made. The lectures, he said, deal with the city, its people, its endless pageantry, and its scenic and historic surroundings.

PLOTTING A SENSIBLE COURSE FOR PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address, entitled "Plotting a Sensible Course for Peace," delivered by him in Denver on September 15, 1943, before the Social Service Foundation of the University of Denver in cooperation with the Rocky Mountain Radio Council, which appears in the Appendix.]

VISIT BY SENATORS TO FIGHTING FRONTS

[Mr. MCNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Arthur Krock from the New York Times of October 3, 1943, entitled "War Tour by Senators Promises Wide Benefits," and an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of October 4, 1943, entitled "Men Who Justify the Existence of America," relating to the recent tour of battle fronts by Senators, with particular reference to the report made on the floor of the Senate by Senator LODGE, which appear in the Appendix.]

SPEAK UP AMERICA—ADDRESS BY HON. ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Speak Up America," delivered by former Gov. Alf M. Landon, October 1, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

AVAILABLE ACREAGE FOR PRODUCTION—ADDRESS BY CARL H. WILKEN

[Mr. BUSHFIELD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Available Acreage for Production," delivered by Carl H. Wilken, educational director, National Association of Agricultural Commissioners and Secretaries, at the recent National Food Conference at Chicago, Ill., which appears in the Appendix.]

TERMINATION OF WAR CONTRACTS—LETTER FROM JAMES S. KNOWLSON

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to Mayor Kelly, of Chicago, by James S. Knowlson, chairman, Post-War Economic Advisory Council of Chicago, dealing with the subject of termination of war contracts, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE—REVIEW BY DAVID G. FARRELLY

[Mr. VAN NUYS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a review of the Senate Judiciary Committee by David G. Farrelly, of Princton University, published in the June issue of the American Political Science Review, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE YOUNG DEAD SOLDIERS DO NOT SPEAK—EDITORIAL BY ARCHIBALD MACLEISH

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Young Dead Soldiers Do Not Speak," written by Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress, and published in connection with the recent War bond drive, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On September 30, 1943:

S. 929. An act for the relief of Dr. Douglas E. Lawson.

On October 1, 1943:

S. 332. An act for the relief of Velma Pikkarainen.

AMERICA'S CLOSED-DOOR POLICY

Mr. HILL obtained the floor.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "End America's Closed-Door Policy Now," which appeared in the September 20 issue of Christianity and Crisis. The article comments upon an interview with Bishop Paul Yu-Pin, distinguished Chinese churchman, which earlier appeared in the Commonweal.

I am among those who have long felt the need for a change in the law which completely excludes Chinese immigration into the United States, and I am impressed by this article, and by the statement of Bishop Yu-Pin, who treats the subject very frankly.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

END AMERICA'S CLOSED-DOOR POLICY NOW

Our esteemed contemporary The Commonweal carried a deeply moving interview with Bishop Paul Yu-pin, visiting Roman Catholic leader. He permitted himself a certain frankness which even Madame Chiang avoided in her public utterances. Yet he spoke a word which America needs to hear from the lips of a representative Chinese. He will be charged by some with having sought to intimidate America. But only fools will avoid a certain tremor of apprehension at the obvious truth of what the bishop had to say regarding America's closed-door policy by which Chinese are excluded from the immigration quota and from the privilege of citizenship, a long-time policy

conceived in prejudice and ill will in 1882 and recently again confirmed by congressional committee action.

Here are his words as quoted in The Commonweal interview: "If your attitude of superiority continues, if the Far East becomes convinced that the United States has forfeited her moral right to leadership and is fixed in her determination to look down upon the colored races, I can foresee only a prospect which makes me tremble at its horrors. * * * In that case the next war would almost inevitably be a war between races, and that would mean a war in which not only armies are pitted against each other, armies and industries, but a war in which child is against child, woman against woman, grandfather against grandfather. * * * It would literally be to the death, and we would not hear of unconditional surrender, but of annihilation.

"Here the legislature of the greatest of the United Nations, the one to which China looked for true understanding, reaffirms a racist law of the most insulting and stringent kind. * * * It comes as a deadly blow to all we had hoped for. * * * No matter how friendly any of us may personally be towards you, we cannot answer for the thoughts of our countrymen's hearts. They will think that the Atlantic Charter is a sham. They will think that your adherence to Christianity is a hypocrisy."

If the common answer be given—"Would you have us open our gates to a flood of Chinese immigration?" (actually it would mean less than 150 a year on the present quota plan)—Bishop Yu-pin has this to say: "We do not wish to have you open your country to a flood of Chinese immigrants. That is your own problem, for you to solve precisely as you wish. It is an internal problem. But we do object to being branded not only as being inferior to you, but as inferior to all the other nations and races in the world, without exception. And this is precisely what your Chinese Exclusion Act does. This is what it means to the Chinese, and no other meaning can logically be attached to it."

These are strong words, but they are not too strong. They are utterly candid and utterly true as anyone knows who has lived in China. They give weight to the fears recently expressed by Pearl Buck and others.

What will American Christianity do? To our sorrow we recall that when the country was madly selling military supplies to the Japanese—whose enmity we had recklessly purchased in part with a crude and unnecessary exclusion act—the church forces were unable to persuade Congress of the suicidal nature of our policy. Events have shown that the churches were right.

Will there be another failure, and a still more inexcusable one? The answer is that there may be unless extraordinary efforts are now made to get a review of the matter in Congress at some early future date.

It is plain to see that careful but plain-spoken education is needed. It ought to be possible not only to enlist the support of the many friends of China throughout the land but likewise of the parents of the boys who have laid down their lives—or may be called upon to lay down their lives—fighting in the Pacific. It ought to be possible to secure the active support of those whose sons, now infants, may be involved in World War No. 3, if such folly is not redeemed by action consistent with our loudly announced principles.

Happily the abolition of extraterritoriality has been achieved, although it took 20 years for others to follow the example of Russia in this action, and one can recall the time when to suggest it was to have verbal brickbats hurled at one's head. The effect of this throughout China was electric. It brought forth the expression of an almost pathetic gratitude. It is safe to assume that had there been no war this victory would have been very hard, if not impossible, to win. The time for action on the Exclusion Act is now, while the thought of America is concerned with China and China's heroic part in our war effort.

If this strikes you as sound, why not do something about it? The place to begin is in your own community, your church, your political circle. Mme. Chiang has reminded us that "the Lord helps those who help themselves." If we accomplish the righting of this wrong we shall not only be helping China; we shall most emphatically be helping ourselves and building a bulwark against the racial conflict which is otherwise only too possible.

It might be well to remember that of the world's population less than a third are white.

H. S. L.

Mr. MALONEY. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there may also be printed at this point in the RECORD, an article by Gould Lincoln, which appeared in Saturday's Washington Star, and which deals with the same subject, and clearly explains why we should take immediate action on a measure proposed by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS]. The Senator from Florida has heretofore addressed the Senate on the subject and has introduced a bill which would do justice to our great ally.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

A real effort to get Congress to repeal the laws excluding Chinese immigration into the United States and to place China on an immigration quota, along with other nations, is under way. Senator ANDREWS, Democrat, of Florida, has introduced a bill for this purpose—a companion to the bill which was introduced in the House last June by Representative MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington.

The advisability, as well as the justice, of such a move is apparent. China is our ally. She has waged for years a magnificent defensive war against the Japanese, our enemy. The resentment of the Chinese against American exclusion laws is well understood. A repeal of these laws would have a psychological effect of great value, not only during the war, but also in the post-war period, when China will be due for a great revival of industry and trade.

Sixty years ago this country enacted its first Chinese Exclusion Act. At that time employers of labor, particularly the railroad builders, had been importing Chinese coolies in unrestricted numbers. Because they were willing to work long hours for little pay and were able to live on far less than American labor was willing or able to live on, there was a roar against the importation of Chinese labor. In 1882, therefore, the Congress put through the Exclusion Act.

JAP EXCLUSION SOUGHT

Not long after this, there also was a demand for the exclusion of Japanese labor. President Theodore Roosevelt, in 1907, was able to negotiate the so-called gentleman's agreement with Japan, whereby Japanese immigration was limited without the enactment of a law. In 1924, however, Congress prohibited Japanese immigration. Only doctors, ministers, and students were admitted thereafter.

Under the present immigration quota law, the Chinese would be allowed only 105 immigrants into this country per year. The small number, even if the Chinese were able and willing to work for less wages and to live on less food, could not be considered a threat either to American labor or to American standards of living. This maximum immigration from all countries permitted under the quota law, based on the size of the blood strains already in the United States, is 153,774 persons annually.

Senator ANDREWS already has interested Chairman RUSSELL of the Senate Immigration Committee in his bill. Senator ANDREWS is himself a member of the committee. It is his hope that it will be possible to begin hearings on the measure in the near future. The State and Justice Departments have been requested to make reports on the bill. When these have been received, Senator ANDREWS plans to ask the committee to begin immediate consideration of the proposal.

CHINESE PRAISED

When he offered his bill Senator ANDREWS said: "The heroic accomplishments of the Chinese people as one of the United Nations in the present global war against totalitarianism make it very appropriate that China should be treated on a par with other countries. The United States has already entered on this policy by voluntarily relinquishing extraterritorial jurisdiction over Americans in China and abolishing the United States Court in China, which for years exercised jurisdiction over such cases. I dedicate my efforts in this matter personally to the First Lady of China, Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, and her heroic husband, recently made President of China, in an effort to aid in a continued friendship which I trust will be everlasting."

In the new world which is expected to arise from the ashes of the present war, China, with her 450,000,000 people, is expected to play an important part. Her leaders are intent upon China's becoming a great, educated, industrial nation as well as agricultural. The estimates of her needs are fabulous in materials of all kinds. It is high time, in the opinion of Senator ANDREWS, that the friendship between this country and China be cemented. Nothing, in his opinion, could be done which would tend to tighten this friendship more than a repeal of the Exclusion Act.

WARREN BACKS MOVE

It is worthy of note that the bill has been offered in the House by a Member from the Pacific coast, where the demand for Chinese, as well as Japanese, exclusion first held sway. Representative MAGNUSON feels as strongly in this matter of improving relations with China as does Senator ANDREWS. Recently when Governor Warren, of California, was attending the meeting of the Republican Post-War Advisory Council on Mackinac Island, Mich., he was asked about the proposal to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act and permit Chinese immigration under the quota system. Governor Warren said then that if the move could be confined to the Chinese, he saw no reason it should not be carried forward. He expressed a fear that later an effort might be made to broaden it, even to the inclusion of Japanese. That, he said, the people of California would firmly resist.

The present strategy is to get Senate approval of the bill first and then bring it up in the House committee and in the House itself. The supporters of the measure are looking forward with interest to the attitude of the administration on the measure. This it is expected will be expressed in the letters which the Senate committee expects to receive from the State and Justice Departments. The immigration bureau is now

in the Justice Department, having been transferred from the Labor Department.

SUNFLOWER ORDNANCE PROJECT, DE SOTO, KANS.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "The Sunflower Scandal," published in the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUNFLOWER SCANDAL

The war's most sensational graft charges, involving construction contractors on the Sunflower ordnance project at De Soto, Kans., were made by Senator LANGER in the United States Senate this week on the basis of information submitted by former Gov. Payne Ratner, of Kansas.

The ordnance plant, which has never produced any powder, was originally scheduled to cost $56,000,000, but LANGER claims it has already cost $129,000,000, and construction is still going on.

Thousands of feet of new lumber, it is charged, were burnt as waste, while temporary buildings, made of good used lumber, were simply knocked down by bulldozers and swept aside. Millions of pounds of concrete were defectively mixed, with the result that piers, columns, and foundations cracked and fell in. It is claimed that excessive amounts of water were mixed with the concrete in order to increase the use of cement, and it is alleged that foremen were actually given bonuses according to the amount of material they could waste.

Langer stated that three C. C. C.-type buildings were hauled down from Iowa at a labor cost of $55,000 when they could have been reproduced in brick for $15,000, that one contractor bought 1,000,000 pencils at 9 cents each when they can be purchased retail for two for a nickel, and that unused structural steel, kegs of bolts, lengths of pipe, etc., were actually buried in the ground for purposes of concealment. Cases are cited where hundreds of workmen "hid out" at wages as high as 90 cents an hour, because material on sidings never reached the jobs, and where dirt was hauled 1 yard at a time in 5-yard trucks at the regular 5-yard price, running the dirt-moving cost up to $5,000,000, when it should have been $625,000.

The cost of the Sunflower works, whether it produces a pound of powder or not, will equal the entire cost of the War of 1812.

What is disturbing is Senator LANGER's charge that these allegations as they have developed have been placed before the Department of Justice and that agents from the Attorney General's office, sent to the Sunflower project, have stated that they have found no irregularities, and the Attorney General has therefore refused to begin any prosecutions. Senator LANGER further states that when former Governor Ratner sought information from Federal agencies as to the identity of the stockholders and directors of the various contracting corporations the information was refused on the ground that it was confidential matter.

It is difficult for the average citizen to believe that under all this smoke there is not at least some fire. There is no graft so easy to conceal as war graft, for all kinds of dirt can be swept under the rug of military secrecy. But any scandal of the magnitude charged in the Sunflower case deserves special congressional investigation with a full and open hearing on all pertinent facts.

In a nation which has set the school children to gathering up bits of scrap metal, which refuses farmers the lumber to build barns, and which pleads for every possible dollar to be placed in War bonds, any claim by responsible persons that good metal is being buried, good lumber burned, and good money thrown away to no purpose is a matter of national concern.

SHORTAGE OF CARS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF CROPS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama further yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate again, as I have time and again since the Congress reconvened, the situation in the Northwest relative to the boxcars furnished by the railroads to carry the crops. Senators are familiar with the fact that a hundred or more telegrams have been published in the RECORD which have been sent here by various elevators and leading farm organizations. This morning I received a telegram from the North Dakota Public Service Commission, by Ben C. Larkin and C. W. McDonnell, also carrying the signature of the commissioner of agriculture and labor, by Matt Dahl, as well as the attorney general, State of North Dakota, by Neal E. Williams, special assistant. The situation in North Dakota is appalling. The telegram is as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *October 1, 1943.*

UNITED STATES SENATOR WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

Shippers advisory board meeting yesterday develops that American railroads will be required to furnish approximately 10,000 grain cars per month to Canadian railroads at Portal, N. Dak., Emerson, Manitoba, and Duluth, Minn., to transport approximately 18,000,000 bushels feed wheat to United States for consumption in southeast and eastern territory. Understand this is under order Department of Agriculture and War Food Administration. North Dakota farmers, grain elevators, producers, and others object strenuously to the arrangement while North Dakota's wheat, flax, and other grains are being dumped on the ground for lack of railroad cars. We have over 1,100 elevators blocked at this time. Some have been blocked since last June. If we don't get cars immediately to handle this grain our farmers will lose millions of bushels through deterioration and this valuable food crop so important to the war effort will go to waste. Snow will begin to cover our crops which are only 60 percent harvested at this time unless you intervene to save the situation. Too much attention being devoted to obsolete car service rule while our crops are spoiling on the ground for lack of boxcars and our War Food Administration paying attention to Canadian feed for southeast and eastern farmers while food spoils in North Dakota. Flax is being windrowed account no place to store under cover at this time. Can you personally take charge of this situation until North Dakota elevators are opened up for business? Understand that cars intended for North Dakota being diverted to other territories before reaching North Dakota.

Mr. President, I took the matter up with the proper authorities in Washington and was told that nothing could be done about the matter. Mind you, the railroads are saying they cannot obtain cars. Yet we find this item in the Washington Evening Star of October 1, 1943. The headline is as follows:

Sixty new boxcars are offered for sale in newspaper ads.

The article continues:

Railroad facilities are burdened to capacity with wartime freight loads, but 60 nearly new boxcars were advertised for sale here today—to anyone with the purchase price and an engine to haul them away.

To make the offer more attractive, the owner, the Warren Tank Car Co., of Warren, Pa., promised to paint the cars without extra charge and to letter on the name or numerals of the purchaser.

Melvin D. Hildreth, attorney at 1420 New York Avenue NW., who inserted newspaper ads for the tank-car company, said he was certain someone would be interested in view of the difficulty of obtaining railroad rolling stock today.

Mr. Hildreth said, however, that he had failed in attempts to dispose of the cars to Government agencies interested in the transportation problem.

In other words, Mr. President, while our grain is spoiling in North Dakota the transportation agencies of the country are refusing to buy these 60 boxcars which could be used to transport our crops.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator from North Dakota to place something in the RECORD. If he is going to make a speech I shall have to decline to yield further, because I must proceed with my speech. With all courtesy to my good friend, I shall yield for him to place something in the RECORD, but must decline to yield for a speech.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama. I serve notice that later this afternoon, at the first opportunity, I shall submit a resolution and ask for unanimous action on it, so we may help the food situation and the farmers of North Dakota.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the Senator to yield to me for about 7 minutes, in which time I wish to place in the RECORD some facts and figures dealing with the Federal civilian employees in the State of California. I do not think it will take more than 5 or 6, or at the outside 7 minutes to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Illinois for that purpose?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I declined to yield further to my friend the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. Is the Senator from Illinois going to make much comment?

Mr. LUCAS. No. I am simply going to read certain figures into the RECORD, and then make very brief comment concerning them. If I take what the Senator considers to be too much time, he can do with me as he did with the Senator from North Dakota, refuse to yield further.

Mr. HILL. Very well, Mr. President, I yield for the purpose indicated by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, when on September 14 we returned from a 2-months' recess, my very able and loquacious friend, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], made a lengthy speech in which he discussed primarily what he had discovered during that time among his own people in Wisconsin. He distinctly said that among all persons on the home front there was "grave concern about the vast bureaucracy of Federal employees."

Then he proceeded to talk about his own State. He also laid particular stress upon conditions in the State of California, saying that in that State there were 232,500 employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government. When I asked the able junior Senator from Wisconsin if he had a break-down of that figure, he said he did not, but that he would obtain one in order to give the country the true information with respect to the employees.

I have watched the RECORD daily, to ascertain the information which I assumed would be forthcoming through the efforts of the Senator from Wisconsin; but to date it has not been presented to the Senate. Therefore, I took it upon myself to find out, through the Civil Service Commission, who were included in the figure 232,000 Federal employees in the State of California; because the statement made by the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin intrigued me to the point where I wanted to know the classification by categories of the employees. In that debate I specifically asked the Senator whether the figure he cited did not include Army and Navy employees. His reply was that he did not think so, but he did not know.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter from the Civil Service Commission. The Commission has gone into the problem, which, as it affects California, affects every other State in the Union. The letter in substance is as follows:

DEAR SENATOR LUCAS: In reply to your letter of September 25, 1943, concerning Federal employment in the State of California, the following data are submitted:

Total Federal civilian employees in California—234,400.

Mr. President, when one reads the speech of the Senator from Wisconsin; which does not give any break-down whatever, one is led to the conclusion that men working in the Army or the Navy are in the group mentioned by the Senator, and that all of them are Federal employees who for some cause or other, some mysterious reason, have been played upon the pay roll; just as someone in my State—I think it was the attorney general—recently had the temerity to say in a speech that the Federal Government was moving 200,000 Federal employees into the State in order to control the election in 1944.

Here is the break-down:

War Department, 112,400.
Navy Department, 72,900.
O. P. A., 3,900.
Office for Emergency Management, 5,800.

The Office for Emergency Management includes the Office of Alien Property Custodian, the central administrative agencies, the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, the National War Labor Board, the Office of Civilian Defense, the Office of Defense Transportation, the Office of Economic Stabilization, the Office of Lend-Lease Administration, the Office of Liaison Officer, the Office of Scientific Research and Development, the Office of War Information, the War Manpower Commission, the War Production Board, the War Relocation Authority, and the War Shipping Administration. In all those agencies, in California, there are 5,800 employees.

In other war agencies in California there are 3,200 employees; and those agencies include the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, the Maritime Commission, the Board of Economic Warfare, and the Office of Censorship.

In the Treasury Department there are 4,300 employees in the State of California. In the Post Office Department, 17,400 employees in California. In the Department of Agriculture, 4,600; in the Department of Commerce, 1,200; in the National Housing Agency, 1,600; in the Federal Works Agency, 500; in the Civil Service Commission, 300; in the Veterans Administration, 2,700; in all other agencies, 3,600.

Mr. President, in that tabulation there are many of the long-established agencies, and I dare say that no one is very anxious to take employees away from a number of those agencies which have been in existence for many years. The other of the agencies grew out of the war. The figures I have cited are taken, so the Civil Service Commission says—

from a recent survey by the Civil Service Commission covering employment during the period April 1–June 30, 1943. These employment statistics include only civilian employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

The letter to me from the Civil Service Commission concludes as follows:

The total for the War Department includes all civilian employees in army air depots and bases, signal and medical depots, ordnance depots, hospitals, camps, posts, and stations; the total for the Navy Department includes all civilian personnel engaged in navy yards, supply depots, air stations, hospital and other Naval establishments. It might be mentioned that the bulk of these War and Navy civilian employees are manual workers such as mechanics and other skilled artisans, semiskilled operatives, laborers, and helpers.

Yours respectfully,

HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President, Civil Service Commission.

So much has been said by the opposition about the bungling bureaucrats, so much will be said in the future, that it is apparent to anyone who reads between the lines, or who even reads the lines themselves, that bureaucracy in Government is the chief thing the opposition will rely upon in the future. When they come forth on the floor of the Senate with a statement of the kind I have mentioned, denouncing bureaucracy in Government in no uncertain terms, but leaving the Senate and the public at large to guess what the figures mean, I say it is totally unfair to the American people. For that reason, I went into the figures submitted by the junior Senator from Wisconsin on California alone in order that the Senate and the country might know what the break-down is.

I thank the Senator from Alabama for yielding this time to me.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] has referred to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. Ordinarily, I should be inclined to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin; but I have now yielded 40 minutes. Let me ask whether the Senator desires to make a request to have matter printed in the RECORD, or whether he desires to make a speech.

Mr. WILEY. No, Mr. President; I do not have in mind requesting the insertion of matter in the RECORD. I think the practice of the Senate has been that when one Senator questions another Senator, the Senator who is questioned is given an opportunity to reply.

I assure the Senator from Alabama that if he will give me 5 or 6 minutes, it will not take more than that to reply to what was said by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois. I shall not even debate with my friend from Illinois the question of who is the more loquacious, he or I. That issue is irrelevant.

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator for a few minutes; but I must say to him very frankly that unless he makes his remarks very short and very brief, I cannot yield further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I listened with a great deal of interest to my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Illinois. At one time I thought he was going to say something of great significance. His speech was really a defense of bureaucracy. If he will read the remarks which I made on the 14th of September, he will see that I said on that occasion that I had just been handed the data, and that I would check into them and obtain a break-down, if possible. I did attempt to check into them and get a break-down. The undisputed figures show that there are engaged in the Government service at this time more than 3,000,000 men and women. It is true that 40 percent of them are engaged in the war-production plants, but the other 1,600,000 are out-and-out bureaucrats.

That is the way our friends the new dealers have reduced the number of Government employees. If we go back to 1932, we remember that one of the pledges made to the Nation was that bureaucracy would be reduced. At that time the Federal Government employed approximately 562,000 people in the civil service. Now the number is in excess of 3,000,000. At the time Roosevelt took over in March 1933 there were about 65,000 Government employees in Washington. Now there are in Washington over 300,000 Government employees. The distinguished Senator from Illinois brought out the fact that there were 120,400 persons engaged in the War De-

partment services in California and 72,900 engaged in the Navy. That would leave approximately 30,000 Federal employees still in the other bureaus—in one State alone.

For days now we have been talking about manpower. Think of it! In one State in this country, according to these figures, 203,300 persons have been taken out of active Navy and Army service. I asked the Bureau to break down these figures further for me. I said that I wanted to know what those employees were doing, and whether or not men were engaged in sweeping floors when they ought to be in the Army and Navy. So far, however, we have obtained no breakdown. I do not question the ability and integrity of many of those Government servants. I do question the necessity in wartime of employing so many of them, especially when the armed services are calling for men.

I might say——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I shall have to decline to yield further.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to report that the Committee on the Judiciary——

Mr. HILL. I decline to yield. If the Senator wishes me to yield to him for the purpose of submitting some report, he must ask that I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I make the point of order that I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). The Chair rules that the Senator from Alabama has the floor. He yielded to the Senator from Wisconsin. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I make the point of order that when the Senator from Alabama yielded to me, the floor became mine. I ask for a ruling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama yielded to the Senator from Wisconsin conditionally, and stated at the time that the Senator would have to conclude promptly; otherwise he would have to decline to yield further.

Mr. WILEY. I make the point of order that the rules do not provide for conditional yielding. I ask for a ruling on that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the precedents the point of order of the Senator from Wisconsin is overruled. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate presents to the Senate a momentous decision the like of which, so far as I can ascertain, the Congress was never called upon to make during the last great war. Certainly this is the first time it has been called upon to make so momentous a decision during this war.

The decision which the Congress must make is whether or not the Congress shall interfere with the plans and the grand strategy of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the high command of the Army and Navy; whether or not the Congress shall set up its judgment and attempt to say to the high command and the Joint Chiefs of Staff that their plans must be changed, that the Congress imposes its judgment and says to them that they may not carry out their plans as they have made them, but that they must do what Congress says and change their plans.

The bill would have Congress not take affirmative action, not do something which would help or fortify or strengthen the war effort; but would have Congress negative that which it has already done in behalf of the war effort. The bill would have Congress change the policy which it declared in the Selective Service Act. The bill would do violence to that act. It would strike at the fundamental theory and basis of the act.

When Congress enacted the Selective Service Act, it refused to make any class distinctions. It refused to legislate upon any class basis. Congress envisioned the Selective Service Act as Woodrow Wilson had envisioned it during the last war, when he declared that it was an act not for the conscription of the individual, but for selection from a nation which had volunteered en masse. In enacting that legislation Congress decided that it would select men between the ages of 18 and 38; that those who could render the greatest and best service in the armed forces would stay in the armed forces; and that those who could render greater or better service in some other occupation than the armed services would serve in other places.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think perhaps the Senator would like to correct a statement which he made. He stated that Congress had decided that we should select men between the ages of 18 and 38. So far as I know, Congress has never mentioned the age 38. Congress placed the age limit at 45. We permitted the President to make an age classification. He availed himself of that privilege by saying that men 38 and over should not be drafted at the present time.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct; but when Congress gave the President power to set the age limit at 38, it did so knowing that it might be necessary to exercise that power, and to that extent delegated the power to the President of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. That applies not only to age 38, but also age 30, or any other age which the President might choose.

Mr. HILL. That is correct. Congress gave to the President a very broad power. Of course, unless Congress had specifically delegated that power to the President, he would not possess it.

In the past, with a few minor exceptions, the Congress has definitely refused to legislate on any class basis. The basis upon which the Congress has legislated has been in the national interest and what the individual citizen was doing, what contribution he was making to the war effort, and whether or not the place in which he was occupied afforded him the best opportunity to make his greatest contribution to the war effort. In the pending bill we are asked to change that policy, to do violence to the fundamental concept of the Selective Service Act, and to proceed to defer, or remove from liability for armed service, a class of men, not on the basis of what they are doing, not on the basis of what contribution they are making to the war effort, but because they have a particular personal situation, namely, that of being fathers.

Up to date the Congress has not attempted in any way to interfere with the grand strategy or plans of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the high command. On the contrary, the Congress has magnificently supported the high command in every way. We have provided for them all the money for which they have asked. We have given them the legislation which they have said was necessary for the winning of the war. We have upheld their hands in every particular. Now, as I have said, for the first time we are confronted with the momentous decision as to whether or not we shall interfere with the plans of the high command, whether or not we shall set our judgment above the judgment of the high command, and whether, to a certain degree, at least, the Congress shall take over the military direction and control of our war effort.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not understand that we left anything to the high command.

Mr. HILL. Yes, we left to the high command——

Mr. TAFT. We delegated to the President of the United States the power to classify men. We indicated that the whole selection should be made on civilian basis, by civilian boards. We have never for a moment attempted to say that the Army may decide whom it will take and whom it will not take in the draft.

Mr. HILL. No; of course we have not done so; but the President of the United States is the highest of the high command. Under the Constitution of the United States the President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. We have, as I have already said, supported the Commander in Chief and all the high command. We have supported them in legislation for which they have asked. We have supported them by giving them all the billions of dollars which they have said was necessary for the winning of the war.

Now, for the first time, we find ourselves confronted with the situation of being asked to interfere with the high command, not supporting the high command, but forcing them to accept our judgment rather than their plans and their well-considered judgment.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. In order to make certain that I understand the Senator

from Alabama, may I undertake to restate in my own words the point which I think he is seeking to make?

Is it not a fact that we have given to the President the power to defer men by classes?

Mr. HILL. That is correct with certain limitations.

Mr. DANAHER. We have given to him the power to defer specifically by classes.

Mr. HILL. We gave him the power to defer by classes. That is correct with certain limitations.

Mr. DANAHER. That being the fact, and that being the law, the President has the power this very minute, by the stroke of a pen, to decide that it is expedient and wise to defer all married men who have children.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama further yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama further yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I am seeking to elicit from the Senator from Alabama an outline of his position so that I may follow him in his argument.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. I wish to know whether the President, having the power to defer by class, may defer any age group which he chooses to defer.

Mr. HILL. I should say that he could defer any age group.

Mr. DANAHER. May the President defer a group on the basis of dependency?

Mr. HILL. Yes; he may. In fact, that is what was done when fathers were deferred.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to read to the Senator section 5 (e), paragraph 1, of the Selective Service Act, as amended June 23, 1942, which provides, as follows:

> The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of any or all categories of those men who have wives or children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes.

So I think the Senator is mistaken in saying that the President is unable to defer men by reason of their family relationships.

Mr. HILL. The local board, under the authority of the President, has to make the determination. That is exactly what has been done. That is the reason fathers have not been called up today. We have been doing that very thing.

Mr. TAFT. The section to which I have referred provides that the President is also authorized to provide for such deferment. The obligation is on the local boards, but the responsibility for deciding whether fathers shall be deferred is now on the President of the United States.

Mr. HILL. The President of the United States has been deferring them, through the local boards, on that very basis.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it not true that the reason we have classes which are called II–A, or II–B, or III–A, or III–B, is that the President has created such classes under the power Congress gave to him?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. Up to date he has created a class and deferred men under the provisions of the law cited by the Senator from Ohio.

General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army, has advised Congress, through its Senate Committee on Military Affairs, that if the pending bill is passed and becomes law the Army will not get the men necessary to carry out the grand strategy and plans of the high command. As General Marshall has expressed it, such a reduction in the number of men as the bill contemplates would inflict heavier losses on our armed forces than could be anticipated as being caused by either Germany or Japan. General Marshall says that the result would be extremely serious and would inevitably lengthen the war.

Admiral King, in substance, agrees with what General Marshall has said. The Selective Service Administration, which is the agency for the procurement of men for the armed forces, tells Congress, through its Senate Committee on Military Affairs, that the needs for the armed forces between now and January 1, 1944, and even beyond that date, cannot be met except by drafting some fathers. The selective service estimates that in order to meet the demands of the armed forces between now and January 1, 1944, some 446,000 fathers must be drafted.

So, Mr. President, if Congress should pass this bill and it should become a law we would deny the selective service the right to draft 446,000 fathers, and the armed forces would be denied those men and would suffer the heavy losses about which General Marshall testified.

The Army is very hopeful that after January 1944 it will not need any additional men, except some 75,000 a month for replacement purposes. On the contrary, according to its present plans, the Navy will need for the 6-month period after January 1, 1944, approximately 92,000 men a month.

When we look at the figures we can well understand why the Selective Service says that the needs of the armed forces cannot be met except by drafting some fathers. I believe that anyone who has studied the operations of the Selective Service System from the very beginning, or who has either heard or read the hearings held at different times before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs on the Selective Service System, and the amendments to the act embodying that System, will recognize that if the war is to continue—and there was faint hope that there would be an end to the war by this time—inevitably some fathers will have to be drafted into the armed forces. The drafting of fathers into the armed forces has been delayed just as long as possible, and today we have arrived at the point where either we must draft fathers or fail to meet the needs of the armed services.

Altogether, on September 1 last there was a total of 22,212,000 registrants between the ages of 18 and 37, inclusive, under the selective system. Of the 22,212,000, constituting the pool from which the Selective Service must meet the needs and the demands of the armed forces, some 8,717,000 have already been inducted into the armed services or have enlisted. The 8,717,000 are not today all necessarily in the armed services. Some of them, of course, have been discharged for physical or other reasons, but that number, up to date, has been inducted or enlisted in the armed services.

The next classification is IV–F, embracing the mentally, morally, or physically unfit, constituting some 3,412,000. When a man has been rejected by the Selective Service because of being physically unfit, that does not mean at all that he will not be reexamined, and even reexamined the third time, in the effort to make use of him, if it be possible. Some men who have been rejected because of physical unfitness have been examined as many as five or six different times. There has been constantly a screening and rescreening of the physically unfit men in an effort to obtain and use as many of them as possible.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator tell me the number of men in the IV–F classification who have been examined five or six times?

Mr. HILL. I cannot give the number, but I will say that was the testimony of General White before the committee.

Mr. WHEELER. I know that was the testimony, but can the Senator give me the names of any individuals, who have been examined five or six times?

Mr. HILL. I cannot give the Senator the names of individuals; I have not attempted to secure the names of individuals; but I will say to the Senator that I shall be glad to ask both the Selective Service and the War Department for that information for the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. If any have been examined five or six times, I do not know of any such cases in my State or in any other State. I know that the Army at the present time has taken 5,000 of those in the IV–F classification.

I am getting letters from people from every section of the country, hundreds of them, saying that at the present time the Army is letting out of the IV–F classification many men who are physically fit, strong, and healthy, and who, when they return to their communities, are able to do a hard day's work. Yet it is sought to draft fathers. When the IV–F men who have been let out of the Army return to their communities, and the people there see them, strong, healthy, and able to do hard work, a very sad effect is created on the morale of the community. Frankly, I think that the Army is doing a great disservice to itself, and I think it is breaking down the morale of the people of the country.

It is all right to cite General Marshall, as the Senator has done, but I call attention to the fact that nowhere in General Marshall's testimony did he say that

the Army had to take fathers, but, on the contrary, he said that the Army preferred to have young single men.

Mr. HILL. There is no question that General Marshall did not say he wanted fathers.

Mr. WHEELER. He said he preferred not to have them.

Mr. HILL. But he said, in the most emphatic manner possible, that he had to have the number of men for which the Army plans call.

Mr. WHEELER. I know he said that; he said that he had to have men; but let me call attention to the fact that he said he had to have them to make up and to fill up certain divisions. If he is going to take men to fill up divisions for the purpose of sending them overseas, what will be the result? He will take fathers who will be sent to the various centers, and they will be used to fill up divisions that are going to be sent overseas, rather than to fill up such quotas from the 5,000,000 men who will be in the Army serving in this country at the end of this year, the vast majority of whom have had over 1 year's training, some of whom have had 2 years' training, and some of whom have had 3 years' training.

What does the Senator think the people of this country will say when the Army starts shipping overseas fathers who will have to leave their children, while there are in this country thousands of divisions and troops who have had from 1 to 2 years' training? Frankly—and I am speaking very sincerely—I am very much afraid that what will happen will be a break down in the morale of the people, which is so essential.

The Army looks at it from the standpoint of the Army alone, but it is your duty and my duty to look at this picture not merely from the standpoint of what the Army wants, for every Army officer wants the very best men he can get, the very cream of the men he can get, and the greatest number he can get; but it is your duty and mine and that of the Congress of the United States, and it should be likewise the duty of the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, to look at the over-all picture. The Army does not look at the over-all picture; it never has looked at the over-all picture; it has always come to the Congress of the United States and asked for more money and larger and larger armies; but when it is said that we must follow blindly the Army because General Marshall says this is what we must have——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I want to be courteous to my friend from Montana; he was extremely courteous to me when he had the floor, but, if the Senator will excuse me, he made the same speech, I think, as my ears tell me, on 2 days last week.

Mr. WHEELER. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. HILL. I repeat, I do not want to be discourteous; I want to yield to my friend and show him every possible consideration, as he showed me every possible consideration.

Mr. WHEELER. I let the Senator make innumerable speeches in my time.

Mr. HILL. But the Senator has made this same speech so many times I do not think it is necessary for him to make it again now in my speech.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to my distinguished friend that I think it cannot be made too often or brought home too often to the attention of the Commander in Chief himself.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, with reference to the question of the limited servicemen who are physically unfit for combat service, the Army today is taking as many of such men as it can. In addition to the men it is taking, who in the beginning did not meet the physical standards, every day other men in the Army are becoming less fit physically, and are, therefore, becoming disqualified for general or combat service. So today the Army has two sources of supply of men who do not meet the physical standards. One supply is being taken in directly from civilian life through the draft; the other supply is developing within the Army itself. Many men who 2 or 3 weeks ago landed at Salerno will not be discharged from the Army, but they will have suffered some kind of a physical disability which will mean that they will no longer be qualified for combat service or for general service, and such men will, therefore, have to do the work which can be performed by those who do not meet the physical standards.

In an efficient army such as we have, the army can make use of a certain number of men who do not meet the physical standards for combat duty. Our Army is doing that very thing today. According to the testimony before the Committee on Military Affairs, the Army is using as many as possible of the men who do not meet the physical standards; it is endeavoring to assign such men to places which they can fill, so as to release for combat or general service, men who are physically qualified.

The Senator from Montana referred to the fact that in many cases men who had been discharged from the Army and had returned home were doing hard work, and he suggested that such a situation had a bad effect on the morale of the people of the community. No doubt there are some men who have been released from the Army for physical disability who have returned home, and are doing, and are capable of doing, hard work, under the normal conditions they find at home, where they have their regular routine, their three meals a day at regular hours, where they sleep every night in their own beds, protected from shellfire and the many other things which a soldier in the Army has to endure.

It was stated in the hearings that a great athlete had been sent home as being physically disqualified. I made inquiry of the Surgeon General to determine why a man with his athletic prowess and his apparent physical perfection should be discharged from the Army. The Surgeon General advised me that this man was suffering from a perforated ear drum, and he stated that a man with a perforated ear drum would be readily susceptible to middle ear infection and to infection of the brain covering and brain tissues when subjected to cold, damp weather.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. On the question of the IV–F's, I have just been talking with a leading doctor of the Ohio State University, one with rather a wide experience, particularly among persons suffering from deafness. He has been in the past the head of the School for the Deaf in Columbus.

According to General Hershey's testimony, last spring at least 109,000 men had been deferred because of deafness. That is 10 times as many as there are in all the institutions for the deaf in the United States. If this number comes out of 20,000,000, it indicates that there are in the United States some 500,000 men so deaf as to be incapable even of limited service.

The doctor to whom I have referred tells me that he has made examinations of men who have been deferred for deafness, and that of the last 27 he examined, 23 could hear just as well as the Senator or I. He said the Army's present tests for deafness are absolutely out of date, that they are wholly useless in determining whether or not a man is deaf; that in the giving of such a test it is very easy for a man to deceive; that of the men deferred for deafness, at least 75,000 are capable of at least limited service, most of them capable of active service. That is testimony from an expert.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that where the word "ears" is used as indicating that there is a physical defect, it would not necessarily mean deafness. There are other conditions, as in the case I have just cited, the case of the athlete who has a perforated ear drum, a condition which subjects him to the middle-ear infection, an infection of the brain covering and brain tissues when subjected to cold, damp weather.

Futhermore, while the reason given for many rejections may be ears, the men may be rejected for a number of different reasons. The doctors merely put down one ground on which a man is rejected, namely, his ears, but the man might have several other disabilities, as well as a disability arising in connection with his ears.

I think that if the Senator will look into hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs he will find that the committee endeavored to go into this matter. I know it did so far as the tests of mental disturbances were concerned, and it tried to make sure that the armed forces were making every effort possible to eliminate those who were shamming or malingering in order to make sure that the test which was given every man was a good test, and that if he had a physical disability, the disability would show up, and if he did not have a disability, he could not sham one and get off with the sham.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Under my amendment the President would be asked to set up a commission of five qualified physicians to go over the whole question of physical

qualifications. It seems to me that is a reasonable approach to the matter. It is more than likely that the testimony I have just given is true, that many tests used are out of date, and that in the natural course of events the Army Medical Corps has not obtained all the facts. I can see no reason why there should not be a commission appointed, outside the Army or Navy, but to some extent with their cooperation, to review this entire question. In this respect that is all my amendment suggests.

Mr. HILL. In connection with the policy of the Army and Navy, both attempt to work in the closest cooperation with the medical profession, particularly with the American Medical Association, because the American Medical Association is the great organization of the doctors of the country. If the Senator would investigate this matter, I am sure he would find that there are many committees from the American Medical Association, and doubtless from other medical associations, which are all the while sitting in and working with the medical men of both the Army and the Navy on the questions of qualifications, tests, and examinations.

One of the most distinguished officers in the Army Medical Corps today is General Rankin, from the State of Kentucky, who for awhile was one of the leading surgeons at the Mayo clinic. Afterward he left that clinic and went to Lexington, Va., and established a great clinic of his own. A year or two ago he was president of the American Medical Association. He was called into the Medical Corps of the Army as a colonel, and is now a brigadier general.

The purpose of calling in men such as General Rankin, and others whose names do not occur to me at the moment—I know of General Rankin as a recent president of the American Medical Association—is to bring to bear all possible skill and ability, in order that the Army may, insofar as possible, get men who are qualified, though physically disabled.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. When I was speaking to the expert from the Ohio State University to whom I referred, he called attention to the fact that in General Hershey's testimony it was stated that last year 400,000 were deferred because of mental diseases, 100,000 were deferred because of mental deficiency, and 157,000 for neurological reasons. That makes 657,000 men in the class of mentally deficient. That would indicate a total of that class in the country of between three and four million men. This doctor stated that such figures are absolutely incorrect, that such numbers do not exist, that the figures are not supported by any other testimony on mental deficiency in the United States, that they represent a hundred times as many as are confined in institutions for the mentally disabled, and that if there were any such number in this country, we might well give up the whole problem of caring for the mentally disabled, because it would be so tremendous. He says it is inconceivable that of the 20,000,000 examined 657,000 should be actually mentally diseased.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator in that connection that there has been a constant study made of the physical standards with the result that time and time again they have been lowered. When the Senator speaks of mental diseases, I will say that even since these figures have been compiled there has been another change in the mental standard, further reducing it.

In this connection I should like to call the Senator's attention to the testimony of Captain Thompson before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read his testimony; but he gave to the committee a most interesting description of the tests which are used in determining mental capacity. There are five different tests. All those who pass the first four tests are accepted. Those in the two highest levels in the fifth test are accepted. The Senator from Ohio is very much interested in this matter, and I wish to commend to him the testimony of Captain Thompson.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Alabama does not have any doubt, does he, that these mental tests have been used, in some instances, as a means of deliberate evasion of the selective-service law; in other words, that persons have deliberately prepared themselves to make a failure on the mental tests? I have been advised by a number of draft officials that it has come to their attention that men were deliberately preparing themselves to fail in the tests. I know during the last war a psychiatrist was sent to our division, and some of the sergeants apprehended men who were coaching each other on what might be called foolish questions and silly answers. The psychiatrist himself was crazy, and we finally talked him into reporting to the division commander that he was crazy, and got rid of him in that way.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Missouri that the committee went into the matter of malingerers rather carefully with Captain Thompson, and on page 157 of the hearings is found some of the testimony of Captain Thompson on this subject. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read Captain Thompson's testimony, but I will say that the committee was impressed with the thought that the Army, and for that matter, the Navy too, were doing all they could to prevent malingering, and to prevent men from escaping the draft by shamming or faking.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I have no doubt that the Army and the Navy are doing the best job they can do. I suggest only that if a commission is appointed under authority from Congress it seems to me it would approach the problem in a different way, in a way to see that the wishes which have been expressed by Congress are carried out. Although appointed under the proposal I make, by the President, who has the full power to appoint anybody he wants, still the commission would feel a responsibility to Congress, specifically to see if it cannot avoid the drafting of married men by finding men in the tremendous group of 3,400,000 IV-F's who can take their place.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. While I look with favor upon the proposal made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] I wish to mention a matter which has come to my attention, and which I have looked into very carefully. The case was that of a man with a perforated ear drum. I could not quite understand why he was not in the service. In my investigation I found that he had tried to join the Army and was rejected. Then he went to the Navy and was rejected. He then applied to the Marine Corps and was rejected. Thereafter he went to practically every division of the armed forces, but was likewise rejected. Then he went to a private physician to see whether he could obtain some sort of report which would probably result in his being admitted into the armed forces, but he could not obtain it. He could not get into the armed forces. Therefore I do not believe we should cast a reflection upon one who had tried with all his heart to get into the service and failed simply because the examining officers had rejected him for such a disability as this man had, a perforated ear drum.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator is absolutely correct. I know of no one who would in any way cast any reflection on any man because he had been rejected because of physical disability. Speaking of physical disability, frequently, as we know, a man who looks absolutely healthy and sound, who seems to be a hundred percent sound and without any physical disability, may be suffering from a very great physical disability which would show up on examination, or which he himself may know about, which he does not see fit to disclose. So by simply looking at a man one cannot always determine whether he has any physical disability or, if he has a physical disability, just what the disability is. The only way that can be determined is by a medical examination. So when a man discharged for physical disability returns to his home, those who reach the conclusion that he should not have been discharged certainly have no real basis or foundation for reaching such a conclusion. They do not know, and they cannot tell what his real condition is. The only way that can be ascertained is by examination of the medical findings.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. With reference to the matter of physical disability, I will say that I was not present in the Senate when a statement was made that physical requirements rule had been relaxed, I think, five times. That is my recollec-

tion of the statement, as I read it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Is that true?

Mr. HILL. I will say, Mr. President, there have been a number of relaxations of the rule with respect to physical standards.

Mr. WHERRY. Are the relaxations downward?

Mr. HILL. Yes. The effect of the relaxations has been to reduce the standards, to make more men eligible for service.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sending for my files. I received a communication from a draft board in northeastern Nebraska, which says that out of 32 men called for induction, 22 were sent back from the induction center in Omaha. I wish to place the letter in the RECORD, if the Senator will permit me to do so.

Mr. HILL. I will ask the Senator to place the letter in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I am intensely interested in the point on which the Senator is now dwelling. I am desirous of making up my mind concerning the matter. I should like to be convinced that the most available use is being made of our men who are physically disqualified. Recently I have received 5 or 6 letters dealing with this subject. The last letter, concerning which I spoke a moment ago, came in August, and told of 22 Nebraska boys out of 30 called for induction, who were sent back because they were physically disqualified. I cannot conceive of such a condition existing.

Mr. HILL. Was the letter written last August?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. Last August, I believe. As I recall, the number rejected was 22 out of 30 called.

Mr. HILL. That is within the past 60 days. Does the Senator from Nebraska know what their prior qualifications were?

Mr. WHERRY. I have received the letter now, and will read it.

Mr. HILL. Some of them, at least, may have been men who had already been rejected once, or perhaps twice, for disability, but in an effort to obtain as many men as possible, in an effort to defer the drafting of fathers as long as possible, they may have been sent back for induction, not once, but as I have suggested, several times. Some of the men might have been previously rejected.

Mr. WHERRY. The letter is dated September 14, 1943. It comes from South Sioux City, Nebr., and the man who signed the letter is J. J. Eimers. I read:

DEAR SENATOR: I note that the manpower matter is to be aired in Congress. I am a member of the draft board for this county, and suggest that Louis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, be interviewed on the subject. In a circular letter, of date August 21, 1943, sent to local board members, is the following paragraph:

"We have 2,976,000 IV-F's. We are constantly reworking that group and many are inducted every month. The possibility of recovery, however, from class IV-F is not great in the light of present physical standards of the Army and Navy. We shall continue to insist that class IV-F men be reconsidered and inducted where possible, but most of these men will remain in class IV-F until the present physical standards are changed by the Army and Navy."

That is the end of the quotation, and that is the circular letter they received.

Now I continue the letter of Mr. Eimers:

At one time recently our board sent 32 men to Omaha for induction.

Mr. Eimers does not state the month when they were sent.

I continue to read from the letter:

They were all under 30 years of age; 22 of them were rejected. I have been peeved about this ever since. It appears that the Army is looking for supermen. Some of the rejections seem to me to be ridiculous.

There are some other portions of the letter, but I shall not take time to read them.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it seems to me from the letter, as I understood it, that some of the 22 men who were rejected had been previously rejected. I do not know how many times they had been rejected, but undoubtedly they had been previously rejected. So I think it is evident that that was not the first time the 22 men had been rejected. That board is evidently doing what other boards are doing—and I certainly do not condemn any of them for doing so—making every possible effort to defer as long as possible the induction of fathers, and therefore they have been trying to screen and rescreen the men who have been classified as physically disabled, and to obtain from the particular group every man who possibly can be obtained.

As I have said, the Army can use only a certain number of men who do not meet the physical requirements. There are only two classes of men who are subject to being qualified though physically disabled. One class is made up of those who come directly from civilian life. The other—and the longer the war lasts, the greater the number of men coming from the second source will become—is made up of those from combat units, men who are in the Army, but who fall below the physical standards because of wounds of battle or because of the stress and strain of Army life.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator's answer to me was somewhat based upon conjecture, and, of course, I am not sure that what the Senator says might not be true. However, I quoted the secretary of a draft board. He seems to feel that the rejections are due to the fact that the Army wants supermen.

Let me refer now to the situation at McCook, Nebr. The complaint coming from the draft board there is practically the same as the one I have already mentioned, although not involving the same number of men, of course. The letter is written by Mr. Max Merrell, secretary of the draft board at McCook, Nebr. It reads in part as follows:

We understand Congress intends to take some action on the selective-service question, especially so those factors in reference to the induction of fathers. We feel and we know the majority of the Members of Congress feel that this action should be delayed as long as possible.

From our experience on the draft board we offer you the two following suggestions which we think would relieve the situation for some period of time and also more evenly distribute the war burden over the 18 to 38-year-old class:

1. There are 228 IV-F men in this county who have been rejected by local doctors and the armed forces for physical defects.

That county is Redwillow County, which has a population of less than 7,000 persons.

The letter continues:

Most of these men are working in nondeferrable occupations, because these occupations can afford to pay well for these draft-exempt men. Give draft boards authority to draft these men into essential industries and thereby release physically fit men for the armed forces.

Mr. President, it seems to me that 228 is a large number of IV-F men in a county of only 7,000 persons. I want to bring the matter home to all of us, because what is largely true in my own experience is almost certain to be true in the State of the Senator from Alabama. I refer again to a local board. Our local draft board sent to Omaha, for induction, a young man by the name of Barker. His father served with me in World War No. 1, and rose from the rank of buck private to the rank of officer, and deserved a lot of credit for doing so. His son wanted to do what his father did. He went in the service as a buck private, although he was a graduate of Pawnee High School, and had been recommended for officers' candidate school. He was sent to Omaha, but was returned home. They said he had some slight difficulty with one ear. The boy had been captain of a football team. He played for 3 years alongside my boy at left tackle. During those 3 years of playing on football fields, he got more bumps than many soldiers will get. I can conceive of possible services in the Army where he might be hurt by high explosives and where he might not be useful; but certainly somewhere along the line that man is capable of rendering service to his country and desires to do so.

Mr. President, what about Frankie Sinkwich, who was sent back into civilian life the other day? I have followed football all my life. He was rejected after he had been trained in the Army, and yet according to yesterday's newspaper I notice that he accounted for three touchdowns at Detroit. What is the matter with him? After training him for all these months, is there not some place for him in the military service? Could he not take the place of some other man, and thus release the other man for more active service?

In reading more or less between the lines of the testimony of General Hershey, I received the following impression—I wonder if the Senator from Alabama received a similar impression—Is it not true that General Hershey would

favor a reduction of the physical requirements? Does the Senator know whether he would? The Senator is close to the situation.

Mr. HILL. In reply to that query, I will say to the Senator that General Hershey very frankly described himself before the Committee on Military Affairs as a salesman, a person who was trying to sell something.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. And with that viewpoint and with that obligation, he was endeavoring to have the Army and the Navy take all the men he could. However, he also said that if he were a field commander or a combat commander his viewpoint might be entirely different. He said he was a salesman, that his job was to try to get the market to dispose of as much of his product as possible, and therefore he was trying to get the market to take as much of his product as possible. However, he said if he were in the field as a military commander his viewpoint obviously would be different.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me say there is no dispute between the Senator from Alabama and myself about the military need. I am willing, with the Senator from Alabama, to go along with the Army number, even though they have to draft fathers or grandfathers, if it is a military necessity.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I am asking the Senator if in the Army of 5,000,000 men there are not active men who can be relieved by men in class IV-F. I have given instances of some outstanding men who were once inducted. We must rely on experience. My experience is that what the Army is asking for is supermen; and from the testimony of General Hershey I certainly got the impression that his view is that he would lower the standards still further, if necessary, in order to get the men needed for military service.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has referred to a man with a perforated eardrum; is not that correct?

Mr. WHERRY. Well, he had some difficulty with one of his ears.

Mr. HILL. This question has arisen before, and the War Department—more particularly, the Surgeon General—has expressed its views on the matter. Here is what the Surgeon General advises me:

> A person with a perforated eardrum is easily susceptible to middle-ear infection and to infection of the brain covering and brain tissue when subjected to cold, damp weather. Damp conditions lead to flare-ups of acute inflammation in the middle ear, and necessitate hospitalization and lengthy treatment. Such infection leads to brain abscess r meningitis. Whether or not a person is an athlete has no bearing upon his susceptibility for infection as a result of perforated eardrums. Such persons are not acceptable even for limited service because limited service personnel go into the zones of communication and with combat troops in noncombat duty.

Now listen to this:

> From July 1942 to January 1943, the War Department accepted persons with perforated eardrums for limited service against the advice of civilian physicians. The result was the filling of Army hospitals with persons who had received infection as a result of the perforated eardrums.

Mr. WHERRY. But there are places where such a man could be used, to relieve another man. Let me give another illustration. This summer I visited a prison camp. I found in that prison camp 57 officers and 459 enlisted men, 10 doctors, and 30 nurses. There was a hospital of 150 beds. In the town in which the prison camp is located, a town with a population of 20,000, there is only a 36-bed hospital, and there are only 3 doctors to take care of the civilian needs. I asked whether or not the men in charge of the camp were limited-service men. The director of the camp said no, that those men were ready to do active duty. Certainly such a man as we have been talking about could fill the shoes of one of those men.

That brings up another question. Is manpower being efficiently used in the Army? I gather from the evidence that the War Manpower Commissioner admitted that there was a 25-percent waste of personnel within the Army.

Mr. HILL. The statement of the War Manpower Commissioner dealt only with the use of manpower in industry, and did not deal with the Army.

Mr. WHERRY. What about the Army? Does the Senator feel that 57 officers and 459 enlisted men are necessary to administer a prison camp with only 1,025 prisoners? If the barbed-wire fences were taken down, the prisoners would not run away. They love this country and from all indications would like to become citizens of the United States.

Mr. HILL. I am not so sure that they love this country. All I know is that certainly within the past few months they were doing everything possible to kill every American they could. Whether they have undergone a change of heart and now love us, I do not know; but the very reason they are prisoners in the camps is that they were soldiers, doing all they could to shoot and kill American boys.

I do not know the facts as to the particular prison camp to which the Senator refers. I am sorry the Senator did not inquire as to the number of men engaged in service at that prison camp who were limited-service men. As I have said, the Army can use a certain number of limited-service men. As I understand, one place where some of those men can be used is at prison camps. The Army is trying to use all the limited-service men it possibly can. It may be that this particular camp was set up overnight, and that in the beginning it was necessary to send in troops who were not limited-service men. It may be that it was necessary to send troops who were nearby and available at the time for that duty. It may be that they were sent there with the intention of relieving them as soon as possible, and that later limited-service men will be detailed to perform the necessary duty at that particular camp.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator have any statement to make with regard to those who are educationally disqualified? Does the Senator have any figures showing the number, and does he know what the general provisions are?

Mr. HILL. In that connection let me recommend to the Senator that he read the testimony of Captain Thompson before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. I have before me a memorandum on the subject of illiteracy, but I hesitate to take the time of the Senate to read the entire memorandum.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask a further question. I think the Senator can answer it quickly. The Senator was a member of the subcommittee which considered Senate bill 637, which is a bill for Federal aid in education.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe the distinguished Senator, who did a good deal of work on that bill, will remember that the educational authorities interested in the bill came before us and asked for appropriations to educate boys and make them fit for military service. While I do not have the record before me, I am quite sure that the figure stated was approximately 800,000. Approximately 800,000 men were educationally disqualified for the armed services. I was surprised to learn that in my State the figure represented approximately 18 percent of all those who were eligible for the draft.

Let me give another illustration from my own home town, namely: A boy whose name I will not mention and who did not finish the country school. I suppose he would have a difficult time with higher mathematics or English composition; but he is as smart a mule trader as I have seen anywhere. He is not taken, although if I were in the front lines I would like to have him fighting alongside me. Are such boys being rejected and sent back home on the ground that they are not qualified? Such a man could be utilized. The man to whom I refer is physically fit, single, and 27 years of age.

Mr. HILL. The Senator says he could perform limited military service.

Mr. WHERRY. He certainly could.

Mr. HILL. As I have said several times previously, the Army is taking all the men with limited service qualifications that it can use. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read the whole memorandum, or go into the whole story of illiterates, but I shall read the first paragraph of the memorandum from Captain Thompson, who testified before the committee. I hope the Senator will read his testimony. Captain Thompson said:

> At the present time there are no restrictions on the number of illiterates who can be inducted into the armed forces. A man need not be able to read or write or speak the English language to be accepted by the Army or Navy, provided he is able to meet the required minimum intelligence standards.

The committee was very much interested in what those standards were. The distinguished Senator from South

Dakota was present at the hearing. We took a good deal of time to go into the tests which the Army and Navy are now giving to determine a man's intelligence and whether or not he can serve in the armed forces. We went into much detail. We had a number of demonstrations by Captain Thompson of the various tests, and I am sure that every member of the committee was impressed, as I was, by the fact that the tests are of the simplest kind. They are so simple that it does not seem to me possible for any man with anything like normal intelligence to fail to pass.

Mr. WHERRY. Is any provision being made to educate those boys within the Army?

Mr. HILL. I think an effort is being made to educate them. That is one job which is being done by the Army today. The Army has taken every man it could. The Army will take them if they are capable of learning, but have not had the educational opportunity. The Army is sending such men to school and teaching them so that they may become fit soldiers. Such schools are now being conducted throughout the country for men who have not had sufficient education.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator have any figures as to the number of men who are now being educated?

Mr. HILL. With further reference to the Senator's query, let me read this paragraph from Captain Thompson's memorandum:

> Illiterates who are inducted into the Army are sent immediately to special training units. At those units they are taught the rudiments of reading, writing, and arithmetic, and are given some basic military training. The course extends over a period of 3 months. However, men who fulfill the requirements at any time prior to this period are sent to regular units for basic military training.

If a man can qualify before the 90 days have expired, he does not stay in school for 90 days He is sent on for his basic military training. Every effort is being made to use illiterates. They are given an opportunity to learn.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator have any figures as to the number being educated?

Mr. HILL. The number now in school?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I do not believe I have that information, but I shall be glad to ask the War Department how many illiterates are now in the different Army schools.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be very glad to have the information.

Mr. HILL. I wish to speak further concerning the men who are unfit for military service. As I have said, the Army and the Navy are using all such men they feel they can possibly use. I believe the Army and Navy are to be commended in this respect: The Army has reduced the number of men it has asked for by some 563,000. It has done so on the basis of two conditions. One was the change in the military situation which came about when we took north Africa. That changed our military situation so that it enabled us to withdraw from the Caribbean area troops we had to use there, not knowing what would happen so far as north Africa was concerned, so far as Dakar was concerned, and so far as other strategic places were concerned. Due to our conquest of north Africa, these strategic places were, at least for the time being, removed from the picture. On that basis, and on the basis of making the Army more efficient by reducing so far as possible all useless jobs, by employing every man on a needed and useful job, as well as causing every man to give his full cooperation and devotion to his job, the Army has reduced its originally proposed size by some 563,000 men.

The Army might have adhered to its original figure, including the 563,000 men, and taken in a large number of men who were physically disqualified. However, as officers of the Army have said, for an efficient Army it can use only a certain number of physically limited men. It does not want to take men unless it can use them, or unless there are places for them in the Army.

There is a vast difference between the conditions experienced by a man living at home where he has his routine and obtains a good sleep every night and the conditions a man may experience in the Army, where he may go for hours without sleep and without food, and where he may be subject to all the dangers and hardships of bombing, shells, fire, and vermin of all kinds. There is a vast difference between what a man can do at home under normal peaceful conditions, where he receives his food regularly and enjoys his regular sleep every night, and what he can do under the conditions of the Army. Many of the limited-service men will be used, not here at home to guard a prison camp, for instance, but they will go right up into the combat areas. Many of them will remain for days in the combat areas. Some of them will be stationed there as antiaircraft men. Some of the antiaircraft men are subject to more bombings and greater fire than men in the front lines. Some of them will be used as signal men at the front, and some will be assigned to the engineers in construction work. The fact that a man is confined to limited service does not mean that he will not be subject to fire and all kinds of danger.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator has stated that the Army has reduced its requirements and is now satisfied that an army of 7,700,000 men will be sufficient.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. That is so far as the present time is concerned. According to the figures given, that would require the drafting of 460,000 fathers in order to attain the required number of men.

Mr. HILL. The number would be 446,000. Allow me to say that a large number of those men will go to the Navy. Some will go to the Army and some will go to the Navy.

Mr. TAFT. If that number of men are taken is there a reasonable hope that replacements after that time, in order to keep the number to 7,700,000, may be obtained from the 1,200,000 men who become of age every year, so that having obtained 446,000 fathers, there will be some reasonable hope that we may never have to draft the other million fathers who are said to be qualified within the physical requirements, and so forth?

Mr. HILL. There is a reasonable hope that, so far as the Army is concerned, that may be possible, provided the Army can obtain the 75,000 men needed for replacements each month among the younger men who are coming in from other sources. I do not think that would be a reasonable hope so far as the Navy is concerned because, according to the latest information which I have, for the 6 months' period from January 1, 1944, up to July 1, 1944, the Navy will need about 92,000 men a month, or a total of approximately 552,000. That figure is gross; it includes both the additional men and those needed for replacements in the Navy. However, I doubt that it will be possible during the 6 months' period from January 1, 1944, to July 1, 1944, to obtain each month the 75,000 men needed for the Army and some 92,000 which the Navy indicates it will need, without taking some fathers during that 6 months' period.

Mr. TAFT. However, there is some hope that if we——

Mr. HILL. I will say that there is a very definite hope that the Army will not ask that its size be increased beyond 7,700,000. As I have said, the plans called for, and Congress appropriated for, an Army of 8,200,000-and-some-odd men. Due to the change in combat conditions to which I have referred the Army found it possible to reduce its numbers by some 563,000 men, and there is a very definite hope that the Army will not, in this war, have to take more than 7,700,000 men. But that does not apply to the Navy. Concerning the Navy, let us remember, that for a long time the Navy did not receive any men through selective service. The Navy relied entirely on enlistments, and therefore, we naturally think of the selective service as being tied in more with the Army than with the Navy. In the future the Navy will require about 92,000 men a month for the 6 months' period from January 1, 1944, to July 1, 1944. The Army must have its quota of 75,000 men during that 6 months' period, and it seems that we shall have to draft fathers for the Navy.

Mr. TAFT. Has any study been made by the committee of the question of whether the Navy really needs 3,000,000 men? As I understand, that is about 3 times the size of any navy the world has ever seen, and I wonder if any study has been made of the need for a personnel of that size.

Mr. HILL. The testimony of Admiral King and of Admiral Jacobs was to the effect that if we are properly to man and use the ships and airplanes which will be coming off the ship lines and the

airplane lines during the 6-month period from January 1, 1944, to July 1, 1944, we shall have to have that number of men. I had in mind that later in my remarks I would discuss the subject, and it might be well to do so now.

Mr. TAFT. Will not that increase in the Navy figures fully offset the decrease in the Army figures of about five or six hundred thousand and bring the Navy figures above any that have ever been mentioned before in the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. HILL. I believe the Senator is correct in that respect. I believe that if the Navy obtains the number of men during the 6-month period which they now indicate they will need, it will offset the gain we made when the Army modified its plans so as not to take in the additional 563,000 men which the Army had originally planned to take.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of an army of 7,700,000 men, can the Senator tell us how many would be combat troops and how many would be noncombat troops?

Mr. HILL. As the Senator well knows, because he is a distinguished soldier himself——

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator will not confuse this question by injecting any irrelevant matter.

Mr. HILL. I shall not confuse it, but I should like to say that the first time I had the honor and pleasure of meeting my good friend, the Senator from Texas, was during the last war when he and I were attending military school at Fort Meade, and one day found ourselves sitting on the same bench. I will say to the Senator that in this war it is extremely difficult to distinguish combat soldiers from noncombat soldiers. Our soldiers are really broken down into what might be called two classes, one of which is the combat class. Of course, it does not need any explanation to indicate what a man in that category does. He is the man in the air, the man on the ground with a rifle in his hands, or a man behind a 70-millimeter gun. Then, there is what is called the Service Command.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. If the Senator from Florida will wait for a few moments, until I have answered the Senator from Texas, I shall be glad to yield to him.

As I was saying, the next category is what is called, as the distinguished Senator from Texas knows, the Service Command. The Service Command is made up of Antiaircraft men, Signal Corps men, engineers, men who serve at ports and load ships, men, it may be, who operate barges which convey our amphibious troops. These men are auxiliary to the combat forces and are classified as service troops.

Then, we have the third category, which we call household troops. Household troops are not used out of the United States. The combat troops provide for their own household arrangements, but in the camps located in the United States, where men and units and divisions are trained, there are in the service those who are called household troops. They are the men who keep the camps going, who operate the water, light, and utility systems, who police the roads and camps, and who even see that the garbage is removed. They do many different things that have to be done at a camp. A camp is like a city, and, exactly as a city must have these different services, so a camp must have them.

I am not prepared to give to the Senator a break-down as to the combat services and the household services, but I wish to say to him that I have here a memorandum which at the present time is confidential which I should be delighted to have him or any other Member of the Senate see. If the Senator will read the memorandum, I think it will answer exactly the point he has in mind. I can understand why he has the question in his mind, and I shall be delighted to let him see this confidential memorandum.

Now I shall be happy to yield to my good friend from Florida.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, the question has been raised as to the great number of men who are in the Navy. The number of men now in the Navy is approximately 3,000,000. It is also true that in no time in history has the United States had to engage in battles on the seven seas, all around the world. Furthermore, most of our battlegrounds are 3,000 miles away from home. Thus a very large naval personnel is required. Is not that the reason why there are so many in the Navy?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Florida is exactly correct. I had thought that a little later on in my remarks I would speak briefly along the line he has suggested. The Senator has put his hand on the heart of the problem which I fear many of us have permitted to escape our attention.

Mr. President, we cannot compare our relative strength in soldiers or in naval personnel with the relative strength of some other nation and obtain anything like the picture we ought to have to guide us in our deliberations and in our judgment, unless the factors that enter into the respective situations are the same; unless the other nations' problems are approximately the same as our problems.

We are at war today with Germany; we are at war with Japan; but our problems are entirely different in many particulars from the problems of Germany and Japan. As the Senator from Florida so well brought out, our supply lines are 5,600 miles long. All those supply lines have to be guarded and protected, as the Senator from Florida has indicated. Our Air Force today is fighting on 10 different fronts, and, remember, every front has to be considered not only so far as the men actually operating on it are concerned, but also the men needed to maintain the men operating on the front, and the necessary reserves. Germany, operating on small interior lines, can ship her reserves from one front to another without extreme difficulty and without any great delay. Today Germany can ship air power from the Russian front into Italy in a few brief hours perhaps, without any great trouble. We cannot ship to the Italian front our air power from New Guinea or from the Solomons or even from the United States without great trouble, delay, and burden. That means that the Italian front has got to have far more in the way of reserves on our side of the line than Germany has to have on her side of the line, because, as I have said, the Germans can bring reserves in much more quickly and much more readily than we can send reserves to Italy, for our reserves have to cross thousands of miles of ocean, whether they come from the United States or whether they come from the Pacific. The reserves, however, must be there. They must be there for two reasons.

They must be there in the event unexpected force is brought to bear against our forces in that particular field of operations. We must have reserves and be able to call upon them in the event they are needed. If the enemy makes an unusual thrust there, if he is able to employ more force than the regular combatant troops can meet, we have got to bring in reserves, to hold the line, to save the line, and to save our troops in the combat line.

In the second place, when we make a thrust into the enemy line if we are to derive the benefit from such an operation and obtain victory, we must send in reserves to take advantage of the opportunity which may be afforded. If a combatant front is denied reserves, there occurs exactly the thing that happens as when the gong sounds in a boxing bout. When one boxer has the other boxer groggy, if the gong is rung, the man who is about to give the knock-out blow is stopped from giving it. The reserves are used to give the knock-out blow. They are the forces that bring and insure victory. Our forces are scattered all over the face of the earth, with supply lines 5,600 miles long, with various fronts and theaters of operation, and our problems are entirely different from the problems of our foes.

We hear of manpower. The testimony shows that even with Italy out of the war the Axis Powers now have only 14 divisions less than have the United Nations.

Mr. BARKLEY. The testimony was they had only 14 divisions less than they had a year ago.

Mr. HILL. I understood there were only 14 less than today.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Axis have only 14 divisions now less than they had a year ago, notwithstanding the fact that Italy is out of the war.

Mr. HILL. Either situation shows how they have combed their manpower, and how they have built up their divisions. But, as I have said, we cannot compare by divisions or numbers of troops. We have to base our plans, we have to make our decisions, as the Senator from Florida so well brought out, on what the respective problems are.

What are the problems? Germany today has no transportation problem in the sense in which we have one. No troops

of Germany have to be sent over thousands of miles of water. Our problems are entirely different from those of Germany.

Much has been said about air power. Practically everything we have done up to date, with the exception of knocking Italy out of the war, has been in the effort to secure and hold air bases from which we could reach the enemy with air power. What was the great purpose of the Italian campaign? Certainly after Italy went out of the war one of the great purposes, I should say the paramount purpose, was to get air fields so that we could use our air power against Germany.

Another thing we have to consider is that Hitler and Japan started their preparations for the war in 1933—10 years ago. They have trained and retrained, and then trained their troops further, while we feel we are doing very well if we are able to train one of our combat outfits a year before it meets the enemy in battle. We have to consider the training our enemies have been able to give their men, the long period of superior training their men have received.

There are many such factors which have to be considered, which we can think about and know about, and then there are many others about which we cannot and do not know. The only ones who can make the decisions are those who have knowledge of these matters. There is no man on this floor who really knows what the military situation is throughout the world. To know that, we would have to have information about China, which we do not have; we would have to have information about Russia, which we do not have; we would have to have information about Britain, which we do not have; we would have to have the information about all our other allies, which we do not have, and then we would have to have a great deal of information about our own forces which those outside the high command do not possess.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think anyone is disposed to question 10,800,000 men as the number the two services of the country require. I asked whether anyone had looked into the Navy figure, 3,000,000, to ascertain whether that figure included some who were tentative members of the Navy, or reservists, or on what basis the figure was made. I suppose the Committee on Military Affairs would not have jurisdiction of that question.

Mr. HILL. We exercised jurisdiction, when we had the hearings recently on the pending bill, to question Admiral King and Admiral Woodson about the Navy's need for 3,000,000 men; but, of course, we did not go into the subject as the Naval Affairs Committee might have done, taking merely that one subject and going into all its different ramifications, and securing all the information on it.

Mr. TAFT. The vital question is not that of the number of men at all, but who is to go first. It seems to me that on that question Congress has a perfectly legitimate right to go into the whole problem.

Mr. HILL. Whereas I am not for the Senator's amendment, I think the Senator's amendment makes clear his position; that is, that while he is not for the pending bill, he is not going to try to do anything which might deny men to the armed forces, but his amendment does set up certain categories, and requires the armed forces to take the men according to the categories prescribed in his amendment.

Mr. President, if I may return to the question of physically disqualified men, I may say that the committee questioned General Marshall, Admiral King, Admiral Jacobs, and General Hillman, of the Surgeon General's Office, War Department, to see if any way could be found to lower the requirements. The answer came back from all those men that they felt that the armed forces had reduced the physical standards just as far as possible, and that they did not see how there could be further reductions of such standards.

The next group of men are those in II–A category, sometimes described as irreplaceable, necessary men engaged in activities in support of the war effort. This group includes industrial workers. It also includes men in our transportation systems, men in the utility systems, men employed by city governments, such as policemen, firemen, and men of that kind. It includes students whom the Army is sending to school, and some who have been temporarily deferred. It also includes Federal employees. The II–A group includes the men who have been deferred because of occupation, and the sum total of that group is 1,508,000.

Mr. President, much has been said about Federal employees. They are in this group. I think some of the loose and inaccurate and irresponsible statements which have been made about Federal employees in the draft have been very unfair. To hear some of the statements one would think that the Federal Government today was a haven for draft dodgers, that it was a refuge for men who were shirking their duty to their country, and who were using their jobs in the Government in order to escape the draft. Such statements have been unfair, first and foremost, to the Federal employees, the countless thousands of honest, devoted, and patriotic men and women who are carrying on the manifold duties of our Government, many of which duties contribute directly to and are a part and parcel of the war effort. Blanket indictments against such employees, or anything that appears to be blanket indictments against them, are absolutely unjustified and without any basis in fact or in figure. It was unfair to the people back home, to the mothers and fathers of the boys who are now in our Army, and particularly to those who are now on our battle fronts, to give the idea that while their sons were out fighting and enduring all the travail, hardship, and danger of battle, here in Washington the Federal Government was a refuge for draft dodgers, and that there were many men protected within the Federal Government from selective service and from doing their part in the armed forces of the United States.

The figures show that of the millions of employees in the Federal Government today there are about 115,000 deferred because of their occupations in the Federal Government. Of course there are others in the Federal Government who have been deferred for other reasons, some for physical disabilities, some because they are fathers, but such men would have been deferred no matter where they might have been employed. They would have been deferred if they had been making any contribution whatever to the war effort. Only about 115,000 have been deferred because of their work for the Government. Of that number, 51,875 are employees of the Navy Department, 30,423 are employees of the War Department, the War Shipping Administration has 7,409, and the Maritime Commission 4,309. Altogether in the War Department, the Navy Department, the War Shipping Administration, and the Maritime Commission 94,016 men have been deferred because of the work they are doing in the Government service. Some of these men are working in our navy yards, such as the navy yard at Norfolk. Not many months ago I went to Norfolk to witness the launching of one of our greatest battleships, the battleship *Alabama*. That battleship had been built by the Government with its own employees. In our arsenals many of the men who are deferred are building guns and making ammunition for our forces. They are men in key positions in the arsenals of warfare.

Only about 21,000 have been deferred in Government agencies other than the War Department, the Navy Department, the War Shipping Administration, and the Maritime Commission. Many among the 21,000 are engaged directly in the war effort. They may be engineers. Civilian engineers landed with our forces at Salerno so that they might as quickly as possible prepare and make ready for our air forces airports in Italy. Some are with the Coast Guard. Some are working with the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Some are making absolutely necessary maps in different parts of the world for our armed forces. Some are making delicate instruments for our fliers so they may have the best possible information about the weather. They are, with few exceptions, engaged in some vital war work.

If we should take the entire 21,000, in addition to those who are directly engaged in the war agencies, and they were examined, out of that number it would be found that perhaps not over 10,000 or 11,000 would meet all the requirements, including physical, for service in the armed forces.

Mr. President, there have been no more grossly unfair statements than those with reference to the Government being a refuge for draft dodgers. A few such cases may be found here and there, and

where found, of course, the men affected should be inducted into the service. As I said on the floor of the Senate the other day, since July 1, under the Maybank-Lodge Act the selective service each month has been obliged to file with the Congress a list of the names of all Federal employees who are deferred, the reasons why they are deferred, and the draft boards which have deferred them.

An examination of the requirements for deferment in the Federal Government shows clearly that it is far tougher and far more difficult to be deferred because of occupation in the Federal Government than it is because of occupation in industry, or in any other operation which is either directly or indirectly connected with the war effort. If a Federal employee is wise and wants to avoid the draft he will get out of the Federal Government and into industry, because unless he is engaged in the most vital piece of work for the war effort he will surely be drafted.

As to men in industry, as of July 31 this year there were 1,553,000 men deferred because of their occupation in industry. According to the estimates of the Selective Service, if these men were put through the physical and other examinations which a man has to stand before he can be admitted to the armed forces, of the 1,553,000 men there would perhaps be only 775,000 who would qualify and who would be acceptable to the armed forces. Only 775,000 men who are qualified are today deferred in industry.

The question is whether we can take keymen from our airplane plants, keymen from our shipbuilding plants, men from our machine-tool plants, men from plants which are so absolutely necessary to the war effort, and place them in the Army without hampering and jeopardizing our production. Last week there was held in Washington a meeting of the council of the aircraft producers of the country. The council adopted a resolution deploring the fact that some men had already been taken out of the aircraft industry to go into the armed forces, and pleading that no more keymen be taken from the aircraft industry. It stated that if more of them were taken from the industry there was bound to be an impairment of aircraft production, and that the aircraft industry could not possibly meet its schedules.

In all such cases the War Manpower Commission, the Selective Service System through its local boards, and management, are supposed to be making every effort possible to obtain replacements. In other words, if a man can be found or if a man can be trained to take the place of a draft-age man employed in industry, he is put in, and the other man now in the particular place is released for the armed forces. But we cannot go into the war industries and take these men out except there be replacements, unless we want seriously to impair and hinder the production of the war materials of the country.

While I speak of replacements, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the point that the fact that a replacement is needed or the fact that a replacement is wanted does not mean there necessarily will be a replacement. In order to have a replacement, the man who is to do the replacing must be ready, willing, and capable of doing the job. So it is all very well to talk about replacements; but unless there are replacements ready, willing, and capable, replacements cannot be made.

While we consider the situation in industry, I think we should also recall the fact that when this great program was first started under the impact of the attack at Pearl Harbor, speed was the great need of the hour; the demand was to produce things, to produce them right away, to get the airplanes and ships as speedily as possible.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Overton
Andrews	Guffey	Pepper
Austin	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bailey	Hatch	Reed
Ball	Hayden	Revercomb
Barbour	Hill	Reynolds
Barkley	Holman	Robertson
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Burton	Kilgore	Stewart
Bushfield	Langer	Taft
Butler	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Tunnell
Chavez	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Van Nuys
Connally	Maloney	Wallgren
Danaher	Maybank	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	Wherry
Eastland	Moore	White
Ellender	Murdock	Wiley
Ferguson	Murray	Willis
George	Nye	Wilson
Gerry	O'Daniel	
Gillette	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ADDRESSES BY SENATORS RETURNING FROM THE FIGHTING FRONTS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish the attention of the Senate for a moment to make an announcement concerning a change in the program heretofore announced.

It had been arranged to have Members of the Senate who made the trip abroad address the Senate at 2 o'clock on Wednesday in closed session. After discussing the matter with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and other Senators, it has been thought wiser not to interrupt the proceedings of the Senate by having those addresses at 2 o'clock on Wednesday, but instead to begin at once at 12 o'clock on Thursday. Therefore, the program is changed to that extent. The closed session will be held on Thursday immediately after the convening of the Senate, rather than at 2 o'clock on Wednesday.

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, at the time of the quorum call, I was referring to the situation in industry, and the question of replacements. In this connection, I think it ought to be said, so far as replacements, hoarding, shortages, and employment in industry are concerned, that no one has any power to make any worker do anything he does not want to do. No one can say to a worker, "You must work in this particular plant. You must go into this plant and replace some one else. You must do this particular job."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Has the Senator read any of the mandates issued by the War Manpower Commission?

Mr. HILL. I am coming to those. The War Manpower Commission, without any control over the individual, has been doing everything it possibly could to take care of the matter of replacements, and deal with the question of hoarding, shortages, and employment. It has worked out several plans. As I recall, it first had the so-called Baltimore plan; then more recently the so-called Buffalo plan; and now the Byrnes or Baruch plan is being tried in the aircraft plants on the west coast.

Through these various plans the War Manpower Commission has been doing everything it could, as I understand, and as the testimony will show, to get men into the proper places, and to get them to stay in the proper places and make the largest possible contribution to the war effort.

However, as I have said, the War Manpower Commission cannot say to John Smith, "You are an aircraft worker. Go to the Boeing plant. We have a job there for you. You must take that job and stay on the job. You must work so many hours a day in that job." If John Smith says to the War Manpower Commission, "I am not fit to take that job, and I am not going to take it," I do not know of any power under the law which can compel him to go into that plant and take that job. In our consideration of the subject of employment in industry, we must bear in mind that there are indirect sanctions which can be brought to bear on management and employee, but there is no power to force a man to work in an industry.

It is all very well to talk about hoarding, and to make charges and statements with reference to it, and I agree that such conditions ought to be eliminated so far as possible, but there are definite limitations, very great limitations, which have been placed on the

authority of the Manpower Commission to handle these different situations. As we know, in England, Australia, and New Zealand, universal service acts have been enacted, and under those acts the government may tell a man where he shall work, or where he shall serve, to the same extent as under our Selective Service Act the Government may tell a man what he shall do in the Army and where he shall serve in the Army. Under those acts every citizen is subject to the control and absolute dictation of the government. We do not have that kind of a law. We still have our private-enterprise system, and under it now—as from its beginning—each man, as it has often been said, is a sovereign. Every citizen is a sovereign. He does what he pleases so long as he does not step on the toes of his neighbor. That is the situation today. So far as industry is concerned, and so far as our civilian population is concerned, there is no service act or power by which the Government can force anyone to do anything he does not want to do.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I agree that there is no power to compel a man to do anything he does not want to do, but I say that today the War Manpower Commission is saying to a man in Cincinnati, for instance, "You stay in this plant. We will not allow any other employer to employ you. You have got to stay here."

Mr. HILL. I say that is an indirect method of approach, but I am glad it is being done, and I think more of it ought to be done.

Mr. TAFT. In so doing, the Commission is usurping a power which I agree with the Senator they do not have.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am glad they are doing it, and they have my good wishes in doing it. What I am saying is that if the man says, "Well, I am not going to do what you want me to do," and thumbs his nose at the Manpower Commission, all the Manpower Commission can possibly do is to prevent him from obtaining a job in some other plant. The Manpower Commission cannot compel him to work in a particular place if he does not wish to work there.

Mr. TAFT. They could starve him into staying there.

Mr. HILL. I do not think they could starve him into staying there, and I shall explain why. There are many opportunities for a man to work and make a living outside of industries which are under the control of the Manpower Commission. A man may obtain a job at some crossroads grocery store, for example, and eat out of a cracker box. The Manpower Commission might make it inconvenient and uncomfortable for him, but they have no direct power over him. That is one thing which we have to bear in mind at all times in our consideration of the question under consideration and of the matter of replacement. Someone may say, "Let us replace these men and get them into the armed forces," but no one has the power to say to any man, "You have got to go into this plant and replace another man."

Much has been said on the subject of the hoarding of employees. The record shows that in the shipbuilding plants the manpower hours required per unit have been reduced 35 percent. Management has cut down the number of men required to build a particular ship, or to do a certain job in a shipbuilding plant. The number of men required to do the work has been cut down one-third. On the whole, that speaks pretty well, I think, for management. In the aircraft industry the manpower hours per unit have been reduced 25 percent, or one-fourth.

To hear some of the statements which have been made relative to hoarding, one would think that management in this country is doing everything it can to place men on the pay rolls and to cause them to be falling over each other, and that the men cannot work because they are getting into each other's way.

The record, however, shows that instead there has been an average reduction in the number of persons employed in our shipbuilding plants and in our airplane plants for the particular job to be done. I do not doubt that in some plants there is some hoarding of employees, but the figures would indicate that, on the whole, that is not the true situation. On the contrary, they indicate that most of the persons working in such plants are doing an honest and necessary job, and that they are located where they certainly ought to remain until some replacements can be provided for them.

In our system today there is no such thing as a cost-plus contract. We do have cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. It will be recalled that during the last war we paid some contractors a percentage on the amount of the contract. That, of course, resulted in an incentive to pile up the costs as high as possible, because the contractor's fee was a percent of the cost. Today the Government makes contracts in which it permits the costs to vary, but not the fee. The fee is fixed. The fee being fixed there is no incentive to hoard more men than are necessary.

On the other hand, I must admit that the cost being variable, there is no incentive for the contractor to reduce it, as he would be inspired to do if there were a ceiling on the cost. I, for one, hope that we may get away from cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts as quickly as possible. I am not sure that within 24 hours' time we could terminate all such contracts, but I believe that every possible effort should be made to return to the old competitive bidding system.

According to all the testimony given before our committee, and according to the statement which was made by the Aircraft Industrial Council which met in Washington last week, the main trouble, so far as the wastage of manpower in industry is concerned, is turn-over. The average turn-over in our manufacturing plants today is said to be 84 percent. The Aircraft Industrial Council said that in the aircraft industry the turn-over was running 100 percent. That represents an increase from 84 percent to 100 percent in 1 year's time. Maximum efficiency and the best results cannot be obtained from manpower with that kind of a turn-over. Yet, as I have said, we are faced with the situation that no one today, not even the Government of the United States, has the power to say to a person, "You must work on this particular job." No one can compel any citizen in this country to work or remain on any particular job.

The percentages to which I have referred run high, and I think that one reason for that is the very high turn-over rate among women. Of course, more and more women are being employed in industrial plants.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The evidence seems to me to be abundant, that there is a high rate of turn-over in industries, and also that there is a hoarding of labor in various industries, as well as in the departments of Government. The representatives of the Government handling war contracts certainly ought to make a complete check-up in the various war plants. They ought to send someone into the plants to check up on them, and wherever men are being hoarded the Government should take them out. That is one thing the Government can do.

Mr. HILL. There can be no disagreement between the Senator and me on the question of hoarding. I think the Government should make every possible effort to eliminate every man in industry who is not necessary on a job, or who is not making the full, necessary contribution on the job.

I certainly would not be disposed in any way to speak except in the most complimentary terms about the local selective-service boards, of which there are some 6,500 throughout the United States. I think on the whole they have done a very fine job and, as we know, they have received no compensation or reward whatever for their work. They have done everything gratis. They have had many headaches, no doubt, for it has been a very disagreeable and troublesome job for them most of the time. They deserve great credit for what they have done. However, after all, these matters in most cases head up in the local boards. The local boards determine whether or not a man is really necessary in a given plant in a particular community.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me suggest that the able Senator is wrong with reference to the local boards. I call attention, first, to the fact that Colonel Keesling testified before the committee that the boards deferred men in industry when it was said that they were irreplaceable. Men go from the various States of the Union, from Montana and almost every other State, to California for instance. They obtain a statement from the foreman of the plant where they work that "This man is working in industry."

The local board then defers him, but the local board at home, the local board

in Montana, or the local board in Alabama, or the local board in some other State cannot tell whether or not that man is doing an efficient job in a shipyard in California or whether another man is doing an efficient job in Connecticut or some other State. That the local boards accept such certificates is one of the great troubles. The local boards told the men from one end of the country to the other, "Get jobs in industries, and you will be deferred." The result was that young men, single men, went into industry. They were attracted by big wages and by the fact that they would be deferred from the draft. They went to various places and filled jobs in defense plants, and now it is said they are essential to industry. On the other hand, the married man, the father, remained at home taking care of his home and doing the work in which he was engaged. He did not want to lose his job. So, because of the mistakes the Government has made in that respect, now it is proposed to draft fathers.

Mr. HILL. Let me say, in answer to what the Senator has stated, that what he says is true in many particulars. As I said, I think the local boards deserve great credit, for they have done a wonderful job. They have had their difficulties. A board in Montana has difficulty in passing on a man, say, who has come from Birmingham, Ala., to work in a plant in Montana.

It is my understanding that under the present regulations of the Selective Service with reference to replacements there is no reason why the local board in Montana should not communicate with the local board in Birmingham, Ala., to have that local board, that knows the local situation, ascertain the facts about a particular man. That has been one of the difficulties with which the local board has been confronted. In many cases the local boards have sought, I know, to find out the status of a man who has left the State and gone into some other State, so that it would be able accurately and fairly to pass on his case.

Now, with reference to the young men going into industry, that is true in many particulars, too. As I was about to say at the time the quorum was called, we have had two stages with reference to industry and production. First was the stage when speed was the prime essential. We had to get airplanes because we did not know but that the Japanese might attack the west coast. We had to get ships, we had to get guns, and I can tell the Senate now we even had to get gunpowder. So there was haste, and haste makes waste. The shipbuilding plants and airplane plants and other war plants multiplied manyfold in a few weeks' time; some of them multiplied hundreds percent. What did they do? They got the most available men; they reached out and got the men they could get the quickest. It was the natural thing to do. Naturally, more men were found available among the young unmarried men than among the group that was married, who probably had homes and fixed residences, and perhaps had jobs which they had held for some time. We were trying to get men to go into the airplane plants in Los Angeles, Calif., and so other States were combed in the effort to get the most available men to meet the situation at that time, to meet the demand for speed which was so necessary, that the younger men, many of them, as I have said, unmarried men, were placed in industry.

Now we have reached the second stage when the great compulsion for haste no longer exists, but we can get the maximum use out of our manpower and insofar as possible not draft any more fathers than may be necessary. That is our problem today.

But, as I said, as to the younger men, we want to replace them as rapidly as possible; but a man cannot be replaced until there is found someone else who is ready and willing and capable of going in and taking his place in a factory.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator see any objection to the proposal made in my amendment that, in addition to the home board passing on the question, a selective-service board at the location of the work—I care not whether a local board or a board of appeals in the city where the work is done—also pass on the question before a man can be deferred?

Mr. HILL. I was about to suggest to the Senator that, instead of having a local board in the particular area in which the man works pass on the question, it might be better to have it passed on by an appeal board.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator see any objection to tightening up the business of deferring for industrial purposes and giving some jurisdiction to a board where the work really is done and which can examine the character of work being performed?

Mr. HILL. No, I want to say to the Senator I see no objection to a tightening-up process. The fact is if there is any way of tightening it up, without too much loss of manpower or delay as the result of the tightening, I am strongly in favor of a tightening; I want to tighten it. If there are any men in these classes who are not necessary in industry and who are eligible for the draft, I want to get those men out of industry and into the armed services where they belong.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that my amendment, or a part of it, perhaps with some modifications, will meet the Senator's desire in that respect.

Mr. HILL. I want to thank the Senator for commending to me his amendment.

Mr. TAFT. I want to thank the Senator for saying that something of the kind is needed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I desire to clear up the statement made by myself relative to the use of men in the IV–F classification. I hope the Senator, in his closing remarks, if he can do so, will present figures to show that the Army is using IV–F men to the greatest possible extent.

I desire to quote a short paragraph from the testimony of Colonel Keesling before the subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee on September 9 and 10:

One of the matters that you, Senator—

I think he was speaking to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]—

One of the matters that you, Senator, wanted me to discuss, as I recall it, was the possibility of utilizing these IV-F rejects, either individually in war-effort work if they are not already in it, or by having them go into a special corps, which would be either a part of the War Department or auxiliary to it, so that it would be semimilitary, or completely military, or completely civilian, and that corps, perhaps, could be a mobile crew that could move here and there. In that connection, speaking just personally, I believe that if you are going to have to have some group make sacrifices, if you feel you are not going to be able to improve certain jobs beyond a certain point, and if labor, management, and everybody agrees on that, namely, that wages can't be raised and working conditions can't be better for some jobs because of circumstances, then if those jobs have got to be done to win the war, the questions of how many do you need to do the jobs, and what is the right selective basis for choosing those whom you are going to call on voluntarily or otherwise, are very important and must be answered in either event. Most people would be satisfied, including the people themselves who are called, if the proper types are selected and called.

This is the point I wish to suggest to the Senator:

There are psychological reasons why some persons themselves would wish to go in. I think the IV-F's are about in that position, particularly the young single ones. I know a number, particularly the young single fellows, who, but for their physical condition, would have been in the service. They feel very embarrassed, particularly if they are not in war effort work. If they get into the war effort work then they feel all right psychologically. If they are not in, I think something should be done by a voluntary appeal, or maybe there should be some compulsion involved.

The point I am making is this: Why cannot those who are rejected in class IV–F, which now constitutes nearly 3,500,000, because of standards which have not been reduced as much as I feel they should be reduced under the showing made, be enlisted in the service at this time, before anyone else is taken, whether fathers, or even grandfathers, so far as that is concerned?

Mr. HILL. The witness whom the Senator was quoting was talking about a corps which would be semimilitary, or completely military, or completely civilian, which would be either under the War Department, or auxiliary to it.

Sometime earlier in the day I spent sometime discussing the IV–F classification, and I hesitate to go over the discussion. I stated that, so far as the Army was concerned, General Marshall and the other spokesmen for the Army and Navy have said that there was a certain number of limited-service men whom the Army could use, and that the Army were using and would use the maximum number of them.

I also called attention to the fact that the Army had two sources of supply for these limited-service men. One was to take them directly from civilian life, through the selective service, taking in today about 5 percent of the limited-service men. The other source of supply, which source will get larger and larger all the while, is made up of the men who went in physically qualified, meeting the general standards, but who, due to injury in battle or some other injury suffered, or due to some physical disability which has developed because of the stress and strain of Army life, would fall into this limited-service class.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I spent nearly an hour this morning discussing the limited-service question, and I do not want to go over it again. Let the Senator from Nebraska finish, then I shall yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHERRY. I have here the report of the hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on one of the 1944 appropriation bills, in which I find this quotation:

> General HERSHEY. I would say the Navy standards, because the Army has gone to the Navy standard. They have gone to it, but if they would change that so that when they make those calls we could take in men below that standard, as soon as they do that we can begin to do business.

The Navy has accepted only about 35 percent of the available inductees. The Army has turned down more than 35 percent because of the Navy standards, which, as I get the figures, have been reduced by the Army by 17 percent. It is my contention that we have not used the available men in IV-F, according to the testimony of General Hershey.

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. The Army is taking in only 5 percent of the IV-F's. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. HILL. That is correct as of the present time.

Mr. WHEELER. Up to May 1 they were taking 10 percent, but beginning with May 1 they cut it down to 5 percent. I am not asking these questions to be controversial, but I say that all we have to do is to take the figures which General McNarney himself presented to the committee. If we take those figures, we can show enough men in limited service to make up a sufficient number so it will not be necessary to take fathers.

It should be brought to the attention of the Senate, for I do not think it has been made clear, that 200,000 fathers would be taken into the Army between now and the first of the year. The figure 446,000 has been used, but of that 446,000, 200,000 are to be used by the Army, and the remainder are to be used by the Navy. The Navy not only wants that number of men, but it wants 500,000 after the first of the year, which will bring the number up to nearly a million fathers in the United States who are to be taken into the armed forces, at the very least, if the Navy program is to be carried out.

I also call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the Japanese Navy is the only one left to oppose us. The French Navy is out of consideration, having come over to our side, the Italian Navy no longer opposes us, and the Mediterranean has been opened. I do not know how many ships are in the Italian fleet that is being turned over to the United Nations; but the only Navy left is the Japanese Navy.

Mr. HILL. Therein lies the trouble. There is that little "if" about which Mr. Kipling wrote. Think of all the thousands of miles of water between us and Japan.

Mr. WHEELER. But there is the British Navy, and there is the American Navy. We have a larger Navy than has any other country, and we will soon have a larger Navy than the combined navies of the world. In the face of that situation, it is proposed that 750,000 more fathers be taken.

Mr. HILL. The Senator speaks about the Italian Navy. I do not think anyone knows just what that Navy is going to be worth so far as our side is concerned. We are glad, of course, that it is no longer against us, but what it is going to be worth to us I am not sure anyone knows. The Senator and I cannot make the examinations, because, as I stated earlier—and I do not want to go back over it—I have not today any plan in my mind as to how we are to defeat Japan, and I do not suppose the Senator from Montana or any other Senator has any real plan. We do not know what our problem is, we do not know what our job is, we do not know what is to be done not only to win the war, but to win it in the shortest possible time. I cannot overemphasize the importance of winning in the shortest possible time, because every hour, every day, every week, every month the war lasts, costs lives of American boys.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, we know that there is just one way in which to end the war quickly, that is for our ally, Russia, to give us bases in Vladivostok. Army and Navy officers, and everyone else with whom I have talked, concede that the quickest way to win the war, with the least possible loss of life, would be for our great ally, to whom we have sent so much in the way of supplies, to let us use the bases in Vladivostok. We could blow Tokyo and Nagasaki and all the other cities of Japan out of existence. That would be the easiest and the best way to win. I noted that Mr. Browder, the head of the Communist Party, said that, of course, that is not going to happen, that Russia is not going to let us have those bases.

I did not rise for the purpose of bringing up that subject, of course, but to call attention to the fact that, taking into consideration the British Navy, which was supposed to be the greatest navy in the world, the navy on which we were supposed to depend for the protection of the United States, and our own Navy, which today is the largest in the world; taking into consideration the Japanese Navy, as to which we can read reports coming from our Navy Department concerning the number of ships the Japanese have lost and those which have been bombed; and then counting the Italian Navy and the French Navy, which assures that the Allied Nations have a navy superior to anything the Japs have or can possibly have, if we cannot defeat them without taking a million fathers, something is wrong.

Mr. HILL. Yes; we have a Navy which I think is far superior to that of the Japs, but we have a problem entirely different from theirs.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. We are all proud of the fact that we have a three-star Navy which is larger than it has ever been in our history, and larger than any other navy in the world. We are glad the British have a large navy, and we are all glad that the Italian Navy at least has been immobilized for the time being. Certainly the Italian Navy is not going to do anything against us. Those navies are serviceable and useful in the protection of the sea lanes, and the transportation of men and equipment of all sorts, and in fighting against the submarine, and against the Japanese Navy if and when it can be found.

But no matter how large the Navy is, it cannot climb the Alps and get into Germany; it cannot go into Poland, it cannot go into the heart of Japan. It cannot whip the armies of the Axis wherever they may be. So that valuable as the Navy is in protecting our shipments of supplies and equipment, and the transportation of our men, of course no one would contend—the Senator from Montana of course would not—that the Navy can engage in land warfare against the well trained and veteran armies of Germany and Japan which have been fighting for years. Valuable as the navies are in getting us to the places where the fighting is to be, off the water itself these navies cannot do much fighting.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. When I asked Admiral King if the Navy had taken into consideration whether we should continue to build the vessels we have on order—and when I asked Mr. Baruch the same question—the reply was that that had been taken into consideration, and, as I recall, Mr. Baruch said, if not publicly at least privately, that examination was to be made of that phase of the matter, or my recollection is he said it was now being considered.

May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator has said repeatedly, as others who are opposed to my bill have said that we should follow the War Department implicitly with reference to these matters. That is the statement which my distinguished and good friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and others have made. Let me ask the Senator from Alabama a question. The War Department has urged the passage of a universal service

measure, the so-called Austin-Wadsworth bill, and has stated that its enactment would mitigate the loss of life on the fighting front. That is the statement of the War Department. Does the Senator agree with that statement, or does he favor the passage of the Austin-Wadsworth bill?

Mr. HILL. I have made my position clear, that in this matter I would follow Gen. George C. Marshall and Admiral King, the high command. If the Senator wants my position on the universal service measure, I will say frankly that I think immediately following the impact of Pearl Harbor this country should have passed a universal service act, and if we had then passed such an act totally mobilizing all the manpower and the womanpower of our country, in my opinion, we not only would have been more efficient and been able to carry the war effort forward better than we have, but we would not be plagued by all the headaches we now have.

Mr. WHEELER. Does the Senator now favor the Austin-Wadsworth bill?

Mr. HILL. The Senator has asked me particularly with respect to the Austin-Wadsworth bill. I am not prepared to say that I am in favor of that bill, but I am today in favor of a universal-service act. The fact is, about a year ago I introduced a bill of my own, I will say to the Senator from Montana, to provide for universal service.

The fundamental trouble today is that we have two systems in this country. In the Army we have a system of absolute control. Among the civilians we still have free enterprise. Now we are told, with much acclaim, that we are engaged in a total war, a war not of armies any more but a war of nations. The men who meet the enemy are properly mobilized and are under proper control. The others of us who make up the remainder of the body engaged in waging a total war, as I said earlier—I am not sure the Senator from Montana was present at that time—are still under a free-enterprise system, which means we can do pretty well as we please.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I suppose if all were placed under the same system the logical result of the Senator's argument would be that we would have to fix the workmen's wages in accordance with the standard of the men in the armed forces?

Mr. HILL. No; that does not follow at all. In England, in Australia, and in New Zealand that is not true at all. We have legislated on the basis of wages in our price control and ceiling legislation. We have done some things about it.

Mr. TAFT. It still is a different system from that of the military, and inconsistent with the military.

Mr. HILL. It is different from that system, but the fundamental thing is that if all were placed under the same system it would bring every man and every woman under the Government, and every man and woman would have to work or fight or serve in the place where the particular person could make the greatest contribution to the war effort. I do not care to discuss that subject now. I do not mind at some proper time speaking about universal service. I am in favor of universal service, and I introduced a bill to that effect, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio, but I should like to finish my remarks on the bill now before the Senate.

With reference to the subject of limited service, I have before me a memorandum from the War Department which at this point I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate. It is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT GENERAL STAFF,
Washington, October 1, 1943.

Memorandum for the Legislative and Liaison Division:

Based upon an occupational analysis of duties, the maximum number of positions in which limited-service personnel can be used is between 9 and 10 percent of the total strength of the Army as it is geographically distributed at present. With a 7,700,000 Army, this means that there are approximately 700,000 positions in which limited-service personnel may be used.

At the present time we have approximately 562,000 limited-service personnel in the United States and some additional overseas. This figure includes members of the Women's Army Corps.

The difference between these two figures (approximately 140,000) is needed to absorb increases in limited-service personnel obtained (1) from the induction of approximately 9,000 per month; (2) from WAC enlistments; and (3) from general-service men who become limited service as a result of accidents or battle casualties. In addition to this, there will be a decrease in the number of limited-service positions available as the geographical distribution of the Army changes.

R. BERRY,
For M. G. WHITE,
Major General, Assistant Chief of Staff.

Attached to the memorandum is the following statement:

Limited duty personnel may be given the following assignments and those of a similar character:

Prisoner of war escort companies; permanent personnel at post, camp, or station installations, except certain trainer personnel at replacement-training centers or unit-training centers; recruiting and induction stations; reception centers; port battalions; fixed harbor defense and antiaircraft units; aircraft warning companies; special-service personnel; exchange personnel; barrage-balloon units; special units such as bakery companies, decontamination companies, sanitary companies, heavy maintenance companies, engineer regiments' base; station and general hospitals; and appropriate rear echelon detachments or installations of combat divisions, corps, armies, and like large units or organizations normally employed in communication zones or zones of the interior.

Mr. President, in connection with my statement with respect to the Army, at this point in the RECORD I should like to place a statement from the Navy with reference to the use by the Navy of limited-service men.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

There will be approximately 1,718,000 men either at sea, assigned to seagoing ships, or on shore outside the continental limits, on December 31, 1943.

There will be approximately 605,000 men assigned to the shore establishment as of December 31, 1943. These are distributed among:

Bureaus and offices, Navy Department, naval districts; training stations (operating personnel); ammunition depots; air stations; section bases; navy yards and naval operating bases; advance-base depots; receiving ships and stations; hospitals; recruiting and induction stations; harbor entrance control posts; port directors and routing offices; schools (operating personnel).

Approximately 170,000 of these will either be women, or men of substandard physical qualifications. There thus remain approximately 435,000 billets on shore. However, if these billets were to be filled now by men of substandard physical qualifications, there would be no place whatever to usefully employ men who experience has demonstrated must be periodically rehabilitated from sea or advanced theaters. In addition, provision must be made for those who return from combat areas with minor physical disabilities as a result of active combat with the enemy. Personnel in this category often are the most useful of any class to the Navy, and if billets on shore were filled with men of substandard physical qualifications, there would be no place for their employment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the next class of men deferred under the act, who have not been called into the service, are the men deferred under the Tydings amendment, those who are engaged in agriculture. Today, there are some 1,715,000 men, some single men, some married men, and some fathers, who are deferred under the Tydings amendment. Those men will continue under that amendment to be deferred so long as they meet the terms and conditions laid down in the Tydings amendment. Senators will recall that we prescribed in that amendment that a person had to be engaged in essential agricultural production, production essential to the war effort, and he also must be irreplaceable, that is, there was no other man who could be placed in his position to carry on the work of production in which he was engaged. Those men will continue, of course, to be deferred just as they have been deferred in the past.

The next group is what we call class III–D. The men in that group are registrants whose induction would cause undue hardship and privation to their dependents. There are 102,000 men in that group.

The next group is made up of certain officials of State, county, and city governments. There are 6,000 men in that group.

The next group is made up of neutral aliens requesting relief from training and service, and aliens not acceptable to the armed forces. There are 48,000 men in that group.

The next group is made up of ministers of religion and divinity students. There are 120,000 men in that group.

The next group is made up of men who are conscientious objectors. Some 10,000 men are in that group.

When one considers that list among the 22,000,000 registrants, he finds it is inevitable that it will be necessary to draft some fathers. However much one might deplore it or however much one

might wish to avoid it, examination of the list I have sought to give to the Senate in detail shows how inevitable and unavoidable is the drafting of fathers.

Mr. President, what I have said about physically unfit men applies in part to men over age 38. In that connection, I should like to have printed at this point in the RECORD, General Marshall's testimony about men over age 38. I shall not go into that matter; I simply desire to have his statement printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

General MARSHALL. As to men over 38, I have already expressed myself in considerable detail. They would be, to my mind, a burden rather than a help, because the number that prove ineffective for our purpose is so large, and the conditions under which we must accept them under the policies of Congress as to hospitalization, etc., immediately imposes on us a very heavy burden. I mean by this that a man may never have been in a hospital in his life in his ordinary civil occupation, but when he comes into the Army he gets a certain right and he takes advantage of it. We have him immediately on our hands, and he is operated on for this, operated on for that, and we must do it. So that the men over 38 I would regard as a burden.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, today there are about one and one-half million married men in the Army. Some 800,000 fathers are in the armed forces of our country.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest two things about the point he has raised?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In the first place, a very considerable number of the fathers are men who volunteered for service.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TAFT. The fact that they volunteered indicates that they were able to make some arrangement about their businesses or their families. A very large number of the fathers are men who became such subsequent to Pearl Harbor. Of course, they knew exactly the condition they were creating, and they did not get married and have children unless they knew there was a method of taking care of their wives and children.

So I do not think the fact that there are one and one-half million fathers in the Army today has any very great bearing on the present question of the drafting by force of fathers.

Mr. HILL. I did not say there were one and one-half million fathers in the Army. I said there were one and one-half million married men, and some 800,000 fathers. I concede that the fact is that because there are some 800,000 fathers in the Army it does not necessarily follow that other fathers should be drafted; but, I think the Senate should know that today there are 800,000 fathers in our armed forces, and many of them are at the battle fronts. In the consideration of this matter, and of what so often has been described as the American home, we must consider the homes of the 800,000 fathers who now are in the armed services, many of whom, as I have said, are at the battle fronts.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wonder if the Senator would relate the presence in the Army of those 800,000 fathers to the very, very bad condition in the matter of child control at the present time. It is a notorious fact that today in this country 13-year-old and 14-year-old girls——

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator refer to the matter of delinquency?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Exactly.

Mr. HILL. I will say to my distinguished friend that the question is a very apt one, but I have not investigated that matter. However, I have the thought—I give it to the Senator only as a thought—that the delinquency about which we hear so much, and which no doubt does exist, exists more among the children of persons who are engaged in industry and in other civilian occupations, rather than among the children of fathers who are in the armed services.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would say to the Senator that possibly the absence of a father leads to a weakening of the control of the family and leads to the existence of conditions about which all of us hear, when 13-year-old and 14-year-old girls are chasing soldiers, and all that sort of thing, and that related to that is the matter of the employment in industry of the wives of those fathers, with the consequent disruption of family control.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator that undoubtedly one of our problems today is that of juvenile delinquency. However, during the last war, as I recall, while there was a great wave of juvenile delinquency it never was necessary to draft fathers, and fathers never were drafted. We never did reach the point where it became necessary to draft fathers. By the time we nearly reached the point of drafting fathers, the Germans signed the armistice, and the war was over, and we did not have to draft fathers.

I think there are many factors, in addition to the fact that the fathers are absent, which contribute to delinquency. There are many other things about war which breed delinquency. To start with, war per se does not appeal to the higher or the finer or the better instincts of human nature. To be filled with the idea of destroying something or killing one's fellow men is not conducive to what might be called a healthy or wholesome atmosphere for either children or adults.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest to the distinguished Senator that to the extent that the father, the head of a family, does exercise family control—and in most instances I think he does exercise some control——

Mr. HILL. At least, the Senator and I like to believe he does.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes; in most cases I think he does—at least to that extent, we are releasing that much control over the discipline of families at home, when we draft fathers.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me ask whether any Senator is able to determine the proportion of responsibility for any existing juvenile delinquency above that which is normal which is attributable to the absence of fathers, particularly the fathers of young girls. I refer particularly to the delinquency among young girls which was referred to by the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], with especial reference to their location about Army camps, and one thing and another. Is any Senator able to furnish any statistics to show to what extent young girls may be delinquent because of the absence of the stabilizing influence of an older unmarried brother who is in the Army? It is difficult to assign to any family group of any status total responsibility for delinquency. If the facts showed that no one had been delinquent except the children of the 700,000 or 800,000 married men with children who are in the Army, there might be some support for the statement which has been made. However, in my opinion there are no such statistics.

As the Senator from Alabama said, war breeds a lowering of morale, and leads to a breaking down of the instinct to follow the straight and narrow path.

I doubt if anyone could furnish the information, unless it was based on a house-to-house canvass all over the United States, of the extent to which the delinquency of children is attributable to the absence of fathers, or even the absence of brothers who usually have a stabilizing effect on their sisters, as well as on their own brothers. I do not think it is possible to say that all the delinquency which now exists is attributable to the absence of the 800,000 fathers who are in the armed services; because in order to prove that it would be necessary to make a census to determine how many of such fathers have delinquent children.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I did not assert that.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; but all during the debate it has been emphasized that the delinquency now suffered is due to the presence in the Army of some seven hundred or eight hundred thousand fathers.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I will concede that in some cases family discipline is probably improved by the absence of the father.

Mr. BARKLEY. That may be true. I do not like to think that that is the rule.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As a rule, I believe that family discipline is definitely impaired by the absence of fathers.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that it is more usually claimed that delinquency is due to the absence of the mother working in a war plant. Of course, the

moment the husband is drafted, the wife is practically forced to go to work in a war plant. So the indirect effect is probably even greater than that of the absence of the father. As to the 800,000 fathers, as I pointed out to the Senator, it seems to me that they are in a class apart. They are men who volunteered, or who were found by draft boards not to have any serious family situation, in nearly every case. I doubt if any of those men left families without having previously made provision by which the wife and children may be taken care of by other members of the family or by independent means.

Mr. BARKLEY. That raises the question as to how many of the wives of the 800,000 fathers are in war work or in war plants. I do not know. My judgment is that the proportion is small. As the Senator from Ohio says, those men largely volunteered, or were found to have a family status which did not justify their deferment, and therefore that did not create any delinquency problem. I doubt if one could prove anything on the subject of delinquency by taking the 800,000 fathers as an example, or as a basis for calculations.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator might be interested in the report of the Committee on Health and Welfare of the Welfare Division of Cuyahoga County, Ohio, in which this statement is made——

Mr. HILL. From whom is the Senator quoting?

Mr. TAFT. This is a report by the Committee on Health and Welfare of the Welfare Division of Cuyahoga County, Ohio, which is an association of all the charitable institutions and others dealing with this problem. The committee makes this statement, which I think sums up the general situation:

> War has a devastating effect on practically every individual and family, even without the removal of the bread-winner, husband, and father. With this additional loss, the supervision, training, and, hence, the stability of children are threatened in practically every instance. England has gone so far as to recall many men from the front in order to make more male leadership available for children and young people in schools, clubs, churches, and homes.

I think that is a fair summary of the situation. No one can exactly evaluate it. This committee consists of experts on the subject. They have been studying the problem of juvenile delinquency in Cleveland, and I think their conclusion can be said to be a reasonable one.

Mr. HILL. So many factors enter into the question of juvenile delinquency that one would have to go into it and study it rather carefully, and then I am not sure that he would be able to evaluate the many factors which enter into it.

While we are speaking of fathers and children, I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that when the Senate adopted the Tydings amendment deferring men because of agricultural occupations, it recognized that the national interest transcended the question of fathers or of delinquency. Under that amendment we not only provided that if a man were engaged in essential agriculture and could not be replaced, he should be deferred, but we went a step further and provided that if he were engaged in agriculture essential to the war effort, and left his occupation, he would be drafted, irrespective of dependency, children, or anything else.

The plans and the grand strategy of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, to whom we commonly refer as the high command, have not been guessed at, or arrived at in a haphazard manner. Those plans were studied for months by the Joint Staff Planning Committee.

In part 24 of the hearings on manpower before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs will be found a report on those plans, and the story of the committee and its work. That committee did not confine itself to military or naval testimony. It consulted with and sought the advice of economists, industrial engineers, agricultural experts, and experts of all kinds, having in mind that it had to consider what the enemy could do, what his power was, what his problems were, and the fact that we have to win the war in the shortest possible time, and with the smallest expenditure of life.

That committee had to consider that we here at home had three fundamental obligations to meet: First, the raising, equipping, maintenance, and transportation of our armed forces; second, meeting our obligations under the Lend-Lease Act; and, third, the maintenance of our civilian economy.

Predicated on those three obligations, and predicated on the enemy, his power, condition, and problems, these plans were carefully thought through and worked out. Certainly nothing was done in the framing of the plans which would in any way justify us, or any other civilian body, in now saying to our high commanders, "Your plans were not properly predicated. They were not properly worked out. You did not give consideration to many factors which you should have considered."

On the contrary, all the evidence clearly shows that the many factors which should have been considered were brought into consideration. As I stated earlier in the day, many of the factors which the high command considered, and which it should have considered, are not available to us for consideration. No person, even admitting that he had military experience, background, and knowledge, or even admitting that he had military genius, could possibly work out such plans unless he also had knowledge of all the factors which should enter into the plans, and unless he not only knew all the facts about our own armed forces, our lend-lease obligations, and our civilian economy, but also knew what our allies had, what they could do, what their problems were, how much we could depend on them, and how much help we might get from them, as well as how much help we had to give them, and how much they were depending upon us. To know that, we would have to know exactly, as the Joint Chiefs of Staff must know, what the situation in China is, what the situation in Russia is, and what the situation in Britain is, with respect to the British Army, the British Navy, and the British civilian front. We would have to know the situation of all our allies. We do not have such information.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I admit that we have to go a long way in accepting the recommendations of the joint chiefs of staff. Will not the Senator agree with me that it is contrary to our duty to accept automatically the recommendations of the military, that the military are not in the best position to preserve the balance between the civil power and the military power?

I would remind the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama that one of the assigned reasons for our separation from Great Britain was the allegation that the King had affected to render the military power independent of, and superior to, the civil power. For that reason, and because of all prior history on military tyranny, the Constitution puts in Congress the power to declare war, and the power to raise and to maintain the Army and Navy. We cannot escape our responsibility.

Mr. HILL. Not the power to fight that Army.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The power to raise and maintain the Army. We have the power to raise and maintain the Army. The argument goes directly to the raising and the maintaining of the Army. For that reason, I cannot go along with the theory that we must automatically accept the recommendations of the military, no matter how highly we may esteem them.

Mr. HILL. Of course, we should not automatically accept, and would not be justified in automatically accepting, the recommendations of the military. Certainly, in normal times, and, insofar as we can in wartimes, we should know exactly what the military are doing; and insofar as we can, we should check the military. I agree thoroughly with the Senator on that proposition.

However, in the light of the situation we confront today, in which we find ourselves involved in a great global war, fighting for the very life of our Nation, the very salvation of our freedom and our institutions, I say that in many of these matters, so far as military strategy and military plans are concerned, we must put our faith and our confidence in our military commanders, and must support them and back them up.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I repeat to the Senator from Alabama that we should go a long way on that, but we should not accept all recommendations automatically. So far as I am concerned, if it is suggested by the military that out of several million deferments for health reasons, illiteracy reasons, and essential-industry reasons, we cannot recomb the lists and obtain 450,000 men who are not fathers, then I cannot accept that military judg-

ment. Therefore, I favor the Wheeler bill as amended by the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. HILL. I say to the Senator that not only did General Marshall and Admiral King, as well as others in the Army and Navy, give us the information they thought they could, before the committee, but, as the Senator knows—because I was interested to note that he was present at many of the meetings—frequently they gave us information which was off the record, information which could not go into the record.

I believe they sought to give us all the information they possibly could or that they felt they would be justified in giving without at the same time endangering the lives of American boys who now are in battle or in combat in the theaters of operations. I am very sorry the Senator does not have the same faith and confidence in General Marshall that I have in this matter. I have great faith in him, and I think he justifies that faith in a matter of this kind, when we are today in the midst of battle and when at this hour American boys are fighting and dying. We must sustain and support our military commanders.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me say to the Senator that I share his faith in General Marshall. As a junior officer in the last war, I observed at rather close range the greatness of General Marshall. General Marshall is a great general and a great salesman. He can charm a bird off a tree. I would say that if General Marshall were not elbowing in and pushing and grabbing for everything he can get for his military forces, I would think him an incompetent; and he is not incompetent. I suggest it is his duty to get everything he can get in the way of manpower for his armies. At the same time, it is our duty to preserve the balance between civilian duties and military power.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I cannot agree with the Senator's estimate of General Marshall when he says the general is shoving and grabbing in order to get all he can get for his Army. No doubt the General could have had 563,000 more men for his Army, because Congress agreed, and had appropriated the money to enable him to have 563,000 additional men. However, he is so conscientious, and is so much a statesman as well as a soldier, that he voluntarily came to Congress and said, in effect, "I have been able to retrench in such a way, due to a difference in the strategic situation, and due to economies I have been able to put into practice in the Army, that I shall not ask for these 563,000 men."

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thought that action on the part of General Marshall was quite commendable.

Mr. HILL. It was quite commendable, and it shows an attitude and a spirit of purpose contrary to any attitude or purpose to try to scrouge in and get all he can. I think General Marshall is imbued with one great thought, and that is to win the war in the shortest possible time, and save the life of every mother's son he can, and he has based his plans and his strategy on that one thought.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I would not take any action at this time to reduce the overall size of the Army. I would not, however, object to some little delay and to training-camp dislocation in order to see if we cannot get the 450,000 men from those who are not fathers.

In the testimony of General Marshall I noticed with special interest that he said there would be dislocations if the men did not come into the Army according to present plans. I would remind the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama of a fact he well knows: The art of war is largely an art of overcoming dislocations. From the moment a force lands on a beach, dislocations commence. Every time a front is widened or narrowed, every time the depth of an organization is increased or decreased, every time a unit is attached to any given organization, every time a unit is detached from any given organization, there are dislocations. I believe that a reasonable amount of training-camp dislocation provides excellent staff training for the officers of our Army. During the next few months the flow of manpower might not be quite as smooth as we should like to see it; but if in the end we obtained the ultimate manpower which is needed, I believe the resourcefulness and intelligence of our great Army staff is equal to the task of overcoming those dislocations.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I recognize that what the Senator says is true, that in time of war there are many dislocations. However, I do not want any more dislocations than are absolutely necessary, because when we have dislocations we pay a terrible price for them; we are likel to pay in human life, in human body and in human blood.

In time of war we can permit dislocations in anything but in our armed forces. Dislocations in other matters might cost us some money or might cost us some discomfort or might cost us some delay, but I cannot join in the thought the Senator has expressed concerning dislocations. We want the minimum number of dislocations we can possibly have. We want to prevent every dislocation it is possible to prevent, because, as I have said, when we have dislocation we pa" such a terrible price for it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It seems to me that would involve the question of balance between the dislocations which could not be overcome by the Army and the dislocations which could not be overcome at home.

Mr. HILL. Yes. I think no man has shown greater ability in overcoming dislocations than has General Marshall. As I have said, he showed that when he voluntarily changed his plans without any suggestion by Congress and reduced the number of the Army by some 560,000 men.

Mr. President, while we are speaking of General Marshall and Admiral King and other officers of the high command, I recall that Mr. Gladstone said on one occasion that the good fortune of America lay in the fact that always, in the hour of her need, God Almighty raised up a man to lead and guide her. If any people have ever been fortunate in their commanders the American people have been fortunate in having General Marshall and Admiral King. They were particularly fortunate when this terrible war came upon us that General Marshall was at the time and had been for some months previously the Chief of Staff of our Army. The record of these commanders is a brilliant one. Considering the problems that have confronted them and considering the stupendous job they have had to do, I might say that they have almost achieved the impossible.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will let me finish my speech, I will appreciate it, but I do not want to be discourteous to him. Does he desire to say something on a subject not related to the commanders of our forces?

Mr. TAFT. No, I merely wish to comment on the statement as to General Marshall's magnanimity in reducing the size of the Army.

Mr. HILL. I did not say it was magnanimity; I said it was soldier statesmanship.

Mr. TAFT. The point I want to suggest is that he asked for an army of 8,200,000 men, and if we had acted on that 6 months ago and said, "No, seven million six or seven hundred thousand men is sufficient," the Senator from Alabama would have stood up and denounced us——

Mr. HILL. I certainly would not, because conditions themselves are different from what they were then. At that time we had not conquered north Africa, and had not effectuated certain economies in our Army.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Alabama would have denounced us and said we were causing the deaths of more boys at the front. Yet it would have turned out that we would have been right.

Mr. HILL. In the light of conditions then existing you would have been wholly wrong.

Mr. TAFT. I absolutely deny——

Mr. HILL. Conditions changed.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think there has been any change in conditions that caused this reduction in the Army. They simply found they could not handle a larger Army than 7,700,000.

Mr. HILL. Is the Senator aware of the conquest of north Africa?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator know that the figures 8,200,000 were arrived at many months—I think over a year—before the conquest of north Africa? Has the Senator stopped to realize what that conquest has meant so far as this war is concerned and so far as we are concerned? If the Senator would turn his thinking a little bit more to what we have done and what we are going to do than why we should not do these things he might see more of the picture.

Mr. TAFT. I do not see that anything that has happened has furnished any reason for a reduction of the number of men in the Army. There are just as many men needed in Italy as ever were

needed in north Africa. I may state to the Senator that I think General Marshall's reduction of the figures was eminently praiseworthy. I only wanted to say that it only shows that General Marshall may have been right or he may have overestimated the number; but I deny that his opinion is infallible, and it seems to me very clear that he has modified the Army estimates, although Assistant Secretary Patterson, Secretary Knox, and other high officials are pointing out that we have even a greater task now before us than before the invasion of Italy. We have made an invasion of Italy from the south. That task is only begun, and certainly this is no time to reduce the Army. The fact is we never did require an army of 8,200,000 men; there is no evidence that we ever required such a number.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio says the task has only begun. He is entirely wrong. The task has multiplied, however, since the infamous attack at Pearl Harbor. The major doing of the task has only begun. There is a difference between a task and the major doing of the task. We have now arrived at the point where we can go forward with the major doing of the task. It took many months to prepare to do this task. I shall not take the time to reiterate what I said about how the north African conquest changed our situation, and how the economies effectuated in the Army changed our situation; but the situation today is entirely different from what it was many months ago when the figures 8,200,000 were arrived at. If the Senator cannot see that the north African campaign has changed our situation, there is nothing I could say that would give him the picture.

Mr. President, since the Senator speaks about that campaign, let me call the attention of the Senate to what has happened. I will not go all the way back to early 1942 when, as I recall, the plans were agreed upon and the size of the Army at 8,200,000 men was arrived at. Let us go back to a year from today, and see how the situation has changed. One year ago today the British Eighth Army were standing with their backs to the gates of Alexandria; Rommel, with his Afrika Korps, was knocking at the gates of Alexandria; and it looked as if Rommel and his Afrika Korps would smash those gates and through the British Eighth Army, drive on through Egypt, take the Suez Canal, and enable the Germans and the Japanese to join hands. Had they joined hands instead of our being on the interior lines we would have had a ring of steel around us and we would be on the outside, with China completely knocked out of the war, with India knocked out of the war, and with practically no access to Russia from then on.

One year ago the epic siege of Stalingrad had just begun, and no one knew but that Stalingrad would remain in the hands of the Nazis. The Germans were driving south toward the great oil fields of the Middle East, and if they had been successful 1 year ago in that drive to the oil fields of the Middle East, every drop of petroleum for every plane and every tank and every other gasoline machine possessed by any of the United Nations, from China to the United States, would have to come from one of the countries of the Western Hemisphere. Just a year ago we were confronted with that situation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will permit me to finish, then, I will yield. I do not want to be discourteous to the Senator; I merely desire to finish my remarks.

Mr. TAFT. All I wanted to suggest was that if all these dreadful things had happened, we could not have used an Army of 8,200,000 under any circumstances, because we could not have transported them to Europe in the way and in the numbers in which we are now able to transport them.

Mr. HILL. I do not agree with the Senator as to that. One year ago, Mr. President, America's might was still being mobilized; we were still in the process of training and mobilizing our might. We were yet to make an appearance in force on Europe's battle fields. One year ago Japan was on the offensive everywhere, and particularly in New Guinea, where Japanese troops were moving down the southern slopes of the Owen Stanley Mountains, threatening the United Nations, great base at Port Moresby, and threatening to make a drive on Australia.

Today, under the briliant command of Gen. George C. Marshall and Admiral Ernest King, what is the situation? The Russians, as we know, hold Stalingrad; the Russians stopped the Germans long before they got to the precious oil fields in the Middle East, and, in more recent months, they have been driving the Germans back until they recaptured all the territory in which are located the cities of Orel, Kharkov, and Rostov. They have even recently retaken the city of Smolensk, and now they threaten the ancient city of Kiev. They have been driving the Germans back, back, back, until they have now driven them to the Dnieper River.

In the Far East we know of the victories which have been won in the Solomon Islands, at Munda, Lae, Salamaua. Do those names mean nothing to us? We have been squeezing the Japanese out of the jungles of New Guinea, driving them, destroying Japanese ship after Japanese ship and Japanese plane after Japanese plane, taking our objectives, and winning victory after victory.

We have only recently established a command in India under Lord Mountbatten, and are now making a drive out of India soon to go on through Burma and reopen the Burma Road, so that we may get supplies to our Chinese allies.

In Europe, Italy has been completely knocked out of the war. Her men, her armies, her fleet, her ships, her guns, all her war effort, are out. No longer confronted are we with Italy and her armies and her fleet. We have taken the southern portion of Italy; we are now moving in on the central portion, and judging from recent dispatches, it will not be long before we will be the masters of all central Italy. The whole German position in the Balkans has been outflanked by our conquest of Italy, and the Adriatic has changed from an Axis lake to a United Nations lake.

We have driven the Nazis out of Sardinia and Corsica, and have now taken those two bases in the Mediterranean. We have seized other bases in the Mediterranean, in the Aegean Sea, in the Adriatic, and in the other seas pouring into the Mediterranean. The Mediterranean is now our sea, our lake.

The Germans will shoulder greater burdens in the Balkans. We know that a large proportion of the soldiers of occupation in the Balkans were Italian soldiers. Those soldiers are now out of the war, so their places must now be filled by German soldiers. We also know that when the Italians laid down their arms, some of those arms, at least, fell into the hands of little guerilla bands in the Balkans, and the Germans will now not only not have these Italian arms fighting with them and for them, but those arms will be in the hands of men in the Balkans who will be waging warfare against Germany.

We know that in northern Italy, Germany today has her forces and services of supply, such as transportation, which were formerly carried on and manned and maintained by Italians, which will constitute an additional burden for the Germans, because they will have to operate the railroads and carry on the lines of supply and do many things which Italians were doing.

Mr. President, the situation has changed entirely since last year. A year ago we were on the defensive practically everywhere. Today, we have seized the greatest factor in military success, we have seized the great factor of offensive, and today, practically everywhere, we are on the offensive.

General Marshall has said that the pattern for victory is now clear. All we have to do, whatever the costs may be, whatever the sacrifices may be, is to drive forward according to this pattern, and we know that victory for us in the war will be inevitable.

Now, Mr. President, the Senate is confronted with a momentous decision, as to whether or not it will take such action as will change or endanger this pattern for victory, whether or not it will change or force a change in the grand strategy and the grand plans of our high commanders, which have proven so successful up to date, which have brought us great victories, which have put us on the offensive everywhere and whether or not it will make a decision which will set up our judgment over the judgment of these brilliantly successful military and naval commanders. Our military and naval commanders tell us that if we set our judgment up against theirs, if we force them to make changes in the plans and in the strategy, and take our judgment rather than theirs, the war inevitably will be lengthened; and when we lengthen the war, we increase the danger of every American boy who goes out to the battle front. Every boy on a warship, every boy flying an airplane,

every boy in the ground troops, will find the danger which threatens him increased if we lengthen the war. He has so many chances of life within a given period. If we extend the war, we lessen his chances for life, we lessen his chances to come back whole of body and of mind.

Mr. President, for us to change the plans of our commanders, for us to refuse to sustain and to support our commanders, is for us to gamble with the lives of our boys and with the safety of our country, and greatly increase the burden upon the American people. Every day the war lasts the heart-breaking financial burden increases. Every citizen of this land has his burden increased every hour of every day the war lasts. There will be more mothers without sons, there will be more wives without husbands, there will be more children without fathers, there will be more of the citizens of this country gone, for every day the war continues. There will be the huge debt piling day by day and week by week upon the backs of the American people. There will be the greater and greater depreciation each day of our critical and strategic materials, all the materials which are so precious to our civilization, to the economy of our Nation, and to the future of our country.

Mr. President, knowing the record of our military commanders, knowing how they have been tried in the balance and found not wanting, how they have done things which many military men counted impossible of accomplishment, knowing their brilliant achievements and the victories we have won, I shall keep my faith and my confidence in them, I shall continue to support and sustain them, and I shall refuse to gamble with the lives of American boys and the safety of our country.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Chief of Staff expressing the attitude of the War Department on the proposed amendment of the Senator from Ohio to the pending bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, October 4, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: The Secretary of War has referred to me your request for my views on the proposed amendment of Senator TAFT to the pending bill, S. 763, providing for the deferment of certain married men with children depending upon age. I am advised by Selective Service that the effect of Senator TAFT's amendment would be that the armed forces would receive only men attaining the age of 18 and over the age of 30 after about February 1, 1944.

From a military standpoint the induction of men within age groups in a predetermined order, namely, those under 25, next those between 25 and 30, and then from 30 to 38, is unsound. Men being taken at this time and in the future for military service are for use from 4 to 16 months hence depending upon the type of training required. While the Army is now approaching its ultimate strength, a number of units must be filled during the remainder of this year. Most of these are service elements in which older men can best be used. Next year the bulk of men will, in all probability, be required for replacements to combat troops, and they should represent the younger and most vigorous types.

If Selective Service is required to furnish the Army only those men under 30 years of age during the remainder of this year, and those over 30 next year, it would appear that the younger men must, of necessity, be placed in service units in order that those units will be ready when required. The older men will then be received in large concentrations and must therefore be trained as battle replacements. Such an arrangement appears unsound and not in the best military interest, since the only pool from which battle casualty replacements could be secured, if Senator TAFT's proposed amendment is enacted into law, would be from that category of men older than 30 years, and those later becoming 18. Also, it would appear unfair to the older men and to the service to so time their induction as to force the majority into combat units as loss replacements.

The Army must meet its personnel requirements on schedule, and this cannot be done if the Army is required to reshuffle and retrain personnel because it has not received a fair and average cross section of age and phyisical condition.

The training of the men has been planned upon a basis of receiving such a cross section. My sole concern is the procurement of men with proper qualifications in the required numbers and at the necessary times. Legislation which would compel the induction of men by age groups or upon other artificial standards would threaten the orderly flow of the Nation's military manpower in the armed forces and, I believe, would hinder its efficient utilization.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the greatest wastrels in the most wasteful nation of all history are the military overlords of the Army and the Navy. They are wasting the natural resources of this Nation in a scandalous manner; they are wasting the funds and throwing this Nation into hopeless bankruptcy at a pace that does shame to the profligate of all ages; and they are wasting the manpower of this Nation with utter disregard for civilian welfare and for our assumption of being the arsenal of democracy and our ambition to be the world's granary.

They have been hoarding huge supplies of lumber and small hardware of every description, with no use in sight, while the civilian goes without. They deliberately burned millions of feet of scrap lumber that civilians would have been glad to pay for. They caused wild and devastating inflation by paying unheard-of wages in the construction of Army and Navy camps.

More goes out the back door of America's Army camps than goes in the front door of any other army in the world.

That is not my statement. It is the statement of a man who purchases and salvages grease from Army kitchens.

Why does Congress permit such waste? The answer is very simple. The Army and the Navy have the Congress and the people over a barrel. They have our sons and the sons of the American people on all the battle fronts of the world. If we deny them anything, if we curtail their extravagance in any respect, we are faced with the assertion by them that we are cutting off the supply of food, clothing, and weapons of our loved ones at the front, and are speculating with their lives.

I have sense enough to know that the Army and the Navy cannot spend $100,000,000,000 in 12 months efficiently and effectively. It is my honest opinion that military appropriations could be cut 50 percent without injury to the war effort. And yet, this summer I voted for the hundred-billion-dollar military appropriations, because I will not take a chance on the life, well-being, or comfort of a single American boy. I am sure that many of my colleagues faced the same impossible dilemma and reached the same conclusion I have reached.

Last summer I spoke to many audiences of Navy mothers and Army mothers. I had hundreds of private conferences with them. I would prefer the guillotine to failure to support fully their flesh and blood on the field of battle. Yes; the military overlords of the Army and the Navy have the Congress and the country over a barrel, and they are making the most of it. It is their day to howl, and they are taking full advantage.

On September 1 of this year they had an Army, according to General Marshall, of 7,300,000 persons. This did not include the personnel of the Navy, Marines, or Coast Guard. It is conceded that by January 1, 1944, not more than 2,700,000 of these men can be transported to the various battle fronts, supplied and equipped; and yet our military overlords insist that they must bring the Army to a strength of 7,700,000 by January 1, 1944, with an excess of 5,000,000 men to be left in the United States. Furthermore, during the entire 12 months of 1944 only an additional 2,300,000 will be transported to the combat areas, which still will leave 2,700,000 men in the United States if not another man is inducted during the next calendar year other than the 18-year-olds to care for all necessary replacements.

On the cold mathematics of the thing, it is my conclusion that the Army and Navy do not have immediate need for the 1,221,000 men which they are going to induct during the next 3 months; but, as I say, the military overlords are in the saddle, with American soldiers all over the world and, in keeping with the admonition of Bernard Baruch, I for one am not going to do any "cheese paring" or "trading down." Even though in my opinion they cannot use 1,221,000 additional men during the next 3 months to good military advantage, I am not going to try to impose my will on them.

Congress has given them every dollar, every natural resource, every law, and every man they have asked for since that fatal 3d day of September 1939, and we will continue to give them everything without stint until this awful thing is over.

However, that is not the issue in the pending measure. The Senator from

Montana [Mr. WHEELER] does not propose to deny General Marshall or Admiral King one solitary man or woman. He is perfectly willing that they should have the full 1,221,000 additional inductees which they have requested. The question, and the only question involved, is whether this 1,221,000 shall contain 446,000 pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. In spite of all the shouting that is the only issue.

General Marshall and Admiral King are not involved in it in any way. Both have testified that they are not requesting 446,000 fathers but that they are requesting 1,221,000 men and women for the armed forces between October 1 and December 31 of this year.

Senators who thump their chests and wrap themselves in the flag and shout eternal support for General Marshall are evading the issue. It is not Chief of Staff General Marshall whom they are supporting; it is the War Manpower Commission. They are shouting their approval of General Marshall, but it is the Manpower Commission they are approving.

Those of us who are supporting the Wheeler bill and the various amendments and substitutes for it believe that the Selective Service can find the 1,221,000 men without touching a single one of the 446,000 pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. That is all there is to this whole issue. We believe Selective Service should make an honest effort to get sufficient men without taking pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. We think they are taking the easy way out. It is easier to take fathers than it is to scrape the bottom of the barrel for single men.

POST-WAR COLLABORATION—THE FULBRIGHT RESOLUTION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in today's newspapers appears a poll taken by the Associated Press of the United States Senate on what is called the Fulbright resolution. In that so-called poll by the Associated Press it is said that some 42 Senators are supporting the Fulbright resolution, and 11 are against it, and 43 not committed.

Mr. President, it is not my habit to discuss newspaper articles or newspaper polls. I would not do so today except for the fact that I am fearful that not so much the contents of the news article as the headlines which have been given to it might create a wrong impression, not only in the Senate, and perhaps in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, but also throughout the country. For instance, the headline in the newspaper which I have before me at this moment reads:

> Fulbright resolution backed by 42 Senators.

That is a substantial number of Senators. Inasmuch as my own name appears among those who are backing this resolution, and also the name of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]—the Senators who introduced the Senate resolution—it might be thought that we had abandoned our particular resolution, or the purposes and objectives which we had in mind, and that we are now supporting the Fulbright resolution.

Mr. President, I think I am correctly quoted in the article. It is said in the article:

> The general attitude is summed up by Senator HATCH, of New Mexico, with this comment, "If that is all we can get I am for it, but it is not strong enough."

Mr. President, I am quite certain I made that statement, and upon that statement I was included among those listed as being in favor of the Fulbright resolution. But I wish to make it clear here today that I am not supporting the Fulbright resolution. I am not backing the Fulbright resolution. While I did say that I might vote for it if I could not get something better, I am not so sure today that I would vote for it at all.

I do not want to enter into a discussion now of the details of that resolution, but I do want to say that my whole thought about the rights of this body to make a declaration at all is based on the Constitution of the United States, section 2, article II, which reads in part, referring to the President—

> He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties.

The word "advice" to me has seemed to be a word which was used by the framers of the Constitution with deliberation, meaning that the Senate, not the House of Representatives, not the Mackinac convention or any other body—the Senate of the United States was charged with the duty and responsibility of giving advice to the executive branch of government.

I have thought in that connection that if that should be our responsibility, the advice should be given in advance, and I believe, Mr. President, if advice is to be of any use whatsoever it should be advice which means something. It should not be a mere play on words and phrases which could be susceptible of any interpretation or of any meaning, and I speak now directly of the Fulbright resolution, with all due respect to its author and to those who voted for it, having the best motives and purposes in mind.

The reason I say today that I am not supporting and not backing that resolution is because it is susceptible of practically every interpretation under the sun. On the one hand, those who oppose any collaboration can safely vote for such a resolution and say it means nothing. On the other hand, those who would go to the extreme view may say, "We can do everything we want to within the terms of this resolution."

I think, Mr. President, if the Senate of the United States exercises its constitutional power its action ought to be to set forth in language plain enough and definite enough so that it would amount to advice within the intent and meaning of the Constitution.

Mr. BALL subsequently said: Mr. President, I merely wish to associate myself with the remarks made a few moments ago by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] regarding the Fulbright resolution and the poll which appeared in this morning's newspapers. I cannot escape the conclusion that at the forthcoming conference between Britain, Russia, and the United States, the question of the arrangements to maintain peace and stability in the European theater must be discussed.

All of us hope that the war in that theater will be over in the next year. I myself cannot see how the influence of the United States can have the weight it should have in that conference unless the United States Senate speaks clearly and specifically as to the policies and programs which it is prepared to set forth at this time to maintain peace after we shall have won the war.

The American representatives in that conference now can say what they think the United States will do, but our allies know very well that what they propose must eventually come to the Senate to be approved. Our representatives will speak with much greater authority, and our influence will be much greater in setting the pattern of the peace after this war, if the Senate speaks clearly and specifically as to the policies or programs which it believes will best safeguard the peace after we shall have won the war.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. On that point, I do not want it to be inferred from the remarks which I made that I thought there was anything improper in the Republican Party adopting a plank, or any other organization passing a resolution, as to policy. I was trying to point out that there is an entirely different obligation on the Senate than on the other organizations, which are not charged with responsibility.

Mr. BALL. I agree with the Senator from New Mexico.

SHORTAGE OF CARS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF CROPS

Mr. LANGER. Earlier today, Mr. President, I brought to the attention of the Senate a telegram sent to me by the North Dakota Public Service Commission, also signed by the commissioner of agriculture and labor and by the attorney general of the State, dealing with the boxcar situation.

Most Senators know that the records of the Department of Agriculture show that North Dakota this year has raised more wheat than any other State in the Union. It has surpassed even the great State of Kansas, which has held the record for some time.

Mr. President, the telegram says that the farmers of North Dakota—and I might say the same situation prevails in the State of Montana—will lose millions of bushels through deterioration of the wheat. It is piled up with the rain coming down upon it, and within a few days snow will be coming down upon it. Roughly 40 percent of our wheat is still in shocks. The telegram says that over 1,100 of our elevators are blocked at this time because we cannot obtain cars. Yet the telegram says that our railroads are arranging to import 18,000,000 bushels of

feed wheat to the United States from Canada.

Mr. President, I submit that our railroads ought to take care of our farmers first before they take care of those of Canada or any other country. Our farmers in North Dakota are now working with old machinery. They could not obtain repairs. Thousands of the farmers there sent their wives and little children out into the fields to plant the crops and to harvest them, and now when they have the crops they cannot even get the railroads to haul the crops, and the excuse is that they cannot obtain boxcars.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article which, as I said earlier today, appeared in the Washington Evening Star of October 1, which sets out that an attorney named Melvin D. Hildreth, of Washington, D. C., has advertised for sale 60 boxcars, and that the Government will not buy them. These 60 boxcars, according to this article—

were built to order for an ordnance plant, but reverted to the Warren Car Co. when work at the plant was discontinued after the cars had hauled munitions only a few weeks.

They are only 36 feet long—4 feet less than standard—

The article continues—

but are of normal width and height and have 80,000 pounds capacity. Underframe construction, the roof and ends of the cars are of steel. They have air and hand brakes and meet all Interstate Commerce Commission safety appliances and interchange requirements.

In other words, Mr. President, they are good cars, 60 of them, just as good as the railroads are using anywhere in the United States. Yet the railroads are making no effort to use them, and apparently no committee of the Senate or the House is making any effort to have them used while the crops of the farmers of North Dakota are spoiling.

I have hundreds of letters, but I have brought with me one which is typical of the conditions our farmers confront. The letter was written on the 1st of October by Mr. B. S. Brewer, a farmer residing at Erie, N. Dak., which is in the Red River Valley, in the heart of the breadbasket of the country. He is one of the best known and most reliable farmers in North Dakota.

Mr. Brewer says:

DEAR MR. LANGER: I am a farmer in Erie, N. Dak., farming a section of land—

A section of land is 640 acres, in case anyone does not know that.

The letter continues:

Or at least I am trying to farm it, with such a terrible farm condition that we have out here now. I have been trying to buy a corn picker for 2 years. They are so scarce around here that we will not be able to get our corn in this year. I had to leave part of mine last year until spring, and then took a great loss. I did not get over half of it. I have had my order in for a Wood Bros. corn picker now for over 2 years but am not sure of one yet. The corn is getting ripe and will be ready to pick soon.

Mr. LANGER, is there anything that you could do to get me an order that I can get a corn picker in time to pick my corn and help some of my neighbors pick theirs? If you can, I will certainly appreciate it. I have a lot of hogs and cattle to feed this winter, and must have the corn to feed them, or else will be forced to sell them now. I will take any good make of a corn picker, but prefer Wood Bros.

Mr. LANGER, there will have to be something done about the farmers here in North Dakota or there will not be many farmers left. The farmer is not getting a square deal at all. We are just as patriotic as anyone, but we just cannot last at the way the farmers' affairs are run down there in Washington. We work from 16 to 20 hours a day, and just cannot make a living at $1.18 to $1.20 a bushel for our wheat, when we have to pay $7 and $8 per day and board and room for the kind of help that we can get. Farmers are quitting by the hundreds this fall—

If anyone has any doubt about it, Mr. President, let him look at any North Dakota newspapers, and see the auction sales being advertised there.

The letter continues:

And I fear for the food problem, if there is not a drastic change made in the farm problems. We must have something done about farm equipment and farm labor or else the farmers cannot continue. All the guns, planes, tanks, ships, and all the rest of our war equipment will be useless without food for the men behind it.

Mr. LANGER, I know you are very busy, but please do all that you can to help me get a corn picker before it is too late this fall, and it will surely be very, very much appreciated.

Mr. President, as I have said, that letter is typical. In my office I have hundreds of similar letters. I call the attention of the Senate again to the fact that the patriotic farmers in North Dakota produce more wheat than do the farmers of any other State of the Union; that they have led the entire Nation, per capita, in the purchase of War bonds; that they are a loyal, hard-working, honest people, but they have not gotten a square deal, as every Senator on this floor knows. Wheat is the only basic commodity the price of which is not up to parity.

From the telegram by prominent State officials, we find that 1,100 elevators cannot take another bushel of grain, and that the farmers are threshing, and are using every possible means of distributing their wheat or flax or barley. The farmers pile it up on the ground; and, as is said in the telegram signed by responsible State officials elected by the people out there, those crops are spoiling. Yet we who are in Washington are told that something must be done about the food situation.

So, Mr. President, I submit a resolution which I ask to have referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, requesting that an investigation be properly made. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be referred to the committee at once, and that the committee be requested to take action as quickly as it possibly can, for unless action is taken quickly, hundreds, if not thousands, of farmers will be ruined.

Mr. BARKLEY. The resolution would ordinarily be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce in due course.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 185) to investigate the causes of, and means for relieving, the shortage of railroad cars for the transportation of grains in the Northwestern States was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to (1) the causes of the existing shortage of railroad cars for the transportation of wheat, flax, and other grains in the Northwestern States, and (2) means of relieving such shortage. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $20,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the Evening Star for October 1, 1943. The article is entitled "60 New Boxcars Are Offered For Sale in Newspaper Ads."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIXTY NEW BOXCARS ARE OFFERED FOR SALE IN NEWSPAPER ADS

Railroad facilities are burdened to capacity with wartime freight loads, but 60 nearly new boxcars were advertised for sale here today—to anyone with the purchase price and an engine to haul them away.

To make the offer more attractive, the owner, the Warren Tank Car Co., of Warren, Pa., promised to paint the cars without extra charge and to letter on the name or numerals of the purchaser.

Melvin D. Hildreth, attorney at 1420 New York Avenue NW., who inserted newspaper ads for the tank car company, said he was certain "someone would be interested, in view of the difficulty of obtaining railroad rolling stock today."

Mr. Hildreth said, however, that he had failed in attempts to dispose of the cars to Government agencies interested in the transportation problem.

The 60 cars were built to order for an ordnance plant, but reverted to the Warren Car Co. when work at the plant was discontinued after the cars had hauled munitions only a few weeks, he explained.

They are only 36 feet long—4 feet less than standard—but are of normal width and height and have 80,000 pounds capacity, he added. Underframe construction, the roof and ends of the cars are of steel. They have air and hand brakes and meet all Interstate Commerce Commission safety appliance and interchange requirements, he added.

The price remains to be set at a conference between the owner and purchaser, but will be less than $3,000 for each car, Mr. Hildreth said.

The company wants to make sure the cars will remain in railroad use, he added, explaining that sales will not be made to brokers.

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I listened with interest today to the eloquent speech of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], because I had read in the newspaper that he was about to criticize the substitute amendment which I have presented. So far as I can see there was no criticism in his speech of my substitute. He seemed to admit the necessity for dealing in some way with the industrial deferment question, and also for dealing in some way with the physical deferment question. He did not at all deal with the question of dividing the married men into categories separating those under 30 years of age from those over 30 years of age.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I had so many things in mind that I did not reach the Senator's substitute. Later I intend to comment on it.

Mr. TAFT. I understood that the Senator had concluded his remarks.

Mr. HILL. I had concluded my remarks on the bill. The Senator's proposal is in the form of a substitute amendment. I expect to comment on the Senator's substitute amendment to the bill. My remarks today were devoted to the bill.

Mr. TAFT. I was mistaken in thinking that the Senator had finished.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Alabama apparently reached a conclusion, but not the conclusion which the Senator from Ohio thought he had reached. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAFT. In other words, there will be a second conclusion.

During the remarks of the Senator from Alabama there was inserted in the RECORD a letter from General Marshall attacking my amendment, and attacking specific division of married men into two groups, those over 30 and those under 30.

I should like to answer very briefly the statements made in that letter. The letter reads as follows:

OCTOBER 4, 1943.

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: The Secretary of War has referred to me your request for my views on the proposed amendment of Senator TAFT to the pending bill S. 763 providing for the deferment of certain married men with children depending upon age. I am advised by Selective Service that the effect of Senator TAFT's amendment would be that the armed forces would receive only men attaining the age of 18 and over the age of 30 after about February 1, 1944.

It has been assumed all through the hearings, and the general says later, that the Army strength of 7,700,000 men may be considered for present purposes its ultimate strength, and that all that will be needed thereafter will be replacements. Every year we have 1,200,000 boys coming into the 18-year age class, and it has been assumed that replacements would come from that group. Apparently this letter assumes that we are not through. If we now draft 500,000 fathers, we must look forward to drafting another 1,000,000 or so in 1944. At least, the argument is made on that assumption. I think it is an unwise assumption. I think we should work on the assumption that we may not need more than 500,000 fathers, even if we go into the question of drafting fathers.

The letter continues as follows:

From a military standpoint the induction of men within age groups in a predetermined order, namely, those under 25, next those between 25 and 30, and then from 30 to 38 is unsound.

It is, however, the method pursued in most of the military countries of the world and has been so pursued for many years.

I continue reading:

Men being taken at this time and in the future for military service are for use from 4 to 16 months hence, depending upon the type of training required.

In other words, these men are not necessary now, but will be necessary from 4 to 16 months from now, when finally they may perhaps be trained. We are to take 500,000 fathers immediately in order to start training them for use many months from now.

I continue reading:

While the Army is now approaching its ultimate strength a number of units must be filled during the remainder of this year. Most of these are service elements in which older men can best be used.

It appears now that fathers, particularly fathers over 30 years of age, are to be taken and put into the service elements. We have been pointing out all day that that is where the IV–F men could be used. For that service the Army does not need young, active men. It could use the IV–F men instead of the fathers.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I submit that the Senator should distinguish between limited-service men, who have to have limited service because of some physical disability, and service troops. Service troops go right up to the front line and into combat. Many of them must be physically qualified men. There is a difference between service troops and limited-service men.

Mr. TAFT. If that be true, younger men are needed for service troops just as much as for combat troops.

Mr. HILL. I will not interrupt the Senator further, but there is quite a difference.

Mr. TAFT. The letter continues as follows:

Next year the bulk of men will, in all probability, be required for replacements to combat troops, and they should represent the younger and most vigorous types.

During the next year 1,200,000 young men will become of military age.

The letter continues:

If Selective Service is required to furnish the Army only those men under 30 years of age during the remainder of this year, and those over 30 next year, it would appear that the younger men must, of necessity, be placed in service units in order that those units will be ready when required.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. On the subject of the younger men, the testimony before the committee shows that at the present time, without any consideration being given to combat replacements due to battle casualties, the number of men required for replacements is about 75,000 a month, or 900,000 a year. So without regard to battle casualties, which must become greater and greater as the fighting grows in intensity, approximately 900,000 of the men becoming 18 years of age will be required, if they are qualified, as replacements at the present time.

Mr. TAFT. I do not wish to examine the testimony at the present time, but if the Senator will examine the testimony, I believe he will find that the 75,000 replacements a month include battle replacements, unless there should ensue a campaign of a much more deadly character than any we have had so far.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator will find that 75,000 was the average at the time the testimony was given. Either General Marshall or General McNarney—I do not remember which; perhaps both—stated that as we actually fought and had battle casualties as a result of the fighting, the number of replacements would increase proportionately.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is mistaken. We can examine the hearings tomorrow.

I continue reading from the letter:

The older men will then be received in large concentrations and must, therefore, be trained as battle replacements.

That also seems to me to be a rather extraordinary statement. If the service troops are right up with the combat troops, I do not see much difference in age requirements as between combat troops and service troops. Certainly the younger men who serve as service troops could easily be used as combat troops. Their training would be very valuable for combat service. They could then be replaced in the service battalions, if necessary, by the older men with shorter training. It seems to me that the argument as to the necessity of drafting men all the way from 20 to 38 years of age today in order to have a certain number of older men who otherwise would be put off until next year, is almost completely fallacious.

I continue reading from the letter:

Such an arrangement appears unsound and not in the best military interest, since the only pool from which battle-casualty replacements could be secured, if Senator TAFT's proposed amendment is enacted into law, would be from the category of men older than 30 years, and those later becoming 18.

But again, the fact is, of course, that actual battle replacements will all come from the younger men, who became 18

years of age, of whom there are 1,200,000 becoming available every year.

I continue reading:

Also, it would appear unfair to the older men and to the service to so time their induction as to force the majority into combat units as loss replacements.

Very likely most of the fathers, even up to 38 years of age, if they get into the service at all, would rather be in the combat troops than in the so-called service battalions digging ditches and making airfields. The whole program seems to be one of taking fathers from 30 to 38 years of age, men who have risen in life and obtained responsible positions in the professions and various branches of business, and putting them into service troops in order that they may dig ditches in Italy. That appears to be the argument presented by the Chief of Staff in this extraordinary letter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator must realize that service organizations are not limited to the digging of ditches. Of course, that is a convenient catch phrase; but we know that service units encompass all sorts of things, including driving trucks almost up to the battle line with ammunition. The Senator must realize that there may be a difference between the physical qualifications of men performing that kind of service and those of men on foot on long marches with guns on their shoulders. The Senator recognizes that difference, I am sure.

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not. I maintain that a service battalion in Italy is under just as strong physical pressure as are the men in the combat troops. I maintain that no difference will be found on the battle front between service troops subjected to physical strain and men who are in the combat troops.

I continue reading:

The Army must meet its personnel requirements on schedule, and this cannot be done if the Army is required to reshuffle and retrain personnel because it has not received a fair and average cross section of age and physical condition.

The training of the men has been planned upon a basis of receiving such a cross section. My sole concern is the procurement of men with proper qualifications in the required numbers and at the necessary times.

Legislation which would compel the induction of men by age groups or upon other artificial standards would threaten the orderly flow of the Nation's military manpower in the armed forces and, I believe, would hinder its efficient utilization.

Certainly an age group is not an artificial standard. We already have that standard in the act. The ages are 18 to 38.

I should like to contrast that with General Marshall's testimony. Last month, in reply to a question by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], he testified as follows:

Senator BRIDGES. General, in view of the experience of the Army with younger men, the success of the younger men as contrasted with older men, do you think it would be practical to limit the father draft, we will say, from fathers between 18 and 30 rather than going up from 30 to 38, and thus get into an age class that has not been too successful?

General MARSHALL. Well, I will say in general that the younger ages are better for us to handle. Just what effect it would have in the manpower problem if you eliminated fathers over 30, I do not know. But we find it a simpler matter and quicker business to train and prepare the younger men.

Mr. President, this letter bears every evidence of having been brought here by those who are opposed to the pending bill for the purpose of defeating the bill. It is a violation of General Marshall's own testimony; I should like to have every Member of the Senate read this letter and try to analyze the argument that is made in it, and see whether he does not find it a ridiculous non sequitur.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is nothing whatever inconsistent between the letter of General Marshall and his testimony. Of course, the Army prefers the younger men, but where there is not a large enough pool, as General Marshall and all the officers of the Army and Navy and the Manpower Commission and the Selective Service say—and it is necessary to take all their testimony together in order to arrive at a logical conclusion—if the pool which they need and from which they must draw the required number of men does not contain enough men under 30 to meet their requirements, then of course, they must have a cross section ranging from the ages 18 to 38, according to the law Congress passed.

Mr. TAFT. I would question the Senator's statement. There is no assumption that the pool is insufficient. So far as any testimony in the record is concerned, we can get all the men the services are now asking for by taking the married men under 30, and using the younger men to come in as replacements. That does not take account of the suggestion made here today, that the Navy is not only asking for 3,000,000 men by the first of January, but that they are asking for 500,000 additional men during the first 6 months of 1944. I do not know about that. The Naval Affairs Committee has not passed upon it. No necessity has yet been shown, and there is no testimony in the record to prove it, so I do not think we can assume that we are going to have to draft 1,500,000 fathers.

Certainly, if that is the understanding, there will be much more support for the bill of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], because the general impression has been that only a limited number of families are to be broken up. If we are to proceed on the assumption that we are to break up a million and a half American families, then I think we had better delay the whole matter until we can study the question of manpower.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, there is no assumption of that sort so far as the requirement for raising 7,700,000 men is concerned, as fixed by the Army, by the end of this year. No one on the committee or on the floor has made such a suggestion. Whether there would have to be any more fathers drawn into the Army would depend entirely on the length of the war, upon the intensity of the fighting, and the number of casualties caused by reason of the fighting. No one has suggested that in order to raise the number of men immediately required a million and a half fathers would have to be drafted, or any more than the 446,000.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Alabama suggested that the more successful the fighting is, the fewer number we will have to have in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think the Senator has put the correct interpretation on the remarks of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, before I go further, I ask to have printed as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Washington Post of this morning endorsing my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELECTIVE FATHER DRAFT

There is a profound difference in spirit and purpose between Senator WHEELER'S bill to ban the drafting of pre-war fathers before January and the substitute proposal introduced by Senator TAFT last week on behalf of a bipartisan Senate group. A majority in the Senate appears to be convinced that the size of the Army should be determined by the military authorities. If Senator WHEELER'S proposed ban were to become effective, the Army maintains that it could not obtain the number of men it requires. No similar objections can be raised against the Taft plan that merely seeks to make the selection of recruits more selective without absolutely prohibiting the drafting of any group of men required to meet Army demands.

The proposal to call all fathers under 30 before drafting older men and to require Selective Service approval of occupational deferment for workers under 30 would reduce the number of drafted men with heavy family responsibilities to a minimum. Since age is of prime importance in distinguishing between men with a large number of dependents and those with none or only a few dependents, we conclude that age classifications provide a very reasonable basis for comprising the controversy over the drafting of fathers.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to say to the Senator quite firmly that I have talked with the Selective Service officials, and am familiar with the testimony before the committee. We talked about 446,000 fathers, but that number is only what the Army is going to take up to January 1. General Marshall testified befor the committee that he hoped they would have to have only that number of men; but only 200,000 of those fathers are going into the Army. The others are going into the Navy.

The Senator from Alabama indicated that after the first of the year the Navy's requirements will make it necessary to go into the ranks of the fathers to the extent of at least 750,000 up to a million, which means the taking of practically every father in the United States who is physically fit for service.

As a matter of fact, General Hershey has said to me—I do not think there is any secret about it—that even out of this fathers' pool, if the Navy is to take all the men it certainly is going to require, it will be necessary to take every physically fit father in the country, and he does not know where physically fit fathers are to be obtained with the standards as they are today.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know all Admiral King may have told the Selective Service, but I read his testimony, and I saw no indication of increase in the Navy beyond 3,000,000 men. That would make a total for the armed forces of about 10,800,000. I have always felt that up to that number the country could stand it, and that we should grant that number if they were requested. I feel very strongly that if we are to go above that number, there should be a complete study of the whole manpower situation, to determine what this country can do, whether we can conquer the world, whether we can supply all our allies with lend-lease material, whether we can carry on a world-wide war, in which we assume the burden of all the supplies for a great many of the civilian population. But I have not understood that we have reached that point. I think for the present we are working on the old assumption that the Army and Navy want 10,800,000 in the armed forces, and if that is what they want, they can get from the fathers under 30 those they still need. That is the reason for the amendment I have suggested.

Mr. WHEELER. All I have to go on is exactly what General Hershey said to me, borne out by what the Senator from Alabama said today, that in order to get what the Navy wants—if I may have the attention of the Senator from Alabama——

Mr. HILL. I am listening to the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. They are going to have to take at least 500,000 fathers, in addition to the 446,000, after the first of the year. I ask the Senator whether that is correct.

Mr. HILL. I would say that if the Navy gets the men they need to man the new ships and planes to come in after January 1, it will be necessary to take some additional fathers. The Army will want 75,000 for replacements, the Navy's figure is about 92,000 a month, which makes 167,000 each month. I do not think, from what the Selective Service has advised me, that we can get the 167,000 entirely from young men who become 18 years of age, or from what they call replacements, that is, those taken out of industry, or perhaps some of the class IV–F's. There will be some fathers, probably, who will have to be drafted to meet the figure of 167,000 each month, over the period of 6 months, from January 1 to July 1.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, it depends on how many men can be gotten out of the industrial deferred class, and how many it is possible to get out of IV–F. Is it not true that the Navy has never presented to the Committee on Naval Affairs any such demand for men, that that never has been authorized by the Congress, and that no one has seen the basis of the figures upon which that request has apparently been suggested by the Navy to the Selective Service Director? It seems to me something we cannot take into consideration when dealing with this problem.

Mr. HILL. The Senator says we cannot take it into consideration. I desire to be absolutely frank and candid always with the Senate. I say to the Senator and to the Senate that from the hearings before the committee, from Admiral King's testimony, and from the information I have received from the Selective Service, it would seem that we are going to have to take in from January 1 to July 1 approximately 167,000 men each month, and from the information the Selective Service has given me I think it extremely doubtful that 167,000 men can be secured or will be secured from among nonfathers.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from Alabama refer me to any place in the testimony where Admiral King even suggests that 500,000 more men are going to be requested?

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator that that testimony was off the record. Admiral King, as I recall the testimony, was testifying at that time with reference to new ships and new planes which were going to be produced and come into use from January 1 to July 1, 1944.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. HILL. And then of course the question arose, "What about the manning of these ships and planes." And as I recall the Admiral's testimony, it indicated that the Navy would need about 90,000 men for replacements, and for the manning of the additional ships and planes over a period of 6 months beginning on January 1.

Mr. TAFT. As I understood, of the 92,000 about 70,000 are to be new men?

Mr. HILL. I will say that according to the testimony the Navy estimates it needs some 25,000 for replacement purposes. That would mean then that about 65,000 would be needed as additional men to man the new ships and new planes which will be produced and come into use by the Navy.

Mr. WHEELER. I think the Senator from Alabama is correct with respect to what the Admiral testified. That is correct according to the information that was given to me by General Hershey.

Mr. HILL. I wish to make it clear also, because I want the Senator to have the benefit of any information I may have been able to glean, that the 25,000 men as replacements for the Navy are in addition to the 75,000 men needed as replacements for the Army.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I understand that. But what I want to point out is that this fact, which is off the record, is for the first time an official suggestion that we are going beyond the figure of 10,800,000 men for the armed forces to a figure which approximates 11,500,000, and that that policy is one which certainly, it occurs to me, should be passed upon by Congress before it is spoken of as an established policy of the United States Government.

Mr. HILL. I do not know that I can put my hand at this moment on any testimony in the record, but I think the figure of 11,000,000 or 11,100,000, or 11,200,000, has certainly been under discussion throughout the period of the months since we first began to attempt to find out what the size of the Army and Navy would be. I think the figure is 11,000,000. Then there is another thing the Senator must realize about these figures. Remember that these figures for the Army and the Navy include the women, the WAC's and the WAVES, although they do not run so very high, and I am not sure that when we began to discuss these figures we included the women.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that the WAC's and the WAVES take the places of men. Let me ask the Senator a question. Has any over-all study been made by way of comparison of the Army needs and the Navy needs? Has any such study been made by the General Staff to be sure that they are not asking for men both in the Army and Navy to do the same thing? Obviously the marines' tasks overlap those of the Army. Obviously the various service brigades which make up a tremendous number in both Army and Navy may be planning to do exactly the same work, unless there has been some close study and coordination. Does the Senator know whether that subject has been studied?

Mr. HILL. I cannot speak for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but I cannot think that they have not considered these questions. That is the very purpose of having Joint Chiefs of Staff. I am not sure that the Senator heard my remarks made earlier in the day. As I said in my remarks, not only do we have Joint Chiefs of Staff, but there is a joint chiefs of staff planning committee, which is composed of representatives of both the Army and the Navy to work out these plans. Of course the obvious reason for having the joint committee is that it may consider the very things the Senator from Ohio has suggested.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, of course if we are to accept the philosophy which has been expounded on the floor of the Senate by certain Senators who are opposing the bill, and who are following the administration's view, namely to the effect that we must leave the matter up to the Army and to the Navy, and follow blindly whatever its leaders say, then if representatives of the Army and the Navy come before us and say they want 15,000,000 men we must supposedly, give them whatever they say they want, regardless of the effect upon the morale of the people or the economic structure of the United States generally.

Mr. Baruch stated that we ought to follow whatever General Marshall said. I think there is a very serious question as to whether we can have as many as 11,000,000 men in the armed services, and certainly if we are to take every physically fit married man in the country into the armed services, then I think we will completely break down the morale of the people and we will completely break

down the economic structure in the United States.

Mr. President, we have the greatest air force in the world. We are turning out more airplanes than any other country. We are going to have the greatest Navy in the world. We are giving billions of dollars for lend-lease. We are assuming a tremendous task, and giving away the substance of the United States and the raw materials and the finished products. The result will be that we will wreck the United States of America, simply because we follow blindly what every Army or naval chief says when he comes before us.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to suggest that the argument that we cannot defer the fathers until the first of the year, that we do not have the time to recomb all those who have been deferred, falls down on the basis of the statistics furnished the Military Affairs Committee at the request of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and myself with respect to the training history of men who are now in our camps. The number of men who have been in training for from 1 year to 2 years is 1,172,000; from 2 years to 3 years, 510,000, for 3 years of more, 84,000.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator. I remember when the information was requested.

Mr. President, let us consider those figures. Let us then say that we shall take the fathers of the country, that we must have them in the next 3 months, that if we do not obtain them in the next 3 months we shall lose the war, or it will materially affect the war. Can we say that in view of the fact that we have in the Army at the present time more men who have been trained 1 year, and more men who have been trained 2 years, than can possibly be shipped overseas by the end of this year?

Mr. President, I do not care whether General Marshall makes the statement or whether the Commander in Chief makes the statement; when someone makes a statement which is preposterous upon its face, the common sense and the sanity of the American people should deal with it as preposterous. If it does not appeal to the common sense and the sanity of the Members of the Senate, but they still follow blindly whatever is stated, how can the people of the country have any confidence in parliamentary government or in the Senate?

As was pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], there are in the United States 1,172,000 men who have had over 1 year's training. There are 510,000 men in the United States who have had over 2 years' training. Eighty-four thousand men in the United States have had over 3 years of training. When General Marshall says, "I must have these married men in the next 3 months, or the country will go to pieces, and we may lose the war," does he mean he will take 200,000 married men—fathers—and immediately put them into divisions which will be sent overseas, when he already has men who have been trained for 1, 2, or 3 years? It is simply preposterous on its face; it simply does not make good sense.

In all fairness to General Marshall, let me say, in connection with the emphasis which has been placed upon his statement before the committee, that it must be remembered that he was making an offhand statement. He was being questioned by Senators who were asking, "Won't you lose the war, and won't you do this and do that, if you do not get the fathers?" What must be studied is General McNarney's statement about the size of the Army. We must consider what the men who now are in the Army are being used for. General McNarney gave the figures in relation to what the men were wanted for. If Senators will refer to the figures I stated Friday afternoon to an almost empty Chamber, they will realize that the Army does not need 200,000 fathers at the present time, that there would be plenty of time if the 200,000 fathers were deferred from Army service for 3 months, and then, if the whole manpower problem were studied, and if the IV–F's were rescreened, if some of them were taken. If that were done it would not be necessary to take even one father.

The only thing the opposition have to hang their case on is the fact that General Marshall has said, "I have got to have these men between now and January 1, to fill up divisions. If I do not get them to fill up the divisions, I will have to break up some other divisions."

Would it not be far better to break up some of the other divisions, to take out of some of the divisions trained men who otherwise would remain in the United States, than it would be to shove fathers, without any training or with only a few months' training, into divisions which are to be sent overseas?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Montana has spoken of General Marshall's testimony. I received the impression that the Senator was expressing the thought that General Marshall was testifying without a prepared statement, and was being subjected to questions, and that possibly General Marshall may not have presented the matter exactly as he might have felt about it. Is that correct?

Mr. WHEELER. No; I am simply saying that in my judgment the statement General Marshall gave must be taken, because it was an offhand statement—and I think we all know General Marshall has a tremendous job——

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. He is flying between England and the United States, and Italy and the United States, and north Africa and the United States; and he is not as familfar, and could not possibly be as familiar, with the conditions which exist as was and is his Chief of Staff. He said he would have to break up some of the divisions if he could not get the fathers.

Mr. HILL. Yes; the Senator is correct; and let me say that before General Marshall was questioned at all, and before he subjected himself to questioning, he concluded his statement with the following words—this was his direct statement:

> I apologize if I have expressed myself rather vigorously, but I must admit I feel rather intense about this, and I wanted to make it as clear as I could what the conditions are as I see them. Now, I am ready to answer any questions that you wish to ask.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct. That does not add or detract anything from what I have said.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has referred to the fact that General Marshall has flown to London and has flown to north Africa. The trips the general has made to London for a week or so, and to north Africa for a week or so, certainly did not consume sufficient time to prevent him from keeping his fingers on the department over which he presides.

Mr. WHEELER. In answer to that, Mr. President, I say the only thing we have to do is to read General McNarney's testimony which he gave in a prepared statement, and then read General Marshall's statement. I say, with all due respect to General Marshall's statement, that General McNarney broke down the facts and figures, whereas General Marshall's statements were of a general character.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, General McNarney went into greater detail than did General Marshall; but there is nothing inconsistent between the testimony of the two generals.

Mr. WHEELER. I say that taking into consideration General Marshall's statement, we must review and take into consideration General McNarney's statement. Does the Senator think that newly inducted fathers who have not had any training, and will not have any training except for a few weeks, should be shipped overseas with the divisions that are to be shipped overseas, instead of taking men who have been in training for over a year or 2 or 3 years? Does the Senator believe that trained troops should be left in the United States, although the fathers are taken? I say that simply does not make sense. I do not care whether General Marshall says it or who says it. It simply does not make common sense to anyone who will analyze the figures.

Mr. President, other Senators have stated, and I have stated repeatedly, that under the selective-service law the matter rests entirely with the President of the United States. Of course, I know the President has to a large extent left the matter up to the Army and the Navy; but it seems to me that the time has come when the President should recognize the fact that he cannot leave all the details and that Congress cannot leave everything to the Army and the Navy; because the Army and the Navy look at matters purely from one standpoint, not from the general outlook. General

Marshall made it plain that all he wanted was to have the men. It seems to me the President should look at the matter from the standpoint of production in this country, from the standpoint of whether the drafting of fathers will break down our civilian economy, whether it will drive small businessmen out of business. The President should look at the matter from the standpoint of what the effect will be on the moral conditions, and whether it will cause delinquency among the children of the country.

I was one of the first Members of the Senate of the United States and of the Congress to advocate—away back in 1932—the nomination and election of Franklin Delano Roosevelt as President of the United States. I did so while many persons who now are claiming to be new dealers and great Roosevelt followers were sitting back in their chairs, and never mentioned where they stood, and many of them were against Mr. Roosevelt until they found out he was elected, and they thought the popular thing to do was to get on the band wagon. But I supported him in 1932 because I felt Mr. Roosevelt was interested in preserving the homes of the people of the United States. I was for him because I thought he was interested in preserving little business in this country, and was against monopoly and was against the concentration of power in the hands of some of the great monopolies and great corporations. I was for him because I felt he was interested in the future generations of the children of America; and I was interested in him because I felt he would be opposed to our involvement in European wars. I supported him in 1932 before the convention, and I traveled from one end of the country to the other in his behalf. I went into North Dakota for him to line up the North Dakota delegation. I went into Minnesota, and into almost every other State in the Union west of the Mississippi River. I have supported the social legislation and the social programs which he has advocated.

I now appeal to the President of the United States, who has heretofore stood for social progress, who has heretofore been against breaking up American homes, and who has been for looking after the children of America—I appeal to him now as Commander in Chief of the Army of the United States, and the only man who has a right to tell the Army and Navy that they must not break up American homes and drive children into the streets, thus increasing juvenile delinquency, to stop the action which is going on, and tell the Army and Navy to reclassify the IV-F men, of whom there are many hundreds of thousands. General Hershey said—and I take his word for it—that 2,000,000 men could be obtained from the IV-F classification.

I appeal to the President of the United States to insist that the men who are being hoarded in factories be taken out, and that single men be taken before we break up homes by drafting fathers.

The responsibility is his and it is upon him alone. It is apparent that the Congress of the United States will not act unless the President gives the word and says it may be done. I realize that pressure is coming from the administration; but I cannot believe that if he were thoroughly conversant with the facts and realized what the effects will be, Mr. Roosevelt, who has been for a great social program, would want to see us adopt the same policies which Mr. Hitler has adopted, and put American children into institutions and break up American homes, after the pattern of what has been done in Germany. I cannot believe that one who hates the Nazi philosophy as he hates it wants to follow in the footsteps of Mr. Hitler by doing identically the same thing which Hitler is doing with reference to children, and break up American homes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no desire to consume any of the time of the Senate at this time, and I shall not do so. However, I cannot allow the remarks of the Senator from Montana to go into the RECORD without at least making this observation:

I believe that the President of the United States realizes as fully as anybody could realize for him his responsibility under the Constitution of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. He also realizes his responsibility under the Selective Service Act, which conferred upon him certain power with regard to its administration.

Amazing as it may seem to those who are not familiar with the President's intimate and detailed knowledge of all the elements which enter into this question, the President is cognizant of the situation. He has given consideration to all those elements, including those suggested by the Senator from Montana and other Senators, and he has done as much as was humanly possible for him to do in order to meet the requirements of our military and naval situation and protect American homes.

No one has a monopoly on interest in the American home. I am quite certain that no one has a greater interest in the American home than has the President of the United States. He has shown his interest in every act of his administration and every policy which he has inaugurated. I am sure that the President of the United States is not afraid to assume the responsibility which is his, and assume it in the light of all the facts, in the light of his own knowledge of the situation which confronts our country, the type of Army and Navy we must have, the type of war we are engaged in, and the inside information with respect to the type of fighting which will be necessary in order that that war may be speedily and successfully won, so that we may not only protect American homes, but also protect all American life from unnecessary slaughter because of any mistakes which may be made in undertaking to carry it forward in the best and most efficient way possible.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Amos E. Taylor to be Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Oliver P. Hopkins to be Assistant Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Raymond C. Miller to be Assistant Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the United States Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en block.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 5, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 4 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Robert E. Hannegan, of St. Louis, Mo., to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue in place of Hon. Guy T. Helvering, whose nomination for a Federal judgeship in Kansas has been confirmed.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. John Russell Deane (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Albert Coady Wedemeyer (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 4 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

Amos E. Taylor, to be Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Oliver P. Hopkins to be Assistant Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Raymond C. Miller to be Assistant Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

To be temporary passed assistant surgeons, to rank as such from August 1, 1943:

Alfred L. Holloman	George W. Comstock
Kenneth Grant	Anthony J. Lund
James Lloyd Elliott	Herbert Tabor
Herbert E. Pedersen	Robert M. Thomas
Joseph L. Bryant	Spurgeon M. Wingo

To be temporary surgeons, to rank as such from August 1, 1943:

Romeo J. Gentile	Hugh L. C. Wilkerson
George K. Massengill	Charles M. McGill
David J. Zaugg	

To be temporary senior surgeons, to rank as such from August 1, 1943:

Frank S. Fellows	Jacob P. Eberhardt
Elmer A. Carberry	Anthony P. Rubino

William C. Lewis to be a temporary passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 1, 1943.

To be temporary surgeons, to rank as such from September 1, 1943:

Alfred L. Holloman
Kenneth M. Joye
John A. Lewis

Joseph A. Bell to be a temporary senior surgeon, to rank as such from September 1, 1943.

Robert H. Onstott to be a temporary medical director, to rank as such from September 1, 1943.

Elmer J. Herringer to be a sanitary engineer, to rank as such from September 1, 1943.

Gordon E. McCallum to be a passed assistant sanitary engineer, Regular Corps, effective date of oath.

Edmund J. Schmidt to be an assistant surgeon, Regular Corps, effective date of oath.

George Shipman to be an assistant surgeon, Regular Corps, effective date of oath.

To be temporary passed assistant surgeons, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

John B. Spriggs	Emery F. Word
Carruth J. Wagner	Lyman C. Burgess

To be temporary surgeons, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

Curtis R. Chaffin	Eric C. Johnson
Erwin C. Drescher	Earl L. White
Paul T. Erickson	Joseph S. Spoto
John B. Hozier	

To be temporary senior surgeons, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

Leroy E. Burney
Robert H. Felix

To be temporary senior sanitary engineers, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

John J. Bloomfield
Judson L. Robertson, Jr.

Raymond A. Vonderlehr to be a temporary medical director, to rank as such from July 1, 1943.

Calvin B. Spencer to be a surgeon, to rank as such from October 8, 1943.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Stella K. Martin, Plantersville.
Benjamin L. Edmonds, West Blockton.

KANSAS

Regina Cannon, Beattie.
Clara Sainer, Bison.
Nina Short, Concordia.
Mary E. Carpenter, Goddard.
Herbert E. Walter, Kingman.

KENTUCKY

Charles B. Cox, Benton.
Kenneth T. Marquette, Falmouth.

NORTH DAKOTA

Edwin H. Naumann, Kramer.
Curtis L. Wright, Michigan.
Nick F. Schammel, Tolley.

RHODE ISLAND

Elton L. Clark, North Scituate.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ray E. Young, Due West.
Andrew M. Blair, Rion.
William F. Griffin, Travellers Rest.

WEST VIRGINIA

J. B. Puryear, Jr., Holden.
Martha J. Snyder, Shepherdstown.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we praise Thee for our country; it is an ideal and a vision which may be realized by the humblest child. We pray Thee for a season of renewal by widening our range of affection, by the amplitude of service which we can enlarge in unity with every good and needful work. We beseech Thee to give strength of body, minds of deep conviction and courageous spirits to the Congress and to the highest tribunal of our Republic.

Heavenly Father, help us to discern the full pattern of human life and happiness. There are social ills to be overthrown, economic conditions which breed poverty, the curse of alcohol and wrongs which come from tenement districts; these evils are vast with peril to our destiny. Inspire our great land with the Christway of service; deliver us from the misfortunes and the sufferings caused by selfish men who would despoil it of its true worth and dignity. Dear Lord, enrich our souls and fill them with rich treasures which overflow to lift and bless other lands. Whether our gifts be large or small, enable us to build them into God and man; all things else whatsoever shall fail and go. We pray Thee to shield us from the tragedy of the talent which was wrapped in distrust, selfishness, and, at last, failure. In the name of our blessed Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 30, 1943, was read and approved.

APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN OF SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 21, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as chairman of the select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 313), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That CLAIR ENGLE, of the State of California, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Mines and Mining and World War Veterans' Legislation.

The resolution was agreed to.

REORGANIZATION OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, today I shall introduce a public-health bill.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to authorize a reorganization of the unwieldy administrative structure of the Public Health Service. Hearings were held on S. 400 by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, and that committee reported the bill favorably with certain amendments. The bill, as amended, passed the Senate unanimously. Even before the introduction of H. R. 649, the need for a reorganization of the Public Health Service had been the subject of study by your committee. As a result of the study which the committee has given this matter and the hearings which have been held on this bill the committee is convinced that only a thorough-going codification and revision of all of the laws relating to the Public Health Service will accomplish the purposes of H. R. 649 and S. 400.

In order to understand why such a revision and codification is necessary, there must be considered the process by which the Public Health Service has evolved by succession of laws from a small corps of doctors authorized in 1789 to give medical and hospital relief to American seamen of the merchant marine to its present position as the central health organization of the Federal Government with many functions and major responsibilities vital to the welfare and safety of the Nation, both in war and peace.

It is evident that the Public Health Service has grown by gradual accretion of functions and divisions. The laws establishing these functions and divisions generally were passed one at a time and often without any attempt to fit the added functions and divisions into the pattern which had previously been established. For these reasons there not only is an unwieldy and inconsistent administrative structure, but there are also many obsolete, inconsistent and overlapping provisions of law pertaining to the functions of the Public Health Service.

The bill is designed to bring together in one enactment all of the laws relating to the Public Health Service, to permit the administrative reorganization authorized by H. R. 649 and S. 400, to adjust the wartime status of the commissioned corps of the service, to reconcile the conflicts and eliminate the overlapping in the law, and to make certain mechanical revisions found necessary by long administrative experience.

While the bill is not strictly a codification, it is in no sense a measure designed to place the Public Health Service into new fields of operation or to enlarge its functions and powers. Its sole purpose is to enable the Public Health Service to perform its present statutory functions more effectively.

PVT. HELEN F. VAN COUTREN

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I read an article that appeared in the St. Louis Star-Times, September 30:

TEN IN ST. LOUIS FAMILY SERVE IN ARMED FORCES

Pvt. Helen F. Van Coutren started her basic training as a WAC at Ft. Des Moines, Iowa, yesterday and thus became the tenth child of Mr. and Mrs. L. M. Van Coutren of 1292 Hamilton Boulevard, to serve in the present war.

Her two sisters are WAC's, Pvt. Adine Van Coutren serving in Africa, and Pvt. Rita Van Coutren, stationed at Washington.

One brother, Thomas, is a sergeant in the Army, and six other brothers are in the Navy.

I congratulate this family on the great contribution it is making in the present emergency. It is a record that is seldom equaled.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement by Roy Miller, vice president, Navy League of the United States and State chairman for Navy Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may address the House today for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD some observations made by me on the meat and sugar-beet situation in Montana and also on the situation in which the copper miners find themselves in that State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Lorain (Ohio) Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business in order for the day and after any special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 10 minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter from Mr. Hugh Smith, Philadelphia Better Business Bureau, and an address given by Mr. Smith at Cincinnati, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three separate subjects, and include therein newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 50 minutes on the dairy situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Boston Daily Record of Monday, September 27, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Republican leader of the House, as given at the public meeting in connection with the fifteenth annual scientific assembly of the Medical Society of the District of Columbia in Washington, D. C., on October 1, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article by Bill Cunningham that appeared in the Boston Herald of yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article written by the Governor of South Dakota and appearing in the South Dakota Highway magazine; and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an editorial from the Washington Evening Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in three respects, one concerning the cot-

ton farmer and another concerning a subject discussed in three letters written by me which I shall include in my remarks, and in the third to include an article by Mr. Edgar L. Morphet, of the Florida State Department of Education.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of socialized medicine, and further to extend my remarks on the question of the subsidy roll-back.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER] be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article appearing in yesterday's New York Times, by James B. Reston, who writes from London. The article is entitled "Russia Poses First Great Crisis of the Peace."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

RUSSIA VEERING TO THE RIGHT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is gratifying to me, because I pointed out many months ago that Russia was veering to the right and that within a short space of time would demonstrate to the world that its aims are democratic and that justice will prevail.

Mr. Speaker, I was highly gratified to hear the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] call to the attention of the House and the country the unbiased report on Russia by Captain Rickenbacker. I have known the captain favorably for many years and still hold him in high esteem notwithstanding his unfavorable criticism of organized labor, but that was as an officer of one of the large air-transport companies. However, the report which he makes on Russia, to which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] calls attention and is inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is really an official report to and in the interest of our country.

I believe that every fair-minded American whose mind has not been poisoned by Nazi-Fascist propaganda against Soviet Russia will concede that Captain Rickenbacker's report and account of his interviews are based on facts and truths.

Nearly 2 years ago and before Hitler attacked Russia I stated on the floor that Russia in order to gain time was forced into making a treaty with Germany. Notwithstanding strong opposition in this country that action did not cause us to discontinue the shipping to Russia of machinery, tools, implements, and other war materials which they purchased and paid for with moneys deposited in our banks in advance.

While the Nazi propagandists were endeavoring to induce us to forget and divert our attention from the wholesale massacres of all those who failed to agree or follow Hitler's murderous aims, they were charging that Stalin had ordered the elimination of many Russian officers and had closed all churches, denying the people the right of worship. The Nazi propagandists did not state, however, that, unlike the murderous action of Hitler in the cases of certain German officers, civilians, peoples and officials of invaded countries, in his wholesale purges, the so-called Russian officers who were executed received a fair and open trial by Stalin, and that it was upon confessions and evidence that clearly showed they were on the pay roll of the Japanese and Nazis and had sought to undermine Russia that they were convicted and the deserved punishment meted out to them. I obtained a complete report at that time which indicated clearly that all Russia was seeking to accomplish was to separate the church from the state and was not opposed to free worship.

While President Roosevelt stated at that time that he had been assured there would be complete freedom of worship he was being continuously assailed and attacked by the Nazi propagandists and even by our own American pacifists and appeasers, and this notwithstanding that Russia had adopted a real constitution granting freedom and liberty to its people and eliminating many of Lenin's original policies. Russia was gradually and continuously veering to the right, and therefore I am pleased that since then the statements of the President have been justified. I recall stating that Communists promised a great deal—just as the Republican and Democratic platforms usually do, though the makers realized that all the pledges could not be fully carried out.

The statements of Captain Rickenbacker and of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] are timely and should put a stop to the activities of those few Nazi ideologists and even those few misguided Communists in our country.

I congratulate Russia upon its great achievements and upon its continuous liberalizing of its policies affecting the welfare of its people. I believe when history is written that Russia will receive the recognition and credit to which it is entitled for having rendered to humanity, at such terrific cost, a service not only to its own people and country but to the democracies of the world.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

WARTIME CONSTRUCTION OF RECLAMATION PROJECTS

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar (H. R. 3018) authorizing wartime construction and operation and maintenance of reclamation projects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I object.

DISPOSAL OF MATERIALS ON THE PUBLIC LANDS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2697, to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill gives the Secretary of the Interior unlimited authority to dispose of any properties on lands under his jurisdiction, even though that disposal may not be authorized by law—a jurisdiction entirely too great to be passed by unanimous consent. Therefore, I object, Mr. Speaker.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LANDS TO THE CITY OF SITKA, ALASKA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 340, to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to grant and convey certain lands to the city of Sitka, Alaska, for street purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] is on the floor and I would like to ask him to give a short explanation of this legislation.

Mr. DIMOND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Territorial Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to convey to the city of Sitka, Alaska, a strip of land for street purposes. The street will probably be about 6 feet wide, to the best of my knowledge and information.

Years ago all of the land involved belonged to the United States Government and it was used for an Army barracks. Then by act of Congress the land was conveyed to the Territory of Alaska with the understanding that it was to be used

as a home for aged pioneers. The Territorial Government spent about $300,000 in putting up buildings as a home for the aged pioneers on the tract. Recently the population of the city of Sitka has increased and there is considerably more traffic on the streets now than there was years ago. In rehabilitating this street it was found desirable to widen it by about 6 feet, as I recall, at one point where the tract of the Pioneers' Home bulges out into the street, so to speak. It is desired to take a little part of this tract and use it for a street. The land desired for street purposes is not occupied by anything except as a lawn. That lawn could be narrowed and the people benefitted by the passage of this bill.

Mr. PRIEST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. Certainly.

Mr. PRIEST. In the event the city at any time in the future ceases to use this land for street purposes would the title revert to the Government?

Mr. DIMOND. Yes. It is so provided in the original bill and so provided by amendment in the bill now before us.

Mr. RANKIN. The streets of Sitka are very, very narrow, are they not?

Mr. DIMOND. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Washington, our distinguished colleague of a few years ago, Hon. John F. Miller, who has now passed away, said that when Sitka was the capital of Alaska it was the only capital in the world that never had a horse in it, because the streets were so narrow they could not use them. So, Mr. Speaker, with all the territory we have in Alaska, comprising about 590,000 square miles, it seems to me we can very well afford to grant to the city of Sitka the few feet of ground necessary to make these streets passable. I hope there will be no objection of the passage of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska is hereby authorized to grant and convey to the city of Sitka, Alaska, for street purposes, such portions of the lands conveyed to the Territory of Alaska by the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 502), as may be necessary or desirable for such purposes, without regard to reversionary provisions in section 2 of said act.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 7, following the comma, strike out the remainder of the bill and insert the following:

"and not conveyed to the Sitka Cold Storage Co., by the act of August 16, 1937 (50 Stat. 652), as the city of Sitka shall designate are necessary or desirable for street purposes. Any conveyance made under this act shall be without regard to the reversionary provisions in section 2 of the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 502).

"All oil, coal, or other materials in land designated and conveyed to the city of Sitka under this act, and the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same shall be reserved to the United States under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe."

Add the following new section:

"SEC. 2. The city of Sitka shall never sell or otherwise dispose of any part of the property conveyed to it purusant to the provisions of section 1 of this act; and if the same shall ever be abandoned for the uses herein declared the said premises shall revert to the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIXING A REASONABLE DEFINITION AND STANDARD OF IDENTITY OF CERTAIN DRY MILK SOLIDS

The Clerk read the next bill, H. R. 149, to increase agricultural purchasing power and to meet the need of combating malnutrition among the people of low income by defining and making certain a reasonable definition and standard for nonfat dry milk solids.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 26, 1938 (ch. 675, sec. 1, 52 Stat. 1040), dry milk solids or defatted milk solids is the product resulting from the removal of fat and water from milk, and contains the lactose, milk proteins, and milk minerals in the same relative proportions as in the fresh milk from which made. It contains not over 5 percent moisture. The fat content is not over 1½ percent unless otherwise indicated.

The term "milk," when used herein, means sweet milk of cows.

With the following committee amendments:

The amendments are as follows:

Line 5, before "dry", insert "nonfat."

Line 9, after "centum", insert "by weight of."

Line 10, after "centum", insert "by weight."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids."

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF FISHERY COORDINATION

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1242, to authorize appropriations for salaries and expenses, Office of Fishery Coordination.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that application has been made for a rule to consider this bill in Committee of the Whole and I think that would be the far better procedure.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I did submit an application for a rule and after I submitted my application for the rule, I thought that the matter had been satisfactorily adjusted by conference with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and Dr. Gabrielson.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have accumulated a little file on this matter and it develops ever-increasing interest as I go along, and for that reason I think an authorization for the expenditure of $290,000 and the setting up of 30 additional spots with their pay rolls is a matter which might become permanent as we go along and I think is deserving of some debate in the Committee of the Whole. I would much prefer to have the gentleman procure a rule, for I think that is the far better procedure.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I think the matter is so important and the explanation that has been given so clear that I cannot agree; I will have to agree, of course, if objection is made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I regret to press my objection, but I will say to the gentleman from Virginia that I think it ought to be considered in the Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BLAND. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia objects.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I renew my objection.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2801, to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as is indicated by the title to the bill, this would give the Secretary of the Interior an additional Assistant Secretary for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter.

There can be no question but what the duties of the Secretary of the Interior have increased tremendously in the last few years, but I do not think that this burden has increased in proportion any more than the duties of the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War, each one of whom has the same number as the Secretary of the Interior now has. Therefore, I object.

MONTEZUMA CASTLE NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 378, to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the acquisition of a small area of added land to one of our national monuments. The Secretary of the Interior has not recommended the bill, and ordinarily we on this committee would insist that the matter be brought up under a general rule rather than by unanimous consent. However, in view of the fact that the bill is sponsored by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], and in view of the fact that the bill contemplates the expenditure of $25,000, we have decided to forego our principle and practice and to raise no objection at this time. However, we will offer an amend-

ment to limit the appropriation authorized to $25,000.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of the Interior, on behalf of the United States, is authorized to acquire, in his discretion, certain lands located in the State of Arizona known as the Montezuma Well property, containing approximately 180 acres and situated within section 36, township 15 north, range 5 east, and section 31, township 15 north, range 6 east, Gila and Salt River meridian. Such lands, when acquired, shall become a detached unit of Montezuma Castle National Monument.

(b) Effective on the date of the acquisition of such property, the south half of the northwest quarter of section 31, township 15 north, range 6 east, Gila and Salt River meridian, containing 80 acres of land owned by the United States, shall also become a part of such national monument.

SEC. 2. All laws, rules, and regulations applicable to such national monument shall be applicable with respect to the lands described in the first section of this act upon the addition of such lands to such national monument. The title to real property acquired pursuant to this act shall be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

With the following amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York:

On page 2, line 16, after the words "as may be necessary", insert a comma and the words and figures "but not to exceed $25,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEEPAGE AND DRAINAGE DAMAGES ON THE ILLINOIS RIVER, ILL.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3029, to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damages on the Illinois River, Ill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following report is hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers:

Illinois River, Ill.; in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 711, Seventy-seventh Congress, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL JEFFERSON BICENTENARY COMMITTEE

The Clerk called the next business, Senate Joint Resolution 47, providing for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out under the general direction of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I cannot see the justice of this bill if we ever expect to do justice to the memory of Thomas Jefferson. While the real Jeffersonian Democrats of America seem to have been asleep, this commission for the alleged anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson erected the most hideous monstrosity with which the memory of a great man has ever been punished in all the tide of time—this so-called Jefferson Memorial down here.

They picked out of the sayings of Thomas Jefferson certain statements, threw them together, mixed them into a conglomeration that makes Thomas Jefferson look like a Communist, just as far from the Jeffersonian philosophy of government as could possibly be. Now, if we are going to do anything else for Thomas Jefferson, for goodness' sake, as a great Englishman once said: "Let's don't add another pang to his death." Let us get somebody besides this group that perpetrated this outrage on the memory of Thomas Jefferson by putting those inscriptions inside the so-called Jefferson Memorial. I invite all decent Americans to go in there and read them, and get the life of Jefferson, get his own words, his own sayings, and then compare them.

Then they will recognize the hideous attempt to distort history by this Commission. Why not put in there the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson as expressed in his first inaugural address, the 16 points which he announced to the world and to posterity which constitute the sum of good government.

I will read from that address, and will take the liberty of numbering those 16 points and set them out by paragraphs. In that, the most historic address of the nineteenth century, Mr. Jefferson said:

About to enter, fellow citizens, on the exercise of duties which comprehend everything dear and valuable to you, it is proper that you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our Government, and consequently those which ought to shape its administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear, stating the general principle, but not all its limitations.

He then laid down the following 16 points:

First:

Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious, or political.

Second:

Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none.

Third:

The support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against anti-Republican tendencies.

Fourth:

The preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad.

Fifth:

A jealous care of the right of election by the people—a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of the revolution where peaceable remedies are unprovided.

Sixth:

Absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority—the vital principle of republics from which there is no appeal but to force—the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism.

Seventh:

A well-disciplined militia—our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war till regulars may relieve them.

Eighth:

The supremacy of the civil over the military authority.

Ninth:

Economy in the public expense that labor may be lightly burdened.

Tenth:

The honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith.

Eleventh:

Encouragement of agriculture and of commerce as its handmaid.

Twelfth:

The diffusion of information and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason.

Thirteenth:

Freedom of religion.

Fourteenth:

Freedom of the press.

Fifteenth:

Freedom of person under the protection of habeas corpus.

Sixteenth:

Trial by juries impartially selected.

These principles—

He says—

from the bright constellation which has gone before us and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our sages and the blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. They should be the creed of our political faith, the text of civil instruction, the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of terror or alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety.

Why was that not inscribed on the interior of this alleged Jefferson Memorial just as the Gettysburg Address of Lincoln was placed inside the Lincoln Memorial? Why all this conglomeration, why all this distortion of the words of Jefferson? Why all this changing and mixing of phrases and the elimination of statements in order to misrepresent to the children of the coming generations the greatest democratic statesman the world has ever seen?

No; I am not going to agree for this commission—which left these immortal expressions of Jefferson out of the inscriptions on the walls of that memorial—I am not going to agree for that commission to put its hands on the record of Thomas Jefferson again.

I object to this bill in its present form.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will call the next bill on the calendar.

DAM AND DIKE IN THE NORTH SLOUGH, COOS COUNTY, OREG.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3145, authorizing the construction of a dam and dike for preventing the flow of tidal waters in the North Slough in Coos County, Oreg., for the purpose of reclaiming land for farming.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That authority is hereby granted to the State of Oregon, acting through its highway department, and to the North Slough drainage district, organized under the laws of the State of Oregon, to construct, maintain, and operate, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, a dam and dike for preventing the flow of tidal waters into North Slough in Coos County, Oregon, in township 24 south, range 13 west, Willamette meridian.

Work shall not be commenced on such dam and dike until the plans therefor, including plans for all accessory works, are submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War, who may impose such conditions and stipulations as they deem necessary to protect the interest of the United States.

The authority granted by this act shall terminate if the actual construction of the dam and dike hereby authorized is not commenced within 5 years and completed within 8 years from the date of the passage of this act. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 9 of the act approved August 26, 1937 (heretofore extended by acts of Congress approved July 2, 1940, and September 22, 1941), authorizing the State of Oregon, acting through its highway department, the North Slough drainage district, and the North Slough diking district, to construct, maintain, and operate a dam and dike for preventing the flow of tidal waters into North Slough in Coos County, Oreg., in township 24 south, range 13 west, Willamette meridian, be and is hereby revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this authority shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the dam and dike herein referred to be commenced within 5 years and completed within 8 years from the date of approval hereof.

"SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to revive and reenact section 9 of an act entitled 'An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes,' approved August 26, 1937."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes in reply to the statements by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall want 5 minutes in which to reply to the gentleman from Virginia.

The SPEAKER. The Chair reminds the gentlemen that there are other special orders which have already been agreed to.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, this concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

FLAG FOR CERTAIN PERSONS WHO DIE IN THE SERVICE OF THE LAND OR NAVAL FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 800) to provide for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die in service in the land or naval forces of the United States and agree to its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia has the floor, having reserved the right to object.

Mr. BLAND. I have reserved the right to object in order to get an opportunity to speak on the Jefferson bill, to which I think every American is entitled.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has a very wide range under a reservation of objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, there are many things about the Jefferson Memorial I did not know about, there are many things that have been done that I do not know anything about and I am not in accord with all that has been done. They may have been right.

But this has nothing to do with this United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson, except that it is created, and in cooperation with the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will separate it from this Commission that perpetrated this alleged Jefferson Memorial down here and placed those misleading inscriptions inside it, I shall not object. Jefferson was the greatest promoter of agricultural development of his day and generation. I recognize that fact, and I appreciate the attitude of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. In order that this matter may be understood, this calls for the creation of the National Agricultural Bicentenary Committee for the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of Jefferson's birth and deals with agriculture.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; but it is under the supervision of that Commission. It says: "A joint resolution providing for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out under the general direction of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson," and so forth. Whoever collected, composed, or compiled those statements inside the Jefferson Memorial would not know a cottonstalk from a cocklebur or a buckhead from a clevis. What do they know about agriculture?

Mr. BLAND. I do not know.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman from Virginia will separate it from this Commission and let it be conducted by some real Jeffersonians, Democrats or Republicans, or both, I shall not object, but I am not going to even run the risk of having this crowd distort the record of Thomas Jefferson on agriculture, about which they know nothing. Whoever got up those inscriptions inside that Jefferson Memorial knows absolutely nothing about agriculture.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to restore the bill, S. J. Res. 47, to the calendar and that it may be passed over without objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree to that.

Mr. BLAND. I may say that I am a new member of that committee, and it was brought in for the first time for consideration recently. The chairman is not here, and it occurs to me that we can best meet the objections of the gentleman by having it passed over.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman agree that it go over without prejudice?

Mr. BLAND. Yes; that is what I am asking.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill has three pages of whereases. It does not seem to me that it is good practice to write that kind of a bill.

Mr. BLAND. I had some question about that myself when I read those whereases but they seemed to be all right. That will be considered, of course, and the other objections will be considered.

Mr. RANKIN. Do those whereases distort the record of Thomas Jefferson as badly as the inscriptions down here in the Jefferson Memorial?

Mr. BLAND. I have no idea that they do.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the bill being passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a bill. Is there objection?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not know anything about this bill. We have had the Consent Calendar under consideration and the gentleman now asks unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill that has not been on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from New Jersey and to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that the situation is simply this: The bill provides a flag for those soldiers and sailors whose bodies have not been recovered. Under the law, the War Department or the Navy Department when

they send a soldier's body home send a flag with it. But there are a great many of these boys unfortunately whose bodies are not recovered and this measure authorizes the Veterans' Administration to supply those flags.

Mr. KEAN. They are given to the families?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; they are given to the families. I took this up with the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and they are unanimously for it.

Mr. KEAN. I cannot possibly object to such a bill as this but I want to give notice that when we have the Consent Calendar up for consideration, the bills should be on the Consent Calendar and in the future I am going to object.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from New Jersey, that if I had not been thoroughly convinced that no Member of the House would object I would not have called the bill up.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did the gentleman from Mississippi follow the practice of the House which has been announced by the majority and minority leaders and which is generally adhered to, that no bills shall be permitted to come up for consideration until the gentleman expecting to call the bill up has at least conferred with the majority leader?

Mr. RANKIN. I conferred with the Speaker. I also conferred with the majority and minority members of the committee.

Mr. MICHENER. This is just one of those things, a type of bill that no one feels like objecting to. However, the practice is such that it would be ruinous if this general philosophy were followed in calling up bills. The majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], has stated on the floor time and time again, that this practice will not be indulged in. I am just wondering if he was advised that this bill was to be called up in this matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Michigan is absolutely correct. I had no knowledge of the bill coming up.

I heard the colloquy. It is usually good practice, as well as courtesy, to consult the leadership on both sides. It is bad practice not to do so. I would suggest to the gentleman from Mississippi that he bring this bill up tomorrow.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I conferred with the Speaker about this proposition.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker has made the statement from this Chair many times that, after conference with him, any Member intending to take up a matter out of order should confer with both the majority and minority leaders. The gentleman from Mississippi did speak to the Chair about this matter. Not knowing whether or not the gentleman had conferred with the majority and minority leaders, and without questioning him on it this morning, the Chair recognized him. Under the circumstances, the Chair would suggest that the gentleman from Mississippi withdraw his request.

Mr. RANKIN. Then I shall ask permission to call up the bill tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is what I suggested.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws his request.

Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

PROPOSED FORMATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL BANK

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time in order to make some observations on proposals for the formation of some kind of a world bank or international financial organization after the war. In this first place I want to say that nothing ought to be done about this matter until the fullest discussion has been had in the Congress.

An international clearing house to facilitate the settlement of balances as between the nations of the world, to be helpful in assisting nations in balancing their exports against their imports and to put international trade on perhaps a more orderly basis than it has been in the past, would be altogether desirable. There are, however, certain dangers in connection with such a proposal that I want to point out, because it appears to me that if any such world bank were to be given the power to dictate to nations as to what policies they must pursue with regard to their domestic money, it would be exercising a power which will prove dangerous both to international peace and to the expansion of production within the nations.

Some of the proposals for a world bank certainly are open to this objection. What could happen under these circumstances is briefly this: It would be possible for the board or controlling agency of such a world bank to say to a certain nation, "We are sorry, but we cannot continue to accommodate you unless you maintain a certain reserve in such and such a precious metal or unless you reduce the volume of your currency," or "We will take these measures which you request if you do pursue a certain policy with regard to the volume of money in circulation in your nation."

This could mean virtually an economic dictatorship in the hands of such a world bank over the economies of the various nations — particularly the financially weaker ones.

I also want to point out that when we talk about tying the currency of one nation to the currency of another nation we seldom, I think, remember that it does not do the least bit of good to tie the value of the dollar, for example, to the pound, or to tie the pound to the dollar, unless the domestic buying powers of both the pound and the dollar have within the British Nation and the American Nation themselves been stabilized. Otherwise the proposition amounts to something like tying a couple of balloons together in the vain hope that you will thereby stabilize the flight of one or the other.

So the fundamental problem that we confront is the problem of securing a stabilization of the purchasing power of money within each nation, and on the basis of that it becomes possible then to work toward an international stabilization which will be effective.

I do believe, of course, that the granting of credit and the making of loans to certain nations after the war will probably be necessary. I think that if that can be done through some international agency it might be well, provided always, however, that they are not made the means of controlling the domestic economic life of the nations to whom they are made. That is the warning I wanted to sound.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Is the gentleman approaching the suggestion of means whereby stabilization may be effected as to the economies within the respective countries?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I believe it can be done. I have believed it for years. I thank the gentleman for asking that question. It is something about which I have spoken on the floor a good many times, and about which I have written some.

I think it is altogether possible for us to have a scientific monetary system whereby our monetary supply will be expanded in proportion to the expansion of the production of real goods and services, and whereby inflation can be prevented by judicious use of the taxing power. I think with two weapons in the hands of a monetary authority set up by this Congress, namely, first, the exclusive right to create money in this Nation; and, second, the right to recommend to Congress tax measures which would be effective in curbing inflation, you can get a stabilization of the buying power of your money. I think that especially with regard to agriculture there is nothing quite so important from the standpoint of future prosperity.

I want to say a word on another subject if I have time.

We have heard a great deal of opposition expressed to the use of subsidies to keep down the price of farm commodities and food products. I want to say frankly, I think it is true that if we attempt to subsidize the entire Nation to reduce the cost of food to all American citizens by means of the payment of some type of subsidy, we are attempting to lift ourselves by our own bootstraps, and it will not be a counter-inflationary measure, but quite the contrary.

It seems to me there are two problems that we have to confront. One is the problem of having an adequate return to farm producers so as to induce maximum production. Certainly the price that they receive is an important element therein. The second thing is that there are certain people in this Nation to whom the Congress owes a very real and profound obligation, from the standpoint of protecting the buying power of their money. The people that I refer to are, first and most important perhaps, the dependents of men who are now serving the armed forces. We

have passed legislation, inadequate though it be in my judgment, providing a certain number of dollars to the wives and children of men now in the service. We certainly have an obligation to see that the buying power of those dollars is not constantly reduced. We have an obligation not to dilute the buying power of the compensations and pensions being received by war veterans of this country. We have an obligation with regard to every single person who is attempting to get along on an old age pension in the various States.

In addition to that, there are some 21 percent of our population today whose annual earnings are $1,000 a year or less. It does not seem to me therefore that it is an adequate position for a Member to take, nor one that he can consistently defend, to simply say, "I am against all subsidies," and let it go at that. I think there has to be another answer to this problem. My own feeling about this question would be quite different and much more hopeful if we had established what I have chosen to call "the converse of rationing."

A rationing program was instituted for the purpose of seeing that nobody in the population has more than his share of the supply of scarce commodities, but I believe that in time of war it becomes important that we see to it that a minimum basic standard of living is possible for all our people. I do not believe that by policies that have to be pursued for the sake of securing adequate production for the war, we should deliberately permit a 25-percent reduction to take place in the amount of food that can be bought by some of the groups of people whose income is low and whom I enumerated a moment ago. It therefore seems to me that the right way to use a program of governmental support, if you have to do it, is to spend that money where it is really needed and where it will really do the good and reach the need that exists. We have already had experience with the operation of the stamp plan. We used it before for the purpose of making it possible for farm commodities which we called surpluses—when really they were not from any real, human point of view—but we called them surpluses to enable them to be moved to the people who needed additional food.

The answer to this obligation that I said I believed was ours could be found by means of instituting what has been called in a bill which was introduced in the Senate by Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, and in the House by our colleague from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] and myself a national food-allotment plan. Briefly, under this plan, when people whose family income is less than an amount which would enable them to purchase a minimum food-allotment diet as described in this legislation went to their ration board to get their regular ration stamps, they would be able to obtain some supplementary stamps with which they could increase their purchasing power of food, in order to bring up their buying power for food to this minimum national food allotment which is herein described. Under those circumstances, we would then have protected all of our people, especially the groups I mentioned, against the possibility that where an increase in the price of a farm crop was absolutely necessary in order to cover the cost of production, those people, where it would really hurt them and where they would get less food than they needed, could still be protected and get the food that they needed.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Would that not solve the problem which is now before us, where a certain amount of money is necessary to subsidize the production of butter? We increase the points and thereby prevent them from having it anyway.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think that is a very pertinent observation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does your bill assume that there is plenty and that the difficulty lies in the lack of purchasing ability?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No, it does not quite assume that there is plenty. I think there are a great many food products where, relative to the present existing demand, there is a real shortage. I do not think we can avoid that. I think that is going to be with us. But I am saying that as to these people who are in a position where their incomes have not been increased at all since the war began, or where they are attempting to get along on these dependency allowances that we provided, or where they are attempting to go along on compensation for disabilities created in previous wars, or where old folks are trying to get along on their old-age pensions, or where there are certain groups of school teachers, white-collar workers, and a good many wage-earners who do not have enough to buy the food they actually need, it seems to me that the minimum necessary to sustain real health and welfare ought to be secured to them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Assuming that I have 54 cents and I want to buy a pound of butter, I can now only get a quarter of a pound of butter. What are we going to do when there is not enough butter in the country and the Government is purchasing too much of it? That is what we are getting so many kicks about. What are we going to do when we have such a tremendous shortage of production?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am not saying that my bill is going to solve the whole problem.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I understand.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is not the whole purpose of the bill. But I want to be free to do everything within my power to increase production of agricultural commodities.

Sometimes I think an increase in the price is necessary and important in order to do that, but I think it is important likewise for the Congress to be in position where it can say that it is not permitting such price increases to take from any American family the food it needs.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman considered the great advisability, to my mind, of having different ration points for butter than for meat? It seems rather illogical to me that we should have to use the same points for butter that we use for meat.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am sorry I do not feel I am competent to answer that question. If my wife were present I am sure she could give the lady from Massachusetts an intelligent answer on that question, but I do not think I should attempt to do so.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know that the gentleman goes into everything very thoroughly.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understand and I think I see what the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has in mind. I suppose, however, it is important to keep these things as simple as they can be, and it is complicated at best. That is the only thing I can think of that arises on the other side of the picture, but I will say to the gentlewoman that I am inclined to agree with her about it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman. He is always very fair.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If I understand correctly, it takes about 4 years to get a milk producer.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If that be correct, is not one of the reasons for this great shortage the fact that we have been killing off our milk cows, getting rid of them?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think we must prevent the slaughtering of any good milk cows whatsoever.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And we will not have butter until that shortage has been met?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The reason goes beyond that; it is the result of a vast increase in the demands for these products, the tremendous increase in the demands for butter; the fact that the American people are consuming vastly more dairy products than they ever did before, together with the demands for our armed services, all this adds up to a far greater increase in demand than our farmers have had to meet ever before, together with the fact that we also have a responsibility to certain people across the water which we did not have before.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is the fundamental reason. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I do not want any policy to be pursued that is going to cut down the supply or result in a de-

crease of production; we have got this responsibility to meet, and I want to preserve every ounce of production possible. I do not want these dairy cows to be taken out of production; I want to stimulate production under present circumstances. I want to have a price policy that will guarantee maximum production, but when I advocate that I do not want to be in position where I can really be charged with having reduced the buying power of some groups of our people below the minimum required to provide a decent living for American families.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by General O'Connor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE PRISONS A SOURCE OF MANPOWER FOR THE ARMY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been a great deal of agitation in the country about the drafting of fathers into the armed forces. I am one of the men who has voted for every dollar the Army and the Navy have asked for, and I would be the last man who would do one thing to hinder the armed forces, because if there is one problem ahead of all others it is to win this war. I am willing to give them just as many men as they need, regardless of where they come from or how badly it hurts; but, after all, there seems to be a question in the minds of a lot of people as to the necessity of some of the things that are being done.

The question has arisen as to why so many men in penal institutions are not used, why all of those men do not find their way into the war effort. Because of that I have recently introduced a bill, H. R. 3202, which provides that before any fathers are inducted into the armed forces, all able-bodied, sound-minded men in the penal institutions should be used in the war effort wherever they might fit. For just a short while today I want to talk about this problem and call to the attention of the House the reaction I have had dealing with this subject.

There is no reason exactly that I can see why the armed forces should not take a lot of men that society must ultimately take. It is true that after a man has served his time the Army takes him. The man serving his time is no worse than the man who has served his time; and those of us who have done the same things but did not get caught are no better than they are. So I cannot see any good reason why sound-minded, able-bodied men should not be used in the armed forces. It simmers down to this: All these men except the lifers in these prisons eventually serve their time or are paroled regardless of whether they are sound in mind and body or not. Society has got to take even the feeble-minded ones. I do not see why society should have to take a group of men that the Army refuses to take. If there is one place where they can be disciplined, it is in the Army.

I call your attention to certain facts and information which I shall read from an editorial in a publication known as The New Era published at the Leavenworth Federal Prison, Leavenworth, Kans. I quote from the editorial:

> Every day and every night the hundreds of radio programs of the Nation repeat one message, over and over, "Forget sectional and personal differences! Banish every custom or prejudice which might hold back the fullest war effort. Let nothing prevent the utilization of every available man, every talent, every skill, every dollar."
>
> And yet, strange as it seems, 200,000 able men, American men, many of them skilled at manning these, or similar, farms and machines, plead for a chance at these jobs now, today—reaching out toward this chance of redemption and their chance of helping America, as a man dying of thirst reaches out toward a water mirage in an agony of hope and in an agony of mentally fighting against the black despair of being held back now—now of all times.

Hundreds of articles have appeared in magazines and recent publications attesting to the patriotic men in institutions. They get very little money for what they do, and yet in every penal institution in the country they are asked to and do buy War bonds. For instance, the inmates of Leavenworth Penitentiary purchased War bonds totaling $86,025, and they do not get as much per day for their labor as many of us Congressmen spend a day for cigars. Money is donated to service organizations totaling $3,034.98. One thousand four hundred of the inmates of Leavenworth donated 1,335 pints of blood. Certainly this attests to the patriotic nature of these men. They are not lying down on the job. I quote further:

> In proportion to their income, which is barely adequate to supply them with the simplest luxuries such as cigarettes, these prisoners have contributed financially to the war effort through the purchase of bonds to a degree that should shame the civilian. Their record as voluntary blood donors to the Red Cross is a nationally known example of patriotism. The record of the prisoners already accepted into the armed forces is literal and undeniable proof of their Americanism.
>
> All of these agencies have pointed out the fact that these prisoners are going to be released at some future date anyway and have asked "Why not now when conditions for their reform are best and when the Nation's need of their services is greatest?"
>
> The Federal penal rules governing the release of prisoners did not contemplate that America might be drawn into a great war. These rules were made to fit a peacetime economy in which men competed for jobs.
>
> These rules, as they now stand, preclude the release of a prisoner until he has served a certain number of years of his sentence, no matter whether the prisoner is rehabilitated or not.
>
> However much training or skill the man may have acquired, however completely the classification board of the penal institution may have determined that the prisoner is ready and safe for reentry into society, under these rules he cannot be released until his minimum time, be it 2 or 20 years, has been served.

He goes on in another article written in the Rocky Mountain News to say:

> I am in hearty agreement with Lewis E. Lawes, former warden of Sing Sing, in his recommendation that at least 75 percent of the men in America's prisons should be released to fight.
>
> Mr. Lawes says he sometimes thinks there is more patriotism and spirit inside the prisons than outside. Whenever blood donors are asked to volunteer, for example, scores of men in prison step forward. "Just give them a chance to fight for their country, and then get out of the way," he advised.
>
> And that's sound advice.
>
> On my last visit to the State penitentiary with Governor Carr, I found ample proof of the patriotic spirit mentioned by Mr. Lawes.

There has been some effort made to release prisoners and some have gotten into the armed forces and have very good records.

In New Jersey some 400 prisoners have been paroled to go into the service and have been transformed into real fighting men. Only a handful have proved unsuited for military life, none have committed serious infractions, and many have records of conspicuous merit.

It is stated further here that—

> The Federal Government is also exploring the possibility of utilizing manpower bottled up in Federal penitentiaries.

Why should the Federal Government be exploring that? The President has authority to order your son or my son or you or I into the service. Why should not the President issue a proclamation that these men of sound mind and able bodies be used in the armed forces where they can serve?

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman know that the Federal Bureau of Prisons under the direction of James Bennett is exploring this matter, that prisoners from our Federal prisons have gone into the armed service, that this exploration to which the gentleman refers is already under way and has been for a long, long time? Does the gentleman's bill provide for the release of all prisoners to go into the armed service?

Mr. GROSS. It provides that those of sound mind and able body up to the age of 45 may be taken into the service.

Mr. STEFAN. Do they have to pass an examination under a psychiatrist or a doctor?

Mr. GROSS. "Sound mind," of course, would imply that.

Mr. STEFAN. Is that the only qualification, just sound mind?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. It is a fact that prisoners have been released who have had sound minds and they have committed terrible crimes upon society through the parole system sometimes. The parole system itself is being explored. I may say to the gentleman that I happen to be a member of the Committee on Ap-

propriations that makes the appropriations for Federal prisons.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman will find some very illuminating information if he will refer to the proceedings of that committee.

Mr. GROSS. The fact is that the red tape connected with it has kept men back and that what it needs is streamlining. This matter of exploring, exploring and investigating in an emergency is one of the things that the country is sick and tired of.

It is stated here further:

Those favoring release of inmates for war effort point out that 96 percent of them will come out eventually. Now, they contend, is the ideal time, as there is plenty to keep them occupied.

That is taken from the Christian Science Monitor of April 6, 1943.

Now, I want to call attention to some reaction I have received. I have here a communication signed by Dutton S. Peterson, of the joint legislative committee of the State of New York, to study the use of New York State prisoners in war service. That committee has made a study of this and here is what he writes:

Your proposal that no pre-Pearl Harbor fathers be inducted until all convicts between the ages of 18 and 45 and physically fit are inducted is interesting.

* * * * *

I feel confident that some type of Federal legislation might help the situation. Of course various Federal agencies are working at the problem with varying results in different States.

The recently established special selective-service panels in the prisons are making little progress, in fact seem to be retarding Army inductions. I have reports from many States relative to this difficulty.

In their report they go on to say:

1. Within a radius of 50 miles of Elmira Reformatory an estimated 25–30 percent of hay is still standing in the fields unharvested due to lack of help.

2. Within one-half mile of Elmira Reformatory the Elmira Foundry Co., a General Electric affiliate, engaged wholly in war production of the most critical kind, is seriously hampered by lack of common laborers. Delivery of orders is delayed and additional orders refused because of this shortage of unskilled labor. Twenty men working in the yard would speed the work of hundreds in the production of critical war material.

Certainly there is a place where a lot of these men could be used. They go on to say that induction is slow and cumbersome and needs streamlining.

Let me quote some of the things I have clipped from newspapers recently in connection with this problem. Just a week or so ago there appeared an Associated Press report, reading like this:

Prisoners at Western State Penitentiary heard themselves praised yesterday by Lewis E. Lawes, former warden at Sing Sing, for their outstanding service to the Nation through production for the war effort.

More than 1,000 inmates gathered on the prison athletic field and saw a Navy color guard run up a production pennant within the walled areas. They had earned it by fulfilling Navy, Army, and Coast Guard contracts in the prison's metalworking and textile shops.

Warden S. P. Ashe announced that the prisoners had bought $12,455.75 worth of War bonds in the Third War Loan, almost quadrupling their quota of $3,378.

May I say that I am mighty happy to report that while some judges throughout the country have not expressed themselves about this thing, certain other judges are in a great many cases giving men suspended sentences if they will present themselves for induction. In my county—York County—Judge Sherwood and Judge Anderson have recently suspended the sentences in the case of nine men if they would promise to present themselves for induction into the armed service. Seven of them have passed the examination and are now in the armed forces. Evidently this thing is taking hold throughout the country and the judges are going to get as many men into the armed forces as they can in preference to seeing them go to prison.

It is a fact that some fellows have simply committed a trivial offense and they could thereby escape getting into the armed forces. I have before me an Associated Press report where a man over at Philadelphia, who has a very excellent record in the marines, is now on probation and consequently cannot get into the armed forces. The thing he was charged with was slapping a nurse on the back at Jefferson Hospital in Philadelphia. He said he did it as a joke; he thought it was a lot of fun; but they picked him up, took him before an alderman, who gave him a suspended sentence. Here is a good, old-time marine who will not be taken by the marines, the Army, or Navy because he slapped a nurse on the back.

It is too ridiculous for us to talk about when you are thinking about taking a man with half a dozen children and putting him in the armed forces, when the Army will not take a man because he slapped a nurse on the back to give her a laugh.

We can go on down the line and mention numerous cases. Let me call your attention to some of the response that has come from people around the country. For instance, here is a letter from California. It states:

This is just to tell you that I believe that your bill providing that no pre-Pearl Harbor fathers be inducted until all convicts between the ages of 18 and 45, and physically fit, have been drafted, is a good thing, and I surely trust that it will go through.

Then I have a letter here signed by Neil S. Bishop, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the Maine Legislature. He is heartily in support of this movement. He says:

More power to you.

He goes on to say that he has for a long time been hoping that something along this line would be done. This only goes to show that men in public life are thinking about it.

You may wonder what the prisoners think about it. I have here a letter from a prisoner, inmate 16790, by the name of John B. Suttle, in the Oregon State Prison, in which he says that he has given his blood right along, he has bought his bonds, and he is willing to serve in the armed forces any place that he can serve.

I have a number of other letters. Here is one from the Illinois State Penitentiary, from Convict Warren Wilcoxen, register No. 16023. He says:

I have pleaded and demanded a chance to show my Americanism and my willingness, yes, eagerness to fight for the land that my forefathers fought and died for. Am I to be deprived of this chance because I have violated one of man-made laws? Who, if not I and my kind, are more capable of slinking through the jungles taking pot shots at the ones that have become so egotistical that they think they can invade our soil?

I am writing you this to tell you you have not the slightest idea of the feelings of a con toward all isms but one, Americanism.

He goes on to say that all he wants is an opportunity.

Here is another one signed by Henry Shepperd, register No. 16998, from the Illinois State Penitentiary, which has just about the same story, pleading for an opportunity to fight and to prove himself.

I have here another one from Elmer Whited, register No. 17852, in which he pleads for an opportunity to fight for God's country and to reinstate himself.

I have two other letters from inmates of the Illinois State Penitentiary similarly pleading for an opportunity.

Here are some cards I have received. These are all written in good handwriting, better than the average man writes. These are from the Kentucky State Prison. This man's name is Finley Duncan, convict No. 35173. He says that he is 30 years of age and would like to get into the armed forces and serve his country.

I have another one here from a young man who says:

I am 32 years old. That is a fine bill and we all would like to do our part in the armed forces.

Here is another card from the La Grange Penitentiary. He says:

I am a prisoner in this institution, serving an 8-year sentence for robbery. I possess a clean past record, and I am fully qualified to serve these United States as only a true American can. I am 25 years old.

Can you imagine a man who has committed one crime of larceny being in the pen for 8 years at a time like this, when maybe just when the war is over he will have served his 8 years, so that when he goes out society will have to take him; yet today the Army refuses to take him? After all, whether or not they make good soldiers, if they cannot be handled in the Army where will they ever be handled?

Here is another card from a convict named Clarence B. Young, No. 29799. He says:

I have just read in the paper your opinion on drafting pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. I think it is a good idea to draft all convicts that are able-bodied. We will be watching the outcome of your bill and hoping that we will have a chance to help lick the enemy.

These are written in good handwritings, better than half of us Congressmen write.

Here is another one from the penitentiary signed by Manon Dixon, convict No. 33342. He says:

I would appreciate the opportunity to help win this war.

So it goes on. I have a lot more mail in the office. I am not pleading to keep fathers home if we need them, but to give these men an opportunity. The prisons are overcrowded. They are more of a public burden than most people realize. Here will be an opportunity to give a lot of men a chance to prove themselves. If they come out of the Army with a good record, with an honorable discharge, I see no reason why they should not be released. If they come out of the Army and do not have an honorable discharge, certainly they should go back and serve out their time. I believe this is something worthy of consideration.

I have not received a single letter nor have I had a single comment in opposition to this kind of thing. I hope the Military Affairs Committee of the House will, at an early date, take action on this bill to help these men to find their places, and thus relieve many fathers from duty, and permit these men to find their places in the armed forces.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] be permitted to extend his remarks by including a letter written by one of his constituents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

UNPROVED RAYON THEORY THREATENS COTTON—GRANT OF REQUEST FOR EXPANSION OF RAYON PLANTS TO MAKE RAYON CORD FOR TIRES WOULD STRIKE SEVERE BLOW AT THE COTTON FARMER

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, if a certain request now pending before the War Production Board is granted it may, and probably will, have the ultimate effect of doing irreparable harm to the cotton farmer and to the economic structure of the South. I refer to the pending application of the War Department for certain priorities and permission to expand and convert additional facilities to the manufacture of rayon cord to be used in synthetic tires to take the place of cotton cord that has always been used for that purpose.

So serious and so dangerous is this threat that the Truman Special Investigating Committee of the United States Senate spent several months in an extensive study and investigation of the subject. The committee filed a report on July 16, 1943, strongly urging the W. P. B. to defer the application in view of existing evidence, and concluded with the warning that if the program of conversion is carried out the South will lose about 10 percent of its normal domestic market for cotton.

It follows that the subject is of profound importance to the cotton farmer and to the economic structure of the Southland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the facts behind this proposal? There has already been an expansion, under high priorities, of facilities in existing rayon plants sufficient to provide rayon cord for 97,000,000 pounds of synthetic rubber. I am addressing my remarks now to a request that is now pending calling for the building of new and additional facilities that would provide rayon cord for an additional 100,000,000 pounds.

In view of the fact that this expansion and conversion program so seriously affects the cotton industry, which is one of this Nation's greatest enterprises, it follows that the change certainly cannot be justified unless it is made perfectly clear by thorough tests that the rayon cord is, in fact, superior to the cotton cord and that the change would be to the best interest of the war program.

TRUMAN COMMITTEE REPORT SAYS RAYON EXPANSION NOT JUSTIFIED

I have already spoken of the Truman report. At this point I should like to quote from the conclusions contained in that document:

1. The committee is convinced and strongly urges that further expansion of rayon-cord facilities, now recommended by the Rubber Director and approved in part by the War Production Board, be deferred until proper and complete tests of a standard which has not been met by tests to date will indicate with a reasonable degree of certainty whether or not further use of rayon cord will aid the war effort.

2. The tests conducted by the War Department failed to indicate superiority for rayon tire cord in the tire sizes for which the bulk of the new expansion would be used.

3. Expansion of rayon facilities would use large amounts of materials sorely needed by vital war industries. The strong profit possibilities to chemical companies generally, and war-expanded producers of cellulose in particular, should not be overlooked. Against this should be balanced the heavy damage to the economy of a large section of the United States. These considerations weigh heavily in any appraisal of contentions that rayon capacity should now be increased as insurance against the possibility that rayon may some day be proven superior to cotton. There is today under construction sufficient capacity for such insurance.

And the report contains this further significant statement:

The effect of the War Department predilection for rayon, whatever the merits of the controversy, will be a disaster to the post-war economy of the South—loss of 10 percent of the domestic cotton market.

COTTON-CORD QUALITY BEEN PROVEN

The four major rubber companies in this country have to some extent for some time been promoting the conversion from cotton cord to high-tenacity rayon. This was true before the war began, but the difficulty of the proposed conversion has been aggravated by the fact that the cotton cord for that purpose is from 25 to 50 percent less expensive than is rayon cord. During peacetime at least one of the big tire companies manufactured some premium rayon-cord tires. But at the same time that was being done, some independent concerns, who did much research in the uses of cotton cord, were able to compete with the rayon products on a mileage-guaranty basis. Therefore, up until the synthetic program got under way, cotton had held its own in the research laboratories as well as on the highways of this country. And since the wartime synthetic program was begun, the alleged superiority of rayon cord over cotton has not been proven or demonstrated by fair and convincing tests.

Mr. Speaker, the cotton cord used with natural rubber has been tested and its quality has been proven. Great advancement in the lasting qualities of tires using cotton cord has taken place in recent years. Prior to the war, cotton-cord capacity was more than 400,000,000 pounds, amounting to 96 percent of tire production in this country. As I have said, it was far less expensive to use. Moreover, each pound of rayon cord twisted requires machinery that could twist 1.7 pounds of cotton cord, and this advantage of cotton over rayon has been, and still is, an important factor, as the Truman report has pointed out.

But now we find the big tire companies and their associated rayon manufacturers are urging and advertising the added advantages of rayon-cord in tires. It has been pointed out that the rayon expansion program has to date been conducted in part on a basis of certificates of war necessity, and this will enable new facilities to be amortized for tax purposes, over a period of 5 years or the duration, whichever is shorter. The Truman committee shows that in part this is financed by the Defense Plant Corporation. At the end of the war, plants will have been built in which the big tire companies will have little or no investment. This fact may enable rayon-cord prices to be on an equality with the prices of cotton-cord tires.

TESTS REFUTE CLAIM OF RAYON SUPERIORITY

It is true that certain tests have been made upon which the War Department based its opinion that the superiority of rayon-tire cord was proven. But the Truman committee has exposed obvious flaws in the method and system employed in making those tests. The tests were under the supervision of men formerly connected with different major tire companies, and the personnel of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. actually conducted the tests.

In this connection and as bearing on the conclusiveness of these tests, in October and November of 1942, medium-size truck tires were tested and cotton there proved superior to rayon in natural rubber tires for military purposes, and other tests applied to synthetic tires have not supported the claim of rayon

superiority. After considerable controversy had arisen on the subject, Mr. Jeffers last fall appointed an independent tire-testing expert, C. R. Smith, of Sears, Roebuck & Co., to investigate the fairness of the tire-cord tests involved. After 6 weeks of intensive study and observation, Mr. Smith reported that the tests, upon which the War Department relied heavily, were incapable of producing accurate or reliable results. He recommended a fair and accurate method of testing that would remove any doubt as to the respective superiority of the two fabrics. The Truman committee has joined in that request.

Mr. Speaker, certainly the taxpayers are entitled to have a most thorough and complete test made before added expenditures are authorized for rayon expansion and before highly strategic war materials are diverted to this expanded program. The results of the outcome of this issue are of far-reaching importance. The cotton farmer and the cotton industry have a tremendous stake in the outcome. The burden is on the proponents of the proposal to change from cotton to rayon to prove their case before any agency of this Government should become a party to a program that would take from the cotton farmer 10 percent of his normal domestic market. Every reasonable doubt should be resolved in favor of the use of cotton cord. The cotton farmer and the cotton industry and all they mean to the economic life of the South and to the Nation are entitled to that simple consideration at the hands of the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

NEWSPAPER WEEK

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, Newspaper Week is being celebrated throughout the United States this week, approximately the two hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the founding of the first American newspaper. This country's first news sheet, called Publick Occurrences Both Foreign and Domestick by its owner and publisher, Benjamin Harris, appeared in Boston in 1690. The first issue was printed on three pages of a folded sheet, leaving the last page blank, and was to be circulated about the county once a month. The aims of Publick Occurrences, as stated by Harris in the maiden issue, were to make known "such considerable things as have arrived unto our notice," and to take steps toward "curing or at least charming that spirit of lying which prevails among us." Harris also promised that "nothing shall be entered herein but what we have reason to believe is true, repairing to the best fountains for our information," and added his willingness to "expose the names of such persons as are malicious raisers of false reports."

In the 2 days of its existence, Publick Occurrences informed its readers that the Christianized Indians in Plymouth had appointed a day of thanksgiving, that two children had been stolen by Indians from the settlement of Chelmsford, that the smallpox was abating in Boston, and that there had been two fires in the vicinity. Also included among the "occurrences" was the news which proved to be Harris' undoing, a report of the expedition against the French and the use of the friendly Maquas Indians in the battles. His account of the savage treatment of French prisoners by the Indians was extremely displeasing to the authorities, even though the stout old man was speaking for the side of humanity and progress.

Several days later the legislative authorities officially forbade the printing of anything without a governmental license, which Harris did not have and could not get. For at this time the right to regulate the press had been granted in their instructions to each of the colonial governors.

Thus perished the infant publication, the sole point of contact between the great mass of people in America—a vast majority of whom did not even know of the existence of Benjamin Harris—and what we now call public opinion. This act of suppression of the first paper aroused no protest from the humble first settlers—the records, in fact, indicate that the suppression was regarded with a complacency tantamount to approval.

For that little Boston community had not, even as the world had not, yet grown to realize that freedom and liberty of conscience cannot be generally or individually obtained without freedom of opinion and discussion. Harris, in his Publick Occurrences, was alone in protesting against conditions of his day as opposed to affairs as they should ideally be. He stands out individually as the personification of democracy, of rule of, for, and by the people through public opinion.

He represented the democratic ideal, the theory of public rights, and when he attempted to materialize his ideal through the medium of the yet young printing press, he was suppressed. And as he was alone in his ideals and the upholding of them through actual practice, so was he alone in his protestations against this governmental check. For in the midst of his colony founded on the idea of public rights and liberty, its citizens failed to recognize that within themselves they were creating an autocracy just as binding and hateful as the one from which they had escaped across the ocean. And they were silent and approving as the Governor tied and crushed Harris and his dream. They were as silent then as they are today.

But, like other colonial and revolutionary casualties, it is today easily and glibly said that Public Occurrences, the materialization of the democratic ideal, did not die in vain nor will it today. Today the journalistic system has slowly evolved to a point where the people of America are given the fullest measure of control of their existence through the public newspapers. They have come into direct sponsorship of the Government in their representation by the press. Every section and group of individual citizens has a delegate and trustee to his Government in the form of his daily news sheet, battling for his share of attention and consideration in a democracy where the will of the people is reputedly the law of the land, however, since the invasion of the field of the press by the O. W. I., it is questionable whether this principle is still the law of the land.

The journalistic profession, in its high regard for the simple truth, completes the most competent circle of delegation of power and return that has ever existed. It has devised its own responsive and elastic system of checks. It keeps its avenues for complaints wide open. The continued support of its readers through the years is the only real proof of whether any news organ has achieved its high aims. The existence of the newspaper depends upon its service of that incomprehensible thing, the public. For the democratic citizens are, and must be, free to choose the media through which they wish to be expressed and through which they gain their information. The people have tried out their papers and in them, and in the men who bring the news into being, America is trusting and confident.

Extreme indifference on the part of the American people of the usurpation of their rights might again find us confronted with a situation such as Harris found in 1690. My recommendation to the Congress is to abolish the O. W. I., and turn over to an American unstrangled press, where it rightfully belongs, the handling of the news. During this newspaper week the Congress should resolve to take the shackles off the American press and that America shall be told what they want to know, and that is the truth of what is happening.

Over the years the American press has given a magnificent performance and they deserve our heartfelt thanks rather than the shabby treatment now being dished to them by so-called brilliant intellectuals of the O. W. I.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CHEATING THE NAVY OF PLANES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from yesterday's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post of yesterday, on page 3-B, Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, wife of the publisher and owner of the Washington Post, paints a picture that is, to say the least, very startling. But there is not anything new in what she writes. Months ago people who knew about the situation which confronts the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation, about which she writes, were here in Washington, and they told of the situation which then existed in this plant, which was one which prevented production.

The facts were given to the Navy, or, more accurately, in the first instance to the gentleman from Georgia, Chairman VINSON, of the House Committee on Naval

Affairs, to whom I wrote on the 9th of February last. I myself presented them to the officer sent up by the Navy, who had his office in the old House Office Building. They made an investigation. They found the facts to be as presented to them. They did nothing about it.

The only purpose of putting this article into the RECORD now is because of the source from which it comes. Patriotic Americans, a hundred of them or a thousand of them might speak on the same situation and call attention to the remedy, and the Washington Post would not pay any attention to it nor would people generally. But the wife of the publisher and editor goes up there, as she has gone to other plants, and then we get it in the press. We get publicity on it. Let us hope that something comes of it.

In printing this story, the Post is rendering a patriotic service. My only regret is that it did not print the truth about the situation back in the early days of 1943—yes, and prior to that date. As far back as 1939, from the well of the House, attention was called to the situation at Detroit, where the C. I. O. for 42 days, held up production of materials for the Navy and denied the Navy's request for the return of its own patterns and plans.

All that went into the RECORD, verified as it was by a letter from Acting Secretary of the Navy Edison. It was all glossed over. My statement made on the floor of the House was regarded as just a few more idle words from one who was falsely characterized as a labor-baiter.

Now the Navy—yes and the Army and the War Production Board—is reaping the benefit of its own indifference, its own neglect, its own surrender to the labor politicians.

But the Washington Post should not complain. It and the New Deal, which it has supported in season and out, day and night, while the foundations have been laid for what she pictures here, has furnished the canvas, the paint, and the brushes—has furnished everything which finally brought about this situation.

Now, she talks with this union leader and she quotes him in this way:

He, De Lorenzo, the head of the C. I. O., is speaking. Listen to this quotation from him:

Our policy is not to win the war at any cost.

The policy of this great union, whose activity, according to Mrs. Meyer, has resulted in the loss of 65 planes—they are short 65 planes because of strikes—with the resulting stoppage of work, since May 31, 1942. Their policy is not to win the war; they do not intend to win the war, so they say; they do not intend to get out the planes; at least, that is what they say, speaking through their leadership, if they must sacrifice any of their union rights to do it.

With De Lorenzo the labor union comes first—before the United States of America. Putting it another way, John Jones, a member of the union, does not propose that John Smith who joined the union after he did, shall work over in that corner of the plant, if he is in position to do it, even though plane production is stopped when John Jones has been a member of the union longer than John Smith.

That statement is not made by a Republican Congressman. That statement is not made by a Member of the House of Representatives. That statement, according to the wife of the publisher of the Washington Post, was made by the union leader.

Men who were members of the Coast Guard Reserve, but who were also members of the union; men who by their oath pledged allegiance to the Government of the United States, disregarded their sworn duty, followed the orders of the union when those orders ran contrary to the orders given by the Navy.

The Navy caused them to be arrested. They were thrown in the brig. They were tried. They were convicted of violating the orders given by their superior officers in the Navy and they were sentenced to prison. But a high administration official, whether in the Navy I do not know, commuted the sentences and the men were given back their jobs. That information comes from the daily press. It has not been denied by the naval authorities. So far, it stands uncontradicted.

The men in the Solomons, on the other war fronts, who are in the Navy, accept the orders of their superiors, even though it may mean death to them. But here in Philadelphia, safe and secure in their homes, with jobs paying top wages, these union men, although they were in the service of the Government, took—perhaps because they were forced to do so—the orders of the union boss, defied Uncle Sam in time of war and, when convicted of such disobedience of orders, were, by the politicians of this administration—and do not forget that Franklin Delano Roosevelt is Commander in Chief of the Navy and gives the orders—permitted to escape punishment; were actually rewarded for disobedience.

If that sort of procedure does not tend to undermine the morale of our men in the armed service, can you tell me what would? Does not that sort of procedure come under the definition of sedition? Where is Prosecutor Maloney and his grand jury?

I suggest that you read this article. It comes from an administration supporter; it comes from one of the newspapers which, for the last 8 years, come hell or high water, has supported the New Deal philosophy, the New Deal's policies. Now they find out what they have been hatching; they are getting the crop from the seed they have been sowing; they find what they have been working to produce, and they have it here in an organization which says, "We will win the war, but we will not win the war if winning the war requires us to let go of any of our union rules and regulations."

Now let me read to you from the other side of this page, where we see some of the reasons why union men were discharged and why production was stopped.

On June 24, 25, and 26 a stoppage occurred at Johnsville because the company dismissed for loafing and refusing to work, three women, which they had a perfect right to do. And in protest the union called a strike.

In this article Mrs. Meyer places a large part of the blame on the management, forgetting that the Washington Post has supported the administration throughout in its determination and in the policy which it has followed of changing the management of the Brewster Aeronautical Co. The management in that company is the management selected by the Navy and the boards of the administration, and yet she comes along and says that the fault, a large part of it, rests upon the management.

The management which Mrs. Meyer blames is the management given to the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation by this administration itself. When the first labor dispute arose, the administration took the side of the union leaders and, because the company would not yield to the union's demand that it—the union—be given the controlling voice in the operation of the plant, the management of the corporation was fired and a new management, selected by the Navy, or perhaps more accurately, by the administration, was placed in charge.

From that day to this, this administration has been responsible for the management of the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation; it has been responsible for its failures, because it has never supported the management when a controversy arose between management and labor.

Let us take courage from the fact that the Post, evidently following the lead of the Philadelphia papers, has decided to throw a little light on the situation which exists in this great plant.

The management discharged these women for loafing. They were not working; they were drawing their wages; they were hindering production; they were refusing to produce, as were others. Then what happened? The union called and kept in force the strike which further hindered production. No one would believe this story if I had written it, but here is a statement of a labor representative, the head of the union, Tom De Lorenzo. And here is an administration paper, you might say, which says he made that statement. Now, talk about seditionists, talk about the activities of the so-called seditionists and the thirty-three-odd who have been referred to as seditionists who have been indicted, but what about the 21,000 workers up here who Mrs. Meyer says, in this article, were hindering production and would not continue production—could not continue, because of the orders of Tom De Lorenzo—if it interfered in any way with the members of "my—his—organization."

One of the men who refused to go out, who was fired by the union—and there was no court procedure, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, no court procedure; the union held its own court, a kangaroo court; no law, no justice, and they disciplined this man; he was a man charged with watching a flyer who was then in the air, who had a pilot in the

air, because he said, "I am not going to go off the job until my man lands; I cannot do otherwise."

So the union fired or disciplined him. The writer of this article, at another point, calls attention to what happened when she states:

Thirteen people were variously punished for not quitting at once when the stoppage was called. Among them was George Stano, a flight inspector, who had a plane in the air. He refused to desert his responsibility until the plane returned. Before the Board he said in strong language that he could not leave his pilot in the air. Therefore, he was cited for using language not becoming to brother workers, and suspended for 30 days without pay, although he is an irreplaceable man.

In conclusion the article states:

This whole history illustrates what I saw all through the country during my 3 months' tour of our war centers. * * *

But today too many of our highest business and industrial executives are the easy-going descendants of their rugged forebears. They have to compete with a labor leadership that has achieved its position by shear personal merit.

Are we all to be called upon to sacrifice, to spend, and to do without in order to win the war and then have the administration give support to, as it has, as it does, and as it will continue to do—to these union leaders who say: "You shall not have planes unless you comply with what I request"? I ask you in all sincerity, if a year ago I had said outside of this Hall that the Army and the Navy should not have planes, should not have guns, unless they complied with certain requests that I named, how long would it have taken Brother William Powers Maloney and his grand jury down here to have indicted me for sedition? Is not Tom De Lorenzo doing more to decrease production of planes needed by the armed forces, doing more to depress our fighting men and our people when he says we will not get planes, when he says we will get them the union way or not at all, than anything or all the whole 33 indicted ever did?

If our leaders in business and in industry appear now to be easygoing, as Agnes Meyer reports, in my judgment it is not due to any fault on their part but to the realization that, if they assert their independence; if they follow the method which will give our country needed production of war materials; if they are efficient; if their policy or their methods run counter to the interests of the labor politicians, the strong arm of the administration will force them into the way, make them travel the road, which the labor politicians desire.

That has been shown time and again. All too often in the past, when ambitious labor leaders, anxious to establish and to maintain their power, made un-American demands upon management, followed lawless methods, this administration, on the order of the President himself, has taken over private industry, put it under Government operation, given the union leaders what they demanded, and, in practically every instance, lessened production and increased the cost to the taxpayer.

Illustration after illustration might be cited. One of the most outrageous was that when the Government took over the Toledo, Peoria & Western Railroad.

The administration has been, and it is, playing politics with certain labor leaders. It is directly responsible for the chaos at Brewster. In return for the mess which it has made of things, for the special privileges which it has granted to certain favored labor leaders, they now announce their support of the fourth term.

Glad, indeed, may loyal, patriotic Americans be that the Washington Post at last is beginning to realize the kind of a harvest which the American people will be forced to reap from the seeds which it assisted this administration in sowing.

At last, from a great publication which, through thick and thin, has consistently supported the New Deal, we have a story which shows beyond controversy that at least one policy of this administration is hindering a more efficient prosecution of the war. The administration seems to be more intent on maintaining its political fences than it is in the volume and the quality of the production of planes.

Because the article in the Post comes from a source which can under no circumstances be charged with being either antiadministration or antilabor; because it is so factual, so revealing, and because it so clearly, in spite of the writer's apparent admiration for Mr. De Lorenzo, sets forth the vicious, unpatriotic, and un-American tactics of Mr. Tom De Lorenzo and leaders who share his views it is printed as a part hereof:

CHAOS AND TYRANNY COMPETE BITTERLY AT BREWSTER PLANT—INCOMPETENT MANAGEMENT IS HOPELESSLY ENSNARLED BY SHREWD, RUTHLESS UNION AUTOCRATS

(By Agnes E. Meyer)

As the management-labor relations of the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation and its failure to get production have become notorious throught the Nation, I was reckless enough to inject myself into this hurly-burly for a solid week of intensive investigation.

After interviews with labor leaders and management at the Long Island City and Newark plants, I went through the Johnsville plant, just 12 miles north of the Philadelphia line, which was made famous by the guard strike.

Never did I expect to see in America such a picture of managerial chaos, such a complete break-down of worker morale, as this factory presents.

Right and left were men and women idling, laughing, talking, or just sitting inert at empty benches. Some work was going on here and there in a half-hearted kind of way. Three women sitting under semicompleted fuselages made a pretense of activity when I strolled by with a member of the managerial staff. But such concessions to supervisory authority were rare. When one girl was reproved by her foreman for taking time off to make up her face on the assembly line, she looked up calmly and asked, "So what?"

WHAT DO WE CARE?

The toilets are frequented by people taking a smoke, and when Mr. Steele, factory superintendent, who is popular with the rank and file, tried on one occasion to eject them and introduce a semblance of discipline two of the workers replied, "All right, take our numbers. What do we care?"

A similar state of things already had been described to me by workers and management alike at the Long Island City and Newark plants. But to see it for one's self is to realize that even though such a production fiasco is not typical of industry throughout the Nation something is radically wrong in our country when even one such instance can occur.

Only once before have I witnessed such a total break-down of management and worker morale. It was in Paris under the Blum regime when that friend of the workers had given the labor unions the green light.

Exactly the same sabotage of our war effort—the same kind of break-down which in France was the prelude to defeat—is taking place in the Brewster factories.

Who is to blame? An objective study of the conditions in these plants and of their origin is important, not only because of the critical nature of this one situation but because of the light it throws upon some of our most fundamental problems in labor relations.

COMPANY HISTORY

The Brewster Co. was organized in 1932 by James Work on a shoestring. Prior to 1938 the company operated only in Long Island City, manufacturing airplanes and parts with 500 employees. In 1937 the plant was unionized by the U. A. W.-C. I. O., as Local 365, the contract providing that all future plants should be under the same jurisdiction. Mr. Work granted the union shop and anything else the union leadership demanded in exchange for a low wage scale.

The union leaders accepted low pay rates because they felt confident they could attend to those later, under contractual provisions that are now recognized by all labor-relations experts as among the most restrictive that can be found in the U. A. W.-C. I. O. today.

The company's growth began in 1939 when foreign orders came in. That year a second plant was opened in Newark, N. J., and in 1941 the third one was opened at Johnsville, Pa. Today the company employs 21,000 people, but at no time has production been satisfactory.

As one Navy man put it: "They never had any real production at Brewster, and what they did produce wasn't any good."

The British contracts were canceled last week. The remaining orders are principally for the Navy which, inclusive of the British, amounted to $250,000,000.

So alarming was the situation in April 1942, that the Navy took over the plants and properties by Executive order of the President and turned them back in May of the same year, under new directors and a new management headed by C. A. Van Dusen, a man of reputation in the airplane field, who lasted for a year without achieving any improvement in production.

MORE STALLING

Van Dusen was convinced that no progress in efficiency could be made under the present contract, which expired in January, 1943. He began negotiations with the union committee that went on for months without final agreement. When certain clauses were settled to mutual satisfaction, the union negotiating committees said that before submitting the case to the War Labor Board, they would have to submit the agreements to their membership.

After a month's delay, they reported that the members had rejected the clauses agreed upon.

The union vote is a farce, as later statements by the workers will prove; this whole technique of stalling and wearing out the management's patience is used by Local 365 in large as in small matters.

When Fred Riebel, now the president of the company, continued the negotiations for a new contract, the same performance took place all over again.

The expired contract is still recognized by both parties for lack of a new one. "Van Dusen was broken trying to get a new contract," said one of the men who had worked with him. "He refused to go into the shop because it simply meant an incessant bombardment of trouble."

PERSONAL EXPERIENCE

What kind of trouble? Instead of repeating hearsay, I shall begin by describing the complex nature of these incessant shop upheavals with my own personal experience.

Last Tuesday as I was sitting in the office of Marco Cicala, vice president of Local 365, the telephone rang. Cicala went to town in no uncertain way.

"Don't you know you can't make changes without consulting our shop committee?" he snapped over the wire. "Say, listen, George, ye're talkin' to Marco."

The conversation was ended. "Whom are you dusting off in that fashion?" I ventured. It was George Schwobel, plant manager of the Long Island City factory, one of the highest executives of the company.

THE ARGUMENT

The argument was this. The company had engaged MacDonald Bros., nationally known engineering experts, to establish a method of reporting production with a view to encouraging greater efficiency. For 3 weeks, after Mr. Schwobel had consulted the union stewards in this department, the group leaders in certain sections of the wing department, Ford Building, had furnished time recorders with the starting and finishing time of jobs.

During these 3 weeks with the same manpower and equipment, merely by keeping records, average production had been raised from 15 to 21 spars, or approximately 40 percent.

The night before, Al Nash, a "B" assembler under the group leaders, but their superior in his capacity as chief union steward of the wing department, had arbitrarily ordered the men to discontinue the timekeeping in spite of its beneficial effects on production.

In order to be sure the management was accurate in its description of events, I asked to be present while Al Nash was questioned by President Riebel. Asked if he had ordered the men to stop, he replied he "had merely told them it was O. K. not to do it, because they did not like the procedure."

Asked whether he would agree to stop interfering with management orders, he said he would agree to nothing until he had consulted the shop committee, and the fact that he was interfering with production made no difference. "The men were objecting violently to the time study," he added, "feeling the company is checking up on them. They are getting resentful and suspicious, which will tend to affect production." Thereupon Riebel fired Nash and a shop committee management meeting had to be called at once. Both parties sent hot telegrams to the War Labor Board for its decision on this minor item of shop routine.

Now the staggering point about this debate is that Al Nash was within his rights according to the prevailing contract, because the management had consulted only the shop stewards before making an innovation and not the whole shop committee.

OBSTRUCTIVE TACTICS

The incident illustrated for me what Fred Riebel, appointed by the Navy in March to succeed Van Dusen as president, had said about the contract:

"If it is strictly invoked by labor, management has no prerogatives. It cannot hire or transfer men, change shifts, use discipline, or do anything else without the O. K. of the shop committee, and every single move involves such lengthy arguments that thousands of man-hours are lost over the slightest move the management tries to make. The union leaders can do as they please, how, when, and where."

Such purely obstructive tactics are daily occurrences and appear to be flagrant exhibitions of union domination. At Johnsville recently a worker hit a company foreman over the head with a chair, wounding him in the face. Before the company could dismiss this man, the case had to be taken to the shop committee, then to arbitration, with lawyers employed on both sides. After more than 3 weeks of litigation, the man was finally discharged at a cost of more than a thousand dollars to the management in lawyer's fees.

Yet when the union sends an employee undesirable to it, flying, the company would have to enter into endless debate to keep him. So it meekly accepts the union verdict, no matter how valuable the man may be, for the sake of peace, and because the management is already devoting almost all its time to union meetings and arguments instead of to production.

By such methods the union has taken over from management the power of dismissal, and the workers know it.

As I shall show later, the union has not built up its stranglehold on the company overnight nor solely on the contract, but through the continuous and brilliant leadership of a powerful personality, its president, Tom De Lorenzo, who has taken shrewd advantage of the company's incompetence and of changing management over a period of years.

Managements have come and gone, but the union and Tom De Lorenzo have been on the job uninterruptedly, establishing precedents and customs to augment their legal hold upon the company and its employees. But if past managements have been inefficient, De Lorenzo now finds himself confronted with a bird of different feathers, for in March when the Navy appointed Riebel as president, it also put in Henry J. Kaiser, the west-coast wizard, as chairman of the board. So far Mr. Kaiser left everything in Mr. Riebel's hands, but as of yesterday he made his first move by appointing Harry Morton to take over labor relations.

UNION MADE THE BOSS

But before we enter the field of personalities, let us take a look at some of the major provisions of the contract. The maintenance-of-membership clause is absolute, but the executives are not opposed to the closed shop; in itself this situation is not different from that of other closed-shop plants, but this clause and a rigid insistence upon seniority have enabled the union to undermine every last vestige of managerial control.

Paul Krebs, secretary of the union and De Lorenzo's man Friday, told me that they insist upon observance of seniority at any price, even that of production, because they must protect the future of the union's membership when the war is over and the layoffs begin. Seniority like the closed shop has its merit, but this is a question of the abuse of a legitimate union principle.

At Brewster, seniority is used, together with strikes, slow-ups, and constant obstruction of transferals, to prove to the company who is boss.

The Coast Guard strike at Johnsville is a case in point as this whole rumpus hinged on the right of the guards to bid for their posts according to seniority at the expiration of every 6 months. This practice had not hitherto existed but it had taken place once, and on that basis, the union claimed that it was a good old-fashioned custom.

The union leadership felt its accumulated power. It announced that as of August 23, the guards insisted upon bidding for posts. In the union leaders' favor is their assertion that the Navy had promised that membership in the Coast Guard would not nullify the men's union status. The Navy claims it said no such thing.

In any case, the Navy has to have flexibility in changing the guards as the protection of valuable materials and the handling of people, at the gate, for example, are very different jobs. When the fatal August 23 arrived, four men refused to accept their Navy assignment, and were promptly thrown in the brig. Last week the War Labor Board ruled that in the new agreement, "nothing shall be construed in any way to interfere with the organization, training, and control by the Navy Department of the company guard force."

UNION LOSES A DECISION

The union took its first defeat philosophically, but the very fact that it was willing to take on the Navy, and called a strike to prove it, shows how heady the behavior of Local 365, U. A. W., can be. The cost of the strike was 164,000 man-hours of work or the equivalent of about 15 planes.

The incident also demonstrated to the public what the Brewster company has to contend with day in, day out, and it will make more credible to what fantastic lengths the union goes in its interference with daily management to uphold its seniority rule.

Until the War Manpower Commission recently insisted upon a better balance of the day and night shifts, the night shift was hobbling along on a skeleton crew because most of the skilled workers who have the seniority refused to accept night duty and couldn't be forced to accept it against their will.

Three weeks ago a new fighter line was instituted at Johnsville which was still out of balance between skilled and unskilled workers when I was there last week because the shifting of workers from one department to the other, or for that matter within the department, is always attended by endless talk back and forth between the shop committee, the workers, and the management during which incalculable numbers of man-hours are lost.

BETWEEN DEVIL AND SEA

Do such conditions mean that the 21,000 Brewster workers are less patriotic than those at other factories? Not in the least. It means that they are confused as to where their torn loyalties should lie, because the union has real power over their destinies, their chance to work and to progress, and the company has none.

Even the company foremen say to themselves: "The management changes, but if I'm not at loggerheads with the union, I'll still be a foreman when the latest management goes." The union's power over the worker is such that it can and does stage a strike, a walk-out, or a slow-up on the most trivial pretext.

Since May 31, 1942, there have been 13 different stoppages or slow-ups and strikes which the company calculates as costing 719,337 man-hours, or the time it takes to make 65 military planes. In money wasted they represent between one and two million dollars. This does not include the amount of time which is wasted daily by loafing on the job.

MANAGEMENT INCOMPETENT

But before I show how this labor union leadership has consolidated its power, it should be stated that this loafing is not all due to the workers' confused state of mind. Much of it is due to past and present incompetence on the part of management.

When I was in the Johnsville plant some 25 women workers surrounded me to talk because the welding department had nothing to do. They claimed that they had had very little to do for the past 2 months.

"When work comes in, we fight for it" said one of them, "because we are so anxious

to work." "I've been here 3 weeks" wailed another, "and I'm not getting any experience."

In several of the other departments it was the same story, now a lack of tools, now a lack of materials. "Production planning in Brewster has always been bad," said one foreman, "and is getting rapidly worse."

Riebel, the president, himself said that this was one of the company's weaknesses, but much of it he blamed on the national over-all planning for the aircraft industry. But I have been in enough airplane factories to know that though shortage of materials hampers all of them to some extent, I have never seen such acute, widespread, and apparently continuous shortages as bedevil the Brewster plants.

ABSENTEEISM ACCEPTED

But this is not the only weakness of management to be seen even by so inexpert an observer as I. Discipline of the workers is nonexistent, which, no doubt, is largely due to the fact that respect for the union exceeds that for management. But management seems to have signed off to an extent which must be humiliating. The problem of absenteeism which is acute in all three factories is looked upon as inevitable. Among women it is 12 percent, the average for all employees 8 percent.

My questions as to what management was doing to combat absenteeism were considered surprising, as if it were just an act of God and nobody's fault.

Turn-over is low in all three plants. Though the workers do not separate themselves from the pay roll as readily as in most airplane factories, they seem to stay away or come in late whenever they please. Only in extreme cases are workers dismissed for absenteeism. The company is now initiating a program for combating it.

HOW UNION PROFITS

What probably contributes to absenteeism is that so many of the workers have little or nothing to do, and it certainly is a great factor in the lack of morale among the employees.

It was constant mismanagement of this sort in the past 4 years which gave the union its chance to consolidate its powers.

The first fight was conducted on an improvement of haphazard wage rates. This defined the union as the workers' friend and protector. As soon as the other plants were opened, the union set about improving its organization until it is a perfect tool for shop control.

Under the president is a vice president in each of the three plants, as well as a chairman of the joint shop committee, a chairman of each separate shop committee, and under them section stewards, whose number is in proportion to the size of the department, each handling about 75 men.

One former steward informed me that these stewards are given systematic instructions in a technique for harassing the management.

Formerly the management also had leadmen, union members, in charge of small groups which left the management completely devoid of control at the lowest level. The Treasury stabilization unit permitted the company to raise the leadmen's salaries and promote them to be section subforemen, nonunion positions. After a 3-month battle this improvement in management's position took place, though the union is still fighting for the replacement of these leadmen for the purpose of controlling supervision.

In addition, there is a union executive board of 17 men who are on the company pay roll, sometimes to the tune of $8,000, although they devote their whole time to the affairs of the union. This means about $100,000 of taxpayers' money in the union's pocket, since the company is largely on a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract. This is a matter of public record in the War Labor Board proceedings.

THE TRIAL BOARD

One of the most important factors in union control is its trial board. The union shop, together with the vague seniority clause which the union can always reinterpret to suit immediate objectives, gives the union leaders complete control of shop operations. The trial board adds to these powers an almost tryannical control of the workers themselves.

Moreover, the union has not hesitated to use this instrument as a star chamber for the punishment of the slightest infringement of its orders. To be sure, the court is elected, but the ticket can be fixed through union caucus methods.

The source of the Board's influence arises from the fact that it cannot only fine and suspend union members but expel them and make it impossible for the victim to secure another job in any union shop. The worker has the right of appeal to the international U. A. W.-C. I. O., and thence to the civil courts, but a worker without a job can scarcely afford such costly proceedings.

As a result, the influence of the Board is felt by all of the workers as an intimidating force.

Some cases of which I secured photostatic records will illustrate the lengths to which the Board goes in its disciplinary sentences. On June 24, 25, 26, a stoppage occurred at Johnsville because the company dismissed for loafing in a fuselage three women who were still in the probationary period, which it had a perfect right to do.

Thirteen people were variously punished for not quitting at once when the stoppage was called. Among them was George Spano, a flight inspector, who had a plane in the air. He refused to desert his responsibilities until the plane returned. Called before the Board, he said in strong language that he couldn't leave his pilot in the air. Thereupon he was cited for "using language unbecoming to brother workers" and suspended for 30 days without pay, although he is an irreplacable man.

Among a list of some 30 cases are such union charges as "giving orders in his department without authority," "insubordination to department stewards," "reporting union brother in violation of company rules to a management supervisor" (this for reporting with witnesses a fellow member asleep during working hours). The most frequent charge is "remaining at work during a stoppage." These court decisions have to be upheld by the union membership, but woe betide any worker who would dare raise his hand in open opposition to a decision of the trial body.

The union power to intimidate workers was most clearly illustrated in the famous guard strike at Johnsville.

The employees, not singly but in large groups, assured me that they did not want to go out on that occasion; that they not only disapproved of the strike but were still ashamed of it.

"Then," said I, "why did you all vote for it the day after it was called?" They explained that there is no secret ballot on strikes or any other union matters except the election of union officials. They did not dare oppose the union decision. They were indignant at the fact that they have no secret ballot.

Although these urban workers are more union-minded than those in most large war industries, they are thoroughly unhappy about their lack of freedom. "We have good wages now," said one young man, "but the Brewster employees have found out that wages alone cannot make a man happy. We are just as patriotic as any other Americans. We don't like these slow-ups and strikes. Some of us are ashamed of the fact that we work in a factory with such a reputation, but when the shop steward points toward the door with his thumb we have to go or get in 'dutch.' The worst of it is that hard work and ability count for nothing in this set-up. If you want to stay in this place and get along or be upgraded, you have to stand in with the shop stewards.

"The company foremen can't do a thing for you. You have to be in with the clique that runs the show."

IN CONCLUSION

This whole history illustrates what I saw all through the country during my 3 months' tour of our war centers. The leaders of labor, especially of the U. A. W.-C. I. O., are among the ablest men in the country and not infrequently the superiors of their managements. These labor leaders have had to battle their way to the top just as management did two or three generations ago.

But today too many of our highest business and industrial executives are the easygoing descendants of their rugged forebears. They have to compete with a labor leadership that has achieved its position by sheer personal merit.

Fortunately the U. A. W.-C. I. O. has among its international leaders men very different from Tom De Lorenzo, men like Walter Reuther who have a statesmanlike point of view. Walter Reuther said to me when I last saw him in Detroit:

"The time has come when labor leaders must modify their purely aggressive techniques and learn to cooperate with management if private industry is to survive in America."

What America seems to need in the field of management is more Henry Kaisers. The active intervention in the Brewster situation of this production genius began last week with the appointment of his west coast trouble shooter, Harry Morton, to take charge of labor relations. If he can teach Tom De Lorenzo the meaning of the word "cooperation," Mr. Kaiser will not only get out the planes, but his contribution to Tom's education might save the Nation a lot of trouble in the post-war world.

TOM DE LORENZO IS JUST STARTING—BREWSTER UNION DICTATOR IS FORMIDABLE AND ASTONISHING

After gathering the amazing picture of a beautifully organized tyranny (discussed in the adjoining columns), I was naturally curious to see the man whom everybody gave the somewhat dubious credit of being the unquestioned dictator, not only of the union at the Brewster plant, but of the whole situation, Tom De Lorenzo, president of Local 365.

I expected a forceful personality, but what I could see in this firmly built 35-year-old American of Italian descent was a good deal more than I expected.

If I am any judge of people, the country is going to hear a lot more from Tom De Lorenzo.

He was born and grew up in New York, in a section of the city where every boy has to fight his way from the moment he is out of diapers. De Lorenzo is still fighting his way upward. It is my impression that nobody can stop him.

As there was no use mincing my language with this two-fisted, forthright labor leader, I confronted him at once with his statement to the company president, Mr. Riebel, at a meeting with the negotiating committee:

"Our policy is not to win the war at any cost. The policy of our local union is to win the war without sacrificing too many of the rights which we have at the present time."

"That sounds to me as if you put your union above your country," I asserted.

"I'm willing to take a chance and talk frankly to you," came the surprising response, "because I like your husband's letter on Congressman Cox. Any newspaper that cares

that much about civil liberties may give even a labor leader a fair hearing. My statement to Riebel was made negatively because I wanted to make clear what the union is trying to do within the shop, and that the company can't get anywhere by merely trying to out-negotiate the union."

QUESTIONS COMPANY'S SINCERITY

"Don't you believe the company is carrying on those negotiations for the sole purpose of getting production?"

"No, I don't."

There was no use trying to break down his conviction that the company is trying to undermine union rights, so I gave that up and changed the subject.

"What is your reaction to the War Labor Board's decision that the Navy must control the guards?"

"I expected it. The War Labor Board had to give the military forces precedence over civil rights in time of war and, therefore, I bow to their decision. In fact, if I had known that our men were subject to court martial and jail for disobedience I would have told the guards to obey. I would never have let those men risk going to jail. The strike was not sound because we had no chance of winning."

"But what about the other strikes and slowdowns?" I countered. "In speaking of strikes at his news conference on the War Labor Board decision, W. H. Davis said that strikes are not only illegal now, under the 'no-strike clause,' they are in effect not strikes against a company but against the Nation and the war effort. On that basis you are sabotaging production and endangering the national safety."

As patiently as if I had asked him the time of day, he answered:

"I have one goal or aim; I want the war over as soon as possible, but I want conditions to be no worse in the country than when we started. The most important thing in this war is to preserve the system of government that we have, among other things, and the procedure for adjudicating union troubles. There is no sense in winning the war if we are going to lose all those privileges."

HAS TO WEIGH HIS CHANCES

"All right, but if everybody thought and acted the way you do, we wouldn't have enough production to win the war and then where would your union privileges be?"

"I have to weigh how far I can go," was the astounding but honest reply.

"All my life I have found force to be the only effective weapon. Sometimes you just have to use it, even if it means stopping the planes. It has always been effective until the guard situation arose. And I'm sure if we had laid out that strike more effectively, we would have won that point, too.

"If I had brothers at the front who needed the 10 or 12 planes that were sacrificed, I'd let them die, if necessary, to preserve our way of life or rights or whatever you want to call it. Democracy is too broad and meaningless a term. What's more, if I were in their place, I'd expect them to do the same thing. I'd expect them to let me die.

"The real trouble with the Brewster Co. is that we have never had an efficient management. The people the Navy has put in here know nothing about manufacturing airplanes, and they don't know anything about getting on with people. Sometimes I am convinced that it would be best for the Navy to shut down the Brewster plants and let the people go work somewhere else where there is efficient management.

HOPES FOR IMPROVEMENT NOW

"But if management is inefficient, our union has a first-rate organization. Under our contract we can stop any innovations in which we do not believe. But what I want to prove above all things, and especially to the Navy Department, is that we can be of use to the war effort if we are utilized properly by an efficient management such as H. J. Kaiser is famous for and can give us.

"I know that with Harry Morton (Kaiser's recent appointment), in charge of labor relations, things will improve. And with Kaiser sending in some people who know something about production, Kaiser style, I am convinced that all the men in the shop, in spite of being union members, will be interested in winning this war as quickly as possible, and will prove it to the world by producing the ships we need."

That was a conciliatory ending and I am sure the man meant it. But at this very moment he is at the U. A. W.-C. I. O. convention fighting with the support of a majority of the delegates from local 365 for the abrogation of the no-strike clause.

Such an attitude during war, as well as the statement he made to me, will be condemned by many people. But it should not be forgotten that a tough, competitive environment produced Tom De Lorenzo, made him the formidable mind and character that he is, and led him to believe through hard experience that nothing but force can be relied upon by those who want to survive.

In the 3 years of his union leadership, he has encountered only managers who confirmed his faith in force by going down before him like a lot of ninepins, thus making it easy for him to build up what he calls unions rights, but which are, in fact, tyrannical powers that represent a menace not only to the Brewster Co. but to the sound development of the labor movement.

AGNES E. MEYER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas). The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a few remarks I had intended to make for the past 2 weeks but have been unable to, and to attach thereto an editorial from the Detroit Free Press, dated September 23 of this year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much disturbed by, and somewhat suspicious of, the press reports regarding the possible shift of Gen. George C. Marshall, the Chief of Staff. Particularly disturbing and unbelievable were reports that a prospective change in status for this great warrior-leader entailed, under whatever title or pretense, a demotion rather than advancement. Of course, I hold General Marshall in highest esteem. I rate him as one of the greatest soldiers and military leaders that this Nation ever produced. He is plain, persevering, and productive, a master strategist whose abilities have been recognized by his superiors even in the First World War. His name and fame is not known alone in this country or the Western Hemisphere but throughout the entire world. Though of positive character, he is soft-spoken, kindly, and thoroughly human. I believe his character embraces all of the fine attributes of a Christian gentleman, of an American, of a man.

I believe his very fine qualities, his experience, and his great accomplishments have been recognized by the highest authorities in the land. First among these was the Chief Executive, his Commander in Chief, when he considered and named George C. Marshall as Chief of Staff from a field of brilliant generals among whom more than one rated by seniority the post of Chief of Staff. The President, in his wisdom, elevated to the leadership of our armies this modest though capable officer because he believed beyond any doubt that George C. Marshall was deserving, because he was preeminently qualified. I believe, in fact I am confident, there was no extraneous, no unwholesome motive in the President's choice at the time of his selection, and the brilliant record of the present Chief of Staff since his elevation justified the President's action and proved his excellent judgment of men. Why, then, would anyone today have cause to infer, assume, or presume that the President of the United States would, after continuing by reappointment General Marshall as Chief of Staff, undertake by some means or method to seek his demotion at this the most critical time in our Nation's history?

I feel that I would like to go along with General Marshall in the fulfillment of any role which he himself might choose. Not being a military expert, I do not know for a certainty whether it would be an added honor to General Marshall's brilliant military career were he chosen to lead the final and all-out invasion of the Nazi-held European stronghold, but it appears that it would be a great and an historical achievement if, with his valiant sword, he pointed the way for the millions of young Americans who would thus follow him toward the liberation of the oppressed and the restoration of human freedom throughout the world. It is particularly true, if reports as yet unfounded are worthy of credence, that both Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt decided upon making of Marshall the leader in the global war and the generalissimo of all of the American-British forces throughout the world.

It is unfortunate that Marshall's name should be bandied about so recklessly by irresponsible scribes and newspaper pharisees who, as Roosevelt haters, underhandedly are seeking to discredit the President as the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy and that such reprehensible methods would be employed at this particular time, the time when the Nation needs unity more than it needs anything else to accomplish the one great purpose which was expressed with our declaration of war against the Axis. It must be a great disappointment and unjustified embarrassment to this great and retiring soldier. As usual, he is silent while a synthetic storm is raging, occupied with the manifold and complex problems of an indescribably difficult task.

As a soldier he will prove his greatness by serving his country wherever he may be called. The Commander in Chief will, I am sure, promote General Marshall as he deserves to be. No one in this country needs plead the cause of the Army's foremost leader because his value was

recognized by the President far in advance of the rest of the people, and, since Marshall has proved his capacity even to the inclusion of those who may have had some doubt, certainly the President would be the last to do him an injustice by any demotion at this time. I am sure that whatever course the Commander in Chief shall choose will have for its lofty purpose the further recognition and the employment of Marshall's outstanding leadership and ability.

Plans, tactics, and stratagems of this war are fundamentally and substantially those of the modest though able Chief of Staff, the details of which have been worked out by his assistants. Who, then, in the entire Army would be in a better position to put them into effect? Whatever the future may hold for Marshall, whatever course he may be directed to follow, I can only visualize his great accomplishments and glory in the service of his country.

[From the Detroit Free Press of September 23, 1943]

WE'RE FIGHTING A WAR—NO POLITICS!

Keep politics out of this war!

The soldiers of America now scattered over the face of the globe are not fighting and offering up their lives for the Democratic Party or the Republican Party or any other political group.

They are fighting for the preservation of this Nation and the right of human beings everywhere to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They are dying in battle to rid the earth of a scourge that threatens all that we hold sacred.

To use their valiance for partisan political purposes is to render mean and contemptible the supreme sacrifice many of them are making.

Wars are not won by newspaper headlines, by mouthing politicians on the rostrum, or by glib columnists and commentators.

Yet there are men in the Halls of our National Congress who are willing and eager to use this Armageddon of the human race for their own petty advantages.

This is the first war in the history of the United States for which we have been fully prepared.

Both President Roosevelt, as Commander in Chief, and Prime Minister Churchill have made their reports to their peoples through their legislative bodies, and, with pardonable pride, they have spoken of the achievements of the United Nations.

President Roosevelt paused in the writing of his message to pay special tribute to the tremendous tasks performed so magnificently by Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army.

Yet the ink is hardly dry upon the printed page of his report before cock-eyed rumors are sprung that Marshall is either to be deposed or kicked upstairs. These ugly rumors go on to explain that the reason for all this is that Marshall is not liked by the British because he does not see eye to eye with Churchill.

So, with the ill-logic of such people, it is further contended that he is to be placed in charge of the European war front—upon which will depend the very life of Great Britain.

If the English do not like Marshall, it stands to reason they would not accept him as the commander of their offense and defense. But logic has nothing to do with mean and petty politics.

In answer to this there comes another report that instead of being demoted the great American chief is to be made complete commander of all Anglo-American forces throughout the world.

The Free Press makes no claims to omniscience. What was agreed upon at the Quebec conference we do not pretend to know, nor do we think it our business to know. Such matters must be sacredly secret. It is viciously unfair to these leaders and of great benefit to the enemy even to conjecture—and thereby start such wild rumors that can only be of disservice to the cause.

The Free Press has said before, and now repeats, that the Republican leaders who have tossed the honored name of Gen. Douglas MacArthur into the political arena, as a hope of winning an election, have done both him and the national cause an injury.

MacArthur is a soldier, not a politician. Nobody to this day knows what his political party affiliations are, if any.

He is naturally not unaware of this movement to make him the party leader of the Republicans. He has not repudiated it.

Therefore, anything that he now says is not taken as the word of a soldier dedicating his life to a mighty military cause. He is suspect immediately of political ambitions.

When he issues a statement from his southwest Pacific headquarters, as he did Tuesday, that he stands ready to play "a secondary role" and inferentially criticizes the program worked out by his commanding officers, we naturally think of the late great Gen. Billy Mitchell.

One of the chief criticisms of Mitchell was that he talked too much for publicity purposes and publicly criticized his superiors, a violation of the rigid military code of ethics and discipline. And Gen. Douglas MacArthur was on that trial board which condemned him to dismissal.

Not in the history of military literature is there a more poignant testimonial of a pledge than that given by General MacArthur upon his departure from the Philippines, that he would return. Nobody in his right senses has any idea that the Pacific war will be over by next summer. Therefore, how could MacArthur become a candidate for the Presidency without giving up the fight to which he has pledged his life?

A great soldier and a great patriot has been put in a false light by the political ambitions of a few Republican leaders.

And MacArthur's statement of Tuesday lends encouragement to their ambitions.

So far we have fought this war successfully because big men in both parties have submerged their differences and have fought shoulder to shoulder.

Now that victory is in sight—though far from won—it is no time to endanger that victory by breaking up a winning combination through discord wrought by selfish ambitions and cheap politics.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a column written by Blair Moody, of the Detroit News, The Low-Down on Washington, with regard to the tax problem now before Congress—a very interesting and commendable article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

CONSUMER SUBSIDIES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, as usual, this is one of our semiweekly vesper hours. In my humble opinion it serves a very useful purpose. Certainly it may be a trespass upon the time of some, but it enables me to clarify my own thinking; in addition I hope it makes available some summarized historical information on problems that will confront us from time to time.

There is an impending issue; it is being formulated at this moment in the Committee on Banking and Currency. It might be styled an echo of the issue of that period just before we recessed when we were engaged in the battle of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the battle of subsidies. At the moment the Committee on Banking and Currency is holding a hearing. No bill has been introduced. It is being held upon a typewritten bill, so neither you nor I unless you have had the good fortune to see this proposal may know what is in it. I made careful search at the document room to see whether a Member of another body whose name under the rules I cannot mention here had introduced the bill and I found that he had not. I found also that no Member of this body had introduced a bill; but the battle is in the making, and in a little while we shall be concerned once more with the whole question of subsidies as a part of our food program.

I sometimes wonder whether when we are dealing with these problems it would not be better after all to avoid rather than enact legislation of doubtful value. I recall that the first major depression in the history of the civilized world took place in Rome several thousand years ago. It came about when a broker in Rome had gotten a corner on all the purple dye and all the ostrich feathers in the known world. He went to the principal bank in Rome and there he negotiated a very substantial loan. The dye and ostrich feathers were imported from Phoenicia, or some other distant place. Unfortunately the vessel went down. The cargo was lost and there was no insurance as a hedge against that bank loan, and the first great major banking enterprise in the history of the civilized world failed, and there ensued out of that failure a depression. They did exactly nothing about it. They rode out that depression, and the world has ridden out every major depression from then on until the depression of 1929. The world went forward, some people were washed out, some businesses had to go through the wringer, which seems to be one of those inevitable incidents of an economic dislocation, but they finally came out and the world went on just the same. We have a new technique today. We must see what we can put on the books and how fast we can put it there. When I go back and read history, I try to evaluate all these enactments to see what good they did for our current problem and I often believe that too many of them did exactly no good considering the amount of the people's money that was invested therein.

We talk about this Commodity Credit bill, about the subject of food, and about all the things that we have done in the last 20 years or a little more. Perhaps a bit of summarized history will be of assistance. Our first agricultural de-

pression began in 1920; that is when we first began to hear about an agricultural depression and about proposals to meet it. In 1920, as you recall, we first lost our foreign markets, or at least they declined very substantially. Then there was a price collapse and then the farm depression began. That was 23 years ago. Now let us look at the 8-year period from 1920 on to see what was done by way of legislative efforts in order to meet that economic problem. In 1921 this Congress passed the so-called Packers and Stockyards Act. In 1921 there was organized a group that frankly I know nothing about, but the history books record that in 1941 there was organized in Congress the farm bloc.

In 1922 we had a national agricultural conference in Washington for the purpose of dealing with farm prices and farm supplies.

In 1922 Congress enacted the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill and in the debates of that period an especial point was made and special emphasis was laid upon the fact that Congress had to set up some kind of restraint in order to prevent the dumping of foreign agricultural commodities on to our own markets.

In 1923 the Congress passed the Agricultural Credit Act.

In 1926 we first heard of hybrid corn, which gives us an increased yield and produces more vigorous varieties. In 1926 there was first proposed the so-called debenture export plan, commonly known in our political and congressional history as the McNary-Haugen bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. There is a vast difference between the debenture plan and the McNary-Haugen bill. They were not even related.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is right. It was the export debenture plan that we first heard of in 1926. Then we heard also in 1926 of the McNary-Haugen plan, which was enacted in 1927 and vetoed.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield for another suggestion?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman talks about a farm bloc being organized back in those days. If he will search the record he will find that I made a speech on the floor of the House, as did other Members, inquiring who the farm bloc was and the only person we could find who was a member of it at that time was the man who advertised himself as the head of it, Mr. Dickinson of Iowa.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from Mississippi will recall that on so many occasions I have spoken about this mythical farm bloc. I know nothing about it either. But the current history back in 1921 indicates, and this you will find in literature of the Department of Agriculture, that a farm bloc was organized at that time.

Mr. RANKIN. That was the mythical farm bloc to which the gentleman refers. It was myth indeed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman and I thoroughly agree on that point.

In 1928 the McNary-Haugen bill was vetoed the second time.

Then in 1929 there came the Federal Farm Board to deal with what? Believe it or not, to deal with surpluses. That is almost an archaic word, but that board was set up under Alexander Legge to deal with the question of surpluses, getting wheat out of the country or diverting it to relief channels as well as meeting the incipient farm panic in 1929.

When that second major farm depression came in 1929 there were other folks who had ideas on how to deal with it. A new program of legislation was then sponsored. First came the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill of 1930, about which we have heard so much. Then came the Farm Credit Act of 1933, which was followed by the first Agricultural Adjustment Act and the creation of the first Agricultural Adjustment Administration in 1933. There came the Soil Conservation Act of 1935, and in that same year the President, by Executive order, created the Farm Security Administration.

There was also the Farm Credit Act of 1933 and the Farm Credit Act of 1935 which set up the so-called production-credit corporations and production-credit associations.

About this same time there was established the Rural Agricultural Credit Corporation, with which we dealt only recently in the agricultural appropriation bill. We made provision for emergency seed and feed loans. We created an agricultural-marketing service. We passed the Reciprocal Trade Act of 1934, which was designed to increase trade with foreign countries and to expedite the export of farm products.

In the same year we passed the Silver Purchase Act, one of the greatest abominations that was ever inscribed upon the statute books by an intelligent Congress. The idea was, of course, to develop a greater flow of commodities to those countries that were on a silver basis. We thought it was going to work out, but the net result was we pushed China on to a managed-currency basis; it did not do Mexico or Bolivia any good, yet that act is still on the statute books of the Nation.

Then we set up a Cotton Stabilization Corporation in 1930.

There was the Marketing Agreement Act of 1937. There was the Division of Subsistence Homesteads created by Executive order in 1933. There was the Federal Surplus Relief Corporation also created by Executive order in 1933, which later became the Federal Surplus Commodity Corporation. Then there was created by Executive order the Resettlement Administration in 1935.

There was considerable jockeying with the so-called parity in all that period. Why was all this? It was only because somebody said that we had too much of everything, there was a great surplus in the world, a great surplus in this country, so there must be enactment by Congress and huge appropriations for the purpose of dealing with a surplus of everything in the food line and for that matter in the fiber line.

We developed a real fear of our capacity. We went around shouting about the beneficences of the good earth that had produced so much as to cause a real national problem and, for that matter, a world problem. So we as intelligent legislators must address ourselves to the problem of dealing with too much, an amazing thing.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. I just wonder if the gentleman has any data since the surplus has vanished of the liquidation of any of the agencies that were created while the surplus was on.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the gentleman we have always had a surplus of Federal agencies, it seems, and we have not been particularly diligent in this body in abolishing a good many of them. Now and then by luck or circumstance we abolish one or two. We abolished the Civilian Conservation Corps. We worked for a few years and finally met with success in liquidating the National Youth Administration. Incidentally, there is a move on in the country right now to restore it, and a very distinguished Senator has introduced the bill to revive it. So it seems that when you do give them the death stab they do not stay dead. It means that we must be constantly vigilant if we are going to win in this great battle of the Congress versus the rising bureaucracy. So I say to the gentleman from Ohio, we will get to that in just a moment.

We were dealing with a surplus in 1932 and 1933 and from then on.

How did we propose to deal with it? Well, there was a fivefold attack. The first one was to produce less. And how do you produce less? You either shrink your tillable domain or you impose acreage restrictions so that you do not produce as much as you did before. That was attack No. 1.

Attack No. 2 was to export more, get the surplus out of the country if we could.

Attack No. 3 was to consume more, get it into channels of consumption if it were possible.

Attack No. 4 was new uses. I remember when I appeared on the Memorial Highway in 1933 with the Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE and the Honorable Rexford Guy Tugwell and a great many other people for the purpose of developing an interest in the conversion of cereal grain into an alcohol of an anhydrous type which could be admixed with motor fuel for the purpose of giving us a premium motor fuel at a cheaper price, and at the same time getting rid of some of this monumental, overhanging, and disastrous surplus that they told us existed only 10 years ago. That was attack No. 4, namely, new uses.

Finally, there was the attack of holding it off the market, in storage, and then letting it feed under a control plan into the market so as not to shake the price structure too much.

What did we do in carrying out that fivefold attack? First, through the Agricultural Adjustment Act there were these restrictions on acreage accompanied by cash benefits.

Second, in exporting more we had trade agreements, we had the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, we set up the Export-Import Bank, and we set up the Federal Surplus Commodity Corporation.

Under attack No. 3, to consume more, we developed a program of relief purchases, a program of school lunches, and a program of food stamps. The amazing thing is that while we started out with food stamps for the folks in the low-income bracket we finally wound up by putting the whole Nation on food stamps, as you so well know today under O. P. A.

Under the proposal for new uses we created the four regional research laboratories in different sections of the country. Let it be said to the everlasting credit of those scientific men, who are the best men working for the Government today, that they are doing a very phenomenal job.

Finally, there was this technique of holding things off the market and feeding them in a little at a time, making it possible for the farmer to hold it under seal. That is where our old friend the Commodity Credit Corporation comes into the picture.

I started out with the premise that we do so much, and sometimes it is of doubtful value. The hand of Nature suddenly intervened for a couple of years. That great providential hand made the sun to shine brighter and longer, and the Architect of the Universe, for reasons best known to Himself, withheld the moisture. At one fell swoop Nature itself did more than all of the things we wrote upon the statute books for a 10-year period in reducing what they said was a great surplus of everything and too much of everything.

I am interested today in this one attack upon that problem of surplus because it is with us, it was with us in June, and it will be with us again in a little while, and every Member of this body who is here will be called upon once more to record himself on this question of extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, with enough additional money out of the taxpayer's pocket or the loan power in order to subsidize the purchase and sale of farm products.

So that problem is with us, born in the days of surplus, when as a part of this attack the Commodity Credit Corporation was created to make loans to hold commodities off the market for the purpose of letting prices rise.

As I go back to that period there is one thing I ought to mention in that whole program, and that is the Gold Reserve Act of 1934. I never will forget an old gentleman from our side of the House who had a very brilliant mind, Representative Luce, of Massachusetts, who was the ranking Republican on the Committee on Banking and Currency, one of the most brilliant students in legislative history. I remember the day he stood here and prophesied that it would be a sorry day for this country, it would be a distressing day for the world, when finally we took this country off the gold standard. I am not so sure but that old Bob Luce was right. But we took the country off the gold standard and it is still off; and maybe it will never get back on the gold standard. It may be that if we had retained a real monetary base such as we knew in other years and that helped us to weather other depressions we would have been infinitely better off. But we are off the gold standard today. That was part of the business of this attack of producing less, of exporting more, or consuming more, of filtering into the market a little bit at a time for the purpose of bringing the prices up. These many approaches whereby we tinkered with our fiscal structure to push prices up, or hold them or pull them down, brings to mind the story about the fellow who had that little mule that was balky and obstreperous and with which he could do nothing. This mule undertook to lie down on the pavement in the very center of town. He tried beating that mule over the nose. It did no good. He even resorted to building a fire under that little beast. It did no good. Finally the veterinarian came along and said, "Joe, what's the matter?" He said, "Can't do a thing with this mule." So the veterinarian reached in his case and got out one of these syringes and squirted something into that mule's hindquarters, and the little beast got up and started right off down the street. Joe watched the departing mule and said, "Doctor, how much was that?" "Oh, that will be about 10 cents." "Well," he said, "here is 30 cents. Give me two shots so I can catch that mule."

It can scarcely be denied that we were squirting little doses into the economic system to make prices go up, putting capstones on them at the time, holding them there, making them come down again. It took a rather rugged and virile kind of free-enterprise system to absorb the recurring shocks of what Congress tried to do for it and what Congress did to it. And yet it endured all this and still survives.

Is it any wonder that you got the civilian economy of this country out of gear? All that was done for what reason? Because there was too much, so they said. Well, was there? Not now. All in 10 years. I can stand here in 1943 and say, "Too much? Not now. But too little now." So now we are to be confronted with proposals now to deal with too little.

History is a very interesting thing, and historical cycles are interesting, indeed, as we go from too much to too little all in one single decade.

Mr. BUFFETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman is quoting history quite liberally. Can he cite any instance in history where any price-fixing scheme has worked and has not resulted finally in some sort of disaster?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know whether I can answer that in the affirmative or not without a little further research. Perhaps the gentleman has done some special work in that field.

Mr. BUFFETT. I will answer the gentleman in this way, that I have studied a great many price-fixing schemes from Diocletian on down to the French Revolution, and a good many in this country, and none has ever succeeded in its intention, that I could find.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman has made an excellent historical statement upon the agricultural machinery with which we have attempted to solve some of the ills that beset the farmer. In mentioning the Commodity Credit Corporation in connection with the question just asked, the gentleman will agree with me, will he not, that the fixing of 85 percent of mandatory loans by the Commodity Credit Corporation did result in bringing farm prices more nearly to their just and equitable level?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. In a way, is that not a form of price fixing? Price support is a form of price fixing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from Nebraska asked about price fixing. That was the question of the gentleman from Nebraska—whether it was not true that over a period of time it hardened into permanency. I understood that to be his question.

Mr. MONRONEY. My understanding of his question was whether or not price fixing ever worked. I do recall that the instrumentality of using a strong support price, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, did result in farm prices going up from 80 percent of parity to 85 percent of parity overnight.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We should understand ourselves about terms. Setting a floor under a price is not putting a ceiling on a price. We supported those prices.

Mr. MONRONEY. I beg to disagree with the gentleman. If you are fixing a price, you are fixing it whether you are supporting a price or whether you are limiting a price. It is an instrumentality that works in either direction. Permitting merchandise to find its own price in a free market is not price fixing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is not price fixing as this Congress has understood it. To put a floor under a price and let that price operate in a free economy above that floor is one thing, but a rigid price fixing is another. Setting a floor is quite another.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I was going to say that I am sure a majority of the Members of Congress did not consider these commodity loans as price fixing, because that would have put us in the unhappy position of freezing the farmer's price at 85 percent of parity, which would mean it was the intent of Congress that the farmers for all time to come should be 15 percent short of cost of production, and our intention was not any such thing. So it was not price fixing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not believe our intention was to fix prices at 15 percent below parity.

Mr. MUNDT. It was an attempt to put a floor under prices, but not the fixation of a price.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I have listened carefully to the gentleman enumerating the things that have been done to the farmers.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Did you say "for the farmers" or "to the farmers"?

Mr. RANKIN. I said "to the farmers." But I notice he seems to have studiously avoided the greatest thing that has ever been done for the American farmer, and that is rural electrification. I will say to the gentleman that the Mackinac conference, from the standpoint of the electric-light and power consumers of America, seems to have been a complete blackout. They overlooked the fact that the American people are more interested in that one question than almost any other economic issue at this time, and yet they did not even mention it. Not only did they not mention rural electrification, but they did not mention the power question at all. I am wondering if the gentleman is going to skip over rural electrification, the greatest development that has ever taken place for the benefit of the American farmer?

Mr. DIRKSEN. You see I have to bring my friend from Mississippi up to date. As a matter of fact, there were six subcommittees established by the action taken at Mackinac Island to deal with various phases of our fiscal and economic problems on the domestic front. That of course will include this question of rural electrification. So I am quite sure he is going to be very agreeably informed by the recommendations that will be made in due time by an appropriate committee handling rural electrification.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman give us the personnel of that committee and give us some indications as to what they are going to recommend? Are they going to remain in this blackout until after election?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. Those committees are taking thought of these various matters that have been assigned to them. One of the committees that I know of, because I happen to be a member, will probably have its first meeting some time in October over in Ohio for the purpose of dealing with one segment of that whole domestic problem.

I cannot name all of the men, but I think I can get the names for the gentleman. I may say to my good friend that he might address a letter to the National Republican Committee and I am sure they will be only too glad to give these names.

Mr. RANKIN. I would like to get the name of the chairman of the committee and the recommendations that they have made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The recommendations have not as yet been made, I will say to my friend, but I expect they will be made before late January.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Is it not a fact that the R. E. A. has been one of the finest accomplishments simply for this reason: Because of the price of commodities the farmers have found it necessary to work both day and night in order to make a living and therefore the R. E. A. gave them electric light to do their night work by.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. In line with the suggestion of the other gentleman from Illinois, I suppose I should add that they are better off than they were under the Fordney-McCumber Act, when they were forced to work both day and night without light.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I hope the gentleman is going to get back to the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, but I am fearful he may not, and I would like to ask him this question: I am definitely opposed to the so-called roll-back subsidies, of having the Federal Government pay a part of my grocery bill. On the other hand I recognize that there are times or that times may arise where subsidies are necessary.

I voted against the last bill we had in here, because I did not like to say to the President of the United States, when we were going home, that he could not put any plans into effect involving a subsidy on agricultural products.

I want to ask the gentleman this question because I know of no man who is better informed on that particular bill: Under that bill, as we passed it through the Congress before we recessed, has the President the power to secure corn and ship it into areas that are out of corn and to pay the freight which, in turn, would be a subsidy?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would appear, as I recall the bill and its language, he could do that; he could do it within the limitations of the money that we approved; I am sure he could, because otherwise there would have been no necessity for making the money available.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. You are of the opinion that he could do that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. As we passed the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. As we passed the bill, as I understand the gentleman to say, the President would not have been barred from using the funds for that purpose?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not think so. As I remember that bill there was no reason for putting the money in if we had had that idea in mind.

Now getting back on the track for a moment. The thesis I want to establish first of all is that we were dealing with the problem of surpluses 10 years ago and putting all sorts of legislation on our statute books, and in the space of a decade it is a case of too little rather than too much, and so our problem now is one of rationing and of keeping production going and, according to the administration, to hold prices in line, and that is the basic purpose of the legislation that is pending in one of the committees today.

Now, did we ever have too much? They say there are 2,000,000,000 people in the world today and that two-thirds of them are suffering from malnutrition, not necessarily famine, but that they do not get enough of the right kind of foods to eat, to protect and safeguard their health and give the energy that is necessary to produce a livelihood. Perhaps there never was too much back even in 1933, and that it was a case of maldistribution in the world, rather than too much.

We are now up against this problem of providing food for our own people, for our soldiers, for our sailors, and for the people in occupied areas. We are told that food will be an offset to any kind of revolutionary virus and help us to restore order and reestablish decent and stable government. There is no question but what food is one of the most important munitions of war and one of the most important instrumentalities of peace. Our problem today is just one thing and nothing more: it is the problem of production. Everybody knows it. If our problem is too little food, the task before us is to produce more food. If prices get out of line, the answer is increased production to enable the balancing effect of supply and demand and bring about a readjustment.

In considering this matter let us examine for a moment the statistics released no later than September 30 by the Office of War Information. They are genuinely enlightening.

Never in the history of the Nation were national income and deposits at such levels as they are today and yet it is

proposed to meet our problems with borrowed money.

They point out that our estimated income for 1943 will be $142,000,000,000. The O. W. I. said that the value of all goods and services available would be ninety and six-tenths billions, so that the excess of income over goods and services available would be fifty-one and four-tenths billions. Last year they said the difference was only thirty-four billions and now it is up to nearly fifty-two billions of excess funds for available goods and services. Another thing in which you would be interested is that the money in circulation has gone to eighteen and six-tenths billions. A year ago it was five billions below that figure.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield before he gets away from the subsidy proposition?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not a subsidy when you pay a concern to manufacture articles on a cost-plus basis and it puts people on the pay roll and permits them to loaf around in order that the contractor may get this plus on their salaries? It not that a subsidy?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; and my friend will not get any quarrel out of me on that, because I mentioned here only the other day that where there was inefficient labor in some of these defense plants something should be done about it.

Where excessive profits occur through the operation of a defense plant, the matter can be cured by the use of the renegotiation power which Congress delegated to the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission. Inefficiency, however, and the inefficient use of manpower must be attacked in another way.

Getting back for a moment to this question of national earnings, the O. W. I. says that money in checking accounts amounts to thirty-five and seven-tenths billions; money in savings deposits—this is the O. W. I. figure of September 30—thirty billions. They talk about trying to repress and repel inflation; why inflation has been here a long time; there has been lots of inflation, and if you do not believe so go down and try to buy a sirloin steak.

The trouble is we have been dealing with symptoms rather than causes. The war expenditure every day amounts to $286,000,000—every 24 hours. There is the great inflationary source; that is more than $12,000,000 every 60 minutes, and as that money turns over and bids for the available services and goods in the country, that is the great dynamic force for inflation. So we are trying to deal with symptoms rather than causes; and that will be precisely the case with the bill that comes from the Committee on Banking and Currency that undertakes to invoke subsidies paid on borrowed money to be repaid by the soldiers and sailors who are beating out their energies in the Pacific and in Italy and the other combat areas; that will be there for them to pay back as the citizens who will shoulder the responsibility in the generation to come. That is the picture that is facing us today.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. These banking figures do not mean anything, for when you give a man a credit on deposit there may be no money passed or deposited. The circulation statement of the United States Treasury of July 31, 1943, shows that we had in circulation in money on that date $17,954,587,757. At the peak of prosperity following the other war, in 1920, we had only $5,698,000,000 as against this $17,954,000,000.

If agricultural prices were permitted to rise to their normal level at the source, cotton, wheat, corn, and dairy products would more than double at the farm. If the farmers were given the benefits that are enjoyed by others of the enormous amount of money in circulation, agricultural prices would more than double overnight.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will observe to my friend from Mississippi that it depends upon which one of these two monetary theses you pursue: Whether it is a question of the velocity of goods and the velocity of the dollar on the one side or the quantity of money on the other. The quantity of money as such means nothing; it is the confidence of the people in their Government, in their administration that makes them go ahead and do business. When you get a dollar turning over 60 or 70 times that spells the difference between prosperity and adversity.

But I want to finish before my time runs out. That bill will probably be coming to this floor one of these days. You remember we solved this problem or left it in a state of suspended solution until the first of January. We have got to do something about it. It will be back here, it will be the same old struggle that we carried on in May and June, and what is the answer to this problem of too little goods and prices too high? It is produce, to produce more, and to produce still more, because the man who cannot get a pork chop will not have to care whether it costs him 20 cents a pound or 60 cents; he still cannot buy it, if it is not available. That is the essential thing today.

How shall it be solved? No. 1: Give the farmer some manpower. You cannot get more out of existing acreage or expand acreage in the country unless you have willing hands to do it. No. 2: There ought to be a greater liberality with steel so the farm machinery makers can manufacture more farm equipment. I talked with a steel man last night, and he says the steel situation is easing. I hope it eases very materially and that the War Production Board takes cognizance of it, and that there will be steel for farm machinery. No. 3: There must be fertilizer if it can be gotten. No. 4: There must be seed and, finally, there has got to be some profit incentive for the farmer to go out there and beat the soil day after day, early and late. There has got to be a livelihood for him, and the way to give him a livelihood is to peel off the restrictions, give him a fair price, and quit jockeying with this infernal parity business all the time, trying to snitch a little here and pinch off a little there until instead of $1.07 for corn, which he does not get, he gets $1.07 minus a marketing charge and minus the freight rate to the nearest terminal.

If a farmer in my township sells corn, it does not make any difference to whom he sells it. The man next door might come and say he will buy it for $1.07, and he will scoop it from the crib into his truck and say, "I will give you $1.07 for it." If the selling farmer takes $1.07 he violates the O. P. A. regulation and they are in fact pursuing farmers today who sold corn out in the Midwest because they did not sell at the ceiling price less that marketing charge, less the cost of transportation to the nearest terminal, even though a railroad or commercial truck never handled the corn.

This has been a rather sketchy recital and I want to summarize my own impressions of the problem before us.

Two decades ago, we saw the rise of apparent agricultural surpluses and rushed in to cure the problem with legislation.

A decade later, we encounter another depression, including the farmers, during which Congress rushed many diverse laws upon the books only to find that the balancing force of nature accomplished infinitely more than all the laws which Congress enacted.

Now we face a shortage instead of a surplus and once more the legislative tinkering will begin to solve the problem.

The problem is simple enough. It is production.

Whether we undertake to expand our farm domain and bring more acreage into cultivation or whether we undertake to get increased production out of each existing acre, the problem is precisely the same. It takes manpower, machinery, and good prices. This is neither mystical or magical. It is only common sense.

Yet manpower has been siphoned from the farms and adequate supplies of machinery have not been made available. How then shall we obtain increased production?

How much has been said about the "four freedoms." Others have added a fifth freedom called freedom of enterprise. Let's add one more. Let's include freedom for the farmer to produce—freedom from red tape, freedom from governmental restrictions and freedom from artifically generated forces which make it impossible for him to forecast from one day to another whether he will produce at a loss or a profit.

But notwithstanding the highest income on record in 1943; notwithstanding huge deposits, huge bond purchases, and a reduction in the available supply of goods and services, it is still proposed that we borrow money, buy whole crops of commodities, sell them at a price below the cost of purchase and charge the loss to the Federal Treasury. It is a bit ironical to think that people are buying bonds so that a portion of the general revenue can be employed to meet the losses which Government must take on the purchase and sale of commodities. What do you think?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MACKINAC CONFERENCE OR MACKINAC BLACK-OUT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, no one enjoys the rhetoric and the eloquence of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] more than I do.

I would like for him, however, to be a little more specific in the proposals that he has in mind for curing our economic ills. I listened very carefully to his discussion of the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill, which to my mind was the beginning and probably the outstanding blunder of all of them. I listened to his discussion of the creation of these various agencies and these various policies, most of which I opposed. I even opposed the creation of the O. P. A. I believed then, and I believe now, that if we had followed the same policy we followed during the last World War we would not have had all the embarrassing and harassing situations that have grown up in every nook and corner of the country, and that today we would have more unity and less confusion.

But the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in attributing all the ills to these various agencies overlooked the fact that in 1921 when his party had a majority of 169 members in this House and 23 in the Senate they imposed the highest protective tariff law ever known up to that time, in the history of mankind. It paralyzed agriculture to such an extent that it drove those sections of the country that must compete with the rest of the world into a state of bankruptcy to begin with. It provoked on the part of Great Britain the Beaverbrook tariff, sponsored, fostered, and pushed by Lord Beaverbrook who has just been appointed Ambassador to Russia, that virtually killed our trade with that country.

What was the result of those tariff policies? You had a tariff of 42 cents a bushel on wheat when we shipped out more wheat than we were shipping in and when wheat was 10 cents a bushel higher in Winnipeg, Canada, than it was in Minneapolis, Minn., just across the line. If you are going back to those paralyzing policies, under which the world became a barbed-wire entanglement of tariff barriers, behind which world trade became stagnant and world commerce became paralyzed, then I say that our struggles will have been in vain. It was only a short time after the passage of the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act until almost every country in the world retaliated against us. They first created the United States of Europe, consisting of some 23 nations. That was before Hitler and Mussolini broke out. They not only put on retaliatory tariffs, but they put on quotas, license requirements, and inspection fees, and then required that when you shipped American grain into those countries you had to mix 25 percent American grain with 75 percent native grain, making it virtually impossible for us to do business with the rest of the world.

When Mr. Hoover was elected in 1928, the situation was not improved. Let me say here that I have great admiration for Herbert Hoover as a man and as an American. I would not say anything to detract from his good name. However, he had never served in either House of Congress and seemed to take advice from someone on the outside who did not understand the cause of our troubles. Somebody talked him into advocating raising the tariff and making the statement that we were going to supply the rest of the world with manufactured goods.

Then Congress proceeded to pass the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, adding another load that broke the camel's back, and we had the crash of 1929 that continued until 1932. I will admit that the program that was adopted to try to cure it was wrong. We should have put recovery ahead of reform. That is what I wanted to do. I was coauthor of the Thomas-Rankin bill to give the President the power to issue $3,000,000,000 in currency against the gold we had. We had ample gold, and still have. As a matter of fact, we had practically 50 percent of the world supply of monetary gold. If he had issued $3,000,000,000 in currency against that gold and put it into circulation, then all these attempts to reform human nature, reverse the law of supply and demand and change or abolish our economic system would not have been necessary.

The country would have recovered its prosperity almost overnight.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to the gentleman that in the first place I do not defend a great many of the things that have been done heretofore. The gentleman asked for a specific remedy. Why do we not let the Commodity Credit Corporation proceed with the authority they had in the first instance when created in 1933 to make loans to farmers so that they could hold their stuff, and let it go at that, instead of trying to inject a subsidy program at this time that will cost additional billions of borrowed money?

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois that I took a good deal of abuse here because I opposed the bill that provided for killing pigs and plowing up cotton. Nothing ever hurt me worse than when I saw them go into my own field and plow up cotton that was already matured and open; because I realized that we were flying in the face of the economic laws, the laws of nature, and the laws of God. I have never been in favor of destroying anything in order to try to boost the price.

Here are two philosophies: First there is the philosophy of abundance, that has been preached to us by wise men since Biblical times, even by Moses himself. All through Holy Writ and down through the ages of history you will find that wise men have advocated the philosophy of abundance. On the other hand, you have the philosophy of scarcity, that has been advocated by a little selfish group—and I must say to the gentleman from Illinois that your high protective tariff advocates fall within that category—the philosophy of squeezing production, squeezing supply, in order to raise prices, and benefit certain individuals or certain interests.

That is the line of demarcation today. On one side of it you have regimentation and scarcity; on the other side you have freedom and abundance.

Talk about the "four freedoms." One commentator said the other night that every convict in the penitentiary in his State had the "four freedoms." He had freedom from fear, because, he said, no matter how badly his enemies hated him they could not get in there to do anything to him. You know, the penitentiary sometimes is a great storm cellar for certain individuals.

He said the convict had freedom from want, because he could get all he wanted to eat and all he needed to wear. He said he had freedom of speech. He could say anything he pleased and nobody paid any attention to him. He said he had freedom of worship. He could pray to any God he wanted to, worship in any religion, and pray just as loudly and just as long as he pleased, and that he had a chaplain to assist him and a Bible to go by.

But the fifth freedom, the freedom to work, the freedom to conduct your own affairs, liberty if you please, is the freedom that Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Patrick Henry, and Alexander Hamilton had in mind.

Whenever you impose a restriction, whether through a high protective tariff or the O. P. A., that unnecessarily cuts down production or distribution and imposes a policy of scarcity, on a nation of abundance, then you depart from those fundamental principles upon which this Nation must stand if it is to continue to be a great leader among the countries of mankind.

ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER—RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Now I want to talk to you just a moment about the greatest economic issue this country has ever seen, as far as the masses of our people are concerned, and that is the power issue. I read all the reports from Mackinac. Of course, I was familiar with the record of One World Willkie, the one-time fashion plate of the Power Trust, who now presumes to be a second Lincoln. I was familiar with his record, because I had fought him up and down the Tennessee Valley, and throughout north Mississippi, and especially in my own district, just as I have fought in the Electric Bond & Share up and down the Columbia River.

I know that we are moving into an electric age. I know that it is the greatest economic issue confronting the American people. Yet you had 19 Republican Governors at the Mackinac conference. The people of the States over which those Governors preside were overcharged for their electricity in 1942 amounts ranging from $185,000,000 in New York down to $3,534,665 a year in the State of Vermont. I will put the complete figures in the RECORD and name

them by States and name the Governor of each State.

CALIFORNIA

The State of California was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Earl Warren.

In 1942 the people of the State of California were overcharged for their electric lights and power $45,853,921, according to the T. V. A. rates; and $61,700,088, according to the Ontario rates.

COLORADO

The State of Colorado was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. John Vivian.

In 1942 the people of the State of Colorado were overcharged for their electric lights and power $10,032,575, according to the T. V. A. rates; and $11,493,451, according to the Ontario rates.

CONNECTICUT

The State of Connecticut was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Raymond Baldwin.

In 1942 the people of the State of Connecticut were overcharged for their electric lights and power $24,868,268, according to the T. V. A. rates; and $28,442,103, according to the Ontario rates.

DELAWARE

The State of Delaware was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Walter Bacon.

In 1942 the people of the State of Delaware were overcharged for their electric lights and power $3,116,365, according to the T. V. A. rates; and $3,565,713, according to the Ontario rates.

IDAHO

The State of Idaho was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. C. A. Bottolfsen.

In 1942 the people of the State of Idaho were overcharged for their electric lights and power $4,548,908, according to the T. V. A. rates; and $5,465,659, according to the Ontario rates.

ILLINOIS

The State of Illinois was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Dwight Green.

In 1942 the people of the State of Illinois were overcharged for their electric lights and power $92,319,678, according to the T. V. A. rates; and $105,274,784, according to the Ontario rates.

IOWA

The State of Iowa was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Bourke Hickenlooper.

In 1942 the people of the State of Iowa were overcharged for their electric lights and power $20,999,241, according to the T. V. A. rates; and $24,104,248, according to the Ontario rates.

MAINE

The State of Maine was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Sumner Sewall.

In 1942 the people of the State of Maine were overcharged for their electric lights and power $8,500,739, according to the T. V. A. rates; and $9,694,372, according to the Ontario rates.

MASSACHUSETTS

The State of Massachusetts was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Leverett Saltonstall.

In 1942 the people of the State of Massachusetts were overcharged for their electric lights and power $56,630,318, according to the T. V. A. rates; and $63,566,574, according to the Ontario rates.

MICHIGAN

The State of Michigan was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Harry Kelly.

In 1942 the people of Michigan were overcharged for their electric lights and power $57,607,112, according to the T. V. A. rates; and $69,348,138, according to the Ontario rates.

MINNESOTA

The State of Minnesota was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Edward Thye.

In 1942 the people of the State of Minnesota were overcharged for their electric lights and power $24,337,522, according to the T. V. A. rates; and $28,274,784, according to the Ontario rates.

MISSOURI

The State of Missouri was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. F. C. Donnell.

In 1942 the people of the State of Missouri were overcharged for their electric lights and power $27,230,943, according to the T. V. A. rates; and $32,175,217, according to the Ontario rates.

MONTANA

The State of Montana was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Sam Ford.

In 1942 the people of the State of Montana were overcharged for their electric lights and power $4,989,702, according to the T. V. A. rates; and $6,044,851, according to the Ontario rates.

NEBRASKA

The State of Nebraska was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Dwight Griswold.

In 1942 the people of the State of Nebraska were overcharged for their electric lights and power $8,515,120, according to the T. V. A. rates, and $9,993,975, according to the Ontario rates.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

The State of New Hampshire was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Robert Blood.

In 1942 the people of the State of New Hampshire were overcharged for their electric lights and power $5,825,127, according to the T. V. A. rates, and $6,623,623, according to the Ontario rates.

NEW YORK

The State of New York was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey.

In 1942 the people of the State of New York were overcharged for their electric lights and power $185,460,625, according to the T. V. A. rates, and $206,608,500, according to the Ontario rates.

OHIO

The State of Ohio was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. John W. Bricker.

In 1942 the people of the State of Ohio were overcharged for their electric lights and power $69,270,721, according to the T. V. A. rates, and $82,776,491, according to the Ontario rates.

OREGON

The State of Oregon was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Earl Snell.

In 1942 the people of the State of Oregon were overcharged for their electric lights and power $7,127,731, according to the T. V. A. rates, and $9,605,692 according to the Ontario rates.

PENNSYLVANIA

The State of Pennsylvania was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Edward Martin.

In 1942 the people of the State of Pennsylvania were overcharged for their electric lights and power $95,175,358 according to the T. V. A. rates, and $112,773,228 according to the Ontario rates.

SOUTH DAKOTA

The State of South Dakota was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. M. Q. Sharpe.

In 1942 the people of the State of South Dakota were overcharged for their electric lights and power $4,191,208 according to the T. V. A. rates, and $4,652,372 according to the Ontario rates.

VERMONT

The State of Vermont was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. William Willis.

In 1942 the people of the State of Vermont were overcharged for their electric lights and power $3,534,665 according to the T. V. A. rates, and $4,051,758 according to the Ontario rates.

WISCONSIN

The State of Wisconsin was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Andrew Goodland.

In 1942 the people of the State of Wisconsin were overcharged for their electric lights and power $29,477,511, according to the T. V. A. rates; and $34,147,079, according to the Ontario rates.

CONCLUSION

What do these Governors propose for the relief of these overburdened power consumers in their respective States?

What does the Republican Party as a whole propose to do?

These are questions that must be answered unless the Mackinac conference is to go down in history as the Mackinac black-out.

Every State in this Union is financially better off than is the Federal Government. There is not a man here who will rise to deny that statement. These Governors all boast that their States are solvent, that they have money in the treasury. Many of them do not owe a dollar. Yet, not a one of those Governors raised his voice, as far as I have ever been able to find, in the interests of the power consumers of their own States, and not one of them has offered to aid in this great program of rural electrification.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I certainly will; and if the gentleman can point out one of these Governors who made any statement on

the power question, I certainly would be glad to have his name.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to my friend from Mississippi that there really was no occasion to say anything particular, for this reason.

Mr. RANKIN. They talked about everything else, pertaining to the farmers.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman wants the facts?

Mr. RANKIN. All right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There was one general statement on foreign policy. There was a general statement on domestic policy. It was left to the various subcommittees that were created to spell out the various items for the agenda of those various subcommittees.

Mr. RANKIN. In those various reports that I read—and they were put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD here—you discussed everything pertaining to the farmer except the one thing in which he is most vitally interested, and that is rural electrification. I am not quarreling with the gentleman from Illinois, for he is not a governor; but I want to get him straight before he gets too far off the track.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I just want to make clear that there was a statement to the general effect that they wanted to preserve the freedom of the American farmer and supply him with the instrumentalities that are necessary to a decent living and effective production. It was not the purpose of that council to go any further than that. The specific recommendation will be made at some subsequent time.

Mr. RANKIN. If their statements on these issues are as innocuous or as silent in the future, they might as well not go to the farmers of the country, because those farmers are more interested in rural electrification than in anything else that has been advocated in your day and mine.

When first I came to Congress, back in those glorious days when the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act was levying a tax on everything the farmer bought, from the swaddling clothes of infancy to the lining of the coffin in which old age was laid away, during those boom days of alleged Harding-Coolidge prosperity, the American people were using 40,000,000,000 kilowatts of electricity a year. This year, 1943, they will use 200,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, or five times as much. My prediction is that unless some selfish interests get control and continue to strangle the American people with exorbitant rates, within 10 years after the close of this war they will be using 500,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. We have 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of annual production of undeveloped water power now going to waste, flowing wanton to the sea, for which we get absolutely nothing. We could harness that water power, give the people the benefit of it, and make it pay for its development in a generation.

I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that I am not seeking personal credit. Some people have exerted themselves very much to keep me from getting credit even for my coauthorship of the act creating the Tennessee Valley Authority. I noticed the other day a great deal of publicity about who was responsible for raising the soldiers' pay to $50 a month. Everybody in the House, and all the soldiers, know that I not only introduced that amendment but stayed with it and fought it through. I started the rural electrification fight in my own district, in my home county. We worked out a program that has been adopted and spread to the rest of the country. These cooperative associations are independent; they are not subject to control by any Federal agency. They are controlled by the farmers themselves. In 1935, 2 years after I started this rural electrification program, we had only 10 percent of our farms electrified—and they were largely suburban farms, near town. Germany had 90 percent, Sweden and Norway had 90 percent, France and Italy had 94 percent, Holland and Switzerland had 100 percent of their farms electrified at that time, and even Japan had 90 percent of her farms electrified. New Zealand, a far-away, new, and sparsely settled country, had 65 percent of her farms electrified. After 8 years of hard struggle in which we have been joined by farmers, Democrats, Republicans, and independents in every State in this Union, our program has been carried on without regard to party politics, and we have raised the percentage of American farms electrified from 10 percent to 38 percent.

If we are going to have independent farmers in the years to come, if we are going to have farmers who are to enjoy the comforts and conveniences of modern life, everything from electric lights to electric irons, electric fans, radios, vacuum cleaners, washing machines, refrigerators, water pumps, milking machines and cold-storage facilities, and all the other conveniences that electricity will bring, I submit we are going to have to have a more pronounced and positive policy than I found in the reports of the Mackinac conference.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a speech made by Mr. Bruce K. Brown.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by Hon. Josephus Daniels on September 26 entitled "Congress and the Peace."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WORLD-WIDE AVIATION

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. ROGERS] has requested that this telegram from Donald W. Douglas, of the Douglas Aircraft Co., which is in his congressional district, be placed in the RECORD as an extension of remarks. With the permission of the House, I shall read the telegram at this time:

SANTA MONICA, CALIF, *September 21, 1943.*

S. J. SOLOMON,

Chairman, Airlines Committee for United States Air Policy,

Washington, D. C.:

You have my permission to release contents of my letter September 13 which read as follows:

"I have studied with great interest the declaration of policy of world-wide aviation as advocated by the 16 signatory air lines. It is my firm belief that the basic policy involving free competition under reasonable governmental regulation will be necessary to insure the development of a sound and efficient post-war foreign air-line system. I pledge my active support to the over-all effort now being put forth to assure American supremacy in international air-line operation through the American principle of competition."

DONALD W. DOUGLAS,

Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this telegram may be included in the Appendix as the extension of remarks of the gentleman from California, Mr. WILL ROGERS, JR.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. VURSELL was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BURCH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. BLAND), indefinitely, on account of illness in family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 5, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, October 5, 1943, at 11 a. m., to begin hearings on projects being considered for inclusion in an omnibus river and harbor bill.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold public hearings at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, October 6, 1943, on H. R. 2701 and private bills.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on Thursday, October 7, 1943, on general bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct further hearings on H. R. 2857, a bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, at 10

a. m., on Monday, October 11, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

The Committee on Pensions will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 12, 1943,, at 10 a. m.

At that time consideration will be given to the following bills:

H. R. 2350. A bill to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents.

H. R. 2784. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, to certain maimed soldiers, to certain widows, minor children, and helpless children of such soldiers and sailors, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1926.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 12, 1943, at 10 a. m.

At that time consideration will be given to the following bills:

H. R. 3257. A bill to amend subtitle—insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The purposes of the bill is to affirm and clarify the authority of the W. S. A. to agree to a waiver of the statute of limitations in connection with claims arising from insurance agreements in case of missing vessels, in order to provide for prompt settlement of both marine risks and war risks involved.

H. R. 3258. A bill to prevent double recovery on claims under section 1 (a) of Pulic Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to seamen employed by the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to limit the possibility of double or overlapping recovery on account of death or injury of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the W. S. A. The possibility of such overlapping recovery arises in cases of seamen who are entitled to sue under the law of the United States in case of death or injury and may also be entitled to sue under foreign law on account of the same casualty.

H. R. 3259. A bill to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to exclude from consideration for the purposes of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, services of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the U. S. A. on foreign-flag vessels or contracted for and performed wholly outside the United States, so that the coverage for such benefits for seamen employees of the W. S. A. shall be in line with the coverage in case of similar services by seamen employed by private shipping operators.

H. R. 3260. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for requisition or purchase of vessels owned by subsidiaries of American corporations.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the requisition or purchase under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, of vessels owned by American concerns through foreign subsidiaries but which are not owned by United States citizens within the terms of the Merchant Marine Act and which are not idle foreign vessels within the terms of the act of June 6, 1941—Public, No. 101, Seventy-seventh Congress.

H. R. 3261. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is, by amending Public Law 44, Seventy-eighth Congress, to authorize the return of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less which are owned by the United States under the procedure of Public Law 44 for the return to private ownership of vessels to which the United States has title which are no longer needed in the war effort.

H. R. 3262. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to expressly authorize the waiver of recovery of seamen's insurance payments by the W. S. A. particularly in cases where insurance has been paid to beneficiaries on the assumption that the missing seamen were dead, but later are found to be alive. The bill follows a similar provision with respect to recovery of benefits paid by the Veterans' Administration.

House Joint Resolution 158. Joint resolution to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The purpose of the resolution is to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy similar to that provided for the United States Coast Guard Academy.

House Joint Resolution 161. Joint resolution to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities.

The purpose of the resolution is to authorize the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration to pay cash awards for suggestions received from employees to increase efficiency or improve the functioning of the agencies.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m. on H. R. 3334, to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

775. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims which have been submitted by the Treasury Department and requires an appropriation for their payment, amounting to $84,991.83 (H. Doc. No. 312); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

776. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a record of judgments rendered against the Government by the United States district courts as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which requires an appropriation of $3,178.83 together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (H. Doc. No. 313); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

777. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of vessels of the Navy, in the sum of $12,997.86, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of December 28, 1922 (34 U. S. C. 599), and which require an appropriation for their payment (H. Doc. No. 314); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

778. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the War Manpower Commission of the Office of Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $17,043,000 (H. Doc. No. 315); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

779. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting four supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, amounting to $17,546,700 (H. Doc. No. 316); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

780. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for payment of a certain claim allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to $2,880.82, as covered by a certificate of settlement, the number of which is shown in the first column of the attached schedule (H. Doc. No. 317); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

781. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Federal Security Agency to pay a claim for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of a vessel of the Public Health Service, in the sum of $60, which has been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of June 15, 1936 (14 U. S. C. 71), and which requires an appropriation for payment (H. Doc. No. 318); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

782. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting records of judgments rendered against the Government by the United States district courts as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which require an appropriation of $10,705.19 together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (H. Doc. No. 319); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

783. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting four supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for the Department of Commerce (Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics), amounting to $3,081,000 (H. Doc. No. 320); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

784. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supple-

mental estimates of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $4,427,550 (H. Doc. No. 321); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

785. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a schedule of claims amounting to $517,126.42, allowed by the General Accounting Office, as covered by certificates of settlement the numbers of which are shown in the first column of said schedule under appropriations, the balances of which have been carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874 (31 U. S. C. 713), and for the services of the several departments and independent establishments (H. Doc. No. 322); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

786. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Department of Justice to pay claims for damages to privately owned property in the sum of $253.58 which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of March 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1184), and which requires an appropriation for its payment (H. Doc. No. 323); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

787. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of a vessel of the United States Coast Guard, in the sum of $3,061.09, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of June 15, 1936 (14 U. S. C. 71), and which require an appropriation for payment (H. Doc. No. 324); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

788. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations submitted by the several executive departments and independent establishments to pay claims for damages to privately owned property, in the sum of $22,622.70, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of December 28, 1922 (31 U. S. C. 215), and which require appropriations for their payment (H. Doc. No. 325); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

789. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Goshute Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

790. A letter from the Chairman, War Shipping Administration and United States Maritime Commission, transmitting quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for the period ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

791. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report of determinations made by him during the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944 as to the numbers of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the executive departments and agencies; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

792. A letter from the Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a form setting forth information in response to questions Nos. 1 and 5, in accordance with instructions in Bureau of the Budget Circular No. 421 of May 31, 1943, for the use of the Bureau in determining the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics during the period October 1, 1943, to December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

793. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting copy of the estimate of personnel requirements of the United States Tariff Commission for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

794. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for The National Archives for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

795. A letter from William H. McReynolds, administrative assistant to the President, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements of the Liaison Office for Personnel Management for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

796. A letter from the Commissioner of the Budget, transmitting the quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for the Office of Budget and Administrative Planning, Migratory Bird, and Expenses of Loans, supplementing the estimates sent under date of September 28, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

797. A letter from the Chairman, War Manpower Commission, transmitting Bureau of the Budget Forms No. 80–R001.1 for the War Manpower Commission, exclusive of the Bureau of Selective Service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

798. A letter from Frank K. Sanderson, administrative officer, the White House, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the White House office; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

799. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting an estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

800. A letter from the Administrator, National Housing Agency, transmitting copies of supplemental materials which were presented to the Bureau of the Budget in support of requests for personnel needs during the first quarter of fiscal 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

801. A letter from the Director, Office of Censorship, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of Censorship for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

802. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements of the National Labor Relations Board for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

803. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Strategic Services, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of Strategic Services; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 3374. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey, on behalf of the United States, to Jack Henry Post, No. 1 of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building, known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building, located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage Townsite, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana:

H. R. 3375. A bill to support the price of cotton at 40 cents per pound; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3376. A bill to provide that during the present war all persons in the armed forces shall have in force national service life insurance in the amount of $5,000 without the payment of premiums, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3377. A bill to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from $40 to $50 per month, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 3378. A bill to authorize the purchase of certain lands for addition to the Navajo Indian Reservation in New Mexico; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 3379. A bill to codify the laws relating to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 3380. A bill to provide for the issuance and award of a Civil Air Patrol Medal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 3381. A bill relating to credits against the victory tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 3382. A bill to enable disabled veterans to accept employment during the war period without deductions from their pensions or compensation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 3383. A bill providing for the refund of penalties paid with respect to marketing excess wheat for the 1941 marketing year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 3384. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept property for the Moores Creek National Military Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 3385. A bill for the relief of Mary Keegan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 3386. A bill for the relief of Robert Caven; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland:

H. R. 3387. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Jason McVay Austin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H. R. 3388. A bill for the relief of John P. Hayes, postmaster at Albany, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 3389. A bill for the relief of William R. Weathers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 3390: A bill for the relief of Mavis Norrine Cothron and for the three children of Mavis Norrine Cothron and the late William Edward Cothron, namely, Norma Lee Cothron, Florence Janet Cothron, and Nina Faye Cothron; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAFOLLETTE:

H. R. 3391. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Judith H. Sedler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 3392. A bill for the relief of Gladys Mary White; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 3393. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred G. Crane; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2640. By Mr. PLOESER: Petition of H. C. Mueller's liquor store and 45 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2641. Also, petition of Emil W. Mueller and 22 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2642. Also, petition of Peter Yanczer and 23 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2643. Also, petition of William J. Hemmen and 23 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2644. Also, petition of George J. Amsler and 24 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2645. Also, petition of Joseph L. Gobbert and 23 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2646. Also, petition of Herman F. Prange and 23 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2647. Also, petition of Paul V. Neidhart and 16 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2648. Also, petition of Edward C. Bolm, Sr., and 22 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2649. Also, petition of Norman Cook and 23 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill, 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2650. Also, petition of John F. Telthorst and 23 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2651. Also, petition of Christanich Anton and 24 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2652. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communications from B. K. Leach, of St. Louis, Mo., Allen K. Swann, of Evansville, and Walter Duncan, Jr., of Mount Vernon, Ill., favoring the immediate passage of House bill 3203, providing for an increase in the price of crude oil in order to stimulate the much-needed production of same; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2653. Also, resolution unanimously adopted by the Rotary Club of Albion, Ill., urging the immediate consideration of House bill 3203, providing for an increase in the price of crude petroleum; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2654. Also, communication from Jarvis Bros. and Marcell, of Decatur, Ill., supporting House bill 3203, in order to stimulate the much-needed production of oil; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2655. Also communication from G. C. Curtis, superintendent of oil conservation of Illinois, urging the adoption of House bill 3203, providing for an increase in the price of crude oil; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2656. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Theodore H. Kefrig of St. Louis, Mo., and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2657. Also, petition of Angelo Stargars and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2658. Also, petition of John William Hoemmeke and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2659. Also, petition of Mary Capstick, of Normandy, Mo., and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2660. Also, petition of employees of Procter & Gamble, St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2261. Also, petition of the United Shoe Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Local 56A, and signed by 124 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2662. Also, petition of Elmer E. Taylor, of St. Louis, Mo., and 45 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2663. Also, petition of Bernard Kauling, of St. Louis, Mo., and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2664. Also, petition of George E. Wilhelm and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2665. Also, petition of Richard S. Lowe, of St. Louis Mo., and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2666. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Mrs. Arthur Neiderbeiser, president, the Ruth Bible class of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Hollidays Cove and Weirton, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2667. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the San Francisco City and County Federation of Women's Clubs, relative to national sugar emergency, and urging Congress to exert full efforts to bring about an announcement by the War Food Administration of an effective program and policy as regards beet sugar, on or before October 1, 1943; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2668. By Mr. DELANEY: Petition of Lewis Nelson, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and 27 petitioners, protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082, or any other legislation having for its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2669. Also, petition of the F. & M. Schaefer Brewing Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., and 154 petitioners, protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082, or any other legislation having for its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2670. By Mr. BUCKLEY: Petition of Martin D. Liss and 69 others, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2671. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of sundry citizens of Pratt, Kans., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who dost overarch our fleeting years with Thine eternity and dost undergird our weakness with Thy strength, at the day's beginning we pause to bow our hearts at this shrine of our spirits. We would silence tense emotions, calm stormy passions, that we may be still and know that Thou art God. Without Thee even our radiant hopes for humanity are like withered leaves—once bright with sunshine which change to brown and crumpled ruins, blown upon a bitter wind.

O God, save us from succumbing to the terrible temptation to be men of lost faith. Help us to see that way madness lies and the surrender of all that gives life worth and loveliness and grace. Join us in spirit to those who in other times that tried men's souls went on believing in beauty and love and God in the midst of ugliness, hatred, and horror. For, as in humility we turn to Thee, we remember that we date this day's deliberations from the lowly cradle of one who died on a cruel cross, mocked, reviled, insulted, outraged; yet that cross of torture sways the future. By its crimson sign may we conquer. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, October 4, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 378) to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 149. An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids;

H. R. 340. An act to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to grant and

convey certain lands to the city of Sitka, Alaska, for street purposes;

H. R. 3029. An act to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damages on the Illinois River, Ill.; and

H. R. 3145. An act to revive and reenact section 9 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved August 26, 1937.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Guffey	Overton
Austin	Gurney	Pepper
Bailey	Hatch	Radcliffe
Ball	Hawkes	Reed
Barbour	Hayden	Revercomb
Barkley	Hill	Reynolds
Brewster	Holman	Robertson
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Burton	Kilgore	Stewart
Bushfield	Langer	Taft
Butler	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Tunnell
Chavez	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Vandenberg
Connally	McNary	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maloney	Wagner
Davis	Maybank	Wallgren
Eastland	Millikin	Walsh
Ellender	Moore	Wheeler
Ferguson	Murdock	Wherry
George	Murray	Wiley
Gerry	Nye	Willis
Gillette	O'Daniel	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Conditions on the West Coast.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has been confined to a Madison hospital since September 13.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent on official appointments.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CONTRACT WITH KLAMATH DRAINAGE DISTRICT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to approve a contract negotiated with the Klamath drainage district and to authorize its execution, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF A DEPARTMENT AND VARIOUS OFFICES

Letters from the Secretary of Labor, the Administrative Officer of the Office of the President, the Acting Director of the Office for Emergency Management, the Director of the Office of War Mobilization, the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, the Administrative Officer of the Office of Defense Transportation, the Chairman of the National War Labor Board, the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, the Director of the Selective Service System, the Director of the Office of Censorship, the Administrator of the National Gallery of Art, and the Archivist of the United States, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective departments and offices for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; and also a letter from the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, submitting, pursuant to law, copies of supplemental materials which were presented to the Bureau of the Budget in support of requests for personnel needs of the agency during the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF VETERANS REGULATION NO. 10—DEFINITION OF LINE OF DUTY AND MISCONDUCT FOR PENSION AND COMPENSATION PURPOSES

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to define line of duty and misconduct for pension and compensation purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National War Labor Board, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 130, the sixth monthly report of the Board for the month of August 1943 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table.

CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO OR MODIFIED BY THE MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of contracts entered into or modified under authority of Public Law 46, Seventy-seventh Congress, for the period beginning July 1, 1943, and ending September 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION UNDER THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT

A letter from the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifth report by the Administration of action taken under section 217 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 498, 77th Cong.) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

PETITION

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of St. Francis, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT—TELEGRAMS FROM KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent that a telegram I have received from Harold J. Lamb, of Ottawa, Kans., in regard to the drafting of fathers be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OTTAWA, KANS., *September 21, 1943.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Draft all single men and married men without children up to age 45 years, but don't break up a half million homes where the children need their fathers for guidance, care, and training. Stop. The homes are the very foundation of our democracy. Stop. Investigate the single and married men without children who are now employed by the bureaus who are under 38 years of age.

HAROLD J. LAMB.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I also present and ask unanimous consent to have appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD a telegram embodying a resolution I have received from the George A. Cunningham Post, No. 295, American Legion, of Cheney, Kans., in regard to the drafting of fathers.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OTTAWA, KANS., *September 21, 1943.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,

Senator, Washington, D. C.:

At a regular meeting of our post the following resolution was adopted:

"*Resolved*, For the immediate benefit of war effort and the future of our country we recommend that all nonessential single and married men without children, of selective service age, now employed in defense plants, Government agencies, and other business, be placed in armed forces before fathers are drafted."

GEORGE A. CUNNINGHAM POST, No. 295,
Cheney, Kans.

LEGISLATION DESIRED BY KANSAS FARMERS' UNION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks and appropriately referred, a letter just received by me from Mr. E. K. Dean, president of the Kansas Division of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, more generally known as the Farmers' Union.

In his letter, Mr. Dean outlines what the Farmers' Union would like to have included in farm legislation by the present session of Congress. The Farmers' Union is one of the great national farm organizations, and its views are entitled to real consideration by the Senate.

I call special attention to what Mr. Dean has to say about the wheat grower and wheat prices. He says the wheat grower is entitled to parity. Congress declared that to be the national policy a decade ago; but now when it would be possible, almost overnight, for wheat to go to parity in the market place, Government itself is holding the price down considerably below parity.

I have been contending all along that wheat should be allowed to go to parity in the market place. Mr. Dean contends

that if wheat is not allowed to rise to parity, then it is the duty of Congress to provide parity payments sufficient to bridge the gap between the held-down market price and parity price.

I invite the attention of the Senate to other points raised by Mr. Dean in his letter.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARMERS EDUCATIONAL AND
COOPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA,
Salina, Kans., September 29, 1943.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Confirming our conversation in your office while I was in Washington and in reply to your request, I am herein setting out the items of major interest to the members of our organization, and we believe to all of agriculture and the Nation as a whole.

It is not my intention to list these in the order of their importance, but to merely call them all to your attention.

In the case of wheat, which as you know is a major source of income to Kansas farmers, I want to state most emphatically, that in the opinion of our members neither the administration nor the Congress has kept faith with wheat farmers. The administration, because they permitted a ceiling to be placed on flour at a level that would not reflect parity price for wheat to the farmer, without including parity payments, which placed wheat in the position of being subject to the whims of Congress for an appropriation for parity payments, to bring the price farmers received to full parity. The Congress lost faith because they failed to correct the position of the administration on flour ceilings and still refused to appropriate the necessary funds to make parity payments which are inevitable in order to reach full parity price under present flour ceilings. Our organization is opposed to the subsidy route to reaching parity price while the market is artificially held below parity by flour ceilings. We are, however, determined to have parity price for wheat farmers, in light of the consideration given all other groups. If the Congress is unable, or unwilling, to bring about a change in flour ceilings that will permit wheat to go to parity price at the market place, then it behooves it to appropriate funds for parity payments.

While we do not agree with those who believe that any raise in flour ceilings would jeopardize the administration hold-the-line program and bring on uncontrolled inflation, we are willing to leave that up to the judgment of the Congress. Our members are fully aware of the inevitable outcome of inflation and also that it is the small farmers who will be hit hardest by the deflation that follows.

We believe also that the Congress should be in a better position to judge and we necessarily are depending on the judgment of Congress.

Wheat is the only major commodity selling below parity price and we are expecting Congress to do something about it. If they don't do something to guarantee the wheat farmers fair and equitable treatment, then the Congress itself will be answerable to the people of this country for any shortage of food brought on by the farmers failing to meet the requested increase in wheat acreage.

Our message to the Congress is, if in your judgment raising flour ceilings to a level that will permit wheat to reach parity at the market place, will not bring on inflation, then immediately take the necessary steps to bring about such a raise.

If the Congress is unwilling to accept the responsibility of forcing a change in the administration policy, then appropriate adequate funds for parity payments. The farmer must not continue to be the goat.

We are opposed to increasing the loan price to 90 percent of parity and leaving flour ceilings at their present level. Such a program would wreck the present marketing system by forcing the entire wheat crop into the hands of Commodity Credit Corporation to be sold back to processors at a loss to C. C. C. Such a course would be necessary because the processor would not be able to pay 90 percent of parity and sell flour under present ceilings. We favor 90 percent of parity loans if flour ceilings are raised to permit wheat to bring parity price in the market.

We believe that crop insurance should be restored. Farmers should not be expected to take all the risk involved in food production. Industry is guaranteed cost-plus on their contracts and farmers should not be expected to accept less.

Farmers are fully aware of the effort being made by the banking interests to curtail, cripple, or do away entirely with the Federal lending agencies that have been set up for the benefit of individual farmers and their cooperatives. They are also aware of the exorbitant interest rates they would be forced to pay if these agencies were discontinued. The story that private lending agencies should be entitled to the business at the same rates of interest and on the same basis Federal agencies handle the business, sounds good, but farmers are too realistic to believe that present service and rates of interest would continue if our farm-credit system were discontinued or placed in the control of people who would render it ineffective.

The farmer and his local co-op feed mixing organization are getting the run around by the large mixers and War Food Administration. The large commercial feed mixers have had almost complete control over the supply of protein ingredients for the past 18 months or more, through a long-established custom of forward selling, which works all right in normal times. We are opposed to this program of forward selling in these times, giving the big mixer control of from 75 to 80 percent of the available supply of protein ingredients and forcing farmers to buy commercial mixed feeds with lower protein content at much higher prices, in order to secure the much-needed protein supplement.

As the Nation's manpower crisis tightens, repeal of all or most of Public Law No. 45 becomes imperative. This self-defeating legislation appropriated $26,000,000 for recruiting, placement and transportation of farm labor—and then in effect froze all farm labor where it was. Instead of mobilizing all farm labor for use whenever and wherever needed, under reasonable wages and working conditions, it has broken the United States into 3,000 little countries with the county agent as a little king, subservient in most instances to the largest farmers in the county. The law provides that no Federal funds may be used to transport farm labor from State to State without approval of the county agent. (No national farm organization will defend this provision.) In practice, this provision, along with the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act (which defers farm men so long as they are engaged in essential farming activities), and State laws against "labor snatching," are being used in combination to immobilize and freeze farm labor in whatever county it happens to be.

Thus we have the scandalous spectacle of farm labor shortages and farm labor surpluses at the same time. While hundreds of thousands of farm-bred families are underemployed at low wages in some parts of the Nation, food is being lost in other parts because of labor shortages. These shortages, aggravated by an act of Congress, have forced us to divert troops and use war prisoners to harvest crops.

Such mishandling of our farm labor resources is equaled only in the continued refusal to equip and assist 1,300,000 undercapitalized and underequipped and therefore underemployed farm families for maximum production on the land they occupy. Together, this wastage of farm manpower makes sense only to those determined to extend control of the Nation's agriculture further and further toward complete monopoly in the hands of commercialized agriculture and banking interests. The purpose is clear. Frozen labor is to be kept plentiful and cheap in some localities and is to be replenished by small farmers and their families driven from their own land to work the land of others.

It should be enough to state that such a program is, of course, contrary to the very purposes for which this war is being fought. But it is also likely to result in declining farm production, rising food prices, and inflation that will strike at the heart of the entire war effort and endanger post-war rehabilitation and the making of a lasting peace.

Not less than $1,000,000,000 in loans should be authorized immediately to provide small farmers with the things they need to get into all-out-war-food production. All-out-war-food production by all farmers can be best achieved by doing a production engineering job, using war-food-production agreements between the Government and farmers. Such agreements should assure to war-food producers the same types of aid and service given industrial war producers, including credit, advance, and progress payments, priorities, and other assistance in getting machinery, fertilizer, feed, seed, labor, and other essentials. The agreement should include crop and war-risk insurance and technical advice and assistance. The soundness of this method has been proved by the F. S. A. record in increasing the war-food production of 463,000 farm families.

We endorse the National Farmers' Union recommendation that adequate funds be appropriated to option land to provide farms for returning veterans while at the same time checking inflation of land prices.

Respectfully yours,
KANSAS FARMERS UNION,
E. K. DEAN, *President.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 759. A bill for the relief of W. I. Dooly; with amendments (Rept. No. 439);

S. 1169. A bill for the relief of Samuel Margolin; with amendments (Rept. No. 440);

H. R. 938. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Robert C. Anderson; without amendment (Rept. No. 441); and

H. R. 2734. A bill for the relief of Kathleen B. Maier; without amendment (Rept. No. 442).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 2886. A bill to provide for the removal of oysters from the waters of York River and Queen Creek, Va., affected by sewage disposal emanating from the construction battalion training camp, at Camp Peary, Va., and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 444).

REPORT ON FUEL SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE WEST (REPT. NO. 443)

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from

Kansas [Mr. REED] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to submit an ad interim report from the Special Committee to Investigate Production, Transportation, and Use of Fuels in Certain Areas West of the Mississippi River, pursuant to Senate Resolution 319, Seventy-seventh Congress, as continued by Senate Resolution 61, Seventy-eighth Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and printed.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

ROBERT E. HANNEGAN

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance I report favorably the nomination of Robert E. Hannegan, of St. Louis, Mo., to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and ask that the report be received as in executive session for the Executive Calendar.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the report made by the Senator from Georgia is simply a report for the calendar?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. Not accompanied with a request for consideration today?

Mr. GEORGE. No; I asked merely that it be received for the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received, as in executive session, and placed on the Executive Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 1414. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the life and services of George Westinghouse; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1415. A bill to provide additional allowances for certain dependents of certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 340. An act to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to grant and convey certain lands to the city of Sitka, Alaska, for street purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 149. An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry-milk solids;

H. R. 3029. An act to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damages on the Illinois River, Ill.; and

H. R. 3145. An act to revive and reenact section 9 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Commerce.

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT—AMENDMENT

Mr. REVERCOMB (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them jointly to the amendment of Mr. TAFT in the nature of a substitute to the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INDUSTRIAL DECENTRALIZATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR McCARRAN

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the remarks of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] at a joint meeting of the Members of the House and Senate held yesterday, October 4, at which more than 50 Members of the House of Representatives determined to aline themselves with an already established group of more than 30 Senators to work for industrial decentralization, with particular stress on the establishment of a new facility for protection of iron and steel in accordance with the policy and in pursuit of the program outlined as of yesterday by the Senator from Nevada.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the body of the RECORD, as follows:

Senator McCARRAN. On behalf of my colleagues of the Senate, I wish to welcome to this meeting the many Members of the House who have come here today. I know that the presence of these House Members is an indication of their community of interest with us, and of their sincerity of purpose in working toward a solution of the problem which we propose to attack. I sincerely hope that out of this meeting may come a degree of organization which shall insure the affirmative cooperation we must have in order to attain our purposes. I refer not only to affirmative cooperation between the two Houses of Congress, but also between the various Members of each House.

Early last July, shortly before the summer recess of the Congress, I addressed a letter to a number of my colleagues in the Senate, calling attention to a particular phase of this problem—namely, the desirability of decentralizing heavy industry (perhaps I should say recentralizing heavy industry), especially through establishment of new or expanded facilities for production of iron and steel, in areas outside the few acknowledged steel centers of this country.

As I pointed out in the letter to my colleagues, known coal deposits are to be found in 32 of the 48 States, while iron ore, in usable quantity and quality, is known to exist in 34 States. Twenty-seven States have both coal and iron ore. Thirteen of these 27 States have some iron or steel production. Fourteen of those 27 States have no iron or steel production whatsoever. On the other hand, seven of the States which now produce iron or steel, lack, as a part of their natural resources, either coal or iron ore. States which now produce iron or steel in any quantity are: Alabama, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, Utah, Virginia, and Washington. As we all know, many of those States produce so little iron or steel that their total contribution to the national output is hardly a drop in the bucket. But there is no reason why those States whose production now is so small should not, as a result of the coordinated program which we hope to undertake, achieve a substantial expansion of this industry, so as to attain that place in the national picture which should be theirs on the basis of their natural resources.

States which have both iron ore and natural coal deposits in usable quantity and quality, but which produce no iron or steel, include Arizona, Arkansas, Idaho, Iowa, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, West Virginia, and Wyoming. There is no compelling immutable reason why any one or all of those States should not have such facilities for iron and steel production as their natural resources justify.

One of the important problems which should engage the attention of the country, and of the Congress, not only in relation to the post-war period, but now, while the war is in progress, because it is an important factor in the conduct of that war, is the problem of a proper use of our natural resources.

Particularly disturbing, to many of us in the Senate, has been the fact that much of this country's expansion for war production has ignored such basic factors as the location of resources, and has followed what appears to have been the line of least resistance; that is, augmentation and expansion of facilities already in existence; building plant upon plant to create a sort of inverted pyramid of production facilities. This policy has not only prevented the country from reaching its maximum potentialities in various lines of production, but also has contributed greatly to transportation bottlenecks.

Recently, a high official of our Government was praised, in an article in a national magazine, because, among other reasons, on one occasion he ordered a special train to rush a shipment of steel to a shipyard which needed it. In my view, if you have a shipyard here, which needs steel in a hurry, and the nearest steel is over there, any 10-year-old child can figure out that it would be a good idea to take the steel to the shipyard; and if he had authority to order a special train, he would probably order it. What I am greatly concerned about is the situation under which it is necessary to transport steel from one end of the country to the other in order to put that steel into a ship, when all the resources necessary for producing steel are available within a relatively short distance of the shipyard.

It should be understood, and I think you will all agree, that no one here has any desire to move a blast furnace from Pittsburgh, or a rolling mill from Gary, to any other part of the country. We need today all the steel production facilities we have, and more; and we shall need far more tomorrow. The decentralization—or recentralization—which we hope to achieve, is not through moving anything, but through the creation of new production facilities, or the substantial expansion of facilities which are now far less than those amply justified by available resources.

Iron has been spoken of as the mother of metals. This is a most apt description. While the age of light metals may be well on its way, there is no question about the fact that today, and for some years to come,

at least, our industrial economy will be supported on pillars of steel and iron. Moreover, we may safely rest assured that when the light-metal age comes upon us, the policies which we have fixed and maintained with regard to the production of iron and steel will at least mold, if not control, our policies with regard to the production and use of the light metals.

Heavy industry follows iron and steel production, to a large extent. That is one of the reasons why the development of heavy industry has been seriously retarded in the central part of the United States, along the great waterway of the Mississippi and its tributaries, in many portions of the South, of the Southwest, of the Middle West, and of the Northwest, as well as in the north central portion of the country and on the Pacific coast.

The subject of industrial recentralization is so big that it is obviously impossible to define rigidly the limits within which this group should act, and the boundaries of the matters which we as a group may properly consider. If we attempt such definitions, we shall most certainly find ourselves at some later date foreclosed by our own definition from following some line of investigation or some line of action necessary to the advancement of our aims.

Let me pursue this thought a little further. As I have already pointed out, decentralization of iron and steel production facilities will carry with it a basic change in our internal economy. Where new facilities for the production of iron and steel are set up, new heavy industries will be established. Where new heavy industries are established, other industries will follow. Establishment of new industries will change our transportation needs, and will affect the demand for fuel and for electric power. It must be apparent, on the basis of only a moment's thought, that a complete consideration of this question is going to involve, eventually, the power policy of this country; that it is going to involve the question of the conservation and the proper use of our oil reserves; that it is going to involve most vitally the whole problem of transportation, in all its phases, including the problem of freight rates.

Many other branch avenues, and side paths, will have to be explored before we reach the end of this matter; and I shall not be surprised if we find ourselves on occasion going down blind alleys or up dead-end streets.

It is not necessary, however, to discuss all of these ramifications at this time. For the moment, let us confine our consideration to the matter of iron and steel.

This is a problem of great concern to all of us who represent States in which either iron or coal deposits are known to exist. It is a problem which affects States producing natural gas, because natural gas, as we know, can be used in the reduction of iron ore. It is a problem which affects States having large hydroelectric developments or possibilities for such developments, because the possibility of reducing iron ore with the use of electricity is an established fact.

Now, some progress has been made, here and there, along the lines of developing additional facilities for iron and steel production, but while individual Senators and individual Members of the House have on occasion won significant benefits for certain States or certain areas, the problem has not before now been approached, as I believe it should be approached, on a truly national basis. If we will pool our interests in this regard, and deal with this question cooperatively, and in the light of the national interest first, we can greatly serve that national interest and at the same time achieve far more for the specific areas which we represent than any of us could hope to achieve through single-handed action.

It is my hope that every Member of the Senate, and every Member of the House, who joins in this program will consider himself pledged, not to mere lip service, but to active participation in the fight which must be waged, and which we intend to wage.

We are here to do more than organize just another pressure group. Undoubtedly, we can accomplish many things just by standing together on issues affecting this question; but we cannot hope to achieve the larger ends toward which we aspire by mere static force, whatever we may think that our power and prestige may be worth. We can only hope to achieve those larger ends by affirmative and aggressive action. Some of the lines which such action should follow will occur to you immediately; some of them may become apparent only as we progress. Let me mention briefly some of the lines of action which I believe should be followed.

One need of this group will be the power to pursue such inquiries as seem necessary, without restriction; and to pursue those inquiries as a matter of absolute right, without having to seek courtesies or favors from any agency of government, or from any private interest. For this purpose, I propose shortly to introduce a resolution for establishment of a special committee of the Senate to deal with this problem. Such a committee will have the power to call witnesses from within or without the Government, to subpena records, and to hold public hearings wherever and whenever such hearings are indicated as desirable. Through such a committee, also, funds will be available for employing such expert services as may be necessary in connection with such new lines of investigation as it is found desirable to pursue. I believe the Senate of the United States will have no hesitation in authorizing such a committee, for the importance of this problem, and a proper solution of it, to the country as a whole, stands unquestioned.

Another item for legislative action is the provision of additional funds to supplement the $2,000,000 voted by the present session of the Congress for subsurface mineral exploration, particularly for iron and steel. Two million dollars is a lot of money if you have it all in one pile, but when you split it up among the 48 States, no one State can hope to receive an allocation sufficiently large to do an adequate job of charting its mineral deposits. I have no exact thought at this moment as to the additional amount which should be provided for this purpose, but I do know that $2,000,000 is a long way short of being enough.

In this connection, I should like to point out the fundamental necessity of combining with this project for subsurface exploration, a project for the development and discovery of the best ways for utilizing the mineral deposits which are found to exist. It is not enough for us to know what lies beneath the surface of our mountains and our valleys. We must know also how to use it to the best advantage. We can spend millions of dollars on exploration alone, and when we conclude our labors we shall know, perhaps, what lies beneath the soil of every quarter section in every county in every State of this Nation. If we do not know what to do with the wealth we shall then have charted, what will it profit us? Our ultimate aim should be not merely an inventory of our mineral resources, but a comprehensive study of how the thousands of individual mineral deposits which compose those resources are related one to another, and what processes are best adapted to effective utilization of those resources.

One of the things we must seek, concretely, is a streamlining of the existing governmental agencies which deal with this overall problem, either a streamlining of such agencies, or an abolition of one or more of them. The Bureau of Mines, for instance, if that is to be deemed the proper agency for continuing the program of subsurface explorations, and for carrying out an expanded program along that line, should be imbued with the spirit which I believe is manifested by this group; should regard its activities not as mere fact-finding research, but as a crusade for the proper industrial development of this Nation, and for a proper utilization of its mineral resources.

The reclamation and power policies of the Interior Department should be reappraised, and should be constantly watched and guided, in the light of the need for the industrial recentralization which we seek.

Similarly, the policies and activities of the National Petrolcum Administration for War should be overhauled so as to include a proper provision for the days that are to come.

It is not enough, along any of these lines, to limit our thinking to the day after tomorrow; we must think, and these agencies must be taught to think, in terms of the year after next, and the decade after next.

I believe this group should work aggressively for the establishment of a governmental agency to deal exclusively and directly with the mining interests and mining problems of this country; and I believe that this agency should be, if possible, independent of control by existing agencies of the Government. Certainly, it should have no connection with the War Production Board. I have in the past advocated, as have numerous other Senators, establishment within the War Production Board, of a special mining division to serve this purpose. We have been promised repeatedly that such a division would be established. The promises have not been kept. I say to you now I am glad that those promises were not kept, because I am satisfied today that such a division could not function properly, could not serve its purpose, under the control of the War Production Board and under the control of those who presently administer that Board.

I am frank to say I have lost all patience with the War Production Board and with most of its policies and practices, and I have lost nearly all the confidence I ever had in the ability of that Board to deal effectively with any problem under the sun.

I doubt if there is a Senator present, or a Member of the House, who has not had some experience with the W. P. B; an experience perhaps enlightening but certainly disillusioning. The W. P. B. deals today with many of the most important problems affecting our national welfare and affecting the conduct of the war. In almost every instance, the W. P. B. deals with those problems from a cramped and prejudiced viewpoint, and often without the vaguest conception of the basic essentials which should enter into any impartial consideration of such problems. While the W. P. B. numbers among its officials many men of outstanding ability, it also has on its rolls, and frequently in positions of importance, men whose ability is open to most serious question. Furthermore, many officials of the W. P. B., though their technical knowledge may be vast, though their experience in the fields of commerce and industry, if not in the field of Government administration, entitles them to some measure of respect, are incapable of discharging their duties properly, because they are hampered by a complete inability to view the many problems entrusted to them from any angle except that of their own experience; an inability to deal with those problems and to formulate policies for dealing with those problems from a viewpoint uncolored by their own interests or by the interests of those with whom they have been associated in private industry.

The W. P. B., if it runs true to form, is going to be a major adversary of this group. We ought to realize what we are up against. We may as well understand here and now that in order to achieve what we seek—and by

that I mean, broadly, the fullest possible development of the natural resources of our several States, in the manner most advantageous to the national welfare—in seeking that end, we are going to run head-on into the W. P. B., or at least into certain officials and certain groups and certain interests within that organization. I hope it will not be this group which gives way.

We must realize that in dedicating ourselves to work for the establishment of facilities for the production of iron and steel, in sections of the country which do not have such facilities, we are charting a course which, if we sail it truly, will mean substantial changes in the economic set-up of this Nation. The importance of these changes will be, perhaps, far beyond our present capacity for visualization. I believe these changes, if made, will greatly benefit the country as a whole, as well as benefitting the individual States which we as Members of Congress represent. I want to see those changes made. But I do not believe we should embark upon the course through which those changes may be produced, without a realization of the broad scope of the results which our actions may have.

We should understand clearly that the course to which we propose to commit ourselves is not one which may be run in a day, or a week, or a month, or a year. There are many things which we can accomplish almost immediately, through concerted action. There are many other things which can be accomplished, if at all, only as a result of long and arduous effort. I believe we should pledge ourselves to continue that effort until our ends have been achieved. And one of those ends should be that, in the final analysis, there shall be no great section of this country which shall not have emerged into economic self-sufficiency.

THE PHENOMENAL GROWTH OF THE NAVY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALSH

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Phenomenal Growth of the Navy," delivered by him at the John Barry celebration, Faneuil Hall, Boston, Mass., September 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FIGHT FOR QUALITY PRODUCTION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TRUMAN

[Mr. WALLGREN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Fight for Quality Production," delivered by Senator TRUMAN at Shenandoah, Iowa, on October 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. PAUL V. McNUTT BEFORE AMERICAN LEGION CONVENTION

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, before the American Legion, at Omaha, Nebr., on September 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY ARCHBISHOP SPELLMAN AT HOLY NAME RALLY, NEW YORK CITY

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Most Rev. Francis J. Spellman, the reverend Catholic archbishop of New York, at a gathering at the Polo Grounds in New York City on October 3, which appears in the Appendix.]

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW REPUBLIC

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Science and Technology," published in the New Republic of September 20, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOBS FOR SOLDIERS AFTER THE WAR

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "When Peace 'Attacks' This Nation," published in the Shreveport, (La.) Times of October 1, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSCRIPTION OF LABOR—LETTER FROM ILLINOIS STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Victor A. Olander, secretary-treasurer of the Illinois State Federation of Labor, on the subject of the conscription of labor, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I shall not discuss the amendment proposed by the bill to the present law, but I shall, if I can, cover the theory of the Selective Service Act as it is reflected in the agitation for the bill.

If I were to take a theme for my remarks, I would take it from one of the sentences uttered in the prayer of our Chaplain this morning, when he prayed that we may be saved from the temptation to succumb to a loss of faith.

Mr. President, the agitation for any amendment to any of the plans which are in the course of being executed would necessarily result in a type of discussion which would not be helpful to the war effort, or helpful to an understanding of the law which controls the Army and the Navy in the recruitment of troops by draft. I do not say that at all in criticism of those who are attempting to improve present conditions by the legal process, by the offering of amendments to the law. No one could have attended the recent hearings of the Committee on Military Affairs without appreciating that all is not well. Indeed, we knew from the beginning that all would not be well. We had had the experience of the last war. We had witnessed the initiation of a great draft. When the present Selective Service Act was introduced, certain individuals attempted merely to reenact the law enacted during the last war, in anticipation of a coming war.

That plan was not followed, but the committees of Congress, and the Congress itself, proceeded to study the selective-service theory, and produced a very much better law than was covered in the measure as it was first introduced.

It probably would do us no harm to be reminded of the fact that not much of what appeared in the bill as it was introduced was enacted into law. The original language was practically all stricken out. In the bill as it was introduced there appeared high-sounding statements, but the committee saw fit to face the issue as it was presented. Therefore it was decided merely "to provide for the common defense by increasing the personnel of the armed forces of the United States and providing for its training."

Then, as a declaration of policy, we moved even into a simpler phase by providing, "That the Congress hereby declares that it is imperative to increase and train the personnel of the armed forces of the United States," and "The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of military training and service should be shared generally in accordance with a fair and just system of selective compulsory military training and service."

Mr. President, I think it does no harm to revert to the ideas Congress had in mind when this act became law, in order to realize the fundamental theory underlying it. It will do no harm to read again, for the benefit of us all, the simple sentences in the joint resolutions which declared that a state of war existed. Let us see what the Congress of the United States pledged at that time in regard to the people of the United States and their property. The three joint resolutions are identical, patently made identical because the problem was a single one when once we got into war. The concluding sentence of each resolution simply reads:

> And to bring the conflict to a successful termination all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

That was the declaration of Congress, Mr. President, and every man and every woman in the United States knows about that declaration. Every American citizen, as well as every person in the country not an American citizen, realized the obligation which was his when once the Congress of the United States passed the joint resolutions.

Mr. President, the fundamental theory of the Selective Service Act is a very simple one, and the provisions of the act were laid out in a simple way. First, the selection should be made by lot. Second, after the technique of lot was used, persons would be called into the service after review by boards composed of their neighbors. The idea was that this should be a thoroughly democratic process. When the original bill was under consideration efforts were made by some of us to provide that there be no class deferments at all, but Congress refused to accept the measure in that simplicity. We started by deferring persons in some classes. The theory underlying the measure was, and I think that should be the theory in the minds of all of us at this time, that every man called would stand before his draft board, and the question of whether he should serve or not should be passed upon by that board; that all things should be taken into consideration when the individual man stood before his board in deciding whether or not he should be selected.

Before the bill became law we had already decided to exempt some classes of persons from service. I think that was a fatal mistake. Only 10 of us in the Senate voted against the first great exemption which was made, but I still think it was a fatal mistake. The first exemption was of those persons who were preparing for the ministry.

Mr. President, to prepare to become a witness for God on earth is to prepare for a high and a holy calling. It is a calling which seems to be thoroughly inconsistent with military service, but it is not, otherwise Christians would never go to war for their country, nor would persons of other faiths. What I am thinking about and what I shall stress in my remarks today is simply this: When once we decided to exempt a given class and to defer a group of persons by class, we immediately brought about the difficult condition which we had attempted to avoid when passing the Selective Service Act. We know that England in the last war prided herself on the fact that she recruited an army by voluntary methods entirely; but, Mr. President, in reality it was not a voluntary method. The worst of all social coercion was used; the worst of all mediums were used to make persons in civilian clothes feel that they should be ashamed. That method was indulged in. It was primarily to overcome such a situation that the Selective Service Act was brought into existence.

Mr. President, we have heard the word "slacker" used on the floor of the Senate during the discussion of the pending bill and the amendments proposed to it. If every boy and every man in the United States registers and takes a chance on being called, the theory is that those who are not called are not slackers. If a man is judged by his neighbors on the draft board to be worthy of exemption, then he should be received in his community without invidious remarks. So, when we deferred a class we brought about a situation which has made it difficult for men and boys to go through with the program of life, because some may say that once America is in war no true-blooded American should seek to avoid the responsibilities of performing his military duty.

Mr. President, in the midst of the discussion of the pending measure last week I saw four men from a seminary in one of the Senate elevators. They were fine young chaps, but they were in clothes that marked them, and I heard someone remark, "Is it not strange that in times such as these men of that age, men of that physical ability, would hide behind an exemption or a deferment."

Mr. President, it would have been very much better had we avoided entirely and in every way class deferment, and left to the local boards the decision as to where a man should serve in the best interest of his country, as was the scheme embodied in the original law. But we classified, we directed, and directives were issued, until now the people of our country sometimes point with the finger of scorn to the young man who has submitted himself to the call, who has submitted himself to the chance of being inducted, but has not been called, and they say, "How is it that the board has overlooked him but has called upon his neighbor?" That is the beginning of the disintegration of morale in a democracy.

Mr. President, all persons of military age can no more serve in the military services than they can fly. We cannot maintain an army of 30,000,000 or 40,000,000 persons. If we had an army of that size it would mean we had the poorest army on earth. All the experience of France in the last war, and all the experience of England in the last war, and our own experience as well, although we are always loath to speak the truth about ourselves, was that too many men were called into the service. We did it in the last war. We would have done it again, because when the first amendment proposing to reduce the age limit was brought before us and when we held hearings on it, the estimate of the size of the Army was made greater than it is today.

Mr. President, the whole theory of selective service was that we would call into being an army containing the right number of men, taking into consideration the whole economic welfare of our country, the war objective, and that we would not do what had been done before, lessen our war efficiency by having more men than we could properly train, more than we could properly house, more than we could transport, and more than we could use in combat.

Much has been said along the line that we should give the general in command complete control, and should let him have what he wants. Of course, that is not the American way, and it never has been done; and no general who is worthy of the name would develop an army in that way.

In the last 3 years we have brought into existence and have developed an army the like of which the world has never seen in all its history. That remark is not an overly optimistic one. Our Army has before it a tremendous task the like of which, I say again, no general staff in all history ever thought of planning for—the carrying on of a war whose battle lines extend some 56,000 miles. No person of whom I have ever heard who may have contemplated even a universal world war could imagine a conflict of the magnitude of that which faces us today.

Furthermore, it is not only the war which we must think of, but it is the peace; because, Mr. President, today things are taking place in the world which should give us more concern about our problems not only of winning the war but of winning the peace. There are factors in the world which are very much larger than even the war factor. Perhaps someone may say that, of course, that statement cannot be true, but it is true. If I should ask any historian to state the outstanding, greatest-of-all resultant growing out of the last war, greater than the war itself, I think he would admit that the Russian revolution presented greater problems than did any other event connected with the war.

Mr. President, if the Russian revolution presented problems in 1919, 1920, and from that time to date, I wonder if we should ever lose sight of the fact that with the termination of the present war and the beginning of peace there will come into the world the simultaneous culmination of the three greatest social, political, and economic revolutions the world has ever known, namely, the Russian, the Indian, and the Chinese, to say nothing of the revolution which is bound to confront Europe as well as America and the other nations of the world in the processes of adjustment. Let it be remembered that more lives were lost after the armistice following the last war than were lost during that war.

Since I began in rather optimistic vein toward the subject of the raising of an army let me point out a further fact in reference to a comparison of the present war with the last war. In the last war we lost more men getting them into the service than were lost as a result of German or other enemy bullets. That has not been the case in the present war, because the law provided a plan for the raising of our Army, and a planned enlargement of our Navy, designed in such a way that manpower would not be wasted through lack of facilities for training and lack of facilities for organizing. Had certain officers of the Army had their way, that would not have been the case. In spite of the fact that the new law was built upon past experience, in spite of the fact that we had gone forward for nearly 2 years with a training program without very much loss of life, due to the fact that there was incorporated in the law a provision that men could not be called until trainers, facilities, housing, uniforms, and equipment were ready for them, on the day after the passage of the joint resolution declaring war there came to us a recommendation from certain quarters that that part of the law be changed. They said, "We cannot wait any longer, we cannot bother with these facilities." Because of that hysteria, a program which would have resulted in chaos was proposed. However, that was stopped. It was stopped by Members of the Senate and the House who had had experience with and in the last war, and who knew that the raising of armies by chaotic and hysterical means is just about the worst possible way of doing it.

So, Mr. President, a few questions were asked by us when we were requested to remove that provision from the law, so that 10,000,000 men could be called overnight. We started asking questions; and I think it is worth while that the people of our country should know about them: "What are you going to do with these men? Where are you going to ship them? Are you going to fight the war here?"

The reply was, "No; they have got to go somewhere else."

Then we asked: "If they go somewhere else, you can send only as many as you have ships to haul. You can send them only when you can send them; and when you do send them, there will be vacant places; and that will be soon enough to take more men, because you cannot train soldiers until you have trained officers."

So, better counsel prevailed; and each time better counsel has prevailed through discussion. I bring out this point, Mr. President, because I am, as every other Member of the Senate is, a thorough believer in the democratic process. By the

democratic process, I simply mean that in America governmental affairs shall be carried on by civil means, instead of by military means. The raising of the Army has gone forward in a democratic way, in a democratic land; and for the most part the people of the United States are proud of their accomplishments and of what the Army and the Navy have done. If that were not so, enlistments would have stopped long ago. If that were not so, we never could have done the revolutionary things we have done, such as putting women into the armed forces.

My plea, Mr. President, is that we do not place restrictions on our men of military age, that we remember that even a married man with dependents likes to serve his country, and is ready to serve his country, if it is his duty to do so, and that all he asks is that there be a review of his condition.

In that relation, I desire to read, and to make a part of my remarks, a resolution adopted by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the State of Utah, at Salt Lake City my home town. I am proud of the fact that the resolution has come from my home town, and am all the prouder that the resolution has been adopted by the junior chamber of commerce of the entire State:

Whereas we, the Utah State Junior Chamber of Commerce, represent a cross section of the young married men of draft age in Utah; and

Whereas we fully realize our responsibilities to our country in this time of war; and

Whereas acts and statements made by misinformed persons have created the false impression that draft-age fathers wish special consideration from the Selective Service System on a dependency basis notwithstanding military requirements: Be it

Resolved by the Utah State Junior Chamber of Commerce in State board meeting assembled this 3d day of October 1943, That we urge the defeat of all legislation which attempts to defer heads of families on the basis of dependency only, and reaffirm the fact that we have been and are ready and willing to answer the call to arms, if and when we are summoned.

UTAH JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
JAY BROCKBANK, *President.*

Mr. President, I believe that the Utah Junior Chamber of Commerce is speaking for practically 100 percent of all the fathers who may be touched, or deferred, or set aside by this proposed amendment to the law, or by any amendment which would bring about deferment by certain classes. Such amendments have been discussed. I do not have to repeat them, and I shall not repeat them, because the discussion has been long.

I wish to say further in relation to the selective service and in connection with the suggestion to put class deferments into the law, that the more of that type of thing we do the more we shall have to do. If, instead of treating each individual on his individual merits, we designate classes, injustice follows. How can anyone say that a 25-year-old father with one child or two children is in such a position that he can serve better than a 26-year-old father with one or two children? There are other factors besides the factor of age, either of the parent or the child. The only persons who can judge those factors are the local draft boards. That is where we should leave the question, as it is under the law today.

When anyone is called to serve his country to the extent of giving up his life, how are we to measure the extent of sacrifice? Who is there to say that it is harder to lose a boy in the finest physical condition than it is to lose a father? Of course, we can multiply to any extent the number of factors which should be taken into consideration, but we cannot do so by law. It is utterly impossible. The cases must be handled on their individual merits, and even then we can never do exact justice. It simply cannot be done.

I do not know who makes the greatest sacrifice. There are other factors besides that of sacrifice. Our country has ever honored the soldiers whom it has called, and it will continue to do so. Our country has taken care of veterans, and it will continue to do so. Our country has taken care of dependents, and it will continue to do so. Last week the Senate passed a bill providing for the care of expectant mothers. The fathers of children, who have left their wives at home, must wonder what the Congress is talking about when it talks about the deferment of fathers. A father who is in the service might well say, "If John Doe is to be deferred because he is a father, I should have been deferred." Why should we draw a foolish distinction, which should never have been made in the regulations, between a post-Pearl-Harbor father and an ante-Pearl-Harbor father? Why did we resort to that kind of refinement in the administration of the law? It was because the administrators of the law themselves forgot the theory of it. The great fundamental on which it rested, we thought, was that, so far as the selective service was concerned, it would always be in the hands of civilians. We thought that a boy should not be a soldier until he had taken the oath. That theory was changed in some way or other, through a clumsy method, a method which has not worked out well, I admit, in spite of the fact that I am here to defend our great accomplishments. When we once decide that all we need to do is to get men into the Army, and forget the fundamental theory underlying the act itself, there follows a break-down in the administration of the act. These distinctions were made, and it was made impossible for a man to stand before his draft board as an individual.

I am not exaggerating, Mr. President. According to the testimony of one of the colonels at the hearing, of every 10 men called throughout the whole country 5 have been rejected. In some sections of the country, of every 10 men called 7 have been rejected since the beginning of the draft, and in other sections only 3 out of 10 have been rejected. We can philosophize on the reasons for it. I think I know the basic reason. It was in those sections of the country where there were high educational and health qualifications that a high percentage was rejected. The most interesting fact of all in relation to these statistics is that enlistments were very much higher in the States in which 7 out of 10 persons were accepted under the draft than they were in the States in which only 3 out of 10 persons were accepted in the draft.

Statistics never tell the whole story. I would not imply that I am telling the whole story, but I am telling a story which should hearten every person who believes in democracy and an equal opportunity for all. It may be said that it was uneconomic to make it possible for 7 out of 10 boys to be accepted in certain States. It may be said that those States were extravagant. No. The loss is all on the other side. The loss is in those communities where only 3 out of 10 were acceptable. There was a terrific loss to the country, to the community, and to the honor of the individuals concerned. The finger of scorn will be pointed in greater degree at civilians in those areas of the United States, whether they deserve it or not, because they will have a larger proportion of civilians.

It was understood that the economic welfare of our country would be a primary consideration in the administration of the draft. Our transportation system, and all the other factors which make it possible for a nation to fight, were to be taken into consideration. The individual was to receive protection, not by exemption, or by class deferment, but by reason of the theory underlying the administration of the draft.

"I am serving my country well," the individual could say when his case had been reviewed by his draft board and he was told to stay where he was. That is the spirit which makes for the feeling in our Nation of universal responsibility, and it is that spirit which makes it possible for our country in 1943, during a period of 1 month, before the war has ceased, to oversubscribe a war loan three times as large as the great Victory loan of the last World War.

Mr. President, there are many things to be considered. There are already 700,000 fathers in the Army. If any one of the suggested amendments had been in the act when they entered the service, and they had been called under the act instead of voluntarily enlisting, they would have been deferred.

Mr. President, how do you think the morale of these men stands? I know how it stands. I know what the morale of a good soldier is. He is not thinking about the debates in Congress. He is not thinking very much about the way the people back home are feeling. He is not a "sorehead." After he has completed his fundamental training, after he has shown his willingness to offer and give his life, and after he has been trained as the soldiers of the United States are trained, there is nothing which can destroy his faith. The testimony of such persons as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who has just come from a visit to our boys who are located in areas abroad, is that their faith has not been destroyed. They know what they are fighting for. They want the war to be over, to be sure, but they are

not going to be concerned about some of the things which disturb us. But, Mr. President, are not the people of our country concerned? Is not the unity in the war effort being interfered with? Is our great boasting about carrying on total war, and every man having a place in it, being challenged when we propose to increase class deferments? Are we not breaking down the greatest democratic institution we have ever thought of for the recruitment of men to carry on war? That institution gives the men who are fighting under it the great fundamental realization that they are in the same class with others, that their duty is one and the same.

It is inevitable, Mr. President, that Congress should be criticized by the people. That is one of the glorious habits which has come down to us since the beginning of representative government. If someone in a group back home says with reference to a Senator or a Representative, "He is there to represent my ideas, but he does not represent them," of course, whether the criticism is just or unjust, it is inevitable and, under democracy, it is proper. I doubt, however, whether the morale of a fighting nation is increased by criticism when criticism is not due. Criticism is always due for the representatives of the people, but it is not always due for the boy who has done his best. We have heard of criticism of persons called by the Army of the United States and assigned to take training work in certain colleges. "They ought to be fighting somewhere," say some persons—an unwise remark. There will always be a tomorrow, there will always be a need for trained leaders, and if we neglect them in this generation, we shall do damage to the next generation. If, for example, we make it impossible to carry on the war next year by enacting unwise legislation which will interfere with the developing war process this year, we do damage to ourselves as well as to the whole country.

Mr. President, I pointed out the other day in regard to the returned soldier that we shall have to take care of him for two reasons: First, for the sake of the soldier himself; second, for the sake of the generation with which he competes. It is hard for us to see that when the time comes to bring back 10,000,000 boys from the armed services and try to integrate them into our economic life we shall be cheating a whole generation of people of their opportunity by thrusting upon them extra competition—competition which is aided, competition which is subsidized, competition which is honored. Those are the inevitable upsetting consequences of war, and all the talk in the world will not overcome them. They are with us. Are we statesmen enough to look at the morrow? Do we know when this war will end? Do we know even about the responsibilities of conquest? Assuming that we shall be successful and that our march goes on and on and on, we shall have obligations to conquered peoples, and if they are not fulfilled, the resultant chaos will be worse than the war itself.

There probably is a magnificent place for the older men in the Army of the United States, a place which even the generals have not yet thought of. Men are being told, "You must be over 38 years of age before you can go to the Government schools which are furnishing training in the administration of occupied areas"; and it is foolishly said, "You must be over 38 years of age because we are not going to take anyone out of the draft for this training." Why not admit that experienced men are needed to administer occupied territories?

If our people allow the Draft Act to be administered without amending it, and without introducing more class deferments, we shall go forward in the future as we have gone forward in the past. Our Army will become stronger instead of weaker. A new officer personnel will develop from experience, and when the time comes for the final crushing of the enemy he can be crushed by an army of veterans.

Mr. President, it was not difficult for persons who were used to thinking about armies, and who had read history, to know that things would not go well with our Army during the first year. The reason, primarily, was that wherever our men fought they had to fight enemies who had been fighting for years, soldiers who were veterans. That situation was our greatest liability. Those veterans showed themselves to be worthy. But wherever the trained boy or the man with some experience has met the enemy, he has demonstrated that the American type of life is such that it can be adapted, and that it can and does develop a soldier more quickly than can be done in any other country.

Mr. President, I have already spoken longer than I had expected to speak. I close with the same plea I made in the beginning, namely, that the Senate of the United States when the votes are cast in regard to the bill and amendments to it be thoughtful about the fundamental principles of the Selective Service Act, and not mar, by an amendment of pure sentimentality, the efficiency and ability to keep our Army strong and make it stronger. It would be a fatal mistake, indeed, if in the Army which has been created there should develop a weak place. Already we have known that our commanding generals like certain types of soldiers better than they do others. That is inevitable. They want divisions in their armies composed of officers and men whom they have known and upon whom they can rely. There will be enough of the unuseful and the nonused when the time of reckoning comes to startle us all. I hope that we will not mar a good law whose execution and administration have produced a great Army by introducing a factor not only of uncertainty but actually a factor of inefficiency.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah a question before he takes his seat. If it is desired to include those who rushed to the altar and began establishing a family, does not the Senator think that the date of the enactment of the Selective Service Act would be a more just date than the date of the attack on Pearl Harbor? The record will show that it was when the Selective Service Act was under consideration and passed in 1940, some 18 months before the 7th day of December 1941, that the marriage rush began. So would not the date of the enactment of the act be a more just date if it is desired to exempt those who may have tried to avoid being selected?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I would not have had any classification of that kind at all if I had had anything to do with administering the act. What right has the Government of the United States to put a stigma upon anyone because he got married at a certain time? Why did we decide that just because a boy and girl married after the 7th of December 1941, that they acted with fraudulent intention?

Mr. President, we have done a foolish thing once, and, whoever is responsible for it cannot escape now the responsibility, but we might do just as foolish a thing if we tried to provide another date.

Mr. ANDREWS. The Senator has expressed my views on that subject. The distinguished Senator from Utah I believe helped to draft the Selective Service Act. Could there be conceived a more democratic and just method of selecting men for the Army and Navy than was provided by that act?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think not. As I have already said, one or two class deferments which were allowed to get into the act were wrong. We could have made it more just by not making such provision.

Mr. ANDREWS. The Selective Service Act, in the very American way, provides for local selective service boards composed of citizens who are the neighbors of the men and boys in the community subject to the draft and who are presumed to know the persons on whom they must pass. There could be no more just law for selective service as it now stands without the enactment of the Wheeler bill.

If the Senator will permit me, I should like to state also that I was glad to hear him read the resolution from the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the State of Utah. From my State of Florida, which has about 2,000,000 population, I have received, I believe, less than two dozen telegrams and letters in favor of the Wheeler bill. I am proud to make that statement. As one friend of mine in Florida expressed it to me, when I was recently in the State, the married men who have children do not want to be exempted by some special statute and placed in a class which will cause them to have the feeling the remainder of their lives that they were not wanted because they were told they were not eligible to serve their country. Another expressed his feelings to me by saying, "I am not in favor of the Government handing me a special exemption" other than actual physical and mental fitness. I believe that is the opinion of a great majority of the people of my State; otherwise, I would have heard from them. I realize that those who opposed the Selective Service Act, and later its extension, lend-lease, and repeal of the

Neutrality Act, would naturally receive many letters in favor of this bill, while those who were in favor of those acts would not be in favor of the present Wheeler bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Guffey	Overton
Austin	Gurney	Pepper
Bailey	Hatch	Radcliffe
Ball	Hawkes	Reed
Barbour	Hayden	Revercomb
Barkley	Hill	Reynolds
Brewster	Holman	Robertson
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Burton	Kilgore	Stewart
Bushfield	Langer	Taft
Butler	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Tunnell
Chavez	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Vandenberg
Connally	McNary	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maloney	Wagner
Davis	Maybank	Wallgren
Eastland	Millikin	Walsh
Ellender	Moore	Wheeler
Ferguson	Murdock	White
George	Murray	Wiley
Gerry	Nye	Willis
Gillette	O'Daniel	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, many people have said they thought that General Marshall's figures should be accepted blindly, indicating, in a way, that he was infallible.

Yesterday the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] said, in answer to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as appears at page 8025 of the RECORD:

> Mr. HILL. Does the Senator know that the figures 8,200,000 were arrived at many months—I think over a year—before the conquest of north Africa? Has the Senator stopped to realize what that conquest has meant so far as this war is concerned and so far as we are concerned? If the Senator would turn his thinking a little bit more to what we have done and what we are going to do than why we should not do these things he might see more of the picture.

I also wish to call attention to the fact that General Marshall testified, as did General McNarney, that they had reduced their estimate for the size of the Army from 8,200,000 to 7,700,000. I refer to General Marshall's testimony before the House committee in October 1942. Bear in mind, he said they had reduced the figure in recent months from 8,200,000 to 7,700,000, and that the reason for reducing it was consideration of the Aleutian situation and the north African situation, General Marshall informed Congress last year, in October 1942, that the War Department planned to have an army of 7,500,000. In explaining how they arrived at a total of 7,500,000, he said:

> These figures total, in our estimates, for the calendar year 1943 an aggregate of 7,500,000 men by January 1, 1944. * * * We arrived at the present figures for 1943 many months ago; in fact, as early as April of this year (1942).

Likewise Secretary Stimson informed us:

> We will have a total approximately of 7,500,000. Those have been the figures on which the Army has been working for many months past, and on which it is planning its work.

Mr. President, one who will go through the record of the House hearings will find they are replete with the statement that the Army it was planned on having would number 7,500,000. If they were planning on an army of 7,500,000, as Secretary Stimson and General Marshall said in October, if that represented all they were planning to take, they would not have to take 200,000 fathers into the Army, as they are now planning to do. Of the 446,000 fathers to be taken by the first of the year, the Army is to take 200,000, according to their own testimony. Yet, General Marshall said before the hearing that they reduced the figure from 8,200,000 to 7,700,000 because in the last year the situation in the Aleutians and the situation in north Africa had improved, so that they did not need what they figured they would have to have.

Are we to believe the figures General Marshall gave us in October last year, or are we to believe what he says today? There is certainly an inconsistency in the figures. I submit that if one reads General Marshall's figures and Army figures submitted from time to time when Army officials have testified before House and Senate committees, consistent statements cannot be found to have been made by them at any time during those hearings. General Marshall gave us certain figures with respect to the size of the Army in October of last year, when the general war situation, from the standpoint of the United States, was much worse than it is at the present time. Then the Russian Armies were not driving the German Armies back. At that time a question existed in the minds of many whether Russia could stand against the assaults of the German Armies. Now the picture is reversed. The Russians are now driving the Germans back, and back, and back, and instead of the Russians collapsing it looks as if the Germans might collapse.

I call attention to General McNarney's statement, appearing on page 25 of the hearings:

> This allotment of forces to be employed totaled 8,248,000 and was to be recruited by December 31, 1943. At the insistent direction of General Marshall, the War Department has been on the constant alert to effect savings in manpower and to adjust our military manpower requirements with changes in the strategic situation. Defensive installations in the United States, the Caribbean, and Alaska will be reduced by approximately 98,000 men by the end of 1943. A savings of some 80,000 men will be effected by reductions in overhead and in our replacement and school program. Studies are under way to reduce the number of men assigned to colleges under the Army specialized-training program.
>
> The Washington Conference in May gave overriding priority to the combined bomber offensive against Germany, and directed General Eisenhower to knock Italy out of the war.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Before the Senator leaves the point about the discrepancy or difference between 7,500,000 estimated and 8,200,000 estimated, I wish to call his attention to the cause of that difference as testified to by General McNarney, only a line or so, on page 33 of the hearings. The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] asked the question:

> Senator THOMAS of Utah. But your statement is still consistent with the plans made over a year ago. The plans which were announced here were slightly different, as I remember, one was for 7,500,000 and the other was for 8,200,000.
>
> General McNARNEY. The 7,500,000 you referred to was enlisted men and the 8,200,000 included enlisted men, officers, and women.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, yes; but General Marshall did not say anything about enlisted men and officers. General Marshall when testifying before the House committee spoke of an army of 7,500,000 men. That was to be the size of the Army.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In Army language and Army vocabularly the word "men" has a very distinct meaning; there is a line of distinction drawn between officer personnel and what we call the men personnel, the men who are not officers, either the privates or the corporals or the sergeants. As the Senator from Vermont has indicated, that was always the understanding, and it was called to attention in the testimony, that the size of the Army would be approximately—and I use the word "approximately" because Secretary Stimson used it—7,500,000 men, meaning the men personnel in the Army, not the officer personnel. Then there would be about 700,000 officers, giving a total strength of 8,200,000.

Mr. WHEELER. I submit that when General Marshall spoke of the Army before the House committee he spoke of an Army of 7,500,000 men.

Mr. HILL. No, no. Just a moment.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me finish my statement.

Mr. HILL. He did not say that. He said 7,500,000 men.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me finish my statement.

Mr. HILL. The keyword is "men."

Mr. WHEELER. Let me finish my statement. I tried to be courteous to the Senator when he spoke, and I ask him to be courteous to me.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I do not wish to be discourteous to the Senator, of course, but I do desire to emphasize that the word

"men" has a distinctive meaning in the Army and in military vocabulary.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, yes; the Senator always comes in with some excuse for the figures given by the Army. I say that Army authority said 7,500,000 was to be the size of the Army. Now an attempt is made to say that the size of the Army is to be 8,200,000, and that the size of the Army is to be reduced by five-hundred - and - some - odd - thousand men. What did the Secretary of War say? He said the size of the Army will be 7,500,000. Those are the figures on which the Army has been working for many months past, and on which it is planning its work in the future. What did General Marshall say?

These figures total, in our estimates for the calendar year 1943, an aggregate of 7,500,000 men by January 1, 1944.

These figures, he said, have been worked out over a long period of time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I did not hear what the Senator from Vermont said a few moments ago. I do not wish to be guilty of a twice-told tale in the Senate, but I desire to make sure that what the Senator from Vermont called to the attention of the Senator from Montana and the Senate was the statement of General McNarney appearing on page 33 of the hearings.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator from Vermont called attention to that statement a few moments ago.

Mr. HILL. I wanted to make sure of that, because I think there we find the answer to the question the Senator from Montana has raised. The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] asked the question of General McNarney:

But your statement is still consistent with the plans made over a year ago. The plans which were announced here were slightly different, as I remember, one was for 7,500,000 and the other was for 8,200,000.

General McNarney, replying to that question asked by the Senator from Utah, said:

The 7,500,000 referred to was enlisted men and the 8,200,000 included enlisted men, officers, and women.

Mr. WHEELER. Officers and women?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me call attention to some other figures. I submit that when the Secretary of War and General McNarney appeared before the House committee they were speaking of an army of 7,500,000. Now when a bill is before the Senate Army officials undertake to show that what they are trying to do is to cut down the Army by 560,000. I say if they stick to their original figure of 7,500,000 for the Army, they would not have to take fathers.

Figures which have been given me show that the Army has called upon the Selective Service for 160,000 men in October, in November 175,000, in December, estimated, 175,000, or a total for the Army of 510,000.

The Navy has called on the Selective Service in October for 147,196, in November 125,274, in December 121,274, a total of 393,744.

The total for the Army and the Navy is 903,744.

The deficit, which is proposed to be made up by drafting fathers, is 444,362. That does not include the 70,000 WAC's the Army hopes to get, and whose enlistment, so General McNarney stated at page 35 of the hearings, would reduce the Army's call by that number.

Let us consider those figures and examine the facts. The Army expects to get 70,000 WAC's—70,000 women. If it gets them, that will reduce its calls by that amount. But the calls have gone out, and the Selective Service has to get the men, regardless of whether it gets the WAC's or does not get them.

Again, Mr. President, if the Army gets 70,000 women, they are supposed to take the place of combat troops. Is there any Member of the Senate who does not think that instead of taking 70,000 WAC's, the Army could take 70,000 or 200,000 men who are in class IV-F, and thus replace combat troops who are used in noncombat service? I should like to have some Member of the Senate tell me, if he can, the answer to these questions: If the Army takes 70,000 WAC's who are not trained, and who never will be trained in the same way that the men are trained, and if the Army can use them to replace combat soldiers in noncombat service, why cannot the Army use IV-F's who have perforated eardrums or who are a little deaf or who have flat feet or who have some other minor physical defects? Why cannot the Army use men from class IV-F to replace combat troops who would be kept at home anyway, and why should not the Army be compelled to take men from class IV-F before fathers are drafted?

Senators can say all they want about not wanting to take the responsibility, but they will have to take it. They will have to take it either by calling fathers and breaking up American homes, or by taking from war industries men who never before knew anything about manufacturing or machines, but who have swarmed into them in order to escape the draft, or by taking many Government employees. That is the responsibility of the Members of the Senator and they cannot shirk it.

The other day I called attention to the turn-over which was occurring in some of the war industries. I called attention not only to the fact that a terrific turnover existed in the war industries, but also to the slowdown by labor which was occurring in them. A great many Members of the Senate have said on the floor that they believed the labor organizations were entirely to blame for the slowdowns. I think labor organizations are partly responsible for the slowdowns; but how can we expect labor organizations and laboring men not to engage in slowdowns, how can we expect laboring men, union men, and everyone else to feel that it makes any difference if they waste their time, when we see the executives and heads of various industries encouraging that sort of thing by the waste, extravagance, mismanagement, and inefficiency which are occurr' ?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Before the Senator leaves the point he made a moment ago with respect to physical defects, it might be interesting to him and to the other Members of the Senate to know that some time ago representatives of the War Department appeared before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs and asked the committee to recommend to the Senate legislation which would waive all the rights of men who had physical defects. In other words, the committee was asked to recommend the enactment of legislation which would waive all the rights had by a man who had some physical defect. For instance, he might have something wrong with his ear; but under the legislation the War Department's representatives proposed, we would waive all that man's rights as to anything else which might happen to him. If we would do that, the War Department's representatives said, they could use large numbers of so-called defective men. Naturally the Senate Committee on Military Affairs could not see the logic in that sort of proposal. We did not believe that a man, even though he were willing to waive his rights, should do so, because he may have dependents and obligations. So even if in his enthusiasm and patriotism he might want to waive his rights, we did not think he had a right to do so.

The point I am trying to make is that the only reason why such men are not being brought into the service is because they do not waive rights to such pay and other provisions as the Army makes in behalf of its veterans. It is not a matter of whether the Army can use the men to advantage. It is a matter of the liability because of the man's defects. That is the ground the Army is standing on; and the Surgeon General, in order to protect the Treasury of the United States, simply sits there like an iron rod, and will not permit such men to pass. But he does not stop to think that when the Army takes a married man who has children, the Government of the United States has a very serious obligation on its hands in taking care of the man's wife and children. The War Department seems to overlook that fact entirely.

Mr. WHEELER. I certainly am surprised to hear from the Senator from Colorado the statement to the effect that, before the Army would take men in class IV-F, it wanted them to waive the rights they had because they had certain defects, and that the War Department wanted Congress to pass a law insisting that the men waive their rights because of such defects.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, it was to be done on a voluntary basis; we were to give the men permission to waive their rights, and that was the consideration on the basis of which they could be inducted.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, that is a surprise to me; but now I can understand what is happening. Within the

last several days there have come to my office men who said that when they were being let out of the Army—they were being let out because of some minor physical defects—the Army asked them to sign a statement saying that they had those physical defects when they entered the Army; and that would be a lie.

As the Senator has pointed out, the Army and the Navy entirely overlook the fact that when a father is taken into the service, if something happens to him or if he is killed, the Government not only has the wife but also the children to support, and that the Government will have to pay more for the care of the children during the time the father is in the Army; and to that extent, from an economic standpoint it is perfectly ridiculous to take fathers when men in class IV–F and men in similar classes are available.

Mr. President, I do not know how many persons have read the very enlightening article which appeared in last Sunday's Washington Post, written by Agnes E. Meyer, who, so I understand, is the wife of the publisher of the Washington Post. Everyone recognizes that Mrs. Meyer is a very brilliant woman and a very keen observer. She tells of the experiences she had and the conditions which she actually saw with her own eyes at the Brewster plant. Such conditions may be found not only in the Brewster plant, but in some other plants.

When the article was called to my attention, someone said to me, "That is an attack upon labor." I said, "I do not care. If labor is wrong, it is wrong. It makes no difference to me whether labor or management, or the manufacturer, is wrong. If such conditions exist they should be corrected, whether they are caused by a labor organization or by a manufacturer."

During this period of war there can be no excuse for labor leaders or labor-union members lying down on the job, any more than there is for manufacturers lying down on the job.

Mrs. Meyer points out:

CHAOS AND TYRANNY COMPETE BITTERLY AT BREWSTER PLANT—INCOMPETENT MANAGEMENT IS HOPELESSLY ENSNARED BY SHREWD, RUTHLESS UNION AUTOCRATS

As the management-labor relations of the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation and its failure to get production have become notorious throughout the Nation, I was reckless enough to inject myself into this hurly-burly for a solid week of intensive investigation.

She did not simply sit down in Washington and listen to reports which came in. She went into the factory itself. She states further:

After interviews with labor leaders and management at the Long Island City and Newark plants, I went through the Johnsville plant, just 12 miles north of the Philadelphia line, which was made famous by the guard strike.

Never did I expect to see in America such a picture of managerial chaos, such a complete break-down of worker morale, as this factory presents.

Right and left were men and women idling, laughing, talking, or just sitting inert at empty benches. Some work was going on here and there in a half-hearted kind of way. Three women sitting under semicompleted fuselages made a pretense of activity when I strolled by with a member of the managerial staff. But such concessions to supervisory authority were rare. When one girl was reproved by her foreman for taking time off to make up her face on the assembly line, she looked up calmly and asked, "So what?"

WHAT DO WE CARE?

The toilets are frequented by people taking a smoke, and when Mr. Steele, factory superintendent, who is popular with the rank and file, tried on one occasion to eject them and introduce a semblance of discipline two of the workers replied, "All right, take our numbers. What do we care?"

A similar state of things already had been described to me by workers and management alike at the Long Island City and Newark plants. But to see it for one's self is to realize that even though such a production fiasco is not typical of industry throughout the Nation something is radically wrong in our country when even one such instance can occur.

If she had gone through some of the shipbuilding plants on the Pacific coast, she would have found exactly the same situation. My informants, who are laboring men who have come back to Montana, have told me so. One cannot go into any small community in my State without hearing the stories of laboring men who have come back from the Pacific coast shipbuilding yards. They tell of inefficiency, waste of manpower, and waste of raw materials, including steel, copper, and other materials. What is true of my State must be true of Colorado, and of other States from which men have gone into those industries.

Mrs. Meyer continues:

Who is to blame? An objective study of the conditions in these plants and of their origin is important, not only because of the critical nature of this one situation but because of the light it throws upon some of our most fundamental problems in labor relations.

To say that that condition is due to labor unions alone, or to management alone, is not stating the correct picture. The responsibility for that condition rests upon the administration in Washington. That conclusion cannot be escaped. If such things are going on in the Brewster plant and in the shipbuilding plants, the responsibility lies here in Washington. The situation can be and should be and must be corrected by the administration.

I have been told of hundreds of instances which have occurred on the West coast. I have received many letters from working men. I have talked with some persons who did not want to be quoted.

Mrs. Meyer continues with the history of the Brewster Co.:

The Brewster Co. was organized in 1932 by James Work on a shoestring.

It was organized exactly as some of the companies on the Pacific coast were organized. They were organized on a shoestring. They had some pull in Washington with Army officers or procurement officers. Instances have come within my knowledge of such organizations having been built up overnight on a shoestring. They had no previous experience in building anything, but now they are employing thousands of men.

Mrs. Meyer continues:

COMPANY HISTORY

The Brewster Co. was organized in 1932 by James Work on a shoestring. Prior to 1938 the company operated only in Long Island City, manufacturing airplanes and parts with 500 employees. In 1937 the plant was unionized by the U. A. W.-C. I. O., as Local 365, the contract providing that all future plants should be under the same jurisdiction. Mr. Work granted the union shop and anything else the union leadership demanded in exchange for a low wage scale.

The union leaders accepted low pay rates because they felt confident they could attend to those later, under contractual provisions that are now recognized by all labor-relations experts as among the most restrictive that can be found in the U. A. W.-C. I. O. today.

The company's growth began in 1939 when foreign orders came in. That year a second plant was opened in Newark, N. J., and in 1941 the third one was opened at Johnsville, Pa. Today the company employs 21,000 people, but at no time has production been satisfactory.

As one Navy man put it: "They never had any real production at Brewster, and what they did produce wasn't any good."

How can we blame industry for hoarding men when at the same time the Army is hoarding men in the city of Washington and the Navy is hoarding men in the navy yard? Stenographers and other personnel are being hoarded.

As I stated yesterday, a captain in the Navy came to see me and said, "Senator, you are right. We could do with one-third to one-half of the personnel we have in the Navy Department. Everyone down there knows it." Those conditions are discouraging to men who want to work.

I continue quoting from the article by Mrs. Meyer:

The British contracts were canceled last week. The remaining orders are principally for the Navy which, inclusive of the British, amounted to $250,000,000.

So alarming was the situation in April 1942, that the Navy took over the plants and properties by Executive order of the President and turned them back in May of the same year, under new directors and a new management headed by C. A. Van Dusen, a man of reputation in the airplane field, who lasted for a year without achieving any improvement in production.

MORE STALLING

Van Dusen was convinced that no progress in efficiency could be made under the present contract, which expired in January 1943. He began negotiations with the union committee that went on for months without final agreement. When certain clauses were settled to mutual satisfaction, the union negotiating committees said that before submitting the case to the War Labor Board, they would have to submit the agreements to their membership.

After a month's delay, they reported that the members had rejected the clauses agreed upon.

The union vote is a farce, as later statements by the workers will prove; this whole technique of stalling and wearing out the management's patience is used by Local 365 in large as in small matters.

When Fred Riebel, now the president of the company, continued the negotiations for

a new contract, the same performance took place all over again.

The article further states:

ABSENTEEISM ACCEPTED

But this is not the only weakness of management to be seen even by so inexpert an observer as I. Discipline of the workers is nonexistent, which, no doubt, is largely due to the fact that respect for the union exceeds that for management. But management seem to have signed off to an extent which must be humiliating. * * *

My questions as to what management was doing to combat absenteeism were considered surprising, as if it were just an act of God and nobody's fault.

Turn-over is low in all three plants. Though the workers do not separate themselves from the pay roll as readily as in most airplane factories, they seem to stay away or come in late whenever they please. Only in extreme cases are workers dismissed for absenteeism.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of October 3, 1943]

CHAOS AND TYRANNY COMPETE BITTERLY AT BREWSTER PLANT—INCOMPETENT MANAGEMENT IS HOPELESSLY ENSNARLED BY SHREWD, RUTHLESS UNION AUTOCRATS

(By Agnes E. Meyer)

As the management-labor relations of the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation and its failure to get production have become notorious throughout the Nation, I was reckless enough to inject myself into this hurly-burly for a solid week of intensive investigation.

After interviews with labor leaders and management at the Long Island City and Newark plants, I went through the Johnsville plant, just 12 miles north of the Philadelphia line, which was made famous by the guard strike.

Never did I expect to see in America such a picture of managerial chaos, such a complete break-down of worker morale, as this factory presents.

Right and left were men and women idling, laughing, talking, or just sitting inert at empty benches. Some work was going on here and there in a half-hearted kind of way. Three women sitting under semicompleted fuselages made a pretense of activity when I strolled by with a member of the managerial staff. But such concessions to supervisory authority were rare. When one girl was reproved by her foreman for taking time off to make up her face on the assembly line, she looked up calmly and asked, "So what?"

WHAT DO WE CARE?

The toilets are frequented by people taking a smoke, and when Mr. Steele, factory superintendent, who is popular with the rank and file, tried on one occasion to eject them and introduce a semblance of discipline, two of the workers replied: "All right, take our numbers. What do we care?"

A similar state of things already had been described to me by workers and management alike at the Long Island City and Newark plants. But to see it for one's self is to realize that even though such a production fiasco is not typical of industry throughout the Nation, something is radically wrong in our country when even one such instance can occur.

Only once before have I witnessed such a total break-down of management and worker morale. It was in Paris under the Blum regime when that friend of the workers had given the labor unions the green light.

Exactly the same sabotage of our war effort, the same kind of break-down which in France was the prelude to defeat, is taking place in the Brewster factories.

Who is to blame? An objective study of the conditions in these plants, and of their origin, is important not only because of the critical nature of this one situation but because of the light it throws upon some of our most fundamental problems in labor relations.

COMPANY HISTORY

The Brewster Co. was organized in 1932 by James Work on a shoestring. Prior to 1938 the company operated only in Long Island City, manufacturing airplanes and parts with 500 employees. In 1937 the plant was unionized by the U. A. W.-C. I. O. as Local 365, the contract providing that all future plants should be under the same jurisdiction Mr. Work granted the union shop and anything else the union leadership demanded in exchange for a low-wage scale.

The union leaders accepted low-pay rates because they felt confident they could attend to those later, under contractual provisions that are now recognized by all labor-relation experts as among the most restrictive that can be found in the U. A. W.-C. I. O. today.

The company's growth began in 1939 when foreign orders came in. That year a second plant was opened in Newark, N. J., and in 1941 the third one was opened at Johnsville, Pa. Today the company employs 21,000 people, but at no time has production been satisfactory.

As one Navy man put it: "They never had any real production at Brewster, and what they did produce wasn't any good."

The British contracts were canceled last week. The remaining orders are principally for the Navy which, inclusive of the British, amounted to $250,000,000.

So alarming was the situation in April 1942, that the Navy took over the plants and properties by Executive order of the President and turned them back in May of the same year, under new directors and a new management headed by C. A. Van Dusen, a man of reputation in the airplane field, who lasted for a year without achieving any improvement in production.

MORE STALLING

Van Dusen was convinced that no progress in efficiency could be made under the present contract, which expired in January 1943. He began negotiations with the union committee that went on for months without final agreement. When certain clauses were settled to mutual satisfaction, the union negotiating committee said that before submitting the case to the War Labor Board they would have to submit the agreements to their membership.

After a month's delay they reported that the members had rejected the clauses agreed upon.

The union vote is a farce, as later statements by the workers will prove; this whole technique of stalling and wearing out the management's patience is used by Local 365 in large as in small matters.

When Fred Riebel, now the president of the company, continued the negotiations for a new contract, the same performance took place all over again.

The expired contract is still recognized by both parties for lack of a new one. "Van Dusen was broken trying to get a new contract," said one of the men who had worked with him. "He refused to go into the shop because it simply meant an incessant bombardment of trouble."

PERSONAL EXPERIENCE

What kind of trouble? Instead of repeating hearsay, I shall begin by describing the complex nature of these incessant shop upheavals with my own personal experience.

Last Tuesday as I was sitting in the office of Marco Cicala, vice president of Local 365, the telephone rang. Cicala went to town in no uncertain way.

"Don't you know you can't make changes without consulting our shop committee," he snapped over the wire. "Say, listen, George, ye're talkin' to Marco."

The conversation was ended. "Whom are you dusting off in that fashion?" I ventured. It was George Schwobel, plant manager of the Long Island City factory, one of the highest executives of the company.

THE ARGUMENT

The argument was this. The company had engaged MacDonald Bros., nationally known engineering experts, to establish a method of reporting production with a view to encouraging greater efficiency. For 3 weeks, after Mr. Schwobel had consulted the union stewards in this department, the group leaders in certain sections of the wing department, Ford Building, had furnished time recorders with the starting and finishing time of jobs.

During these 3 weeks with the same manpower and equipment, merely by keeping records, average production had been raised from 15 to 21 spars, or approximately 40 percent.

The night before, Al Nash, a B assembler under the group leaders, but their superior in his capacity as chief union steward of the wing department, had arbitrarily ordered the men to discontinue the timekeeping in spite of its beneficial effects on production.

In order to be sure the management was accurate in its description of events, I asked to be present while Al Nash was questioned by President Riebel. Asked if he had ordered the men to stop, he replied he "had merely told them it was O. K. not to do it, because they did not like the procedure."

Asked whether he would agree to stop interfering with management orders, he said he would agree to nothing until he had consulted the shop committee, and the fact that he was interfering with production made no difference. "The men were objecting violently to the time study," he added, "feeling the company is checking up on them. They are getting resentful and suspicious, which will tend to affect production." Thereupon Riebel fired Nash and a shop committee management meeting had to be called at once. Both parties sent hot telegrams to the War Labor Board for its decision on this minor item of shop routine.

Now the staggering point about this debate is that Al Nash was within his rights according to the prevailing contract, because the management had consulted only the shop stewards before making an innovation and not the whole shop committee.

OBSTRUCTIVE TACTICS

The incident illustrated for me what Fred Riebel, appointed by the Navy in March to succeed Van Dusen as president, had said about the contract:

"If it is strictly invoked by labor, management has no prerogatives. It cannot hire or transfer men, change shifts, use discipline or do anything else without the O. K. of the shop committee, and every single move involves such lengthy arguments that thousands of man-hours are lost over the slightest move the management tries to make. The union leaders can do as they please, how, when and where."

Such purely obstructive tactics are daily occurrences and appear to be flagrant exhibitions of union domination. At Johnsville recently a worker hit a company foreman over the head with a chair, wounding him in the face. Before the company could

dismiss this man, the case had to be taken to the shop committee, then to arbitration, with lawyers employed on both sides. After more than 3 weeks of litigation, the man was finally discharged at a cost of more than a thousand dollars to the management in lawyer's fees.

Yet, when the union sends an employee, undesirable to it, flying, the company would have to enter into endless debate to keep him. So it meekly accepts the union verdict, no matter how valuable the man may be, for the sake of peace, and because the management is already devoting almost all its time to union meetings and arguments instead of to production.

By such methods the union has taken over from management the power of dismissal, and the workers know it.

As I shall show later, the union has not built up its strangle hold on the company overnight nor solely on the contract, but through the continuous and brilliant leadership of a powerful personality, its president, Tom De Lorenzo, who has taken shrewd advantage of the company's incompetence and of changing management over a period of years.

Managements have come and gone but the union and Tom De Lorenzo have been on the job uninterruptedly, establishing precedents and customs to augment their legal hold upon the company and its employees. But if past managements have been inefficient, De Lorenzo now finds himself confronted with a bird of different feathers, for in March when the Navy appointed Riebel as president, it also put in Henry J. Kaiser, the west-coast wizard, as chairman of the board. So far Mr. Kaiser left everything in Mr. Riebel's hands, but as of yesterday he made his first move by appointing Harry Morton to take over labor relations.

UNION MADE THE BOSS

But before we enter the field of personalities, let us take a look at some of the major provisions of the contract. The maintenance-of-membership clause is absolute but the executives are not opposed to the closed shop; in itself this situation is not different from that of other closed-shop plants but this clause and a rigid insistence upon seniority have enabled the union to undermine every last vestige of managerial control.

Paul Krebs, secretary of the union and De Lorenzo's man Friday, told me that they insist upon observance of seniority at any price, even that of production, because they must protect the future of the union's membership when the war is over and the lay-offs begin. Seniority, like the closed shop, has its merit, but this is a question of the abuse of a legitimate union principle.

At Brewster, seniority is used, together with strikes, slow-ups, and constant obstruction of transferals, to prove to the company who is boss.

The Coast Guard strike at Johnsville is a case in point as this whole rumpus hinged on the right of the guards to bid for their posts according to seniority at the expiration of every 6 months. This practice had not hitherto existed but it had taken place once, and on that basis, the union claimed that it was a good old-established custom.

The union leadership felt its accumulated power. It announced that as of August 23, the guards insisted upon bidding for posts. In the union leaders' favor is their assertion that the Navy had promised that membership in the Coast Guard would not nullify the men's union status. The Navy claims it said no such thing.

In any case the Navy has to have flexibility in changing the guards as the protection of valuable materials and the handling of people, at the gate, for example, are very different jobs. When the fatal August 23 arrived, four men refused to accept their Navy assignment, and were promptly thrown in the brig. Last week the War Labor Board ruled that in the new agreement, "nothing shall be construed in any way to interfere with the organization, training, and control by the Navy Department of the company guard force."

UNION LOSES A DECISION

The union took its first defeat philosophically, but the very fact that it was willing to take on the Navy, and called a strike to prove it, shows how heady the behavior of Local 365, U. A. W., can be. The cost of the strike was 164,000 man-hours of work or the equivalent of about 15 planes.

The incident also demonstrated to the public what the Brewster company has to contend with day in, day out, and it will make more credible to what fantastic lengths the union goes in its interference with daily management to uphold its seniority rule.

Until the War Manpower Commission recently insisted upon a better balance of the day and night shifts, the night shift was hobbling along on a skeleton crew because most of the skilled workers who have the seniority refused to accept night duty and couldn't be forced to accept it against their will.

Three weeks ago a new fighter-line was instituted at Johnsville which was still out of balance between skilled and unskilled workers when I was there last week because the shifting of workers from one department to the other, or for that matter within the department, is always attended by endless talk back and forth between the shop committee, the workers, and the management during which incalculable numbers of man-hours are lost.

BETWEEN DEVIL AND SEA

Do such conditions mean that the 21,000 Brewster workers are less patriotic than those at other factories? Not in the least. It means that they are confused as to where their torn loyalties should lie, because the union has real power over their destinies, their chance to work and to progress, and the company has none.

Even the company foremen say to themselves: "The management changes, but if I'm not at loggerheads with the union, I'll still be a foreman when the latest management goes." The union's power over the worker is such that it can and does stage a strike, a walk-out, or a slow-up on the most trivial pretext. Since May 31, 1942, there have been 13 different stoppages or slow-ups and strikes which the company calculates as costing 719,337 man-hours, or the time it takes to make 65 military planes. In money wasted they represent between one and two million dollars. This does not include the amount of time which is wasted daily by loafing on the job.

MANAGEMENT INCOMPETENT

But before I show how this labor-union leadership has consolidated its power, it should be stated that this loafing is not all due to the workers' confused state of mind. Much of it is due to past and present incompetence on the part of management.

When I was in the Johnsville plant some 25 women workers surrounded me to talk because the welding department had nothing to do. They claimed that they had had very little to do for the past 2 months.

"When work comes in, we fight for it," said one of them, "because we are so anxious to work."

"I've been here 3 weeks," wailed another, "and I'm not getting any experience."

In several of the other departments, it was the same story, now a lack of tools, now a lack of materials. "Production planning in Brewster has always been bad," said one foreman, "and is getting rapidly worse."

Riebel, the president, himself said that this was one of the company's weaknesses, but much of it he blamed on the national over-all planning for the aircraft industry. But I have been in enough airplane factories to know that though shortage of materials hampers all of them to some extent, I have never seen such acute, widespread, and apparently continuous shortages as bedevil the Brewster plants.

ABSENTEEISM ACCEPTED

But this is not the only weakness of management to be seen even by so inexpert an observer as I. Discipline of the workers is nonexistent, which, no doubt, is largely due to the fact that respect for the union exceeds that for management. But management seems to have signed off to an extent which must be humiliating. The problem of absenteeism which is acute in all three factories is looked upon as inevitable. Among women it is 12 percent, the average for all employees 8 percent.

My questions as to what management was doing to combat absenteeism were considered surprising, as if it were just an act of God and nobody's fault.

Turn-over is low in all three plants. Though the workers do not separate themselves from the pay roll as readily as in most airplane factories, they seem to stay away or come in late whenever they please. Only in extreme cases are workers dismissed for absenteeism. The company is now initiating a program for combating it.

HOW UNION PROFITS

What probably contributes to absenteeism is that so many of the workers have little or nothing to do, and it certainly is a great factor in the lack of morale among the employees.

It was constant mismanagement of this sort in the past 4 years which gave the union its chance to consolidate its powers.

The first fight was conducted on an improvement of haphazard wage rates. This defined the union as the workers' friend and protector. As soon as the other plants were opened, the union set about improving its organization until it is a perfect tool for shop control.

Under the president is a vice president in each of the three plants, as well as a chairman of the joint shop committee, a chairman of each separate shop committee, and under them section stewards, whose number is in proportion to the size of the department, each handling about 75 men.

One former steward informed me that these stewards are given systematic instruction in a technique for harassing the management.

Formerly the management also had leadmen, union members, in charge of small groups which left the management completely devoid of control at the lowest level. The Treasury Stabilization Unit permitted the company to raise the leadmen's salaries and promote them to be section subforemen, nonunion positions. After a 3 months' battle this improvement in management's position took place, though the union is still fighting for the replacement of these leadmen for the purpose of controlling supervision.

In addition there is a union executive board of 17 men who are on the company pay roll, sometimes to the tune of $8,000, although they devote their whole time to the affairs of the union. This means about $100,000 of taxpayers' money in the union's pocket, since the company is largely on a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract. This is a matter of public record in the War Labor Board proceedings.

THE TRIAL BOARD

One of the most important factors in union control is its trial board. The union shop, together with the vague seniority clause which the union can always reinterpret to

suit immediate objectives, gives the union leaders complete control of shop operations. The trial board adds to these powers an almost tyrannical control of the workers themselves.

Moreover, the union has not hesitated to use this instrument as a star chamber for the punishment of the slightest infringement of its orders. To be sure, the court is elected, but the ticket can be fixed through union caucus methods.

The source of the board's influence arises from the fact that it can not only fine and suspend union members but expel them and make it impossible for the victim to secure another job in any union shop. The worker has the right of appeal to the international U. A. W.-C. I. O. and thence to the civil courts, but a worker without a job can scarcely afford such costly proceedings.

As a result the influence of the board is felt by all of the workers as an intimidating force.

Some cases of which I secured photostatic records will illustrate the lengths to which the board goes in its disciplinary sentences. On June 24, 25, 26 a stoppage occurred at Johnsville because the company dismissed for loafing in a fuselage three women who were still in the probationary period, which it had a perfect right to do.

Thirteen people were variously punished for not quitting at once when the stoppage was called. Among them was George Spano, a flight inspector who had a plane in the air. He refused to desert his responsibilities until the plane returned. Called before the board, he said in strong language that he couldn't leave his pilot in the air. Thereupon, he was cited for "using language unbecoming to brother workers" and suspended for 30 days without pay, although he is an irreplaceable man.

Among a list of some 30 cases are such union charges as "giving orders in his department without authority," "insubordination to department stewards," "reporting union brother in violation of company rules to a management supervisor" (this for reporting with witnesses a fellow member asleep during working hours). The most frequent charge is "remaining at work during a stoppage." These court decisions have to be upheld by the union membership but woe betide any worker who would dare raise his hand in open opposition to a decision of the trial body.

The union power to intimidate workers was most clearly illustrated in the famous guard strike at Johnsville.

The employees, not singly, but in large groups assured me that they did not want to go out on that occasion, that they not only disapproved of the strike but were still ashamed of it.

"Then," said I, "why did you all vote for it the day after it was called?" They explained that there is no secret ballot on strikes, or any other union matters except the election of union officials. They did not dare oppose the union decision. They were indignant at the fact that they have no secret ballot.

Although these urban workers are more union-minded than those in most large war industries, they are thoroughly unhappy about their lack of freedom. "We have good wages now," said one young man, "but the Brewster employees have found out that wages alone cannot make a man happy. We are just as patriotic as any other Americans. We don't like these slow-ups and strikes. Some of us are ashamed of the fact that we work in a factory with such a reputation, but when the shop steward points toward the door with his thumb, we have to go, or get 'in dutch.' The worst of it is that hard work and ability count for nothing in this set-up. If you want to stay in this place and get along or be upgraded, you have to stand in with the shop stewards.

"The company foremen can't do a thing for you. You have to be in with the clique that runs the show."

IN CONCLUSION

This whole history illustrates what I saw all through the country during my 3 months tour of our war centers. The leaders of labor, especially of the U. A. W.-C. I. O., are among the ablest men in the country and not infrequently the superiors of their managements. These labor leaders have had to battle their way to the top just as management did two or three generations ago.

But today too many of our highest business and industrial executives are the easygoing descendants of their rugged forebears. They have to compete with a labor leadership that has achieved its position by sheer personal merit.

Fortunately the U. A. W.-C. I. O. has among its international leaders men very different from Tom De Lorenzo, men like Walter Reuther, who have a statesmanlike point of view. Walter Reuther said to me when I last saw him in Detroit:

"The time has come when labor leaders must modify their purely aggressive techniques and learn to cooperate with management if private industry is to survive in America."

What America seems to need in the field of management is more Henry Kaisers. The active intervention in the Brewster situation of this production genius began last week with the appointment of his west coast trouble shooter, Harry Morton, to take charge of labor relations. If he can teach Tom De Lorenzo the meaning of the word "cooperation," Mr. Kaiser will not only get out the planes but his contribution to Tom's education might save the Nation a lot of trouble in the post-war world.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have criticized executives and management on the west coast; but if what Mrs. Meyer has stated in the article to which I have referred, concerning the situation in the Brewster plant, is true I should condemn equally the labor union and individuals who are responsible for the situation in that plant. There can be no excuse whatever for it, and, as I have said, the responsibility for such mismanagement rests almost entirely with the Government here in Washington. It could be stopped, it should be stopped, and it must be stopped.

Not only that, Mr. President, but the hoarding of labor in all industries should be stopped and must be stopped. The hoarding of civilian employees in the War Department itself, and in the Navy Department itself, should be stopped and must be stopped.

Not only that, but the cost-plus contracts by which the Government of the United States is losing thousands of dollars, and which form an incentive to hoard labor, should be stopped and must be stopped.

Mr. President, it has been said by some that Congress does not want the responsibility. Congress is afraid, if you please, to assume responsibility when the executive branches of the Government have completely failed in their duty with respect to these matters. The failure of the Government and the executive branches of the Government in these respects is the only reason why the drafting of fathers and the breaking up of homes is necessary in the United States of America at this time.

I am surprised and shocked when Members of the Senate say, "I do not want to take the responsibility; it is a matter for the executive branch." Surely, it is a matter for the executive branch of the Government, and the departments of the Government in whom we have entrusted great powers in a time of war, and those Government agencies into which we have poured billions and billions of dollars. As the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has said:

> We have given every dollar which the Navy Department has asked for, every dollar which the War Department has asked for, and every dollar that every other agency has asked for to be used in carrying on the war.

Yet, if for one moment one criticizes the executive department of the Government, he must expect—and some are timid about the criticism—to be criticized by the Daily Worker, the organ of the Communist Party; he must expect to be criticized by PM, and the Chicago Sun. He must expect to be criticized by a lot of crackpot columnists who claim to know all the answers there are to be known about how to conduct the Government of the United States. So far as I am concerned, all their smearing rolls off of me because I have been smeared before—and have been smeared by experts. [Laughter.] Those who are now trying to smear me are mere amateurs compared with some of those who have previously tried it.

Yesterday I said that the responsibility for the situation which now exists rests entirely upon one man—the President of the United States. It rests on him by virtue of the fact that he is Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy. It rests upon him by virtue of the fact that the law itself gives him the right to make the selection of men for military service. When he said by Executive order that 300,000 or 275,000 men above the age of 38 years should be exempted—which meant that 275,000 fathers of families must be taken into the Army as a consequence—he, the President of the United States, is responsible for the breaking up of homes and the sending of children into the streets.

When the President refused to permit members of the IV-F class to be taken as Great Britain is doing; when he refused to do what another one of our great allies—Russia—is doing, namely, taking men of this class he virtually said that he wanted the fathers of the United States to be drafted into the Army.

I cannot believe that to be his philosophy, but I think he must be misinformed with reference to the facts. So on yesterday I appealed to the President of the United States to put a stop to it. I do not believe that he or Congress wants to follow the Nazi philosophy of breaking up homes. That is what we are doing. We denounce Hitler in one breath and then we follow his philosophy in another breath. Hitler broke up the homes of Germany. He took the children and

put them into institutions and trained them in the Nazi philosophy. We are not yet training our children in the Nazi philosophy, but we are going to break up many homes, because there are not only 446,000 fathers involved, there are over a million fathers involved, for once we relax in this matter the Navy will take approximately 500,000 fathers next year, according to testimony of some of its representatives. Representatives of the Navy say they must have that number of men, and General Hershey has said that they cannot get them without taking IV–F's. The Selective Service has told me that in their opinion the number of men they will have to obtain from the class including fathers will be small in comparison with what they get out of other classes, and that, in their judgment, they will probably have to take every able-bodied father in the United States of America.

It is said that this is class legislation. It is, of course, class legislation; the Selective Service Act itself is class legislation.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], in his remarks a few moments ago, said we were building up a great army. Certainly we are building up a great army. He referred to the morale of the people, but I ask you, Mr. President, when a million fathers of this country are taken into the army, then what happens to the morale of the people of America?

The agitation is not going to stop with the defeat of the pending legislation. Do not get it into your heads that it is. When a million fathers are taken for the Army a million mothers are equally vitally interested; and there are not only a million mothers and a million fathers but there are a million grandmothers and a million grandfathers who are going to see their grandchildren driven into the streets. Make no mistake about that.

The ramifications of this question, Mr. President, go far deeper than many may think. If you want to break down the morale of the people of this country more than it has already been broken down, you can do it, but the responsibility is not going to rest upon me. When you defeat this bill you are not defeating me; you are defeating a million homes in the United States of America; you are defeating many more than perhaps two million or three million children in the United States who ought to have the right kind of homes.

I close by saying that I am not speaking for the fathers of America. Of course they ought to do their part, and perhaps they have a greater interest in preserving the American way of life than have many of the single men. I am speaking for the children of America. Mr. President, you can call that sentimentalism or you can call it whatever you please; call it sentimentalism, if you want to; but I call it a fundamental principle of American Government—protection of the home. Destroy it if you want to, tear it to pieces if you want to, because you are afraid, because the whip has been cracked. Destroy it if you want to because some Army officer has said he must have these men; destroy it if you please because you do not want to delay the program 3 months, because some general says to pass the bill would wreck the country or prolong the war, when he has already told you that he has reduced the Army requirements by 562,000 men. Because a man puts on a uniform is he infallible? Officers of the Army look at this question from the standpoint of the Army. As they have said, they want the best men; the Army leaders overseas are asking for the very best and most intelligent and highly educated men. Of course, they are, but you and I have a duty to perform, and we must look at it not only from the standpoint of what the generals and the colonels and sergeants overseas want but we must look at it from the standpoint of the future of the United States of America.

I am told that South American troops are not wanted because they are no good; that the desire is to get American boys to do the fighting because the South Americans do not fight so well.

There are colored troops in this country who have been trained and trained and trained, and who want to fight, but who are now doing guard duty, while not only the flower of the white boys of the country but the fathers of the country are going to be sent overseas.

We are lend-leasing, if you please, to every South American country, yet within the past week I was told by a high-ranking officer of one of the Government departments that if we would permit it, 500,000 South Americans would volunteer to fight in our Army, but we would not let them into our Army, and the only way they could volunteer at the present time and get into the fight was to go over into north Africa and join the French Army. Men in the IV–F classification can go to Canada and join the Canadian Army; the Canadians will take them, but we will not take them; we prefer to take fathers. In England and Russia, men in a category similar to those in our IV–F class are being taken, but we will not take them.

Is there not something back of this besides what we see on the surface? Why this determination to break up American homes, when men in the IV–F category can be obtained? Instead of taking fathers, why keep back the colored troops, who want to be used and want to fight and who made such a record in the last war? I am told that they are not wanted in north Africa and are not wanted in other places, and Latin Americans are not wanted. Is it fair to the American people, who are lend-leasing to South America, to say, "Even if you want to volunteer, you cannot come here and volunteer in the American Army and take the places which would be filled by American fathers"? Is it fair to take fathers because the Congress will not pass a law saying that men in the IV–F category who go into the Army will have to sign a waiver of their defects? Does that make common sense? If it does, I have no place in the Senate of the United States. Under the program outlined, men in the IV–F category are not being taken into the Army, but are being sent away by the hundreds of thousands. I do not know the exact number, but I am told that 200,000 have been rejected; and every day we receive letters saying that men who are physically fit have been rejected by the Army and are returning to their homes. We have seen within a few days the spectacle of a noted football player who was rejected for a physical defect making three touchdowns in a football game.

We saw the spectacle of a famous motion-picture actor being turned down because of a punctured eardrum. Yet the Army puts WAC's in the places of fighting men. Under such conditions can we wonder that the people of this country are losing faith in their Government?

Oh, yes; merely because some general comes forward and says, "We do not want the IV–F's; we are going to take fathers," we acquiesce. Let me say those responsible had better think twice before they do it. I am told the Army authorities are stubborn, and I know they are, but they had better get over their stubbornness in this respect, and they had better think of the principle rather than of who introduced the bill. They had better think about the morale of the people. If they had been out among them as Senators and Representatives have been the past summer, they would realize that the morale is not very high.

They had better recognize, as I have, that never in the history of this country, in my judgment, at least in my generation, has there been so much bitterness among the people as there is at the present time against bureaucracy, and if it continues and grows as it has been growing the past year, we may not have a democracy in the United States. It will not do to continue to fly in the face of public sentiment, with a horde of people here in the O. P. A. and other bureaus issuing edicts and saying to the farmer and to the little merchant, "You have to do so and so." The people are not going to take it.

I did not intend to speak as long as I have spoken, Mr. President, when I rose, but, as I stated when I opened the debate, never during my 20 years as a Member of this body have I risen to speak upon an issue which I felt was more important to the fundamental principles upon which this Government was founded than the one upon which I am speaking today. I have never risen in the Senate to speak upon an issue about which I was more sincere and more honest. I have never risen upon this floor to speak upon an issue when the facts were so plain as they are in connection with the issue I have presented in this debate. I say "plain" because we cannot go behind the statement of Hershey that he could get 2,000,000 men out of the IV–F's. I say "plain" because there cannot be any dispute that thousands upon thousands of young single men are hiding in the war industries, which are overmanned. I say "plain"

because it is not possible to get away from the fact that according to the Byrd report, and according to the testimony of various individuals, so far as manpower is concerned, the departments of the Government, the War Department and the Navy Department, among others, are overcrowded and overloaded, and I doubt that any responsible person from the Army or the Navy, who is working in those Departments, who will tell the truth and dare speak out, will deny that what I am saying is true, because it has come to me from innumerable men in uniform who are working in those Departments.

Mr. President, facts mean nothing, logic means nothing, the American home and the American children mean nothing, when someone nods his head and says something ought to be done, what has been proposed is going to be done, and when my bill is defeated, if the President of the United States does not step in and put a stop to the labor racketeering that is going on, to the break-down in some of the war industries; if he does not put a stop to the hoarding, the mismanagement, and the inefficiency; if he does not put a stop to the taking of fathers when it is unnecessary; if he does not go into the IV–F's and say to the Army generals and Navy officials, "You can not break up the American home," there will be an outcry from one end of the country to the other.

Let any Democrat go home and say to his folks, "I did it because General Marshall told me to." Tell the mother of the children that you did it because of that. She is going to say, "How about John Doe? Why didn't you take him? He is in a factory, a single man, and he went there to hide, in order to escape the draft." She is going to say, "What about that boy in IV–F out here playing football?" That is what the grandparents are going to say, and what the aunts and everyone else interested in the children are going to say.

You Democratic leaders, who have great responsibility with little power, and apparently little influence with the administration, had better impress upon the administration what the outcome is going to be, and tell them they had better not listen to some of the boys who are sitting around and merely telling them what they want to hear.

Mr. President, having said this much, I am willing to have a vote on the bill at any time, at any place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not know that any other Senator desires to address the Senate at this time. I had hoped, and I think the Senate itself has been hoping, that we might reach a juncture in the discussion when we might vote on something. The pending amendment is the committee amendment. I do not know that any Senator wishes to discuss that, and so far as I am concerned, we can vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 10, after the word "act", it is proposed to insert the words "until January 1, 1944," so as to read:

(m) Every registrant who was married prior to December 8, 1941, who has maintained a bona fide family relationship with his family since that date, and who has a child or children under 18 years of age shall be exempt from training and service under this act until January 1, 1944.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Guffey	Overton
Austin	Gurney	Pepper
Bailey	Hatch	Radcliffe
Ball	Hawkes	Reed
Barbour	Hayden	Revercomb
Barkley	Hill	Reynolds
Brewster	Holman	Robertson
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Burton	Kilgore	Stewart
Bushfield	Langer	Taft
Butler	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Tunnell
Chavez	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Vandenberg
Connally	McNary	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maloney	Wagner
Davis	Maybank	Wallgren
Eastland	Millikin	Walsh
Ellender	Moore	Wheeler
Ferguson	Murdock	White
George	Murray	Wiley
Gerry	Nye	Willis
Gillette	O'Daniel	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That paragraph (1) of section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act, in the land and naval forces of the United States, of any or all categories of those men whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose activity in other endeavors, is found in accordance with section 10 (a) (2) to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided, however,* That if the registrant is under 30 years of age on October 1, 1943, he shall not be deferred under the authority given by this first sentence of paragraph (1), unless such deferment is approved by the local selective-service board where the registrant is registered, by the selective-service appeal board having jurisdiction over the locality where the registrant is working, and by the Director of Selective Service.

"Under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, registrants not deferred under the foregoing paragraph, or under any other provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, who have persons dependent upon them for support, shall be assigned to categories as follows:

"Category I. Men who have dependents other than wives and children, and who do not fall within categories II, III, IV, V, or VI.

"Category II. Every married man who was married prior to December 8, 1941, and who has no children as hereinafter defined, who has maintained a bona fide family relationship with his family since December 8, 1941.

"Category III. Every married man who has not attained the age of 25 on October 1, 1943, who has maintained a bona fide family relationship with his family since that date, and who now has a child or children as hereinafter defined.

"Category IV. Every married man who has attained the age of 25 on October 1, 1943, and has not attained the age of 30 on said date, who has maintained a bona fide family relationship with his family since that date, and who now has a child or children as hereinafter defined.

"Category V. Every married man who has attained the age of 30 on October 1, 1943, and has not attained the age of 38 on said date, who has maintained a bona fide family relationship with his family since that date, and who now has a child or children as hereinafter defined.

"Category VI. Every man otherwise classifiable in any other category, whose induction would cause extreme hardship and privation to a wife, child, or parent with whom he maintains a bona fide family relationship in their home.

"Nothwithstanding the provisions of section 4 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, induction into the armed services shall be upon a Nation-wide basis, without regard to any State or the District of Columbia or the subdivisions thereof, and no person in category I shall be inducted (unless he volunteers for induction) until substantially all available registrants without dependents, except men who are deferred under other provisions of this section, of this act, and of regulations issued thereunder, shall have been inducted, and no man in any subsequent category shall be inducted (unless he volunteers for induction) until substantially all available men who are in all prior categories, except men who are deferred under other provisions of this section, of this act, and of the regulations issued thereunder, shall have been inducted.

"The term 'child' as used in this act means a legitimate child born prior to September 15, 1942, a stepchild who became such prior to December 8, 1941, or an adopted child adopted prior to December 8, 1941, who is less than 18 years of age, or who by reason of mental or physical defects is incapable of self-support, and who is unmarried.

"The President is authorized under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of any or all categories of those men found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective; in order to enable the President to perform his duties under this sentence of paragraph (1), and to delay as long as possible the induction of men living with their families, the President shall forthwith appoint a commission of five qualified physicians of whom at least one shall be an Army officer and one a Navy officer, who shall examine the physical qualification requirements for admission to the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps and recommend to the President any changes therein which they believe can be made without impairing the efficiency of the armed services. The commission shall especially consider the establishment of special standards for men who will be inducted only for limited service.

The Director of Selective Service shall cause to be reexamined those men who may qualify under any new standards established.

"For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of men is advisable because of their status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the land or naval forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents.

"No deferment from such training and service shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual, and no such deferment shall be made of individuals by occupational groups or of groups of individuals in any plant or institution; nor shall individuals be called for induction for such training and service, or be inducted because of their occupations, or by occupational groups, or by groups in any plant or institution. Rules and regulations issued pursuant to this subsection shall include provisions requiring that there be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those men who have been classified by such local board."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not intend to explain the amendment further, except in one respect regarding the change I made in the printed amendment. The amendment has been on the desks of Senators for some days. The only change made in the amendment as offered is on page 2, line 7, where I have struck out the words "after January 1, 1944", so that the amendment reads—

That if the registrant is under 30 years of age—

And so forth—

he shall not be deferred under the authority given by the first sentence of paragraph (1) unless such deferment is approved—

And so forth. The deferments come up approximately every 6 months. The deferments are granted for only that length of time; and about 100,000 men will come up for renewal of deferment in October, and about the same number in November, and about the same number in December.

Also, in line 9, I struck out the word "local", and in line 10, I inserted the word "appeal", after the words "selective-service," so that the provision reads—

by the selective-service appeal board having jurisdiction over the locality where the registrant is working—

And so forth. I point out that a local board has a very narrow jurisdiction; and it frequently happens that in the course of his work a man finds that he is transferred from the jurisdiction of one board to that of another board.

Therefore, the approval should be from the appeal board, not from the local board.

With those exceptions, the amendment is as I explained it the other day.

I call attention again to the fact that the last two paragraphs are merely a restatement of the existing law.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer to the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. By way of explanation, let me say that most of the men whose classifications the Senate has been discussing have established homes, businesses, or professions. The record of the Selective Service indicates that forty and a fraction percent of all men called in the United States during the month of August were deferred because of physical defects. In fairness to the group of men who are about to be called if the proposed legislation is not passed, we should afford them every possible opportunity to ascertain in advance whether they will be accepted; because it will be found that 4 out of every 10 men in the class which is to be called will be returned to their homes as unacceptable. In most cases those men will have either sold their businesses, closed their offices, or lost their jobs; and it is not fair to call them and later return them to their homes, if there is an opportunity to ascertain in advance whether they are acceptable.

Therefore, I offer the amendment providing that they be given permission to have a preexamination before they are inducted. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the proposed substitute amendment will first be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6 following line 12, of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Mr. TAFT, it is proposed to add the following provision:

Any registrant within the categories herein defined may, if he requests it, be permitted by his local board, and the granting of such permission by such local board is hereby made mandatory, to take a preinduction physical examination, at any regularly established induction center. Such local board shall, upon such request by the registrant being made, issue him an order for that purpose and the examining officers of any induction center are hereby required to conduct such examination in the same manner as though after induction.

The examining officers at such induction center who conduct such physical examination under this provision shall issue to the registrant a certificate showing his physical fitness or lack thereof, and such certificate shall be accepted by the local board and shall be binding upon such board in the same manner as now followed upon examination after induction.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the amendment just read an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the amendment just read is offered as an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute which has been offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Do amendments offered to the bill itself take precedence, in the voting on amendments, over any amendments offered as substitutes to the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that under rule XVIII amendments offered to the original bill would take precedence over the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. BAILEY obtained the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. For what purpose?

Mr. REVERCOMB. For the purpose of offering an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BAILEY. I yield for that purpose, but not for a speech.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. This is not the printed substitute which bears the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] and myself. The sole purpose of it is to limit deferments under 30 years of age to essential and irreplaceable workers who are skilled artisans or who have the professional training necessary for the employment in which they are engaged. I make that explanation because it is quite different from the printed substitute which was intended to be offered by myself and the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from West Virginia that the amendment which he offers to the substitute of the Senator from Ohio is not in order at the present time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. This is not a substitute, but an amendment to the substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] has already offered an amendment to the substitute of the Senator from Ohio. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] has offered an amendment to the bill itself. The amendment of the Senator from West Virginia to the substitute of the Senator from Ohio is not in order at this time.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. Does the Senator from North Carolina desire to have his amendment stated, or included in the RECORD without reading?

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to have the amendment read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out, on page 1, lines 6 to 11, inclusive, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

(m) After the beginning of the second calendar month following the date of enactment of this subsection and until the termination of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President, no registrant between the ages of 18 and 38 shall be employed by or remain in the employ of the Federal Government so long as he is deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces of the United States under section 5 (e) or section 5 (c) (2) by reason of such employment, unless (1) such registrant was married prior to December 8, 1941, and has a child or children under 18 years of age, or (2) the services of such registrant in the Federal position in which he is or shall be employed are certified by the committee or official authorized to request deferment in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 23, Seventy-eighth Congress, to be indispensable to the operations of the Federal department or agency concerned. Any such certification shall contain a statement of the reasons for determining that the services of such registrant are indispensable, and a copy of such certification shall be transmitted to Congress within 30 days from the date such certification is made.

(n) In the case of any registrant whose prinicipal place of employment is located outside the appeal board area in which the local board having jurisdiction over the registrant is located, any occupational deferment under subsection (c) (2) or subsection (e) of this section, existing at the date of enactment of this subsection shall within 30 days after such date, and any such occupational deferment made after the date of enactment of this subsection shall within 10 days after such deferment is made, be submitted for review and decision to the selective service appeal board having jurisdiction over the area in which is located the principal place of employment of the registrant. Such decision of the appeal board shall be final unless modified or changed by the Director of Selective Service. The Director of Selective Service, upon appeal or upon his own motion, shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, training and service under this act; and the determination of the Director shall be final.

(o) To the fullest extent determined by the Director of Selective Service to be administratively practicable and consistent with the requisitions of the land and naval forces and with the other provisions of this act, registrants shall be ordered to report to induction stations in such a manner that registrants who were married prior to December 8, 1941, who have maintained a bona fide family relationship with their families since that date and who have a child or children under 18 years of age, will be inducted after the induction of other registrants not deferred, exempted, relieved from liability, or postponed from induction under this act or the rules and regulations prescribed thereunder who are available for induction and are acceptable to the land and naval forces. The term "child" as used in this subsection means a legitimate child born prior to September 15, 1942, a stepchild who became such prior to December 8, 1941, or an adopted child adopted prior to December 8, 1941, who is less than 18 years of age, or who by reason of mental or physical defects is incapable of self-support, who is unmarried, and with whom the registrant has maintained a bona fide family relationship in their home since December 7, 1941, or since the date of birth if such date of birth is later than December 7, 1941.

SEC. 2. Section 10 (b) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The President is authorized to delegate to the Director of Selective Service any authority vested in him under this act (except section 9). The Director of Selective Service may delegate and provide for the delegation of any authority so delegated to him by the President and any other authority vested in him under this act, to such officers, agents, or persons as he may designate or appoint for such purpose or as may be designated or appointed for such purpose pursuant to such rules and regulations as he may prescribe."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair make the parliamentary situation clear. The amendment which has just been read is an amendment to the original bill. As such, it takes precedence over the substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and also the amendment thereto offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD].

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I shall undertake briefly to explain the amendment. In the first place, the amendment destroys the bill known as the Wheeler bill by striking out lines 6 to 11, which are the legislative lines of that bill. The other lines are the enacting clause. The amendment would insert in lieu of the language of the legislative lines of the Wheeler bill a provision relating exclusively to the civilian employees of the Government.

In that respect it differs from the amendment originally offered by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and myself. In that amendment we undertook to propose a section relating to commissioned officers. For good reasons—reasons entirely satisfactory to myself—I have decided not to pursue that line of legislation. I believe that before I take my seat I shall give my reasons for it. For the present, however, I shall proceed with an analysis of the amendment as now proposed.

The amendment is to strike out lines 6 to 11, inclusive, of the pending bill and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

(m) After the beginning of the second calendar month following the date of the enactment of this subsection, and until the termination of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President, no registrant between the ages of 18 and 38 shall be employed by or remain in the employ of the Federal Government so long as he is deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces of the United States under section 5 (e) and section 5 (c) (2)—

These being sections merely allowing deferments by the President under the Selective Service Act—

by reason of such employment—

That is, Government employment—

unless (1) such registrant was married prior to December 8, 1941, and has a child or children under 18 years of age, or (2) unless the services of such registrant in the Federal position in which he is or shall be employed are certified by the committee or official authorized to request deferment in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 23, Seventy-eighth Congress, to be indispensable to the operations of the Federal department or agency concerned. Any such certification shall contain a statement of the reasons for determining that the services of such registrant are indispensable, and a copy of such certification shall be transmitted to Congress within 30 days from the date such certification is made.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator state the difference between that and the present law with regard to the deferment of Federal employees?

Mr. BAILEY. The present law provides that no consideration shall be given, but this amendment provides that there shall be an affirmative certification of indispensability. I think there is a very decided difference.

Mr. TAFT. But indispensability is the test now as well as afterward.

Mr. BAILEY. Under the test I believe there is discretion as to the ground of deferment; it is in the judgment of the employer, the Government. But under the proposed amendment there must be an affirmative certification of indispensability. I think that is the main difference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not only that the employee is indispensable but reasons must be assigned for such indispensability, and such reasons must be furnished to the Congress.

Mr. BAILEY. That is correct.

The second division of subsection 2—it is here designated "n," to conform to the original legislation—I think we owe to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. It provides for certain machinery in the case of men who move from one jurisdiction to another. It is as follows:

(n) In the case of any registrant whose principal place of employment is located outside the appeal board area in which the local board having jurisdiction over the registrant is located, any occupational deferment under subsection (c) (2) or subsection (e) of this section existing at the date of the enactment of this subsection shall within 30 days after said date, and any such occupational deferment made after the date of enactment of this subsection shall within 10 days after such deferment is made, be submitted for a review and decision to the selective service appeal board having jurisdiction over the area in which is located the principal place of employment of the registrant. Such decision of the appeal board will be final unless modified or changed by the Director of Selective Service. The Director of Selective Service upon appeal or upon his own motion shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption, or deferment from, training and service under this act; and the determination of the Director shall be final.

Subsection (o) reads as follows:

To the fullest extent determined by the Director of Selective Service to be administratively practicable, and in consistence with the requisitions of the land and naval forces and with other provisions of this act, the registrant shall be ordered to report to induction stations in such manner that registrants who were married prior to December 8, 1941, who have maintained a bona fide

family relationship with their families since that date and who have a child or children under 18 years of age, will be inducted after the induction of other registrants not deferred, exempted, relieved from liability, or postponed from induction under this act or the rules and regulations prescribed thereunder who are available for induction and are acceptable to the land and naval forces. The term "child" as used in this subsection means a legitimate child born prior to September 15, 1942, a stepchild who became such prior to December 8, 1941, or an adopted child adopted prior to December 8, 1941, who is less than 18 years of age, or who by reason of mental or physical defects is incapable of self-support, who is unmarried, and with whom the registrant has maintained a bona fide family relationship in their home since December 7, 1941, or since the date of birth if such date of birth is later than December 7, 1941.

SEC. 2. Section 10 (b) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The President is authorized to delegate to the Director of Selective Service any authority vested in him under this act (except section 9). The Director of Selective Service may delegate and provide for the delegation of any authority so delegated to him by the President and any other authority vested in him under this act, to such officers, agents, or persons as he may designate or appoint for such purpose, or as may be designated or appointed for such purpose pursuant to such rules and regulations as he may prescribe."

The last section I will dispose of at once by saying that it is intended to clear the relationship between the Manpower Commission and the Selective Service, and gives the President the right to authorize and delegate authority to the Selective Service under the authority vested in this act.

As to the other two sections, the first section is intended to remove from the civilian Federal service all the single men who are available for the armed services. I have heard the number estimated to be as high as 113,000. I do not know. I should be amazed to learn that that many men qualified for military duty are in the Government service when their brothers are fighting in the uniform of their country. But however that may be, there appears to be a very considerable number. I have a great deal of trouble in my capacity as a Senator because of the reports which come by mail and by newspapers indicating a very decided sense of unrest in the country, a feeling that Federal employees who are available for war service are escaping their duty and at the same time enjoying the emoluments of office while their brothers are either fighting abroad or are soon to be fighting abroad.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I think the Senator's idea with reference to indispensability is a good one; but I desire to make two comments: First, the Senator emphasizes the fact that it should be called the Wheeler bill. I want to say, as I have said before, that I am not interested in any bill bearing my name.

Mr. BAILEY. I assure the Senator I did not intend to injure his feelings by calling it the Wheeler bill. I was simply trying to describe it in such terms that everyone could understand what I meant.

Mr. WHEELER. I think perhaps it would have to be called the Wheeler bill. If the Senator would go further and say to industry, which is hiding single men, that the same rule should apply to it as should apply to the Government, that an affidavit would be required showing that an employee was indispensable, I think the Senator would have something, because a reading of the testimony of Mr. Baruch when he was on the witness stand will disclose that he was of the opinion that industry was deferring single men only when they were absolutely indispensable. I said to him, "You are wrong about that," and I called attention to the fact that Colonel Keesling said that it had been going on from the start, that men were being deferred because industry said they were irreplaceable, and, of course, if an industrialist has a man working for him he does not make any attempt to prevent deferment. The big plants get deferments after deferments. As I pointed out, in one factory in Los Angeles, there were working twenty or thirty thousand men, the average age of whom was 24. They had all rushed in there, as we know, from the West when the draft question came up, for two reasons: They were attracted by high wages and also by the fact that they were told that if they got into an essential industry they would be deferred.

Mr. BAILEY. I see that my distinguished friend is going to make a speech. I want to make a bargain with him. Will he let me sit down and rest until he gets through and then yield the floor to me?

Mr. WHEELER. I am not making a speech, and if the Senator does not want me to interrupt him, of course, I have nothing further to say.

Mr. BAILEY. I want the Senator to interrupt me, but I did not want to stand on the floor longer while he was speaking.

Mr. WHEELER. I shall not take long. I conclude by saying that if an affidavit were required that the worker was not merely irreplaceable, but essential, then so far as the local boards are concerned, a man could not hide behind the fact that he was working in a war industry.

Mr. BAILEY. I am glad the Senator commends the amendment so far as he does. I can respond to his suggestion, I think constructively. There may be a great many abuses by way of single men and some married men, perhaps, who are qualified for war service, which is the primary service, now being employed in war industries, and therefore being protected and deferred; but I do not think this is the time, I do not think this is the occasion to consider the broad problem of manpower. I will agree that there are difficulties there; I will agree that there is confusion there; and I will agree that the American people are rather restless on the point of employees in industry escaping warfare responsibility; but if we should undertake to go into that question now the debate would be interminable. I do not think we have the facts. I myself do not feel that I am prepared to legislate with respect to the manpower proposition generally. It is too vast and it is entirely too important to proceed with except upon the basis of the utmost intelligence.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BAILEY. Let me finish the point and I will certainly yield. We have the farming situation; it is absolutely necessary that there be agricultural production; so when it is said that young men are escaping by way of agricultural activity let us find out about that.

Then, there is the tremendous munitions industry. I think practically from 75 to 80 percent of the activity of America today is related directly to the war. It is of the utmost importance. Everybody is talking about the battle on the production front. I do not wish to take a step that would tend to dilute the force and effect of that battle. I will agree with the Senator from Montana that there is a problem there, and if he will go along with me to find the facts, so that in taking any step we may take we will not make a serious blunder, I think we may make a satisfactory disposition.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not talking about the manpower situation; we do not have to study the manpower situation now. All I am saying is that if a single man is being kept in an industry, whether a war industry or not, he ought to be absolutely essential to the industry or he ought to be in the war service. In my judgment, there ought to be in the Senator's proposal a provision not for an affidavit that a man could not be replaced but an affidavit should be required that he is essential. It would not be necessary to have a study of the manpower situation to know that if he is essential he should be kept there. If he is not absolutely essential, he should not be deferred.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not know that I would greatly differ with the Senator about that. But let us first deal with the matter of Federal employment. The Senator wishes to avoid the manpower problem, but he talks about employment in industry, and that is the same thing.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. REED. May I inquire of the Senator from North Carolina whether he regards interference with the men in industry of more importance than the breaking up of American homes by drafting married men, when perhaps there are a sufficient number of single men to fill the requirements of the Army?

Mr. BAILEY. I will say to the Senator very frankly that I think breaking up the home is about the worst thing that can be done; I do not believe I can think of anything worse this side of murder; but I want the Senator to hear me for a minute. If it is necessary in order to win the war to take fathers from their homes we ought not to flinch about it. If we need 10,000,000 men or 20,000,000 men and it calls for you and it calls for me, and we are fathers, we will go. This is war, but that does not break up anybody's home.

Mr. REED. We are not quarreling about that at all. My only difference

with the Senator from North Carolina—I should use the term "difference" in preference to "quarreling"—is as to the relative importance which he seems to attach to avoiding disturbing single men in industry against the importance of breaking up American homes. That is the only question that is involved here.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not want the Senator to misunderstand me. I am not trying to avoid disturbing men in industry; I am simply trying to do one thing at a time. The industrial feature of the problem is too large for me to tackle now, and it would take too much time.

Mr. DANAHER and Mr. REED addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BAILEY. I desire, first, to clear the minds of Senators about this matter. During such time during the debate as I have been able to remain on the floor—and I have been here much of the time—I have heard a great deal said about breaking up homes and throwing children onto the street. Everybody knows there is nothing to that. From the beginning of time until the present hour fathers have fought, and the homes have not broken up. Fathers are fighting over in Europe today, and homes are not broken up. This measure is not going to turn any children out on the street, either. That sort of talk is the plainest ad hominem argument.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. REED. Would the Senator from North Carolina be willing to accept, as he indicated a moment ago he might be—at least he did not differ with the Senator from Montana—a similar test applied to single men in industry as he has applied in his amendment to the single men in the Government service?

Mr. BAILEY. I think that when we set up a standard affecting the Government, we would have to go all the way. All I am trying to deal with is the situation we have in hand, and dispose of that. I will go along with the Senator on the principle.

Mr. REED. Let me inquire of the Senator from North Carolina——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Just a moment. The Senator from Connecticut was trying to get recognition. In the interest of orderly debate, the Rules of the Senate should be observed, and before a Senator is interrupted the Senator desiring to interrupt should first address the Chair and get consent of the Senator who is speaking. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the Senator from Kansas, although I realize that my honored friend, the Senator from Connecticut, was first on his feet, and I trust he will have patience.

Mr. REED. He is also my honored friend, and in a moment I shall yield to him to ask the Senator from North Carolina to yield to him.

I wish to inquire of the Senator from North Carolina in what way it would interfere with the manpower question if we applied now the same test to single men in industry which he intends to apply, and which his amendment requires to be applied, to single men in the Government service.

Mr. BAILEY. I think I have explained that to my honored friend from Kansas. I was saying that I wished to limit the amendment to something we can presently handle. I am not in favor of postponing this issue indefinitely. If we assert the principle with respect to the Government, the principle will run all the way through the avenues of life—and I will go with the principle.

I take it the Senator wishes to drive me to the point of attaching to my amendment one which would affect practically every industry in the country and would bring on no end of controversy. I do not wish to do that. I want to have my amendment adopted.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. Not at the moment. I agreed to yield to the Senator from Connecticut. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Unless the Senator from Connecticut is about to discuss the same question propounded by the Senator from Kansas, will the Senator from Connecticut permit me to interrupt?

Mr. DANAHER. I do not have the floor.

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut; then I shall yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from North Carolina. In subclause (m), on the first page of the typewritten copy of the Senator's amendment, we find, about halfway down the page, these words, relating to the deferment of those in Federal service:

> Unless (1) such registrant was married prior to December 8, 1941, and has a child or children under 18 years of age.

Having called the Senator's attention to that language, I wish to know specifically whether he construes the term "child or children," as there used, to be defined by the term "child" in the language which is employed for that purpose in the last 10 lines of section 1.

Mr. BAILEY. I had not thought about making that construction. I think that in case of a construction it would have to be interpreted on the basis of the language as it stands.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. With the Senator's permission, I should like to reread that clause with the term "child or children" defined as indicated in the last 10 lines of section 1. Paraphrasing, there will be no deferment "unless such registrant was married prior to December 8, 1941, and has a child or children under 18 years of age. The term 'child' as used in this subsection means a legitimate child born prior to September 15, 1942, a stepchild who became such prior to December 8, 1941, or an adopted child adopted prior to December 8, 1941, who is less than 18 years of age or who by reason of mental or physical defects is incapable of self-support, who is unmarried, and with whom the registrant has maintained a bona fide family relationship in their home since December 7, 1941, or since the date of birth if such date of birth is later than December 7, 1941."

I specifically ask the Senator whether, with the language thus read, construing the meaning of the term "child," he does not intend to adopt the construction in the form in which I have just proposed it.

Mr. BAILEY. I answer by saying that if the Senator wishes to so amend the amendment as to have the definition of "child" as stated in the lines beginning at the bottom of the second page, in subsection (o) apply to the whole bill, I shall agree to it.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BAILEY. There must be but one definition.

Mr. DANAHER. Surely that is necessary if we are to be just, and avoid inconsistency, and I thank the Senator.

I call to his attention subsection (o), in the middle of page 2. We find there the language—

> To the fullest extent determined by the Director of Selective Service to be administratively practicable and consistent with the requisitions of the land and naval forces and with the other provisions of this act, registrants shall be ordered to report—

And so forth. Is it the purpose of the Senator, if we may have it made clear, that the words "to be administratively practicable" would make available to the selective service, on a Nation-wide basis, all those who, in an "administratively practicable" way, would be subject to induction?

Mr. BAILEY. The object of subsection (o) was to give a preference to the married men as compared with the single men, and to insure that the single ones would be taken first. We put in the qualification, "To the fullest extent determined by the Director of Selective Service to be administratively practicable and consistent with the requisitions," and so forth.

I agree that that is a qualification, but in a law of this sort we cannot afford to be too rigid. The whole system of equity is based on the wrong of rigidity of the statute law. I take it we have to leave something to discretion, and I think the limitation is as far as we could go.

I should be very glad to say "Yes," to take every single man in the country available before we take the married ones. But I question whether the law could be administered in just that way, so I say "to the fullest extent administratively practicable." That calls on the good faith of the administrative officer.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Obviously, we must avoid the discrepancies which occur when one board is supplying a third of its total quota, and another board only 10 percent. Insofar as one State may have encountered some discrepancies as compared to another State, there is a situation which must be dealt with. I therefore say that if it is the purpose of the Senator from North Carolina, in the language referred to, to put this "ad-

ministratively practicable" provision on a Nation-wide basis, to the end that the needs of the Selective Service be met, then I wish to have the act so construed, and I would believe it an admirable result. I hope the Senator has that in mind.

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to see it come to that, but we started on another base. I think that tends to explain the use of the words "administratively practicable." We are in the midst of a war. The Chief of Staff has told us we must have 446,000 more men than are now in sight, probably married men. We have that situation to deal with. We cannot disrupt our whole Selective Service process and law in order to make an adjustment now. We have to trust something to the administration. I might as well discuss that question now.

I do not intend to take responsibility for the conduct of the war. I have the utmost contempt—I would have the utmost contempt for myself—for a man who is not a soldier undertaking to do a soldier's job. I have nothing to do with the strategy of the war. I have no advice to give. I am not a soldier, and never have been one.

I think we ought to realize, Senators—probably we do—that warfare is not only a skill, it is one of the greatest skills; that it is not only a science but one of the greatest of sciences; one of the most difficult of sciences, and modern warfare requires incomparably more of skill and science than it ever did before. I am very much interested in that.

Mr. President, we thought back yonder in 1861 that all we had to do was to place a musket on a man's shoulder and march him off and he would be a soldier. Well, the men did quite well, and I would not reflect upon the men on either side, but we had much to learn in that war. Since then war has become mechanized. Warfare now is all in the region of power, chemistry, machinery. It has come to be one of the vastest of undertakings.

We can reflect upon the fact that at the very beginning of things the word the Romans used for army meant skilled men, the Roman word for army is exercitus—skilled. The conduct of warfare required skill even in the days before Julius Caesar and before Alexander. When men spoke of the Roman Army they spoke of men who were experienced, exercised, and skilled. No one else fought in the army. Warfare then was a professional business.

We have now reached the time when this great skill must be universally applied. Whereas in ancient times warfare was confined to professionals, now it has expanded to include all the young men. When we come to deal with that problem it must be dealt with only by men who possess the skill and who have the means to apply the science.

I do not know where to attack, and I really do not know how to train a man. I have been through Army camps, and I have been utterly amazed to see what is being done there. I do not know how great an army is needed. I do not know how many ships we need. I do not know how many planes we need. With all due respect, I doubt if there is any other Senator who knows.

I heard an able argument in the Senate the other day addressed to the proposition that air power would win the war. Maybe so. That is what is said by the major who writes all the time in the newspapers. I am unwilling to trust my judgment on that point, and I am unwilling to trust his as well. If he really means business about it I should think he would speak to the men here who are responsible, and would not try to confuse the American public as to how we should fight the war, whether we should fight it with cannon or planes or ships or fight it with everything we possess.

Mr. President, I must find someone in whom to place my trust. I do not place it in the Congress in the matter of warfare. I do not place it in anyone except the skilled man, the trained man, the master man. I have occasior to give thanks that we have some first-class men.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. Let me finish my statement and I will gladly yield. I think in General Marshall we have a Chief of Staff in whom we can place our confidence. I think we can place our confidence in General Arnold, in Admiral King, and in their associates and aides. I feel we are extremely fortunate that our armed forces are led by masterful men. I would have very deep misgivings if we had to substitute for them some of the persons who are writing columns every day telling us how to run the war, or persons who are lecturing on the radio, some of them in evangelistic style, and some of them talking about some sort of shampoo or shoe polish with the same unction they talk about whipping the Germans. [Laughter.] I must find some one in whom I can put my faith.

Mr. President, I do not mind making a confession to the Senate. I have tried to follow that course altogether. I place my faith in matters of shipping in Admiral Land. I do not know anything about building ships. If the Admiral tells me it is so, I say "All right." How else could a man get along in this world?

Let me tell a story which I read in Mr. Freeman's Life of Lee. In the midst, I think, of McClellan's campaign on the peninsula in 1862, Jefferson Davis, who used to sit in the front row of the Senate on this side, a very able man no doubt, but no great fellow in battle, decided he would go forth and see how General Lee was fighting a battle near Richmond. He put on his silk hat and his frock coat, and he got all his cabinet together and they put on their silk hats and their frock coats, they shined their shoes, and they picked up their gold-headed canes, and walked out to the scene of the battle to be greeted by General Lee. The president of the Confederacy got a little ahead of his crowd, and when he came to where General Lee was, "Old Marse Robert," pointing to the members of the cabinet with their silk hats on, asked, "Mr. President, whose army is that?" Jefferson Davis was taken a little by surprise and said, "It is not mine." Robert E. Lee said "It's not mine, either. Take them home." [Laughter.]

So I think when the politicians begin to conduct the war—and I do not reflect on politicians—for all of us are politicians—when Senators, Representatives, and columnists begin to run the war, and also to run our diplomacy, it is time to break up school and go home.

This war is a serious matter, Mr. President. It is the most serious thing that ever befell the human race. It is the most serious thing that ever befell you and me or our country. We cannot afford to trifle about it. I shall place my faith in the powers that be, and trust to God that the powers that be are ordained of God for our deliverance.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the Senator, however, that so far as the Army is concerned, whether General Marshall gets a married man of 28, or a single man of 28, or a man 28 years old who has certain industrial qualifications, or one who has not, has nothing to do with the conduct of the war. I fully agree with what the Senator has said. I do not wish to interfere with the conduct of the war, but does not the Senator think that there is another side of the picture? It may make no difference to the general what kind of man of 28 he gets, but does not the Senator think it might make a great difference to the civilian population whether we take away a man possessed of certain industrial qualifications, or a man of family, or whether we take away a man who has no family? Is not that a phase of the subject which Congress should determine, and is it not true in fact that only Congress can determine it?

Mr. BAILEY. I will say to the Senator that I think Congress might determine the social features of the matter with a proper regard to the necessities of the situation and the advices of the Chief of Staff. The Chief of Staff says he does not want the men divided into categories—that it will interfere with his plans. The Chief of Staff really prefers single men to married men, but he says it is necessary to have married men in order to fill up his divisions. When he tells me that I am ready to believe him.

Mr. TAFT and Mr. WHEELER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BAILEY. I shall yield first to the Senator from Ohio and then to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. TAFT. I have one or two questions I should like to ask the Senator. Did not the Senator read the testimony given by the Chief of Staff in which he said he preferred men under 30 to men over 30?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; and he said he preferred single men to married men, but he also said, as I understand—I am trusting to what I have read in the newspapers—that the matter of dividing men into categories was administratively difficult. Am I not correct about that?

Mr. TAFT. That question I discussed yesterday, and I explained the reasons why I think the argument is wholly fallacious, even on the face of the letter which was read in the Senate yesterday, and which I think answers itself.

However, I should like to ask the Senator one other question specifically. As I understand the purpose of subsection (o), it is not to put the priority of selection of married men on a Nation-wide basis?

Mr. BAILEY. I should not think so. I think it fits in with the act as it is written.

Mr. TAFT. In that respect it seems to me it would have a substantially different effect from that of the substitute offered by me.

Mr. BAILEY. I think so. I think I am going as far as I can go in the Senator's direction. I am not claiming to be going all the way.

Mr. TAFT. I understand.

The other point to which I desire to call attention is that in connection with persons serving in Federal employment, the Senator's proposal is entirely satisfactory to me, in that it would strengthen the existing law. I find that the existing law is based upon Executive Order 9309, which only requires that the committees certify that the employees' civilian services are essential, in that the loss thereof would substantially impair activities essential to the war effort. As I understand the Senator's amendment, it would provide that such employees must be found to be indispensable.

Mr. BAILEY. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. I would suppose the language of the Senator's amendment is stronger, and would strengthen the provision of existing law regarding Federal employees.

Mr. BAILEY. I think so; I think a stronger word than "indispensable" can scarcely be found.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that I think the Senator misspoke himself when he said General Marshall said it was necessary to take fathers. I think General Marshall did not say that anywhere in the hearings.

Mr. BAILEY. No; I think I must agree with my enemy—meaning "mine enemy" according to the Scriptures; I say "enemy" in a friendly way.

Mr. WHEELER. General Marshall said he did not want the fathers; he wanted men, and he preferred single men to fathers.

Mr. BAILEY. But he said he would take fathers if he could not get the men he needed in any other way.

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly. Many persons are trying to hide behind General Marshall's statement, and the newspaper headlines carried the story as General Marshall's statement. Some fellow taking pictures at the hearing wanted to take General Marshall's picture. When General Marshall asked if the man could not do without a picture of him, a newspaperman said, "Well, if you will say you will take fathers."

So, it was perfectly apparent that the whole thing was a "plant," that it was desired to have General Marshall say he would take fathers. But he would not say it at any time.

The question is whether the men can be obtained in any other way except by taking fathers. I say they can be obtained in other ways.

Mr. BAILEY. The question is where the men can be obtained.

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly.

Mr. BAILEY. And to take fathers if it is necessary.

Mr. President, I shall conclude very shortly. I fully agree with my distinguished friend the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] that to call fathers is a rather grievous business; it is abhorrent; but it is pretty bad to take sons, merely to take the young men. Senators may say that taking fathers may be worse; but that is not what we are dealing with.

Mr. WHEELER. It is bad to take anybody.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; that is just my point.

My other point is that this is no time for America to flinch.

Mr. LUCAS. Right.

Mr. BAILEY. If it takes fathers to do the job we will not flinch. We will call for them, and will go back and account to our constituents. If we put sorrow in the homes we must put sorrow in the homes. War has been made upon us, and the national security and the national life are still at stake. We are safer than we were, thank God; but we are not yet out of the war, and the fortunes of war are the most uncertain fortunes in all the experience of men. We must win the war. That is certain. We must win the war or all is lost. We will never win the war by standing back or flinching. We will never win the war by talking about what we are losing by fighting the war. We must be prepared to lose everything we have in order to win the war. Homes? Yes. Children? Yes. Fathers? Yes. If all of us go and we save our country it is worth the price.

Mr. President, that is hard to say, it is very hard to say, but it is the solemn truth and we have got to confront it.

So I am not resolving this question in terms of the grievousness of what we are doing. I have passed that.

I sat in the Senate Chamber some months ago when the Selective Service Act was passed. I thought then I knew what it meant. I voted for it, and I do not regret that I voted for it. I sat in the Senate Chamber a number of months ago when we knew war had been made upon us, and I think all of us knew what it meant. It means a great deal more than was meant in the Civil War. It means a great deal more than was meant in the First World War. The present situation means everything that can be meant in the way of solemnity, in the way of gravity, in the way of grief and sorrow. We must measure up to it. That is all that is to be done.

Mr. President, I, too, am receiving complaints. I know about the letters my friend the Senator from Montana read the other day. I am receiving similar letters. Wives do not want to see their husbands go. I do not blame them. Fathers do not want to leave their children. I do not blame them. Fathers do not want to see their sons go, either; mothers do not want to see their sons go. But now the full power of this country must be summoned, and there must be no holding back. If those conducting the war for us want all the money we have, they get it. If they want all the manpower we can spare, they have it. This is war. We must win it.

So, Mr. President, all the argument which has been made here about breaking up homes, all the argument which has been made about the taking of fathers, has long ago been resolved by me. We Senators are going to give to our country everything by way of political risk we can give. We will do our duty by our country, and go home and give an account; and if the voters send us out into oblivion, why, Mr. President, that will be nothing, if the country is saved; and it will be less than nothing as compared to the blood that is poured out today by some boy on a battlefield in Italy. So, I feel we should abandon all this gesticulation of weakness. We should not flinch from any duty or any hardship.

I have this point to mention in conclusion: I am very hopeful about our winning the war, and I am very well satisfied that our enemies are not going to defeat us. At one time I thought we were in danger of invasion. Now I doubt if we are; but that should not put us to sleep. The war has yet to be won; and one of the best ways to win it quickly is with the full power of this Nation thrown into the battle without delay. That means you and me. Let Hitler know that we will put 5,000,000 men across the sea in 12 months, and will put 10,000,000 more men later, if necessary. Let the Japanese know. They say they are ready to lose 10,000,000 men, rather than to give up. We are ready to pay the price of 20,000,000 men. We will not give up. We will win this war. We Senators who represent the people, and who must give an account to them, must lead the way. We will meet the attacks and the criticism, and will tell our folks that we did what we could, that we spared them all we could, but we resolved everything in terms of the necessities of the power and the men and the sacrifices necessary to bring our country through this war to victory.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I rose earlier to ask a question, at the time the distinguished Senator from Kansas made his inquiry with reference to the matter of industrial deferment. As I understand the first section of the Senator's amendment, the section which deals with Federal employees, it is predicated, not on the proposition of deferment, but rather on the proposition of employment in the Federal service. Of course, the Congress, sitting in a way as a board of trustees for the Federal Government, might well take action with reference to employment in the Federal Govern-

ment, whereas it might hesitate, or there might be some question as to its power to go into the question of employment in private industry. Is not that correct?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator. I have declared my mind on this subject. I stated the principle. Let the Government act first. I will go along with my friends on any principle consistent with the efficiency of American enterprise.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. We have already passed upon the question of industry. The selective-service system now lays down rules with reference to industry. The question is whether we are to tighten those rules in industry, as we are tightening the rules with regard to business. To say for one moment that we are the custodians and trustees of the Government, but that we have nothing to say about persons who are avoiding the draft in industry is, to my way of thinking, pure nonsense.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, before I take my seat I wish to offer for the RECORD a letter from the chief of staff, General Marshall, addressed to myself. It will fully explain why I withdrew from the amendment submitted several days ago that portion which related to commissioned officers. I withdrew it in deference to the judgment of the chief of staff, and also in view of the very strong assurance which he gives in the next to the last paragraph. I ask that the letter be read from the desk for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JOSIAH BAILEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: In accordance with your request, I have carefully considered the amendment intended to be proposed by you and Mr. CLARK of Missouri to the bill (S. 763), exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

I feel that the section of your amendment which, in effect, would require the assignment of officers on a basis of their marital status would be harmful to the war effort, as it would inject into a constantly flowing situation a rigidity based upon a standard without relation to military efficiency.

I have found much public misconception on the question of officers in Washington. As you are fully aware, the Army has grown from a peacetime strength of 120,000 to approximately 7,300,000. Naturally this tremendous increase has brought with it many problems in connection with shelter, clothing, subsistence, armament, training, and troop movements. Obviously, the administration of an Army of this size requires a proportionate increase in War Department overhead.

I am sure that you will appreciate that, almost without exception all officers on duty in Washington are anxious for troop duty. Were it a matter of choice, few, if any, officers would be remaining in Washington. However, officers of intelligence, vision, and drive are as essential in staff positions in Washington as they are on the battlefield. The orderly expansion and operation of the Army are dependent upon retention of officers of this caliber in the War Department. More than a year ago, I personally directed an exhaustive study with a view of relieving as many officers as could be spared from their duties in Washington for reassignment to the field, and to reduce to the minimum, consistent with military efficiency, the field overhead establishments. This has been done and I sincerely hope the Congress will not by law require a rigid standard which would compel the War Department to assign officers on any basis other than actual military necessity.

Concerning Washington specifically, instructions have been in effect since December 5, 1942, prohibiting the assignment of any officer under the age of 28 years to Washington unless specific authority in each case, based upon proven necessity, is secured from the Deputy Chief of Staff and the Secretary of War. Furthermore, no more than one-third of the officer strength in each War Department branch is permitted to be under 35 years of age. As a matter of fact, as of September 15, 1943, 51 percent of officers on duty in the War Department are over 38 years of age. These requirements are being strictly observed, and I feel that they are in complete harmony with the spirit of your amendment and yet they do not base the assignment of officers on considerations that have no relation to military necessity.

I am anxious to get as many trained officers in the field as the situation will permit. This has been done and will continue to be done, and I sincerely hope the Congress will permit the continuation of this procedure in an orderly fashion and in accordance with our military considerations.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

Mr. REVERCOMB and Mr. WHEELER rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am interested that we may all have an opportunity to consider very thoroughly the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. I am advised that the amendment covers three pages. It has been sent to the printer for publication, and will not be printed until tomorrow.

With that situation before us, it would not be fair to vote on the amendment this afternoon, even though we are all anxious to dispose of the bill. I therefore ask the able Senator if he would not be agreeable to having the amendment go over until tomorrow.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I think that is a reasonable request. I suggest that we go ahead with as much debate as possible in order to bring this matter to a conclusion as quickly as may be, and that the amendment be printed and taken up tomorrow.

Mr. McNARY. I am sure that that suggestion would meet with the approval of the able Senator from North Carolina. We are all anxious to finish tomorrow, because on Thursday we have another matter outlined for us, which will involve other considerations. If the amendment is to go over until tomorrow, I shall be glad to have the Senate meet at 11 o'clock in the morning, with the almost perfect assurance that we can complete action tomorrow.

Mr. HILL. I shall be glad to talk with the distinguished majority leader, who will shortly return to the Chamber, about the proposal to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair had recognized the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I desired to address several inquiries to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] with respect to his amendment. I see that he has left the Chamber, and I cannot do so. Since the amendment will not come to a vote until tomorrow, I shall reserve my inquiries until that time.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I rose for the same reason stated by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], who suggested that the Bailey amendment be printed and go over until tomorrow.

From the comments of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, one would gather that he was implying that those of us who wish to have this matter looked into before we draft fathers are trying to do something to hinder the war effort, and that possibly we are not quite as patriotic as he is, or as some of those who take the opposite position are.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I would not think of claiming to be more patriotic than anyone else, especially my distinguished friend the Senator from Montana. I did not intend any such implication, and I hope he will not read it into my remarks.

Mr. WHEELER. Very well.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Before the Senator from North Carolina returns to his seat, I should like to propound a question to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from West Virginia for the purpose of a question?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I desire to address this question to the Senator from North Carolina: As I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina, it deals only with the question of Federal employees. Is that correct?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me inquire why the same ban upon deferment should not apply to employees of the State governments and employees of municipalities. I have particularly in mind the city of New York. Figures

which have been furnished me show that more than 2,700 men between the ages of 21 and 38, and who have no dependents, are employed by the government of the city of New York.

I address my question to the Senator in all sincerity. If his amendment is to prevail, why should it not also apply to employees of State and municipal governments?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I believe the principle would apply all the way through, but a serious question with respect to sovereignties is involved. I should be glad first to set the example as to the Federal Government, and later take up the question of State, county, and city employees. But I believe the Senator understands what was in my mind concerning the matter. I should like to cross one bridge at a time, or, as the general said, take one objective at a time. We cannot take them all at once.

However, let us assume there are some Senators who feel that the Federal Government does have the right to determine who shall serve in a State and who shall not. That would be a very debatable question and would prolong the debate on the pending measure. I do not know how I myself would stand on that question. I should have to look into it. I could argue the question both ways, but today I could not argue it very intelligently either way.

So, Mr. President, I am dealing first with the domain in which we have control. Let us take up the other domains later on. Let us take one thing at a time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield, so that I may ask a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana further yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The question is not one which can be long delayed. The question which has been debated here more than a week is a serious one, and should be debated until it is determined and some solution is arrived at by Congress.

Mr. BAILEY. It is not possible to solve all the questions at once.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That may be true, but it should be done as quickly and as fully as possible.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. To dispose of the question piecemeal, first as to Federal employees, then as to State employees, next as to county employees, and finally as to city employees, would, it seems to me, unduly delay a solution.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree with the Senator from West Virginia that the same general principle should be applied to employees of the States and municipalities, and that would be possible if the amendment approached the subject from a different angle; but I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from West Virginia to the fact that the amendment does not purport to approach the problem from the standpoint of deferment or through the process of deferment. If we were saying that no one who is a Government employee should be deferred, and so on, unquestionably we would have a right to do so. But, as I take it, the Federal Government has no right to say that a State shall not employ a man, or that a municipality shall not employ a man. Therefore, in order to do what the Senator from West Virginia is talking about doing it would be necessary to have an entirely new approach. The amendment makes its approach by saying that the Federal Government, in its capacity of employer, shall not employ anyone who is in a certain category. It has nothing to do with the question of deferment.

Mr. REVERCOMB and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If what has just been stated is the scope of the amendment, then I suggest that the amendment is much too narrow to effect any good. If we are to deal with the question of taking from Government employ men who have been deferred, men without dependents, then we should approach the question in a head-on and direct manner, and should take not only from the National Government, but from the State and municipal governments, such persons who are improperly employed there.

When the Senator from Missouri says the approach is such that we cannot deal with those employees, I understand that the Federal Government can deal with all persons, whether employed by the Federal Government or outside the Federal Government, and can say whether they should be deferred. If the subject is dealt with, I hope it will be dealt with completely, and that all those who are not entitled to deferment will be not deferred.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit one further word——

Mr. WHEELER. Very well.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from West Virginia evidently misunderstood my view of the matter. I did not say the Federal Government could not say that any one classification of employees—whether employees of States, municipalities, or anyone else—could not be deferred. I said the amendment approaches the problem from an angle over which the Federal Government unquestionably has control, namely, in its role of employer, by saying that the Federal Government shall not employ anyone who meets a certain description. I did not say the Federal Government does not have authority to go into the question of deferment, and to specify that someone should or should not be deferred. That question, as I see it, is a somewhat different one.

The amendment goes to the question of the Federal Government saying that it, in its capacity as employer, will not hold itself out as a haven to any persons in certain classifications.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like merely to clear up the statement the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia made in connection with the matter of deferment, which is rather different from the matter of employment, on which the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina and the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri have spoken.

Insofar as the deferment of Federal employees is concerned, I believe the matter of deferment is fairly well covered in Senate bill 886, which was passed last April. I shall not take time to read it, but if the Senator from West Virginia will refer to Senate bill 886, I believe it will answer the question he was asking the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for one further statement?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the approach to the whole subject of who may be taken into the service and who may be deferred is an approach solely from the standpoint of the question of whom the Federal Government may employ, then we are approaching the subject in a very narrow way.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana further yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana further yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator. Let me say that if the scope or range is a very narrow one, the only thought I have on that point is that certainly, insofar as deferments are concerned, under Senate bill 806, as I have already stated, the matter was handled very emphatically and categorically, I should say. I believe the Senator misunderstood its effect.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, of course, the amendment would have us say to the Federal Government, "You cannot employ men under certain conditions unless they are absolutely essential." In that way we would have laid down a principle. If that principle is good for the Federal Government, and is applicable to the Federal Government, it should be applicable to every other class of employees in the United States, unless we are passing class legislation again. In other words, we would be laying down one standard for the Federal Government, we would be laying down a different standard for a city government, we would be laying down a different standard for county and State governments, and we would be laying down a different

standard for all the industries in the United States. Of course, when finally analyzed, it does not have any particular effect at all. That is the plain, unadulterated fact: If we want to enact legislation which will be effective in preventing the deferment of persons who are not essential to industry, not essential to the Federal Government, or not essential to city, county, or State governments, we should say so if we believe in that principle. But we should not do so merely to meet the criticism of one particular group of persons in the United States.

As I said a moment ago, the reason why I rose was because of the fact that my good friend the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] said that, of course, if the Army wants 10,000,000 men, we have got to provide 10,000,000, and, if they want 20,000,000 men, we have got to provide 20,000,000, regardless of their efficiency, regardless of whether they can properly be utilized. The Senator said, "I have faith in the powers that be." I am glad to note that he is a convert to that idea. I have known times when he did not have such implicit faith in the powers that be.

I agree with the Senator from North Carolina that, if it is necessary to win the war, married men should be taken and fathers should be taken, but can we not use common ordinary horse sense and say that men in different industries who are nonessential should be taken before fathers are called?

My distinguished friend agrees with me that the home is important. What are we fighting for if it is not for the preservation of the American home? When reference is made to the American home and the children of the country, Senators may say it is "hogwash," but when the American home is destroyed the foundations upon which this Government is built are blasted. You cannot laugh that statement off; you cannot wish it off. You may wrap the American flag around you and say that in the line of patriotic duty you would even destroy American homes, but it is not necessary to destroy them, according to the testimony given before the committee. You cannot hide behind the skirts of General Marshall, for General Marshall never said that he wanted the fathers of the country. You cannot hide behind the skirts of Admiral King, for he did not say that he wanted the fathers. He said he wanted men. Yet, after General Marshall testified, many of the newspapers, which wanted to take fathers, stated that General Marshall said, "It is necessary to have fathers." There is not a scintilla of truth in it; yet it is repeated upon the floor of the Senate.

We say we are fighting for the preservation of the United States of America. The question is, How many men can you take and still preserve the United States of America? You have faith, yes; you have to have faith; but faith has to be based upon common, ordinary sense. If some one tells you something that is not so, you do not have to have faith in it because it is told you.

General Hershey says that 2,000,000 men can be obtained from the IV–F category. If there is any Senator on this floor who does not know that the Army is releasing men in that classification, let me again remind the Senate of the football player from Georgia who was recently released from the Army as a IV–F and who made three touchdowns in a football game the other day.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. His name is Frank Sinkwich.

Mr. WHEELER. Sinkwich was his name. I presume he had flat feet or a perforated ear drum or a tooth missing. At any rate, he was not good enough for the Army. Is there any common sense in that? Cannot a man with a broken ear drum perform some service for the Army? I have had my ears pierced, and for 25 or 30 years have had a hole in one ear, but I should hate to think I was not competent for combat duty, though probably not so competent as younger men. Yet men are rejected by the Army because they have a punctured ear drum, because they are a little deaf, because they have a flat foot, or because of other trivial defects. What faith can we have in Army officers who are rejecting men for such causes when the British Army and the British Navy are taking such men and were taking them before and after the war began. They did not defer them. Certainly you can wrap the American flag around you and say, 'Have faith." We have been told "to have faith" from the beginning of this administration down to the present time; we have been told "You must have faith; you must follow blindly"; but I am surprised that the Senator from North Carolina makes such an argument that to me and to the Senate of the United States, because, with all due respect to his great ability, he is singing a somewhat different tune than he has sung heretofore on many occasions with reference to faith in the powers that be. Conversion is a good thing for the soul, even if it comes late in life, and, of course, as we grow older in life, we are easier to convert, but we always want the other fellow converted.

While I am on my feet, I desire to call attention to a statement made by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, who said that when the Army generals were speaking about an army of 7,500,000 they spoke not of the Army but of the enlisted men. Let me call his attention to the fact—and I have to keep calling his attention to the facts—that General McNarney said at page 21 of the hearings on S. 2748, lowering the draft age to 18 years, October 14 and 15, 1942:

> General MCNARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I have prepared a statement which, if I read, you will probably find contains considerable repetition over what General Marshall has just said. However, for the sake of continuity, if you will bear with me I would like to read the whole thing.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. It has been suggested, General, that if you so desire, you can place your prepared statement in the record and just make an extemporaneous statement, after which the members of the committee, of course, will be privileged to question you.
>
> General MCNARNEY. Well, if you don't mind, then, I will not read from the prepared statement in its entirety.

As General Marshall stated, the strength of the Army—

> Not of the enlisted men alone—
>
> which we plan for the end of the calendar year 1943 will be about 7,500,000. The Army today is slightly over 4,000,000, and by the end of December of this year we expect to have in the Army approximately 5,000,000. This means a heavy draft during the remaining months of this year, which will run close to 400,000 men a month.

So he was not talking about the enlisted men alone, he was talking about the Army. The Senator from Alabama said they were talking only about the men, but when they talk about the Army they mean one thing and when they talk about the men they mean another. Certainly "Army" includes officers, and it is a fair assumption that the committee thought Marshall, Stimson, and McNarney were talking about the over-all size of the Army.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield to my good friend from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The Senator, I presume, is going back to the statement of General Marshall made a year ago in which he used the expression "7,500,000 men." I insist that General Marshall at that time was talking about 7,500,000 enlisted personnel.

Mr. WHEELER. That is the interpretation of the Senator.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will be a little patient with me, I again call attention to the testimony of General McNarney on page 33 of the recent hearings, when the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] had this to say——

Mr. WHEELER. Listen to this——

Mr. HILL. The Senator goes back to this proposition again, and since he goes back to it again, and since Senators are now on the floor who did not hear the statement earlier in the day, they have a right to hear it now. The Senator from Utah addressed this question to General McNarney:

> But your statement is still consistent with the plans made over a year ago. The plans which were announced here were slightly different, as I remember, one was for 7,500,000 and the other was for 8,200,000.

General McNarney replied to the observation or question of the Senator from Utah, as follows:

> The 7,500,000 you referred to was enlisted men and the 8,200,000 included enlisted men, officers, and women.

I have before me——

Mr. WHEELER. If the Senator desires to make a statement——

Mr. HILL. I desire to give the Senator the true facts. I do not like to interrupt him, but he has made the same statement many times, and gone into the same figures, and since he has referred to me, I should be permitted to enlighten him.

Mr. WHEELER. Proceed; the Senator may make his speech.

Mr. HILL. I do not care to make a speech, but I do want to keep the record straight.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator will yield to me for a moment.

Mr. HILL. Not now. General McNarney appeared on October 14, 1942, with reference to the lowering of the draft age to 18 years, the same proposition on which General Marshall was appearing before the House committee. General Marshall and General McNarney both testified at that time, in October a year ago, about the size of the Army. This is what General McNarney said. I read from page 24 of the hearings of October 14, 1942:

By the end of this year the enlisted strength of the Army—

That is, there is a difference between the strength including sergeants and corporals and privates——

Mr. WHEELER. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. HILL. From the hearings before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs on October 14, 1942, the same time General McNarney made his statement before the House committee. This was before the Senate committee, but on the same bill and at the same time. General McNarney said:

By the end of this year the enlisted strength of the Army—

And the enlisted strength differentiates between total strength, and the total strength less the officer strength. The enlisted strength does not include the officer strength, and would not include the women.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is reading from what page; page 24?

Mr. HILL. That is correct; the hearing of October 14, 1942, before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. This is General McNarney testifying in October 1942:

By the end of this year the enlisted strength of the Army will approximate 5,000,000 men.

That is, by the end of 1942, not 1943. General McNarney proceeded:

To complete this year's program, a million more men will be inducted during October, November, and December of this year.

During 1943 we plan to add two and one-half million more men, to reach a total of seven and one-half million by the end of 1943.

Seven and a half million by the end of 1943. That meant enlisted men. That was the plan at that time, to have seven and a half million enlisted personnel, as General Marshall said before the House committee, but in considering the over-all picture we also have to consider the officers and the women, which gives the total number, not 7,500,000, but 8,200,000. That is the story.

Mr. WHEELER. I called attention to this because the Senator from Alabama said this afternoon that when they mentioned the men they meant one thing, and when they spoke of the Army they meant another.

Mr. HILL. Let me say this——

Mr. WHEELER. No; I refuse to let the Senator interrupt.

Mr. HILL. Proceed.

Mr. WHEELER. I should like to finish a sentence.

Mr. HILL. I do not mean to be discourteous.

Mr. WHEELER. I read from General McNarney's statement of October 14.

Mr. HILL. Give me the page, and which hearing it was.

Mr. WHEELER. I am reading from page 21.

Mr. HILL. Of the same hearing?

Mr. WHEELER. Of the same hearing.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

Mr. WHEELER. General McNarney said:

The strength of the Army which we plan for the end of the calendar year 1943 will be about 7,500,000.

He said "the strength of the Army." If soldiers and officers are not members of the Army, I do not know what they are. That is what is confusing; they have said at one place they want an Army of 7,500,000 men, they come forward again and say they want an Army of 8,200,000, then they talk about reducing it.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. No; let me finish. Do not become excited.

Mr. HILL. I am not excited; the Senator is the one who is excited.

Mr. WHEELER. No; I am not excited, but I do not like to have the Senator break in every 2 minutes.

Mr. HILL. I want to make a correction, but I do not wish to be discourteous.

Mr. WHEELER. Have you a correction on page 23?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I have a correction that is very easy to make.

Mr. WHEELER. Very well.

Mr. HILL. The statement from which I read about the enlisted strength, on page 24, was the prepared statement of General McNarney, the statement he brought to the committee, carefully prepared and typewritten. When he got to the committee the chairman of the committee said to him——

Mr. WHEELER. I have just read that.

Mr. HILL. But wait a moment. The chairman said:

It has been suggested, General, that if you so desire, you can place your prepared statement in the record and just make an extemporaneous statement, after which the members of the committee, of course, will be privileged to question you.

General McNarney said:

Well, if you don't mind, then I will not read from the prepared statement in its entirety.

Then he proceeded to speak extemporaneously. He did not speak with that degree of accuracy which he followed in his prepared statement, but the prepared statement shows clearly that he spoke of seven and a half million enlisted personnel, which, with the additional officers, makes a total of 8,200,000. That is the whole story. He was not as accurate in his extemporaneous statement as in his prepared statement.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator contends, then, that when he made the statement as to 7,500,000 men he was not accurate, and that he did not mean what he said.

Mr. HILL. No; I do not mean that. I will not say he was not accurate—I do not know that that is the proper word—but he did not give as specific a picture as he did in his prepared statement. He used the figures 7,500,000 without stating whether it meant 7,500,000 as an over-all figure, or whether it merely meant 7,500,000 enlisted men. But in the prepared statement, which was no doubt carefully formulated, he made very clear that the 7,500,000 applied only to the enlisted personnel, because he used the very words, "enlisted strength of the Army," in differentiation from over-all strength, which includes, as I have said, officer strength as well as enlisted strength.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to repeat—if the Senator will let me have time to repeat what I said—the story went forth from one end of the country to the other, it was published in every newspaper, that the Army was going to number 7,500,000. That was the statement by Mr. Stimson, the Secretary of War, and that was the statement made by General McNarney and the statement made by General Marshall. The statement was that the Army was to number 7,500,000. They did not say anything about officers and WAC's increasing the number to 8,200,000. The statement which went from one end of the country to the other, by the Associated Press and all the newspapers, was that they were asking for an Army of 7,500,000.

If Senators will examine newspapers of that date, they will find that to be the fact. That was in accordance with the testimony of Army officers.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, before my distinguished friend, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], leaves the floor I wish to say a word further. He spoke of his difficulty in getting me to understand the figures he presented. He has referred several times to the fact that General Hershey said we can obtain 2,000,000 men from the IV-F's. I have brought this matter to the attention of the Senate once before, and I dislike to continue to go over it, but the Senator from Montana continues to make the same statement.

Mr. WHEELER. Did not General Hershey make that statement?

Mr. HILL. I will let the Senate know exactly what General Hershey said. It appears on page 190 of the hearings recently held before the Senate Military Affairs Committee. I read as follows:

Senator WHEELER. The next question I wanted to ask you was: If these standards were lowered and a full check was made of the available single men in this country, and if the Army and Navy standards were lowered to take in some of the classifications you have named today, you would not have to take married men at least for a long time, would you?

General HERSHEY. That is right. We have 3,000,000 men, approximately, in IV-F or a little more. If you could lower the standards to the place where you could take 2,-

000,000 of them, obviously you would put it off.

Put off the drafting of fathers. Then General Hershey proceeded:

The procurement man must try, if he can, to sell what he has on hand. It is my business to sell every last man that the Army and Navy can possibly use.

Senator WHEELER. You have tried to the best of your ability to do that, but the Army and Navy have disagreed with you with reference to that.

General HERSHEY. They have come down some, but obviously they have not come down to the seller's market yet.

Senator HILL. You are not trying to speak as a battery commander or a regimental commander * * *

General HERSHEY. * * * On the other hand, if General White would come to me and say, "If you were a member of my division, what would you advise me on this," obviously my advice would have to be different because it is a different viewpoint.

Mr. President, there can be no question about it. If we could go into the IV-F's and take them all we would obtain 3,000,000 men, or as General Hershey said, if we could take 2,000,000 of them we would not be obliged to draft any fathers. But the standards in the armed services would have to be lowered. General Hershey said, however, he is a salesman, and is trying to sell every man the Army and Navy can use.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is no doubt in the Senator's mind, is there, that there are many IV-F men who can render service in the Army in many important capacities? I have in mind a general officer in the Army, a very efficient one, now on active service, but who was to my knowledge thrown out of the Army years ago when he was 18 years of age by reason of the fact that he had a perforated eardrum. He still has a perforated eardrum. He had it when he was a little boy. He got back in the Army in some way and served in the last war, and was an able, efficient, fine, brilliant officer in that war, and has been in the armed service ever since, and is now a general. That is simply an illustration. I am not saying that in any way with the idea of reflecting on the standards of the armed services, but I say that if those in authority will comb the IV-F's they will find many able men available for service in the armed forces. The Senator from Alabama knows that to be so.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, according to the testimony those in authority are constantly screening and rescreening the IV-F's. I do not know what kind of perforated eardrum the officer referred to by the Senator from Missouri had. I do not know what the years have done to him so far as curing that affliction is concerned. I do know that time and again reference has been made to the famous athlete who could perform such great feats on the football field but who had been rejected by the Army because of perforated eardrums. So I asked the office of the Surgeon General of the Army about perforated eardrums, and this is what the office of the Surgeon General informs me:

The Surgeon General advises that a person with a perforated eardrum is easily susceptible to middle ear infection and to infection of the brain covering and brain tissue when subjected to cold, damp weather. Damp conditions lead to flare-ups of acute inflammation in the middle ear and necessitate hospitalization and lengthy treatment. Such infection leads to brain abscess or meningitis. Whether or not a person is an athlete has no bearing upon his susceptibility for infection as a result of perforated eardrums. Such persons are not acceptable even for limited service because limited service personnel go into the zones of communication and with combat troops in noncombat duty. From July 1942 to January 1943 the War Department accepted persons with perforated eardrums for limited service against the advice of civilian physicians. The result was the filling of Army hospitals with persons who had received infection as a result of the perforated eardrums.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. That statement, Mr. President, is certainly ridiculous. As I have said, I have had a perforated eardrum for 40 years. When one who has a perforated eardrum goes into water the ear may become affected. I, with my perforated eardrum, however, have been in swimming and got it filled with water, with no bad results. Of course, if a man who has a perforated eardrum gets a cold it affects him to some slight degree. But when a physician says that a man 25, 30, or 38 years of age is not fit for service in the Army simply because of the fact that he has a perforated eardrum, that physician is saying something which cannot be borne out by experience had by persons with perforated eardrums. That is all there is to that.

If the Senator will permit me further, I wish to show the difference between the standard we have and the standard the British have had for their Navy. The British take into the Navy men who are hard of hearing and place them in special positions. They take men with flat feet and place them in other positions. The same thing is true with respect to men with other infirmities. But our Navy and our Army have insisted upon the very topnotch men, men without any defects of any kind or character. That is what has brought us to the place where it is necessary to take fathers. The British, as I have previously pointed out, have boasted of their Navy, and we all recognize that they have had the greatest Navy in the world. The Russian Army is one of the greatest fighting forces in the world today. It has done more than any other Army or any other group of armies to drive the Germans back.

Mr. HILL. With reference to perforated eardrums I wish to call attention to the fact that the Army, contrary to the advice of civilian physicians, over a period of 6 months did accept persons with perforated eardrums, and the experience was just exactly what the civilian physicians foretold; to wit, the hospitals were filled with persons who received infection as the result of having perforated eardrums.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me say——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to let me complete my remarks. The Senator has made his speech, and he and I will stay here all night if he goes back over that speech.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not going back over it.

Mr. HILL. The Senator referred to the British Navy. We are taking some of the limited-service men. We are going to have about 700,000 limited-service men in the Army of the United States. We have taken some, as I have said several times, directly from civilian life, through the Selective Service System, and we are developing others who either because of battle casualties or because of the stress and strain of Army life, are no longer fit for combat duty. So we shall have some 700,000 men of limited service in the Army. We are taking some from the IV-F category and are developing others.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I propose to offer to the pending amendment, and I ask that it be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of Mr. BAILEY's amendment it is proposed to add the following:

Amendment proposed by Mr. CLARK of Missouri to the amendment proposed by Mr. BAILEY (for himself and Mr. CLARK of Missouri) to the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, viz: At the end of the amendment insert the following additional section:

"SEC. 3. Section 10 of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) In order to assist in the determination of whether or not men should be deferred from training and service because they are physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective, and to delay as long as possible the induction of men living with their families, the President shall forthwith appoint a commission of five qualified physicians, of whom at least one shall be an Army officer and one a Navy officer, who shall examine the physical qualification requirements for admission to the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and recommend to the President any changes therein which they believe can be made without impairing the efficiency of the armed services. The commission shall especially consider the establishment of special standards for men who will be inducted only for limited service. The Director of Selective Service shall cause to be reexamined those men who may qualify under any new standards established'."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be printed, and also that it be printed in the RECORD, for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not intend at this time to discuss the bill or the amendment, but I wish to call attention to the publication in various

newspapers in the United States of an article written by Mr. Ray Tucker. We all know Mr. Tucker. I have known him for many years; and I have a very high regard for him, and I have never felt that he would knowingly publish misinformation or information which he himself did not believe to be accurate.

It seems that within the last 2 weeks there has gone over the country, and been published throughout the country in the newspapers served by the McClure Newspaper Syndicate, an article written by Mr. Tucker which I wish to read in order that I may refute it. It appeared in his column entitled "The News Behind the News," from Washington.

The particular clipping I hold in my hand came from the Grand Rapids Herald, of Grand Rapids, Mich. I am informed that throughout the Middle West, especially, the article appeared in many newspapers. It reads as follows:

THE NEWS BEHIND THE NEWS

(By Ray Tucker)

The real reason for disunity between Chief of Staff George C. Marshall and President Roosevelt is the military leader's personal opposition to the draft of fathers. As reported in this column on September 16, the head of our armies and Selective Service boss Hershey do not believe it is necessary to mobilize them.

In a confidential conference at the White House, General Marshall is said to have explained that he had enough fighting men and did not require heads of families. General Hershey made a similar report. At least 2,000,000 me can be enrolled for both the Army and Navy, providing certain standards are lowered, without calling on parents.

Mr. Roosevelt, however, was adamant. He insisted that they be taken, against the advice of both Marshall and Hershey. Naturally, the two generals had to bow to F. D. R.'s wishes. They swallowed their pride and opinions when they appeared before congressional committees and sang a Presidential tune.

But you can paste this in the inside of your hat: Both General Marshall and General Hershey, no matter what their Commander in Chief forced them to say at Senate hearings, think that the paternal conscription demanded by the administration will disrupt the home front.

WEDDING

Two entirely different ideas animate General Marshall and President Roosevelt in their fixing of military quotas and their decisions on how the armed forces should be used during and after the war.

The Chief of Staff wants enough soldiers to defeat the enemy. He considers that he has almost reached that goal. He will have nearly 8,000,000 trained fighters a year from now, sufficient to whip Germany and Japan. Therefore, he is not in favor of drafting daddies and slowing down factory and farm output. In short, he seeks a balanced Army and production set-up.

Mr. Roosevelt is looking forward to the peace table. He can dominate that conference only if the United States, not Russia or Britain, possesses the world's most powerful fighting machine. Therefore, the President is determined to muster men with new wedding rings on their fingers.

In view of these revelations, readers may still wonder why Generals Marshall and Hershey testified in favor of the President's plan before congressional committees. Let it be repeated: There is nothing mysterious about their seeming strange behavior. When the C. in C.—

That is, the Commander in Chief—

issues commands, they are usually obeyed.

Mr. President, the plain inference of the article is that General Marshall and General Hershey came before the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate and testified as they did against their own convictions, against their own desires, but at the command of the President of the United States. I do not know how widely the article or similar articles may have been read; but certainly they have been circulated in the States of Senators who are called upon in the performance of their duties to vote upon the question now before the Senate. In order that the RECORD may speak the truth, I wish to state the sequence of events which led up to the testimony of General Marshall and General Hershey.

We all know that when the pending bill was introduced last February, it remained before the Committee on Military Affairs until May, when the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the author of the bill, appeared before the committee and made a statement in its favor. No one else was heard.

The bill was referred, in the routine reference, to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. Both those Cabinet officers wrote letters to the committee expressing opposition to the bill.

In July the Congress was about to take a recess, and the bill had not been reported, notwithstanding that on the 5th of May the Senator from Montana had appeared in behalf of his measure. No further testimony having been heard, the Senator again went before the committee, and asked that the bill be reported with the understanding that it would not be taken up until after the recess. The bill was reported.

When the Senate returned after the recess the bill was promptly made the unfinished business. There was a general feeling here that there should be hearings. Senators did not have the information which they required in order to enable them to cast an intelligent vote upon the measure and, by general agreement, hearings were had.

At the time when the Senate ordered hearings, or the committee provided hearings, it was understood that General Marshall and General Hershey, at least, among others, would appear before the committee. At that very hour General Marshall was on his way to Mexico City. He knew nothing about the fact that the hearings had been scheduled to begin on the following Wednesday or Thursday—I do not now recall which.

The hearings were held according to schedule. In lieu of General Marshall, General McNarney, the deputy chief of staff, came before the committee and testified at length. Following him, General Hershey, Judge Patterson, the Under Secretary of War, and Admiral Jacobs, the head of the personnel division of the Navy, came before the committee, and testified. General Marshall was not to return to Washington until Saturday night following those hearings. The hearings went over until Monday, in order that General Marshall and Admiral King might be heard.

General Marshall returned from his trip to Mexico on Saturday night or Sunday morning, and appeared before the committee on Monday morning. General Marshall did not see the President. He did not even have a conversation with him on the subject of his testimony, or whether he was to testify before the committee. General Marshall came before the committee at the invitation of the committee and made a preliminary statement in writing, which he submitted to the committee, after which he submitted himself to questions. No such conference as that which is described in this article was ever held by the President with General Marshall or with General Hershey.

It seems to me that in the midst of war, and all the complications which arise with regard to our Army, at least we might credit the Chief of Staff of the United States Army with sufficient courage and integrity not to traipse up to the Senate and testify against his own convictions, as it is claimed the President of the United States made him do.

I believe that Senators who must vote on this subject and the people who must think about it ought to know that no such conference was ever held, and that no such orders were ever given. I am not certain that the President even knew that General Marshall or General Hershey was to testify, unless he obtained such information from the newspapers, as did everyone else. General Marshall and General Hershey ought not to be put in the attitude of having been compelled by the Commander in Chief to testify against their convictions. In my judgment the President has never compelled any Army or Navy officer to testify against his convictions on any subject before the committees of Congress.

I do not believe that they would be so spineless as to testify against their convictions about things that they have worked out, and in which they believe, simply because they might be ordered to do so. The Senate ought not to be required to vote on an important measure of this kind on the basis of some alleged intimidation on the part of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy against the highest ranking officers of the Army and Navy.

I felt it my duty to call attention to this article. I regret that now and then I must take occasion to call attention to inaccurate statements sent out through the press. As I said at the outset, I know Mr. Tucker. I do not believe he would consciously misrepresent anything of that sort, but the statement has gone out. No such conference occurred. No such conversation occurred. No such orders were issued. The Senate and the country ought to know it. Where Mr. Tucker got his information, of course I do not know; but there ought to be on

the part of those who seek to inform the public an effort to verify the truthfulness and accuracy of statements affecting the morale and the very integrity of our Army and Navy organizations, and their responsibility under the Constitution and the laws of Congress, and under their commanding officers, before the people can be expected to feel that no possible error can creep into such reports. It seems to me that this report was a very regrettable error. I have therefore felt it my duty to call attention to it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from Kentucky has called attention to the article in question; but I do not think it is necessary to become so excited about articles which emanate from Washington. The people make up their own minds. At this particular time the people are united. They know what it is all about. Naturally, articles which emanate from Washington are read, but they are generally more entertaining than conclusive as to what is actually going on.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

SALE OF BONDS DURING THIRD WAR LOAN CAMPAIGN

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to give the Senate a little information which I received today from the Treasury Department. The information makes me very proud, and it will indicate to this body that, after all, the people of the various States are doing their full share.

The Research and Statistical Bureau of the Treasury Department informed my office this afternoon that returns under the quotas for the Third War Loan drive are divided into two categories. The first category includes individuals and estates; the second, corporations, associations, and other institutions of that nature. In the second division, New Mexico leads, as of October 2, with 325 percent fulfillment, or 225 percent above its quota. The national average fulfillment for corporations, associations, and other such institutions, as of the same date, is 123 percent, or 23 percent above the quota. So it can readily be seen that the people of the United States are united in the effort which is being made.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a compilation published in the Washington Star, which shows the State-by-State sale of bonds in the Third War Loan drive through last Friday, October 1. I am very proud to note that the State of Maryland stands first in the compilation, having subscribed 146 percent of its quota—in other words, nearly half as much again as was assigned to it, and about 8 percent more than its closest competitor, West Virginia, which also went well over the top. It is a matter of great satisfaction and pardonable pride to know that the quota for Maryland was $196,000,000, and the subscriptions were $285,000,000. I believe that this information should be placed in the RECORD so that the totals may be referred to from time to time in the future.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE-BY-STATE BOND TOTALS—MARYLAND CONTINUES TO LEAD NATION WITH 146 PERCENT OF QUOTA RAISED

The State-by-State sales of bonds in the Third War Loan through Friday were announced last night by the Treasury Department as follows:

	Grand total			Sales to individuals		
	Percent of quota	Quota, in million dollars	Sales, in million dollars	Percent of quota	Quota, in million dollars	Sales, in million dollars
Maryland	146	196	285	86	84	72
West Virginia	138	76	105	103	42	43
Ohio	136	698	950	85	313	267
Georgia	126	137	173	134	70	94
Rhode Island	118	81	96	54	31	17
Minnesota	112	216	242	76	96	73
New Hampshire	112	39	44	48	13	6
Illinois	111	921	1,022	67	330	221
Utah	111	41	45	49	20	10
New York	110	4,709	5,173	85	796	680
Oregon	109	104	114	90	58	52
New Jersey	106	585	620	64	185	118
Alabama	105	108	114	86	56	48
Tennessee	104	141	147	94	64	60
Virginia	104	153	158	61	74	45
Delaware	103	49	51	87	15	13
Missouri	103	320	328	73	129	94
North Carolina	103	145	150	70	70	49
South Carolina	101	61	62	55	33	18
Indiana	99	257	255	71	118	84
Pennsylvania	99	1,071	1,067	78	88	301
Massachusetts	98	783	768	60	176	105
Colorado	97	72	70	67	37	25
Mississippi	97	53	51	95	34	32
Montana	97	35	34	86	18	16
Connecticut	94	453	424	50	99	50
Florida	94	117	110	90	58	53
Maine	94	54	50	51	27	14
Michigan	94	451	426	59	225	133
Oklahoma	93	110	93	81	45	36
Texas	93	420	389	88	201	176
Iowa	92	196	180	85	89	76
Washington	91	191	174	51	88	45
Wisconsin	91	298	271	58	103	609
Louisiana	90	123	111	80	58	47
Kentucky	89	126	113	98	57	56
North Dakota	89	29	26	72	17	12
Southern California	82	422	347	50	207	102
New Mexico	82	14	11	50	12	6
South Dakota	82	35	29	70	20	14
Wyoming	82	12	10	45	8	4
Arizona	80	32	26	62	17	11
Idaho	80	25	20	60	15	9
Nevada	80	12	10	61	8	5
Arkansas	78	58	45	82	31	26
Northern California	76	424	324	71	182	129
Kansas	76	112	85	62	65	41
Nebraska	76	103	78	52	47	24
Vermont	76	27	21	50	9	4
Possessions	72	21	15	59	11	6

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I fully share the feeling of pride of my colleague in regard to the excellent showing made by the State of Maryland in the Third War Loan drive. The people of Maryland have acted vigorously, quickly, and most effectively under the skillful leadership of Hooper S. Miles, chairman of the committee.

LEASING OF THE CAPITAL GARAGE BY THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "One Hundred and Twenty-nine United States Cars in Big Garage Cost $85 Month Each to House," which was published in the Washington Post of this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-NINE UNITED STATES CARS IN BIG GARAGE COST $85 A MONTH EACH TO HOUSE

(By Linton Burkett)

Garaging 129 Government-owned vehicles at the old Capital Garage, 1312 New York Avenue NW., which was leased August 1 by the Federal Works Agency, is costing the Federal Government $85 a month for each car, exclusively of pay for personnel, it was learned yesterday.

While there are now but 129 cars using the huge garage for night storage only, officials explained that it was planned to store a total of 386 vehicles there eventually.

At the same time it was shown the building is being leased for a rental of $134,925 a year, or more than $11,000 a month.

This would mean that the cost to the Government of housing the 386 cars at night would amount to $28 each a month.

At the same time it was learned that the Capital Garage, which formerly occupied the building but has since moved to 1630 L Street NW., charges $15 a month to garage a car for the night.

The Government agencies maintain a staff of 12 to operate the building, including 2 mechanics. The F. W. A. is now trying to get more mechanics. The cost of this force is not reflected in the per-car garage cost.

In addition to parking Government cars, there are three floors which have been set aside for use in storing records of various agencies. Among these is the Bureau of the Census and the Navy.

Among the agencies now using the garage for parking are the Navy, the Office for Emergency Management, Public Buildings Administration, the Geological Survey, and the F. W. A.

Officials said offers to take care of the additional cars they believed could be accommodated had been made to several agencies and that some of them were now canceling their arrangements with private parking concerns.

The garage is equipped to wash and service cars with gasoline, oil, and greasing jobs, as well as repair work. It has the equivalent of 10 stores, accessible by ramps.

Due to the nature of the use to which the cars are put, the garage is usually empty during the daylight hours. As the time when the cars will be required for use is practically the same with all agencies, officials of the F. W. A. said they feared that storing more than 386 would create a serious traffic problem on New York Avenue when the cars leave in the morning and return at night.

Officials said they had learned that prior to the time the Capital Garage relinquished the building the concern was storing only 200 cars a night and averaging 300 transient cars a day. Officials of the company said the building could park a total of 1,250 cars without using the roof.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I believe that I have unimpeachable evidence which shows that this garage could hold 1,200 cars, and, with the use of the aisles, 1,400 cars, while there are now but 129 cars using this huge garage for night storage only. The rent on this garage amounts to more than $130,000 a year, or more than $11,000 a month.

That is not all, Mr. President. Strange as it may seem to the Senate, the fact is that the Government apparently thought it worth while not to deal directly when it rented this garage, but to deal through an agent. The National Mortgage & Investment Co., which owned the garage, was eager to lease it. For merely getting the president of the

company to meet with the agent of the Government, which leased the garage, and for drawing up the lease, the United States Government paid the agent $6,500. The lease provides that if the Government shall lease the garage for another year, the agent shall receive $3,900 more.

Mr. President, if that is not pure, unadulterated waste, I should like to have some Senator define to me what waste is. Investigation shows that a 5-minute streetcar ride or a 2-minute taxicab ride was all that was needed for the president of this company to conclude the entire leasing transaction with the Government. All persons who had contracts for space or service in the building were notified to vacate by July 31, 1943, and the garage was surrendered to the Government on August 1. Yet more than a month after the Government took over this garage, for which it is paying $130,000 a year rent, it has nine cars in the basement and nine cars on the first floor.

I cannot resist congratulating the newspapers of Washington for their courage in bringing out the facts about this 10-story building. In my judgment, it is a typical example of the waste and inefficiency which is prevalent among many Government departments in Washington.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. Many persons think that it is the Congress of the United States which does these things. Will the Senator enlighten us as to who performed this valiant service for the taxpayers of the Nation?

Mr. LANGER. I will explain in detail the article which I have read. It appears in this morning's Washington Post. The article reads as follows:

> The garaging of 129 Government-owned vehicles at the old Capital Garage, 1312 New York Avenue NW., which was leased August 1 by the Federal Works Agency, is costing the Federal Government $85 a month for each car, exclusive of pay for personnel.

Have I answered the Senator's question?

Mr. HOLMAN. My question has been answered. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, after confirmation of the nominations which appear on the Executive Calendar it is my purpose to move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow, with the hope that we may finish consideration of the pending bill and all amendments which have been or may be offered, and conclude the subject.

As we all know, on Thursday Senators who made the trip around the world are to begin at noon when the Senate meets to speak to us about their experiences. I do not know how long that will take, but I think it is desirable on the part of the Senate to conclude the consideration of the pending bill. I, therefore, hope that Senators will be present promptly at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning so that no unnecessary time may be lost in getting started.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States nominating John K. Caldwell, of Kentucky, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, acting as minister resident and consul general in Ethiopia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Ethiopia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONFIRMATION OF POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations of postmasters appearing on the Executive Calendar be now considered as in executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The clerk will proceed to state the nominations.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lloyd R. Dyer to be postmaster at Worley, Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul E. Byrum to be postmaster at Milltown, Ind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 6, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate October 5 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John K. Caldwell, of Kentucky, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, acting as minister resident and consul general in Ethiopia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ethiopia.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 5 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

POSTMASTERS

IDAHO

Lloyd R. Dyer, Worley.

INDIANA

Paul E. Byrum, Milltown.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, who holdest in Thine hand the destiny of human life and bringest to the desolate soul blessings of comfort and consolation, be pleased to hear our prayer. O Lord, who riseth with healing in Thy wings, let it stream from the hills and the plains giving strength to tenderness and tenderness to strength. Heavenly Father, this trailing earth is shaking and convulsing with conflicts of upheaval and death. We pray for our sons and daughters who from dawn to dusk are struggling to rescue the precious things which guard the citadel of the soul. As they gaze on range after range of accumulating trials and hardships, to every tear give a promise and to every doubt a blessed assurance. Between them and our enemies shall be erected the standard of our Lord beyond which they cannot pass.

"Sometime when all life's lessons have
been learned,
And suns and stars forevermore have
set,
The things which our weak judgments
here have spurned,
The things over which we grieved
with lashes wet,
Will flash upon us out of life's dark
night,
As stars shine most in deeper tints of
blue!
And we shall see how all God's plans
were right
And how what seemed reproof, was
love most true."

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. CON. RES. 38. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the resolution (H. Res. 30) authorizing and directing an investigation of the progress of the war effort.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of September 30, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Youngstown Vindicator, of Youngstown, Ohio, of September 26, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

BERLIN LAKE SAVES VALLEY

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, about a year and a half ago when we were considering the lease-lend, I recall coming down into the Well, and addressing the House on the necessity of building a dam for the protection of the steel industry above Youngstown, Ohio, on the Mahoning River.

This Mahoning Valley steel district, which produces 11 percent of all of the steel in the United States, had been retarded in the winter and spring of each year with high water and in the summer and fall with low water and drought. I called the attention of the Congress to the fact that if they would allow $6,000,000 of the $6,000,000,000 appropriation of lease-lend for this badly needed dam, that it would be the best investment that could be spent from this money.

After calling on all of the departments that had the handling of this lease-lend money, also the Lanham Act funds, under which authorization the dam could have been constructed, I appealed to the Members of Congress. With your foresight and vision and determination to do everything possible to speed the production of war materials, the money was immediately appropriated, for the construction of the Berlin Dam.

Last fall the dam was completed and at Christmas time it held back 11,000,000,000 gallons of water. At that time, the water in the Mahoning River came within 2 inches of shutting down the entire production of steel in that valley. Fortunately, we lost but 6,000 tons of steel because of the high water. Had the dam not been built, we would have been many months digging frozen steel from the furnaces as had been the case in previous years.

This past summer we had very little rain, but the dam having a storage capacity of 23,000,000,000 gallons allowed 280,000,000 gallons to be released daily into the stream of the Mahoning River for the use of steel and other industries.

That additional water, industrial leaders say, was the reason for their being able to save and produce a million additional tons of steel. When we think of the War Production Board granting priorities for coffee grinders and other utensils made of steel, it makes one wonder what might have happened to the war effort and to that Board if this added million tons of steel had not been made available for their allocation.

I again wish to thank the Members of this Congress for their foresight and vision in creating the authorization for the construction of the Berlin Dam.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent report of a Federal grand jury in the district court of the United States for the southern district of New York, dealing with the question of aliens and immigration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given unanimous consent to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a copy of an address made on September 28, 1943, by the Honorable Walter E. Edge, formerly a member of the Senate from the State of New Jersey.

I am advised by the Public Printer that the total cost will be $157.50, which is $67.50 in excess of the allowance, and I ask unanimous consent for this exception.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein excerpts from a broadcast delivered by Lisa Sergio, on September 28, 1943, over Station WEIL, of New York.

This request was made by Mr. W. F. Wegrzynek, president of the National Committee of Americans of Polish descent. He is also the publisher of the largest Polish newspaper in New York State.

Mr. Wegrzynek is a patriot of unusual distinction and has rendered many great services to this country in behalf of Polish American citizens who have always been patriotic and loyal to the land of their adoption.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Judge N. K. Buck, before the Spokane Chamber of Commerce, on July 7, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject, Congressmen Act to Avert a Serious Milk Shortage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SCHIFFLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Friday, October 8, after the disposition of other matters on the Speaker's desk, and following any other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Dayton Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes today at the conclusion of the legislative program for the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a report of a meeting of the Farm Labor Committee of the State of Missouri at a meeting of the committee held at Columbia, Mo., on September 17.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Thursday I may address the House for 15 minutes after the conclusion of the legislative business for the day and other

special orders that have already been entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SUBSIDY IN REVERSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion on the floor of Congress and throughout the country about providing subsidies to prevent the increase in the cost of food. Some time ago the O. P. A. ordered a rollback in the price of meat and suggested that a subsidy would be paid to offset the reduction in price. It was supposed to go to the producer, but he has not heard of it yet.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, on August 1 the Commodity Credit Corporation, without previous notice, ordered every processor in the country to increase their prices on soybean meal, cottonseed meal, and peanut meal all the way from $8.50 to $10.50 per ton and to pay the money direct to the Commodity Credit Corporation. This regardless of the fact that some of the meal had already been contracted but not delivered. Livestock feeders were required to pay the extra $10.50 per ton on all stocks sold during a 60-day period from August 1 to October 1. The amount collected on soybean meal is more than $400,000,000, on cottonseed $20,000,000 or $30,000,000. In other words, this agency of the Government collected almost one-half billion dollars from the livestock feeders of this country in the 60-day period and thereby, of course, increased the cost of feed on the livestock being produced for market. Here is a case when an agency of the Government attempts to keep prices down by talking about paying subsidy and turns around and collects nearly one-half billion dollars from the feeders and producers to be turned over to the Commodity Credit Corporation. I do not know where they get the authority for it, but it certainly is a case of subsidy in reverse where the left hand does not seem to know or care what the right hand is doing.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are you going to skip tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. With the gentleman's permission; yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman think we ought to begin to attend to some of this stuff that is pressing? If there is no necessity of us coming here to do that, could you not adjourn so that we could go hunting or fishing and not make any pretense of trying to fool the folks any more?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know that there is any fooling of anyone. Whatever the gentleman wants to say is perfectly agreeable to me; I am in a most pleasant frame of mind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes today at the conclusion of other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. FISH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including therein a letter from the Secretary of the Interior on the Board of Geographical Names.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have three requests to submit: First, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a copy of a bill I have introduced, H. R. 3376, for the purpose of amending the National Life insurance Act of 1940; second, to insert the copy of a bill I have introduced for the purpose of placing a floor under the price of cotton at 40 cents a pound; and third, to include in the RECORD a copy of a bill I have introduced to amend section 2 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 relating to eligibility for annuities and providing that employees may have the right to retire after 30 years of service regardless of age.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS TO SIT DURING SESSION OF THE HOUSE TODAY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors may sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WISDOM OF CHURCHILL-HORE-BELISHA DUAL CITIZENSHIP SPEECHES QUESTIONED

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday Mr. Hore-Belisha, of the British Empire, made a speech advocating making every citizen of the United States a citizen of the British Empire, and making every citizen of the British Empire a citizen of the United States. The same proposition was advanced by Mr. Winston Churchill in his recent speech at Harvard University.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time that somebody in the American Congress served notice on these British leaders that they are not doing the Allied cause any good by advocating a policy which would mean abolishing the Declaration of Independence or ignoring the Constitution of the United States, unless we were to take the issue to the people themselves in the form of a constitutional amendment, which it would take several years to get passed upon, and would stir a bitter Nation-wide controversy.

I do not believe that there is one man out of a hundred in this House or the Senate who could be reelected on such a platform. The American people are willing to join the other civilized nations of the earth after this war in enforcing international law and maintaining freedom of the seas, but they are not in favor of extending American citizenship beyond the borders of our own country or becoming citizens of some foreign nation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation which was read:

OCTOBER 4, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign my membership on the Committees on the Census and Pensions.

Very respectfully yours,
JAMES GALLAGHER.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Cambria Dispatch, Portage, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter to a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT]?

There was no objection.

THE LATE CHESTER R. THRIFT

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, a face that has been familiar in this Chamber for nearly a score of years will be seen no more. A man who has been attendant in the Press Gallery for nearly 19 years passed away this morning.

Mr. Chester R. Thrift came to this body as a page boy on October 6, 1919, and later, in 1924, was made assistant superintendent of the Press Gallery and has served in that capacity until this morning.

He was in good health yesterday and worked in the gallery until late in the afternoon. Some of his people are residents in my district. He was a faithful public servant. He was loved by all who knew him, devoted to his work, trusted and respected by all who knew him.

Mr. MANASCO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. I want to say that I have known Chester Thrift for 11 years and I know that he was one of the best liked men in the Press Gallery. He was devoted to his duty, he had a delightful sense of humor when things were going tough. Chester always had a little saying or a little action on his part that would soften the temper of everybody. He was a very faithful employee of the House of Representatives and will be missed not only by the newspaper boys but by the committee chairmen and their clerks because he kept up with that phase of the work of the House.

Mr. DONDERO. A line from Lincoln's favorite poem, Mortality, aptly applies to Chester R. Thrift:

'Tis the wink of an eye, 'tis the draught of a breath,
From the blossom of health to the paleness of death.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I was very much shocked when I learned of the death of Chester Thrift. It was only yesterday that I was talking to the Press Gallery and the voice at the other end said, "This is Chester, Mrs. Rogers."

I want to pay my tribute to him as a man and for his fine service, faithfully and perfectly done. He was always helpful and useful; he was a fine, patriotic citizen. We will all miss him.

BRITISH-AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, permit me to go on record as endorsing every word spoken by my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. However, the gentleman does not need to worry about Hore-Belisha when he talks about common citizenship between the two countries. You do not think that he or any other Britisher is foolish enough to enter into any agreement whereby they would be required to pay taxes as American citizens, to supply funds, as for example, for a lend-lease program. Hore-Belisha has no idea like that.

The British are too smart, too shrewd, to be caught in a dual citizenship which would obligate them to share equally with us in the vast expenditures which are being made throughout the world. Lend-lease has demonstrated, as our contributions to World War No. 1 did, that we are the contributors, while others are on the receiving end, and there is no evidence that, after this war is over, they intend to permit us to share on equal terms, as we would if there was dual citizenship, in the airports, the air lines, the trade facilities, which are being built up and established by lend-lease money.

I am amazed that the gentleman should call attention to the danger of being brought back into the British Empire as a province or dominion; the danger that now confronts us is this demand that we surrender our independence and enter into a declaration of interdependence.

Has the gentleman forgotten that on the 27th and again on the 30th of January 1942, from the floor of the House, I made two speeches, afterward consolidated under the title "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," in which I pointed out that the plan of the internationalists was to repudiate our Declaration of Independence and adopt a declaration of interdependence, and that thereafter, because that speech was circulated throughout the country by some who were pro-American, I was hailed before the grand jury here in Washington? Let the gentleman watch his step or he will be a Republican.

The gentleman voted for the Fulbright resolution. Dual citizenship is just another step that has been tacked on that resolution. The gentleman did not see it, but there it was—that union-now proposition. The gentleman wants to watch his step or he will be going against the union-now movement. He will be opposing the internationalists.

I wholeheartedly endorse the pro-American, the patriotic words, and attitude of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. He has now placed himself squarely in accord with the declaration of the Republican Party as enunciated at Mackinac Island. He now, as did the Republicans then, proclaims his willingness to cooperate, but he insists, as did the Mackinac declaration, that when cooperation with any foreign nation becomes detrimental to the interests of our country America be given first consideration.

By adoption of the Fulbright resolution, the leadership of the House—the majority leadership—jockeyed the Republicans into a false position which someday they, as well as the majority party, will be forced to repudiate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement on the International Bimetalist.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOMERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Terre Haute Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ISSUANCE OF FLAG TO NEAREST RELATIVES OF PERSONS WHO DIE IN SERVICE IN THE LAND OR NAVAL FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 800) to provide for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die in service in the land or naval forces of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the case of any person who has died while in the military or naval service of the United States after May 27, 1941, and prior to the end of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to issue free of cost to the nearest relative of such person, or to such other person as the Administrator deems most appropriate, a flag of the United States, if no person is otherwise entitled to receive a flag of the United States used at the funeral of the deceased person.

SEC. 2. (a) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to prescribe such regulations as he deems necessary for carrying out the purposes of this act.

(b) The appropriation of such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this act is hereby authorized.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I hope the gentleman will explain the bill to the House. It is a very meritorious one. Certainly the family of every man who dies in action is entitled to a flag. Some of the men die at sea or die as a result of air attacks and it is not always known at once that they are gone. The body cannot be brought home. The family will think a great deal of that flag and justly so. Precious life has been given for it. I assume that the Veterans' Administration will notify the family that the man has died in action and then the family or some other suitable person can have the flag. This bill had the unanimous approval of the World War Veterans' Committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that she has analyzed the bill correctly. When the body of a man in our armed forces is brought home the proper department presents a flag to the family. However, a great many of these men are being lost at sea and otherwise lost and their bodies cannot be returned. This bill provides for supplying a flag to the families of those men. This is to be done through the Veterans' Administration. In a case of this kind the Veterans' Administration usually works through the various veterans' organizations in the localities where the men lived.

I do not know that there is any objection at all to the measure. If I felt there was I would not bring it up. I think it is meritorious and necessary, and should be passed without question.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am not clear as to the dates covered by the bill. Will the gentleman explain to the House the dates that are covered in this bill?

Mr. RANKIN. It covers the period after May 27, 1941, which seems to be a date that is being written into these various laws.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. As I understood the bill as it was read, I do not believe it covers persons in the Coast Guard and the Marine Corps. Can the gentleman tell me whether or not it covers them?

Mr. RANKIN. It does cover the Marine Corps. It covers any person who has died while in the military or naval service of the United States. The Coast Guard is regarded as part of the Navy during the war period; therefore, it would cover the Coast Guard and the Marine Corps also.

I polled the committee and found no opposition, so brought this measure before the House for passage.

Now, if I may be pardoned for just a minute, I wish to answer the statement made with reference to me a moment ago by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. The question that he raised has absolutely no connection with dual citizenship. The resolution passed the other day was largely contained in the platforms of both the Democratic and Republican Party in 1920. It does not propose the setting up of a super-Government. It does not propose wiping out the Constitution of the United States or the Declaration of Independence, or the surrendering of any part of our national sovereignty.

As I have said on all occasions, I am for my country's joining the other civilized nations of the earth when this war is over to help enforce international law and to guarantee the freedom of the seas, but I am not in favor of extending citizenship to everybody beyond the confines of the United States and its possessions. I am not in favor of having American citizens take out citizenship in any other country. I am not in favor of trying to feed and clothe everybody from Singapore to Timbuktu at the expense of the American people when this war is over. I am not in favor of sending our men to the four corners of the earth to police every man or every enterprise that wants to exploit the resources of some other country.

We are in this war to win, and we want it distinctly understood that America is doing her part in every way, and the men in our armed forces are doing their part. But we do not expect to pull down the American flag or to cancel the Constitution of the United States or the Declaration of Independence.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then the gentleman stands squarely on the declaration adopted at Mackinac Island. That is just what the gentleman has been doing—restating the principles the policy announced at Mackinac Island.

Mr. RANKIN. I was discussing the Mackinac black-out on yesterday.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I say, the gentleman stands on the declaration that was adopted up there?

Mr. RANKIN. The part of the Mackinac black-out in which I was most interested was that covering the domestic questions, wherein they overlooked the power issue, including rural electrification, the outstanding domestic issue before the American people.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is enough in it, if they did overlook one point.

Mr. RANKIN. If the members of that conference agreed with the international policies I have just advocated, they are to be congratulated.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the pending bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The bill (H. R. 800) was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. FULMER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

MARY T. RECELY

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 1042, for the relief of Mary T. Recely.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Mary T. Recely, of 2523 Sage Street, New Orleans, La., the sum of $721, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damage sustained when the car in which she was riding was struck by a United States Army truck at the intersection of Franklin Avenue and the Louisville Nashville Railroad crossing, in the city of New Orleans, La., on December 19, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to", insert "Frank J. Recely and his wife."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$721" and insert "$500."

Page 1, line 9, after the word "car", strike out "in which she was riding" and insert "of Frank J. Recely, operated by Mary T. Recely."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Frank J. Recely and Mary T. Recely."

FRED A. FLANDERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1144, for the relief of Fred A. Flanders.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the Dual Compensation Act of May 10, 1916 (39 Stat. 120), as amended by the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 582), Fred A. Flanders, an employee of the War Department under the United States engineer suboffice at Clewiston, Fla., be authorized to accept and retain $590.55 heretofore paid him as salary by the United States Weather Bureau, for the period November 1, 1930, to March 31, 1941.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the indebtedness of Fred A. Flanders in the amount of $590.55 arising out of the fact that for the period from November 1, 1930, to March 31, 1941, he was paid for services rendered by him as surveyman or inspector in the United States Engineer Office at Clewiston, Fla., and also as cooperative weather observer at Moore Haven, Fla., for the Department of Commerce, the payment of such dual compensation being in contravention of the provisions of section 6 of the act of May 10, 1916, as amended by the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 582, U. S. C., title 5, sec. 58)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARGUERITE R. McELROY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2190, for the relief of Marguerite R. McElroy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Marguerite R. McElroy, of Uxbridge, Mass., the sum of $150, in full settlement of all her claims against the United States for property damage sustained by her as a result of an automobile accident which occurred on the 7th day of October 1940, and involved a Government-owned motor vehicle operated by an employee of the Work Projects Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "Administration", insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY TANSEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2304, for the relief of Harry Tansey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harry Tansey, of Chicago, Ill., the sum of $39,105, in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement of the value of tax-paid liquor, which was seized on the 1st day of December 1923 and illegally destroyed by Federal prohibition agents on the 18th day of October 1926, at Chicago, Ill.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARL OPLINGER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2459, for the relief of Carl Oplinger, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Carl Oplinger, of Akron, Ohio, a minor, the sum of $7,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of personal injuries sustained on June 6, 1940, by the said Carl Oplinger, at Ellet School, Akron, Ohio, when he was struck by a truck which was being operated under the direct supervision and authority of the Work Projects Administration.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 5, after the word "to", insert "the legal guardian of."

Line 6, strike out "$7,500. The payment of such sum shall be." Insert in lieu thereof "$3,000; to pay the City Hospital of Akron, Ohio, the sum of $63.92; to pay Dr. Walter A. Hoyt, of Akron, Ohio, the sum of $250."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Carl Oplinger, City Hospital of Akron, Ohio, and to Dr. Walter A. Hoyt."

At the end of the bill add: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Carl Oplinger, City Hospital of Akron, Ohio, and to Dr. Walter A. Hoyt."

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the bills on the Private Calendar.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(Mr. CASE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE FOOD SITUATION

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, during the recess I, like many other newer Members in the House, had an opportunity to visit my constituents as a Congressman rather than as a candidate for office. During that time I was able to meet many, many different groups in the district, including the A. A. A., the F. S. A., the county agricultural agents, the bankers, feed dealers and the butchers, as well as business organizations and civic organizations. I think as a result of that opportunity of contacting these various groups, I was able to get a pretty good picture of the way the machinery is working out in the rural areas of this country, at places where this food that is gaining in daily importance is really being produced.

I wish to say, before I make any further statement here today, that I do not want anyone to draw any other conclusion than that I am cognizant of the fact that last fall, when I was asking the voters in my district to vote for me, that I assured them that I should never spend any time in destructive criticism; that I was always willing to support any plan or any constructive suggestion that would help in this war program, and I presume that every other Member feels the same way.

With this in mind, I asked for this time today for the purpose of discussing the food situation. This food situation is becoming more and more serious every day this war lasts, and every indication is that it is going to become more serious, and for that reason, if I can make some contribution to keep the machinery that is in operation working, take out some of the squeaks to keep the machinery running smoothly, I will have served my purpose.

One of the big problems confronting us now, and that is one of the reasons why the C. C. C. is asking for a continuation of its appropriation, is to deal with the inflation problem from the standpoint of roll-backs and subsidies.

I think that every one of us should obtain all of the many facts we can in connection with all this inflationary program in order that we will be able to make some suggestions or offer some contribution on the question of furnishing food for the winning of this war. If we can keep this discussion on that basis I am sure that it will be worth while to many of us.

On September 23 I discussed the dairy situation and made as best I could, a factual presentation of the dairy picture as far as the location of the industry and the increase of production could be expected. In that statement I indicated there are five factors that have an influence upon food production and will continue to have an influence upon food production. Those factors I listed as follows: First, manpower; second, feed; third, the influence of cash crop production, the return from cash crop; fourth, irritations caused by rulings made by Federal agencies from Washington, to whom we are appropriating money and who are charged with the responsibility of increasing food production when, as a matter of fact, they are hindering food production at this time; and, fifth and last, I put price. I put the price at the last because the price at which these products must move is going to be influenced very materially by the other four factors that I bring out. Every one affects the price so far as getting maximum production is concerned.

First of all, let us spend a few moments on this question of manpower. Most of us realize that in its broadest sense the question of manpower must be approached from the standpoint of not only the men that work on the farm but also from the viewpoint of the manpower needed to keep up the operations. In other words, translating or transferring these crops into foods for war and for the war food program.

During this recess I have had many opportunities to see that in action. For example, take the average garage in the little towns in the rural sections. Those people are not growing or producing any food, and yet there is not a single one

of these garages that, day after day, you will not see one, two, three, or four milk trucks in for repair. It does not do any good to produce one-eighth of the milk of the United States in Wisconsin, for example, if we cannot get that milk to the marketplace. And the trucks that you see in these garages must, of necessity, be kept in repair to meet the transportation problem. These garages are just as much a part of the food program and are just as essential as the men who are actually engaged in the production.

There is no more reason why the people in the Midwest should engage in joyriding any more than people in any other part of the United States. But we must realize that in certain parts of the United States they are engaged in the program of producing food for the winning of the war. We must be as careful as we can to keep those services in operation if we are going to continue to have this flow of food production. You can then consider businesses like that of the garageman, the hardware man, the country store, the country newspaper as a part and a necessary part of the war food program. The country newspaper has been able to carry the message to the people every week telling about the various programs the Government wants to present. Now, let us take the example of the cheese maker. I went to a cheese makers' convention one night and expected to hear a lot of criticism on how crazy the folks were in Washington. I sat there an hour and a half listening to their business meeting. Those people spent all their time asking how they were going to figure out that 3 percent transportation tax on milk that they went out and got themselves, that the farmers did not bring into them. They wondered how they should make out their social-security tabulations.

They had lots of things they were working on, but during the whole meeting there was not one word said about the matter of price, and a lot of those fellows were getting no more for making cheese than they received in 1939. It convinced me, that regardless of the fool things we may be doing here in Washington those people out there are going to produce the milk, are going to make the products, are going to produce the food needed to win the war regardless of all the obstacles we may put in their way.

The canning industry is another example. To me it has been phenomenal what the canners of this country with all the obstacles that have been thrown in their way have been able to put in cans during this past season. They have been confronted with confusion by the O. P. A. and the Agriculture Department. They have here performed a most splendid food service. In spite of all these handicaps the canning people have gone out and put every ounce of food they possibly could into cans which, as you probably know, is a very satisfactory quantity.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan; yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In the Labor News of a few days ago that came to my desk there was an article carrying a headline to the effect that the War Manpower Commission had just issued a confidential report pointing out that there was a great wastage of manpower on the farms of this country. Has the gentleman run into anything that would support such a statement while he was home in his district during the recess?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I may say to the gentleman that from my own personal contact with these rural people, close as I have been to them for so many years, the thing that impressed me when I went home was to see the effect of the labor they have been doing in connection with this war effort. I have wondered since I came back whether a lot of people realize the contribution these farm folks are making. They are putting every ounce of energy into the effort. I believe the farm people never worked so hard in the last quarter of a century as they have during this past year and I just wonder how long they will be able to carry on. Right in this connection I want to say to my good friend from Michigan that possibly he saw the article in the New York Times of last Sunday telling how the employer gets mixed into this food program. One item to which I would call particular attention at this time is the reduced delivery of milk in New York City, the every-other-day delivery. By this means they were able to reduce the number of employees by 950, but it met with opposition from the 950 who lost their employment.

I realize, of course, that those fellows who have been delivering milk every day would like to continue doing so, but I would also call attention to the fact that thousands of businessmen have been put out of business. Mr. Taylor, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, told us that 300,000 would be eliminated this year. I notice that as of July 1 the figure had reached 167,000; so I guess we are catching up to the 300,000. Those people who have been delivering milk daily in New York City under peacetime conditions, those 950, have probably just got to kind of do a little something else in connection with this war.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Did the gentleman see many women at work in the fields in his district when he was home?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I saw women working who never had been in the fields before in their lives.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Running tractors?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; running tractors.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Running hay rakes and forking hay?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; doing all kinds of jobs on the farm. The rural people have made every effort to carry on their part of this program. In bringing these facts to the attention of my colleagues I do not want them to think for 1 minute that I am trying to pit group against group, I am not posing as having a bleeding heart for them, I am just reciting the historical fact that they are exerting every energy they have in order to produce this food and are doing it with less labor and machinery.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for another question, Did the gentleman see women working in the fields—I do not mean these so-called farmerettes, but farm women, going into the fields after they had done the morning's cooking and taken care of their children as best they could, women who labored in the fields until late in the afternoon and then would go home and do the cooking and the house chores and probably get to bed around 11 or 12 o'clock? Did the gentleman run into anything like that during the summer recess?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; but I may say that that probably is more pronounced in areas that have cash crops.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I saw what I have been describing in my own district in a far more expanded form than ever before and I want to say to the Labor News and to the War Manpower Commission charged with issuing that report that in the Eighth District of Michigan there is no waste of manpower on the farm. I have read that in the papers until I get sick and tired of it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan, in connection with that, that I presume a part of that charge has come from the testimony of certain Manpower officials. This was given before the Agriculture Committee last year. Possibly they meant the people living in the hills of Tennessee and Kentucky who Manpower seemed to infer were not making a full contribution to the food program.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not know what they mean. I have tried to run down and locate the so-called confidential report and I cannot get it anywhere. I put these questions up to the head of the National Farm Bureau and the Farm Grange but they do not know anything about it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In reference to the question asked by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] may I say that I attended a little social gathering when I was back home at one of my neighboring farmer's in Minnesota. That was just last month or, rather, in August. The question came up about the threshing arrangement in that particular community and it was brought out that only 1 out of 12 threshing rings around that particular community had a full crew to operate with. So, if Mr. McNutt or Labor News or anybody else claims that the farmers are overstaffed at the present time, they better go back and find out the facts.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am very much interested in what the gentleman has to say with reference to the manpower situation. Is it not true that there are two causes for the manpower shortage on the farm; first, the taking of the farm lads into the service and, second, the fact that the farm hands can get higher prices and better wages than they ever got before, and make more money than they ever made before, in defense plants and particularly in those defense plants located in the agricultural and rural communities?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes. You most correctly bring out two of the factors.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Are there not three solutions to the shortage of manpower in the agricultural areas; first, grant furloughs to the farm boys in the service, second, increase the price of milk and other agricultural products so that the farmer can compete with industry that is hiring all his help, and, third, do just what the gentleman from Wisconsin has pointed out, let the farmer work longer hours and take his wife and family into the field and finish the job he is doing?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa that the farmer has done that to the very limit to which he can drive himself.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The limit will be his physical endurance.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is talking about the war manpower situation. May I say that as far as the commanding officers in the armed forces are concerned I understand they have a lot more sympathy for the problems which the farmers have had than is indicated by some other authorities. I refer particularly to certain instances whereby the farmers were attempting to get their boys home from the service to work on the farms. I know that the armed forces have had a great deal of sympathy with this particular problem and have in many cases understood the whole problem that the farmer has to face and have let the boys off to return to harvest the crops on the farms.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I may say they did that in many States.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to go back to what the gentleman said in answer to the gentleman from Michigan and to observe, if I may, that regardless of what anybody else may have meant I think the gentleman's answer to that question is the right one, namely, that so far as any statement that there is a waste of labor in agriculture is concerned, it is not due to the fact that people are not working as hard as they know how nor due to the fact that the farmers have not made use of such labor as they could get, even though a great deal of it has been inexperienced, but is due to the fact that there are in some places in the country at any rate small farmers who are having a hard time conducting a highly efficient and economical operation, which is one reason, at least so far as I am concerned, for having tried my best to keep the farm security loan program going in order that that might help correct the situation.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BREHM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. What the gentleman says in regard to the shortage of men and material on the farms, certainly applies in my district. We have a terrible shortage of farm labor and equipment. However, on my way back to Washington I stopped in Maryland and talked with a member of the draft board and he informed me that in one district of Maryland there were hundreds of men and boys who have been deferred for farm labor work hiding behind corn shocks and not contributing one nickel's worth to the war effort.

He says that the president of the County War Production Board is an old man in his dotage and that he requests deferment for anyone who can distinguish between an ear of corn and a grain of wheat and that a majority of the board, not knowing the facts, go along with his recommendations.

He says that Mr. Baruch is absolutely correct in his report, so far as this district is concerned.

He said, "When you get to Washington, if you can report that to the proper authorities, for goodness sake, do it. They can come out in the Sixth District of Maryland and raise a company of soldiers from men who are being deferred because of their farm efforts but who are producing nothing on the farms." So I think it depends entirely upon the section of the country we are discussing. The Sixth District of Maryland, according to this member of the draft board, has an oversupply, and we do not have enough men.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. They, in Maryland, are close enough to Washington that they should be able to solve their problem. A number of discussions have taken place on this floor in regard to feeds.

There are five of these factors, and feed is just one of them. When you think of the price of feed, always remember that these are relationships, and that it will not do much good to raise the price of any commodity if the other four factors go up accordingly, because the producer will be in the same position relatively that he was when he started. I think that is the basis from which we have to start in connection with the question of feed. I should like to see a little bit more of a constructive and a doing attitude existing in high places around here than this feeling of defeatism.

In the next day or so I shall place in the RECORD a letter to our majority leader from Mr. Jones. I do not criticize Mr. Jones for this letter because I feel he did not write all of it. Such a letter has to come from the departments. We have too many fellows down here who have the defeatist attitude. The writer of this letter was trying to tell me that you cannot feed rye because of this, that, and so on. It is a purely academic letter, a purely defeatist approach to the whole question of getting any feed from Canada.

There are two reasons I want to see the feed come in from Canada. First, much of this territory is closer to Canada than it is to the sources of feed in our own country.

The second reason is the feed dealer himself or the farmer himself ought to have at least equal consideration with the governmental agency as to price of feeds imported. That leads into one of our difficulties right today, the fact that this feed has to be funneled through a governmental agency. I do not care to criticize any governmental agency at this particular time, but the facts are that they have to get this feed through the Commodity Credit Corporation if they want it. All I am trying to do is give the feed dealer an equal chance with the Government and also give the people of this country a chance to get some of the hundreds of millions of bushels of feed that are in Canada at this time.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Does the gentleman mean that in this letter Judge Jones gave the impression that there is not a feed shortage in this country?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No. I am not criticizing Judge Jones, because I know he cannot write all the letters he has to write. I can tell just by the sound of the letter. It sounds like the words of a typical bureaucrat. You read it over and see what he says about flax and what he says about rye. I do not want to take any more time now discussing that letter, but you read it.

Mr. CASE. The reason I asked the question is that I was discussing the feed situation with Judge Jones yesterday, particularly as it relates to the lamb situation. He made the statement to me that he recognizes that livestock production has outrun the production of feed.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I know, but as Mr. Jones brought out in the committee the other day, you must have either a higher price or more feed. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has surely done his part. However, the first thing to do is to get the feed. That is the easiest thing to do, without being so eager to appropriate some money for our grandchildren to repay. We at least can go through the machinery of getting the feed. That is the reason why I wish the Committee on Ways and Means would find a little more ways and means to get that job done.

Mr. CASE. I hope the gentleman's efforts in that regard do produce results. I may say that the Livestock Division of the War Food Administration told me

this morning that they are having a conference in Chicago on Thursday particularly on the feed problem as applying to lambs. It might be a proper thing to have urged at that conference the lifting of the bars to let the feed come from wherever it does come from to meet the situation.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The mere fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation can get only 20,000,000 bushels of wheat in here since April is no indication to me that the businessmen in this country cannot obtain the same faster than that. They have been fooling around with the problem at least since last April. At least you can take off this barrier and give them a chance to do it. If they do not do it, that is not the gentleman's fault or mine.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The feed shortage has been about as severe in my section of the country as anywhere,

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I know it has.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It has been severe both from the point of view of supply and from the point of view of tremendous increases in the cost of feeding, dairy feed, poultry feed, everything.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The Commodity Credit Corporation had to make nine or ten dollars a ton on you.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I know; but let me ask the gentleman this question. He does not need to answer it if he would rather not. I am asking it because it is a tough question. I do not know for sure what the answer is myself.

In connection with the price of farm commodities and the adjustment of those prices to cover costs, does the gentleman believe, or does he not, that there ought to be a ceiling price on the feed somewhere along the line in order that you can have some assurance, so that the livestock producer and the dairyman and poultryman can have some assurance, that if he does get an adjustment in his price it will not be taken away from him by a further increase in the price of feed?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I tried to say that a few moments ago when I said there was not any use increasing the price of the product unless they had control over the price of the feed.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman thinks we need to do that?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. You have got to do that or else you will not get increased production. You have to have and maintain a fair relationship or have none whatsoever. I do not think any fair-minded man should oppose that premise.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Would the gentleman from California go further and say that there should also be control of wages so that there will not be excessive increases in transportation costs and other labor-handling costs in bringing the feed in?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not want to yield further at this time.

There is the competition of cash crops to consider. For example, three acres of cucumbers on land that cost less than $35 an acre, one man obtained over $1,000. On another farm he sold $2,800 worth of cucumbers. I saw another man who had $5,000 worth of canning peas. I could not help observing the possible influence of these cash returns on milk production.

Then take potatoes, with a guaranteed price of around 90 cents a bushel, with returns running around $200 an acre. That has an influence on all this other type of food production that we claim we want so badly. That does not include milk but all livestock products. The cash crop returns makes the ability to get increased production of livestock products all the more difficult.

Then there is one more that comes under the heading of the irritations. I do not want to spend too much time on the O. P. A., because that was set up on a city basis and they did not take the country into consideration in putting in their rules and regulations. I have a higher respect for the county O. P. A., from my experience with them this summer, than when I left here. As a matter of fact, I found they talked more sense, according to my interpretation, than most of them I had talked with in the office here in Washington. I think if they could shift the county O. P. A. down here for a while and let these boys go out and see what they have to go through in order to get the job done in the country, it would be a good thing for both groups. But the O. P. A. is given a lot of criticism for things they do not have anything to do with. One of them said to me, "We are crazy enough without having to account for everybody else's sins."

I will show you a couple of these little irritations in getting equipment in order to produce this food. I always got along, personally, with the War Production Board in getting equipment in order to get this job done, better than I have with the War Food Administration. I will give you a concrete example. I do not know this man personally. He is getting 20,000 pounds of milk a day. He is making a ton of cheese every day. I had a letter just like you get, and he said he could not get a pasteurizer. I said, "I will go over and take a look at his factory." I went over there. He had a very good place. He is getting 18,000 pounds of milk even now and he is making 1,300 pounds of cheese a day. It is not the best factory in the State of Wisconsin, but it is a pretty good factory. I could not find out why he could not get a pasteurizer. So one of these fellows told me, "There are a lot of other things you have to take into consideration." I did not know this man personally, but I know that he has a good cheese factory and I know he is producing a ton of cheese a day. I just know that if there is anyone in the world who should have a pasteurizer he is entitled to have it. He will get a much greater yield and he will get a great deal more U. S. No. 1's. Why does not he get it? He has been trying for 6 months. I would like to know.

I can give you a half a dozen illustrations as far as can washers are concerned. Some fellow said, "What kind of a can washer do they need?" He said, "They do not need one that washes so fast. You can buy one up in New York." Well, New York is all right for certain things, but they do not need to go to New York to get a can washer when they can get one that is made right where they live. The W. F. A. said, "They do not need one that washes quite so fast." Well, that may be their opinion, but if you are doing 2 men's work in one of these factories you would like one that would wash 50 cans a minute and you would not like to have somebody tell you what kind of a can washer you needed to carry on your business.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That does not have anything to do with the income tax.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to my colleague from Iowa, the champion food-producing State of the Nation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I quite agree with the gentleman that price is only one of a number of factors to be taken into consideration in this whole question, but evidently price is a very important factor insofar as the farmer is concerned. My question is, since there are two views as to how the price should be arrived at for the farmer, in figuring out what it should be and in arriving at an increase of the farm price, one theory being that we should increase the price to the farmer, and the administration's plan is to get the price increase through roll-back or subsidies. My question to the gentleman from Wisconsin is: In his opinion, which is the best method as it affects the morale of the farmer?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will say to the gentleman that he is asking a question that I do not care to evade, but it would take so long to go into details that I would rather wait until a later time. At this moment I am trying to lay the ground work, to give the factors that can be used in meeting this problem in order to arrive at some kind of a conclusion when this thing is over.

I will touch upon that question, I think, before I have finished here. I want to make a few constructive suggestions in our consideration of the question of roll-backs and subsidy. The first one is that I would like to have you look at the record for a moment. In the first place we had Mr. Wickard; then we had Chester Davis, and he made the mistake of visiting Mr. Hoover; he did not believe in roll-backs, so they rolled him out the front door, and instead of Chester Davis we now have Judge Marvin Jones. We do not know how long he will be there; we cannot tell. But somebody has got to make some definite proposal and now is the time to act. First, they should not fall down on these commitments that are made to producers.

A lot of harm to food production has resulted from commitments that have been made and that have not been followed up as closely as they should.

Second. We should follow the written word, as well as the spirit of the law. For example, today we know wheat is only 89 percent of parity as of September 1. Now, it would take too much time to go into that whole question, and the wheat producers have been able to get enough money out of the Treasury during the last few years without having me to help them, but in fairness to the wheat producers I must say that they are entitled to what the law provides, and yet wheat today as I mentioned before, is only 89 percent of parity.

Now, on the question of hogs we get into another problem. The price of hogs is being fixed at $12.50 for sometime next year. Is not this 11½ cents on the farm and below present parity which is even now 12 cents per pound? One of the purposes of the Price Control Act was to set up machinery under which definite steps could be taken to see that products were not sold below parity. If they cut the price to 12½ cents per pound at Chicago next year, that will be reflected back on the farm at about 11½ cents. That price is for the choice hogs weighing 220 to 270 pounds.

Should anyone tell the hog producers that a year from now they are to be provided less than parity and less than the amount provided by the written law?

I would like to ask you how we can expect the producers to continue a food-production program if they do not have some confidence in those who are issuing the rules and regulations. We must instill some confidence in the hearts of the people who are out in the sections engaged in the food-production program.

As my third point, I deal with the question of buck passing by the O. P. A. I referred to a letter from a prominent administration agricultural leader very recently with respect to the O. P. A. efforts at setting prices on feed.

You know better than that; you know that according to law the O. P. A. cannot set any agricultural price without the O. K. of the Secretary of Agriculture. Now, why do they not kind of keep some of the cards on the top of the table part of the time? Fourth. We should centralize all of the responsibility in one food czar here in Washington. If there was ever a time when we needed an understandable program to follow it is now when we are going into another year with even more complex production problems than we faced this year. Surely we should get behind the Fulmer bill if for no other reason than to have a program in which somebody will know who has the responsibility, in which we will know with whom to cooperate in order to carry on next year's food program. Let it be Judge Jones. We need a head to the agency even more now than when the Fulmer bill was passed by the Agricultural Committee. I feel that the contribution of our distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] in creating interest in the food problem should have the appreciation of every Member of this House and every person in this country who is really interested in a constructive food program.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I did not expect the gentleman to pay me such a high compliment, but I was very much interested in what he brought out.

The gentleman has been saying that we ought to centralize this authority in somebody, and that person should have the power to say and do whatever it takes to put this food business on a sound basis. I do not come from a big agricultural section but I do come from a consumers' section and I make it a point to go around to these markets. I was at four markets last Saturday in this city. Those who are not familiar with the food situation have something to learn, because it is terrible. I hope the Members will support the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] and pass this bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

No. 5. I would suggest what has been called by some people—it is kind of a bad word but it is the word that has been going around—the bucket-shop operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation should stop. The last I knew, and I presume it is still going on—I know it was a few months ago when we still had a cotton-use program—they were selling cotton for around 13 cents a pound that was worth 20 cents on the market, or somewhere near that figure, probably cotton that had been carried under loan. At the same time that Henderson was running around the country trying to cut a couple of inches off of somebody's already abbreviated shirttail we have an agency that is going out and selling it for probably two-thirds of what it is worth.

They can do business in ways and make money in ways that I did not know were in the books. You will remember last April when the question of the wheat subsidy came up and we were trying to get wheat in for Canada. At that very time we were paying from 25 to 30 cents a bushel to get rid of it to other countries. That only stopped last April. All right, that is No. 2. No. 3, this matter of profiting $9 to $13 a ton on those protein feeds. To me that is not the purpose of a governmental agency. I did not know that the Commodity Credit Corporation could do that without the O. P. A. or the Department of Agriculture, but the C. C. C. seems to be able to.

Now, here is another one. We are going to pay $140 a ton for peanuts. You know we heard all about that, how we had to have the oil. Incidentally, we pay high prices for the oil as well as for the edible peanuts, which makes a very high cost to us. Here in the last 2 or 3 days we hear we are going to have a subsidy on peanut butter after we have subsidized the peanuts for 75 to 80 percent. We now turn around and subsidize peanut butter. I am not going to think that our colleague from Georgia goes along with that; he is too sound a businessman for that. Then you have conversion, overhead, and all the complicated business that goes along with this bean business. This ought to interest our friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], the ranking member of the Committee on Banking and Currency; that should surely be of interest to him. Probably many of you are familiar with the fact that we have in that case an O. P. A. ceiling of $5.80 a bushel, O. K.'d by the Agricultural Department. Then we have a support price of $6.50 a bushel by the C. C. C., another Agricultural Department agency. The bean crop this year will be 23,000,000 bags, not a great increase over the year before, and nowhere near in keeping with its possibilities by any means. The 60 percent of the crop that the Government takes will receive the Government support price of 6½ cents per pound.

There is the 40 percent that goes to the trade at the O. P. A. ceiling price. Then you have to figure out a lot of forms and he can send them in and can get the difference between the O. P. A. ceiling and the support price. That is the subsidy situation on the poor little navy bean. It is just one more example of the complication that is so unnecessary and that has been so disturbing during this whole food program.

The potato program has worked out a little better. There have been nonrecourse loans and good weather conditions. They have been able to get 470,000,000 bushels of potatoes which should be an abundance for all the people in this country if you get them distributed at the right time and the right place. May I say at this time, no matter how disagreeable it may be, as we go into the next session and when we get ready to get up a program for production next year, we should give a little more attention to the nonrecourse loans as a way of increasing food production in crops. I do not say that in connection with livestock. I have a report for you as far as my district is concerned and if it works out anywhere near the way it looked when I was home I think you will find that the nonrecourse loans properly handled under the right set-up will prove to be an instrumentality that can be used to increase production and with less loss than can be provided by any other means figured out up to this time, and so much less overhead.

The O. P. A. support price on potatoes is $1.90, market price $2.10, and the O. P. A. ceiling $2.15. So the potato situation has been working a little bit different than the bean program.

We still have not worked out a food-production program. We have been talking about prices before we talk about production and I have been hoping all along that we would not get to talking about politics instead of production because the situation is getting more dangerous as we go along. I hope that they will talk more about a maximum food crop in 1944 than they will talk for a vote crop in 1944. Anyone who thinks that that applies to him may continue to think so and it is all right with me.

I will sum up by saying that the first step is to pass the Fulmer bill and concentrate authority in one department. I found in my contacts with these different county agencies that they felt county coordination of agencies would be a constructive approach to the problem. Let us then work first for the Fulmer bill here in Washington to be followed by constructive set-ups at the county levels. The war food program needs these two proposals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Communications Commission and certain newspapers have emphasized the necessity for a congressional committee maintaining a judicial point of view. I refer to the attack on the former chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate the Federal Communications Commission. Without examining the merits of these contentions our able colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] resigned the chairmanship and a new chairman is taking his place. During the chairmanship of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] the committee issued a subpena duces tecum to the Budget Director, Harold Smith, and Communications Commissioner Fly. Both refused to present the documents on the grounds that they were confidential. Both are heads of agencies created by Congress and are certainly within the limits of the examination of Congress. Yet both of these heads to this date have not furnished to the committee, and in a broader sense to Congress, the documents requested.

On September 20 I called these facts to the attention of the House. At that time the gentleman from Georgia, Hon. E. E. COX, was still chairman of the committee. Since a new chairman is now appointed I want to again request that this committee now examine the record of the testimony of Harold Smith, Budget Director, and Mr. Fly, F. C. C. Chairman. I have examined the record and I believe the testimony presents a fundamental issue that strikes at the very heart of the integrity of the Congress of the United States. Shall we be told as one of the three coordinate branches of the Government by any agency head that information is confidential? Can their papers and documents representing their operation be placed beyond the reach of congressional inquiry?

If it is true that Chairman Fly and Budget Director Smith can refuse to produce documents then certainly the stature of Congress is limited to voting blank-check authority to the executive branch of the Government and Congress' power of the purse is limited to voting for appropriations to sustain, maintain, and expand the executive branch of the Government.

Reorganization plan No. 1 transferred the Bureau of the Budget from the Treasury Department to the Executive Office of the President.

There seems to be some feeling that the Office of the Budget Director is a part of the Executive Office of the President, and therefore it is not to be used by the Congress of the United States. In other words, anything they determine to be confidential can be kept beyond the purview of our investigation and enlightenment. So on September 20 I introduced a bill, H. R. 3273, to make the Bureau of the Budget an independent establishment of the Government. If this bill becomes law there will be no question that we have equal access to the files, the original papers, the data, and the testimony of the several departments, independent establishments, and agencies of the Government when they present their request to the Budget Bureau.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that an agency head testifying before the Committee on Appropriations is barred from making disclosure of his requests before the Budget Bureau and is subject to reprimand by his agency if he makes such disclosure? Of course, Congress can elicit it, but if he volunteers the information he is subject to reprimand.

Just consider the numbers of the Congress of the United States, 96 Senators and 434 Congressmen, competing with over 3,000,000 employees of the executive branch of the Government. What chance have we and our office staffs to find out the scope of the activity and the work of these Government agencies? How much time would it take us to find out their activities before we grant them the money? True enough, we hold hearings on the appropriation and legislative bills; but if you examine the hearings, you will find that our scope of inquiry is not broad enough and comprehensive enough to give us a real working knowledge of what the departments and agencies are doing. We need the manpower of every last person in the Budget Bureau to work with us, to advise us, and to counsel with us so that we can present questions in an intelligent and searching manner to the department heads that come up here and ask for funds. Only by the help and assistance of the personnel of the Budget Bureau can we get comprehensive information to prepare for the appropriation hearings.

Let us just look at our procedure. First, the departments go down before the Budget Bureau with requests that have been made up by the different agencies of the Government, and they hold hearings, I understand, behind closed doors. The Congress of the United States never gets a chance to see the actual testimony given. We never get a chance to know how much money was asked for originally by a particular agency unless we drag it out of the agency head or the bureau chief from whom we are asking information. Of course, we may get the over-all picture of the maximum amount an agency has requested, but we do not get the real working knowledge of what was hoped to be accomplished if the maximum were granted. When it is turned down by the Budget Bureau, that is an end to that portion of the presentation. We need to know the course of the wind where these folks in the bureaus intended to drift.

The legislative branch of the Government, composed of 96 Senators and 434 Congressmen, need to be armed with an abundance of information so we can cross-examine the bureau heads, the Cabinet members, and the agency chiefs as you would prepare a line of cross-examination. Then we would not find bureaucrats ducking, dodging, and slipping off our line. They could not lead us into a collateral inquiry to keep us from finishing the original inquiry we intended to make. They, working with the affairs of their agency over a period of years—maybe long before we came here—are well schooled in what they are doing. We, on the other hand, shadow-box with meager knowledge.

The Congress of the United States shelf of legislative and appropriation hearings by and large are really a 5-foot shelf of books noted for the information lacking.

I am not doing this to carp at Congress because, like every one of you, I love the institution of the Congress of the United States. I love it and revere it, and want the institution of Congress to rise to the stature the founding fathers intended. My approach to the problem of introducing H. R. 3273 is one of trying to strengthen the knowledge of the Congressmen, of the men on the committees dealing with these departments, so that we can lend our efforts and emphasis to making better government for the people of the United States.

Now let us look at our failures. I want to look at the failures from the standpoint of being alert in the future to try to correct the errors of the past.

The Council of Personnel Administration was organized by the bright young men in the New Deal some years ago for men to be trained in colleges to rate the personal worth of other employees on the Federal pay roll many years their senior. An overwhelmingly New Deal Congress looked at the Council of Personnel Administration and said, "This thing is no good," and refused to appropriate money for it.

Can we be proud, Mr. Speaker, that this summer, several years later, the Ramspeck committee makes a startling discovery that a group of bright young men in the Federal department have loaded their fraternity brothers and college chums on the pay roll? How was it done? When Congress refused to appropriate money for the Council of Personnel Administration the President transferred its functions to the Civil Service Commission and the bright young men continued to do the same thing from a new head office with Civil Service Commission funds.

The District Court of Appeals decided that the Rural Rehabilitation Administration was unconstitutional. Everyone thought that was the end of the project. The President transferred its functions to the Agriculture Department, called it Farm Security Administration, and it has

continued to date doing the same thing that Mr. Tugwell envisioned.

We have given it appropriations and authorizations in the agricultural appropriations bills but the fundamental unconstitutionality that the district court of appeals pronounced still exists in the Farm Security Administration. Can we be proud that we did not learn that Farm Security Administration was paying poll tax until the practice was well entrenched? Can we be proud that the Farm Security Administration, restrained by an appropriations limitation from buying tracts of land for communal projects, has defied the Congress of the United States by allowing its personnel to organize corporations and borrow money to do the same thing.

Can we be proud, Mr. Speaker, that it took us 7 months after Pearl Harbor to eliminate W. P. A.?

Can we be proud that it took us 19 months after Pearl Harbor to eliminate N. Y. A. N. Y. A., organized for the purpose of giving or making work to needy youths, was still in existance long after there was a critical labor shortage throughout the length and breadth of the land. Seven months after 18-year-olds were to be drafted in the Army N. Y. A. was still functioning.

Can we be proud that we have appropriated sixty-five and a half billion dollars for lend-lease that was originally designed for countries that did not have credits with which to purchase equipment of war, and now discover that our dollars spent by other Government agencies in Mexico, Central and South America is driving them into inflation. Yet they are on the lend-lease list. Today, the latest efforts of the Rockefeller administration in the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs have been directed toward helping the South American countries avert inflation.

Mr. Speaker, we have never stopped to re-examine the lend-lease expenditures.

Can we be proud, Mr. Speaker, when we prohibited grade labeling by a limitation on the O. P. A. appropriation to find a few days after Congress recessed that Mr. Fred Vinson, Stabilization Director, established grade labeling on meats. Mr. Vinson said he got the authority from the War Powers Act of the President. I ask you, have we taken issue with this thwarting of the will of Congress?

We have never reexamined the functions of the many agencies of government when conditions in the country have changed; which perhaps eliminated their original purposes. Read the address of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] yesterday and you will find numerous agencies that were formed from 1920 to date, in order to help the farmers. Many agencies were formed for the purpose of taking care of surpluses of food raised in this country. The surpluses vanished, but you cannot find the liquidation of one agency in the Department of Agriculture because of these changing conditions.

The information that we get from our department heads in our Committee on Appropriations and in the legislative committees is all slanted from the standpoint of those witnesses trying to make their bureaus and departments permanent, important, and forever upon the Federal pay roll. We need to have the original facts from the Budget Bureau given to Members of Congress who are willing to work to try to eliminate the duplication of useless agencies; given to us long before the hearings on the appropriations or legislation. Then we may determine whose job is necessary, what agency is necessary, and which ones we can liquidate.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Congress of the United States does not have the facts. The Budget Bureau has the personnel to help us. Would we not think it was silly if the doctors in a hospital would never turn over a specimen of tissue to a bacteriologist across the street? Would any doctor guess the disease of his patient when there is a bacteriologist available? Are we guessing whether an agency or department is necessary when presumably we have experts in the Bureau of the Budget who can tell us? Then why should we deny ourselves the information that the Bureau of the Budget could give us, by allowing them to say to us, "We are a part of the Executive Office of the President. We are in a confidential capacity. Although you can vote money for our personnel, although you can keep us on the pay roll, although we will make an examination of all agencies that come before us for funds, you cannot have the benefit of our wisdom, our counsel, our advice, and our hearings. You cannot have the original papers." In the doctor's case with the bacteriologist we think it is silly. Is it not just as silly that we should deny ourselves the work and efforts of the Bureau of the Budget, lacking enough personnel in our own offices and in our own committees?

The Budget Bureau as it is presently organized and functioning is of little assistance to the legislative branch of the Government to give us the actual scope of activity so that we have a comprehensive knowledge of what the money we voted will be used for before we vote for it. Agencies run far afield from the activities originally intended by this Congress creating them. Three million people in the executive government have reached into the private lives of nearly every American citizen and they have made Washington, D. C., the hub of the world in war, politics, and economics. We need every last man and woman in the Budget Bureau whose salaries and expenses are paid by appropriations for which we have voted to fully school us by documents and testimony in their possession. We will never be able to get the full measure of cooperation that the need of Congress requires until the Budget Bureau is made an independent establishment responsible alike to the executive branch of the Government and to the legislative branch.

It may be argued that the Budget Bureau hearings are held months in advance of the fiscal year on estimates prepared as high as 18 months before the money will be finally consumed. It may be argued that in the interval of 18 or 20 months only the broadest advance inquiry can be made. I am stating here and now that every Member of this Congress should have a firm and thorough knoweldge of the scope of activity and if changing conditions cause a change in the program the Congress of the United States should be immediately advised by the personnel of the Budget Bureau.

The next agency that I would call upon to help the Congress of the United States know what the executive arm of the Government was doing would be the General Accounting Office. Recently the Comptroller General stated that the cost of his office from 1931 to 1940 was a dollar per thousand of audited expenditures. If the rate had prevailed in 1940 at $1.10 per thousand the expenditures of the General Accounting Office would have been approximately as follows:

1941	$13,478,718
1942	32,622,851
1943 (estimated)	80,109,466

Instead, the expeditures of the General Accounting Office for these 3 years of increasing audited expenditures have been as follows:

1941	$10,784,412
1942	12,548,464
1943 (estimated)	19,700,000

Now, think of it. Here is a man who is going to do the auditing of the books. He should go into every voucher and see that the money is legally expended, yet he is given a paltry $19,000,000 instead of $80,000,000, which, according to the history of his office, he needs to give adequate accounting. It may be that that is the reason why there are 8 or 9 agencies doing duplicate postwar planning, according to the report of the Congressional Library Legislative Reference Service. It may be that the Congressional Library Legislative Reference Service has found duplication in from 8 to 16 agencies, in one problem after another, from labor relations to economic relations with other nations.

I have introduced a bill to give the General Accounting Office $20,000,000 for the balance of this fiscal year. If the money should be appropriated along toward the end of the calendar year, it would mean around $60,000,000 rate for the full year. Mr. Speaker, I think it is entirely necessary to give them this extra fund so the Congress of the United States can demand from the Comptroller General's office the kind of information that we need to eliminate duplication of effort from the record of expenditures.

Here we have appropriated $330,000,000,000 for the prosecution of this war. We have only spent a little over $100,000,000,000. We ought to be able to use the history of the expenditure of the first $100,000,000,000 to see how many billions of dollars we can save on the next $200,000,000,000.

We cannot do the job alone, because obviously about all we can hope to do, as Members of Congress, is to become walking encyclopedias of the money we have appropriated, the rules of the Senate and House, and the status of legislation. We may know generally the functions of the

various agencies, but do any of us know the details in the departments themselves, how they use the money, what is their program, what they hope for, what are their ambitions? We need to have a check on the money expended in the departments. We can't do the job as Congressmen without the help of the Budget Bureau and the General Accounting Office. If they were serving us properly, Mr. Speaker, we would not be disillusioned when the Senators come back from a 40,000-mile trip around the globe, and report the operations of the Army and the Navy, the lend-lease program, and the B. E. W. and O. W. I. expenditures. Had they served us yesterday we would not need to be disillusioned today when we learn that 6 months after the war is over our airplanes cannot land on the airports we have built on the many islands in the Pacific and in the continents of the world. Mr. Speaker, we should not wait until 2 years after the lend-lease law was adopted and 22 months after Pearl Harbor to recover the right to use airports we built. We should have known where we were going 2 years ago. We should know now where we are going 2 years from now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very splendid letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McGRANERY). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] may extend his own remarks and include a magazine article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial, A Challenge to the Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REPORTS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent that that committee may have until midnight tonight to file reports on the bill (H. R. 3363) extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made and the bill (H. R. 3381) relating to credits against the Victory tax, both of which have been unanimously reported by that committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until Thursday, October 7, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold public hearings at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, October 6, 1943, on H. R. 2701, H. R. 3070, and private bills.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on Thursday, October 7, 1943, on general bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct further hearings on H. R. 2857, a bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, at 10 a. m., on Monday, October 11, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

The Committee on Pensions will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 12, 1943, at 10 a. m.

At that time consideration will be given to the following bills:

H. R. 2350. A bill to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents.

H. R. 2784. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, to certain maimed soldiers, to certain widows, minor children, and helpless children of such soldiers and sailors, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1926.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 12, 1943, at 10 a. m.

At that time consideration will be given to the following bills:

H. R. 3257. A bill to amend subtitle—insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The purposes of the bill is to affirm and clarify the authority of the W. S. A. to agree to a waiver of the statute of limitations in connection with claims arising from insurance agreements in case of missing vessels, in order to provide for prompt settlement of both marine risks and war risks involved.

H. R. 3258. A bill to prevent double recovery on claims under section 1 (a) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to seamen employed by the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to limit the possibility of double or overlapping recovery on account of death or injury of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the W. S. A. The possibility of such overlapping recovery arises in cases of seamen who are entitled to sue under the law of the United States in case of death or injury and may also be entitled to sue under foreign law on account of the same casualty.

H. R. 3259. A bill to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to exclude from consideration for the purposes of old-age and survivors insurance benefits services of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the W. S. A. on foreign-flag vessels or contracted for and performed wholly outside the United States, so that the coverage for such benefits for seamen employees of the W. S. A. shall be in line with the coverage in case of similar services by seamen employed by private shipping operators.

H. R. 3260. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for requisition or purchase of vessels owned by subsidiaries of American corporations.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the requisition or purchase under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, of vessels owned by American concerns through foreign subsidiaries but which are not owned by United States citizens within the terms of the Merchant Marine Act and which are not idle foreign vessels within the terms of the act of June 6, 1941—Public, No. 101, Seventy-seventh Congress.

H. R. 3261. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is, by amending Public Law 44, Seventy-eighth Congress, to authorize the return of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less which are owned by the United States under the procedure of Public Law 44 for the return to private ownership of vessels to which the United States has title which are no longer needed in the war effort.

H. R. 3262. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to expressly authorize the waiver of recovery of seamen's insurance payments by the W. S. A. particularly in cases where insurance has been paid to beneficiaries on the assumption that the missing seamen were dead, but later are found to be alive. The bill follows a similar provision with respect to recovery of benefits paid by the Veterans' Administration.

H. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The purpose of the resolution is to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy similar to that provided for the United States Coast Guard Academy.

H. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities.

The purpose of the resolution is to authorize the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration to pay cash awards for suggestions received from employees to increase efficiency or improve the functioning of the agencies.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 10 a. m. on H. R. 3334, to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

804. A letter from the Quartermaster General, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the convention of the Forty-fifth National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, held in Boston, Mass., August 15 to 19, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 33); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

805. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting information, as required by the Bureau of the Budget, which specifies the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the Department of Labor and its bureaus, for the second quarter beginning October 1; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

806. A letter from the Administrator, National Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting copy of the report, Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements, called for by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget under Circular 421, dated May 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

807. A letter from the administrative officer, Office for Emergency Management, transmitting one copy of Budget Bureau form "Quarterly estimate of personnel requirements," in accordance with Bureau of the Budget Circular No. 421, dated May 21, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

808. A letter from the vice president, Panama Railroad Company, transmitting quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

809. A letter from the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, transmitting in accordance with the provisions of section 217 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 498, 77th Cong.), Report No. 5 of action taken under section 217 of such act, as amended; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

810. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, for the fiscal year 1944 in the amount of $355,300 (H. Doc. No. 326); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

811. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to the provisions of section 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended by the acts of June 28, 1940, and December 8, 1942, and referring to his letter dated January 7, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 541), reporting similar cases; a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 131 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

812. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting information for the purpose of making the determination of the number of employees necessary for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the Federal Works Agency for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

813. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to approve a contract negotiated with the Klamath drainage district and to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

814. A letter from the Director, Division of Administrative Management, National War Labor Board, transmitting quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for the National War Labor Board for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

815. A letter from the Director, Office of War Mobilization, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of War Mobilization for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

816. A letter from the Acting Director, Office for Emergency Management, transmitting copies of the quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for the Division of Central Administrative Services for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3363. A bill extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made; with amendment (Rept. No. 722). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3381. A bill relating to credits against the Victory tax; with amendment (Rept. No. 723). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 3394. A bill to incorporate the United States Army Mothers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 3395. A bill to provide for the repayment to the United States of the revolving fund created for the establishment of the Production Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana:

H. R. 3396. A bill to amend section 2 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, relating to eligibility for annuities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHWABE:

H. R. 3397. A bill to provide that veterans of the First World War and the Second World War may carry a combined amount of national-service life insurance and United States Government life insurance of $20,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. J. Res. 170. Joint Resolution providing for the development of foreign commerce through the development of the Arctic regions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 3398. A bill expediting the naturalization of Mary Lecomte du Nouy; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 3399. A bill expediting the naturalization of Pierre Lecomte du Nouy; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H. R. 3400. A bill for the relief of LaVerne Whipple; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 3401. A bill for the relief of Lester B. McAllister and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMASON:

H. R. 3402. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertha Holmes; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1, of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2672. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of E. L. Banta and 429 residents of the First Congressional District of Iowa, urging the protection of the boys in the armed services against alcoholic beverages and immoral women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2673. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of William A. Carp and 20 other citizens of Amsterdam, N. Y., protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress, and requesting their Senators and Representatives to vote against any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2674. By Mr. DIRKSEN: Petition of E. L. Banta, of Jacksonville, Ill., and 779 other persons residing in Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, Oklahoma, Iowa, and California, urging the enactment by Congress of a law for the protection of men in the service against alcoholic liquors and other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2675. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of 140 residents of Franklin County, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2676. Also, petition of Ruth Ludwig and 20 other residents of Ohio, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2677. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Sylvester J. Salz and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2678. Also, petition of Mrs. J. Backmann, of St. Louis, Mo., and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2679. Also, petition of Mrs. L. Kretchman, of St. Louis, Mo., and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of

House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2680. Also, petition of Michael J. Coffee, of St. Louis, Mo., and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2681. Also, petition of Arthur G. Huether Gabels, of St. Louis, Mo., and 80 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2682. Also, petition of Julius Pety and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2683. Also, petition of Louise Dudley, of St. Louis, Mo., and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2684. Also, petition of Louis Kissane and 23 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2685. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. August Wagner and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2686. Also, petition of Henry Hempe, of St. Louis, Mo., and 56 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2687. Also, petition of A. S. Preusch and 25 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2688. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition presented by Evangelist E. L. Banta, of Jacksonville, Ill., signed by 125 residents of southern Illinois, urging the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2689. By Mr. SCRIVNER: Petition of sundry citizens of Iola, Allen County, Kans., urging passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2690. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of sundry citizens of Grinnel, Iowa, favoring House bill 2082, to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2691. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Yakima, Ellensburg, Davenport, Clarkston, Opportunity, Walla Walla, Grandview, Dayton, Prosser, Pomeroy, and Sunnyside, urging enactment of House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2692. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of Robert G. Wearner and 13 other citizens of Sulphur Springs, Tex., urging early consideration and a favorable vote on House bill 2082, introduced by the Honorable JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war, to reduce absenteeism, increase production, and eliminate sources of disorder and physical disability which are hampering our war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2693. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of Tom Olsen and 239 other citizens of Olympia, Wash., and vicinity, protesting passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2694. Also, petition of Harold Troy and 149 other citizens of Olympia, Wash., and vicinity, protesting passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2695. Also, petition of George F. Kelley and 90 other citizens of Olympia, Wash., and vicinity, protesting passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860 or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2696. Also, petition of William Altizer and 59 other citizens of Vancouver, Wash., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860 or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2697. Also, petition of George L. Sears and 55 other residents of Chehalis, Wash., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of legislation designed to bring about prohibition under the guise of a war measure or otherwise and request Congress, and particularly the congressional delegation from the State of Washington, to work and vote against such legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2698. Also, petition of Edith H. Pilgrim and 29 other residents of Vancouver, Wash., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2699. Also, petition of Soren Mikkelson, of McLaughlin Heights, Vancouver, Wash., and 30 other citizens of the United States, protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2700. Also, petition of G. R. Johnston of Vancouver, Wash., and 33 other citizens of the United States, protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2701. Also, petition of Frank B. Tohnski and 59 other residents of Centralia, Wash., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2702. Also, petition of C. O. Park and 29 other citizens of Bucoda, Wash., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2703. Also, petition of Phil Merry and 60 other citizens of Oakville, Wash., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2704. Also, petition of John Baker and 29 other citizens of Rochester, Wash., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2705. Also, petition of A. G. Kern and 29 other residents of Centralia, Wash., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2706. Also, petition of N. A. Wray and 29 other residents of Elma, Wash., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2707. Also, petition of J. F. Dillon and 29 other citizens of Shelton, Wash., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, and any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2708. Also, petition of Ethel Buckley and 29 other citizens of Olympia, Wash., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, and any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2709. Also, petition of Alex Graham and 29 other citizens of Olympia, Wash., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, and any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2710. Also, petition of John Hunt and 58 other citizens of Rainier, Wash., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, and other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2711. Also, petition of D. E. Lane and 180 other citizens of Aberdeen, Wash., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2712. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of George S. Cochran, of Washington, D. C., and 59 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2713. Also, petition of Dorothy Higgs, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2714. Also, petition of J. A. Saunders, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2715. Also, petition of Anthony Seidel, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2716. Also, petition of Lukas Houlis and Mike Macoulas, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2717. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of A. M. Loban and 19 other residents of Riceville, Iowa, opposing enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2718. Also, petition of W. A. Hogan and 19 other residents of Osage, Iowa, opposing enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2719. Also, petition of B. M. Feeney and 19 other residents of Osage, Iowa, opposing enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2720. Also, petition of M. L. Tracy, manager of the Hanford Hotel, and 19 other residents of Mason City, Iowa, opposing enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2721. Also, petition of Bert David, of Charles City, Iowa, and five other citizens, opposing enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2722. Also, petition of W. E. Leslie, of McIntire, Iowa, and 19 other residents of Iowa, opposing enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2723. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary-treasurer, Building and Construction Trades Department, American Federation of Labor, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to improving working conditions; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit who dost bring forth Thy righteousness as the light and Thy judgments as the noonday, in the presence of the ageless realities we pause in reverence and with a deep sense of responsibility as servants of the public weal, praying for courage to attempt, power to achieve, patience to endure. In this pavilion of peace above the confusion of tongues we would commit our way unto Thee, fretting not ourselves because of the men who bring wicked devices to pass, knowing that evildoers shall be cut off but that those who wait upon the Lord shall inherit the earth. Forbid that in this solemn hour when great clocks of destiny are striking we whose is the birthright of the democratic tradition should meet the world's spiritual crisis with blind unbelief, blighting cynicism, and timid unwillingness to make decisions in time and together.

We pray not for man's victory over man, but for the triumph of Thy kingdom in all the world as we fight on, with the fire of our ruling passion burning, not because we loathe the same evils, but because we love the same God who is the Father of all men. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, October 5, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Overton
Andrews	Guffey	Pepper
Austin	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bailey	Hatch	Reed
Ball	Hawkes	Revercomb
Barbour	Hayden	Reynolds
Barkley	Hill	Robertson
Brewster	Holman	Russell
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	Kilgore	Taft
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McCarran	Tunnell
Chandler	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wagner
Connally	Maloney	Wallgren
Danaher	Maybank	Walsh
Davis	Millikin	Wheeler
Eastland	Moore	White
Ellender	Murdock	Wiley
Ferguson	Murray	Willis
George	Nye	Wilson
Gerry	O'Daniel	
Gillette	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Conditions on the West Coast.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has been confined to a Madison hospital since September 13.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has been confined to a Madison hospital since September 13.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent on official appointments.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS, OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Alien Property Custodian, submitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of personnel requirements of his office for the quarter ending December 31, 1943, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITION TO SAVE THE JEWS IN NAZI-CONTROLLED EUROPE—APPEAL BY THE RABBIS OF AMERICA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the petition and appeal of the rabbis of America for the adoption of immediate and practical measures to rescue and save the Jewish people from persecution in Nazi-controlled Europe, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 6, 1943.

To the Honorable HENRY AGARD WALLACE,
Vice President of the United States:

In the name of God, creator of the universe, blessed be He, who voiced in our Holy Torah the command: "Thou shalt not stand idly by the blood of your neighbor. I am the Lord."

In this hour of our distress we call upon the Almighty, Lord of heaven and earth in the ancient words: "A voice on high is heard, the voice of our brothers' blood—innocent souls by the tens of thousands, children, infants, and sucklings—the aged, men and women, cry out unto us: 'Save us'."

How can we face the Lord on the hallowed day, the Day of Atonement, knowing that we have not fulfilled our duty? And on the eve of this day most holy to us, we come brokenhearted to ask you, Mr. Vice President, to hear the cries of our brethren, now in the hands of the murderous Nazi government which singled out the people of Israel as its target and has decreed their annihilation and oblivion. The Nazis have poured out their rage against our people with a horrible cruelty unequaled by the savages of ancient days. Millions of Jews have already fallen, exterminated with fire and sword; tens of thousands have died of starvation and have been victims of barbarous and unnatural executions.

In view of this tragic emergency, it is a holy obligation to take drastic steps to save the Jewish people:

1. To adopt immediate and practical measures of rescue and to use all possible means to end the murders committed by Nazi criminals.

2. To warn Germany and all the Nazi-satellite countries that every atrocity and crime perpetrated against their Jewish residents, whether by governments or private individuals, will be held against them and that, likewise, every act of kindness toward these unfortunates will not pass unnoticed.

3. To send ships with food and medical supplies to the Jews starving in ghettos, which will be distributed under the supervision of a neutral commission or through the International Red Cross.

4. To influence and persuade neutral countries to allow the Jewish refugees who flee from the Nazi sword to seek security within their borders and to guarantee to these countries the means for the temporary maintenance of these refugees.

5. To open the gates of the United Nations to provide havens therein, and to facilitate the entry into our land, the United States of America, of those who can escape the Nazi terror.

6. To open immediately to these refugees the doors of Palestine, the Holy Land of our forefathers, which was given to Israel for eternal heritage by the Lord, blessed be His name, with oath and covenant.

7. To create a special intergovernmental agency to save the remnant of Israel in

Europe with powers and means to act at once on a large scale.

We pray and appeal to the Lord, blessed be He, that our most gracious Vice President, HENRY AGARD WALLACE, consider and recognize this momentous hour of history and the responsibility which the Divine Presence has laid upon the leaders of this great Nation that they may save the remnant of the People of the Book. And we pray that the Lord may aid us to gain complete and speedy victory on all fronts against our enemies and that we may be blessed with everlasting peace. And we shall pray on the day of atonement for the triumph of our country, the United States of America. Amen.

RABBI ISRAEL ROSENBERG,
President, Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States.
RABBI L. B. LEVINTHAL,
President, Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States.
RABBI JUDA L. SELTZER,
Executive Director, Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States.
RABBI WOLF GOLD,
Member Executive Committee, Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States, and Honorary President, American Mizrachi Organization.
RABBI ELIEZER SILVER,
President, Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States, and President, American Agudas Israel.
RABBI HAIM I. BLOCH,
Vice President, Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States.
RABBI REUBEN LEVOVITZ,
Secretary, Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States.
RABBI SOLOMON M. FRIEDMAN,
President, Union of Grand Rabbis of the United States.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 771. A bill to provide for payment of pensions and compensation to certain persons who are receiving retired pay; with an amendment (Rept. No. 446); and

H. R. 693. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 447).

SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys I ask unanimous consent to report, with amendments, the bill (S. 1243) authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes, and to submit a report (No. 445) thereon. I also ask unanimous consent that the committee report and bill as proposed to be amended be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and the report and bill will be printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from Wyoming.

The committee report and bill, as proposed to be amended by the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, are as follows:

The Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1243) authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes, having carefully considered the same, report favorably thereon with the following amendments and with the recommendation that the bill, as amended, do pass.

On page 2, line 2, after the word "products", add the following: "The plants shall be of the minimum size which will allow the Government to furnish industry the necessary cost and engineering data for the development of a synthetic liquid fuel industry and of such size that the combined product of all the plants constructed in accordance with this act will not constitute a commercially significant amount of the total national commercial sale and distribution of petroleum and petroleum products."

On page 3, line 16, after the word "purchaser", strike out the period and add the following: "through regular commercial channels."

This bill might well be termed "a bill to assure the United States a continuous supply of domestically produced motor fuel and aviation gasoline." The military demands for petroleum and its products during the war have been so great that we are now burning up liquid fuel at the rate of approximately 1,500,000,000 barrels of crude oil every year. This tremendous drain upon American supplies has been occasioned by the fact that the United States oil fields have been the only sure and certain source of supply for the armies, the navies, and the air forces of all the United Nations. Even though the recovery of the Mediterranean Sea from Axis control is opening up middle-eastern sources of oil, the demand for American supplies is likely to continue at a tremendously high rate because the American air fleets are being constantly augmented. More and larger planes of longer flying radius are under construction and the demand for these planes will not be appreciably diminished while the war with Japan continues.

The consumption of oil in the United States is now proceeding annually at a rate much greater than the discovery of new supplies. During the years 1940, 1941, and 1942, the additions to the proven oil reserves of the Nation amounted in the aggregate to approximately 1,600,000,000 barrels of crude oil as compared with additions of 5,400,000,000 barrels in the preceding 3 years. The rate of discovery has been steadily declining and while your committee is of the opinion that the search for oil in the public-land States can be successfully stimulated, it is nevertheless evident that the demand for liquid fuel is likely to continue at such a high rate that the Nation's interest can be conserved only by immediate action to bring about the manufacture of synthetic fuel from the unlimited supplies of coal which this country possesses and from the vast deposits of oil shale to be found in several of the public-land States.

There can be no doubt now that aviation will be one of the principal industries toward which the world will turn after the war. The United States now occupies a position of world leadership in this field. Not only because of the genius and skill of its citizens who are engaged in the design and manufacture of airplanes, but because we have had a large supply of crude oil. If, however, the country is to maintain its leadership in the air it must take steps now to guarantee a sure and certain supply of liquid fuel. This can be done by the use of coal, oil shale, and other materials for the manufacture of synthetic liquid fuels. In Germany, Japan, and in England, also, the hydrogenation of coal has been a source of gasoline supply. The process has not been used in the United States largely because of the cost; and industry has not as yet undertaken to demonstrate the possibilities.

The Bureau of Mines, acting under the authorization of a special appropriation has made experiments in a small plant at the Bureau of Mines Station in Pittsburgh, Pa. These experiments, which have been successfully carried out, have proceeded to such a point that it is now desirable to carry them on in a more extensive manner. The Pittsburgh tests were scarcely more than laboratory tests; the next step is to construct and operate demonstration plants.

The committee held hearings during the recess of Congress at Washington, D. C., Pittsburgh, Pa., Salt Lake City, Utah, and Sheridan, Wyo. Opportunity was extended to all branches of industry to discuss the measure. The response, not only from industry but also from public authorities in the coal-bearing States, was little short of enthusiastic. Only one doubt was expressed, namely, that the authority might be used to put the Government in competition with private industry. This was not the intention of the sponsor of the bill, nor of the Department of the Interior, and statements to that effect were made at the hearings. In order to make the matter clear, however, the committee, at the recommendation of the subcommittee which conducted the hearings, has adopted the amendments on pages 2 and 3 of the bill which are set forth in full above, to make certain that there will be no invasion of the domain of private industry and no competition by Government with commercial enterprise.

The report of the Secretary of the Interior is hereinbelow set forth in full and made a part of this report:

MY DEAR SENATOR HATCH: You have asked my views on the provisions of S. 1243, a bill authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of the legislation proposed in the bill. It is high time that the country embarked in earnest upon the program of research and development work necessary to determine the processes and equipment required for the establishment of an industry which can help to supply the continuing needs of the country for liquid fuels which have heretofore been available from the ample but now waning domestic petroleum reserves.

The total demand for liquid fuel in 1941 and 1942 reached about 1,500,000,000 barrels annually. The rate of discovery of petroleum has decreased sharply since 1937. In the 3 years 1937–39 about 5,400,000,000 barrels were added to the Nation's proved oil reserves, whereas in the 3 years 1940–42 the increment was only 1,600,000,000 barrels. In 1942 the new reserves discovered, including extensions and new horizons in old fields, were at a low of 317,000,000 barrels or only about one-fifth of our annual rate of consumption. This failure to find adequate quantities of new oil was not due to lack of prospect drilling, as 3,264 wildcat wells were drilled in 1941 and 3,029 in 1942.

The decline in the rate at which new discoveries are being made is causing serious concern as to a sufficient supply of crude petroleum in the event of a long war. The ominous implications of the progressive effect of this decline upon the peacetime econ-

omy of the post-war years are easily foreseen and can be effectively forestalled by timely action. The answer to the problem clearly lies in the utilization of other materials than petroleum as sources of the liquid fuels required to supply the Nation's needs.

It is apparent that this country can no longer delay in embarking upon a synthetic liquid-fuel program. Our study of petroleum reserves and the rate of their depletion indicates clearly that unless we take action, the end of the age of abundant oil is in sight. This development—and I fix no date for it—will inevitably bring major repercussions throughout our entire economy in peace as well as in war.

Fortunately, the Department of the Interior has been aware of these trends and has initiated the study of means which may still be taken to prevent the Nation from feeling the full force of future natural petroleum deficiencies. In particular, the Bureau of Mines has developed processes that actually have produced petroleum products and liquid fuels from coals, oil shale, gases, and other substances. We have also studied similar developments in other countries.

However, the time has come when we must get out of the test-tube stage into actual production Past experiments have given us the scientific knowledge of the basic processes involved, but the way must be blazed for American industry to enter this synthetic fuel field, which inevitably will be one of the major industrial developments of the near future.

It is, in my opinion, the responsibility of an alert government to meet such a situation forthrightly.

Therefore, I propose that the Government harness its facilities to the business of blazing this path so that industry and private initiative may take up the work. Under present conditions we cannot rely upon industry to make the initial, unremunerative expenditure necessary to solve the technical and economic problems of synthetic fuel production. Therefore, I propose that the Government fulfill its duty on a demonstration basis, making its findings and experience available to industry so that private enterprise can take up the task of providing synthetic fuels on the scale necessary to safeguard the Nation's future.

The Department has not as yet been informed by the Bureau of the Budget concerning the relationship of this proposed legislation to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, within the limits of critical materials available, is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate one or more demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances with all facilities and accessories for the manufacture, purification, storage, and distribution of the products. The plants shall be of the minimum size which will allow the Government to furnish industry the necessary cost and engineering data for the development of a synthetic liquid-fuel industry and of such size that the combined product of all the plants constructed in accordance with this act will not constitute a commercially significant amount of the total national commercial sale and distribution of petroleum and petroleum products.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purpose of this act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized—

(a) to conduct laboratory research and development work necessary to determine the best demonstration plant designs and conditions of operation;

(b) to acquire, by purchase, lease for a term of years or less, donation, or otherwise, land and any interest in land, including easements and leasehold interests; options on real or personal property; plants and their facilities; secret processes, technical data, inventions, patent applications, patents, irrevocable nonexclusive licenses, and other rights and licenses under patents granted by this or any other nation; to assume the obligation to pay rentals in advance on property so acquired, and to pay damages arising out of the use of any such property;

(c) to engage, by contract or otherwise, engineers, architects, and any private industrial organization he deems suitable, to do all or any part of the work of designing, constructing, or operating the plants the operation to be under his supervision, and through leases or otherwise as he believes advisable;

(d) to cooperate with any other Federal or State department, agency, or instrumentality, and with any private person, firm, or corporation, in effectuating the purposes of this act. Sections 321 and 322 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended, shall not apply to any leases under this section; and such leases may be made for a term of years notwithstanding Revised Statutes, section 3679, as amended, or any other provision of law.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to sell the products of the plants at not more than actual cost, including amortization of capital expenses, as determined by him, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal or any State government, but priority shall be given to orders placed by the War or Navy Departments. Any remaining products may be sold at going prices to any purchaser through regular commercial channels. The Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, shall also have authority to dispose of any lands or other real or personal property acquired, but in his opinion no longer useful, for the purposes of this act, and to grant, on such terms as he may consider appropriate, licenses under patent rights acquired under this act.

SEC. 4. All moneys received under this act for products of the plants and royalties shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. The Secretary of the Interior shall render to Congress on or before the 1st day of January of each year a report of all operations under this act.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior may issue rules and regulations to effectuate the purposes of this act. The authority and duties of the Secretary of the Interior under this act shall be exercised through the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIS:

S. 1416. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Judith H. Sedler; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. HATCH introduced Senate bill 1417, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. McCLELLAN) introduced Senate bill 1418, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1419. A bill to authorize collectors of internal revenue to receive cashier's checks of certain banking institutions in payment for revenue stamps; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1420. A bill providing for the reorganization of the Government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH BUILDING, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill for appropriate reference, and in connection therewith I request that a letter from the Secretary of the Interior dated September 22, 1943, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1417) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey on behalf of the United States, to Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building, known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building, located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage townsite, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys; and the letter presented by Mr. HATCH was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington 25, D. C., September 22, 1943.

Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE,
President of the Senate.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I transmit herewith a proposed bill "to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey, on behalf of the United States, to the Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building, known as the telephone and telegraph building, located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage townsite."

The building proposed to be donated is one story in height and measures 36' x 46'. It was built by the Alaska Railroad in 1916 at a cost of $3,826.43 and was used by the Alaska Railroad and by the city of Anchorage as a city office and telephone and telegraph exchange until September 30, 1937, at which time the city and the Alaska Railroad discontinued the use of the building and removed all equipment.

Beginning in October 1937, the Civilian Conservation Corps occupied the building, rent free, as living quarters with the understanding that it would vacate if the site should be required for the construction of a United States post office and court house. When, in December 1938, the site was required for that purpose, the Civilian Conservation Corps requested permission to move the building to nearby land of the Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, which it had rented for a nominal sum. This permission was granted and the building was moved to the land of the Jack Henry Post where the post had provided, without cost to the United States, a concrete basement foundation and plumbing fixtures to facilitate the use of the building.

On August 25, 1942, the Civilian Conservation Corps unit moved out of the building to its camp on Palmer highway. In the meantime, the Jack Henry Post had permitted the demolition of its building on other land so that the land might be used (at a rental of $1 per year) by the United Service Organizations for the erection of a building.

Accordingly the manager of the Alaska Railroad leased the building to the Jack Henry Post, No. 1, for 5 years, beginning September 1, 1942, at a monthly rental of $2.50. The post has made improvements to the building which it uses as a meeting and club room for itself and its Women's Auxiliary, and has also made meeting space available to the Boy Scouts without charge. No commercial enterprise is carried on within the building.

In view of the generosity of the Jack Henry Post, No. 1, to the United States, the questionable salvage value of the building, and

the small rental income therefrom, I recommend that the proposed bill be enacted.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised me that there would be no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

ADJUSTMENT OF MAXIMUM PRICES ON MILK

During the delivery of Mr. REED'S speech, which appears later in today's proceedings, the following occurred:

Mr. EASTLAND. I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill on behalf of the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and myself, and request that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). Without objection, the bill will be received and referred as requested by the Senator from Mississippi.

The bill (S. 1418) to provide for the adjustment of maximum prices on milk, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 800. An act to provide for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die in service in the land or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1042. An act for the relief of Frank J. Recely and Mary T. Recely;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Fred A. Flanders;

H. R. 2190. An act for the relief of Marguerite R. McElroy;

H. R. 2304. An act for the relief of Harry Tansey; and

H. R. 2459. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Carl Oplinger, City Hospital of Akron, Ohio, and to Dr. Walter A. Hoyt; to the Committee on Claims.

ISSUANCE OF IDENTIFICATION CARDS TO SENATORS

Mr. MCKELLAR submitted a resolution (S. Res. 186), which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate is authorized and directed to issue to each Senator an identification card bearing a photograph of such Senator, the signature of such Senator, or a facsimile thereof, and the words "the person whose photograph and signature appear hereon is a Member of the United States Senate." Each such identification card shall be signed by the Sergeant at Arms.

SEC. 2. When any identification card issued under the foregoing section is presented or exhibited by the Senator to whom it was issued, such Senator shall be admitted to any building or other property occupied or used by any department or agency of the Government, and shall be so admitted without regard to any rule, regulation, or requirement of such department or agency relating to the admittance or identification of persons entering such building or other property.

RENUNCIATION OF EXTRATERRITORIAL RIGHTS IN CHINA

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article which I have prepared on the subject of extraterritoriality in China be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me concerning the above article.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

NATIONAL WAR FUND—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by the President of the United States on October 5, 1943, in connection with the National War Fund, which appears in the Appendix.]

BEHEADING OF AN AMERICAN FLYER BY THE JAPANESE—COMMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper article dated October 6, 1943, giving an account of the President's comment in a press conference regarding the beheading of an American flyer by the Japanese, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BUTLER ON FOOD SITUATION IN SOUTH AMERICA

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Food Situation in South America," delivered by him at the National Food Conference, Chicago, September 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CATTLE SITUATION—ADDRESS BY C. J. ABBOTT

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Cattle Situation," delivered by C. J. Abbott, of Hyannis, Nebr., at the National Food Conference, Chicago, September 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY JESSE H. JONES ON POST-WAR PROBLEMS

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Post War Problems," delivered by Hon. Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, before the New York Board of Trade, September 30, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY FRANK E. GANNETT AT NATIONAL FOOD CONFERENCE

[Mr. BUSHFIELD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Frank E. Gannett at the National Food Conference, Chicago, Ill., September 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOD FOR 1944—ADDRESS BY WHEELER MCMILLEN

[Mr. BUSHFIELD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Food for 1944," delivered by Wheeler McMillen, editor in chief of the Farm Journal and Farmer's Wife, at the National Food Conference, at Chicago, Ill., on September 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WILLIAM C. BULLITT'S CANDIDACY FOR MAYOR—STATEMENT BY HARRISON E. SPANGLER

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Thomas P. O'Neil, published in the Philadelphia Record of October 5, 1943, dealing with the statement made by Republican National Committee chairman, Harrison E. Spangler, concerning the candidacy of William C. Bullitt, which appears in the Appendix.]

FREIGHT-RATE LEGISLATION WILL NOT FIX PRICES—EDITORIAL FROM LOUISVILLE COURIER-JOURNAL

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Freight Rate Legislation Will Not Fix Prices," published in the Louisville Courier-Journal for September 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SYNTHETIC-RUBBER PROGRAM—EDITORIALS FROM PHILADELPHIA RECORD AND STATEMENT BY WILLIAM M. JEFFERS

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the synthetic-rubber program by William M. Jeffers, and two editorials from the Philadelphia Record on the same subject, which appears in the Appendix.]

WASHINGTON COMMUNITY WAR FUND CAMPAIGN—ADDRESS BY PRESTON DELANO

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the remarks of Hon. Preston Delano, Comptroller of the Currency, Chairman of the Government Division of the Community War Fund, at the opening of the Government Division mass meeting October 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

BERNARD M. BARUCH—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several editorials of commendation for the services rendered by Bernard M. Baruch, which appear in the Appendix.]

LAME DUCKS IN ERMINE—EDITORIAL FROM FORT WAYNE (IND.), NEWS-SENTINEL

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lame Ducks In Ermine" published in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinal of October 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] to the so-called Bailey-Clark of Missouri amendment.

Mr. MCNARY. I am not familiar with the proposal of the very distinguished Senator from Missouri. I should like to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add at the end of the pending amendment the following:

SEC. 3. Section 10 of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) In order to assist in the determination of whether or not men should be deferred from training and service because they are physically, mentally, or morally deficient

or defective, and to delay as long as possible the induction of men living with their families, the President shall forthwith appoint a commission of five qualified physicians, of whom at least one shall be an Army officer and one a Navy officer, who shall examine the physical qualification requirements for admission to the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and recommend to the President any changes therein which they believe can be made without impairing the efficiency of the armed services. The commission shall especially consider the establishment of special standards for men who will be inducted only for limited service. The Director of Selective Service shall cause to be reexamined those men who may qualify under any new standards established."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I should like to say very frankly that the amendment which I have just offered is lifted bodily from the substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I offer this amendment not for the purpose of stealing the provision from the amendment of the Senator from Ohio but because I think it is a meritorious provision to which, it seems to me, there can be no reasonable or substantial opposition. I am anxious to have as much included in the original Bailey amendment as can be added without controversy. Therefore I have merely taken the suggestion from the substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri a question. I notice that in the language of his amendment he uses the word "shall"; that is, the President is commanded by the language of the amendment, if it shall be adopted, to appoint the proposed board. Ordinarily the language of legislation is an authorization.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I believe the usual language is "authorized and directed."

Mr. BARKLEY. Authorized and directed. As a matter of good form I think that language should be substituted for simply the plain word "shall."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have no objection, Mr. President. I so modify my amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand the Senator strikes out the word "shall" and substitutes the words "authorized and directed."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator explain what the proposed change is?

Mr. BARKLEY. It simply would mean the use of the words "authorized and directed" instead of the word "shall."

Mr. TAFT. "Authorized and directed"; that is satisfactory.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is the customary form.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let me ask what the modification was. I did not hear it clearly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is simply to strike out the word "shall" and insert the words "authorized and directed"; so the language would be "the President is authorized and directed forthwith," and so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], as modified, to the so-called Bailey-Clark (of Missouri) amendment.

The amendment, as modified, to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the original Bailey-Clark amendment. At the end of section (n) I propose to insert the following new sentence:

After the beginning of the second calendar month following the date of enactment of this subsection and until the termination of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President, no registrant between the ages of 18 and 38 who is employed by any employer other than the Federal Government shall be deferred, nor shall the deferment of any such registrant continue, on occupational grounds under section 5 (e) or section 5 (c) (2) by reason of such employment, unless (A) such registrant was married prior to December 8, 1941, and has a child or children under 18 years of age, or (B) the employer of such registrant furnishes to the registrant's selective service local board an affidavit to the effect that the registrant's services in the position in which he is employed are indispensable to the operations of the plant, establishment, business, or other activity in which he is employed. Any such affidavit shall contain a statement of the reasons for determining that the services of such registrant are indispensable.

Mr. President, that language sets forth the identical principle which has been set forth in the Bailey-Clark amendment. In other words, the great body of men concerning whom complaint is made that there is hoarding is the body of men employed by industry. Not only one person has made such complaint, but thousands have made it. Everyone familiar with the situation knows that hoarding of labor occurs in industry. Representatives of business have made that statement, as I have already said on the floor of the Senate. I have read statements from representatives of business to that effect. Representatives of labor unions have made such statements with reference to certain automobile plants, certain aluminum plants, and other plants. Everyone is agreed that the practice should be stopped.

My distinguished friend, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], said yesterday that we are here dealing with manpower. Of course, everything we are endeavoring to do here at the present time deals with manpower. Certainly we cannot set up two standards, one for the Government of the United States and another for private industry.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana has merit. I mean it would place industrial plants upon the same basis upon which Government agencies are being placed in the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina. But the Senator from Montana has used language in his amendment which, I am afraid, if the amendment is adopted, would make it difficult to enforce or apply. The Senator's amendment would require that an affidavit shall be made. That means that a foreman or a superintendent of a plant must swear under oath that a certain man's services are indispensable. I can very well understand how such a foreman or superintendent might hesitate to swear about something which is a matter of opinion on his part, for if someone later should find fault with the affidavit, or with the situation, and claim that the man in question was not indispensable, and felt keenly enough about it to try to make trouble, he might have the foreman or superintendent indicted for false swearing. It seems to me that to require certification and the giving of the reason for the certification would be all that would be necessary, instead of requiring the making of an affidavit under oath.

As the Senator from Montana, of course, realizes, no matter how indispensable a man in a war plant might be in the opinion of the foreman, or the superintendent of the plant, or the head of the organization, after all the man who makes affidavit is required to swear to an opinion. He might take the position that the Government of the United States has no right to compel him to make oath about an opinion of his regarding the indispensability of some workman, and say he will not do it; that he would rather give up the man than to swear to such an opinion, and then perhaps have someone come along later and try to have the affiant indicted in Federal court for making a false statement.

I think the word "certification," as we have used it in the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina is sufficient, if that amendment is to be adopted. I will say frankly that, with that modification, I think the amendment has merit. I know of no reason why industrial plants should be placed upon a different basis than Government agencies, except that there has been more furore created about hoarding men in Government agencies than there has been about hoarding in industrial plants. But I feel that it is going too far to require a foreman or a superintendent of a plant to make oath that any individual man is indispensable, which means that he cannot be gotten along without, that no one can take his place.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I think there is something in what the Senator from Kentucky has said. Suppose I change the language to read:

The employer of such registrant furnishes to the registrant's selective service local board a written statement to the effect that the registrant's services in the position in which he is employed are indispensable to the operations of the plant, establishment, business, or other activity in which he is employed. Any such written statement shall contain a statement of the reasons for determining that the services are—

And so forth.

Mr. BARKLEY. That meets my view about it, I will say, and I think it improves the language.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, the reason I offer the amendment is that I think we cannot make a distinction

between Government employees and other employees. We cannot pick out Government employees and say that it must be shown that they are indispensable, and then permit employees in industry to remain without such a showing being made. If such provision is contained in the law, then it seems to me that if the Selective Service officers do their duty, as they should, it will result in doing away with the hoarding of labor. It will then be up to the Selective Service, it seems to me, to do their duty, and to drive out of industry all persons who are being hoarded there, for example, young persons who have been placed in high positions by superintendents and friends, concerning whom complaint has been made by labor organizations and by others.

Mr. President, similar complaints have come to me from various communities in my own State. Complaint has also come to me from representative businessmen that the Army itself in some of the camps is hoarding labor. One of the outstanding businessmen of Great Falls said that the Army was hoarding mechanics, whereas other communities in Montana were short of mechanics.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I did not catch the language of the proposed amendment. Does it make it mandatory on the board to defer the applicant when the evidence provided in the amendment is furnished, or does deferment lie in the discretion of the board?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator from Montana again read his amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. I shall read the whole of my amendment again.

Mr. TUNNELL. I am sorry I could not catch it all.

Mr. WHEELER. The amendment reads:

> After the beginning of the second calendar month following the date of enactment of this subsection and until the termination of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President, no registrant between the ages of 18 and 38 who is employed by any employer other than the Federal Government shall be deferred, nor shall the deferment of any such registrant continue, on occupational grounds under section 5 (e) or section 5 (c) (2) by reason of such employment, unless (A) such registrant was married prior to December 8, 1941 and has a child or children under 18 years of age, or (B) the employer of such registrant furnishes to the registrant's selective service local board a written statement to the effect that the registrant's services in the position in which he is employed are indispensable to the operations of the plant, establishment, business, or other activity in which he is employed. Any such written statement shall contain a statement of the reasons for determining that the services of such registrant are indispensable.

Mr. TUNNELL. I thank the Senator; I think that answers my question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to say frankly to the Senator that I think the amendment as modified would be helpful, and I shall support it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so as to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think it should be perfectly clear that the test of indispensability is not one to be made solely by the employer, but by the local board. If the amendment now under consideration is added to the act as it now stands, there would be one standard, based on a statement from an employer; but the local board, under the law, still has other standards on the basis of which it may defer registrants. So it seems to me that the amendment should be perfected in order to make it clear that we are not changing the former standard, which is a very different one from the standard proposed by the amendment, but are saying that the board must find that the registrant is indispensable. I suggest that only as a proper method of perfecting the amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I am inclined to agree with the Senator's suggestion. Will the Senator suggest appropriate language?

Mr. TAFT. That will take a little time.

Mr. WHEELER. I think what has been suggested is clearly the intention of Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the board have to do that anyway? The board acts; and the amendment would merely require that certain evidence be placed before the board.

It would seem to me the Senator's amendment covers the matter without the suggested modification.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield first to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I understand the language proposed by the Senator, it is that a man cannot be deferred on the basis of occupational grounds, regardless of what they may be, unless a certificate of indispensability is provided.

Mr. WHEELER. That is the intention.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. It might be helpful in this connection if I should bring to the attention of the Senate the conditions now required for the deferment of a registrant. It might be helpful in aiding us to do what I think we are all in agreement we want to do. We merely want to be sure we shall accomplish what we seek to do.

Today, in order for a registrant to be deferred under the selective-service law he must be what is called a "necessary man" in war production or in support of the war effort. Regulation No. 622.24 defines "necessary man." It says:

> "Necessary man" defined: A registrant shall be considered a "necessary man"—

The words "necessary man" are in quotation marks—

> in industry, business, employment, agricultural pursuit, governmental service, or in any other service or endeavor, including training or preparation therefor, only when all of these conditions exist: (1) He is, or but for a seasonal or temporary interruption would be, engaged in such activity; (2) he cannot be replaced because of a shortage of persons with his qualifications or skill in such activity; and (3) his removal would cause a serious loss of effectiveness in such activity.

I am in accord with the Senator. We have used the "indispensable" rule for Federal employees. I know of no reason why we should not use the same rule for industrial employees.

Mr. WHEELER. The difficulty which has existed is that, as a matter of fact, the law has not been carried out according to the intention of Congress. Senators will recall the testimony of Colonel Keesling when Mr. Baruch was on the witness stand. He said they had been deferring registrants because of the fact the employers said they could not replace them.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me in that connection?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I should like to say that I think even if we lay down a rule of "indispensability"—as I think we have done for Federal employees, and as I think we should do for industrial employees—the question of replacement is bound to arise. The question whether a man is indispensable might well turn on the question whether someone to replace him could be secured. The man might be doing the most important job in a factory. If it were impossible to obtain anyone else to replace him, he might be indispensable to the continued production in the factory, whereas if it were possible to put someone else in his place he would not be indispensable. No matter what language we might see fit to write into the provision, unless we do something which might seriously impair industrial production, I do not think we can entirely escape considering the factor of replacement.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, Mr. President, I think there is something to what the Senator says.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Let me ask what effect the Senator's proposed amendment to the amendment would have upon agricultural labor.

Mr. WHEELER. It would not affect agricultural labor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The point I desired to inquire about when I rose a moment ago probably has been cleared up. I was not quite certain, from reading the amendment, whether the filing of the statement itself would require the board to grant the deferment.

Mr. WHEELER. No; the board could not defer the registrant without the statement. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has suggested the following modification of the amendment to the amendment, and I think his suggestion is a good one:

And such board finds such statement to be in accord with the facts.

Mr. HATCH. Then the finding still would be left to the local board; is that correct?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; it would be left to the local board. I think the suggestion which has been made by the Senator from Ohio is a good one.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me ask why the Senator says the provision would not apply to agricultural labor. Is the section a new one?

Mr. WHEELER. No; it would not apply to agricultural labor because it refers to a section of the law which does not touch agricultural labor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the amendment apply to the same section which would be affected by the Taft amendment?

Mr. WHEELER. No; my amendment is proposed to the Bailey amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does not the Bailey amendment provide for an entirely new section? Being a new section, would it not apply to all classes alike?

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say that this morning I talked with the drafting clerk who drew the amendment, and he informed me that it would not affect or touch deferments of agricultural labor at all. I took his word for it, because I asked him to state explicitly if that was correct. He said that was true, and he pointed out the reasons why it was true. I cannot now recall them, but he pointed out the sections of the bill, and said it did not apply.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I know that under subsection (k), which deals exclusively with agricultural labor, an agricultural worker is set aside.

Mr. WHEELER. But the amendment to which my amendment would apply leaves out subsection (k) entirely. It refers to section 5 (e) and section 5 (c) (2). So it is an amendment of section 5 (e) and section 5 (c) (2).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana, as modified, to the so-called Bailey-Clark (of Missouri) amendment, as amended.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in following the usual practice, the amendment to the amendment should be read by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the amendment proposed by Mr. BAILEY and Mr. CLARK of Missouri it is proposed to insert the following:

After the beginning of the second calendar month following the date of enactment of this subsection and until the termination of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President, no registrant between the ages of 18 and 38 who is employed by any employer other than the Federal Government shall be deferred, nor shall the deferment of any such registrant continue, on occupational grounds under section 5 (e) or section 5 (c) (2) by reason of such employment unless (A) such registrant was married prior to December 8, 1941, and has a child or children under 18 years of age, or (B) the employer of such registrant furnishes to the registrant's selective-service local board a written statement to the effect that the registrant's services in the position in which he is employed are indispensable to the operations of the plant, establishment, business, or other activity in which he is employed and such board finds such statement to be in accord with the facts. Any such written statement shall contain a statement of the reasons for determining that the services of such registrant are indispensable.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as I have stated, I shall vote for the amendment. I did not want anything which might have been said to convey the idea that the selective-service local boards, or, for that matter, the State directors, are not now checking the requests of employers. They do not merely accept the statements of employers without questioning them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not question the intention of the selective-service authorities, but I do question very much the Senator's statement as to the efficacy with which that plan has been followed. The other day I stated on the floor of the Senate that in the St. Louis metropolitan area—and I mention that constantly because it is the one with which I am most familiar—there are some 591 plants which have industrial deferments. They are plants engaged in essential war work. The only personnel available for checking those matters in any way and passing on the question is one officer. He is an excellent officer, whom I have known for many years, but there is only one officer, who comes from the State headquarters at Jefferson City on Tuesday of each week and stays in St. Louis until Friday of each week. He has one stenographer as his entire staff. It is utterly impossible for two persons to make any reasonable check on that number of personnel. I am informed that 80 percent of the industrial deferments in the whole State of Missouri are in the metropolitan area of St. Louis. It is utterly impossible for the present staff to make any adequate check. I hope that one thing which will come out of this debate will be a provision for adequate staffs to check industrial deferments.

Mr. HILL. The Senator may be correct. I did not mean to indicate that I thought the job was being done as thoroughly as it might be done, or as thoroughly as the selective service authorities felt was necessary.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I say that not by way of criticism, but by way of trying to point out a thing which permits great loopholes. Certainly Congress never intended to be niggardly with the Selective Service System by allowing insufficient personnel for the administration of the law.

Mr. HILL. What I wanted to bring out was that the local boards and State directors were not simply accepting certificates from employers without questioning their statements and checking them. Colonel Keesling, who testified before the committee in the recent hearings, was asked about the matter by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. I read from page 356 of the hearings:

Senator WHEELER. You go entirely on the replaceability by the manufacturer himself?

Colonel KEESLING. No, sir; we check it ourselves, check into it ourselves, as much as we can.

Senator WHEELER. You mean the local draft board does?

Colonel KEESLING. The State director and his industrial advisers as well as the local board.

With reference to what the Senator from Missouri has said, if the Selective Service does not feel that it has a sufficient staff thoroughly, painstakingly, and carefully to check requests for deferment, I hope the selective service authorities will come to Congress, if they need anything from Congress, so that we can give them whatever they may need to make sure that there is a thorough check of requests for deferments.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I should like to point out that that proposition works both ways. I happen to know of one instance in which a concern is engaged 100 percent in essential war work for the Army. A good many of its men have been taken for the Army, but it has been able to operate.

It says that the irreducible minimum under which it can operate the plant is five diemakers. It can replace general personnel, but it cannot replace diemakers. This concern appealed to the War Manpower Commission's office in Kansas City, which somewhat modified the requirements for diemakers. The War Manpower Commission reduced the time required for a man to be considered a competent diemaker from 4 years to 2½ years. The particular concern to which I refer decided that it must have at least seven diemakers in the character of business which it is doing. It has only five. The local board is paying no attention to the directive from the War Manpower Commission with respect to diemakers. So the thing works both ways, and should have the most meticulous supervision by the Selective Service System.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Alabama made a rather rash promise a moment ago. As I understood him, he said that we would appropriate everything asked for by the selective service authorities for certain purposes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I did not say that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not want the Senator to go that far.

Mr. HILL. I do not mean to say that—not anything they ask for.

Mr. McKELLAR. They have asked for enough already, and I hope the Senator will not encourage them to ask for more.

Mr. HILL. If I conveyed that impression, I am glad the Senator has called my attention to it. I did not mean to say that we would appropriate all the money they asked for. I meant to say that I was sure the Congress would support them in any way within reason, in thoroughly and carefully checking the matter of deferments.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I entirely agree with what the Senator from Missouri has said. In the smaller communities, where the decision is left to the selective-service boards, the draft boards can check requests for deferments; but in the large industrial centers, where from 20,000 to 40,000 persons are employed, it is a physical impossibility for the boards, with the number of employees available, to check requests for deferments. Certainly the Selective Service System ought to have some means at its command by which it could go through the factories and check up on such requests. If that were done, it would not only save the Government of the United States money, but it would likewise get a lot of people into the service who ought to be there.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], as modified, to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the original Bailey-Clark amendment, as amended.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from North Carolina, the author of the amendment. I call his attention to the language on page 3, beginning in line 3:

> The Director of Selective Service, upon appeal or upon his own motion, shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, training and service under this act; and the determination of the Director shall be final.

I have no complaint with the paragraph, but the question arises whether that language applies only to subsection (n), or whether it has general application. I assume that the Senator intended that the paragraph should have general application, and did not intend to have it apply only to subsection (n). There is some question in my mind as to whether it applies only to subsection (n), particularly because it is in that subsection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I do not think there is any question about that. The language is:

> The Director of Selective Service, upon appeal or upon his own motion, shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, training and service under this act; and the determination of the Director shall be final

The words "this act" refer to the entire act.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, allow me to say to my friend that it was not only a question in my mind but it was likewise a question which I raised in the mind of the legislative counsel, Mr. Murphy. There was some question about it, and it was thought that it might possibly be interpreted in that way. I wished to have the explanation of the Senator from North Carolina, which is that the language is not intended to apply merely to this particular subsection but that it is to apply generally to the whole selective-service law.

Mr. BAILEY. If the language had been intended to apply merely to the subsection it would have read "under this subsection" instead of "under this act." The word "act" is very significant. In my judgment, it refers to the whole act.

Mr. WHEELER. All I wanted was an interpretation by its author so there could be no question about it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the so-called Bailey-Clark amendment, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] to the Taft amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, has the Taft substitute been formally offered?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Taft substitute was offered yesterday.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. McNARY. As I understand, the adoption of the so-called Bailey-Clark amendment, as amended, practically disposes of the so-called Wheeler bill. Am I correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] to the Taft amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. McNARY. That is true, but that does not quite answer my inquiry. So far as the practical question is concerned——

The VICE PRESIDENT. As a practical matter, the Senator is no doubt correct, but the original Bailey-Clark amendment as amended was not a complete substitute.

Mr. McNARY. Oh, no; but it is practically a complete substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Practically speaking, it is.

Mr. McNARY. Yes; and to that extent it totally disposes of the Wheeler bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Practically speaking.

Mr. McNARY. I thank the Chair. The next question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] to the Taft proposal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I desire to offer an amendment to the Wheeler bill as amended. Would such amendment be in order at this time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may offer the amendment as an amendment to the Taft substitute. If that should be voted down the Senator could then offer it as an amendment to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not wish to offer it as an amendment to the Taft substitute. I desire to offer it as an amendment to the Wheeler bill, if it is a proper amendment to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may offer it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment is not in order. We have adopted an amendment to the Wheeler bill. The amendment having once been adopted, it cannot again be amended without unanimous consent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, if I may interrupt, my inquiry is whether the Wheeler bill as amended can be further amended. If so, I have such an amendment which I desire to offer.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may I suggest that it may be offered if it is not an amendment to the amendment. As the amendment has replaced all the language of the former bill I do not think that it can be amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not replaced all the language of the original bill. The first five lines of the bill are still intact.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the amendment which has been agreed to by the Senate is language which takes the place of lines 6 to 11, inclusive, of the bill. Of course, the Senator from Ohio is correct in stating that the language of the amendment which has been adopted in lieu of the original language of the bill cannot now be amended without unanimous consent; but an amendment to any other part of the Wheeler bill, not included in the amendment which has been adopted, would be in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A new section would be in order.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest that before the Chair rules the amendment of the Senator from Colorado be read.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the amendment which I desire to offer would not attempt to change any of the language of the so-called Wheeler bill as amended. It would merely provide two new sections to the bill, and the purpose of it would be to increase family allotments. It is offered in the form of new sections to the Wheeler bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado would then be in the form of entirely new sections to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. Mr. President, perhaps I could save considerable time of the Senate by explain-

ing the provisions of my amendment. It is an exact copy of a bill which prior to the summer adjournment was passed by the Senate with respect to this matter, except that under my proposed amendment children would receive an allowance of $50 instead of $18 and $11, as was provided in Senate bill 1279 which passed the Senate and is now pending in the House of Representatives.

Yesterday I heard the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] say that the Nation, and the Congress would not permit hardships to be placed upon the families of fathers who were drafted. I thought those were fine words. I wish to implement them by something concrete in the way of a statutory provision. That is the object of my amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I should like to know if by offering this increased-allotment proviso to the pending bill, there would result any possibility of delaying the final passage of the allotment bill. I ask the question for the reason that, as I understand, the Military Affairs Committee of the House reported yesterday to the House a bill from the Senate amended by the committee, and asked for House approval. Therefore, if the House should agree to the committee recommendations and approve the bill, the enactment of increased allotment provisions would be completed. If we should insert an increased-allotment provision in the pending bill we would then complicate matters by having two bills before the House. That would mean a delay in the receipt by the dependents of soldiers of increased allotments. I am fearful that by attaching such a provision to the pending bill as that suggested by the Senator from Colorado we might delay rather than expedite the receipt of the increased allotments. Will the Senator clear my mind on that question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I cannot agree with the Senator that the amendment I have offered should cause any delay. It is a simple matter. We either want to do what the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] said yesterday, namely, make provision so that there will be no hardship, or we do not want to do it.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, how does this differ——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I will yield in a moment. I wish fully to answer the first inquiry of the Senator from South Dakota before I am asked another question; but, in the meantime, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I merely wish to know how the amendment of the Senator from Colorado differs from the amendment reported to the allotment bill yesterday in the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am not informed as to that. I do not know in what way it differs. The House has had Senate bill 1279 before it for some time.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to finish my reply to the Senator's first question as to the likelihood of delay. As I say, I do not see why this amendment should cause any considerable delay. It is an exact copy of Senate bill 1279, which was passed by the Senate last summer, with the single exception, as I say, of a further provision for the children of men inducted into the service. The change is this: Instead of an allotment of $18 for the first child, under my provision it would be $50. A wife and one child, under my provision, would receive $100 instead of $68, and for each additional child a payment of $50 additional would be made. That is the only change in the bill which was given careful consideration by the Senate Military Affairs Committee, worked out with the Army officers and officers in other branches of the military service, and passed by the Senate after full consideration. The single exception is as to children, and that is a point on which I am anxious to have the Senate express itself.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield first to the Senator from South Dakota, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. GURNEY. I thank the Senator for yielding. I believe that the increased-allotment bill should be considered separately on its own merits. Because the House Military Affairs Committee has reported the Senate bill with some changes, to the House, I think the Senate will, within a few days, have a chance to express itself individually on the changes recommended by the House Military Affairs Committee, and that we can expedite the payment of increased allotments by not burdening the pending bill with another idea which will go to the House Military Affairs Committee after they have already reported a single bill which deals with allotments alone. The Senate will have a chance, too, through its conferees, to take up the matter of increased allotments for mothers and children without having such a provision on this bill. Am I not correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I do not think there is any fundamental logic in the Senator's suggestion. The House has had Senate bill 1259 before it for a long time and has not acted. At long last the bill has been reported from the committee in the House. Whether it will be passed by the House or not is something that I should certainly hate to predict; I should hate to speculate on that question. I am not concerned with what the House may do. I think we ought to be concerned with what we ourselves do. Under the provisions of the amendment to the pending bill which was adopted by the Senate a few moments ago, we expressed ourselves as to fathers who are to be taken into the service, and I think this bill is the proper place to implement the fine language of the Senator from North Carolina, the sponsor of the pending amendment, who said that the Government of the United States would certainly take care of the dependents of the men whom it was found necessary to induct.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a moment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I must yield first to the Senator from Florida, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am in hearty accord with the views expressed by the able Senator from Colorado but may I first ask a question? What is the exact provision of the Senator's amendment? What is the amendment the Senator now proposes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The amendment I now propose is to increase family allotments.

Mr. PEPPER. What are the figures the Senator proposes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Under the present law, as the Senator will recall, a wife with one child receives $62 and $10 for each additional child. In other words, a wife with two children would receive $72. That is the present law. Early last summer the Senate amended the allotment law by providing that a wife with one child should receive $68, and a wife with two children should receive $79; that is, $18 for the first child and $11 for each additional child. That bill was passed by the Senate and has been pending in the other House for many months. My proposed bill would give to a wife without children $50, which is the amount paid under the present law; to a wife with one child $100; to a wife with two children $150, and so on—$50 additional for each additional child.

There are some other changes from the present law in the Senate bill 1279 with respect to parents. In my amendment I propose to embody all those changes. In Senate bill 1279, for instance, a mother who is completely dependent upon her son in the military service would be paid $50 a month, as against $15 under the present law; if there were two parents, a mother and a father, they would receive $68. Under the amendment I do not change those provisions at all; I leave them as they are and restate them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I beg pardon of the Senator from Florida. I thought he had concluded.

Mr. PEPPER. Whether or not the figures suggested by the Senator from Colorado or the figures upon which he wants the Senate to agree are the proper ones, we should certainly come to some agreement about what the figures should be; they certainly should be larger than they now are. But the able Senator from Colorado is absolutely right, in my opinion, in saying that the question of the amount of benefits to dependents is directly related to the question of drafting fathers. It became very apparent, it seems to me, from the testimony of General Marshall and Admiral King that the matter of the need for fathers in the Army is largely a question of the number of men available and the physical qualifications of the men; but we can

cure the matter of hardships for the fathers who will have to go, in spite of all that is done by the amendment adopted this morning, by a more generous provision for dependents' benefits; and the time to do it, it seems to me—we cannot do it too soon; it should have been done already—but the appropriate time to do it is when we are dealing with the question of the deferment of fathers. We have done a very fine thing this morning, and the sponsors of the amendment are to be highly commended.

We are trying to bring into the military service as many single men as possible before taking married men, but we should also proceed to give assurance to the men who will have to be taken that their dependents will be more decently provided for than they have been in the past, and the time to do it is now, when we are dealing with the whole question of father deferment and father induction.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I deeply appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. TAFT. Has the Senate Committee on Military Affairs recommended an allotment of $50 for every additional child, as proposed by the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; so far as I know, such a proposal has never been brought before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TAFT. I introduced the first bill to provide allotments for dependents, and I think the original allotments should be increased, but provision of $50 for each additional child seems to me to be at least of doubtful wisdom.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should not wish to argue that question with the Senator, but, in my opinion, if we are to carry out the doctrine that was espoused here yesterday by the Senator from North Carolina, that this Nation would not take men and leave their families adrift, we should enact legislation of the kind proposed.

Mr. TAFT. What occurs to me is that the House Committee on Military Affairs has now reported the original bill the Senate passed, and if we attach the proposed amendment to the pending bill and send it to the House, they will strike it out and will say, "We dealt with this subject on the bill now before the House."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That will be entirely for them to say, if they so desire.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me to be a rather peculiar way to legislate, for the Senate to pass one bill, which is now before the House of Representatives, and then pass it again in a different form.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think we are justified in doing that, because the House has delayed for so many months the passage of the bill the Senate sent to them.

Mr. BARKLEY. On what date did that bill pass the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not have the date before me.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator said a few moments ago that the Senate passed it just before the recess.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think that is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. We were in recess from the middle of July to the middle of September, and neither House was functioning during that period. I do not know that the House has been guilty of any unusual delay.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill was passed just prior to the recess.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was passed the day we adjourned, that is, July 8.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We did not adjourn on July 8, did we?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; we did.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That might have been the legislative day.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it was July 8. The legislative day was May 24.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I know it was passed shortly before we adjourned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not very long before; it was passed on the same day. If the bill now pending shall go to the House, no one knows how long the Committee on Military Affairs of the House will keep it in committee, and if dependents are to rely for increased allotments on the bill now pending here instead of the one we have already passed, and if the House committee should say that the Senate had decided to send a different bill to the House, attached to another measure, and should delay for a long time considering that bill, what might happen to the dependents of servicemen, so far as allotments are concerned?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If it were identical with Senate bill 1279, which was passed, there perhaps would be much logic to the Senator's argument, but it is not the identical bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not making an argument; I am endeavoring to ascertain what would happen.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We are increasing the allotments to children. Yesterday, when the Senator from North Carolina made the statement that the United States would not turn service men's children out on the street, but would take care of them, I noticed all about the Senate chamber signs of approval of the sentiment thus expressed. That sentiment is fine, so far as it goes, but we should implement it by an actual statute.

Mr. BARKLEY. While it does not have anything to do with the merits of the Senator's proposed amendment, I do not think the House has been guilty of any negligence. We have been back in session only 3 weeks, and the Senate is now considering the first and only legislative bill we have taken up since we reassembled. The House committee has reported the Senate bill, or it is about to be reported, and can be taken up in the House at any time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am not criticizing the House, nor am I proposing that the Senate legislate on the basis of what the House thinks or does. We should be able to legislate intelligently, and if we believe children should receive higher allotments, we should say so. If we do not believe that, we should state that we do not agree with the proposal.

Mr. OVERTON and Mr. GURNEY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Under the Senator's amendment, how much would a wife with five children receive, if her husband was in the service?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Under my amendment a wife with five children would receive $300 a month, which I believe would be a proper amount. I notice a man in Colorado with nine children is about to be drafted, one of the children an infant less than 2 weeks old. I believe the family of that father should be taken care of.

Mr. BARKLEY. How much would that family receive?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That family would receive $500 a month.

Mr. BARKLEY. How would that compare with the compensation of the head of the family in civil life?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not care to argue that point with the Senator. I cite him the language of the Senator from North Carolina on that point. If we want to take fathers away from their families, and if it is our purpose to see that the families are not subjected to hardship, and homes disturbed and broken up, it seems to me we should be willing to pay the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Paying the bill is one thing, and paying them more than the bill is another, if they are to receive more with the father gone than if he is at home.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. They will need more money with the father gone than they need with the father at home. I yield now to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate I think we should know exactly what the House subcommittee has done, so I give the information as it appears in this morning's newspaper, as follows:

A boost of $10 a month for the wife and first child of a man in the armed forces was approved late yesterday by a House Military Affairs Subcommittee.

Chairman SPARKMAN (Democrat), of Alabama, announced that the subcommittee would submit its plan to the full Military Affairs Committee at 10:30 a. m. today and that House action might be obtained early next week.

The bill would boost the monthly allotment for wife and one child from the present $62 to $72.

A wife and two children would get $90, in place of the present $72. The third child and each additional child would receive $16 a month, in place of the present $10 allotment for each after the first child.

The subcommittee action boosted the scale of children's allowances approved last July by the Senate, but retained other major provisions of the Senate measure.

These include extension of the dependents' allowances from the four lowest to all seven enlisted grades and Government payment of the entire allowance for the first month of the enlisted man's service.

The children's allotments would be payable, too, to the children of a divorced wife, even though the divorce decree were silent on cash support for the children. An exception would be that the second child of a

divorced wife would receive $16 rather than $18. The $16 figures would apply to additional children.

The House group also endorsed the Senate plan to retain the present $50 allowance for a childless wife and the Senate scales for dependents other than wives and children.

For example, a parent dependent for chief support on the serviceman would receive $50 a month in place of the present $37, and two parents would get $68 in place of $47. In contrast, two parents dependent only for substantial support would be cut from $47 to $37.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. All the provisions the Senator has recited will be found in Senate bill 1279, with the single exception of that relating to the allotment for children, and the House committee were a little more generous than we were. Whereas we raised the allotment for the first child to $18, they apparently raised it to $22, so that a wife and one child would receive $72, whereas under Senate bill 1279, a wife and one child would receive $68.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Does the Senator from Colorado have any information as to how much his amendment would increase the present cost of maintaining soldiers' wives and children?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No, I have no estimate of cost from the Budget. So far as I know the Bureau of the Budget has never approved the paying of anything to dependents of men inducted into the service. I have no way of knowing how many children will be left fatherless when the 446,000 fathers are taken into the service. I have no idea how many will be left stranded and thrown out on the streets when the new pronouncement becomes effective.

Mr. WILLIS. Of course, we all want to provide proper care for the widows and orphans and the mothers and the children of men taken into the service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am giving the Senator from Indiana a chance to do what he says we are all in favor of doing.

Mr. WILLIS. We all want to do that. But is not the proposed action another example of how we are spending the money of the country without any knowledge of what the ultimate result will be? Should not this matter have been brought up in the discussion of the original Wheeler bill, so that we might have had the information before us as to what we are letting ourselves into under the proposal of the Senator to have his amendment adopted?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator will recall that we passed legislation without batting an eye providing for the expenditure of over $100,000,000,000 for the Army and the Navy. We were not very careful at that time. We did not make any inquiries. Now, when it comes to taking care of the children who would otherwise be thrown out in the streets by our action some want us to begin to skimp, some want us to begin counting the dollars.

Mr. WILLIS. I am not objecting to the Senator's good intentions, in fact I am in sympathy with them; but this is just one feature we failed to discuss at the time the so-called Wheeler bill was before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The so-called Wheeler bill is still before the Senate, and I am still discussing it.

Mr. WILLIS. If we defer fathers, as was the original intention of the Wheeler bill, with which I was in hearty sympathy, we would save the country a great deal of money by inducting the single men first. I should like to have clearly brought before the Senate that this is a phase of the measure which should have been discussed before we adopted the amendment emasculating the Wheeler bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct, and I thank the Senator from Indiana for making that point.

Mr. WILLIS. And a great deal of expense that might not have been necessary is saddled on the Government by the action taken here earlier today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is true; I agree with that observation. The Army have already stated that the reason they did not want to take in the IV-F's was because it would cost the Treasury too much money. They would rather take fathers because the cost to the Treasury would be a little less by taking fathers than by taking IV-F's. They themselves place it on a dollar basis. If we are to take fathers it does not seem to me that we should skimp, and we should be sure that the children of the men who are taken are not thrown out on the streets. If we are to adopt the policy which we seemingly are about to adopt, then let us go the whole way and not throw out on the streets the families of the fathers who may be taken; let us not disrupt or disturb families.

Mr. WILLIS. If we adopt this measure we must be prepared to accept the consequences of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. It is a part of the cost of the policies we are adopting.

Mr. WILLIS. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course the Government is not going to have any children thrown out on the streets. It seems to me that even to suggest such a thing here is not exactly proper. The Government will not permit anything like that. It never has done it and never will do it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is doing it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Oh, yes; it is.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is mistaken. The Senator would have a difficult time in furnishing the names of any children he has ever seen who were thrown out on the streets because the Government took their fathers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to tell the Senator about an incident which occurred not very long ago near the city of Denver. A very distressing crime was committed there. A little boy was thrown off a cliff by another little boy. The boy who threw the smaller boy off the cliff did so in order to get a few little trifles which were in his pockets, and his shoes and other articles of clothing. It developed that the father of the boy who was killed was in the armed forces wearing the uniform of his country, and it so happened that the mother was working in a defense plant. That is only one case, of course. But it is a case of this great Government of ours throwing a child out on the streets, where he was gobbled up by the wolves.

Mr. McKELLAR. We all know that such incidents happen when the fathers are not taken from the children by the Government, and the mothers are not away from home. But, aside from that, I think every Member of the Senate wants to do the right thing by the children of the men we send to war. We have a committee, the Military Affairs Committee, of which I believe the Senator is a member.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is a fine committee. That committee has had charge of the bill designed to further a benign policy toward the children and the wives who are left behind when the fathers are taken for war purposes. As I understand, that bill was reported by the Senate committee some time ago, and was passed by the Senate the last day Congress was in session before the adjournment on July 8. I voted for that bill as, I believe, every other Senator voted for it, showing that the Senate wanted to do the right thing. The committee had looked into the matter. The committee made a report which went far beyond any relief of that kind ever before given soldiers under similar circumstances by our own Government or by any other government in the world. It is right to do so. We passed that bill. If I remember correctly, the Senator from Colorado voted for the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Colorado sponsored that bill. The Senator from Colorado was on the subcommittee of the Senate Military Affairs Committee which reported the bill favorably.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator thought the taking of such action was justified. The Senator believed he was doing the right thing in introducing and sponsoring that bill and in having it passed by the Senate. It is now in the other House, having been reported to the House by the Committee on Military Affairs of that body. Under those circumstances, it seems to me it is rather extraordinary for the Senator now to propose a change from the action taken by the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, to change the bill he then sponsored, and for which he voted, and asked other Senators to vote for, and include it in another bill.

The House committee reported the bill, and no doubt it will be passed by the House. It seems to me we ought to act on that matter when the bill comes back to us from the House.

Mr. President, we are in a war, and some may therefore say the sky is the limit, and that we should agree to the largest amount suggested by any Member of the Senate for whatever purpose, so long as it is connected with the war. I do not believe that is the way for this body to act. I think we should act in the usual way, act on reports of committees, and agree to measures in that way.

The Senator from Colorado evidently thought he was doing the right thing when he urged the passage of his bill, and I know he was doing the right thing when that measure was enacted into law. It seems to me we should proceed in the regular way, and that the bill then passed by the Senate should not be made a part of the pending measure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to say one word in answer to the Senator from Tennessee. Since the Senate acted on Senate bill 1279 something new has come into the picture so far as the drafting of men is concerned.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Oh, yes. Since that time the Selective Service has announced to the world that no longer is dependency a cause for deferment.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Selective Service is acting under the same law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Oh, yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is acting under the same law that was in force at that time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Under the same law, but under different rules. It made a new ruling.

Mr. McKELLAR. Its new rulings do not count for anything if they are not right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. They count with me.

Mr. McKELLAR. They may count with the Senator, because the Senator evidently wants to vote for $500 a month for a family of nine.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. And when the Senator was asked how much the head of the family was earning when he was inducted into the service, the Senator did not state the amount.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I did not give the amount.

Mr. McKELLAR. It seems to me that, in the case of a man who, for instance, was making $100 a month, to give him and his family $500 a month, as an amount to be paid under such circumstances as that, is a matter which should be discussed and considered by a committee, and should be reported on, before the Senate acts on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The point is that we were told yesterday by the sponsor of the Bailey amendment that we were not going to throw people out on the streets.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say there is no Member of the Senate or anyone else who thinks more highly of the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] than I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I agree with the Senator on that, certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think a great deal of him; but his mere ipse dixit on the floor of the Senate about another matter certainly should not control us to the point where we would join in saying, "Here is the Treasury of the United States; it is open to the world. Let us appropriate all the money we have, all that we ever expect to get, all that we ever hope to get. Let us appropriate it. No one is asking for it, but that does not make any difference. Let us appropriate it."

The Senator from North Carolina said we should put the Treasury wide open to everyone.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I did not say that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not understand the Senator from North Carolina to say that in the first place. I understood him to argue, and to argue well. He convinced me. I am for his amendment. But I never understood the Senator from North Carolina to say we should adopt a policy which would result in the appropriation of all the money we have, without stint, without let, without hindrance, without regard to amount, without having a committee pass on the matter, and without having anyone pass on it. Nevertheless, the Senator from North Carolina made that statement; and if we did what he said we would simply open the Treasury.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; but first I desire to say that I never quoted the Senator from North Carolina as making any such rash statement as the one just attributed to him by the Senator from Tennessee. I never quoted the Senator from North Carolina as saying a thing about opening to the world the doors of the Treasury. The Senator from North Carolina pleased me a great deal when he said this Nation was not going to throw children and families out on the streets.

Mr. BAILEY. Is that the ipse dixit which has been mentioned?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, it was not an ipse dixit. Does the Senator know what an ipse dixit is? I will give the Senator an idea of what ipse dixit means. The correct meaning of ipse dixit is "he himself has said."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield again to me, let me say that I agree with the Senator a thousand percent that we are not going to throw any children out into the streets.

Mr. BAILEY. I am not ever disposed to indulge in ipse dixits, let me say.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think the Senator is, and I did not think he wanted any opinion of his to be regarded as an ipse dixit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I never said it was.

Mr. BAILEY. But I did say, Mr. President, and I stick to it, that the drafting of fathers does not mean the destroying of homes. The drafting of fathers does not mean the turning of children out into the streets. The United States Government is not going to do that, and the great governments abroad that are calling upon the fathers to fight are not destroying homes. They are saving homes.

I am in favor of making suitable provision for maintaining the homes from which fathers are taken. What suitable provision is, I do not know. I do not know how much is necessary. I never have known about those things. I hate to undertake to pass upon them. I am greatly disturbed about the matter of the cost of living and the American standard of living. I see one man who can live very happily on a very moderate amount, and another man who looks as if his heart would break, as if he would starve to death, as if he would be just ruined, when $5,000 is taken out of an income of $15,000. All that is a matter of controversy. I am willing to work it out.

However, I stick to my proposition that to draft the fathers, if it is necessary to do so, does not imply the turning of children out into the streets. We are not going to turn them out into the streets. The drafting of fathers does not predicate the destroying of homes. We are not going to destroy homes.

When this great Government reaches the point of determining what is necessary in the way of payments to be made to the mother of one or two children, I am going to be for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say that I agree entirely with the Senator. I am going to be for it, too, but I want it to be done in the right way.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not want to see it done in any arbitrary way. I do not know what the correct amount may be, but I am going to be for it. I would not think about taking a father from his family, and leaving at home a wife and two children with no means of livelihood. Of course, they must have a means of livelihood. Whatever is necessary for them, I shall be for; but I will not be for more than is necessary.

So far as the matter of breaking down our Treasury is concerned, I am not for breaking it down, either. I think the time has come when we must conserve our money. I do not like all the big bills coming to the Senate. I do not like the disposition to be spending money merely because we are spending money. A great deal of such talk is going on. We have spent so much money, and our commitments in the war are so great, that we must practice economy everywhere. Of course, economy begins at home. We must enforce it in the departments, and we should start right here in the Senate. We are the ones who hold the purse strings. If there is extravagance in government, it is our fault. We cannot avoid the responsibility. I am speaking in the presence of the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], in whom I have the utmost confidence. I spoke yesterday of having confidence in people. I have confidence in him. I believe he will do the right thing about appropriations. I simply

say to him that if he will begin to cut them, and cut deep, I will be right back of him.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator with all my heart. He is the first Senator who has expressed that view.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It seems to me that the discussion has gone somewhat afield from the scope of the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and further than the Senator's amendment entitles it to go. I am as much opposed to extravagance as is the Senator from Tennessee, the Senator from North Carolina, or anyone else. However, the question is not one of extravagance. At the present time the Government of the United States, through the Selective Service, has announced a policy which it proposes to put into effect immediately—not next month, not next year, but immediately—a policy of taking fathers, many of whom have a number of dependent children, and putting the fathers into the armed services.

When a man is put into the armed services, it does not make any difference to him what may be the ultimate intention of the Government to see that there is no hardship. The fact that the Government, when it gets around to it, intends to do the right thing and to see that the children are not put on the street, that they do not suffer hardship, does not put any food into the mouths of his children. The time to take steps to provide for the dependents of the fathers who are to be drafted into the armed services—and it is perfectly apparent, from the temper of the Senate, that nothing is to be done to prevent the drafting of fathers into the armed services—the time to take steps to see that their dependents do not suffer undue hardship is now, at the same time when the Selective Service goes ahead, under the authority it already has under the law, to put into effect the drafting of fathers.

As I understand the purpose of the Senator from Colorado, he is simply endeavoring to expedite this legislation. The Senate considered the bill after it was reported from the committee. The bill was passed by the Senate, but has not been passed by the House of Representatives. It certainly will not hurt anything to have the Senate take two bites at that cherry. If doing so will expedite by as much as 1 hour the increase in the allotments, it will be justifiable to have such a duplication in the action of the Senate. I think the Senator from Colorado is to be very highly commended. If it is extravagance to say that the Government of the United States should make complete, generous allowance for the dependents of fathers who are taken into the Army, I am in favor of that kind of extravagance. When we are giving away money all over the world, and when we are proposing to feed the people of various nations all over the world, setting up relief agencies for their benefit, and talking about setting up international banks, in which we shall be the principal stockholders, or the principal "sack holders," as the case may be, it will be hard to make the American people believe that it is extravagance for the Congress of the United States to provide decent living conditions for the wives and children of these men when they are taken into the armed services. I think anything which expedites that purpose as much as 1 hour is a very meritorious proposal.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am very grateful to the Senator from Missouri for stating the case so forcefully and so well.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from Missouri has said many things which I wanted to say. I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to a further matter.

In every State of the Union at the present time the Red Cross is taking care of children. In my State some of the little children could not get school books. School opened about the middle of September, and some of the children could not have gone to school except for the Red Cross. Some did not have clothes. The Red Cross stepped in and helped them out. I inquired and found that a similar situation prevailed in practically every State in the Union.

I wish to join the Senator from Missouri in commending the Senator from Colorado for bringing up this matter at this time.

Mr. WHEELER and Mr. REVERCOMB addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield first to the Senator from Montana. Later I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have always favored reducing the expenses of the Government. In the last Congress I joined with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] in eliminating a great many unnecessary expenses. I find that many Senators are conservatives when it comes to eliminating various bureaus and reducing the expenses of the Government; but when it comes to appropriating billions of dollars to give away to some foreign country, they are the most generous-hearted persons in the world. They never think about that expense. Billions of dollars are voted for South American countries and not a word of protest is raised on the floor of the Senate; but when it comes to some petty bureau in Washington, if a proposal is made to reduce its appropriations by $20,000 or $30,000, there is a great hurrah about it. I agree entirely that waste in Government bureaus in Washington ought to be eliminated; but while we are looking at this "chicken feed" why do we not have the courage to stand up and fight the waste and extravagance which is going on in connection with the money which we are throwing away all over the world?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, is the Senator referring to me?

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. I think the Senator from Tennessee is consistent; but he and other Senators have voted to appropriate money to be spent all over South America. We are lend-leasing it or giving it away to South America. Everyone knows that we will never get a 5-cent piece back. Let us be frank and honest with ourselves. We know perfectly well that when the war is over the South Americans are going to trade where it is to their best interest to trade, and where they can sell their goods for the highest prices.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure the Senator does not wish to leave a wrong impression. I do not understand that lend-lease aid is going to South American countries.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. There may be one or two South American countries which have received some lend-lease assistance. We have bought a great deal of critical material in South America and have paid more for it than we would ordinarily have had to pay; but we had to bid against our enemies in order to get those goods. We bought them as much to keep them out of the hands of our enemies as to get them for ourselves. I do not think it is quite accurate to leave the impression that we are giving away money all over South America under lend-lease, because that is not an accurate statement.

Mr. WHEELER. If that is not an accurate statement, it is contrary to the testimony brought out before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry when Mr. Stettinius appeared. Money was being lend-leased to South America.

Mr. McKELLAR. Only to those countries engaged in the military effort.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator says only to those countries engaged in the military effort; but which one of the South American countries has furnished a single man to fight the Axis Powers?

As I have previously stated, we are talking about what we are going to do after the war. We are going to feed the Italians and the Germans after the war is over. We are going to feed the whole world after the war is over. That is the plan. We are to set up a W. P. A. for all the world. Many of my idealistic friends are going to be entirely for it. We are going to have to do that; but we must not give anything to the people of the United States, and we must cut down appropriations such as those to which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has referred.

Recently I said to a man who is interested in world government, policing the world, and all that sort of thing, "I cannot understand why your boss is in favor of it." He said, "You know, my boss is a conservative when it comes to government in the United States, but he is a liberal when it comes to international affairs." A liberal, yes—liberal with the Government's money. When this war is

over we are going to be looked upon as the most gullible people upon the face of the globe, because of the waste and extravagance. We built a road through Canada——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We are not going to be looked upon in that sense by the children of our own soldiers.

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly. We are going to be looked upon as the greatest of international "suckers" when this war is over, because of the waste and extravagance which is going on all over the world. We are building bases and other facilities for everyone else. Senators wrap the American flag around themselves and say, "This is our war; we must do this, that, and the other thing." They do not say anything about what our allies should do. We are furnishing the money, the men, the tools, and everything else.

I am not familiar with the provisions of the Senator's amendment. Perhaps it provides more money than the dependents of soldiers should have; but I am weary of hearing Senators say "We must cut this down, and cut that down, and cut the other thing down." I agree that we ought to conserve our finances, but we ought to start with the big things and not with the petty things. We ought to cut out great appropriations by means of which we are giving away money and throwing it down a rat hole.

If we would do now what we should do with reference to the hoarding of labor in industry, and waste and extravagance in industry, resulting in excess costs to the Government of millions of dollars which are being thrown away by the various departments of the Government, we would not have to worry about how much money we give to the children whom we are throwing into the streets.

I say that they are being thrown into the streets. The best evidence of that is what Mr. Hoover, of the F. B. I., said. He has called attention to the fact that child delinquency in the United States has increased more than 64 percent in the past year, almost entirely because of the fact that families have been split up and wives have had to go to work in industry. If that is not driving children into the streets, I do not know what it is. I am not responsible for the statement which Mr. Hoover made, and I am not responsible for the statements which are being made by every chief of police in the United States. I do not know of one of them who has made a report upon the subject who has not reported the same thing. The reports of police officers, of the F. B. I., and of all the civic organizations of the country tell exactly the same story; and preachers of all denominations tell the same story.

Yet, Mr. President, we talk about deferring fathers. What did a Senator state yesterday? He said that a representative of the Army said, "If you will permit us to have a waiver with respect to some of the IV–F's who have minor defects we will take them into the Army." But they are not going to take them into the Army because they have said that to do so would cost the Government more money. I said yesterday that I was shocked to hear that statement being made by an official of the Government of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator looked directly at me when he made that statement. I did not make the statement to which he refers.

Mr. WHEELER. No; I know the Senator from Tennessee did not make it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am quite sure that the Senator——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have the floor.

I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] for his industry and vigilance in matters of Federal economy. He has saved the Treasury actually billions of dollars by the hard and consistent fights he has made during the past 3 years to reduce appropriations. I have supported the Senator in all his fights for economy and expect to continue that course in the difficult days ahead. I have nothing but admiration for the Senator from Tennessee, and I congratulate the people of the United States on his faithful and valuable services to keep down inflation and Federal expenditures.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I have about concluded. I invite attention to what I said a moment ago. Through the Army the Government of the United States has said in effect, "We cannot take IV–F's because it will cost the Government more money. If you have some plan of waiver with respect to them so that they cannot put in claims and it will not cost so much money, we will call the IV–F's. If you do not do that we shall have to call fathers."

Mr. President, is there any excuse for that sort of a thing. By calling fathers it can readily be seen what will take place. It will cost much more money to call fathers and take care of the wives and children who are left behind than to call some of the IV–F's.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The amendment which is being proposed by the Senator from Colorado has not been printed and I desire to direct an inquiry to the Senator for information.

We, on this side, have not heard all the discussion which has taken place on the other side of the Chamber. Do I correctly understand that the provisions of his amendment are such that $50 is to be paid for each child regardless of the number of children the soldier may have?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is the way it was as I introduced it.

Mr. President, I desire to modify my amendment by making certain changes in the amounts set forth in the amendment which the clerk has before him. I desire to change the amounts so as to provide $80 for a wife and one child and $20 for each additional child.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator from Colorado make his request in the form of a modification of his amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I am asking to perfect my own amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. While the Senator is doing that——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have yielded to the Senator from West Virginia, and I do not know whether he has finished.

Mr. BARKLEY. I apologize. I thought the Senator from West Virginia had concluded. I wished to call attention to the differences between the present law and the amendment so that we will get a picture of what the amendment is, if the Senator will permit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Very well.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the present law a wife and one child, for example, would receive $62, and $10 for each additional child. So a wife and two children would receive $72 under the present law.

Under Senate bill 1279 a wife and one child would receive $68, and $11 for each additional child. So a wife and two children would receive $79.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the Senate bill, as amended by the House, a wife and two children would receive $90; that is, $72 for the wife and one child and $18 for each additional child.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is what I understood the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] to say.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator now, instead of providing by his amendment $100 for a wife and child, and $50 for each additional child, which would provide $150 for a wife and two children, by his amendment provides $80 for a wife and one child, and $20 for each additional child, which would be $100 for a wife and two children.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that from a parliamentary standpoint I think it would have been better to handle this matter in connection with the Senate bill as amended by the House, because either that bill or this amendment will be thrown out. Both of them cannot become law. But the Senator's modification of his own amendment makes it more in line with what the Senate and the House contemplate, and there is less objection, I will say, on my part to having it put in this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, did the Senator from West Virginia have something further to say?

Mr. REVERCOMB. No. Following the modification of the amendment which has been made by the Senator from

Colorado, I wish to join the able Senator from Kentucky in saying that that has changed the whole situation very much and it is more in line and more in keeping with what should be done. I should like to know what it would cost the Government under the change now being proposed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I cannot tell the Senator because I do not know how many fathers will be taken. We know that 446,000 of them will be taken between now and the first of January. There are rumors to the effect that 500,000 more will be taken next year. I do not know as to that. But, the cost under this amendment would depend entirely on the number of fathers inducted into the service.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And upon the size of their families.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It would depend also upon the size of their families.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is all I have to say. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have no figures at all, of course, on the point raised by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REED obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado had the floor, but the Chair thought he had yielded the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I simply want to ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on my amendment whenever the vote shall be taken. If we can settle the question as to whether we can have the yeas and nays on my amendment, then, any other business may proceed, but I want to have that point settled so that when the vote on my amendment shall be taken it shall be by the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado demands the yeas and nays on his amendment. Is the demand seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE (S. DOC. NO. 101)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk, referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Since the Japanese launched their attack on the Philippine Islands, I have on several occasions addressed messages on behalf of the American people to the courageous people of the Philippines—expressing our admiration of their heroism and loyalty. I have assured them that the Government of the United States of America will see to it that their independence will be promptly established and—still more important—that it will be protected. The resources of the United States, in men and material, stand behind that pledge to the people of the Philippines. We shall keep that promise just as we have kept every promise which the United States has made to the Filipino people.

The Philippine government, now in the United States, has been collaborating with the rest of the United Nations in the united task of destroying our common enemies in the east and in the west. As I stated on August 12, 1943, the United States, in practice, regards the Philippines as having now the same status as the governments of other independent nations—in fact all the attributes of complete and respected nationhood.

I am sure that the American people believe that the Filipino people have earned the right juridically to be free and independent.

The date now set by statute and by the vote of the people and the Legislature of the Philippine Islands for independence is July 4, 1946. It is possible, however, that the fortunes of war will permit an earlier consummation of this joint will of the American and Filipino peoples.

I, therefore, recommend legislation by the Congress giving the President the authority, after consultation with the President of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, to advance the date provided in existing law and to proclaim the legal independence of the Philippines, as a separate and self-governing nation, as soon as feasible.

If the Congress takes this action, there are several steps which, in my opinion, are necessary to make good our pledge that the independence of the Philippines will be protected in the future and to give them the opportunity of economic rehabilitation which is their due.

I, therefore, also recommend:

1. That the Congress make provision authorizing the President of the United States and the President of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands to enter into immediate negotiations and take the necessary steps to provide for full security for the Philippines, for the mutual protection of the islands and of the United States, and for the future maintenance of peace in the Pacific.

2. That the Congress make provision for determining the adjustments necessary in the existing provisions of law which govern the economic relations between the United States and the Philippines, so as to assist in making the Philippines, as an independent nation, economically secure wherever possible.

3. That the Congress make provision for the physical and economic rehabilitation of the Philippines made necessary by the ravages of war which the invaders have inflicted upon them.

All of this is due to the Filipino people in recognition of their heroic role in this war, the political ties which have bound us together, and the bonds of friendship which will join us together in the future.

Such action on the part of the Congress would assure the Philippine people again of our sincerity of purpose, and of our resolution to accord them as soon as feasible the legal status of complete freedom, independence, and nationhood to which, as a member of the United Nations, they are entitled.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 6, 1943.*

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the message from President Roosevelt which has just been read represents an agreement all the way around between the Filipinos, through President Quezon and Vice President Osmena, and various agencies of the United States Government, including the President, as to the best means of handling the Filipino situation, but, in order to avoid unfortunate inferences and speculation not founded on fact, I think I should state that it will not be possible in my humble judgment to accomplish the immediate objectives set forth in the message, if we are to include all the matters with which it deals in the independence bill itself. Therefore, other legislation will be introduced, as was intended in the beginning, to accomplish many of the objectives set forth in the President's message.

I hope this brief statement will be sufficient to cause those who may comment not to suppose that other matters are being lost sight of than those which are in the independence bill, which is already pending before the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, for there will be forthcoming other legislation in full agreement with the ideas of the Filipinos and the United States Government together, which will embrace other things than those now in the pending joint resolution for an advance state of independence for the Philippine Islands.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On October 2, 1943:

S. 159. An act for the relief of the United States Parcel Post Building Co., of Cleveland, Ohio.

On October 5, 1943:

S. 426. An act for the relief of Maj. George E. Golding; and

S. 881. An act to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 800. An act to provide for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die in service in the land or naval forces of the United States;

H. R. 1042. An act for the relief of Frank J. Recely and Mary T. Recely;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Fred A. Flanders;

H. R. 2190. An act for the relief of Marguerite R. McElroy;

H. R. 2304. An act for the relief of Harry Tansey; and

H. R. 2459. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Carl Oplinger, City Hospital of Akron, Ohio, and to Dr. Walter A. Hoyt.

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 763) exempting certain

married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me to propound a unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). The Senator from Kansas has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, yesterday in a colloquy with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] in reference to what we have come to call the Bailey-Clark of Missouri amendment, I brought out the fact that the definition of the term "child" was limited to subsection (o). The Senator from North Carolina at that time agreed with me that the definition should obtain throughout the section. Therefore, I have consulted with the majority leader and the minority leader and with other Senators interested, and I respectfully ask unanimous consent that, on page 3, in line 22, of the Bailey-Clark of Missouri amendment, there be stricken out the word "subsection" and there be inserted the word "section." Thus, Mr. President, the definition of "child" will appertain throughout section 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me on one further point?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from North Carolina yesterday discussed a further change in his amendment where on page 3, in line 10, we find the word "consistent." If the word "consistent" be stricken out and in lieu thereof there be inserted the words "in accordance," the legislative change will be desirable, it is believed both by the authorities charged with the administration of the proposed act and by the Senator in charge of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, in discussing the question before the Senate, I first want to pay my tribute to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. He has technically lost a part of a battle. He has definitely won the war. The compromise amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], on behalf of the administration, is a surrender. It is not an unconditional surrender, it is true, but it represents so much progress that had the administration been willing in the beginning of this debate, to take all that the Bailey amendment now contains, I am reasonably sure that it would have been acceptable to those of us who have supported the Senator from Montana in his position. As the day progresses, I shall vote for the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. It represents what is to me a more rounded out and more acceptable program. No matter what the outcome of this day's debate and voting may be, progress has been made in the direction of some degree of protection for fathers from induction into the armed forces while there are single men still available.

Only the courage, the genius, and the persistence of the Senator from Montana has made this result possible. The people of this country owe a debt of gratitude to him.

Mr. President, the set-up of the Selective Service administration has been wrong in one respect from the very beginning. A civilian instead of an Army officer should have been at the head of the Selective Service administration. This is not to be taken as any criticism of General Hershey. I think he has done a reasonably acceptable job. However, the Constitution—section 8—devolves upon the Congress the duty—

> To raise and support an Army.
> To provide and maintain a Navy.
> To make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

Distinguishing between groups of civilians, and determining the order in which the various groups shall be called into the armed services, is a civilian and not a military duty. Making these "rules for the Government and regulation" is a function of the Congress. It is a duty that we cannot and should not attempt to avoid. The Congress, of course, must have information from Army authority as to the number of men such authority deems necessary. The Congress then must establish the "rules and regulations" which will provide the number of men it regards as necessary. Authority of the Army begins only after the civilian selectee has been inducted into the Army. Up to that point, all is up to civil authority. A military officer should never have been placed at the head of the Selective Service, and military officers should not have been used in important positions in Selective Service administration. To this extent, the Selective Service has been improperly organized from the beginning.

I hope my good friend, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, is listening. When he was lecturing some of his fellow Senators yesterday as to their duty in these matters, I feel he overlooked the command of the Constitution.

The principal remaining point of difference between those of us who have followed the Senator from Montana and his critics is whether or not the same rules of deferment should be attached to industry that the Bailey amendment proposes in Government employment. It is my judgment that the hoarding of manpower in war industry has kept a much larger number of men out of the military service than is the case with Government employment. Let us examine a few facts.

I think there will be no dissent from the statement that of all the important industries in the country, the railroads have done the best war job. When the war approached there was much apprehension about whether the railroads could meet the necessities of war. They have done a magnificent job—the most nearly 100-percent complete job done by any industry.

How have they done it? Joseph B. Eastman, the foremost transportation authority of the country, and present Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, on July 14 made the statement that in April 1943 the average weekly hours per railroad employee were 50.8. To begin with, all railroad labor contracts are based upon a workweek of 48 hours. As a result, the railroads were able to utilize their experienced employees to the extent of 48 hours per week without the payment of overtime. While the railroads have had a large turnover in employment, it has been small as compared with the turnover of employment in some of the various so-called war industries. As a result of the policy followed in railroad employment, almost miraculous results in efficiency have been obtained.

Now let us go to the aircraft industry. Much has been said about the vital necessity of adequate aircraft production. This point cannot be over-emphasized. Much has also been said about the difficulties in both the quality and quantity of labor employed and available for aircraft production. This has been one of the sore spots in the whole war industry situation. Now let us consider the weekly hours of labor in the aircraft industry.

In May, June, and July 1942 the hours of weekly labor in the aircraft industry, as compared with the corresponding period in 1943, were, according to the official reports of the Department of Labor:

	May	June	July
Weekly hours, 1942	47.6	47.4	46.7
Weekly hours, 1943	46.8	46.5	45.6

The hours of labor have decreased from 1942 to 1943, and the hours of labor in July of this year are lower than for any month the figures of which I have read.

Nearly 2 years after Pearl Harbor, and with all the pressure for greater production of aircraft; with all the need for more aircraft on the fighting fronts to save the lives of men in all branches of the armed services; with all the effort made to provide aircraft factories with more men and more labor; with all the attention given by the War Labor Board and other Government agencies; and after a year of intensive war, in which the airplane has been a more and more important factor, both of attack and defense, the cold, hard fact remains that the average hours of employment per week in aircraft factories in 1943 were fewer than they were a year earlier.

No more crushing indictment can be made of the whole labor policy of this administration than these figures present.

This waste of labor is not confined to aircraft production. It runs through—or nearly through—the whole war effort.

Mr. President, I am very sorry the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] does not happen to be on the

floor of the Senate at the moment. I would have liked to continue the discussion we had yesterday, when he had the floor, and was courteous enough to yield to me.

There is not a very great difference of opinion between the Senator from North Carolina, as reflected in the Bailey amendment, and those of us who have taken another position. We are not trying to reduce the Army below a safe number. We are not now trying to pass judgment on how many men should be in the Army. All we are trying to do is to define the source from which the men should come. That is the only important difference between those who agree with the Senator from North Carolina and those who do not.

In that connection, Mr. President, I obtained some figures this morning from the Selective Service authorities which are rather interesting. Altogether, from December 1940 to July 31 this year, 5,791,999 men have been inducted into the service, and 2,363,324 men have enlisted. The sum of those two numbers, which represent the men who have gone in the Army in 32 months either by enlistment or by induction, is 8,155,323. That is an average of nearly 300,000 a month and is not being niggardly with the Army; that is being generous with the Army as to the number of men.

I was startled by this further figure. From July 31 this year to August 31 this year, 1 month, there were inducted into the armed services 716,829 men. Think of it, Mr. President, more than 700,000 men in 1 month. If we continued at that rate through the year, we would have over 8,000,000 men taken in 1 year. That is why industry and agriculture and the various avenues of necessary employment have been so greatly strained in recent months. It is because of the enormous number of men who have been taken recently by the Army.

I do not like to have any difference of opinion with General Marshall. I respect him very highly, admire him very much, and have confidence in his ability, but I think he only detracted from his own stature when he came to the Senate and took the position he assumed with regard to the necessity for the immediate drafting of fathers. If the Wheeler bill had been in its original form, indefinitely deferring the drafting of fathers, I would have been opposed to it. When it was amended by the committee to defer their taking only to January 1, 1944, I could see no great harm to come from taking 90 days to give the matter attention, make an examination, check the situation over, and find out just where we were.

In the RECORD of Monday of this week appeared a letter addressed to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, in which there was a surprising statement about the number of men in training in this country. I was rather surprised to find that there are 84,000 men still in the United States who have had 3 years' training, that there are 510,000 men who have had more than 2 years' training, and that there are 1,172,000 who have had more than 1 year's training. That is an aggregate of 1,766,000 men who have had more than 1 year's training, who are in this country at the present time.

In addition to that, as nearly as one can estimate, there are about 3,000,000 to 3,500,000 men who have been inducted this year, or within the last year, and who have not had a year's training. The aggregate of men now in training in the various services in this country is around 5,000,000.

Mr. President, when General Marshall or any other Army officer undertakes to make the statement that, in the face of that situation, the Army cannot wait 90 days to inquire into a very critical and important matter, it does not carry conviction. So far as I am concerned it only raises a regrettable doubt as to what the facts are. I wish the General would not do that. I have no disposition to embarrass him in any way, but I feel earnestly on the subject.

Mr. President, I wish to speak of the men who are in the Army now. The Army notoriously is extravagant with men and the labor of men. Of course, any general who commands an army and who must fight a battle wants enough men to win the battle, but when it comes to nonbattle conditions, when it comes to the doing of ordinary labor and the conduct of ordinary affairs, the average Army officer is most wasteful and extravagant of labor. The average Army officer has no idea of the efficiency of labor under normal circumstances and conditions. Why should he? He has scores or thousands of men at his disposal who are being paid by the month and the year, with not much for them to do in normal times. Why should he have any idea about the value of labor?

I have made some observations of my own and have received information from other sources. It is my personal opinion that at present the Army has so many men that the Army does not know what to do with them or how conveniently to handle them. The figures I have read, and which will appear in the RECORD, are official figures showing that, in this country now, we have close to 5,000,000 men in the Army. The figure might exceed 5,000,000, probably does. Anyhow we have in the neighborhood of 5,000,000 in the training camps. Yet it is insisted that the Army cannot wait 90 days to check over and see what can be done to avoid drafting fathers of families.

Recently I saw a letter written by an Army officer whose business it is to inspect war camps. His name, of course, will never be mentioned, but this is what he wrote:

> As it appears, at least, to one who has been around very extensively that they need not fear that the Army will suffer if Congress refuses to draft the pre-Pearl Harbor dads. The Army has grown so fast that in the nature of things it has not digested all that has been fed into it. On all bases there are scores who can be spared. If the Army were shut off and made to operate with what it has, plus the normal flow of young fellows coming of draft age, it will be forced to use to better advantage what it already has.
>
> There is danger from lack of manpower on farms and in factories. From what I see there is no immediate danger from lack of manpower in the Army.

That letter comes from an officer whose business it is to inspect Army camps and to report upon the conditions there.

When I was in Colorado on my vacation this summer I came across a very interesting letter written by a noncommissioned officer who is well known to the person who showed me the letter. This is what the noncommissioned officer wrote:

> At one training center in the desert between California and the Mexican border, noncommissioned officers were summoned to a meeting and there informed that as of August 10, men would enter upon 13 weeks of basic training and all furloughs suspended. The noncommissioned officers expressed amazement and on protesting at doing over and over what had been done again and again more than a year, were told by the officer conducting the meeting to "sit down and shut up."
>
> The battalion is reported to have suffered deep depression at the announcement and also voiced bitter resentment. Every man, it is claimed, had been taking basic training for more than a year, including maneuvers in "this hell hole" and are thoroughly conditioned for combat, and the excuse given is that further training is resorted to because those in command can find nothing to put them into. A comment by men leaving the meeting was, "Why should fathers be inducted, when this desert is full of soldiers being sent from post to post, unless it is to prolong the war until after election?"
>
> One group in this desert center has been there more than a year and has been named the "forgotten battalion," wasting time and valuable supplies, while more and more men are being dragged from essential industries to join others in useless wanderings.

Mr. President, as everyone in public life knows, we receive many statements, verbal and in writing, which are manifestly and obviously exaggerations. I have had that experience. Everyone in public life has had that experience. But the two letters I have read, coming from the sources within the Army that they do, convey, I think, the truth. These letters have an obvious ring of sincerity and earnestness that makes me credit what they say.

Mr. President, I wish to refer to a newspaper editorial from the Iola Register in Kansas. I may say that while the Iola Register and its editor are Republicans, they do not belong to my crowd in the Republican Party in Kansas. The editor who wrote what I am going to read has never supported me in any party struggles. After a party struggle is over he has supported me of course. The editorial is an interesting one. It is as follows:

> WASTER OF MANPOWER
>
> I know an Iola man who went into the Army almost a year ago. After basic training, I. Q. and aptitude tests, he was assigned to a school for instruction as a ground-crew mechanic in the Air Force.
>
> He went through the course and completed it with high honors. He knew his stuff. He could almost take an airplane engine apart and put it back together again blindfolded. Then he and some others from his class were sent to Kelly Field where we have one of the largest concentrations of training planes in the United States.

When they got there the commanding officer gathered them together and said, "Gentlemen, I'll be perfectly frank with you—I haven't the slightest idea what we're going to do with you. We have all the mechanics we need. We have not received any orders concerning your placement. Please bear with us until these orders come."

Day after day no orders came. Finally our Iola man was assigned to communications, riding a jeep around the post delivering mail.

For 5 stricken months this expert mechanic spent his time doing a job that any messenger boy—or girl—could do. Then he was transferred to California for 3 weeks additional training as a mechanic in an aircraft plant there.

Where he will go from there he doesn't know.

There probably isn't a person in Iola who doesn't know of a similar case of wasted manpower in the Army, of trained men idling away month after month for lack of anything to do, of three men anywhere you look doing a job that one could well handle by himself.

I come now to the point under immediate consideration:

And they are starting this month to break up family homes throughout the Nation in order to pour another half-million men into the Army. Does it make sense?

I can't help feeling that it doesn't.

It is not that I criticize the Army for finding itself overstaffed here and understaffed there with gaping holes throughout its organization. It would be beyond human perfection to expect any organization to expand from 350,000 to 11,000,000 in 2 years without developing a few soft spots and ragged edges here and there.

But if it has worked out that the Army is able to train men faster than it can put them to work, why keep pouring in still more men to be trained—and then to sit idle twiddling their thumbs and wondering what to do?

It may be argued that the important thing is to get the men trained as soon as possible regardless of how long it may be before their training is put to use. But to do that is nothing more nor less than to hoard manpower which certainly could be used in civilian production until it is actually needed for military service.

I have a strong feeling that it would be a wholesome thing for everyone concerned if the Army would take a few months off to digest the manpower it has already inducted rather than continue to gobble up everything in sight as fast as it can chew.

The Kansas City Star, the most important newspaper in my section, through its Washington correspondent, has this to say and it refers to a statement I heard the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] make on the floor:

When TRUMAN tells his colleagues that both the armed forces and industry are wasting manpower, or not using it efficiently, the country has a right to question the arguments of the military leaders for the drafting of fathers. During the last 3 or 4 months TRUMAN has received an average of about 30 letters a day from persons in the area adjacent to Kansas City, almost unanimous in expressing views similar to those held by the Missouri Senator. The letters follow the general theme, that the Army should utilize more effectively the soldiers now in the training camps, or else turn them back to civilian life, where their services are badly needed.

While TRUMAN will not support the Wheeler bill to postpone the drafting of fathers, viewing the measure as class legislation, he believes there should be no whitewashing of past mistakes or blundering in handling of the now critical manpower problem.

Mr. President, I am coming to a close. I wish to say again what I have said before, lest someone might feel that I have not sufficient concern for the welfare of the Army, that I have a son now in the Army in north Africa; I have a son-in-law now at Pendleton Air Base, in Oregon; I have a son-in-law now at Wright Field, at Dayton, Ohio; I have a grandson now in a training camp, as a private, in Mississippi; and I have another grandson who won an Army scholarship through competitive examination and now is at Virginia Military Institute for training under the Army training program. I do not want anyone to question my concern for the welfare of the Army unless he has a record equal to that.

I wish again that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] could have been here during my remarks. He spoke about the necessity of drafting fathers, and said it might bring sorrow into homes, but that also was the result of drafting sons. That is correct. However, the Senator from North Carolina did not properly evaluate the difference between those two situations. I can do that. I happen to have a son-in-law now a part of the Air Force, and his son—my grandson—is the private I mentioned as being in a training camp in Mississippi. The death of either of them of course would bring extreme sorrow to the whole Reed family—and it is a large family. So far as the degree of regret and sorrow as between the death of the father or the death of the son is concerned, I should not attempt to appraise it. However, Mr. President, so far as the result and the effect upon the economic and social position of the family is concerned, the difference is as wide apart as the poles. The death of the grandson would cause all of us deep sorrow. The death of the father would not only cause sorrow, but would leave the family in a very difficult financial and economic position. In the case I mention the father was a commissioned officer with the Army in France in the First World War. He has passed the age of the draft, but went back into the Army this time, after he had spent a lifetime building up a law practice. He left it to go back into the Army and to do his part in this war. His death would be a disaster in an economic sense as well as a deep sorrow to that family. That is the difference which the Senator from North Carolina and other Senators who agree with him in his position should consider.

Mr. President, I desire to say just one further thing: The administration has blundered so amazingly in its labor policy that it is rather difficult to describe it. What I say now is not hindsight; I have said it before. A year ago last month I said on this floor, in discussing the question of labor on the farms, particularly, that the administration had blundered. I then told a story of going with the Kansas delegation in Congress to discuss the manpower situation with various high officials. First, I went with all other members of the Kansas delegation in Congress, including my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], who now sits in front of me in the Chamber, and including all the Members of the House of Representatives from Kansas. I stated that we went first to see Secretary of Agriculture Wickard, and on the next day we went to see General Hershey. We went there as a delegation; all of us together. The next day we went to see Paul McNutt, Chairman of the Manpower Commission. The next day we went to see Under Secretary Patterson, of the War Department. Then we went back to see Secretary Wickard. We discussed the labor question. We spent an hour with Paul McNutt. If there was a single statement on his part that showed any grasp or understanding of the gravity of the manpower situation—and that was 13 months ago—I do not recall it, and none of my colleagues recall it. We have since discussed the absolute paucity and lack of understanding we were met with at the War Manpower Commission.

On this floor, on September 22, 1942, I spoke about the situation which now has become acute—the shortage of milk, butter, and dairy products in this country. We should not be surprised about that. Then I said—and this was a year ago:

The President again sounds a note of alarm to the people of the country, but on the wrong basis. The note of alarm which the President should have sounded is that unless he and those responsible for the blundering, inefficient, confused, and impossible labor policy, which is stripping the farms of their labor, change that policy, the danger to the American people, particularly those living in the towns, in 1943 will not be a few cents more or less on the price of milk or the price of butter, but it will be the danger of the impossibility of obtaining those commodities.

If ever a man was justified in a statement, I have been justified in making that statement, which at that time was regarded as perhaps extreme.

The point I make in conclusion is that we have had a blundering labor policy; we have had a blundering war-contract policy; but we should make sure that similar blunders are not made in connection with the drafting of fathers.

In connection with the blundering war-contract policy, let me say that when I was in Wichita, about a month ago, I went to visit one of the aircraft plants there. It is one of the important aircraft plants and employs approximately 11,000 men. At one time that plant had one of what might be called the standard contracts which called for renegotiation. All those contracts are based upon the cost to the manufacturer plus a fixed fee for his services. The management told me, in the half day I spent there, that they requested a change in policy so as to give them a fixed price for their planes, and then they would take the responsibility of production. That would permit them to pay what might be termed "an incentive wage." That was done. The management told me that that change had increased the output per man 25 percent.

The administration has blundered on its labor policy; it has blundered on its

war-contract policy. The point I make is that I do not want the dangers and the results of those policies to be applied against fathers of children, to have such blunders result in disaster to the wives and the families. Upon that solid ground I plant my position today.

REPORT OF REFUGEE CONFERENCE IN BERMUDA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, today several hundred Jewish rabbis of the orthodox faith are here petitioning the President to do something to help the Jews in Europe. Particularly are they asking him to see to it that if possible Palestine be opened to them.

My attention was further called to this matter by the fact that, according to the newspapers of yesterday, Sweden has just taken over several thousand Jews from Denmark.

On May 6, 1943, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] complained in the Senate of the skeptical reception accorded in Jewish circles to the refugee conference held in Bermuda, in which he acted as one of the United States delegates. He asked us to be patient and wait until such time as he could report to the Senate on the work and results of the Bermuda Conference. A few days later, on May 10, 1943, I took the floor again to welcome the Senator's announcement of a forthcoming report. I reminded Senators with what heartrending anxiety millions of Americans of Jewish descent were waiting for this report, in order to hear what was being done—or for that matter that something is being done—to save their suffering kinsmen in the countries under German domination.

Five months have passed since then. The unprecedented mass murders and deliberate starvation of European Jews by Nazis continues unabated. According to newspaper accounts, since the Bermuda Conference hundreds of thousands of new Jewish victims have been added to the millions of victims whom the inhuman policy of exterminating a whole ancient people had claimed previously.

What is there on the record of the ledger? What if anything has been done about saving these innocent victims, noncombatants, women, and children, from the sentence of death? How many of them, thanks to the diplomatic efforts of our Government, the British Government, and other United Nations' governments, have been enabled to leave the countries of persecution to find a haven in nearby neutral territory or in territory under control of the United Nations?

Mr. President, I submit that by doing nothing we have acquiesced in what has taken place over there.

As yet we have had no report from the Bermuda Refugee Conference. With the best good will in the world and with all latitude that could and should be accorded to diplomatic negotiations in time of war, I may be permitted to voice the bitter suspicion that the absence of a report indicates only one thing—the lack of action.

A few days ago was the day held holy by the Jews of the world as the Jewish New Year. That was the day on which that ancient people began the five thousand seven hundred and fourth year of its history. Probably in all 5,703 years, Jews have hardly had a time as tragic and hopeless as the one which they are undergoing now. One of the most tragic factors about the situation is that while singled out for suffering and martyrdom by their enemies, they seem to have been forgotten by the nations which claim to fight for the cause of humanity. We should remember the Jewish slaughterhouse of Europe and ask what is being done—and I emphasize the word "done"—to get some of these suffering human beings out of the slaughter while yet alive.

I submit that the time has come for the Senate to take a hand in this matter. Many times before the legislative branch of the United States Government has initiated policies. Certainly in connection with a question in which human conscience is involved, it is our right, and it may even be said to be our duty, to remind our Government and the governments of the British Empire and of other allies, of the moral duty involved.

We have been requested to await the report of the Bermuda Conference. Five months have passed. In all sincerity I ask, Where is this report? Has anything been done? How many people were saved as the result of that conference? The Bermuda Conference was a conference on refugees. It did not deal with the problem of the Jewish people in Axis-dominated countries who have been singled out by the Nazis from all the other subjugated peoples for utter annihilation.

Perhaps if a special agency were established on behalf of this Government or in combination with other governments, to deal with the saving of the Jews of Europe, something more effective would be done. Then somebody at last would feel it his direct responsibility to get things done. Perhaps immediate and urgent attention should be drawn to the need of guaranteeing to the neutral governments of Europe—Sweden, Switzerland, Spain, Portugal, Eire, and Turkey—that they will be fully compensated for their financial outlay in giving refuge to Jewish refugees from Nazi-held Europe, thereby making it possible for those neutral countries to accept such refugees in large numbers.

Perhaps, without wanting to prejudice permanent solutions or post-war settlements, we should respectfully remind our British friends of the general perplexity with which popular opinion in America is following that strange phenomenon of the Jewish national homeland—Palestine—entrusted to the guardianship of Great Britain, under international safeguards mainly for the purpose of offering refuge to the Jews who want and need to establish a homeland of their own. Palestine has become now the only country on earth not under German jurisdiction where a policy of actual discrimination is carried out against the Jews. Since the war started, every Pole, Yugoslav, and Greek refugee who was able to reach Palestine was welcomed there without reference to immigration laws, quotas, or other formalities of the days of peace. The only people who are scrutinized with minute thoroughness are Jewish refugees trying to reach Palestine. In their case, countless formalities must be complied with. Their number is held down to a ridiculous figure announced in other days by the British Government and never yet approved by the League of Nations, which exercises the right of control over the government of Palestine. Ships carrying helpless Jewish refugees to Palestine have been allowed to sink rather than to discharge their human cargo in the land of their destination. At other times, these so-called illegal refugees were put on board other ships and sent from Palestine to far-away islands in the Indian Ocean, and all this in the days of a catastrophic shipping shortage. All this is practiced in a country which was guaranteed in the last World War by England to be the Jewish national home.

Perhaps this reminder of mine will suffice. Perhaps other speeches will be made in support of my demand that the saving of lives be not longer delayed. Perhaps it would be necessary to introduce a formal resolution or to ask the Secretary of State to report to an appropriate congressional committee on the steps being taken in this connection. Normally it would have been the job of the Government to show itself alert to this tragedy; but when a government neglects a duty it is the job of the legislature in a democracy to remind it of that duty. Perhaps this reminder would have come with greater grace from the ranks of the majority party, but when a majority party neglects its duty, I hope it will not mind that this reminder is offered from the ranks of the minority. It is not important who voices a call for action, and it is not important what procedure is being used in order to get action. It is important that action be undertaken.

I am glad that today in the city of Washington these hundreds of Jewish rabbis have come in person to present their petition to the President of the United States.

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I am in full accord with what the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has just said. I believe it is a part of the duty of the Government of the United States to do what it can to be helpful to men and women who are being slaughtered and imprisoned in Europe, and aid them in finding a home.

Mr. President, the waging of war in this present technological and scientific age is a task of tremendous proportions; it is, moreover, a task which requires the utmost degree of efficiency and cooperation of every enterprise, every

group, and every individual throughout the Nation.

In this war the United States and its allies have been forced to deal with enemies who have made a national career of aggression. In the furtherance of that career, our enemies have conscripted and utilized every available resource and every available citizen for military purposes. The effectiveness of the ability of our enemies to organize and to act needs no further description or elaboration. That tremendous surge of concentrated power which has overrun and despoiled almost the entire continent of Europe, the region of the Mediterranean, and virtually every outpost on the Asiatic mainland and in the far Pacific stands as immutable testimony to the ruthless efficiency of the cruel and cunning enemies against whom we are pitted in this struggle to the death.

As Mr. Bernard Baruch has testified, it will take "everything we have and more" to defeat these aggressors. We cannot, therefore, afford to permit any trace of inefficiency, incompetence, or lack of determination to mar our efforts in this war.

The military men, who are charged with the active prosecution of this war, are responsible for the formulation of strategy and for the carrying forward of that strategy to complete and overwhelming victory. General Marshall and Admiral King, upon whose shoulders the prime responsibility for our military effort falls, advised us in clear, forthright, and unambiguous statements that the manpower requisitions which our armed forces have made must be fully and effectively met if the war program of the United States is to go forward according to plan. I, for one, will support that contention. I will support that contention because the achievement of our armed forces since Pearl Harbor are such that they command the full and continuing confidence of the American people.

Those military men who have come out of West Point, Annapolis, V. M. I., and our other military schools to plan and develop our armed forces have proved their mettle. They have so executed their appointed tasks that every man and woman in America today shows heartfelt gratitude that the destinies of America's military effort have been entrusted to such competent hands as these.

On the production front, the record of America is no less inspiring. American men and women who now labor at those arduous and vital tasks of war production have—without a trace or semblance of outside compulsion—attained a record of efficiency and accomplishment which has amazed the civilized world. America today can take great heart in the fact that the planners and workers of American industry have responded so effectively and so well in meeting the demands of this crucial hour.

Indeed, if we had done as well on the civil administrative front as we have done on the military and production fronts, the question of the drafting of fathers would not have risen up to plague us at this early hour. But the tragic truth remains that the administration of the manpower problem by the civilian agency charged with that task is a handbook of incompetence and indecision. The repeated edicts, the conflicting statements, the absence of any continuing policy, and the lack of coordinated planning have contributed nothing but confusion and chaos to the over-all manpower situation in the United States.

In connection with this subject, I released a statement to the press under date of August 12, in which I set forth the steps which I felt and still feel must be taken, if we are to forestall the induction of fathers into the armed forces. I am still prepared to stand behind the six points which I raised in that statement, and I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The recent pronouncement by the War Manpower Commission and the Selective Service Headquarters to the effect that the induction of fathers into the armed forces will begin on or about October 1, 1943, represents one of the most ill-considered, arbitrary, and unnecessary directives that has ever emanated from a Government agency.

Only recently I have returned from an extensive tour of the State of Pennsylvania, and I have encountered among the people a bitter feeling of doubt, resentment, and distrust which has been occasioned by the release of this latest directive.

Many local board members and Selective Service officials have informed me that this order is both unnecessary and unwise and that they are prepared to place all fathers in class III–D until all single men are removed from the roll of eligibles. This stand meets with my wholehearted approval.

When such edicts as this are issued one wonders what sense of obligation these directing officials feel toward the American home and that new generation of Americans who are only now beginning the journey of life. One wonders also at the vague set of values which these men attach to that most basic of all institutions—the American family.

Now the military situation, as it stands today, certainly does not justify this latest grandiose step on the part of the War Manpower Commission, and, moreover, the manpower reserves available to the armed forces will prove sufficient for all needs, provided such reserves are fully and properly used.

In order that we may be assured of a fair, proper, and efficient use of our available manpower, I recommend that the following steps be taken:

1. That the Congress immediately undertake to enact legislation which will make it illegal to induct any father until all other categories of eligible manpower are exhausted throughout the Nation.

2. To remove the Selective Service System from the domination of the War Manpower Commission and to restore it to its original autonomous status.

3. To terminate the deferment of all those in the Government service whose deferments have not been approved or requested by the President's Committee on Deferments.

4. To terminate all industrial deferments which are not based upon scarce or irreplaceable skills.

5. To limit all deferments to a period not to exceed 6 months with no deferment renewals permitted.

6. To immediately reclassify all those now designated IV–F, especially those rejected for illiteracy and slight physical defects.

I am confident that if these steps are taken we can effectively meet all our manpower needs without causing the American home and the American family to become the casualties of war which they must certainly become if we accede to the demand that the fathers of our American youth and the heads of our American families be inducted into the armed forces.

I should consider myself something less than a proper representative of the people of Pennsylvania if I did not do everything in my power to overcome and nullify this latest irresponsible edict of the War Manpower Commission—and nullify it firmly, fully, and finally.

Mr. DAVIS. It is well known that the Selective Service Act was efficiently and effectively administered until the Selective Service System was subjected to the domination and control of the War Manpower Commission. But from the date of this change the Selective Service System has been the target of a great deal of public criticism—principally because the ill-considered, inefficient, and contradictory antics of the War Manpower Commission have thrown every individual and every family in America into a state of demoralizing turmoil. The failure of the War Manpower Commission to perform its job properly is manifest in every area and at every turn.

In this connection, I wish to call attention to the third point which I raised in my statement:

To terminate the deferments of all those in the Government service whose deferments have not been approved or requested by the President's Committee on Deferments.

Here, in my opinion, is one of the most glaring examples of incompetent and unfair utilization of manpower. At the present time there are more than 3,000,000 employees on the pay roll of the Federal Government. According to a House investigating committee, there are several hundred thousand single and childless married men now working for the Government who have not been deferred by the President's Committee, but who have, nevertheless, not been called up for military service. This condition, which is a matter of public knowledge, can only serve to have a demoralizing effect upon the citizens of America, especially now that the induction of fathers is imminent.

If this administration feels impelled to summon the heads of the American family into military service, it should, in all justice, put its own house in order. The administrative departments should stand as an example of complete adherence to the selective-service law for all other manpower-using agencies throughout the land.

But the fact remains that certain department heads and a number of other high officials within the Government have—by placing too much emphasis upon the fate of their own particular organizations and too little emphasis upon the fate of the Nation as a whole—caused the public service to be looked upon as a haven for draft dodgers.

This condition is unfair to those men of military age who are now on the public pay roll, and it is equally unfair to those other citizens of America who are now faced with premature induction into the armed forces by reason of this selfish

and narrow-minded attitude on the part of certain governmental officials.

While the situation within the Government service is such that it cannot be explained away, I have found, through reports which have been made to me, that the situation within private industry is, in many cases, almost as deplorable. It was on the basis of these conditions that I drafted the fourth point raised in my statement:

> To terminate all industrial deferments which are not based upon scarce or irreplaceable skills.

Now, I fully realize that the war production effort of America is of an importance almost equal to that of our actual military effort. I would certainly not advocate the induction into the armed forces of men whose skills and training are of vital importance to the industries of war. But, on the other hand, I am well aware that the vast majority of jobs in modern industry require no great skill, and I am also well aware that replacements for all but the keymen in industry can be effectively and speedily trained. The requests for deferments have been altogether too numerous and too indiscriminate in recent months. I was told by members of a local draft board of one instance where a large industrial plant in my own State asked for the deferment of a considerable number of boys and young men—many of whom had been employed by the company concerned for a period of less than 6 months—on the ground that they were essential to the war effort. These requests were refused. Such practices as this are contrary to both the spirit and the letter of the Selective Service Act. It is such practices as this—practices which amount to the selfish hoarding of manpower—that have brought us to the bottom of the manpower barrel in such a rapid and disorganized manner.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand that the draft boards refused to defer the men referred to by the Senator?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. LUCAS. How does the Senator reach the conclusion that such incidents as that are causing the hoarding of labor?

Mr. DAVIS. There are many cases of such requests not being refused, as has been pointed out in the debate on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Whose fault is that?

Mr. DAVIS. I should say that in part it is the fault of the local boards and in part it is due to the Manpower Commission.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the Senator another question. The draft boards have certain rules and regulations which they have to follow.

Mr. DAVIS. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. In my community in Illinois they have had no difficulty in following the rules and regulations laid down by General Hershey, and I have received little or no complaint from anyone in my State. After all, does it not get down to the question of proper administration with respect to the manpower situation as to whether men are deferred or whether the draft boards say they should go into the Army?

Mr. DAVIS. That is the point I am making, as the Senator would know if he was listening to what I am saying.

Mr. LUCAS. I have been listening to the able Senator, as I always listen to him, but I want to point out that, in my opinion, from what I know of the Manpower Commission and what I know from General Hershey and those who are administering the Selective Service Act, they do not want to defer men any more than anyone else wants to defer them. After all, it seems to me it gets down to the question of what the local boards do with respect to the deferment of men. Does not the Senator agree with me on that?

Mr. DAVIS. I agree with the Senator to a certain particular extent, but I know from reports which have come to me as to draft boards in my own State that some of them have been very lenient.

Mr. LUCAS. What would the Senator do about that? That is a point I myself am worried about. The Senator says that draft boards are lenient.

Mr. DAVIS. I do not want to get into a long argument with the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I like to argue with the Senator because I like him.

Mr. DAVIS. My affection for the Senator from Illinois is so great that I do not like to argue with him.

Mr. LUCAS. What the Senator from Pennsylvania says about his affection for me obviously I appreciate. I think the Senator is a fine man, and Pennsylvania is very fortunate to have him here.

Mr. DAVIS. I thank the Senator and I reciprocate his feeling, and appreciate the eulogy on the floor of the Senate by my distinguished friend while I am living.

Mr. LUCAS. As a general rule the only eulogies a man gets are those paid to him after he is dead, and I am happy to pay a tribute of respect to my friend while he is performing useful work in the Senate.

Mr. DAVIS. The able Senator from Illinois is most generou in his remarks and I am truly grateful to him, but I must proceed with my remarks and do not desire at this time to yield further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania declines to yield further.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, in an attempt to gain the reaction of industrial leaders and leaders in other quarters, I inserted the following as point 5 in my statement: "Limit all deferments to 6 months with no deferment renewals permitted." I fully expected to receive considerable discussion on this particular point, but only three men, of the several thousand who have written me, objected to this point. The only conclusion I am able to draw from this lack of criticism is that the general public realizes that deferments once granted are all too easily renewed.

I have raised these points in no sense of baiting or criticism. I have raised them in order to remind my colleagues that the administration of the manpower allocation program is certainly such that it needs a thorough and comprehensive overhauling. The fault for these conditions does not rest with the military authorities. They do not control the civilian manpower program. The military authorities must be given all the manpower which they need, and we would be derelict in our duty if we denied this request. The military authorities deserve the highest commendation for the efficiency and results which have attended their efforts thus far.

The fault for these conditions, far from lying at the feet of the military authorities, is directly traceable to the failure of Congress to take a more intelligent and definite part in the formulation of basic manpower legislation and policies, and to the complete failure of the War Manpower Commission to develop anything resembling a realistic policy in its administration of the manpower program.

It is my sincere hope that the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate will cause an investigation of the entire manpower problem to be made, and that they will see to it that all unjustified deferments are canceled, and that all eligible single and childless married men, whose deferments are not justified, are called for military service.

If the Congress does not take such action immediately, if present practices, which may in the long run exert a serious and an adverse effect upon the effectiveness and success of our over-all military effort are allowed to continue uncorrected, the Congress cannot escape its full share of blame for the increased chaos and confusion which must inevitably attend our manpower problems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], as modified.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Green	Overton
Austin	Guffey	Pepper
Bailey	Gurney	Radcliffe
Ball	Hatch	Reed
Barbour	Hawkes	Revercomb
Barkley	Hayden	Robertson
Brewster	Hill	Shipstead
Bridges	Holman	Stewart
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Buck	Johnson, Colo	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lodge	Tunnell
Caraway	Lucas	Tydings
Chandler	McCarran	Vandenberg
Chavez	McClellan	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Wallgren
Connally	McNary	Walsh
Danaher	Maloney	Wheeler
Davis	Maybank	White
Eastland	Millikin	Wiley
Ellender	Moore	Willis
Ferguson	Murdock	Wilson
George	Nye	
Gerry	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN's name was called.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, before the roll is called, I wish to call attention to the fact that my amendment has been modified so that the wife of a serviceman and the first child would be paid $80 a month, and each additional child would be paid $20 a month. Beyond that my amendment is practically the same as Senate bill 1279, which has already been passed by the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. A point of order. I make the point that the roll call has been started.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No vote has been recorded. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the $80 a month which the Senator just mentioned include what the serviceman shall allocate out of his own pay?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is the total, including what the serviceman allocates out of his own pay.

Mr. PEPPER. It still contemplates the serviceman putting up $22 a month out of his own pay?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. I accepted the figure now appearing in the amendment very reluctantly, I may say. I think the amount should be more, but I know that it will aggregate quite a total, and I agree with the Senator from Tennessee and other Senators, who expressed themselves to the effect that we must protect the Treasury in every possible way and effect all the economies possible. In that spirit I have agreed to the lesser amount. I wanted to make this statement before we voted.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President may we have the question stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. BUSHFIELD. May the clerk state what the modifications are?

Mr. AIKEN. May we have the amendment read as mod'fied?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment as modified.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add new sections to the bill, as follows:

SEC. 1. That section 101 of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 381; 37 U. S. C. Supp. 201), is amended by striking out in the first and second lines the words "of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grades."

SEC. 2. That section 102 of such act is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the words "except as to the initial family allowance provided by section 107 (a) hereof."

SEC. 3. That section 103 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 103. The dependents of any such enlisted man to whom a family allowance is payable under the provisions of this title shall be divided into three classes to be known as 'class A,' 'class B,' and 'class B-1' dependents. The class A dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the wife, the child, or the former wife divorced of any such enlisted man. The class B dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the parent, grandchild, brother, or sister of such enlisted man and who is found by the secretary of the department concerned to be dependent upon such enlisted man for a substantial portion of his support. The class B-1 dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the parent, brother, or sister of such enlisted man and who is found by the secretary of the department concerned to be dependent upon such enlisted man for the chief portion of his support."

SEC. 4. That section 104 of such act is amended by inserting after the words "class B" in the sixth and thirteenth lines, respectively, thereof the words "or class B-1."

SEC. 5. That section 105 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 105. The amount of the monthly family allowance, consisting of the reduction in, or charge to, the pay of the enlisted man and the Government's contribution, payable to the dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man shall be—

"To class A dependent or dependents: A wife but no child, $50; a wife and one child, $80 (with an additional $20 for each additional child, the total amount payable on account of two or more children to be equally divided among the children); a child but no wife, $42 (with an additional $20 for each additional child, the total amount payable on account of two or more children to be equally divided among the children); a wife divorced, $42 (in no event more than the amount of alimony decreed and still payable).

"To class B dependent or dependents (where there is no class B-1 dependent): Where there is no class A dependent, $37 (payable to only one designated dependent); where there is a class A dependent, $20 (payable to only one designated dependent).

"To class B-1 dependent or dependents: One parent but no brother or sister, $50; two parents but no brother or sister, $68 (the total amount payable on account of two parents to be equally divided between them); one parent and one brother or sister, $68 (with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister but not to exceed two); two parents and one brother or sister, $79 (with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister but not to exceed two); a brother or sister but no parent, $42 (with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister but not to exceed two. The total amount payable on account of two or more brothers and sisters to be equally divided among them)."

SEC. 6. (a) That section 106 (a) of such act is amended by striking out in the sixth and seventh lines thereof the words "both class A and class B" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "more than one class of."

(b) That section 106 (b) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) In any case in which the payment of the monthly family allowances involves two or more dependents, the total amount may be apportioned and paid for the benefit of such dependents as may be prescribed by the secretary of the department concerned."

(c) That section 106 (c) of such act is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, in any case in which a family allowance is granted under this title—

"(1) to a wife or a child living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order or decree or a written agreement, the amount of the family allowance payable to such wife or child shall not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or decree or in the written agreement as the amount to be paid to such wife or child, except that in the case of a wife or child living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order or decree or a written agreement, and such order, decree, or agreement is silent as to the amount to be paid to such wife or child, no family allowance shall be payable unless application is made by the enlisted man or unless the Secretary of the department concerned finds that it is impracticable for the enlisted man to make such application, in which case the full allowance prescribed by this title shall be paid; and except that in the case of an application filed for an allowance for a child living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order or decree or written agreement which fixes the amount to be paid for such child's support at a lesser amount than is provided for such child by this title, the Secretary of the department concerned may authorize payment of the allowance in any amount greater than that fixed by such court order, decree, or written agreement, but not in excess of the amount prescribed by this title; or

"(2) to a former wife divorced, the amount of the family allowance payable to such former wife divorced shall not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or decree as the amount to be paid to such former wife divorced."

SEC. 7. (a) That section 107 of such act is amended by striking out all before the first proviso, including the word *"Provided,"* and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 107. (a) An initial family allowance shall be paid for the month in which an enlisted man enters a pay status in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after October 1, 1943, in the amounts and to the dependents hereinafter set forth.

"Such initial family allowance shall be paid to the designated dependent only when a written application therefor is filed by such enlisted man within 15 days after the date of his entry into active service in a pay status and shall be paid as soon as practicable after the filing of such application.

"If paid, such initial family allowance shall be in lieu of the regular monthly family allowance for the month of the enlisted man's entry into active service in a pay status.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of this title, the full amount of such initial family allowance shall be paid by the Government, and no reduction in or charge to the pay of the enlisted man shall be made for such payment.

"The amount of the initial family allowance payable to the dependent or dependents shall be—

"(1) $50, if such enlisted man has a wife but no child;

"(2) $80, if such enlisted man has a wife and one child, and an additional $20 for each additional child;

"(3) $42, if such enlisted man has no wife but has one child, and an additional $20 for each additional child;

"(4) $50, if such enlisted man has one parent dependent upon him for chief support; $68 if such enlisted man has one parent and one brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each brother or sister dependent upon

him for chief support, but not to exceed $90 in the aggregate;

"(5) $68, if such enlisted man has two parents dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, but not to exceed $101 in the aggregate;

"(6) $42, if such enlisted man has no parent but has a brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, but not to exceed $64 in the aggregate. Payment of the initial family allowance may be made to one payee for each class of dependents, as defined in section 103, for whom an allowance is requested.

"(b) The monthly family allowance provided for by this title shall be paid for the period beginning with the first day of the month in which application therefor is filed, or the first day of the month in which the dependent or dependents first become entitled thereto, whichever is later, subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, and shall be terminated or reduced, as may be required, on the last day of the month in which the disbursing officer paying the allowance receives notice of a change in status of the enlisted man or a dependent which terminated or limited the right of his dependent or dependents to receive such allowance: *Provided*, That the period of entitlement to family allowances shall be as hereinbefore prescribed for payment, except that in the case of a change in status of a dependent, the period of entitlement shall cease with the last day of the month in which such change occurs: *Provided further.*"

SEC. 7a. That section 108 of such act is amended by inserting in the first line thereof after "Sec. 108," the subparagraph designation "(a)," and adding at the end of the section a new subsection to read as follows:

"(b) An enlisted man receiving a monetary allowance in lieu of quarters for dependents, or who, being entitled thereto and having made application therefor on or before the date of approval of this act, may, at his option, receive or continue to receive such monetary allowance, or elect to receive in lieu thereof, the benefits of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended: *Provided*, That an enlisted man's election shall be irrevocable during the period of entitlement to such allowance as set out in section 101: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the department concerned is authorized to make the election on behalf of the enlisted man in any case in which he deems it desirable and finds it impracticable for the enlisted man to so elect, however, such an election made on behalf of the enlisted man shall not preclude an election at a later date by the enlisted man: *Provided further*, That in the case of any enlisted man whose dependents are receiving family allowances and occupying public quarters, a deduction from or charge to his pay shall be made at the rate of $1.25 per day."

SEC. 8. That section 110 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 110. (a) Entitlement to and payment of any family allowance authorized under provisions of this title to the dependent or dependents of any enlisted man shall not be contingent upon pay accruing to such enlisted man or upon the monthly pay of such man being reduced by or charged with any amount."

SEC. 9. That section 119 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC 119. Any person who shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, contract for, charge, or receive or shall attempt to solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee or compensation for assisting in any manner an enlisted man or dependent in obtaining a family allowance payable under this title, shall, upon conviction thereof, be guilty of a misdemeanor and for each and every offense shall be punishable by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $1,000 or by imprisonment at hard labor for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

SEC. 10. That section 120 (c) (4) of such act is amended by striking out the words "under oath" in the fourth line thereof.

SEC. 11. That section 120 (i) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The terms 'man' and 'enlisted man' mean any enlisted individual of the first to seventh grades, both inclusive, in any of the services mentioned in section 101 of this act and include members of the band of the United States Marine Corps, but do not include the leader and second leader of the band of the United States Marine Corps, the Philippine Army, the Philippine Scouts, the insular force of the Navy, the Samoan Native Guard or band of the Navy, or the Samoan reserve force of the Marine Corps."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will resume the calling of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. I am advised that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who is necessarily absent, if present would vote "yea."

Mr. WAGNER. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is necessarily absent. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. PEPPER. I announce that the junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on important business. I am advised that if present he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are detained on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting, these Senators would vote "yea."

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who is absent because of illness, if present and voting would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is necessarily absent. If present he would vote "yea."

The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has been confined to a Madison hospital since September 13.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent on official appointments. If present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent because of illness. If present he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 1, as follows:

YEAS—78

Aiken	Gillette	O'Daniel
Andrews	Green	O'Mahoney
Austin	Guffey	Overton
Bailey	Gurney	Pepper
Barbour	Hatch	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hawkes	Reed
Brewster	Hayden	Revercomb
Bridges	Hill	Robertson
Brooks	Holman	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Butler	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	Lucas	Tunnell
Chavez	McCarran	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Van Nuys
Connally	McKellar	Wagner
Danaher	McNary	Wallgren
Davis	Maloney	Walsh
Eastland	Maybank	Wheeler
Ellender	Millikin	White
Ferguson	Moore	Wiley
George	Murdock	Willis
Gerry	Nye	Wilson

NAYS—1

Ball

NOT VOTING—17

Bankhead	Glass	Scrugham
Bilbo	La Follette	Smith
Bone	Mead	Tobey
Burton	Murray	Truman
Byrd	Reynolds	Wherry
Downey	Russell	

So the amendment of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, in regard to the pending amendment the Senate has placed its stamp of approval upon the Government's policy of drafting fathers. According to a statement recently issued by General Hershey, there are in that class, subject to immediate draft, approximately a million and a half men. The policy already is in effect. In nearly every case the fathers have either a little business of their own, a job of their own, or a profession in which they have engaged. The Selective Service records for the month of August of this year—and the records for that month are comparable with those for all other periods throughout the history of the Selective Service—show that approximately 40 percent of the men drafted failed to pass the physical examination, and have been returned to their homes as unfit for service. That means that four out of every ten men who are subject to the draft, and who are called, make arrangements, prior to

their calling, for the disposal of their businesses. They dispose of their businesses, they close their offices, or they give up their jobs, and then go to the induction centers. Of course, it is supposed that before they leave their homes they receive some kind of cursory physical examination. Evidently the examination is of little value, because the induction center records show that a fraction over 40 percent of all persons examined at the induction centers are returned to their homes as unfit.

I say to the Senate that, inasmuch as we have adopted the policy, it is unfair to the heads of families to force them to close their offices or give up their jobs before they are ordered to the induction centers. We should do everything possible to avoid the situation of having a man give up his job, but subsequently, because he does not pass the physical examination at the induction center, return to his home and have to look for a new job or have to open up another business.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think the pending amendment is an extremely meritorious one and certainly should be included in the bill. When I was at home I talked to a great number of draft officials, and the situation the Senator has mentioned was brought up in a great many instances. For example, when a man found that the calls were getting close to his number, formerly he could go to an induction center and get an examination substantially the same as the examination he later would be given. However, today that has been changed. The Army will not permit such examinations except in rare cases of extreme hardship.

The result is that if a man has a little business or has a home on which he is paying, if he sells his business or tries to dispose of his home before he takes his examination and then is rejected for physical reasons or for any other reasons, he will be out of a job or will have disposed of his home. On the other hand, if he has passed the examination, he has only 3 weeks, in the case of the Army, or 1 week, in the case of the Navy, to dispose of his home or business, all of which simply means he gives it away.

I think the pending amendment is an extremely sensible and necessary one.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] a question. If the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota is added to my proposed substitute, and if the substitute is rejected, will the Senator then offer his amendment to the bill itself, so that there will be no question that the amendment will be in the bill, regardless of what the vote on the substitute may be?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, let me say, if the Senator from South Dakota will permit me to do so, that I think the amendment should now be offered to the bill, and then should be offered to the substitute of the Senator from Ohio, so that regardless of the fate of the substitute, this very necessary provision will go into the bill.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to say that I think the proposal is meritorious, and should be offered as an amendment to the bill, as a new section, so that even if the Taft amendment is defeated, the proposal of the Senator from South Dakota will go into the bill, and will be placed in effect.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I am not sure whether I understand the language on page 2 of the amendment, lines 8, 9, and 10:

> Such certificate shall be accepted by the local board and shall be binding upon such board in the same manner as now followed upon examination after induction.

The examinations are not made after induction. They are made before the men are inducted. The examination determines at least the physical facts bearing on the question of whether the man will be inducted.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That depends on the technical definition of "induction."

Mr. HILL. The man is examined before he is taken in.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator may be correct.

Mr. HILL. I desire to say a further word. I want to be frank. I do not think the Senator's amendment should go into the bill. In the first place, there are some 5,600,000 fathers. Some of them may never be reached. Some of them may. The Selective Service has advised me that its medical boards and doctors are now just as busy as they can be in meeting the normal constantly occurring demands for physical examinations. If the amendment goes into the bill every one of the 5,600,000 fathers and any other men who may have been deferred and who have not had their physical examinations would have a right to say to their local boards "I want to be examined," and the amendment would make it mandatory on the board to provide for their examination.

From the information I have from the Selective Service, that would be impossible. The burden already imposed on the doctors and medical boards is almost greater than they can carry, according to the advice furnished me by the Selective Service. The Senator's amendment would impose too great a burden on the doctors and medical boards. As the Senator knows, the doctors who serve on the boards do so gratis. They have been wonderful, just as fine as it is possible for anyone to be, in giving their time free, without any reward or compensation. Their services have been most commendable. If provision now is made for all the men to be examined immediately the burden will be greater than the medical boards will be able to carry.

Furthermore, let me say that the amendment provides for examination after induction. I do not know what that means. The examination is given before induction. Certainly, I should not want to do anything to prevent the boards from examining a man once, twice, or three times, if necessary. The evidence is that in some cases men have been rejected because of physical disability, and later the draft board has sent them back as many times as they wanted, in an effort to take care of them. So, Mr. President, certainly I should not agree to any effort to make one physical examination final.

Furthermore, let me say to the Senator that a man might be examined today, but might not receive an induction call for 6 months or perhaps a year. An examination made today might not show the man's true physical condition a year from now. A year from now his condition might be entirely changed. I understand what the Senator has in mind, and I have deep sympathy with his purpose. I think it would be an admirable thing if today every registrant within the category from 18 to 37 could know at this hour definitely and finally whether or not he was going to be called. I wish that answer now could be given, so that all those men could know whether or not they must go. But the answer cannot be given now. To try to give it now would be to impose a burden on the boards and on the doctors which they could not carry. Furthermore, we do not want to do anything which would make any one examination final.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator for his contribution; but as a matter of practical mechanics in handling the work, no such trouble as has been suggested would arise, because only a comparatively small percentage of all the men subject to induction would go to the trouble of going to induction centers to be examined.

Mr. HILL. How can the Senator tell that there would be only a small percentage?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Just a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Not at the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. As a matter of practical mechanics, very little additional burden would be placed upon the examining officers at the induction centers.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

In further reply to the Senator from Alabama, let me say that the suggestion has been made that my amendment be modified by adding, after the word "defined" in the first sentence of the amendment, the words "when it appears his induction will shortly occur, may." It seems to me that modification would meet the objection of the Senator, that

a man might be examined today and not be called for a year.

The reason for my amendment, Mr. President, is that 4 out of every 10 married men in this class who will be called in the next 4 months will be returned to their homes. None of them knows what is going to happen to him, but 4 out of 10 are going to be rejected and sent home. When they get home they will have no business, no job, no office. I think it is only fair to give these men such an opportunity for examination as the amendment proposes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield first to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will wait.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Then I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator knows, today, from the time a man is examined, if he is found fit to go into the service, and is to be inducted, he has a period of 3 weeks in which to return home and arrange his affairs before he is inducted. Three weeks is the rule. The local board has the power, if there are any unusual circumstances, to extend the period of 3 weeks. The board may extend the time so long as in its discretion it sees fit to extend it. So a man is not hauled up today, examined this afternoon, and put into the Army tomorrow morning. He has at least 3 weeks. Then, as I say, if there is any unusual hardship involved, or if there are unusual circumstances, the board may extend the period of 3 weeks. In numerous cases boards have extended the period beyond 3 weeks.

The Senator must recognize that no group, either in the Army or out of the Army, is more burdened today than the doctors. Today one of our problems is the shortage of doctors to meet the demands both of the Army and of the civilian population. We simply cannot put this burden of examining an additional 5,600,000 men on the doctors over night.

Frankly, I do not know what the second part of the Senator's amendment means, because there is no examination after induction. We certainly ought not to do anything which would make any one examination final.

Much of the argument has been to the effect that insofar as possible the men who are rejected because of physical disabilities ought to be reexamined and taken into the Army. It is said that we ought to screen them and take in as many as possible. There ought not to be a final examination. As I have said, if a man is examined today, what would that examination be worth 6 months, 9 months, or perhaps a year from now?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. We are all pretty much burdened in this country today; and a little more burden on a few doctors in the examining division in the induction centers will not hurt them any more than it hurts the boys who are being called.

I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, aside from the question of burden, I should like to clear up what the amendment would do in another respect. We know that when the men are called they are given a preliminary examination by the local draft board.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. If it is obvious that they are unfit, the local draft board can so find. If they are accepted for induction, they go to an induction center and are subjected to a physical examination, under the regulations of the War Department, to determine whether they are fit.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. And 40 percent of them are send back home.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand, but if they are found fit they are inducted.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. The examination to determine their fitness takes place before they are inducted. It is not an examination after they are inducted. Many of them who are examined before induction and rejected are rejected because of some physical defect which may be cured or remedied. I have had my attention called to cases in which the local draft boards passed men. They went up to their induction centers, were examined, and rejected because of a more or less minor physical defect, which in all probability could be removed within 60 or 90 days, or which might be cured by nature. They were told that they were not fitted at that time to enter the service, and therefore they were not inducted, but they were ordered to report back within 60 days, or told that they would be called back in 60 days or 90 days to determine whether by that time the physical defect had been removed. Under the terms of the Senator's amendment the examination before induction would be made final.

The examination must be before induction, because I think the Senator from Alabama is correct in stating that men are inducted after they are found fitted in every way. That examination does not take place after induction. If we make the preliminary examination final, we take away from the induction centers the right to reexamine anyone who is rejected because of a more or less minor defect which might be remedied by nature in from 60 to 90 days, or any other given time.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I am bound to disagree with the distinguished Senator. At the present time the selective-service law provides that the local draft boards may keep on sending a man back, time after time, even though he is rejected by the examining center.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true. A man can be sent back from time to time by the local draft board. I have some doubt whether the examination made prior to induction should be the final examination. It seems to me that the examination must be made prior to induction, even to accomplish the purpose of the Senator. It is then up to the induction center. I have some doubt whether the local draft board could send a man back for further examination after an examination had been held which had been determined by the amendment to be final.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. It would be final only in the sense that it is final today, when the man is examined at the induction center and is rejected.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not final. He may be examined time and time again.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I know it is not final, because the local draft board may send him back to the induction center as many times as it sees fit.

We have been extremely solicitous of the welfare of everyone connected with the war effort. It seems to me that the men who are now being taken into the Army under the new policy are entitled to a certain leeway if they want it. I ask Senators, in all seriousness, how many of them would be able to wind up their business affairs during 3 weeks.

Mr. President, I am agreeable to the suggestion made a moment ago with respect to the modification of the first line of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I ask that my amendment, as modified, be offered, if it be in order, as an amendment to the original bill as well as an amendment to the substitute.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to say to the Senator that many of us are extremely cordially inclined toward his amendment. So as to eliminate some criticism which has been made, I wonder if he would agree to an amendment which would provide in substance that it shall be the duty of the selective-service board to notify a registrant as far in advance of his induction as possible, and that the armed services shall, so far as practicable, provide free examination opportunities to the registrant.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I do not believe the inductees particularly care whether the examination is a free one. They want an opportunity to know in advance whether they must lose their businesses, or their offices, or their jobs, before they are taken.

Mr. PEPPER. That is what I had in mind. That is what all of us wish to see corrected. We wish to provide that a registrant may have as early an examination as it is possible to give him. The able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has referred to the shortage of civilian doctors and the difficulty of examining all registrants. I was wondering if we could not meet the problem and eliminate the objection which has been raised by not making it mandatory upon the Army to afford these examination facilities or opportunities, but make it their duty to allow as many of the registrants to be examined as they properly can examine with the facilities which they possess.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I could not hear all the Senator said, but I certainly desire to cooperate with him in any way I can to protect this group. I wish to make a further suggestion, that the Navy allows inductees 1 week, not 3 weeks. There is no man in the United States who can

close his business, his job, or his profession in 7 days.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have personal knowledge of several men who have suffered in consequence of the impracticable procedure which has been followed, and I think this is one of the most reasonable provisions that has been offered for inclusion in the bill at any time.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I suggest merely one change. I suggest that in line 3, on page 2 of the amendment, after the word "though", the word "after" be stricken out, and in lieu thereof the word "for" be inserted.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I accept the Senator's suggestion and ask that the modification be made.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I think that at the end of the amendment the words "shall be binding upon such board in the same manner as now followed upon examination after induction" should be changed to read: "Shall be binding upon such board in the same manner as now followed upon examination immediately prior to final induction." The words "immediately prior to final induction" would be substituted for the word "after", which appears in line 10 after the word "examination."

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I accept the suggestion of the Senator from Kentucky, and ask that the modification in the amendment be made.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I rose to request that the modification suggested by the Senator from Kentucky be restated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Kentucky again state his suggested modification?

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest that on page 2, line 10, after the word "examination", the word "after" be stricken out, and in lieu thereof the following words be inserted, "immediately prior to final."

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Does the Senator from Kentucky refer to lines 3 and 4 on page 2, as well as to line 10 on that page?

Mr. BARKLEY. The two provisions are a little different. In line 3, on page 2, it is provided that the examination shall be conducted in the same manner as though after induction. That is all right, but the change I have suggested in line 10 is a little different. There the provision is for the binding effect of the examination, and it ought not to be after induction because it takes place before.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator restate the change in line 10 which he has suggested?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am suggesting that after the word "examination" the word "after" be stricken out, and that in lieu thereof the words "immediately prior to final" be inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, as modified, will be read for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6 of the Taft substitute amendment, following line 12 therein, it is proposed to insert the following:

> Any registrant within the categories herein defined, when it appears that his induction will shortly occur, may, if he requests it, be permitted by his local board, and the granting of such permission by such local board is hereby made mandatory, to take a preinduction physical examination, at any regularly established induction center. Such local board shall, upon such request by the registrant being made, issue him an order for that purpose and the examining officers of any induction center are hereby required to conduct such examination in the same manner as though for induction.
>
> The examining officers at such induction center who conduct such physical examination under this provision shall issue to the registrant a certificate showing his physical fitness or lack thereof, and such certificate shall be accepted by the local board and shall be binding upon such board in the same manner as now followed upon examination immediately prior to final induction.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit, I will make another suggestion merely in the interest of phraseology. He is seeking to make this request mandatory upon the board. All he has to do is to change the word "may" at the end of line 1 to "shall", and strike out in line 2 beginning after the word "board" the words "and the granting of such permission by such local board is hereby made mandatory." The use of the word "shall" would make it mandatory without the original language.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Perhaps the Senator is correct, but the reason for the original language was a very definite one. As it works out in practice, many of the local boards in my State ignore a man's request for examination.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the word "shall" were used it would make it compulsory.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, what is the suggestion of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggested striking out the word "may" at the end of line 1 on page 1, and inserting "shall"; and then in line 2 beginning after the word "board", to strike out the words "and the granting of such permission by such local board is hereby made mandatory."

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The alteration suggested by the Senator from Kentucky also referred to line 1 on page 1.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes: to strike out the word "may" at the end of line 1, and then in line 2, after the word "board", to strike out the words "and the granting of such permission by such local board is hereby made mandatory."

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I accept the Senator's suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] offers his amendment as modified to the substitute amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I offer the amendment as modified.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the modifications would change the amendment to a considerable extent. It still might impose quite a burden on the Selective Service, and more particularly on the Army. As we know, in the beginning the registrants were given two examinations. One examination was by the doctors of the local boards and the Selective Service. The other examination was given by the doctors of the Army when the registrant arrived at the Army camp. There were two examinations. Because of the great burden which has been placed upon the doctors, not only because of their work for the Selective Service, but because of the shortage of doctors both in the armed services and in the civilian population, the Selective Service had to discontinue the examination by doctors of the local boards, and require that the examination be given only by doctors of the armed services. A man now entering the Army will not be examined by a doctor of the local board, but will be examined by the Army doctor. The Army doctors have to devote a certain part of their time to examining registrants and giving them physical examinations. All details surrounding the induction of a recruit have to be worked out. Transportation has to be provided. We do not send men out haphazardly. If a certain number of men are being sent today from some particular board—and there are 6,500 boards throughout the country—that board works out all the transportation of the men from the local board where the men report, to the Army camp where they receive their physical examination.

Sending these men to the Army camps is not a simple matter. There is the question of transportation, and working out the schedule so as not to have too many men arrive on 1 day, and so as not to put any more burden on the Army doctors than is necessary.

As I have said, I sympathize with the Senator's purpose; I wish it were possible to allow all these men to know for sure whether they will have to go or will not have to go; but if the amendment shall be adopted, there will be imposed a very severe burden on the Army doctors, who are already overburdened; there will be imposed a burden on the local boards and on the Selective Service System, which are already overburdened. Instead of the program moving on schedule and according to calls and numbers, under the amendment a man would be permitted to jam himself in when perhaps there are only 95 seats, and there would be 105 men to go. It seems to me there is absolutely no way to let the men know absolutely, definitely, and for sure, whether they are going to be accepted or not going to be accepted, because, as I said, a man examined today might be rejected, but in a short period thereafter his board might send him back again, and the next time he might be accepted.

Of course, any registrant can go to his own private civilian doctor with a copy of the specifications and have an examination. He would not, of course, have a final decision, but he could obtain a very good idea as to whether or not he would meet the physical requirements and standards.

If there is some way to effectuate what is desired, I should like to see it done just as much as the Senator from South Dakota or any other Senator; but from what the Selective Service tell me—and they are conducting the show—I doubt if it can be done. We have been talking for days about the wastage of manpower. The adoption of the amendment would certainly result in wastage; it would certainly put an undue burden on the Army doctors who are too heavily burdened today by long hours, a shortage boards and on the Selective Service.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The suggestion that a local physician could give the examination is certainly not a sound one, because men who, under this new policy, are giving up their homes, who are giving up their businesses, who are giving up their professions, are entitled to know finally whether they are going to be accepted. The men who are sent back home have a right to know whether they are going to be accepted or not, if they ask for an examination. So far as the burden upon the doctors is concerned, who, in this civilization of ours, is not burdened today, as well as on the local of manpower, and in many other ways? I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator another question as to the effect of the amendment he added awhile ago at the suggestion of the Senator from New Mexico, to the effect that if the induction is imminent—that is not the exact language——

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The language is "will shortly occur."

Mr. BARKLEY. Who is to decide whether it will shortly occur?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The local board can tell within a reasonable time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is that to be left to the local board or to the registrant? I think it is left to the local board itself, anyway, under the law. I do not know that it will create any difficulty, but suppose it is not possible to tell whether a man's induction is imminent, but he decides he wants to be examined anyhow to determine if, when he is examined, he would be fit to go into the service. Is he or the local board to decide that?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I think the local board.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the burden is placed on the local board to make an order. When the man appears before the local board the first thing they would determine is whether or not induction is likely or will shortly occur. That is all there is to it. If the local board determines his induction is not going to occur shortly it would say "No." That is the way it occurs to me. Is that the Senator's idea?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is a question whether there would be a great rush of men to be examined. In all likelihood it may work out in this way: Those who think they have a physical defect which would bar them from induction would like to know whether they can depend upon that situation. Those who are physically fit and feel they will be accepted will not be in as great hurry to have any examination take place except in the ordinary routine of the regular order as those who are handicapped in some way which leads them themselves to believe that they would be rejected whenever they are called, and, therefore, would like to know at once without having to wait whether they would be. It may be that the defect is one that can be cured by an additional week or a few months' waiting. So it is doubtful, in my mind, whether there is going to be any great rush on the part of the 6,000,000 fathers to be examined, because if I were myself in such a situation as that, I should not care to precipitate my examination if I thought I was going to be inducted, unless I was in a hurry to have it done so that I could enter the Army. In those cases I suppose the examination would be facilitated, but if I were pretty certain that I could not stand the examination, and still was more or less suspended in midair until it was determined, I would naturally want to know what my status was going to be.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if he has in mind that the examination should be final for all time?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No; no more so than at present.

Mr. PEPPER. It is for the particular call?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. So, if he were to be called again the previous examination would not be a finality?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No; and the Selective Service and the draft boards can send a man back as many times as they want to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], as modified.

The amendment, as modified was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the same amendment as offered to the substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I accept the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota as a part of my substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is accepted as a part of the substitute.

The question now is on the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, as amended. The substitute amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, as has been stated, we now come to the consideration of the substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio. In a few minutes I desire to offer an amendment to the substitute, but before doing so I desire to discuss quite briefly the germane question arising on the whole subject, a subject which has been debated for more than a week. It has been approached from many angles; it has been discussed in many phases; many figures have been furnished us, they are in the RECORD, and I do not care to repeat them; but it does seem to me, Mr. President, that certain conclusions may justly be drawn from all the facts which have been presented, not only in the arguments, but in the evidence which has been given to the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate since the convening of the Seventy-eighth Congress. I submit that the facts adduced bear out the conclusions which I shall now state to the Senate.

The first is that the Army and the Navy say that they need more men. The armed forces do not care, and have made no requirement, as to whether the men inducted are married or single, whether they have dependents or do not have dependents, so long as they are physically able to bear arms and serve in the military forces.

Another conclusion which has been proven beyond doubt, regardless of the number involved, is that there are in Government civil employment today a number of men of draft age without dependents. Not only are there such men in the employ of the National Government, but in the employ of the State governments throughout the Union and of the municipal governments of the cities and towns throughout the country.

I had hoped that when the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] was presented, they would approach that question as a question of deferment, and not as a question of the employment of men in the National Government; that they would deal with all governments—National, State, and city. They have seen fit not to do so.

I shall support the Taft amendment, because it is directed at all persons, whether they may be employed in the National Government or whether they may be employed in State or municipal governments, or whether they may work in factories.

There is another conclusion we cannot escape; that is, that there are too many men today employed in certain industries, men who are not needed.

There is another conclusion, stated by the Chief of Staff of the Army, that the Army desires younger men within the selective-service category.

Mr. President, I wish to say, with all respect to those who have discussed the subject, and brought the question into this debate, that in order to avoid deciding on this question of the drafting

of fathers, we have had a great deal of appeal to patriotism. We are all patriotic; no appeal to that sentiment has any bearing on the definite subject we have to decide here.

Also, unfortunately, there has been brought in an appeal based upon what are said to be the views of General Marshall. Once and for all, before the debate shall be ended, I desire to clear up the position of the distinguished general, and I turn to the record and quote the language of General Marshall upon the subject we are considering here today. I read from page 264 of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. The general was asked this question:

Is this conclusion correct, General: That the Army needs a number of men, and it makes no difference to the Army whether they are men with children or without children; is that correct?

General Marshall responded:

That is correct. Our interest is that we get men of a certain physical state and a certain mental ability; and we are concerned at the same time that it does not cut production.

Then this question was asked:

The order in which men shall be taken from civil life into the armed forces through the selective service is a matter for determination by the War Manpower Commission?

General Marshall answered:

That is correct, sir.

This question was then propounded:

Then, in the final analysis, on the bill that is before the Congress today, it is a matter as to whether or not the Congress is going to approve the plan that has been brought to us by the War Manpower Commission. That is correct, is it not?

General Marshall answered:

I think that is correct.

Then this question was asked:

It is not a question of a quarrel with the Army or a difference with the Army on its requisitions for men; it is more or less a question of whether the Congress will approve the order in which men are to be taken from civil life as laid down by the War Manpower Commission?

The answer of General Marshall was:

Yes, sir; so long as we get the men, and the production of military material is not affected.

I submit, Mr. President, that there is only one question involved here, and it is not an issue with the Army, nor is it a question of General Marshall or what he may want. It seems to me that the administration leaders have brought the General in to drag him across the path of the course they were taking, like a red herring, to take us off the true course, the real question that is involved before this body. The real question—and we cannot escape it—is whether or not Congress is going to put its approval upon the method of selection which has been adopted and which has been practiced now for nearly 2 years by the War Manpower Commission.

The Army does not take the men out of civil life; that is provided for by the Manpower Commission, and the men are taken through the action of the Selective Service. So there is but one question, I say; that is, whether the Congress today is going to approve what has been done, whether it is going to approve it in the face of the fact, which has been established, that there are thousands upon thousands of young men without dependents employed in industrial plants. We all know that in the communities where we live men from the towns and from the countryside went into these plants when they expanded. Some speak of these men as slackers. I doubt that very many of them are slackers. I think they went into those plants because of the money they were to receive, but many of them are still in the plants. In the course of a few months after they had started work we have heard them called essential workers. But they are not, as the evidence so clearly shows. There are too many of those men. That has been proven, and it has never been refuted. There are too many in the factories today.

Nothing has been enacted by Congress as yet which requires the taking of those men from the overcrowded plants. No step has yet been taken to reach the so-called hoarding of labor. Up to this moment the law has been left in substance just as it was before we started discussion. There have been added a few guarded restricting words, but in substance there has been no change. Deferments have been left to the unlimited discretion of the selective service boards. Unless that discretion is narrowed, we cannot help the situation, there can be no relief in the situation.

I may say that I do not feel that the substitute offered by the eminent Senator from Ohio takes care of the question to which I have just alluded, and for that reason there has been drawn, by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] and myself, an amendment to the substitute, and at this time I wish to present and offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 4, it is proposed to strike out the language beginning with the words *"Provided, however,"* and continue through to the end of line 12, on page 2, and to insert in lieu thereof the following: *"Provided, however,* That if the registrant is under 30 years of age on October 1, 1943, he shall not be deferred under the authority given by the first sentence of this paragraph (1), unless he is an essential and irreplaceable worker who is a skilled artisan or has professional training necessary to the employment in which he is engaged; any such deferment must be approved not only by the local selective service board where the registrant is registered, but also by the selective service appeal board having jurisdiction over the area in which is located the principal place of employment of the registrant. Such decision of the appeal board shall be final unless modified or changed by the Director of Selective Service. The Director of Selective Service shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, training and service under this act; and the determination of the Director shall be final."

Mr. REVERCOMB. The only language that is added by this amendment requires in effect that any man in industry under 30 years of age may not be deferred unless he is an essential and irreplaceable worker who is a skilled artisan or has the professional training necessary to the employment in which he is engaged. I may say that when the first amendment was drawn by us we intended to meet this question directly with the provision that there could not be any deferments in these plants of men under 30 years of age. However, we have been persuaded that there may be instances of men under 30 years of age where they were so needed that they were indispensable. I think of the skilled, trained artisan such as a clockmaker in some of the plants; I think of the professionally trained chemist in the chemical plants. But the whole effect of the amendment is to narrow the group without dependents that may be deferred in these plants or in Government positions, if you please.

Mr. President, we are face to face with a question that, so far as I feel, is perhaps the most important to the people of the country that has come before the Senate at this session. The people are expecting the Congress to meet it, and to meet it fairly, to meet it earnestly. It is a question we should not dodge. We must meet it, however difficult, however hot it may be, and handle it; and Mr. President, I say if we are going to take from the plants and from Government positions men who are not needed there, we must be definite in our requirements upon the Selective Service System. For a year and a half that agency has had carte blanche power to act, and the result is the situation in which we find ourselves today.

So I offer the amendment in the hope that it may be acceptable to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], with the hope that it will correct the situation in respect to the so-called hoarding of labor and of men working in Government positions who should be serving in the armed services, so that they may be inducted into service before those with dependents in this country are taken from their homes.

This is not a question of helping any particular man or serving the particular purposes of any group. It is a question of what is best for the welfare of the country. The great subject, the great end toward which we should all act now and immediately, is the winning of the war, but we must win it bearing in mind that we must keep our own country as sound as possible in the winning of the war. Therefore, I say the duty has come to Congress to be definite in its restrictions as to how men without dependents may be left in industries when men with dependents are taken into the armed services.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Referring to the language in the last line on the first page of the amendment, I ask the Senator whether he would consider a slight change to be acceptable. That is, after the word "who", the first word in line 8, on page 1, to insert "has special knowledge, skill, or experience or", so the language would be "unless he is an essential and irreplaceable worker who has special knowledge, skill, or experience or is a skilled artisan or", and so forth.

It does not tie it up quite so tight.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that the purpose was to tie it rather tight and to make it as narrow as could reasonably be done.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think the Senator has tied it so tight that he would greatly cripple the production of aircraft.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish the Senator would accept the words suggested by the Senator from Vermont. I shall be very glad to accept the amendment as a part of my substitute at least. I wish to say that I feel that the word "artisan" is likely to be construed to be a person who has a trade only. That is the usual definition of the word "artisan"; a man who is a worker.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. A man, as the Senator points out, may have some special knowledge, skill, or special experience, and yet he would not be an artisan.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. The language now is confined to artisans who may be said to be craftsmen and men with professions, which is also a very limited group, of course.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me ask the Senator from Vermont if he would be satisfied to leave out the word "experienced", and retain only the words "has special knowledge, or skill"? The word "experienced" is one which may be played upon rather broadly by Selective Service.

Mr. AUSTIN. Of course I would. I submitted the proposition to the Senator for his views. I do not care to be the author of the amendment. Of course I would accept whatever the Senator is willing to suggest on that point.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I address the Senator from Ohio. Would adding after the word "who" the language "has special knowledge, or skill" be satisfactory?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. The words to be added would be "has special knowledge or skill." If a man did not have some skill with his experience he would not be any good.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct; but he might have experience without skill.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. So the Senator modifies his amendment so the language in line 8 on page 1, "who is a skilled artisan", is changed to read "who has special knowledge or skill."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in the early months of the year various news items were permitted to leak out of the departments to the effect that it was possible that married men with families would not be called until after January 1, 1944. As the weeks went by we, all of us, I think, gained the impression that there was a distinct possibility that married men with families might not be called at all. As time went on that possibility approached a probability. It was, therefore, a great shock to find one morning, without any notice, that a directive had been issued to the effect that married men with children would be drafted on October 1.

Mr. President, why were we and the people of the country led to believe, all during the early part of the year, that married men with children would not be drafted this year? And then the sudden reversal, the bitter truth. Why was this truth kept from us, from the fathers about to be drafted, and from the wives and children of those fathers? Why were those fathers, by the very inference that they probably would not be drafted, encouraged to go ahead with their businesses, building them up and making them secure, instead of making provision for their families during the time they would be in the service? Why the unnecessary anguish in many of our American families, and the consequent state of total unpreparedness for the immediate future?

Mr. President, the Senate has just reconvened after an 8 or 9 weeks' recess. During those 8 or 9 weeks most of us went back to our States with a view to finding out what the people at home were thinking. So far as traveling conditions permitted, I covered my State of Wyoming. The reaction I received on all sides, on the question on drafting fathers, was definite opposition. The people agree that if it is necessary to draft fathers in order to win the war, then fathers must be drafted; but the big question is whether it is necessary to draft fathers now, to break up the homes now, when so many single men and childless married men are still on the wrong side of the draft.

What is back of this question? What is the truth behind it? How much is being concealed from us? Is this another Pearl Harbor or Doolittle raid? Pearl Harbor, where, on December 7, 1941, every battleship we had in that vicinity was at the bottom of the ocean? Everything we heard about that for 12 months was a suppression of facts. It was not until December 4, 1942, that we were told what is supposed, today, to be the truth—yes, 12 months after, but, more significant still, 1 month after the election on November 4, 1942.

And the Doolittle raid in February 1942: We were given to understand that all planes but one had reached their destination, and that one had come down on Russian territory and the crew had been interned. What was the truth? Not one single plane was saved. How many men were lost? We do not know. What is supposed to be the truth was told us again about 1 year later—to be exact, in February of this year, or 4 months after election. We were told that the truth could not be divulged before—that, for military reasons, it had to be kept from the enemy. I am not a betting man, but I would wager a considerable sum that within 24 hours after the attack on Pearl Harbor the Japanese Government, in Tokyo, knew every detail of the disaster, and that it was conveyed to Germany and Italy, and immediately both those nations declared war against the United States.

There surely cannot be a Senator here today who is not in favor of first drafting all single men and childless married men. We are going to supply the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force with the men needed, but, in so doing, we are hoping that it is going to be possible to take the single men and the childless married men first. That is the object of this amendment. When it is necessary, all eligible men between the ages of 18 and 38 will be drafted.

If there should be any doubt in anyone's mind that the administration is playing politics with the war effort, no greater confirmation could be supplied than the letter from General Marshall to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, asking that the Taft amendment be defeated. Can anyone imagine Premier Stalin asking Marshal Timoshenko to interfere in domestic and political matters? Can anyone imagine Churchill asking General Montgomery? Can anyone imagine Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek appealing to one of his generals?

Mr. President, I am surprised; I am amazed; I am disappointed. This matter is not one for General Marshall. It is the business of the War Manpower Commission and the Selective Service draft. If the heads of those departments are not functioning satisfactorily, turn them out, and put in someone who will.

If the Nation is to continue to have confidence in the high command, and if the administration expects the American people to continue to over-subscribe future war bond drives, the great majority of the 300,000 single or childless married men must be in the Army before spring comes. This is no idle gesture. The people of my State, the State of Wyoming, are incensed over the statement that while there are 1,100 State employees in the State, there are 6,200 Federal employees there. The cry is—and I am satisfied there is a similar cry in every one of the other 47 States in the Union—"Why are not a large percentage of these men in the Army?"

I want to call attention to a note on the bottom of page 369 of the hearings before the Military Affairs Committee, that the figure of 300,000 men does not include those in the Department of Agriculture, the District of Columbia Government, the Maritime Commission, the National Housing Agency, the War Relocation Authority, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the Navy Department, or the Federal Works Agency.

I do not think single men or childless married men in the Department of Agriculture or in the Department of Interior have any claim to exemption under the

agricultural-worker exemption. It pertains to workers in the fields. The same would apply to any single or childless married man in the 20 Government farm-loaning agencies. A certain percentage of those men will be found physically unfit for military or naval service, and due allowance must be made for that. There surely can be little doubt in anyone's mind that if a thorough combing of all Government departments, bureaus, and agencies is made, a large percentage of the single and childless married men will be found available.

There is also little doubt that there is a vast supply of hoarded labor.

During the debate on this bill last week, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] referred to the building of the battleship *Alabama* by the Government, that that ship was built in a Government-owned and -operated shipyard. In this connection it is interesting to note that several sister ships of this battleship were built by private yards—the *South Dakota*, the *Massachusetts*, and the *Indiana*. One of those private yards, where work is on an incentive basis, built its battleship, the *Indiana*, for approximately $8,000,000 less cost than the Government, and in addition supplied the Government with the necessary plans and ordered most of the material for the Government. This difference of $8,000,000 for identical ships is largely a difference in the cost of labor—not in the rate per hour paid, but in the method of handling labor, the elimination of labor hoarding, and the incentive system of pay in this private yard.

There are other ways of obtaining men which seem to have been neglected. In the Navy someone thought up the bright idea of the Seabees. From reports they are a great success, and apparently there are few, if any, restrictions regarding age. During one of the open hearings by the Military Affairs Committee on this bill, I had the privilege and pleasure of having as my guest at the hearing Seaman Edgar Swallow, of the Seabees. Seaman Swallow is a neighbor of mine in Wyoming, a stockman, and fine American who, even though he was raising livestock, felt that he was not doing enough for his country in the war effort, and so about 4 months ago he enlisted in the Seabees. The interesting part of this story is that Seaman Swallow is 48 years of age and four times a grandfather. He is a fine specimen of a man, hardy and ready for anything. It was a great privilege to introduce Seaman Swallow to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, and many of the other members of that committee. General Hershey was also in the room at the time, and was much interested in meeting Seaman Swallow.

I tell this story because the value of the Seabees was brought home very clearly to all who read an article entitled "Salerno Witness," published in the Washington Post of October 1, 1943. I shall read only one or two excerpts from this article, but ask unanimous consent to have the entire article inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMAN TANK RAN THROUGH—300 DEAD—NONE ESCAPED

NEW YORK, September 30.—American and British soldiers were blown to bits by Nazi tanks and the beach was littered with dead and dying Allied soldiers before the Fifth Army secured its bridgehead at Salerno.

This was the story told tonight by Lt. Comdr. Frank C. Grismer, United States Naval Reserve, on the N. B. C.'s March of Time program.

Commander Grismer prefaced his description of the savage fighting with the statement he had a grim story to tell—"a bloody, ugly story you may not care to hear."

After telling how he was assigned to one of the larger assault boats, Commander Grismer told of the actual landing itself in the following words:

"We arrived off the beach at Salerno a few days later just about dawn. United States cruisers and destroyers were giving the beachhead a terrific pounding.

"The shells whined incessantly over our heads. We could see the red and orange flashes of the explosions on shore. The noise was deafening. Meanwhile, our fighter planes and bombers were working on the landing area. That's one thing we had on the Nazis, hands down—air power and plenty of it.

"Then the British Commandos, American Rangers, and Navy Seabees went in. They're always first. The Commandos and Rangers silence machine-gun nests and artillery positions. The Seabees clear spaces for dressing stations, drag ashore the trench diggers and bulldozers. All this before the main body of troops ever hits the beach.

A NIGHTMARE OF DESTRUCTION

"British troops were the next to land—and where we were on the beach the infantry was all British. At 10 in the morning, the first German counterattack came. And it was a lulu. Tiger tanks, as the Nazis call them, firing those vicious 88-millimeter guns, driving right down on the beach, into, over, and around our forces, blasting men and equipment to bits on every hand. Supporting the tiger tanks were well-placed guns in nearby hills.

"That German attack, frankly, rolled over our men like a stone crusher. The troops had to get off the beach—those who were left to get off. The Commandos, Rangers, and Seabees, however, stuck. They hung on almost literally by their teeth and fingernails in hiding places they'd infiltrated in the hills.

"The beach was littered with our dead and dying, and with our wrecked tanks, trucks, guns, and jeeps. Right then I saw what this war meant in losses. It's a nightmare of destruction. The paint on that equipment was hardly dry. And the dead men were so young they had scarcely begun to live.

"But that night, our landing craft charged up to the beach again. And the troops came back. More men, more guns, more tanks. The Germans kept up their fire. They couldn't stop the landing. Our cruisers and destroyers were in close again, mercilessly smothering the Nazis under a hail of steel and explosives.

"The next morning the landing operations were pressed home still harder. The landing craft were now able to disembark their men and machines without getting anybody's feet wet. This time the Germans couldn't crash through the way they did the day before. I walked down the beach amongst the gun roar and cursing and shouting. That's when I stumbled over a man, and as I turned to apologize I saw that he was dead. That was the first dead man I'd seen in this war. He was British. I'll never forget it.

"A little way along, I came to one of those Italian dairy farms, with a wall around it. The British troops who made the first landing had dug in there, in foxholes along the wall. A German Tiger tank had run through them in the night. Some 300 lay dead. Not one had escaped from that position. Rifles, machine guns, the litter fron knapsacks lay about in all directions.

BRITISH WERE CALMLY BREWING TEA

"Those personal letters and family snapshots, splattered with blood, and ground into dirt, made this war seem mighty personal * * * those personal effects were the living flesh of freedom, and a Nazi tank had torn and strewn and rolled them over.

"At this same scene, a few hours later, some British soldiers were calmly boiling water for tea. They offered me some. They were completely undisturbed and cheerful—and determined. Our grip on the beachhead was now a giant hand, choking the Germans so hard they had to wriggle out.

"Prisoners were coming in. They weren't arrogant, those Nazis. But they said Germany would fight to the finish for Italy. The Germans knew what our possession of the airfields to the north would mean to their homeland. There were Italians with them, too. The Nazis hadn't told them their government had surrendered.

"Then I had to return to my ship. We were ready to go back for more men and tanks and guns. Within those 2 days the Seabees had turned the beach into an Allied base. The sky was thick with United States planes. The Germans were retreating."

Mr. ROBERTSON. This is a report of a story told by Lt. Comdr. Frank C. Grismer, United States Naval Reserve, describing the Fifth Army's landing at Salerno beach, over the National Broadcasting Co.'s March of Time program. Says Commander Grismer:

We arrived off the beach at Salerno a few days later just about dawn. United States cruisers and destroyers were giving the beachhead a terrific pounding. The shells whined incessantly over our heads. We could see the red and orange flashes of the explosions on shore, etc. Then the British Commandos, American Rangers, and United States Navy Seabees went in. They're always first. The Commandos and Rangers silence machine-gun nests and artillery positions. The Seabees clear spaces for dressing stations, drag ashore the trench diggers and bulldozers. All this before the main body of troops ever hits the beach.

Then follows a description of the troops landing. I again quote:

At 10 in the morning, the first German counterattack came—tanks driving right down on the beach, into, over and around our forces, blasting men and equipment to bits on every hand. Supporting the tanks were well-placed guns in nearby hills. That German attack, frankly, rolled over our men like a stone crusher. The troops had to get off the beach—those who were left to get off. The Commandos, Rangers, and Seabees, however, stuck. They hung on almost literally by their teeth and fingernails in hiding places they'd infiltrated in the hills.

I particularly call attention to the United States Navy Seabees. They were first ashore and the Navy Seabees stayed there. This is an organization in which age makes little difference.

Why is not a similar idea used in the Army, not only for construction battalions, but in many ways to relieve

younger men for the actual combat forces abroad? I am reliably informed that there are over 250,000 military police in the Army today. Many of the duties of the military police in this country, such as guarding buildings, railway bridges, and so forth, and all the more or less normal police duties, could be performed by men over 38 years of age or by many under 38 years of age who have some slight physical defect which has been the means of their rejection under the present rigid Army requirements for service abroad.

In Wyoming we have an Italian prisoner of war camp. I am reliably informed that there are approximately 2,000 Italian prisoners of war there. To guard them there are 400 enlisted men and 40 officers. I hope it will be agreed that it is not necessary and not efficient use of our manpower to utilize our highly trained 18- to 38-age Army for this purpose. What would the police forces of our great cities do if they had to retire men at 38 years of age?

The amendment which I am sponsoring with my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] seeks to draft every single man and childless married man under the age of 30. It does not permit any deferment up to 30 years of age, except for essential and irreplaceable workers and those who have special knowledge and skill, or are skilled artisans or have professional training necessary to the employment in which they are engaged. The argument has been put forward that this might disrupt or retard airplane manufacture. I cannot subscribe to that view. In support of my objection I quote from an article in the Washington Post of October 1 by Ben W. Gilbert, Post staff writer. It is headed "Hershey assails industry pressure for deferments." I will read only two paragraphs of this article, and ask unanimous consent that the whole article be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERSHEY ASSAILS INDUSTRY PRESSURE FOR DEFERMENTS—INCENTIVE WAGE HIT—THREAT TO SYSTEM

(By Ben W. Gilbert)

Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, yesterday lashed out at industry for using pressure tactics to obtain occupational deferments for physically fit single men and warned that the whole system of granting job deferments was being endangered by the actions of some employers.

Of unusual significance in view of the current criticism in Congress of occupational-deferment practices is the following strict policy which Hershey laid down simultaneously:

Management and management alone has the responsibility to use superhuman efforts to see that no deferment is requested for a man capable of rendering military service unless the job must be done and can be done by no other person.

Speaking at a meeting of the American Management Association in New York City, the draft chief bluntly informed the industrialists that certain practices of some of their number were inviting an unfavorable public reaction which might outlaw all occupational deferments, thus hurting the war effort.

Hershey accused some employers of attempting deferment privileges, of threatening draft boards with action from Washington, of exaggerating the importance of men on their staff and some who had not even been put on the pay roll at the time deferment was requested, of changing job titles to bring them within selective-service lists of essential jobs, and of padding draft-replacement schedules with names of employees already in service or who were draft exempt for one reason or another, thus slowing up the rate of induction of draft eligibles.

He vigorously defended the work of local draft boards, and by implication left the impression that prime responsibility for present manpower ills rested elsewhere—presumably on the shoulders of industry, the War Manpower Commission, and production agencies.

"The aircraft situation on the west coast is the perfect example of Selective Service taking 8 percent of the men and receiving 90 percent of the blame for the fact that production schedules have not been met in some plants some months," Hershey said.

"The local board can hardly escape a feeling of futility when they see 140,000 workers leave an industry during a period in which the local boards removed 10,000."

It was understood that Hershey has laid similar figures before W. M. C. with the challenge to do something about the turnover rate in war industry before further liberalizing job-deferment rules.

Hershey pointed out that he gave repeated warnings to industry during the early days of the draft against the "indiscriminate hiring of very young men," but "the warning voices were little heard and less heeded by industries expanding at a rate which dizzied management."

"A great many of our people believe," Hershey declared, "that the time has come when these young single men should be in the service and that industry should find others to do this work or get more work out of those already in the plants or yards. Men must be deferred to the end that the necessary airplanes are made, but public morale is just as essential as airplanes in the winning of this war.

"It is the considered judgment of hundreds of local boards that industry has made the tasks of the local board members extremely difficult by the retention of young men simply because it is more convenient to do so, and that if the practice is pursued consistently an unfavorable public reaction is certain, and when it comes the pendulum cannot be arrested on center but will go to a point approaching total elimination."

Hershey accused some employers of placing "startling evaluations" on individual employees in filling out deferment forms.

"One State selective-service director remarked that industry changed job descriptions more rapidly than we can keep up with the real facts," Hershey said.

Some replacement schedules carried names of men "who had been gone for months, or who are overage, or who were already in IV-F."

Mr. ROBERTSON. I quote from the article:

Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, yesterday lashed out at industry for using pressure tactics to obtain occupational deferments for physically fit single men and warned that the whole system of granting job deferments was being endangered by the actions of some employers. Hershey accused some employers of attempting deferment privileges, of threatening draft boards with action from Washington, of exaggerating the importance of men on their staff and some who had not even been put on the pay roll at the time deferment was requested, of changing job titles to bring them within selective-service lists of essential jobs, and of padding draft-replacement schedules with names of employees already in service, or who were draft exempt for one reason or another, thus slowing up the rate of induction of draft eligibles.

General Hershey would not make public a statement of that character unless he had positive evidence to support his statement.

The time is past when we can pick and choose. We are in the midst of a great war. We are fighting not for Democracy; not for four, or five, or a dozen freedoms. We are fighting for our very existence as a Nation. The total and proper utilization of our manpower in our fighting forces abroad, and at home, and of the men on the farms, in the factories, and in the mines, is essential.

Mr. President, this amendment is designed to do these things, and I trust it will receive the most earnest consideration of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will ask the Senator from Ohio to defer for a moment. The Chair inquires of the Senator from West Virginia whether he adopts as a part of his amendment the suggestions offered by the Senator from Vermont and by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia adopted the following language to be inserted in line 8, on page 1, after the word "who", "has special knowledge, or skill, or." I adopted those words as a part of the amendment, and understood that the Senator from Ohio had accepted the amendment as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment as modified, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 4, of the substitute proposed by Mr. TAFT, Mr. REVERCOMB proposes to strike out *"Provided, however,* That if the registrant is under 30 years of age on October 1, 1943, he shall not be deferred under the authority given by this first sentence of paragraph (1), unless such deferment is approved by the local selective-service board where the registrant is registered, by the selective-service appeal board having jurisdiction over the locality where the registrant is working, and by the Director of Selective Service," and in lieu thereof to insert the following: *"Provided, however,* That if the registrant is under 30 years of age on October 1, 1943, he shall not be deferred under the authority given by the first sentence of this paragraph (1), unless he is an essential and irreplaceable worker who has special knowledge, or skill, or has professional training necessary to the employment in which he is engaged; any such deferment must be approved not only by the local selective-service board where the registrant is registered, but also by the

selective-service appeal board having jurisdiction over the area in which is located the principal place of employment of the registrant. Such decision of the appeal board shall be final unless modified or changed by the Director of Selective Service. The Director of Selective Service shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, training and service under this act; and the determination of the Director shall be final."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I notice that in the reading of the amendment there were omitted certain words which were not intended to be omitted from the language as amended. I call attention to line 8, which should read as follows:

> Who has special knowledge, or skill, or is a skilled artisan—

And so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio agree to the modification or amendment suggested to his amendment by the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. TAFT. I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, as modified.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, so far as I know, the pending question is the only one now remaining in connection with the consideration of the bill. I shall take only a short time to explain the present somewhat complicated situation.

Earlier today the question was asked whether the Wheeler bil. was now eliminated. I wish to say that in my opinion whatever bill is passed will be a Wheeler bill. It may not contain exactly the language the Senator from Montana originally introduced; but only because of his efforts will the Senate pass any bill; only because of his efforts is the Senate now facing the problem and endeavoring to deal with it in some kind of constructive way. Bills attempting to establish some system in the whole method of selective service have been pending in the Committee on Military Affairs for over 2 years. The Kilday bill providing for three or four definite categories was passed last April by the House of Representatives, and since that time has been pending in the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate. If it had not been for the efforts of the Senator from Montana, we should not have before us today any bill dealing with the subject.

It is unfortunate that we should have to write on the floor of the Senate a bill on such an important subject. I share with every other Member of the Senate the regret that it has been necessary to do so. That has been the case because those who are charged with the responsibility of handling the problems which have arisen under the Selective Service Act have not presented a constructive solution of them.

When the Senator from Montana introduced his bill, I went over the various bills which had been proposed, including the Kilday bill, which was passed in the House of Representatives by an overwhelming vote, and I endeavored to prepare a constructive measure dealing with each phase of the situation.

I dealt with the question of industrial deferment, and attempted to provide stricter and more definite rules regarding it. I drafted the provision for a commission to study the whole question of deferment because of physical disability, and to work out standards which could be followed, so as to get back into the service some part of the 3,412,000 men who now are classified in IV–F.

In many respects the bill now before the Senate includes the provisions I suggested.

With regard to the question of industrial deferment, almost my exact language was adopted by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] in his amendment. To make that amendment still more strict, it was then amended by the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. In order to make the amendment still more strict, I have accepted the amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. I do not regard those two amendments as materially different. Both of them require a higher standard. One says "indispensable worker"; the other says "essential and irreplaceable worker"; but, in effect, both would tend to tighten up the standards. Then both provide that the deferment must be approved by the board located where the work is being done, and then they place on the Selective Service Director the responsibility of determining whether the board's judgment is correct. So, in substance, the bill and the amendment are now identical.

The same thing is true with respect to the matter of physical deferment. The only other question which is dealt with directly by the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina is that dealing with Federal workers. I am quite willing to accept it as a part of my amendment, although I think it is really covered by the industrial-deferment section. However, I understand it will be offered as an amendment to my substitute, and I shall be glad to accept it.

So, Mr. President, the difference between the bill and the substitute now depends upon what might be called the category section. That section of my substitute which begins on page 2, line 13, provides that all persons shall be assigned to categories and that each category shall be exhausted before the next category is called for induction.

There are two things in that amendment which I believe to be essential for the proper administration of the Selective Service Act, two things which are not contained in the Bailey amendment, and which, therefore, now constitute the issue between the bill and the substitute. The first is the so-called national pool. The substitute I have offered provides that substantially all single men must be called before any married men are called. It provides that substantially all married men who are not fathers must be called before fathers are called. It goes on to provide then that the younger fathers must be called first in the group from 18 to 25, and after that then from 25 to 30, and finally from 30 to 38. But the most important question is that of the national pool.

To some extent the Selective Service Director has been blamed for not adopting that system. I do not see how he can be blamed because he acted very definitely, and Congress in the beginning prescribed a State quota; in fact, Congress may be said to have prescribed local quotas. My amendment does modify that provision of the law. The amendment refers to that section and says:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, induction into the armed services shall be upon a Nation-wide basis.

Unless we are prepared by legislation to change the present law, the Director of Selective Service has no legal right to put the system on a national basis. In the beginning it was right that each State should provide substantially the same proportion of the Army as it had population, but we have gone beyond that; we have met that requirement. Practically 10,000,000 have been eliminated on that basis. Now we have reached the point where we are going after the others, and there is a great deal of unfairness, because from some States nearly all the single men have departed. The difficulty in the Rocky Mountain States is that all the men there have left, and men have largely left the agricultural districts but, on the other hand, in the industrial districts there are more men than are needed. For instance, the junior Senator from Michigan tells me that in the city of Detroit there is still a large reservoir of single men who have not yet been called. So it may not be necessary to call married men by November and possibly not before the 1st of January.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. The figures I am about to recite reflect significantly, I think, upon that point. In California this year there will be a shortage of manpower, that is, workers. The shortage is not limited to a class, and I am speaking of the whole group of workers. In California there will be a shortage of 92,500 workers, whereas in Texas there will be a net surplus of 182,000. That, I think, is a striking contrast.

Mr. TAFT. Undoubtedly there has been a great migration of men, particularly of single men, who have registered in the towns to which they have gone, and today there is a great difference. There are other reasons for the difference. If a board refuses to grant industrial deferments then the married men in that district are not reached so soon because single men are obtained, but if a board is liberal in granting industrial deferments, then, they very soon reach the married men. So there is a complete inequality, and men in one section of the

country in exactly the same situation as men in another section will be drafted before men in the other section are drafted.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Is not that in reality the key to what we call the hoarding of labor in industrial plants? In other words, does it not depend upon the draft boards themselves as to whether or not a man goes or whether he stays? As the Senator said, some boards are more lenient than others, and those who are lenient on the question of deferment soon pile up the manpower in the industrial plants. Young men appear from everywhere, and if they are single and are deferred the conclusion is reached that there are many men in the plants who ought to be in the Army. In many cases that may be true, but I maintain that the draft boards under the present Selective Service Act have the definite power to make the determination, and if they want to be strict the question of hoarding of manpower, so far as the men are concerned in various communities, will depend upon the attitude of the members of the draft board.

Mr. TAFT. I think that is very true. That is one advantage in the suggested plan for industrial deferment, because it takes away largely from the draft board the final determination and puts it on the Selective Service Director. Also the question of who is drafted depends somewhat on the manner in which the medical restrictions are administered. They are administered very differently in various sections of the country. I have, for instance, here a letter from the chairman of local board No. 1 at Akron, Ohio, in which he says:

> As an example of the situation to which your attention is directed, our local board called for induction of 138 men in April, 48 of whom were used, and 90 were rejected. In our May call only 29 were accepted, out of a total of 74, 45 being rejected. June and July have shown no better results.
>
> All these men were in their late teens and early twenties. Their medical records returned indicated the reasons for rejection, in many cases, were that they were "immatured", but most of them were rejected for the reason of mental deficiency. This percentage is obviously too high, if the armed forces are to be raised to the number indicated by military authorities. It has now reached the state of the ridiculous. Some college graduates, and even men of business responsibility, have been rejected for reason of nervousness or mental inaptitude.
>
> As an example of the extremes to which the system has gone a registrant was rejected on June 10th, as being disqualified for mental reasons, but on June 18th, he was given a commission in the Army Specialist Corps.

Mr. President, that is exactly the condition referred to by the Senator from Missouri as having occurred in the World War. The only point I want to make is that the result is that married men in Akron are reached long before married men in a section where there is not that peculiar dealing with them. So there has been developed a great inequality. It seems to me essential if we are going to treat this question fairly that we should require all those in category No. 1 to be drafted before going on to the next category. I have not said "all" because I want to avoid the difficulty raised by some Senators that somebody might go into court and produce a case of a man in a previous category who had not been drafted, and, therefore, try to escape by getting an injunction against being drafted. So I have not said "all"; I have said "substantially all."

I also realize that the Director of Selective Service must know a month or 2 months ahead of the time approximately how many men he is going to call, and if he knows there are so many left in a certain category he can call that many from that category. So I have not attempted to make it too tight but have said "substantially all."

I have not talked to anyone in recent months who has not agreed that there ought to be a selection on a national basis. The Selective Service Board already has set up categories. They have already said to each board they should not draft married men before they take all the single men. But that does not eliminate the difficulty, because it is confined largely to one board or one State. Without legal authority the Director has attempted now to say to boards, "Well, you do not quite need to fill your quota, if you have to go to married men, until I tell you." But that is a power which I doubt very much he has under existing law, and it is one that is so limited in its effect that it has not actually accomplished the purpose.

The other matter, Mr. President, which is contained in the substitute is the category as to age. As to the categories, I think I first proposed the categories to the Selective Service, and they have taken men, first with collateral dependents, then they have moved on from that to men with wives only, and finally now they are proposing to move on to the last category. They put all the married men in one category, somewhat over 6,000,000 men. They are to be selected at random. They expect to get perhaps a million and a half, by lot numbers, without regard to age. They will then go to men deferred perhaps for industrial purposes, or for physical reasons, and, finally, if they are not deferred for any reason, they are to be drafted.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. In the written instructions by Major General Hershey to the local board members of the Selective Service System occurs the following, as appears at page 455 of the hearings:

> Now that the drafting of fathers has been directed, available men are to be called for induction by local boards in the following order:
>
> (a) Single men without dependents.
> (b) Single men with collateral dependents.
> (c) Married men without children.
> (d) Men with children (nondeferrable activities and occupations).
> (e) Men with children.

So that in practice a division into five categories is already made.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I thank the Senator for calling attention to that.

I wish to state my philosophy on the division at age 30; and age 25 applies in the same regard, but I think the argument I make applies particularly to a break at age 30.

If we drafted all the fathers under 30, we would get probably about 550,000 qualified men, according to the figures which are presented. From those over 30 I think the Selective Service expects to get 800,000 to 900,000 qualified men. It is my hope that if only those fathers are drafted who are under 30, we will never have to draft any fathers over 30. That would mean that about 2,000,000 families would be subjected to uncertainty, and 550,000 broken up, but the other 4,000,000 families would feel fairly confident that unless the war continued a long time, they would not have to make substantial changes in their present occupations.

Mr. President, I think that would be an advantage. It is said that no one is entitled to be relieved of uncertainty. I do not think anyone is, but that is not the question. The question is whether we are to maintain the civilian machine operating. There are very few really unessential activities going on today. Practically everything that is going on is necessary if we are to maintain the civilian machine operating behind the lines.

The question is whether we are to subject the whole economy to uncertainty or whether we are going to say to those over 30, in effect, "Your job is at home. You do your job at home, and you will be doing the best thing you can for the people of the United States."

I think it is fair to say that presumptively a man under 30 should be in the armed forces. There are 14,000,000 men between the ages of 18 and 30. Fourteen million men certainly are many more than we are actually proposing to draft at the present time. Out of those 14,000,000 men I believe we should get the men who are to do the fighting. Their first duty is to fight, when we need anything like that number of men.

On the other hand, the men over 30 I say are more satisfactory in civilian life. They have reached more important positions. It is more difficult to replace them. From their own standpoint they have reached positions in their business or profession which, if they now give up, may never be recovered. They are far along in years, and might never be able to get started again. They are established in the professions and industries in which they are occupied, and they have reached positions of importance in which they are more likely to be keymen than the men under 30.

From every standpoint the Army prefers men under 30. General Marshall so testified. Every one in authority has suggested that a man under 30 is a far better soldier than a man over 30. In general, the Army wants men under 30, except as specialists, as officers, to fill a certain number of positions.

I say that presumptively men under 30 should be in the Army, unless they have some very special disqualification for Army service or some very special qualification for civilian life. Men over

30 presumptively should be in civilian life, unless they have some special qualifications for the Army.

As a matter of fact, I have never received a protest from a father under 30 on the ground that he was a father. I do not think fathers under 30 object to going. They would like to see that their wives receive sufficient financial compensation, yes; but they feel a little bit ashamed if they remain at home. Certainly the only letters I have received protesting against drafting fathers have been from men over 30, men with standing and substantial responsibilities.

Further, the men over 30 have reached a higher and more expensive scale of living. They find it harder to support their families. They have built up expenses, as every man does as he grows older. It seems clear to me that, in a general way, they make much more satisfactory employees than fathers who are under 30.

General Marshall has written a letter which takes exception to fixing the age at 30. He says that if now we draft fathers under 30 we will draft substantially all of them by the first of January, and after that we will get all older men, from 30 to 38, all at once, for replacements, and that he would like to have the older men now because he wants to put them into service units, that a certain number of service units have to be built up.

It seems to me there are obvious fallacies in that argument. In the first place, these service units are of two characters. The men in one class are right up at the front, like the Seabees, referred to by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], in the Navy, men who should be just as young and just as physically qualified as any combat soldier. The others are of the clerical class and such positions as they fill should be filled by the men in IV–F. They should be filled by men capable of limited service.

Certainly there is no reason why we should take fathers from 30 to 38, in substantial positions, with homes and children to maintain when there are plenty of IV–F men able to perform the clerical duties. I do not think the Army should be able to draft fathers from 30 to 38 in order to fill up the service units. They are far more useful at home than in either type of service unit that has been suggested.

Furthermore, General Marshall suggests that the replacements would then all be from older men. Of course they would not all be from older men, because the bulk of all replacements would come from the young men, the new 18-year-old men. One million two hundred thousand come of age every year. Of those, probably 900,000 are physically qualified, and will go into the armed forces. Those are the men who will be substantial replacement men.

The general assumes we are going to have to take the fathers from 30 to 38. If the pending bill works, we should certainly get 500,000 men out of 3,400,000 IV–F's and 1,500,000 industrial deferments. We should certainly get a million men, and prevent the drafting of any fathers, but certainly if we got 500,000 fathers under 30, we should be able to eliminate the fathers over 30 altogether, and get the rest of the replacements who may be needed from the IV–F's and the industrial deferments.

Mr. President, I do not think the objection made is a sound objection. I believe very strongly that we should, when we get the fathers, say that we are in favor of first drafting fathers under 30. We hope that the older men will not have to be drafted. We hope that the younger men may not have to be drafted.

It appears perfectly clear to me that of the 5,000,000 men who have been deferred for either physical or industrial reasons, we should find a sufficient number before we draft fathers, but if a few fathers are drafted and they come from the younger group, I do not think they themselves will greatly object to performing the service which all their friends, and all their contemporaries, are performing already.

We already have 700,000 married men in the Army, nearly all of whom were classed as being under 30 years of age. They are men who volunteered. They are men whose wives can be taken care of by other members of their families, or the men were able to make some other arrangements for their wives. The younger wives are more able to work, more able to go back to their own families.

So, Mr. President, I ask that the substitute, which is a carefully worked out amendment of paragraph 1 of section 5 (e), be adopted. It contains everything the Senate has already approved. It also contains two sections, one creating a national pool and providing that we shall take one group of men in the Nation before we pass on to another; the other dividing the fathers into the groups of younger fathers and older fathers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator accept my amendment?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I accept the Senator's amendment, which was adopted to the bill, as part of my substitute amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As the Senator from Ohio knows, I am very deeply in sympathy with the essential provisions of his substitute, namely the establishment of a national pool of I–A men and men who ought to be in I–A, and secondly, the priority by age groups in the calling of fathers.

However, the Senate today adopted an amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] on his behalf and on mine, which was amended in two particulars by the Senate. One very important amendment to that amendment which was adopted is that offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. I do not like, by voting for the substitute of the Senator from Ohio, to be placed in the position of voting to strike out that very beneficial amendment which was placed by the Senate itself in the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina. I ask the Senator if he is not willing to incorporate in his substitute the amendment adopted earlier today, as amended, to make it possible to narrow the issue simply to the two questions which the Senator has discussed.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator offered first the amendment dealing with the Federal workers, which was adopted yesterday with the first section of the Bailey-Clark amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No section was adopted until today.

Mr. TAFT. No; but it was part of the Bailey-Clark amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes. I will offer that as an amendment to the substitute of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator describe it so the clerk may have it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is the portion of the printed Bailey-Clark amendment beginning on line 1, page 1, and extending through line 14 of page 2.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I accept as an amendment to my substitute paragraph (m) of the Bailey-Clark amendment. That is the one dealing with Federal employees, concerning which I made no special provision in my substitute amendment. I therefore accept that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio may modify his amendment in that respect.

Mr. TAFT. As to the other amendment, I do not see how I can accept it, because I accepted an amendment by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] dealing with the same subject, and I think it is to the same effect. The Senator from West Virginia has been very earnest in trying to limit industrial deferment, and the amendment which was adopted by the Senate, perhaps while the Senator from Missouri was out of the Chamber, which I accepted, provides that there shall be no deferment unless a man is "an essential and irreplaceable worker who has special knowledge or skill, or has professional training necessary to the employment in which he is engaged."

That seems to me to be substantially the same as the word "indispensable" used by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. The latter parts of the two amendments about the board and approval by the Selective Service Director are exactly the same. So I am afraid I cannot accept the Senator's amendment. It would be contradictory to what is already contained in the language of my substitute. I hope the Senator will read the Revercomb amendment; I think he will find that whichever is adopted, the bill or the substitute, the provisions are substantially the same.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not want to offer an amendment to the Senator's substitute unless he is willing to have me do so. I was anxious to perfect the substitute so I could vote for it. But I do not want to do anything which would force a fight on the Senator's substitute.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am hoping we can dispose of the bill today in order that the Senate may possibly

adjourn tomorrow, following the addresses by our colleagues who have been away, until Monday. I do not wish to delay a vote on the substitute, but inasmuch as I have not discussed the bill either originally or as amended, I should like to make a few observations with reference to the Taft substitute as it now appears in contrast to the bill as we have amended it, and in order that I may not be diverted from the few things I have to say I ask that I may be permitted to proceed for a while, not very long, without interruption. I hope not to take long at all.

Mr. President, there have been so many things said in the debate about the whole military situation and about the method of raising an army under the law which Congress enacted, that there has inevitably and probably unintentionally crept in a good deal of confusion and misunderstanding. I would hope, if I might, to clarify just a little some of the things which have been discussed and which are now presented to us.

I think that we have written, in the amendments offered by the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Missouri, as modified, and as they now appear in the bill, a very good measure. I hope that the substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] will not be agreed to.

It seems to me the facts are rather simple in regard to the needs of our Army. A good deal has been said in criticism or in apparent criticism of our Military Establishment, because the Army started out to raise an army of 8,200,000 men, and then reduced the number to 7,700,000, and the inference has been drawn from this that they were not wise in their original conclusion, otherwise they would not have changed it.

I do not care to discuss the differences between 7,500,000 without officers and 7,700,000 with officers. It seems to me that it is not worth while to spend any time on that, although I think it is entirely consistent, and there is no divergence among military officers as to that. General Marshall testified, and I do not think anybody can deny it, that when they contemplated an army of 8,200,000 men they had to take into consideration the Caribbean situation, the Central American situation, and the South American situation; they had to consider that we did not at that time have possession of Dakar and Morocco, and that there was a possibility that with those points in the possession of our enemies it might be necessary for us to deploy men into the Caribbean in protection of the Panama Canal and even in protection of the coast of South America.

Furthermore, at the time they were projecting that sort of an army Japan was in possession of two or three of the Aleutian Islands, and obviously had it in mind to come east from Attu and Kiska and other points which they had been able to take, which might involve our Pacific coast.

So, when those two situations were cleared up, there was no longer any danger in the Caribbean or on the east coast of South America, because of our possession of Morocco and Dakar and the adventure in north Africa, and there was no longer any danger on the Pacific coast from the Aleutian Islands. The War Department of our country did precisely what the Canadian Government did. When there was no longer any danger on the Canadian Pacific, they reduced their force by some 20,000 men who constituted more or less a home guard.

So, Mr. President, instead of being subject to criticism or to having any unfair inferences drawn because of that reduction, I think the Army and the War Department ought to be commended for taking advantage of the improved situation with regard to west Africa, the east coast of South America, and the Pacific coast, to reduce our Army and its requirements by approximately 500,000 men.

Therefore, I arrive at the figure—7,700,000 men. The testimony shows there are approximately 100,000 young men becoming 18 years of age each month, which means 1,200,000 young men each year. About 20,000 of the 100,000 are enlisted in the Navy—most of them go into the Navy—which reduces to 80,000 the net number of available youths arriving each month at 18 years of age. The testimony shows that when those who are rejected for physical reasons are deducted, there remain approximately 45,000 who are accepted by the military service; so that instead of 100,000 young men 18 years of age being available each month, or 1,200,000 each year, we have in the neighborhood of 500,000 out of the 1,200,000, when we deduct the one-fifth who go into the Navy or who otherwise enter the armed services, and when we also deduct those who are rejected for physical reasons.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the Senator; but if I may do so, I should like to point out that we cannot deduct the ones who go into the Navy, because they go into the Navy and help make up the armed services.

Mr. BARKLEY. They are already calculated, now, as a part of the 7,500,000 and of the 7,700,000; so they must be included in order to arrive at the net figure.

Mr. TAFT. No, Mr. President; I think the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not agree with the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. The Navy has a certain number of men who enlisted when they were 17 years of age, before they reached the age of 18. Of course, we can count on the same proportion of young men enlisting next year when they reach the age of 17.

Mr. BARKLEY. All those are counted in the number of men available this year.

Mr. TAFT. Certainly the Senator is confusing the two groups.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I am not

Mr. TAFT. They are not related to the group of 7,700,000 men.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator is correct as to the situation which will exist when we finally arrive at the proper number of men to be retained in the Army; but while we are in process of reaching that point the Senator is not correct.

Mr. President, the testimony shows that, with the Army as it now is, with our battle situation as it was at the time when the testimony was given, the number of men required for replacements is 75,000 per month. That means that every year, even if we were not to fight any battle beyond the conflicts in which we already have engaged, there would be required 900,000 men for replacements alone. That number is only for the Army. It does not include the Navy.

So I think it has been demonstrated—at least it has been demonstrated to my satisfaction; I do not see how any fair-minded man can come to any other conclusion—that all the men who are needed to bring the Army up to the requirements set by the War Department and by our military officers cannot be obtained by taking only the young men arriving at the age of 18; they cannot be obtained by a recombing of the 3,000,000 men in class IV–F, because the representatives of the Selective Service testified before the committee that they already are recombing them every day, that every day they are going over those men again. They considered the matter of the number of men they could obtain from that group of 3,000,000 men before they reached the conclusion that in order to obtain a total of 7,700,000 men this year, and to obtain the number of men they will require next year, they could not confine the call to the young men becoming 18 years of age, and they could not confine it to the 3,000,000 men who are in class IV–F, unless they were to reduce the standards to a degree which the War Department regarded as unsafe.

Therefore, Mr. President, they reached the conclusion that it is necessary to draft 446,000 married men with children, in order that the Army may be raised to the size which has been projected I think the Senate has practically determined by its course up to now that it will not write into the law any prohibition against the induction of married men with children. I think that has been the overwhelming feeling of the Senate, and it has been confirmed by the action of the Senate on the amendments which have been agreed to so far.

So now we come down to the matter of the necessity of raising an Army of 7,700,000 men this year, and also providing for 600,000 men for the Navy. We have increased the size of our Navy until it is not only the largest Navy in the history of the United States, but the largest navy ever possessed by any nation in the history of the world. Obviously it is folly to put ships on the ocean unless they are properly manned. Therefore we must increase naval personnel until we have sufficient men to man the ships. That number of men—to be taken out of the draft or the pool, whatever it may be; because now they are taken from the draft pool—amounts to approximately 500,000 or 600,000.

So it is utterly impossible to obtain the required number of men from the 3,000,000 men in class IV–F, from the

group of boys becoming 18 years of age, or from any other source except from the group of those whose drafting is provided for in the plans of the War Department and the Selective Service.

We must remember that the pool of unmarried men is almost drained. There will not be any more of them in 1943 or by 1944 or 1945. When we shall have exhausted the pool of unmarried men, we shall have exhausted it permanently, so far as the war is concerned, because the young men 18 years of age will already have been taken, and they do not constitute a pool similar to that from which the War Department and the Selective Service have been able to draw from the beginning of the war up to now. So, Mr. President, when we have exhausted that pool we shall be limited to the drafting of married men with or without children, or the drafting of married men with children, under the legislation now under consideration, and we shall be limited to the drafting of boys becoming 18 years of age. If even they are not sufficient, we should have to depend either upon a reshuffling of the 3,000,000 IV-F's or the induction of a greater number of married men with children. To me, that situation seems a very simple one.

The Senator from Ohio has accepted, or has indicated his willingness to accept, nearly every proposition which has been suggested here and which, under the Bailey-Clark amendment, already has been included in the bill, except the one suggested by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] with reference to industry.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. I might put it the other way. The Senator from North Carolina has accepted nearly everything I have suggested.

Mr. BARKLEY. So we get down to two propositions. I do not care to discuss the Revercomb amendment because I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] earlier in the day, which was accepted and agreed to, takes care of the industrial situation even better than does the so-called Revercomb amendment.

Mr. President, we have heard complaints about hiding behind war plants and behind Government desks, and even some reference to hiding behind skirts. I do not know just how applicable that is, either in Government offices or in war plants, but we have now provided in the proposed legislation against any such haven of safety or security, both in Government departments and in industry, under the amendment which has already been agreed to by the Senate. So now we are down to two propositions: One is a national pool and the other is age categories among married men with children.

When Congress enacted the legislation in the first place, it provided for the calling of all men between the ages of 21 and 35. Then we amended it so as to provide a pool of men between 18 and 45. Then, by executive administration, the War Department, under the direction of the President, eliminated those above 38. So the pool is now made up of those between 18 and 38.

Congress itself made a wider pool than that, by providing for the induction of men between the ages of 18 and 45, but the experience of the War Department convinced the Department, as General Marshall said in his testimony, that when men above the age of 38 are drafted, even though at the time of their examination and induction they are able to pass the physical examination and meet the requirements of the War Department, so many men above 38 require hospitalization, and so many must finally be discharged, that the Department found that it was in the interest of economy and administration to eliminate by Executive order all those above 38. That was done.

So we have been raising our Army by induction of men between the ages of 18 and 38. We provided for this pool; and in the administration of the law the War Department has pursued a consistent policy of trying to obtain a cross section of the ages between 18 and 38.

We might go into the question of the wisdom of mixing men of various ages in the Army, so far as training is concerned. Those of us who were reared on the farm know that it has always been regarded as better policy, when breaking in a young horse to become part of a team, to hitch him up with an old, experienced horse, rather than to hitch two young horses together. That is the experience of every farmer who ever broke a young colt to harness. It is much more efficient and easy to train a young horse alongside an old, seasoned, gentle horse, rather than to put two young horses together and try to train the two in harness together, and it can be done in half the time. That is a crude barnyard illustration, but it applies to the Army.

The Chief of Staff, General Marshall, as well as General McNarney, General White, General Hershey, and all the rest of the witnesses who testified on the subject, said that in the training of men it is wise to break up some units which are well trained. It is in the interest of efficiency and economy to take some of the newer men and infiltrate them into units of older men, so that they all may reach a common level of efficient training for the entire unit in a briefer time—whether the unit be a division, a corps, a company, a platoon, a brigade, or whatever it may be. So in the administration of the law, as between the ages of 18 and 38, giving a 20-year spread in the pool, the Army has undertaken to mix the various ages.

When we enacted this law we fixed it on a State quota basis. We may have made a mistake. If we had started on a different basis we might have raised as good an army, as strong an army, and as well trained an army. In the beginning the Selective Service Act was not a so-called administration measure. The Congress initiated the legislation and enacted it upon its own responsibility. It was the expression of the will of Congress.

We provided for State quotas. In the break-down of its administration, in order to make the Army as democratic as possible, the War Department, acting through State administrations, without regard to politics, set up county boards to pass upon local registrants as to their fitness preliminarily, and as to the question whether they should be inducted.

The substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio provides that before any of these later categories can be taken in any State or any county, substantially all of the first category shall be exhausted. What is "substantially all"? If we are to have 1,000,000 men drawn into the service between now and January, and if we are to have a million and a half men drawn in next year, when we shall really get into the heart of the fighting and battle casualties increase day by day, who is to say, out of one and a half million or one million who might be required, how large a number constitutes "substantially all" of any one category, before we can reach over and take a single man in another category? I do not know that it would happen, but it is entirely possible that all of a prior category might be exhausted in 40 States, and still there might be 8 States in which they had not been exhausted, and we could not draw a single man from those 40 States until we had exhausted substantially all those of the other 8. Is that the way to raise an efficient army?

The Senator from Ohio has made light of the letter of General Marshall. Mr. President, I do not need to defend General Marshall. I think General Marshall is not only one of the outstanding military scientists of our country and of the world, but I believe that General Marshall is even more than a military strategist, more than a great soldier, more than a great military organizer. At heart he is really a great humanitarian. He is a great statesman, in addition to his qualities as a military leader. He is not only a father, but he is a grandfather; and he is not bereft of all the sentiments and emotions which play around the heartstrings of men who are both fathers and grandfathers.

It is regrettable that we must draft anyone to fight this war. It is regrettable that we had to go to war. It is regrettable that it was possible for one man, at this juncture of human history, to bring about all the woe that has been precipitated by one man, aided by two or three others who had a desire to conquer and control the world; but, as Grover Cleveland once said, it is a condition and not a theory which we face.

General Marshall has stated in his letter, which has been ridiculed by the Senator from Ohio, his objections to the Taft substitute. General Marshall did not rush up here in order to write a letter. He was asked by the Committee on Military Affairs his opinion of the Taft substitute. There have been no hearings on the Taft substitute. When General Marshall, General Hershey, General McNarney, General White, Admiral Jacobs, and Admiral King came before the Committee on Military Affairs to testify at the invitation of the committee, the Taft proposal was not before the committee. It had not even been sug-

gested, and no one asked anything about it. The witnesses did not testify about it, because it was not involved. Yet the committee felt it incumbent upon it to ask for the opinion of General Marshall with regard to the Taft substitute. In obedience to that request he has written a letter. The Senator from Ohio seeks to nullify its effect by saying that it is unsound.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I have been informed that at a meeting held by four or five Senators in connection with the adoption of the pending bill, its amendments, and so forth, which was attended by a colonel from the War Department, this question was discussed, and the colonel was asked whether there was not some argument against the 30 years of age proposition, to which he replied, "Well, if you go over into next year you might get too many of those older men." He was asked if he could not obtain a letter from General Marshall to that effect, and he said he would try. Thereupon the letter was written and sent to the Military Affairs Committee. But it was sent actually as a result of the meeting to which I have referred, consisting of what might be said to be the administration supporters who were trying to find some argument against the Taft substitute.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator has been misinformed. There has been some discussion among groups of Senators without regard to politics on this whole situation. I have attended several such meetings and they have been nonpartisan. There was a meeting held by a group seeking to ascertain the effect of the Bailey amendment upon the draft situation. To the meeting Republicans were invited; some could not attend because they were absent from the city, but there was one Republican in attendance. We sought the advice of Selective Service with reference to the bill. We asked questions of Colonel Keesling, who has been very efficient and helpful in undertaking to analyze the various propositions to those of us whose minds are not trained from a military standpoint, and who have therefore had some difficulty in understanding all the questions involved. We also asked the War Department to give us its interpretations.

In the discussion and the analysis of the Bailey-Clark amendment as it was originally drawn, naturally the Taft substitute came up, and there was no understanding, agreement, or instruction by anybody, so far as I know, that General Marshall would be asked to write a letter. There was a suggestion—and I think a proper one—that the Committee on Military Affairs would ask the Secretary of War, through any agency he might designate, to give us a statement with respect to the substitute which the Senator had advised us he intended to offer, so that we might understand its effect. This letter may be said to be a result of that suggestion.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator. It seems to me the word "yes" might have answered the question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, Mr. President, knowing the Senator from Ohio has always boasted that he is not a "yes" man, I hesitated to use that term. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. President, let us see about the categories. The pending substitute provides that all men who are between the ages of 18 and 25 shall be drawn before any men between 25 and 30 shall be drawn. I do not know whether all Senators have read General Marshall's letter, and I do not want to take the time to read it, but there is one paragraph in it which I think it might be well for us to keep in mind. General Marshall goes on to state that it will be necessary in the immediate future to fill many units of service men from the draft, and that if those units are not filled they will have to be disbanded or disorganized. In other words, it is the Army's desire and plan to fill those units. I do not know how many divisions will be required to be filled in that way. In his letter General Marshall says that under the Senator's substitute, if they have to fill those service units they will have to draw men between 18 to 25 years of age first, and then draw men between 25 and 30 years of age, and next year when the going is hard and our armies are fighting every inch of the way, and men are being injured or being killed on the battlefields, when replacements of new men will be required, the Army would be limited then to men between the ages of 30 to 38.

Obviously, it does not require a military genius to know that when we must fill the places of men who have been upon the front actually fighting we need the younger men more than we need the older men. It seems to me there is nothing unsound about that suggestion.

Let me point out a situation with which, if this substitute is adopted, we shall be confronted. Under the Taft substitute a man 24 years of age with four children would be called before a man 26 years of age with one child. There would be no escape from that. I do not know how many of such men there would be, but if we are going to take into consideration the family relationship of all the men between the ages of 18 and 38 so that we may have some background for any preference either in deferment or induction, certainly we do not want to create such a situation that automatically and mandatorily we must first take a man 24 years of age with four children before we can take a man 26 years of age with one child.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, a man 24 years of age with four children today would almost certainly fall in the class of extreme hardship and privation, and in category VI. In my substitute I have provided for such cases. So when there is any extreme inequality of that sort it would be taken care of by classification of the man in the hardship group. That is the present law, and that is exactly the provision which I have inserted in my amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, let us take the other category between the ages of 25 and 30 and beyond the age of 30. A man 29 years of age with two children would be called before a man 31 years of age with one child. It may not be possible that either one of them would come under the hardship provision. If they could not excuse themselves, or if before the local boards or the Selective Service agencies, whether local, State, or on appeal to General Hershey or the President, neither one of them could establish a hardship situation, then they would fall back automatically into the category, and a man 29 years of age with two or three children would be inducted before a man 31 years of age with only one child. There is no escape from that conclusion.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest that today a man 37 years of age with four children is drafted, whereas a man 38 years of age without any child or children is not drafted at all. So while we have borderline cases, we also necessarily have cases that are not on the border line.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that, but the Senator realizes that when we get up among those of the age of 37 it is improbable that a man 37 years of age with four children will ever be reached in any draft pool from which the Selective Service has the right to draft men.

Mr. TAFT. I do not understand why not. The present situation is that such a man can be drafted according to his number before a father of 21 with one child.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; not under the situation that has been written into the legislation up to this time.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Is it not true that, regardless of the motives or the purpose involved, each time the category is increased and made more rigid, a greater number of border-line cases are created, and there is an inescapable increase of the number of hardship cases?

Mr. BARKLEY. Undoubtedly that is true. The greater the number of categories set up, the greater will be the increase in border lines. So, instead of having a border line now between men 38 and 39 years of age, we will have a border line between those of 24 and 25 years of age, another border line involving those between 29 and 30 years of age, and still another border line involving those between 37 and 38 years of age.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the wider the pool, the larger the pool, the greater latitude the board has in hardship cases. Is not that true?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course. In other words, it can deal with hardship cases

over a broader field, and spread them out more, whereas under these three categories they have to deal with the hardship cases in each category.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator indicates, the hardship may be a relative thing, and since it may be a relative thing, the broader the pool the greater the latitude the board has.

Mr. BARKLEY. Undoubtedly that is true.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I desire to go back to what the Senator was discussing a moment ago when he was reading General Marshall's letter.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not read it yet.

Mr. WHEELER. I refer to the paragraph the Senator read. As I understood General Marshall's testimony, it was a general statement that he intended to take the new men to fill up divisions and fill up vacancies in the overseas service. That seemed to me to be one of the most inhumane things that could possibly happen, because if they do what they intend to do, they will take fathers who have not had any training, and send them overseas to fill up divisions, while they leave in the United States any number of the 5,000,000 men in the armed services who have had from 1 year to 3 years' training. That is the only conclusion to which one can come from reading General Marshall's testimony, and I gather that was what the Senator said a moment ago. I hope I am mistaken about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I shall read the letter, because it will not take long. While it was published in the RECORD a few days ago, probably not all of us have read it. The letter is addressed to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and reads:

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: The Secretary of War has referred to me your request for my views on the proposed amendment of Senator TAFT to the pending bill (S. 763) providing for the deferment of certain married men with children, depending upon age. I am advised by Selective Service that the effect of Senator TAFT'S amendment would be that the armed forces would receive only men attaining the age of 18 and over the age of 30 after about February 1, 1944.

From a military standpoint the induction of men within age groups in a predetermined order, namely, those under 25, next those between 25 and 30, and then from 30 to 38 is unsound. Men being taken at this time and in the future for military service are for use from 4 to 16 months hence, depending upon the type of training required. While the Army is now approaching its ultimate strength a number of units must be filled during the remainder of this year. Most of these are service elements in which the older men can best be used. Next year the bulk of men will, in all probability, be required for replacements to combat troops—

In other words, to replace men who have either been wounded or killed on the battlefield.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me finish the sentence.

Next year the bulk of men will, in all probability, be required for replacements to combat troops, and they should represent the younger and most vigorous types.

Now I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The only thing I desired to point out was that in the event the Taft amendment should be agreed to, the men between 30 and 38 years of age coming in next year would be the men who would be placed in the replacement outfits, and after 3 or 4 or 5 months training they are the ones who would be sent overseas, as I understand. I may be wrong.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the men who are to be called will be required to undergo some 4 to 16 months' training, depending on the type of service they are to render.

Mr. LUCAS. But if I understood correctly, I may be wrong about it, but it is very important, and if I am wrong I desire to be corrected by the Senator from Alabama—if we adopt the Taft amendment, the men who are coming in from 18 to 25 years of age would go into training units, along with older men, and they would be trained and get ready to train the other men who are coming in. When men above 30 years of age come in, say 6 months or 9 months from now, they are to receive very little training in the replacement centers. They will be filtered in with older men, and in 3 or 4 or 5 months they will go out of the replacement centers with some units ready to go overseas.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is possible; it might happen. In other words, if, in order to fill the units which must be filled at once, what we call the service divisions, the Army are required to take the younger men, then when they reach the point where they must draft men for replacements on the battle front, they will be limited to men beyond 30 years of age, and depending on the urgency of their need on the battle front, the training of those men will have to be given accordingly.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not desire to get into a long discussion.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wanted to call attention to the fact that there have already been inducted into the Army 5,300,000 men under 30, so it certainly is going to be perfectly easy to fill up units with men under 30. As a matter of fact, the figures I have are rather interesting. There have been inducted into the Army 5,300,000 men under 30 years of age as compared with 1,500,000 over 30. In other words, the proportion is about 3½ to 1.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is talking now about unmarried men.

Mr. TAFT. Some are married, but of those who have been inducted into the Army, the proportion is 3½ to 1 of those under 30 compared to those over 30. If we do not classify fathers, we are going to get 500,000 fathers under 30 and 800,000 over 30. We are going to get them at the rate of 1½ to 1 the other way. In other words, unless we classify fathers, we will get a heavier proportion of men over 30 than we have ever gotten before.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is assuming that all the married men between 18 and 30 would be required.

Mr. TAFT. General Marshall is assuming that all the married men over 30 will be required. That is the whole basis of his argument.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not assumed all married men will be required. Not even all men who are not married are being required. There are various categories of exemption, deferment, and other matters which determine the proportion of the entire unmarried population between 18 and 30 who will go into the Army or Navy.

Mr. TAFT. The idea of the service is that they will get about 800,000 over 30, and General Marshall's whole letter is based on the assumption that of those 800,000 who are going to have to be drafted he is going to get them all at once, and he cannot mix them. I say he can handle them, because he has 5,300,000 already inducted whom he can mix in, and 1,200,000 are coming of age every year whom he can mix in. The whole basis of the argument is unsound.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is unfortunate that the Senator from Ohio is not Chief of Staff instead of General Marshall, but that is not the way it is, and so far as I am concerned, I am not willing to discard General Marshall's expert military opinion in that regard.

Let me finish General Marshall's letter:

If Selective Service is required to furnish the Army only those men under 30 years of age during the remainder of this year, and those over 30 next year, it would appear that the younger men must, of necessity, be placed in service units in order that those units will be ready when required. The older men will then be received in large concentrations and must, therefore, be trained as battle replacements.

Such an arrangement appears unsound and not in the best military interest, since the only pool from which battle-casualty replacements could be secured, if Senator TAFT'S proposed amendment is enacted into law, would be from the category of men older than 30 years, and those later becoming 18.

Also, it would appear unfair to the older men and to the service to so time their induction as to force the majority into combat units as loss replacements.

The Army must meet its personnel requirements on schedule, and this cannot be done if the Army is required to reshuffle and retrain personnel because it has not received a fair and average cross section of age and physical condition.

The training of the men has been planned upon a basis of receiving such a cross section. My sole concern is the procurement of men with proper qualifications in the required numbers and at the necessary times

Legislation which would compel the induction of men by age groups or upon other artificial standards would threaten the orderly flow of the Nation's military manpower in the armed forces and, I believe, would hinder its efficient utilization.

The letter of General Marshall speaks for itself, and it is not necessary for me to comment upon it any further.

Mr. President, I wish only to say in conclusion that excerpts from General Marshall's testimony have been read here with a view of undertaking to convince the Senate that General Marshall himself was opposed to the drafting of married men with children, and that he had indicated that he did not desire to do so. Let me state merely what General Marshall's attitude has been and is now, and this is true of the entire War Department.

Of course General Marshall would prefer not to have married men with children. So would we all There is not a Member of the Senate of the United States, there is not a person in the United States who looks upon this subject with a proper perspective who would not rather draw unmarried men into the military service in preference even to married men without children but with family obligations; and certainly we would prefer to take unmarried men and married men without children in preference to married men with children. But General Marshall's position was and is that he needs 7,700,000 men. He testified that it would be unwise from a military standpoint to reduce the physical standards now set by the War Department for induction into the Army.

Admiral King made the same statement with reference to the Navy. General Marshall also said that if it were stated by the Manpower Commission and by the Selective Service in the hearings before the Military Affairs Committee that the required number of men could not be obtained without taking 446,000 married men with children, then he was in favor of their being taken, because otherwise the Army would be compelled to reshuffle their entire plans and reorganize and reduce the number of men as well as the number of divisions they were required under their plan to organize for the Army of the United States.

So, General Marshall, of course, said the question of where those men should be taken was not for him to say; that it was for the Manpower Commission and for the Selective Service to say whether the required number could be obtained from unmarried men or married men without children. But assuming that they could not obtain them from that class, then they must be obtained otherwise.

General Hershey said they could not be obtained otherwise. The Chairman of the Manpower Commission, Mr. McNutt, said the same thing. He also said that every day they are recombing and reshuffling these men to see how many men they can obtain, but that they cannot obtain the required number without the 446,000 men referred to.

So, Mr. President, without taking the further time of the Senate I hope the substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio will be defeated, and that the bill as amended up to this juncture by the Senate will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in the nature of a substitute for the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my substitute amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. Not knowing how he would vote if present, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who, I am informed, would vote "nay," and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WAGNER. The junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is absent on official business. If present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Conditions on the West Coast.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who is absent because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who would vote "nay," is paired on this question with the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], who would vote "yea." The Senator from Ohio is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], who would vote "yea," has been called from the city on public business. His pair has been announced.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent on official appointments.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—31

Aiken	Butler	Ferguson
Ball	Capper	Hawkes
Bridges	Chavez	Holman
Brooks	Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.
Buck	Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.
Bushfield	Danaher	Langer
Maloney	Revercomb	Wheeler
Millikin	Robertson	Wiley
Moore	Shipstead	Willis
Nye	Taft	
Reed	Vandenberg	

NAYS—45

Andrews	Gurney	Overton
Austin	Hatch	Pepper
Bailey	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barbour	Hill	Reynolds
Barkley	Kilgore	Russell
Caraway	Lodge	Stewart
Chandler	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Connally	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McFarland	Tunnell
George	McKellar	Tydings
Gerry	Maybank	Van Nuys
Gillette	Murdock	Wagner
Green	O'Daniel	Wallgren
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Walsh

NOT VOTING—20

Bankhead	Downey	Smith
Bilbo	Glass	Tobey
Bone	La Follette	Truman
Brewster	McNary	Wherry
Burton	Mead	White
Byrd	Murray	Wilson
Davis	Scrugham	

So Mr. TAFT's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. It would come at the end of the bill, and reads as follows:

That fathers be deferred until such time as the Selective Service has determined and inducted into the armed services the number of men now deferred in Government and industry that will be available for call under the provisions of this act, and the number of men in the IV-F classification who can be inducted into the armed services by a review of the physical standards as may be recommended by the Commission established by the President for the purpose of examining the physical qualifications requirements for admission into the armed services of the United States as provided by this act.

I have offered the amendment because of the fact that every Member of the Senate who has spoken on this subject on the floor of the Senate has said he wanted to do everything he possibly could do to have fathers deferred. I do not think any Member of the Senate who has spoken during the debate on the subject has disagreed with me in the slightest with respect to what would be the effect if fathers were drafted. Every Member of the Senate who has spoken on the pending bill has stated he wanted to see all other available men drafted before fathers were drafted.

The changes which have been made in the original bill by the Bailey-Clark amendment were for the purpose of providing that single men between the ages of 18 and 38, or childless married men of those ages who are in the Government service, and who had been deferred, should be taken out of the deferred class, and should be inducted into the Army, unless it should be shown that they were not only essential, but, as a matter of fact, were indispensable. What will be the number of physically qualified men in that classification, I doubt if any Member of the Senate can say.

Various committees which have investigated the subject have estimated the number of men who have been deferred and who are on the Government pay roll as running into the hundreds of thousands. No Member of the Senate has

risen on the floor to contradict the statement I have made with reference to the hoarding of labor in war industries, particularly in the shipbuilding industry. As a matter of fact, no one could deny what I have said in that respect, because the actual situation has been brought out by the Truman committee. It was brought out not only by that committee, but by committees of the House of Representatives and by the Baruch committee which called attention to the fact that under the system of cost-plus contracts which has been in vogue, single men were being hoarded in industries. On the floor of the Senate I have produced the evidence, not of merely one man, but of hundreds of men who have written letters giving concrete examples of the hoarding which has occurred.

Furthermore, I have produced before the Senate concrete examples of testimony by the members of selective-service boards in many of the States in the South, the East, and the West, that in the particular communities represented by those boards single men were deferred, and that the members of the boards were no longer willing to serve if single men were deferred and fathers were to be taken.

In an amendment offered to the Bailey-Clark of Missouri amendment there was a provision which I think an excellent one. It authorizes and directs the President of the United States to set up a commission of doctors which would review the standards fixed by the Army and the Navy, to determine whether those standards were proper and whether the Army and the Navy could not take men below the standards which had already been provided.

I have pointed out to the Senate that the standards required for the British Army and British Navy are not so high as those required for the United States Army and Navy, which demonstrates that if the United States Army and Navy standards were made the same as those for the British Army and Navy—and Britain has boasted of having the greatest Navy in the world—fathers in the United States would not have to be drafted.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator have any information as to what has become of the inventory which the Selective Service ordered, which was started about the 1st of September and was supposed to be completed by the 30th of September? It seems to me that that would give the complete over-all manpower picture in this country. If anything has ever been done about it, I have never heard of it.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator for the inquiry, but I do not know.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me, I have several letters from Col. John J. Griffin, chairman of the Associated Draft Boards of St. Louis and St. Louis County, Mo., in which he says:

> The first of this month we started an inventory of the first two registrations. That inventory is to give a complete history and also in that inventory will be listed the number of children that each married man with children has according to our records.
>
> That record will not be complete until September 30, if then.

This letter is dated September 18, 1943.

> Instructions are to send the original direct to Hershey at Washington and a copy to State headquarters.
>
> In the inventory we are taking, the boards are finding an opportunity for quite a few pick-ups of men who have probably been missed or have been classified incorrectly or whose status has changed or any one of many things that can occur. This all over the country with a check up of that type should be able to pick up quite a few men.

He suggests that——

> It might be well to ask General Hershey to present to you folks in Congress the results of the inventory that has been taken by him in every draft board of the country, broken down in the same manner in which he has asked it broken down by the boards. That, of course, would give you the complete manpower picture.

It seems to me that everything that is in the bill as it now stands, if it tends to do anything, tends to increase the available number of single men. It seems to me that we ought to have that information. At least the information ought to be available, and be acted upon in accordance with the terms of the bill before we start drafting fathers.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. President, if we are sincere and honest in our conviction that we want to do something, and that the bill before us is intended to do something to drive out of industry single men who are in industry and who are not needed, and if we are sincere in our statements that the bill is going to be of some help, then I say that we ought to defer the fathers, whom it is not necessary to take this month, until such time as the board which is to be appointed by the President of the United States has an opportunity to go over the standards required by the Army and Navy and compare them with the standards required by the British or the Russians, or the British alone, both in their Army and Navy. Then we ought to have an opportunity to see how many single men are not absolutely indispensable to industry before we start taking the fathers of the country.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Did the Senator ever hear of the Russians, or any other people, applying the literacy test which we apply in our Army? It never occurred to me that men had to have a Phi Beta Kappa key or a Ph. D. from Harvard in order to be able to pull a trigger or stick someone with a bayonet. One of the greatest military geniuses ever produced in this country or anywhere else was Nathan B. Forrest. He did not learn to read and write until after he was grown. He was a pretty good soldier.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course. The same thing is true in the Chinese Army. A few years ago when I was in China I was told that 90 percent of the population of China was illiterate.

Mr. President, I do not intend to take up much of the time of the Senate in discussing this matter. I do not want word to go out to the country that we have enacted legislation which is going to take care of the situation and help the fathers. Mind you, Mr. President, if we do not do something about it, 446,000 fathers will be taken by the 1st of January. All we have to do in the next 20 or 30 days is to make a review of the men who are being hoarded in industry. As Mrs. Meyer pointed out in her article in the Sunday Post, the evidence is overwhelming in the shipbuilding industry and in various other industries, with respect to slow-downs and other actions of those who are not working.

Are we to insist upon taking fathers before we do anything to find out how many it is absolutely necessary to take, and before we make any checkup? Yesterday the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], in a very impassioned speech, said that we will take 10,000,000 men, or 20,000,000 men, if necessary, and that we will take all the fathers, and everyone else. Of course, if it is necessary for the preservation of this country, no Senator would say that fathers should not be taken. But when we are giving lip service to the necessity of protecting American homes we must face the fact that because of the errors which have been made in the past, and because of the hoarding of labor in industry and in the departments, fathers will be drafted unless Congress acts to prevent it being done. We are saying to the people, "We do not want to call fathers; we do not want to break up the homes," but we are doing so because of the fact that some general said that the Army does not want men in the IV–F classification. It does not want men with punctured ear drums. It does not want men with flat feet to take the places of combat soldiers. It can utilize women to take the places of combat soldiers, but it cannot take men with punctured ear drums.

Let Senators go back to their constituents and tell them that. Their constituents will reply, "We have seen strong young men come back home after they have been rejected by the Army, after they have passed the physical examinations. We know them by the hundreds in this community. They are here working, and are out of the draft. They are physically fit and strong. They could take the places of combat soldiers much better than could any WAC or WAVE."

All I am asking the Senate to do is to wait until the provisions of the bill can be put into effect. They can be put into effect within the next 30 days if my amendment is adopted. It would not do a particle of harm to the Government of the United States or to the Army or Navy. It would not prevent the Army or Navy from getting a single, solitary man. If my amendment is made a part of the bill, the departments will be compelled to check up on industries which are hoarding young men who are not indispensable; and the Government will check deferments.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take any more time. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I have every hope that the amendment of the Senator from Montana will prevail. Unless it does prevail, I shall feel under obligation to vote against the proposed legislation in its present form. For the past 10 days I have been prevented by a severe cold from taking part in the debate, as I should like to have done. I shall be very brief now in giving expression to the view which I entertain respecting the need for drafting fathers.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to interfere with the Senator, but I hope that Senators will remain in the Chamber, in order that we may complete action on the bill tonight, so that we may devote tomorrow to the addresses of our colleagues who have returned from the fighting fronts. I hope Senators will not leave until we have concluded.

Mr. NYE. I can assure the Senator and the Senate that I shall be very brief.

I have before me a letter from a very eminent citizen of my State, reading as follows:

DEAR MR. NYE: On your recent visit here I did not get an opportunity to express myself on the draft situation as it pertains to fathers. I feel rather deeply on the situation of drafting fathers, and I feel that I have a thoroughly complete picture, being a member of our local draft board. When the need actually comes no one will oppose such a draft, but there are so many cases of sidestepping now that I cannot feel the necessity.

Then follows a recitation of the so-called side-stepping. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

R. B. GRIFFITH CO.,
THE ONTARIO STORE,
Grand Forks, N. Dak., September 16, 1943.

Hon. GERALD P. NYE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NYE: On your recent visit here I did not get an opportunity to express myself on the draft situation as it pertains to fathers. I feel rather deeply on the situation of drafting fathers, and I feel that I have a fairly complete picture, being a member of our local draft board. When the need actually comes no one will oppose such a draft, but there are so many cases of sidestepping now that I cannot feel the necessity. Take the local situation at the university. There is a Regular Army Corps in control of the Air Corps school here. Many of the men are young noncommissioned officers who could be replaced by limited-service men and these chaps made available for war duty. This could be multiplied many times throughout the country. We have scores of younger men in defense industry with a deferred rating who could be more easily relieved than to tear fathers from their homes and families. Again, why train a single man and just because he reaches 38 release him from service? Why not call these men back into service—they are already trained—rather than call and train fathers? There are always a large number of soldiers on our streets home on furlough, and we're but a small spot on the map. I don't question the vacation for the boys for a minute, but if we have enough men now in training to allow such wholesale home visiting, why the fathers?

I want to do my duty to my country and am willing to give all the time necessary to administer the local draft, but I am sorely tempted to resign from that important job if we have to be made responsible for wholesale family hardships. And the other members of our board feel the same. This has no bearing on the father draft situation, of course, but I think it does represent the feeling of the majority of draft boards.

With best regards, I remain,
Yours sincerely,
PAUL B. GRIFFITH.

Mr. NYE. It will be noted that the writer states:

I want to do my duty to my country and am willing to give all the time necessary to administer the local draft, but I am sorely tempted to resign from that important job if we have to be made responsible for wholesale family hardships.

Mr. President, I have read in the newspapers a United Press release under the heading of "Canada disbands two army divisions." It is disbanding at a time when we are called upon to reach into the homes of America and draft fathers in order further to enlarge our fighting forces.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the dispatch to which I have referred, under the heading "Canada disbands two army divisions," be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANADA DISBANDS TWO ARMY DIVISIONS

OTTAWA, ONTARIO.—Canada will reduce the number of combat troops on duty at home by about 20,000 because of the "improved strategic position" of North America, Col. J. L. Ralston, National Defense Minister, revealed.

Two divisions of the Army stationed in Canada will be disbanded and another will be partially demobilized in a reorganization which will allow "substantial numbers" of men to return to civilian life, Ralston said.

His statement was released also in Washinton, and it said that the move had been "appraised in consultation with the United States authorities."

It said the plan had been made possible by eviction of the Japanese from the Aleutians, continued Russian successes, destruction of the Axis forces in north Africa, the capitulation of Italy, and "striking betterment" of antisubmarine activities in the Atlantic.

Ralston said that disbandment of divisions does not necessarily mean all the units will be disbanded. Many men will be reallocated according to the needs of the service to fill up remaining units and for potential reinforcements, depending on age, rank, and medical category.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, there are findings to the effect that there is a waste of 25 percent in manpower in war industries. Twenty-five percent of all the manpower in war industries is not utilized. Must we now, with all this wasted manpower, reach out and take heads of families into the fighting forces? Why would it not be better and the part of greater justice to demand of the administration in this war that labor hoarding and waste of labor be stopped and that the surplus of manpower in industry be turned into the Army?

An acquaintance of mine writes to me from Long Beach, Calif., telling me of his intimate knowledge of conditions existing at the California shipbuilding yard at Wilmington, Calif. He tells me that in that yard, which is employing approximately 40,000 workers, terminations of employment range between 4,000 and 5,000 a month. It was this informant's business to learn the reasons for those terminations. He writes me as follows:

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *September 30, 1943.*

Hon. GERALD P. NYE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NYE: You, no doubt, will be surprised in hearing from me, but I have wanted to write you for some time relative to the conditions existing at the California Shipbuilding Corporation's shipyard at Wilmington, Calif.

Gerald, after reading portions of Senator Wheeler's talk on the drafting of fathers, I could not resist writing to you.

I was employed as a personnel counselor by this corporation for some 4 months and my duties were to interview the men who terminated their employment with the company and of course, I became very familiar with the conditions in the yard. They employ approximately 40,000 people, and the terminations would average about four and five thousand a month, and it was my duty to find out why they terminated.

Senator, one of the important reasons for terminations was a political set-up in the yard of former W. P. A. administrators and State emergency relief administrators and unless you belonged to this clique, the chances for advancement were practically nil. A number of the men who are heads of departments are young men of draft age and single, who have had no former business experience and a great many of them employed there for the sole purpose of evading the draft. In my judgment, and in the judgment of many others, there is an excess of five to six thousand men who could be dismissed without affecting production in the least. Their big ballyhoo is the number of ships they put out, which is to the credit of the men engaged in production and not to the management. It would be interesting to know the cost of these ships. I have had hundreds of men whom I interviewed when they were in the process of termination who told me they had absolutely nothing to do, and refused to be a party to a deal of this nature. A few days prior to my terminating with the company, I was given a merit award or whatever they may be pleased to call it, for the services I rendered. I noticed by last evening's press that a subcommittee of the House Naval Affairs Committee is going to investigate the Los Angeles Ship & Dry Dock Corporation, and I want to say in all honesty and truth, Senator, that in comparison of the two corporations, the conditions at the California Shipbuilding Corporation are so much worse, there is no comparison. I assure you, Senator Nye, that if you wish to proceed in asking for an investigation of the California Shipbuilding Corporation, that you will be doing this Nation a service for which they should be ever grateful to you. You will have the cooperation of men who are now employed there and men who were formerly employed there who were completely nauseated with conditions in this yard. If you would wish, I would be only too glad to

furnish you with a partial list of the former W. P. A. administrators as well as a list of some of the single men of draft age who are employed there and could be replaced by any man or woman of normal intelligence.

Trusting you and your family are enjoying the best of health, and with kindest personal regards,

Yours respectfully,

JAMES T. MULLOY.

Mr. President, that is only one piece of evidence, of which we have so much in this debate, concerning the waste of employment in defense industry.

Much has been said about the wastefulness of employment by the Government itself, especially in Washington. Very direct have been charges concerning the degree to which the Government pay rolls are a hide-out for many men who are subject to the draft. Surely there is time to look into the availability of military hands in these quarters before digging into American homes for the men upon whom wives and children are dependent. The people generally feel very deeply about this prospect. I wish to quote from one of many letters which have come to me bearing upon the subject. The letter is from Mr. G. L. Ireland, an eminent businessman of Grand Forks, N. Dak. I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAND FORKS, N. DAK., *September 15, 1943.*

Hon. Senator G. P. NYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NYE: The question of drafting fathers will, no doubt, come before you.

It is a most serious question.

I am sure no one would object, regardless of the seriousness of breaking up homes, business, etc., if—

First, the thousands of bureaus and departments of government overstaffed now were combed and recombed and every man taken out of them who could better serve the armed forces.

Then comb the war work. Industries for deferred single men who can be easily replaced with older men or women.

We all know that if this were done there would be no need at this time for taking pre-Pearl Harbor fathers.

I hope you will insist that this is done before you allow these fathers to be taken.

I also believe you will find the agriculture States have a quota far beyond their fair proportion, because the original quotas did not call farm work essential and calling farm workers exempt now means that every father in the State who can qualify will have to be taken to fill North Dakota quota.

This is a serious matter and needs your attention.

Yours very truly,

G. L. IRELAND.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, in every controversy involving the way to win the war with the greatest expedition I have invariably given the benefit of doubt in my mind to our military leaders, following their advice and their requests. But in spite of their representations in support of the drafting of married men, especially those with children, I find myself without doubt concerning the merit of the pending Wheeler amendment.

It seems to me that our progress on the fighting fronts is of such splendid account that, with a reserve of millions of men, trained or in training in the home camps, we need not now reach out for those so desperately needed at home.

There is another front in addition to the military front, upon which we must largely depend in winning this war. It is the production and financial front at home. One cannot observe what is taking place on the home front without knowing that all is not well, without knowing how strained is the production effort, especially. I cannot help but feel that our military leaders, who now seek new fields from which to call fighting forces, are not sufficiently aware of the dangers confronting our cause here on the production front.

Our food problem grows more difficult with each season. Shortages of vital commodities become more acute. The shortage of farm manpower is the largest contributor to the plague of short and ever-shorter production. Butter is a case in point. The Land O' Lakes Creameries, Inc., has presented in recent hours a demonstration of why there is not sufficient butter. I ask to have inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement concerning this subject which has been made by the Land O' Lakes Creameries, Inc.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVERY AMERICAN SHOULD KNOW THE REAL ANSWER TO THIS PROBLEM!—WHY ISN'T THERE ENOUGH BUTTER?

Despite a rise from 10 to 12 points in ration-point value, there is still not enough butter in many localities for you to purchase it with your stamps. Why isn't there enough of this important food to supply our civilians? Is it the farmer's fault? Is it the distributor's fault? Is it the Government's fault? No! More than anything else, of course, you can blame the war. But there are also five fundamental reasons for the butter shortage. If they are clearly understood by public and Government much can be done to correct them. They are:

1. Production decrease: Butter production is always off in late summer and fall months because there is less pasture, but this year's decrease is greater than usual. Due to an inequitable relationship between dairy prices and other farm prices dairying is less profitable to farmers than other farm effort. That fact, plus inability to get adequate manpower and equipment, has discouraged butter production.

2. Government-storage holdings are at an all-time high, estimated at 235,000,000 pounds. This butter would normally have been yours, but now it is set aside for our fighting men and allies. Remember, "Butter is as important as bullets."

3. Increased buying power has brought about an unprecedented demand for butter. Many people who had never eaten butter regularly are demanding it now.

4. Unequal distribution: Butter is rationed on red stamps with meats, cheese, cooking fats, lard, and substitutes, and the lowering of point values of other foods in this group—or the shortage of some of these foods—makes more points for the purchase of butter. This also means that areas nearest the production points buy up the supply before it can be distributed equitably to all parts of the Nation.

5. Lack of price or rationing control of cream for purposes other than making butter: Cream brings a higher price as cream than it does as butter. There is the equivalent of many millions of pounds of butter now being hoarded as cream. This is not available as butter to our armed forces, lend-lease, or you.

These five reasons for the butter shortage are current. Behind and contributing to them are a deep-rooted lack of understanding of the farmers' problems. A price order won't produce a dairy cow—it takes 3 years to do that. Approximately 15 percent of our national income goes to farmers who make up 25 percent of our population and their labor far exceeds 25 percent of the Nation's productive war effort. A farmer cannot arbitrate with his cows because they must be milked twice a day, 7 days a week. Nature won't wait for a debate, but you are going to wait a long time for more butter unless understanding and action on America's food problem is prompt.

Here's what should be done to improve the butter situation:

1. Correct the farm manpower situation.

2. Make farm machinery and equipment available—quickly.

3. Adjust dairying prices—dairying is at the bottom of a list of 10 basic farm products for income per hour expended.

4. Ration butter separately.

5. Take off the butter subsidy. Farmers don't want it, and it saves the average American only 60 cents per year—if he can buy his ration allotment of 12 pounds of butter. Why put off paying our national grocery bill? Each of us will pay much more than the cost of the subsidy in years to come—in taxes, interest, and handling charges.

6. Recognize in action instead of words the fact that food is America's No. 1 weapon and encourage rather than discourage its production.

LAND O' LAKES CREAMERIES, INC.

Mr. NYE. In conclusion, Mr. President, I assert that not until there can be a showing of consistency on the home front, not until there can be elimination of the apparently available military hands from the swollen departments of Government and from the shops where so much wasted employment is in evidence—not until then will I vote to draft the pre-Pearl Harbor fathers of America and bring further chaos to an already chaotic economy here at home. For these reasons I gladly support the pending Wheeler amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, it seems to me that the only effect of the amendment now pending, offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], would be to provide that, in good faith, effect should be given to the provisions which the Senate has today adopted, and which the Senate will undoubtedly, before we adjourn this evening, enact into law, so far as one body of the Congress can do that. It would be no advantage to anyone, no advantage to the country, if, having set up these tighter provisions for inducting single men into the service, the Selective Service and the Manpower Board should go right ahead inducting the pre-Pearl Harbor fathers into the service before this proposed inventory was made, taking into consideration the provisions sought now to be enacted into law. Therefore, it seems to me that, in order to maintain good faith as much as possible, the amendment should be adopted.

There is very little dispute, I say from my experience, among the people in the field who are actually closely connected with the administration of the law, that a very large number of men who are not married men with children and who have been deferred for one reason or another can be inducted into the service, if a bona fide effort is made in good faith to do that. The purpose today is to put into effect such provisions as that, and they cannot be effective unless such an amendment as that offered by the Senator from Montana shall be agreed to.

I do not intend to detain the Senate more than a moment, but I wish to take the time to read a letter from one of the most intelligent men I know, a man who does not happen to be of my political faith. He is the chairman of a draft board in a large rural county in Missouri. He has been chairman of this draft board since the inception of the Selective Service, and has had experience in the matter, and it seems to me that his comments in this situation are very illuminating. He says:

THE CONSTITUTION TRIBUNE,
Chillicothe, Mo., September 17, 1943.

Hon. BENNETT C. CLARK,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: As chairman of the Livingston County Selective Service Board, and as one who has worked consistently and sincerely at the job since the very inception of selective service, I have certain convictions which have been inspired solely by study and experience.

Our board took all of the experimental phases in stride and was in splendid condition to deliver properly when the actual function of drafting an army really started. The personnel of our board is unchanged and we have continued to carry out selective service obligations and regulations promptly and conscientiously, though it has not always been easy to reconcile our own views and ideas, based on our on-the-ground experience, with those of Washington as expressed through our State director.

That we have operated in a highly satisfactory manner is indicated by commendatory letters from Missouri State headquarters and personal expression from selective service officials, indicating this board as one of the outstanding boards of the State. This, of course, is not important to you except as it provides a basis for certain views which I want to express concerning the proposed drafting of fathers.

I am convinced that selective service, up to this point, has been a popular plan of replenishing our armed forces. Mistakes have naturally been made both in Washington and in individual boards, but these have been rectified in most cases. However, there remains plenty of evidence of miscarried justice in individual cases and in group consideration which only now is beginning to arouse public concern and comment in face of the probable induction of fathers. The public is begining to suspect, and with cause, that if all available single men were inducted into service it would not be necessary to call on fathers. In other words if service dodgers were smoked out of deferrable classifications our service manpower situation would be taken care of.

I base that statement on conditions that I know actually exist in our board and in other boards that I have contacted—conditions that local boards can do nothing about because of certain specific occupational regulations and certain group regulations.

The IV–F files of boards everywhere are loaded with young men who could and should be used in the service; thousands more are deferred to essential industry and occupation when the individual himself is certainly not strictly essential and should indicate his patriotism in service rather than in dollars. And that only scratches the surface. A competent investigator could ply the streets of any town or city of size and in 24 hours point out plenty of young men who are escaping service improperly.

And to overcome this shortage we are asked to draft fathers, the very backbone of our moral and economic structure. In his case we are not dealing with an individual alone, we are dealing with the personal, economic, social, and commercial ramifications that involve the lives of every American mother and father who are trying to raise a respectable family by the generous, but too often difficult, American plan.

Thousands of fathers are in the service already, that is conceded, but these are fathers whose family problems have been met satisfactorily, and who find it entirely possible to volunteer their service to their country. And that is an excellent spirit, and should be encouraged. Thousands more perhaps would do likewise. And these fathers will make good soldiers, but the indiscriminate drafting of fathers will create a situation that undoubtedly will be hard to cope with locally, and a very unhealthy condition nationally.

As an actual fact, very, very few of the thousands of fathers processed will ever reach the point of actual induction. As an example, of the first 25 fathers processed by our board we have only two remaining subject to induction, and even they may fail of passage before the induction center physical examination.

Nevertheless all 25 were hailed before the draft board, blood tests taken, and classification made. They and their families were subjected to all of the distress, uncertainty, mental anguish, and general unrest that is bound to accompany such procedure regardless of whether or not they are eventually drafted.

Washington has been drafting fathers over the radio and through the press about every 30 days since last February and the present state of affairs concerning this subject in Washington is a fit climax to a situation that has driven fathers and their families into at least a partial state of insanity, and draft boards entirely nuts!

Under conditions as they exist now, our board is definitely and determinedly opposed to the drafting of fathers.

Sincerely,

C. E. WATKINS,
Chairman, Selective Service Board
No. 1, Livingston County, Mo.

Mr. President, it seems to me that if the pending legislation is to be enacted in good faith, tightening the deferments, and attempting to put into service single men who should be drafted before married men are taken, then such an amendment as that proposed by the Senator from Montana should be agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Montana, the author of the pending amendment, would interpret it in two respects. First, in his opinion, if the amendment shall be agreed to, will a sufficient number of men be forthcoming each month to supply the Army needs in the proportion in which they would come if his amendment were not agreed to? Secondly, would the Senator's amendment exempt, where they were regularly employed and irreplaceable and indispensable, men on the farms and men in industry who are needed because of some particularly high skill, or the fact that there are no replacements? Would those men still be exempt in the communities of the country?

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator for his inquiry, and I shall answer the second inquiry first.

The amendment does not touch men who are indispensable in industry or on the farm. If they are indispensable on the farm or are indispensable in industry, then they are deferred, and my amendment would not touch them.

Secondly, could the Army get the number of men they wanted in time? I think they could get all the men they wanted, provided the departments in Washington acted with the rapidity with which they should act. It would mean the deferment of fathers only for a comparatively short time. In a great many communities throughout the country, I think in most communities, it is not going to be necessary to take fathers this month to any great extent, but if the commission, which an amendment adopted today directs the President to set up, will go into the rules and regulations with reference to the IV–F's, and if they will check up on the men who have been deferred in the departments, and make them subject to the draft immediately, and check up on the men who are not indispensable to industry and make them available immediately, and if after that there are not enough single men and married men without children, of course we will have to take the married men with children.

What I am trying to do is to give the people of this country the benefit of the legislation which we have passed, and if we are sincere and honest about it, it seems to me there can be no objection to the amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have taken no part in the debate, but the charge has frequently been made that men who were eligible for the draft had been deferred because they were working in war industries, in the shipyards, airplane plants, and so on. How would that situation be changed by the Senator's amendment? Would a new standard be set up by which to measure these men, in cases where there is occupational deferment?

Mr. WHEELER. Under the law we have passed, and under the amendment adopted by the Senate, the foreman or the superintendent or the manager of a plant must make a statement that the man is indispensable to the industry involved, and he must state the reasons why.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is, there is to be a tighter standard applied hereafter than was applied originally?

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me ask one other question. The Senator has answered my question, I think, as accurately as he can, with the little information available. How much delay does the Senator think might be occasioned in obtaining the quotas which are to come in during the months of October and November if

induction should be stopped somewhat while this reconsideration of the whole draft picture was being made?

Mr. WHEELER. I should say that it might possibly stop the drafting of some fathers during the month of October, but that could easily be made up in November. General Marshall says he wants these men by the first of the year. But certainly by the end of October, in 30 days' time, this check-up could be made, if those in the Government service are efficient and want to make a complete check-up, and do it quickly.

Mr. President, I appreciate that General Marshall says he wants all these men within 3 months, January, February, and March. I call attention, however, to the fact that a large number of these men are going into the Navy. When Mr. Baruch was before the committee I asked him whether he had taken into consideration the fact that we had taken over the Italian Navy.

Mr. Baruch, or Admiral King—I am not sure which—said that that matter was now under consideration, and the reason why they were having to take more men into the Navy than they had expected to take was that warships had been completed faster than had been expected. So when a Senator stands on the floor of this body and says we are going to lose the war unless we take this number of men into the Navy, at a time when warships are coming along faster than the Navy expected them to come along, an inconsistent attitude is taken, because certainly it was not expected that the war would be lost when a less number of men were expected to be taken to man the ships which it was contemplated would be completed.

Mr. President, I have not heard any Member of the Senate say he wanted to take fathers. I have not heard any military man say he wanted to take fathers. Everyone, in every walk of life, has conceded that one of the worst things that can be done is to take fathers and break up American homes. Certainly if we should delay the drafting of fathers for one month, or for six weeks, we would not lose the war. It is proposed to take men from Government service who have heretofore been deferred. That is one of the things my friend the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is urgently insisting upon. I have said that we should take men from industry in the same way we take men from the Government service. Of course, if it will simply be said, "We are going to do this after the first of the year, or 6 months from now," the 446,000 fathers will be in the draft and in the Army, and 446,000 homes will be broken up.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, what I am immediately interested in is this: If we do not take the 446,000 men the Army says it wants to have, as the Senator says, in the next 3 months, and if we adopt the Senator's amendment and put into effect the machinery which he proposes to set up, I wonder whether substitutes for the 446,000 men will be secured or whether, when the 90-day period has passed, we will have to take in the fathers anyway, without any men being taken to fill the gap in the Army in the period the Army says it wants them. I know the Senator obviously cannot give me a "Yes" or "No" answer to that question.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Frankly, I like the general tenor of the Senator's amendment, except I do not want to interfere with the induction of men into the Army at the rate the Army says it must have them. I believe if we can obtain an answer to that question from someone who might be closer to the picture than either the Senator is or I am, we might give it more consideration than we feel can be given at the moment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I call attention to the fact that it is expected to induct into the service in the next 3 months 1,221,000 men, and among those 1,221,000 we find the 446,000 pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. The Army now, under present conditions, has its fingers on approximately 800,000 single men, and certainly it could use them for a stop-gap for this 6 weeks' period the Senator is pleading for to make the adjustment with respect to the fathers.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I may be mistaken but it may be that the chiefs of staff will be so obstinate that they will say they are not going to lower the standards at all. I feel strongly, however, that after the President sees what the sentiment of the Congress is, and what the sentiment of the country is, he will say, or the Board proposed to be set up will say, that more than 5 percent of IV-F's must be taken; that there cannot be a turning back of as many men as are now being turned back, such as baseball players, football players, movie actors, and others. Some 200,000 such persons have been turned back after having passed a physical examination. Such persons are being turned back every day, and in their places it is proposed to take fathers.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not true that the answer to the question of the Senator from Maryland depends upon two or three things to which no one can at this time give an answer? One is, how many men will be strained out of the Government departments so that they will be required to go into the Army or Navy under the amendment the Senate has already adopted? How many men will be strained out of industry who are now under certificates of indispensability? No one can answer those questions and tell how many there will be until the process has been adopted and completed.

Furthermore, even if the bill should become a law, and the board created by the bill, as it has been amended, should be set up, which is to recommend to the President any changes in the physical standards which now exist in the Army and the Navy, no one can tell whether the board could go into the situation sufficiently to make its report to the President even by the first of January. I would not know how long it would take such a board to examine the entire physical situation so as to make a report to the President. So that if we defer or suspend the induction of men now in all these categories, Government departments, industry, IV-F's, and wait for any possible reduction in the physical standards, we may delay the induction of the 446,000 men until beyond January the first, so, we might as well have adopted the Wheeler bill to begin with.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not agree with the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, inasmuch as the Senate has already adopted an amendment providing for the taking of men out of the Government service who have heretofore been deferred, there is much to be said for doing the same thing in industry where men may be improperly deferred. I hate to foreclose the opportunity, so long as one exists, to establish the machinery for reconsideration of the situation with respect to employees outside the Government, so that the number of fathers eventually drawn will be as small as possible. It strikes me we should adopt some amendment dealing with industry. Much complaint has been made about persons hiding behind deferements in industry, and there is nothing in the law to change that situation.

I think it would be unfortunate, I may say to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who has been very active in connection with the bill, if we could not take advantage of the Wheeler amendment to put into the bill some language which would call for reconsideration of the deferments of men outside the Government, for, if it is proper to place under a new standard those in the Government who were deferred, certainly it is proper to take from industry men who have been improperly deferred. I do not like the breadth of the Wheeler amendment, because it seems to me that by agreeing to it we might delay the whole program. On the other hand, I do not believe it is wise to let that entire phase of the matter go without any provision in that respect.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. In a moment. Before I yield to the Senator from Alabama, let me say that what we want to do is to speed up the thing and get some action on it. If we agree to the amendment, first, the Commission will act rapidly, and, second, the Government will act rapidly. But if we do not have something of this kind in the bill, all of us know that because of Government red tape the matter will be delayed until after fathers are drafted, and then it will be too late.

If the Senator from Alabama will pardon me, and then I shall yield to him, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to an article which came to my attention today. It appears in the September 18, 1943, edition—the latest one, I believe—of The Economist, a magazine

published in London. The article reads as follows:

Parliament's coming inquest on manpower policy will be as close and critical as its discussion of the Italian war. It was announced last week end that, in view of the urgent need for men in the armed forces, the Government has decided that deferments granted for men in certain occupations, who were born in or after 1915, 1910, and 1905, must be brought to an end. This prosaic announcement, the latest of a multitude of similar instructions since the old-style schedule of reserved occupations was first instituted and then transformed, came as a bombshell to many. To some, it seems a hint of some sudden and dramatic change in manpower policy—perhaps following on the decisions of the Quebec Conference. In recent weeks, the relation between recruitment and strategic needs appeared to have been made more clear-cut than before. The Army, it was gathered from official statements, had reached practically full strength; and, industrially, the process of its equipment (the colossal task that was restarted after Dunkerque) was completed, leaving only a demand upon industry for maintenance, replacement, and the supersession of certain specialized weapons by new ones. Men called up were to go into the Navy, the Air Force, or industry, especially coal mining.

The article shows that the British Government considers it has all the material it needs, and at the present time is taking men out of industry, and putting them into the Army or the Navy, whereas we are saying we must have so many more men in industry. I submit that if our Government would have the courage to take from the industrial plants the men who are hoarded there, the situation would be taken care of. I care not whether the situation is brought about by labor or by the mismanagement of industry; I care not which one has caused it. To me either one by whom it is caused is just as bad as the other. If the Governmen' would say to the plants which already are so overstaffed that the men are falling all over themselves, "We are not going to stand for this any longer," it would not be necessary to draft fathers. But the Government has simply lacked the courage to stand up to labor and tell it or some of the industrialists what they have to do.

The time has come in the United States when we can no longer permit persons either in labor or in industry either to rook the Government of huge sums or to hoard men, regardless of whether it is caused by slowdowns or by industries having cost-plus contracts, or anything else. If we have efficient departments to check up on such matters, those abuses will stop. I do not know of one Member of the Senate who, if he were in a responsible place, whether he were a friend of labor or a friend of industry, would not put a stop to what everyone from one end of the country to the other knows is going on.

I say it is little less than criminal to draft fathers and yet allow the waste and extravagance which are occurring in the industries, under the cost-plus contracts which have been pointed out time and time again to every Member of the Senate who is familiar with them in the slightest degree.

If my amendment is agreed to, in my judgment it will do more than anything else would do to make our Government and its departments get busy and clean up the situation. If we do not do that, the departments will say, "Oh, well, we have plenty of time," and they will go along in a lackadaisical way, fathers will be drafted, the legislation which Congress has passed will be merely a meaningless gesture, and in my judgment Senators will have to apologize to the people of the country for having passed legislation which did not mean anything.

I yield now to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's courtesy, but I shall wait, and shall speak in my own time. I thank the Senator just the same.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I shall be as brief as possible—and briefer still, if I am not interrupted.

If the Senate were to agree to the amendment now before it the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], it would have defeated all the legislation and the whole process which has been gone through in the Senate since the introduction of the original bill. The purpose of the bill was to delay until January 1, 1944, the induction of fathers. I have the bill before me; it provides for the amendment of the act by adding the following new subsection:

(m) Every registrant who was married prior to December 8, 1941, who has maintained a bona fide family relationship with his family since that date, and who has a child or children under 18 years of age shall be exempt from training and service under this act until January 1, 1944.

Now, at the last moment, after long debate, many speeches, thorough discussion, and the adoption of a number of amendments by way of cushions, the pending amendment is proposed by the author of the original bill, to whose bill the Senate has practically shown its opposition. He offers an amendment which would postpone the induction and training of fathers for perhaps six months. Rather than to agree to his amendment, we would be much wiser to undo all we have done, and to pass the Senator's original bill. That would be a much more reasonable procedure.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I shall yield in a moment.

It would be much more creditable to the Senate to pass the Senator's original bill. If we were to agree to the amendment now offered by the Senator from Montana, it would be said of us, as it was said of old:

The King of France, with 20,000 men, went up the hill, and then marched down again.

That would be done under the leadership of the Senator from Montana, to whom I pay the compliment of saying that he is superior, not to a general—that is not the name for him—or not to an admiral, but, I think, even superior to Marshal Rommel, of Germany, in the matter of a strategic retreat, a legislative retreat.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the Senator, but I am yielding with this understanding——

Mr. WHEELER. I resent the Senator's statement.

Mr. BAILEY. If the Senator resents it, I beg his pardon, because I did not mean to reflect on him.

Mr. WHEELER. I certainly resent the statement. I am not a Rommel, and I am not a Nazi. I am just as good an American as the Senator ever dreamed of being at any stage of the game. I am not one of those who march up the hill and then march down again. I am not one of those who say one day that they want to take orders from the administration, and the next day back away from it.

Mr. BAILEY. I would not say that about the Senator. I said that Rommel was a great master of retreat in military affairs.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand; but I know what the implication was.

Mr. BAILEY. I disavow any such implication.

Mr. WHEELER. So far as I am concerned, the Senator had better disavow it, because I am not going to take that from him or anyone else.

Mr. BAILEY. I would not have the Senator take it. I would not say it. I would not think about it. I am very sorry that the Senator has taken it as he has. If I had thought he would do so, I certainly would not have uttered the words. If the Senator wishes that statement withdrawn from the RECORD, I shall be very glad to withdraw it, because nothing was further from my thought than an intent to reflect upon him or offend him. I leave it to the Senate, and I leave it to him. I would certainly like to get along in a spirit of good will in all matters. I have very good personal reasons for overlooking the fact that the Senator appeared to threaten me. I do not think he meant to do so. I have very good personal reasons for most earnestly disavowing any intent whatever to reflect on the Senator from Montana. I hope I have made that clear. I repeat that if he wishes me to withdraw that little analogy from the RECORD, all he has to do is to say so.

Mr. WHEELER. Perhaps I am sensitive about it; but I have heard paid propagandists from New York, such as Walter Winchell and others, try to smear everyone who had the "guts" to stand up and oppose the administration upon this question or any other question. Those who do not agree with the administration have been accused of being Nazis. The last man in the Senate I would expect to feed them something they could use is the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I believe I will change my figure——

Mr. WHEELER. I am becoming weary of paid propagandists who write books smearing everyone who disagrees with the administration in the slightest degree.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I think we have made that clear. I did not know that my friend had been troubled

by such reports as those to which he refers.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not particularly irritated by them.

Mr. BAILEY. If I had known that he had been troubled at all, I would not have said anything to add to the irritation.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not irritated. I consider the source from which it comes.

Mr. BAILEY. Shall I change my figure of speech to say that the Senator, like Robert E. Lee, beat a strategic retreat?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not care what the Senator says.

Mr. BAILEY. I see that I cannot please my friend. I will proceed with the argument, but with the perfect understanding that I do not intend to permit this little passage between us to affect my high regard for him or my warm sense of friendship toward him. We fought a battle together once, and I formed an attachment for him—as I am likely to do under similar circumstances—which will last a lifetime. My friendship for him will last.

Let us get back to the main question. I am saying that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana would bring about a delay longer than would his original bill. It provides that fathers shall be deferred until such time as the Selective Service has determined and inducted into the armed services the number of men now deferred in Government and industry who will be available for call under the provisions of the act, and the number of men in the IV-4 classification who can be inducted into the armed services by a review of the physical standards, as may be recommended by the commission to be appointed by the President for the purpose of examining the physical qualification requirements for admission to the armed services of the United States, as provided in the act.

All that would defeat the whole purpose, and would defeat the plans of the Chief of Staff. The amendment adopted this morning struck out the language of the bill to which we have been referring as the Wheeler bill, and said that after the beginning of the calendar month following the date of the enactment of this subsection, certain action shall be taken. Evidently action will not be taken under the amendment adopted this morning, known as the Bailey-Clark amendment, until after the beginning of the second calendar month following the date of enactment of the amendment. Let us assume that the bill passes the Senate today and goes over to the House. It will be there some time. Finally it will become a law some time in October. Then we go over to the beginning of the second calendar month following the enactment of the bill. I think the first calendar month after October is November. We would go to December; and if we got to December and then had to go through the processes required in the amendment of the Senator from Montana, we would be beyond January 1, 1944. That is my argument.

I do not think the validity of that argument can be challenged. It is a matter of calculation on the calendar. If we are to postpone the training and induction of fathers until after January 1, 1944, why did we not adopt the bill of the Senator in the beginning? Why did we go through all this?

Mr. President, I have one further word. If we should adopt the amendment of the Senator from Montana, we would seriously interfere with the plans of the Chief of Staff. There has been a good deal of debate about what the Chief of Staff had to say. I wish to read for the RECORD just what he said in response to questions asked him by the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]:

Senator AUSTIN. The evidence before us tends to show that the existing calls for supply in the period under consideration, January 4, would include 446,000 of the father class. Let us assume that we pass this bill—

That is, the bill of the Senator from Montana—

and postpone until January 1 the induction of 446,000 men, without supplying a replacement in any way, would that be a serious cut in the program?

This is what General Marshall said:

General MARSHALL. Well, of course, that would be a very serious cut. We would have to immediately go into conference to decide what to eliminate from the Army in order to provide men that we must have now.

There is an instant need. It is not men who are to be needed January 1, 1944. General Marshall is saying that under the conditions of the act proposed by the Senator from Montana, he would have to go immediately into a conference to decide what to eliminate from the Army in order to provide men whom we must have now. It means that he would have to eliminate some activity in some branch.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I beg the Senator's pardon. General Marshall did not say that.

Mr. BAILEY. I have just read what General Marshall said.

Mr. WHEELER. I beg the Senator's pardon, but the General did not say that. What the General said was that he wanted the men. If he cannot get the men without taking fathers, then, of course, what the Senator is reading is correct. But the Senator is reading only a portion of his testimony.

Mr. BAILEY. I am reading only a portion. I have read it all, and I am going to stand upon this portion. It is an answer to a categorical question.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator must read all his testimony.

Mr. BAILEY. General Marshall said:

We would have to immediately go into conference to decide what to eliminate from the Army in order to provide men that we must have now. We would have to accept the definite hazard of lacking those troops at a later date, sufficiently trained to employ at the time we thought we could employ them.

We could not afford to speculate on the present, and we have to play this to the limit. The only way we could possibly do that is by emasculating other units and speculating on the future.

That is taking the life out of the other units. I continue to read:

I am adverse to speculations in this matter of human life and security of the United States.

That is the answer to the first question. The testimony continued as follows:

Senator AUSTIN. We come next logically to this question, it seems to me: Let us assume that we did postpone the call of this 446,000 father class and then after January 1, the war not being over but rather increasing in demands upon us according to the program, what would be the probable effect of carrying out the same theory and just eliminating the father class from liability to serve the country in this war as combatants? What would be the effect of that?

General MARSHALL. Well, Senator, I do not believe, on two counts, that I could well answer that. First, as Chief of Staff, your question involves requirements and conditions which are under constant study by the Manpower Commission and which are not under constant study by me personally. The effects are reported to me after rather exhaustive studies.

The other reason would be, I can only answer your question as a private citizen, and I do not think that would be appropriate right now.

He did not care to answer the question as Chief of Staff. The questioning continued as follows:

Senator AUSTIN. Probably it would be the proper thing for me to ask you whether it is likely that the program of the high command of the Allies could be carried out if we permanently cut out 446,000 men who are now contemplated as necessary?

General MARSHALL. We have to have the 446,000 men.

That is a flat answer.

We have to have them, if we are to go about this war in a businesslike manner.

If we adopt the amendment which the Senator from Montana has proposed we will postpone until after January 1 the induction and the training of the 446,000 fathers whom we need. So I ask that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I have yielded the floor.

Mr. AUSTIN. Before the Senator takes his seat I should like to invite his attention to another part of the same record from which he was reading. I believe he was reading from part 3?

Mr. BAILEY. That is correct.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should like to read from the testimony of General McNarney, Assistant Chief of Staff, in showing another of the disturbances of the timetable of the war which may take place. He said:

If you prevent us, by not giving us enough troops at the time required, from fully implementing an operation it forces us to put the starting date of that operation off for 3 months, 4 months, or 5 months; you may prolong the war a year.

The time factor is so important in this war, it is so necessary to get going and defeat the enemy now rather than to wait until next year, or the next year, or the next year to do it. The over-all loss in time, money, lives, and fathers that will have to be drafted if this war drags on is incalculable. Anything that prevents us from going ahead just as fast as we possibly believe we can is detri-

mental to the United States, not only the Army, it is detrimental to every civilian, every mother, every father, every person in the State.

That gives some picture of the effect of the disturbance of the timetable.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the Senator, and I take it that he agrees with me that the testimony is to the effect that the postponement which is contemplated by the pending amendment would be very injurious to the whole Army program.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do agree with that.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish merely to say that as the bill is now before the Senate there is in it the same rule respecting indispensability in industry as ground for deferment that is provided for deferment because of service with the Government.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, there is a far more practical reason, it seems to me, for rejecting the pending amendment than has yet been argued. In the first place, if we do not pass the pending bill or something like it there will be no limitation or rule of conduct for the guidance of the Selective Service and the administrative officials who are interested in the existing law. The result obviously will be that fathers will be drafted tomorrow, and Friday, and Saturday, and a month from now, and there will be no limitation whatever on their Federal service, as to indispensability, or anything else.

Mr. President, as practical men, we all know very well that, when the bill goes to the other House, if it should carry with it the amendment of the Senator from Montana—and the amendment has aroused objection on the part of the administration forces in charge of the bill—it will not come out of the Military Affairs Committee of the House if they do not want it, and it will not come up for a vote before the House if the Rules Committee does not want it to come up. The fact of the matter is that we shall not have any limitation or any rule of conduct for the guidance of the Selective Service officials. On the contrary, were we to pass the bill tonight without the amendment of the Senator from Montana, and if the House acted immediately and passed the bill in substantially the form which the Senate has thus far approved it, we would find this much as a rule of conduct which could be made effective at once for the guidance of the Selective Service and officials administering the law as thus amended:

To the fullest extent determined by the Director of Selective Service to be administratively practicable, and in accordance with the requisitions of the land and naval forces and with other provisions of this act, the registrant shall be ordered to report to induction stations in such manner that registrants who were married prior to December 8, 1941, who have maintained a bona fide family relationship with their families since that date and who have a child or children under 18 years of age, will be inducted after the induction of other registrants not deferred, exempted, relieved from liability, or postponed from induction under this act or the rules and regulations prescribed thereunder who are available for induction and are acceptable to the land and naval forces.

There, Mr. President, is the legislative rule. There is a declaration of policy on which the Congress can agree forthwith. Under the administration of that rule of conduct thus declared we could achieve some semblance of immediate relief in all the particulars which have been pointed out. Therefore, Mr. President, I respectfully submit that practical considerations alone demand that we act in accordance with the measure as thus delimited.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, during the debate we have received on this very important and trying question opinions of the Army and Navy, opinions of the officers of the Selective Service, the views of various Senators, and, also, the opinions of fathers and mothers who have written us. But there is one voice which has come into the Senate, unofficial, which has impressed me very much. It is the voice of the members of the draft boards of the country, serving our country without compensation faithfully and at great personal sacrifices. They have not been here to testify, but they have written us, and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] just quoted from a letter which he received, which is in substance a duplication of what we have all received from draft boards all over the country. Let me read just two paragraphs:

In other words, if service dodgers were smoked out of deferable classifications our service manpower situation would be taken care of.

That is from a letter from the chairman of a draft board in Missouri to whom the Senator from Missouri referred.

Now listen to another paragraph, and I ask my fellow Senators whether they have not all received from draft boards similar expressions of sentiment. I read:

The IV-F files of boards everywhere are loaded with young men who could and should be used in the service.

Think of it. These administrators of the selective-service law are on the ground, they are dealing with this problem in our home towns; they meet these boys; they see their fathers and mothers; they are better informed than anyone else as to what the problem is, not as to getting the numbers, but as to whether the law is justly and fairly administered. I proceed:

Thousands more are deferred to a special industry and occupation when the individual himself is certainly not strictly essential and should indicate his patriotism in service rather than in dollars.

Is not that so? He states further:

And that only scratches the surface. A competent investigator could ply the streets of any town or city of size and in 24 hours point out plenty of young men who are escaping service improperly.

Is that exaggerated? Is that a distortion of the real facts? I have confirmatory testimony from draft boards in my own State, using almost the same language and the same words. We are now asked to continue by the drafting of fathers, an injustice which has been brought to our attention by these draft boards, when an opportunity is afforded to remedy the situation.

The bill as voted upon up to this hour is in every way commendable, it is helpful in removing this injustice. It is an important contribution to the solution of the problem in a way that is satisfactory to everyone who is interested in removing injustice, and in seeing to it that every able-bodied single man is sent into the service, without deferment, before we go into the homes to take the fathers. But in my opinion, as the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] states, the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana is notice to these Government agencies who are given this directive power under the Bailey amendment to immediately go to work and remove these injustices quickly and conclusively.

The reason why we have had to delay and why we are disturbed about drafting the men needed for the Army and Navy is that everyone knows that there has not been a complete and full attempt to bring into the military service all the single manpower of this country without going into homes and taking fathers. That is the thing that is troubling us. We want to draft fathers if really essential, but we do not want to do it until it is absolutely necessary. The Army and Navy is not responsible for this discrimination and these injustices. We are responsible by permitting loafers and deferred men who are single and strong and healthy to escape service.

Go into any cafe, any hotel, any theater, walk up and down the street, and such men fit for service can be seen by the hundreds. Some of them may have justification and reason, but the draft board authorities say they are helpless without our support to remedy the situation.

It is not pleasant or agreeable to refuse the Army their needed quota, but they have asked for men, not necessarily family men. It is up to us to give them all they require before we draft the fathers of families.

Mr. President, in view of the situation as we know it, I have no hesitancy in making my protest against the failure to draft all available single men by voting for the Wheeler amendment and thereby forcing the Selective Service to speedily remove the widespread injustice and discrimination that are clearly apparent. Let our actions indicate a demand for combing the country to place all available single men in the service before we interfere with the normal family life of the country. I repeat, let us draft all unmarried and married before we conscript fathers.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I wish to say merely one word. I perhaps acted a little hastily when I felt that the Senator from North Carolina, with whom I enjoy a close friendship; as I have for some time had reflected on me, but I have known so many of the guttersnipes who have been criticizing everyone that I was perhaps a little oversensitive. I accept his statement with reference to the matter.

So far as I am personally concerned, the only thing I have in mind is to try

to bring about some speed on the part of the Government bureaus. Now we are to wait, as the Senator from North Carolina intimates, before anything is done about the matter, and we are going to have 446,000 fathers in the Army.

I submit that nowhere in the testimony of General Marshall, no matter how much there was an attempt to get him to say it, can be found the statement that he wanted fathers. He did say that he wanted the men. In the Clark amendment which was agreed to today we provided that the President shall set up a commisison to study the rules and regulations by which men are to be taken into the Army.

Protests have come in from one end of the country to the other about not taking IV-F men. I know the Army does not want to take them, because, as they testified, they are looking at the matter from the standpoint of dollars and cents. Think of it, they want the Congress to pass a law providing that when IV-F men go into the Army they shall waive all the privileges which other men have because of the expense, the dollars and cents, to the Government of the United States.

While we are pouring millions upon millions and billions of dollars into the war some Army officer says, "I do not want to take you unless you sign a waiver, because it is going to cost the Government a few more dollars." So, because they will not take them for the reason that it would cost a few more dollars to hospitalize some of these men over 38, American homes are to be broken up.

I say that these men can be gotten without breaking up a home. I say they can be gotten before January 1, because they can be taken between the ages of 38 and 45, single men. I say that the Army could go into the IV-F classes and get them without breaking up the Army, as General Marshall said. I say that men can be gotten out of the Government service, and out of the industries, where they are nonessential, and where they can be replaced.

That is the issue, Mr. President. Senators cannot hide behind the skirts of General Marshall. If Senators wish to take fathers, if they wish to break up homes, let them do so. But I say that when fathers are taken on the wholesale basis that is now being considered, it will do the Army no good, it will do the country no good. The mail which comes in from all over the country, and the sentiment expressed by people from one end of the country to the other should have some influence upon us, as well as upon those at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, including the Army chiefs. The trouble is—let us be honest about it—that we do not have anyone there as Secretary of War. We have a fine old gentleman, but he cannot act in his capacity as Secretary of War. If we had a man like Jeffers there, with the intestinal stamina that he has, we would not be in the situation we are in today. If we had a Barney Baruch at the head of the War Department we would not be in the situation we are in today. If we had anyone else who had health who could properly conduct the Department, we would not be in the situation we are in today. But because of the incompetence of some department heads the children of America are going to suffer.

Senators can vote the amendment up or vote it down, but so far as I am concerned, if I am the only one who votes for it, I shall vote for it, and I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] on which he demands the yeas and nays. Is the demand seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHANDLER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who, I am informed, if present, would vote "nay." I vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WAGNER. I announce that my colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is absent on official business. If present he would vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Conditions on the West Coast.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILEO] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who is absent because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], whose pair has been announced, has been called from the city on public business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who would vote "nay" on this question, is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent on official appointments.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—26

Aiken	Hawkes	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Wallgren
Chavez	Millikin	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	Moore	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Nye	Willis
Ferguson	Reed	

NAYS—48

Andrews	Green	O'Daniel
Austin	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Gurney	Overton
Ball	Hatch	Pepper
Barbour	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Holman	Stewart
Caraway	Kilgore	Taft
Chandler	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Danaher	McClellan	Tunnell
Eastland	McFarland	Tydings
Ellender	McKellar	Vandenberg
George	Maloney	Van Nuys
Gerry	Maybank	Wagner
Gillette	Murdock	Wiley

NOT VOTING—22

Bankhead	Downey	Smith
Bilbo	Glass	Tobey
Bone	La Follette	Truman
Brewster	McNary	Wherry
Burton	Mead	White
Bushfield	Murray	Wilson
Byrd	Reynolds	
Davis	Scrugham	

So Mr. WHEELER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

The War Manpower Commission is authorized and directed to survey the use of labor in plants, mills, mines and all other production or service establishments and to check on the use of labor in these establishments for the purpose of achieving its most efficient use. The War Manpower Commission shall report to the Congress every 90 days on the number of persons made available for military service and essential war work as a result of these surveys.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to modify the amendment so as to add, after the words "check on the use", the words "or the hoarding", so that the amendment would read:

The War Manpower Commission is authorized and directed to survey the use of labor in plants, mills, mines, and all other production or service establishments and to check on the use or the hoarding of labor in these establishments for the purpose of achieving its most efficient use. The War Manpower Commission shall report to the Congress every 90 days on the number of persons made available for military service and essential war work as a result of these surveys.

Mr. President, at this hour I shall not inject into the discussion a controversial amendment. I was hoping that in re-

sponse to what has been declared in the discussion to be the sentiment of the Senate—that there should be the maximum utilization of labor in the industrial plants of the country—the able Senator in charge of the bill might be agreeable to taking the amendment to conference, for consideration there.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I notice a weakness in the Senator's amendment. No provision is made as to the nature of the survey to be made or the personnel who would make it. I can envision more persons in behalf of the War Manpower Commission using more manpower to make the survey proposed by the Senator's amendment than could possibly be obtained as a result of the survey. I am opposed to the amendment, coming as it does at this hour.

Mr. PEPPER. No presently established agency has the duty of making such surveys, and I did not know of any agency better qualified than the War Manpower Commission to make an investigation of the subject of the use of labor.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator is talking about an organization which was created under Executive order, which has not been set up in accordance with any legislative standards. We have no knowledge whatsoever of the extent or scope of its purported operations. I respectfully submit that while the Senator from Florida hopes no controversy over the proposition will be raised at this hour, his amendment is just starting one.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment; but I should like to make an observation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent is not required.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well, Mr. President. I should like to say that from the beginning of the war the British have had a labor utilization inspection service. They have had the representatives of their ministry of labor go into various war industries and ascertain whether the employers were making efficient use of the labor they had.

We never have had anything like that. If we had, we could, I am sure, discover many instances of the hoarding of labor and many instances of the inefficiency of labor, and we could achieve a great deal in the way of a more effective use of the Nation's manpower.

So I hope such an investigation and survey will be made. As a matter of fact, I believe it already to be the duty of the War Manpower Commission to make such investigations and surveys, so that when an employer applies for additional labor, but is not making efficient use of the labor he has, the additional labor he requests will not be granted to him by the employment service to which he makes application.

Therefore, Mr. President, even if the amendment is not formally agreed to, I am sure what has been said in the debate will call to the attention of the War Manpower Commission its obligation to see to it that there is no hoarding of labor, and that all management makes the most effective use it possibly can of the labor it has.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DANAHER. I understood the Senator from Florida to ask unanimous consent, and to have obtained it, to withdraw the amendment he offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent was not required, so the Chair informed the Senator from Florida.

Mr. DANAHER. Was the amendment withdrawn?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Presumably so.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on page 1, in line 5, instead of the word "subsection," the word "subsections" should appear, because as the bill was originally drafted there was only one subsection, but as now amended there are a number of subsections. I offer the amendment that at that point the word "subsection" be changed to read "subsections."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I offer another minor amendment: On page 3, in line 10, insert a comma after the word "practicable."

A comma really should appear there. If the matter of that insertion will result in the raising of any argument, I shall not ask that the insertion be made. I offer the amendment providing for the insertion of a comma at that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendmen of the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on the final passage of the bill, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair, and I am advised that the Senator with whom I am paired would vote as I am about to vote. Therefore, being at liberty to vote, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. My colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], is unavoidably absent on public business. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WAGNER. My colleague the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is absent on official business. If he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. CHANDLER (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], who is unavoidably detained. I am advised that if he were present he would vote as I have voted. Therefore, I permit my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family. I am advised that, if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Conditions on the West Coast.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, those Senators would vote "yea."

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are detained on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting, those Senators would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] has been called from the city on public business. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent on official appointments.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—69

Aiken	Gillette	Murdock
Austin	Green	O'Daniel
Bailey	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Ball	Gurney	Overton
Barbour	Hatch	Pepper
Barkley	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bridges	Hayden	Revercomb
Brooks	Hill	Robertson
Buck	Holman	Russell
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Capper	Kilgore	Stewart
Caraway	Langer	Taft
Chandler	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Tydings
Connally	McFarland	Vandenberg
Danaher	McKellar	Van Nuys
Eastland	McNary	Wagner
Ellender	Maloney	Waligren
Ferguson	Maybank	Walsh
George	Millikin	Wiley
Gerry	Moore	Willis

NOT VOTING—27

Andrews	Burton	Glass
Bankhead	Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.
Bilbo	Byrd	La Follette
Bone	Davis	Mead
Brewster	Downey	Murray

Nye	Smith	Wheeler
Reed	Thomas, Idaho	Wherry
Reynolds	Tobey	White
Scrugham	Truman	Wilson

So the bill (S. 763) was passed.

The bill as passed is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(m) After the beginning of the second calendar month following the date of enactment of this subsection and until the termination of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President, no registrant between the ages of 18 and 38 shall be employed by or remain in the employ of the Federal Government so long as he is deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces of the United States under section 5 (e) or section 5 (c) (2) by reason of such employment, unless (1) such registrant was married prior to December 8, 1941, and has a child or children under 18 years of age; or (2) the services of such registrant in the Federal position in which he is or shall be employed are certified by the committee or official authorized to request deferment in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 23, Seventy-eighth Congress, to be indispensable to the operations of the Federal department or agency concerned. Any such certification shall contain a statement of the reasons for determining that the services of such registrant are indispensable, and a copy of such certification shall be transmitted to Congress within 30 days from the date such certification is made. After the beginning of the second calendar month following the date of enactment of this subsection and until the termination of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President, no registrant between the ages of 18 and 38 who is employed by any employer other than the Federal Government shall be deferred, nor shall the deferment of any such registrant continue, on occupational grounds under section 5 (e) or section 5 (c) (2) by reason of such employment, unless (A) such registrant was married prior to December 8, 1941, and has a child or children under 18 years of age, or (B) the employer of such registrant furnishes to the registrant's Selective Service local board a written statement to the effect that the registrant's services in the position in which he is employed are indispensable to the operations of the plant, establishment, business, or other activity in which he is employed and such board finds such statement to be in accord with the facts. Any such written statement shall contain a statement of the reasons for determining that the services of such registrant are indispensable.

"(n) In the case of any registrant whose principal place of employment is located outside the appeal board area in which the local board having jurisdiction over the registrant is located, any occupational deferment under subsection (c) (2) or subsection (e) of this section existing at the date of enactment of this subsection shall within 30 days after such date, and any such occupational deferment made after the date of enactment of this subsection shall within 10 days after such deferment is made, be submitted for review and decision to the selective service appeal board having jurisdiction over the area in which is located the principal place of employment of the registrant. Such decision of the appeal board shall be final unless modified or changed by the Director of Selective Service. The Director of Selective Service, upon appeal or upon his own motion, shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, training and service under this act; and the determination of the Director shall be final.

"(o) To the fullest extent determined by the Director of Selective Service to be administratively practicable, and in accordance with the requisitions of the land and naval forces and with the other provisions of this act, registrants shall be ordered to report to induction stations in such a manner that registrants who were married prior to December 8, 1941, who have maintained a bona fide family relationship with their families since that date and who have a child or children under 18 years of age, will be inducted after the induction of other registrants not deferred, exempted, relieved from liability, or postponed from induction under this act or the rules and regulations prescribed thereunder who are available for induction and are acceptable to the land and naval forces. The term 'child' as used in this section means a legitimate child born prior to September 15, 1942, a stepchild who became such prior to December 8, 1941, or an adopted child adopted prior to December 8, 1941, who is less than 18 years of age, or who by reason of mental or physical defects is incapable of self-support, who is unmarried, and with whom the registrant has maintained a bona fide family relationship in their home since December 7, 1941, or since the date of birth if such date of birth is later than December 7, 1941."

SEC. 2. Section 10 (b) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The President is authorized to delegate to the Director of Selective Service any authority vested in him under this act (except section 9). The Director of Selective Service may delegate and provide for the delegation of any authority so delegated to him by the President and any other authority vested in him under this act, to such officers, agents, or persons as he may designate or appoint for such purpose or as may be designated or appointed for such purpose pursuant to such rules and regulations as he may prescribe."

SEC. 3. Section 10 of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) In order to assist in the determination of whether or not men should be deferred from training and service because they are physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective, and to delay as long as possible the induction of men living with their families, the President is authorized and directed forthwith to appoint a commission of five qualified physicians, of whom at least one shall be an Army officer and one a Navy officer, who shall examine the physical qualification requirements for admission to the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and recommend to the President any changes therein which they believe can be made without impairing the efficiency of the armed services. The commission shall especially consider the establishment of special standards for men who will be inducted only for limited service. The Director of Selective Service shall cause to be reexamined those men who may qualify under any new standards established."

SEC. 4. Any registrant within the categories herein defined when it appears that his induction will shortly occur shall, if he requests it, be permitted by his local board, to take a preinduction physical examination, at any regularly established induction center. Such local board shall, upon such request by the registrant being made, issue him an order for that purpose and the examining officers of any induction center are hereby required to conduct such examination in the same manner as though for induction.

The examining officers at such induction center who conduct such physical examination under this provision shall issue to the registrant a certificate showing his physical fitness or lack thereof, and such certificate shall be accepted by the local board and shall be binding upon such board in the same manner as now followed upon examination immediately prior to final induction.

SEC. 5. That section 101 of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 381; 37 U. S. C. Supp. 201), is amended by striking out in the first and second lines the words "of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grades."

SEC. 6. That section 102 of such act is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the words "except as to the initial family allowance provided by section 107 (a) hereof."

SEC. 7. That section 103 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 103. The dependents of any such enlisted man to whom a family allowance is payable under the provisions of this title shall be divided into three classes to be known as class A, class B, and class B–1 dependents. The class A dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the wife, the child, or the former wife divorced of any such enlisted man. The class B dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the parent, grandchild, brother, or sister of such enlisted man and who is found by the Secretary of the Department concerned to be dependent upon such enlisted man for a substantial portion of his support. The class B–1 dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the parent, brother, or sister of such enlisted man and who is found by the Secretary of the Department concerned to be dependent upon such enlisted man for the chief portion of his support."

SEC. 8. That section 104 of such act is amended by inserting after the words "class B" in the sixth and thirteenth lines, respectively, thereof the words "or class B–1."

SEC. 9. That section 105 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 105. The amount of the monthly family allowance, consisting of the reduction in, or charge to, the pay of the enlisted man and the Government's contribution, payable to the dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man shall be—

"To class A dependent or dependents: A wife but no child, $50; a wife and one child, $80 (with an additional $20 for each additional child, the total amount payable on account of two or more children to be equally divided among the children); a child but no wife, $42 (with an additional $20 for each additional child, the total amount payable on account of two or more children to be equally divided among the children); a wife divorced, $42 (in no event more than the amount of alimony decreed and still payable).

"To class B dependent or dependents (where there is no class B–1 dependent): Where there is no class A dependent, $37 (payable to only one designated dependent); where there is a class A dependent, $20 (payable to only one designated dependent).

"To class B–1 dependent or dependents: One parent but no brother or sister, $50; two parents but no brother or sister, $68 (the total amount payable on account of two parents to be equally divided between them); one parent and one brother or sister, $68 (with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister but not to exceed two); two parents and one brother or sister $79 (with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister but not to exceed two); a brother or sister but no parent, $42 (with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister but not to exceed two. The total amount payable on account of two or more brothers and sisters to be equally divided among them)."

SEC. 10. (a) That section 106 (a) of such act is amended by striking out in the sixth and seventh lines thereof the words "both

class A and class B" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "more than one class of."

(b) That section 106 (b) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) In any case in which the payment of the monthly family allowances involves two or more dependents, the total amount may be apportioned and paid for the benefit of such dependents as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the department concerned."

(c) That section 106 (c) of such act is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, in any case in which a family allowance is granted under this title—

"(1) to a wife or a child living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order or decree or a written agreement, the amount of the family allowance payable to such wife or child shall not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or decree or in the written agreement as the amount to be paid to such wife or child, except that in the case of a wife or child living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order or decree or a written agreement, and such order, decree, or agreement is silent as to the amount to be paid to such wife or child, no family allowance shall be payable unless application is made by the enlisted man or unless the Secretary of the department concerned finds that it is impracticable for the enlisted man to make such application, in which case the full allowance prescribed by this title shall be paid; and except that in the case of an application filed for an allowance for a child living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order or decree or written agreement which fixes the amount to be paid for such child's support at a lesser amount than is provided for such child by this title, the Secretary of the department concerned may authorize payment of the allowance in any amount greater than that fixed by such court order, decree, or written agreement, but not in excess of the amount prescribed by this title; or

"(2) to a former wife divorced, the amount of the family allowance payable to such former wife divorced shall not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or decree as the amount to be paid to such former wife divorced."

SEC. 11. (a) That section 107 of such act is amended by striking out all before the first proviso, including the word *"Provided"*, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 107. (a) An initial family allowance shall be paid for the month in which an enlisted man enters a pay status in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after October 1, 1943, in the amounts and to the dependents hereinafter set forth.

"Such initial family allowance shall be paid to the designated dependent only when a written application therefor is filed by such enlisted man within 15 days after the date of his entry into active service in a pay status and shall be paid as soon as practicable after the filing of such application.

"If paid, such initial family allowance shall be in lieu of the regular monthly family allowance for the month of the enlisted man's entry into active service in a pay status.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of this title, the full amount of such initial family allowance shall be paid by the Government, and no reduction in or charge to the pay of the enlisted man shall be made for such payment.

"The amount of the initial family allowance payable to the dependent or dependents shall be—

"(1) $50, if such enlisted man has a wife but no child;

"(2) $80, if such enlisted man has a wife and one child, and an additional $20 for each additional child;

"(3) $42, if such enlisted man has no wife but has one child, and an additional $20 for each additional child;

"(4) $50, if such enlisted man has one parent dependent upon him for chief support; $68, if such enlisted man has one parent and one brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, but not to exceed $90 in the aggregate;

"(5) $68, if such enlisted man has two parents dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, but not to exceed $101 in the aggregate;

"(6) $42, if such enlisted man has no parent but has a brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, but not to exceed $64 in the aggregate. Payment of the initial family allowance may be made to one payee for each class of dependents, as defined in section 103 for whom an allowance is requested.

"(b) The monthly family allowance provided for by this title shall be paid for the period beginning with the first day of the month in which application therefor is filed, or the first day of the month in which the dependent or dependents first become entitled thereto, whichever is later, subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, and shall be terminated or reduced, as may be required, on the last day of the month in which the disbursing officer paying the allowance receives notice of a change in status of the enlisted man or a dependent which terminated or limited the right of his dependent or dependents to receive such allowance: *Provided*, That the period of entitlement to family allowances shall be as hereinbefore prescribed for payment, except that in the case of a change in status of a dependent, the period of entitlement shall cease with the last day of the month in which such change occurs: *Provided further*".

SEC. 12. That section 108 of such act is amended by inserting in the first line thereof after "SEC 108", the subparagraph designation "(a)", and adding at the end of the section a new subsection to read as follows:

"(b) An enlisted man receiving a monetary allowance in lieu of quarters for dependents, or who, being entitled thereto and having made application therefor on or before the date of approval of this act, may, at his option, receive or continue to receive such monetary allowance, or elect to receive in lieu thereof, the benefits of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended: *Provided*, That an enlisted man's election shall be irrevocable during the period of entitlement to such allowance as set out in section 101: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the department concerned is authorized to make the election on behalf of the enlisted man in any case in which he deems it desirable and finds it impracticable for the enlisted man to so elect, however, such an election made on behalf of the enlisted man shall not preclude an election at a later date by the enlisted man: *Provided further*, That in the case of any enlisted man whose dependents are receiving family allowances and occupying public quarters, a deduction from or charge to his pay shall be made at the rate of $1.25 per day."

SEC. 13. That section 110 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 110. (a) Entitlement to and payment of any family allowance authorized under provisions of this title to the dependent or dependents of any enlisted man shall not be contingent upon pay accruing to such enlisted man or upon the monthly pay of such man being reduced by or charged with any amount."

SEC. 14. That section 119 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 119. Any person who shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, contract for, charge, or receive or shall attempt to solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee or compensation for assisting in any manner an enlisted man or dependent in obtaining a family allowance payable under this title, shall, upon conviction thereof, be guilty of a misdemeanor and for each and every offense shall be punishable by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $1,000 or by imprisonment at hard labor for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

SEC. 15. That section 120 (c) (4) of such act is amended by striking out the words "under oath" in the fourth line thereof.

SEC. 16. That section 120 (i) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) The terms 'man' and 'enlisted man' mean any enlisted individual of the first to seventh grades, both inclusive, in any of the services mentioned in section 101 of this act and include members of the band of the United States Marine Corps, but do not include the leader and second leader of the band of the United States Marine Corps, the Philippine Army, the Philippine Scouts, the insular force of the Navy, the Samoan Native Guard or band of the Navy, or the Samoan reserve force of the Marine Corps."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the title of the bill be amended so as to read, "A bill amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes."

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may we have an order that the bill be immediately printed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT OF BRIGADIER GENERALS OF THE LINE IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Military Affairs, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate bill 1410, which was unanimously approved by the committee, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. It is a very short bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1410) to amend section 4 of the act approved June 13, 1940.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment on page 1, at the end of line 5, to insert the words "of the Regular Army", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act approved June 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 381), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. That hereafter brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army shall be appointed from among officers of the line permanently commissioned in the Regular Army and carried on the promotion list in grades not below that of lieutenant colonel whose names are borne on an eligible list prepared annually by a board of not less than five general officers of the line, not below the grade of major general; and hereafter appointment as chief of any branch shall be made from among officers permanently commissioned in the Regular Army in grades not below that of lieutenant colonel and who have demonstrated by actual and extended service in

such branch or on similar duty that they are qualified for such appointment."

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is merely to remove a restriction which now exists and which discriminates against Regular Army officers. The restriction is contained in the following words of existing law:

who are accredited with 28 years continuous commissioned service in the Regular Army, as hereinbefore provided.

That condition or limitation does not exist as to any other officers except Regular officers of the line in the Regular Army; and the occasion for the immediate consideration of the bill is the fact that there is held up a list of nominations to fill vacancies among the permanent general officers of the line.

The President sent a memorandum to the Senate, addressed to the President of the Senate, and reading as follows:

Memorandum for the President of the Senate:

Attached is a list of nominations to fill vacancies among the permanent general officers of the line. The names of these particular officers are well known for the conspicuous services they have already rendered the Nation in the present emergency. Five of them, however, Lieutenant Generals Kenney and Clark, and Major Generals Handy, Eaker, and Smith, have less than the legally prescribed 28 years of continuous commissioned service in the Regular Army which is required by the National Defense Act as a prerequisite to appointment as a brigadier general of the line of the Regular Army. The provisions of the National Defense Act quite evidently had in mind peacetime conditions because it is not conceivable that a lieutenant general, for example, in highly successful command of our Air Forces engaged with the enemy in the southwest Pacific is not qualified for appointment as a brigadier general of the Regular Army.

I hope you will arrange for the necessary modification of the law to meet this situation.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SHORTAGE OF BOXCARS IN NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a number of telegrams and letters received from various farmers and cooperative associations dealing with the boxcar situation in North Dakota.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REGENT CO-OPERATIVE EQUITY EXCHANGE,
Regent, N. Dak., September 14, 1943.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

YOUR HONOR: In regard to car shortage for shipping wheat and other grains, and the cars that do come are not properly divided between the elevators, elevators that in ordinary times didn't hardly get any grain are now getting their equal share of cars with others that got three-fourths more grain, and they get the wheat because they got the room. We are now getting 1 or 2 cars per day where we should have 9 or 10 cars daily. There is ever so much grain piled up in the fields waiting for cars so it can be picked up and put in elevator.

Please see what can be done to help the situation. This is very urgent. Thanks for cooperation.

Yours respectfully,

ANTON A. BOLTE, *Director.*

REGENT COOPERATIVE EQUITY EXCHANGE,
Regent, N. Dak., September 15, 1943.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: There is a condition existing here in marketing grain through our cooperative elevator. We have a large volume of grain and don't get our share or proportion of cars, and lots of co-op-minded farmers have to haul to the old-line elevators. It seems like we should get cars according to our volume of grain. Now there are a dozen trucks waiting here at 7 a. m. The boys know what I have written and are going to sign this letter instead of writing one themselves.

Yours very truly,

R. E. NEWBY.

W. F. Brugamyer, Regent, N. Dak.; P. O. Hegge, Regent, N. Dak.; Adam Krebs, Regent, N. Dak.; A. A. Gion, Regent, N. Dak.; Carroll Rutherford, Regent, N. Dak.; Henry Monhi, Regent, N. Dak.; Norman Hartman, Regent, N. Dak.; Eddie Gion, Regent, N. Dak.; Hazel Rutherford, Regent, N. Dak.; G. E. Trundhill, Regent, N. Dak.; Vincent Olson, Regent, N. Dak.; Leo Rausch, Mott, N. Dak.; Anton Bolte, Regent, N. Dak.; H. D. Johnson, Regent, N. Dak.; Herbert Halverson, Regent, N. Dak.; E. A. Child, Regent, N. Dak.; Kaspar J. Krebs, Lefor, N. Dak.; Anton Krebs, New England, N. Dak.; Gabriel Greff, Jr., New England, N. Dak.; Mike Koppinger, Regent, N. Dak.; Robert Huffman, Regent, N. Dak.; George Huffman, Regent, N. Dak.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The above names are a few of the farmers and members of this corporation that have signed this letter to try and get more grain cars at this station.

Yours very truly,

REGENT CO-OP EQUITY EXCHANGE,
R. A. GRAY, *Manager.*

WILLISTON, N. DAK., *September 25, 1943.*

Senator LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Members of Williston Township Farmers' Union Local respectfully inform you the grain-storage situation here is very bad. Grain piled on ground is spoiling and granaries and elevators plugged. More boxcars must be made available immediately to accommodate essential flax crop before it goes to waste. Allocation of boxcars absolutely should be based on historic volume, but this is not being done. We request a Senate investigation immediately to effect relief.

WILLISTON TOWNSHIP
FARMERS' UNION LOCAL,
EMIL LARSON, *President.*
MRS. OSCAR DURHAM,
Secretary.

RAY, N. DAK., *September 22, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The railroad has dug up an old ruling which is making it hard for our cooperative elevator, and we feel that this is nothing but a plan of the private grain trade to cut down our volume. Our elevator had about 10 times the handle of grain last year of our competitor, and now under this old ruling we can only get car for car with them, and here we sit with no way of getting our crops out unless we patronize some private concern. We hate to be taken advantage of in these critical times. Will you kindly look into this for us.

MARY OLSON,
Secretary, West Bank Local.

ZAHL, N. DAK., *September 25, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

Storage insufficient. Grain on ground menace to livestock. Cars needed.

DALE AMSBOUGH.

ZAHL, N. DAK., *September 25, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

Farmers' elevators of these small towns need cars at once.

RALPH E. EMERY.

ZAHL, N. DAK., *September 25, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

Farmers badly in need of cars to move 1943 crop.

CLIFFORD CHRISTIANSON.

APPAM, N. DAK., *September 24, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Shortage grain cars is very bad. I have half of my flax standing and cannot harvest balance of flax account of storage space. Elevators are plugged. Please use your influence to relieve grain-car shortage.

LESTER B. QUIE.

APPAM, N. DAK., *September 23, 1943.*

WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We are in a very bad fix on account of boxcar shortage. Wheat and barley is piled all over the fields and we have no place for our flax. Pasture is short. I cannot leave my sheep and cattle out account of grain piles. Please do what you can to relieve car shortage.

OLIVER P. HOLM.

APPAM, N. DAK., *September 23, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Millions of bushels of wheat and barley piled on the ground on account of lack of cars to haul same, elevators are filled to capacity. Please use your influence to relieve car shortage; cannot turn stock loose.

ED. C. NELSON.

APPAM, N. DAK., *September 23, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Would you please use your influence in behalf of the farmers to relieve boxcar shortage; wheat and barley piled on nearly every field. Flax harvest discontinued. Elevators filled to overflowing.

HENRY KNUDSVIG.

APPAM, N. DAK., *September 23, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

I am asking your help to relieve the shortage of boxcars to haul the grain; wheat and barley are piled up in nearly every field; pastures are short and cannot turn stock out.

ANDREW THORPE.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., *September 22, 1943.*

Senator LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Grain boxcar shortage critical. Thousands bushels awaiting shipment. Flax storage on ground a total loss. Other grain loss also large. Farm storage all filled. Allocation of cars should be according to last year's business. Please investigate.

FARMERS UNION, LOCAL NO. 385,
THEO. SANDVIK, *President,*
ARNOLD ANDERSON, *Secretary.*

WILLISTON, N. DAK., *September 22, 1943.*
Senator LANGER,
Senate Office Bldg., Washington, D. C.:
Shortage of grain boxcars critical. Last year's business should be basis of allocation. Please investigate.
NELS TROGSTAD.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., *September 22, 1943.*
Senator LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Grain boxcar shortage critical. Allocation should also be on last year's business. Please investigate.
ARNOLD ANDERSON,
Bonetrail, N. Dak.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., *September 22, 1943.*
Senator LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Shortage of grain cars serious. Allocation should be on volume of last year's business. Please investigate.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., *September 23, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Grain marketing situation critical due to serious boxcar shortage. Farm shortage facilities exhausted. This township alone has estimated 80,000 bushels grain on ground. Must have cars to move flax for which no storage facilities available. Much flax will not be harvested under present conditions. We feel cars should be allocated according to past volume. Urge immediate attention.
In meeting assembled, September 21, 1943.
HEBRON FARMERS UNION, LOCAL 398.
ORMAN ROCKSTAD, *Secretary.*

APPAM, N. DAK., *September 22, 1943.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:
Boxcar situation very bad. Elevators plugged. Farmers are discontinuing flax harvest for lack of storage space. Wheat and barley piled on almost every field. Livestock cannot be turned loose on account of this situation. Please do everything you can to relieve present car shortage.
APPAM FARMERS ELEVATOR CO.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., *September 22, 1943.*
Senator LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Grain is going to waste every day. Boxcar service is bad. Allocation of cars unfair. Please investigate.
THEO. SANDVIL.

APPAM, N. DAK.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Drastic steps should be taken to relieve car shortage. Forty-five percent of flax not harvested. Farmers cattle have to be kept up with piles of wheat in fields yet.
SECRETARY, BLUE WINNER
FARMERS UNION LOCAL.

APPAM, N. DAK., *September 24, 1943.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:
Car shortage in this territory critical. Farmers unable to harvest crops on account of green weeds in flax making spoiling of same in elevators very high. Farmers unable to continue because impossible to put flax on ground. Allocation of cars very unfair to cooperative movement.
SIDNEY R. SOLBERG.

KILDEER, N. DAK., *September 16, 1943.*
The Honorable Senator LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: It has been for about 20 years the custom of the railroad companies to distribute grain cars to elevators according to past volume of business, which I think was a fair practice.
Now they have changed this ruling, giving every elevator, big or small, the same amount of cars.
This is about as unfair as if a rationing board of some city would give a small restaurant the same amount of sugar or some other rationed item, than a very large restaurant. Therefore, I, as the president of the Farmers Elevator Co. of Killdeer, N. Dak., in behalf of our association, ask you to do all that is in your power to help change this order of the railroads to what it was before, so that a fairer distribution of cars can be effected.
Yours truly,
HANS SCHMIDT.

BRANTFORD, N. DAK., *September 22, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.
An order not used for 20 years blocks our two elevators at Brantford from receiving our share of boxcars on past volume of business. Storm in this section destroyed hundreds of granaries last summer with no lumber to rebuild. The situation is critical. Grain on ground destroying rapidly. The Government asks for wheat. Can't we get cars in this storm district to care for crops. One of our elevators here handled 250,000 bushels last year. Immediate action imperative.
THE ST. ANTHONY & DAKOTA ELEVATOR CO.

BOWBELLS, N. DAK, *September 21, 1943.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
The board of directors of the Bowbells Farmers' Union Elevator request you to protest to the Office of Defense Transportation against the present railroad order on box car distribution. Distribution should be made on past volume of business.
R. A. OWINGS, *President.*
PALMER CHRISTENSON, *Secretary.*

ZEELAND FARMERS UNION
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Zeeland, N. Dak., September 18, 1943.
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Our cooperative and its members wish that you would give your best possible support to see that the cars are distributed right as it should be. We need cars here in the Northwest and we need them badly.
The cooperatives are being abused at this rate, and the cooperatives are owned and run by farmers who have had such a hard struggle thus far.
Your help certainly will be appreciated.
Yours truly,
LEONARD KOCHER, *Manager.*

WILLISTON, N. DAK., *September 21, 1943.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Grain marketing situation here critical due to boxcar shortage and faulty allocation of boxcars. Grain piled on ground causing waste of essential food. Urge your attention immediately.
MISSOURI RIDGE FARMERS UNION LOCAL.
Mrs. C. A. WICKS, *Secretary.*

FINLEY FARMERS GRAIN
& ELEVATOR CO.,
Finley, N. Dak., September 17, 1943.
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Be sure to have A. R. A. Order C. S. C. No. 10 rescinded as this distribution of cars is entirely unfair. Cars should be distributed according to volume of business.
Yours very truly,
S. B. DYRSTAD, *Manager.*

REGAN FARMERS UNION COOPERATIVE,
Regan, N. Dak., September 15, 1943.
Mr. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
DEAR SENATOR: The board of directors of the Regan Farmers Union Cooperatove authorized the writing of this letter: The object: Circular C. C. S. 10, under the date line of July 23, 1923.
The above order, when applied to our business, is very unfair, obstructive, detrimental, and represents a financial loss to us, in that our very existence depends upon the amount of business we are able to transact, and the above order certainly prohibits transactions.
To us it appears that at the time this order was issued certain influence was brought to bear causing the I. C. C. to overlook the interests of the cooperatives. In our line of business the cooperatives (through the incentive set forth in our constitution, and the desire to patronize home industry), the requirement for boxcars is greater than for the line elevator companies, who are our competitors, and should be recognized as such, in the distribution of grain cars. An equal distribution, instead of on the basis of previous shipments, is favoring the line elevators, and this is the basis of our objection to the above-mentioned order.
In our own personal interests, and the interests of all cooperatives, we beg of you, to lend all of your influence, and power at your command, to have the above order conveyed in circular C. C. S. 10 rescinded immediately, and the distribution basis reestablished on previous shipment requirements.
Thanking you in advance for any relief you can get for us in this matter, we are
Yours truly,
W. W. SCOTT, *Manager.*

HALLIDAY FARMERS ELEVATOR CO.,
Halliday, N. Dak.
WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR MR. LANGER: Ours is a cooperative elevator and we believe that we are being discriminated against by the action of the railroads, by not allowing the boxcars according to volume of business. Therefore we respectfully ask your support of any action that may be taken by Senator WHEELER of Montana, to correct this discriminatory procedure arising out of the fact that the railroads are using that ruling known as C. C. S. 10 to distribute boxcars. We believe that this ruling is forcing business away from the cooperative elevator.
We sincerely hope that you will do everything in your power to correct this matter through law.
Yours very truly,
GEO. BOECKEL, *Manager.*

HAZELTON FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR CO.,
Hazelton, N. Dak., September 17, 1943.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: In former years grain cars allocated according to past receipts. This year

the railroads are dividing the cars evenly regardless of past receipts. Due to this ruling we are losing about 75 percent of our business. A. R. A. order No. 10 is a menace to all farmers and farmers' cooperative elevators and we ask that you put forth every effort to rescind A. R. A. order No. 10 so that grain cars again will be distributed according to the amount of business performed.

We are sure Joseph Eastman, chairman of O. D. T. will help correct present procedure if presented with the true facts which we are certain you will be able to present to him.

Yours truly,

MIKE PFLUGRATH, *Manager.*

WILLISTON, N. DAK., *September 20, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

All farmers in this community have granaries filled and grain piles on ground due to plugged elevators and boxcar shortage. With present rainy weather we face serious loss of this grain and especially if flax cannot be delivered to elevators. We have responded to Government plea for increased production. Now in fairness we demand Government force railroads provide adequate transportation so our production will not have to rot on the ground. Railroads now favoring independent and line elevators as against farmers' cooperative elevators by refusing to allocate boxcars on basis of historic volume. We respectfully ask Senate investigate this situation and take remedial steps immediately.

TWIN LAKE FARMERS UNION LOCAL,
CARL R. LARSON, *Secretary.*

WILLISTON, N. DAK., *September 20, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

All elevators in this area plugged due to boxcar shortage. Thousands of bushels wheat and barley now piled on ground. These piles not only wasteful, but constitute serious menace to livestock. Many farmers decided not to harvest flax until elevator space is available. Present method of allocating boxcars to elevators very unfair. Farmers Union elevator in Williston with capacity to handle 25,000 bushels daily allocated 1 car per day same as smaller elevators regardless of volume. We respectfully request immediate congressional investigation of this situation, looking toward early relief.

WILLIAMS COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
S. A. FORSETH, *Secretary.*

SHERWOOD, N. DAK., *September 18, 1943.*
WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

A most serious boxcar shortage exists here. Tens of thousands of bushels of grain are piled high on the prairie. The flax crop is excellent, but will spoil on the ground unless this car shortage is released at once. A dozen cars will do no good; we need hundreds to save this crop if the Secretary of Agriculture wants response from the farmers next spring when asked to seed flax he will have to act at once to save this crop.

FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR CO.

PERTH, N. DAK., *September 17, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

Car shortage very serious. No cars since the 10th. Wheat is being dumped on the ground. Farmers frantic. Line houses seems to be favored.

PERTH FARMERS COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
W. FALLE, *Manager.*

ALAMO, N. DAK., *September 18, 1943.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The present railroad order on boxcars discriminates against coop elevators. This order has not been used since 1923 and there is no reason for digging it up now. We want nothing more than a fair distribution of cars on a basis of historic volume of business. Revoke A. R. A. order C. S. C. No. 10.

ALAMO FARMERS COOP ELEVATOR CO.

ADDRESSES BY SENATORS RETURNING FROM THE WAR FRONTS—ORDER FOR SESSION WITH CLOSED DOORS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the order, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, that on tomorrow (Thursday, October 7, 1943), immediately following the prayer of the Chaplain, the Senate proceed to consider business with closed doors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations and withdrawing a nomination, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

John K. Caldwell, of Kentucky, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, acting as minister resident and consul general in Ethiopia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Ethiopia.

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment, appointment by transfer, and promotion in the Regular Army; and

Sundry officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads;

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert E. Hannegan to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc; and without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, October 7, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 6 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Angus J. Gallagher, of Ohio, to be administrative officer, at $5,600 per annum, national headquarters, Selective Service System.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Admiral Herbert F. Leary, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 1st day of November 1943, and to continue during his assignment as Commander Eastern Sea Frontier.

The following-named rear admirals of the Navy, when retired on November 1, 1943, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral pursuant to an act of Congress approved June 16, 1942:

Adolphus Andrews
Roland M. Brainard

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate October 6 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

POSTMASTER

WISCONSIN

Arthur H. Klingbeil to be postmaster at Brodhead in the State of Wisconsin.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 6 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Robert E. Hannegan to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

POSTMASTERS

LOUISIANA

Gussie Long Harris, Athens.
Willie B. Killgore, Lisbon.

NEW YORK

Frank C. Timm, Attica.
Agnes D. Buckley, Boonville.
Mary B. Sherry, East Patchogue.
Alma H. Jones, East Quogue.
Jennie W. Jewell, Fishkill.
Agnes Rourke, Gansevoort.
Samuel J. Hand, Genoa.
Joseph P. Wilson, Manhasset.
Milton S. Smith, Mayville.
S. Erle Dodge, Newfane.
Sylvester J. Krasniewicz, Pine Island.
Wilbur A. Gruhn, Sea Breeze.
Josephine Westphall, South New Berlin.
Walter Rossen, Vestal.
Parke Higgins, Warsaw.
J. Austin Howe, Weedsport.
Myrtle M. Freeman, Windsor.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, in all the confusion and perplexity of these convulsive days we look up with the inner eyes of deep desire, believing with a faith that will not be denied that somewhere in the universe is a Reality that answers to the noblest hopes which ever flash their bright beams in the darkness. From the misty flats of dull and sluggish moods which so often becloud the radiant faith by which we really live, lift our spirits, we pray, to the height of the historic moment in which we are set.

As day by day within these hallowed walls we stand in the Valley of Decision we would fail not Thee nor our fellow men who, caught in the fell clutch of tyranny, are counting on us for deliverance. Strengthen our will to choose that which is morally excellent rather than that which is politically expedient; so that receiving today the inheritance of yesterday we may transmit it unsullied and unwasted to tomorrow. Bring us to an enduring peace when justice shall roll down like the waters and righteousness as a mighty stream. We ask it in that Name above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, October 6, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

DELIBERATIONS WITH CLOSED DOORS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order adopted yesterday, the Senate will now proceed to deliberate with closed doors to hear the Senators who recently visited the fighting fronts.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate proceeded to deliberate with closed doors.

After 4 hours and 27 minutes the doors were reopened.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, certain routine reports received this day will be received.

Mr. BARKLEY. As if presented in the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As if presented in the morning hour.

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1382. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the foreign service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; without amendment (Rept. No. 448).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1282. A bill for the relief of Eric W. Rodgers; without amendment (Rept. No. 449).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1222. A bill for the relief of Jacob Wolozin; without amendment (Rept. No. 450).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1346. A bill for the relief of the R. B. Walker Funeral Home; without amendment (Rept. No. 451);

S. 1347. A bill to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 452);

S. 1348. A bill to amend the second paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 453);

S. 1350. A bill to establish the grades of commissioned warrant officer and warrant officer in the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 454);

S. 1352. A bill to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service; without amendment (Rept. No. 455);

S. 1354. A bill to amend the Act approved January 16, 1936, entitled "An Act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United States Naval Academy;" without amendment (Rept. No. 456);

S. 1386. A bill making it a misdemeanor to stow away on aircraft and providing punishment therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 457); and

H. R. 1869. A bill authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Cross to George F. Thompson; without amendment (Rept. No. 458).

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 3291, Calendar No. 425.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3291) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I shall be glad to make a brief statement with respect to the bill. It deals with the subject of the Federal Housing Administration. It does not create any new functions for the Federal Housing Administration, nor does it appropriate any money. The bill provides for extending the time of operation under title I, title II, and title VI, the provisions of each of which expire July 1, 1944. It is obvious that that period is too short, and that something must be done to extend the time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Maryland a question. In lines 4 and 5 on page 1, I find a provision striking out "'$1,200,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$1,600,000,000.'" That provision would authorize an increase of $400,000,000.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I had not come to that feature. I have been discussing the three amendments which merely extend the time for operations under titles I, II, and VI.

Under title VI, the present authorization is $1,200,000,000. That has been about exhausted. In order to take care of the projects which are considered necessary in regard to our defense housing additional authorization of $400,000,000 is necessary.

Mr. McKELLAR. The bill authorizes the appropriation of an additional $400,000,000. I want to know for what it is to be used.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I will gladly endeavor to explain this item.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The bill does not provide for the appropriation of any money.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that; it would authorize an appropriation.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No; it would not make any appropriation at all. All it would do would be simply to increase the amount of insurance which can be created by the F. H. A: Last spring Congress fixed the total amount at $1,200,000,000. It was, however, quite obvious that such amount would not be sufficient, and the developments since then, and the studies made have brought out clearly the fact that we shall have to increase it. Otherwise, the additional war housing will have to be put up by the Federal Government, and the cash will have to be advanced for that purpose, out of the Federal Treasury. Certainly it is better for the United States Government to guarantee the loans by insurance for which it receives premiums, than to advance the entire amounts of the loans.

In order to obviate such a drain on Federal funds, and to permit the F. H. A. to continue to operate under title VI, it is necessary to create the authorization

which will be required for the projects of this year and for those of 1944, by providing for an additional amount of $400,000,000 of insurance or guaranty.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. There would never be any appropriation, and there would not be any authorization for an appropriation, unless the amount of insurance carried by the Government should result in a loss to the F. H. A., which is not likely, as I understand.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is entirely true. Under title I and title VI the insurance fund is about carrying itself. Under title II, $65,000,000 has been accumulated in the insurance fund; so at this time there is no question whatever before the Senate of an appropriation of money. Title I and title VI are carrying themselves, because insurance premiums received have been about sufficient for all purposes for losses and expenses. Let me emphasize that all the bill attempts to do is to enlarge the amount of authorization for insurance, plus extensions in time, by approximately $400,000,000 additional required to take care of the housing which has already been provided for, and which is necessary or will be necessary during 1943 and 1944.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let me ask if the bill did not pass the other House.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The bill has passed the other House, with several small amendments.

Mr. McNRY. I understand it is desired to return the bill to conference within the next day or two, for consideration there; is that correct?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It is very urgent, because the F. H. A. has substantially exhausted the $1,200,000,000; and unless the Congress increases the authorization, it will be necessary that all the housing be constructed by the use of Federal funds, rather than under the F. H. A.'s operations.

Mr. McNARY. Is it the Senator's desire to have the bill passed at once, in its present form, so that it may be submitted to the House, and become a law by the first of the week?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes; that is really imperative; because Mr. Ferguson has told me that unless the bill is passed, he will have to send out telegrams the first part of the week suspending all operations of the F. H. A. under title VI, so far as new operations are concerned.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, at the suggestion of Edgar G. Brown, director of the National Negro Council, a few days ago I submitted an amendment to the bill, and intended to press for its adoption. However, I find the time is so short and the necessity for immediate action so great that I shall not do so at this time.

I desire to have printed in the RECORD two letters addressed to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] by Mr. Abner H. Ferguson, Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration, setting forth the reasons why he thought the adoption of the amendment was not essential at this time. I ask unanimous consent that the letters may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., October 2, 1943.

The Honorable GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR RADCLIFFE: The question has been raised as to whether the National Housing Act or the way in which it is administered discriminates in any way against the colored race.

I can assure you that the act does not permit such discrimination and that our rules, regulations, policies, and procedures are drawn and administered impartially and without the slightest discrimination against any group or individuals on account of race, color or creed.

One of the primary purposes of the National Housing Act, expressed in the title of the act itself, is "to encourage improvement in housing standards and conditions." We believe this was intended to apply to all housing, regardless of the race or color of the occupant and all of our policies and procedures have been based upon this principle. We do not have one set of property standards and construction requirements for Negro housing and another for housing designed for white occupancy, but insist that both meet the same standards and requirements in order to become eligible for F. H. A. insurance.

The fact that our records as well as our procedures make no distinction between applicants of different races makes it difficult to furnish you with complete figures with respect to the number of mortgages we have insured on properties owned or occupied by Negroes. In view of your interest in the matter, we have been able to secure reports from 26 of our insuring offices containing figures which are interesting, particularly as they indicate the small percentage of applications for insurance of mortgages on Negro housing which has been rejected by this Administration. The applications received by the reporting offices for insurance of mortgages on Negro housing totaled 7,157 units in the amount of $22,871,994. Out of this total only 531 units in the amount of $1,797,445 were rejected. These figures show that about 7½ percent of such applications were rejected, whereas our general records, including both white and colored housing on a national basis show a rejection ratio of approximately 19 percent.

From these figures, it is clear that we are insuring a substantial number of mortgages on Negro housing and that only a very small percentage of such applications are rejected by our insuring offices. It is true that in neighborhoods which are well established and where the character and type of occupancy is clear, the F. H. A. under sound underwriting procedure and general mortgage practice does not, under the insured mortgage system, take any action which will result in a change in the character of such established neighborhoods when such change would tend to introduce inharmonious elements which would cause or accelerate deterioration in property desirability or values. Our responsibilities to other property owners in the neighbohoods are clear in this regard and this is equally true whether the established character of the neighborhood is white or colored.

There are, of course, many large and successful Negro housing projects located in and about Washington, D. C., Chicago, Ill., Richmond, Va., Atlanta, Ga., and many other areas, mortgages on which were insured by the F. H. A. In addition, many thousands of individual homes occupied by Negroes have been constructed in accordance with our property standards and accepted as security for F. H. A. mortgages.

As an illustration of the feeling of the people for whom this housing is constructed, I am attaching a copy of a section of the newspaper, The Negro Freeholder of Houston, Tex., dated Saturday, July 25, 1942. You will note that the entire section of eight pages is devoted to news, comments, and appreciation of the new Clinton Park housing project, the construction of which was financed through the F. H. A. I am informed that these articles were written by Negroes who had no direct financial interest in the project and were not inspired by anyone connected with this Administration.

You will also be interested in knowing that the National Housing Agency, in cooperation with the War Production Board, has recently granted an additional quota of 2,000 dwelling units for Negroes in the District of Columbia under its privately financed War Housing Program. This Administration will cooperate to the fullest extent possible in fulfilling this program.

Sincerely yours,

ABNER H. FERGUSON,
Commissioner.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., October 5, 1943.

Hon. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR RADCLIFFE: In addition to the statements made in my letter of yesterday, in reference to the attitude of this administration toward racial distinction, I feel that I should call your attention to the following pertinent fact:

In the administration of the National Housing Act we only deal with lenders or mortgagees. We have no relationship with borrowers or builders. The act expressly provides (section 203 (a)) that authority to insure mortgages is only "upon application by the mortgagee." It follows, therefore, that before we can insure a mortgage we must have received an application from a mortgagee. You can readily see that our operations are limited to locations and cases where mortgagees first determine that they are willing to lend their funds.

It is not necessary for me to say to you that we do not have, and never have had, any Government money to lend.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ABNER H. FERGUSON,
Commissioner.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, from what the able junior Senator from Maryland has said, I understand that in the future when we are considering the subject in its larger aspects the Senator will be very glad to consider the proposal which I make to the bill which already has passed the House. Is that correct? I understood the Senator to state that later, when we have a real housing bill before us, he will consider a proposal of the kind covered by the amendment I have offered.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon is entirely correct. I have discussed the matter at some length with Mr. Ferguson. He has told me there is no general policy of discrimination, but that, on the contrary all housing, whether it is Negro housing or white housing, is given the same consideration and opportunities. He has written me two letters in which he makes entirely clear his position. The Senator

from Oregon has placed them in the RECORD and so I shall not attempt to read at this time unless some Member of the Senate desires that I do so.

Mr. McNARY. A moment ago I obtained unanimous consent to have the letters printed in the RECORD. In that connection, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the amendment I offered sometime earlier in the week, at the suggestion of Mr. Edgar G. Brown.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. McNARY to the bill (H. R. 3291) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, viz: On page 2, after line 5, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 5. In the administration of the National Housing Act, as amended, and in making benefits available under the provisions of such act, as amended, there shall be no discrimination on account of race, creed, or color."

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That matter could be taken up later, when the time element is not so important as it is at present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to make a statement at this time. I desire first to read from the act which is to be amended, so we may know what we are doing. We are asked to increase the governmental obligations $400,000,000, by the bill.

I read from the act which is proposed to be amended:

Provided, That the property covered by the mortgage is in an area or locality in which the President shall find that an acute shortage of housing exists or impends which would impede war activities: *Provided further*, That the aggregate of the principal obligations of all mortgages insured under this obligation shall not exceed $1,200,000,000.

Those figures would be stricken out by the bill as proposed to be amended, and provision would be made to increase the amount to $1,600,000,000.

Therefore, what we would be doing would be to enter at this time upon a borrowing scheme, which the Government would guarantee, of an additional $400,000,000.

The requested increase may be necessary; it may be entirely necessary that we should build $400,000,000 of housing this fall and the coming winter. Where is the housing to be built, and what is the necessity for it at the present time?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, that question is a rather large one to attempt to summarize briefly.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is what the bill proposes to do, and that is why I am asking the question. I simply want to know what are the facts.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me say that those who are familiar with the situation and who realize the need of building new housing in the vicinity of the war plants estimate that so many units will be necessary, and that they will cost approximately $400,000,000 additional. If their estimates are correct—and certainly we must assume them to be correct, since they have been gone into very carefully by the Government, by the F. H. A., and by the other authorities interested—what is the alternative? The houses must be built. They will not be built by private capital, except in some cases. This is done under the F. H. A. If the bill is not passed, the houses will have to be built with funds out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. McKELLAR. In effect they will be built out of funds from the Federal Treasury whenever we pass the bill, because the Treasury would underwrite or make bond for the $400,000,000 additional.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course, that goes to the whole root of the F. H. A.—whether the Federal Government should build houses out of its own funds instead of providing a guaranty. That is a question as to which there may be a difference of opinion. All I can say is that so far, from the $1,200,000,000 of houses and apartments which have been built or are in process of being built, the insurance premiums have been about sufficient to take care of all the losses. I cannot tell what the future result will be, except to say that so far the F. H. A. has operated very successfully and, I think, very efficiently.

The houses must be built. They will be built either by Federal funds, F. H. A. funds, or by private capital apart from the F. H. A.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator defer to me for a moment?

Mr. PEPPER. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say that the Senator from Maryland has not explained why it is to be done or what the necessity is or where the money is to be obtained, or anything about it; and by passing the bill we would be entering into an additional obligation of $400,000,000.

The Senator from Maryland wants the Senate to take the matter on faith, from our Federal representatives. The Senator may be entirely correct about it; the obligation may be an entirely proper one; but so far as the facts now before the Senate are concerned, I do not think the Senate is in a position to pass on the matter. I hope the Senator from Maryland will let the bill go over until we can obtain more information about it; because at the present time, not having the information I think we should have, I should be compelled to vote against the bill.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that the plans have been very carefully worked out.

Mr. McKELLAR. What are the plans? They are plans with respect to certain plants. In what States are the projects to be built? I should like to know something about it. It is proposed to spend $400,000,000 at this time. I should like to know where it is to be spent, and what is the necessity for it. We have appropriated very large sums for building at every place where there are war activities, and in every field in which war activities may be found in the United States. I should like to know the necessity for it, and I should like to have time to look into the question. I should like to have the bill go over until we can look into it.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It is not proposed to put up any money at this time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that. It is only proposed to put the Government behind $400,000,000 worth of houses. I should like to know the necessity for it before it is done.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator from Tennessee may not quite realize the technical situation which we face. As he knows the Federal Housing Administration does not build houses. The houses are built with money loaned by banks and other lending institutions. The Government guarantees the loans.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. We have heretofore authorized the Federal Housing Administration to guarantee up to $1,200,000,000 worth of these houses. Up to the present time there has been no appropriation for any losses, because the premiums collected have taken care of the obligations. We all hope, and the F. H. A. hopes, that there will never be any losses. The record of the F. H. A. shows that it is one of the few institutions of Government which have actually made money and turned it back into the Treasury, rather than losing money. The extra $400,000,000 is to be guaranteed on the same basis as that on which the $1,200,000,000 has been guaranteed, and for the same sort of housing activities.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator state where the housing is needed? There ought to be some report from the Department as to where the houses are needed, and why we should become liable for another $400,000,000. It is proposed to accept an I O U for it. It is proposed that we guarantee it. All I should like to have is sufficient time enough to look into the question. It may be that the bill is entirely proper but I do not know anything about what has taken place. We are accepting it on the faith of those who are putting it forward.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the bill was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and was considered by that committee. Mr. Ferguson, the head of the F. H. A., and others, appeared before the committee, and, as I recall, the bill was unanimously reported by the committee.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The bill was unanimously reported. That committee has considered quite carefully what the F. H. A. has done. It has not attempted to analyze carefully each particular project; but the members of the committee are entirely satisfied that the program which has been carried out so far as well as the program which is contemplated are wise and needful. If the Senator from Tennessee would like to have a detailed statement as to what has been guaranteed in connection with the $1,200,000,000, I can easily furnish the information.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to know something about the $400,000,000 which

we are about to spend. The $1,200,000,000 is gone. I want to know about the $400,000,000. I am asking the Senator, in all good faith, to let the bill go over. There is no binding necessity on the Senate to pass the bill this afternoon. Tomorrow I may be just as strongly in favor of it as he is, but I should like to have time to look into it. The report does not show anything. It refers to the previous act. We are all familiar with the fact that we provided $1,200,000,000 with which to build these houses; but what is to be done with the $400,000,000? The report of the committee does not show.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I can explain it in this way: The $400,000,000 of guaranties do not represent a separate transaction.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course not.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. If the Senator will pardon me a moment, I think I can make some points clear as to the history of the transaction.

Last spring when this subject was before the Senate, and when the extension was made in March of this year, it was realized that the $1,200,000,000 would not be sufficient to finish the program. At that time the studies had not been carried forward sufficiently far to enable us to know just how much would be necessary. That has now been done as far at least as 1943 and 1944 are concerned. The $400,000,000 does not represent an entirely new set of operations. It represents a continuation of the original program. For instance, this year there are 33,000 units which cannot be constructed unless this authorization is made. Between 70,000 and 80,000 units are allocated in various sections of the country to complete the present program. Those two allocations together amount to about $400,000,000. That is the way the amount is arrived at. The $400,000,000 does not represent new types of projects, but merely a continuation of the existing program.

Mr. McKELLAR. I remember when the scheme was first started. We know all about it, and it has worked very well. But the Senator is asking that the Government commit itself to $400,000,000 more; and there is not a fact in the report, and the Senator has not stated a fact this afternoon, except that we must take on faith what the administrators say about it. The Senator is unwilling to agree that the bill may go over until tomorrow. It is such a life-and-death matter that he wishes to have the bill passed this afternoon, without giving me an opportunity to look into it. I should like to have an opportunity to look into the question. I think, in common courtesy between Senators, I ought to have such an opportunity.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me understand as definitely as I can what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will tell the Senator what I have in mind. I intend to have Mr. Ferguson come here tomorrow and give me the facts about it. It is proposed to bind the Government to the extent of an additional $400,000,000 with merely a gesture. I should like to know what are the facts. If I have the right to object to consideration of the bill this afternoon, I shall object. If I have to make a speech on it——

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I shall, of course, not press the consideration of the bill at this time to meet the wishes of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad the Senator has decided not to press the bill.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I very much hope that we can promptly reach a conclusion on this question.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will look into it at once.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Otherwise operations throughout the country will be stopped.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have never heard of the proposal before. I understand that the bill was reported on the 28th of September, but it has not heretofore been called up.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has been trying to obtain consideration of the bill for several days, but other things have intervened to prevent it.

Mr. McKELLAR. All I want is time to look into it. Later I may be just as much in favor of the bill as is the Senator from Maryland, but with such information as is contained in the report, I cannot say now that I am in favor of it.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to help the Senator obtain any information he wishes between now and tomorrow.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very much obliged to the Senator.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I will tell Mr. Ferguson what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. McKELLAR. And ask him to come to my office tomorrow?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I will go even further than that. I will ask him, when he comes, to bring with him such data as seem to be necessary to show where the various allocations are contemplated.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is exactly the information I want.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it not a fact that one of the Housing agencies—either the United States Housing Authority or the United States Public Buildings Administration—is the over-all housing agency to determine whether there is need for any additional housing facilities?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. Then, when the need is ascertained, another housing agency determines what agency shall construct the houses needed. It may be the United States Public Buildings Administration, which builds them as United States projects out of United States funds, or the construction may be allocated to the F. H. A. It may be of a type which can well be financed by private enterprise if guaranteed by the F. H. A. This proposal is a part of the general scheme of providing houses, and is to enable the F. H. A. to perform its part, which may be delegated to it by the over-all housing agency.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is true.

I should like to make a supplementary statement in amplification of what the Senator has said. The Federal Housing Agency does not reach that conclusion on the basis of its own information. It is reached only after very careful consultation with the Army and Navy and other departments of the Government. Then all the information is collected and carefully considered. Thereupon conclusions are reached as to what is regarded as necessary in our program to see that necessary housing for war workers is provided.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States nominating JAMES PATRICK MCGRANERY, of Pennsylvania, to be the Assistant to the Attorney General, vice James Rowe, Jr., resigned, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John K. Caldwell, of Kentucky, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Ethiopia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ORDER FOR SESSION TOMORROW WITH CLOSED DOORS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the Chap-

lain's prayer tomorrow the Senate proceed in closed session, after a quorum call, to hear the remainder of the reports of our colleagues who have just returned from a visit to the war fronts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, October 8, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate October 7 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

ASSISTANT TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

JAMES PATRICK MCGRANERY, of Pennsylvania, to be the Assistant to the Attorney General, vice James Rowe, Jr., resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 7 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

FOREIGN SERVICE

W. Averell Harriman to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

John K. Caldwell to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ethiopia.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be a brigadier general

Dwight David Eisenhower

To be a major general

Dwight David Eisenhower

To be captains, Judge Advocate General's Department

Nicholas Eugene Allen
James Wesley Booth
George Brainerd Chapman 3d
Edward Burton Crosland
John Marshall Fasoli
William Franklin Fratcher
Frank Joseph Gollings
Joseph Alexandre Guimond
David Moffatt McConnell
Reginald Conklin Miller
William Dempsey Partlow, Jr.
John Marshall Pitzer
Robert Frederick Hoke Pollock
Gerald Pflaum Rosen
Raymond Paul Sharood
William Taylor Thurman
George Clark Van Nostrand

To be chaplains, with rank of first lieutenant

Russell Lloyd Blaisdell
Steve Pettie Gaskins, Jr.
Frank Louis Grafton
Elmer Everett Wehking

To be first lieutenants, Dental Corps

John Alexander Duthie
Paul Joseph Lundell
Frank Monroe Taylor, Jr.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Alfred Hiller Bungardt
Arthur Lynn Burks
Stanley David Burton
Dan Crozier
Arnold Lewis Field
Joseph Arthur Gautsch
Leo Joseph Geppert
Thurman Knight Hill
Charles Bullard Hooker
Camp Stanley Huntington
Herbert William Jenkins
George Thomas Kelleher
Paul Victor Kiehl
Joseph Davis Lea
Donald Withers Lyddon
Frank Alphonzo Mantz, Jr.
George Deshon McAfee
William Henry Merritt
Hugh Mullan
Orland Stenberg Olsen
James Archer Orbison
William David Tigertt
James Arista Wier
Herman Saul Wigodsky

To be chaplains, with rank of first lieutenant

Warren Earl Ferguson
Maury Hundley, Jr.

To be second lieutenant, Pharmacy Corps

Charles Joseph Mrazek, Jr.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Irving Abelow
Burton Elias Ezra Adams
John Hawes Amesse
Frank Louis Bauer
Kenneth Lennox Brown
Wilson Gordon Brown
Bernard Tetlow Daniels
William Todd DeVan
Alf Torp Haerem
Welland Angel Hause
Harold Mendez Jesurun
Louis Caspar Kossuth
George Vernon Potter
Thompson Eldridge Potter
Percy Hall Sutley

To be chaplains, with rank of first lieutenant

Harold Francis Donovan
Arthur Henry Marsh

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To Quartermaster Corps

Capt. Samuel Fayette Silver

To Finance Department

Capt. Charles Harlow Miles, Jr.

To Ordnance Department

Second Lt. Raymond Ira Schnittke

To Infantry

Col. Madison Pearson
Lt. Col. Clyde Lloyd Hyssong
Lt. Col. Frank Martin Smith

To Air Corps

First Lt. John Barkeley McPherson
Second Lt. Edward Sterling Abdo
Second Lt. William Edward Byerts, Jr.
Second Lt. Thomas William Fishburn
Second Lt. Alpha Alsbury Fowler, Jr.
Second Lt. Howard Anthony Linn
Second Lt. Robert James Lynch
Second Lt. Ernest Darius Scott, Jr.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonel, Field Artillery

Edwin Albert Zundel

To be colonel, Air Corps

Clinton Wilbur Howard

To be colonel, Field Artillery

Charles Manly Busbee
Albert Whitney Waldron

To be colonel, Ordnance Department

Raymond Marsh
Henry Benton Sayler

To be colonel, Field Artillery

Joseph May Swing

To be colonel, Infantry

Charles Wolcott Ryder

To be colonel, Field Artillery

Stafford LeRoy Irwin

To be colonel, Air Corps

Joseph Taggart McNarney

To be colonel, Cavalry

Pearson Menoher

To be colonel, Coast Artillery Corps

Albert Henry Warren

To be lieutenant colonel, Infantry

George Huston Bare

To be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps

John Edward Burrows

To be colonel, Medical Corps

George Earl Hesner
William Alexander Smith
Edwin Leland Brackney
Edward Jones Strickler
Aubrey Kenna Brown
Frank William Pinger
Neely Cornelius Mashburn
Charles Booth Spruit
Lucius Featherstone Wright
Herbert Hall Price
William Elijah Moore Devers
Samuel Elkan Brown
Clyde Clifford Johnston
Ernest Farris Harrison
Walter Midkiff Crandall
Harry Ainsworth Clark
Malcolm Cummings Grow
Clarence Clinton Harvey
Daniel Currie Campbell
Jose Canellas Carballeira
Clyde Danford Oatman
Carroll Porteous Price
Henry Charles Johannes
Donald Ion Stanton
Charles Beresford Callard
Joseph Hall Whiteley
Clyde McKay Beck
William Clare Porter
James Bliss Owen
Joseph Sherman Craig
Lincoln Frank Putnam
Rufus Leroy Holt
John DuBose Barnwell
Everett LeCompte Cook
Ralph Leslie Cudlipp
Virgil Heath Cornell

To be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps

Gordon Adams Clapp
Kincheon Hubert Bailey

To be captain, Medical Corps

James Arista Wier
Stephen Lawrence Gumport
Edward Mansfield Gunn
William Maurice Jackson
George Howard Wood
Raymond Arnold Lawn
Carl Frederick Tessmer
James William Humphreys, Jr.
Walter Albra Ricker, Jr.
Charles Fore Wilkinson, Jr.
Elwyn Nickell Akers
William David Tigertt
Joseph Harold Bornstein
Irving Richard Lyman
George Sauter Bozalis
Willard Henry Cleveland
John Ficicchy, Jr.

To be colonel, Dental Corps

Roy Albert Stout
Roy L. Bodine
James Jay Weeks
Thomas Joseph Cassidy
Howard Austin Hale

To be colonel, Veterinary Corps

Francois Hue Kari Reynolds
Charles Sears Williams
Fred W. Shinn
Irby Rheuel Pollard
Frank Caldwell Hershberger
Clifford Eugene Pickering
Raymond Randall
Joseph Hiriam Dornblaser
Seth C. Dildine

George Leslie Caldwell
Jacob Landes Hartman
John Harold Kintner
Samuel George Kielsmeier
Oness Harry Dixon, Jr.
John Wesley Miner

To be colonel, chaplain, United States Army

John Ralph Wright
Harry Carleton Fraser

To be captain, chaplain, United States Army

Russell Lloyd Blaisdell

To be colonel, Pharmacy Corps

Arthur Elmer Brown

To be lieutenant colonel, Pharmacy Corps

Thomas Grimsley Hester
William Harvey Kernan
William Clarence Williams
Frank Steiner
Max Verne Talbot

To be major, Pharmacy Corps

Edward Martin Wones
Seth Overbaugh Craft
Douglas Hall
Charles Lawrence Driscoll
Edward James Gearin
Paul Estabrooke Zuver
Orion Victor Kempf
Robert Lee Black
Paul Nixon
Leonard George Tate Perkins
Harold Lincoln Gard
Joe Edward McNight
Homer Clarence McCullough
Joseph Carmack
Louis Felix Williams
Frank Randle Day
Paul Christian Borup

To be captain, Pharmacy Corps

Carrol Conrad Barrick
Thomas Raymond Jones
Cornelius John Curran
Gerard Adrien Belanger
Guy Wycoff Harlow
Wilfred Arthur Emond
Harland William Layer
Eugene Gordon Cooper
Arthur Melville Henderson
Eli Egbert Daman
Everett Walter Partin
Andy Vaughan Little
Omar Kenneth Andrews
Frank Stepczyk
Jacob Bruce Martin
Harry John Nelson
James Thomas Johnson
Glenn Keith Smith
Howard Brim Nelson
Leonard Paul Zagelow

To be first lieutenant, Pharmacy Corps

Claud Dale La Fors
Bernard Korn
Ennis Dallas Sandberg
James Thomas Richards
Paul Cable Larnce
Emerson Beery Taylor
Thomas Floris Criswell, Jr.
Woodrow Charles Herbert
Elliott Powell Rigsby
Edward Casimir Rogowski

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To Air Corps

First Lt. Robert Leonard Colligan, Jr.
First Lt. James Gleason Foley
First Lt. Emil Franklin Hawes
Second Lt. James Erwin Crosby, Jr.
Second Lt. Oliver Morton Legg
Second Lt. Richard Concklin Snyder
Second Lt. Roscoe Barnett Woodruff, Jr.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be first lieutenant, Infantry

Robert Emmet Kennington

To be first lieutenant, Field Artillery

William Trabue

To be first lieutenant, Infantry

William Love Latta, Jr.

To be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps

John Bangs Corbett

To be first lieutenant, Infantry

Alfred Martin

To be first lieutenant, Field Artillery

Carl Kenneth Warren, Jr.

To be first lieutenant, Infantry

John Barwick Strahan

To be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps

Richard Greenwood Thomas.

To be first lieutenant, Cavalry

William Michael Delaney

To be first lieutenant, Infantry

Francis Marion Smith

To be colonel, Medical Corps

Theo Wallace O'Brien
William Charles Munly
George William Rice
Robert James Platt
James Neal Williams
Rollo Preston Bourbon
Wesley Cintra Cox
Floyd Vern Kilgore
John Christopher Woodland
Walter Leslie Perry

To be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps

Richard Emmons Elvins

To be major, Medical Corps

Joseph Pease Russell

To be captain, Medical Corps

Edwin Stow Chapman
Carl Ziegler Berry
Other Franklin Speaker
Joseph Raymond Henry
Walton Merideth Edwards
George Vernon Potter
Harold Leslie Robinson
William Todd DeVan
John Philip Harney
Harvey George Tousignant
James Howard Smith
Vernon David Pettit
John Nicholas Furst
Lee Frank Ferrell
John Lynch Dixon
Walter Anthony Butkus

To be colonel, Dental Corps

Walter Davis Vail
Clement John Gaynor
Walter Andrew Rose
Alvin Ellsworth Anthony
William Burns Caldwell
Lewis Walter Maly
Glover Johns
Leslie Dean Baskin
Dell Stuart Gray
William B. Stewart
Boyd Lee Smith
Avery Giles Holmes
George Robert Kennebeck
Joseph Lyon Boyd
Richard Foster Thompson
William Swann Shuttleworth

To be colonel, chaplain, United States Army

John Oscar Lindquist
Frank Meredith Thompson
Joseph Burt Webster
Alfred Cookman Oliver, Jr.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

John Russell Deane
Albert Coady Wedemeyer

To be lieutenant generals

Hugh Aloysius Drum
Ira Clarence Eaker
Barton Kyle Yount

To be major generals

Harry John Collins
Douglass Taft Greene
Ray Edison Porter
William Elmer Lynd
George Wesley Griner, Jr.
David McCoach, Jr.
Stephen J. Chamberlin
Robert Walker Grow
Shelley Uriah Marietta
John Alden Crane
Joseph Nicholas Dalton
George Fairless Lull
Stanley Eric Reinhart
Albert Walton Kenner
Lloyd Edmonstone Jones
Charles Paul Stivers
David Norvell Walker Grant
Robert Lily Spragins
James Luke Frink
Robert Hilliard Mills
Robert LeGrow Walsh

To be brigadier generals

Thomas Francis Hickey
Stuart Cutler
Eric Spencer Molitor
Edward Barber
Paul Edmund Burrows
Hubert Ward Beyette
Charles Morris Ankcorn
Laurence Carbee Craigie
Victor Vaughan Taylor
Merrick Gay Estabrook, Jr.
John Hamilton Hinds
John Sheridan Winn, Jr.
Thomas Francis Bresnahan
Dale Vincent Gaffney
Curtis Emerson LeMay
Emer Yeager
Edward Montgomery
Morris Berman
William Robert Nichols
Edward Julius Timberlake, Jr.
Harold Rufus Jackson
Ralph Francis Stearley
Albert Francis Hegenberger
Henry Anson Barber, Jr.
Leo Thomas McMahon
George Jacob Nold
Charles Edwin Thomas, Jr.
John Macaulay Eager
David Marshall Ney Ross
Nathaniel Alanson Burnell 2d
George Godfrey Lundberg
Earl Hamlin DeFord
David Lewis Ruffner
Harold Lyman Clark
Raymond Whitcomb Bliss
Thomas Raphael Phillips
Kenneth Perry McNaughton
Edward Chambers Betts
Otto Paul Weyland
Raleigh Raymond Hendrix
William Howard Arnold
Charles Roland Glenn
Garrison Holt Davidson
William Carroll Christy
Frank Charles McConnell
John Y. York, Jr.
David Myron Schlatter
Ralph Pulsifer
Donald Weldon Brann
Vincent James Meloy
Mervin Eugene Gross
George Craig Stewart
Russell Alger Osmun
Herbert Slayden Clarkson
Roland Francis Walsh
Francis Henry Lanahan, Jr.
John Merle Weir
Julian Wallace Cunningham
James Maurice Gavin
James Bryan Newman, Jr.
Thomas Harry Ramsey
John Will Coffey
Paul Hyde Prentiss
Malcolm Cummings Grow
John Trott Murray

To be major generals

Frederick Henry Osborn
Leonard Fish Wing

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Mary L. Brennan, Elkhart.
Leonard L. Riegel, Galatia.
Emily M. Cole, Glenview.
Anna E. Sullivan, Grand Tower.
Paul T. Hartline, Hillsboro.
Lenora B. Dickerson, La Fayette.
Paul F. Lewis, Lawrenceville.
Edward J. Shunick, Monmouth.
Bertha M. Paris, Montgomery.
Mary Convery, Raymond.
Otis M. Lamar, Rosiclare.
Fannie E. Smith, San Jose.
Walter G. McEwan, Sheldon.
Ira Dezouche, Wayne City.

TEXAS

Otto M. Naegelin, Castroville.
Rosa A. Hannes, Eden.
Anna Jo Wilson, Gunter.
Leonard B. Baldwin, Huntsville.
Russell B. Cope, Loraine.
Hattie M. Welch, Meadow.
Clarence M. Maney, Natalia.
Mary Elizabeth Graves, Port Isabel.
Paullin J. Fowler, South San Antonio.
Charles M. Palmer, Vickery.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Unto Thee, our Father in heaven we offer our tributes of praise and gratitude. We pray Thee to emancipate us from all evil purpose that we shall be worthy to occupy the summits in the realm of virtue. Without divine guidance the still small voice fades, the vision passes and we wander in the wilderness of uncertainty. By Thy spirit enable us to adjust our bearings and our thoughts to the everchanging conditions of these days.

Heavenly Father, there are things we do which even for prayers or tears cannot be recalled. The sharp keen-edged word, the unimproved opportunity, the selfish deed mark our thought upon our country's life; Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap. We pray, blessed Lord, for courage that we may make our responsibilities pedestals on which to stand and thus avoid the failure of being untrue to the best we know. O shield us from a regretful past and aim us toward a hopeful future; lift us to the loftiest thought and feeling and these will be our best defense. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 5, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on Friday, October 1, 1943, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 763. An act amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 1410. An act to amend section 4 of the act approved June 13, 1940.

THE LATE FRANCIS D. CULKIN

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute on our late colleague, the Honorable Francis D. Culkin.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is frequently said that death loves a shining mark. The truth of that statement was never better evidenced than when the arrow of death found its resting place in the heart of one of the most beloved members of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. We returned to our duties here but found that we were compelled to take up our tasks without the wise guidance, the cautious counsel, and the genial presence of Francis D. Culkin, of the Thirty-second District of New York. As chairman of the committee, I felt possibly Mr. Culkin's absence more keenly than others, for he had labored with me diligently and helped me greatly to construct the framework of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and to pass all of the legislation enacted since the approval of that law. His profound knowledge of shipping matters has enabled the committee to work wisely and well in creating and maintaining a wise and safe policy. To me he was always a wise counselor, a ready worker, and a faithful friend. Seldom were we in disagreement, and I shall miss him always while I labor on the committee.

The Subcommittee on Steel Shortage and the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of both of which he was a member, adopted a resolution. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this resolution in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The resolution referred to follows:

Committee Resolution 5

Whereas during the recent recess of Congress the subcommittee on steel shortage of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives and the full committee have suffered the loss of Francis D. Culkin, of New York, one of the most industrious, diligent, and faithful members of the said subcommittee and of the full Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, a valued contributor to the achievements of the subcommittee and of the full committee, and an invaluable factor in upbuilding an American merchant marine, in promoting the American fisheries, in expanding the United States Coast Guard, in providing navigation aids, in supporting marine hospitals, and in upbuilding the Panama Canal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved—

1. That the subcommittee on steel shortage of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and of the full committee recognize in the death of Hon. Francis D. Culkin, Representative from the Thirty-second District of New York, a loss of a devoted public servant, a faithful Representative, a sterling patriot, and a loving friend whose record in Congress was marked by industry, energy, ability, fidelity, zeal, and patriotism, and whose sound judgment, signal ability, and wise statesmanship were of inestimable benefit to this committee in its deliberations at all times;

2. That this subcommittee and the full committee will ever cherish the memory of their association with Mr. Culkin and will find in the patience, intelligence, and zeal with which he served an example and inspiration;

3. That this subcommittee and the full committee extend to the district which Mr. CULKIN served and to the family which survive him its deepest sympathy in their sorrow; and

4. That these resolutions shall be spread upon the minutes of this committee, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that a copy shall be sent to the family of the deceased.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech made by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler at the opening of the one hundred and ninetieth year of Columbia University, September 29, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio broadcast by the Honorable Francis Xavier Swietlik, dean of the law school of Marquette University.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE PATRICK A. NASH

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved to learn of the death of the Honorable Patrick A. Nash, the chairman of the Cook County Democratic Committee of Illinois, former National Democratic committeeman, who was my personal friend to the end of his long and useful life.

For many years he rendered distinguished service to our State and to the Nation, always contributing to the common welfare as a civic leader of great resourcefulness and distinction. In his passing the State of Illinois and the city of Chicago have lost one of their finest and most outstanding citizens.

It was through the combined efforts of our beloved mayor of Chicago, the Honorable Edward J. Kelly, and Mr. Nash, that Illinois went overwhelmingly for our great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in 1932, 1936, 1940.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today at the conclusion of the other special orders that have been entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MOTIVES BEHIND RATIONING ORDERS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the article I am about to read is taken from the Chicago Daily Tribune, but it was carried in many Illinois newspapers:

HARRISBURG, ILL., October 4.—Ray Durham, southern Illinois civic leader, resigned today from the Saline County Ration Board, on which he was chairman of the panel on boots, kerosene, and stoves. He said in a letter to Chairman W. C. Kane that he was quitting because he is "convinced that every order issued by the Office of Price Administration had its origin in a mind" devoted to "the repression of liberties."

Durham, an insurance man, was formerly mayor of Harrisburg, which is under a commission form of government. He is president of the Kiwanis Club, formerly was head of the school board, and still is a member of that body.

In his letter of resignation, he said:

"My high regard for you personally has caused me to hesitate for several weeks to tender my resignation as a member of the rationing board. But I have come to the definite conclusion that I can no longer allow myself to be connected with a bureau whose regulations and actions I consider absurd and ridiculous."

TIME WAS WASTED

"I have been on this board in some capacity since the program was started and I am convinced that I have not rendered one particle of service or benefit to the citizens of this community, and that my time has been absolutely wasted.

"I am also convinced in my own mind that every order issued by O. P. A. had its origin in some mind that had an ulterior motive for the repression of liberties or else it was inspired by that idea; and that, carried to its ultimate conclusion, will destroy the merchandising of this country, and relegate ultimately all supplies to a Government commissary.

"The distribution of kerosene in this community on the basis of 20 gallons per person per month, with some restrictions as to family size, is an absurdity."

STOVE RATIONING "JOKE"

"The rationing of boots has been provoking and has worked to the benefit of the merchants nearest the board office and to the detriment of the remote merchants. I know of stocks of boots in this county from which not one pair has been sold since rationing started.

"We have had only 1 month of stove rationing and it has become a joke.

"Consequently, as above stated, I consider that my time is being wasted, as well as that of all the people whose applications I have processed. I desire this resignation to become effective at once."

Mr. Speaker, I would say that we in Congress should do something against these left-wing bureaucrats down here if we are to keep free enterprise in America.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes today at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE PEARL HARBOR INCIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, it was with real interest that I read a joint Army-Navy statement to the effect that Rear Admiral Husband Kimmel and Maj. Gen. Walter Short had waived the statute of limitations which would have barred their court martial if not arraigned before December 7, 1943.

Many of my constituents in Montana and, for that matter, many people in the Nation as a whole have been disturbed about the possibility of the Pearl Harbor incident being hushed up. I shared these apprehensions as it is my feeling that this matter needs much more investigation before the true facts are known.

It is still inconceivable to me how Pearl Harbor, the most highly fortified area on the face of the globe, could have been surprised and so successfully attacked as it was on December 7, 1941. I find I cannot agree with the Roberts' Commission's report to the President:

It was a dereliction of duty on the part of each of them (Short and Kimmel) not to consult and confer with each other respecting the warnings (sent from the War and Navy Departments between November 27 and December 7, 1941) and the appropriate measures of defense required by the imminence of hostilities.

To me the cause goes much deeper than fixing the blame exclusively upon Kimmel and Short. A real investigation of the Pearl Harbor disaster and the needless loss of lives caused by this tragedy will have to, and must, take place at the first appropriate opportunity. Due to this disaster thousands of lives will be forfeited before this war is won and endless months, if not years, added to our war against Japan. This sacrifice on the part of our sons, relatives, and friends must be paid for not only in the ultimate and complete defeat of Japan but also in the punishing of those responsible for the Hawaiian disaster whether the fault lies in Honolulu or Washington. It is a story which America is entitled to know and I intend to do my humble best to see to it that the whole shame-ridden tale is told in full. Yes, Japan will answer and so must those of our own citizens who were negligent, careless, and too complacent.

The humiliating unconditional surrender of our forces at Wake, Bataan, and Corregidor can be laid, in part at least, to the Pearl Harbor incident. These men who fought so courageously for us and whose eyes surveyed the skies and the seas for the help that never came, and their relatives and friends who feel they have been betrayed, are entitled to a full and complete explanation. That can come only from Congress and I would be derelict in my duty to my country and myself if I did not declare openly my position on this great American tragedy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by placing therein an article from the Daily Oklahoman.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MUST HAVE MORE OIL TO KEEP 'EM FLYING

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, yesterday some 125 Members of Congress representing a majority of the States of the Union met to discuss and consider the serious problem confronting the Nation because of the rapidly diminishing supply of crude oil, so essential to the prosecution of the war.

At that conference it was pointed out that of the twenty-odd oil-producing States of the Union, all showed a marked decrease in production of oil with the exception of five; that because of the enormous increase in the cost of drilling operations and production, and especially because of the greatly increased cost of wildcat operations, that the hazzards of opening and development of new fields and the extension of old ones have been drastically increased.

It was also pointed out that many oil drillers have been forced to abandon drilling operations for the duration because of the intolerable conditions imposed upon the oil industry. The unreasonable and impractical regulations prohibiting the drilling of more than 1 well for each 40 acres has seriously handicapped drilling operations and discouraged the small operator and producer.

The continued unreasonably low price of crude oil, however, is now the most serious handicap to solving the problem

of making certain for the duration the securing of oil and oil products, so vitally essential to the prosecution of the war. Certainly no one can overestimate the importance of making certain sufficient gasoline to keep the bombing planes and the fighters in the air, soften up the enemy, and hasten the end of this tragic struggle. In other words, this is one sure and practical way to "keep 'em flying." Moreover, the fact that 60 percent of all cargo vessels carry oil and oil products to our own forces and our allies is sufficient evidence that oil is not only vitally essential but, under our modern mechanized warfare, it is of paramount importance to assure victory.

Considering the tremendous importance that oil is playing in this war and the further fact that the demand for oil and its byproducts is increasing on all of the far-flung fronts of the world, we cannot afford to take any chance on further reducing our diminishing oil reserves or the inevitable shortage of American oil supply for 1944 and later. Despite the recent testimony of Sumner Pike and others, the fact remains that there has been considerably less oil discovered and brought into production to date in 1943 than during the same period of 1942; and with the cost of wildcatting and operating up more than 40 percent, it is obvious that there will be still less actual production brought in next year unless early and substantial relief is given. Production is what counts, and more production of oil is what the Nation must have.

Unfounded and absurd charges have been made that those of us who have been hammering at this perplexing problem and predicting for months that a future oil shortage was inevitable unless relief were given, were attempting to "bail out" independent oil producers and operators of the country. Such charges and insinuations are not only untrue but are being repeatedly made evidently for the avowed purpose of prejudicing the Congress and the country against an industry that is bending every effort to produce the oil so essential for the war effort. The fact is, however, that hundreds of independent producers of what are known as stripper wells have been forced to abandon or sell them for a song or less to the big oil companies. Last year more than 10,000 small wells were abandoned, sold, or practically given away to the Standard Oil and other major oil companies. That is only a part of the tragic story of what is happening to the oil industry.

At the conference yesterday it was repeatedly suggested by some Members that a special committee be appointed to call upon certain individuals in the administrative branch of the Government. It was asserted that if those in charge knew that 125 or 150 Members of the House were seriously concerned about the impending oil shortage, that we might be able to secure administrative relief, especially with reference to the need for a substantial price increase in crude oil.

Mr. Speaker, as I told that conference, I have served on many committees which have called on administrative officials with reference to this all-important problem, and I gave notice to the conference of Congressmen that I did not choose to serve on such committee; that I felt then as I have for months that this is a problem of sufficient importance that this Congress can no longer ignore it or refuse to deal with it directly.

Several months ago I agreed to serve on a committee to call on Mr. Prentiss Brown, shortly after the very affable gentleman was appointed director of the O. P. A. It was not only an agreeable conference, but the committee was assured by Mr. Brown that he was much concerned about the problem and agreed that a substantial increase in the price of oil would be helpful to the war effort. Moreover, the committee thought it had his assurance that this would be done and so reported to the Congress and the country. But a very short while thereafter, the O. P. A. director evidently had a change of heart or of mind, or perhaps he may have been told what to do or not to do, for it is a matter of record that he wrote a letter definitely denying such an increase.

Perhaps pending legislation to take from the Office of Price Administration all the functions pertaining to the jurisdiction of oil and petroleum products would be helpful. Most people familiar with the problems of the independent producers and operators agree such functions should have naturally gone to the Petroleum Coordinator in the first place. And I might add, incidentally, that unless the O. P. A. functions more efficiently in the future than in the past, that many other functions now under its jurisdiction should by all means be transferred to other governmental agencies.

One thing is certain. Congress cannot longer refuse to take cognizance of the impending danger and disastrous results of a drastic curtailment of production of the Nation's oil fields. Patience with administration heads has ceased to be a virtue. Immediate and drastic action must be had. The war effort must not be impaired because of a short-sighted, ill-advised, obstinate and arrogant attitude of a Washington bureaucracy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein an article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TOUR OF THE WAR FRONTS BY SENATORS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the entire Senate of the United States is to consider the evidence brought back by the Senators who made the tour of inspection of the war fronts. The Senate is meeting in executive session today to hear them, as the Members believe it to be of such importance.

Yesterday I asked the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to call us in session and to invite the Senators to appear before us. I understand that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], and the gentleman from South Dakota would like to go further than that. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I was wondering whether the entire membership of the House should not have the benefit of the views of these Senators, whether they should not be invited to discuss their trip before the House in executive session.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois that it would be very beneficial if all could have the benefit of their experiences and observations. We are going to be required to pass very far-reaching legislation during this session. I believe every Member would be greatly helped by the information the Senators can impart to us. Their information may mean that many lives and much property can be saved.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

THE SUBSIDY PROGRAM

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the uncertainty resulting from the reactionary subsidy program that the Government seems to be insisting on has resulted and is resulting in destroying our military production. Unless that reactionary attitude is abandoned by the administration—and I understand that those who really know what it is all about in the administration realize this—we are going to confront a very serious situation this winter. I hope the people back home will get to understand this and realize what is to blame for the milk situation being as bad as it is.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Surrender of fascism and include therein a letter received from James Loeb, Jr., and a set of resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

FULBRIGHT RESOLUTION

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, here is a quotation from the Weekly Analysis of Newspaper Opinion, based on the editorial pages and front pages of newspapers serving all sections of the United States, for the week ending September 25, 1943:

THE FULBRIGHT RESOLUTION

House passage of the Fulbright resolution is approved by 89 percent of the press, treated in a noncommittal manner by 7 percent, and disapproved by 4 percent. The approving majority hails the large vote as showing nonpartisan near-unanimous support, as reassuring our allies, as indicative of our great change in policy, as a great step toward world cooperation, etc., and practically all of this group urge the Senate to quick action. The amendment providing that the United States must engage in commitments through constitutional processes is viewed by 16 percent of the approving group as unnecessary but acceptable, while 3 percent praise the amendment and 3 percent stress disapproval of the amendment. Most of the noncommittal 7 percent hold the resolution can mean much or little, while the disapproving 4 percent rather weakly deplore the action and urge the Senate to reject the resolution.

CEILING ON HOGS

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WILSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. LAMBERTSON and Mr. NORMAN asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, in 1938 Lord Runciman went to Czechoslovakia to study the political situation for England. In the Pollyanna manner common to so-called statesmen of that day, he took his golf clubs along. With that kind of thinking and leadership, it was no wonder that Europe turned into a flaming hell.

Today the New Deal leadership of this Congress follows a similar course. This Congress has been back at its post over 3 weeks. What has it accomplished? The answer is, "Nothing." The New Deal bureaucracy marches steadily on toward state socialism and the destruction of free enterprise and the American home. If the American Army leadership fumbled time away like this House, the war would last for 50 years.

IS A POLITICAL TREND INDICATED?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that the Members of this House are interested in political trends, so, for the benefit of those who are interested, I submit the following:

Last Monday 143 out of the 169 towns and cities in Connecticut held their local elections. The Republican Party made substantial gains, carrying 127 out of the 143 towns and cities holding elections. The industrial city of Norwalk, after 4 terms under a Democratic mayor, went into the Republican column by 3,000; the industrial city of Bristol elected a Republican mayor; and the city of Torrington went Democratic by a scant 20 votes.

Three weeks from now I expect to have the pleasure of advising the House that the capital city—Hartford—is in the Republican column.

Whether or not these figures indicate a political trend, I leave to the Members of the House to decide.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for today. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw that order and instead to address the House on Monday next at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement of recommendations by the Michigan Food Conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Judge Wadhams of East Jewett, New York. As a member of the executive committee of the League to Enforce Peace, Judge Wadhams worked out a plan for the League of Nations and observed at close range the cause of its failure. He is presenting a new and more hopeful approach to securing an enduring peace, in this article. The Government Printing Office informs me that this will cost $22.50 in excess of the allowance, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CLASON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein two short editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday and Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative programs and any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

OCTOBER 7, ANNIVERSARY OF TWO GLORIOUS VICTORIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, today is an anniversary dear to the heart of every true American. It is the anniversary of two of the most important victories won by our forebears in the Revolutionary War.

On October 7, 1777, our first great victory was won at Saratoga, which sent a thrill of enthusiasm throughout the struggling Colonies; and on October 7, 1780, a second great victory was won by the Americans, the battle of Kings Mountain.

I call this to the attention of the House at this time because I believe the American people should pay more attention to this date on which our forefathers won those glorious victories in their struggle for the fifth freedom, which is expressed in those two glorious words, "liberty" and "independence."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for Friday. I ask unanimous consent that that order be vacated and that I be permitted to address the House for the same amount of time on Monday next, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, can the majority leader give us some idea of the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Frankly, I am unable to at this time. I doubt if the Commodity Credit Corporation bill will be in a position to be considered.

The Committee on Military Affairs reported out this morning a bill that has passed the Senate with reference to increasing the allowances for certain dependents of those who are serving in the present war. This is an important matter. If a rule is reported on this bill it can probably be considered the middle or latter part of next week, probably Wednesday.

This is the only bill I know of now that may be brought up for consideration next week, although I do not want to be bound by that statement, as I would have to make further inquiry.

The chances are that a rule will be requested for that bill and that it will be reported out. It is a matter of such importance that I want to bring it up as soon as possible. We cannot do that before Wednesday of next week, so if a rule on it is reported out, I shall probably assign it for Wednesday of next week.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. In addition to the bill which has been reported by the Committe on Military Affairs, on which a rule in all likelihood will be requested, the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on urgent request today reported a bill repealing the Chinese Exclusion Act. Also, the gentleman from North Carolina has a resolution pending authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain needs for the future development of our air transportation. In view of this situation, I will call a meeting for tomorrow, at which time we may be able to report on these three requests and bring in rules for the measures that are urgent.

Mr. McCORMACK. As to the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act, the action on which I am aware of and am very glad to note, personally, I do not intend to bring that up next week. I hope a rule will be reported out so that it may be considered in the very near future. However, as far as bringing it up next week is concerned, it is not my intention to do so. It will probably come up the week after next.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I hope the gentleman does not bring up any bill to change our immigration law materially during this war. What the Chinese want is something to fight with and something to eat. They are not interested in changing our laws as they affect the United States. If you start to break down our immigration laws now, as some people would have them broken down, you will literally flood this country from every nook and corner of the world with people many of whom will be undesirable.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand the majority leader, the only bill of importance that may be on the agenda for next week is the one from the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct.

Of course, I respect the views of the gentleman from Mississippi on the question of immigration. I think this bill is clearly an exception to the position which the gentleman has so consistently maintained. As I understand, this bill is to repeal the exclusion of the Chinese by name, which was certainly an ignoble act, something we ought to remedy, an act passed years ago in an atmosphere of economic pressures.

The repeal of this act would mean that under the quota system 105 Chinese would be allowed to enter this country each year. In view of the fact that the brave people of China are now going into their seventh year of resistance to one of the most vicious peoples the known history of man records, as well as the fact that the Chinese are our allies, I think that the passage of such a law, in addition to being an act of justice on our part, would be distinctly in the best interests of our country. That is my viewpoint. I do not want to get into any controversy or discussion of the bill at this time, but I felt that the opinion of the gentleman from Mississippi, which we respect even in disagreement, should not be permitted to remain unanswered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the Japanese have been waging propaganda through the Black Dragon Society for years to destroy all the immigration restrictions to which the gentleman refers.

As I said, the Chinese want something to fight with and to eat.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The regular order has been demanded.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then I object, Mr. Speaker.

BATTLE OF KING'S MOUNTAIN

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has just called the attention of the House to the fact that today is the anniversary of the victory at King's Mountain on the 7th day of October 1780. While not many men were engaged on either side in that battle, yet it was a victory for the Americans that had far-reaching consequences. It was fought by men from

North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia. But I do not intend to say very much save that it was "a great and glorious victory."

But I do want to call attention to the fact, not known by many, that prior to the date of that battle there were appeasers in the Continental Congress, and that these appeasers, not openly, were talking among themselves of making peace with Great Britain by letting Great Britain have the Carolinas, Georgia, and the English part of Florida. It was the victory at King's Mountain that put a stop to this sentiment and this talk among those who would have a peace no matter how they got it. For this reason the battle of King's Mountain has been well called the turning point of the Revolution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the other special orders, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUPPLY OF CORN FOR EASTERN UNITED STATES

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of Congress who are interested in obtaining corn for the dairy herds in their district, and for their poultrymen, to urge members of the Committee on Banking and Currency to report favorably my resolution—House Joint Resolution 169—removing the ceiling price of $1.07 a bushel on corn and letting it seek its own level and thereby start corn moving east to our farmers and industries.

This is a very critical situation, and unless our farmers get corn within the next few months it will mean curbing production or going out of business.

I do not understand how the administration, in view of its request for ten and a half billions in additional taxes, can have the temerity to ask for subsidies from Congress which will eventually cost three or four billions more. It is obvious to me that the big taxpayers are already squeezed dry and the small taxpayers are not in a position to pay even half of the proposed ten billions in new taxes.

It makes the entire financial situation utterly absurd to talk about subsidies, which will mean merely taking the money out of the pockets of the poor people to pay subsidies to the farmers they do not want and starting a most vicious system. Instead of trying to soak the poorer and middle-class taxpayers more, the policy of the Government should be to cut down expenditures and save at least $4,000,000,000. There are today 3,000,000 men and women on the Federal pay roll, and I believe if they were cut in half we would have just as good, if not better, efficiency in the Government.

The New Deal, instead of thinking up methods of spending more money and increasing the tax burdens of the wage earners and the middle classes, should concentrate on trying to save and stop governmental waste and extravagance now existing on the most colossal scale in our history.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a quotation from a speech made by John Garfield, motion-picture star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, in addition to a permanent loss to the committee, the Congress, and the Nation, in the departure of Francis D. Culkin, has suffered materially a further loss in the departure for service in the Navy of another of its members, James E. Van Zandt, one of the most industrious, informed, and patriotic members of the committee, whose splendid patriotism has led him into the war. The loss to the merchant marine in this respect is a gain for the Navy. We envy them that gain. Our loss cannot be expressed in words, for he was one of the hardest workers and most genial members on the committee. Always friendly in his approach, he was deeply beloved by all members of the committee. We shall miss him much. We wish him well, and we hope the fortunes of war bring him back to the Congress soon, and all of us on the committee would welcome him to his old position on the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries has adopted the following resolution in fond memory of his service with us.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas on September 23, 1943, the Honorable James E. Van Zandt, a Member of Congress from the Twenty-third Congressional District of Pennsylvania, notified the Speaker of the House of Representatives that he had submitted to the Governor of Pennsylvania his resignation as a Member of the Seventy-eighth Congress, effective at 6 p. m. September 24, 1943; and

Whereas the Honorable James E. Van Zandt has been for many years one of the most loyal industrious, and zealous members of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives, and by his distinguished, loyal, patriotic, and faithful work and his genial companionship at all times has won for himself the abounding affection and lasting love of all members of the commitee; and

Whereas his services with this committee have been characterized by industry, efficiency, great patience, profound skill, and untiring energy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, in session assembled, wish him the greatest success in his new fields of endeavor and the greatest achievements in his new labor, with the abiding assurance to him that his colleagues here will never forget his past labors, his loyalty, his friendship, fidelity, and his zeal, and we wish to assure him that his loyalty, fidelity, and friendship here fill us with a deep sense of personal loss, which, though poignant, will be somewhat alleviated by the conscious knowledge that though absent in the flesh he will be with us in the spirit, and that our prayers for his safe return and our best wishes will follow him until we, or at least some of us, will be privileged to share gladly that victory which he will have helped to win for us; and be it

Resolved further, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this committee and that a copy shall be sent to Mr. Van Zandt.

THE COAL SUPPLY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the War Labor Board for some time has had the settlement of the coal situation. They should act at once. The bituminous-coal stock is 30,000 tons below normal. The anthracite stock is much less. The stock of bituminous coal is steadily decreasing at the rate of 6,000 tons a month. We cannot win the peace for this country and the world if peace in the coal industry is not brought about. Intense suffering will result in hundreds of homes. Industry cannot function without bituminous coal. It is a very dangerous situation.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 755) to amend the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, so as to give protection to persons in military service, and their dependents, as to certain mortgages.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Alabama to briefly explain the bill?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of the Federal Housing

Act when a mortgagor defaults, the mortgagee is protected out of the fund provided in the act for insurance of mortgages on residential construction and bonds are delivered to take care of the obligation, such bonds to bear interest at not more than 3 percent. The provision of the bill before us provides that where foreclosure is postponed because of the fact that the mortgagor is in the armed service, the interest on the bonds will be paid from the time of default rather than from the time of final foreclosure. That is all there is in the bill. It has the unanimous report of the Committee on Banking and Currency and officials of the Federal Housing Authority.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In short, it makes effective the provisions of sections 302 and 306 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act which otherwise would not be applied to F. H. A. loans?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of section 204 (a) of the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That with respect to mortgages to which the provisions of sections 302 and 306 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as now or hereafter amended, apply and which are insured under section 203 of the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, and subject to such regulations and conditions as the Administrator may prescribe, there shall be included in the debentures an amount which the Administrator finds to be sufficient to compensate the mortgagee for any loss which it may have sustained on account of interest on debentures and the payment of insurance premiums by reason of its having postponed the institution of foreclosure proceedings or the acquisition of the property by other means during any part or all of the period of such military service and 3 months thereafter."

SEC. 2. The last sentence of section 604 (a) of the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That with respect to mortgages to which the provisions of sections 302 and 306 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as now or hereafter amended, apply and which are insured under section 603 of the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, and subject to such regulations and conditions as the Administrator may prescribe, there shall be included in the debentures an amount which the Administrator finds to be sufficient to compensate the mortgagee for any loss which it may have sustained on account of interest on debentures and the payment of insurance premiums by reason of its having postponed the institution of foreclosure proceedings or the acquisition of the property by other means during any part or all of the period of such military service and 3 months thereafter."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Since the Japanese launched their attack on the Philippine Islands, I have on several occasions addressed messages on behalf of the American people to the courageous people of the Philippines—expressing our admiration of their heroism and loyalty. I have assured them that the Government of the United States of America will see to it that their independence will be promptly established and—still more important—that it will be protected. The resources of the United States, in men and material, stand behind that pledge to the people of the Philippines. We shall keep that promise just as we have kept every promise which the United States has made to the Filipino people.

The Philippine Government, now in the United States, has been collaborating with the rest of the United Nations in the united task of destroying our common enemies in the East and in the West. As I stated on August 12, 1943, the United States in practice, regards the Philippines as having now the same status as the governments of other independent nations—in fact all the attributes of complete and respected nationhood.

I am sure that the American people believe that the Filipino people have earned the right juridically to be free and independent.

The date now set by statute and by the vote of the people and the Legislature of the Philippine Islands for independence is July 4, 1946. It is possible, however, that the fortunes of war will permit an earlier consummation of this joint will of the American and Filipino peoples.

I, therefore, recommend legislation by the Congress giving the President the authority, after consultation with the President of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, to advance the date provided in existing law and to proclaim the legal independence of the Philippines, as a separate and self-governing nation, as soon as feasible.

If the Congress takes this action, there are several steps which, in my opinion, are necessary to make good our pledge that the independence of the Philippines will be protected in the future and to give them the opportunity of economic rehabilitation which is their due.

I, therefore, also recommend:

1. That the Congress make provision authorizing the President of the United States and the President of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands to enter into immediate negotiations and take the necessary steps to provide for full security for the Philippines, for the mutual protection of the islands and of the United States, and for the future maintenance of peace in the Pacific.

2. That the Congress make provision for determining the adjustments necessary in the existing provisions of law which govern the economic relations between the United States and the Philippines, so as to assist in making the Philippines, as an independent nation, economically secure wherever possible.

3. That the Congress make provision for the physical and economic rehabilitation of the Philippines made necessary by the ravages of war which the invaders have inflicted upon them.

All of this is due to the Filipino people in recognition of their heroic role in this war, the political ties which have bound us together, and the bonds of friendship which will join us together in the future.

Such action on the part of the Congress would assure the Philippine people again of our sincerity of purpose, and of our resolution to accord them as soon as feasible the legal status of complete freedom, independence, and nationhood to which, as a member of the United Nations, they are entitled.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 6, 1943.*

CONTESTED ELECTION—SULLIVAN AGAINST MILLER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House which was read, and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Elections, No. 3, and ordered printed:

OCTOBER 6, 1943.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to lay before the House of Representatives the contest for a seat in the House of Representatives for the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States for the Eleventh Congressional District of the State of Missouri, John B. Sullivan against Louis E. Miller, notice of which has been filed in the office of the Clerk of the House; and also transmit herewith original testimony, papers, and documents relating thereto.

In compliance with the act approved March 2, 1887, entitled "An Act Relating to Contested-Election Cases," the Clerk has opened and printed the testimony in the above case, and such portions of the testimony as seemed proper to the Clerk, after giving the requisite notices, have been printed and indexed together with the notice of contest, and the answer thereto and original papers and exhibits have been sealed up and are ready to be laid before the Committee on Elections.

Two copies of the printed testimony in the aforesaid case have been mailed to the contestant and the same number to the contestee, which, together with a joint letter of the parties to the Clerk of the House of Representatives transmitting a stipulation to dismiss the contest, will be laid before the Committee on Elections to which this case shall be referred.

Yours respectfully,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

ADDITIONAL ALLOWANCE TO DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Military Affairs Committee of the House may have until

midnight tonight to file a report on the bill S. 1279.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, following the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], and in order that the House may have definite information, it is the intention to bring up this bill on next Wednesday.

Mr. MICHENER. That is the draft bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; it is the bill providing for additional allowance to dependents of servicemen. The bill which the gentleman from Michigan has in mind is the bill which passed the Senate on yesterday.

Mr. MICHENER. It is the same bill to which the majority leader made reference a few months ago?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and insert a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE FOOD SITUATION

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, we have been back very nearly a month, and I cannot see any evidence that we have accomplished a great deal. We have done a lot of shadowboxing, we have said a lot of things here in the House. But frankly, I cannot feel as much encouraged as I did when I came back from the congressional recess. That respite of several weeks imbued me with enthusiasm for action that returning to close contact with the folks at home always gives me. And so, frankly, I was very glad to hear at least a feeble attempt on the part of the majority leader today to announce some forthcoming legislation. I think it is about time, as we have been here nearly a month, that we should begin to do something. There was not one of us, when we were going around in our home districts this summer, who did not find people in a state of unrest because of the deplorable situation in Washington.

As I have said, we have done a lot of shadowboxing; we have set up the bureaucrats down town as straw men and have had a lot of fun knocking them down. Back home, we talked about ambitious programs, flailed the air with our arms, waved the flag, and made impressive speeches as to what we were going to do when we got back to Washington. But to this day, aside from the passage of one or two important measures, we have not done a single thing since we returned from the congressional recess.

I say that we are fiddling while Rome is burning, and I feel that the time has come for action. I think it is time that we took the bull by the horns and saw to it that this food-for-victory program, which is so important toward the winning of this war, was put into force and effect in real earnest by the various departments and agencies of the Government. We should insist that feed be sent or brought into the Northeast so dairy cattle and poultry flocks that need it can survive.

I think it is time we took action in the interest of the servicemen and bring into this House measures which will benefit the dependents of the men in service. I am glad to hear that a bill has been reported from the Military Affairs Committee. I have not yet read the report, but I am happy to learn that there is some step being taken to improve the lot of the wives of servicemen and their dependents. Personally I am afraid we will not give them enough. But I sincerely hope that action will be forthcoming before long to increase the allotment for wives and dependents of these men who are striving with might and main to win this war.

You cannot do much toward raising a family on $50 a month. It will not go very far, and when you have one or more children—and, in many instances, three or four, as in the case of many fathers who are being sent to the colors—it is absolutely impossible to support those children on the allotments which dependents are now getting. No instance has come back to my attention in my district of any wife wasting the money that has been allotted to her; I have not seen any example at home of the funds sent to the servicemen and their families being wasted.

As I have said, this House must take the responsibility to pass legislation to increase soldier allotments.

I want to discuss the food-for-victory program for a few minutes this afternoon. Last night I heard a group of agricultural authorities say that unless corn is shipped into the Northeast, unless feed is brought to the farmers of up-State New York, there is going to be a milk shortage throughout the entire metropolitan district of New York and in other big cities that will be serious indeed before the winter is over.

The remedy, in my opinion, is for the O. P. A. to lift the ceiling price of $1.07 per bushel on corn, which I am told is holding that feed in the Middle West at the present time and keeping it away from the dairy cattle and poultry flocks in up-State New York.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to inform the gentleman from New York, as one coming from a district in Nebraska that raises corn, that we are not holding back any feed from your part of the country; we need the feed in that section to meet the demands at home.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Then, why is it that only last night I talked with men from dairy organizations of my district who said there was plenty of corn throughout the Middle West and the only way to get it moved to the Northeast is to raise the ceiling price?

Mr. STEFAN. Since the gentleman from New York has made his first talk on the corn situation and the alleged report that the farmers in the Middle West were holding corn from other parts of the country, I made some inquiry in the Department of Agriculture. I am told that they have recalculated the parity price for the new corn crop. There may be some increase in the parity price, but I do not see that there is any possibility of increasing the ceiling price on corn at this time, from information that I get.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Very well. It simply means that we cannot get corn into the Northeast; we cannot get the feed needed for the dairy cattle and for the poultry flocks to meet the demands of food in the city of New York and the rest of the big metropolitan districts. This means that they are going to have to go without milk and dairy products and without eggs, to say nothing of the dearth which the armed forces will feel in these products that the Northeast raises.

I know you will be interested—I know the gentleman from Nebraska will also be interested—to know that New York State is third in the production of agricultural commodities in the entire Nation. He may share the general impression prevalent in some parts of the country that up-State New York is identified as the tail on the city of New York. Such is not the case, I want to assure him, even though up-Staters are about the last to get any consideration down here in Washington.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The producers of corn and feed in my State are producing a gigantic amount of corn and are raising and are just as much interested in sending to your farmers as much feed as they possibly can; they are interested in your farmers as well, but let me tell the gentleman something about the corn situation in Nebraska. In some parts of the Middle West we have had another drought which hit some sections of the Corn Belt, and we have only raised about 50 percent of the normal crop this year. Then the Commodity Credit Corporation came into some of the drought-stricken counties and took practically all of the Government-owned corn out of those counties and shipped it to other parts of the country for commercial uses.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. They have not been moving that corn into our section of the country.

Mr. STEFAN. With the result that we have to put the corn to use back at home.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. I hope there will be no quarrel between the eastern representatives of the farmers and the midwestern farmers, because the only way we are go-

ing to be able to get corn is to raise the price of corn from its present price of $1.07 per bushel, because the midwestern farmers can feed it to their hogs and get $1.30 out of it.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am sorry, I cannot yield further.

Mr. STEFAN. The difficulty is the people have been keeping down the price of corn.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Let me say this: That we have got to have the corn that the people of the Middle West are producing and if the O. P. A. or the Secretary of Agriculture, who, as I understand, has the final say, are to bring any relief it is time they woke up and furnished the corn to the Northeast, and provided a break for the consumers, city and rural as well.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I am going to make a few remarks later in which I am going to point out that I have a telegram from my district which states:

> Both our feeders and grain dealers are up against it. The feeders are disposing of their stock for want of feed and elevators will be put out of business.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. All the figures we have at our disposal indicate there is a lot of corn out there. The reason we cannot get it moved into our part of the country is because of the $1.07 ceiling price. They have stubbornly insisted on leaving that price where it is all summer, and they will not even raise it a few cents. So for that reason I hope that some action will be taken. I have tried, and other Representatives from my section have tried, to get some settlement, some solution to this serious problem.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Will the gentleman support legislation in this House to give the farmer parity for his corn?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am a member of the Agricultural Committee and I have supported parity price for agricultural commodities.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. What I am talking about now is will the gentleman now, today, support a bill to give the farmers parity for their corn?

This administration for 10 years has been promising the farmers parity, but what do they get? They get $1.07 on the Chicago market today. When by feeding that corn they can get a ceiling price of $1.15 or more, why should they sell it?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. As I see it, it has passed beyond this House, it has passed into the hands of O. P. A. They regulate the price as they see fit regardless of what the Secretary of Agriculture wants or says; his voice seems to have no influence on the action taken down there.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is why I ask the gentleman if he will support legislation to fix a decent price to the farmer, the price that this administration has promised them for 10 years?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Let me ask the gentleman what he wants as a price for a bushel of corn?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I am asking the gentleman if he will support legislation to pay the farmer parity for his corn?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. What is parity on corn?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. It is my understanding that parity on the Chicago market would be $1.15 per bushel and I believe the farmers should get at least that.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I have been told they would not release corn even though they put it up to $1.20 a bushel or higher. However, I don't pretend to know about that. What I do know is that the New York milkshed is going dry unless we get some feed and get it quickly. The end of October, I am told by various dairy organizations, is the deadline for feed. There is no available corn left thereabouts. The granaries of the distributors of corn and other feeds are empty.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We have in southwestern Minnesota—and I think the same thing applies throughout the area extending down from Sioux City into eastern Nebraska—the greatest corn crop we have ever had; I think it is almost assured now in that country. We have a 92-cent ceiling or thereabouts. I believe that we would flood your eastern market with corn if they would permit us to sell our corn at the Chicago ceiling price in Tyler, and not in Chicago, at $1.07. I would like to see you get that corn from that great producing area, and I am talking about my own producing area, every possible bushel that the gentleman's people could consume.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Answering the gentleman from Minnesota, I will say we have appealed to the Secretary of Agriculture. I appealed to Judge Jones yesterday when he testified before the Committee on Agriculture. I asked him if he would see to it that the ceiling price was lifted. I have appealed to O. P. A., I have appealed to every agency that I know of, but they all steadfastly resist any suggestion to allow a rise in that price. This, I am told by the farm groups in my country, would be a solution to the whole problem and the only solution that we have.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. CASE. What did Judge Jones say yesterday when the gentleman asked him to raise the ceiling price of corn?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. He did not say anything definitely.

Mr. CASE. Did the gentleman ask him whether or not he would have authority to recommend a change that would be followed?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. According to him the Secretary of Agriculture has the last word. The Secretary of Agriculture can disapprove of that $1.07 ceiling price. He is able to do that because it was provided at the time Congress passed the bill last year.

Mr. CASE. Was there any discussion about establishing a proper relationship between the various ceilings so that if the price of corn was changed that the feeder of cattle would get an even break with the hog raiser?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes; I believe according to what he said—and we can only go by what he said—I believe it was his intention to make ceilings equitable among all groups of feeders.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. What did he say about helping the feeder out, in answer to the question of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. He was indefinite in his answers to some questions asked him. Here is another thing, if I can get the chance to bring out this matter. I talked to him about the Commodity Credit Corporation. For my part I am dissatisfied with the way the Commodity Credit Corportaion has been handling things. To my way of thinking they are squeezing out a lot of private dealers. They are withholding feed from some.

The C. C. C. should be using every available channel for the distribution of foods throughout our section. When I asked Judge Jones he assured me that he would see to it that the Commodity Credit Corporation did use all these available food agencies. I, for one, hope he means what he says, because these feed dealers are having a very hard time of it. The C. C. C. is not utilizing the facilities of the feed dealers and distributors as they should, and that is one of the main reasons the farmers of my section are not getting the feed they ought to have, and that they must have, in order to carry out the war-food program.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. CASE. If the gentleman will permit this observation, it is my thought that the Committee on Agriculture should take the bit in its teeth, so to speak, and report out to the House legislation that would bring about a proper relationship between the ceilings on food and on livestock. In doing so they must take into consideration the natural relationship between corn and pork and make the ceilings on other types of livestock correspond to the support price on hogs.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I agree with the gentleman. I want, however, to get to another phase and that is a brief review of some of the other things that Judge Jones mentioned in his testimony yesterday. I kept trying to get some information out of his jurisdiction over these various agencies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, in order to conclude my statement, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds the gentleman that there are about an hour and a half of other special orders yet on the calendar. Nevertheless, the Chair will put the gentleman's request, and he may proceed if those having the other special orders do not object.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that he proceed for an additional 5 minutes?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Did I understand correctly that the gentleman believes an increase in the price of corn will solve the problem of the farmers in his district?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is exactly what I was told. I have been assured by the dairymen, by the Grangers, by the agricultural experts in my district that that is the one solution to the problem: To lift the price of corn, to let it seek its natural level so these farmers in the Middle West can dispose of their corn. I am not prepared to say whether the price should be $1.25, $1.35, or $1.40, but the experts to whom I talked said that the price of corn should be allowed to seek its proper level and that when it reached that level the whole problem would be remedied in a very short time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. May I make this observation to the gentleman, then? Week before last a weekly paper in one of our counties of about 15,000 population carried notice of 10 auction sales in 1 week. Nine of those auction sales were for the purpose of selling out livestock and the herds because the farmers out there at the present price of grain, particularly corn, could not continue with the present price of milk. What is the gentleman's answer to that question?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In my district there have been a tremendous number of auction sales. I think there have been as many, if not more, than in the gentleman's district.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The point of my question is that if they have to sell off their herds because the price of corn at its present level is too high, would they not have to sell off more herds if the price of corn were raised still higher? Would that be a solution to the problem?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. According to the dairymen who know, men with whom I have talked about it tell me that is the solution to the problem. I have explored other phases of the problem, but I am told by these experts that if the price of corn were lifted above $1.07 it would solve the problem. I am not prepared to say whether it should be lifted to $1.25, $1.30, or $1.35.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does not the gentleman believe the farmers know more about it themselves than the experts?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The only experts I talked with are the farmers themselves. They are experts enough for me. And they do not have to be too expert to know they cannot get corn; they want it and must have it if they are to do their part in the food-for-victory program.

Let me say further that Judge Jones in appearing before our committee would not agree with any of the members when they kept pressing him and trying to get him to say that he should have jurisdiction over a number of these agencies that were pulling in different directions. Unless someone is given the power to make these agencies operate together, make their efforts cooperative, supplementary, and uniform in the direction of helping the American farmer, they might just as well quit trying to have a program, because they will not accomplish anything until this happens. Whenever we asked Judge Jones why he could not do this he would say he had no authority over this question; that we had better go to the Commodity Credit Corporation or some other agency that had charge of it. The result was that we were playing a great game of round robin and were unable to get anywhere, because the authority was not under any one head, as I frankly feel it should be. The only excuse he gave us was that this was a pretty big country, and we had a lot of different and diverse problems that he could not settle.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman think, though, in fairness to Judge Jones, that he did point out very clearly that he was not in a position at this date to give us the recommendations that he got from the rural sections of this country as to the program for another year? Did he not kind of give us the assurance that he was going to try to bring order out of chaos?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I do not want to be unfair in my criticism, but I have given my reactions and have stated the problem that faces me in my district. I wish Marvin Jones all the success in the world. His is a most difficult assignment, and I am sure he recognizes that for his food program to reach its goal, upstate New York dairymen and poultrymen must have feed corn or else consumers of the East will get no milk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following the special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PAY INCREASE FOR RAILROAD LABOR

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, there has been lots said on this floor about the question of organized labor and its problems, much pro and much con. There is no Member of this body who has condemned racketeering in stronger terms than I. But let me say to you that, according to my code, it is not who does a thing that makes it wrong, but what is done, irrespective as to whom it is done by. The responsibilities that rest on our shoulders are too great to permit us to let personal interest, prejudice, or expediency direct our course. We must be as big as our responsibilities and not permit one class to forage upon the rights of another class.

I want to predicate my further remarks on the premise that there is no class whose duties and services are more directly connected with the full and successful prosecution of the war than the railroad employees of these United States, and let me say to their eternal credit that there is no class who has displayed a greater degree of patriotism and complete devotion to their task. This Nation and our armed forces will be under lasting obligation to them for the great job they have done in maintaining transportation at the high standard of perfection that they have held it.

Let us analyze and see what they have done: It is a fact of common knowledge that this emergency caught the railroad companies short of equipment and that it has been necessary to put into service obsolete and defective operating equipment to take care of the great increase in freight and passenger volume. The business of the companies throughout the country has multiplied many times, but by loyal and faithful devotion to duty, experienced men have handled the job and done it in a great way. Their time has not been consumed in turmoil and confusion and agitation, but in steady and efficient application of their many years of experience to a big job which they have done well.

It is a known fact that the cost of living has all but tripled and that the companies many months ago were granted a large increase in rates, and that their volume of business has increased possibly by 500 percent, yet they have steadfastly refused to give their employees a raise in pay.

Let us see how this injustice was met by their men: On September 25, 1942, 15 organizations representing over 1,000,000 nonoperating employees served notice on the companies that they expected an increase of 20 cents an hour with a minimum hourly wage of 70 cents. This request was denied by the management. Then on December 15, 1942, the management met the representatives of the employees on a national basis to try and work out something that would be satisfactory to employer and employee, which effort failed. The Mediation Board was then requested to try and compose the differences. This Board started hear-

ings on January 7, 1943, but failed in its efforts. Then on February 20, 1943, the President, by Executive Orders Nos. 9172 and 9299, appointed an Emergency Board to take the matter under advisement and this Board held hearings for 44 days at which evidence from both sides was offered. On May 24, 1943, this Board in keeping with its duty and based on the evidence it had heard, reported to the President, in which report it recommended an increase of 8 cents an hour. On June 22, 1943, Mr. Vinson, Economic Stabilization Director, denied the increase as recommended by the Emergency Board.

On August 7, 1943, the management of the railroads and representatives of the various crafts negotiated an agreement incorporating the recommendations of the Emergency Board. Mr. Vinson has declined to act since the agreement of all parties concerned, and more than a million good Americans are carrying the great task of operating the railroads and thereby maintaining a high standard of transportation while they are barely making a livelihood for their families. All this at a time when the administration is crying for higher taxes to drain off the surplus of income of the Nation. If some of those guys had to leave their easy chairs in which they are trying to figure some way to get more of the earnings of these men and go to a machine or a carshed by a whistle and leave by a whistle for about 2 days, these boys would not have any trouble getting just treatment at their hands.

This great class of Americans have been handed a raw deal and the responsibility rests in the bosom of this administration and it cannot shift it. These men are and should be keeping score.

It only takes reasonable intelligence and a little thought to determine the right and wrong of any issue. Are these men entitled to this raise? As a matter of justice, they are entitled to at least a flat 25 percent increase, and who is there in this Chamber that will dispute this fact? I will yield a minute of my time to any Member who will question this fact.

The top pay for mechanics in railroad work is 95 cents and the minimum for unskilled help in shipyards is about this figure. Unskilled help of railroads runs as low as 36 cents an hour. It is an undisputable fact that railroad mechanics on the whole are the most skilled in the Nation. They are subject to the same tax rate as those in shipyards, pay the same for food and other necessities of life, and in many instances are required to spend a great deal of their time away from home at an additional expense. They love their families as much as anyone else and no individuals or class has through the years contributed more to the development and growth of this Nation and its many industries than the railroad employees. Will we now sit idly by and see them kicked around like a bunch of slaves?

In my district I could cite cases where the sons, or neighbors' sons, of men who have put their life in the service at the throttle of an engine, with all its attendant danger and responsibility, or at a machine in a machine shop, who have just finished high school and do not know how to do anything, are making nearly twice as much in a shipyard as they are making. You will never be able to make these men or the American people believe this to be fair and just. Bringing the steel to a shipyard is just as important a part of the construction of a ship as working the steel after it gets there.

I say the treatment these men have received and are receiving is an insult to their intelligence. I wonder if this administration actually thinks that they are dumb enough to be fooled by its empty gestures of a program of roll-back of food prices. These men are not begging for subsidies or to get their hands in the Federal Treasury, they only ask that they be given an honest day's pay for an honest day's work. You cannot fool them. What have you done when you save them possibly $4 a year on their milk bill and take $10 of their own money to pay some youngster to administer this un-American program? You only add insult to injury. Did you ever think that it would take an increase of a great deal more than has been agreed upon to pay the increase in income tax of these workmen, to say nothing of the fact that you are now trying to increase their tax by near 50 percent and not taking into account the fact that they are working for wages they received when the cost of living, over-all, was barely half of what it is today?

I say to the membership of this House that a great bloc of as good American citizens as we have is being shamefully abused and that our present emergency is being taken advantage of to put it over them. They have proven that their loyalty and patriotism have caused them to refrain from exercising their only means of protecting their rights, that is, to strike. If a strike occurs and the transportation system is locked down, let me tell you that this administration must accept the responsibility. I am opposed to any strike while our boys are dying on battlefields, but let me say again, if it occurs, let us place the blame where it belongs.

There is no one more opposed to the racketeering for which John L. Lewis is noted than I. But, did it ever occur to you that Lewis is only the product of a condition, and one for which someone was responsible? Just such injustices as this will make good men do things that otherwise they would bitterly condemn. We are all human. Can you expect these men to maintain the high standard of efficiency that has made possible the great job of handling the transportation that this emergency has demanded when they know that they have been shamefully mistreated? You need not, it just does not happen that way.

I know that this is not a matter that the Congress can control. We must admit, however, that we are the guardians of the rights of the American people and I am calling on each Member of this House to make it known to the President and Mr. Vinson that you are taking note of the unjust treatment these men are receiving and request that justice be done them.

Mr. President and Mr. Vinson, I say to you that this is developing into a critical situation and I respectfully request that you take immediate steps to see that the rights of this great mass of American people are protected; if you fail, then you must assume the full responsibility.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I wish to compliment the gentleman on the splendid statement he has made in reference to this appalling situation. Is it not a fact that through the processes of collective bargaining the men and their employers agreed upon a settled wage scale, which Mr. Vinson, as one man, has refused to recognize, and thus we have the rule of one man voiding the contractual relationship these people have arrived at as a result of collective bargaining?

Mr. GIBSON. The gentleman is definitely correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following the special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes in order to air this corn situation a little further.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, if this Congress could enact into law those things which the people back home recommended to us during the recent congressional recess and those things which each one of us told our people we were for, it would be a great victory on the home front and would help to win the war.

Since our return to Washington there has been little or no legislative program. I have before me the whip notice for this week. It is like the one for last week. It reads as follows:

> There is no legislative program in the House of Representatives for the week beginning Monday, October 4, 1943. The Consent and Private Calendars will be called, and, if anything of importance comes up, your office will be notified.

The majority leadership in charge of the program in this House is, by "sitting on the lid," making it possible for the executive branch of the Government to do everything by bureaucratic directive and regulation and is denying to the people, through their Representatives, the right to government by law.

Does anyone, regardless of his party affiliation, feel that the price-control law,

for instance, should not be drastically changed? Are your people back home satisfied with the operation of the O. P. A.?

Are these people content to let dairy after dairy close and the milk supply of countless communities be shut off?

I read you a telegram that came to me the day before yesterday from Holdrege, Nebr.:

Within 10 days this city of 3,500 people will be without milk unless we secure some action that will enable our dairies to pay farmers a higher price for whole milk. The dairy here that produces 40 percent of our milk supply today ceased operation and all other whole milk producing farmers are expected to follow within the next 10 days. Can't you do something to clear the situation? We have made repeated requests to the O. P. A. but apparently we cannot secure consideration from that Government area.

It ought to occur to the people of the Office of Price Administration that it is better for the children of America to have some milk at 14 cents a quart than no milk at 12 cents a quart. They cannot seem to understand that, however.

Are the housewives of your districts satisfied with the present production and distribution of butter?

Are the farmers, dealers and processors of corn content with the O. P. A.'s handling of the ceiling price on corn?

I read to you the following telegram which I have received from Falls City, Nebr.:

We call your attention to the O. P. A. corn regulation pertaining to the price of corn in Kansas and Nebraska. The ceiling of corn in Nebraska area A is 94 cents to elevators and 96 cents to feeders, and the Kansas area 3 price is from $1.08 to $1.12. This makes it impossible for elevators and feeders to buy corn in Nebraska and the only way to obtain corn is to go over to Kansas and purchase it on their ceiling and haul it back, all of which is stupid and an impossible situation. The total production of corn in Doniphan, Brown, and Nemaha Counties, Kans., is 7,698,000 bushels and in Richardson, Pawnee, and Nemaha Counties, Nebr., is 7,373,500 bushels, hence corn should not be moving from Nebraska to Kansas. We have contacted the Omaha O. P. A. office and obtained no relief. We recommend that the price of corn in Nebraska be raised to meet the Kansas price or else the Kansas price be lowered to equal the Nebraska price. Both our county feeders and grain dealers are up against it, and feeders are disposing of their stock for want of feed and elevators are being put out of business, and we ask your help in obtaining relief from this difficult situation.

N. K. Hosford, manager, Continental Grain, Verdon, Nebr.; Farmers Union at Dawson, H. Francis, manager; O. A. Cooper Co., Humboldt, Nebr.; Power Bros. Sheep Co., Humboldt, Nebr.; Danen Milling Co., Rulo, Nebr.; Farmers Union Elevator by Frank Snyder, manager, Preston, Nebr.; W. F. Kentopp, Strausville, Nebr.; Falls City Grain Co., Falls City, Nebr.; Falls City Milling Co., Falls City, Nebr.; F. B. Knisely & Son, Shubert, Nebr.; Hart Grain Co., Stella, Nebr.; Windle Elevator, Salem, Nebr.; Ralph Biggs, chairman, Richardson County A. A. A.; Dave Gatz, feeder; Ben Stalder, feeder; Ralph Stalder, feeder; Boose & Son, feeders.

Are the farmers of your district provided with the necessary machinery, gasoline, and price incentive to stay in business and produce the food we must have?

How about the gasoline situation? Are the thinking people of your districts satisfied to have this Nation go on using more petroleum products each month than we are producing? Are they satisfied with the amount of gasoline that people are getting in your districts? Do they want any changes in gasoline rations?

For months and months and months the Office of Price Administration has held down the price of oil, the development of new fields, and the drilling of new wells by refusing to raise the price of crude oil. Are we satisfied with their actions? In whom is vested the legislative powers of our Government?

Are the so-called white-collared employees of your districts getting a fair deal? In my opinion they are the forgotten men and women. Many of them are working at salaries arrived at during years of drought and depression. Now, they must pay the increased costs of living. They are paying their taxes and buying bonds. These people are the salt of the earth, yet, although their employers want to raise their pay, this administration, through its executive boards and bureaus, refuses to permit even moderate raises in wages and salaries. I think that the Congress of the United States has an obligation to that fine group of people.

Do the businessmen of your districts want to be freed from the number of Government forms they must fill out? Do they want a reduction in the number of snoopers and pay-rollers that pester them?

Most of these pressing problems which I have mentioned, have to do with the price-control law. The Wolcott price-control bill, which represents the minority party's views on price control, should be brought out upon the floor for action. It would provide a vehicle whereby the Congress could legislate upon all of these problems in the light of the observations that the Members have made in recent weeks back home. The administration leaders in this House will never bring that bill out. We must force it out. If you Members have not already signed the discharge petition to bring this price-control bill out for consideration, I urge you to do it now.

Among other things, that bill preserves to every citizen the right to take his case into court from the rulings of the O. P. A. That right is denied and taken away under the present law. That right alone is a cause well worth fighting for. Here in free America this administration first packs the highest Court in the land with its own administrators, making sure that their philosophy prevails in the opinions of that Court, and then, in the second place, they deny to the citizens of America their day in court. Today the Government starts the lawsuits and takes the appeals. It takes the appeals to a New Deal-packed court. A taxpayer recently told me of a tax controversy he had had with the Federal Government. The Government attorneys said to him:

We know that your view is the law; there are five or six decisions holding your view, but we don't think it ought to be the law, so we are going to appeal your case.

Think of it. Dragging a citizen to the Supreme Court, not to interpret a doubtful point of law but to rewrite the law.

We have a situation before us in the field of insurance, which has never been considered interstate commerce. There are a number of Supreme Court decisions so holding. It has always been subject to State, not Federal law. A court in Atlanta, Ga., in a recent case, reaffirmed that position, but the Government has appealed that case, bringing it to the Supreme Court. The purpose of the United States Government appealing the case is to bring all kinds of insurance under the jurisdiction and the heel of the Federal Government. It would place one more activity under Federal Government control, it means more Government employees, more taxes, and more regulation.

This administration is now making use of the Court reform it put over a few years ago. Call it liberalism, if you want to. but it is despotism.

Are we of this House going to permit the legislative functions of this Government to be exercised by executive boards, bureaus, and agencies, through edicts and directives? As for me, I want to be counted among those who will fight for representative government and the rights of the people, through their elected Representatives, to make the laws of the land. What will it profit this Nation if we win the battle of Italy and lose the battle of Washington?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Judge Jones to the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HENDRICKS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, recently I spoke on the floor of the House on the difficulty experienced by solicitors in the Third War Loan drive in Delaware County, Ind., in attempting to secure extra gasoline for use in soliciting prospective bond purchasers. In making this drive to sell bonds, in that county, it was found that many of the solicitors would be forced to walk to personally visit and see the people who were prospective bond purchasers, unless extra gasoline could be obtained for that purpose. The time was exceedingly short in which to act, and an application was made, by those in charge of the War bond drive, for a gross amount of gaso-

line for distribution among those who would participate in the general clean-up drive which was then in progress, there being insufficient time for each individual solicitor to make the trip and make application for such extra gasoline. However, because of the rigid rules and regulations of the O. P. A., issued from the central office in Washington, neither the local ration board, in Delaware County, nor the State ration board, at Indianapolis, could grant such request. The local board and the State board were bound by the rules and regulations which had theretofore been issued from the Washington office and they were powerless to act, except in the manner and form prescribed by those rules and regulations.

Mr. Speaker, among the many ills in the Washington office of the O. P. A., which consist in part by the sudden changes of the rules and regulations issued and the many and various interpretations placed thereon by the central office, here, great confusion exists on the part of the people and, in many instances, the local ration boards are confused thereby.

During the recent recess of Congress, I found in a part of the counties of the district which I represent that the local ration boards were in a quandary as to what to do, and what they should not do. There is no discretion vested in those boards. The members of those boards have no power to exercise their independent judgment. They can only follow the rules and regulations issued by the Washington office of the O. P. A. The difficulty which developed in Delaware County, Ind., respecting extra gasoline for the War bond drive, the fault did not lie in either the local ration board in that county or in the State ration board, but the fault lies in the lap of the central office at Washington.

Mr. Speaker, on many occasions I have urged, and I now urge, that some discretion and some power to exercise their own independent judgment be vested in the local ration boards. The members of those boards reside in their respective communities and they are fully advised of the needs and necessities existing there. They know the people, and they know what their requirements are. They are far better qualified to pass upon the question of either granting or refusing the requests made than some employee of the O. P. A. sitting in an office in Washington.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in order that all rationing be placed upon a fair and reasonable basis, predicated upon the real need in the various communities, some power and some discretion to act should be placed in the hands of the local ration boards. The members of those boards are patriotic American citizens, they serve without pay, and they are performing a splendid service for our country in time of war. They will not be misguided in the exercise of their good judgment in all matters presented to them.

It is the fervent wish of all that our rationing program may be made just and reasonable in the face of the community needs and deserts, and that it may not fall in the classification of regimentation directed from a central office in Washington.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman realize that the very things he is pointing out make it impossible for the administration in Washington to delegate that authority? Does not the gentleman realize that no one back home trusts this administration?

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to thank the gentleman for his observation. I think he is entirely correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HENDRICKS). The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

FINDING THE FACTS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, the other day I spoke on the question of the participation of Congress in the affairs of the Federal Government. Today we have been in session 2 weeks without any legislative program, as the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] pointed out. I would not be so worried about no legislative program if we were well organized during this time to get the facts concerning legislation we will vote upon in the weeks and months to follow. The important thing is that we are not organized to get at the basic facts.

Let us just go back and review for a minute. We did not have the basic facts in the rubber situation until the Conant and Baruch committee made their report. There were many committees of both Houses of Congress delving into the problem, but there was not a comprehensive picture for the production of synthetic rubber to help win the war and keep the internal economy of the United States on wheels until the Baruch-Conant committee made its report. The singular thing is that Mr. Conant and Mr. Baruch and the other member of the committee did not belong to any department of the Government, either executive, legislative, or judiciary.

Lately Collier's magazine made an editorial appeal again that somebody outside the Government of the United States look into the "muddled" food problem. Collier's, like all of us, merely wants the facts. It seems to me these two cases present a plain tragedy on our state of affairs under our three branches of government provided by the Constitution, as we have known it. Should not this great national weekly publication, should not the people, look to this congressional body, this constitutional body, to find the facts with relation to the problems that engulf us in this war?

Now let us examine our stature with the executive employees. During the debate on the subsidy question in another body, Senator TYDINGS reported a speech by one in the executive branch of the Government who held a high position. The Senator was discussing the attitude of members of the executive branch toward the Congress of the United States. Fundamentally, Congress does the legislating and the executive branch of the Government carries out our policies. That is the way the founding fathers intended us to operate. Instead of that, let us see what Mr. TYDINGS reports:

> When the parliamentary question was raised I was stating that Mr. Cox, a high-ranking official in the Department of Justice, recently in addressing a group of Government attorneys, said that the mission of the Department of Justice was not to interpret acts of Congress strictly as they were written, but to find ways and means by which administrative agencies could do things. I think he properly expressed the attitude of the interpreting attorneys under the present dispensation. They do not say, "This seems to restrict us," but, "How can we find the means of breaking through this restriction and doing what we want to have done?"

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Cox was just following the lead of the Commander in Chief, who also happens to be the President. You will recall that Congress said they should not use any of the money that we were appropriating on a certain occasion for this information center down here; but the President took $980,000 and put up the building just the same. You cannot blame these subordinates for disregarding the law or the will of Congress. You remember about that $25,000 limitation that the President added, after the Congress said we did not want it. I do not criticize these men—you cannot call them hired men, because the Congress pays them—but these fellows who are in the administration. They just follow the boss. We have got to trim his wings if we want to get anywhere.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Now, I want to make this further observation. The $840,000,000 that was appropriated as a secret special fund for the conduct of the war, appropriated to the President of the United States, has been transferred in no small measure to the regular agencies of the Government and special war agencies for purposes that Congress had previously turned down in several appropriation legislative bills.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield once more?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Would the gentleman suggest to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments that they try to ascertain where this money came from that paid for the trip of the First Lady down to Australia and these other out-of-the-way places; how much it was and when we authorized that expenditure?

Mr. JONES. I would answer the gentleman by saying, We do not have the comprehensive facts of the way our money is being spent. The Congress of the United States does not have the

comprehensive facts of the American war economy. If we turn down a proposal, sometimes it runs along for 18 months or 2 years before we find that the executive branch attorneys have found "the means of breaking through the restrictions." The will of the Congress of the United States is unimportant to the executive.

I want to make this further observation. I am not making these statements to carp at the other branch of the Government or attack personalities. I make them from the standpoint of the love that each one of us has for the institution of Congress. Certainly we should live up to the stature of the founding fathers so that the people and Collier's Weekly magazine will naturally think of us—the institution of Congress—to find the facts for us.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield just once further?

Mr. JONES. I only have a minute or so. I would like to proceed, if I may.

Now, we are woefully ill-equipped for manpower. There are very, very few men with the personal equipment, with the stamina and with the character to find the facts, like our colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], who has recently written an article for the Reader's Digest and about whom the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post carries an article. There are few of us who have the fine high qualities and ability to get a comprehensive picture such as those two articles show the gentleman from Michigan has. The membership of Congress is a cross section of the American people as a whole. We are just like the ordinary Rotary Club or Kiwanis Club; some of us doctors, some lawyers, some farmers and some businessmen. If we do not have the ability to put together a comprehensive picture like the food problem or the rubber problem, certainly we should recognize the responsibility of hiring skilled analysts to put that kind of a comprehensive picture together for us. We should have the ideal constantly before us of getting that job coordinated and making conclusions upon it so that there is a final analysis when we make a pronouncement.

We should fire the Federal employee who tries to create public opinion in favor of his agency's legislative hopes. O. P. A.'s technique is disclosed in a recent letter I have from a constituent.

She says:

> Last Friday, October 1, I sat in on a consumers' interest meeting and the informant was an O. P. A. representative from Toledo. I represented the Farm Women's Clubs. He asked me if the farm women were in favor of subsidy on milk and eggs, or were they satisfied with the present trend of ceiling to producer's receipts but raising the price to consumer. My answer was "No" to both * * *. Of course his next question was, "How would you bridge the gap between cost of food and ceiling price to producer, get rid of the middle man?"

Regardless of how that question was answered by the lady, the fundamental issue is, an O. P. A. employee, who is supposed to carry out the will of Congress, goes to a meeting in my district and attempts to propagandize "subsidies" from Uncle Sam.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may continue for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Now, if there is a question of the right or wrong of subsidy, certainly the O. P. A. officials from the top should present the issue to the Congress of the United States and present their facts. I have never seen an analysis of the facts collected in the O. P. A. office in Washington which would substantiate the necessity of a subsidy. Instead of our membership debating with the experts of the O. P. A., should not the Congress have the basic facts and let us come to a legislative conclusion based on the science of facts? Every last Member of this House and of the Senate should be sold on the decision we make and help to support our legislation by speeches through the length and breadth of the land. The men and women in the armed forces deserve that kind of support from us. Instead, we do not have the facts. O. P. A. keep propagandizing us and the people without letting anyone see their fountain of wisdom.

Mr. RAMEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. The gentleman from Toledo who addressed your distinguished gathering in Lima was a businessman of Toledo, formerly of the city of Lima. He realizes that subsidies merely mean to take it away from the grocery bill and put it on the tax bill, plus administrative expenses.

When we eliminate the extravagance which is classified for convenience as administrative expenses we will be able to carry on the war effort to victory achievement without making the tax burden confiscatory. Dictatorship will thus be avoided in this country.

I believe he realizes the danger of these administrative expenses, and I believe he answered the lady's question on that, because of the grave danger of administrative expenses; that was what is taking away from the war effort; that was what is taking away some of the necessary functioning of government—administrative expenses—and you will remember that when we new Congressmen arrived with a mandate we found the country $91,000,000,000 in debt. Most of this indebtedness was not in connection with the war effort. Let Congress itself audit all administrative expenses.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman will recall that the O. P. A. official asked a question that called for an answer favorable to the O. P. A.'s position on subsidies or no answer. The inexperienced could not answer, of course, leaving the O. P. A. representative the winner of the argument in the district.

Now, on the question of subsidies: We are getting ready right now to fight the Administration's request for subsidies. Yet, the tragedy is that the United States, through lend-lease, has given England a subsidy without Congress learning of it for a year and a half. Great Britain in 1942 has paid out of her treasury about $503,000,000 for subsidies and we have lend-leased food to Britain worth $200,000,000 more. We have "overwritten" England's subsidy payments. In other words, the effect of our food shipments is to hold down her inflation and support the subsidy payments of England out of the Treasury.

Can we be proud, as Members of the House, that we should not know through the channels of our own hearings, through the channels of our Lend-Lease and State Department officials and through the channels of debates on lend-lease that lend-lease has maintained the internal economy of Britain? Why should Arthur Krock, of the New York Times, be the first to tell us?

We cannot go along, Mr. Speaker, and maintain the integrity of the United States Congress if we are unaware of the effect of our votes until some private citizen or institution discloses the facts. The executive branch has let this Congress down. We must equip ourselves to get the facts, put the picture together so the people, the national publications, yes, even our own colleagues, will rely upon our pronouncements.

We would then learn that 135,000,000 of the United States cannot maintain the internal economy of one-half billion people of the British Empire.

We would investigate the entire Lend-Lease Administration to determine how much is necessary war expenditure and how much maintains the internal economy of our allies. We would then call upon Mr. Crowley to liquidate Lend-Lease Administration and recover into the Treasury no small part of their $24,500,000,000.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

LEADERSHIP INITIATIVE

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention as a new Member of this Congress to be too critical of its actions, but to say the least, I am disappointed in the lack of initiative on the part of leaders on both sides of the aisle.

I am of the opinion that the record will show that there has never been a time in the history of the world when a free legislative body such as this Congress has sat supinely by and watched, while the people it represents were being taken for the damnedest financial sled ride the world has ever known.

While this Congress idles, our Capital has become the international headquarters of the "Order of the Empty Satchel," where delegates assemble in answer to the urging of starry-eyed "Globats" who course the world making lush and ridiculous promises of American goods and American money, while here at home our people are forced to give up and pay for hundreds of essentials such as farm machinery, food, gasoline, clothing, and even crude rubber, that these articles

may be given to noncombatant nations whose people are not now, and in my opinion, never will be, engaged by actual participation in this so-called all-out war. "All out" is correct, inasmuch as they all keep out financially as much as possible.

We acquiesce by our silence while homes are broken through the drafting of fathers to fight in a war that has been generously given to us by some of our so-called allies, one of which is now, with the sanction of this Government, disbanding part of her own divisions and sending them home.

We complacently permit the placing of 8 percent of our population under arms compared with 4.6 percent by England, although Winston Churchill stated in a broadcast, recorded in the New York Times, February 10, 1941:

> We do not need the gallant armies which are forming throughout the American Union, but we do need most urgently an immense and continuous supply of war materials, and technical apparatus of all kinds. We need them and we need to bring them here. Give us the tools and we will finish the job.

This is a rather unusual statement from a man who, until this date, has not sent one British soldier from the Province of South Africa to fight on European battlefields.

In building our great Army, Congress has gullibly accepted as infallible the statements of Army, Navy, and diplomatic leaders, who court-martialed Billy Mitchell, predicted the destruction of the Russian Armies within a few months, predicted the destruction of the Japanese Navy within a few weeks, and assured the American people again and again that their policy, namely, supplying Japan with scrap iron, copper, and other essentials, would keep us out of the war.

On the one hand, Congress pleads with American industry to produce the machinery of destruction so necessary in waging war and we are proud of the miracles of mass production performed by American industry in supplying the war needs of the Allied Armies of the world. On the other hand, we permit and encourage Federal witch-hunts and persecution of these industries by Government agencies which would destroy the morale and confidence in Government of any group they think less patriotic than themselves.

Today this Congress is asked to forget the wisdom gained through the centuries "that the power to tax is the power to destroy" and is considering a second tax measure for $10,560,000,000, which is nothing more nor less than an insidious attempt to bankrupt both individuals and business. This measure is a furthering of the thought in Washington that it is a crime to have money and is masquerading under the misnomer of sopping up surplus income.

England, we are told, by advocates of "union now" and by that they mean union in everything except sharing the cost, is paying one-half of her war costs from current taxation while we pay but one-third. However, they do not state that England's war budget for this year is $21,000,000,000 while ours is approximately $120,000,000,000.

This House is controlled by committees. These committees are controlled by senior members. No reform can be made without their sanction. No vote can be taken without their approval. The responsibility for any action in this House is squarely upon their shoulders. The membership of this House can be likened to the parable of the bundle of sticks. We have neither unity nor program. Lacking unity, there is no strength. May I therefore suggest that the senior leaders assert their leadership in the interest of the American public and grant to this Congress the right to stop regimentation and express itself on matters of public policy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two different subjects: One to include an article from the Los Angeles Daily Journal, and the other to include a resolution adopted by the Smaller War Plants Corporation Board of Directors of Southern California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of September 4.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Monday, at the conclusion of the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WAGONS WEST

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the liberty of delivering to all of my colleagues in the House today a little booklet entitled "Wagons West." This book was written by Philip H. Parrish, who is the editorial-page editor of the Portland Oregonian and who is also chairman of the Old Oregon Trail Centennial Commission. We are celebrating this year the one-hundredth anniversary of the Old Oregon Trail and the establishment in this country of the first civil government west of the Rocky Mountains, at Champoeg in Oregon. This little booklet has for its purpose recounting some of the historic events that took place in those stirring pioneer days a hundred years ago, when our ancestors made the greatest and longest trek in history, across plains and mountains leading from the Missouri River to the far West, to establish there a civilization, hew States out of the wilderness, and to save and preserve this great Pacific coast area for the United States.

My colleagues, as I said in my letter presenting this book to you, I am sure you, as students of American history, will be interested in reading again some of the historic events which took place a hundred years ago, and in which our pioneer ancestors played such a heroic part in winning and holding as a part of the United States the old Oregon country, now comprising much of the Pacific Coast States. If the World War had not broken upon us in such fury in this centennial year, a fitting celebration of this outstanding event in American history would have taken place. While we are fighting to preserve America, it is well to keep vividly before us the contribution made by these worthy pioneers of a hundred years ago in helping to lay the foundations of this great land of ours.

I hope you will find a spare moment's time to reread, as set forth in this booklet, the recital of the courage, daring, and foresight of these hardy pioneers. May we not pray that we had more of their kind today to help to bring solutions to the momentous problems facing us as a nation. We could well emulate their courage, independence, and the ability to achieve, relying solely upon their own endeavors.

I am including as a part of my remarks two editorials worthy of consideration in connection with this centennial—one entitled "The Pioneer Trails Association," appearing in the Oregonian of August 20, 1943, and the other entitled "Westward Cavalcade," by Walter Meacham, which was published in the Oregon Journal of its issue of August 19, 1943:

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of August 20, 1943]

THE PIONEER TRAILS ASSOCIATION

"From shirt sleeves to shirt sleeves in three generations."—American folklore.

No saying has been more widely quoted and understood by the American people than this one. Our national lustiness—our expansion over a continent under conditions of free enterprise—has created the conditions which have illustrated the reality so many, many times. Somebody, born in a log cabin, a tenement, or a village outskirt, works hard and becomes wealthy; his son is insensitive to the sacrifices and puts on a lot of dog; his grandson is not only insensitive but a wastrel, and having spent the family patrimony is compelled in the end to go to work. The American people understand that cycle. They have seen it among their neighbors.

But how many transpose the thought and apply it to the wider affair of the earth? How many realize that nations as well as individuals are subject to the temptations which cause the movement from shirt sleeves to shirt sleeves in three generations? Not many, we are afraid.

The fact is that the individual family breaks down through the absorption of the founder who creates the family. Concerned with his own discipline and his own dangers, he has no time to give to his son, or, later, his grandson. He assumes, and wrongly, that they will know instinctively what he has gone through, and that they will carry on in the same spirit. So what he has accomplished is shortly dissipated.

And all this can be just as easily repeated among nations as among individuals, unless

there is forethought and constant effort to bring home to the people of the wealthy and fortunate nation how the people got that way—by what bravery and sacrifices and blood and toil they secured their favorable position.

Those who cherish the history of the Nation, and of the regions and the communities, are in effect the conscience of the Nation. They are the people who are trying to keep clear in the minds of the second and third and fourth generations a realization that the advantages they enjoy have not emerged from some inevitable providence but from sweaty and harsh struggle.

All of which is to say that the American Pioneer Trails Association, meeting in Portland in this week in its national convention, is engaged in a work as vital as that of actually carrying rifles on the battle fronts. If it were not for a consciousness of our history—if it were not for the consecration of the average American to the causes and principles for which America has stood—our soldiers and sailors struggling through the swamps of New Georgia and bombarding the toe of the Italian boot could not claim superiority over those against whom they are giving battle. Our might lies in our consciousness of right. And our consciousness of right is lodged entirely in the principles for which our forefathers fought and the principles of freedom and individual dignity which they have incorporated in our Government and our way of life.

And certainly in all our national memories there is no prouder chapter than that of the final surge to the Pacific coast—the story of the opening and the deepening of the Oregon and California trails. Those of today who really know that story could never bear to let their Nation down. The telling of that story is the purpose of the American Pioneer Trails Association, and of Dr. Howard R. Driggs, of New York, successor to the late Ezra Meeker as its president.

Oregon is pleased to be host to the association on this hundredth anniversary of the opening of the Oregon Trail. And we hope that all the people of Oregon, including our newcomers, will take a little time out to refreshen their minds on the chronicle of the world's longest wagon road. If enough remember and know, there will be no danger of this region, or of this Nation, slipping, through carelessness, back to shirt sleeves.

[From the Oregon Journal, Portland, Oreg., of August 19, 1943]

WESTWARD CAVALCADE

(By Walter Meacham)

The annual convention of the American Pioneer Trails Association brings to mind a series of historic events which have played a large role in the cavalcade of America. It recalls the story of two men with vision and purpose. In 1906 Ezra Meeker, that grand old patriarch, set out with a covered wagon and ox team to mark the Old Oregon Trail and preserve its identity. Twenty years later he organized the Oregon Trail Memorial Association in New York City and was made its first president. He crossed the Great Divide in 1928 at the age of 98.

Dr. Howard Driggs, of New York City, was elected to fill the vacancy. Driggs was professor of English education in New York University. But, while he taught English, his heart was in American history. He was born in Utah and learned history from those who made it, as they sat before the pitch-pine fires in their log cabins. Under his leadership the Oregon Trail Memorial Association carried on a program of marking and monumenting our pioneer trails, saving our historic landmarks, and carrying the story of America's making into our schools and homes.

Much creative work was done under his guidance. The Pony Express Trail, from St. Joseph, Mo., to Sacramento, Calif., was marked and monumented. The State of Kansas purchased and preserved the old Shawnee Mission and the Cottonwood stage station. Scotts Bluff, Nebr., has been made a national monument. Chimney Rock, that celebrated landmark on the Old Oregon Trail, has been donated by its owner to the State. Several original Pony Express stations have been saved.

The State of Wyoming purchased old Forts Laramie and Bridger and saved them from destruction. The former is now a national monument. Farsighted citizens of Walla Walla have purchased the site of the Whitman mission and expect to restore it to its former appearance. Pocatello citizens expect to restore old Fort Hall.

Some years ago Oregon acquired the site of Champoeg and it is now a State park.

In order to satisfy a widespread demand for inclusion in this patriotic work, the American Pioneer Trails Association was formed in 1942, embracing all western trails. Dr. Driggs is president of this association. Each State has its local council and conducts the work within its own boundaries, while participating in the national program. Its membership is not confined to pioneers, but is open to all who are interested in the preservation of American history, traditions, and ideals. The marking of the Old Oregon Trail was the main project for this year, but the war has curtailed the work though it has not stopped it. Oregon council, through the generosity of Edmund Hayes, of the Row River Lumber Co., has furnished cedar posts for the temporary marking of the Old Oregon Trail from the Missouri to the Pacific.

August 12 was designated as Trail Marking Day, with token marking through all trail States. The Boy Scouts of America assisted in this work, receiving a real lesson in history while helping preserve it.

While this year's convention will not be as large as in former years, it will nevertheless be important and constructive. Two main subjects of discussion will be trail marking and the history-teaching challenge in our homes, schools, churches, libraries, and museums. Dr. Driggs stresses history teaching in a human, understanding way, starting with local and State history, branching out into interstate and national. Every mile of the Old Oregon Trail has a story spot teeming with human interest, many of which have been hidden in the mists of forgetfulness.

The story of the stretching of the western boundary of the United States from the Missouri to the Pacific is an epic unsurpassed in the history of human endeavor.

Oregon's greatest advertising asset is the Old Oregon Trail and our people are beginning to realize it. Oregon's boundaries are not confined to its geographic lines but extend as far as the vision and enterprise of its citizens.

Like all other patriotic organizations, the American Pioneer Trails Association is primarily concerned with winning the war. Its next concern is winning and maintaining the peace. We are trying to preserve our national background through a knowledge of and pride in the accomplishments of our pioneers from sea to sea, to keep our morale strong, our spirit high, to win on the home front what our boys are fighting to win on the battle front.

The solution lies in our homes, churches, and schools, which must meet the challenge if the vision and enterprise of pioneer America are to be preserved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include some newspaper editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if we remember the situation of our colleague the gentleman from Illinois, CALVIN D. JOHNSON, who just called our attention to our inaction, we can understand why he speaks as he does; why he is impatient; why he wants something done, and why he wants it done now. He recently lost a son in the armed service, and he has two others in the service, and no father wants a son to die in vain. No one wants less than the utmost done at all times to make the task of the fighting men less dangerous.

Later still he was confined to the hospital, and while there he had plenty of time to do some sober thinking. Like the rest of us, when he was home he learned from his people that this administration lacks the confidence of the home folks, lacks the confidence of the people because of the things that are happening, the actions which interfere with production; which add to the cost of the war program; excessive costs which have come to the attention of our people through the efforts of our colleague the gentleman from Michigan, ALBERT ENGEL.

Our colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] has been doing a job which was not his to do; he has rendered a service over and beyond that which he is required to perform as a Representative. He took on a job which it was the duty of the different committees of the House to do. And he rendered the country a magnificent service. As an illustration, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has known for a long, long time that there was a criminal waste of money appropriated by the Congress, not only for war activities, but by other agencies of the Government, and yet that committee, which was created to keep the lid on executive expenditures and prevent the waste of tax money, has refused, time and time again, to do one single thing about it.

That committee had a meeting this morning. The chairman of the committee the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'LEARY] wants to go ahead and he wants to obtain from this body authority to subpena witnesses and to institute and carry on an investigation of matters which have come within his knowledge of where the Government money is being wasted and where the Government is being overcharged for certain items. In the committee he was met by the objection, which has been voiced before, that it was not necessary, that we could not get any authority from Congress to subpena witnesses.

The only explanation that I can see for that objection is that there is something so rotten connected with the expenditure of the taxpayers' money by some executive departments that this admin-

istration dare not permit the committee to look into it. I issue that challenge to the majority leader now. One of the Members on this side just a moment ago called my attention to the fact that there were 2 Democrats present on that side; I think there are 2 now, and I notice there is 1 more back of the table waiting to make a motion to adjourn. There are some 35 Republicans present.

Let me say to the Republicans that the Democratic leadership has been doing a masterly job, being in control and being responsible for legislation and for the making of legislation, being responsible for the amounts of funds which have been appropriated and wasted—the gentleman from Massachusetts and his lieutenants—I mean Mr. McCORMACK and his lieutenants—are doing a wonderful job in keeping the minority, whose business it is to criticize policies, from instituting or conducting investigations, keeping us from getting the legislation we should have to stop waste which they are permitting. The Republican minority by one means and another has been gagged and made to like it.

I wonder where the leadership of the Republican side thinks we are going. When I was home—and I also challenge anyone to contradict me in the statement, that when you were home, you led the people to think the Republicans could not do anything and we did not get away very well with the argument that each of us was only 1 of 435; we did not get away very well with the argument that we were only the minority. The home folks want to know why we cannot at least make a noise to let them know we are alive.

If the Republican leaders, and if the Members of the House on the Republican side, will read the remarks that were made previously today and will read between the lines, they will see that there are Republicans who have been telling the Members of our side a good many different times, as I have done, that we want to do something about this situation of inaction. We know the New Deal is unsound, that it will eventually die, but that is no reason why we should not give it a push—an earlier than natural death. I have been down here since 1935, and time and again I have been told in language that was so plain anyone could understand it, for me to go back and shut my big mouth. Today that same mental paralysis exists, and I have been saying, over and over again, that we must do something about the waste other than imposing additional taxes. Yet nothing has been accomplished. I am only one of 435, but as long as I am here I am going to keep that big mouth open, as long as I can find important business to talk about and certainly there is plenty of it.

Next week I am going to talk about the way this administration is going to make us take subsidies whether or not we like it. They tell us, "You are going to take a subsidy and you are going to like it." Before we get through unless the Republicans unite that is just what we will do. And, there are enough of us, together with those on the side—there are 35 or 40 Democrats who believe in our form of government, in our way of doing things—and those 35 or 40, joined with us, went along with us and gave the administration a trimming where it should be trimmed in the early days of this Congress, and then we Republicans turned around and what did we do? We gave them a kick on the shin, on the most tender part, on the antilynching bill, and on the poll-tax bill.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am sorry, I cannot yield; I hope the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] will get time of his own, because he has been squawking and kicking about this situation right along for the last month or more, has he not? The gentleman nods his head in the affirmative.

And I say to the gentleman, get up and make your wishes known and hang to it and keep kicking until you get support enough to institute and put through a program of your own, just as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], as well as some others, have done. Then we will get somewhere; we will find that the gentlemen on the other side, these good, loyal, American Democrats, will be glad to go along with us in a program to end the foolishness of the New Deal—restore the constitutional way.

I do not have any pride of authorship, I have no pride of leadership, and I will go along with anyone who will fight the New Deal.

Yesterday I had two letters. One came from a man who has a son who has been 2 years and a half in the service, 2 years of which have been spent across the sea. The other's son has served continuously for more than 18 months in a battle area, where he went after less than 6 months' training. They wanted to get a furlough for their boys.

Both of these gentlemen wrote along this line:

"Why is it that we cannot get the boys home on furlough; why are we told that there is not enough gas to come home on and at the same time the First Lady of the land is traveling around the world at enormous expense in a special plane, burning hundreds of gallons of gas.

"She can go and come, but my boy cannot come home."

And one of those boys has a mother who was becoming mentally deranged, because of worry over her son just as many and many a mother worries. She wants to know and the father wants to know: Why cannot the boy come home? Well, the only thing I could write was that wherever he was stationed the commander had authority and that because of the exigencies of the war he had to be there; that if the war required him to be shot, or killed, or whatever it was, he had to make the sacrifice. That was all right, only it could not be prevented, but why can Eleanor go, all the time, anywhere, everywhere? That is the thing they want to know; why can she rub noses—as the papers state—with these people over there? I do not know where the nose-rubbing custom originated, but they said she rubbed her nose against that of some Maorian woman, kissed Joe Lash, wore a grass skirt,, and so on. A heck of a lot all that helped the fighting men. The President was absolutely right when he said that in Washington we had a community that was the least aware of the fact that a war existed. He was right about it, and the least cognizant of the sacrifice which must be made, of the things which we must have and do to win the war apparently is the First Lady of the land. Now, if they will just bring her home and let her do a little home work, let her do a little work in the garden, let her do a little something that will produce results, then maybe the rest of the people will be more willing to buy bonds; maybe they will be more willing to go without butter, or meat, or this or that or the other as our people are willing to go without anything and everything which they may be asked to go without if only here in Washington the administration will set the example.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the fact that I cannot do this subject justice in 5 minutes, but I imagine much more will be said about it in the near future.

I am today introducing a bill to repeal section 294 (a) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to additions to the tax in the case of substantial underestimate of the estimated tax. This repeals the section that provides a 6-percent penalty on the taxpayer for failure to estimate within 80 percent of his income.

I am sure that many Members of this House had the same experience while they were at home during the recess that I had. Many of my constituents called upon me and I would say that I had more complaints about this penalty than about any other one problem except the regulations of the O. P. A. My constituents who discussed this penalty with me pointed out how difficult it would be to estimate this tax and the injustice of the penalty. It seems to me that this penalty clause in the recent tax bill is going far afield to try to make our already burdensome tax problems more so.

We passed a pay-as-you-go tax bill at the request of the people of this Nation. It is natural that these people who requested this bill will want to pay as they go and therefore the section referred to is penalizing them for something which they already desire to do but may not be able to do because incomes now fluctuate and vary so greatly from time to time.

I can see no need for a penalty for failure to estimate within 80 percent of the taxpayer's income. If the taxpayer fails to estimate his income properly he, of course, has the option to file a return

later, and it would naturally be to his advantage to do so as he would like to keep his taxes current. And when he files this additional return the Government will then get the tax that they are entitled to.

There is already a provision in the bill that if the taxpayer fails to pay his tax on his estimated return when he makes that return he is penalized $2.50 or 2½ percent of his tax, whichever of the two is the larger. This penalty seems to be sufficient.

The Secretary of the Treasury has now proposed that we raise from ten to twelve billion dollars in additional taxes. The people of this country are paying the highest tax that they have ever paid and the possibility is that when we pass a new tax bill that we will pay the highest tax of any nation in the world. The very least we can do is to make this burden, which is almost unbearable, as easy as possible.

When Congress reconvened after the recess, Senator GEORGE issued a statement that he felt that this penalty provision of the tax bill should be repealed, and that if the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives did not repeal it that the Senate committee would consider the repeal when they received the bill.

I have had the privilege of conferring with Senator GEORGE about this matter, and he has gone over the bill, that I have introduced, with me, and has given his approval. Senator GEORGE feels that this bill will accomplish the purpose desired and will ease the taxpayers' burden somewhat. Therefore, with the approval of Senator GEORGE and of many Members of Congress with whom I have discussed this matter I am introducing this bill and request that the Ways and Means Committee consider this amendment in their present hearings and incorporate it in the tax bill which they will present to the House sometime in the not too distance future.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I have listened very attentively to what the gentleman had to say, but has the gentleman considered the matter of these two estimates, one on September 15 and one on December 15, that they might be entirely eliminated and still the situation might be handled without loss? Most of the taxpayers are glad to keep current with their taxes.

Mr. HENDRICKS. That is true. I talked with the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means today. Incidentally he assured me they would try to consider this in connection with the present bill. He tells me he is considering simplifying those returns and those forms the taxpayer has to fill out. The committee is going to consider that.

Mr. BROOKS. May I say further that this would be to the interest of the taxpayer who wants to be current and we could then eliminate these two estimates that require so much bookkeeping, so much time and trouble.

Mr. HENDRICKS. That is exactly the point I made, that there is no reason in penalizing a man for something he wants to do and is asked to do; yet that is just exactly what we are doing with this 6-percent penalty. I see no reason for the 6-percent penalty. I know many of my constituents are unable to estimate their tax because of fluctuating income and changes from time to time.

I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for his contribution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

LEND LEASE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, if the information I have obtained is correct, the armed forces now have complete control over providing war materials to the nations with which we are fighting to preserve freedom. I am further informed that the armed forces deal with the different nations on a direct basis; that is, if any nation needs and requests war material, they determine the validity of the claim as to the amounts and use, and then deal directly with the nation making the request.

We must, by reason of the circumstances in which we find ourselves today, conclude that all of our industrial and natural resources fall rather definitely into the category of war material. I say this because almost daily I receive from someone in my district a complaint that the regulation imposed by one or another agency here in Washington is curbing and in many instances threatening complete destruction of businesses removed from direct connection with the military program of this war.

Assuming that all materials and processing facilities are either in or subordinated to the war effort, a serious question arises in my mind as to why we need more than one authority to deal with extending our goods for the use of our allies.

General Eisenhower, by experience, has learned that food, clothing, and certain other materials, together with a stimulation of personal effort on the part of people in countries we are occupying, are materially essential to the progress of the war toward our military and goodwill victory. It seems to me that he and others in like authority would know best the needs to accomplish this end.

This causes me to question the further need of an agency that has already committed our economy to the obligation of twenty-four and one-half billion dollars out of a total of approximately $65,000,000,000 we have pledged to other nations in materials to win the war, when that agency deals with nonmilitary materials, indirectly or through an allied nation that is intermediate between the source and need; in a manner permitting our materials to find their way into the commercial channels of the nation in which they are used and, further, permitting the intermediate nation to collect money for material we provide without our receiving money or definite credit, in instances permitting the goods to be sold on the open market to retail trade, no doubt at profits, and permitting an intermediary nation, to be the clearing house for 37 other nations, acquiring cash and credits in the performance of this function.

If we had included the $24,500,000,000 this administrative agency has spent with the money the armed forces are spending, I am sure the amount would have been materially reduced, and if not reduced, a much greater benefit would have resulted.

It is my honest opinion the need for the Lend-Lease Administration has long since passed. I believe we should group all materials into one general category of war materials and place the responsibility for their distribution and use in the hands of the armed forces. If we can afford to place the best use of our sons and daughters in their hands, can we be so restricted in reason as to mistrust their efficient use of something so much less in value, such as dollars and materials?

There may be great benefits derived from our country's sending another country electric welders to be sold to retail trade on the commercial markets at a profit when our own commercial markets have no such items available except for use directly in the war effort, but I am unable to agree.

There may be some benefit to the prosecution of the war in our sending the French and British over a thousand band instruments under lend-lease, but I am unable to agree.

It may be better that the Lend-Lease Administration had over 2,500,000 tons of war material on hand for the many countries, as of May 1, 1943, rather than have it in the hands of the armed forces, but I am unwilling to agree.

I am of the profound conviction that the leaders of our armed forces are most capable of upholding any trust we may place in them when the interests of this great country are concerned, and I believe their administration of the whole lend-lease program most definitely would remove the exchange of goods and extension of credits among the United Nations from any suspicion of geopolitics.

Lend-lease in every degree of estimation is a war adjunct. It began with the war and it should end with it. The only way to make that sure is to make it a part of the war. Let us turn it over to the armed forces and make a real war contribution of it. Let us quietly and without formal ceremony eliminate and bury the Lend-Lease Administration and thereby eliminate the possibility of one more incubator of bureaucracy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial appearing in the Philadelphia Bulletin on October 4.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FULBRIGHT, from October 11 to 16, on account of official business.

To Mr. VINSON of Georgia, for 15 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. LARCADE, for 10 days, to visit his district on important business.

To Mr. ROWE, for 10 days beginning October 8, on account of illness at home.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 763. An act amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1410. An act to amend section 4 of the act approved June 13, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 11, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in executive session at 10:30 a. m., Friday, October 8, 1943.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct further hearings on H. R. 2857, a bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, at 10 a. m., on Monday, October 11, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

The Committee on Pensions will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 12, 1943, at 10 a. m.

At that time consideration will be given to the following bills:

H. R. 2350. A bill to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents.

H. R. 2784. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, to certain maimed soldiers, to certain widows, minor children, and helpless children of such soldiers and sailors, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1926.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 12, 1943, at 10 a. m.

At that time consideration will be given to the following bills:

H. R. 3257. A bill to amend subtitle—insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The purposes of the bill is to affirm and clarify the authority of the W. S. A. to agree to a waiver of the statute of limitations in connection with claims arising from insurance agreements in case of missing vessels, in order to provide for prompt settlement of both marine risks and war risks involved.

H. R. 3258. A bill to prevent double recovery on claims under section 1 (a) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to seamen employed by the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to limit the possibility of double or overlapping recovery on account of death or injury of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the W. S. A. The possibility of such overlapping recovery arises in cases of seamen who are entitled to sue under the law of the United States in case of death or injury and may also be entitled to sue under foreign law on account of the same casualty.

H. R. 3259. A bill to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to exclude from consideration for the purposes of old-age and survivors' insurance benefits, services of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the W. S. A. on foreign-flag vessels or contracted for and performed wholly outside the United States, so that the coverage for such benefits for seamen employees of the W. S. A. shall be in line with the coverage in case of similar services by seamen employed by private shipping operators.

H. R. 3260. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for requisition or purchase of vessels owned by subsidiaries of American corporations.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the requisition or purchase under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, of vessels owned by American concerns through foreign subsidiaries but which are not owned by United States citizens within the terms of the Merchant Marine Act and which are not idle foreign vessels within the terms of the act of June 6, 1941—Public, No. 101, Seventy-seventh Congress.

H. R. 3261. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is, by amending Public Law 44, Seventy-eighth Congress, to authorize the return of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less which are owned by the United States under the procedure of Public Law 44 for the return to private ownership of vessels to which the United States has title which are no longer needed in the war effort.

H. R. 3262. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to expressly authorize the waiver of recovery of seamen's insurance payments by the W. S. A. particularly in cases where insurance has been paid to beneficiaries on the assumption that the missing seamen were dead, but later are found to be alive. The bill follows a similar provision with respect to recovery of benefits paid by the Veterans' Administration.

H. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The purpose of the resolution is to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy similar to that provided for the United States Coast Guard Academy.

H. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities.

The purpose of the resolution is to authorize the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration to pay cash awards for suggestions received from employees to increase efficiency or improve the functioning of the agencies.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 3334, to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold a hearing on H. R. 2994, Wednesday, October 13, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, 416 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

817. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $1,420,000, together with two proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations, one of which increases the existing limitation on the appropriation "Expenses of loans, act of September 24, 1917, as amended and extended, 1944," from $57,600,000 to $107,700,000 (H. Doc. No. 327); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

818. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting report of contracts entered into or modified under authority of Public Law 46 for the period beginning July 1, 1943, and ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

819. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting copies of quarterly estimate of personnel requirements pertaining to: (a) Regular administrative activities; and, (b) field loan liquidation and pay-off activities of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

820. A letter from the Alien Property Custodian, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the second quarter of fiscal year 1944, of the Office of Alien Property Custodian; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

821. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to define line of duty and misconduct for pension and compensation purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

822. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting copies of the quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for each of the Department's reporting units for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

823. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Office of War Information for the fiscal year 1944 in the amount of $5,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 328); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

824. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the appropriation for the Office of Scientific Research and Development for the fiscal year 1944 (H. Doc. No. 329); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

825. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 (H. Doc. No. 330); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

826. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report suggesting legislation, the purpose of which is to establish and centralize in the General Land Office of the Department of the Interior, the necessary facilities for the acquisition, abstracting, titling, recording, and disposition of Federally owned and controlled lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

827. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting his recommendation for the enactment of legislation designed for the purpose of eliminating the practice by subcontractors, under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts of the United States, of paying fees or kick-backs, or of granting gifts or gratuities to employees of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee prime contractors or of other subcontractors for the purpose of securing the award of subcontracts or orders; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

828. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting copies of the information required by the Director of the Budget for the purpose of determining the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of this Department; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

829. A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Smithsonian Institution for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

830. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting the contest for a seat in the House of Representatives for the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States for the Eleventh Congressional District of the State of Missouri, *John B. Sullivan* v. *Louis E. Miller* (H. Doc. No. 331); to the Committee on Elections No. 3 and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 3070. A bill to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 732). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. Report pursuant to House Resolution 30, a resolution authorizing and directing an investigation of the progress of the war effort; without amendment (Rept. No. 733). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1279. An act to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 734). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. S. 514. An act for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton; with amendment (Rept. No. 724). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GREEN: Committee on Claims. S. 694. An act for the relief of the W. G. Cornell Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 725). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri: Committee on Claims. S. 841. An act for the relief of J. P. Woolsey; without amendment (Rept. No. 726). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 302. A bill for the relief of Robert Griffin; with amendment (Rept. No. 727). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GREEN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1311. A bill for the relief of Dan Crotts; with amendment (Rept. No. 728). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1640. A bill for the relief of Mrs. J. D. Price; without amendment (Rept. No. 729). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GREEN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1933. A bill for the relief of Ronald A. Cox; with amendment (Rept. No. 730). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3001. A bill for the relief of James T. Rogers; without amendment (Rept. No. 731). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 3403. A bill to withdraw and restore to their previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain Hawaiian home lands required for use for airplane landing fields, and to amend sections 202, 203, and 207 of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. ELSTON of Ohio:

H. R. 3404. A bill to permit amendments and revisions of declarations of estimated tax to be made after the close of the taxable year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 3405. A bill making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers, feeds, nursery stock, or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3406 (by request). A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to define line of duty and misconduct for pension and compensation purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 3407. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify terminal railway post offices," approved June 14, 1934, in order to provide higher grades for certain clerks in terminal railway post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3408. A bill to amend chapter 7 of the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 3409. A bill relating to the penalty for substantial underestimate of the estimated tax under chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3410 (by request). A bill to create a Civil Service Court; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 3411. A bill directing the Secretary of Commerce, through the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, to make a survey of the need for a system of airports, landing fields, landing strips, highway flight strips, seaplane landing areas, and anchorages throughout the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 3412. A bill to exclude service performed by certain real-estate salesmen from the definition of "employment" under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 171. Joint resolution to permit the importation from foreign countries free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 3413. A bill granting a pension to Reuben Evarts; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina:

H. R. 3414. A bill for the relief of Mr. Edward C. Robbins, Pineola, N. C.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3415. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Homer D. Isenhower, Sr., and Robert Isenhower, Route No. 2, Newton, N. C.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 3416. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Almira W. Gunther; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 3417. A bill for the relief of W. E. Dowdell and June Dowdell; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2724. By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Petition of J. A. Cox and 41 citizens of Auxvasse, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transporta-

tion of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2725. Also, petition of C. A. Craig and 49 citizens of Missouri, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2726. Also, petition of Mrs. Justeen Foster and 31 citizens of Missouri, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2727. Also, petition of Mrs. W. C. Huddleston and 21 citizens of Missouri, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2728. Also, petition of Mrs. Obie Wright and 51 citizens of Missouri, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2729. By Mr. PLOESER: Petition of the Aircraft Workers Lodge, No. 710, and 25 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2730. Also, petition of Peter Yanczer and 23 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2731. Also, petition of Jacob Willer and 28 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2732. Also, petition of Joseph A. Eck and 23 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2733. Also, petition of Joseph Grimm and 23 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2734. Also, petition of Theodore D. Zeiter, Jr., and 23 petitioners, of St. Louis, Mo., opposing enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2735. Also, petition of A. D. Parker and 24 petitioners, of St. Louis, Mo., opposing enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2736. Also, petition of John Koehler and 44 petitioners, of St. Louis, Mo., opposing enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2737. Also, petition of Monte F. Gummels and 40 petitioners, of St. Louis, Mo., opposing enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2738. Also, petition of Theo. R. Mayer and 20 petitioners, of St. Louis, Mo., opposing enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2739. Also, petition of Norvel H. Faulkner and 22 petitioners, of St. Louis, Mo., opposing enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2740. Also, petition of Edward A. Burger and 23 petitioners, of St. Louis, Mo., opposing enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2741. By Mr. FENTON: Petition of 2,800 citizens of Schuylkill and Northumberland Counties in Pennsylvania, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2742. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Mrs. Jessie Oldham and 27 citizens of Naperville, Ill., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2743. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Mrs. August Jaedicke and 39 members of the Women's Missionary Society of the Evangelical Church Association, Hanover, Kans., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2744. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Memorial of Capt. John C. Clark, of the One Hundred and Sixth Cavalry (Mecz.), Camp Hood, Tex., and Lt. Lowell L. Wilkes, Jr., of the One Hundred and Third Signal Company, A. P. O. 470, Camp Claiborne, La., favoring Senate bill 758; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2745. Also, memorial of Bill Smart, of Palmer, Tex., and J. J. Wilms, of Dallas, Tex., favoring House bill 2350; to the Committee on Pensions.

2746. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Hammond's Seafood Restaurant, Washington, D. C., and signed by 62 citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2747. Also, petition of Gertrude A. Emswiler, of Washington, D. C., and 15 citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2748. Also, petition of Ninth and New York Avenue Lunch, Washington, D. C., and signed by 60 citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2749. Also, petition of Hughey A. Hanger, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2750. Also, petition of Alberto Atwello, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2751. Also, petition of Arthur O. Wildermuth and 23 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2752. Also, petition of Arthur Townsend and 38 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2753. Also, petition of the St. Louis Gasoline & Fuel Co., and signed by 30 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2754. Also, petition of Mary W. Whitlock, of St. Louis, Mo., and 60 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2755. Also, petition of Edw. Benz and 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2756. Also, petition of William Bendyke, of St. Louis, Mo., and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2757. Also, petition of William H. Steenbock, of St. Louis, Mo., and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2758. Also, petition of Edward J. O'Brien, of St. Louis, Mo., and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2759. Also, petition of Edward F. Yaeger and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2760. Also, petition of Spencer Corless and 49 other citizens of Missouri, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2761. By Mr. CLASON: Petition of Raymond E. Chapin, of Springfield, Mass., relative to establishment of a calendar of 13 months; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2762. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Slovak Evangelical Union, Pittsburgh, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to allegiance and full faith to the President and pledge their full faith in the President and the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Spirit of the Living God, Thou hast chosen the heart of man for Thy inmost shrine. The spangled heavens keep their dreadful order, the swelling seas stretch in mystery to far horizons, the silence of the infinite spaces awes and terrifies our minds and on earth our eyes behold tyranny, misery, poverty, man's inhumanity to man and nation lifting up sword against nation. Yet we thank Thee for the sustaining faith that we are not orphans in an empty universe: that there are no shadows back of which Thou dost not stand keeping watch above Thine own.

Forgive us that like birds upon the wing that question the air in which they fly, so in hours of doubt we have questioned Thee. Join us with those great spirits of the past who lived in dark days yet, seeing Him who is invisible, won

their victory for truth and noble living; who looked out and saw Thy garments across the sky, Thy footprints upon the earth, and looking within made their bodies Thy temple and their hearts the altar for Thy flaming love. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, October 7, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 755) to amend the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, so as to give protection to persons in military service, and their dependents, as to certain mortgages.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Gurney	Overton
Bailey	Hayden	Pepper
Barbour	Hill	Radcliffe
Barkley	Holman	Reed
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Brooks	Kilgore	Robertson
Buck	Langer	Russell
Burton	Lucas	Shipstead
Butler	McCarran	Stewart
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McNary	Tunnell
Chavez	Maloney	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Van Nuys
Connally	Millikin	Wagner
Danaher	Moore	Walsh
Ellender	Murdock	Wheeler
George	Murray	White
Gerry	Nye	Wiley
Gillette	O'Daniel	Willis
Green	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Conditions on the West Coast.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is necessarily absent from the city as a member of the Truman investigating committee.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has been confined to a Madison hospital since September 13.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent on official appointments.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent because of illness.

The Senators from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN and Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names.

DELIBERATIONS WITH CLOSED DOORS

Under the order adopted yesterday the Senate (at 12 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) proceeded to deliberate with closed doors.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

While the doors were closed, the following business was transacted:

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] has conferred with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] about the bill the Senator from Maryland desired to have considered yesterday, that the Senator from Tennessee is satisfied with the situation and is willing that action be taken on the bill. The Senator from Maryland is compelled to return to Baltimore, and is anxious to see if he cannot have the bill disposed of now. The Senator from Tennessee desires to make a brief statement about it. If we can dispose of this bill without too much delay, I should be glad to accommodate the Senator from Maryland.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the execution of the order for a secret session will be temporarily postponed for the consideration of the bill at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. That really is not necessary, because the Senate can transact business in closed session as well as it can in open session. It would be most unfortunate to open the galleries for 5 minutes and then have to close them again. I was going to suggest that if this bill is passed the proceedings on it and any other routine matters received by unanimous consent ought to appear in the RECORD following the disposition of the business for which the doors were ordered closed. I make that request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I objected yesterday to the consideration of the bill offered by the Senator from Maryland because, as it seemed to me, there were not sufficient facts upon which to pass such a bill. This morning the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] and I had before us Mr. Ferguson and Mr. Blandford, the heads of the two activities mentioned, and we obtained these facts which I wish to state very briefly.

The Government in 1940 provided $10,000,000 as an insurance fund for housing. That had to be administered, of course, and from the premiums the Government has paid up to date the cost of administration and there is left in the fund about $10,000,000 which was the amount originally authorized. However, it must be said that, while the Congress authorized $10,000,000, only $5,000,000 of it has been used up to date but the other $5,000,000 is subject to call and can be used when it is necessary.

Mr. President, it further appears that the Federal Housing Administration in insuring these loans first made an examination to see how many of the houses which they insured would be useful after the termination of the war.

Title VI, as referred to in the bill, takes care of the permanent housing because it is expected there will be a market for it after the war is over.

Up to July 1, 1943, the Federal Housing Authority took over 195 units of about 250,000 units insured, or which it was committed to insure. It has about 90 percent of these 195 units rented today, so that up to date the operation has worked well.

Temporary housing is now built with funds provided by the Lanham Act, beginning in 1940. Approximately $1,300,000,000 has been appropriated, and $1,600,000,000 authorized. The housing under the Lanham Act is not affected in any way by the housing provided for in Title 6 of the National Housing Act. The purpose of the bill, under the Lanham Act, is to build temporary housing which shall be torn down and removed after the war is over. All programming for war housing, both public and private, is under the National Housing Agency. F. H. A. handles the insurance of the private part of the program, and the F. P. H. A. handles the expenditures under the Lanham Act.

The money necessary to supply the war need, speaking broadly, is to be expended in about 150 cities in the United States where there are war units or war plants which are expanding war production or expanding war units, and where additional workers are required.

The over-all agency has its representatives in every community where war work is proceeding, and they obtain their information as to the need of housing both from the war plants, from the Army and Navy, the Maritime Commission, the War Manpower Commission, and such other sources as they see fit to question, and it is upon the information thus collected that the over-all agency determines, in the first place, where permanent houses can be erected, and, in the second place, where temporary houses may be placed under the Lanham Act.

At the conference this morning attended by Mr. Blandford and Mr. Ferguson the following facts were developed:

Senator McKELLAR. Under this plan do you expect to use the entire $400,000,000 provided for insurance under these acts between now and next July?

Mr. BLANDFORD. We definitely expect to require the total $400,000,000 of title 6 insurance during the remainder of this fiscal year. It is very much in the interest of the Government to obtain as much privately financed housing as possible with the help of title 6 insurance because it correspondingly reduces the necessity of using the Lanham funds and, therefore, reduces Federal direct expenditures.

Senator McKELLAR. How much have you unallocated on your insurance?

Mr. FERGUSON. One hundred and thirty-six million dollars still uncommitted, but there are applications pending and being processed in our office that will absorb that amount.

Senator McKELLAR. So that at the present time you are obliged to have an increase in the authorization for this insurance and from the reports you got from all sources it is absolutely necessary to have as much as $400,000,000 additional?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is true and our figures show $410,000,000. This is on a basis of 85-percent insurance of the whole privately built housing program.

It is also expressly provided in title 6 that these areas in which houses are to be built under title states that it must be expressly designated by the President in war areas where there is a shortage of housing.

After going into the matter very carefully, and considering every phase of it, I came to the conclusion that the bill should pass. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, I am willing that it may be taken up and passed.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I wish to propound an inquiry to the able Senator from Maryland. The bill passed the House some weeks ago, did it not?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It did.

Mr. McNARY. What reason does the Senator assign for the necessity of immediate consideration of the bill by the Senate?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It is essential that action be taken immediately, because practically all the authorizations heretofore provided have been exhausted, and unless immediate action shall be taken on the bill, it will be necessary for the Federal Housing Administration to suspend its operations, so far as title VI is concerned. Every day's delay is vitally important.

Mr. McNARY. The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, which has jurisdiction, as I understand, reported the bill favorably unanimously.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. After very careful consideration, the committee reported the bill unanimously as it passed the House, because the committee realized that prompt action should be taken. Otherwise, it would be necessary that the cost of the housing be paid from funds in the Federal Treasury, and the committee was desirous to protect against that contingency, so that the system of insurance and guaranties as it has been operated so successfully in the past by the F. H. A. might be continued.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland knows, as I do, of the very deep interest the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has taken in all housing problems. He is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and is unavoidably absent. Can the Senator indicate to me what the attitude of the Senator from Ohio is toward the proposed legislation?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator from Ohio was present in the committee and participated in the discussions. He concurred in the unanimous vote by which the bill was ordered reported to the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I desire to state also that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] spoke to me a few days ago and asked for early and favorable consideration of the measure.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that I have known of instances in my State of the Federal Housing Administrator using the funds in question. I think this is one of the most salutary instances of the use of Federal funds of which I know, because in the selection of sites where houses shall be built the Housing Administration has been most scrupulous to select sites which shall have a permanent value for housing after the war. The Housing Administration has steadfastly refused wherever possible to build such houses in places where they will have only a temporary value. The Housing Administration has sought to use only sites having a permanent value for such construction.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is entirely correct. The F. H. A. has operated successfully, and I think very wisely, and its activities have obviated the necessity of the Federal Government probably spending a billion dollars for the construction of homes in addition to the amounts which have been expended.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3291) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2299. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of W. M. Hurley and Joe Whitson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 459).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 1421. A bill making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers, feeds, nursery stock, or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1422. A bill to define the terms "line of duty" and "willful misconduct" as used in any law or regulation administered by the Veterans' Administration; and

S. 1423. A bill to provide for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service-incurred disability and to widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, on October 5, the House passed the bill (H. R. 800) to provide for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die in service in the land or naval forces of the United States, and sent the bill to the Senate. It was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. The bill deals entirely with matters connected with the Veterans' Bureau. Matters dealing with the Veterans' Bureau have always been considered by the Committee on Finance.

I ask unanimous consent that the Military Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Finance. I have discussed the matter with the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and the proposed action is satisfactory to him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

BRIEF OF THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO VISIT THE WAR THEATERS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a brief summation of the findings of the committee of five senators appointed to visit the theaters of war operations overseas, upon which we are all in agreement.

There being no objection, the summary of the findings was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The members of the Senate committee appointed to visit the war theaters present the following conclusions:

1. Our men in all branches of the service are satisfied with the weapons and airplanes they have received. The food on the whole is as adequate as the tactical situation permits. Medical care is excellent. The high command functions effectively. Mistakes which are probably inevitable in a war of this size and novelty are not being repeated. We are learning fast from experience.

2. A great deal more oil should be provided from the deposits of the Middle East. Existing sources of crude rubber in the Orient, now held by the United Nations, could be increased. Too much American gasoline is made available to civilians in north Africa.

3. The mission assigned to the Office of War Information of conducting propaganda activities in friendly foreign countries raises many doubts. While the personnel is sincere and capable, this whole policy should be carefully reexamined.

4. The men who are bearing the brunt of battle do not feel that the true picture of their hardships is being given to the public. They have a realistic viewpoint regarding war which they would like to have shared

by our public relations officials and the public, insofar as military security permits.

5. Close integration of our land, sea, and air forces has been accomplished in most theaters and works extremely well. It points the way toward a sound post-war military policy. Our military effort is well coordinated with that of our allies in the areas visited.

6. The United States has constructed huge airfields all over the world at tremendous cost to our people. The use of some of these fields in the future may be just as essential to our security as battleships or divisions. We have no post-war rights of access to these fields outside the Western Hemisphere at the present time. These rights of access are also indispensable to the vitally important growth of commercial aviation.

7. The need for parity in international communications is stressed in every theater. Equality in these cable and wireless communications would seem to be a fitting subject for consideration and possible reverse lend-lease.

8. A policy of relieving men overseas after they have served a certain length of time would be in the interest of efficiency as well as conducive to physical and mental welfare. The committee is aware of the shipping problems which have created this situation. It believes that the shipping situation is now improving. A definite promise to a man that after a certain length of time he will be replaced is a big morale factor.

9. The need of a clear national policy is strikingly apparent. With such a policy should go an American representation abroad in which our military, diplomatic, and business personnel work as a team, with appropriate international rank. We owe this to ourselves and to the world.

10. The committee returns inspired by the bravery of our American fighting men and impressed with the obstacles which they have overcome. They are the products of a free system of government, and their sacrifices are a justification of our democratic way of life. Their courage should inspire us to leave no stone unturned to be worthy of their sacrifice.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL.
JAMES M. MEAD.
ALBERT B. CHANDLER.
HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.
RALPH O. BREWSTER.

MODERN EXPLORERS AND PIONEERS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Modern Explorers and Pioneers," delivered by him on Thursday, October 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

After 5 hours and 6 minutes spent deliberating with closed doors, on motion of Mr. BARKLEY, the Senate, as in open legislative session, adjourned (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) to Tuesday, October 12, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, strong to save, in these tragic days of strife, commercial greed, and social prejudice, forbid that the sanctities of responsibility and cooperation should be corroded. Shield us from all threatening elements of modern life which are a menace to home, to free institutions, and to a commanding democracy. We need Thee, O Christ, as a moral goal and impulse; for Thou alone art the hope of men and for the liberation of humanity.

Almighty God, as our country is destined to some tremendous undertaking and the call is fiercely in earnest, we pray that all hindrances may be removed. Free it from every type of volcanic patriotism; we pray that we may be devout, industrious and sincere, meeting every challenge in the spirit of Jesus of Nazareth; O help us to reassert His code, once ridiculed and evaded. As Thy servants, heavenly Father, help us to remember that each is but a unit in our great human family, bound together by ties so delicately adjusted, that what helps one helps all and what hurts one hurts all; O let all differences dwindle into harmless and forgetable proportions and may we quietly enter into the realm of a larger and clearer service. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 7, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3291. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

CREDITS AGAINST THE VICTORY TAX

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of H. R. 3381, relating to credits against the Victory tax, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 453 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the credit against the Victory tax) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 453. Credits Against Victory Tax.

"(a) Allowance of credit: There shall be allowed as a credit against the Victory tax for each taxable year—

"(1) Single persons: In the case of a single person, a married person not living with husband or wife, or an estate or trust, an amount equal to 25 percent of the Victory tax of $500, whichever is the lesser.

"(2) Heads of families: In the case of the head of a family, an amount equal to 40 percent of the Victory tax or $1,000, whichever is the lesser.

"(3) Married persons: In the case of a married person living with husband or wife—

"(A) if separate returns are filed by each spouse an amount equal to 40 percent of the Victory tax or $500, whichever is the lesser, or

"(B) if a separate return is filed by one spouse and no return is filed by the other spouse, or if a joint return is filed under section 51 (b), only one credit not exceeding 40 percent of the Victory tax or $1,000, whichever is the lesser.

"(4) Dependents: For each dependent specified in section 25 (b), excluding as a dependent, in the case of a head of a family, one who would be excluded under section 25 (b) (2) (B), an amount equal to 2 percent of the Victory tax or $100, whichever is the lesser.

"(b) Change of status: If for any taxable year the status of the taxpayer (other than a taxpayer who makes his return and pays his tax under Supplement T) with respect to his marital relationship or with respect to his dependents, changed during the taxable year, the amount of the credit provided by this section for such taxable year shall be apportioned, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, in accordance with the number of months before and after such change For the purpose of such apportionment a fractional part of a month shall be disregarded unless it amounts to more than half a month in which case it shall be considered as a month.

"(c) Status of Supplement T taxpayer: If for any taxable year a taxpayer makes his return and pays his tax under Supplement T, for the purpose of the credit provided by this section, his status for such year with respect to his marital relationship or with respect to his dependents shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of section 401."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 454 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the post-war credit of Victory tax) is hereby repealed.

(b) Section 34 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out "sections 453 and 454" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 453."

(c) Section 456 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the 90-percent limit on the tax imposed by chapter 1) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 456. Limitation on Tax.

"The tax imposed by section 450 (Victory tax), computed without regard to the credits provided in sections 453 and 466 (e), shall not exceed the excess of 90 percent of the net income of the taxpayer for the taxable year over the tax imposed by this chapter, computed without regard to section 450 and without regard to the credits provided in sections 31, 32, 35, and 466 (e)."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this act shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TIME FOR FILING APPLICATIONS FOR RELIEF OF EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3363) extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 722 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code (prescribing the time for filing applications for general relief under the excess-profits tax) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Application for relief under this section: The taxpayer shall compute its tax,

file its return, and pay the tax shown on its return under this subchapter without the application of this section, except as provided in section 710 (a) (5). The benefits of this section shall not be allowed unless the taxpayer within the period of time prescribed by section 322 and subject to the limitation as to amount of credit or refund prescribed in such section makes application therefor in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. If a constructive average base period net income has been determined under the provisions of this section for any taxable year, the Commissioner may, by regulations approved by the Secretary, prescribe the extent to which the limitations prescribed by this subsection may be waived for the purpose of determining the tax under this subchapter for a subsequent taxable year."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1939.

INTEREST

SEC. 2. (a) Deficiencies: Section 292 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended (1) by inserting immediately before the first paragraph the following: "(a) General Rule.—" and (2) by inserting at the end of such section the following:

"(b) Deficiency resulting from relief under section 722: If any part of a deficiency for a taxable year is determined by the Commissioner to be attributable to the final determination of an application for relief or benefit under section 722 for any taxable year beginning prior to January 1, 1942, no interest shall be assessed or paid with respect to such part of the deficiency; and for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1941, no interest shall be assessed or paid with respect to such part of the deficiency for any period prior to 1 year after the filing of the application for relief under section 722, or September 16, 1945, whichever is the later."

(b) Overpayments: Section 3771 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(g) Claims based upon relief under section 722: If any part of an overpayment for a taxable year is determined by the Commissioner to be attributable to the final determination of an application for relief or benefit under section 722 for any taxable year beginning prior to January 1, 1942, no interest shall be allowed or paid with respect to such part of the overpayment; and for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1941, no interest shall be allowed or paid with respect to such part of the overpayment for any period prior to 1 year after the filing of the application for relief under section 722, or September 16, 1945, whichever is the later."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman please explain the purpose of the bill?

Mr. DOUGHTON. The purpose of H. R. 3363 is to extend the time within which applications for relief under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code may be filed.

Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Revenue Act of 1942, provides that where the taxpayer can establish that his excess-profits-tax credit causes an excessive and discriminatory tax because of some unusual condition in his business he may apply for relief.

The original period within which his application for relief was required to have been made was 6 months after the date of enactment of the Revenue Act of 1942. This 6 months' period expired on April 21, 1943, but was subsequently extended to September 15, 1943.

It has now developed that this extended period of time is too short to allow taxpayers to properly prepare their applications and compile the detailed supporting data. Consequently it is proposed by this legislation to make the period within which such applications must be filed the same as that now applicable to claims for refunds. In general this period of time will be 3 years from the time the tax return was filed or 2 years from the time the tax was paid, whichever is later.

The existing law requires that the Federal Government pay 6-percent interest on all refunds made to the taxpayer and that it collect 6-percent interest on all deficiencies paid to the Government; the interest to begin running from the date the overpayment was made in the case of a refund, and from the date the tax should have been paid in the case of a deficiency.

Since section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code is for the relief of the taxpayer, and since it was made retroactive from the date of its enactment in October 1942 to the years 1940 and 1941, it is believed to be equitable to both the Government and the taxpayer not to pay interest on refunds, nor to collect interest on deficiencies for those 2 years when the refund or deficiency arises out of the application of section 722. With respect to the year 1942, and subsequent years, it is also believed to be equitable for interest not to begin to run on refunds or deficiencies arising out of the application of this relief provision until September 16, 1945, or 1 year after an application for relief has been filed, whichever is later. The reason for this is because more than 25,000 applications have already been filed with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and a reasonable time should be given to the Commissioner to examine the complicated data filed in support of the claims before the Government is compelled to pay interest on any refunds which may be made or to collect interest on any deficiencies which may be assessed as a result of adjustments in other taxes following the granting of the relief under section 722.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAX WITH RESPECT TO TRANSPORTATION OF PROPERTY

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3338) relating to Government and other exemptions from the tax with respect to the transportation of property, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman give a brief explanation of the bill? I might say that the bill has the unanimous report of the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I wonder if this in any way would reach that $70,000,000 of Marshall Field's that is now escaping both income and inheritance taxes?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill relates only to the transportation tax.

Mr. RANKIN. And the gentleman does not consider it would reach that $70,000,000?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not think it would.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, there is no tax money involved in this, and Marshall Field does not owe a cent to the Government. Everything that he should pay he has paid, even more, and if the gentleman would be fair he would desist from these continued attacks.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further. I reserved the right to object. A bunch of shrewd lawyers wrote that will of Marshall Field. I have a copy of it. They saw the income tax and the inheritance tax coming, and they wrote this will so as to escape it.

Mr. SABATH rose.

Mr. RANKIN. I decline to yield. This will was written by some shrewd lawyers, in order to close up this Marshall Field estate, and exempt it from inheritance and income taxes, and the money was to be delivered to the present Marshall Field at the time the youngest child became of age, 21 years. That was on the 28th day of September.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, at the urgent request of the leadership on both sides, I will temporarily withdraw the point of order. I will renew it hereafter, perhaps.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan withdraws the point of order temporarily.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I want to complete my statement that these shrewd lawyers wrote this bill——

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order has been demanded.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SABATH. I demand the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. Now whom is he protecting?

Mr. SABATH. The House and the people.

The SPEAKER. The gentlemen will suspend. No debate is in order. The regular order has been demanded

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3475 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the tax on the transportation of property) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Government transportation: The tax imposed under this section shall not apply to amounts paid for the transportation of property to or from the Government of the United States, or any State, Territory, or political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or to amounts paid to the Post Office Department for the transportation of property."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by section 1 shall take effect with respect to amounts paid, on and after the first day of the first month which begins more than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this act, for the transportation of property on and after such first day.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word in order to respond to the question asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. I simply requested that the gentleman explain the bill briefly.

Mr. ROBERTSON. When we passed the law placing a tax on transportation, it was not intended to apply to the States, but in preshipments, where the shipper paid the freight, the Bureau of Internal Revenue ruled that the States would have to pay the tax. We did not intend to exempt from the tax private shipments on Government barge lines, but that was actually done.

This bill merely corrects those two unintentional errors and has the endorsement of the agencies and the full endorsement of our committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. In order to get the record straight, as I pointed out a while ago, Marshall Field came into possession of between seventy and seventy-five million dollars on the 28th of September, on which he will not pay one dollar of income or inheritance taxes. This bill does not reach that situation, does it?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No, but it does take care of your State Highway Commission that is very much interested in not having to pay this tax on the road material which they buy.

Mr. RANKIN. But this Marshall Field estate got by with this seventy or seventy-five million dollars that was not taxed at all and on the $10,000,000 invested in Government bonds, Marshall Field will collect $250,000 a year interest.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. FULMER. Is it the purpose of this bill to repeal the transportation tax as a whole?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No. The Treasury has recommended that that be included in a bill now pending, but this does not repeal the whole tax.

Mr. FULMER. There will be a tax on property transported in the future as in the past?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Unless the committee adopts the recommendation of the Treasury Department in the new bill to repeal the tax in toto.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, there is a bill pending which repeals that entire tax, and until that is given further consideration, I object.

The SPEAKER. It is too late to object. Unanimous consent has already been granted.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENDING APPLICATION OF SECTIONS 3114 AND 3115 OF THE REVISED STATUTES, AS AMENDED.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the committee, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of H. R. 3309, a bill to suspend during the present war the application of sections 3114 and 3115, of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. REED of New York. Reserving the right to object: This is rather an interesting war measure, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] will explain, but I have this interest. I live on the Great Lakes, and the traffic that comes down through the Soo Canal and also Detroit is greater than that moving into Liverpool, and at the present time there is a vast movement of iron ore. We are very short of steel in this country. There are some ships over 500 feet in use at the present time, 560 feet and longer, that cannot get into the harbor on the American side for repairs and it is necessary for them to make Canadian ports where the facilities are such that they can be repaired. The delay of one of these ships for just a short time runs into thousands and thousands of dollars, and the purpose of this bill, so far as I am interested in it, is to remove the tariff on those repairs. The other phase of the bill the gentleman from Virginia will explain to the House.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. The statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is absolutely correct. I traveled this summer, from Laurium to Duluth, on one of the steamers that is 621 feet in length and 67 feet wide. It reached Duluth at 1:30, finished loading at 5:30, and started back to Cleveland at 5:30 with 16,000 tons of ore on it.

Another ship was in the lock when we passed through the Soo Locks that was 651 feet long, one of the largest on the Lakes, and a bill of lading was shown to me indicating that it was carrying something over 18,000 tons.

Mr. REED of New York. And is it not true that right now it is important for these great ships to pass into the harbors on the Canadian side for their repairs?

Mr. BLAND. Absolutely.

Mr. REED of New York. And for service.

Mr. BLAND. Absolutely, because they are behind now on the transportation of ore, especially because of the weather and the size of the boats.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] who is complaining because these ships are not permitted to come into the Great Lakes, that if the Congress had passed the rivers and harbors bill which we had up here last year that included the St. Lawrence development, it would not only have provided the deep waterway into the Great Lakes, but it would also have provided the people of New York and New England with cheap electric power and relieved them of the overcharge of $250,000,000 they now have to pay every year for electric lights and power.

I wonder if the gentleman from New York would join with me and others in a movement to bring that rivers and harbors bill before the House and provide for the development of water-power resources as means of providing post-war employment?

Mr. REED of New York. I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi that when he gets Marshall Field to pay the tax he is referring to it will help pay the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from New York that if I had my way the bill I introduced would have passed preventing Marshall Field from escaping with that $70,000,000 untaxed of which he did not earn one penny.

The fact that Field bought $10,000,000 worth of bonds on which he will receive $250,000 a year interest does not justify letting that $70,000,000 escape taxation.

But that is no reason why we should not provide for the development of our water-power resources in this country, and our inland waterways to furnish employment in the post-war period.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill relates principally to the present coastal shipping situation and is a very important war measure. It has the endorsement of the Treasury Department, the War Shipping Board, and I had a letter from the War Food Administrator pointing out how important this measure is, especially with reference to the importation of sugar.

Under the present law repairs made in a foreign shipyard are taxed 50 percent of their value when the ships get back to this country. Under this law our ships that cannot get repairs made in domestic yards because of crowded war business, will be permitted to have

necessary repairs made in foreign yards and the importation of sugar and coffee, two most essential foods, will be expedited.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the application of the provisions of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 19, secs. 257 and 258), is hereby suspended.

SEC. 2. This act shall remain in force until the day following the date of a proclamation by the President that the present war has ended or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution, or the President by proclamation, may designate, and shall apply to all duties which have accrued on repairs made, or equipment purchased, on or after December 8, 1941.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, after the figure "1941" change the period to a colon and insert the following: "*Provided,* That no claim for a refund of duty pursuant to this act shall be allowed unless a written application for such refund is filed by the party in interest within 6 months from the date of the enactment of this act with the collector of customs at the port where entry was made or the Bureau of Customs: *Provided further,* That nothing in this act shall be construed to require any Federal department or agency to obtain a refund of duty pursuant to this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEAL OF CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT

Mr. SABATH from the Committee on Rules presented the following report on the bill (H. R. 3070) to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 735) which was read and referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3070), to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

INCREASE OF ALLOWANCE TO DEPENDENTS OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, presented the following report on the bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 736), which was read and referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

JAPANESE ON THE WEST COAST

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have here a telegram I received pointing out that the W. R. A. is releasing Japanese and they are being shipped to the west coast.

In this releasing of Japanese from the relocation centers all they are doing is advocating bloodshed. The people of my State, particularly of my district, do not want the Japanese moved back there. As I have said before in this House, the only good Jap is a dead Jap, and that is just what is going to happen to every one of them that is sent back there. So the Government better wake up and keep these Japs in camps where they belong.

Mr. RANKIN. We will try to send them to you.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I did not yield to the gentleman.

The Japanese question on the west coast is going to be a hot one, and the W. R. A. is only bringing bloodshed closer and closer to those people. The proper place to keep them until after the war is over is in the camps where they are at the present time. When the war is over, as far as I am concerned, we should ship every Jap in the United States back to Japan, if there is any Japan left to ship them to.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain data I have compiled on allowances and allotments.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COTTON PRODUCTION

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter from Hon. Marvin Jones, with reference to crop quotas.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the War Food Administration announced, according to the press, a crop program for 1944. The article I read, a copy of which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD October 7, 1943, indicated that the same amount of cotton is to be grown in 1944 as was grown in 1943. This would infer that each individual cotton farmer is to grow about the same amount of cotton in 1944 as he grew in 1943. Such an inference is at variance with the facts, according to information many of us heretofore have received and according to a letter Hon. Marvin Jones, the War Food Administrator, wrote me October 7, 1943. One sentence of the Jones letter states:

With quotas suspended on the named commodities—cotton is one of the named commodities—a farmer may plant within or in excess of the acreage allotment previously established for the particular commodity and may sell his entire production free of the marketing penalties and restrictions.

I want the entire country to know that the quotas on cotton have been taken off by the authorities of the War Food Administration and the little farmer now has a chance because of this action to make his fair and equitable share of income from cotton.

I herewith include the letter written to me by Mr. Jones:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, October 7, 1943.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR LINDLEY: This is in response to your letter of September 27 inquiring about any quotas or restrictions in the production of cotton and other crops in the 1943 and 1944 agricultural programs.

Flue-cured and Burley tobacco are the only crops for which marketing quotas are applicable in 1943 and 1944. The proclamation of 1944 quotas on these crops has been made on the basis of Public Law 118, Seventy-eighth Congress. Quotas on cotton, wheat, and peanuts were in effect in 1942, but were terminated on the 1943 crops during the current year and will not be applicable for these commodities in 1944. The terminations were made under authority contained in section 371 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. With quotas suspended on the named commodities, a farmer may plant within or in excess of the acreage allotment previously established for the particular commodity and may sell his entire production free of the marketing penalties and restrictions.

Under the 1943 programs a farmer who planted within the farm cotton acreage allotment, or only slightly in excess of it, is eligible for an agricultural-conservation payment, no deduction being made, as was done in prior years, for the small excess acreage. In addition, the cotton produced on the farm is eligible for Commodity Credit Corporation loans. If the acreage planted to cotton exceeded the farm cotton acreage allotment to the extent that the farm is determined to have been knowingly overplanted (sec. 302 (f) of the act) payments and loans cannot be made.

As announced, the 1944 program will provide for establishing farm goals for certain essential food and fiber crops. On a voluntary basis farmers who carry out approved soil and water conservation practices will earn payments at rates now being established. Excepting tobacco, farm-acreage allotments will not be established for any crop, and there will be no restriction on the acreage planted or the quantity of the commodity marketed. Likewise, the acreage planted to any commodity or the extent to which farm goals are met will not affect the payment earned with respect to conservation practices.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two particulars and in one to include an address by His Excellency, the Ambassador of Poland.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein part of a speech made by William Jennings Bryan.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. NORMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Saturday Evening Post entitled, "The Man Who Has Astonished Washington." This deals with our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 12 minutes tomorrow at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today at the conclusion of the other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

MINORITY VIEWS ON H. R. 3070, TO REPEAL THE CHINESE EXCLUSION ACTS

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may file minority views on the bill H. R. 3070.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article by George Matthew Adams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article that appeared in the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the Agricultural Adjustment Agency of Pennsylvania and an editorial from the Potter County Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOCH]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. FULMER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Memphis Commercial Appeal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an essay by E. E. Murphy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in reference to Government publications and also to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include several newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT]?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE USED AS PROPAGANDA AGENCY

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on April 1 last in this House I charged that the Office of Civilian Defense and the Office of War Information were going far beyond their spheres of activity as outlined by the Congress or the Executive in their creation. Furthermore, I charged that there was a White House clique operating behind the scenes for the promotion of a fourth term. I charged that the O. W. I. was serving in the place of the publicity department of the Democratic National Committee as the propaganda agency for that clique promoting the fourth term.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time I charged that the Office of Civilian Defense was not primarily functioning for the promotion of civilian defense but rather was promoting a revolution in our civilian economy and in our ways of thinking in this Nation. I charged at that time that the heart of the Office of Civilian Defense is the block plan for civilian war services. It is outlined in a pamphlet published by the United States Office of Civilian Defense, printed by the United States Government Printing Office, marked for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C., price 5 cents.

Quoting from the pamphlet, it says:

The block plan is a plan of organization established to insure total coverage of all households for civilian war services.

Now, let us examine those last three words, "civilian war services," and let us see how that program is presently operating in at least one part of the country, and whether or not their activities can be directly classified as civilian war services, bearing in mind further that the pamphlet stated that "the training of the block leaders is the most crucial part in the whole plan"—the whole plan for what? At that time I thought it was solely limited to a fourth term. Again I say, let us look at its latest developments.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand an article which appeared in the Chicago Tribune under date of October 6. Let me read this article. It is headed "O. C. D. aides told: United States must waive independence." I ask this membership to let me know whether this O. C. D. meeting outlined a contribution toward civilian war services or whether it is in fact a contribution toward civilian defense, remembering at the same time, Mr. Speaker, that only recently the ac-

tivities of the Air Raid Warning Service in this country were suspended, releasing hundreds of thousands of civilian volunteers by and with the approval of the President.

Six hundred block captains—

Notice that—"block captains" working under the O. C. D.—

assembled last night by the Office of Civilian Defense, heard Earl S. Johnson, assistant professor of social sciences at the University of Chicago, assert that the United States must give up some of its national independence for the benefit of world security.

Johnson spoke in Schutz High School at the first of a series of meetings designed to train leaders of neighborhood discussion groups throughout the city.

And get this:

The program is sponsored by the morale department of the O. C. D.

Note those words—morale department.

After he had finished his speech, Johnson offered to answer questions, and a member of the audience asked: "Do you believe in the surrender of United States sovereignty in a dominating world federation?" Johnson replied: "If you want world security, I can find no other prescription than that there be some reduction in the absolute independence of the United States. That is the price you must pay."

I wonder what answer Professor Johnson would get from some of the boys' who are fighting in the fox holes and jungles of the Solomons if they were asked whether they are fighting to give up one iota of American independence and the American way of life.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if we have to give up any of our independence and of our sovereignty in the United States, let that be for the American people to decide and let them decide that in a strictly constitutional manner by and with the approval of the Senate of the United States. And above all, let us insist that the O. C. D. stick to its knitting and not have its speakers going around the country educating the block leaders to advocate the surrender of American independence. Have we gone so far in this country as to permit the O. C. D. to become subsidized by those who are advocating Union Now. Have we gone so far as to permit speakers, operating under the auspices of the O. C. D. to be educating our block leaders to pull down the Stars and Stripes and raise instead some flag of some super world state in which we may—if we are lucky—obtain a dominion status? Mr. Speaker, I fully recognize that in the post-war world, we in this country must stand ready to cooperate and collaborate with other nations in the maintenance of world peace, but I am not one of those who, having taken an oath to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, will go around this country advocating we give up one iota of our independence in order to protect the security of any other nation on the face of this earth. Let us at all times by the Grace of God be the masters of our own destiny.

Let me quote one other statement from this exalted professor. He was asked the question: "How can there be fair competition when inequalities of wealth exist?" Get that question and analyze it in the spirit of the original thesis of Marxian socialism; and here is his reply:

There cannot be fair intellectual competition while sharp inequality of wealth exists.

From this answer one cannot help but feel that this speaker, selected by the O. C. D. to train its block leaders, who in turn under the block plan are scheduled to become the leaders of discussions within the immediate vicinity of their homes, is fundamentally a disciple of the Marxian philosophy and certainly is not an advocate of the American way of life under which we have been told we can prosper in direct proportion to our individual initiative under a system of private enterprise.

Further to quote Professor Johnson:

As an example, when one newspaper in a city is so much larger than its competitor that it virtually monopolizes the field, there cannot be fair intellectual competition.

Inasmuch as this meeting was in the city of Chicago, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that Professor Johnson is citing the inequality of distribution rather than wealth as it exists between the Chicago Tribune and the Chicago Daily Sun. It is unfortunate that perhaps Professor Johnson does not realize that the distribution of a newspaper is not dependent upon the wealth of its owner because in this instance I doubt that there is little difference in the respective wealth of Colonel McCormick or Mr. Marshal Field; but rather that the success of a newspaper and the relativity of circulation is dependent upon the American right to think as we choose and to read what we choose. I hope that in its selection of speakers to train the block leaders the Office of Civilian Defense will hereafter be careful to select some who have just a little bit of fundamental understanding of the Bill of Rights and just a faint understanding of the American principle of free enterprise in a free Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time that this Congress act to curtail the un-American activities of the O. C. D. The most salutary thing that has happened to this Nation in many years was the wisdom of the Senate in sending five of its Members on a world-wide tour of our many battle fronts and outlying garrisons. It is to the distinct credit of those gentlemen, who have had their eyes opened, that upon their return they have been unafraid to speak frankly and truthfully to the American people and to this Congress on their observations. They have not hesitated to condemn the foreign propaganda activities of the Office of War Information. They have not hesitated to point out the fact that we are not being given credit as a Nation for the multitude of bounties which we are passing out in the form of lend-lease. They have come to realize—as have many of us heretofore—that while we have fighting Allies in this war, nevertheless, we have Allies who justifiably are thinking of themselves first today, and are thinking of themselves first in the post-war world. These gentlemen are not afraid to advocate, yea to insist, that the time is here when the Congress of the United States, and everyone else in authority in the United States, give some thought to America first now, and America first in the post-war world. I say to you that is a salutary thing. I hope it will bear fruit. If it does, one of the first things this Congress should do, inasmuch as we have now found it possible to discontinue the voluntary efforts of the Air Raid Warning Service, to put an end to the un-American and the political activities of the Office of Civilian Defense and the Office of War Information.

The Office of Civilian Defense must not be permitted to become the publicity department for the Union Now or World State movements.

VICTORY ON THE HOME FRONT

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial taken from the Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the time has arrived, if not already past due, for the Lincoln Republicans and the Jeffersonian Democrats to unite for victory on the home front, just the same as the soldiers, sailors, and marines have united for victory on the battle front.

I would not want to inhibit anyone's emotions, but it seems to me that some Members of the Congress have permitted their emotional nature to exceed their intellectual nature.

Isolationism died with James Monroe, but there are still those who bandy the word about in order to throw stardust in our eyes and blind us to their interventionist and internationalist schemes.

My motto is "cooperation but not amalgamation."

The following article describes the theory of the amalgamationists, with which I am not in sympathy:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of October 11, 1943]

RHODES PUPILS IN UNITED STATES POSTS ALMOST TRIPLE DURING YEAR—SOCIETY WOULD REDUCE STATES TO BRITISH COLONY, WRITER SAYS

How American Rhodes scholars have infiltrated key positions in the United States Government, almost tripling their number in Federal service in the course of a year, was disclosed yesterday in the official magazine of their society.

There are now 128 of them in Government jobs, as against 49 when the last survey was made.

These Government workers were educated at Oxford University in England under provisions of the will of Cecil John Rhodes, the great British Empire builder who founded what he called a "secret society," aimed at winning the United States back for England and gaining other territories for the British crown.

RHODES WOULD REJOICE

Rhodes, who was in the habit of laying his hand on a section of the globe and saying, "I want to see all this red (for England),"

would have rejoiced at the way his proteges in America are carrying out his ideas.

Clarence Streit, a Rhodes scholar and the author of Union Now, has been one of the foremost advocates of reducing the United States to the status of a British colony, and his fellow Americans from Oxford have been no less energetic in getting control of America's Government, although their methods may have been less spectacular.

The Rhodes men on the Federal pay roll include such top-ranking figures as Elmer Davis, who heads the Office of War Information; Representative J. W. FULBRIGHT (Democrat), of Arkansas, author of a post-war "world security" resolution; ROBERT HALE (Republican), of Maine, stump speaker for the internationalists, and CHARLES R. CLASON (Republican), of Massachusetts, through C. J. Durr, Federal Communications Commissioner; C. D. Mahaffie, Interstate Commerce Commissioner, and dozens of executives in the State Department, Office of Price Administration, War Production Board, and the old Board of Economic Warfare, reorganized after the Wallace-Jones feud on Washington.

The American Oxonian, magazine of the American Rhodes scholars, which lists their names and positions in its October 1942 issue, says in an article in an earlier issue of the same year:

"If Rhodes scholars have not yet fulfilled their founder's hopes in the sphere of politics, their influence in the field of education (which in the long run may well be important) has certainly exceeded everyone's expectations."

This paragraph was written some 9 months before the publication of the roster which disclosed 128 Rhodes men in Federal employment and concerned Rhodes scholars who are now college presidents and professors.

The Washington Times-Herald and the Chicago Tribune first disclosed the presence of Rhodes scholars in Washington jobs in a survey based on the 1940 and 1941 rosters of the American Oxonian, then the latest available. At that time there were 49.

The 1942 directory lists 1,079 living Americans educated under the Rhodes will, from money Rhodes amassed in the diamond and gold fields of South Africa during the latter part of the nineteenth century.

The scholarships provide a grant of $1,200 tenable for three years at Oxford University. The Rhodes will originally provided that two students should be sent each year to England from each State in the United States and from many of the British colonies.

On the basis of the directors' figures, assuming that all of the 1,166 American Rhodes sent to Oxford completed the full term of residence, the cost of their education to the Rhodes' estate approximated $4,000,000, not considering whatever overhead there may have been in the trustee arrangement.

FULBRIGHT BILL FAVORS UNION

The Rhodes plan for winning the United States back as a British colony and writing off the effects of the American Revolution parallels the original Union Now idea voiced by Lord North before the Declaration of Independence was signed, and rewritten for modern usage by Clarence Streit. The Fulbright resolution, drafted by the Oxonian Congressman, sets up the machinery for such a union.

On the basis of the record in the 1942 roster, 11.8 percent of all living American Rhodes scholars now hold Government jobs. The roster also lists 86 in the Army and Navy, apparently in active service; 31 others in the Naval Reserve, and 17 who hold Army or Navy commissions, indicating that they have permanent assignments in Washington or at military base hospitals, arsenals, or other posts in this country. There are also six who are civilian employees of the Army or Navy.

It is possible the 1942 list is already out of date and that many more of the Oxford educated beneficiaries of the Rhodes will are in Government service.

CAPT. FRANK R. WALKER

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a news item.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to pay my tribute to the gallant exploit of Capt. Frank R. Walker, of Alabama, who by skillful maneuvering, daring leadership and indomitable courage wrote a requiem to the efforts of the Japanese to conquer the north Solomon Islands.

On Wednesday evening last at midnight this brave American, although his force was outnumbered 3 to 1, and knowing the odds against him, so maneuvered his destroyer force 15 miles off the coast that within a few minutes time he sent to Davey Jones' locker four Japanese warships and routed a Japanese force that outnumbered his 3 to 1.

This proves conclusively that the fighting qualities of the American fighting men, whether on land, sea, or in the air, are superb, not matched by the men of any other nation. This is because they are so well trained, so well led and have a cause so worthy fighting for.

The article to which I refer follows:

STORY OF SEA VICTORY

Allied Headquarters in the Southwest Pacific, Sunday, October 10.—The Battle of the Solomons surged toward the southeastern fringe of Rabaul, main Japanese South Pacific base, today after an outnumbered and outgunned United States destroyer flotilla singlehandedly mauled and routed a triple enemy naval force in a midnight requiem to Japanese control of the north central Solomons.

At least three and probably four Japanese warships, including a light cruiser or destroyer leader, were sunk and two or three other destroyers were damaged badly by a more-than-two-to-one outnumbered force commanded by Capt. Frank R. Walker of Alabama, 44-year-old veteran, in a lightning battle some 15 miles off the northwest coast of Vella Lavella Island Wednesday night, frontline headquarters dispatches reported.

The remainder of a fleet of nine Japanese destroyers, along with gunboats, torpedo boats, and barges sent in as a final evacuation force after the Japanese high command wrote off the central Solomons as a bastion to Rabaul, led in panic before a hail of shells and schools of torpedoes. United States losses were given as "moderate."

(The Japanese Domei news agency yesterday broadcast an Imperial Headquarters communique announcing that the Japanese garrisons had been evacuated from both Kolombangara and Vella Lavella. The announcement, recorded by the Federal Communications Commission, characterized the retreat as a "successful transfer" carried out "almost without enemy interference.")

ADMIRALS SEND CONGRATULATIONS

Both Admiral William F. Halsey, commander at South Pacific headquarters, and Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, Pacific Fleet commander, sent congratulations to Captain Walker, with Admiral Halsey stating:

"Our hats are off in pride for your gallant and determined action. God bless all of you."

Although a spokesman at Gen. Douglas MacArthur's headquarters said the Japanese apparently were on their way to attempt another evacuation from Kolombangara, a dispatch from Francis McCarthy, United Press correspondent at the Third Amphibious Forces headquarters, said the enemy was headed for Vella Lavella, where between 300 and 700 troops had been cornered by American jungle fighters.

Describing the circumstances leading up to the battle, a South Pacific headquarters spokesman said that United States scouting planes had sighted enemy shipping movements southward, indicating that an attempt would be made to evacuate Vella Lavella.

"The latter action indicated the estimate was correct," he added, expressing the belief that the flotilla probably was organized at Rabaul.

"We sent destroyers north in two groups. The advance echelon was under Captain Walker, who spent 16 of 22 years in the Navy at sea. Walker's force arrived in position 15 miles north of Vella Lavella in the Bougainville Strait at 11 p. m., ahead of the second destroyer force."

The spokesman said the United States destroyers were shadowed by Japanese planes all evening so that the enemy knew they were coming. "Captain Walker," he added, "spotted three groups of Japanese craft coming toward his force in fairly close order led by four destroyers and a light cruiser or new-type destroyer leader. This was followed by four destroyers in a group, and the third group of barges, gunboats, and probably torpedo boats.

Deciding not to wait for the second echelon of American destroyers, and thus give the Japanese a chance to escape, Captain Walker sent his destroyers charging in, engaging all nine warships in the first two groups with torpedo and gunfire. The battle lasted only a very few minutes, said the spokesman.

Two of the leading group, a destroyer and cruiser, were seen to blow up and sink quickly. A third destroyer, hit heavily by gunfire and torpedoes, burst into flames from stem to stern and also went down. Hits likewise were observed on other enemy ships and the second Japanese force, with some of its craft damaged, lost heart and fled, said the spokesman. The third flotilla hovered indecisively on the fringes of the action, then scattered northward.

"This engagement again demonstrated the effectiveness of our destroyers when used on the offensive under superb handling. By skillful maneuvering our force was placed in a strategic position to attack the Japanese force," commented Capt. Francis X. McInerney, representative of the commander of destroyers of the Pacific Fleet.

"Our success is not due to luck—it was due to intestinal fortitude coupled with well-trained fighting ships. With such a combination we can never lose."

AMERICANS OF JAPANESE DESCENT

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I heard with a great deal of regret the remarks of the gentleman from California with respect to the War Relocation Authority and the Japanese situation. I should like to put this House straight. There are in the United States of America about 70,000 American citizens of Japanese descent who have proven them-

selves absolutely loyal to American principles. I call attention to the fact that right at this moment there is in Sicily a combat team made up entirely of Americans of Japanese descent. I call attention to the fact that there has not been a single disloyal act of espionage or sabotage on the part of any American-born Japanese. I think it ill behooves a Member of this House when we are today fighting for the "four freedoms" to speak in such an intemperate, immoderate, and un-American way respecting loyal Americans of Japanese descent.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file some reports from the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement of Dr. Felix J. Underwood, of the Public Health Department of Mississippi against the so-called Wagner bill that proposes to socialize the medical profession of this country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

DISLOYAL AMERICANS OF JAPANESE DESCENT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in a moment I am going to offer a resolution to invite the Senators who have been to the Far East to come here to address the House in secret session. We are entitled to that information.

Let me reply now to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

I am not willing to sit here and hear him call un-American the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT], who is not now on the floor.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania says no American-born Jap has ever been found to be disloyal. I wonder if he does not know that some of those American-born Japs signaled to give those brutal Japs our range while they were bombing Pearl Harbor in violation of all the rules of war and in disregard of all the laws of God and man.

I wonder if he did not know that those loathesome Japs were wearing rings showing that they had graduated from American institutions at the time they were shot down at Pearl Harbor. I wonder if he did not know that Japs who had been born there and had been receiving the protection of the American Government all their lives, were out waving flags and directing the enemy to attack the American Fleet.

I wonder if he did not know that those loathesome Japs who were born in Hawaii, and some of them born in California, Washington, or Oregon, were driving their Fords and smashing the tails of those airplanes to keep our men from going into the air to defend America from the most treacherous, damnable attack the white man's civilization has ever known.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a verse from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE TREASURY TAX PROPOSAL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Treasury tax proposal for the liquidation of the middle-income group is certainly tough enough. On the other hand, its scheme of post-war credits shows a "sissy-pants" attitude toward the meeting of the tax problem. This is no more nor less than a plan to allow our soldiers, when they return, to bear a part of the civilian tax bill which ought to be paid presently. When 10,000,000 soldiers return, with their families they will constitute perhaps 40,000,000 American citizens. They will be given an opportunity to contribute their tax money to repay a part of the civilian tax burden which ought to be borne here and now by the home-front taxpayers. I say that is a reproach to the leaders of the country.

The Morgenthau plan for the liquidation of middle incomes contains not a word about elimination of waste or about savings through governmental economy. The will to fight waste does not exist in the executive department.

The returning soldiers will become the backbone of our economic life during the next few decades. The executive branch of the Government proposes that we ask our soldiers after the war to contribute from their earnings to pay back to civilians the taxes the civilians paid while the soldiers were told they were fighting for the "four freedoms" or the Atlantic Charter. They were not told they were fighting to repay our 1944 tax bill.

Are we going to ask our soldiers to pay our taxes and our grandchildren to pay our grocery bills?

PROPOSED INVITATION TO CERTAIN SENATORS TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last I, with several others, called attention to the importance of having the five Senators who have just returned from the far-flung battle fronts give the Members of the House their findings regarding conditions on the battle fronts. I understand there is some objection to having them appear in the House Chamber. I hope the gentleman from Mississippi and some of the other Members will join in asking them to appear in the Caucus Room. Then we can all have the benefit of their valuable information. It does not matter where we hear their testimony so long as we hear it.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentlewoman will yield, let me say that these are Members of the United States Senate. They have the privilege of the floor. We have a perfect right to invite them here to address the Members of the House in secret session. We want them to come here and give us the benefit of the information they have garnered in their trip to the various battle fronts of the world.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman consulted the Speaker and the leaders about it?

Mr. RANKIN. I have, and I think that when the resolution is offered they will agree that this is the place to have them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is time for the Chair to make a statement, because this matter was discussed with the Chair by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], last week, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], over the phone.

The Chair does not intend to recognize a Member to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution inviting Senators to address the House in open or executive session, because the Chair thinks that is tantamount to an amendment to the rules of the House and, therefore, is a matter for the House to determine. If resolutions like that are introduced, they will be sent to the proper committee.

Mr. RANKIN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, the Speaker has a right to refuse to recognize me for that purpose, but I think if the Speaker will investigate the rules he will find that we have a right to invite those men to come here to address the Members in the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already investigated that and finds it is otherwise. Members of the Senate have the privilege of the floor, but they do not have the privilege of addressing the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Would it be within the rules to have a recess, as we do when foreign potentates and rulers come here, and have the Senators come over and talk to us?

The SPEAKER. If the House stands in recess at that time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent brief statement issued by the Missouri Farm Labor Committee on the farm situation in Missouri.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the special orders today I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the commissioner of education of Connecticut, and certain schedules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NO CHANGE IN THE DESIGN OF THE AMERICAN FLAG

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, when I returned home and canvassed my district this past summer the thing which inspired me most of all was the opposition expressed by people everywhere to any proposed change in the American flag or substituting for it some other flag of different design. I understand there is a committee afoot dedicated to giving us a new banner in place of our beloved flag. I wish to serve notice on those who are stirring up dissatisfaction with the red, white, and blue—if they can find any dissatisfaction—that, as far as I personally go as a Representative in this House and of the people that I serve, those loyal and patriotic Americans back home, I shall fight with every ounce of my energy to keep intact the present design of the Stars and Stripes. Old Glory has flown over this victorious and prosperous country for 160 years, and she must never be hauled down. Let me repeat, I am against any proposed change in the American flag.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a recent resolution adopted by the Lions Club of Endicott, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from today's New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert an article from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars, in one to include a radio broadcast by Upton Close, and also by Norman Thomas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the close of the legislative business of October 12, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED ADDRESS OF SENATORS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to ask a question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the Member from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] what good it will do to have the Senators come over here and tell us what they found in their travels inasmuch as the House has already without knowing the facts passed the Fulbright resolution committing us to certain participation in a super world government.

Mr. RANKIN. I thought the gentleman from Michigan might need some light.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Some of us knew long ago that we were being taken for a ride by those who will be business competitors when the war is over.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the Nevada State Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a plan for world order, and I ask in that connection that it appear with the capitalizing and the form in which it is presented.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MARSHALL FIELD

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that the gentleman from Mississippi without any reason, cause, or justification continues to assail and attack one of our most honorable citizens, Mr. Marshall Field III, whom I have had the honor and distinction to know personally, and whose distinguished grandfather, one of the foremost American citizens of his time, I was privileged to know. The gentleman from Mississippi again harps that Mr. Marshall Field III came into possession of $75,000,000 and that the terms of the will in which he is the beneficiary were so drawn that he will not be required to pay an inheritance or income tax. If the gentleman were fair in this matter he would not so often make these unwarranted statements. The fact is that the grandfather of Mr. Field drew the will years and years before the income, inheritance, or estate tax laws were enacted.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Marshall Field III is one of the very few rich Americans who came into great wealth in an honorable and honest manner and has at no time to my knowledge or to the knowledge of the gentleman from Mississippi avoided the payment of his taxes whatever they may have been. He is a real patriotic American who is not hoarding his money, but is expending it in the interest of the masses, the underprivileged, and the wage earner.

Only a few years ago there was built in Chicago by the Field estate with his approval a great housing project at a cost of over $25,000,000, as I recollect, providing better living quarters for the poor people of that city. On the day that the gentleman from Mississippi last assailed Mr. Marshall Field III, Mr. Field came into possession of this wealth and purchased $10,000,000 worth of United States War bonds. Does the gentleman from Mississippi know any one of the

many millionaires who has done likewise or even bought half as much as Mr. Field III?

Mr. Speaker, from the speeches made by the gentleman from Mississippi heretofore it has been made clear that he dislikes Mr. Field III because his two publications, PM and the Chicago Sun, have fearlessly printed the truth. These papers have advocated justice for those that are being discriminated against. We in Chicago for years had only one morning newspaper, which was extremely antagonistic and unfair to President Roosevelt, to the New Deal, and to the Democratic Party in general. Therefore Chicago warmly welcomed the Chicago Sun and was grateful to Mr. Field that he had given the city another morning newspaper. The gentleman from Mississippi charges that Mr. Field is publishing these newspapers at a great loss because such loss can be deducted from his income tax, but the gentleman knows that these newspapers were established several years before he came into possession of this $75,000,000 inheritance which he admits is not subject to the present income-tax law.

Mr. Speaker, unlike most of our millionaires and rich men, Mr. Field is not endeavoring to accumulate greater wealth or make more money. He is spending his income and even part of his capital, as I have stated, in the interest of the masses. It seems to me that the gentleman from Mississippi must know that Mr. Marshall Field III, unlike most of our rich men, is unselfish.

As to the statements of the gentleman from Mississippi that I am trying to protect Mr. Field, that statement is just as unwarranted as his charges are against Mr. Field. He, by the way, does not need any defense at my hands.

Mr. Speaker, since I have been a Member of this House I have urged and advocated higher income, inheritance, and estate taxes, and am urging now high excess-profits taxes and a higher tax on the profits of war profiteers. I have spoken and voted against joint income-tax returns and voted for single tax returns, and I am ready to compare my record on that score with that of the gentleman from Mississippi.

In conclusion I wish to say that I regret I was again obliged to answer the gentleman from Mississippi, and I hope it will not be necessary for me to do so again. I trust that the gentleman from Mississippi will realize that there are many of us who could assail the newspapers that attack us progressive Democrats, but I for one believe in freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and, yes, freedom of religion, and I hope that the gentleman from Mississippi knows that our Constitution so provides.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is violating the rules by referring to the Member from Mississippi as "you."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The Chair will state that if the Chair called attention to each and every time the rule is violated by Members addressing other Members as "you" instead of "the gentleman from," it would be a wearisome task.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I did ask before to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. RANKIN. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman's time has already expired.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already stated that.

CHINESE INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the fathers of our country established for us a free Government untrammeled by any suggestion of the despotic. America fought for and fights to retain our precious heritage. Thirty-two years ago the children of our brave ally China in a revolutionary uprising which ended in the overthrow of the Manchu monarchy, began a battle for the establishment of a republic of China which might enjoy the three people's principles—the principle of the people's nation, the principle of the people's rights, the principle of the people's livelihood. Yesterday the Chinese people, grim, determined, and confident celebrated in manner befitting China's Independence Day. China, our friend, under the brilliant leadership of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, so ably supported by his gracious wife, who by the force of her sincerity and charm won the hearts of all Americans, paused in the continuing battle for Chinese ideals to pay tribute to Sun Yat-sen, her first Provisional President, and his followers who have striven so loyally to reach the glorious objective of their government—a full-fledged constitutional republic. Independence Day means to America a day of joyous thanksgiving for a freedom by revolution that is past. China celebrates her Independence Day with joy for the victories of yesterday and hope in the final victory of tomorrow. Her revolution for the obtaining of that political democracy when her government will be handed over to her people continues until that day of her realization of republican nationality. The world well knows this history of China—and particularly America, strong, virile, and rich, feels keenly the suffering and the sorrow that follows the blood shed by Chinese for the attainment of her full glory. The people of the United States have a lasting feeling of friendship and respect for the people of China. They know that now and after victory China will play a major part in the development of the post-war world. Americans all desire that everything possible be done to give Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and his brave men maximum assistance in her heroic struggle. Americans all look upward through the blackness of war nights with strong hope that a new day of peace on earth will soon break across this international horizon—a day when all the Allies can join with China in salute to her national flag—a white sun with 12 rays on a blue sky in a red field—flying high over China—in glorious victory.

China—on your Independence Day—we salute you.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Comptroller General and two articles from the Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

PROCEDURE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks and include a copy of a letter I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have just been wondering what the occupants of the gallery think of the procedure and the scene which they have had to witness for the last 30 minutes. I honestly believe that if the majority leadership would rise to the occasion and present a constructive program, such scenes would not be witnessed by the galleries.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

REPEAL OF THE CHINESE EXCLUSION LAW—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 333)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read by the Clerk and referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

There is now pending before the Congress legislation to permit the immigration of Chinese people into this country and to allow Chinese residents here to become American citizens. I regard this legislation as important in the cause of winning the war and of establishing a secure peace.

China is our ally. For many long years she stood alone in the fight against aggression. Today we fight at her side. She has continued her gallant struggle against very great odds.

China has understood that the strategy of victory in this world war first required the concentration of the greater part of our strength upon the European front. She has understood that the amount of supplies we could make available to her has been limited by difficulties of transportation. She knows that substantial aid will be forthcoming as soon as possible—aid not only in the form of weapons and supplies but also in carrying out plans already made for offensive, effective action. We and our allies will aim our forces at the heart of Japan in ever-increasing strength until the common enemy is driven from China's soil.

But China's resistance does not depend alone on guns and planes and on attacks on land, on the sea, and from the air. It is based as much in the spirit of her people and her faith in her allies. We owe it to the Chinese to strengthen that faith. One step in this direction is to wipe from the statute books those anachronisms in our law which forbid the immigration of Chinese people into this country and which bar Chinese residents from American citizenship.

Nations, like individuals, make mistakes. We must be big enough to acknowledge our mistakes of the past and to correct them.

By the repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws we can correct a historic mistake and silence the distorted Japanese propaganda. The enactment of legislation now pending before the Congress would put Chinese immigrants on a parity with those from other countries. The Chinese quota would, therefore, be only about 100 immigrants a year. There can be no reasonable apprehension that any such number of immigrants will cause unemployment or provide competition in the search for jobs.

The extension of the privileges of citizenship to the relatively few Chinese residents in our country would operate as another meaningful display of friendship. It would be additional proof that we regard China not only as a partner in waging war but that we shall regard her as a partner in days of peace. While it would give the Chinese a preferred status over certain other oriental people, their great contribution to the cause of decency and freedom entitles them to such preference.

I feel confident that the Congress is in full agreement that these measures—long overdue—should be taken to correct an injustice to our friends. Action by the Congress now will be an earnest of our purpose to apply the policy of the good neighbor to our relations with other peoples.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 11, 1943.*

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I wish to withdraw my request to address the House today under a special order, and I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to do so on next Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes, at the conclusion of any other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE FOOD PROGRAM

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the question of payment of food subsidies is one of the principal domestic problems confronting Congress as well as the people of this country at the present time. This problem has been discussed on the floor of the House and through the press from various angles and with divergent views.

It is agreed the most important thing is that we have the largest food supply than can be produced to take care of the demand of the armed forces as well as civilian requirements and commitments to our allies and to the starving people across the sea. Supplies ought to be furnished at a price commensurate with other costs to the ultimate consumer. No American interested in the welfare of his country wants inflation or exorbitant prices for the things he sells. I do not think the producer should nor does he want to demand anything except a fair share of the Nation's income for his labor in producing food compared with what he is required to pay for the things he needs to buy. Everything possible and reasonable should be done to encourage and meet the increased demand for food supplies of the next year. Officials in high places have conceived the idea that rather than permit certain farm products to bring a price in line with the cost of production that they should hold the line by using money from the Federal Treasury to pay the difference between the amount received for food and the cost of producing it, and this disregards the fact the Nation's income is the largest in history. This money is of course taken from Federal taxes and the sale of War bonds. It ought to be observed right here, too, that our Government formerly paid subsidies to keep prices up, now we have that thing reversed. It is proposed to pay subsidies to keep them down. The proposal is for two and a half billion dollars to support the program for next year. It is obvious that unless this money is paid immediately from increased income taxes that it will be added to the national debt so the boys who are now abroad in our armed forces will have a chance to help pay our grocery bills.

The farmers and producers of this country have taken a lot of unjust criticism with respect to the higher costs of living. The cost of living is the total of things the consumer buys—food, clothing, electric-light bills, transportation, taxes, insurance, doctor bills, and necessities and luxuries for which they spend their money. Food is an important item, and yet on the average of the Nation at large only 21 percent of the consumer's income, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics Bulletin of March 1943, was spent for food. Furthermore, this 21 percent does not all go to the farmer. He gets about 55 percent of the 21 cents. The rest of it goes to retailers, wholesalers, processors, distributors, transportation, license fees, taxes, and so forth. They all come out before the farmer gets his money, so of the 21 cents of the consumer's dollar for food the farmer gets about 11½ cents or 12 cents. Furthermore, less than one-fourth of the consumer's food dollar is paid for meat, so when you talk about a roll-back in order to decrease the retail price on meat you are talking about a very small proportion of the expenditure by consumers. Do not forget the 6,000,000 farmers in this country are also consumers of all kinds of goods, and do not forget they are not working on a guaranteed or cost-plus basis.

Now I want to direct your attention to the manner in which the so-called roll-back of prices affected the cattle industry when put into effect a few months ago. The O. P. A. decided meat prices were too high, especially beef. Without apparently taking into consideration beef supplies for the future and the need for encouraging production and without considering whether livestock owners would lose thereby, an order went out directing a roll-back on meat prices. It was said, of course, the difference would be made up in subsidies. What happened? The meat packers immediately pushed the price back $1 to $2 per 100 pounds on live cattle. The reduction went back all the way down the line. The farmer and the livestock raiser, of course, took the loss. Regardless of statements to the contrary, there are thousands of livestock feeders who have been selling their cattle on the markets during the past few months at a substantial loss. This, notwithstanding the fact that their Government claims it wants to encourage an increase in the production of food. Discouraging prospects for cattle prices in the future with little incentive to finish cattle in the feeding pens, the markets of our country have been crowded with cattle during the past several weeks. Three weeks ago there were more cattle on the principal markets of this country than we had in more than 25 years. Let me give you some recent figures. Beginning with September 13 and ending with September 27 this year, there were 861,400 cattle sold on our 12 principal markets. Only a year ago the figure for the same period was 759,400. Thousands of these cattle went to slaughter that should have gone to the feeding yards where they could be finished. The paralyzing of the livestock market by the O. P. A. will undoubtedly show up in a shortage of meat within the next year.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman from Kansas is always so fair in his statements and covers so completely the subject matter, I believe he will agree with me, since we come from nearly the same section of the country, that a terrific drought which hit our respective southwest cattle-raising districts had something to do with the enormous cattle movement to market.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, that is true; and part of them came from his State, but if the cattlemen could have purchased feed they might have protected themselves to some extent. The gentleman from Oklahoma who, after all, resides in the city and not in the country, if he were familiar with the ques-

tion, would realize that if the cattle growers could have obtained some cottonseed, or some other kind of protein feed at fair prices they could have carried their cattle a little longer and it would not have been necessary to ship so many of them to the market. They would not have been so hard pressed during the past season. But there was no incentive to hold them, so they sold and took a loss.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Not now.

Mr. Speaker, the farmer just cannot understand why at this time he is required to accept a reduction of from $1 to $3 per 100 pounds for his cattle and sustain a substantial loss in his effort to produce food for the armed forces and civilian use. He does not see that reduction reflected in the price of meat on the retail counter. Neither can he understand why he should sell cattle in Kansas City for $13 per 100 that "kills out" about 50 percent when the product sells in New York or Philadelphia or Washington for 60 to 90 cents per pound if you can get it.

Mr. Speaker, we do not hear of rollback on anything else except as affects the farmer. You do not see it reflected in the hotels or eating houses. The menu card on railroad trains and hotels says and I quote, "The prices of our meals are the ceiling price at the highest price quoted by our establishment between February 1 and April 15, 1943." Mr. Speaker, let me call your attention to some further figures. I quote from my local paper in the community where I live. This is of last Friday. The price paid for butter to the farmer for first grade, 48 cents; for second grade. 45 cents. In Washington it is about 70 cents. The farmer in my community gets for his eggs from 36 to 40 cents a dozen. If you buy these same eggs from the retailer in Washington they cost from 65 to 75 cents per dozen.

Mr. Speaker, since it is agreed that an adequate supply of food is our first consideration and since it certainly should be agreed that the farmer and producer are entitled to a fair compensation for his services, I do not believe the payment of a subsidy from the Federal Treasury is the method by which this problem should be solved. Increased production will do more to stop inflation than anything else. If we cannot pay our grocery bills now we will certainly have a tough time doing it after this crisis is over. Our income will be smaller and the demand will be greater. We ought not to ask someone else to help us pay these bills. Does the average American citizen want the Government to help him pay his food bills when the money is needed for our ships and planes and food for our armed forces as well as the Allies abroad? I do not think so. Let us not permit this to be another case of too little and too late.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers of this country will do everything possible to meet the requirements of the expanded program of the War Food Administration. They will do it in spite of the handicaps that face them. They and their wives and children remaining at home will work from dawn to sunset in an effort to reach the goal, but Mr. Speaker, if we expect a maximum production in this country it is certainly not unreasonable to suggest that the farmers of this country be given a little encouragement by assuring them that they may have fair prices for their products and reasonable pay for services rendered and that they may have reason to believe that while they are doing their best to provide one of the most important products required for the winning of this war that they can be protected against roll-backs and any other interferences on the part of our Government. The farmer does not want inflation. He knows it will injure him more than anyone else. He just wants a fair price and a little encouragement to produce an abundance of food, and food after all is necessary in the winning of this war.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman from Kansas has mentioned several times in his speech that the Government rolled the prices back on the farmer, and the reason, the gentleman understands, does he not, was the effort on the part of the Government to prevent the farmer from taking a loss after the Government had made an effort to reduce retail prices?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman from Oklahoma knows full well, being familiar with the reports—and I am surprised that he has made the suggestion—he knows full well that the O. P. A. has reduced the price of retail meats and thereby reduced the price of livestock in the markets. If he will examine the market reports he will see that on the principal cattle markets last summer, the day the price was rolled back, the market on cattle went down a dollar a hundred or more in Chicago, Kansas City, Omaha, and other points where livestock was sold, and that loss has never been recovered. As a matter of fact, it went on further down, and the same class of livestock sold at that time is now selling for at least $2 a hundred less. Those lower prices are not reflected in the retail price of meat and neither has the farmer received any subsidy; neither does he want the subsidy that the gentleman from Oklahoma refers to. He just does not believe he should sustain a loss. I do not think so either.

If any subsidy was paid it must have gone to the packers and processors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SUBSIDIES VERSUS FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time in the 9 months I have served in the House that I have asked the indulgence of this body for a special order. Perhaps I have been mindful of the Chinese proverb: "Even a fool may rise to great heights if he keeps his mouth shut." I do not, however, promise to be so quiet from now on because even though a new Member I desire to have some small part in making a few constructive suggestions as to what ought to be accomplished in the next year. I follow the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] and shall speak on subsidies and food production.

From recent press reports and the hearing before the Banking and Currency Committee it is understood that the War Food Administration is about to ask Congress for an appropriation to carry on an extensive subsidy program. It has attempted the subsidy program in the face of the emphatic opposition of Congress. The administration has been urging a subsidy program against the wishes of nearly all of the farm organizations in this country. I wish someone could explain why the bureaus, who have the food program to administer, do not follow the considered judgment and advice of the men out on the firing line who have the practical knowledge of the food production and distribution. These various groups are consulted but generally their advice is not followed.

In the face of the impending administrative bill which will soon be introduced upon the subject I wish to call the attention of the House and the country to the fact that the experience so far of subsidies in the food program has been one causing confusion and a restriction in the amount of food produced.

The Members of Congress have recently returned from their districts, the food-producing sections of the country, reflecting the thinking of their own constituents, are more than ever opposed to the administration's subsidy program. This un-American policy, in the payment of subsidies, is bound to do a great deal of harm to the producers and the consumers of food in this country.

We have heard a great deal about the holding of the line, which is a nice sounding phrase, but I think we should examine the facts as to who is holding the line in the production of food. This line seems to have a hook and the farmers of the country are the ones that are being hooked. Let me present this bit of evidence. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the Bureau of Labor Statistics concurring have released figures on income and expenses in the production of food. They show without dispute that the cost of food is not the principal factor in a rising price level. In comparing industrial production with factory pay rolls and with living costs which include food costs they find that labor costs per unit of industrial production have increased 65.6 percent while retail food prices have advanced by 39 percent. These figures were as of July 1943. The cost of living has increased 24 percent. The amount of increased labor costs in the things we buy provides an accurate measure of how much labor is contributing to rising prices. The increased labor costs per unit of production is no doubt due to a combination of increased wages, time and a half for overtime and the slow-downs. Farm costs increase with the cost of industrial production and the cost of farm labor. We have no accurate figures on farm costs because there was a

failure to include farm wages in the parity formula. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics shows that the increase in earnings in all lines of industries since Pearl Harbor with a few exceptions, like those engaged in water transportation in war zones, that the greatest increase of wages has been that of farm workers.

The increased costs in retail food and the cost of living is reflected both in the things farmers buy and in the labor they hire. The things the farmers buy and that which goes into the production of food has gone up. With the increased amount that labor now receives in comparison to the cost of food it seems unusual that labor leaders should continue to attack agriculture and demand roll-backs in food prices. If the subsidy is a remedy, which we doubt, then we should start where the trouble lies and roll back wages so it can begin to cut down the costs of production. I am not advocating such a move but suggest that as an inflation curb it would be much sounder than that of rolling back farm prices. A subsidy in farm prices stifles production. It provides the already swollen purse of the public with additional funds. This is definitely inflationary.

If one analyzes the figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics it shows that in June 1943 the average weekly earnings of labor stood at an index of 163. The cost of living index was 124. It further shows that the living-index costs have only gone up 24 points since January 1941 while the wages of the working man have gone up 63 points. If the analysis of this Bureau is correct, and they should be, it would seem that farm prices should be permitted to go up and this would make a further subsidy to the consumers of foods unnecessary.

The further thought on holding the line the cattle feeders of Nebraska and Iowa points to the following examples in the cost of their feed operations. In eastern Nebraska corn will cost close to $1 per bushel where a year ago it was 65 to 70 cents. The protein feeds which now are almost unattainable will cost from $65 to $30 a ton. A year ago they were $45 a ton. Labor costs are $100 a month plus extras, while a year ago it was $65. There are many other items in the cost of feeding such as salt and hay that have greatly advanced.

The cattlemen have passed a set of resolutions which in general state that the uncertainty which exists among cattle feeders and producers comes from the activities and attitudes of certain Government agencies. The cattle producers and feeders would like to have a definite statement as to what is wanted in the way of meat production during the next year. What type and degree of finish is desired? The cattle producer and feeder want an end to the threat of imposing price ceilings on live animals. They want cattle raising and feeding recognized as an essential part of the food-production program.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of this House and country to the national food conference which was held in Chicago on September 16 and 17. At this meeting there were the producers, processors, distributors, and the consumers. They adopted the following recommendations:

1. Fair prices at the market place instead of the present system of subsidies which tend to place food production and distribution under bureaucratic control.
2. That no roll-back of prices be financed out of Government funds and no subsidies either direct or by subterfuge be paid.
3. Obtain maximum production as the best means to halt inflation. Protect consumers against the further growth of black markets.
4. When increased production is requested by the Government, floor prices must be guaranteed on all such commodities, to insure against loss those assuming such war risks.
5. Timely provisions for skilled labor, necessary machinery, supplies, and equipment must be made.
6. Unification of the whole food-production, processing, and distribution program, in one Government agency.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the splendid statement he is making. He is giving the House some irrefutable facts in the form of statistics.

I think it should be emphasized at this point in view of the fact that future generations of taxpayers are going to resent bitterly the political trick of charging them with today's grocery bill. I think we should emphasize the fact that the stigma for that should not fall on the farmers; the farmers are not asking for food subsidies, it is a little coterie of New Deal politicians attempting to pass it on to the people. This should be clear in the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman from South Dakota for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, there is a program in a nutshell which will solve many of the ills in our food program.

The production and distribution of food in this country has always been on the basis of free enterprise. The American farmer with his access to market conditions by radio and through the press has learned to gauge his production program to consumers' demand. The American farmers know just as well, yes, a great deal better than the bureaucrats of Washington the type of food his land can best raise. He knows his equipment, his labor problems. He should be assured a floor under the food that he is raising. There should be a ceiling to keep the food from going too high. Then if the farmers are given the price incentive along with the necessary labor and machinery he will produce to the utmost. Let me state right here a fact that I fear our food experts have failed to remember. The only way to keep down the cost of food is to bring production up to the demand.

At the recent meeting held by the Cooperative Milk Producers Federation which has the support of the leading farm organizations of the country the whole program of proposed food subsidies and price roll-backs was strongly criticized and vigorously attacked as being deceptive and unworkable. It was attacked as a fraud which would pass the cost of everyone's grocery bill on to the men who would soon return from the armed forces. They stated:

1. That food subsidies represent a constantly increasing public debt which will be transferred in a large part to our fighting forces, the majority of whom are serving for $50 per month.
2. Food subsidies are inflationary. Printing bonds to pay for foods is not like printing currency to pay for governmental experiments.
3. Food subsidies imply that the Government intends to share more or less permanently the payment of grocery bills for its citizens without regard for their capacity to pay for their own way through life.
4. The milk subsidy which is being worked out on the basis of individual subsidy payments to some 3,000,000 producers of milk will strengthen bureaucratic control over the life of our farm people. The terms and conditions of receiving a subsidy constitutes the exercise of policing power not contemplated by existing laws. Government by regulation is constantly supplanting government by law. Government by regulation repeatedly emerges into government by fear.

Mr. Speaker, the idea of subsidies is just as un-American as is the idea of monopoly. It is the very essence of bureaucracy. Under it government becomes the master instead of the servant of the people. If persisted in it will destroy free enterprise.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. After all, does not a subsidy really mean taking it off the grocery bill but putting it on the tax bill plus administrative expenses? And the administrative expenses are what eat up money.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is correct.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the very able address he is making. Is it not furthermore true that the farmer as well as every other citizen of the United States will be taxed in order to pay these subsidies?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is correct.

Mr. SHORT. So that the roll-back program should really be called the roll-under program, because it plows the farmer under; it does not roll him back, it rolls him under.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is correct; I thank the gentleman.

Subsidies do not prevent inflation, they merely change the form of inflation. Everyone who is a taxpayer must help to pay the cost of subsidies. In addition we must pay for the Government's activities in manipulating a subsidy program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us examine the principle of subsidies from the practical standpoint. Let us see what effect it will have on our present problem of getting food at a reasonable price. In the first place it has and it will continue to create uncertainty in the minds of producers and consumers alike for they all know that the power to grant subsidies

and the power to withhold them will rest in the hands of certain bureaucrats in Washington. In the face of this uncertainty and because of the shortage of help and machinery and because of the additional red tape and confusion the producer cannot give an all-out effort in the production program. This will result in less production. On the other hand, the consumer of food will be under a great temptation to hoard because he is already acquainted with coffee rationing, which was not needed, and the fact that subsidies on meat and butter have resulted in a shortage of these commodities. Certainly, the subsidies adopted so far have disrupted the normal procedure of production and distribution. Subsidies will let loose a whole new flood of orders which require record keeping and Government supervisors.

By whatever amount of money the Government attempts to support subsidies by just that amount does it increase inflation. In other words, if the Government grants subsidies to the amount of $1,000,000,000 it will create $1,000,000,000 more buying power which, when added to the reduction in production due to the needs created by the program, it will cause a further unbalance in the relationship between the supply of goods and the purchasing power of the people. Subsidies do not fall like manna from heaven, someone must pay the bill. Someone must also pay the costs in the operation of the program. The money the Government borrows to pay subsidies so that your grocery bill and mine may be lower will have to be repaid and with interest by those very men and women who are now fighting our battles. It would seem, Mr. Speaker, that it would almost be a crime for this Congress to appropriate money or to permit the Government to borrow money to pay our grocery bills.

The cost of a proposed subsidy program would be hard to estimate. It might well cost more than $5,000,000,000. The money thus expended by the administration would purchase the complete regimentation of agriculture and the right of someone in Washington to decide what people should raise for other people to eat. The efforts thus far by the Washington bureaucrats along this line have been entirely faulty and destructive. The Washington bureaucrats who continue to tangle with the farm program are causing a limited supply of food and this acts as a weapon to keep control by the Government over agriculture.

Our Government has made commitments to feed the liberated nations. This cannot be done when there is a large group in the Agriculture Department who are still under the obsession that there must be a limited supply of crops planted. It is well to remember that it was but a few months ago that the Agriculture Department formally gave up plans for limiting wheat acreage and it is also a fact that even after these plans were announced a farm organization leader protested, and the Secretary of Agriculture has never issued a denial that the Government authority would be used to prevent the raising of wheat by those who have not previously been raising it. Certainly the Government's policy in the farm areas with certain supporting food prices in preference to other crops has caused a marked shortage of certain foods.

The Department of Agriculture should issue an early program for the production of food. This program should remove all acreage limitations. It should announce a support price and a ceiling. The support price should be the floor and the lowest price the farmer is to receive. There should also be a ceiling which is the top price which might be received for that product. It should be the same as the O. P. A. ceiling. The farmer should then plan his own crops without Government interference. He can do this without the gentlemen in Washington hatching up schemes to control his production. Such schemes in the past have caused a diminishing food supply.

Let me repeat again the ideas of subsidies are totally un-American. They are contrary to our idea of free enterprise. It is Government control of production in its worst form. Crying down through the last century and a half comes those warning words of Thomas Jefferson:

> Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap the people would soon want bread.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and the special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

WHAT MISSOURI ASKS OF WILLKIE

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on September 1 of this year, nine questions were asked Mr. Willkie by the Missouri Republican Party's principal State and national officers and all of the Missouri delegates to the 1940 convention at which Mr. Willkie was nominated.

Those questions were asked Mr. Willkie in a letter, a copy of which follows:

DEAR MR. WILLKIE: The undersigned constitute all of the principal officers of the Missouri Republican Party and all the members of the Missouri delegation of the Philadelphia Convention of 1940. We were the first Middle Western delegation to give you a large vote. We believe that in those few memorable days we were instrumental in exerting some measure of influence on the delegations from other Middle Western States to join us in nominating you. We worked energetically for your election, so much so, that normally Democratic Missouri gave you as large a percentage of its vote as did normally Republican Ohio and normally Republican Pennsylvania. We have proved our friendship to you in the past. We are not unfriendly now.

We are unanimously of the opinion that in the post-war world America should seek whatever arrangements of world affairs are in the best interest of America. We are in favor of whatever international commitments promise best a peaceful future, and which will enable us to again pursue our happiness in the traditional American way of freedom under the principles and liberties guaranteed by the Constitution of our Republic.

We seek enlightenment on method. We should like to have your considered views about this world when it is again at rest. We would like to know what you mean when you say "One world."

1. Do you believe that the United States should become a member of a world supranational state? If so—

a. Would it involve any limitation upon the sovereignty of the United States?

b. Would it mean that the Army, Navy, and Air Force of the United States and its technical equipment for war are to be placed under the control of the world state?

c. Would it mean that, except for domestic police purposes the United States is to have no independent military force of its own?

2. If you favor a world state, what would you do about nations that refuse to come in?

a. Force them in by military means?

b. Treat them as outlaws by not permitting them to trade with the members of the world state?

c. What other action would you favor?

3. Do you believe in absolute freedom of international trade?

a. Will that mean that the goods and services of peoples with low living standards are to enter the United States without any restrictions designed to protect the American standard of living?

b. If you believe in restrictions, please state what they are to be.

4. Do you believe that a world monetary system should be established? If so,

a. What is to be the reserve for its currency?

b. What relationship is it to have to the American dollar?

c. How is it to be administered?

5. Do you believe in the free and unrestricted movement of peoples? If so, how do you propose to prevent the peoples from Asia and other war-torn countries from overrunning the United States?

6. Do you believe that it is desirable for America to permit flooding our country with alien individuals and alien ideas? If so, what effect do you think this would have on our particular civilization?

7. In what other respects do you envision the political and economic organization of one world?

8. Newspapers report you to have said that if the Republicans adopt a liberal platform they can win. We want to win!

What do you mean by a liberal platform? Be specific, please.

9. If by any chance you are not the Presidential nominee of the Republican Party in 1944, will you, as a good Republican, actively support the nominee chosen by the Republican Convention?

As we may desire to memoralize our representatives on the Policy Committee of the Republican National Committee, we shall be very appreciative of a reply, item by item, addressed to the chairman of our delegation, by September 10.

Sincerely yours,
GROVER W. DALTON,
Delegation Chairman,
1940 Convention,
Chairman, Missouri Republican
State Committee.

I have the consent of all the following delegates and party officers to the signature of their names to this letter:

F. William Autenrieth, twelfth district; Henry M. Carey, second district; Mack Denman, at large; T. H. B. Dunnegan, sixth district; Frank R. English, fourth district; Joe

Grandhomme, eighth district; Paul Groeschel, second district; Luke E. Hart, thirteenth district; Edmond Koeln, twelfth district; A. Kraemalmyer, eighth district; H. M. Langworthy, at large; Homer B. Mann, fifth district; Arthur McKim, fourth district; Don McVey, first district; Louis E. Miller, eleventh district; W. A. Morant, at large; Albert J. Ott, thirteenth district; W. F. Phares, third district; Edgar M. Queeny, at large; Sidney R. Redmond, eleventh district; J. W. Reese, seventh district; Charles Rendlen, first district; Edw. L. Scheufler, fifth district; Harry Scott, ninth district; Leo Simmons, seventh district; H. T. Simpson, tenth district; W. D. Smith, sixth district; A. B. Suenkel, ninth district; G. L. Zwick, third district. Charles Ferguson, State chairman in 1940; Miss Cleta Smith, State vice chairman in 1940; Barak T. Mattingly, national committeeman; Mrs. Myrrl R. Remley, national committeewoman; Mrs. Frances J. O'Meara, vice chairman, Missouri State Committee.

Upon receipt of these questions, Mr. Willkie replied that he would be glad to answer them, and any others which the signers of the letter might put to him. He added, however, that the replies would have to be "off the record."

The press and many members of the Republican Party protested to Mr. Willkie that his answers to these questions were of public interest and should not be given in a closed meeting.

Newspapers then quoted Mr. Willkie as saying: "They are not going to put Wendell Willkie on the spot," and he characterized the questions as "bearing no relationship to reality."

Later, he was quoted as saying the questions were "ridiculous" and that he would not answer them.

Still later, he announced: "I will make a public appearance and talk on a subject of my own choosing," adding that his views on the subjects covered by the questions were "well known."

Finally, subsequent to all the foregoing, he announced that he would speak "on the subjects covered by the questionnaire."

Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising that as a result of what has transpired since the questions originally were asked Mr. Willkie, there is a great deal of confusion in the public mind regarding the purpose of these questions and Mr. Willkie's shifting attitude toward them.

I know, from the queries I have received from fellow Members of this House, as well as my constituents in Missouri, that many are wondering if the Missouri Republicans who worked so diligently for Mr. Willkie during the last election are now solidly against him; or if the issues have been beclouded by Mr. Willkie himself in his rapidly changing viewpoint toward them.

It seems appropriate that I, who was one of the signers of the letter to Mr. Willkie because of my support of him at Philadelphia as a member of the Missouri delegation, should seek to clarify the position of Missouri republicanism and answer some of the uncertainties before Mr. Willkie makes his visit to Missouri. I feel that I am a proper one to do it because I spent considerable time and effort as one of his preconvention managers in enlisting interest in his behalf among the Missouri delegation to the convention, and because, in Washington, I am able to maintain a perspective that perhaps might not be possible to one who has been living in the State during the last several weeks and been subject to the many diverse comments current there.

In justice to those who signed the letter to Mr. Willkie, I know there was no desire to put him "on the spot." There was a very real desire, however, to get him "on the record" before decision could be made on his solicitation of the support of many whose names appear on that letter.

Likewise, in fairness to Mr. Willkie, I think his ultimate decision to speak publicly on the subjects covered by the questionnaire is commendable and is what he would have made in any event. Unfortunately, perhaps, in the interval while arriving at his final decision he spoke rashly in response to questions that I believe were designed to further a public understanding of the position of both Mr. Willkie and the Republican Party.

I am convinced that Mr. Willkie's final decision in any case would have been to cover the subject matter of these questions, because I believe sooner or later he would have examined his published statements and articles to see what answers he had given there, and would have found no adequate replies to any of the specific questions asked.

Now I am delighted to learn that he will speak on the subjects covered by the questionnaire. This is in accord with our previous conception of Mr. Willkie for candor and courage.

Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Willkie's views on these subjects were well known, there would have been no occasion to propound these specific questions to him by his 1940 supporters, who wrote him—and meant it—that they are not unfriendly to him now.

As will be indicated hereafter, the questions do not in any sense warrant the characterization of being "ridiculous." I think a fair examination of the facts will show they are most material and relevant. Moreover, that they bear a significant relation to Mr. Willkie's utterances and to the activities of his sponsors and advisors.

Mr. Speaker, the country craves light from its leaders and not heat in charting its course. It insists upon candor and courage and not equivocation. In these times, in the great intellectual arena of thought and debate, America must have men who are willing to stoutly assert their love for and their belief in our form of government and its institutions, and also condemn any proposal which would make us a vassal in the society of nations. America has come of age and must assume its rightful role and play its part manfully in the international tomorrow.

Our party, in 1863, struck the shackles of servitude from the hands of millions of Americans. America must now be ready to fulfill its manifest destiny and emancipate mankind from the tyranny of political, economic and racial despots.

Presumably such views as Mr. Willkie has on our post-war relationships with other nations are contained in his book, One World, which is both a pleasing travel record and a very inspiring moral philosophy.

However, I am unable to find in this book one specific recommendation as to how its philosophy can be implemented. Stassen and Hoover, on the other hand, have advanced specific proposals. Dewey has pronounced himself in favor of an alliance with Britain. I would conclude from my own rereading of One World that Mr. Willkie favors the retention of national sovereignties, because of his reference to "a new society of independent nations." I might also conclude that he favors a world state by his frequent references to a united nations and a sentence such as "The United Nations must become a common council."

Mr. Speaker, a resort to the dictionary tells us that the word "united" means "joined together to form a whole—incorporated into one." "Common council" is defined as "a legislative body." Is it a correct interpretation to assume that Mr. Willkie's post-war United Nations means the nations of the world incorporated into one with a common legislative body? Or—if that is not the proper interpretation of Mr. Willkie's meaning, are not the Missouri members of his party doing both Mr. Willkie and the country at large a service by enabling him to amplify and more clearly define his meaning?

Mr. Willkie, I note, also makes frequent references in One World to a "new society" that will arise. The established meaning of "society" is "a collected body of persons composing a community or the aggregate of such as subjects of a civil government." Is it correct, or is it not, for one to assume that such a new society contemplates that the world's people are to be an aggregate of subjects of one civil government?

It is not my idea, and I know it was not the idea of the other signers of the letter, to read unintended meanings into Mr. Willkie's utterances. Perhaps the dictionary meanings are the ones Mr. Willkie also means. Perhaps not. If they are, no one will contest his right to hold such opinions—but the fact that they are his opinions should then be on public record so that the members of his party may support or oppose him according to their own beliefs on the question of a world state.

Mr. Speaker, a clear interpretation by Mr. Willkie of these meanings is important for another reason as well. That is, because of the published attitudes of his associates in New York's Freedom House. Mr. Willkie was one of the founders of, and is now a member of the board of directors of, Freedom House, which was formed by a group which long prior to Pearl Harbor was on public record as campaigning for American intervention in the European war. It is also a matter of record that he has appeared frequently before the members of this organization.

Many of Freedom Houses' directors and members are active in Clarence Streit's Federal Union Now, which petitioned President Roosevelt to submit to

Congress the Union's plan for a supranational federal union comprising the United States and the members of the British Empire—and to which Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, France, and Finland would be admitted on equal terms as soon as they were freed from Hitler. This federal union would also admit other nations such as India, China, and Russia as soon as they had established a democratic government. All the foregoing is from publicly stated objectives of the federal union group.

The United States would occupy in such a supranational state the same relative minority position that Missouri now occupies in the United States. Even after the war, its representatives in the proposed parliament would form a minority. The proposed constitution of Streit's supranational state would give to it all military forces except national militias and police; it provides also for absolute freedom of international trade, emigration and immigration within such a state; and the sole power to coin money would rest within such a state. Again, these are publicly stated objectives of this group.

The petition from this federal union organization, urging Presidential action on its objectives, states:

> Let us begin now a world united states.

Mr. Speaker, that federal union petition would bear no great significance in connection with the questions that the Missouri members of his party have asked Mr. Willkie, if it did not carry the signature of several of Mr. Willkie's associates in Freedom House, and if it had not been signed by Russell Davenport, the talented publicist who resigned the editorship of Fortune in order to manage Mr. Willkie's last campaign, and who remains his intimate and trusted adviser.

The petition was signed also by Mr. Willkie's companion in his flight around the world, Gardner Cowles. Mr. Cowles is an active Willkie man; he is also publisher of Look magazine, in which Mr. Willkie recently opened formally his current campaign for the Republican nomination.

Furthermore, among those commonly understood to be the largest contributors to Federal Union, Inc., are the publisher of the pro-Willkie Life, Fortune, and Time, and the international banker, Mr. Thomas Lamont, long known as one of Mr. Willkie's stanchest and most liberal backers.

I am not expressing thoughts that the federal unionists themselves have not documented clearly when I say that they brand national patriotism as an anachronism in this day of the airplane. They believe it is the cause of wars. They would modify the Stars and Stripes and exchange the Declaration of Independence for a declaration of interdependence. They would be, in their own words, "citizens of the world first, and secondly, American citizens." They hold, with Mr. Justice Roberts of the Supreme Court, that "for the sake of world peace we must be willing to surrender our national sovereignty." Their objective is not a mere league of independent nations or an international alliance; they want to begin now a world united states. They are antinationalists—in a word, they are globalists.

But, Mr. Speaker, it would be straining words and unfair to accuse this group, which contains so many distinguished men, of renegade treason, which is the ultimate of antinationalism. That would be as unfair as it was for Mr. Willkie to accuse those who asked him the questions of September 1 of isolationism.

Treason is more the word for the antinationalism of Freedom House than is isolationist the word for any of the men or women who declared in the Missouri letter to Mr. Willkie that they are—

> unanimously of the opinion that in the postwar world America should seek whatever arrangements of world affairs are in the best interest of America. We are in favor of whatever international commitments promise best a peaceful future and which will enable us to again pursue our happiness in the traditional American way of freedom under the principles and liberties guaranteed by the Constitution of our Republic.

If this is isolationism in Mr. Willkie's mind, it would appear that he favors going much further. Would a Federal Union alone satisfy him?

It is not my desire, Mr. Speaker, to give unintended interpretation to Mr. Willkie's philosophy, or to impute to him the philosophy and purposes of his associates in Freedom House and those of his backers and advisers with Federal Union, Inc.

However, I am reminded of the truism that "a man is judged by the company he keeps."

Mr. Willkie's book and his speeches fail to define his position on a subject where the position of so many of his close associates is amply clear, and—to many Americans—obviously inimical to our country's national interests.

As a candidate for the Republican nomination, Mr. Willkie owes it to his 1940 supporters in Missouri and the Nation to state his position clearly and definitely.

That is the one—the only—reason why the questions were addressed to him.

The eighth of those questions begins:

> Newspapers report you to have said that if the Republican Party adopts a liberal platform it can win.

Then the question asks:

> What do you mean by "a liberal platform"?

As I have always understood the meaning of a true liberal, he is one who advocates freedom of the individual from government restraint in his political, spiritual, and economic life. Early true liberals fought for and secured for us the repeal of many statutes that restrained individual freedom. By slow and progressive processes they secured freedom of speech, freedom for the individual to worship in his own way, freedom of the press, and individual economic freedom. Woodrow Wilson phrased it this way:

> The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it.

The true liberal philosophy was never better expressed than in our own Declaration of Independence and in the organic law of our land, the Constitution of the United States, and its Bill of Rights. Thomas Jefferson was the world's greatest and most effective exponent of true liberalism, and it was to uphold his principles that the Republican Party was founded. At no previous time in world history and in no part of the globe were these principles ever so operative as in the United States. They are responsible for America's unique spiritual and material progress—the phenomenon that is beating the Axis.

Before his nomination 4 years ago, Mr. Willkie personified the result of this liberalism—American individualism. In the best American tradition he had pulled himself up by his own bootstraps to the presidency of a large corporation. He declared that "business is the power and glory of America." He had waged a long and successful fight against incipient state socialism, as exemplified by the T. V. A. He inveighed against other Government agencies that were encroaching here and there upon individual freedom. He called it, and properly, "big government."

He sought refuge in the Republican Party because his own had departed from true liberalism, as confirmed in his official campaign biography of 1940, which said:

> He had his training in the Democratic Party, which he opposes today, because he feels that this party departed from its ideals of pro-Americanism as expounded by Jefferson.

Also, in reporting a speech at San Francisco in March 1940 the biography says:

> Willkie gave his concrete idea of a liberal: "A liberal," he said, "is a man who believes first in liberty."

In recent years within our country a different philosophy has misappropriated to itself the word "liberal." It poses as altruistic and patriotic. It advocates the constant increase of governmental power. Now it preaches that if we relinquish our individual freedom to a benevolent state, want and fear will vanish, not only in America but everywhere. It believes that through continued maintenance during peace of the present controls over prices, production and employment, and with the privilege to spend billions and trillions, a myriad of commissars and petty despots can bring about a better world. We have seen some of this stupid, rigid, and extravagant regimentation in action.

This is not the true liberalism advocated by Mr. Willkie in 1940. Rather, it is a neoliberalism. Its ultimate phase is Caesarism—a totalitarian state like Russian communism—wherein all individual rights to liberty disappear, except those which are bestowed or permitted at the pleasure of a despot.

In the deep pink vanguard of this neoliberalism is the weekly New Republic. In the eyes of the neoliberal editors of the New Republic, three of whom are listed by the Dies committee as members of Communist front organizations, the New Deal could do no wrong except that it never went fast enough nor far enough. Their wistful gaze was seemingly directed

toward Moscow. They have been constant and morbid critics of true liberalism, and agree petulantly with another proponent of their philosophy, Stuart Chase, when he declares that one nation should not have "all the fun of making the world over."

From the pen of the editor of the left wing Michigan Chronicle comes this bewildering statement:

I am a New Deal Democrat with my left eye on Wendell Willkie and my right eye on HENRY WALLACE. And I insist that I am not cross-eyed.

The New Republic of August 23, contains an article from the pen of one of its neoliberal editors, George Soule, author of A Planned Society and The Coming American Revolution.

Did the liberals who opposed Wendell Willkie in 1940 misjudge him?

Soule asks.

Since the war began, his public record has, in their eyes, been brilliant. Not merely has he gone far ahead of his own party in his attitude toward international affairs and preparations for peace; he has at crucial points said the right thing when Mr. Roosevelt himself either failed to say it or by the action of his administration seemed to be going in the wrong direction.

Mr. Soule heaps encomiums on Mr. Willkie for his failure to utter one word of criticism against the administration's domestic policies. Mr. Soule, at least, assumes that silence signifies assent. Mr. Speaker, I hope and I believe that Mr. Soule has misinterpreted Mr. Willkie. How could one seek to be a candidate against a philosophy with which he is in agreement? True liberalism and neoliberalism are the antithesis of each other and no political alchemy or legerdemain can ever bridge the two.

That is why we of Missouri asked Mr. Willkie: "What do you mean by a liberal platform? Be specific, please." Neither in any of Mr. Willkie's previous writings, nor in his latest published pronouncements in Look, do I find an answer to this question that is adequate in its definition of a liberal platform or specific in stating how the planks in such a platform are to be converted into realities.

Answers to those nine questions in that Missouri letter of September 1 concern a man's fundamental philosophy, Mr. Speaker. There is no question there of timing. One's basic, personal philosophy should not change with the phases of the moon nor from year to year, nor with the approach of an election, else it becomes merely a philosophy of opportunism. Nothing can be gained by anyone by concealment or equivocation. Because of the possibility it may profoundly have an effect not only on our lives but on the lives of generations yet unborn as well, Mr. Willkie's philosophy should be a matter of public knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the purpose of any responsible member of this party in Missouri to embarrass Mr. Willkie. We have long admired him. Our delegation did much to bring about his nomination; we fought hard for his election. It is possible that he may be the Republican candidate again, in which case we will work for his election. Therefore, we do not seek to do anything which, in the event of his nomination, would harm his chances of election. Indeed, it is our belief that if Mr. Willkie answers our questions frankly and makes his true position known publicly, it will enhance his chances of the Republican nomination. It is the very confusion resulting from conflicting interpretations of his position which is his greatest handicap.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that these questions were not asked any other potential candidate for the nomination because of three reasons. Firstly, neither this nor any other similar chain of circumstances surrounds any other man. Secondly, no other potential candidate or leading member of the Republican Party has urged publicly that his party take a definite position in favor of a world outlook in preference to national interests, without at the same time giving his own formula for accomplishment of such a goal. On the contrary, specific proposals have been advanced by Stassen, Hoover, and Dewey, each with definite consideration for the interests of the United States. Lastly, no other potential candidate has solicited the active support of many of the signers of the letter which was sent to Mr. Willkie, as will be attested by the Republican State chairman, Mr. Grover Dalton.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a summary of why Missouri sent its questions to Mr. Willkie. It is a summary of what Missouri asks of Mr. Willkie today. I have, I think, been objective in my statement of the facts—and I do not believe they are facts that will bring issue from any man or woman who is sincerely interested in the preservation of a free, strong, and independent America among the future family of nations. America at this time demands a leader of high courage, vision, and purpose. It must have a leader who possesses a big mind and big heart, sufficiently large to comprehend the desires of millions who want to keep our form of government and make it strong and great, while at the same time playing our part manfully among the nations of the world. America now is thinking in terms of what is best for America. Mr. Churchill is thinking, acting, and speaking in terms of what is best for England. He does not favor the liquidation of the Empire. Mr. Stalin is thinking, acting, and planning in terms of what is best for Russia. We must be mindful of what is best for America. The country demands this. Translated into simple terms—it is but patriotism in performance. To propose less would be treason. But we cannot and we will not shirk our part and our duty in preparing a better post-war world.

I believe Mr. Willkie will speak in Missouri on the subjects covered by the questionnaire of September 1—and I believe he will do so fully, definitely, and publicly. I am yet unable to say that Mr. Willkie entertains beliefs similar or identical to those held by his associates of Freedom House or by the members of Federal Union, Inc. If I am mistaken in my assumption that he does not support such convictions, then at least I would be the last to deny him his right to such opinions or his public expression. If, on the other hand, his beliefs are at variance with those of his associates in these organizations and of the editors of the New Republic, I know that many millions of Americans who supported him in 1940 would welcome a clear statement to that effect. In either case, the nine Missouri questions offer Mr. Willkie the opportunity to state his true position, whatever it may be, without equivocation. I am confident that he will avail himself of that opportunity.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman spoke about certain platforms. May I suggest that the Democratic platform of 1940 was a splendid platform, but it is still new. It has never been used. I am wondering whether we can put much faith in any platforms or the statements of people before Presidential campaigns.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. They have not used up all the 1928 Communist platform yet.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow at the conclusion of other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

INVESTIGATION OF LEND-LEASE OPERATION

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the time has come to tell the full story of lend-lease. This Congress cannot sit idly by in view of insistent public demand that all of the facts in connection with this program be revealed. We have not been frank in telling the public just what has transpired in the past, or just what is contemplated in the future; fact is, we have put the soft pedal on these activities. A reading of the testimony at the time of the last hearings shows much off-the-record conversation from which it might be assumed that testimony of a confidential nature was given.

Not only is there a demand for a closer scrutiny of lend-lease operations by the public, but last week from the other side of this Capitol came statements that the entire program be examined and appraised with a view to protecting our national interest. We can no longer

acquiesce in a "hush-hush" approach to a program so important to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it has been charged that lend-lease supplies sent by this country to Great Britain are being distributed by the British as their own products, breeding good will for them and laying the basis for future trade. Further, it is charged that funds under this program are used to build expensive air bases with no right for us to use them after the war. And again, it is alleged that some of our Allies use our petroleum supplies while they hoard their own. It is further charged that this Nation's course to date has created among foreign nations the expectation of gifts and favors under lend-lease far beyond our capacity to confer. And that is the very thought, Mr. Speaker, that is uppermost in the minds of our people today—the impression that we have promised to give away our very substance under this program.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that this Congress clear the atmosphere on this important matter. To that end, I have today introduced a resolution asking for the appointment of a special committee to make a full and complete investigation of all operations carried out by the various departments and agencies of Government under the so-called lend-lease law. It aims to determine, among other things:

First. The extent of goods and services, civil and military supplied to date, in dollars and cents, and the recipients thereof;

Second. The extent of goods and services, civil and military, received by the United States, in dollars and cents, and from whom received;

Third. Whether the transactions constitute a debt against the recipients or outright gifts;

Fourth. Whether such operations are carried out in an efficient and economic manner and with due regard to the best interests and welfare of the citizens of the United States; and

Fifth. Whether such operations have in every case promoted the defense of the United States.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I want to congratulate the gentleman for introducing his resolution because it is beginning to dawn upon the American people that on his first visit to America Mr. Churchill took our coat back to England, on his second visit he took our pants, on the third visit he took our underwear, and before we get out of this mess he will skin us out of our hide.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this country has been and is on a spending spree unparalleled in its history, and the appropriations for lend-lease constitute a large part of it. The original appropriation in March 1941 was $7,000,000,000. Since then sixty-five billion has been appropriated, and obligations to date are approximately $25,000,000,000. It is apparent that taxes and more taxes, from the rich and from the poor, are required. Constituents realize that spending means taxing and they want to know about the effect of this huge debt upon our economy. Few of them believe in the philosophy that a large public debt is a national asset. In fact, they fully realize that debt without the ability to pay leads to national bankruptcy. So today we owe it to those who fight and those who labor to protect them against insolvency. We have heard a great deal about the "four freedoms," one of which is freedom from fear. It has been suggested that we add a fifth freedom, to wit, "freedom from insolvency." Until ways and means are devised to insure against that possibility there can be no real freedom from fear.

Mr. Speaker, we shall soon be considering an appropriation for lend-lease, and I submit that the hearings authorized by my resolution should be held before that time so that this House can have the benefit of the findings and conclusions of the committee. It is my opinion that unless the people of our country are given all the facts about the lend-lease program the writing of the peace may be in jeopardy, at least our relationship with our allies may be seriously impaired. The people are insisting upon the truth and nothing but the truth at this time.

I respectfully ask that my resolution receive favorable consideration by the proper committee, and that it be presented to the House as soon as possible for action.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, being one of two Democrats on the floor, I will yield to the gentleman gladly.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 307, Rept. No. 745), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct an investigation and study of such matters related to present and probable future conditions and developments in and affecting air navigation and domestic and foreign air commerce as it may deem advisable.

The committee, as a whole or by subcommittee, shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations for legislation as it may deem advisable.

The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to conduct such investigation and study at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, as it deems necessary; except that in conducting such investigation and study outside the United States or at any place in the United States away from the seat of government such committee shall act by a subcommittee of not more than 11 members.

WOULD THEY BETRAY THE AMERICAN FIGHTING MAN?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Stalin insists that every Russian shall fight for the security, the preservation, of the United States of Soviet Republics. He is acknowledged the world over as the one man who will brook no interference with the interests of his country. Those who from without would destroy the sovereignty of his empire are battled to the death. Those within who fail to adopt and to carry out the slogan, Russia First, are shot or sent to Siberia.

With determination which no one can doubt, Churchill frankly announces that he did not become "the King's first minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire." It is his fixed purpose that where flies the British flag, there it shall remain. When this war is over and the peace has been made, it will be found that the Union Jack, the flag of the British Empire, waves over more territory, a greater area of the earth's surface, than ever before.

Because of his loyalty to the British Empire; because he can see no interests but the interest of the British Empire; because he has been able, by flattery and cajolery, to induce other peoples and other nations to serve Britain's interests; because he has no other thought than the preservation and the extension of the British Empire, Churchill has been acclaimed as one of the world's greatest statesmen.

His most recent major service to the Empire culminated with our entry into the war and that, he said, "is what I have dreamed of, aimed at, and worked for and now it has come to pass."

Stalin and Churchill, because each thinks of the interests of no country other than his own; because the whole interest of each lies in the advancement of his own homeland; because neither will do anything to aid any other nation if it interferes with the prosperity and advancement of his own people, are praised the wide world over, acclaimed by all people as the world's two greatest patriots.

But here in America those who place love of country, faith in her institutions, confidence in her people, make her independence and her continued existence their first thought, are branded as creators of disunity, charged with a lack of loyalty.

Why is it that those acts, those efforts for the preservation of our Government, of our methods, of our prosperity and our happiness, which, when exerted by other nationals in the interests of their governments, are so highly praised, should be here condemned?

And who is it that here condemns those who insist, as do Stalin and Churchill, that one's own country comes first?

What weakness of mind, what lack of good sense and judgment, what doubt

of the courage of our fighting men, what want of confidence in our Constitution and our form of government, what inferiority complex, what lack of faith in our people and the righteousness of their purpose impels those who loudly and continuously denounce those who proudly, fearlessly pledge loyalty first to America?

Only since the coming of the spenders of other people's money and sustenance, only since the arrival of the wasters, only since the supremacy of the little dictators and tyrants of the O. P. A. and its blood brothers, only since the ascendancy of the power of the crackpots, the fuzzy-wuzzy thinkers, the overrunning of the Nation's Capital by those who, fed and clothed by our Government, seek to remake America, have the patriotic, loyal Americans, those who believe in the America of today, who have faith in the America of tomorrow, had leveled at them such vile, false charges as are now appearing in print.

One purpose of these false charges is to intimidate those who insist that loyalty to our country, protection of our national interests and integrity should be our first concern.

Another objective is to destroy the system of private enterprise which renders the individual secure in his home life, in his civil affairs, in his means and manner of earning a livelihood and establishing security for his old age; enables him to be free and independent of a tyrannical, dictatorial government.

Still another purpose is to destroy us as a nation, make us but a part of an international state.

That intimidation of those who oppose the New Deal—more recently, the fourth term—brought about by the fear of the Government, is one of the means of the administration to perpetuate itself, is shown by the arbitrary and unconstitutional rules, orders, and directives issued and enforced by an army of snoopers and petty tyrants.

On every hand throughout this broad land of ours, the heretofore free and independent citizen is met by a Government agent armed with a so-called order from some executive department. That order all too often is an arbitrary one, serves no good purpose; on the contrary, renders production, the prosecution of the war effort, more difficult.

Proof that the efforts of the administration are destroying our way of life can be found at every crossroad throughout the land, where some individual has had his means of livelihood lessened by an administrative directive.

That the purpose is to surrender our independence and make us a part of a superworld government, which our taxpayers will be required to support, to which and at whose command the sons, the husbands, the daughters of our people will be sent to police and maintain order, was shown by the propaganda on which appeared the name of Secretary of the Interior Ickes and Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts, which came to the desks of Senators and Congressmen late in January of 1942.

That plan, in no unmistakable terms, called for the surrender of our independence, the substitution in lieu thereof of a declaration of interdependence upon other nations of the world. It called for the hauling down of the Stars and Stripes and for the replacement of that flag by the mongrel flag of the united nations of the world.

Ever since Franklin D. Roosevelt became obsessed with the idea that he was the indispensable man, that surrounding him were supermen and master minds, the taxpayer's money has been used to further his political interests.

His stock in trade has been the use of the taxpayer's money to grant special privileges to one group after another. He has protected other groups in their lawlessness and disregard of constitutional provisions and, throughout it all, he has attempted to purge those members of his own party who disagreed with his policies; and his political adversaries in other parties have been consistently smeared and charged with disloyalty.

For absurdity, inaccuracy, and misjudgment of American sentiment and thinking, as well as for false and vicious propaganda, a recent article in the Washington Post by William L. Shirer was typical.

It is in line with the policy of the Washington Post, whose editor has unceasingly condemned and challenged the motives, the loyalty, and the patriotism of all those who have ventured to place the interests of America above those of any individual, race, people, or nation.

There are those who, as in the days of old, worship false idols. Then the god might be a graven image. Today it may be either love of gold, worship at the feet of international financiers, or love of pomp and show; desire to bask in the smile of some prince or king or queen; to be knighted, made a member of the British royalty.

There are those who, having obtained freedom of speech, freedom from fear, freedom from want, and freedom of religious worship here in this country and under our form of government, now disavow all loyalty to the country, which gives them the opportunity to eat, prosper, and be happy; who seek to surrender our sovereignty, make us a subject nation.

They are not America firsters, they are America seconders, or, more accurately, America lasters. They think of their country only after and when they have thought of and promoted the interests of other countries, other peoples.

Because the article by Shirer is so typical of the absurd, stupid—yes, vicious—propaganda put out by the anti-Americans, let us take a glance at his story.

It is evident that the article was written before the return and report of the five Senators who toured the war front. Evidently Mr. Shirer was too tired to rewrite it to make it conform to the fact after their report.

Their report substantiates in every particular the charges of those who are smeared because they place America first.

That report shows beyond argument that Great Britain is extending its commercial empire at our expense. It shows that Russia continues to deny us bases in the east from which we could get at Japan.

It is apparent from that report that our Nation is being stripped of its natural resources for the benefit of the British. Especially is this true with reference to oil.

Mr. Shirer headed his article, "Isolationist strategy, a warning in time."

We all agree that war is wicked and wasteful. He and those who agree with him then jump to the assumption that war can be prevented if we join with certain nations and fight a war to preserve the peace whenever some race or nation may refuse to obey the orders of the international group of which we are a member.

The fact that throughout history world alliances, combinations of nations to preserve peace, have not prevented war is blandly ignored.

The experience of the ages is brushed aside, and egotistically it is proclaimed that we, with Great Britain, Russia, and China, can accomplish that which no other group of nations has ever been able to bring about.

The America Seconders would perform an international marriage ceremony, giving us at least three husbands or wives, when two of the three, Britain and Russia, through their spokesmen, Churchill and Stalin, have announced clearly, and in all apparent sincerity, that no international marriage shall interfere with the interest of either Great Britain or Russia.

Because Mr. Shirer expresses so well the thought of those who would surrender our sovereignty, let me quote. He writes:

> As a people, I think we have two weak spots in this regard. We do not like the idea of giving up an iota of our sovereignty to any world organization. And we have an almost grotesque fear of being done in by slick allies, especially the British and the Russians.

Read that again.

So dislike of giving up an iota of our sovereignty is a weakness, is it? Suggest that thought to Stalin or to Churchill. And the "fear of being done in by slick allies, especially the British and the Russians" is grotesque, is it, Mr. Shirer?

When we remember how, after the last war, to the winning of which we contributed so much; when we recall how our men went in when Britain was on the verge of defeat, and at the cost of their lives saved France and Britain from defeat and how after the war was over, in spite of our contributions of men and of money, we were branded as a Shylock, is there any reason why we should not expect to again be "done in"? When we recall that we were told that lend-lease would be repaid to us in money or in kind and that it was but a loan and not a gift, and now we learn that no reimbursement is to be made, are we not being "done in"?

When we know, as now we do, that materials contributed by us to Britain are being reexported by her to other countries as gifts from her, not from us, are we not being "done in"? When we learn, as we have learned, that our money and our materials which our people are denying themselves are being used to

build harbors and wharves and stock houses and factories and airfields in almost every land throughout the world and that those facilities will be used by our trade competitors after the war is over, while we are denied their use, are we not being "done in"?

So today the American manufacturers, the American workingman, who support this administration and ask a fourth term for F. D. R., will awaken to the realization that the factories which we are building in foreign lands will be operated by cheap foreign labor and that the job of the American worker will be done in a foreign land, while he seeks work on a Government made job. The export trade of the manufacturer will be lost to the factory operating abroad.

Done in, yes we are being done in and sold out by those who lack confidence in the American people, in the American form of government, in our Constitution.

Shirer writes that the people are at the mercy of a minority, which he says may by "legislative trickery and connivery" defeat the will of the people. Then he called attention to the arguments which the so-called minority has used. He writes:

> Listen, for example, to Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, of Michigan. The Fulbright resolution, he said in the debate, "means but one thing, that we repeal the Declaration of Independence * * * if we agree in setting up such international machinery we are, to all intents and purposes, surrendering a portion of our national sovereignty * * * we shall not be masters of the situation * * * we may find ourselves, to our sorrow, in the position of an Australia New Zealand, or Canada—a royal province, back once more under the Union Jack instead of the Stars and Stripes * * * Is there any reason * * * why we shall be ashamed of the proposition that we are for America first? * * * Our forefathers brought forth the Declaration of Independence."

Well may I ask Mr. Shirer, what is wrong with that argument? It is largely a statement of fact. The propaganda put out by World Fellowship and Federal Union and the material which came to the desks of Senators and Congressmen on the 27th of January 1942, and the proposition which was endorsed by Harold Ickes and by Justice Owen J. Roberts called for the surrender of our independence, a declaration of an interdependence. It called for the hauling down of our flag and the substitution of another flag. That program demanded that we surrender a part of our sovereignty; that we join with other nations and abide by the joint decree of those nations.

Now I ask, Mr. Shirer, and any and all of those who agree with you on this move to enter into an international supergovernment, what is wrong with the proposition that we stand for America first? In view of the fact that Stalin is for Russia, Churchill for Britain first, tell me just why I should not be for America first?

Continuing, Mr. Shirer writes:

> Today, Mr. Hoffman continues, "Great Britain is extending her commercial empire while we furnish the sinews of war and aid in financing her international trade."

Does anyone with a knowledge of the facts today doubt that Great Britain is extending her commercial empire, while we furnish the sinews of war and aid in financing her international trade?

If Mr. Shirer does not know that fact, let him read the statements of the three Democratic Senators, of the two Republican Senators, who just returned from a trip to the battle front.

Then he refers to those who oppose a super world government, of which we should be but a part. The article gives this subhead, "They forget the Yankee trader," and under it is this paragraph:

> The sequel is that if we get into an international organization, we shall certainly lose our shirt if not our pants. It seems to this writer that if these gentlemen had ever seen the shrewd Yankee trader dealing with the "slick" Europeans, they would lose their weird and hardly justifiable inferiority complex. Or is it merely a good demagogic talking point which many Americans, our background being what it is, easily fall for?

We do not need to get into the permanent international organization to be certain that we are not only losing our shirt but our pants, and may I add, Mr. Shirer, if we continue, we will lose our shoes and socks, and we will be lucky if our toenails are not pulled out.

Are you and your fellow advocates of America last, so ignorant of the fact that you do not know that we are already on the paying end of the war? Take a trip out into the country and see the farmer, who, for example, is unable to buy a wrench or a pair of pliers, necessities on every farm, and then finds in a catalog published in England that British manufacturers have both for export.

We know now from the reports of the returning Senators that we are losing our pants as well as our shirts in our international deals. We know now that our farmers are going without much of the machinery which is needed in the war effort. While that machinery—yes; and complete factories—is exported to other countries.

The Yankee trader to whom Mr. Shirer refers is but a myth. If there is one in evidence today, he will be found down in the Smithsonian. He has been succeeded by a Harry Hopkins, by a HENRY WALLACE, each big-hearted and generous with other people's money. Hopkins, if he had his way, would supervise at the expense of the American worker, farmer, and businessman, a world-wide glorified W. P. A. Not only would he rake leaves, put shoes on and feed everyone, but he would set the Hottentot and the Bushman to sweeping up the waves of the ocean with paper brooms and pay them with American dollars.

WALLACE would be a little more practical. He would give, he first thought, 1 quart, but later reduced it to a pint, a pint of milk to everyone everywhere. He hasn't yet determined whether he would send it in glass or paper containers, or whether, accompanying each pint to the tropical countries, an electrical refrigerator with a power plant to keep it cool would go.

Writes Shirer:

> Representative HAMILTON FISH, who was in favor of the resolution, spoke in the same vein. "The time has come," said he, "for some of us at least to take an American view of our foreign policies." That will be the propaganda line. America First!

So you think, Mr. Shirer, that the time has not come when some of us should take an American view of our foreign policy. So you believe that this is not the time when we should pledge our loyalty first to America? Would you also do away with the pledge to the flag? You think, do you, that it is not now time to save the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence for the soldiers who will return? Apparently you have plenty of company—others who would sell America short.

It is quite evident from the arguments made in the press and elsewhere that there are those who would remake, as HENRY WALLACE advocates, America. There are those who hope as Tugwell said, that we can destroy the American system of business and that the process may not be too bloody.

Let me suggest to Mr. Shirer and those who think with him that they go out into the highways and the byways, into the small cities, the towns, the crossroads, and there suggest to the businessmen, to the farmers, and to the workers, who have sacrificed to aid in the prosecution of the war; who have bought bonds; who are struggling along as best they may to do their utmost in support of our fighting men, that America does not come first; that we are fighting the war for Britain or for Russia or for China.

Let him suggest that we should not save the Constitution, that we should not adhere to the Declaration of Independence; that the time has not arrived for us to take an American view of our foreign policy. Do that, Mr. Shirer, or any of you who believe as he apparently does, and then come back, if you can, and tell us of the reaction.

One more line from Mr. Shirer. He quotes WILLIAM LEMKE as having said during the debate:

> "Uncle Sam is not going to be a perpetual Santa Claus. They (our returning troops) will never substitute a mongrel flag for the Stars and Stripes."

And then Shirer writes this:

> Those will be the beautiful words, nicely wrapped up for the American people in red, white and blue to disguise their enormous emptiness and meaninglessness.

So you believe, do you, Mr. Shirer, that the statement that our returning fighting men will never substitute a mongrel flag for the Stars and Stripes is empty and meaningless?

Now, you tell that to the boys who are about to take off in a bomber, knowing full well that they may go down in flaming death or be cast adrift to die of hunger or of thirst on a blistering ocean.

You go down, Mr. Shirer, to the boys who are fighting not only the Japs but loneliness and sickness in the South Sea Islands, and tell them that America, the homeland, does not come first. You tell them that the statement that the Stars and Stripes shall not be hauled down does not mean anything.

You tell the war-weary boys in Africa, in Sicily, in Italy, that the Stars and Stripes under which they fight is but a rag and is to be replaced by the flag of some international organization.

You go, Mr. Shirer, to the mothers and the fathers, the wives and the sweethearts, of the men who are fighting this war, and tell them that their sons and husbands and brothers are not fighting for home, for fireside, for America.

Go, if you will, Mr. Shirer, into the homes which have received that little slip of paper telling that a loved one has been lost in battle or is missing in action, and take with you, instead of the Stars and Stripes, which the House last week voted should be given to the parents of every man who lost his life in this war, the mongrel flag referred to by the gentleman from North Dakota, WILLIAM LEMKE.

To Mr. Shirer and to all those who think so little of our liberty, our independence, our freedom, our prosperity, and the happiness which was ours before this war, that they would subordinate our interests to the interests of other nations, to a group of international bankers and power politicians, who, after each war, have financed the rearmament of nations bent on war, let me say that there are millions of Americans who believe first in America, who do not propose to be intimidated and that, if need demands, they will fight here at home to maintain our independence and our sovereignty.

Millions of Americans, when they recite the pledge to the flag, mean it. They are for America first. They believe in the America of today; they believe in the America of tomorrow and they intend that, down through the ages, shall go an America willing in the future as in the past to help every unfortunate people, unfortunate nation, but an America free and independent.

EXHIBIT A

ISOLATIONIST STRATEGY, A WARNING IN TIME

(By William L. Shirer)

The American people are pretty much agreed, as the House debate and vote on the Fulbright resolution the other day showed, that unless this Republic takes a hand in preserving the peace, this sorry world will be in for another war 20 to 30 years hence and the sons of the veterans of this war, the grandsons of the veterans of the last one, will once more have to give up the decent life of peace to die bloodily on a battlefield.

And yet the curious propaganda of a small but vocal group of our politicos and their press lords plus what Representative RAY J. MADDEN of Indiana, in describing Senator LODGE'S fight against this league, called "legislative trickery and connivery," may yet combine to rob us and our children of the chance to live for more than a dozen or two years in the dignity and decency of peace.

Few of my generation are aware, and our elders probably have forgotten, that Senator James E. Watson, the floor leader in the Senate fight against the league, admitted privately at the time, 80 percent of the American people were for the league.

There seems little doubt that an equal percentage today favors our participation in some sort of international machinery with the power to maintain the peace. But if 80 percent of the people could be double-crossed and fooled after the last war, it would be naive to believe that it cannot happen again.

WE ARE AT MERCY OF THE MINORITY

If there is "legislative trickery and connivery" this time, there is little that you and I can do about it. We are, after all, at the mercy of a minority in the Senate, as we were in 1919–20.

Against the flood of propaganda that will surely flow, we are not so helpless. We know already the line it will take. The remarkable debate on the Fulbright resolution in the House showed us pretty well how the spokesmen of the bitter-end isolationists will talk. It demonstrated that their propaganda will be cunningly directed at the most vulnerable points in the mental armor of our American citizenry.

As a people, I think, we have two weak spots in this regard. We do not like the idea of giving up an iota of our sovereignty to any world organization. And we have an almost grotesque fear of being done in by slick allies, especially the British and the Russians.

It was on these points mainly that the opponents of the Fulbright resolution concentrated their peculiar wrath.

Since the American press cannot—or at least does not—report adequately the debates in Congress and not one citizen in a hundred thousand reads that revealing journal, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which does report them down to the last word it might be enlightening to investigate a little more fully than has been done in the arguments of those who opposed Mr. FULBRIGHT'S resolution calling upon American participation in "appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain just and lasting peace."

For they are the gentlemen who will be in the vanguard of the fight to "save the Republic" and "preserve the Constitution" by staying out of "foreign entanglements" when the time comes to try to organize the peace.

WHAT CLARE HOFFMAN HAS TO SAY

Listen, for example, to Representative CLARE HOFFMAN or Michigan. The Fulbright resolution, he said in the debate, 'means but one thing, that we repeal the Declaration of Independence * * * if we agree in setting up such international machinery we are, to all intents and purposes, surrendering a portion of our national sovereignty * * * we shall not be masters of the situation * * * we may find ourselves to our sorrow, in the position of an Australia, New Zealand, or Canada—a royal province, back once more under the Union Jack instead of the Stars and Stripes * * * Is there any reason * * * why we should be ashamed of the proposition that we are for America first? * * * Our forefathers brought forth the Declaration of Independence," etc.

Britain becomes the real villain to Mr. HOFFMAN as well as to most of the other speakers against the resolution.

"Today," Mr. HOFFMAN continues, "Great Britain is extending her commercial empire while we furnish the sinews of war and aid in financing her international trade."

But Representative HOFFMAN is perhaps mild on the subject compared to the Congresswoman from Illinois, Miss JESSIE SUMNER. She told the Congress that "* * * England is now hated from one end of the world to the other * * * English * * * want to finish this war richer than they were when they got into it—at American expense. In addition they want us to give up our independence by joining an alliance which will throw us into every war they fight. They are going too far."

WHO AFTER ALL STARTED THE WAR?

It seemed strange to this reporter, pouring through the voluminous pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to find that some speakers in the debate still implied that the United States—and not Germany and Japan—was responsible for this country entering the war.

Thus Representative HOFFMAN: "Well did we know, when we sent munitions of war through belligerent waters to one of the warring nations, that war would follow. * * *" Representative WALTER E. BREHM, of Ohio: "* * * If we had been strong internally and had not been so anxious to furnish the munitions of war to countries which we knew were preparing for war, just for the sake of amassing fortunes in this country, we would not be at war today."

This may sound like bilge—but one need not be a prophet to predict that we will hear much more of the like when the discussions of peace come up.

And there will be cries of "danger" and "revolution." Representative SUMNER of Illinois opened her speech by saying: "I consider the Fulbright resolution the most dangerous bill ever presented to an American Congress."

Representative FREDERICK C. SMITH, of Ohio, thought that "there are too many unknown factors at this juncture to safely undertake the formulation of so far-reaching and revolutionary a policy as this would involve."

Throughout the speeches of the extreme isolationists was threaded the curious argument—of which we shall certainly hear a great deal more—that while Winston Churchill and Joseph Stalin are always looking out for the interests of their own countries first, our leaders are bashful about looking out for American interests first.

THEY FORGET THE YANKEE TRADER

The sequel is that if we get into an international organization we shall certainly lose our shirt if not our pants. It seems to this writer that if these gentlemen had ever seen the shrewd Yankee trader dealing with the "slick" Europeans, they would lose their weird and hardly justifiable infericrity complex. Or is it merely a good demagogic talking point which many Americans, our background being what it is, easily fall for?

Representative ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, of Illinois, though supporting the Fulbright resolution, had his suspicions on this subject. He asked: "Has not the time arrived when we should begin to beware of the kind of man who is 'a steady patriot of the world alone, the friend of every country but his own'?"

Representative JOHN M. ROBSION, of Kentucky, who also supported the resolution, said: "We knew that those in charge of the present administration are strongly inclined toward internationalism. Instead of placing the welfare of our own country first, many other countries are first in their thinking."

Representative HAMILTON FISH, who was in favor of the resolution, spoke in the same vein. "The time has come," said he, "for some of us at least to take an American view of our foreign policies."

That will be the propaganda line. America First! Save the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence! Don't sell America out to the perfidious British or the Red Bolsheviks! In the immortal words of Representative WILLIAM LEMKE, "Uncle Sam is not going to be a perpetual Santa Claus. * * * They (our returning troops) will never substitute a mongrel flag for the Stars and Stripes."

Those will be the beautiful words, nicely wrapped up for the American people in red, white, and blue to disguise their enormous emptiness and meaninglessness. Those will be the words to watch, the propaganda catchwords that will try to trick us out of another honest attempt to make peace endure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZIMMERMAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California

[Mr. POULSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE OIL SITUATION

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, since the return of the five Senators who have made a round-the-world trip of the war zones, we have heard considerable discussion about the fact that the United States is supplying over 65 percent of the oil for the war, and as a result is dwindling its oil reserves to a very dangerous position. We only own and control 20 percent of the known oil reserve of the world. At the same time they have stated that our ally, Great Britain, has access to the great Persian oil fields and is not contributing its share. Inasmuch as this subject has been brought to the forefront, I consider it a very opportune time to make some further inquiries into this general oil situation, and I address my questions publicly to Brig. Gen. Walter Pyron and Capt. A. F. Carter, representing the Navy on what is known as the Army-Navy Petroleum Board. With the impending cut in gasoline usage on the west coast due to the shifting of the war emphasis to the Pacific area, it becomes more imperative than ever that we should explore all known sources of oil within our control.

The question I ask bluntly is this: Why has the Board asked for and received appropriations running in excess of $100,000,000 for the purpose of exploiting, or what is commonly known as wildcatting and prospecting in the most remote and inaccessible part of northern Canada not only in behalf of Canada but in behalf of private enterprise known as the Imperial Oil Co.? They have done this wildcatting with the provision that in the event further oil is discovered we will still pay for it at the regular market price and we have no rights to it whatever, and all title and interest is retained by the Canadian Government and the Imperial Oil Co. Now, this wildcatting with American money for the benefit of our allies would not be so questionable were it not for the fact that the prospecting of the area suggested has been restricted to an established but to date limited productive portion of a comparatively remote oil area lying wholly outside of American territory, while the economically attractive United States naval reserve within 400 miles of the industrial center of Alaska, Fairbanks, northern terminal of the military highway, remains untested.

If our Government had been as enterprising and had used the same initiative in exploring and developing our Alaskan naval reserve as it had in establishing the air route and Alaska military highway, the results could have been at least as much and probably more than attained in the Canadian venture.

For those who are not acquainted with this Canadian venture, I would like to discuss some of the high lights. This is known as the Fort Norman wells. The Norman wells area is situated about 1,000 miles north of Edmonton, Alberta. It was necessary to build a road to reach this oil area because the original transportation was over the most nonpassable muskeg terrain known in the Alaskan regions. A pipe line also had to be built from the Norman wells to White Horse on the military highway.

After years of development, plus the recent vigorous efforts, the Norman wells have proven to be an inadequate source of oil for the prevailing needs of our northern theater of operations. According to reports turned in to the Navy by well-informed geologists, this territory has never compared with our own Alaskan oil reserve.

The question I ask this Army-Navy Petroleum Board is why it has not spent some of our money exploiting and wildcatting in our own oil reserve where we will retain all interest and title if and when we discover oil?

The reports of different and competent oil experts show that this Alaskan territory has favorable geologic, climatic, and geographic factors. Furthermore, it is within our boundaries. It is favorable for present military necessity and there are chances of obtaining a greater volume of oil than is at present produced in Canadian territory or can be anticipated from this district.

Northwestern Alaska located as it is in the path of the new short air route to Asia definitely becomes a desirable spot for oil development, and then realizing that it has those requisites certainly should command the attention and respect of our leaders to the extent that exploration should be made in this territory. The objection previously used was that it was inaccessible for want of transportation, but with the development of the airplane and air transportation this argument has been removed. On the affirmative side is the fact that the development of air transportation has definitely increased the need for petroleum reserves in this identical region.

I want to again refer you to a letter placed in the RECORD on February 26 from a man with a record in the oil game equal to the best, and who has sufficient world-wide experience in oil. I also refer you to a report turned in to the Navy Department and the Office of the Budget. At this point, I also want to again point out that the Japanese are fully aware of these possibilities, and furthermore much of this information can be found in our libraries in the Geological Surveys. I am submitting herewith a memorandum which I have received from an official source:

Subject: Importance of United States Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 to the present and post-war economic development of northwestern Alaska.

United States Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, situated in the northwestern part of Alaska, is an area roughly rectangular in shape with its long axis trending east-west and extending from Icy Cape in the west to the mouth of the Colville River in the east.

After a detailed reconnaissance geologic study of the reserve over a period of 4 years, evidence of the most positive and critical nature discovered was that of the live seepages of naphthalene base oil issuing at Cape Simpson and Dease Inlet near Barrow. The results of this exploration also cast considerable light on the stratigraphic aspect and structure of the terrain underlying the reserve. The various data showed evidence that the rocks contain petroleum, presumably at intervals throughout a thickness of at least 8,000 feet.

The areal extent of the reserve is 35,000 square miles, of which at least one-fourth (southern mountainous part) is decidedly not of the type usually associated with oil areas of economic interest. This unattractive part of the reserve, one of severe folding with a narrow zone of intrusives, is adjacent to the Brooks Range thrust fault.

It may also be considered neutralized by a more attractive area of approximately 3,000 square miles lying immediately to the west and contiguous with the western boundary of the reserve, and another large area on the trend east between the Colville and Canning Rivers.

Adhering strictly to the terminology applied to petroliferous regions, this 35,000-square-mile area does not qualify, as yet, to carry the appellation "petroleum reserve." Only the results of an adequate test with the drilling of at least one carefully spotted location will tell whether the area in question is truly a petroleum reserve.

In either domestic or foreign oil development, it is an established fact that with an attractive-looking, but untested region of this character, the practice employed by the major oil companies is preliminary structure searching, with a subsequent test of the most favorable looking structure. This task may be accomplished by a systematic prospecting campaign in search of a structural trap. With the known structural trends of the area and key reference horizons discovered by previous study, a group of four 1-inch rotocore drills would readily accomplish the job. Three or four north-south sections of shallow holes in the region adjacent, and to the west of the seepage area, should supply sufficient information with which to spot the initial test of the reserve. In this region of gentle unbroken folds and a sequence of relatively conformable strata, geophysical prospecting is considered unnecessary.

The structure-prospecting program, which invariably precedes the oil test, would require that the light portable rotocore equipment and its operating crews be hauled to the area by air transport. This prospecting operation should be consummated and a well location made by the time the big-hole drilling equipment arrives by water transport. The latter equipment would have to be shipped by shallow draft barge via Bering Strait to Wainwright or Barrow during the months of July and August.

During the present crisis, and that impending in the Dutch Harbor-western Aleutian area, with such a limited supply of oil (Fort Norman), and that at a relatively great distance from the north Pacific, Aleutians, Bering Sea, and the Kotzebue Sound-Lisburne regions, it is necessary for the Navy to test and develop immediately any promising-looking oil area with a consequent less severe problem of logistics.

On the basis of comparison with neighboring oil-bearing areas, for example, the McKenzie delta region and Fort Norman to the east, the Cold Bay-Aleutian region, and the Katalla area, the No. 4 reserve, although still untested, is outstanding for the various reasons as enumerated below:

1. The entire production of the Fort Norman area does not exceed at capacity 3,000 barrels of oil a day. This volume is from a system of some 20 wells located in an area well over 500 miles from tidewater. Normally

production of such volume is considered of minor importance and, except under stress of great necessity, would never warrant the construction of a 500-mile pipe line over extremely mountainous terrain.

Conversely, if an initial test of reserve No. 4 near Barrow or Wainwright proved an oil area of even moderate importance, a pipe line could be readily laid along the Chip-John-Ray Valley route via Livengood to Fairbanks, most important industrial and farming district in central Alaska. Fairbanks, with its intensive mining activities, has outlet to the Pacific by two major routes, the Alaskan Railroad to Seward and the Richardson Highway to Valdez, and a third to the Bering Sea by river craft via the Yukon. Moreover, should reserve No. 4 produce with only mediocre volume, the fact that the fields are at tidewater with 3 months' shipping seasen is of tremendous importance, both economically and strategically. In this respect reserve No. 4 has an alternative in the case of sabotage or bombing of the pipe line, while the Norman-Whitehorse line has none. With shallow draft barges, during a 3-month period, a fleet of 30 small shallow draft tanker barges could establish a formidable reserve at various strategic localities between the Diomede Islands and the Aleutians. The latter condition appears worthy of further investigation.

No other areas of promising oil possibilities are known to exist north of the Turner Valley, Alberta fields.

2. Aleutian-Kodiak area: Due to the presence of volcanics, nearby intrusives, severe folding, faulting, and related disturbed zones, this area is not considered favorable to accumulation of oil in commercial quantities. Although seepage evidence is present, adequate tests of the region have all been of a negative nature.

3. Katalla: Oil occurs in fractured zones rather than in true structure with normal sand conditions. Commercial production in this field is of nominal importance.

Since the very event for which U. S. Naval Reserve No. 4 was established has now arrived—war in the Pacific—it is readily apparent that necessary steps should be taken immediately to prospect and test the most promising looking areas in Reserve No. 4.

The structural prospecting and drilling of one, preferably two, test wells of adequate depth (at least 6,000 feet) could be accomplished with a gross expenditure not to exceed $1,000,000.

Operational conditions in general are not nearly so severe as those of the Shelby-Cutbank region of Montana, nor those of Turner Valley, Alberta; the maximum temperature range at Barrow is from 50° to 90°. There are neither mountains nor glaciers, little snow, and less than 6 inches annual precipitation.

Development of Reserve No. 4 would, by solving the fuel problem in Alaska, unquestionably be one of the most conspicuous events of our post-war planning.

The surface terrain overlying the presumed oil series from Cape Lisburne to the Canning River, east of Barrow, also contains one of the richest workable series of high rank bituminous coal on the North American Continent. There are no major bituminous coal deposits on the Pacific slope. All coal distributed for Bering Sea (Nome) and lower Yukon consumption is imported at great cost from the bituminous fields of Colorado and Wyoming. Fuel oil and gasoline for the Seward Peninsula gold dredging and related mining operations is transported 3,000 miles from the California fields. Naval Reserve No. 4 is less than 500 miles distant from Nome by water route.

If Reserve No. 4 were tested and found to contain petroleum in commercial quantities, the Navy could have the option of producing and refining their oil, or, as is their practice elsewhere, of turning it over to capable private oil producers and refiners. Once the initial test has been made and financial risk eliminated, private interests would welcome the opportunity to develop, produce, and supply Alaskan industries with Alaskan oil.

To summarize, it appears that production of oil in this region would not only be of considerable strategic importance, but would also greatly stimulate the opening of economically potent northwestern and central Alaska to post-war exploitation and commerce. It is well known that basic metals in continental United States are rapidly being depleted. Alaska, a natural reservavoir of most of these metals, has, because of the prohibitive price of fuel (oil and steam coal), remained largely undeveloped. However, if Reserve No. 4 is tested and develops into a producing oil area, the mining of basic metals in Alaska would unquestionably become of great importance to the internal economy of Alaska.

If oil is developed in Naval Reserve No. 4, the effect on the industrial development of Alaska would be comprehensible only to one who is familiar with the industrial possibilities of northwestern Alaska and the great Yukon Basin.

Mr. Speaker, in line with the necessity for additional oil, it does seem that the board should at least give serious immediate consideration to the exploitation and testing of the Alaskan naval reserve area. This is a subject for investigation by the proper committees in this House. At the same time investigation should be made of corporate connections of the Imperial Oil Co.

TAXATION AND APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 6 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, the membership of both branches of the Congress are very much disturbed because of the recommendation of the Treasury Department asking for an enormous increase in the levying of taxes on the citizenship of this country for the next fiscal year—a program which, if the Congress should adopt, will be absolutely confiscatory. In fact, if any increase should be levied by the Congress, it will have practically the same result.

The old adage is "the power to tax is the power to destroy." Every nation that launched itself on a spending and wasteful program to the extent it was necessary to levy taxes out of line and not commensurate with the income of the public, created revolutions and chaos. History alone reveals their once existence.

This Nation started that program 10 years ago; it has reached the stage today under the guise of the successful prosecution of the conflict we are now engaged in that the amounts asked for and appropriated by the Congress are such stupendous sums that it is impossible for the minds of the ordinary person to visualize.

We have appropriated already for the fiscal year July 1, 1943, to July 1, 1944, more than four times the entire cost of World War No. 1. In fact, in the past 3 years we have appropriated and authorized over $325,000,000,000—an inconceivable sum of money. The total debt of the allies of our country, many of which have been engaged in World War No. 2 for the past 4 years, only equals about the amount we appropriated in 1 year—$125,000,000,000.

We are appropriating for this year alone an amount that exceeds the entire Axis debt by at least $20,000,000,000.

It is impossible for 130,000,000 people to withstand this continued avalanche of a drain on their daily earnings. If we continue an expenditure of moneys for the next 3 or 4 years as we have in the past few years, and the signs of the times point to similar requests, our national debt will be four hundred to five hundred billion dollars, which will be at least 10 to 40 percent more than our entire national wealth.

Mr. Speaker, I am just calling the House's attention to this trend, with a view that its membership and especially the Appropriations Committee, will heed the Stop, look, and listen sign and begin to investigate just what is being done by the administration with these enormous sums that the Congress has blindly given them to spend.

I am of the opinion that the amount of money already appropriated this year, if judiciously expended and the waste eliminated, will last every department insofar as our war effort is concerned in carrying on for at least another 2 years.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGEHEE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman favor an inquiry as to what has been done with lend-lease money, with the view of curtailing further expenditure of that money, or seeing that it goes into proper channels?

Mr. McGEHEE. That is one of the purposes of my remarks today, to see to it that the Appropriations Committee of this House will scrutinize every expenditure; not only that but investigate what lend-lease money has been spent for already.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is along the lines suggested by our colleague from New York [Mr. TABER] and our colleague from Ohio [Mr. JONES]?

Mr. McGEHEE. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGEHEE. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I imagine the gentleman always felt as I did, that before lend-lease went into effect we should have had some arrangement with other countries and we should have been able to tell just exactly what they were going to do for us.

Mr. McGEHEE. My thought was when the first lend-lease bill was placed before this Congress, that it should have been in the form of loans to our Allied Governments rather than a lend-lease program. If they never repaid it, then we would know exactly what it was loaned to them for, and we could keep up with it then. As it is, my information is that there is being sent to our Allied countries every conceivable article that

they desire; that those articles are being purchased under lend-lease to be used after the war is over, thereby filling up their countries with the articles that our people are deprived of today in their necessary avocations.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGEHEE. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman from Mississippi is making a very interesting statement and a very thought-provoking one. I had occasion to examine the assessed valuation of the United States not long ago and I find it is about $209,000,000,000. The figure that the gentleman gives us will be double the assessed valuation of the entire country at the end of this war. Does not the gentleman think that we are engaging in a wrong program when we are looking for subsidization of nearly every activity of the American people? I am thinking of a bill in another Chamber in this Capitol which will be taken up this week, looking for $300,000,000 annually to subsidize education in this country. They want subsidies for the libraries of the country. Does not the gentleman think that is the wrong trend?

Mr. McGEHEE. I would rather not express myself at this moment on that broad question.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGEHEE. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I congratulate the gentleman on the statement he has made. I would like to point out something that is generally misunderstood in connection with the transfer to England of our lend-lease supplies, that that is not the end of the proposition. They have also increased the price of the things transferred, and have collected the original price plus a profit from the people to whom they have transferred. This has not been developed by the six Senators who have come back from foreign countries.

Mr. McGEHEE. If our Committee on Appropriations will go thoroughly into this matter there will be things revealed to the Congress and the people of the United States that will be most astounding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I think the Congress should at once repeal our lend-lease program and whatever sums that are necessary to furnish our allies should be loaned to them and the expenditure of it confined to those things necessary for the prosecution of the war. We are today spending under the lend-lease approximately one and a half billion dollars a month, or at the rate of eighteen to twenty billion a year, and all the war strategists predict the war will last 2 or 3 years more, hence, you can readily see what an enormous sum this will amount to when already we have authorized and appropriated sixty billion for this one purpose.

We are told that much of this money is being spent and utilized by our Allied Nations for goods that the people of this country are being deprived of, when they are so necessary to carry on their proper avocations, or necessary equipment in their personal lives, which would not be done if the funds were loaned to them. Remember membership, in my opinion, none of these funds will ever be repaid.

The Appropriations Committee should scrutinize most closely the expenditures by the different agencies in the prosecution of the war. I am sure each Member has the information of the enormous surplus of certain materials that are being hoarded throughout the world for rehabilitation program that we should not participate in as a Santa Claus bringing gifts. There are those who are in key positions of our Government who advocate this world Utopia and daily in the furtherance of their plans, after the Congress appropriates the moneys, are carrying them out, thereby placing this burden on the 130,000,000 people of this country, when there are a billion souls involved, who certainly must have their part and share in world rehabilitation rather than enslave the people of these great United States.

The five Senators who have just made a global trip to all the battle fronts of the world, have only revealed those things that we knew already, but they have brought first-hand information and it is time for this Congress to wake up, and at least when they appropriate money again or levy more taxes on the people, know how the funds are going to be spent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed encouraging to find Members of the House and of the other body in Congress giving some scrutiny at least to the Lend-Lease Administration. On May 21, when we had the last $6,000,000,000 appropriation before the Congress of the United States, I stood in the Well of this House and pleaded with the membership to scrutinize that appropriation. I thought then, and I think now, that every cent of that $6,000,000,000 was for the purpose of maintaining the civilian economy of the United Nations, and particularly Great Britain. I do not think, even if our hearts urged us to do it, that 135,000,000 people can maintain the internal economy of 500,000,000 people and more of the British Empire. I do not think that our 135,000,000 people can maintain the internal economy of 457,000,000 Chinese and 170,000,000 Soviets. In other words, United States cannot maintain the internal economy for 1,127,000,000 people and fight a global war successfully without breaking up internally. You do not find any evidence in the hearings or in the lend-lease reports that we are maintaining the civilian economies of the United Nations. The weasle-worded lend-lease reports hide all of this international W. P. A. program that the Lend-Lease Administration has started and Congress, in its innocence and trust, has been taken in. One splendid example of that is the lend-lease in reverse propaganda.

The lend-lease reports and the lend-lease idealists highlight the fact that lend-lease works both ways. Without citing the tonnages of our lend-lease, the lend-lease reports say that from June 1, 1942, to April 1, 1943. Great Britain shipped us 1,643,000 ship tons as lend-lease in reverse. When you are through reading lend-lease reports, you gain the impression that lend-lease in reverse is inexorably tied to our lend-lease program so we could not quit lend-leasing if we wanted to. However, when you examine the facts and discover the size of our shipments, the lend-lease in reverse theory is exploded like a bubble. From May 1, 1942, to May 1, 1943, we shipped 20,000,000 tons for our own Army to do the same thing that lend-lease does in addition to furnishing our own troops to man and expend them for the same purposes as lend-lease, to wit: To maintain the territorial integrity of our allies.

At the same time the Navy was shipping supplies to its forces at the rate of 8,538,051 long tons per year. This does not include our lend-lease tonnages but are merely the tonnages to supply and equip our own fighting forces.

While I do not have the lend-lease tonnages for the same period, for the first 6 months in this year lend-lease tonnages were 11,000,000 long tons. This would make a total tonnage of Army, Navy, and lend-lease at the rate of 50,000,000 tons a year. This would indicate that lend-lease to our allies and the supplies to our Army and Navy which will do the same immediate job—that is, maintaining the territorial integrity of our allies—represents a highway of 50 lanes flowing from the United States and 1 lane flowing to the United States as lend-lease in reverse.

Australia, Belgium, Fighting France, New Zealand, and Great Britain are the only nations having lend-lease in reverse agreements signed with us. According to my best estimates, the lend-lease highway that the political idealists talk about presents a picture of a broad highway of 51 lanes—50 in the direction of our allies and not more than 2 in our direction.

The United States, with a population of 135,000,000 people, is keeping 50 lanes full of supplies going to the fifty-odd battle fronts of the world, while the British Empire, with 500,000,000 people are maintaining 1 to 2 lanes of lend-lease in reverse.

Lend-lease working both ways by ship tonnages is an exploded theory. From sources very close to Lend-Lease Administration and from responsible officials, I learned that the cash value of lend-lease in reverse from all nations amounted to approximately $800,000,000

in December 1942. This was $60,000,000 less than Congress has given to the President for his secret war emergency funds. On a dollar valuation as of the first of this year, lend-lease in reverse is a mere bagatelle.

There is another way that lend-lease is working both ways. In England we are spending $203,000,000 more for food shipments to England than England is paying in subsidies to freeze the price of food. The Lend-Lease Administration program of maintaining the civilian economies of the United Nations in the British case, operates against inflation, while in South America it tends to drive them into inflation. It is estimated that the United States, acting through many agencies of the Government, will spend $2,000,000,000 in South America alone. We are making enormous expenditures for strategic materials, building highways through their swamp lands, and establishing rubber plantations, in addition to our industrialization program. The Army and Navy are spending money for permanent facilities there and charging them up to the Army and Navy appropriations, rather than lend-lease.

All these activities in South America for which we will pay the South American Republics in cash $2,000,000,000, is driving them into inflation. The latest developments of Nelson Rockefeller's office, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, has been to advise the South American republics how to escape inflation.

The Lend Lease Act originally was intended for aid to those countries who were not able to buy equipment of war from us because they lacked credits or international exchange from which to purchase them from us.

The American republics present the absolute opposite picture, however; every one of them are listed among the 46 nations entitled to lend-lease. The entire lend-lease nations are as follows:

Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fighting France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Turkey, United Kingdom, U. S. S. R., Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

The Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1944, Public, No. 92, approved June 26, 1943, contains approximately $552,000,000 justified for the United Nations. Of this amount, $383,000,000 is justified under the appropriation "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships," $12,000,000, or 3 percent, of which is for the American republics. On this basis, 3 percent of $552,000,000, or approximately $16,000,000 would be allotted to the American republics. The Army has a similar lend-lease program in which South America participates.

Lend-Lease Administration is not geared to the war; its transfers to other nations and its exports are in inverse proportion to the United States' victories. Most significantly it works both ways—the first way by preventing inflation in England by shipments of food and other civilian commodities whose values are higher than the subsidies paid by England to maintain her price levels, and the second way, lend-lease adds to the $2,000,000,000 we are spending in cash in the American republics and hastening their threat of inflation.

Lend-lease appropriations to date are $65,726,650,000, which is $4,000,000,000 more than Great Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand have appropriated for their entire war effort from the beginning of hostilities—from the year 1939, the outbreak of the war. The appropriations by years for Great Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand are as follows:

	Great Britain	Canada	Australia	New Zealand
1939	$5,355,917,748	$100,000,000	$42,664,811	$3,240,000
1940	10,800,160,592	835,000,000	223,103,658	26,112,825
1941	14,636,019,480	1,435,000,000	2,002,600,000	116,626,239
1942	21,564,019,480	3,000,000,000	[1] 1,035,803,960	211,681,142
Total	52,356,117,300	5,370,000,000	3,303,677,430	357,660,207

[1] This figure also includes 1943.

The amount that we are furnishing to the other nations is underestimated because many people have not realized the change in conception of aid to our allies since Pearl Harbor. Oftentimes the newspapers discuss lend-lease in terms of round figures of $25,000,000,000. This is merely the amount that has been appropriated to the President of the United States and is a portion of the fund that is principally used to maintain the civilian economies of our allies and is under the direct supervision of Edward Stettinius, Administrator of Lend Lease Administration.

Since the war, the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission have sought what they called defense aid limitations' on the funds appropriated in their own supply bills. The Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, and departments other than War have a total limitation on their appropriations of $41,116,650,000. In addition to that, the Navy Department may lease ships without any dollar value limitation. The total appropriations in cash that are available for aid to our allies is $65,700,000,000. As of December 31, 1942, the transfer of lend-lease goods and services was as follows:

United Kingdom	$3,959,950,000
Australia, New Zealand, India, and other British Territories, Egypt	2,393,193,000
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	1,532,230,000
China	156,738,000
Other	210,622,000
Total	8,252,733,000

At that time I charged that lend-lease material was moving to territories in inverse proportion to the victories of the United Nations on the 50-odd battle fronts of the world.

The May 25, 1943, report of Lend-Lease Administrator Stettinius says:

> In view of the global nature of the war, the name of the government to which goods are transferred does not necessarily indicate the battle front on which the goods will be used * * * hence, in considering aid by countries, the export figures give a better picture of the part played by lend-lease in various fronts of the war than do the figures on transfers. Table II shows the monthly total of lend-lease exports by countries.

I now quote from the cumulative total of table II, and I submit that the exports are still to countries in inverse proportion to the victories of the United Nations. The totals are as follows:

United Kingdom	$3,116,000,000
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	1,822,000,000
Africa and Middle East	1,000,000,000
China, India, Australia, New Zealand	875,000,000
Other	292,000,000

But lend-lease's own figures indicate the United Kingdom still gets one and seven-tenths times as much as Russia, and the latest figures for China alone show that England received over 700 times as much as China.

Lend-Lease Administration is not geared to the war. The enormous equipment and supplies for our troops in the various theaters of the war, for whom no one gets an accounting, of necessity are responsible for the gains we are making in the South Pacific, the victory of north Africa, Pantelleria, and Sicily. Wherever our American troops are fighting and throwing the weight of munitions and supplies purchased with the $330,000,000,000 of appropriations of our Army and Navy in those places we are winning victories.

Neither lend-lease transfers nor exports show a direct relationship to the victories won by the United Nations.

The enormous sums transferred or exported to the United Kingdom are explained in part by the answer of Mr. Stettinius to one of 68 questions I submitted to him May 5. I quote the question:

> 39. In the December 31 report, at pages 36 and 37, there is a category in the table entitled "Australia, New Zealand, India, other British territories, Egypt" for expenditures of $2,393,193,000. Will you please name the countries, territories, possessions, islands, or other political subdivisions represented by "other British territories" in this table?

Mr. Stettinius answered as follows:

> In the table to which you refer the following are included under the category "Australia, New Zealand, India, other British territories, Egypt":
>
> Aden, Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, Australia, Bahrein, Bahamas, Barbados, Bermuda, British East Africa, British Honduras, British Malaya, British Oceania, British South Africa, Burma, Canada,[1] Ceylon, Cyprus, Egypt, Falk-

[1] Lend-lease goods included in the table which have been transferred to Canada were for incorporation in articles furnished by Canada to the United Kingdom or to replace goods previously purchased by Canada and incorporated in such articles.

land Islands, Gambia and Sierra Leone, Gibraltar, Gold Coast, Hong Kong, India, Jamaica, Leeward Islands, Malta and Gozo, Mauritius, Newfoundland and Labrador, New Guinea, New Zealand, Nigeria, Palestine and Transiajordan, Rhodesia, Trinidad and Tobago, Union of South Africa, Windward Islands, British forces in Iran and Iraq.

The United States is making a tremendous effort in the global war. Our armed forces are giving a splendid account of themselves wherever they have met the enemy. We will need every friend we can gain at the peace table and should have every ounce of good will earned by the sacrifice and devotion of our armed forces and civilian population on the fighting front, on the financial front, and the moral and spiritual front. We certainly should earn the good will of every island, nation, or territory who receive benefits from the United States. The admission of Mr. Stettinius that goods are transferred to these 56 nations by the British Empire shows conclusively that someone else is gaining the good will to which we are rightfully entitled. From Aden through the alphabet to the Windward Islands, the United States should deal with each one of these countries direct to earn friends for America. Lend-lease is losing them for us.

The hearings have never disclosed any of the material that the Senators now bring back to you. I must confess that this House was not impressed with information I gave you on May 21 and which the Senators have now confirmed. Perhaps you had more confidence in the statements made by the Administrator of Lend-Lease.

Here is a typical example of a question submitted to Mr. Stettinius by a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee:

Mr. SCHIFFLER. * * * Are any of the things that have been administered under lend-lease and shipped abroad being utilized or are they being used for commercial purposes by any of the nations receiving them?

Mr. STETTINIUS. Not unless they are filling an essential service in connection with the prosecution of the war. There might be a small number of replacement parts, spark plugs, that are finding their way into the civilian life of a country, but only if that is creating necessary transportation to munitions workers or for doctors or for air-raid wardens or something of the kind. I can assure you no spark plugs and no tires are being used for purposes of the civilian population in lend-lease countries that are not an essential purpose connected with the prosecution of the war.

Mr. Speaker, that answer is a falsehood, and if not known by Mr. Stettinius it certainly is no recommendation for him as Under Secretary of State. As a matter of fact, we ship all of the oil that the Navy can get in tankers for allocation to the north African theater of war. From the oil delivered to Africa, the Army and Navy make their requests and the balance is turned over to the country for consumption in private commercial channels. The government collects the money and enhances its treasury to that extent. In the British case, they retransfer our oil, collect the money from the transferee country, and stick the money in their treasury, in addition to earning the good will. This I told you on May 21.

This explains why lend-lease allocations, transfers, and deliveries have been made to countries in inverse proportion to where our victories are won, as I warned you on March 10. There is great clamor now to hear the Senators in executive session, in off-the-record occasions. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I maintain that our officials in the Lend-Lease Administration and in other Government agencies and even the President, himself, should deal with this Congress above the boards. We should not have to wait until our toil, sweat, and tears are dissipated for the internal economy of our allies before we can get the truth confirmed by Senators.

Now, at this late hour, after we have appropriated $65,500,000,000, after the Senators have made a 40,000-mile trip around the globe, Congress begins to look into it. But it was our responsibility before we voted the money to limit its uses to military items. Within the next 2 or 3 days I am going to introduce a bill to recover back into the Federal Treasury money that is scheduled for nonmilitary items, gifts, and services. I will present a bill to abolish the Lend-Lease Administration and limit aid to our allies to military items.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Ohio need have no regrets about the waste of this money. I recall very distinctly when, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, not only on the floor of the House, but in the lobbies as well, he protested most vigorously against what he saw coming and prophesied what would happen, and what he prophesied has happened and it has been working out just as he predicted, and I remember how the gentleman from Ohio was criticized very severely by other Members because he objected to the program of lend-lease when he was advocating that the money should be spent by the Army and the Navy for equipping our forces, and should not be used and expended under Harry Hopkins and others to create a sort of a world-wide W. P. A.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I want to call your attention to the fact that when I submitted 68 questions to Mr. Stettinius about lend-lease there arose a great deal of criticism on and off the floor against your colleague. The answers to those questions were not given to any Member of Congress until the majority leader, in the heat of debate, said he would get the answers to me. Two months later I got the answers to the questions. And, to this date, it has not begun to permeate the country how big is the job of getting lend-lease facts. It is a job that requires personnel and the hard work of every individual Member of Congress, in the interest of our country. Certainly, it is entirely too big to be located in the files of one Member of Congress and analyzed by a few for the membership of Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, the gentleman will join with me in praying to the good Lord, that since the Republicans alone cannot do it, we hope that we will be joined in this effort by the Democrats.

Mr. JONES. I sincerely do.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has rendered a valuable service throughout the months in sincere effort, both as a Member of the House and as a member of the Appropriations Committee, and I would like to ask him this question: Why is it that the majority leadership on the Appropriations Committee usually brings in a bill that provides funds not only for the regular establishments, but ties these lend-lease funds in the same bill so that the Members of Congress, if we are not satisfied with the showing that the committee has made, cannot vote against the funds so provided without voting against the entire bill? Why is that always done?

Mr. JONES. I was inclined to make the same criticism, but it is a criticism that cannot now be made. This same House by an overwhelming majority—there were only five votes against—voted for this last $6,000,000,000 appropriation for Lend-Lease Administration. It was a bill for Lend-Lease Administration and Lend-Lease Administration alone. It did not provide money for the army or the navy of our allies; it was purely for the civilian economy of the nations of the world and that was the sole question that was put to us on May 21, 1943.

What was the House's attitude toward disclosures similar to those now made by the Senators? Instead of a reaction to get at the facts, instead of listening to warnings of abuse by Lend-Lease Administration, you will remember several Members took the floor and accused me of making a personal attack upon the Lease-Lend Administrator. The House clearly missed the boat.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not only that but the gentleman was accused of hindering the war effort, of being disloyal and unpatriotic. The gentleman told them that some of the money would be wasted but he had no idea, I believe, that the expenses of Eleanor's trip and Willkie's trip throughout the world were going to be financed with the taxpayers' money.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 755. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, so as to give protection to persons in military service, and their dependents, as to certain mortgages.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 47 minutes) the House

adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 12, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

The Committee on Pensions will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 12, 1943, at 10 a. m.

At that time consideration will be given to the following bills:

H. R. 2350. A bill to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents.

H. R. 2784. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, to certain maimed soldiers, to certain widows, minor children, and helpless children of such soldiers and sailors, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1926.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, October 12, 1943, for consideration of H. R. 2909 and H. R. 3306.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 12, 1943, at 10 a. m.

At that time consideration will be given to the following bills:

H. R. 3257. A bill to amend subtitle—insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The purposes of the bill is to affirm and clarify the authority of the W. S. A. to agree to a waiver of the statute of limitations in connection with claims arising from insurance agreements in case of missing vessels, in order to provide for prompt settlement of both marine risks and war risks involved.

H. R. 3258. A bill to prevent double recovery on claims under section 1 (a) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to seamen employed by the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to limit the possibility of double or overlapping recovery on account of death or injury of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the W. S. A. The possibility of such overlapping recovery arises in cases of seamen who are entitled to sue under the law of the United States in case of death or injury and may also be entitled to sue under foreign law on account of the same casualty.

H. R. 3259. A bill to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to exclude from consideration for the purposes of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, services of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the W. S. A. on foreign-flag vessels or contracted for and performed wholly outside the United States, so that the coverage for such benefits for seamen employees of the W. S. A. shall be in line with the coverage in case of similar services by seamen employed by private shipping operators.

H. R. 3260. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for requisition or purchase of vessels owned by subsidiaries of American corporations.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the requisition or purchase under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, of vessels owned by American concerns through foreign subsidiaries but which are not owned by United States citizens within the terms of the Merchant Marine Act and which are not idle foreign vessels within the terms of the act of June 6, 1941.—Public, No. 101, Seventy-seventh Congress.

H. R. 3261. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is, by amending Public Law 44, Seventy-eighth Congress, to authorize the return of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less which are owned by the United States under the procedure of Public Law 44 for the return to private ownership of vessels to which the United States has title which are no longer needed in the war effort.

H. R. 3262. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to expressly authorize the waiver of recovery of seamen's insurance payments by the W. S. A. particularly in cases where insurance has been paid to beneficiaries on the assumption that the missing seamen were dead, but later are found to be alive. The bill follows a similar provision with respect to recovery of benefits paid by the Veterans' Administration.

H. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The purpose of the resolution is to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy similar to that provided for the United States Coast Guard Academy.

H. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities.

The purpose of the resolution is to authorize the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration to pay cash awards for suggestions received from employees to increase efficiency or improve the functioning of the agencies.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 3334, to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold a hearing on H. R. 2994, Wednesday, October 13, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, 416 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

831. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayments to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

832. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Investigation and Research, transmitting its estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

833. A letter from the Administrative Officer, Office for Emergency Management, President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, quarterly estimate of personnel requirements covering the quarter ending December 31, 1943, of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

834. A letter from E. G. Allen, rear admiral, United States Navy, Director of Budget and Reports, transmitting report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of service, with special qualifications therefor, of each person commissioned from civilian life in the Navy from July 30, 1943, to September 29, 1943, and in the Marine Corps and Coast Guard from August 1, 1943, to September 30, 1943; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

835. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting two proposed provisions affecting existing appropriations of the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1944 (H. Doc. No. 334); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

836. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the appropriation for the Office of Defense Transportation, Office for Emergency Management, fiscal year 1944 (H. Doc. No. 335); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

837. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of the information which has been submitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for his use in determining the number of employees required by the Department of State during the second quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, part 2, minority views on H. R. 3070. A bill to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act, to establish quctas, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 732). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1113. An act to amend section 11 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 737). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1132. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, so as to provide for the payment of a uniform gratuity to certain officers recalled to active duty; without amendment (Rept. No. 738). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1170. An act authorizing the conveyance to the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, of a portion of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 739). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAAS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 2976. A bill to grant military rank to certain members of the Navy Nurse Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 740). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 3223. A bill to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service; with amendment (Rept. No. 741). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DREWRY: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 3224. A bill to establish the grades of commissioned warrant officer and warrant officer in the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 742). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAAS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 3225. A bill to amend the act of May 27, 1908, as amended, authorizing settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps; with amendment (Rept. No. 743). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 3230. A bill to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942; with amendment (Rept. No. 744). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 2924. A bill to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada; to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 746). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 3377. A bill to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from $40 to $50 per month, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 747). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 3176. A bill to regulate the furnishing of artificial limbs or other appliances to retired officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard and to certain civilian employees of the military and naval forces of the Regular Establishment; with amendment (Rept. No. 748). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 3356. A bill to provide for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service-incurred disability and to widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 749). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. S. 964. An act to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation; without amendment (Rept. No. 750). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 3418. A bill to provide for promotion of certain American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 3419. A bill to continue the pay of all persons serving in the armed forces of the United States for 1 year after the termination of the present conflict; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 3420. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 3421. A bill to amend section 408 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, relating to consolidations, mergers, and acquisitions of control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 3422. A bill to increase the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy allowed for Delegates in Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3423. A bill to increase the number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy allowed for Delegates in Congress; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 3424. A bill to authorize payments in lieu of taxes to States and political subdivisions thereof in which real property has been acquired by the United States for military purposes, Indian lands, wildlife refuges, national forests, and national parks; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HARNESS of Indiana:

H. R. 3425. A bill redefining sea duty and duty beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska in the case of residents of Territories and possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 3426. A bill to clarify and define the constitutional rights of retired personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3427. A bill to provide dispensary treatment and hospitalization in Army and Navy hospitals for retired enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 3428. A bill to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 743; 48 U. S. C., secs. 440, 441, 442); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 3429. A bill to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution to establish a balanced nondefense National Budget; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution to welcome the people of Italy to the family of liberated nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 316. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate operations under an act to promote the defense of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 317. Resolution to provide for expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 316; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BUTLER:

H. Res. 318. Resolution to investigate the cause for the numerous fatal accidents in the military flying forces of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 319. Resolution inviting Senators RUSSELL, CHANDLER, MEAD, LODGE, and BREWSTER to address the House of Representatives in executive session; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF:

H. Res. 320. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to investigate the price paid and received by and the profits of wholesalers and other handlers of food; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 3430. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hazel Stutte; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H. R. 3431. A bill for the relief of the Home Insurance Co. of New York; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 3432. A bill for the relief of Thomas E. Schacher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3433. A bill for the relief of Isa H. Yunker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TIBBOTT:

H. R. 3434. A bill for the relief of Joseph Mrak; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2763. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. O. G. Harmon and others of Mountain Grove and Wright County, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2764. By Mr. FISH: Petition of Mrs. H. Peterson, of Newburgh, N. Y., and 33 other residents of that city urging the early consideration and favorable vote on the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) in order to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the present war, to reduce absenteeism, increase production, and eliminate sources of disorder and physical disability which are hampering our war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2765. Also, petition of Mrs. William M. Millen and 34 residents of Swan Lake and Sullivan County, N. Y., appealing for the enactment of House bill 2082, and contending that by its enactment untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved, and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2766. Also, petition of Florence B. Mallory, of Pine Bush, Orange County, N. Y., and 39 residents of Pine Bush, N. Y., requesting Congress to pass House bill 2082, introduced by Representative JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, in order to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by the prohibition of the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination or demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2767. Also, petition of Alfred B. Heiser, of Beacon, N. Y., and 34 other residents of Dutchess County, N. Y., urging early consideration and a favorable vote on the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) in order to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war, to reduce absenteeism, increase production, and eliminate sources of disorder and physical disability which are hampering our war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2768. Also, petition of Mildred Browning and 45 other residents of Hyde Park, Dutchess County, N. Y., protesting against the wastage of sugar and grains in the manufacture of beer, wines, and distilled liquors, contending that the use of these beverages jeopardizes the efficiency, morale, and safety of all our people, and advocating legislation to prevent such waste; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2769. By Mr. PLOESER: Petition of Elmer G. Huch and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2770. Also, petition of Harry J. Fields and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2771. Also, petition of Carl C. Cook and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2772. Also, petition of Eugene Bauer and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2773. Also, petition of Al. Becker's Market and 40 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2774. Also, petition of Fred J. Eggeman and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2775. Also, petition of Bruce J. Strode and 43 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2776. Also, petition of Edward Harder and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2777. Also, petition of George Gable and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2778. Also, petition of Fred Saettele and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2779. Also, petition of Moses Aaron Teitelbaum and 320 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2780. Also, petition of Louis Amelung and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2781. By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of Evangelist E. L. Banta and 10,538 sundry citizens of the counties of Sangamon, Christian, Macoupin, and Montgomery in the Twenty-first Congressional District of Illinois, urging Congress to use its influence to improve conditions in the vicinity of Army camps in connection with the sale of intoxicants and the presence of vice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2782. Also, petition of Mrs. Margaret Schwass and 20 citizens of Elmhurst, Ill., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2783. By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of milk producers of southern Berkshire County, Mass., opposing a subsidy on milk; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2784. By Mr. RAMEY: Petition of Daisy Meachen and 12 other residents of Lakeside, Ottawa County, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, sponsored by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2785. Also, petition of Mrs. C. B. Harmon and 50 other residents of Lucas County, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, sponsored by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2786. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of the Atlanta Coast Line Railroad of Washington, D. C., and signed by 19 citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2787. Also, petition of N. H. Brown, of Washington, D. C., and 19 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2788. Also, petition of Capt. Tom's Restaurant, of Washington, D. C., and signed by 20 citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2789. Also, petition of the 400 Restaurant, of Washington, D. C., and signed by eight citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2790. Also, petition of the P. & N. Restaurant, of Washington, D. C., and signed by 58 citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2791. Also, petition of the Westinghouse Electric Supply Co. and signed by 22 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2792. Also, petition of the Brass & Copper Sales Co. and signed by 24 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2793. Also, petition of Joseph H. Muckholz and 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2794. Also, petition of the Tobacco Workers' International Union, Local No. 200, and signed by 132 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2795. Also, petition of the Chemical Workers' Union, Local No. 21536, and signed by 57 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2796. Also, petition of Rose Koby and 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2797. Also, petition of the International Longshoremen's Association and signed by 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2798. Also, petition of Joseph J. Langen and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2799. Also, petition of Ruth Rogers and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2800. Also, petition of Angelo Oldani and 22 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2801. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of Mrs. Robert W. Keller, of Raymond, Wash., urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), in order to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war, to reduce absenteeism, increase production, and eliminate sources of disorder and physical disability which are hampering our war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2802. Also, petition of Mrs. Lantz Wiss, of Shelton, Wash., and 57 other citizens of Shelton and vicinity, urging passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2803. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Memorial of Mrs. Bill Collins, of Navarro, Tex., favoring House bill 2350; to the Committee on Pensions.

2804. By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of Vincent Jacobs, secretary of the Staunton Trades Council, Staunton, Ill., and sundry citizens of the Twenty-first Congressional District of Illinois, protesting against the overriding, by Congress, of the President's veto of the Smith-Connally bill, and protesting against the congressional ban on subsidies in connection with the roll-back of prices on food and other items to the levels of September 18, 1942 and urging Congress to support an extensive program of subsidies to effect such a roll-back; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of the nations, on this day of national honor we give Thee thanks for the daring faith of that intrepid mariner who, trusting in Divine guidance, gained a New World for Thy benign purposes on the earth. From fragile ships tossing on

mad and mystic seas we would listen again to the voice of the brave captain whose words as leaping swords stir our sluggish hearts, "Sail on! Sail on!" May that stern command resound in our hearts today as Thy summons to us who live in this supreme hour, that we may discover for our own time the meaning and significance of America for itself and for the world. May we discover America as a moral and spiritual enterprise which has direct responsibility both to the people who live under it and to the God who reigns above it. Thus, in the spirit of the great explorer who pushed back the veil from a waiting continent which, in the unfolding of history was to be Thy last and best hope for humanity, may our America fulfill its manifest destiny in proving an instrument in Thy hands for making this old world of human hate into the New World of Thy redeeming love. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, October 8, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Guffey	Pepper
Bailey	Gurney	Radcliffe
Ball	Hatch	Reed
Bankhead	Hawkes	Revercomb
Barbour	Hayden	Reynolds
Barkley	Hill	Robertson
Bilbo	Holman	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	Kilgore	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McClellan	Tunnell
Capper	McFarland	Tydings
Caraway	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Wagner
Connally	Mead	Walsh
Danaher	Millikin	Wheeler
Davis	Moore	Wherry
Ellender	Murdock	White
George	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Green	Overton	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Conditions on the West Coast.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are detained on important public business.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is necessarily absent from the city as a member of the Truman investigating committee.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent on official appointments.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has been confined to a Madison hospital since September 13, where he is now recovering from virus pneumonia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3309. An act to suspend during the present war the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

H. R. 3338. An act relating to Government and other exemptions from the tax with respect to the transportation of property;

H. R. 3363. An act extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made; and

H. R. 3381. An act relating to credits against the Victory Tax.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 755) to amend the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, so as to give protection to persons in military service, and their dependents, as to certain mortgages, and it was signed by the Vice President.

REPEAL OF CHINESE EXCLUSION LAWS AND GRANT OF CITIZENSHIP TO CHINESE (H. DOC. NO. 333)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk and referred to the Committee on Immigration:

To the Congress of the United States:

There is now pending before the Congress legislation to permit the immigration of Chinese people into this country and to allow Chinese residents here to become American citizens. I regard this legislation as important in the cause of winning the war and of establishing a secure peace.

China is our ally. For many long years she stood alone in the fight against aggression. Today we fight at her side. She has continued her gallant struggle against very great odds.

China has understood that the strategy of victory in this world war first required the concentration of the greater part of our strength upon the European front. She has understood that the amount of supplies we could make available to her has been limited by difficulties of transportation. She knows that substantial aid will be forthcoming as soon as possible—aid not only in the form of weapons and supplies, but also in carrying out plans already made for offensive, effective action. We and our allies will aim our forces at the heart of Japan—in ever-increasing strength until the common enemy is driven from China's soil.

But China's resistance does not depend alone on guns and planes and on attacks on land, on the sea, and from the air. It is based as much in the spirit of her people and her faith in her allies. We owe it to the Chinese to strengthen that faith. One step in this direction is to wipe from the statute books those anachronisms in our law which forbid the immigration of Chinese people into this country and which bar Chinese residents from American citizenship.

Nations like individuals make mistakes. We must be big enough to acknowledge our mistakes of the past and to correct them.

By the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Laws, we can correct a historic mistake and silence the distorted Japanese propaganda. The enactment of legislation now pending before the Congress would put Chinese immigrants on a parity with those from other countries. The Chinese quota would, therefore, be only about 100 immigrants a year. There can be no reasonable apprehension that any such number of immigrants will cause unemployment or provide competition in the search for jobs.

The extension of the privileges of citizenship to the relatively few Chinese residents in our country would operate as another meaningful display of friendship. It would be additional proof that we regard China not only as a partner in waging war but that we shall regard her as a partner in days of peace. While it would give the Chinese a preferred status over certain other Oriental people, their great contribution to the cause of decency and freedom entitles them to such preference.

I feel confident that the Congress is in full agreement that these measures—long overdue—should be taken to correct an injustice to our friends. Action by the Congress now will be an earnest of our purpose to apply the policy of the good neighbor to our relations with other peoples.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 11, 1943.*

ADDITION OF LAND TO THE MONTEZUMA CASTLE NATIONAL MONUMENT, ARIZ.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 378) to

provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument, which was, on page 2, line 14, after the word "necessary", to insert "but not to exceed $25,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Letters from the Secretary of State, the Under Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Comptroller General of the United States, the Administrative Officer of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice of the Office for Emergency Management, and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective departments and offices for the quarter ended December 31, 1943, and for the Department of Agriculture for the quarter ended September 30, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

REMISSION OF CLAIMS ON ACCOUNT OF OVERPAYMENTS TO CERTAIN CHARWOMEN

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayments to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

REPORT ON PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of War, submitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report relating to the personnel of the land forces on August 31, 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 131 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Immigration.

ABSTRACTING, TITLING, ETC., OF FEDERAL LANDS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, reporting, in accordance with law, as to suggested legislation the purpose of which is to establish and centralize in the General Land Office, Department of the Interior, the necessary facilities for the acquisition, abstracting, titling, recording, and disposition of Federally owned and controlled lands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

FEES OF KICKBACKS, GIFTS, OR GRATUITIES TO EMPLOYEES UNDER COST-PLUS-A-FIXED-FEE CONTRACTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, in accordance with law, a draft of proposed legislation having for its purpose the elimination of the practice by subcontractors under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee prime contracts of paying fees or kickbacks, or of granting gifts or gratuities to employees of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee prime contractors, or of other subcontractors, for the purpose of securing the award of orders or subcontracts thereunder (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REGISTRANTS DEFERRED BECAUSE OF EMPLOYMENT UNDER THE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director of the Selective Services System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifth monthly list of registrants who have been deferred because of their employment in or under the Federal Government as of September 15, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITION AND MEMORIAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following resolutions of the Legislature of Pennsylvania, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joint resolution making application to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the imposition of conditions upon grants of moneys and rebates of taxes in certain cases

The General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby resolves as follows:

SECTION 1. The General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby makes application to the Congress of the United States, in accordance with the provisions of article V of the Constitution of the United States, to call a convention for proposing the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

Resolved by the Convention for proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States, called by the Congress of the United States, pursuant to application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. All grants of public moneys to the several States or political subdivisions thereof shall be outright and without condition, except as to the public purpose for which they shall be used. Congress shall not make any law providing to any State or to the people thereof any rebate, refund, or payment by way of taxes or otherwise, except in the exercise of powers delegated to the United States by the Constitution. Any State through its proper officers may enforce the provisions of this article by injunctive process.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Commonwealth shall transmit certified copies of this resolution to the President of the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the president of the senate and the speaker of the house of representatives of the legislatures of each of the other 47 States of the United States.

"SEC. 3. The provisions of this resolution shall become effective immediately upon its final enactment."

JOHN C. BELL,
President of the Senate.
IRA T. FISS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
Approved the 27th day of May A. D. 1943.
EDWARD MARTIN, *Governor.*

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances; and providing limitations on taxes so levied; and repealing the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States

Whereas there is now pending in the current session of the Congress of the United States proposed legislation to repeal the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States and to amend the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances; and providing for a limitation of taxes thereon; and

Whereas the people of the State of Pennsylvania are greatly interested in the passage of such legislation: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized as follows: That application be, and it is hereby, made to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes from whatever source derived without apportionment among the several States and without regard to any census or enumeration: *Provided,* That in no case shall the maximum rate of tax exceed 25 percent.

"SEC. 3. The maximum rate of any tax, duty, or excise, which Congress may lay and collect with respect to the devolution or transfer of property or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of death, or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death, or by way of gifts, shall in no case exceed 25 percent.

"SEC. 4. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date, to collect any tax on incomes for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December, laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

"SEC. 5. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight on the last day of the sixth month following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States to collect any tax on any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3, laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect." Be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is requested to provide as the mode of ratification, that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he hereby is directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States and to each Pennsylvania Member thereof.

IRA T. FISS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
W. J. RIDGE,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
W. E. HARBYSHAW,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Harrisburg, June 7, 1943.

I file herewith, in the office of the secretary of the Commonwealth, with my objections, House Concurrent Resolution No. 50, Printer's No. 651, entitled "Concurrent Resolution, Pennsylvania Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances; and providing limitations on taxes so levied; and repealing the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States."

This resolution would memorialize the Congress to call a convention to amend the Constitution of the United States to limit the maximum rate of any tax, duty, or excise which Congress may lay and collect with respect to the devolution or transfer of property to a maximum of 25 percent and in like manner to limit the power to lay and collect taxes on incomes.

Much as I feel constrained, as a matter of general policy, to keep taxes to the lowest possible sum consistent with good government, and anxious as I am to collaborate with those bent upon erecting barriers against the mounting costs of government, with the concomitant increases in taxes, I am yet above all conscious of our deep involvement in the most serious as well as the most expensive war in which this or any other nation was ever engaged. There is as yet no indication of the termination of the war or of the vastness of additional funds necessary to prosecute the war to victory. At this time of great national crisis, with the future demands for money unpredictable, and not knowing what the service charge will be on the national debt at the conclusion of the war, I am unwilling to take any action that might hamper the Government in the due prosecution of the war.

For these reasons the resolution is not approved.

EDWARD MARTIN.

REGULATION OF INSURANCE BUSINESS—LETTER FROM LEAVENWORTH (KANS.) INSURANCE BOARD

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter containing resolutions adopted by the Leavenworth Board of the Kansas Association of Insurance Men, favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 1362) to affirm the intent of the Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States and that the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as amended, be not applicable to that business, introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY].

While I have the floor, I desire to state that I intend to support S. 1362. The bill, as I understand it, would reaffirm and write into a statute the intent of Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance shall remain within the control of the States.

There being no objection, the letter containing resolutions was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS ASSOCIATION OF
INSURANCE AGENTS,
Leavenworth, Kans., September 29, 1943.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: The Leavenworth Insurance Board asks you to support Senate bill 1362 (Van Nuys and Bailey), a bill to affirm the intent of the Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States.

Enactment would make possible continued operation of the business of insurance under State regulation which has proven in Kansas to be in the public interest.

Some of the older members of our association remember what unsatisfactory conditions existed in Kansas before State regulation.

Your support of this measure will be greatly appreciated.

Yours very truly,
THE LEAVENWORTH INSURANCE BOARD,
Z. D. KELLY,
The Kelly Agency.
ED. REILLY,
JOHN BAUM,
Fidelity Insurance Agency,
MARGARET E. BERNHARDT,
Manager, Reyburns Agency,
W. W. FLUHONY.

PROTEST AGAINST MANUFACTURE OF BEER, WINE, AND DISTILLED LIQUORS—MEMORIAL

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a tabulation of a memorial sent in by Mildred Browning, of Hyde Park, N. Y., expressing opposition to the wastage of foods and other materials essential to the operation of the war, and especially sugar and grain used in the manufacture of beer, wine, and distilled liquors.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Finance and the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hyde Park, N. Y.	22
Staatsburg, N. Y.	22
Keuka Park, N. Y.	1
Salt Point, N. Y.	2

CONTROL AND REGULATION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC DURING THE WAR—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a tabulation of 379 petitions supporting the bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Is request made that all the petitions in question shall be made part of the RECORD, together with the names and addresses?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I ask for the printing of the tabulation, Mr. President.

Mr. LUCAS. Only the tabulation?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; only the tabulation.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Maine	52
Maryland	105
Minnesota	124
Texas	97
Virginia	1
Total	379

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a tabulation of 5,716 petitions. The petitions pray for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Alabama	246
California	20
Connecticut	52
Delaware	237
Florida	40
Illinois	1,997
Indiana	44
Kansas	49
Maine	516
Maryland	120
Minnesota	1,521
New Jersey	89
New York	39
Ohio	470
Oklahoma	79
Pennsylvania	174
South Carolina	22
Virginia	1
Total	5,716

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point an editorial published in the Providence (R. I.) Journal of September 15, 1943, and also a news item published in the Providence Evening Bulletin of September 15, 1943. The editorial and the news item bear on the subject of the petitions indicated by the tabulation.

There being no objection, the editorial and news item were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence (R. I.) Journal of September 15, 1943]

THERE IS A LIMIT

Conditions in downtown Providence during the evening hours—especially on week ends—require considerably more attention than they are receiving from naval shore patrols, Army MP's and the local police.

Drunkenness among servicemen is getting out of bounds. The attitude of a considerable number of the men—drunk or sober—toward unescorted women has grown increasingly bold and embarrassing. The conduct of some of them and the women companions they find on the streets is far outside the realm of ordinary decency.

This situation reflects on the armed services and on the majority of servicemen, whose behavior is beyond reproach. It ought to be promptly corrected. Otherwise it will become worse.

There is no disposition to make this a puritanical community. We want men who come here on leave to feel welcome and to enjoy themselves within reason while they are here. We are aware of the restraints they are under most of the time and understand their consequent urge to cut loose a bit when on liberty.

But there is a limit, and when uniformed men stumble around the streets too drunk to know what they are doing, when women cannot go about their own affairs on our highways without fear of insult and even physical molestation, and when some seek

to make downtown Providence a sort of open-air brothel, that limit has been exceeded.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of September 15, 1943]

NAVY AUTHORITIES SILENT ON SERVICEMEN'S CONDUCT—NEWPORT OFFICERS DECLINE COMMENT ON EDITORIAL ABOUT PROVIDENCE CONDITIONS

Navy officials at Newport today declined comment on an editorial in the Journal and Bulletin urging action by Navy, Army, and local police authorities to curb the excesses of many servicemen on liberty in Providence.

The editorial asserted that the drinking, accosting of unescorted women, and the activities of some servicemen and their women companions was "getting out of bounds."

The public relations officer at the Newport Naval Operating Base, asked to obtain comment on the editorial from Admiral William S. Pye, the commandant, or the proper authority, brought back word that the Navy had no comment to make.

Efforts to reach Captain Teed, United States Army, of the 1102d Battalion, Military Police, stationed at Niantic, Conn., for comment on the Army's views on downtown Providence's wartime social condition, were not immediately successful. At present, it is understood, Captain Teed details a sergeant and six men to Military Police duty in Providence. The MP's are housed at Chad Brown station. Week ends, two additional MP's arrive from Camp Edwards for duty at the bus station.

Soldiers of the Narragansett Bay harbor defenses are not responsible for any deterioration in conditions in downtown Providence, Brig. Gen. Arthur G. Campbell, United States Army, in command of the harbor defenses, said. He said men from the forts going to Providence are for the most part residents of Providence, and when they get leave they don't go home to make trouble.

Police Chief James J. Cusick, of Providence, commenting on the editorial, outlined difficulties police faced in prosecuting law violations connected with nocturnal conditions in the city, but at the same time said he felt police were making progress.

Refusal of some women to make complaints against servicemen who have molested them is a factor which ties the hands of police, Cusick said.

In many cases, he said, women who have been molested have refused even to report to police. Others who tell police about being bothered by servicemen refuse to identify themselves.

Cusick said the police department has a special detail of 12 men working in plain clothes downtown each night, checking activities of young girls and servicemen in hotels and cafes. The details are so made up that the patrol posts overlap and there is relatively little time during which some cafes are without a police observer, he said.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on Pensions:

S. 1225. A bill granting a pension to Constance Eager; without amendment (Rept. No. 460).

By Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 3029. A bill to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damages on the Illinois River, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 461); and

H. R. 3145. A bill to revive and reenact section 9 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes", approved August 26, 1937; without amendment (Rept. No. 462).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 1372. A bill to authorize the purchase of certain interests in lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians; with amendments (Rept. No. 463).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to create the War Shipping Field Service; with amendments (Rept. No. 464).

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 11, 1944, as Edison Day in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Alva Edison; without amendment.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

James Patrick McGranery, of Pennsylvania, to be the Assistant to the Attorney General, vice James Rowe, Jr., resigned.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Luther M. Swygert, of Indiana, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Indiana, vice Thomas W. Slick, resigned.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Rear Admiral Herbert F. Leary, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 1st day of November 1943 and to continue during his assignment as commander, Eastern Sea Frontier; and

The following named rear admirals of the Navy, when retired on November 1, 1943, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral pursuant to an act of Congress approved June 16, 1942:

Adolphus Andrews.

Roland M. Brainard.

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

Col. Edwin C. Kelton, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as president and member of the California Debris Commission, provided for by law, vice Brig. Gen. Warren T. Hannum, to be relieved; and

Col. Rufus W. Putnam, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as a member of the California Debris Commission, provided for by law, vice Col. Clay Anderson, Corps of Engineers, to be relieved.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 1424. A bill for the relief of Owen Wimmer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1425. A bill to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint rates of freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

(Mr. MAYBANK introduced Senate bill 1426, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1427. A bill to authorize the appointment of Gregory Boyington a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps;

S. 1428. A bill to amend the provision of the act authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child or dependent relative of officers, enlisted men, or nurses of the Navy or Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

S. 1429. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the Outlying Degaussing Branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942; and

S. 1430. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in Tent L–76 at the Amphibious Training Base, Camp Bradford, Norfolk, Va., on March 15, 1943; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 1431. A bill for the relief of Carl F. R. Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1432. A bill to extend the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1433. A bill for the relief of Clarence A. Giddens; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 1434. A bill to provide for voluntary apprenticeship in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1435. A bill granting a pension to Frances Leonard Barnes; to the Committee on Pensions.

(Mr. LANGER also introduced Senate bill 1436, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

SUSPENSION OF TAXES ON OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to provide that certain taxes imposed with respect to the sale or manufacture of oleomargarine which is yellow in color shall be suspended until the expiration of 6 months after the termination of hostilities in the present war.

In view of the fact that the bill relates to the subject of taxation, I ask that it be referred to the Finance Committee.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1426) to provide that certain taxes imposed with respect to the sale or manufacture of oleomargarine which is yellow in color shall be suspended until the expiration of 6 months after the termination of hostilities in the present war, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MAYBANK. In connection with the bill I have just introduced, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an excellent article dealing with the subject matter of the bill, written by Jefferson G. Bell, and appearing in the New York Times of October 2, 1943. I also ask to have printed at this point an editorial entitled "Inequitable Oleo Tax," published in the Washington (D. C.) Star.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of October 2, 1943]

HOSPITAL PATIENTS GET LITTLE BUTTER—VOLUNTARY INSTITUTIONS REPORT THEY ARE 40 PERCENT SHORT AS SUBSTITUTE IS URGED—OLEOMARGARINE TAX CITED—LEVY ON COLORING MATTER SAID TO MAKE SUBSTITUTE'S COST ALMOSH PROHIBITIVE

(By Jefferson G. Bell)

High point rationing and the Federal Government's set-aside requirements for

lend-lease, the armed forces, and other priority consumers, have placed butter almost beyond the reach of New York City's voluntary hospitals and other charitable institutions, it was reported yesterday.

This group of institutions, trying to provide for the sick, the indigent, the orphans, and other unfortunates, have now been compelled to reduce their consumption of butter to about 40 percent of normal.

"Like everyone else, we are having a very hard time getting butter," explained John Hayes, president of the Greater New York Hospital Association. "Some of our hospitals are giving butter to our people only once a day—at breakfast. This cut in butter consumption, of course, represents a cut in the consumption of bread, which is significant from the standpoint of the welfare of the patients in our hands."

PATIENTS REVOLTED

Mr. Hayes explained that without the use of coloring it was impossible to use oleomargarine as a substitute for butter as a spread on toast, for instance, because many patients revolted at the sight of oleomargarine in its natural state when it resembles lard. When coloring is used to make oleomargarine resemble butter, an acceptable and wholesome substitute results, according to Mr. Hayes, but the Federal tax levied on the mere use of coloring matter for butter makes the compound's cost just about prohibitive.

The point made by Mr. Hayes was further emphasized by a bulletin of one of the purchasing agents for a group of hospitals and other charitable institutions.

Under the heading, "Butter is harder to buy than filet mignon," the commodity bulletin of the purchasing agent for institutional users had this to say:

"We don't buy many beef tenderloins (13 points per pound), but our hospitals and other institutions have always been large butter consumers. The announcement that the number of ration points needed to buy a pound of butter has been increased 33⅓ percent to 16 points per pound comes as no special surprise.

"However, being so well aware of the seriousness of the butter shortage, we have no reason to question the wisdom of the authorities in placing this item farther out of reach by the present increase in points, although it would seem to us that a way would be found to make it easier for hospitals, particularly, to procure an adequate supply.

OLEOMARGARINE TAX LAW

"What we do object to and with good reason we believe, is the oleomargarine tax law which prohibits the use of oleomargarine to which color is added, in voluntary institutions, unless a Federal tax is paid amounting to $600 a year per institution, plus 10 cents a pound for every pound so colored. We object to this law because:

"1. City, State, and Federal institutions are exempt therefrom.

"2. Any member of the public can buy oleomargarine in its natural state, and add color, so long as the product is used in his own house.

"To serve oleomargarine in its natural state to sick people or to the aged (whose appetites at best are rather indifferent), is completely to discourage the use of this product. Margarine to which color has been added is almost indistinguishable from regular butter, and since it is claimed to have the same nutritive value as butter and since, further, there is a very free supply pressing on the market (at half the price of butter), it seems a shame that these institutions cannot use it as a substitute without involving themselves in such a prohibitive tax.

"An institution using only 120 pounds of margarine a week to which color has been added would have a tax liability of $1,200 a year, or 20 cents a pound."

City Markets Commissioner Daniel P. Woolley hailed metropolitan New York's victory gardens which had swelled the harvest of garden truck, when he released his weekly review of food supplies showing continued improvement in supplies of meats, butter, and eggs, and plentiful farm produce.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

INEQUITABLE OLEO TAX

Even in some of the big dairy States there is evidence of rising dissatisfaction with tax laws which prevent the citizens of these States from buying oleomargarine at reasonable prices under the existing conditions of the butter shortage.

In a recent editorial the Milwaukee Journal cites a letter from a Wisconsin housewife complaining about the butter situation. She would like to have more butter; lacking that, she would like to have some oleomargarine, "which she cannot get because a State tax effectively prohibits the sale of this substitute in our communities." Thousands of Wisconsin housewives, says the editorial, "will agree with the writer of this letter. They know that the oleo law has hurt Wisconsin in other States because of its discriminatory character. Now they know that the law is hurting Wisconsin residents themselves, for with butter hard to get even at 12 ration points a pound, oleo, which could be had for four points a pound, is barred by statute."

The editorial goes on to cite the Wisconsin State laws, whose repeal it demands as an "unpardonable interstate trade barrier," and also as an unwise way of dealing with the butter-oleo problem.

Citizens outside of Wisconsin can do little about these Wisconsin State laws; however, similar arguments apply to certain Federal taxes on the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine all over the country, and the citizens of all States should actively interest themselves in the matter of bringing to their Congressmen's attention the matter of relieving at least this phase of the injustice.

ELECTION OF THE GOVERNOR OF ALASKA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference providing for the election of the Governor of Alaska. A short time ago a committee representing the Senate was sent to Alaska to study the new highway. Some months ago I introduced a bill providing for statehood for Alaska. The bill I now introduce is exactly identical to a bill introduced by Delegate DIMOND, of Alaska, with the exception of the last two lines of section 9, which I have eliminated, as follows:

The repeal thereof to take effect on January 1, 1945.

Under the terms of the bill I now introduce, it would take effect immediately upon its signing by the President of the United States, in case it is passed by Congress.

In connection with introduction of the bill providing for the election of the Governor of Alaska, I desire to state that I am not receding at all from my contention that Alaska should have been made a State some 25 or 30 years ago.

I may add that the bill providing for the election of the Governor of Alaska has in its favor all the points mentioned a few days ago by the President of the United States when he sent to Congress a special message asking for the election of the Governor of Puerto Rico, except that I think the case for the election of the Governor of Alaska is much stronger than that for the election of the Governor of Puerto Rico.

The bill (S. 1436) to provide for the election of the Governor of Alaska was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in this connection I send to the desk, and ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Wrangell Chamber of Commerce, Wrangell, Alaska, in favor of statehood for Alaska.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is now pending before Congress a measure—S. 951—introduced by Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, and Senator PATRICK A. MCCARRAN, of Nevada, providing for statehood for Alaska; and

Whereas Alaska, long isolated due to lack of transportation and communication, is now moving rapidly forward in its general development, industrially and agriculturally; and

Whereas it is no longer isolated due to the Alaska military highway road connection with continental United States, as well as numerous air lines in addition to water transportation; and

Whereas the permanent population of Alaska is more than 100,000 persons, exclusive of the military, and is growing by leaps and bounds; and

Whereas this rapidly increasing population, through industrial effort, is capable of absorbing the additional cost of statehood: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Wrangell Chamber of Commerce go on record urging the passage of S. 951 to provide statehood for Alaska, and that copies of this resolution be presented to the Honorable ANTHONY J. DIMOND, Delegate in Congress from Alaska; the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER, United States Senator from North Dakota; and the Honorable PATRICK A. MCCARRAN, United States Senator from Nevada.

Adopted this 17th day of June 1943.

H. C. MCKOWAN,
President.
W. L. EASTAUGH,
Secretary.

Mr. LANGER. Likewise, Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a report to the people prepared by William R. Carter, one of the outstanding newspapermen in the Territory of Alaska, who resides at Juneau, and ask that it be printed, together with the preface. Let me say that when the matter comes up, as I hope it will some time later in the day, I expect to devote more time to a discussion of the Alaskan question.

There being no objection, the preface and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SIXTEENTH ALASKA LEGISLATURE—A REPORT TO THE PEOPLE

(By William R. Carter)

PREFACE

At the conclusion of the 1943 session of the Alaska Territorial Legislature an opinion was expressed by many that it was unfortunate the people of Alaska did not have the privilege of securing a more comprehensive picture of the way in which the representatives whom the people elected

conducted themselves—some of the background that only those in attendance were able to see.

For the purpose of better informing the people, some members of the legislature, acting in the belief that only an informed public can choose its representatives wisely, furnished the money necessary to pay the expense of printing this small booklet.

The author attended all meetings of the sixteenth session as a correspondent for the Daily Alaska Empire and has attempted to tell the truth in the following pages, even though some feelings may be hurt, some toes trod upon, and expecting the usual hue and cry from the offended.

I. THE LINE-UP

When the doors to the legislative halls in Juneau closed for good on the sixteenth session late on the night of March 25, 16 representatives filed out of the house chambers and 8 senators left the senate. In 1945, according to an amendment to the Organic Act of Alaska, passed in 1942 by the United States Congress, 24 representatives will enter the house for the seventeenth session, and 16 senators.

The senate will be doubled in size, and the house larger by one-third. For that reason Alaskans must take a greater interest than ever in choosing who will represent them in 1945. In the fall of 1942, little interest was shown generally throughout the Territory in either the primary or general election. This paved the way for election to office of several persons who by their deeds proved that a disinterested public is not always well represented.

To accuse any legislator without qualification would not be fair. Neither would any purpose be accomplished. But it is the author's belief that several of the solons were negligent in their attitudes toward the people they were pledged to represent. The reader will be able to decide for himself.

The lineup of the sixteenth legislature was as follows:

Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Nome each had two senators. Ketchikan had one and one came from Pelican City, also in southeast Alaska.

From Anchorage came Edward D. Coffey, a veteran with two sessions in the house behind him and 1943 was his second term in the senate. He held the important position of chairman of the finance committee. Also from Anchorage was Herbert H. McCutcheon, with seven terms in the house to his credit.

Fairbanks' senators were Hjalmar Nordale, completing his first term, serving in his second session, and Frank S. Gordon, serving his first term in the senate but with two terms in the house behind. Nordale was chairman of the judiciary committee, Gordon headed the committee on taxation.

From Nome came veteran O. D. Cochran and Stewart L. Stangroom, the latter taking his first seat in the senate with one term in the house to back him up, the former completing his fourth year in the senate, as president this time.

Ketchikan came up again with N. R. "Doc" Walker, former president of the senate, member of the legislature since 1933.

Arthur P. Walker was the eighth member of the upper house, a resident of Pelican City serving his first year in the senate, but with sessions in the house in 1935 and 1939 behind.

In the house, Juneau had two members—Mrs. Crystal Snow Jenne serving her second term, and James V. Davis serving his fourth term, this time as speaker.

R. E. Hardcastle, first-timer, and Andrew Gundersen, also new, were elected from Ketchikan.

From Nome came Tolbert F. Scott to serve for a fourth term; Frank H. Whaley, for the second time, and Christian A. Roust, for the first time. Wallace Porter, of Haycock, came down from the second division for a second term.

Harvey J. Smith, of Anchorage, chairman of the rules committee, was present for a third term; and Stanley McCutcheon, also of Anchorage, son of the senator, was serving a first term.

Joseph W. Kehoe came down for a second term from Seward, and William A. Egan was down for a second time from Valdez.

Fairbanks had the remaining four. Mrs. Alaska Stewart Linck came down for a first time, and Leo Rogge was serving his fourth term. Rogge held the most important committee chairmanship in the house—the ways and means committee. Jesse Lander was down for his third straight session, and John J. O'Shea, Jr., was here for the first time.

These were the representatives of the people.

II. INVESTIGATION

The legislative happening which created the greatest amount of interest as far as the people were concerned was the investigation of charges of politics in the Territorial department of labor, charges brought to the attention of the legislature at the first of the session by Walter P. Sharpe, elected commissioner of labor to replace appointed Michael J. Haas.

The charges involved Haas and newly elected Senator Arthur P. Walker of the first division formerly employed by the labor department as an inspector.

Senator Walker brought about the investigation by demanding a thorough airing of the charges on the Senate floor. The results were not beneficial either to Haas, Walker, or to the new commissioner, the events proved.

The investigation had a direct bearing upon the newly elected commissioner's appropriation, gave the people who attended the hearings a picture of politics in operation, resulted in one new law.

When Sharpe took over the department of labor at the end of 1942, he found rows of empty filing cabinets, a bank account almost as empty, in spite of the fact that the appropriation for the operation of the office was supposed to run the office for at least 2 months in 1943.

Between July 1, 1941, and December 31, 1942, Haas had caused to be expended practically the entire $30,000 appropriation. Consequently, Sharpe had no funds with which to operate the office efficiently until the legislature made an appropriation.

Drawn up by resolution, a committee consisting of the judiciary committees of each house, with the exception of Representative Stanley McCutcheon, chairman of the house judiciary committee, held public hearings to determine the truth or falsity of the charges.

McCutcheon asked to be excused because the investigation involved his brother, Steve McCutcheon, former inspector for the department. Representative McCutcheon, however, took an active part in the proceedings and used his seat in the house in a move to stall the general appropriations bill containing allowances for the department.

He was replaced on the house committee by Representative Harvey J. Smith. Smith was nominated for the job by the house committee on committees, and his appointment was confirmed unanimously on the floor.

As the resolution was drawn up, the power of appointing members of the investigating committee was not given to the chair in either house.

In addition to Smith, house members were Representative Christian A. Roust of the second division, Joseph W. Kehoe of the third, and John J. O'Shea, Jr., of the fourth. Senate members were Hjalmar Nordale of the fourth division, Norman R. Walker of the first, O. D. Cochran of the second, and Edward D. Coffey of the third.

Kehoe was elected chairman, and the investigation followed regular court procedure as closely as possible. Attorney General Henry Roden represented the Territory, and Ketchikan attorney and Mayor Harry G. McCain represented Hass and Walker.

On the closing day of the session the committee issued a report which found the following:

1. That Haas didn't keep books of account, but did file vouchers of expense with the auditor and kept duplicates. That he sent or received 184 telegrams at the expense of the Territory and left copies for only 94 of these, a few being purely personal or political. That the files which Haas removed from the office at the expiration of his term were records of work performed for the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor. The committee said that the failure to keep books of account or records of expenditures of his office was negligence on the part of Haas.

2. That shortly before the primary election in April 1942, at which time Haas was a candidate for election to the commissioner's job, Steve McCutcheon, then inspector for the office, "unnecessarily and without benefit" to the Territory or anyone except Haas, went to Anchorage "for the sole purpose of making a political speech * * * in the political interests of Haas," that the cost of the trip plus per diem expenses were charged to the Territory and paid for by the department of labor.

3. That the facilities of the office were used by Haas and A. P. Walker to advance their political interests, Walker being a candidate for senator.

4. That Walker made several trips to first division towns for the ostensible purpose of inspecting canneries, but there were no canneries operating at the time (February and March), that he made no inspections but did distribute campaign literature for himself and Haas. The Territory paid the expenses, but the committee found that the trips were of no benefit to the labor department, the Territory, or anyone else, "except the said Walker and Haas."

5. That Walker used the facilities of the office to advance his political campaign.

All members of the committee signed the report except Chairman Kehoe, who submitted a minority opinion, a procedure which would have been proper had the committee been sitting as a supreme court, but which seemed improper in this case.

Kehoe could find no foundation "for the charge of misconduct and fraud alleged against former Commissioner Haas."

In my opinion, when any official approves a voucher for paying expenses of trips for political purposes at the expense of the people, and certifies these expenses as just and proper, without doubt knowing for what purpose the trips were made, that is a perversion of the truth, and an intentional perversion. What else is fraud? These actions also come under the heading of official misconduct.

Kehoe said that the evidence did sustain the charges that Walker used the facilities of the office to further his political interests. But he blandly overlooked the fact that Haas as the administrative officer approved Walker's actions.

At the time of the hearings Haas held the job of War Labor Board representative for Alaska, also taking with him the post of Wage-Hour representative, formerly vested by the United States Department of Labor in the Territorial Department of Labor at no cost to the Federal Government.

Here it might be well to mention that the new commissioner has been criticized several times for stating during the hearing that it was not the duty of the commissioner to collect wage claims. Before making that

statement he asked for an opinion on the matter from the attorney general, who agreed that the law creating the department did not authorize the commissioner to collect these claims.

Neither did it appear to be the desire of the legislature that this become one of the commissioner's duties. Senator A. P. Walker introduced a bill for this purpose and it was killed.

Apparently most of the wage claims which Haas collected were collected under enforcement of the wage-hour law. Haas was the Federal Government's agent for this division, serving without pay while commissioner of labor for the Territory.

After leaving the office and receiving the War Labor Board appointment, Haas was also named wage-hour representative and therefore took the collection duties out of the office with him.

During the hearings, the attorney general pointed out that expenditures of the labor department under Haas increased before the elections, and also shortly before the end of Haas' term. The attorney general charged that Haas deliberately tried to deplete the fund after losing in the election.

Letters and telegrams read during the hearings pointed out political connections between Haas and numerous candidates, including Representative Joseph W. Kehoe. One telegram brought Secretary of Alaska E. L. "Bob" Bartlett into the picture in a way that might be taken as evidence of a violation of the Hatch Act. Introduced as evidence was a telegram reading:

Mr. BOB BARTLETT,
Care of Alaska Steamship Co., Cordova:
Joe contacted Seattle. Papers with Don. Believe Joe leans toward upper. Don certain easy victory for lower. Joe would work hard for upper. Highly desirable they both run, their friends will be pleased. Contact Don.

MICHAEL J. HAAS,
Commissioner of Labor.

This telegram undoubtedly referred to Kehoe and to Don Carlos Brownwell. It was paid for by the Territory. It should be pointed out here that Bartlett is not an employee of the Territory but of the Federal Government, is not responsible to the people of Alaska.

Haas followed this telegram up with another, 5 days later, addressed to:

DON CARLOS BROWNWELL,
Seward, Alaska:
Very important that you return; also that Joe file for house. Full support, both of you. Regards.

MICHAEL J. HAAS.

Also charged to the Territory.

At the first hearing, Edmund J. Krause, who was a Republican candidate for the legislature, testified that Haas called him in and offered him the underground support of the Democratic Party, if he (Krause) would come out publicly against James V. Davis, elected and named speaker of the house in the last session. Krause was defeated.

Haas denied this at a later hearing. But it was certain that one of the two was lying. Both testified under oath.

The speech made by Steve McCutcheon will be remembered by Anchorage residents. In it he plugged Haas for election, condemned Sharpe and others as being backed by a fantastic whisky ring in Seattle. It was mudslinging at its height. A copy of the speech may be found in the appendix of this booklet.

The investigation accomplished very little for all practical purposes. Haas already had been defeated at the polls and already held a Federal job.

Senator A. P. Walker was elected by the people of the first division. His record in the senate, which will be discussed later, will determine his chances of being reelected. That A. P. Walker only defeated Allen Shattuck, his opponent at election, by seven votes, in spite of the fact that, according to the investigating committee's findings, he had used his office to advance his political campaign, seems worthy of comment.

Commissioner Sharpe lost materially by bringing about the investigation. He was elected and by keeping his mouth shut could have used the office in the same way if he had wished. It also is probable that he would have received the same increase in salary that other officials received during the last session.

But it is this writer's opinion that Sharpe gained with the people by airing the details of the case, and at the same time, other matters were forced out into the open.

Governor Ernest Gruening long has been an opponent of Sharpe. As long as Haas was in office, the Governor condemned the low salary being paid the commissioner, but when the legislature passed a bill raising the salary, and appropriating funds to run the department, the Governor vetoed the bill. A copy of this veto message will be found in the back of the book.

The result was that Sharpe received no increase in salary and the appropriation was contained in the general appropriations bill.

The House voted to override the veto. But in the senate, three senators formed a bloc to like procedure. These were Senators Frank S. Gordon, of Fairbanks, Herbert McCutcheon, of Anchorage, and, naturally, A. P. Walker.

There is no doubt in my mind but what the Governor allowed prejudice to influence his decision to veto that bill. It was also a rare thing for any Governor to attack another public official in a veto message.

Not only did the Governor veto the legislative-approved salary raise for Sharpe, but suggested a 60 percent reduction in salary. This would have given Sharpe, a legally elected official, less than the Territory pays the Governor's stenographers, less than the Territory allots each biennium for the Governor's entertainment.

Siding with the Governor in the battle against Sharpe were the three aforementioned Senators—Gordon, McCutcheon, and A. P. Walker. McCutcheon said once on the senate floor that the labor department was nothing but a "Tammany Hall," a strange statement to make considering his attitude on the question.

Gordon, just a few minutes before the senate closed its doors for good on the sixteenth session, attempted to lead the senate into rejecting the report submitted by the seven members of the investigating committee, and to accept the minority report written by Kehoe.

Needless to say he was ruled out of order by President Cochran. According to the provisions of the resolution bringing about the investigation, the committee was to hold hearings and make a report to the legislature. There was no question of accepting or receiving to be voted on.

On the other hand, it would seem that Chairman Kehoe's separate report was out of order. It was by no means the report of the committee. He had the privilege of not concurring in the committee report along with the other members, but there his privilege ended.

Representative McCutcheon, although at first expressing a desire to have no part in the investigation, attended the hearings and later submitted an affidavit of prejudice against Representative Smith, charging Smith with bias and prejudice. An extra hearing was held to settle this question and Smith stayed on the committee.

Although it should not have been so, the investigation was directly tied up with the question of an appropriation for the department of labor.

It was realized near the beginning of the legislative session that the Governor would probably disapprove a raise in salary for the new commissioner of labor, and there also was the fear that any appropriation for the department might be knocked out if carried in the general appropriations bill, usually one of the last to be passed.

Generally, the appropriations bill reaches the Governor too late for the legislature to receive it back, if any changes are made by the Governor, before the session closes. The Governor usually gets this bill after the fifty-seventh day. He gets 3 days in which to consider it. If the legislature has already adjourned sine die at the end of the third day, the Governor may veto any items at will. This is known as the pocket veto.

For this reason, and also because the department of labor was out of funds with which to operate, a separate bill, making an appropriation and also raising the commissioner's salary to $5,000, was introduced, passed by both houses over minority opposition, sent to the Governor. He vetoed it.

The Gordon-McCutcheon-A. P. Walker triumvirate in the senate provided the necessary three votes to sustain the veto in the senate, although the house voted overwhelmingly to override the veto.

It was obvious that unless one of the triumverate gave ground, a separate bill to increase Sharpe's salary, as suggested by the Governor, was doomed.

A bill for this purpose was introduced in the house and passed. But this vicious triumverate refused to cast a vote to accept the bill in the senate, a two-thirds vote being necessary after the fiftieth day. Later, Senator Coffey attempted to introduce a bill for this purpose in the senate. The same three refused to allow him this privilege. It was the first time, as far as any of the legislators could remember, that a senator had not been granted this courtesy.

There was still the question of making an appropriation for the department. The nature of the Governor's veto message indicated that he would veto such an appropriation, given the opportunity. "The Territory * * * certainly needs a department of labor less now than it did 2 years ago, and it will need it decreasingly as long as the war lasts," he had stated. "* * * newly established Federal agencies—the War Labor Board and the War Manpower Commission—have come in to take over a large part of the governmental labor field * * *"

Ironically, it should be remembered, Haas was War Labor Board representative for Alaska at this time.

Senator N. R. Walker of Ketchikan strongly condemned the move to tear the labor department out of the books. He pointed out how long labor had fought to get such a department in Alaska.

So the Senate proceeded to rush the general appropriations bill through with an amendment carrying funds for the labor department, to get it to the Governor before the fatal fifty-seventh day.

The senate passed the bill unanimously, on the fifty-fifth day, Saturday. But Senator McCutcheon stood up and gave notice of reconsidering his vote on the bill. That meant it would have to be held until Monday, the fifty-seventh day. Senator N. R. Walker condemned McCutcheon, stating that he had declared in the presence of himself (Walker) and Senator Nordale that he would move for reconsideration in order to delay the bill and eliminate certain items. McCutcheon admitted this was true.

And that was the reason the senate met at 5 o'clock in the morning on the fifty-seventh day—to vote again on the appropriations bill and send it to the house for confirmation. The Governor received the bill at 3:46 p. m. on that day and had only until that hour on

the last day to veto or approve it. He approved it.

The incident should not be closed without mention of Representative McCutcheon's move to get a reconsideration of his vote on the appropriations bill when it got back to the House. He tried it, backed by Representative Lander, and was ruled out of order, properly. Speaker Davis refused to recognize the request because it was obviously only to delay the bill. McCutcheon did not challenge the ruling.

III. APPROPRIATIONS AND TAXES

When the legislature convened, its members found on their desks a report from the Territorial board of budget, recommending a total of $4,384,999 for expenditures for the biennium. Because the board of budget had simply acted as a recorder for requests submitted by various agencies and officials, this figure was nothing more than an expression of these requests.

But at the same time, the report contained an estimate that receipts for the 2 years would probably amount to only $3,001,307.

Obviously, some new taxes would be needed.

And at the same time, the problem of figuring out a raise in salary for school teachers was something that needed solving. Other officials, too, were low-laid.

When the appropriations bill came out, the final product, approved by the Governor, amounted to $4,335,861; less than the amount appropriated in 1941, but little less than the recommendations made by the board of budget.

A survey of the tax field showed that little revenue would be expected from mining, that less would come in from the salmon industry.

Yet only two tax bills were passed by the members of the sixteenth session, both increasing existing taxes. No one can say whether the present surplus in the Territorial treasury, plus the revenue that will be obtained will be enough to carry the Territory through 2 more years. But if that is the case, the members of the sixteenth session are to be commended for refusing to increase the tax burden.

It should be the duty of the legislature not to tax to the limit, but to tax only for the purpose of securing enough revenue to pay the bill. Some would tax to the limit in the belief that a huge surplus should be built up. The 1941 legislature was asked to levy an income tax and didn't respond. Still, at the end of the next 2 years, the Territory was in fine shape financially.

An income-tax bill was introduced late in this session, too, and failed to get out of committee. It is this writer's opinion that the Federal Government already has practically exhausted this field. The bill was introduced by Representatives Stanley McCutcheon, Joseph Kehoe, and John J. O'Shea.

The first tax bill that was passed provided for an additional 5-cent tax on each case of salmon packed. If the salmon pack averages 5,000,000 cases each year, this tax would bring in $500,000 for the biennium.

It is interesting to note that the packers, called in by the Ways and Means Committee, were convinced that additional taxes were needed and readily endorsed the bill.

This fact became generally known. When the bill came up before the Governor, some expected him to veto it. I could find no grounds for this reasoning unless it was in the fact that Senator Gordon was holding in the hole a bill which would have doubled the existing tax.

The Governor did not sign the bill but allowed it to become a law without his signature, remarking, "we should be grateful for small favors at all times and accept them with thankfulness and humility." I would not call $500,000 small.

The other tax bill, that which broadened the school tax to include employed women, also was criticized by the Governor and allowed to become a law without his signature.

IV. LEGISLATION, GENERALLY

Out of the grand total of 135 bills which were tossed into the hopper, only 53 of them became laws.

Most of the bills were well written, simple enough for the average person to understand. Some were so complicated that they were doomed from the start.

General speaking, Alaska's 1943 legislature paid little attention to special groups.

The bills that were passed reflected the purpose for which the legislators came to Juneau—to represent the people. But some of the representatives were unable to thrust special interests behind them. Luckily, these were in the minority. But at the same time the minority was able to band together near the end of the session, and whenever a two-thirds vote was needed, to defeat some worthy legislation against the will of the majority.

In addition to the administrative needling, I heard only one criticism of the session concerning the legislation that was or was not passed, and that was in the form of a resolution adopted by a labor union group which claimed that the legislature had not done a good job because it had not voted gains for labor.

Just why it should be the duty of the solons to separate any special group from the people as a whole, and pass bills benefiting this group, was not explained.

The complaint, of course, was in the fact that every bill asking changes in the unemployment compensation set-up that was introduced failed to pass. Most of these proposed measures, by their very complicity, killed themselves. Not only were the authors of the bills unable to explain the purported good of the measures, but the few experts who were called in failed to give an explanation that could be understood.

This objection of complicity immediately lays the grounds for the real block to the bills. Not only would the working man be at a loss to know what his rights were, but the difficulties involved in attempting to administer the proposed laws would have led to endless dispute and trouble. Rarely, under most of these measures, were the regulations down in black and white. Most cases would have been up to the administrator to settle and interpret.

Obviously it is impossible to discuss each bill introduced and all that passed and became laws. Some, however, deserve special comment.

But before continuing, I would like to make one point clear. The house divided itself shortly after the session got underway into two sections. There were nine representatives on one side and seven on the other. These nine were able to more or less control the house except when it came to obtaining a two-thirds vote. The nine-seven combination didn't hold on all things, because sometimes one or two of the seven would slip over to bolster the nine.

Members of the nine were Representatives R. E. Hardcastle, Alaska Stewart Linck, Wallace Porter, Leo Rogge, Christian Roust, Tolbert Scott, Harvey Smith, Frank Whaley, and Speaker James V. Davis.

Members of the other side were William Egan, Andrew Gundersen, Crystal Snow Jenne, Joseph W. Kehoe, Jesse D. Lander, Stanley McCutcheon, and John J. O'Shea.

Of this latter group, Jenne, Kehoe, Lander, and McCutcheon rarely strayed to the other side.

The majority side, in this writer's opinion, stuck more to the job of representing the people, and I failed to find in them any special malice toward any group, including labor.

In the senate, as earlier explained, Senators A. P. Walker, Frank S. Gordon, and H. H. McCutcheon formed the minority bloc.

V. WORTHY BILLS PASSED

The 1943 legislature stamped its O. K. on two bills benefiting the ailing and the young. One of the first through the mill was Representative Harvey J. Smith's bill to establish a juvenile code for the Territory.

For years Alaska's American Legionnaires had attempted to better the plight of Alaska's children.

Under the new law, children under 18 years of age who are delinquent either through fault of their parents or for other reasons, would be brought into the justice courts, not as criminals, not in a public hearing, and if the court deems such procedure advisable, would be cared for by the Territory in private homes wherever possible and given a chance to live a better life. The law carries an appropriation of $50,000. The department of public welfare, under Director Russell Maynard, strongly recommended the bill's passage.

Another piece of progressive health and welfare legislation was Representative William Egan's bill appropriating $25,000 for the purpose of providing for the treatment of tubercular patients in hospitals within the Territory, setting up tubercular wards for this purpose under the supervision of the Territorial Department of Health.

Another important piece of legislation was Senator N. R. Walker's Uniform Narcotic Drug Act, modernizing Alaska's laws in cooperation with the Federal Government to prevent the illicit peddling of dope and filling in the twilight zone between Territorial and Federal legislation. A noteworthy feature of the bill is that it will allow pilots on commercial planes to carry certain pain-killing drugs to be used in emergency cases. Heretofore this was prohibited and the victim of many a plane crash underwent unnecessary suffering.

Representative Frank H. Whaley succeeded in getting passed a Model Airport Zoning Act, a measure that will greatly aid the development of safe landing fields throughout the Territory.

Also worthy of comment is Senator Edward Coffey's Fire Control Act, a measure that will prove its worth in the interior of Alaska more than in other sections.

The law is aimed to prevent, suppress, and control forest fires throughout Alaska. It establishes a fire season and sets up strict penalties for violations of safety regulations.

VI. THE WAR POWERS BILL

A bill which stirred up quite a bit of interest and gained the nickname of the "Mussolini" bill was the Department of the Interior's bill which would grant the Governor a wide variety of powers over amusements, various health and sanitation subjects, liquor regulations, prostitution, and other matters.

It passed the senate by a narrow margin, Senators O. D. Cochran, Stewart Stangroom, and Edward Coffey voting against it. In the House it was killed by a 9–7 vote. Voting for the bill in the House were Representatives Egan, Gundersen, Jenne, Kehoe, Lander, McCutcheon, and O'Shea.

The bill would have granted to a Federal official not responsible to the people of Alaska, powers guaranteed to the people in Alaska's organic act.

It should be interesting to note in this connection that in Puerto Rico, a Territory now known as the "Gibraltar of the Atlantic," the legislature, unmindful of the people, under the guise of granting war powers allowed Federal officials to turn the Territory into a socialistic guinea pig.

This was a gradual process in Puerto Rico, but in two sessions laws were passed providing for Government ownership of all sugar lands, turning sugar mills into public

utilities, authorizing the Government to purchase and operate all forms of communications, providing for Government ownership of all means of transportation, creating a Government bank for all insular revenues and forming a development company through which the Government could engage in any form of private business.

Unfortunately, the legislature or the Federal officials behind the scenes didn't think of giving the Government a monopoly on the press, and the news got to Congress, where it created quite a bit of fuss.

Representative Kehoe strongly defended the "Mussolini" bill as did Mrs. Jenne, Lander, O'Shea, and others.

VII. GOVERNOR VERSUS THE PEOPLE

No attempt will be made in this booklet to sidestep the glaring breach which existed between Gov. Ernest H. Gruening and the majority of the legislature, representing the people.

Until Alaskans are allowed to elect their own executive, one who will be called to task in an election at regular intervals, the breach will continue to exist.

With all due credit to the Governor as a man of great ability, perhaps like any man in his position, he realizes that he is not responsible to the people of Alaska and therefore has a tremendous advantage over an administrative official who would be weighted down with this responsibility. And perhaps as any other man in his position might do, he took advantage of the situation, going out of his way to take jabs at the bills that were passed, attacking elected Territorial officials, criticizing the writing of the bills, ridiculing our "patchwork tax system."

The legislature reacted to this needling from above as might be expected. Many legislators refused to have anything to do with bills backed by the Governor. Because of this breach an appropriation for the Alaska Territorial Guard, certainly needed at this time, was almost whittled down to where the organization would have been stumped for operating funds.

There were statements of protest on the floor of the house and on the senate floor for the lobbying from above, and not without justification.

It was a great disappointment to me, after hearing the excellent speech given by the Governor at the opening of the legislative session, to see him allow prejudice or other reasons lead him beyond the realm of logic in later messages concerning various legislation.

On January 27 the Governor delivered his message to a joint session of the house and senate.

"It is a time," he told the legislators, "for laying aside petty differences, personal and political animosities; for the submergence of selfish interests; for clear-headed and full-hearted devotion; for patriotism of deeds rather than of words; for action. It is a time for greatness."

That was a fine statement.

Later, however, whether the heat of the battle was the cause, or what, the Governor seemed to completely forget other statements he made in that message, turning around to contradict his own words.

When the Governor informed the legislature that he was allowing the new fish-tax bill to become a law without his signature, one of his criticisms was that the bill spoke of losses of taxes.

His exact words were, "The preamble likewise speaks of the 'loss of taxes from other sources resulting from the war.' What are these? Liquor stamp taxes have been higher than ever. * * *"

Yet this statement was made hardly 2 months after the Governor had said in his message:

"The Territory may face a substantial deficit before the end of the coming biennium. The reasons for this foreshadowed decrease in revenue are familiar to all of us; the mining of gold, a commodity not essential to the prosecution of the war, has been suspended for the duration except in the few instances where its extraction is accompanied by the recovery of strategic minerals; and salmon packing, our largest industry, is likewise, curtailed owing to transportation difficulties. * * *"

Later in the speech he said:

"Likewise it is impossible to foretell with any degree of accuracy what the tax returns from liquor sales will be: they were high during the first part of last biennium, but factors relating to the war are curtailing the supply and limiting the hours in which liquor may be sold; and there may be further restrictions."

Concerning liquor in his message on the fish tax bill, the Governor said, "liquor stamp taxes have been higher than ever."

This wasn't the only example of the Governor switching his opinions in the middle of the road.

The Governor made another statement in his opening message that was to be remembered later for comparison. He said:

"The argument that local, State, or Territorial government should be practically inoperative in wartime, and that instead we should abdicate to the Federal Government, is a negation of the very essence of democracy."

But later, in his veto message of the Territorial department of labor bill, he suggests the Territory abandon a Territorial agency because "* * * newly established Federal agencies—the War Labor Board and the War Manpower Commission—have come in to take over a large part of the governmental labor field and are carrying out the far-reaching provisions beneficial to labor which have been established with the creation of these agencies. As the war continues, Alaska's labor will increasingly come under Federal jurisdiction * * *."

And in the same veto message, the one in which he suggests a cut in salary for the labor commissioner, he inserts a copy of the message on the subject which he wrote for the 1941 legislature, stating, "the salary of the commissioner * * * is inadequate. The salary of every other elected official in the Territory is $5,000 per annum. The commissioner of labor should rank with these."

These glaring contradictions leap out of all of the Governor's contacts with the legislature, shouting too loud to be overlooked. No one can deny that these were the facts, however unbelievable.

It was apparent that the chief executive went out of his way to widen the existing breach, to go to great length to take a jab at the people's representatives, to hammer at bills for "defective draftsmanship," a phrase that appeared often in messages to the two houses.

Many of these things could have been overlooked. It is noteworthy that some mistakes were overlooked.

For instance, until the 1943 legislature amended the law, the Territory had upon its statute books a law which said that every public office, institution, officer, or employee of the Territory, before making purchases over $50, would have to obtain bids for the purchases. The 1943 legislature changed this amount to $250.

Meanwhile three bills (in the monetary sense) came into the legislature to be paid—some old debts. One was for $798 worth of steel lockers purchased for the Alaska National Guard in Ketchikan. Another was for $427 worth of lumber for the same purpose in Fairbanks, and the other for $325 for a safe at Bethel, all purchases apparently made without competitive bids being called for, necessary according to both old and new laws. Yet these bills were approved in spite of the fact that the law had been violated if these purchases were made without calls for bids.

At this writing a bill has been introduced in Congress by Alaska Delegate ANTHONY J. DIMOND, asking that Alaskans be granted the privilege of electing their own Governor. Speaker James V. Davis introduced and the house and senate of the Territorial legislature passed a memorial urging Congress to take favorable action upon such a measure.

Davis introduced the memorial on March 11 and it was referred to Representative Stanley McCutcheon's judiciary committee where it was held until March 17 before being referred out. That was on the fifty-second day, and it was obvious that it would have to be advanced rapidly if passed through both houses before the session ended.

The votes on this measure, so close to the Territory's universal desire for home rule, are important. How any of the elected representatives could vote against the measure was hard to believe.

Yet, when the bill came up for second reading, and Representative Harvey J. Smith moved to suspend the rules and advance it to third reading and final passage, Representative Crystal Snow Jenne voted against advancing it. Mrs. Jenne objected to this reporter for mentioning this fact in a story, saying that her reason for so voting was that she was against advancing measures out of their regular procedure. Her objection was not valid because the house journal will show that Mrs. Jenne at various times voted for advancing other measures.

The action of certain senators on this all-important memorial also should be interesting to the people. Because it was received in the senate on the fifty-fourth day, a two-thirds vote was necessary for its acceptance for consideration. Both Senator Frank S. Gordon and Senator A. P. Walker voted against receiving the measure. One more vote would have killed it right there and then. The other members of the senate, however, voted to receive the measure and it was referred to Senator Hjalmar Nordale's judiciary committee which referred it back out favorably on the same day, advanced to third reading and final passage at the request of Senator Nordale, and passed by a 7 to 1 vote. Senator Gordon voted against it.

Here was an opportunity to determine how well the people's representatives fulfilled their duty to the people.

VIII. LIQUOR BILLS

Only one bill that would have added additional taxes to the liquor field, one already exhausted by the Federal Government, came close to being passed. It would have doubled the taxes on all liquor, making the tax on whisky $2 a gallon for the Territory.

The House passed the bill which was introduced by Representatives Leo Rogge and Frank Whaley, but it was lost in conference largely because of the opposition raised by Senator N. R. Walker, who was reluctant to advance the tax because he believed sincerely that another boost would put the sale of legal whisky out of reach of the common man and force him to resort to cheap substitutes, even bootlegged moonshine or his own dangerous product when he wanted a drink.

Representative Harvey J. Smith's wholesale liquor bill, while it might well have added some revenue, would have placed the Territory in business heretofore left to private enterprise. In addition, the bill brought more telegraphic objections from the people of the Territory and more from labor unions, than any bill tossed into the hopper.

Both of these bills were introduced solely with the purpose in mind of raising more revenue. But other liquor bills had a prohibitionist ring to them.

Representative Crystal Snow Jenne introduced a bill that would have closed all cocktail bars in the Territory, would have forbidden the sale of hard liquor for consumption on the premises. Not only would it have driven liquor drinking back into the alleys

but it would have knocked a large chunk off the Territory's revenue.

The bill was referred to Representative Jesse Lander's committee on education, public health, quarantine, and morals. The committee recommended against it, and Mrs. Jenne withdrew it, offering a substitute which would have raised the license fees for such dispensaries from $500 to $1,000 in small towns, to $2,000 from $1,000 in larger towns in Alaska, exactly doubling the license and having the same purpose of taxing out of business many small dispensaries. The bill was killed by a 9-to-6 vote.

Later Mrs. Jenne introduced another bill, this one doubling the licenses for restaurants selling beer and wine from $150 to $300. When the bill came up for second reading, Representative Stanley McCutcheon moved, and Representative Joseph Kehoe seconded the motion, to raise the tax license to $500. The motion was lost by a 12-to-4 vote, and the bill was later killed by a 9-to-6 vote.

IX. TAILINGS

A bill to set up a new office in Alaska was lost in conference after it had been butchered up considerably. This was a measure to set up a tax commission, drafted by Representatives Tolbert Scott and John J. O'Shea to create the office under the Territorial treasurer, and giving the treasurer the power to appoint the commissioner.

Later, it was amended in the senate to give appointive powers to the Governor, to pay the tax commissioner a salary which would have been more than the treasurer gets. The House refused to concur, and a conference committee couldn't make an agreement.

Interest lagged in the bill toward the end. It was doubtful whether the new office was needed.

Representative Crystal Snow Jenne introduced a measure which would have made it illegal to issue marriage licenses to anyone unless applicants could prove that they were free from contagious or infectious venereal diseases, epilepsy, feeble-mindedness, insanity, drug addiction, or chronic alcoholism.

This bill, if it had become law, would have required an examination by a licensed physician to supposedly determine these things. Some legislators believed the bill would lead to more children being born out of wedlock and questioned the justice of any physician being able to determine insanity, when a jury trial is necessary before an insane person may be so adjudged.

A bill introduced by Representatives William Egan and R. E. Hardcastle would have provided for a referendum on statehood. It passed the house 15 to 1, but when referred to the senate committee on education, it never came back on the floor. Chairman of the committee was Senator N. R. Walker, and members were O. D. Cochran, H. H. McCutcheon, and Frank Gordon.

A measure introduced in the senate by Senator Hjalmar Nordale would have provided for the direct election of national committeemen and committeewomen and delegates and alternates to national conventions in the same manner as territorial officers are elected. It was referred to Senator H. H. McCutcheon's committee on elections and brought back out some time later without recommendation. When it came up for final passage, Senator N. R. Walker asked that it be referred to the committee on judiciary and Federal relations for specific amendment, and this was done. The author was chairman of the committee.

Back on the floor, the committee recommended limiting the bill to the direct election of committeemen and committeewomen, deleting the part concerning delegates and alternates to national conventions, and the amendments were adopted.

When the bill came up for discussion and final passage, it was killed.

The legislature attempted to correct differences in salaries existing between certain Territorial officials, and succeeded where prejudice could be thrown aside.

The director of public welfare received a salary increase to $4,800 from $4,000. Teachers' salaries generally were raised by 25 percent, but an attempt to set up a retirement-fund system for Alaskan teachers was not successful.

One of the most important pieces of legislation came in the last few moments of the session. It was a memorial by Representative Rogge urging Congress to take some steps to allow Alaskans to prospect, settle in, and develop some of the new territory which transportation networks brought about by the war have opened up.

The house passed the measure with little objection, and the senate passed it by a 6–2 vote after the Governor did his best to kill it.

Specifically, and most important, the memorial concerned a vast 40-mile strip of land containing some 8,000,000 acres along the new Alaska Highway, set aside by Federal order which prohibits sale, location, selection, and entry under the public-land laws, mining laws, and leasing laws. No prospector could cross its bounds. Prospective settlers would have to hike for 20 miles on either side of the highway to take up land.

The order discouraged settlement and development.

The Governor insisted the reservation was made merely for the purpose of permitting a study to determine the best means of developing the new land, but the order as read into the Federal Register said nothing of this.

A representative of the National Park Service already has been up to make a survey of the land.

There are fears that the new area will be turned into another Department of the Interior project—fine for attracting tourists—terrible for encouraging basic development.

Generally, the elected representatives did a good job concerning the problems presented and the interference by the executive branch into the affairs of the legislative branch.

Noticeable was the lack of division between party lines and the lack of friction in this respect. Senator Stewart L. Stangroom, the lone Republican, voted like a true Jeffersonian Democrat.

I was favorably impressed by the average intelligence and ability of the men and women of the first session of the Territorial legislature which I have had the pleasure of covering from a news standpoint.

At the same time, I was sadly disappointed in the actions of some of the elected representatives because they seemed to lose sight of the purpose for which they had been chosen—to represent the people.

Among those who served the Territory well, in my opinion, were Representatives James V. Davis, Leo Rogge, Harvey Smith, Mrs. Alaska Stewart Linck, R. E. Hardcastle, Tolbert Scott, Christian Roust, Frank Whaley, Wallace Porter; Senators O. D. Cochran, N. R. Walker, Hjalmar Nordale, Edward Coffey and Stewart Stangroom.

Alaska is fortunate to have men of this caliber who are willing to devote 60 days every 2 years, away from their homes and businesses for the welfare of the Territory.

Two years hence, when the legislature meets again, it is probable that there will be 16 Senators and 24 Representatives. If they are chosen well, the same high quality will be maintained.

Some of those who came down for the Sixteenth Session of the Alaska Territorial Legislature were not well chosen.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 3309. An act to suspend during the present war the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

H. R. 3338. An act relating to Government and other exemptions from the tax with respect to the transportation of property;

H. R. 3363. An act extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made; and

H. R. 3381. An act relating to credits against the Victory tax.

ASSISTANCE TO STATES AND TERRITORIES IN FINANCING THEIR SYSTEMS OF PUBLIC EDUCATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. ROBERTSON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 637) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ABSENTEE VOTING BY MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the absentee balloting amendment which I am submitting on behalf of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and myself today is a proposed revision of the legislation which we introduced last June to amend existing Federal law as to absentee balloting by members of the armed forces.

In September of 1942 the Congress established machinery for absentee balloting by members of the armed forces. This machinery, although a step in the right direction, has proved to be too complicated, time-consuming and cumbersome to afford a genuine opportunity for voting.

For these reasons, last June the Senator from Illinois and I, and Representative WORLEY, introduced tentative bills, known as S. 1285, in the Senate, and H. R. 3073 in the House of Representatives, which sought to simplify and facilitate balloting by the services.

Since its introduction, this bill has been carefully studied by its proponents, by representatives of the War and Navy Departments, and by many others. As a result of these studies, the bill has been redrafted in several important respects, and it may interest Senators to have attention drawn to them.

The new draft of the bill which is submitted today would establish a United States War Ballot Commission, composed of five members, including at least two Democrats and at least two Republicans. The Commission would be charged with the duty of generally supervising the administration of the Federal absentee balloting machinery established by the proposed legislation. Acting in consultation with the War and Navy Departments, the Commission would ease the administrative burdens which absentee balloting imposes upon those departments. The Commission would also serve as a liaison between the Federal Government and the States insofar as absentee balloting is concerned, and would gen-

erally seek to facilitate and expedite voting by members of the armed forces.

As originally introduced last June, the bill provided for V-mail balloting by those outside the United States. Studies show that the transmission of a large number of ballots might clog the V-mail facilities and thus prevent many ballots from being returned in time. So the new draft of the bill eliminates the requirement that the ballots be microfilmed. All ballots cast outside the United States would be transmitted by airplane, however, in order to get them back to the United States as soon as possible, and in actual experience air mail is often quicker than V-mail and also ensures secrecy of the ballot.

The June version of the bill had provided for distribution of simple write-in ballots to members of the armed forces outside the United States. The new version of the bill, submitted today, extends this feature to members of the armed forces within the United States, as well. The effect is to cut out application for and return of the ballot and so to cut down the number of steps necessary for balloting from three to one. This simplifies voting very much. It also reduces the time necessary for voting to, at most, one-third of that required by the existing statute, thereby helping to solve the tremendous communications problem involved in voting by servicemen who are scattered all over the world.

Although the amendment sets up a precise and careful procedure for balloting, directed at furnishing the opportunity to vote to as many of the members of the armed forces as possible, considerable administrative discretion is given to the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy, and to commanding officers so as to prevent interference with military operations.

The bill as proposed to be amended would also permit noncommissioned officers, as well as commissioned officers, to administer and attest oaths of electors, thereby easing the burden which existing law and the earlier bill placed upon commissioned officers.

The new draft of the bill also creates sanctions to guarantee that, to the fullest extent compatible with military operations, members of the armed forces will have a genuine opportunity to vote, and that votes cast by them will be counted. Criminal penalties are imposed upon anyone who, willfully and without due justification, deprives any voter of the right or privilege provided for in the amendment or interferes with his right to vote under the amended bill, or who willfully refuses or fails to count any ballot validly cast, or who does any fraudulent act in connection with the casting of ballots. In addition, the amendment provides that when the Governor of each State certifies, as he is required to do by existing law, the appointment of the electors of President and Vice President in his State, he must also certify that there has been a substantial compliance by the officials in his State with the provisions of the proposed voting bill. If the Governor of the State does not so certify, or if the United States War Ballot Commission certifies that there has not been substantial compliance by officials in the State, the Senate and the House of Representatives are empowered to determine by separate but concurrent action whether the noncompliance so affected the appointment of electors as to require the electoral vote to be treated as invalid.

The right to vote under the bill is extended to members of the United States Merchant Marine and to civilians outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces or who are officers or employees of the United States.

In order to afford an opportunity to vote for State officials and to utilize State absentee balloting procedures to the fullest possible extent, post-card forms would be made available to members of the armed forces upon request. These post cards may be used, if State law permits, as applications for ballots or to register under State absentee balloting laws, or as sources of information to implement State absentee balloting laws.

Where a voter casts a ballot under a State absentee balloting law, whether he uses the post-card application form or not, he cannot vote also under the Federal procedure.

I ask that the amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and myself to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to which the original bill was referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be referred as requested by the Senator from Rhode Island, and printed.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day, my colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] submitted an amendment to a bill which was introduced in July of last year. I wish to make one or two observations with respect to that amendment.

Much discussion has been had throughout the country with respect to the bill which was introduced, which would permit soldiers in this country or in foreign lands to participate in the elections of 1944. There was quite a bit of comment in some of the newspapers of the country with respect to voting through V-mail. Many contended that such a procedure would be unconstitutional because of the violation of the secrecy of the ballot. I do not agree with that contention. Nevertheless, in the amended bill which has been introduced that portion of the bill has been stricken, and a ballot voted in a foreign land would be voted as it would be voted in this country, and would be sent to this country by air.

On July 14 of this year, in an address over a national radio hook-up, I said, among other things:

> The bill is now before the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Hearings will be held as soon as the recess of Congress is over. The bill may not be perfect in every detail. I invite Members of the Congress, or any other citizen of the country who is interested in the bill, to study it with a view toward making constructive suggestions to the end that there will be no question about providing citizens in the armed service the opportunity to vote.

During the recess of Congress many suggestions have been made to the Senator from Illinois as well as to the Senator from Rhode Island, containing constructive amendments to the original bill which was introduced. Out of all those suggestions has come the amendment which was today referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

In conclusion, let me say that hearings on the bill will be held in the very near future, and I sincerely hope that any Senator, or any other individual who is interested in the mechanics of the bill, will give to the Senator from Rhode Island and myself, or the Committee on Privileges and Elections, the benefit of his knowledge, because the mechanics of the bill are rather difficult, to say the least.

INVESTIGATION OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS BY WIRE AND RADIO

Mr. WHEELER (for himself, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. MCFARLAND) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 187), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

> Whereas efficient communication by wire and radio between the United States and foreign countries is important to the diplomatic, military, and commercial interests of the United States; and
>
> Whereas such international communications by wire and radio and the facilities and personnel employed therein are in substantial measure subject to the jurisdiction, control, and influence of foreign governments and foreign nationals; and
>
> Whereas it is necessary in the interests of the United States that a national and an international policy of the United States with respect to international communications should be determined and declared, and that the highest practical standards of operations and of service should be made effective at fair and just rates: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate or a subcommittee thereof appointed by the chairman be, and it hereby is, authorized and directed to make a thorough study and investigation of international communications by wire and radio, and in particular of such communications from and to the United States; to receive and hear evidence as to (1) the ownership, control, the services rendered, the rates charged therefor, and the methods of operation, of United States carriers engaged in such communications; (2) the extent and nature of the control and influence, direct or indirect, of foreign governments over communication carriers authorized by them, the extent to which foreign governments own and operate such foreign communications services, whether such operation by government is direct or otherwise, the character and extent of the competition between foreign companies, whether owned by governments or privately, in communications to and from the United States, and in particular the nature and degree of competition of such foreign companies with American companies in such communication services; (3) the character and adequacy of services furnished by

American companies now engaged in international communications to the people and the diplomatic, military, and commercial interests of the United States; (4) the developments and improvements in the art of communication by wire or radio affecting, or which may be expected to affect, such international communications; (5) whether there should be competitive services between American companies in particular areas or circuits in international communications; (6) desirable forms and standards of organization of American communication companies, and in particular whether such companies should be permitted or required to merge or consolidate and the general terms, conditions, and obligations which should be imposed in the event of such permitted or required merger or consolidation; (7) the form and authority of the regulatory body of the United States to be charged with carrying out the policies in international communications declared by the Congress; and (8) generally to consider and to make recommendations to the Congress as to all other matters and things necessary in its judgment in meeting the purposes of the studies herein specifically set forth.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR AND EXPENDITURES BY EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, BUREAUS, AND AGENCIES

Mr. REED submitted a resolution (S. Res. 188), which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Whereas in the several years immediately preceding Pearl Harbor (December 7, 1941) the civilian administrative bureaus and agencies of our Federal Government were increased and expanded manyfold, beyond any comparable period in our history with the result of utilizing or impounding manpower and requiring huge sums of money for their various programs, far in excess of their contribution to our national welfare; and

Whereas this expansion of civil administrative bureaus has been continued since war was declared on December 8, 1941, and many additional bureaus have been created to manage the daily affairs of our citizens in addition to necessary war agencies; and

Whereas heads of many of these bureaus have come to regard themselves as beyond and above the law and not accountable to lawmaking bodies and as outside of and not responsible to fundamental restrictions imposed by the Constitution adopted by the Thirteen Original States as the basis of our system of government; and

Whereas as this disregard of fundamental law has become and is a serious threat to the permanence of our theory of government; and

Whereas it is imperative that this condition be corrected before the financial solvency of our Government is impaired beyond mending; and

Whereas the executive division of the Government has been disdainful and disregardful of the limitation imposed by the Constitution and the division of power and responsibility explicitly set forth in that immortal document; and

Whereas departments, bureaus, and agencies, while flouting the fundamental authority of the legislative arm of the Government and operating upon their own theories of civil and economic organization must, as yet, come to the legislative branch for grants of money and supplies with which to operate; and

Whereas these several departments, bureaus, and agencies immediately disregard plainly and clearly expressed limitations upon and directions as to the use of funds only obtainable by action of the legislative body: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the duly constituted Committee on Appropriations, an agency and servant of the Senate, be instructed that—

(1) In all cases of appropriations requested by the several departments, bureaus, and agencies, the responsible heads be summoned before the committee (or a duly constituted subcommittee) and be interrogated as to the expenditure of funds requested, with particular regard to the extent that the clearly expressed intent of the legislative body has been observed or has been disregarded.

(2) The Senate having created a special committee to give especial attention to the matters referred to herein, namely, the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the Committee on Appropriations is hereby directed to request the cooperation of this committee in determining the extent of cooperation or disregard on the part of the several departments, bureaus, and agencies, of the expressed policy or policies of the legislative body, the observance of which is the essential factor in the use of public funds; be it further

Resolved, That if, upon interrogation, the heads of the several departments, bureaus, and agencies fail to give satisfactory answers and assurance as to the use of funds in accordance with the letter and the spirit of the act making appropriation of funds, the funds for such departments, bureaus, and agencies shall be reduced one-half from the amount requested or be refused entirely, and the committee is directed to recommend to the Senate the extent of the reduction it deems advisable in the various estimates submitted to it. As a matter of policy the Senate of the United States declares that the permanency of institutions created by the Constitution is imperiled unless the legislative branch of government reasserts and obtains complete control over public funds obtained by taxation of citizens of the United States, and brings to an immediate end the flagrant disregard and freely expressed contempt of safeguards over the public purse regarded as essential if our Government is to endure; and be it further

Resolved, That the committees named herein are directed to give particular attention to, among other departments, bureaus, and agencies, the Office of Price Administration, Office of War Information, Department of Labor, War Manpower Commission, Reconstruction Finance Corporation (and its agencies and subsidiaries), Civil Service Commission, Department of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Corporation, Office of Economic Warfare, Petroleum Administration for War, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, War Production Board, War Department (civilians in service), Federal Power Commission, Federal Communications Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, Department of the Interior, Office for Emergency Management, Maritime Commission, Federal Works Agency, Office of Lend-Lease Administration, and Farm Security Agency.

INVESTIGATION RESPECTING THE DISTRIBUTION AND SUPPLY OF FARM LABOR

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution providing for the appointment of a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the supply and distribution of farm labor. I submit the resolution, and I may add that I hope it will be referred to the appropriate committee, which I take it is the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I hope the resolution will be agreed to at an early date. In submitting the resolution, I particularly desire to emphasize that I voted against Public Law 45, of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The resolution (S. Res. 189) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the supply and distribution of farm labor, for the purpose of ascertaining whether the fullest possible utilization is being made of migratory and seasonal agricultural workers in the United States, and whether the effective utilization of such workers has been hindered by the administration of the provisions of the joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, approved April 29, 1943 (Public Law 45, 78th Cong.). Such committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECT OF THE CENTRALIZATION OF HEAVY INDUSTRY

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 190), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Resolved, That a special committee of seven Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the effect upon interstate commerce of the centralization of heavy industry in the United States, with particular regard to whether such centralization inhibits or deters adequate use and development of natural resources or hampers the full and free flow of commerce between the States, and to make a comprehensive study of plans and proposals for industrial recentralization, particularly through establishment of new or expanded facilities for the production of iron and steel. Such committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation and study, with such recommendations for legislation as it may deem necessary and desirable, and shall also report to the Senate from time to time its views on needed or desirable executive or administrative action by any department or agency of the Federal Government.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to request such assistance and information from any departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents,

to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

THANKS TO SENATORIAL COMMITTEE VISITING WAR FRONTS, AND PRINTING OF REPORT

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution which for the information of the Senate I desire to be permitted to read. The resolution (S. Res. 191) is as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate express its thanks to RICHARD B. RUSSELL, a Senator from Georgia; to JAMES M. MEAD, a Senator from New York; to HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., a Senator from Massachusetts; to ALBERT B. CHANDLER, a Senator from Kentucky; and to RALPH O. BREWSTER, a Senator from Maine, for the fidelity of purpose and the objectivity with which they have severally reported to the Senate concerning the matters and things coming to their notice and examined by them while in the course of their world-wide investigation of American participation in the war; and

Resolved, That the report prepared and read by Mr. RUSSELL to the Senate October 7, 1943, after it shall have been edited by him at his discretion, be printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Connecticut will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

WARTIME NATIONAL MILK SUPPLY

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I desire to quote with my endorsement the following four points made by the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation in a statement of policy dealing with consumer food subsidies:

1. Food subsidies represent a constantly increasing public debt which will be transferred in large part, when they return from the war, to the men in our fighting forces, the majority of whom are now serving for $50 a month.

2. Food subsidies are inflationary. The printing of bonds to pay for food is not unlike the printing of currency to pay for governmental expenditures when the governmental credit has run out.

3. Food subsidies imply that the Government intends to share, more or less permanently, the payment of grocery bills of its citizens without regard to their capacity to pay their way through life.

4. The new milk subsidy, which we are informed is being worked out on the basis of individual subsidy payments to some 3,000,000 producers of milk, will strengthen bureaucratic control over the lives of the farm people.

I may add, Mr. President, that through the use of consumer food subsidies, a bureaucratic administration also can increase its control over voters as consumers, by promising more subsidies or threatening to decrease food subsidies to consumers. I ask unanimous consent that the statement of policy from which I have just quoted be printed in full in the RECORD as part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A serious impending shortage of the national milk supply now confronts the American people. Increase of the number of ration points on butter to 16 per pound or double the number of points originally set by the Government, and the recent freeze on sales of fluid milk, are but surface manifestations of a critical condition whose advent was predicted early in the year by the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation. Failure of the Government to provide means whereby dairy farmers could pay for advancing production costs, including higher farm wages and feed costs, is the cause of this national crisis with respect to the milk supply. An arbitrary policy of holding down prices of some dairy products and beating down the prices of others without regard to its consequences now brings the people face to face with the stark reality that violation of the eternal principle of supply and demand, coupled with rationing of relatively low-priced commodities, leads to scarcity.

Instead of following the simple and natural course of adequate pricing to obtain adequate production, the Government has chosen the hard way of attempting to freeze prices, freeze the free movement of producers from one outlet to another and to substitute instead various types of subsidies, to give producers partial compensation under terms and conditions which greatly inhibit their freedom.

At this time we will not attempt to discuss the relative demerits of the different types of subsidies. We limit our comment to the broad question of subsidy in lieu of adequate prices at a time when the vast majority of the people of this Nation are amply able to pay for the food which they are now eating. Such a policy is open to many objections, among which are:

1. Food subsidies represent a constantly increasing public debt which will be transferred, when they return from the war, in large part, to the men in our fighting forces, the majority of whom are now serving for $50 per month.

2. Food subsidies are inflationary. The printing of bonds to pay for food is not unlike the printing of currency to pay for governmental expenditures when the governmental credit has run out.

3. Food subsidies imply that the Government intends to share more or less permanently the payment of the grocery bills of its citizens without regard to their capacity to pay their way through life.

4. The new milk subsidy, which we are informed is being worked out on the basis of individual subsidy payments to some 3,000,000 producers of milk, will strengthen bureaucratic control over the lives of the farm people.

The payment of subsidies has developed an elaborate scheme of interlocking controls so that the terms and conditions of receiving a subsidy constitutes the exercise of policing power not contemplated by existing law. Thus government by regulation is constantly supplanting government by law; and government by regulation rapidly emerges into government by fear. Knowledge is within our possession of many instances wherein this type of governmental compulsion is being exercised coordinately by various branches of officialdom to require persons to obey regulations through pressure tactics and to make them fearful of entering the courts to protect their constitutional rights.

While one branch of the Government is putting an iron hand upon food cost, another branch of the Government is continuously telling the Congress that the people have so much money unexpendable that it must be taxed away from them and that compulsory savings must be inaugurated; and various plans are offered to utilize the increasing take-offs from the incomes of individuals. We hold that a line of distinction should be drawn between those who are able to pay their own grocery bills and those who for various reasons, such as old age, dependency, disability, and lack of sufficient skill, and workers in educational, ministerial, and kindred types of employment, are not able to earn a sufficient amount of money to provide a decent standard of living. For such as these, we concede that the Government should in some degree supplement low standard earnings with relief payments. But for the remainder of the people, it seems to us only common sense that they should pay their own way through this war and not transfer their present living costs to the returning members of the armed forces. If Congress intends to subsidize living costs for those who can afford to pay, let it make cash payments to those consumers who are to benefit; and let those beneficiaries shoulder the responsibility of this stigma. Farmers do not desire such payments. They seek only fair prices.

A large percentage of America's remaining dairy farmers can and will survive the distress under which they now labor. Many will abandon dairy operations. More will curtail dairy production so as to reduce their losses to a minimum; but enforced self-protection of this character will not maintain enough production of milk and its products. The choice, therefore, lies with the people as to whether they will prefer to pay moderately increased prices for dairy products or severely curtail and in some instances do without these products until the time comes when dairy production can be revived.

We are confident that the Congress is aware of this serious economic situation. We, therefore, offer to the Congress the suggestion that it immediately enact legislation which will direct the responsible agencies of the Government to provide reasonable price ceilings which will at least compensate milk producers for their increasing costs of production and enable them to meet the competition of alternative opportunities in farming.

SHORTAGE OF BOXCARS FOR SHIPMENT OF GRAINS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated October 8, 1943, addressed to managers and directors of all cooperative elevators, signed by Mr. M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn., together with a statement by Mr. Charles E. Nieman, general counsel of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, delivered at a meeting of the Northwest Shippers Advisory Board, on September 30, 1943.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION,
St. Paul, Minn., October 8, 1943.

To Managers and Directors of All Cooperative Elevators:

The American Railroad Association Car Order No. 10 directly threatens the welfare of your cooperative elevator and every other cooperative elevator. We have records of cooperative elevators which will suffer a loss in volume of business—because of A. R. A. Order No. 10—of from 100,000 to 200,000 bushels this year. That means that farmers who own and patronize these elevators will lose between 4 and 10 cents a bushel. In each of these communities the farmers will lose between $4,000 and $20,000 because they are unable to move grain through their own co-op elevators.

If you want to end this discrimination against farmers and their cooperative elevators, read the attached statements. They

consist of a brief filed by legal counsel for Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association at a hearing held in the Minnesota State Office Building, St. Paul, September 30, and the text of a broadcast made by Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association on October 3.

Certain selfish interests are making a real effort to preserve the discriminatory A. R. A. Order No. 10. This is another battle in the war against consumer as well as producer cooperatives. These same interests have always fought the cooperative movement. Here is at least part of the record of what these interests have either opposed or failed to support:

The McNary-Haugen bill, influencing its veto on two occasions.

Enactment of Agricultural Adjustment Act.

The ever-normal granary.

The Commodities Exchange Act which enables farm cooperatives to trade on the market places.

The Farm Act of 1938.

They now use the opportunity afforded under A. R. A. Car Order No. 10 to take to themselves profits which rightfully belong to the farmers' cooperatives.

The order must and will be changed. It is to your interest and to the interest of the farmers you represent to read the attached legal brief and broadcast which summarize the present discrimination being practiced against cooperatives through A. R. A. Order No. 10.

Very truly yours,

M. W. THATCHER,
General Manager.

My name is Charles E. Nieman. As general counsel for Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, I appear for the more than 50,000 farmers who own the 300 cooperative elevators affiliated with Farmers Union G. T. A. My remarks are equally in the interest of the additional 300 farmers' elevators not affiliated with G. T. A.

We appreciate that Order No. 10 is not law. It has not been promulgated by any governmental authority. The farmers, therefcre, should be relieved of its unfair effects without recourse to governmental authorities having power to compel such correction.

Order No. 10 is simply a voluntary agreement between the railroads. It provides that each railroad shall deliver an equal number of cars to each elevator in the same community—and without regard to their actual requirements or their ordinary volume of business. They each get one car even though one elevator's business may be two or three times the size of the other—even though one elevator actually may need two or three times as many cars as the other.

For example, there are three elevators at Poplar, Mont. I quote the assistant freight traffic manager of the railway serving that station:

"On August 14 the Poplar Elevator filed notice that they were blocked and turning away grain. On August 15 the Farmers Union filed notice that they were blocked and turning away grain. On August 16 the Occident Elevator filed notice that they were blocked and turning away grain. Prior to those dates, the Farmers Union had loaded 24 cars during the month of August; the Poplar Elevator 14 cars; the Occident Elevator 13 cars. From August 18 to 22 during which period all 3 elevators were blocked, each elevator received the same number of cars, or 7 cars apiece, which is in line with the American Railway Association Car Service Division Circular No. 10."

In other words, the farmers' elevator with a business and a need for cars almost twice as great as either of the other two elevators obtained only one-third of the cars. I have with me convincing evidence of many other, equally gross injustices under order No. 10. A single illustration is sufficient, however, if we realize that it is no isolated case. Any rule which provides two elevators with cars for half of their normal business, but limits the farmers' elevator to only one-quarter of its normal business, is discriminatory and unfair.

Suppose that fuel oil was rationed on the basis of "one home—one car," or "one factory—one car of oil." Would anyone pretend that that was equitable where an apartment building housing 100 families received no more fuel oil than 1 housing only a dozen families? Or would anyone pretend, in the rationing of food, that a rule of "one family—one package" was fair when a family of 10 received no more food than a family of 2? Yet, that's the rule of order No. 10—"one elevator—one car."

What is more, order No. 10's rule of "one elevator—one car" is an unprecedented distortion of equality in the grain business. Today, grain shipments must be prorated because of the car shortage. A year ago, they were prorated because of the shortage of terminal storage space. At that time a committee fairly representing everyone in the grain business proposed a really equitable plan for prorating shipments of grain. It proposed that:

"The permit committee shall make every effort to allot permits so as to maintain the present competitive relationship, recognizing the requirements of each shipper, based on past volume of business."

Thereafter, shipping permits were issued on "the basis of past volume of business." So, today, the only fair basis for allocating cars is as they were prorated last year under the shipping permit regulations, that is, on the basis of past volume of business.

The fact is that many of the elevators are owned by the farmers. By operating their own elevators, they save between 4 cents and 10 cents per bushel. Moreover, they do a larger business per elevator than the privately owned elevators. That's the crux of this matter.

Notwithstanding that the farmers' elevator ships many times the amount of grain shipped by the private elevator in the same community, order No. 10 arbitrarily divides the available cars evenly between the two elevators. The result is that the farmers who are in the elevator business for themselves, must either take their grain to their competitor's elevator where cars are available under order No. 10, or else pile it on the ground. The farmers must take their grain to someone else's elevator and they lose the 4 cents to 10 cents per bushel they ordinarily save by operating their own elevator. So, order No. 10 mulcts the farmers of 4 cents to 10 cents per bushel on the price they should receive for their grain. That's the unfairness of order No. 10. That unfairness is real, expensive, substantial, and perfectly obvious.

The freight rate is the same whether the grain is shipped from one elevator to another. Hence, the substitution of a fair and equitable rule allocating cars on the basis of the elevator's usual, annual business will cost the railroads nothing.

Consider, on the other hand, the unfairness of order No. 10 to the farmers. The farmers already are in the middle between the Administration's fight to hold the line of retail prices by granting producers' subsidies and the refusal of Congress to continue parity payments. The farmer must sell his wheat at a price depressed by a ceiling imposed when parity payments took up the slack between that ceiling and parity. Now those payments have been suspended, but the ceiling remains.

On top of that, order No. 10 now is resurrected from the limbo where it has rested for 20 years. That order extracts still another 4 cents to 10 cents per bushel from the farmers—without 1 cent of profit to the railroads and without adding 1 bushel to our country's food supply.

Our country needs more and more food to win the war. The farmer is urged to increase wheat production by 25 percent. The farmers' patriotism is his only incentive. As against that single incentive, the increase of wheat production is discouraged by the cessation of parity payments, and by the retention of the subparity price ceiling. Now, that needed increase in production is further discouraged by Order No. 10 which means simply that the farmer cannot market his grain through his own elevator. It increases his marketing expense. It reduces by another 4 to 10 cents per bushel his income from his grain. It is unfair to the farmers and is another deterrent to the sorely needed increased production of grain.

Order No. 10 allocates one car to each elevator regardless of how many cars they actually may need. The only fair and equitable basis for allocating cars during the current shortage is to prorate them on the basis of past volume of business. To do otherwise, is to deprive the farmers' elevators of their fair share of the available cars and to compel farmers who own those elevators to sell their grain to their competitors who have the cars. That costs the farmers 4 to 10 cents per bushel which they ordinarily save by marketing their grain through their own elevators.

Order No. 10 is costing the farmers money with no corresponding benefit to the railroads or the Nation. In fact, it will be a substantial deterrent to the achievement of the increased wheat production our country so urgently needs. The farmers therefore urge that the "one elevator—one car" rule of Order No. 10 promptly be rescinded voluntarily by the railroads, in their own interest, as elementary fairness to the farmers, and in the interest of encouraging the wheat production needed by our country at war. The farmers urge the substitution of a rule allocating the available cars on the basis of the ordinary, annual bushelage of grain shipped by each elevator in prior years.

RESIGNATION OF DRAFT BOARD IN PROTEST AGAINST DRAFTING OF FATHERS

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, in the issue of the Washington Star of last evening appeared an Associated Press article under the headline "Entire draft board quits in protest on father rule."

The article is date-lined Whitehall, N. Y., October 11, and is as follows:

Resignations of all members of the Whitehall Draft Board were on file today in protest against I–A classification of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers while, they said, childless married men and single men were being deferred "for reasons we consider insufficient."

In a letter to State Selective Service headquarters, Judge Leon M. Layden, chairman, and H. J. Bascom and Robert Dempsey, the other members, stated:

"We felt that we could no longer conscientiously classify pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, some of them fathers of four and five children, in class I–A, when childless married men and also single men were still being deferred for reasons we consider insufficient, and local boards being apparently nothing more or less than rubber stamps."

At Albany, Brig. Gen. Ames T. Brown, State selective service director, said the resignations would be accepted.

AMERICA'S SALVATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BURTON

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "America's Salvation," delivered by him at the annual conference of the Ohio Fed-

eration of Republican Women's Organizations, Columbus, Ohio, October 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHALL THE PEOPLE OF ITALY RULE?—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LANGER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio speech delivered by him, on the subject Shall the People of Italy Rule? which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BROOKS AT NATIONAL FOOD CONFERENCE

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by him at the National Food Conference of Consumers and Producers, Chicago, Ill., September 16–17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER TO YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF WEST VIRGINIA

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have inserted in the RECORD excerpts from an address delivered by him before the Young Democratic Clubs of West Virginia, at Wheeling, on September 12, 1941, which appear in the Appendix.]

REPUBLICAN POLICY—ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR GRISWOLD, OF NEBRASKA

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Republican Policy," delivered by Gov. Dwight Griswold, of Nebraska, at the annual banquet of the Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Organizations, Columbus, Ohio, October 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY J. E. McDONALD AT NATIONAL FOOD CONFERENCE

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Mr. J. E. McDonald, Texas Commissioner of Agriculture, delivered before the National Food Conference, Chicago, Ill., on September 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. HOWARD LEONARD AT NATIONAL FOOD CONFERENCE

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hon. Howard Leonard, director of agriculture, State of Illinois, delivered at the National Food Conference, held at Chicago, Ill., on September 16–17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY LEON TODD AT NATIONAL FOOD CONFERENCE

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Leon Todd, representing the National Poultry Defense Committee, delivered at the National Food Conference of Consumers and Producers, held at Chicago, Ill., September 16–17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOCIAL SECURITY—ARTICLES BY ROBERT LASCH

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a series of four articles entitled "Towards Security," analyzing Senate bill 1161, written by Robert Lasch and published in the Chicago Sun October 1, 2, 3, and 4, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

MY VICTORY GARDEN—ARTICLE BY F. HINER DALE

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "My Victory Garden," prepared by Hon. F. Hiner Dale, of Guymon, Okla., which appears in the Appendix.]

MAJ. GEN. JAMES A. ULIO—ARTICLE BY BERNARD GODWIN

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a character sketch of Maj. Gen. James A. Ulio, The Adjutant General, United States Army, written by Bernard Godwin, and published in the Washington Star of last Sunday, under the heading "America's war leaders," which appears in the Appendix.]

POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC DISINTEGRATION IN NAZI-OCCUPIED COUNTRIES

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Constantine Brown dealing with the political and economic disintegration in Nazi-occupied countries, published in the Washington (D. C.) Star of October 9, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

OLD-AGE PENSIONS—LETTER FROM MR. TULLY WILLIAMS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter received by him from Mr. Tully Williams, of Hankinson, N. Dak., on the subject of old-age pensions, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE AMERICAN BUSINESSMAN TO AMERICA'S PRODUCTION EFFORT

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by H. A. Benning, president, the Amalgamated Sugar Co., Ogden, Utah, discussing the contribution of the American businessman to the success of America's production effort, which appears in the Appendix.]

TREASURY TAX PROPOSALS—ARTICLE BY FRANK R. KENT

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article discussing the new Treasury tax proposals, written by Frank R. Kent, and published in the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of October 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—PERMANENT PEACE RESOLUTION—EDITORIALS FROM RALEIGH (N. C.) NEWS AND OBSERVER

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials from the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of October 2, 1943, one entitled "Seeing the Light," and the other entitled "Will Santa Claus Fill It?" which appear in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 3291) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and it was signed by the Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MEAD obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Pursuant to the notice I gave at the last session of the Senate, I was preparing to ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 416.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield for that purpose?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I have no objection to having the calendar called, but I think I should be permitted to continue for a moment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, Mr. President, on the call of the calendar there is a limitation of debate.

Mr. MEAD. I fear that under the rule I would be limited to 5 minutes. Therefore, I cannot yield for a call of the calendar at this time, if it is possible for me to decline to yield, and if it is within my right to object to having the calendar called at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no desire to interfere with the Senator's remarks. I request that at the conclusion of the address by the Senator from New York the Senate proceed to consider bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 416.

Mr. MEAD. That is entirely agreeable, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection——

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to make a few remarks following the speech of the Senator from New York.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no desire to interfere with the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I do not wish to make any objection to the request of the distinguished Senator from New York, but I wish to say that in my opinion, when notice is given of a call of the calendar, it is notice to all Senators who are interested in bills on the calendar to be present. Under those circumstances bills on the calendar should have the right of way, just as an individual Senator would have if he had made a request to make a speech at a certain time. I hope that after today we may adhere to the policy of recognizing the right of Senators who are interested in bills on the calendar to have them considered. I know that the Senator from New York is complying with the long-established custom of interfering, and I make no objection to it; but it is difficult for Senators who have come to the Chamber for the purpose of watching the calendar to have to wait 2 or 3 hours for speeches to be made, as has been done in the past. In the future I hope it will be recognized that a call of the calendar is a privilege given to Members of the Senate who are interested in bills on the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may say to Senators that the calling of the calendar will probably require not more than an hour, after which there will be a bill under consideration, during the consideration of which any Senator may speak on that bill, or any subject which he chooses to discuss.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to state that I believe my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts has made a very good point in calling the attention of the Senate to the fact that notice was given that the calendar would be called, and that in accordance with the notice, Members who are interested in the bills on the calendar have put in an appearance and are waiting for the calendar to be called. I did not understand that notice had been given. So, if it is possible for me to reclaim the floor, or obtain recognition at the conclusion of the call of the calendar, I should like very much to have the calendar called. I shall be very happy to wait until that business is completed.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. When the notice was given by our leader that there would be a call of the calendar, notice was also given that immediately after the completion of the call of the calendar a motion would be made to consider Senate bill 637. I wonder if the Senator from New York would not allow that motion to be put, so as to permit Senate bill 637 to become the unfinished business. Then he could speak on it, or on any other subject.

Mr. MEAD. I will agree further that at the conclusion of the call of the calendar the motion to take up Senate bill 637 may be made. We shall then have something before the Senate. That arrangement is perfectly agreeable to me, provided, of course, that I may be recognized immediately after the motion is put.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I shall postpone my statement about the bill until after the Senator from New York shall have concluded.

Mr. MEAD. I shall wait until the motion is made.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from New York for his courtesy and magnanimous attitude. He has always exercised such courtesy in the past.

Mr. MEAD. I believe that the proposal advanced by the Senator from Massachusetts is a very constructive one, and I trust that his suggestion will be followed hereafter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 416.

CARRYING CONCEALED WEAPONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1151) to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to the carrying of concealed weapons was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, to provide penalties, to prescribe rules of evidence, and for other purposes," approved July 8, 1932 (47 Stat. 651; D. C. Code, 1940 ed., title 22, sec. 3204), be, and it hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. No person shall within the District of Columbia carry either openly or concealed on or about his person, except in his dwelling house or place of business or on other land possessed by him, a pistol, without a license therefor issued as hereinafter provided, or any deadly or dangerous weapon capable of being so concealed."

CONSTRUCTION OF PIPE LINES FOR STEAM HEATING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1345) to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is on the calendar a similar House bill, H. R. 3208, being order No. 423. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3208) to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senate bill was reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with two perfecting amendments, the language of which does not appear in the House bill. I therefore offer as amendments to the House bill the same amendments reported to the Senate bill, so as to make the two bills correspond.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be stated by the clerk.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 2, of the House bill, after the word "use", insert "not more than two"; and on the same page, after line 15, insert the following paragraph:

Any repairs to streets, highways, or other public property necessitated by construction or alterations of said pipe lines shall be made in a manner satisfactory to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, at the expense of Lansburgh and Brother.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 1345 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. I have just arrived in the Chamber. I am wondering what happened to Calendar No. 400, Senate bill 1272.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The call of the calendar was started with Calendar No. 416.

Mr. HATCH. Senate 1272 is an important bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The next two bills on the calendar are very important to the Post Office Department. I wonder if the Senator would be willing to postpone his request with respect to Calendar No. 400 until after those bills are called? I am obliged to leave the Chamber.

Mr. HATCH. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next business on the calendar.

INTERCHANGEABLE USE OF POST-OFFICE CLERKS AND CITY LETTER CARRIERS

The bill (S. 970) authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the measure. It is not a House bill. It is a bill proposed by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct. It is very strongly recommended by the Post Office Department that post-office clerks and city letter carriers be used interchangeably. I will read a very short statement from a letter addressed to the President of the Senate by the Postmaster General:

While the country is in a state of war, it is deemed highly desirable that the Post Office Department have authority to interchange personnel to meet the particular necessities of the occasion.

It was the unanimous opinion of the committee that at a time such as the present, when we are at war, the recommendation of the Post Office Department should be followed. That was the purpose of the bill, and the only purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 970) authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That while the United States is at war and for 6 months thereafter, the Postmaster General may, when the interest of the Service requires, temporarily assign any post-office clerk to the duties of city delivery carrier or any such carrier to the duties of such clerk and in an emergency may assign any post-office employee to the duties of a railway postal clerk or any railway postal clerk to the duties of a post-office employee without change of pay-roll status, the compensation of any temporary assigned employee to be paid from the appropriation made for the work to which he is regularly assigned.

APPLICATION OF RECLASSIFICATION ACT TO CUSTODIAL EMPLOYEES IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 2250) to extend the provisions of the Reclassification Act of February 28, 1925, to include custodial employees in the Postal Service, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from New Mexico very much.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I merely wish to say at this time that it was my intention to ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 400, Senate bill 1272. However, it has been suggested that I wait until the call of the calendar is completed, which I am glad to do, because the bill is one on which I think there should be a record vote. As soon as the calendar is completed I shall ask unanimous consent to recur to order No. 400, Senate bill 1272, and request a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish later to make the same request with reference to Calendar No. 349, Senate bill 878, which is a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, approved January 24, 1942."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

APPLICATION OF EXCESS-PROFITS TAX TO PRODUCTION BONUS PAYMENTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2888) relating to the application of the excess-profits tax to certain production bonus payments.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, House bill 2888 is designed to amend section 735 (c) and section 711 (a) (1) (I) and (a) (2) (K) of the Internal Revenue Code insofar as these sections relate to nontaxable bonus income. The bill in substance provides that the income from bonus payments made by a Government agency on account of the production in excess of a specified quota of mineral products recovered from mine tailings shall be excluded from the excess-profits tax, whether or not the producer had an economic interest in the mineral property.

Section 4 of the bill provides that the amendments shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1940, which is the effective date of the provisions of the present law relating to nontaxable bonus income. The effective date of the provisions of the present law relating to nontaxable income from excess output of mines and timber blocks is not intended to be changed by this bill. The latter provisions will continue to be applicable only to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941.

The bill is highly recommended by the War Production Board. The Treasury offers no objection to it. It has been unanimously reported by the Senate Finance Committee without amendment. But there is some possibility that section 4 of the bill might lead to some confusion. I therefore offer an amendment to the bill as reported by the committee, to strike out section 4 of the bill and insert a new section 4, which relates only to the effective date of the amendment. It is intended to prevent confusion in that respect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, after line 10, it is proposed to strike out section 4 of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this act shall be effective as if they were a part of section 209 of the Revenue Act of 1942 on the date of its enactment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, what is the number of the bill?

Mr. GEORGE. It is House bill 2888, Calendar No. 424. It passed the House unanimously and was reported by the Senate Finance Committee without amendment. But in order to avoid any confusion as to the effective date of the amendment the Treasury believes that section 4 should be eliminated, and that a new section 4 should be inserted in lieu thereof.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the explanation of the bill, but I am at a loss to know what happened after we reached Calendar No. 416. As I understand, Calendar No. 418, Senate bill 1345, was passed. Some amendments were included in Calendar No. 423, House bill 3208.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Calendar No. 418, Senate bill 1345, was indefinitely postponed when the corresponding House bill was passed.

Mr. McNARY. Was Calendar No. 421, Senate bill 970, passed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Calendar No. 421, Senate bill 970; Calendar No. 422, House bill 2250; and Calendar No. 423, House bill 3208, were all passed, and the Senate is now considering Calendar No. 424, House bill 2888.

Mr. McNARY. That is the bill to which reference is being made by the able Senator from Georgia?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. To that bill I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

DEMONSTRATION PLANTS TO PRODUCE SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 451, Senate bill 1243. I make the request, after having consulted the leaders on both sides of the Chamber, because it will be necessary for me to leave the Chamber within a short time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, we always object to a change in the program unless it is based on some very strong reasons. I understand that the Senator desires to leave the city within a few minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. At 2 o'clock; yes.

Mr. McNARY. Under those circumstances I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The clerk will state the bill by its title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1343) authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with amendments: On page 2, after the word "products", to insert "The plants shall be of the minimum size which will allow the Government to furnish industry the necessary cost and engineering data for the development of a synthetic liquid-fuel industry and of such size that the combined product of all the plants constructed in accordance with this act will not constitute a commercially significant amount of the total national commercial sale and distribution of petroleum and petroleum products"; and on page 3, line 22, after the word "purchaser", to insert "through regular commercial channels", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, within the limits of critical materials available, is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate one or more demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances with all facilities and accessories for the manufacture, purification, storage, and distribution of the products. The plants shall be of the minimum size which will allow the Government to furnish industry the necessary cost and engineering data for the development of a synthetic liquid-fuel industry and of such size that the combined product of all the plants constructed in accordance with this act will not constitute a commercially significant amount of the total national commercial sale and distribution of petroleum and petroleum products.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purpose of this act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized—

(a) to conduct laboratory research and development work necessary to determine the best demonstration plant designs and conditions of operation;

(b) to acquire, by purchase, lease for a term of years or less, donation, or otherwise, land and any interest in land, including easements and leasehold interests; options on real or personal property; plants and their facilities; secret processes, technical data, inventions, patent applications, patents, irrevocable nonexclusive licenses, and other rights and licenses under patents granted by this or any other nation; to assume the obligation to pay rentals in advance on property so acquired, and to pay damages arising out of the use of any such property;

(c) to engage, by contract or otherwise, engineers, architects, and any private industrial organization he deems suitable, to do all or any part of the work of designing, constructing, or operating the plants, the operation to be under his supervision, and through leases or otherwise as he believes advisable;

(d) to cooperate with any other Federal or State department, agency, or instrumentality, and with any private person, firm, or corporation, in effectuating the purposes of this act.

Sections 321 and 322 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended, shall not apply to any leases under this section; and such leases may be made for a term of years notwithstanding Revised Statutes, section 3679, as amended, or any other provision of law.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to sell the products of the plants at not more than actual cost, including amortization of capital expenses, as determined by him, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal or any State government, but priority shall be given to orders placed by the War or Navy Departments. Any remaining products may be sold at going prices to any purchaser through regular commercial channels. The Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, shall also have authority to dispose of any lands or other real or personal property acquired, but in his opinion no longer useful, for the purposes of this act, and to grant, on such terms as he may consider appropriate, licenses under patent rights acquired under this act.

SEC. 4. All moneys received under this act for products of the plants and royalties shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. The Secretary of the Interior shall render to Congress on or before the first day of January of each year a report of all operations under this act.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior may issue rules and regulations to effectuate the purposes of this act. The authority and duties of the Secretary of the Interior under this act shall be exercised through the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may we have a statement concerning the objectives of the bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the bill was introduced for the purpose of utilizing or creating the opportunity to utilize the natural resources of the United States in coal, oil shale, and other substances, for the purpose of demonstrating that synthetic liquid fuel can be manufactured. The oil resources of the United States are being rapidly depleted. The depletion is likely to continue without regard to the exigencies of the war because the consumption of liquid fuel in this country has been increasing by leaps and bounds. During the course of the hearings upon this bill, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] asked the Bureau of Mines to submit statistics upon the domestic consumption of oil in the United States. The figures which were furnished show that in 1931 the total consumption of oil in the United States amounted to 903,200,000 barrels, and that this amount had increased by 1939—in 8 years—to 1,231,000,000 barrels. So that even before the beginning of the war, before we were making the tremendous supplies out of our resources which we are now making, the use of oil for domestic industry had tremendously increased.

The rate of discovery of oil in the United States has been rapidly decreasing. How significant this is may be judged when I say that the evidence gathered by a joint subcommittee of the Public Lands Committee of the Senate and of the Committee on Mines and Mining of the House of Representatives, headed by Representative RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, developed that one well has been drilled for every 3 square miles of territory in the United States; but in the world abroad, one well to only 500 square miles of territory. The largest area of unexplored lands on which oil may be found is in Russia; so that the future, in a very real sense, belongs to Russia so far as proved petroleum is concerned.

On the other hand, the coal deposits of the United States are so tremendous as to be practically inexhaustible. The testimony before the joint hearing was to the effect that, although we are consuming a billion and a half barrels of crude oil a year, we could make that amount of oil by the hydrogenation process from coal and still have enough to last a thousand years at that rate.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GUFFEY. How large an investment will it require to produce that amount of oil?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The investment will have to be made by private industry, and it would be a very large investment, no doubt.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator said the investment would be made by private industry. There was some question raised, as I recall, that the Government was going into competition with oil and synthetic fuels.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was not the intention of the sponsor of the bill, and it was not the intention of the Bureau of Mines. The committee, as its distinguished chairman well knows, has adopted a specific amendment to make clear that there will be no Government competition.

Mr. HATCH. The reason I asked the question, Mr. President, was in order that the Senator might make that explanation. The amendment does make that entirely clear, and I thought it should be made clear.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The evidence before us is that industry is not making the investment that is necessary to do the pioneering work. The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Bureau of Mines to undertake the pioneering work, so that the tremendous resources of the Government and the scientific methods of hydrogenation may be made available to private industry.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. I cannot let this bill pass without making a statement that I am in full accord with the Senator from Wyoming that the passage of this bill is very necessary. It would be necessary even though we were not at war. Our motor-fuel materials are so short now that we must do everything possible to enable industry, in the future, to furnish us with motor fuel from other materials than those we are now using. The members of the subcommittee during the summer held hearings for some 3 weeks. At those hearings large and small petroleum companies testified, and all of them were in agreement that this is a Government function, and they gave hearty approval to the passage of this bill. I hope it will be passed by unanimous consent not only by the Senate but by the other House. I believe we can fully recommend to the House that they concur in our action.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, from a very hasty reading of the bill I do not observe any appropriation or authorization for an appropriation. Let me ask the Senator in charge of the bill where will the money come from?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There will be no money without an appropriation, of course, as the Senator well knows. It is the thought of the Public Lands Committee that the determination as to the amount of money which should be expended should be made by the respective Appropriations Committees of the two Houses. It was estimated by the Bureau of Mines that if demonstration plants were built to handle oil, shale and coal, several plants, an expenditure of twenty or thirty million dollars might be involved; but the committee did not recommend such an expenditure without having a full report from the Bureau of the Budget and a full examination by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McNARY. It is very unusual to propose a bill of this kind without authorizing an appropriation or actually making an appropriation out of the Treasury.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would not want the bill to carry an appropriation, but, if the Senator desires, I should be very happy to offer an amendment providing that not to exceed $30,000,000 shall be authorized.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Oregon is not referring to what should be done with the bill, but from a good many years of experience and some observation, I do not recall a bill similar to this having been introduced or reported without an authorization or an appropriation. It evidently contemplates an appropriation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It does not carry an appropriation, it merely authorizes the expenditure.

Mr. McNARY. It does not authorize anything as I understand, it does not even authorize an appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired. Does the Senator from Oregon desire to be recognized in his own time?

Mr. McNARY. I do not want to take any other Senator's time, and probably I shall not object to the bill. I shall take my own time.

Mr. President, it is the nature of the legislation that attracts me more than the purpose that may be in the mind of the Senator who is in charge of the bill. I have no objection to the proposition,

but ordinarily, when such a bill comes here authorizing certain things to be done by agencies of the Government, it also contains an estimate or authorization for the amount that must be appropriated, after meeting with the approval of the Committee on Appropriations.

From a hasty reading of the bill, it seems to set forth some very desirable purposes to be undertaken on the part of the Secretary of the Interior through the Bureau of Mines, but, as I read it, there is nothing in the bill that states that it is based upon an ultimate appropriation by the Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very happy to repair that defect, although I am frank to say to the Senator that I do not think it actually exists. On page 1 of the bill, the language is as follows:

> That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, within the limits of critical materials available, is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate one or more demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances with all facilities and accessories for the manufacture, purification, storage, and distribution of the products.

Mr. McNARY. I read that a moment ago. I am speaking on the bill in my own time. It is a nice statement of what the ambition of the Secretary of the Interior through the agency of the Bureau of Mines may be, but it does not specify, as it should, that there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of money which the members of the committee must have had in mind when they reported the bill. It is merely a recital of ideas in the mind of someone without any thought of what the cost will be. Now the Senator tells me very frankly that the bill probably will cost $30,000,000. From a reading of the bill I do not know whether it is going to cost 30 cents or $30,000,000. A measure of this kind ought to give some idea what the cost will be before it is brought to the attention of the Senate for consideration.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In order to meet the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon, I move that, on page 2, line 1, after the period there be inserted the following sentence:

> There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $30,000,000 for the purposes of this act.

Mr. McNARY. That puts it in better form. I am not advocating $30,000,000 or saying that is the proper sum or whether it is sufficient, but the amendment would put the bill in a position upon which we may intelligently operate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I did not wish to take the Senator from Wyoming off the floor. I understood his time had expired. However, I have one question I wish to ask him. First, I want to say that I am in complete accord with the purposes of the bill as I understand them and with the statement made by the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

On page 3 of the bill, at the bottom of the page, I find this language:

> The Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, shall also have authority to dispose of any lands or other real or personal property acquired——

And so forth. The question I wish to submit to the Senator from Wyoming is whether or not that gives the Secretary of the Interior any authority over public lands containing deposits of oil, shale, and coal.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think not, because that refers to properties which may be acquired. Of course, public lands are not lands which would fall within that definition.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not like the language of the Senator's reply when he says, "I think not." I want him to say something more positive than "I think not."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to accommodate the Senator and say that the language to which he refers does not cover the public lands.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired. Does the Senator from Connecticut desire recognition in his own time?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DANAHER. On page 2, line 14, I notice that the Secretary of the Interior would be authorized "to acquire, by purchase, lease for a term of years or less, donation, or otherwise, land and any interest in land, including easements and leasehold interests; options on real or personal property; plants and their facilities; secret processes, technical data, inventions, patent applications, patents, irrevocable nonexclusive licenses," and the like. What does the Senator understand the words "or otherwise" to mean? Would they authorize the Secretary to acquire these various items of property other than through the means specified?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I assume that phrase would include condemnation.

Mr. DANAHER. That was exactly what I had in mind. If the Senator from Wyoming construes the term "or otherwise" to mean by condemnation, it follows that very considerable objection would lie to the bill. We have already had one instance, within the year, of the seizure and alleged condemnation of more than 50,000 patents by the Alien Property Custodian, who, in turn, has made them available to American industry, without redress or compensation, and quite contrary to the theory of trusteeship which obtained during the last war. If it should be in the mind of anyone that the Secretary of the Interior was to be given the power to condemn patents, I submit that a very fundamental objection would lie to the bill. There are at least 10 or 12 private plants, I am informed, rendering experimental service to the country at the moment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should be very glad to strike out the words "or otherwise." There was no intention on the part of the committee to enter into the domain of wholesale condemnation, and I think that the remarks of the Senator are very appropriate. I shall be very glad to move to amend the bill in that respect.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, to the end that the RECORD may speak, I move, on line 15, page 2, to strike out the words "or otherwise."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is already pending an amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be very glad to have the words "or otherwise" stricken from the bill, because I read them in connection with my inquiry of a moment ago, brought out by the language I find at the bottom of page 3. I do not want to see the Secretary of the Interior acquire, under the term "or otherwise" in the proposed legislation, public lands and then have the right to dispose of them. So I am very glad that the words "or otherwise" are to be stricken from the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 1, after the word "products" and the period it is proposed to insert the following: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $30,000,000 for the purposes of this act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I now move on page 2, line 15, to strike out the words "or otherwise".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 15, after the word "donation" and the comma, it is proposed to strike out "or otherwise" and the comma.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator whether he will not modify his amendment so as to insert the word "or" before the word "donation".

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, on page 3 we find another interesting feature of the bill, in lines 10 to 14, inclusive, where it is provided:

> Sections 321 and 322 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended, shall not apply to any leases under this section; and such leases may be made for a term of years notwithstanding Revised Statutes, section

3679, as amended, or any other provision of law.

After the words "term of" in line 12 I move to insert "not to exceed five".

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 12, after the words "term of", it is proposed to insert "not to exceed five".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that on its face the proposed legislation purports to be permanent legislation, and to grant authorization to make a lease irrespective of the limitations of law. Obviously, any lease could run 99 years, or 199 years, for that matter. I wanted the RECORD to show my reason for the interpolation to which the Senate has just agreed.

Mr. President, further, there seems to be very substantial lack of understanding among the various Senators present as to the ultimate impact of the bill. A reading of the report of the committee fails to illuminate adequately the doubts I personally have. I notice among other things that in the letter of the Secretary of the Interior he states:

> The Department has not as yet been informed by the Bureau of the Budget concerning the relationship of this proposed legislation to the program of the President.

In other words, we do not have adequate data, it seems to me, upon which to base our consideration of this measure. In view of the fact that this letter is dated August 2, 1943, and has not been supplemented as of today, late in October, I think no pressing need exists which would justify our immediate consideration of the bill, and that we can just as properly dispose of it 72 hours from now as at this particular time. I therefore respectively ask that the bill go over.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I trust that the Senator from Connecticut will withhold his objection to the present consideration of the bill. The bill comes before the Senate in a straightforward way, and after a committee hearing and long consideration. Ten years ago I was given my first task in the Senate, to act as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Mines and Mining to hold hearings on a measure which would bring about the elimination of waste of our natural resources, particularly with respect to oil, and when we realized that in the last 10 years we have not moved forward toward any act of conservation to take care of the oil itself, and that we have neglected exactly what the pending bill proposes to accomplish, we must conclude that it would be wrong for the Senate to put off, even for 72 hours, the beginning of this great work. Time is of the essence.

The Bureau of Mines have done enough to convince them that all they have planned is perfectly feasible, but they have not done it on a large scale. Over 20 years ago, there was inaugurated an investigation by the Bureau of Mines at my university, looking to the extraction of fuel oil from shale, of which there are literally mountains. We turn to the Bureau of Mines for the ultimate conservation of other resources which we are using.

I trust the Senator will withdraw his objection, and that the Senator from Wyoming may proceed with his bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I desire to join the Senator from Utah in the request which he has made. I do not need to call the attention of the Senator from Connecticut to the fact that today oil is perhaps the most precious commodity there is in the world. The supplies we have in the United States are being rapidly diminished by the war effort. How long that will continue none of us knows. We do know that the load is increasing constantly. I for one am desperately anxious that this country do everything within its power at least to ascertain and know about the available supplies of petroleum from whatever source they may come, coal, shale or from wells sunk in the ground.

As the Senator from Utah has said, the bill does not represent anything new. I may call the attention of the Senator from Connecticut to a condition which existed in the last war when this country was absolutely dependent upon foreign imports for potash. The Senator knows the history of potash in this country during the last war. As the result of legislation almost identical with the proposed legislation, introduced by the late Senator from Texas [Mr. Sheppard]——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, may I speak in my own time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. I shall take but a moment or so. Explorations were carried on by representatives of the United States in connection with private industry in my State. Potash was developed in this country until today we are producing not only sufficient for our use in the United States, but we are even exporting some to our allies who need it desperately.

Mr. President, I do not believe passage of the bill should be delayed. I hope the Senator from Connecticut will withdraw his objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I desire to join the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] in urging the Senator from Connecticut not to object to the passage of the bill at this time. As the other Senators have so well stated, the bill deals with a matter of grave and immediate importance. I sincerely hope the Senator from Connecticut will not object to the passage of the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I desire to join the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] in the request they have made of the Senator from Connecticut. For over 30 years the University of North Dakota, with the help of the Bureau of Mines and large appropriations from the State of North Dakota, has conducted experimentation with the coal of North Dakota. There are in North Dakota 600,000,000,000 tons of lignite coal, and something should have been done about it many years ago.

The report of the committee on the bill now pending is unanimous. A thorough investigation of the subject has been made. Hearings have been held all over the United States. I hope the Senator from Connecticut will withdraw his objection.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in my own time I wish to ask the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] a question. It may not be exactly in point, but in the hearings, in the consideration of his bill, was any testimony adduced with respect to the shortage or prospective shortage of gasoline for war and civilian purposes? Let me predicate my question on this statement: Some days ago I was in a meeting with the War Advisory Board for Oil, which advised with the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior was present, and his oil administrator was present, and a great number of the representatives of the oil industry were present. They there asserted—and I think this to be of general interest because of gasoline rationing, that at the present moment, when from the available supplies of gasoline the demands and the needs of the Army and the Navy are subtracted, there is left remaining for civilian use only 60 percent of what had been used normally by the civilian population in time of peace, and that with the increased demands on the part of the Army and Navy, which they anticipated at an early date, the 60 percent would be reduced.

I think the country should know that, because there is widespread clamor against any restriction in the use of gasoline. That was the view taken not only by the responsible agencies of the Government but by representatives of the independents and representatives of the major companies, and as I recall—and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] was present—there was no dissent from that view.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas is quite correct. The facts are clear. We are using oil much more rapidly than we are discovering oil, and our reserves are being steadily depleted. There can be no question that if we were to continue to take a billion and a half barrels of petroleum out of the reserves each year, as we are now doing, the reserves would not last for 20 years. Of course it would not be possible to take a billion and a half barrels out of the reserves annually, and unless we supplement that supply of liquid fuel by some such process as is authorized by the bill, it will be impossible for the United States to use gasoline motors as we have been using them, and we will not be able to maintain our leadership in aviation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his statement about permanent reserves, but I am talking about the immediate current available supplies of gasoline. These authorities said that there was now available not more than 60 percent of what had been used in peacetime by the civilian population, and that by reason of the demands of the Army and Navy, the 60 percent would have to be reduced. It seems to me that is an answer to many persons who are demanding an unlimited use of gasoline and oil.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas is exactly correct in what he has said. I was present at the meeting, and there was not any dissent from what has just been reported by the Senator from Texas.

Regarding the critical situation with which we are now confronted, I happen to have before me the current issue, date October 15, of the United States News, giving a news account of the situation as to oil. I wish to read one paragraph from the account which stresses the point we are making as to the vital necessity for us to ascertain in this country just what our oil resources are. The article had been discussing the question of importing oil from other countries, and it says:

> The United States load will increase in the months ahead no matter how successful attempts are to take more oil from other areas. Domestic crude output is slated to rise to 4,321,000 barrels a day by April 1944, to 4,400,000 by January 1945. No end to the increase is in sight, and they all go to the military. This continuous drain leads to the question of reserves and the possibility that after the war the United States must depend on other nations for fuel oil.

That, Mr. President, is a contingency I wish to avoid. I want experiments to be conducted now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut withdraw his objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DANAHER. No, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over. The clerk will state the next bill on the Calendar.

ARKANSAS-MISSISSIPPI BRIDGE COMMISSION

The bill (S. 1255) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission" was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, my time had expired on the so-called O'Mahoney bill, and I therefore wish to take a few minutes on the pending bill to make reply to statements made by several Senators. In the first place let it be noted that the Secretary of the Interior in his letter to the committee said:

> It is high time that the country—

Meaning, of course, the Government—

> embarked in earnest upon the program of research and development work.

We find the same theme in the committee's report submitted by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] with reference to the bill which next will be the order of business. I quote from the report:

> The committee takes the position that it is the function of the Congress to make available money to the States for financial assistance in supporting their public schools.

At what point, Mr. President, does the function of government stop? Is it the function of government to provide explorations and investigation of coal, oil, shale, and possible well diggings for oil? Is it the belief of any Senator who has argued here in the last 10 minutes that if this bill goes over until Friday so we may have a chance to look into it that every bus in Washington is going to stop?

Anyone listening to the discussion here as to what will happen because of the shortage of oil would think that to hold up the bill, which was introduced on June 18, and comes to the Senate only today, when its sponsors could have moved at any time in the interim to have it taken up, would be highly dangerous. However, that is mere nonsense. We are not obstructing the war effort. We are not obstructing any development of oil. What we are asked to do is to say that it will be the function of the Government of the United States continually to drain the Treasury of the taxpayers' money, in order to perform functions which always hitherto have been performed by private industry. If there is an oil well anywhere in the United States that is any good, private capital will exploit it, as we all know. If there is a coal-oil development anywhere, capable of profitably yielding coal oil and petroleum products, and ultimately gasoline, private capital will develop it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. At the meeting dealing with coal oil mentioned a short time ago representatives of the Bureau of Mines and others were present. They stated that oil could be produced from coal at about a 30-percent increase in the prices we now are paying for gasoline, and that in the United States we have enough coal in reserve to last us for 3,000 years. I hope that is true. I simply suggest that to the Senator. I suppose the cheaper coals—lignite and others—could be used, but no doubt their use would increase the cost, and probably they would produce an inferior grade of oil.

It was also shown that some of our belligerents in the war are now obtaining gasoline from the hydrogenation of coal and other products.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator has referred to belligerents getting some of their oil by the hydrogenation process, let me say that some of the Senators who came back from the trip to the war fronts also told us about the rate at which American reserves are being depleted while the reserves of some of the same belligerents are untouched. I hope our concern for the available reserves of oil will be expressed by Senators as cogently as expression has been made elsewhere in the last 10 minutes.

Mr. President, I did not have information about the bill, so as to be able to judge accurately about it at the present time. Until 10 minutes ago, I never saw it before. I am not on the committee. No hearings were held, so far as I know. There is a report, but it is inadequate. I do know that in connection with the bill under consideration I submitted two amendments on two fundamental particulars, and both were accepted by the proponents of the bill. There may be other amendments to be proposed, Mr. President, and the passage of 72 hours before we recur to consideration of the bill will not stop the war, and will not cause the busses of Washington to cease operating.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 1255?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1255) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission" was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the act approved May 17, 1939, heretofore extended by acts of Congress approved May 27, 1940, and July 14, 1941, creating the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission and authorizing such commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River, at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark., be, and is hereby, revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to be commenced within 1 year and completed within 3 years from the date of approval hereof.
>
> SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled 'An act creating the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark., and for other purposes', approved May 17, 1939."

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE AT BROOKLYN CENTER, MINN.

The bill (H. R. 2649) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.", approved April 20, 1942, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAYMENT TO MEMBERS OF SANTA CLARA PUEBLO OF NEW MEXICO

The bill (H. R. 128) to authorize a per capita payment of $10 to the members of the Santa Clara Pueblo of New Mexico from funds on deposit to their credit in the Treasury of the United States, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER OF LANDS OF CROATAN NATIONAL FOREST, N. C.

The bill (S. 1315) providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy of certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy all lands owned by the United States and comprising a part of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina which are situated within the present boundaries of the Marine Corps Aviation Base, Cherry Point, N. C.: *Provided*, That in the event the area transferred pursuant to the provisions of this act shall cease to be used for military purposes, it shall revert to its former national-forest status.

TRANSPORTATION OF DEPENDENTS AND HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS OF PERSONNEL OF NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD

The bill (S. 1336) to authorize the transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and the reserve components thereof when on active duty, of grades entitling them to transportation of dependents and household effects on change of station (a) when on duty at places designated by the Secretary of the Navy as within zones from which their dependents should be evacuated for military reasons or for the purpose of relieving congestion in the vicinity of naval activities or where Government quarters for their dependents are not available; (b) or upon transfer or assignment of such officers and enlisted men to sea duty, as such duty may be defined by the Secretary of the Navy; (c) or upon transfer or assignment of such officers and enlisted men to duty at places where their dependents for military reasons are not permitted to join them or where Government quarters for their dependents are not available, may, upon application of such personnel or their dependents, be allowed, subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, transportation for their dependents and household effects, including packing, crating, and unpacking thereof, from their stations or places of storage in the United States to any other points in the United States, and from such points to new stations in the United States to which such personnel may be subsequently ordered for duty, and at which their dependents are not restricted from joining them or Government quarters for their dependents are available.

SEC. 2. Whenever the Chief of Naval Personnel, Commandant of the Marine Corps, Commandant of the Coast Guard, or such subordinates as they may designate, certify that the personnel included in (b) and (c) of section 1 hereof have been transferred to sea duty or to duty at places beyond the continental limits of the United States where their dependents for military reasons are not permitted to join them, the wives of such personnel, or such other responsible persons as may be designated by the officials named above in this section, may execute such certificates as may be required and which are filed with, and relate to, vouchers in connection with the transportation of dependents or household effects: *Provided*, That in lieu of copies of orders of such personnel, the certificate above provided for shall constitute authority for such transportation of dependents, and household effects as may be authorized hereunder and any certificate or certification authorized by this act shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government: *And provided further*, That under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, claims for reimbursement may be submitted by and payments made to personnel concerned or their dependents for any authorized travel performed by dependents at their own expense.

SEC. 3. The Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of disbursing officers in cases where such dependents would have been entitled to transportation if the provisions of section 1 hereof had been in effect on the date of payment for otherwise proper payments heretofore made to transportation of dependents, or reimbursement therefor, under orders issued prior to the effective date of this act, to the extent of the commercial cost of transportation of the dependents from the old-duty station to the new-duty station. Such cost of transportation shall be computed from the last available published rates on the date the orders involved were issued.

SEC. 4. Transportation of household effects of naval and civilian personnel of the Naval Establishment, as now or hereafter authorized by law, may, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe, be by means of rail, water, or van, without regard to comparative costs.

SEC. 5. This act shall be effective as of December 7, 1941, and shall remain in effect for the duration of the present wars and for 6 months after the termination of such wars, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate.

CONVEYANCE TO CITY OF NEW YORK OF CERTAIN LANDS WITHIN THE BROOKLYN NAVY YARD

The bill (S. 1349) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York certain lands within the Brooklyn Navy Yard in the city of New York was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to transfer, under such conditions as may be approved by the said Secretary, to the city of New York, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of land containing three-tenths of an acre, more or less, located on the westerly side of a new street between Kent Avenue and Flushing Avenue, and in and to a strip of land 27 feet wide, located on the southerly side of Kent Avenue between Washington Avenue and Hewes Street, in the Borough of Brooklyn, city and State of New York, both of said parcels being within the boundaries of lands acquired for the expansion of the Brooklyn Navy Yard, and metes and bounds of descriptions of which are on file in the Navy Department.

SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF DECEASED OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The bill (S. 1351) to amend the Act of May 27, 1908, as amended, authorizing settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved May 27, 1908 (35 Stat. 317), as amended (52 Stat. 352; 34 U. S. C. 941), is hereby further amended by striking out the words "five hundred" appearing in line 35, page 373, Thirty-fifth Statutes at Large, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "one thousand."

CLEO PICKRELL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1293) for the relief of Cleo Pickrell, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$7,995.75" and insert "$7,670.75"; and in line 8, after the words "loss of", to strike out "one hundred and four bales of", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $7,670.75, to Cleo Pickrell, of Tipton, Okla., in full satisfaction of his claim against the Commodity Credit Corporation for indemnity for the loss of cotton by fire on December 24, 1942, the insurance on which was canceled by Cleo Pickrell shortly before the fire upon the erroneous advice given him by an inspector for the Corporation that the cotton was protected against fire loss by the Government: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GRAFTON BOAT WORKS

The bill (S. 862) for the relief of the Grafton Boat Works was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Grafton Boat Works, of Grafton, Ill., the sum of $240, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for compensation for storing a boat belonging to the National Youth Administration during the period from December 1, 1940, to April 1, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

MILFORD TRUST CO. AND BLANCHE R. BENNETT

The bill (S. 950) for the relief of the Milford Trust Co. and Blanche R. Bennett, as administrators of the estate of

Charles E. Reed, deceased, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Milford Trust Co and Blanche R. Bennett, of Milford, Del., as administrators of the estate of Charles E. Reed, deceased, the sum of $4,155, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for compensation for damage to a farm building and certain machinery and equipment therein, owned by such estate, which resulted when a United States Army airplane crashed into such building on July 18, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

GERALD G. WOODS

The bill (S. 1008) for the relief of Gerald G. Woods was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gerald G. Woods, of Portsmouth, N. H., the sum of $71.90, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement for expenditures made by him as commander of flotilla No. 301, United States Coast Guard Auxiliary, for rations for members of such auxiliary engaged in operating a Coast Guard patrol boat: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ERVIN S. FINLEY

The bill (S. 1246) for the relief of Ervin S. Finley was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ervin S. Finley, of Sumter, S. C., the sum of $500, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck by a Government-owned truck operated by a civilian employee of the Army Air Corps, at Shaw Field, S. C., on September 15, 1942, and for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by him as a result of such injuries: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of service rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

PAN AMERICAN AIRWAYS, INC.

The bill (S. 1309) for the relief of Pan American Airways, Inc., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of Pan American Airways, Inc., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York, for $2,681.82 as the value of two dry ice boxes belonging to it which were stored in Honolulu, T. H., and which were received from storage by a representative of the United States Army and placed on board the United States Army transport *Royal* ". *Frank* in the mistaken belief that they were boxes belonging to the United States Navy which the Navy had agreed to lend to the Army, and which two boxes belonging to Pan American Airways, Inc., were lost when that vessel was destroyed by enemy submarine action, and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim not to exceed $2,681.82. There is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,681.82, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the payment of the claim: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

J. E. MARTIN

The bill (H. R. 304) for the relief of J. E. Martin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOWARD MORGAN

The bill (H. R. 305) for the relief of Howard Morgan was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE U. S. S. "ST. LOUIS"

The bill (S. 714) for the relief of the commissioned officers of the U. S. S. *St. Louis* during the Spanish-American War, May 18, 1898, to September 2, 1898, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the pension laws or any laws conferring rights, privileges, or benefits upon persons honorably discharged from the United States naval or military forces, the commissioned officers of the U. S. S. *St. Louis* shall be held and considered to have served in the naval forces of the United States between May 18, 1898, and September 2, 1898.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to correct the records of the Navy Department to coincide with the dates of their appointments as shown on their respective commissions and discharges.

SEC. 3. This correction is authorized so that the commissioned officers of the U. S. S. *St. Louis* will be on a lawful parity with their brother officers of the U. S. S. *Harvard* and U. S. S. *Yale* who served during the same period.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask that the report of the committee on the bill just passed be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report (No. 427) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 714) for the relief of the commissioned officers of the U. S. S. *St. Louis* during the Spanish-American War, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

This bill provides that in the administration of the pension laws or any laws conferring rights, privileges or benefits upon persons honorably discharged from the United States naval or military forces, the commissioned officers of the *St. Louis* shall be held and considered to have served in the naval forces of the United States between May 18, and September 2, 1898.

The bill also authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Navy to correct the records of the Navy Department to coincide with the dates of the appointments of such officers as shown on their respective commissions and discharges, in order that the commissioned officers of the *St. Louis* will be on a lawful parity with their brother officers of the U. S. S. *Harvard* and U. S. S. *Yale*, who served during the same period.

At the outbreak of the Spanish-American War three merchant vessels of the United States, the *Harvard*, the *Yale*, and the *St. Louis* were incorporated directly into the naval service, placed under the command of naval officers, and assigned to duty in the scouting forces of the Atlantic Fleet. They operated continuously therein until the close of hostilities when they were immediately returned to owners in order to resume their regular mercantile voyages. The dates these several vessels were placed in commission as vessels of the Navy were, respectively, *Harvard*, April 26, 1898; *Yale*, May 2, 1898; and *St. Louis*, April 24, 1898. All three vessels were placed out of commission on September 2, 1898, and thus were operating with the Navy for a period of 4 months or more.

The personnel of the *Harvard*, *Yale*, and *St. Louis* were not, however, enrolled in the Navy at the time of the commissioning of the vessels. The officers and crew of the *Harvard* were enrolled on June 22, 1898, and were discharged on September 2 of that year; those of the *Yale* were enrolled during the period June 10–15, 1898, and were discharged on September 2, 1898. Members of the crew of the *St. Louis* were never actually enrolled in the Navy but were paid and subsisted by the American Steamship Co. under a special form of contract; the officers of that vessel were enrolled in the service on July 23, 1898, and were discharged on September 2, following.

By virtue of section 3 of the act of June 2, 1930 (46 Stat. 492), the officers and crew of the *Harvard* and *Yale* are now entitled to pensions. The officers of the *St. Louis*, not having actually served under an enrollment in the Navy for a period of 70 days or more, are not now entitled to pensions. Further, the members of the crew of that vessel are not entitled to pensions since, as stated above, they were never enrolled in the naval service.

All three vessels did, however, serve during practically their entire time of commission and the *St. Louis* was in the engagement off Santiago wherein the cable landing at that point was cut. Summarizing, the following dates are shown in tabular form:

Vessel	Commissioned	Crew enlisted	Number of crew	Decommissioned
Harvard	Apr. 26	June 22	254	Sept. 2
Yale	May 2	June 10–15	220	Do.
St. Louis	Apr. 25	Not enlisted	310	Do.

The Navy Department in its report on the bill states, in part, as follows:

"If it could be affirmatively shown that the personnel referred to in the bill S. 714 were not, at the time in question, free to leave their employment in the *St. Louis*, the Navy Department would have no objection to the enactment of the bill; but since the fact of such affirmation is not available to the Navy Department, the Navy Department recommends against enactment of the bill S. 714."

Mr. Michael J. McGinn, formerly an assistant engineer on the steamship *St. Louis*, was inducted into the naval service of the United States as an assistant engineer officer with the rank of ensign. He appeared before the committee and presented evidence showing that he was actually on board the vessel during the period in question and that he and the other officers were not free to leave their employment on the *St. Louis*. Excerpts from his evidence are as follows:

"The record of the U. S. S. *St. Louis* during that period will indicate that it was impossible to leave my employment, even if I had so desired. On April 30, 1898, the *St. Louis* sailed from New York for the West Indies to join Admiral Sampson's fleet, then in those waters. On May 20, 1898, while cutting the telegraph cables at Guantanamo, Cuba, it was necessary to withdraw because of the heavier armament of a Spanish gunboat. On May 22, 1898, the admiral ordered the *St. Louis* to New York to mount heavier guns and to recoal. It arrived in New York May 25, 1898. Engineers were not allowed shore leave, remaining on board supervising the recoaling of the ship and assisting in installing heavier guns. On June 1, 1898, the U. S. S. *St. Louis* sailed from New York for Guantanamo, Cuba. On July 5, 1898, the *St. Louis* left Cuban waters with the Spanish admiral Cevera, his officers, and some 500 Spanish sailors as prisoners of war, arriving at Portsmouth, N. H., on July 10, 1898. On July 17, 1898, the *St. Louis* arrived in New York.

"It is apparent, therefore, that it was impossible to leave my employment between April 30 and July 17, 1898, inasmuch as the ship was at sea during that entire period, with the exception of the period of May 25 to May 30, 1898, when the ship was docked at New York for the reasons stated above, and shore leave could not be granted."

From the evidence available it appears that the personnel on the *St. Louis* actually served for a longer period of time than the personnel of the *Harvard* and *Yale*, and that they were also in actual combat with the enemy, although the crew of the vessel was never actually enrolled in the naval service and the officers were not commissioned until several months after they began actual naval service.

The committee are of the opinion that the personnel of this vessel should be in the same status as the personnel of the *Harvard* and *Yale* as regards pensions and recommend therefore that the bill be enacted.

AMENDMENT OF NAVAL RESERVE ACT OF 1938

The bill (H. R. 2859) to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a number of bills have been passed. I have great confidence in the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. I have not had an opportunity to read the bill. I should like to have him say in a word what the bill means.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the bill, which was passed by the House of Representatives, would amend in several particulars the Women's Reserve section of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended. The Senate Committee on Naval Affairs recommends several amendments to the bill as it passed the House. The report of the committee sets forth the changes made in the original law, the proposed amendments, and the reasons for them.

Let me inquire whether any further explanation is desired.

Mr. McNARY. That is ample, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 2, after line 6, to strike out:

Strike out section 504 and substitute therefor the following:

"SEC. 504. Members of the Women's Reserve shall not be assigned to duty on board vessels of the Navy or in combat aircraft at any time. No such member who is qualified to fill an available billet in the Navy Department proper at Washington, except members of the medical department of the Naval Reserve, shall be assigned to duty outside the continental United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 23, after the word "dependents", to insert "and the children of such members shall not be considered dependent unless their father is dead or they are in fact dependent on their mother for their chief support."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 3, to strike out:

SEC. 2. Each member of the Women's Reserve who was enlisted or commissioned therein on or prior to the date this act is approved shall be restricted to the performance of shore duty within the continental United States, unless and until she shall voluntarily sign a general waiver of said restriction.

And insert:

SEC. 2. The act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy", approved April 16, 1943 (Public Law 38, Seventy-eighth Congress), is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That female physicians and surgeons appointed in the Medical Corps of the Naval Reserve shall be restricted to the performance of shore duty within the continental United States only and shall not be assigned to duty on board vessels of the Navy or in combat aircraft."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask that the committee report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report (No. 426) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2859) to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

Amend the bill as follows:

On page 2, strike out lines 7 to 15, inclusive.

On page 2, line 23, after the word "dependents", strike out the period and insert the following: "And the children of such members shall not be considered dependents unless their father is dead or they are in fact dependent on their mother for their chief support."

On pages 2 and 3, strike out all of section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. The act entitled 'An act to provide for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy,' approved April 16, 1943 (Public Law 38, 78th Cong.), is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ': *Provided*, That female physicians and surgeons appointed in the Medical Corps of the Naval Reserve shall be restricted to the performance of shore duty within the continental United States only and shall not be assigned to duty on board vessels of the Navy or in combat aircraft'."

The Naval Reserve Act of 1938 was amended by the act approved July 30, 1942 (Public Law 689, 77th Cong.), which established the Women's Reserve as a part of the Naval Reserve. The purpose of this law was to expedite the war effort by releasing officers and men for duty at sea and their replacement by women in the shore establishment of the Navy. Several restrictions relating to rank, military authority, minimum age limit, locality and nature of duty assignments, employment within the Naval Establishment, disability and death benefits, and time of effectiveness of the act, were incorporated therein at various phases of its progress through the committees and Houses of Congress.

The present bill as it passed the House of Representatives amended the act of July 30, 1942, which established the Women's Reserve of the Naval Reserve as follows:

1. It struck out section 502 of the original act which provided that there should not be more than 1 officer in the grade of lieutenant commander; nor more than 35 officers in the grade of lieutenant; and that the number of officers in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) shall not exceed 35 percent of the total number of commissioned officers. In lieu thereof it authorized 1 officer in the grade of captain, exclusive of officers in the Medical Department of the Naval Reserve, and established no restrictions as to the numbers which could be appointed to the lower grades.

2. It provided that members of the Women's Reserve or their dependents should be entitled to all allowances or benefits provided by law for male officers and enlisted men with dependents.

3. It repealed section 504 of the original act which restricted members of the Women's Reserve to the performance of shore duty within the continental limits of the United States.

4. It provided that women commissioned or enrolled in the Naval Reserve prior to the date of the approval of the act should be restricted to the performance of shore duty within the United States unless they signed voluntarily a general waiver of said restriction.

The bill as amended by the Senate committee—

A. Retains the House amendment which raised the limitation on rank within the Women's Reserve from that of lieutenant commander to that of captain.

B. Strikes out the House amendments which authorized members of the Women's Reserve to serve beyond the continental limits of the United States; and which provided that women who were enrolled in the Re-

serve prior to the enactment of the bill should be restricted to performance of duty in the continental United States unless they voluntarily signed a general waiver.

C. Amends the House amendment regarding dependents of women reservists by providing that the children of women members of the Naval Reserve shall not be considered dependents unless their father is dead or they are in fact dependent on their mother for their chief support.

D. Adds a new section which provides that female physicians and surgeons appointed in the Medical Corps of the Naval Reserve shall be restricted to the performance of shore duty within the continental United States only and shall not be assigned to duty on board vessels of the Navy or in combat aircraft.

The bill as amended by the Senate committee meets with the approval of the Navy Department. Naval officials informed the committee that if it becomes necessary or desirable at a later date to broaden this bill so as to permit some of the women of the Naval Reserve to be assigned to foreign duty, they will make such a recommendation to the Congress. At the present time they think this is not necessary.

A copy of a letter dated September 28, 1943, from Admiral F. J. Horne, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, addressed to the chairman of the committee, is hereby made a part of this report:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF
NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, September 28, 1943.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WALSH: It has been brought to my attention that the main difficulty with reference to the passage of the WAVE bill is due to the provision for employment overseas.

The Navy Department is very anxious to have the number of WAVES increased and the ranks increased, but at this time is not at all anxious to have included in the bill any provision for employment overseas.

It would be greatly appreciated if you found it possible to use your great influence to have a bill passed as soon as practicable increasing the authorized strength of the WAVES and increasing the authorized ranks as requested by the Navy Department.

The bill as passed by the House with the elimination of the overseas employment provision would be entirely satisfactory to the Navy Department and in fact is just what we would like to have.

With sincere best wishes,
Very truly yours,

F. J. HORNE.

BOARD OF VISITORS FOR UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The resolution (S. J. Res. 77) to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there shall be a Board of Visitors to visit the United States Merchant Marine Academy each year at such time as the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, may fix. The Board of Visitors shall consist of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, the chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives, four Senators designated in January of each year by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, and four Members of the House of Representatives designated in January of each year by the chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives. Whenever a Member is unable to make the annual visit an alternate may be designated in his stead in the manner hereinabove provided. Each member of the Board and a secretary to the Board shall be reimbursed, out of funds appropriated to the War Shipping Administration, under Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the act of June 3, 1926, as amended, for the expenses incurred by him while engaged in duties as a member of the Board, or as secretary.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 54) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1943, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the day on which the joint resolution would have taken effect has passed. Therefore, I ask that the joint resolution be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 932) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

W. I. DOOLY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 759) for the relief of W. I. Dooly, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to strike out "the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $325.58 to" and insert "jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of"; in line 9, after the word "Tennessee", to strike out "in full and complete satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the" and insert "for compensation for the"; and on page 2, line 7, after the numerals "1936", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of W. I. Dooly, of Conasauga, Polk County, Tenn., for compensation for the value of his undivided one-half interest in tract No. 766d, containing 124.03 acres, in Fannin County, Ga., which was included with other lands acquired by the United States pursuant to condemnation proceedings instituted March 21, 1936 (case No. 1928 at law), in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, Atlanta Division, and in which final judgment was rendered on October 5, 1936.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of W. I. Dooly."

SAMUEL MARGOLIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1169) for the relief of Samuel Margolin, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,427.50", and in line 7, after the words "commendation for", to strike out "property damage and", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Samuel Margolin, of Auburn, Maine, the sum of $1,427.50, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for property damage and personal injuries sustained and medical expenses incurred by him as a result of a collision of the truck which he was driving with a War Department sedan on Main Street, Lewiston, Maine, on January 10, 1943: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KATHLEEN B. MAIER

The bill (H. R. 2734) for the relief of Kathleen B. Maier was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ROBERT C. ANDERSON

The bill (H. R. 938) for the relief of Mrs. Robert C. Anderson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REMOVAL OF OYSTERS FROM YORK RIVER AND QUEEN CREEK, VA.

The bill (H. R. 2886) to provide for the removal of oysters from the waters of York River and Queen Creek, Va., affected by sewage disposal emanating from the construction battalion training camp, at Camp Peary, Va., and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I wish to have the Senator in charge of the bill advise whether the Navy concurs in the

proposal that it remove 150,000 bushels of oysters, and plant them at some point other than where they now are located.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me say that it was disclosed to the Committee on Commerce that the Navy does agree to the proposal, and that the Navy already has done considerable work looking toward the accomplishment of the desired purpose.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment, on page 2, line 2, after the word "season", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That there shall be no appropriation hereunder for liquidation of damages to owners or others."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PENSIONS AND COMPENSATION TO RETIRED ARMY AND NAVY PERSONNEL

The bill (S. 771) to provide for payment of pensions and compensation to certain persons who are receiving retired pay was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the bill as amended provides that veterans may elect whether to take their retired pay or whether to take disability compensation. The War Department and the Veterans' Administration both objected to the language of the bill as it was originally introduced by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON]. Both agencies suggested amendments. The Committee on Military Affairs accepted the amendments submitted by the Veterans' Administration and the War Department; and the bill now before the Senate, as amended by the Senate Military Affairs Committee, is in line with those suggestions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That where any person authorized to receive military or naval retired pay in accordance with any provision of law would be eligible to receive pension or compensation under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, if he were not on the retired list in the case of Regular Army or Regular Navy personnel, or if he were not in receipt of retired pay in the case of other Army or Navy personnel, he may waive receipt of retired pay and allowances for the purpose of receiving such pension or compensation; and thereafter such person may waive receipt of such pension or compensation for the purpose of receiving retired pay and allowances. To prevent concurrent payments, when waiver of receipt of retired pay and allowances for the purpose of receiving pension or compensation is filed in the War Department or the Navy Department, the Department concerned shall notify the Veterans' Administration of the receipt of such waiver and the effective date of the stoppage of retired pay and allowances. Similar report to the War or Navy Department shall be rendered by the Veterans' Administration, when waiver of receipt of pension or compensation is filed in the Veterans' Administration for the purpose of receiving retired pay and allowances.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF PAY READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1942

The bill (H. R. 693) to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMPENSATION FOR LOSS OF PERSONAL PROPERTY BY CERTAIN FOREIGN SERVICE EMPLOYEES

The bill (S. 1382) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is authorized to be appropriated, and there is hereby appropriated, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money, which sums represent the value of reasonable and necessary personal property lost by the claimants as a result of war conditions:

Theodore C. Achilles, $5,837.50; Henry E. Stebbins, $411; Henry M. Wolcott, $104; William Nicholas Carroll, $1,707; George K. Donald, $3,593.50; James G. Carter, $12,000; Myles Standish, $900; Sam E. Woods, $650; Edmund A. Gullion, $860; Harold D. Clum, $7,090.15; John H. Lord, $9,200; Landreth Harrison, $1,170.25; Isabel Pinard, $623; Jule B. Smith, $1,086.42; C. C. M. Pedersen, $325; Thormod O. Klath, $275; John K. Davis, $699.33; Stanley G. Slavens, $355; Donald W. Lamm, $270; Frank S. Williams, $125; Arthur B. Emmons III, $139; John K. Caldwell, $792; Gordon L. Burke, $460; Samuel J. Fletcher, $933.25; William E. Yuni, $100; M. R. Rutherford, $230; David C. Berger, $220; John B. Sawyer, $343; Owen L. Dawson, $343; U. Alexis Johnson, $898.50; J. Dixon Edwards, $50; J. Hall Paxton, $100; Quincy F. Roberts, $952; Kenneth J. Yearns, $280; Nathalie D. Boyd, $1,000; Walter W. Hoffman, $1,726.56; Frederic C. Fornes, Jr., $3,801.50; John H. Bruins, $1,938.45; Addison E. Southard, $8,015; Clarence E. Gauss, $447; Kingsley W. Hamilton, $325; Sidney H. Browne, $470; Charles S. Reed II, $400; Edward M. Ingle, $730; Thomas S. Estes, $1,309.50; Harlan B. Clark, $1,550; Martin J. Hillenbrand, $862.50; Kenneth S. Patton, $5,660; Perry Ellis, $796; Robert L. Buell, $620; V. Lansing Collins, $955; Paul Paddock, $1,063; Courtland E. Christiani, $1,203; George A. Armstrong, $534.60; Duwayne G. Clark, $7,311.53; E. Talbot Smith, $2,780; Temple Wanamaker, Jr., $130.33; James E. Brown, Jr., $5,214.49; Cavendish W. Cannon, $3,204; Homer S. Fox, $4,560.08; Thomas McEnelly, $331; Mrs. Anne Gault Antoniades, $100; Gladys Wells, $1,112.63; M. Williams Blake, $207.37; Nathaniel Lancaster, $1,555.16; Norris B. Chipman, $7,740; Harold Pease, $583.99; John M. McSweeney, $268; W. Garland Richardson, $4,229.02; James W. Riddleberger, $1,060.02; Carl E. Christopherson, $1,189.31; Albert W. Chapman, $1,419.98; Ann Hillery, $759.87; Joseph W. Ballantine, $425; Augustus Chase, $580.77; Alfred G. Richter, Jr., $544.68; Wallace W. Stuart, $1,163.34; Jefferson Patterson, $5,377.50; Frederick A. Kuhn, $1,397.46; Ida Mae Orr, $690.57; Lucille C. Strong, $571.50.

Mr. TUNNELL subsequently said: Mr. President, today Senate bill 1382, Calendar No. 454, was passed. The bill represents 81 separate claims. It was referred to me as a subcommittee and I checked over the amounts and they are correct. However, the report which accompanied the bill refers in one place to the total of the claims as being $102,844.73. The correct amount, found on the same page, is $141,037.61.

I thought it should be called to the attention of the Senate that there was an error in the report. The correct amount is the amount which I have just stated.

ERIC W. RODGERS

The bill (S. 1282) for the relief of Eric W. Rodgers was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eric W. Rodgers, of Scotland Neck, N. C., the sum of $52.38, in full settlement of his claim against the United States for expenses incurred October 24, 1935, in transporting his dependent wife and children, and household goods, from his official station at Salisbury, N. C., to his official station at Raleigh, N. C., while employed as district manager of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

JACOB WOLOZIN

The bill (H. R. 1222) for the relief of Jacob Wolozin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

R. B. WALKER FUNERAL HOME

The bill (S. 1346) for the relief of the R. B. Walker Funeral Home was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the R. B. Walker Funeral Home, Greenfield, Ohio, the sum of $200 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for funeral services rendered in connection with the burial of the remains of Artie William Benson, apprentice seamen, United States Naval Reserve: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any

contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

AMENDMENT OF NAVAL AVIATION CADET ACT OF 1942

The bill (S. 1347) to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942 was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 of the Aviation Cadet Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 738; 34 U. S. C. 850k) is hereby amended by inserting after the comma following the word "Navy", in line 6, the following: "or, if no beneficiary has been specially designated, the representative of the officer's estate."

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective from August 4, 1942.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 10 OF PAY READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1942

The bill (S. 1348) to amend the second paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 364; 37 U. S. C. 110) is hereby amended by striking out all of said paragraph after the comma following the word *"Provided"*, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "That such enlisted men shall be entitled to this allowance at the general rate provided for the continental United States although receiving the allowance provided in the first paragraph of this section if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependent is prevented from dwelling with him."

ESTABLISHMENT OF GRADES OF COMMISSIONED WARRANT OFFICER AND WARRANT OFFICER IN THE MARINE CORPS

The bill (S. 1350) to establish the grades of commissioned warrant officer and warrant officer in the United States Marine Corps, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the grades of chief marine gunner, chief quartermaster clerk, chief pay clerk, marine gunner, quartermaster clerk, and pay clerk in the United States Marine Corps are abolished, and in lieu thereof there are hereby established the commissioned warrant and warrant grades of commissioned warrant officer and warrant officer.

SEC. 2. From and after the approval of this act, and without the issuance of new commissions or warrants, all Marine Corps personnel in the commissioned warrant grades of chief marine gunner, chief quartermaster clerk, and chief pay clerk shall be known and entered upon the Naval Register as "commissioned warrant officers," and all Marine Corps personnel in the warrant grades of marine gunner, quartermaster clerk, and pay clerk shall be known and entered upon the Naval Register as "warrant officers."

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in this act shall change or modify in any respect the permanent or temporary status of any officer, nor the rank, precedence, rights, benefits, privileges, pay, allowances, or emoluments to which he is, or may hereafter be, entitled.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR PROPERTY LOST IN NAVAL SERVICE

The bill (S. 1352) to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy and, subject to appeal to the Secretary of the Navy, such other officers or officers as he may designate for such purposes and under such regulations as he may prescribe, are hereby authorized to consider, and to ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay, in an amount not exceeding $1,000 any claim filed under oath of the commissioned, appointed, enrolled, and enlisted personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and of the Coast Guard when operating as a part of the Navy, and of civilian employees of the Naval Establishment, for loss, damage, or destruction of their private personal property occurring on or after December 7, 1941, when such loss, damage, or destruction is not due to fault or negligence on the part of the claimant and has occurred or shall hereafter occur under the following circumstances:

First. When the loss, damage, or destruction is due to operations of war, shipwreck, or other marine disaster, or the wreck of an aircraft or other disaster thereto: *Provided*, That the term "marine disaster" as used herein shall include an accident occurring on board a vessel.

Second. When the loss, damage, or destruction is in consequence of the serviceman or employee having given his attention to the saving of the life of another, or of property belonging to the United States.

Third. When such property is lost, damaged, or destroyed by reason of being shipped on board an unseaworthy vessel by order of an officer authorized to give such order or direct such shipment; or is lost, damaged, or destroyed, whether or not due to negligence on the part of Government personnel, while in shipment pursuant to orders issued by competent authority; but, where the property was transported by a common carrier, the reimbursement shall be limited to the extent of such loss, damage, or destruction over and above the amount recoverable from such carrier.

Fourth. When such property is lost, damaged, or destroyed by reason of being furnished at the direction of competent authority to another person under conditions of immediate and urgent distress.

Reimbursement may be made in all such cases for loss, damage, or destruction of such articles as are required to be possessed and used by officers, enlisted men, and others, in connection with their service or employment, and such additional items of personal property as the Secretary of the Navy shall determine to have been reasonably and properly in the place when they were lost, damaged, or destroyed, in consequence of the service or employment in which the serviceman or employee was engaged.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to reimburse the claimant in kind out of available Government property, or to pay the amount, not exceeding $1,000 in any one case, determined to be due on claims under this act, out of any appropriation available for the purpose. Claims exceeding $1,000 which the Secretary of the Navy considers meritorious may be reported to Congress for its consideration.

SEC. 3. Separation from the naval service or establishment shall not bar the authority to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay any claim otherwise falling within the provisions of this act which accrued prior to such separation. In the event of the death of any person designated in section 1 hereof, whether occurring prior or subsequent to the time any loss, destruction, or damage occurs, reimbursement may be made to any dependent relative, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy.

SEC. 4. Existing claims shall be presented within 2 years from the date of this act, and all such claims hereafter arising shall be presented within 2 years from the occurrence of the loss, destruction, or damage, except that any person missing who is not willfully absent, or any person who is a prisoner in the hands of the enemy, or who is interned in a neutral country, shall in addition be allowed 1 year from the time of return to the jurisdiction of the United States in which to file such claim.

SEC. 5. The provisions of this act shall apply to the personnel of the Coast Guard, military and civil, when the Coast Guard is not operating as a part of the Navy. In such case the Secretary of the Treasury shall have and exercise as to claims of the personnel of the Coast Guard the authority conferred by this act upon the Secretary of the Navy, and payment or reimbursement in kind of such claims shall be made from appropriations available to the Treasury Department, which appropriations are hereby authorized.

SEC. 6. The provisions of this act shall apply to the personnel of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and Public Health Service when serving with the Navy.

SEC. 7. The determination of claims under the provisions of this act shall be final as to all matters necessary to the establishment and payment or settlement of any claim filed hereunder, and acceptance of payment thereof or reimbursement in kind therefor shall conclusively operate as acceptance of the determination thereof. No right to prosecute a claim or action before any court or agency of the United States, except as herein provided, shall accrue to any person hereunder: *Provided*, That claims arising in the manner indicated in this act and which have been settled under the terms of a previously existing law shall be regarded as finally determined, and no other or further right of recovery under the provisions hereof shall accrue to persons whose claims have been so settled.

SEC. 8. The appropriations available to the Navy Department and the Coast Guard for the payment of claims under the provisions of the act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 389), as amended, are hereby made available for the payment or reimbursement of claims determined under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 9. The said act approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 389), entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost or destroyed in such service," as amended, is hereby repealed.

RETIREMENT ANNUITIES FOR NAVAL ACADEMY TEACHING STAFF

The bill (S. 1354) to amend the act approved January 16, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United States Naval Academy" was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United

States Naval Academy," approved January 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1092; 34 U. S. C. 1073–1073e), is amended by inserting therein a new section numbered 4A, reading as follows:

"SEC. 4A. Each civilian member of the teaching staffs who is hereafter retired on or after reaching the age of retirement set forth in section 3 of this act shall be paid a life annuity, terminable on his death, at the rate of the following total annual amount: The average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation received by such civilian teacher during any 5 consecutive years of allowable service at the option of such teacher, multiplied by the number of years of service, not exceeding 35 years, and divided by 70. The retirement annuity payable to each such retired teacher, under any annuity policy provided for by this act, or under the provisions of section 4 of this act, shall be counted as payable on account of the retirement annuity provided in this section 4A, and the Secretary of the Navy shall pay to each such retired teacher, from such appropriations as may be made for the purpose, such additional sums, if any, as will bring the total annual sum paid to such retired teacher to the total annual amount prescribed in this section 4A: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall operate to reduce the retirement annuity which would have been payable to any such retired teacher if this section had not been enacted: *And provided further*, That no payments under this section shall be made to any member of said staffs who shall be entitled to retirement and retirement benefits under the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1920, as amended, and shall elect, or shall have elected, to continue thereunder."

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the said act of January 16, 1936, is hereby amended by striking out the word "and" before the word "professors", and by striking out the period after said word "professors", and by adding after said word a comma, followed by the words "and senior professors."

PUNISHMENT FOR STOWING AWAY ON AIRCRAFT

The bill (S. 1386) making it a misdemeanor to stow away on aircraft and providing punishment therefor was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person who, without the consent of the owner, charterer, or person in command of any aircraft and with intent to obtain a ride or transportation in such aircraft in flight, shall board or be within such aircraft scheduled to fly or flying between any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, or any place occupied by, or under the jurisdiction of, the armed forces of the United States and any place outside thereof; or between points within the same State, Territory, or possession, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, or any place occupied by, or under the jurisdiction of, any of the armed forces of the United States, but through the air space over any place outside thereof; or wholly within the air space over any Territory, possession, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, or any place occupied by, or under the jurisdiction of, the armed forces of the United States shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year or both.

SEC. 2. Any person who, without the consent of the United States, its duly authorized officer or agent or the person in command of any aircraft owned or operated by the United States and with intent to obtain a ride or transportation in such aircraft in flight, shall board or be within such aircraft scheduled to fly or in flight shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year or both.

SEC. 3. The word "aircraft" means any contrivance now known or hereafter invented, used, or designed for navigation of or flight in the air.

SEC. 4. Nothing contained in this act shall modify, restrict, alter, or change any law of the United States enacted for the purpose of preventing any person from entering the United States in violation of the laws of the United States or for the purpose of securing the deportation from the United States of any person who, under the laws of the United States, shall be subject to deportation.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE CROSS TO GEORGE F. THOMPSON

The bill (H. R. 1869) authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Cross to George F. Thompson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

W. M. HURLEY AND JOE WHITSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2299) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of W. M. Hurley and Joe Whitson, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 2, line 6, after the word "Act", to strike out "shall be determined upon the same principles and measures of liability for negligence as in like cases between private individuals" and insert "in order to recover must be established by evidence of legal liability for negligence according to established principles of law governing the rights of riparian owners along navigable waters where there have been damages claimed because of alleged failure of the Government to maintain public improvements in good order."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the calendar.

FEDERAL AID IN FINANCING PUBLIC EDUCATION

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 637, Calendar 331.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 637) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, does the Senator desire to dispose of his motion at this time, or to have it pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock not having arrived, the motion is not debatable at this time.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that; but I wished to ask the Senator a question regarding his attitude. Does the Senator desire to have his motion disposed of at this time, or later?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I should like to have the motion disposed of at this time, in order that the bill may become the unfinished business, in accordance with the understanding which was reached earlier between the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and myself, that after the bill shall become the pending business, the Senator from New York and the Senator from Louisiana may be permitted to proceed.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the present consideration of the bill. A number of Senators have spoken to me about taking the bill up today. It has been suggested that, after the bill has been presented by the distinguished Senator from Utah in all the details which will be necessary to give it full explanation, further consideration of the bill be postponed until later in the week, so that opportunity may be given for Senators to study the bill. The point was made that it should become the unfinished business today, and that the able Senator should discuss the amendments. If we take a recess from today until Thursday or Friday of this week, and then proceed to the further consideration of the bill, in the meantime Senators may have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the record of the hearings, which has just been placed on our desks today.

The Senator is moving to make the bill the unfinished business of the Senate. I invite my very distinguished friend from Kentucky, the majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY], to consider that fact at this time. I assume that we will not complete consideration of the bill today.

Mr. BARKLEY. We will not be able to complete consideration of the bill today.

Mr. McNARY. The suggestion has been made that we allow the bill to go over until later in the week, so as to afford ample time for Senators to study it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Oregon that I have consulted with the Senator from Utah and other Senators. There is no desire to shove this bill through without adequate consideration. I am assuming that the Senator from Utah would like to complete his explanation of the bill today. Perhaps some other Senator who favors the bill would like to do likewise. If other Senators who may be for or against the bill are not ready to proceed today, or could not be ready tomorrow, I have no objection to the bill going over until Thursday.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that largely conforms to my request and my views, based upon statements made to me by other Senators in whom I have great confidence and who are always fair. It occurred to me that, today being Tuesday, the Senate might well take a

recess from today until Friday, so that ample time may be given to Senators to study the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Without attempting to rush matters, or to fail to give every Senator an opportunity, it occurred to me and to other Senators who are also anxious to speak on the bill that we could serve practically the same purpose by taking a recess from today until Thursday, with the hope that we might complete consideration of the bill on Friday.

Mr. McNARY. May we have an understanding that if we take a recess from today until Thursday, if any Senator desires to have the bill go over until Friday for final consideration, that will be done?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection to that.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That means that we will consider it on Thursday, and that the final vote will not be taken until Friday.

Mr. McNARY. If some Senator desires further time to study the bill, it will go over further until Friday.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

Let me say, in addition to what has been said, that when the bill was reported there was an understanding between myself and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that he should have ample time to discuss the bill. When it was first suggested to me that the request would be made to have the bill go over until Thursday I consented. I understand that when the motion shall have been agreed to, Senate bill 637 will become the unfinished business, and that after the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] shall have concluded, I will make a statement with respect to the bill, and then a recess will be taken until Thursday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think it is most unfortunate for the Senate to take up this bill at this time. The bill has been pending for 5 years on the calendar of the Senate. At no time has there been less reason for taking it up than today. This is a revolutionary proposal, probably the most revolutionary ever made to the Congress of the United States. It does not relate to the war effort. Nothing which we can do in regard to education will in any way affect the conduct of the war. We have laid down a general principle that we shall not spend money for nonwar purposes. We have eliminated many agencies. We have abolished the W. P. A., the N. Y. A., and a great many other agencies. That has been the policy of this Congress. We are now suddenly asked to reverse that whole policy which we have established, and of which I believe the country approves, and increase the expenditures of the Government for nonwar purposes by $300,000,000 a year. In the midst of this war we are now asked to consider the adoption of a new policy, a Federal subsidy to common-school education, something which we have avoided in the United States for 160 years.

The bill proposes two things; one, a permanent policy, a so-called equalization of education, although I think I can show that it involves no equalization. It involves purely an emergency section by which it is proposed to increase the salaries of all the teachers in the United States by from $200,000,000 to $300,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, may I ask who has the floor?

Mr. TAFT. I was recognized, I believe, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, has the floor been granted to the Senator from Ohio? I think I should object to the request of the Senator from Ohio, not because I wish to be discourteous, but because I think the bill ought not to be debated until it becomes the pending business and some statement is made in regard to it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object to the bill being made the pending business. I think that we are departing from consideration of proper war efforts and matters to which we should devote our attention, and entering into a debate on a controversial nonwar subject.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I ask that the question be put on my motion, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah. [Putting the question.]

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Guffey	Pepper
Bailey	Gurney	Radcliffe
Ball	Hatch	Reed
Bankhead	Hawkes	Revercomb
Barbour	Hayden	Reynolds
Barkley	Hill	Robertson
Bilbo	Holman	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	Kilgore	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McClellan	Tunnell
Capper	McFarland	Tydings
Caraway	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Wagner
Connally	Mead	Walsh
Danaher	Millikin	Wheeler
Davis	Moore	Wherry
Ellender	Murdock	White
George	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Green	Overton	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 637.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that under the ruling of the Chair, although the hour of 2 o'clock has arrived, the motion is still not debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the ruling of the Chair. The last time this question was before the Senate on April 23, 1940, it was submitted to the Senate, and the Senate voted that the motion was not debatable.

Mr. BARKLEY. It has been debated; but I do not want to violate the rule, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not to exceed 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that, regardless of the attitude of Senators on the bill when it comes to the question of its final passage, I think it ought to be taken up for consideration. One of the reasons given by the Senator from Ohio why it ought not to be considered, it seems to me is a good reason why it ought to be; that is that it has been here for 5 or 6 years. This bill has been reported time and time again by the Committee on Education and Labor, and has been placed on the calendar. A year ago it was desired by those who advocate it that it be taken up and considered by the Senate, but, due to the legislative situation at that time, and the unlikelihood of securing any House action on it before the final adjournment of that Congress, the advocates of the bill agreed not to press it, and it was not pressed?

There was, however, a general understanding that it would be given "a day in court" in this session. Now, we have been here nearly a year; the bill has been on the calendar for some months; and it seems to me it is entitled to be considered, and, regardless of how Senators may vote on it when it comes up for final passage, I hope the Senate will take up this bill and give it the consideration to which it is entitled.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in view of the agreement reached by the majority leader and the minority leader, I withdraw my objection to the Senate proceeding to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah. (Putting the question.)

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 637) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, which had been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor, with amendments.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah obtained the floor.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from New York.

ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS AND SOME RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING OUR WORLD TOUR

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I rise at this time to offer a suggestion with reference to the disposition of the recommendations which have been offered by the overseas committee which visited the battle fronts of the world, and, incidentally, to make clear my position with reference to those recommendations.

Since my return there have been inserted in the press and otherwise brought to public notice statements that I came back an isolationist, an American Firster, and in opposition to the President. I realize the meaning of the term "American Firster," and, while I am, of course, for my country first and last, I am not a member of the America First Committee, nor am I an isolationist. I am more convinced than ever, as a result of my observations, that it is necessary for us to participate in an international effort to preserve the peace of the world and to prevent the recurrence of the bloody and devastating catastrophe which has been forced upon us.

During our trip, Mr. President, we spent 53 days on the ground. That was sufficient time to afford us an opportunity to learn something about what is happening in other parts of the world, how well our war effort is progressing, and what contributions our agencies, civil and military, are making in order that we may successfully prosecute the war.

We saw a great deal that was good, far more than was not in that category. Of course, it was not emphasized in our published report, but, nevertheless, if we stressed only the good we saw, we would be reporting to the Senate for days. We saw some room for improvement here and there, a very natural and a very human finding.

For constructive reasons, in order to be helpful to the war effort, to bring to the attention of the agencies of the Government such opportunities as we did discover for improvement in their administration, we stressed, as I said, for constructive reasons, the weaknesses we discovered. But we did not intend to hurt the war effort, nor was it the intention of any member of our committee in any way to bring about even the slightest degree of unfriendliness between our allies and ourselves; at least, that is my firm conviction.

I am sure, Mr. President, that we want to be helpful to our allies and to our own war effort, and we want this remarkable trip to go down in history as one which will yield fruitful and helpful and beneficial results. We lived too close to the war, we saw too much of the suffering and the dying, to do anything other than to add our contribution to the tremendous tasks our boys are shouldering on the battlefields of the world today. So, Mr. President, while I desire to make the record clear insofar as I am concerned, I wish to make the observation that in my judgment what I say applies to those who made the trip with me.

Standing out among the recommendations as they were listed in the press, the recommendations that were reportedly contained in our report to the Senate, was the matter of Siberian bases, and the question of placing the Pacific theater on a high standing comparable with that of the European theater. It was the directive of the chairman of our Truman committee that we abstain from participating in matters pertaining to military strategy, and as a member of the Truman committee I followed that direction, as did my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. But the fact that press reports linked my name with these military recommendations, and by reason of the fact that the adoption of a program which would include the establishment of bases in Siberia, and the emphasizing of the Pacific theater, placing it on a par with the European theater involve matters of supply, in that manner, of course, it becomes important for me to discuss those subjects.

There were a number of other recommendations presented by our committee, and for the most part they were recommendations which affected our civil agencies. Again, according to the press, they included, as I read them, the question of air bases and our post-war policy with reference to the use of those air bases; a better and a more equitable distribution of the petroleum production of the world; a study, and perhaps a revision here and there, of our lend-lease policy; an inquiry into the informational programs of O. W. I., there being substantial support, as I recall, for the psychological warfare activities of O. W. I.; and, lastly, better coordination in the field of our various civil agencies. These recommendations seem to me the most important of those gleaned from the press as being our reports made to the Senate.

Mr. President, the first two items are military, and in view of the fact that they have been made public, and also because they involve a great problem of logistics, I think we should dwell on them, momentarily at least.

I talked with men high in the military branches of our Government, and of other governments, and with reference to the Russian bases I was told that it might be a simple problem for Russia to give us such bases, but that it would involve immediately a declaration of war between Japan and Russia, and that it would involve immediately the protection and defense and supply of those bases. Either the Russian Government or the American Government would have to tackle that gigantic problem.

I was told, and I fully realized, that the Russian Army has a gigantic task on its hands, and that it was amazing the military world by the tenacity and the determination and the courage with which it was driving the invader out of its country. It was brought home to me that for Russia to tackle another strong power, making it necessary for supplies to be transferred thousands of miles over the Siberian wastes, would imperil the war front in Europe, and, therefore, I was told, it was out of the question.

Mr. President, I was also told that if we could go right around the front door of Japan, through the Sea of Japan, and establish bases right across from Japan, and then protect those bases and supply them, we could more easily land on the shores of China and establish a bridgehead and bases there. The fact that we have not done so indicates the difficulty of the task. The willingness to give us the bases exists, but the military possibility of putting the plan into effect is indeed another problem.

Because it involved matters of supply, and for the further reason that my name was included among those who apparently favored such a move, I went into the question of the establishment of bases in Russian territory.

I believe that the strategy in the Pacific is being carried out as correctly and as properly and as appropriately as it can be, and I doubt very much the possibility of supplying Russian bases at this particular time.

With reference to the general over-all strategy——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he leaves the point he was just discussing?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Did the Senator talk with General MacArthur about Russian bases while he was in Australia?

Mr. MEAD. No; I did not discuss the possibility of the Russian bases with General MacArthur, and, as I stated before, I refrained in most part from discussions of that kind. But I did hear one of the supreme commanders in the Pacific area, who called an executive session, and dismissed everyone from the room but our committee, make this statement: "I agree that the over-all strategy, approved by the leaders of the United Nations, which emphasizes the European theater over the Pacific theater, is a correct one, and one that I am willing to defend."

Mr. President, that came from one of the supreme commanders in the Pacific area, who, by reason of the fact that he was in the Pacific, that his responsibilities were in the Pacific, and that he agreed that favoring the European theater was the most important, appeared to me to be a very expert and a very unselfish witness.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] in his speech a few days ago, which was in secret session of the United States Senate, but which found its way immediately onto the front page of every paper in the United States, told about his conversations with Admiral Nimitz, General MacArthur, and Admiral Halsey, in which they all said that the thing to do, if it could possibly be done, would be to go to Russia and establish bases, in order to save a million American lives. I was

wondering whether or not the Senator from New York, who was on this trip, was in the conversations or in the discussions with any of these leaders in the Pacific and heard that kind of a statement.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I will say to my distinguished colleague that I heard some discussion of the bases, and when the matter of supplies was brought up, there was always added to the statement, "If those bases could be protected and defended and supplied." That was the question that was never answered. But, by reason of the information we received and the information which I presume my distinguished colleague heard from the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] it would be most difficult to supply those bases.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct. Of course, this question of Russian bases is nothing new so far as this country or any other country is concerned. As I understand, the committee did not go to Russia, they did not talk with anyone in Russia with respect to bases, but they did discuss the question with some individuals in the Pacific. It just occurred to me that perhaps the Senator from New York could add something to what the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] said, because the statement was made here in what was understood to be an executive session. Everyone knows now that it was no executive session at all. In my opinion, the voiding of secrecy was a blot upon the integrity of the United States Senate. Nevertheless, the news of that meeting is out. We can now talk about almost anything that happened here in executive session. The statement which was made by the Senator from Massachusetts which has found its way into every newspaper in the United States of America, it seems to me, is a most damaging one so far as the morale of the American people is concerned. How anyone can estimate or judge how the lives of a million American soldiers will be saved by this tactical move or that tactical move is a little difficult for me to understand.

The thing which is surprising to me is that if MacArthur, or any other individual in the Pacific, was going to make the statement to one single individual on the committee, that he did not make it to all the members of the committee which was on this tour throughout the Pacific, and let the committee as a whole, or let the chairman of the committee, if you please, bring back that sort of a statement and make a report here to the United States Senate, or preferably make it to the War Department which sent the committee around the globe. The Senate of the United States did not send the committee on this trip around the globe. The War Department sent the committee. It seems to me the committee should have gone to the War Department before they came to the floor of the Senate, and have given to the War Department all the facts they found, and have sat down with members of the War Department and have come to some comprehensive, some logical, some conclusive report which was in the interest of the war effort, rather than some members attempting to play politics with this trip around the world.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, as I said, I have no desire to criticize any of my colleagues. I have attempted only to convey the thought that it was my opinion that their activity since they arrived home had been in the interest of the war effort. I will say for myself, in an attempt to make the record clear, that I did not make the statement that the establishment of Russian bases would save a million lives, and I want to be saved the responsibility by having this statement of mine printed in the RECORD.

I wish to say in answer to my distinguished colleague that in the Pacific I did hear some conversations with reference to the bases, but they were usually to the effect that we could not under existing circumstances expect Russia to supply and protect and defend them, nor could we expect to do so ourselves. That is the only opinion that I gleaned, and that is all that I care to say on that subject at this time.

Mr. PEPPER. Madam President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARAWAY in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to ask the able Senator from New York if he at any time during the trip which the visiting delegation made, in coming from the Pacific theater back to Washington, had the impression from anything that was said by any member of the delegation that Admiral Halsey or Admiral Nimitz or General MacArthur collectively or individually had stated that the possession or the ability to use the Russian bases by the Allied Nations would save a million lives?

Mr. MEAD. No; I never heard that statement made by any of the men whom the Senator has mentioned. But I did hear some general conversation about the possibility of Russian bases, about their protection and defense and their supply, and the statements were all negative.

Mr. PEPPER. All negative?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Madam President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him a moment?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is absent. There may be some question about the wisdom of the statement which he made in executive session, but I take it that no one is prepared to challenge his veracity, and I hope that is not the purpose of any comments which have been made.

Mr. MEAD. Madam President, when I took the floor my distinguished colleague heard me say that I was not attempting to impute the motives of any of my colleagues, but on the other hand I believe that they were sincere and that they were attempting to aid constructively the advancement of the war effort. I wanted to clear the record and to say to the Senate and the country that I did not make those statements, that I was not an isolationist or an America Firster, as that term is commonly used, and so I am now proceeding, without any attempt to inject any personalities into this discussion, to relate to the Senate just what I think should be related under present circumstances.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I will be glad to.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not want to inject any personalities into this debate either, but a committee was appointed to go around the world, and there was a chairman appointed to that committee, and that chairman was the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I have not heard yet, either in executive session or in the corridors or in the lobbies of the Capitol, a statement made by the Senator from Georgia, who is the chairman of the committee, that these distinguished leaders of the American forces in the Pacific gave him the information that was disclosed here by the Senator from Massachusetts. I am not questioning the veracity of the Senator from Massachusetts, but I do say that it is strange indeed that these great military leaders in the Pacific at this time would give to one individual this information about the Russian situation, and we cannot find it from the others.

Take that for whatever it is worth, Madam President, but if anyone should have had the knowledge and the information about this situation, in my humble opinion it is the Senator from Georgia, who was the chairman of the committee. That is the thing I am complaining about.

I am not complaining about the Senators. I am taking the facts as they gave them to us for what they are worth. I am complaining about the individuals in the Pacific who gave out this information and who made these statements with respect to what would happen to a million American boys. If that is not military information, if that is not affecting the home front, if that does not demoralize the people here at home when we are doing everything we can to back up the finest Army that we have ever had at any time in our history, an army which has gained more victories than any other army has gained in any war in all our history, then I confess I am unable to render a verdict upon anything.

Madam President, the things that were given to us in executive session. Oh, executive sessions. I have seen them in committees, and I have seen them in the Senate since I have been a Member for a short 5 years. There is no such thing as an executive session either in a committee or in the Senate. It simply does not exist. We should forget about executive sessions either in committees or in the Senate. The hypocrisy of the thing is what disturbs me; it is what causes the American people to lose faith in what we are constantly saying is the greatest legislative assembly in all the world and

the last citadel of parliamentary liberty—which of course it is.

Mr. MEAD. Madam President, very little of what I said in executive session appeared in the press, and so I am sure——

Mr. LUCAS. Madam President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that I want to congratulate the Senator, too, on that. I know whereof I speak. I do not say that any member of the committee violated the rule. I do not know who it was; and I care less who it was; but certainly someone violated the rule of secrecy in giving out what I conclude to be military information.

Mr. MEAD. Madam President, as I was about to say, very little of what I reported in executive session appeared in the press.

Madam President, if you could see the mail which comes to me from those who are endeavoring to determine how I made the somersault and became an isolationist [laughter], you probably would find excellent reason for my taking the floor at this time to make the record straight. I have a suggestion, which I desire to offer at this time, which I believe will pay dividends to the Senate, and which probably will eliminate any controversy which might develop in the immediate future.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me ask what is wrong with any citizen of the United States—be he in public office or otherwise—who prefers America to anything else?

Mr. MEAD. I said a moment ago, in explaining the matter, that I was for America first, last, and all the time, but I was not a member of the America First Committee which I was reputed to have joined as a result of my world trip. Those who wrote to me wanted to know whether I went around the world and came back upside down. [Laughter.] I simply want to clear the record.

Madam President, the subcommittee of the Truman committee, before it makes its final report to the Senate, makes its report to the full Truman committee. Before the full committee acts the representatives of the civil agencies and the departments and the military are given full, free, and ample opportunity to study the evidence, read the testimony, and come before us and refute any contention we make, or approve any recommendation we see fit to offer. I, as the chairman of the subcommittee, have already authorized hearings, and I have invited the representatives of the civil agencies to come before us and to have, as I said a moment ago, an opportunity to refute anything contained in our recommendations. After that we shall make our report to the Senate, and that will be our report. It will be a final report. It will be a report on which we will stand and which we will defend.

With reference to the two military matters, would it not be possible for the chairman to summon our committee in executive session, if we still have faith in executive sessions, and to outline a program whereby we would present to the Committee on Military Affairs matters pertaining to the military? The military leaders could in that way be given an opportunity to be heard and to voice their sentiments, and the members of our committee might appear also and present their statements, and their recommendations to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The same thing could be done with reference to the Appropriations Committee, relative to matters pertaining to lend-lease and lend-lease in reverse. Then, as a result of a program of that kind, the study and investigations would continue, for the benefit of the war effort, for the enlightenment of the Senate, and to bring about a higher degree of efficiency and administration in our civil and military agencies.

Madam President, I believe that the committees of the Senate which are in any way concerned with the recommendations made by the reporting Senators should follow the procedure outlined by the Truman committee and should give everyone an opportunity either to present his argument or to defend his actions.

Mr. CONNALLY. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it the Senator's idea that the Truman committee itself should conduct the inquiries, or that it simply should refer them to the respective committees?

Mr. MEAD. No, Madam President; perhaps the Senator misunderstood me. I said that we, the subcommittee, will report our findings to our parent committee, the full Truman committee; and then the full committee, after its report is available, will submit it to the Senate, for reference to such committees as should consider it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask, Why not have the five Senators who went abroad continue as the committee to do all the investigating? They know more about the matters than do the rest of the Members of the Senate. The danger is that if the work is divided among a dozen different committees, none of them will do anything about it.

Mr. MEAD. Madam President, I believe that the chairman of our overseas committee of five should call a meeting and should outline a program of the procedure; and, in addition, the chairman of the Truman subcommittee should present to the full Truman committee the recommendations made by the Truman committee. However, I do believe the suggestion the Senator has made is a constructive one, and I do not believe it would be helpful to the country to drop everything right now. I believe the chairman of our committee, the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], should hold such meetings until we have made our full contribution.

With reference to the matter of supplies and the more modern subject of logistics, I learned in almost every theater of war—perhaps in every one—that more materials, more equipment, and more personnel are wanted. At the beginning of our trip we were told we would find that to be the case wherever we went.

I also said with reference to the situation in the Pacific that there was almost unanimous agreement, at least—I probably could say it was the consensus of opinion—that placing the emphasis on the war in Europe was the correct strategy to follow. The reasons for that were outlined to us here and there, so that I can in a very sketchy way present them to the Senate as they appear to me.

If I refer the Senate to the early days of 1942, the Senate will probably agree that we were worrying about the success of the three-point program which Hitler stated as his victory program. That program called for the success of his U-boat sinkings in the Atlantic. At that time he was sinking more ships than we were building, and he was sinking them right off our shores, and we were worried. The second point in his program was his desire to remove the continent of Africa from the Allied cause. To bring that about he sent Rommel into Africa, with a tremendous fighting force behind him. Not long ago, Madam President, Rommel was pounding at the gates of Alexandria, and it looked as if Africa would be listed as an Axis continent.

Oil was involved in his third point. Whoever had control of the oil of the Old World enjoyed a tremendous advantage; and to bring that about he had the greatest force at his command fighting for the oil in the Caucasus. Only a short time ago there was great apprehension that Stalingrad would fall. The Russian Armies had a superhuman task to perform to stop the Nazi drive into the oil fields of the Caucasus. Of course, Allied strategy had to meet that challenge. It was a case of either stopping Hitler and destroying his three-point program for victory, or deciding who would fight the war in the Pacific if he should win. Where would we get our supplies, and how could we defend bases anywhere if the Hitler program were successful?

Madam President, the day of apprehension is over. The anxieties which filled our hearts are no longer there. The U-boat menace has been minimized. We are building more ships by far than are being sunk today. The great stand made by Montgomery at El Alamein, supported later as he was by the American Army, has driven Rommel and his entire fighting force across the Mediterranean, or into the Mediterranean, and Africa is now on our team. The Mediterranean is our lake. The great voyage around South Africa, requiring many weeks of precious time, is no longer necessary.

The French Navy, once a potential enemy, is no longer fighting against us. Many of its units and thousands of its personnel are on our side. The Italian Navy has steamed into Allied ports, and we now have a decided advantage.

Beyond that, Madam President, the smaller nations, which refused to be

knocked out of the war, remained in, perhaps, because of the United Nations' proclamation giving all of them a voice in the council of the united nations of the world, and giving them the benefit of fighting materials by means of lend-lease. They are now in a position, with their maritime strength, to help eliminate the bottleneck in shipping, and to assist us to carry our materials, our men, and our equipment to every battlefield in the world.

In my judgment, Madam President, credit can be given to those who are in charge of the Allied strategy, those men who outlined the policy which the military followed. In outlining that policy, the leader of this country merits our praise and approval.

The war in the Pacific is now simple compared to the situation which faced us in 1942. The war in Europe is closing in upon the enemy, until today the initiative is in our hands, and the enemy is on the defensive and will remain there until ultimate victory comes to us.

The over-all strategy of our leaders—one of the most important items which our committee or any other committee should report—is in good hands. I am not sure that any of us was interpreted as being bent in any way upon criticizing the war effort of any one of our allies. On the other hand, Madam President, I believe that all of us have praise and admiration for the work being done by every member of the United Nations family.

Patient China, fighting with her back to the wall, and very little to fight with, has carried the brunt of battle for years, and is today stronger than she has been at any time in her recent history. United China, supporting loyally and with confidence the great generalissimo of the armies of China, certainly merits our praise, and all the sympathy, help, and cooperation we can give.

Indomitable Russia, that great fighting force which amazed the military experts of the world, which fought on a 3,000-mile front under the most adverse climatic conditions known to man, is writing a glorious chapter which will always stand out in the history of this war. Russia, too, deserves our praise.

In my judgment no one leveled one iota of criticism at the British war effort. We saw the devastation of Plymouth, London, and other fair cities in the United Kingdom.

We have a high appreciation of the courage and heroism of the people of England. We know the sacrifices they are making, because for days we lived with them and shared those sacrifices with them. We remember the stubborn stand of Montgomery at El Alamein, and how he fought the strongest and most cagey opposition that Hitler could send over to that desert land. We know how that little British island fought tenaciously to keep the invader out and to win the Battle of the Atlantic. Surely we have nothing but praise for the English war effort.

With reference to our own war effort, let me say, in the words of the chairman of our committee, that today we have the toughest, the best trained Army in all the world in the boys who left your community and mine just a short time ago—boys who are over there in the jungles or in the desert, up in the mountain fastnesses, or in the fox holes, or fighting their way up through Italy. Wherever they are, they are giving a great account of themselves, and we can be proud of the rich tradition they are living up to in such an exemplary manner. In my judgment it is our greatest Army. It is our best conducted war. Those boys are well cared for. They have the best medical attention that we can furnish. Their equipment is the most modern. Their clothes are the best. The Senate can well be proud of the great part it played in caring for this matchless Army.

Madam President, not only do we have a good Army in the field and a good Navy on the sea, with all the other complements, including the Air Corps and the marines, but they are well officered and well directed. We can rely upon America's command, wherever it may be.

As I said not long ago, the nation which enjoys a high degree of confidence and faith in its chosen leadership is a favored nation in any war. We must report to the American people that they have every reason in the world to have confidence and faith in the man and in the men who lead us in this great conflict for human decency.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure that in mentioning the larger of the members of the United Nations the Senator did not intend to overlook or express any lack of appreciation for the efforts made by the smaller members in the magnificent guerilla warfare which they have carried on, and for many other things they have done in aid of the united cause.

Mr. MEAD. I am glad the Senator from Florida has called that to my attention, because I have before me a notation to mention the splendid work of the various nations that remained in the conflict. They are doing a great work. They are serving the cause well, and their contribution, in my judgment, earns for them the lasting gratitude of our people, and a deserved place high in the councils around the peace table when the war shall be ended.

Madam President, beyond the job done in the recruitment of our Army, the supplying of our Army, the direction of our Army, and the strategy under which it fights, there is another matter which should be given consideration. In this, the biggest military task in all the history of the world—the biggest single job we have before us, and which the world has before it today—we have not only a complete and efficient integration of our several military services here in this country which work together like clockwork, but we have the most efficient and most cohesive interallied army or combat force that was ever put together.

Madam President, the war is the biggest problem on earth, the foremost in the minds and in the hearts of our people. When we look about for reasons for the success of the inter-Allied effort we must of necessity give some thought to the men who are leading the several nations engaged with us in this great fight for decency. In my opinion, no one of our committee would level one word of criticism—on the other hand, all praise is due the name of Churchill, whose energy, drive, and leadership brought England out of the lethargy in which it found itself, and made of it a great fighting force, serving our common cause in this war.

Madam President, there must be loyalty and confidence in the leaders of the Russian Government as exemplified by her armies and by the faith the Russian people have in Premier Stalin in this fight.

In China, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek is, of course, the outstanding figure. He is the symbol for which China fights. Behind him there is a united effort, difficult and full of obstacles, but nevertheless, because of his personality, China is in the fight to stay, and she deserves the help and assistance of the United Nations in attaining that degree of freedom, dignity, and democracy to which she is justly entitled.

Now, Madam President, I hope that what I say in conclusion will not be considered political in nature. I wish to say it, not only because I believe it, not only because I gleaned the information throughout the world, but because I am sure that the judgment of history will support every word I say. We have in America, guiding our destinies as the President of the United States, as the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, the most popular and most influential personality in charge of any government on earth. Madam President, the oppressed peoples of every nation in the world look to the leadership of America, respect the leadership of America, and believe with all the faith in their hearts and souls in the leadership of America. Divine Providence favored us when President Roosevelt became the leader of our Nation. I say that because I believe, as I have already said, that essentially necessary for success in any conflict or crisis is faith and confidence in leadership. The most important observation which I have to report is this: We have every reason on earth to have the fullest confidence and faith in the President of the United States.

OPERATIONS OF LEND-LEASE ACT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, for the past 6 months, in cooperation with a staff from the Library of Congress, I have compiled facts and figures showing the debts of our Nation and those of other countries of the world. I believe that it will be of interest to the Senate and to the American people to make the tabulation a part of the RECORD.

Before proceeding with the discussion of the compilation, I would like to invite the attention of the Senate to some of the debates which took place when lease-lend legislation was under consideration in the Senate and to other matters pertaining to the administration of the law since its passage. I desire to follow that course because much has been said about

lease-lend in the past few weeks. Mr. President, I did not oppose the Lease-Lend Act. I thought it was necessary. Not only did I favor its adoption, but I have supported every appropriation made to carry out its purposes and I am in favor of its continuation. However, what has puzzled me regarding its operation is my inability to obtain information which I deem pertinent, giving a clear picture of how it is administered. We are given to understand that some of the countries which receive aid under its provisions furnish us goods and services in return, but when an effort is made to determine what it is that we receive in return, the information is not available. I believe that I express the views of the Senate, as well as those of the American people, when I say that it would be far better for us to have an understanding now of what our allies will be permitted to charge us on lease-lend in reverse, than to have a misunderstanding of the matter when peace comes.

On March 5, 1941, when the lease-lend bill was being considered by the Senate, I made this suggestion to the President, and I think it will bear repetition:

It is hoped that the President, in the exercise of those powers—

That is, lease-lend powers given to him—

will take into consideration the vast resources of the British Empire and other countries now engaged in war on its side before extending them too much credit to carry on their war.

I have made a study of the debts of England and the various British possessions now engaged in war with her. I have before me a statement which is very interesting, and I believe the information it contains should be taken into consideration when the pocketbook of Uncle Sam is being opened, as it were, in order to help the British.

Our country, including its possessions, has an area of 3,738,395 square miles. Its total population is 150,450,560. The public debt of the United States up to September 30, 1940, was $44,214,604,746.

I will omit further reading in regard to a comparison of debts because I propose to discuss the subject in detail when I present to the Senate the statement to which I have referred.

Further, Mr. President—

Again quoting from my speech of March 5, 1941:

I hope all that is now being done by the British possessions will be continued after the passage of this bill, to the same extent, if not greater, than now prevails. In other words, after we pass this bill I do not want the British possessions to assume that Uncle Sam is going to do all the work and furnish all of the materials needed.

Under the pending bill the President has the power to trade, exchange, or barter all kinds and quantities of property. It is to be hoped that he will exercise—and I am confident he will—that power so that we will receive some form of compensation for our property, rather than make outright gifts to those who will benefit.

That statement was made, as I have said, on March 5, 1941.

Again quoting:

I submitted figures showing the areas of the various countries. The British Empire is almost four times larger than the United States in area. Likewise, we know that our country is entirely dependent on British and Dutch possessions for rubber, tin, and a few other natural resources that are essential to us; and in making these trades I hope the President will bear these facts in mind and obtain for us vast quantities of these natural resources. I may further add in that connection that the President may look into the feasibility of obtaining permanent bases in the Atlantic from the British rather than 99-year leases. I am not advocating the acquisition of any of the islands involved, but complete sovereignty and ownership in perpetuity of those portions of the islands or mainland as may be necessary to properly establish our bases.

Again quoting:

The fact remains that the British, financially, are not so bad off.

When I made that statement I was comparing the vast trade of the British Empire with her colonies and with other countries and the foreign trade of the United States. Our imports and exports at that time were approximately $3,000,000,000, while those of Great Britain were in excess of $6,000,000,000.

The point I desire to make is that these various angles should be taken into consideration when the President turns American materials and supplies over to the British, as he is empowered to do under the pending bill. It is not the war itself that I dread; it is the aftermath of war. So long as the war goes on we can keep our people busy in the factories, making munitions and other implements of war; but when the factories stop smoking, and industry becomes paralyzed, and we have an enormous public debt of probably $100,000,000,000 to $125,000,000,000—

Keep those figures in mind, Senators, for I propose to point out later how badly mistaken I was when I stated those amounts as estimates of what our debts would be—

as has been variously estimated, I say to you, fellow Senators, that such a condition will probably destroy the very thing we are now attempting to save. Our liberty, our cherished freedom to pursue our own business, our own lives, our own happiness, in our own way, may be forever lost to us.

* * * * *

Today, sad to say, our great country may be penalized because it has industrial advantages unequalled by those of any other nation in the world. Because of the ingenuity of our people, we have become the arsenal of democracy. In the meantime let us not forget that our natural resources are being depleted, and we should demand for our finished products some of the rich natural resources of Great Britain and her allies.

Mr. President, I have merely cited a portion of that speech as a further reminder to the President and his advisers that it is while the war is in progress that he should make every effort to replenish from abroad our God-given natural resources which are now being utilized in such large quantity in this great war.

Mr. President, since the operation of lend-lease, I have made every effort possible to obtain from the Administrator information as to how lease-lend operates, whether or not it is a one-way street, as has been suggested, or whether we are receiving any value in return for what we send to our allies.

I wish to say at this point that I do not expect all our allies to be able at this time to return, either in kind or otherwise, what we are now giving them. Take, for instance, China. I know that China cannot do it; we have heard and read of her poverty. I feel confident also that Russia at this time cannot possibly make any return in kind or otherwise. She has her hands full fighting Germany, and I know that America is proud of her matchless victories on the battlefields of Europe. I predict that when the history of this war is written, Russia's legions will be given credit for saving world democracy and freedom.

Mr. President, I believe that facts and figures have been submitted to this Senate not only in recent weeks, but months ago, which show that Great Britain could to some extent relieve or lighten our burden by returning to us in kind or in some substantial way such materials as we are furnishing her under lease-lend. Furthermore, I believe sincerely that now, while the war is on, as I have just indicated, we ought to have such an understanding. There is no earthly reason why we should not have an agreement that we are to obtain from Great Britain concessions for bauxite from her rich mines in British Guiana. There is no reason why we should not be granted concessions for tin, for rubber, and last, but not least, for oil.

It has been brought to the attention of the Senate that this country has been furnishing about 70 percent of the oil which is now being used by our allies, and we hear, to our amazement, that the British have vast oil reserves in Iran and that big British-owned refineries are running but 60 percent of their capacity. Why should the United States send oil and octane gas across the seas when both could be obtained not far from the actual theaters of war?

Mr. President, in my feeble effort to obtain facts pertaining to lease-lend, when an appropriation was being considered on March 11, 1943, I propounded certain questions to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who was handling the bill at the time, and I read from the RECORD of that date:

I should like to propound a question to the distinguished Senator from Texas. In his opening statement he spoke of lend-lease in reverse. I wonder if he can be more specific. On page 4 of the committee report it is stated that from the passage of the Lend-Lease Act to the end of January 1943 goods and services have been transferred by the United States in an amount aggregating $8,935,000,000. Does the Senator have any figures to show how much our allies have given to us, in cash, goods, and otherwise, to offset any of that huge amount?

He could not give specific information.

I attempted not only in March, but long before that time, to obtain facts as to how lease-lend operated, and up to this moment I have never been able to obtain an intelligent answer. The answers were always shrouded with uncertainties. It seems to me that the Administrator should have tried to estab-

lish fixed policies so that we will not be confronted with myriads of "ifs" and "ands" during and after the war.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAVEZ in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I know the Senator was a supporter of lend-lease, as I was.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the general theory of lend-lease is excellent. It has accomplished a great deal of good and I am still for it, though I would like to see it more equitably administered in the interest of our own country than it has been. When the Senator makes the statement about getting facts, it is interesting to recall that before the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member, we were each given a booklet containing the salient, outstanding facts of lend-lease, when the lend-lease appropriation was before the committee. I thought, as many others did, that it would be very interesting to have such a compilation of the facts at hand. But when the hearing had been concluded, the booklets containing the facts which had been furnished us were collected, just as books would be collected in a class at school and returned to the teacher. That was the end of having the facts available on lend-lease. That brief glimpse was the only real statement of facts we had in making the lend-lease appropriation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have written Mr. Stettinius on many occasions, seeking these facts, and in the course of my remarks I shall read some excerpts from his letters.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, has the Senator concluded the part of his speech relative to petroleum, or does he intend to take that up further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not hear the Senator's question.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator intend to go into the question of petroleum further, that is, how much is being furnished now by Great Britain, and other countries?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I have no specific information as to that. I have had to take my cues as regards oil to a large extent from the newspapers, following the executive session we had here some time ago when our round-the-world Senators addressed us.

I now read further from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 11, 1943, and this gives one of the reasons which prompts me to make inquiry:

> I believe that exact and definite information should be placed in the RECORD for the benefit of the American public. I do not believe that many persons in the country are aware that we receive in return some goods and supplies which offset, to some extent, what we send to other countries under lease-lend.

We are told that there are some, but when we ask for a statement showing how the amounts are arrived at and what the supplies consist of, we cannot obtain the information.

Yesterday morning I telephoned the Lease-Lend Administrator. I was referred to one of the experts, and I again asked how the lend-lease operated in Australia. Much has been said here about Australia. The answer was that neither the British nor the Australians had a sufficient number of men at hand to make the compilations; in other words, that they were short of labor to render such services. Lease-lend has been on the statute books now for over 2¾ years, and it strikes me that the American people are entitled to know how lease-lend is being operated. It will be recalled that some members of the Australian Government contend that their country has furnished us with as much as she has received from us. In other words, the accounts are about in balance.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. In just a moment. Let us take the case of the 30,000 civilian trucks which were made available to Australia, about which we read in the newspapers some time ago. The American civilians got an allotment of 15,000 trucks. It impresses me that the American people should know something about that. It may be that the statement is erroneous. It may be that the number of trucks involved is exaggerated. It may be that the trucks were used for carrying troops and supplies. However, if the statement is true, how is it possible that lease-lend will allot to Australia 30,000 civilian trucks, with a population of 7,000,000 people, and only 15,000 trucks for our country, whose population is in excess of 150,000,000 people. I would like to know more about this contrast in figures and a statement of the true facts would be in order at this time. On the other hand, we are further told, by the same newspaper reports, that when those trucks are delivered to Australia, the Australians give us I O U's, and the Government then sells them to her people and puts the cash in her treasury. The statement quoted from the newspaper came from the lips of one of our most respected Senators, who recently toured the world. It may be, as I have just indicated, that the number mentioned is exaggerated, but whatever the number, we are certainly entitled to know how and under what conditions they were distributed among the civilian population of Australia.

I believe that the American people are entitled to know whether or not these transactions are being carried on in that way. It may be that the transaction has merit; I do not know. My object in discussing lease-lend is to find some way by which the facts can be ascertained. In time, I will ask the Committee on Appropriations, which handles the appropriations for lease-lend, to investigate lease-lend and its operations, or, if they will not do this, I should like to have the Truman committee investigate it, and if the Truman committee is not able to do it, then I propose to offer a resolution so as to have lease-lend investigated. Better learn of its operation now than later. Congress has a huge responsibility, when we consider that lend-lease is now handling goods in enormous amounts. My recollection is that goods valued at one and one-quarter billion dollars were distributed to our allies last month.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Has the Senator ever by countries seen a list at any time of the lease-lend reports, of the projects, or a detailed statement of materials allocated?

Mr. ELLENDER. Never.

Mr. TAFT. I have looked for such a list in vain.

Mr. ELLENDER. I never have seen one, and I was never able to obtain such a list from the Lease-Lend Administrator.

Mr. TAFT. For instance, I once made inquiry in regard to an airport in Italian Eritrea, built by the United States Government apparently on lease-lend to England. I do not know why we should build an English airport in Italian Eritrea. It seems to me there should be filed here a list of all these various projects upon which lease-lend money has been spent, and a statement as to whether those projects have been turned over to the countries to whom the aid was extended, or whether we retain control, or what the status is.

Mr. ELLENDER. In that connection, it may be that the Government itself, in this case the British Government, has knowledge, and there may be some reason why that knowledge should not be divulged.

If that is true there may have been good reasons for handling it that way. I am interested in finding it out, and I do believe that the Congress should know more about the management of lease-lend.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has been quoting from newspapers rumors and statements about lease-lend in Australia. I happen to have in my hand a statement contained in a news letter closely connected with the British. It mentions something about Britain's contribution in reverse. Would the Senator from Louisiana like to hear something contained in that letter for his information?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I am interested in such information, I will say to the Senator. If the Senator has data, give it to the Senate and to the people of the country. I have never been able to obtain much from the lease-lend administrator.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I read from the news letter, as follows:

> Britain has provided supplies, not only for herself and the Empire, but for most of her allies as well, notably Russia and the United States. For instance, by November 1942 she had sent Russia enough equipment for 20 armored divisions on the German scale, and by December, nearly 3,000 tanks and over 3,000 aircraft. Within 1 week of the German invasion of Russia, half a million pairs of boots were shipped to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. By the end of 1941, substantial quantities of rubber, tin, wool, lead, jute, shellac, and thousands of tons of sugar were dispatched.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the last item? Sugar?

Mr. HATCH. Yes, thousands of tons.

Apart from much technical aid supplied to the United States Army in the shape of her new inventions, Britain provided facilities and equipment for America on an appreciable scale. All the accommodation and facilities for United States troops in the United Kingdom were provided as reciprocal aid. From June 1942 to April 1943 this item amounted to nearly two and a quarter million tons of construction material and a total of 1,360,000 ship-tons of supplies and equipment. The two biggest aircraft maintenance depots in the world have been handed over to the Americans, one of which was specially built for them. Machine tools, engines, and much of the paraphernalia for antiaircraft defense has been sent to America, including equipment and tools for a complete gun-barrel factory.

On the financial side, Britain has put some $1,500,000,000 into the American aircraft industry, and spent about $173,000,000 indirect capital assistance to American corporations making aircraft, tanks, and guns. Seven thousand millions of dollars was the total cash purchase made by the British Empire in the United States between September 1939 and September 1942. A great deal more than the total American lend-lease deliveries in Britain in that period.

Mr. President, I will say that that information comes from a news letter, it is from a British source, but I call it to the Senator's attention to show that perhaps there are two sides to the question.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not deny that there are. I am not questioning that at all. I feel confident that if the British Government has spent as much as $7,000,000,000 in this country for war material she has received full value for the money spent.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the contribution made by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is a most worthy one. I do not wish to take words out of the mouth of the Senator from New Mexico, but I for one think that the theory of lease-lend is excellent; and, as I have said, it has accomplished a great deal of good. But I do believe, as the Senator from Louisiana is attempting to tell the Senate, that the country is entitled to know what is going on today in lend-lease. I believe the strongest point the Senator has made today is this: When we give to any country equipment or supplies under lend-lease, which they in turn sell to their civilian population, for which they receive cash from their own people, can anyone in the Senate offer one legitimate reason why that money should be placed in their own treasury and spent for their own purposes and not be returned to the United States? That is one of the loopholes in lend-lease that should be corrected in the interest of justice to the United States and our citizens.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HATCH. Does either the Senator from Louisiana or the Senator from New Hampshire have any proof of the last statement?

Mr. ELLENDER. I received it from the Lend-Lease Administrator, of course.

Mr. HATCH. That other countries receiving lend-lease from us were selling lease-lend articles to their own civilians?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. I will read from the record a statement made by me early in 1943 with respect to the matter. I cannot find the statement at the moment, but, as I recall, I said that shiploads of milk, of cheese, of powdered eggs, and the like are sent to Great Britain, for which the United States receives an I. O. U. The British Government sells the merchandise to the wholesalers in Great Britain, the wholesalers sell it to the retailers and the retailers to the consuming public. What really happens is that the British Government receives the cost of the goods from the wholesalers and puts it into the treasury. No doubt, profits are made on which income taxes are collected by the British Government, and I am almost certain that ad valorem taxes are also collected in like manner.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I think the Senator from Louisiana was present in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry when I or some other Senator asked the question of Mr. Stettinius, I think it was, or some representative of the Lend-Lease Administration, and the answer was very frankly made that the British Government was selling the goods, and the money received for the sale of the goods was going into the British Exchequer. There was no question about it at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. I made statements regarding this on the Senate floor on two occasions at least. I was present at the meeting to which the Senator from Montana referred and recall the incident.

Mr. WHEELER. When Mr. Stettinius appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry he very frankly admitted that that was true. There was no question about it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Now, Mr. President, I desire to read a little more from the RECORD and then I will conclude with lease-lend:

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, when the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] was discussing the pending bill for a continuation of the Lend-Lease Act, in behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I asked him some questions with a view of attempting to clarify a few of the issues involved. As I stated then, I repeat, I voted for lease-lend and I expect to vote for a continuation of lease-lend. I believe that it should be made plain to the American people how lease-lend operates—just how it is proposed to pay us back for the advances made. I have been trying to obtain an answer to the questions for the past 6 or 8 months, and I am still in the dark.

I am informed that the way some of lease-lend works—

I desire to call to the attention of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] that this is the quotation I was looking for awhile ago—

is in the following manner: A cargo of pork, canned fruits, dried eggs, and other products is shipped to the British Government for the purpose of feeding its civilian population. Those products are turned over to an agency of the British Government. The British agency pays nothing for them to our Government but sells them to the merchants in the British Isles, and in turn the merchants sell the goods to the people of the British Isles, thereby enabling the merchants to maintain themselves in business. No doubt, some appreciable income accrues to the merchants upon which the British Government receives taxes and other income. If that be true, I would be interested to find out to what extent is lease-lend operated in such a manner.

Since that time I have tried to obtain that information but I understand that the statistics are not available, and that England cannot furnish the information because of shortage of labor to compile such figures.

I believe that if this matter is sifted to the bottom, it will be seen, as has been said in the House of Representatives, that it is a one-way proposition or words to that effect. I am not seriously objecting to that at the moment, but what I believe ought to be done is to tell the whole truth about it.

Let it not be shrouded in darkness. The people are entitled to know if this is an outright donation or if they are being kidded into believing that they can expect to be repaid in kind or otherwise.

If we are to receive value, let our allies make it real. Let us be shown that they mean business. I am in accord with what the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] stated awhile ago, that while this war is continuing we should obtain absolute sovereignty over the bases that we acquired from England some time ago in return for 50 destroyers. Let us make lease-lend work to that end. I advocated such a proposition almost 1 year ago and I doubt if anything has been done to this moment. Other bases could be acquired in like manner. In that connection why not obtain sovereign rights over some of the air bases we are building in the Pacific and other parts of the world? On the other hand what about the millions of tons of our natural resources that are being sent abroad? Why could not some agreement be entered into now whereby our Government could in some way have returned to it some of the millions of tons of steel it is sending abroad? How about oil, why not make provisions for its return after the war? How about rubber and tin? Are we going to be forced to pay to Britishers, after the war, tremendous sums for rubber and tin as we did after the First World War? It strikes me that while this war is on, while we are giving our all, while we are dissipating our God-given natural resources, we should make every effort to obtain, in kind, those irreplaceable resources. Let some agreement be made now, to make available to us after the war, iron ore, tin, manganese, bauxite, oil, and other resources that are now being used in large quantities. We must and should replenish those resources.

Mr. President, I advocated a similar proposal 2 years ago, when the original bill was before us. I had hoped that something would be done in that direction ere now. The British Commonwealth has many times the natural resources the United States possesses, and I contend that now is the time for us to have a clear-cut understanding of how we are to obtain in kind some of our God-given resources which are now being extravagantly dissipated. Let us obtain if possible, in sovereignty, some of the rich bauxite mines owned by the British, some of the rich tin deposits owned by the British and the Dutch; in fact, sovereignty over some of the rich natural deposits owned by our allies and which are now idle. Let us bargain now while the war is on and not

wait until the war is over. I would like to discuss this subject more in detail—

And so forth. Mr. President, I cite that reference to the Senate merely to show that some of us were not asleep, and that I believe we have made valid suggestions to those administering lend-lease, but somehow they have not been followed. It is my contention that a discussion of this kind probably will lead England to do in regard to other matters what she did in respect to the 50-destroyer deal. It will be recalled that when the British were given 50 destroyers in trade for 7 bases, some of us on the Committee on Naval Affairs, of which the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] was a member, investigated to find out some of the details in regard to that deal. When an investigation was made, what did we find? We found that our Government had simply acquired water and air, and that we had to go down in our jeans and pay out as much as $6,200,000 in order to acquire land upon which to build the bases. I have no doubt that the discussions we had in the past brought the English to their senses; and 2 months ago we were paid for the amount the United States put up to buy the land for those bases.

By the same token, I want to bring to their attention many other things. I am pleading for an understanding now, so that we shall not have a misunderstanding around the peace table.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I should like to ask the Senator if he is satisfied with the progress of the war?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senator asks a silly question.

Mr. TUNNELL. I take it from the Senator's language that he is dissatisfied.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, evidently the Senator does not understand the English language.

Mr. TUNNELL. I certainly am not confined to the language of the Senator from Louisiana, if he has not given that impression.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not care what the Senator thinks or what impression he receives. I think I have made my viewpoint plain on many occasions. I have repeated many times that it is my humble opinion that what we should do in regard to lend-lease, since there has been so much talk about it, is to let the American people know how it operates.

Let me ask the Senator from Delaware if he thinks the British Government acted properly when, on March 16, 1942, it sold to our Government a shipyard located at Richmond, Calif., for $5,506,500, and when, on September 30, 1942, it sold us a shipyard at Bath, Maine, for which the Government of the United States paid Great Britain $8,500,000 in cash. In the light of the fact that we have been sending billions of dollars of goods to Great Britain, was it right for Great Britain to force the American Government to pay in cash for those two shipyards? I wish the Senator would answer that question for me.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly, Mr. President; I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator from Louisiana stated he has been getting his information from newspapers, and on Friday the Senator from Maine showed us one of the newspapers from which some of this rather scandalous and disloyal statement was coming. The Senator has referred to the fact that he predicted there would be a tremendous indebtedness of the United States. I wonder whether he wants the United States to stop spending. What is the alternative?

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall let the distinguished Senator use his own judgment in that respect. What I desire to do is simply and solely to lay the pertinent facts before the American people, to keep them posted—that is all; that should be enough to enable them to draw their own conclusions.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, the Senator says he is taking the information from the same source that they are.

Mr. ELLENDER. Whom does the Senator mean by "they"?

Mr. TUNNELL. The American people. The American people are reading the newspapers, unfortunately.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not believe the RECORD will show that I stated on the floor of the Senate that I got my information solely from the newspapers.

Mr. TUNNELL. If the Senator did not say so a few minutes ago——

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I did mention the newspapers twice, rather facetiously, because the newspapers gave out reports about what took place before the Senate in executive session; and there are two items to which I referred specifically, as the Senator may recall. One was in respect to 30,000 trucks, and the other was relative to oil, as I recall. I desire to say to the Senator that my information in respect to lend-lease and in respect to debts, which I shall talk about in a few minutes, did not come from the newspapers.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator stated he could not get the information from the Government. If he did not get it from the newspapers, where did he get it, let me ask.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have been unable to obtain the information I requested. That I have repeatedly stated.

Mr. TUNNELL. Then, Mr. President, what is the Senator's complaint? If he has no information, what are his charges?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I thought I made myself plain.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I think the Senator has made himself plain.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have tried to secure information, and I am trying to show that, although my efforts have been many, to this moment I have failed to get the desired information. That is why I proposed a while ago that the operation of lease-lend should be investigated by the Appropriations Committee; if it cannot do so, then the Truman committee should act; if it will not do so, then I propose to submit a resolution for the consideration of the Senate, to have the operations of lease-lend investigated.

My only object in pursuing this course, as I have indicated on two or three occasions, is to force an understanding now, while the war is on, rather than a misunderstanding when the war is over.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator proposes that the Government do what the British newspapers call a little horse trading in time of war; is that it?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; of course not. I will get to that discussion in a moment, if the Senator will bear with me.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I was very much interested in the fact just stated by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, that the British Government had sold to our Government two naval bases in the United States. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. ELLENDER. Two shipyards.

Mr. MURDOCK. Whether they were shipyards, bases, or what not, were they owned by the British Government?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Or were they owned by a British corporation or British individual,

Mr. ELLENDER. By the British Government.

Mr. MURDOCK. They were shipyards owned by the British Government, within the territory of the United States?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wished to be sure that I had understood the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

As I indicated awhile ago, I wrote many times to the Lease-Lend Administrator for specific information, and at times I received some, but not all that I thought I was entitled to.

I quote from the last letter received by me from Mr. Stettinius, under date of August 21, 1943. I had asked him many questions. I shall not attempt to read all of the letter at this time, but following my remarks I shall ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in full.

One of the questions which I asked the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] when he was handling lease-lend the last time was why Canada and South Africa did not have lease-lend agreements. He did not know, so I wrote to Mr. Stettinius, and received this reply from him:

> You ask why Canada and South Africa have not entered into lease-lend agreements with the United States. Canada has not received any lease-lend aid. Our economic relations with Canada have been defined by the so-called Hyde Park agreement of April 21, 1942, by which purchases of the United States in Canada and of Canada in the United States are made for cash. As part of lease-lend aid to the United Kingdom, however, raw materials and component parts which are incorporated in Canada in articles manufactured for the United Kingdom may be provided by the United States under lend-lease.

One of the puzzling answers was in regard to the valuation of reciprocal aid. How to evaluate services, and so forth,

seems to have been the troublemaker for the Lease-Lend Administrator. This was his reply:

While we have kept records of reciprocal lend-lease aid received from all countries, it has not been practicable thus far to make evaluation in dollars and cents of the amount of this aid. However, we are endeavoring to obtain from the foreign governments a statement of the costs to them, in terms of their own currency, of the aid which they have given us. The Australian Government has already indicated that it spent approximately £61,000,000—

Which would be about $196,000,000 of our money—

for reverse lease-lend up to June 30, 1943.

I had asked for a statement, but all I received was the amount. Upon further investigation from some of the experts in lease-lend I am told that a large amount of this $196,000,000 which the Australian Government has charged against us is for the money spent by the Australian Government to build roads and airports throughout Australia for the defense of Australia, and for the rent of large airports scattered throughout Australia, and also for the use of docks in Australia. Just think, Senators. Here we are, sending our blood, our money, and everything else to defend Australia, and we are charged rent for the use of bases and the cost of building ports and roads in order to defend Australia.

Before the war the debt of Australia was $5,000,000,000 and some odd millions. Now it is about $200,000,000 less than it was. According to the figures I have, she owes less now than she did before the war. Probably our great country could pay all of its debts if we could get from all our allies material which we could sell for value and put the purchase price in our pockets.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator stated that in defending Australia we were sending our blood and our men, which is quite correct, but the Senator will admit that in defending Australia we are also defending ourselves.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not doubt that. That goes without saying. I am certain also, if we had not helped Australia, she might now be in the hands of the Japs.

Let me read further:

The problem of evaluation is, however, a very difficult one. The reciprocal aid received by us consists of thousands of individual transactions occurring in all parts of the world under the most diverse circumstances. To place values on individual items, or even to arrive at values in terms of general categories, is a vast undertaking. Moreover, there are many types of reciprocal aid that are of such an intangible character that it is impossible to "value" them.

Listen to this, Senators:

It is impossible to measure in dollars either the cost to the British or the value to us, for example, of British engineering and designs of weapons based upon 2 years of combat experience gained before we entered the war. All this has been freely made available to us in the production of planes, tanks, and other weapons in our own factories and for our own forces. No estimate can be made of the number of American lives that have been saved by equipping our forces with those improved weapons.

Just stop and think of that. The great British Government proposes to offset lease-lend aid by engineering experience.

I say to the Senate and to the British people that if they seek to offset lease-lend aid in such a manner, they ought to hang their heads in shame.

Another difficulty is involved in expressing a "value" in terms of dollars.

Hundreds of those airplanes upon which these gadgets are used are in lend-lease. There is no doubt that they utilized many gadgets for which we were responsible.

I am wondering to what extent they charge us or give us credit for that by way of compensation. I am confident that our people are not thinking of charging the British for such services.

I continue reading from the letter:

Another difficulty is involved in expressing a "value" (in terms of dollars) even for items the cost of which is known. Thus, a Spitfire plane costs, in terms of the official exchange rate, only about one-half as much as does a comparable American plane. Is the "value" of the Spitfire, therefore, only one-half that of the American plane? One dollar will buy about three times the quantity of butter in New Zealand that it will buy in the United States. On what basis are we to value the butter received from New Zealand? On the other hand, there are some items which cost more in terms of dollars in England than in the United States.

In many instances our allies have undertaken as reciprocal aid vast construction programs to meet the requirements of American forces; in other cases, foreign governments have turned over to us for our use cantonments, airfields, or the like which were previously occupied, either in whole or in part, by their own forces, and it has been necessary to enlarge other facilities to permit the transfer of their forces to those facilities. How are we to value these facilities? Are we to appraise them as capital cost or upon a rental basis?

A specific example may illustrate the difficulties which are encountered in attempting to place values upon capital projects. When American forces first arrived in Australia the Air Corps requested the Australian Government to construct a huge airfield not far from Melbourne. The plans called for complete installation with landing fields, barracks, roads, and improvements of all kinds. The Australian Government promptly proceeded to construct the field in accordance with our requirements and delivered it to us under reverse lend-lease. Shortly afterward as a result of the successful outcome of the Battle of the Coral Sea and of later developments of the war, the base of operations of our Air Corps was moved 1,500 miles to the north and new fields had to be constructed there. The greater part of the construction was carried on by the Australian Government. Some assistance was given by United States Army engineers, and equipment belonging to both governments was used to the extent that it was available. Even after the base of operations was moved north, the field near Melbourne was not turned back to the Australian Government unconditionally, because of the possibility that, as a result of shifting fortunes of war, it might again have to be used. How are we to "value" the aid given us as a result of these transactions?

Listen to this, Senators:

A list, prepared by the Office of Economic Warfare, indicating the volume of public purchases and private commercial imports from lease-lend countries during the year 1942, is enclosed. With respect to the British Empire, the over-all financial condition of the Empire has thus far required that these purchases be for cash. Our purchases of bauxite from British Guiana, for example, have been cash transactions for this reason.

Think of it, Senators. What about our financial condition? If such a policy is to continue, the American people should know it.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the remainder of this letter. I shall not detain the Senate in order to read all of it, but I wish Senators would read it. I am sure they would agree with me that the information given is not at all specific, but that the matter is still rather beclouded. That is my reason for feeling that the American people should know how lease-lend operates, and to what extent Great Britain and others of our allies should be made to replenish the God-given natural resources to which I have referred.

Mr. President, before I proceed to the next subject, I should like to place in the RECORD a compilation made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in regard to purchases made by it from foreign governments. It will be recalled that when the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] handled the last lend-lease appropriation, I asked him for information as to whether our Government received strategic materials for lease-lend aid. It seems that whenever there are any materials to be exchanged, such as certain minerals, we do not get them without paying for them in cash. For example, in Australia, from January 1, 1942, to June 30, 1943, our Government paid $92,239,028 in cash for minerals or materials. We made purchases from British East Africa in the amount of $9,000,000. We made purchases from Canada in the amount of $102,000,000, from British Malaya in the amount of $28,000,000, and from Ceylon in the amount of $26,000,000. That was all in hard cash, and at the same time we were furnishing implements of war in order to help those countries defend themselves. When it comes to offsetting lease-lend with such materials it does not seem that we get anywhere. That is why I feel that the Senate should investigate the situation, and should find out why it exists and how to avoid it.

I really rose to speak for a few minutes, for the information of the Senate, in regard to the debts of the world. I spent six months with the staff of the Library of Congress who gathered the information on this subject, and I believe that with the data available it is as accurate as it could be made.

In the tabulation I have sought to set forth as accurately as possible the amount of the debts owed by all countries, including our own, before the war and at this time. The information is as follows:

The total debt of the United States and its possessions on September 30, 1940, was $44,214,000,000, or a per capita debt of $293.

As of August 16, 1943, our debt had increased from $44,214,000,000 to $143,431,000,000, or a per capita debt of $935.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. To whom is the debt owed by our Government?

Mr. ELLENDER. To the people and to the banks and large corporations.

Mr. MURDOCK. To the people of the United States, is it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. We are taught, are we not, that in a democracy, government and the people at least should be synonymous.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. So we have the situation of the people owing to the people the total amount of the debt.

Mr. ELLENDER. I said it was owed to the people, banks, and other corporations. Most of it is owed to large corporations and banks.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is true, but all the large corporations and the insurance companies in the United States are owned by the people of the United States; are they not?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct to some extent. Some corporations may have foreigners owning their stock.

Mr. MURDOCK. So we have the situation of the people owing to the people the total amount of the debt.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. That was true prior to our entry into the war; was it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. And it is true today. The Senator has divided the liability value of the debt on a per capita basis. Why is not the asset value of the debt also divisible on a per capita basis?

Mr. ELLENDER. What has the Senator in mind? I cannot quite follow his thought. I cannot understand why a debt should be an asset.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have in mind that all debts have an asset value and a liability value. Is that not true?

Mr. ELLENDER. I cannot agree with the Senator. I do not know what he wishes to establish.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Senator owes me $50, that is his liability, is it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. And it is my asset. Is not that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the people owe to the people a total amount of our governmental debt, as stated by the Senator, then, that debt has a liability value, and it has an asset value. The Senator, for some reason or other, divides the liability on a per capita basis. I call his attention to the fact that the people of the United States are buying bonds. The bonds are evidences of the indebtedness of the Government. We find them distributed widely throughout the United States, do we not?

Mr. ELLENDER. I fail to agree with the Senator on that point. The record shows that the number of people actually owning bonds in any appreciable amount is very small, and that the greater portion of them are purchased by banks and other large concerns.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the Senator is correct in that respect, but the people of the United States, according to their ability, are buying the debt of the United States. Now, I think that especially in time of war, when we should all be interested, as I am sure we are all interested, in uniting the war effort, we should not on the floor of the Senate, in my opinion, give out any information which will disunite the war effort. Therefore, when the Senator divides the liability of the national debt on a per capita basis, I think it is only fair to say that the asset value of the debt should also be considered on a per capita basis.

I do not disagree with the Senator that the distribution of the liability value is a great deal wider than the distribution of the asset value, but, nevertheless, in order to give the people of the United States the correct view, the proper picture of our financial condition today, we should look not only to the liability but also to the asset, and constantly remember that in a democracy government and the people are synonymous, and that the people owe the people this great national debt.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not believe that the Senator meant what he intimated just now, that in the speech I am making in an effort to give the facts to the American people I am trying to disunite them.

Mr. MURDOCK. Absolutely no.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator will pardon me for saying so, I thought I was doing a service.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the Senator from Louisiana is doing a service. I think to call the attention of the American people to the amount of the debt certainly is no mistake, and it is probably timely and opportune to do it. But in giving them the information, let us not say we owe this vast amount in billions of dollars and divide it up on a per capita basis, without following that and saying that we owe it to ourselves and that the asset value is also divisible on a per capita basis.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suppose the people can draw their own conclusions after reading these figures. I am not trying to show that each person owes the amount stated and is going to pay it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not quite understand the Senator's statement with reference to the debt. Did he say it was $142,000,000,000 as of August of this year compared with approximately $40,000,000,000 in——

Mr. ELLENDER. Forty-four billion dollars.

Mr. MAYBANK. Forty-four billion dollars in 1940. Was that the total debt of the Government and political subdivisions, or of the Federal Government alone?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, indeed, that was the debt of the Federal Government as of August 16, 1943.

Mr. MAYBANK. The debt of the Federal Government alone, not including political subdivisions?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to make a comparison.

Mr. WHEELER. I merely wish to ask a question. My friend, the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], spoke of the "asset value" of a debt. That is something new to me.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is why I could not follow the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WHEELER. I was unable to follow the Senator when he spoke of the "asset value" of a debt. Perhaps the Senator could enlighten me upon that subject. As a matter of fact, unless there is involved some new principle of which I am not aware, a debt has been a liability, except in countries where there is extreme inflation. In such a period the man who is in debt profits by the inflation, but the debt to the man who holds it is certainly a liability. I have always felt that it is a liability to anyone to be in debt.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me to comment on the statement of the Senator from Montana? I think he should do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield further to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am rather surprised at the distinguished Senator from Montana making the statement he has made. It is very true that a debt is a liability, of course, to the person owing the debt, but to the creditor it is certainly an asset. If the Senator will go into the reading room and select any newspaper he will find in the bank statements that every debt referred to there as a liability is also an asset. To the person who owes it, the debt, of course, is a liability, but to the bank to whom he owes it it is an asset.

Mr. WHEELER. That is quite a different thing. The Senator is now talking about bank indebtedness and money.

Mr. MURDOCK. If there is a difference, I should like to have the Senator explain it to me.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I desire to proceed. I dislike citing figures to the Senate, but I will ask the attention of my colleagues for a few moments while I contrast the increase in our debt with that of, let us say, Great Britain. As I have just indicated, on September 30, 1940, our national debt was $44,072,000,000. On August 16, 1943, it had increased to $143,297,000,000, an increase in that space of time of almost $100,000,000,000.

Now, let us turn to Great Britain and all her possessions. These figures cover the time during which Great Britain has been in the war, or from 1939, and some of them go as far back as 1938, as is indicated from compilations I am reading from. The entire British debt back in 1939, before Great Britain got into the war, was $52,647,000,000. That, by the way, included the $5,000,000,000 which Great Britain now owes this country. From 1939 to March 31 of this year, a period of 4 years, while she has been at war, the debt of Great Britain increased to $88,240,000,000. In other words, the debt of Great Britain and all

her possessions in the space of almost 4 years has increased $36,000,000,000, in contrast to an increase in our debt of $100,000,000,000, in a little over 2 years.

Here let me give the Senate some figures as to how rapidly our debt is increasing.

On October 31, 1942, our national debt was $92,000,000,000, in round figures. In November it had risen to $96,000,000,000. In December it was $108,000,000,000. In January of 1943 it was $111,000,000,000. In February it was $114,000,000,000. In March it was $115,000,000,000. In April it was $129,000,000,000. In May it was $135,000,000,000. In June it was $136,000,000,000. In July it was $141,000,000,000. In August it was $144,000,000,000. In September it was $158,000,000,000. Since October, 1942, our national debt has increased, in 11 months, by $65,445,000,000, or almost $6,000,000,000 a month.

I have here a compilation, from all the figures available, of the debts of all our enemies, and they aggregate $91,815,000,000, and the debts of all our allies aggregate $125,984,000,000.

Considering the rate at which we are now spending money, and the rate at which our debt is increasing, my guess is that by the end of next year, that is, taking into consideration the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, plus 6 months of the following fiscal year, our country will owe more money than all our allies and all our enemies put together.

Mr. TUNNELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I should like to know whether the Senator's proposal is that we stop spending.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; not entirely.

Mr. TUNNELL. What is the Senator's suggestion?

Mr. ELLENDER. We cannot stop spending; we have our foot in the door. But I do believe that hereafter the Senate and its committees should pay a little more attention to appropriations made.

Mr. TUNNELL. I should like to ask what the Senator means by putting our foot in the door.

Mr. ELLENDER. We are in the war, we are fighting for our very life.

Mr. TUNNELL. We did not start the war, did we?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course not.

Mr. TUNNELL. Then is there any implied blame in the fact that our indebtedness is climbing?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not trying to blame anyone. I voted for all appropriations asked by our Chief.

Mr. TUNNELL. Perhaps it does not sound to the Senator as it does to others of us, but it sounds to some of us as if he were.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let the Senator draw his own conclusions as to that.

Mr. TUNNELL. If that is the Senator's attitude, then I shall do so. I understand him exactly.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am giving facts. I never knew of the truth hurting anyone.

Mr. TUNNELL. If that is the attitude of the Senator, that we cannot ask him a question without being told we can draw any conclusion we want to from his remarks, then we will draw the conclusion we desire.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope the Senator will be calm.

Mr. TUNNELL. I think the Senator's remarks are very clear.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not attempting to prevent the Senator from asking me a question. I try to be courteous. I do not suppose there is a Senator on this floor who can say that I have ever at any time refused to answer questions, but what I am saying to the Senator is that he may draw his own conclusion as to the figures I am citing.

Mr. TUNNELL. I am not questioning the Senator's figures, I am trying to find out what his purpose is. What is the objective?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will leave that to the Senator, let him draw his own conclusion.

Mr. TUNNELL. I think everyone will do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly. Mr. President, as I have indicated throughout the debate, I believe that something should be done during the war, while the war is on, so that we can have an understanding now, and not have a misunderstanding when peace comes.

We have heard the Senators who made the trip around the globe some time ago state the attitude of the British press in regard to the help this country is giving to England. We are told that our efforts are belittled by British propaganda. Many quotations were read from the British and Australian press indicating such an attitude.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I should like to ask whether it is the intention of the Senator to place in the RECORD the valuable statistics he said it took him 6 months to collect.

Mr. ELLENDER. At this time I ask permission to have placed in the RECORD the compilation of the debts to which I have just referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

National debt of the United States

Month	Amount	Increase
Oct. 31, 1942	$92,904,000,000	
November 1942	96,115,000,000	$3,211,000,000
December 1942	108,170,000,000	12,055,000,000
January 1943	111,070,000,000	2,900,000,000
February 1943	114,024,000,000	2,954,000,000
March 1943	115,507,000,000	1,483,000,000
April 1943	129,849,000,000	14,342,000,000
May 1943	135,913,000,000	6,064,000,000
June 1943	136,696,000,000	786,000,000
July 1943	141,524,000,000	4,828,000,000
August 1943	144,059,000,000	2,535,000,000
September 1943	158,349,000,000	14,290,000,000
Sept. 30, 1943	158,349,000,000	
Oct. 31, 1942	92,904,000,000	
Increase	65,445,000,000	

Average monthly increase for 11-month period $5,949,500,000

Per capita debt increasing at rate of $38 plus per month.

	Area in square miles	Before war: Population	Before war: Public debt (in United States currency)	Year	Per capita	Latest available figures: Population	Latest available figures: Public debt (in United States currency)	Year	Per capita
United States and possessions:									
Alaska	586,400	73,023	None			72,524	None		
Samoa	76	12,908	None			12,908	None		
Guam	206	22,290	None			22,290	None		
Hawaii	6,407	423,330	$38,288,000			423,330	$34,201,000	June 30, 1942	
Puerto Rico	3,435	1,869,245	28,908,000			1,869,255	25,077,865	do	
Virgin Islands	133	24,889	None			24,889	None		
Philippine Islands	114,400	16,356,000	74,468,500			16,971,000	74,753,500	June 30, 1941	
Total, United States possessions	711,606	18,781,285	141,664,500			19,396,196	134,032,365		
United States	3,026,789	131,669,275	44,072,940,246	Sept. 30, 1940	$334	133,965,000	143,297,674,000	Aug. 16, 1943	$1,070
Total United States and possessions	3,738,395	150,450,560	44,214,604,746		293	153,361,196	143,431,706,365		935
British Empire:									
Western Hemisphere:									
Canada	3,694,863	11,315,000	3,152,559,314	1938	279	11,505,898	7,524,122,000	Nov. 30, 1942	654
Labrador and Newfoundland	42,734	294,800	99,868,700	1938		300,000	90,302,000	June 30, 1940	
Bahamas	4,404	67,720	1,012,000	1938		68,903	791,000	Dec. 31, 1939	
Barbados	166	193,082	1,798,680	1938		198,023	1,812,000	Mar. 31, 1941	
Jamaica	4,628	1,173,645	25,212,556	1938		1,223,241	27,168,000	do	
Leeward Islands	422	92,726	1,418,000	1938		93,130	1,333,000	1939	
Trinidad and Tobago	1,862	464,889	19,730,304	1938		506,316	19,188,000	Dec. 31, 1941	
Windward Islands	821	257,077	2,283,804	1938		274,192	2,269,000	1939–41	
British Honduras	8,867	57,767	3,337,210	1938		59,965	2,579,000	Dec. 31, 1940	
British Guiana	89,480	337,039	17,427,044	1938		354,219	17,348,000	Dec. 31, 1941	
Falkland Islands	5,618	3,128	(?)			2,785	None		
Bermuda						32,068	303,000	Dec. 31, 1941	
Total, Western Hemisphere	3,853,865	14,256,873	3,324,647,612	1938	$233	14,618,740	7,687,215,000		527

	Area in square miles	Before war. Population	Before war. Public debt (in United States currency)	Year	Per capita	Latest available figures. Population	Latest available figures. Public debt (in United States currency)	Year	Per capita
British Empire—Continued.									
Africa:									
South Africa	472,550	10,160,000	$1,083,965,252	1938–39	$107	10,521,700	1,711,985,000	Mar. 31, 1943	$163
Southern Rhodesia	150,354	1,385,560	49,202,072	1938–39		1,453,543	77,851,000	Mar. 31, 1942	
Somaliland	68,000	344,700		1938–39		344,700			
Tanganyika	360,000	5,260,484	33,031,516	1938–39		5,232,532	30,932,000	1941	
Northern Rhodesia	290,320	1,380,754	9,388,000	1938–39		1,395,393	9,470,000	Dec. 31, 1940	
Nyasaland	37,374	1,672,787	21,495,296	1938–39		1,686,485	14,923,000	Dec. 31, 1941	
Zanzibar	640	250,000	Nil	1938–39		200,000	None		
Southwest Africa	317,725	288,604	11,001,064	1938–39		314,194			
Gold Coast	30,486	852,899	45,740,000	1938–39		3,962,692	41,964,000	Dec. 31, 1941	
Sierra Leone	27,925	1,768,480	6,343,812	1938–39		1,768,480	5,302,000	Dec. 31, 1939	
Gambia	4,068	199,520	155,040	1938–39		199,520	156,000	Dec. 31, 1940	
Nigeria	372,599	20,588,840	99,058,396	1938–39		20,641,814	100,619,000	Mar. 31, 1940	
Basutoland	11,716	562,411	796,284	1938–39		660,650	634,000	Mar. 31, 1941	
Bechuanaland	275,000	265,756	93,016	1938–39		265,756	122,000	do	
Swaziland	6,705	156,715	1,857,994	1938–39		156,715	400,000	1940	
Anglo-Egyptian Sudan	969,600	6,342,477	63,033,600	1938–39		5,858,317	28,517,000	Dec. 31, 1940	
Cyprus	3,572	376,529	3,289,200	1938–39		383,967	3,318,000	Dec. 31, 1938	
Malta	122	268,668	Nil	1938–39		268,668			
Kenya and Uganda	318,941	711,053	19,816,200	1938–39		7,364,567	82,435,000	Dec. 31, 1940	
Mauritius				1938–39		420,861	8,954,000	June 30, 1940	
Total, Africa	3,717,697	52,836,237	1,436,487,152	1938–39	27	63,150,554	2,116,070,000		34
Asia and Oceania:									
Ceylon	25,332	5,780,000	48,975,100	1938		5,981,000	51,600,000	Sept. 30, 1940	
Malaya	132,723	6,088,327	68,495,738	1938		5,560,444	69,632,000	1940	
New Guinea and other islands	124,046	1,065,462	6,639,460	1938					
New Guinea				1938		675,369	65,000	June 30, 1940	
Borneo				1938		270,223	None		
Nauru				1938		3,352	235,000	Dec 31, 1940	
Fiji Islands				1938		220,787	5,724,000	do	
Palestine	10,429	1,466,536		1938		1,568,664	18,057,000	Dec. 31, 1941	
Transjordan	34,740	300,000	882,244	1938		300,000	776,000	Dec. 31, 1939	
	327,270	14,700,325	114,991,541		8	14,579,839	145,619,000		10
Australia	2,974,581	6,997,326	5,364,216,976	1938	767	7,137,221	5,258,000,000	June 30, 1942	737
New Zealand	103,415	1,624,714	1,215,881,088	1938	749	1,634,338	1,244,000,000	Mar. 31, 1942	761
India	1,808,679	352,837,778	767,000,000	1938	2	388,800,000	3,756,635,000	do	10
Total, Asia and Oceania	5,213,945	376,160,143	7,462,089,605	1938	20	411,151,398	10,404,254,000		25
United Kingdom	95,030	47,485,000	40,424,000,000	Sept. 30, 1940	853	47,485,000	68,032,500,000	Mar. 31, 1943	1,433
Total, British Empire	12,880,537	490,738,253	52,647,224,369		107	537,405,692	88,240,039,000		164
Netherlands and possessions:									
East Indies	735,269	69,435,000	682,418,460			71,534,000	746,680,000	Dec. 31, 1941	
Dutch Guiana	60,288	156,332	546,695			181,044	492,000	Jan. 2, 1941	
	795,557	69,591,332	682,965,155			71,715,044	747,172,000		
Netherlands	33,314	8,728,569	1,664,200,000		190	8,833,977	1,983,207,000	Jan. 1, 1940	224
Total, Netherlands and possessions	828,871	78,319,901	2,347,165,155		29	80,549,021	2,730,379,000		34
Denmark and possessions:									
Greenland	838,000	16,901				16,630			
Faroe Islands	540	25,744				25,744			
	838,540	42,645				42,374			
Denmark	16,575	3,805,000	244,105,000		64	3,805,000	258,688,000	Mar. 31, 1939	68
Total, Denmark and possessions	855,115	3,847,645	244,105,000		63	3,847,374	258,688,000		67
Belgium and possessions:									
Belgian Congo	918,000	10,304,080	985,490			10,381,700	198,628,000	Dec. 31, 1939	
Belgium	11,752	8,386,553	1,950,308,000		233	8,396,000	3,583,260,000	Sept. 30, 1942	427
Total, Belgium and possessions	929,752	18,690,633	1,951,293,490		104	18,777,700	3,781,888,000		201
France		42,074,594	11,144,000,000	Aug. 31, 1939	265	42,074,594	19,900,000,000	Aug. 31,1942	473
China		422,707,868	1,043,100,000	1939	2	422,707,868	1,043,100,000	1939	2
Russia		170,467,000	6,805,000,000	1939	40	170,467,000	10,030,000,000	1941	59
Germany		79,364,408	19,360,000,000	1939	244	79,364,408	74,240,000,000	1942	935
Italy		45,209,937	10,000,000,000	June 30, 1940	221	45,209,937	10,000,000,000	June 30, 1940	221
Japan		105,226,101	5,691,140,000	Mar. 31, 1939	54	105,226,101	7,575,280,000	July 1941	72
Total							91,815,280,000		

Total, United States and possessions	$143,431,706,365
Total rest, allies and possessions	125,984,094,000
Total, Axis	91,815,280,000
Total, our allies and Axis	217,799,374,000

Mr. KILGORE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. With reference to placing those statistics in the RECORD, do they contain a statement of the commensurate wage value of the American dollar abroad and at home, in the United States and in the countries to which the figures relate?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. KILGORE. Also the commensurate value of the raw materials, which largely governs the amount of money we will have to spend, because the exchange commodity value of the dollar depends on the cost of the materials at the location where they are produced, as I have always understood economics.

Mr. ELLENDER. The statistics do not show that fact, but the RECORD will show, I believe—I have seen it stated on two or three occasions—that for the fiscal year ending June 30 next our country has appropriated for war purposes $97,000,000,000, as against Great Britain's $18,000,000,000.

Mr. President, as I have said, I am about to conclude. This afternoon I have tried to give facts to the American people, that is all, and let them draw their own conclusions.

As was indicated by the Senators who made the tour of the globe, there seems to be some effort made by the British Government to underestimate the contribution of the United States. That was demonstrated in a poll that was made in England on July 16, 1943, which was publicized throughout this country. It was a poll taken in Britain by the British Institute of Public Opinion. In stating the contributions of the various nations to the winning of the war, Russia was given

50 percent, Britain 42 percent, China 5 percent, and the United States 3 percent.

Mr. President, let me say, in concluding, that our allies, particularly the British people, should be reminded that the emblem of our great Republic is a spreading eagle, and not a goat.

Mr. TUNNELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana how he would enforce his demands on Great Britain if an agreement could not be reached. Would it be by threat of stopping the war, or how would he enforce them?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will answer the Senator in this way: About 12 monts ago an effort was made by a few distinguished Senators to reduce the size of our Army and our Navy. I was rather leaning that way at one time, but I am now glad that we have a large Army, and that we will make it larger, and that we will have a matchless Navy, so that if and when at the peace table Uncle Sam talks, he will have something to back him.

Mr. TUNNELL. Then, is the Senator glad we have spent the large amount of money about which he speaks?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has not heard me charge waste in discussing the large expenditures. There may be much waste, but all I have tried to do was to show the comparison of expenditures made by this Nation of ours, which today are five and a half times more than those of Great Britain, in money. In the face of that, when I read in a newspaper that the British people are giving credit to this country for participation in winning the war amounting to 3 percent, I resent it.

Mr. TUNNELL. But do we not have to fight this war whether we get any credit or not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course we do, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. TUNNELL. What is the object of the criticism?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sorry I cannot further enlighten the Senator.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter of August 2, 1943, from the Lend-Lease Administrator to me be printed in full at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF LEND-LEASE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., August 2, 1943.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate, Houma, La.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am happy to reply herewith to your letter of July 26, in which you ask a number of questions concerning the operation of lend-lease, reciprocal aid, and related subjects. For the sake of convenience I have grouped my replies under the various subheadings indicated below:

1. RECIPROCAL-AID AGREEMENTS

Reciprocal lend-lease agreements have now been signed with Australia, Belgium, Fighting France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom. The agreement with the Netherlands was signed June 14, 1943. In addition, reciprocal-aid agreements with China and with South Africa are now under negotiation, and it is hoped that they will be signed in the reasonably near future.

You inquire as to why the majority of our allies have not signed reciprocal-aid agreements. It will be seen from the above that agreements have either been signed or are now being negotiated with all of our major allies, with the exception of the U. S. S. R. The Soviet Government has expressed its desire to give us reverse lend-lease to the fullest extent possible, but the volume and nature of such aid is limited by the weight of Russia's own requirements and by the absence of American forces in areas which can be supplied by Russia. Thus far, therefore, such aid has been confined to repair, supply, and servicing of our vessels in Russian ports. While we have obtained certain raw materials from Russia, there is a contractual obligation that the value of these be credited against an advance by the Defense Supplies Corporation, and it will not be possible to credit such shipments as reciprocal aid until this obligation has been discharged.

The fact that no reciprocal-aid agreement has been signed does not mean that we do not receive reverse lend-lease aid from countries with which we have lend-lease arrangements. Article II of the master lend-lease agreement provides that the signatory country "will contribute to the defense of the United States of America and the strengthening thereof and will provide such articles, services, facilities, or information as it may be in a position to supply," and it is on this basis that we have received reverse lend-lease from China, South Africa, India, Russia, and other countries, even though we have no reverse lend-lease agreement with them, and from the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand prior to the signing of an agreement. In some cases this aid has been very substantial, although no agreement has been signed. India, for example, has spent more than $55,000,000 for reverse lend-lease.

The principal advantage of signing a reciprocal-aid agreement is that it formalizes the basis for receipt of aid from a foreign country in much the same manner as a lend-lease agreement provides for aid to be extended by the United States. In the case of countries from whom we obtain reciprocal aid in substantial volume, it is desirable that there be some written agreement which may serve as a point of reference in determining the eligibility of specific types of supply as reverse lend-lease.

The situation with respect to the Latin-American Republics is somewhat different from that applicable to other lend-lease countries. Substantially the only lend-lease aid furnished to Latin-American countries consists of munitions and materials for the production of munitions for coastal defense. The lend-lease agreements with the Latin-American countries differ from the master agreements with the United Kingdom and with our other allies in that they provide for the payment of a portion of the cost of the articles in dollars. The agreements do not specifically contemplate the furnishing of reverse lend-lease assistance.

2. RELATIONS WITH THE NETHERLANDS

You are entirely correct in stating that this country makes substantial purchases of bauxite and petroleum from Netherlands possessions in this hemisphere; the Guianas are our only important source of bauxite imports and account for more than one-quarter of our total supply of this material. In 1942, 668,000 long tons of bauxite with a value of $4,452,000 were purchased from Dutch Guiana, and 22,717,000 barrels of petroleum products with a value of $22,134,000 were purchased from the Netherlands island possessions. In neither case, however, did the sales of these products result in any substantial dollar exchange to the Netherlands Government. The Netherlands do not control any oil-producing territory, and the oil refineries on the island of Aruba are owned by the Standard Oil Co. and by the Royal Dutch Shell Co., a British-controlled concern. With regard to the bauxite deposits in Surinam, we are informed by the State Department that:

"Two companies are operating in this field; one American and the other Dutch. The American company is a subsidiary of the Aluminum Corporation of America; it is believed that its proceeds and royalties above what is necessary for local expenses are retained by the company. The operation of the Billiton Co. (Dutch) results in no foreign exchange."

As a result, practically all of the dollar proceeds of sales of bauxite and petroleum are realized by private United States companies and are not available to the Netherlands Government. For this reason we have not requested that these products be supplied to us as reciprocal aid.

Until the present time, lend-lease aid to the Netherlands Government has been confined to small amounts of military equipment and to the training, equipment, and maintenance (excluding pay) of Netherlands air squadrons now actively fighting with us. With the early fall of the Netherlands and the subsequent conquest of the Netherlands East Indies, the whole of the Empire, except the relatively poor Caribbean possessions, was placed in enemy hands. The dollar revenues of Surinam and Curacao have proved inadequate even for the financing of local expenditures, and this has placed a further strain on the already limited resources of the mother country.

3. RELATIONS WITH CANADA AND SOUTH AFRICA

You ask why Canada and South Africa have not entered into lend-lease agreements with the United States. Canada has not received any lend-lease aid. Our economic relations with Canada have been defined by the so-called Hyde Park agreement of April 21, 1942, by which purchases of the United States in Canada and of Canada in the United States are made for cash. As part of lend-lease aid to the United Kingdom, however, raw materials and component parts which are incorporated in Canada in articles manufactured for the United Kingdom may be provided by the United States under lend-lease.

Although a recipient of lend-lease aid, South Africa does not have a lend-lease agreement with the United States. All lend-lease requests for British Empire countries are channeled through the United Kingdom.

The United States purchases substantial quantities of raw materials from Canada, both through commercial channels and Government channels, which enter into production in the United States. The same is true to a much smaller extent with respect to South Africa, from whom Government agencies buy comparatively small quantities of materials such as chrome, manganese, asbestos, and industrial diamonds. Some of these materials in finished form are undoubtedly eventually shipped to England, but it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain even approximately what percentage of the goods so purchased finds its way to England under lend-lease.

4. VALUATION OF RECIPROCAL AID

While we have kept records of reciprocal lend-lease aid received from all countries, it has not been practicable thus far to make a valuation in dollars and cents of the amount of this aid. However, we are endeavoring to obtain from the foreign governments a statement of the cost to them, in terms of their own currency, of the aid which they have given us. The Australian Government has already indicated that it spent approximately £61,000,000 for reverse lend-lease up to June

80, 1943. The New Zealand Government has estimated its expenditures for reverse lend-lease at £10,000,000 up to February 28, 1943. As further information becomes available, I shall report it promptly to the Congress.

The problem of valuation is, however, a very difficult one. The reciprocal aid received by us consists of thousands of individual transactions occurring in all parts of the world under the most diverse circumstances. To place values on individual items, or even to arrive at values in terms of general categories, is a vast undertaking. Moreover, there are many types of reciprocal aid that are of such an intangible character that it is impossible to "value" them. It is impossible to measure in dollars either the cost to the British or the value to us, for example, of British engineering and designs of weapons based on 2 years of combat experience gained before we entered the war. All this has been freely made available to us in the production of planes, tanks, and other weapons in our own factories, and for our own forces. No estimate can be made of the number of American lives that have been saved by equipping our forces with those improved weapons.

Another difficulty is involved in expressing a "value" (in terms of dollars) even for items the cost of which is known. Thus, a Spitfire plane costs, in terms of the official exchange rate, only about one-half as much as does a comparable American plane. Is the "value" of the Spitfire, therefore, only one-half that of the American plane? One dollar will buy about 3 times the quantity of butter in New Zealand that it will buy in the United States. On what basis are we to value the butter received from New Zealand? On the other hand, there are some items which cost more in terms of dollars in England than in the United States.

In many instances our allies have undertaken as reciprocal aid vast construction programs to meet the requirements of Amerian forces; in other cases, foreign governments have turned over to us for our use cantonments, airfields, or the like which were previously occupied, either in whole or in part, by their own forces, and it has been necessary to enlarge other facilities to permit the transfer of their forces to those facilities. How are we to value these facilities? Are we to appraise them at capital cost or upon a rental basis?

A specific example may illustrate the difficulties which are encountered in attempting to place values upon capital projects. When American forces first arrived in Australia the Air Corps requested the Australian Government to construct a huge airfield not far from Melbourne. The plans called for complete installation with landing fields, barracks, roads, and improvements of all kinds. The Australian Government promptly proceeded to construct the field in accordance with our requirements and delivered it to us under reverse lend-lease. Shortly afterward, as a result of the successful outcome of the Battle of the Coral Sea and of later developments of the war, the base of operations of our Air Corps was moved 1,500 miles to the north and new fields had to be constructed there. The greater part of the construction was carried on by the Australian Government. Some assistance was given by United States Army engineers, and equipment beonging to both Governments was used to the extent that it was available. Even after the base of operations was moved north, the field near Melbourne was not turned back to the Australian Government unconditionally, because of the possibility that, as a result of shifting fortunes of war, it might again have to be used. How are we to "value" the aid given us as a result of these transactions?

It is not necessary further to labor this point in order to indicate that the problems of valuation are very great and to explain why, until the present time, it has not been possible for me to render an accounting of the value of reverse lend-lease aid received by the United States.

5. LEND-LEASE AND REVERSE LEND-LEASE IN AUSTRALIA

You asked that I give the figures on Australia as an example of the comparison of lend-lease and reciprocal lend-lease. Total lend-lease aid to Australia to June 30, 1943, was approximately $552,000,000. As has been stated, the total cost to the Australian Government of furnishing reverse lend-lease up to June 30, 1943, was approximately £61,000,000. At the official rate of exchange, this would represent approximately $196,000,000; but, for the reasons above stated, it would probably be quite unfair to Australia to compare a dollar figure so arrived at with the dollar figure for lend-lease aid.

6. LEND-LEASE AID FROM MEMBERS OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE TO THE UNITED KINGDOM

We have very little information with regard to the aid furnished by the various subdivisions of the British Empire to the United Kingdom. Canada has appropriated $2,000,000,000 for the financing of supplies to her allies. The first appropriation of $1,000,000,000 was entirely for the benefit of the United Kingdom. The second appropriation, made in May, 1943, is primarily for the supply of the United Kingdom, but Russia, Australia, China, and other countries will receive a portion of the aid provided. In certain other respects, the various Dominions contribute their resources to the financing of projects which are a common concern of the Empire. An example of this is the Empire air training scheme which is financed by contributions from all of the dominions, as well as the United Kingdom. In addition, Canada, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand are meeting the expenses of their troops which are engaged in the European, north African, and other theaters of the war, far removed from their national territories.

7. RAW MATERIAL IMPORTS

A list, prepared by the Office of Economic Warfare, indicating the volume of public purchases and private commercial imports from lend-lease countries during the year 1942 is enclosed. With respect to the British Empire, the over-all financial condition of the Empire has thus far required that these purchases be for cash. Our purchases of bauxite from British Guiana, for example, have been cash transactions for this reason. However, in view of changed circumstances, we are now negotiating with the British with a view to obtaining under reverse lend-lease those raw materials which are procured by agencies of the United States Government.

8. FOREIGN INSTALLATIONS

In collaboration with the War and Navy Departments, we are undertaking a study of the amount that we have spent on foreign soil in the development of air bases, supply depots, and other installations. This information is extremely difficult to obtain, however, as the reports received by the War Department from commanding officers abroad are slow in reaching Washington, and, in order to reduce the burden of paper work on such commanding officers, reports have been reduced to the absolute minimum.

9. LATEST FIGURES ON LEND-LEASE AID

We are in process of compiling the latest available figures on lend-lease aid furnished to all our allies. These will be included in the forthcoming report to Congress, which is to be presented on August 25.

I trust that the foregoing will give you the information that you desire. If it does not, or if I may be of assistance in any further respect, please do not hesitate to call upon me again.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

E. R. STETTINIUS, Jr.

Public purchases and general imports for 1942 from lend-lease countries

[Millions of dollars]

	Public purchases	General imports
American Republics and Canada:		
Bolivia	35.9	[1] 26.0
Brazil	90.7	165.2
Canada	50.8	716.0
Chile	134.3	[2] 138.6
Colombia	36.7	78.8
Costa Rica	2.0	6.0
Cuba	[3] 205.2	163.8
Dominican Republic	28.1	8.4
Ecuador	3.6	8.8
El Salvador	5.7	11.9
Guatemala	3.7	15.5
Haiti	3.8	6.1
Honduras	.3	5.3
Mexico	53.5	124.2
Nicaragua	3.1	4.6
Panama	.2	[4] 4.3
Peru	15.1	20.6
Uruguay	11.1	20.4
Venezuela	4.1	20.1
British Empire, excluding Canada:		
Australia	111.6	196.4
Bahamas	.1	.7
British East Africa	9.7	13.5
British West Africa:		
British West Africa	1.7	----------
Gold Coast, Gambia and Sierra Leone	9.5	4.7
Nigeria	1.5	4.3
British South Africa:		
Union of South Africa	4.6	96.4
Southern Rhodesia	----------	6.5
British Honduras	.5	1.9
British Oceania	2.9	3.6
Ceylon	31.1	27.5
Cyprus	.1	.3
Egypt	1.7	18.1
India	38.2	105.0
Jamaica	[5] 1.1	3.1
Newfoundland	2.3	[6] 12.5
New Zealand	1.6	22.9
New Hebrides	.4	[7]
Trinidad	[8]	[9] 2.4
United Kingdom	1	133.4
Total, British Empire, excluding Canada	218.6	653.2
French Republic:		
French Cameroons	----------	[10] .7
French Equatorial Africa	.4	.3
French Oceania	.3	5.8
Guiana	[11] .4	[12] .1
Madagascar	1.0	3.1
Tahiti	.6	[13]
Netherlands:		
Netherland East Indies	9.2	88.7
Netherland West Indies (Curacao)	----------	22.7
Surinam	.1	4.9
Europe: Russia	2.4	25.2
Asia:		
Arabia	0.3	[14] 0.9
China	10.5	15.2
Iran	----------	7.6
Iraq	----------	5.3
Turkey	3.7	17.5
Africa:		
Belgian Congo	20.1	40.2
Liberia	4.5	5.6

[1] Includes antimony valued at $1,031,000 and tungsten valued at $775,000 credited to Chile but believed to have originated in Bolivia.
[2] Excludes antimony as per note (1).
[3] Includes purchases of approximately $120,000,000 sugar and molasses which were stock piled in Cuba.
[4] Republic of Panama and Canal Zone.
[5] Jamaica (West Indies).
[6] Newfoundland and Labrador.
[7] Included in United Kingdom.
[8] Less than $50,000.
[9] Trinidad and Tobago.
[10] General Import figure listed as "Cameroon".
[11] Public Purchases not broken up.
[12] Shown as French Guiana.
[13] Included under French Oceania.
[14] Arabian Peninsula States.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I do not rise to join in the debate with reference to whether we shall or whether we shall not continue with the lend-lease program. To me that question has been settled by a vote of the Senate. I do not think, however, that because we consider that question definitely settled it is out of order for the Senator from

Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to request, as he has done in the course of his remarks, an investigation by the members of the Appropriations Committee of the operations and the administration of the lend-lease program.

In this connection I should like to remind the Senator from Louisiana and other Senators, and especially the members of the Committee on Appropriations, that I submitted a resolution on January 7, last, immediately following the big party which was put on at one of the downtown hotels by the man who really runs the lend-lease program. He does not admit it publicly, but he is Chairman of the Munitions Assignment Board, and in that position dominates the situation to a greater extent than does the Lend-Lease Administrator. I have received many letters from the Administrator of Lend-Lease following the submission of the resolution by me on January 7, but they contain no information whatsoever on the subject. The resolution is very brief, and I wish to read it into the RECORD in order to remind Members of what it contains:

Resolved, That a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, to consist of not more than five nor less than three members, who shall be appointed by the chairman of such committee, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the administration and operation of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941 (commonly referred to as the Lease-Lend Act). The subcommittee shall report its findings and recommendations to the Committee on Appropriations at the earliest possible date.

For the purposes of this resolution, the subcommittee is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expenses of the subcommittee, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. President, I was led to believe by several members of the Committee on Appropriations that an honest investigation would follow the submission of the resolution. For some unaccountable reason nothing has been done so far as I know. I should like to ask the chairman, or the acting chairman of that very important committee, if he happens to be in the Chamber, or any other Member who wants to speak for him, why no investigation has been conducted along the lines proposed by the resolution.

I should like to call the resolution to the attention of Senators, especially of the five who have recently returned from a visit to the war theaters and who submitted their reports the other day. Three of the five are members of the Committee on Appropriations. There are 16 Senators, all distinguished Members of this body, on the majority side. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are members of that group. On the minority side there are nine Members, including the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], one of the five who made the trip around the world. I had hoped for an investigation of this fund a long time ago. I am anxious, as is every other Member of the Senate, that we do everything we possibly can, that we can afford to do, to win this war and help to the extreme limit each and every one of our allies; but I cannot forget that it was the strength of the United States that won the decision in the First World War. I think I am safe in saying that it is going to be the strength of America which will win in this war.

None of us knows whether we are going to engage in another war, but I do not think human nature is going to change overnight or over any short period of time. The possibility at least is that ultimately we will have another war. If it should come at a time when we as a Nation have been bled white and do not have the strength at the moment to do the big brother act and come to the assistance of nations wantonly attacked, then what plight would we be in? I think we owe it to ourselves, to our neighbors, especially those in the Western Hemisphere, to maintain our country in a strong position. It cannot be done if we spend our substance entirely and become one of the weaker nations of the globe. That is the reason I submitted the resolution in all sincerity, and I now hope that the Committee on Appropriations will find it possible to proceed with the investigation.

Mr. President, in connection with my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "'Lend-Lease' for War Only?" I prepared that article, and it was published in the May issue of Nation's Business. There are some very pertinent questions brought up in the article. I again express the hope that the Committee on Appropriations will see fit to proceed with the investigation which has been requested by the Senator from Louisiana.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"LEND-LEASE" FOR WAR ONLY?—A FINANCE COMMITTEE MEMBER DISCUSSES THE PUBLIC INTEREST IN A $63,000,000,000 PROGRAM

(By Senator HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska)

The recent action of Congress in extending lend-lease for another year presages the continuation of what is already a multi-billion dollar foreign aid program and involves perhaps the transfer of still more billions to foreign governments for the ensuing year.

This much the American public knows. It knows, too, that lend-lease originally was intended to help those nations which have since become our allies to fight a war. The public knows further that it next became an implement to speed up the United Nations' war effort. We approved it whole-heartedly if it meant the saving of a single American life, if it meant that the war could be won more swiftly.

What the public does not know—but perhaps suspects—is that this lending program is actually an outright donation program—the most colossal dole of all times. Few people know either that the $18,000,000,000 appropriated directly to the President for lend-lease is only about one-third of the total involved in the program.

If the American people are to have their promised part in post-war planning, if they are to have confidence in their Government, if they are not to be disillusioned as they were after the last war by what they termed the trickery of their former allies, it is necessary that they should know all commitments and policies, past and future, of their Government which do not involve military expediency. One place where facts should be made plain is lend-lease.

The total sum involved and the ultimate purpose in the lend-lease program have been matters of conjecture for some time. Actually, the amount involved is approximately $63,000,000,000, which, as time goes on, may be considerably increased. This $63,000,000,000 is made up of:

Three appropriations, $18,410,000,000, made to the President for lend-lease, and $45,016,650,000 of authorized lend-lease transfers of goods and services procured from Army appropriations, Navy appropriations, and other departments.

Nor is this all. Authorized expenditures for foreign construction for plants and equipment production total $2,000,000,000. The plants built and owned by the United States Government and the equipment for plant construction and production in foreign nations, together with that portion of domestic manufacture to be transferred to lend-lease, although the Defense Plants Corporation finances the operations, adds an estimated $4,000,000,000 more.

About $5,000,000,000 more might be added by including the amount contracted by B. E. W., R. F. C., and R. F. C. subsidiaries for purchases abroad. These bring the total to $74,000,000,000.

Even beyond this figure, defying estimation, is the amount of funds which may be transferred for lend-lease purposes from the Naval Appropriations Act of 1942 and subsequent similar appropriations acts and the amount which the new Russian protocols may call for.

It is significant that Assistant Secretary of State Acheson stated recently that Russian aid has been stepped up enormously and that Secretary Wickard concurred in this opinion.

A second point of confusion is the reciprocal feature of the program. The public wants to know what is to be returned to the United States under lend-lease agreements. Members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, themselves in the dark, have asked many questions about the value of "reverse lend-lease."

As far as can be ascertained, slightly more than $1,000,000,000 has been returned in goods or services.

Early in the present war, many patriotic Americans hesitated to become allies of debt defaulters. The distrust and disillusionment which might ensue if the American people are fooled into believing that lend-lease billions will be repaid after the war might well influence the conclusion of a successful peace.

It will not do for Mr. Stettinius to declare that even a reasonable estimate in dollar terms or in ship tons of the value of lend-lease in reverse is impossible. The American public will demand to know.

The distrust of the American people will not be lessened when they become aware of certain disconcerting practices of the Lend-Lease Administration in its dealings with nations obtaining strategic supplies under this arrangement. In many instances these

recipient nations produce metals, strategic supplies, and other commodities which we need. The natural arrangement would seem to be reciprocal trade arrangements but, instead of this, these nations receive lend-lease aid free while the United States buys needed materials from them for cash.

The American public will also want to know if the 14 other claimant agencies which have a call on the Requirements Committee do not to some extent duplicate the specific activities of the Lend-Lease Administration. They will want to know if the broad general principles of the Lend-Lease Administration are not also duplicated by the Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Board, the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, the B. E. W., the O. S. S., the Red Cross, the W. P. B., and others.

The public will want to know if it is true that nonessential materials are being shipped abroad at the expense of home consumption; if products shipped to Britain under lend-lease eventually find their way to South American markets to compete with our own products; if large quantities of lend-lease are lost or stolen and never traced; if food spoilage, transshipments, and reshipments exceed all reasonable limits; if lend-lease aid has been used to serve politics rather than war aims.

WORLD-WIDE W. P. A.?

Once these questions are answered, our people will have more confidence in the lend-lease program.

Beyond the winning of the war objective of lend-lease, the public might well ask, "Where are we headed for in post-war international relations?" Article VII of each lend-lease agreement provides that the terms of the final settlement shall be such as to promote the economic objectives of the Atlantic Charter. It pledges each of the signatories to work with all other countries of like mind for "the expansion, by appropriate international and domestic measures of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods, which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples." Lend-lease officials even now encourage hegemonic use of vast sums of money. The latest expression of this trend is the signing of the 15 secret Latin-American agreements.

LEND-LEASE FOR WAR ONLY?

Such a trend, both in the European and in the South American theaters, has raised the question whether lend-lease is not the opening hand-out of what will finally become a world-wide W. P. A. The door is open to just that, because the Lend-Lease Act provides that "the terms and conditions under which any foreign government receives aid shall be those which the President deems satisfactory, and the benefits to the United States may be repayment or repayment in kind or property, or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems satisfactory."

In this connection it will be remembered that Harry Hopkins, now in a position to influence and control lend-lease to a greater extent than anyone except the President, was formerly Administrator for W. P. A.

Although, when the House Foreign Affairs Committee requested him to appear and testify on lend-lease, Mr. Hopkins replied that he had nothing to do with that agency's administration, he is Chairman of the Munitions Assignment Board, which must authorize all lend-lease requests for transfer of materials. Furthermore, final determination of lend-lease benefits rests with the President and Mr. Hopkins is special adviser to the President.

In reviewing the broad philosophy underlying lend-lease, one continually bears in mind the fact that lend-lease was sold to the American public on the basis which the name implies: Lend or lease. Secretary of War Stimson, testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, emphasized that lend-lease was set up as a Government instrument to overcome the difficulties of the dollar exchange problem between ourselves and other nations which needed American equipment and food. Mr. Stettinius, Lend-Lease Administrator, in his report on the lend-lease operations up to December 31, 1942, said: "It was in our interest that the flow of weapons and other supplies furnished to promote the defense of the United States should not be interrupted by a lack of dollar exchange."

WHY NOT LEND MONEY?

On this basis, the American public has subscribed to War bond drives. They believe they have lent this money, leased this material—not given it. They believe this because they have not concerned themselves sufficiently with the intricacies of the problem to ask, "Why did we not lend the money in the form of dollar exchange if that is necessary?"

The only logical answer to this question is that the original intent of lend-lease was not to lend but to give.

The President himself indicated that position when he told a press conference on December 17, 1940: "What I am trying to do is to eliminate the dollar sign * * * get rid of the silly, foolish old dollar sign."

There is a tremendous conflict between the sound policy of helping foreign nations and receiving materials from foreign nations on a commercial trade, export-import paid-for purchase basis, and the Lend-Lease Administration policy of giving away aid. If continued indiscriminately that policy would ruin private trade, an effect already foreshadowed by the squeezing out of business of numerous exporting and importing firms all over the world.

NO REASON TO BUY

It may be contended that an amendment is entirely feasible to prohibit the Lend-Lease Administration from giving away materials in all cases where the Government has information that a foreign nation can buy.

Of course, a more nearly ideal situation would be for Federal agencies to work primarily through private concerns of this country and foreign nations. Since the Lend-Lease Administration works primarily through Government, it frequently authorizes exportation of material on what is tantamount to a gift basis when the transaction might well have been carried out through commercial trade. Obviously, if foreign nations can get something for nothing they see no reason to buy it.

In doing these things Lend-Lease has obviously taken long steps away from its original purpose as an emergency system for supplying war materials to those countries in a common war effort.

It has moved swiftly toward becoming an extensive, socialistic system of mutual aid, relying in the main on a principle of irrevocable subsidy from the United States Treasury. This is an absurd, costly, dangerous trend embracing the concept that the United States will subsidize foreign nations indefinitely and finance their socialization forever at W. P. A., poor relief, state socialism levels. Mathematically, the American purse is not big enough for this task.

In summary it should be said that close watch should be kept on the effect of an overgrowth of lend-lease activities in transferring supplies.

The General Accounting Office should be encouraged to exercise the same—or more strict—control over the expenditures of the Lend-Lease Administration that it exercises over the finances of other Government agencies, particularly in regard to reciprocal lend-lease accounts. With this in mind, the latter agency should be restricted to use only such funds as will aid primarily in the war effort. Similarly, any unwise hegemonic use of vast stores of supplies should be meticulously avoided.

By no means should it be allowed to implement state socialistic economic theories of a vast international scope.

At all events, a full accounting of lend-lease activities in all their ramifications should be made. Without it, a just final determination of its benefits may be impossible. That final determination should rest with Congress.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator made a trip during the summer visiting some 20 or more South American republics. He has been somewhat more reticent about his experience than have other senatorial travelers. I wonder whether he can tell us if lend-lease operates in all those 20 South American republics?

Mr. BUTLER. I will say in answer to the Senator that I expect to make a report in more or less detail to the Senate. I shall make a report in writing to the Truman committee. It will not be a short report. The United States Government has a program involving a total amount of $6,000,000,000 over a 3-year period, 2 years of which are past. I did not find in any country I visited the thought that we as a nation were able to continue doing what we were doing at the moment. I did not find a single nation that expected us to continue the dole program we have been following to date.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Did I understand the Senator from Nebraska to say that we have a $6,000,000,000 lend-lease program in South America?

Mr. BUTLER. It does not all include lend-lease. The Senator might be interested to know that the total appropriations for lend-lease up to date are but $18,410,000,000, but the lend-lease program, in its various forms, including the $45,000,000,000 provided for the Army and the Navy which can be used for such purposes, makes a grand total somewhere between $65,000,000,000 to $75,000,000,000, which is involved in what might be called the lend-lease program. Our $6,000,000,000 program for South America is included in that figure.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may make a statement in response to a question on his part?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. NYE. I had hoped that the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee might be present directly to give assurance to the Senator as to what is in progress respecting a study of the lend-lease commitments. I am sure I am betraying no confidence when I reveal for the information of the Senator from Nebraska and the Senate itself that the acting chairman of the committee has called a meeting of the whole committee for tomorrow morning, and I can assure

the Senator that the subject of lend-lease will be very much under consideration at that time.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the Senator.

FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 637) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I can see that because of the lateness of the hour we cannot begin consideration of Senate bill 637 at this time. I desire to give notice, however, that the first thing on Thursday I shall try to obtain the floor and hope the Senate may proceed with consideration of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am very glad to note the attitude of the very distinguished Senator from Utah. I should like to suggest that when the Senate concludes its work today it take a recess until Thursday so that we may proceed immediately to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes. I think that is in keeping with the understanding, if it is agreeable to our acting leader.

OPERATIONS OF LEND-LEASE ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is my understanding that when the Senate concludes its business this afternoon it will take a recess until noon on Thursday next.

Mr. President, I desire to speak for a few moments in connection with the discussion which has occurred this afternoon and also in connection with other discussions which have been had on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere throughout the country in recent days and weeks. I hold no brief for any country which is attempting to secure any material advantage from our lend-lease generosity. Perhaps some countries are doing so; I do not know. Perhaps everything the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has said this afternoon is absolutely correct. I do not know. However, Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana had a story to tell of investigation of lend-lease activities, if he desired to have such matters investigated by the Truman committee, as he said he did, I wish he had come before the Truman committee and had requested such an investigation, and had laid his facts before the committee rather than to take the floor of the Senate and proclaim to the country and to the world suspicion and distrust of nations whose men are fighting and dying for our country.

The Senator can count the cost in dollars and cents if he desires to do so, but I am thinking of the cost some of our allies have paid in the blood of their sons—yes, more than that. The Senator has talked about Great Britain, and others have talked about Great Britain. Perhaps Great Britain does have imperialistic desires; I do not know. She has had them in the past. But I do know that for months and months Great Britain stood alone and battled hordes of the Nazi tribes which would have destroyed our Government had it not been for Great Britain in that hour of peril. Let the Senator put that on his balance sheet. How much credit does he give for that? How much does he value his country and his form of government? Let us give Great Britain some credit for that.

The Senator talked about lease-lend to Russia. Mr. President, who can count what contribution Russia has made—communistic state though she may be to free governments throughout the world? Her country was invaded by millions of the finest troops the world had ever seen, we were told; troops that could not be defeated, it was said, and yet Russia threw against the enemy of free government vast numbers of her men, and not only her men but her women as well. Her land was invaded and impoverished. Her homes were destroyed. Her men were killed. Their wives and daughters were ravished—millions of them, Mr. President. How much does the Senator value that in his balance sheet for lend-lease operations? Will the Senator give some credit for that, in computing the dollars and cents we have paid out? I do not know what the Senator thinks the value of that may be, but I know our country has been repaid in the lives of American boys who would have died if it had not been for the contribution made by Russia and by Great Britain, if you please.

Mr. President, I have sat in my seat on the floor of the Senate and have heard criticism thrown at our allies, and I have been reminded that Hitler had but one theme. Anyone who has read his writings knows he counted on success because he did not believe the freedom-loving nations of the world could ever unite. His philosophy was "divide and conquer." And he did. He kept the nations of the world divided until he plucked them off, one by one, and until it looked, for a time, as though democracy and every free government, including our own, would be destroyed by the marching goose-stepping troops of Adolf Hitler—and not alone, when Japan started her march and made her dastardly attack on us.

Today we criticize Russia because she has not declared war on Japan. I should like to see the situation so that Russia could do so, but I understand why she has not. I think Russia is wise and militarily correct; and I am confident that when the tide of war changes in Europe, and when Hitler is destroyed—as he will be if we continue united—Russia will be found fighting Japan on the side of the Allies. Yes, "divide and conquer the nations of the world" was the philosophy of Adolf Hitler, and he counted on division within the democratic countries, because he said even in our own country we could not unite. He talked about the cackling geese in parliamentary bodies, and said we would talk and divide, and never be able to unite. But we did unite; and united we are fighting this war. But the war is not yet won, and we must remain united—not only united with our allies, but we must be united at home.

"Divide and conquer," said Hitler. Yes, Mr. President, he is right. If we divide as nations, if we divide at home, it will mean for us—for free government it will simply mean divide and die. We can remain united, and we can win. Hitler has but the one weapon left, the one secret weapon, and that is this: If through propaganda agencies he could create distrust, discord, and disunity among the Allied forces, he might yet win, and Japan might yet win.

Please God, Mr. President, the sentiments which have been expressed in the Senate and in other places, showing suspicion and distrust and disunity, are not the sentiments which prevail in this country.

Americans think more of the lives of their sons than they do of their dollars; and whatever the cost may be in dollars and cents, this country is going to pay that cost. We are going to pay it gladly, knowing that the more we pay in money—and that may be selfish—the less we shall pay in the lives of our sons. We are not going to let criticism and distrust divide us at home, or divide us from our allies. The American people are resolved that they will remain united, and that we will win.

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, on September 23 last, I gave a talk entitled "Some Comments on Security" in Chicago before the very active and useful Mortgage Bankers Association of America.

I stated that security looms bigger today in the minds of people than ever before. Never has security been sought more eagerly or more assiduously.

Much speculation has there been as to the imagined status of the individual in the early state of human development. Some visionaries have idealized the situation as being one wherein each man did really what he wanted. But the so-called primitive man was not wholly free. He was unavoidably a victim of grave insecurity because of danger from hunger, cold, wild beasts, and enemies. To obtain some protection from these dangers, it was necessary for him to team up with other men and consequently to sacrifice liberty of action in some matters for the sake of adding to his state of general security. As his exercise of retained rights became increasingly complex, he surrendered more and more of his individual independence for restrictions imposed by society.

Today international security is uppermost in our thoughts. History stresses how insecurity has followed again and again attempts made to impress dominion over other peoples. Long ago we accepted the premise that the day of conquest of one powerful nation by another had passed forever. Even the First World War did not destroy that belief.

A few years ago the sinister world-wide schemes of the Axis Powers to dominate the earth shattered our sense of security. For the first time in history, with likelihood of success, an attempt was made by several nations, joined together in a bloody conspiracy, to impose

their cruel and despotic will upon the entire world.

I shall not discuss how such sinister machinations arose and developed, nor the unprecedented efforts which have been made to withstand and to defeat such a gigantic and felonious assault upon the security of the world. We know that there can be no real status of security in this world until the gangster plots of the Axis have been frustrated and entirely crushed. That defeat must, if a feeling of security is to return and remain, so discredit and dishonor plottings and conspiracies to acquire world domination that never again will such a hideous concept rear its head to threaten and to torture the world.

Peace is not in sight but the might of the United Nations grows steadily and certainly none of the peoples of the Axis Powers can really believe today that their defeat can be avoided.

The contrast between the sling and stone with which David slew Goliath and the vast mechanics of present-day warfare suggests a sad commentary upon human progress. It demonstrates that although since the days of David and Goliath the world has devised many new methods of killing people in war, it has made no satisfactory progress in safeguarding peace. Nor has it found a way of preventing the lawless and bloodthirsty international gangster from attacking, despoiling, and frequently subduing other peoples.

Numerous attempts throughout the ages have been made to set up and retain some instrumentality to secure peace. The empires of Alexander the Great and of Napoleon, Pax Romana, various religious organizations, Balance of Power, the League of Nations, represent some of these expedients. These have for a little while seemed successful, but no one has endured. Each has lived its day and died.

In the strain and agony of the world today is the ever present purpose that this time we will not fail to create a system of international relations adequate seemingly to prevent another world war. The task of setting up and carrying out such a plan for the entire world is beset with countless obstacles. No inflated concept of isolationism or of swaggering self-sufficiency must blind us to the fact that this time we must do the job and do it right.

Modern warfare has changed requirements as to security. A fence or wall around a man's property once afforded real protection. Barriers around national boundaries did likewise. The airplane has, of course, upset any such state of immunity or complacency. Naturally post-war planning will be greatly concerned with new and greater uses of the air during both war and peace. Our founding forefathers in all their wisdom never foresaw that rights in the clouds would have to be adjusted.

Before we entered the war we made a wise and far-reaching move in acquiring 12 bases from Great Britain under 99-year leases for air bases and for naval purposes. None of our ancestors could have known that to protect our shores it would be necessary to go hundreds of miles into the ocean to acquire such bases. Lessons learned from this war will undoubtedly show that even more far-reaching arrangements as to far off bases are necessary. Three thousand miles of ocean still afford some protection but who would ever have thought that we could be attacked from the air by the North Pole route? When Seward bought Alaska, derisively dubbed "Seward's ice box", who would have believed that Alaska occupied a vitally strategic position in our program for security? One prominent authority insisted that whoever owned Alaska could dominate the world. Until recently we fought only on the land and on the surface of the water. Now search for security requires us to be ready to fight also in the air and beneath the face of the waters.

Greenland and Iceland also hold strategic positions from the standpoint of our security. The same is true of the western coast of Africa and of various islands in the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans. We want no new possessions to rule but we must see to it that the possibilities of danger to us from the air are met by our having suitable bases in different parts of the world, whether such bases are in possession of the United States exclusively, or jointly with other nation or nations, or whether we merely share the use of such bases.

Says Mark Twain in effect, "Everyone is talking about the weather but no one is doing anything about it." Now everyone is talking about post-war security. Quite a number of us are doing something about it—but not nearly enough.

The growing realization that we can win the war emphasizes our need for constructive planning for international security from war, famine, and anarchy. The demand that the Allied Nations get together now to decide obvious post-war problems ever grows more insistent. The point is made that if the Allies had done so during the First World War many later mistakes, complications, and tragedies could have been avoided. While the War between the States was in progress, a predetermination of the post-war status and arrangements as to seceding southern States would have saved us from many of the agonies of reconstruction.

Since we do not know when the war will be won, we cannot foresee clearly the conditions which will face us then, or what specific measures for protection each Allied Nation will urge for its own safety. We do not even know just who will sit at the peace table. There must be no head of that table. It must be a Round Table, like King Arthur's, with several nations, such as Great Britain, Russia, China, and the United States having dominating voices. Other nations should also have weight there, for instance, Brazil, Mexico, and the other American nations. The nations now under the brutal heel of the would-be conqueror will want to be heard, and deservedly so.

Some people believe that the United States attempted too much after the First World War in trying to participate in the settling of boundaries in Europe instead of being content with joining in the enunciation of general principles and with helping to set up international machinery designed to decide specific questions growing out of clashing of interests of different nationalities. In the end we really agreed to nothing constructive or worth while to safeguard peace. A wave of isolationism swept over our country. We attempted to wash our hands of the whole business of international post-war problems, refusing even to participate in the Versailles Treaty or to become a member of the League of Nations.

Some tried to justify our action by pointing out that the United States and other republics of the Americas settled international disputes in the two American continents without the participation of countries of Europe and Asia. The analogy, however, is not clear. European nations have demonstrated unfortunately time and time again throughout the last 2,000 years that they have not been able to agree upon any method which would insure peace in Europe. Wars in Europe have almost invariably spread into other countries of the world. The hope is a fatuous one that after this war is over the European nations could settle their differences without any participation whatever of non-European countries. Then, the problems of Europe are so often intertwined with those of Asia, Africa, or even of the Americas.

The analogy to our own War between the States is not a pertinent one. If Lincoln had lived, he could have done much to prevent the horrors of reconstruction. Possibly he could have been more successful in dealing with Thaddeus Stevens than was Woodrow Wilson in his efforts to cope with the opposition in the United States Senate to plans for post-war international readjustments.

It may be that we can pass up offers of honors by grand gestures of renunciation, but we cannot dispose of our responsibilities in any such manner. Countless and, at times, constructive suggestions are made as to what should be the character of post-war organizations designed to guard peace among nations. I do not think, however, we should at this time commit ourselves to concrete plans for international readjustments, although we should try to reach in our minds conclusions, sometimes in alternatives, as to what we favor. As to controversies among nations, we should now pledge ourselves to adopt plans apparently adequate for consideration, decision, and enforcement under certain conditions.

The discussions which are now going on are helpful, although some of them have aroused disturbing comment, if not dissension, threatening to imperil that close cooperation which is so essential among the Allied Nations. Desirable though it is that the Allied Nations now discuss among themselves post-war problems and settle some of them now if feasible, it is vastly more important that nothing delays or balks our present war progress. It is significant that usually the most insistent advocates of post-war

planning fall back now quite wisely upon generalizations, but such generalizations can be very helpful.

How can a feeling of real security be brought back into the world by the elimination of the militaristic elements in Germany and Japan? Undoubtedly not one but various methods will have to be tried. Those who worship the use of aggressive force assume that such force if employed by themselves will prevail. No one is likely to start a fight if he expects to be licked. The impending failure of the militaristic attempts of Japan and Germany should do something to discourage their adoration of the use of force.

Security demands that Japan and Germany must be disarmed and their facilities for making war eliminated or restricted very closely. Doing so will require supervision and regulations which will become more and more irksome and difficult with the passing years. Educational methods would help even though the militaristic delusions of Japan and Germany might still be nurtured in secret, plotting for an opportunity to renew fiendish efforts to enslave the world. Somehow out of the welter of war the lesson may be taught conclusively that no nation or group of nations can bring the world into subjection.

There is also a psychological factor to be considered. It is doubtful whether any treaty of peace, if its terms are formulated while war continues, would be similar to the terms of a treaty prepared in times of peace. Would the difference be an improvement or otherwise? A warring nation while fighting for its very existence is likely to insist upon terms so stringent that their execution might jeopardize the welfare not only of nations named, but even of the entire world. This is especially true as to territorial boundaries, war indemnities, and commercial and trade transactions.

Some urge a long-termed armistice before final terms of peace are made. This would give an opportunity for the cooling-off period and the gaining of experience. But such an interim would likely be a fruitful source of friction, jealousies, and secret alinements. I fear such delaying arrangements would be overhazardous.

There are marked differences of opinion as to whether an alliance after the war between Great Britain, Russia, China, and the United States would be beneficial. Whether or not any such alliance exists, the victorious nations must retain a long close-working association with each other to consider problems apparent at the end of the war and others then unforeseen. Such a status should help rather than interfere with the activities of a new League of Nations or of any international courts or police system established. A long while would necessarily elapse before any new international organizations, whatever they be, might be created and become sufficiently operative. The idea that if we form closely working arrangements with our allies by treaty or otherwise, we may find ourselves seriously out-traded and actually despoiled by them of our rights, suggests an inferiority complex on our part to which I do not subscribe. Nor am I willing to impute such unworthy motives to our allies. Much more progress than is apparent has already been made in disposing of potential difficulties at the peace table. Russia, Great Britain, China, and the United States are working each day in closer accord. A conference of Churchill, Stalin, Chiang Kai-Shek, and Roosevelt would be as dramatic and as momentous a meeting as history has ever known.

Never in the history of the world has it been necessary for so many people to make so many and so important readjustments—social, economic, political, and possibly religious—as will be entailed by the coming of peace. Knowing that a chain is no stronger than its weakest link, we cannot hope for a well-rounded, successful economic and social structure, both national and international, after the war is over, unless we plan wisely for changes in countless forms of human activity. A weak link might jeopardize the whole connection.

Should there be a revival in some form of a League of Nations with real power? When we are asked to adopt some such plan for international cooperation and security we will be reminded of the theory that there is no such status as a divided sovereignty, and that, therefore, any agreement which restricts even to the slightest extent, our national freedom of action infringes upon our sovereignty and necessarily destroys it. Is it possible for us to be a party to international agreements, courts, and possibly a policing system to safeguard peace, without sacrifice of our sovereignty? What is our alternative? Suppose some plans requiring some minor curtailment of our national freedom of action really rids us of the menace of war—and we might lose a war! Would it not be better for us to make some such small concession, if thereby we might safeguard international peace and security? We can do so without impairing any essential principles of sovereignty.

I was in favor of the League of Nations and was treasurer of the Maryland branch of the League to Enforce Peace. I voted later for the World Court. I would again support such a league or a world court even if either were given somewhat broader powers than the original plans provided.

Another major matter to be decided has to do with international financing. Should we have international banks or some form of international guaranty of solvency of individual nations? Already there are the so-called British and American plans, among others. The difficulties in successful operation of any of these seems to be almost insuperable, but the lack of any such attempts might invite disaster.

Security demands that international trade and transportation receive urgent attention. Quite likely the first world-wide attempt in history to plan along such lines will be made after this war. The very thought of it is staggering. Naturally the United States will play a leading role, and we can do so without permitting ourselves to be imposed upon throughout the continuing friction which international competition is likely to engender.

Gold according to long accepted standards personified financial security, national and international. Recently, however, we have seen nations with little or no gold function vigorously in peace or war. We own most of the gold in the world. Gold will, of course, continue to be very useful, but no longer will it rule autocratically international commerce and finance. We will need gold for post-war security, but its days of omnipotency are doubtless over. How are we going to readjust ourselves to such a change? The problem will be one of continuing difficulty of solution.

Fortunately in these days we hear much of the "four freedoms." We, in discussing this subject, instinctively have in mind our own country, but there is an international aspect to be considered. Of course, I do not suggest that we in the United States should attempt the preposterous steps of guaranteeing the exercise of the "four freedoms" in the other countries of the world. That responsibility rests with the people of each nation in the administration of its own affairs. We can, at least, cherish and emphasize the hope that sometimes our application of the "four freedoms" will have persuasive force in other parts of the world. We should not be so ultranationalistic that we are willing to sacrifice such an opportunity to promote international security.

We have been trying to shift every industry and almost every human activity to a war basis. When, after the war is over, we will have made changes in a few matters, we must not assume that these will more or less automatically carry along with them other changes, really essential for the success of our post-war regime. There can be no suitable application of true relative values, or of a sound sense of proportion, if one of such economic factors is so slighted or so aggrandized that we have a lopsided result. We will need an economic rehabilitation in this country which will affect closely every form of industry and every individual.

Social-security legislation is not basically so new to us as many people think. For countless ages the poor and needy have received some assistance out of the public till. We have had almshouses giving crumbs of security to a few of the poor and helpless. Public relief and work measures have been put into practice. Now we have far-reaching social legislation whose general plans and practices are not likely ever to contract materially and may be increased.

The statement that people are best governed when least governed is a wise saw to keep in mind, but complexities of modern life have called for activities with which our ancestors did not have to reckon. For many years government has been probing deeper and deeper into private affairs of individuals and companies and regulating them, sometimes too much. The most far-reaching and

radical step in that direction was the adoption in the past generation of the policy of Federal income taxation. The tide toward increasing authority in Federal Government by regulations has been running strongly. Yesterday's depression and today's policy of going from all-peace to all-war have called for gigantic extensions in the exercise of governmental authority.

Of course, some day the pendulum should and will swing back. When it does, let us hope that the prevailing viewpoint will not be that whatever exists must necessarily be changed, or that all we need to do is to return to some much-praised but rather mythical "good old times." We must realize that such old times with their numerous advantages and blessings were not even in their heyday regarded as entirely adequate. Economic conditions are always quite naturally in the state of flux and flow. Let us be vigilant lest we rush into hasty and ill-advised extensions of certain existing governmental activities or lest we make ruthless sacrifice of certain existing governmental policies which should in some form be preserved. We should see to it that the tide runs more strongly in the direction of local government or so called States' rights, and also that evils of bureaucracy, whether federal, state, county, or municipal, are lessened materially.

There is much hue and cry that we have gone so far in passing legislation during the war and the years immediately preceding it that individual initiative has been fettered forever and a day. Remember that the most of the so-called war powers of President Roosevelt have been created by legislation which automatically dies with the coming of peace or within 6 months thereafter, by its own terminology. Should the people of this country after peace comes succumb to the colossal folly of continuing unnecessarily certain war-time restrictive policies, they will have to do so deliberately by passing new legislation.

Oh, yes, I know it is said that the drift in our economic and social life is such that it would be very difficult, if not impossible, for us to refrain from passing new legislation perpetuating such unnecessary limitations upon business and personal initiative. I challenge any such statement. Nothing already done will prevent the American people from exercising their right to decide what they want to retain, modify or undo entirely. We know that 50,000,000 people will continue to go to the polls to vote by secret ballot. No one can tell them authoritatively how they must vote. No one need know how they vote. The will of 50,000,000 people as expressed in the ballot will continue to be the supreme arbiter of the policies of the United States.

We realize that we have tried to protect ourselves with armies, navies and air forces which were much too small. How large an armed force we need for the prosecution of this war calls for decisions where the judgment of those in charge of our armed forces prevail. Gone, I hope forever, will be the pernicious fallacy that we will not always need a merchant marine capable of handling a very big part of our own imports and exports. Our stupid and foolhardy policy, on numerous occasions, of permitting our merchant marine to fall really into disuse jeopardized our very national existence. Every bit of our rapid pace in shipbuilding has been needed to keep us securely abreast of the ravages of hostile submarines so that we could transport the men and materials vitally needed by us and our allies.

We endangered our safety by relying upon our continuing to get rubber from the other side of the earth. Will we be reckless enough to ignore entirely synthetic processes for supplies of rubber? We have been too confident that our supply of natural resources, such as lumber, coal, and fuel oil would remain sufficient for all time. The tremendous inroads made on them especially during this war tend to impair our status of security. If we do not find new sources, we may have to submit to curtailment of uses, or develop synthetic processes, or embark upon a greatly enlarged program of importation. This suggests one of the countless reasons why a merchant marine is essential to us.

Fresh consideration is being given to the question of renegotiation of contracts. Experience after the last war illustrates that the apparent profits of today may be dissipated by post-war movements along the rocky road of conversion from war to peace activities. What seems like security to the manufacturer or contractor today may not have a firm foundation. This possible threat to security must be reckoned within our renegotiation of contracts and in our plans for taxation.

When we called upon our men and women to go to sea and to foreign lands to fight for the preservation of our national liberties, it became our duty and privilege to do justice to them. Justice demands payment of sums of money to the families of those who have been lost and for care of the wounded. It requires suitable compensations of various kinds. And that is not all. Returning members of our armed forces and of our merchant marine must be guaranteed opportunities to make a living and to be refitted into our national economy. We already have laws providing that they may regain, under certain conditions, their former civilian jobs. We must also in a comprehensive and practical way train those who left for war as mere schoolboys. Government boards are already tackling this problem.

There would not be the right kind of security in banking if its functions were to pass from private industry to the United States Government, and yet we would not give up the Federal guaranty of bank deposits. During the depression and the war period the United States Government has exercised many banking activities which in normal times should be in private hands. I have no relish for the concept that more and more private activities must be taken over by the Government.

War requirements have brought insecurity in some lines of business and often a total collapse. The automobile industry illustrates this in a tragic sense. Many forms of businesses have had temporarily to seek other sources of income. Fortunately the ever-increasing demand for manpower has cushioned this shock somewhat.

The grocer, confronted often with inadequate inventories and various Federal regulations such as those of the Office of Price Administration, has found his former state of security badly jarred. Enforced shifts in his methods of operations have, at times, been extremely difficult. The landlord has found his security at times jeopardized by the freezing of rents but not all of his costs of operation.

Those who insist that we could have avoided inflation with its disastrous consequences without adopting policies of price fixing and rationing have not proved their case. They cannot do so. The inconveniences necessarily involved by such policies are a small price to pay for resultant security. Oppressive regulations not essential can and should be eliminated.

Probably no general class of citizens have had their security more threatened than have those engaged in what is known as small business, especially in manufacturing or contracting lines. Large concerns have found it less difficult to convert their business. Some of the contributing factors which made it difficult for small business to convert have been the impossibility or great difficulty in getting materials when and where most needed, enforced stoppage in the manufacturing of certain products used only by civilians, transportation problems, difficulties of acquiring subcontracts of our big war contracts, shortages of labor and the inability of the man of small business to compete frequently with the labor scale of the big war plants. Resultant loss of security to small business has been widespread and serious.

The administration and Congress have made many attempts to remedy the situation. The present plans of the Smaller War Plants Corporation to handle this problem provide for more authority in securing labor, materials, subcontracts, transportation, and other necessities. So far those in the Government seeking to foster the interests of small business have had few duties except advisory. They are receiving much wider executive powers.

Both capital and labor have made valuable, indispensable, and patriotic contributions to our war program. Too many of the comments and criticisms in regard to relations between capital and labor have not been constructive. The post-war period will probably furnish the best opportunity in our history for capital and labor to cooperate on a basis even more satisfactory than has been the case in the past. Security demands that both recognize greater responsibilities to each other. The theory, occasionally advanced, that labor can get what it is entitled to only by resorting to strikes should find itself outmoded by closer methods of cooperation and better

regulations. Although there is now a big shortage of labor, we may have again after the war a grave unemployment problem. Our planning today should reckon upon such a change.

One of the most far-reaching and dramatic steps taken in the promotion of security has been the tremendous growth of insurance in this country. Many losses of property we cannot prevent but we can retain security by insurance in its manifold forms. For instance, the enormous sums of money paid for death benefits by insurance companies provide for an incalculable amount of family stabilization.

One of the interesting developments in the progress of insurance in recent years has been the growth of surety insurance companies. The substitution of corporate surety for the private surety has been a godsend. The corporate surety offers protection against shortages of private and public officials and employees, of court fiduciaries. It guarantees performance of construction contracts, both private and public. These functions illustrate how corporate suretyship has afforded protection from losses which frequently would have been devastating. Surety companies have helped greatly to promote better practices in business generally. They provide some much-needed security in almost every field of business activity.

Every reasonable step should be made to foster, protect, and regulate insurance companies and practices. Just now the Finance Committee, of which I am a member, is considering just how far we can, in the drafting of tax legislation, encourage insurance allowances. We will have to pay heavy income taxes for many years to come. As time goes on, more and more should be done to permit deductions in the payment of income taxes for certain kinds of expenses. The present credit for insurance premiums should be retained and probably increased. Giving tax allowance for money paid out to acquire a home has real merit. True, some people provide for the future support of their families without life insurance or home buying, but these two methods are used so frequently, and are so freed, relatively speaking, from interlocking business complications, that they are entitled to a place in our system of tax exemptions. The supervision of insurance by the States has proved to be satisfactory. The suggested change in control from State to Federal regulation is unwarranted, and I will oppose it.

We would be stupid and unfair to ourselves if we permit a repetition of many of the harmful liquidating policies and practices which followed the First World War. In many instances the desire to discredit, undo, and seek partisan advantage led to grave injustices and unnecessary suffering. Too many abrupt stoppages instead of wisely directed tapering processes occurred in the conversion from war activities to those of peace.

Industry must be encouraged to assume the tremendous task involved in housing and supplying the needs of 130,000,000 of people in this country. It must have real freedom of action. It can use it without riding rampant over the rights of individuals. Our policy toward industry will require today, tomorrow, and in the years to come every bit of resourcefulness and wisdom of which we are capable if we are to maintain necessary equilibrium and yet avoid unnecessary oppressive restrictions.

It is a grave mistake to talk much about our opportunities and little about resultant responsibilities. We are quick to pay tribute to our frontier ancestors. Don't forget their opportunities were few in number and their responsibilities far exceeded their opportunities. No one wants to return to the harsh and cruel privations of pioneer days but we need to apply the spirit of thrift, of self-reliance and individual initiative then so indispensable. We want a better world; we should offer a better United States.

Real estate operations, with its myriads of forms and guises, will be a foundation stone of post-war equilibrium and prosperity. Unless real estate conditions after the war settle down to a stable basis, there will be no such thing as a well-adjusted, well-established plan of economy or a philosophy of life in these United States.

It was inevitable, in the misty days of antiquity, that as soon as individuals realized they might own private property, attempts should have been made from time to time to transfer or assign property. Naturally some transfers were the results of out-and-out gifts or purchases, while others took the form of pledges. The Bible and even earlier codes of laws and regulations made elaborate provisions for such transfers. Often the ruler, whatever his title, would assume that all property really belonged to him and that he could transfer it absolutely by sale or gift, or conditionally by pledge. When Duke Robert pledged the Dukedom of Normandy for funds to be used by him to carry on a Crusade, he was not doing much out of the ordinary procedure as to pledges. Fortunately in this country we escaped most of the entangling and obstructive provisions of feudal law and tenures.

Our experience in Maryland has been somewhat unique. The King of England gave all of what is now known as Maryland, and other parts of the country later snitched from Maryland, to Lord Baltimore, who gave perpetual leases carrying nominal rentals. Still in theory Lord Baltimore owned all of Maryland. The development of somewhat customary real-estate laws and practices followed in Maryland. Our ground-rent system in Baltimore worked very well. It enabled a man of very small, moderate income to purchase his home on a basis easy to manage. The result was that Baltimore became distinctively a city of homes. Our building and loan associations and other financial institutions rendered an indispensable service in the furtherance of a home-making policy.

Factors entering into the cost of housing are often indirect, for instance, as in provisions of law regarding foreclosures of mortgages and transfers of estates. There is a wide divergence in different States both as to costs of mortgage foreclosures and time required for such proceedings to be completed. In some States the cost of foreclosing even a small mortgage has been excessively high and the time required too long. Perhaps a slow foreclosure process gives a certain element of security to the mortgagee in that the intervening time affords opportunity to make better terms with the mortgagor or to arrange for the transfer of the mortgage or for its cancelation. There is, however, another side to the picture. A lender, knowing that costs of foreclosure in any such State will be heavy and the time involved will be drawn out, will be hesitant to lend on mortgages there and will demand a larger apparent equity. Certainly such factors militate against long-term mortgages or low rates of interest. Mechanics' lien laws giving preference in some States to liens over existing mortgages are also deterrent factors.

Some efforts have been made to secure uniformity of law throughout the country which, if successful, would eliminate some of the costs and delays of foreclosures and transfers. About 15 years ago the American Bar Association drafted such a uniform law, but it has been adopted by very few of the States, if any. Also a few years ago a committee composed of the general counsels of housing agencies drafted a uniform foreclosure law which after considerable amendment has been approved by the National Conference of Uniform State Laws. Such uniform legislation would have obvious advantages.

The Federal Government in spite of some evident error has done much in order to encourage uniformity of practices and to improve conditions in real estate business. There are, however, other factors involved. These include State legislatures, local and municipal building and zoning authorities, the building industry, labor, real estate operators, large financial institutions and great industrial corporations as well as many other elements upon whose proper coordination our whole national economy depends. Without the intelligent understanding, interest, and active participation on the part of all of these elements, the problem of the construction and financing of adequate shelter in this country can never be satisfactorily solved. Certainly the efforts already made toward a solution of the housing problem and the maintenance of a permanently sound and profitable system of home mortgage financing will have too restricted limits unless suitable housing can be produced within the incomes of most of our people.

Progress must be made especially in producing adequate houses at costs which people with small incomes can afford. Such progress would lessen the sinister effect of the slum and would be an effectual argument against those who insist that the United States Government must be forced permanently into the business of building houses for civilians—a policy to be avoided by the Federal Government. Banks, insurance companies, and other financial institutions which habitually invest large sums of money can be made

to realize more and more the productive outlets for their funds which the real-estate market can afford. The more the building of houses is looked upon as a sound investment and not a form of speculation or philanthropy, the better will be the housing situation in this country and the better off will be our country.

No one questions the fact that the mortgage has played an indispensable role in home building and in business operations. No one has figured out how our railroads and many big business organizations could have started and developed if they had not issued bonds guaranteed by underlying mortgages. Such a prerequisite still exists.

Spreading out of the risk sometimes has its lure for a mortgage investor who would often rather have a small undivided interest in a mortgage on one or more big tracts, than the entire mortgage upon a much smaller piece of real estate. Of course the process suggests an analogy to the theory of fire, life, and other forms of insurance.

Guaranties of bonds or their underlying mortgages by surety companies was another step, proving during the depression to be highly disastrous to surety companies for various reasons apart from any carelessness in the selection or management of the risks. One was that the spread of the mortgages was too small, and another, the assets of the surety companies were often inadequate to stand the catastrophic losses involved in the tremendous fallings off in real-estate values and markets during a severe financial depression.

The depression found private interests unable in many cases to withstand the strain. Many people active in the home financing field had realized that their institutions suffered from lack of outside credit reserves upon which they could call even in normal times. They foresaw the dangers inherent should a period of depression develop. Their fears proved to be well-grounded. Many became hard pressed for funds which they could not obtain in sufficient amounts from private existing sources.

You will recall that in July 1932, the Federal Home Loan Bank System was established. Following the national pattern set up for commercial banks in the establishing of the Federal Reserve System, 12 strategically located Federal Home Loan banks were organized, each to serve member home-financing institutions in its area by making both short- and long-term advances. The Federal Treasury set up a fund of $125,000,000 for capital stock—for the Home Loan Banks. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation invested as much as $223,000,000 in savings and loan associations, which has been reduced to $64,000,000. Government agencies have received $52,000,000 as dividends on investments in these associations, and also $15,000,000 from its investments in the Federal Home Loan banks.

The facilities and the assistance of the Federal Home Loan Bank System were helpful but they were not adequate after the extreme rigors of the depression developed.

An unprecedented extension of the Federal Government into private real estate operations followed. We are all familiar with the fact that the Government sometimes operated there directly through its own lending agencies as the Home Owners Loan Corporation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and various other departments, and it also set up the Federal Housing Administration to guarantee loans on new construction of homes or repairs to old ones. There were, of course, indirect forms of Federal participation through encouragement and supervision of certain forms of quasi-private agencies and through its long-standing supervision over banks.

The experience of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation is interesting and significant. We know that as the depression developed the ownership of many homes was jeopardized. Foreclosures of homes arose to a thousand a day, which is doubtless an all-time record. The efforts of commercial banks, building and loan associations, and individuals were insufficient to stem the tide. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation from 1933 until 1936 made loans to owners of homes but only where the existing loans were in distress. Since then no new loans have been made or contemplated.

The average loans made by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation were on homes 2 years in default of the principal and interest and 3 years as to taxes. The loans were for an average period of 15 years, with provision for monthly amortization, and were made at a low rate of interest. These loans during 3 years reached the astonishing number of 1,017,821 in amounts aggregating $3,093,000,000. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation made later advances and incurred certain advanced costs of sale and reconditioning which brought the total investment of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation in these properties as of May 31, 1943, to the total amount of $3,483,000,000.

Now, what has been the experience of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation in regard to these loans? As of May 31, 1943, over half of the money has been recovered by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation; that is to say, $1,820,000,000, leaving a balance of about $1,663,000,000. The figures show even better results because 110,000 of these borrowers are now making monthly payments in excess of the amounts regularly due. The number of borrowers prepaying their loans is steadily increasing; 233,861 of the original borrowers and purchasers of these Home Owners' Loan Corporation loans have paid off loans in full. During the month of May 1943 the number of paid-off loans reached 8,984, which was more than twice the number of the May record of the previous year. Also during last year the payments on principal by these borrowers amounted to $272,419,000, which is the highest figure for any 1 year.

Since all these properties were in distress at the time the new loans were made, it was very reasonable to assume that a considerable portion of the loans made by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation would go into default and that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation would be obliged to take over such properties. So far, less than 20 percent of these properties have been taken back by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, that is to say, 195,451. The Government has sold about 86 percent of these properties repossessed. At the end of May the Home Owners' Loan Corporation had on hand 26,983 of those repossessed properties, of which about 84 percent were rented, the remaining ones being held especially for sale or reconditioning. There is a decided likelihood that the total loss of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation in the liquidation of these properties will not exceed $100,000,000.

A reasonable question is whether the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was worth the experiment. The answer is quite obvious. The fact that over a million home owners, less a few who might have found other means of refinancing their homes, did not have to give up their homes is a matter of tremendous importance. The psychological effect of nearly a million families having homes, rather than being homeless, was a factor of crucial importance during the dreary days of the depression. Who can estimate what would have been the increased momentum given to the depression if these homes had not been saved?

But that is not all of the story. Banks, insurance companies, building and loan associations, and other types of corporations were relieved of many problems which would have been unbearable except for the operation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. The taking over of loans from these hard-pressed mortgagees provided relief which is really incalculable. These operations furnished a stabilization and security of immeasurable benefit and proved to be one of the most important factors in helping us over the depression.

What are the lessons to be derived from the operations of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation? Even bearing in mind that real-estate conditions have been somewhat favorable during recent years, the fact remains that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation has demonstrated that distressed properties can be saved on a large scale by suitable methods. They have demonstrated that the average man will not only endeavor to save his home but that often he will succeed in doing so, no matter how hard pressed he is at the moment if he is given time, latitude, and benefit of low interest rates.

The experience of the Federal Housing Administration opens up a big field for speculative thought. Quite wisely the Federal Housing Administration does not lend money and does not build houses. It furnishes guaranties. It is an insurance agency which protects banks, building and loan associations, life-insurance companies, mortgage companies, and other qualified lending institutions against loss on loans made to individuals or companies for the construction or purchase of residential structures or for the repair and improvement of homes and other types of buildings.

Since the founding of the Federal Housing Administration in 1934, more than 1,175,000 families have financed their homes under the Federal Housing Administration plan. The insurance on these homes now exceeds $5,000,000,000. In addition, the Federal Housing Administration has issued repair loans aggregating more than $1,600,000,000 in regard to 4,220,000 homes, farms, and business properties. The guaranties are made by long term loans at 80, or in some cases 90 percent, of valuations with an amortization period which may be as long as 25 years. Interest rates are four and one-half plus an additional one-half percent to cover annual mortgage insurance.

Many homes have been built as we know under this plan in order to meet the greatly increased demand for houses for workers in war industries. In many such cases, if it had not been for the guaranties of the Federal Housing Administration, the United States Government would have had to build these houses at its own expense.

The total income of the Federal Housing Administration during 1943 was over $25,000,000 and yet all expenses and losses were only $11,000,000. The Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance funds of over $66,000,000 have been accumulated from income. It is gratifying to realize that the Federal Housing Administration has operated so far at a profit. No one, of course, can forecast how a period of depression or even a decided shrinkage in real estate values would affect present figures. It is conceded, however, that the Federal Housing Administration has on the whole exercised unusual care in efforts to safeguard against losses. It has insisted upon houses being built of suitable materials and in suitable neighborhoods where there are necessary schools, water supplies, and other conveniences. It has refused to sanction high costs of finance. It has discouraged the second and third mortgage. However, it has guaranteed loans made on a higher percentage of values for a longer period of time, with slower scales of amortization and with lower interest rates.

Even those who have questioned the advisability of having a Federal Housing Administration hold that it has functioned carefully and conservatively.

We had not caught up with the housing shortage when we were forced into this war which put an end very largely to many phases of private construction. Of course it is difficult to forecast with assurance what will be the general state of our finances, public and private, after the war. The indebtedness of the United States Government will have reached colossal proportions and Government bonds will be outstanding in amounts which stagger the imagination. There will be no natural security if we do not handle this debt wisely during the fluctuating economic conditions which the years will undoubtedly bring. Taxes will be very high but it is reasonable to assume that there will be sufficient cash for financing the building and reconditioning of homes on a large scale.

A new element will likely come into the picture. During the war the tremendous demands for strategic and critical materials led to a larger increase in experimental materials as substitutes for customary building materials. Experiments have been made as to glass, steel, plastic, plywood and other materials, and especially in the field of prefabricated homes. Chemistry and electricity are constantly opening up new living facilities. It is quite likely that many in the near future will live in homes built quite differently from those of today. Certainly many such types of homes are being built or planned at this time.

Such prospects give rise to many questions as to the security in construction of new types of buildings, durability in materials used, methods of finance, and changing values of real estate due in part to widespread reshifting of populations which will follow the war. New cities have been built up around new big war plants. After the war is over these cities will not be needed for the purposes for which they were constructed. How to find fresh uses for these cities thereby avoiding wholesale unemployment and vacant houses will be an absorbing problem of post-war days.

One of the cruelest and most unwarranted charges made occasionally against our real estate industry is that real estate conditions were largely responsible for the late depression and that the real estate industry as a whole made a sorry showing in those days of grave distress. Although real estate markets are peculiarly sensitive to adverse business conditions, real estate prices held up as well during the depression as did those in other general lines of business. The fact that even at that time the bulk of our real estate really stood staunch helped to lessen some of the shocks and disasters of the depression.

This fact does not relieve us from the realization that the depression focussed attention on some grave mistakes in our real-estate policies. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Federal Housing Administration, and other Federal agencies directed attention to some of these errors which, of course, many careful real-estate operators had realized for years and had eliminated in part. The Federal agencies and conservative and constructive real-estate operators deserve much credit for what they have done so well. In the hundreds of private constructions which the post-war period will require, a golden opportunity will exist to make other wise readjustments which experience has shown to be desirable.

It is difficult to imagine what would have happened if the Federal Government through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Federal Home Loan Bank System, Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and Federal Housing Administration had not stepped actively into the real-estate situation. I have never heard any means suggested by which certain real-estate problems of the depression could have been solved but for the help of the Federal Government. In doing so it cooperated with many private agencies and individuals who, in a patriotic and constructive manner, were trying to solve real-estate problems which were often so exceedingly acute as to be beyond private effort alone.

What ought the Federal Government do when peace comes, about building houses or issuing guaranties as to loans upon them?

No one advocates the return of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to the mortgage lending business. Some urge with much force that banks and other private lending institutions can absorb very many of the activities which the Federal Government is now exercising in other forms of the lending field. There are other people who insist that the Federal Government should stop guaranteeing mortgage loans.

The question is not an easy one. I would like to see Federal Government avoid every form of unnecessary competition with private industry. Furthermore I would have the Government keep out of any business which can be handled satisfactorily by private operations.

Can private industry meet a demand that the security of underlying real estate be supplemented by some form of guarantee? The surety companies cannot, and should not, attempt the job. Can companies of gigantic capitalization be put into the field which could operate so widely as to be able to avoid local real estate storms and also be big enough to absorb the shock of Nation-wide receding real estate markets? Do not the elaborate systems of reinsurance built up so intricately and yet so successfully by insurance companies suggest a course to follow?

Even possibilities of a general recession in real estate values might not prevent private capital from launching out on such a venture of reinsurance. Some suggest that all demands for guarantees be frowned down upon and be ignored, but some such demand will doubtless continue. I hope and believe private capital can find ways and means of furnishing such guarantees carefully supervised and that some day the Federal Government will be entirely out of the guarantee of real estate values.

The farmer is the natural prey to insecurity from droughts, frosts, tides, wind and dust storms, labor shortages, minimum control over prices, abnormal relations of supply and demand, transportation insufficiencies, besides other hazards. When the United States after World War No. 1 passed from the status of a debtor Nation to that of a creditor, many advantages resulted, but many new baffling problems were involved growing out of shifts in balance of trade affecting international financing. The foreign market of the farmer was badly injured by these changes.

Some of the records as to recent farm-loan movements are suggestive. During the last 10 years total farm-mortgage debt declined almost $2,300,000,000, or more than one-fourth. The Federal land banks and the Land Bank Commissioner held about one-third of the total

at the beginning of 1943, as compared with about one-eighth 10 years earlier. In the late 1930's these agencies held almost 40 percent of the total. Life insurance companies and insured commercial banks now hold about one-fifth of the total. In 1933, life insurance companies alone held more than one-fifth and commercial banks held more than one-tenth. The sharp reduction in interest rates payable on farm mortgages by farmers is reflected in a reduction of about three-eighths in total interest charges during the same period, while outstanding farm debt dropped about one-fourth.

Farm real estate values in March 1943 were almost up to the 1912–14 level, whereas in 1933 they were down to 73 percent of that level. Farm real-estate holdings of the principal lenders are again back to something like the level in 1933. Distress farm transfers were 54.1 per 1,000 farms in the year ended March 15, 1933, but for the same period in 1943, they were down to 6.6 per 1,000 farms. Voluntary transfers, on the other hand, which were only 16.8 per 1,000 farms in 1933, were up to 44.4 in 1943. The improved farm-mortgage situation is shown also by low delinquency figures for Federal Land Bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans at the beginning of 1943. In 1933, almost one-half of the Federal Land Bank loans were delinquent. More prosperous conditions in rural areas as compared with 10 years ago are indicated, also, by the fact that rural bank deposits in 1942 were about three and one-third times the level in 1932, and cash farm income was up to about the same ratio.

These figures on the whole show an encouraging trend, but the fact remains that the farmer's pathway is beset with no end of serious obstacles. Needs of the farmer and public policy itself demand that continued close attention be given to efforts to lessen the insecurity from which the farmer suffers. All of this is necessarily true also as to the canner, packer, stock raiser, and others concerned with the land or its products. Plans for the protection of the farmer have been numerous and complicated. Often they have involved much so-called regimentation which is instinctively abhorrent to many of our cherished historic principles.

No post-war arrangements can be adequate if the real estate situation generally in this country is not on a stable and secure basis. It must always offer convincing incentive for private loans. Naturally the welfare of this country urgently demands the most efficient methods for our real estate transactions that we can devise. Legislation upon such matters must not rest merely upon preconceived theories as to what should be functions of the Federal Government. They must depend upon what is best for the people. I cherish the hope that desired results can follow with a minimum of Federal cooperation and with the laying of more and more stress upon private initiative. The more we can do without the financial help of the Federal Government, the better. I hope to see the Federal Government withdraw from the policy of either building homes or owning them, except to meet war needs.

Whatever errors of commission or omission have occurred in carrying out our war program, our national administration, the Congress, local public authorities, both industry and labor in countless forms, have made a fine record of efficiency in cooperating with our armed forces on land and water and in the air. As a result we are passing rapidly from grave insecurity and danger to such a vastly improved status that we now know how we can obtain essential security and we are moving ever faster in the necessary direction.

With victory now predictable it would be disastrous folly for us to sacrifice the security which victory would bring us by bickering among ourselves, or by a general let-down in our war efforts. We are realistic enough to know that the approaching political campaign might be a menace to our success in winning the war and in handling post-war problems. Anyone who permits politics to get ahead of patriotism is fighting not with us but against us. The American people will have in this coming election their severest test as to whether they can really conduct a combined presidential and congressional campaign vigorously in such a manner as not to hurt, but rather to assist our war efforts. The times will call for eternal vigilance to see that forbearance, common sense, and patriotism have full sway. The members of our armed forces would have a fundamental ground for criticism if we by harmful political activities sacrifice any opportunity of supporting them. In justice to them and to ourselves and to the world itself, we must avoid any such pernicious policy.

We remember that philosophers centuries ago debated long and hotly the question as to whether mind or matter is primary. In considering security it is not necessary for us to settle that medieval controversy. Security is both mental and material in its essence. Of course the search for security is not the chief aim in life. You will remember that the Book of Job discards the theory that security is the most important objective of religion. However, security is and will always be vastly important as a factor in the aims and purposes of mankind.

Security like perfection is never fully reached, but it should be a gleaming goal always to be kept in sight and pursued. In fact the etymological origin of the word "security" is suggestive in that it does not signify complete protection but merely freedom from care and anxiety. Since we will never find absolute protection in our quest for security, we hope to reach such a degree of security as would satisfy the reasonably prudent man or woman.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there being no Executive Calendar, I move that the Senate take a recess until Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, October 14, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, how wonderful are all Thy works. We rejoice that Thou art waiting at the door of every human heart, at the campfires, and on the fields of combat, Thou are there. We praise Thee that Thou wilt show the way home and wilt satisfy all human needs and aspirations for the pilgrimage. The light that is given along the way of time will shine in the realms of a new day. O, could we but see its radiance and glory in the darkness, and to see is but to look. "Come unto Me and I will give you rest," not by the absence of the hill but by the absence of the spirit of fainting.

O Divine Saviour, be a companion to those who are far afield, bereft and alone, and where earth's riches have flown away. Where culture and wealth insure no favor, where all distinctions are wiped out, and the next step may be in the mist and darkness; let Thy gracious Evangel bless every soldier and sailor boy. Do Thou make us loyal servants of Thine and of our country and altogether worthy of their toil, tears, and sacrifice. May we be rich in deeds and willingly submit ourselves to the tragic vicissitudes of war, assured that all things work together for good to them that love Thee. Through Christ our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MRS. VIRGINIA THRIFT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 321) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mrs. Virginia Thrift, widow of Chester R. Thrift, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary compensation at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 to defray funeral expenses of the said Chester R. Thrift.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a very interesting article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two respects, and to include in one extension a brief letter I received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on October 18, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I submitted a request to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD. The Public Printer advises me that this will exceed the ordinary allowance by one-third of a page, with an extra cost of $15 or a total of $155. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may be extended notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF FOOD COSTS AND PROFITS

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Banking and Currency in the House is holding hearings on the continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Embodied in the measure now under consideration is a set-up providing for subsidies, which the House in no uncertain terms rejected earlier this year. The membership of the House is still strongly opposed to subsidies but in favor of continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation. This presents the dilemma of the possibility of voting down a measure that is wanted because of certain provisions that are not wanted.

Let us look at this picture a little more closely. It is stated that the purpose behind the subsidy payments is to "hold the line" on living costs and yet prevent any loss of production on the part of those who produce items of food. It is suggested that $500,000,000 be used for the purpose of keeping down the cost of living. Five hundred million dollars divided among 132,000,000 consumers leaves a reduction of about $3.78 for each consumer annually, or, in other words, a trifle of over 1 cent a day. According to figures secured from the Bureau of Economics, this $500,000,000 for subsidies would mean a reduction of 1 percent annually in the cost of food. According to the report of the economists of the New York Times, it would mean a reduction of only one-half of 1 percent annually in the cost of food. Hence, the reduction proposed on this basis is negligible. However, there is a reduction that can be obtained which it seems to me is far more valuable than the trivial one referred to above.

This reduction can be secured by reducing the wholesalers' profits and those of the packers. There should be an immediate investigation into the profits now being made by wholesalers dealing in food products and also the profits made by packers of meat products.

Labor, a national weekly newspaper owned and edited by the railroad labor organizations, has disclosed some astounding facts in regard to this serious question. I quote from the edition of Saturday, August 21, 1943:

Experts of the O. P. A. have determined that wholesale food dealers increased their profits between 1939 and 1942 as high as 500 percent. This startling information is contained in volume 6 of the O. P. A. series of War Profits Studies, which are not public documents, but are intended only for use of the agency's officials.

The facts and figures in this study are not only a blistering indictment of war profiteers, but are equally an indictment of officials who have permitted them to get "away with murder."

Three out of every 10 food wholesalers reported profits for 1942 more than 300 percent higher than in 1939, and for half of these concerns profits rose 500 percent or more.

Seven out of every 10 food middlemen more than doubled their profits, and 4 of these 7 had at least a 200-percent rise.

Even more startling is the O. P. A. disclosure that in many instances higher profits were harvested on a declining volume of business. In almost every case, profits increased much more rapidly than sales, making it as plain as a pike staff that wholesalers took advantage of the emergency and the complaisance of O. P. A. to jack up prices.

Sales were up 43 percent, but profits rose over 200 percent.

Labor goes on to point out that—

Instead of rolling back wholesale prices, the O. P. A. permitted retailers to hoist their ceilings, and that is the explanation of an increase of almost 50 percent in the prices of food paid by consumers.

Another matter that is worthy of note is the fact that this report has been suppressed, for what reason no one knows. The Congress and the public should be very grateful to labor for exposing these enormous profits.

On October 2, labor again rendered a valuable service by disclosing another confidential O. P. A. study, covering 53 companies in the meat-packing business which handle 85 percent of the Nation's meat production. This report revealed that while the profits of the packers aggregated $24,971,000 a year in the peacetime base period, they had scooted to $108,613,000 in 1942.

This confidential report of the O. P. A. also said that on each dollar of investment, profits mounted three and one-half times.

Labor goes on to say that:

The top group, which does 70 percent of the total business, rolled up 336 percent more profits, from $23,476,000 to $102,322,000. The medium firms rose even more, by 638 percent, from $717,000 to $5,293,000, while the small companies—doing under $5,000,000 a year each—fared worse, going up only 28 percent—from $778,000 to $998,000.

In 1942 alone, compared with the previous year, the large packers of meat products fattened their profits by 40 percent and the medium group 100 percent.

Why these reports of the O. P. A. should remain confidential is beyond one's understanding. Certainly these revelations ought to be clearly understood by everyone, and in order that a full and fair and open hearing may be had on these matters, I have introduced a resolution which empowers the Committee on Agriculture in the House to hold hearings either in full committee or by subcommittee and get all the facts in relation to these profits contained in the confidential report of the O. P. A. Had it not been for labor these matters would still be a secret and known only to a top few officials in the O. P. A., who in too many cases are identified with companies making the large profits.

The following is a copy of the resolution introduced today:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of (1) the prices at which agricultural food products are purchased and sold by processors, wholesalers, and other handlers of agricultural food products, and (2) the profits of such processors, wholesalers, and handlers resulting therefrom with a view to determining whether additional legislation is necessary for the control of such prices and profits.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony, to employ and fix the compensation of such experts, investigators, and other assistants, and to have such printing and binding done, and to investigate income and excess-profits tax returns of such processors, wholesalers, and other handlers of agricultural food products as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as he may designate, the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

THE POTATO SITUATION

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to re-

vise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, due largely to, first, the unquestioned patriotic desire of the potato growers of America to furnish food to win the war; second, to the announced support price; third, to assistance rendered through the non-recourse loans; and, fourth, the prevailing potato-growing weather in the large potato-producing States, we have an estimated national yield of 460,000,000 bushels as of September 1943. The following table shows the production by the leading potato-growing States:

Estimated 1943 potato production with comparisons

[Thousand bushels]

State	Preliminary		10-year average, 1932–41
	1943	1942	
Maine	62,400	42,120	42,805
Idaho	45,355	30,590	26,315
New York	31,317	27,405	29,098
California	28,875	23,130	15,236
Minnesota	24,035	19,380	21,366
Michigan	22,000	16,562	25,135
North Dakota	20,240	17,955	11,133
Pennsylvania	19,712	17,584	23,443
Colorado	19,125	17,020	13,213
Wisconsin	16,150	10,050	19,083
Nebraska	13,800	12,876	8,504
North Carolina	11,772	8,988	8,103
New Jersey	11,502	10,136	8,850
Washington	11,395	7,800	8,365
Other States	122,834	109,554	102,683
United States total	460,512	371,150	363,332

There was an increase in acreage in 1943 over 1942 of from 2,711,000 acres in 1942 to 3,363,000 in 1943, or 24 percent. The estimated production in 1943 over 1942 was, as you will note, from 371,000,000 bushels in 1942 to 460,000,000 bushels in 1943, or an increased production of 24 percent, the same as in the acreage. The average estimated yield per acre for both 1942 and 1943 was 136 bushels, which is some 20 bushels increased yield per acre over the 10-year average production per acre of 1932–41. If the 1943 potato crop had averaged 100 bushels per acre, as potatoes did some years, we would have had a shortage even this year. The acreage in 1943 was less than the acreage of 1928, 1929, 1931, 1932, 1933, 1934, and 1935, although the yield per acre, as previously stated, was much greater in 1943 than the above years.

The need of food for the war and the support price contributed to a better care of the crop this year. Victory gardens furnished an undetermined number of potatoes in 1943. The increase in consumption due to more people working also must be considered.

In order to provide an ample production of potatoes in 1944, it is important that the various commitees, such as the Banking and Currency Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and the Agricultural Committee, give due consideration to the factors involved in the production of potatoes in 1944.

We must realize that before the war we were on a general food-importing basis. In fact, every year from 1920 to 1940 we imported more agricultural products than we exported, and during many of these later years our agricultural imports were twice the amount of our agricultural exports. The American farmer is now asked—and he has responded splendidly up to this time—to furnish food for the armed forces, wherever they may be; to furnish food for domestic consumption; and to furnish food for our allies and the peoples of occupied countries. We have been harvesting around 340,000,000 acres of cropland each year, and the 1944 program asks for 380,000,000 acres. We have a total of 500,000,000 acres available in the United States for crop production. To harvest the 500,000,000 acres available we would of necessity have to plow up some of our pasture lands, which may or may not be advisable. We would also be compelled to use some millions of acres of land usually designated as marginal land.

While the weather conditions are the greatest factor in the production of food, there is no reason why we cannot expect ample production if all of the factors involved are given the proper consideration at the right time. Every available acre should be put to work for the war food program. While the weather is an uncertain element, yet the man-made factors need not be uncertain.

The urge to produce must be maintained; the benefits of the price support must be recognized; and the influence on production of nonrecourse loans must be given the proper consideration as an incentive to production.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

(Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein an editorial from the Iola (Kans.) Register.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER or Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the Traveling Men's Association of North Platte, Nebr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein copies of two letters I have received on the price of milk in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DELIVERY OF WAR BONDS

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, not for days or for weeks but for months I have received complaints. These have come from civilian employees of the War Department, of whom there are approximately 40,000 located at Wright and Patterson Army airfields and in the Air Service Command near Dayton, Ohio. Many of these employees subscribed through the pay-roll deduction plan for the purchase of War bonds from July 1, 1942, through December 31, 1942, and few if any of these bonds have been delivered to date. In fact, these people do not hold so much as a receipt. Their criticism is justified. From 9 to 15 months have now passed and the Finance Office of the War Department has yet failed to work out a system which will effect delivery. Undoubtedly the same situation prevails among other civilian employees throughout the country.

I have written many letters of protest. The Finance Office of the War Department assures me that the system is being decentralized, but the result remains the same.

Recently the Third War Loan Drive was successfully completed. Much time, money, and energy were spent in promoting this entirely worthy and highly necessary effort. Just a little less inefficiency and delay in this Finance Office would do more than all the ballyhoo in promoting sales among these loyal civilian employees who signed away 10 percent of their pay checks to "back the attack" months ago. It is time and past time that these bonds be delivered. It is high time that the decentralized system be made to work.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors, city and county of Honolulu, on repeal of the Chinese exclusion law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the delegate from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to to extend my own

remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial on the subject of why butter is short.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF FATAL ACCIDENTS IN THE MILITARY FLYING FORCES

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a resolution asking for an investigation of the numerous fatal accidents in the military flying forces. According to newspaper reports, there have been 4 Liberator crashes in 5 days in the same area with a loss of 34 of our boys. Two of these boys, well known in my district, have given their lives before they were called to the battle front, and many people in my district, like myself, feel that the crash of 4 of these Liberators in 5 days justifies the grounding of this type of bomber until they are checked and examined by experts and let the public know the facts. We can take it when it is accidental, but feel if it is sabotage or neglect of factory, let them take the responsibility, but please do not destroy our youth before they have had an opportunity to display what their training has taught them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short statement I made over the Mutual Broadcasting System on the Treasury tax proposal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Mr. H. W. Prentis, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter to the editor and a dispatch from London appearing in the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

WEATHER REPORTS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I see by the morning paper that the Weather Bureau and the War Department have finally agreed to release weather information to the people of the United States as a whole. The weather information which is to be released can be of no possible value whatever to the enemy, particularly the weather information on the west coast as west-coast weather comes from offshore and moves eastward. An observer offshore can know more about tomorrow's weather than we can on shore. I believe the censorship on weather information was placed much too rigidly in the first place and without regard for meteorological facts. Now that they are to release the weather information the farmers and the air services and all other services that need this information will be greatly benefited.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors be permitted to sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

FRANCO MUST RECALL "BLUE LEGION"

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident that we have been aiding Dictator Franco immeasurably in his attempt to stabilize his totalitarian regime. We have sent him cotton, petroleum, and many other items under lend-lease aid. No less an authority than His Excellency, the Archbishop Spellman, of New York, writing in a current issue of a national magazine, has acknowledged the obvious fact that valuable assistance has been forthcoming steadily from the United States.

Russia is our ally. She is being bled white in her valiant advance against the Nazi hordes. Yet Franco continues to maintain against the Russians his "Blue Legion" of Spaniards who oppose the Russians every inch of their arduous way. Under such pressing military exigencies, it would be less than fair if the administration were not to demand that Franco remove his Spanish soldiers from Russia's embattled soil.

The Scriptures provide us with the stirring phrase, "He who is not with Me is against Me." Franco still stammers like a stuttering peacock of the death of the democracies; he still extols the totalitarian way.

We must tell Spain in no uncertain language as we did Argentina that she can no longer applaud the philosophy of fraud and enslavement. She must no longer be a pipe line of intelligence to Berlin. She must no longer give aid and comfort to our enemy to the extent of sending a legion to fight in their behalf. Franco has delivered himself of many specious arguments as to the neutrality of Spain. Apparently, his is a weird concept which we cannot and should not accept.

The killing of Russian soldiers by Franco's men can hardly be regarded as a neutral activity by any stretch of the imagination.

It is charged that Franco and his aides spy on our ship movements.

We have emphasized to Argentina that her actions will preclude her place at the peace conference. We must say no less to Franco. The bell of doom is tolling for Franco and his totalitarianism. We must make that warning a siren's shriek. To do any less would brand us as derelict in our duty to our ally, Russia.

CURTAILMENT IN MILITARY AND NAVAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the administration again is importuning the Congress to provide for a greater measure of income, and our Ways and Means Committee again has embarked upon the task of searching out ways in which additional revenue may be raised toward liquidating the growing war cost.

My colleagues will be interested in knowing that their Appropriations Committee, through its Military and Naval Subcommittees, has initiated a move which may result in the recovery of some of the funds available to the armed services and thereby lessen the burden of financing the war's cost.

We have not been actuated by any thought of an early end of the war, or any feeling that the armed services should do aught that might conflict with the most vigorous prosecution of the war according to the judgment of those responsible for its conduct. However, annual budgets are prepared several months in advance of the opening of the fiscal years to which they apply. That fact of itself should suffice to convince anyone of the utter impossibility of accurately foretelling military and naval needs anywhere from 6 to 18 months hence during the course of a world-wide conflict. Consequently, the appropriations that have been made, other than for definite, specific projects, have been based upon the

best estimates that could be made in such circumstances. Many programs; many projects, of necessity, largely were tentative. As the conflict has progressed, changed conditions, changed situations, changed requirements, broadened experience, each may have contributed to a current budget situation different in many respects than that which initially prevailed. There are many ways in which changes could occur which would render unnecessary funds heretofore appropriated.

Your committees on military and naval appropriations subcommittees have called this matter to the attention of the heads of the War and Navy Departments, and they have been requested to have a study made of all available funds with a view to the repeal of any for which a need no longer exists. If there is any surplus money, it is the purpose of the committee to find and recapture it. I am hopeful that we may be able to report to you very worthwhile results.

With your permission I will read to you a paragraph from the communications to the War and Navy Department heads with regard to the recapture program about which I have just spoken.

It reads:

> While not immediately contributory to a reduction in presently available funds, it is quite probable that appreciable savings ultimately would flow from a more alert and assertive attitude on the part of Federal inspectors in holding down the labor rolls in plants having cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts. There is a very strong feeling abroad that contractors, particularly prime aviation contractors and shipyard contractors, are considerably overstaffed. Aside from the considerable cost to the taxpayer, unwarranted large labor rolls militate against many relatively small plants, some of which are experiencing real difficulties in supplying on schedule essential equipment and parts to prime contractors because of the paucity of skilled help. This is not good for the war program and certainly does not augur well for post-war national economy. It is the numerous widely dispersed small plants that will provide the bulk of employment in the post-war era, and their survival for that reason alone is of major importance.

The action initiated by the Military and Naval Subcommittees on Appropriations points the way to lesser expenditures and lesser future appropriations. We are seeking ways to eliminate all unnecessary expenditures in the prosecution of the war. Speaking for myself, I believe we will have the cooperation of the War Department. I shall welcome suggestions from my colleagues and other responsible persons to aid in reaching our objective.

MARSHALL FIELD

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we can all join in wishing our colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] success in his endeavor to have some of that $70,000,000 of Marshall Field's turned into the United States Treasury, but few of us are so gullible as to think anything like that will happen. We would like to see it happen, because it would take away some of the smear fund, the fund being used for smear purposes by PM and the Chicago Sun and other publications.

But may I suggest to the gentleman, while he is talking about getting this sum of money, that he read the remarks of our colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MCGEHEE] the latter remarks made yesterday, and that he do something to make the New Deal quit spending money unnecessarily. I recall very distinctly, the majority on that side has been at the bottom of this wasteful spending, which has run up this great deficit of almost three hundred billions, instead of trying to save something by plugging up the bunghole in the barrel.

Most of us realize that no matter how much is put into a barrel, it never will be full if the open bung-hole—the outlet—is twice as big as the intake. It surely is absurd to continue increasing taxation without any effort to stop waste, extravagance, unnecessary spending. That the New Deal has been spending on other than war activities during the past 10 years far more than was received in revenue we all know. Let it begin to show a little consideration for the overburdened taxpayer.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot yield, I have no more time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the insertion of a recent editorial from the Marion (Ohio) Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the inclusion of a resolution unanimously adopted at the 1943 rally in the Epworth Methodist Church, Bucyrus, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE ISSUING OF BONDS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, issuing bonds to people who subscribe through factory pay rolls is a very technical job, and I simply throw these remarks in for the benefit of my colleague from Ohio, and do it to point out that in my town, where so many thousands of factory workers have made such subscriptions, we found it necessary to get the banks, the Red Cross, the War Finance Local Board, and other forces to assist. Some of the companies have gone so far as to get the banks to issue these bonds for them promptly, but that has become a rather impossible burden, because the banks are now almost unable to obtain the necessary careful help to perform the job. I can understand why my friend's constituents want the bonds issued, but the volume now clearing through and the increase in the shortage of manpower cause considerable delay in getting these individual pieces of paper issued carefully to the proper names and all.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram to Marvin Jones.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE BRANCHES

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have always understood that the great powers granted to our Government were divided into three great departments of government, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. What has become of that very wise separation of the powers granted to this Government? We have the power to investigate the executive branch of the Government for the purpose of legislating, but we have debased that until today the executive branch of this Government has the whip of a Congressman thrown over it everywhere, trying to dictate to the executive or the administrative branch of the Government how to perform its duties, which branch is just as independent as we are, and, we should assume, just as honest and just as patriotic. We ought not to abuse this power that we have to get information on which to wisely legislate by constituting ourselves the censors of a branch of our Government as independent as we are, and I submit as intelligent and as honest and as patriotic, and I submit there should be more respect accorded to this branch of our Government which we almost hourly assail here not for the purpose of acquiring information to legislate upon but to let that branch understand that we are its masters, and that if they do not do our will they will be pilloried before the people of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON] with a great deal of interest. I fear he has

confused the situation. If I have correctly understood the language of the people who have been taking the executive branch to task or who have been directing investigations, it is that Congress has been inquiring as to how it comes that the executive branch should assume legislative and law-making powers. The various inquiries we have had are directed to asserting and reclaiming the powers of Congress, the loss of which the gentleman deplored.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Carmie (Ill.) Democrat.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the development of the Arkansas Valley area.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a clipping.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the other special orders and any business on the Speaker's desk, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

CEILING PRICES AND THE PRODUCTION OF FOOD

Mr. HOFFMAN. Before I begin, I wish to yield back 10 minutes of the 15.

To those Members from the farm districts who are opposed to subsidies and to all others who are inclined to object to the payment of subsidies, permit me to say that if the present program of the administration continues we are going to take subsidies even though we do not want them.

An effort will be made to prove that by citing an instance that happened last summer. They fixed the price of black raspberries on the canning market at 13 cents a pound. They fixed the price on the fresh market at 20 cents a pound. You know how many went into cans, do you not? The same was true of other fruits, especially peaches.

In addition to the fact that we had a shortage of cherries and peaches in Michigan and in other States, they fixed the price so that the canneries could not operate. The majority of the people in the small towns are canning their own provisions.

I wish these city farmers would listen to me, because you are going to be hungry next year. It is not going to bother us out in the country and small towns, but the people who live in the cities and who eat out of tin cans are going to discover, not this winter, but next year, in 1944, that canned goods are short. And when, like Mother Hubbard, you go to the cupboard and find that it is bare, do not blame the farmer; take it out on the planners.

With reference to onions, celery, apples, and other farm crops, the O. P. A. fixed a price and issued orders so as not only to hinder production, but marketing and storage.

The result is going to be this, that as the farmer's income drops, as it will, the administration, through Marvin Jones and others, will tell the farmers that the only remedy is subsidies. I see my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD]. They will catch you on fish. They will find some way to keep your fisherman from making any money.

So when the farmers and others who are engaged in production find that they cannot make a livelihood, we will be swamped in Congress with letters asking for subsidies. They are already trying it in my district, and I am beginning to receive letters from farmers who say, "We do not want a subsidy. We think it is un-American. We think it will not work. We do not like this idea of having a dollar taken from us in taxes and then having 50 cents or 70 cents come back by way of subsidies. There is too much shaving when it runs through Washington. Too many fellows get their fingers on it and take a little out of it. But we must live."

These bureaucrats are like the little boy who swallowed the $5 gold piece of his neighbor. They gave him a dose of ipecac, and up came the money. But when his father took it over to the neighbor, the father said, "Sorry, but there was only $4.50 that came up. That is all we got back out of that $5 gold piece."

It is the same way with every dollar that the taxpayer puts through Washington. When it comes back to him in the way of a subsidy or a payment of any kind, it is less. It is not a dollar. The taxpayer is lucky if it is 50 cents.

How are they going to make us vote for subsidies? They are going to starve our farmers to the point where they will say, "Well, we do not like it, we do not believe in it but we must eat. We must have it. We must live."

On top of that procedure is the demand of the union officials for the roll-back of prices. They want us to take the taxpayer's dollar and make it easier for the consumers to live, but so far, in spite of the millions of dollars which are collected each year right out of the workers' pay envelopes, I have not heard anything from any of the union politicians who are supporting the roll-back, the New Deal and demanding a fourth term for the President, suggesting that there be any roll-back in the payment of union dues so as to aid in reducing the cost of living, so as to help the worker purchase food. Caught by Government price-fixing which gives him less than the cost of production, the farmer—yes, and processors and handlers of food who find their incomes reduced almost to the vanishing point—will of necessity need more money, a greater income; and, with the New Deal in power, there is no other way of getting it except through a subsidy, the major portion of which he will himself pay.

Caught between the pressure exerted by the farmer, who, because of regimentation, is forced to ask for a subsidy, and the demands of the labor politicians, who insist upon a roll-back of prices, which again would squeeze the farmer, Congressmen will be forced to vote for subsidies or clean up on the O. P. A. and the Government planners.

In my judgment, we should waste no time in doing the latter. A house-cleaning in the executive branch of our Government is long overdue. Why sit here and let the New Deal force us farther along the road toward a socialistic state?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 12 minutes.

THE NEW DEAL IS STUCK IN MOLASSES

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, molasses is a very sticky substance, and I have an idea that the administrative agencies who are dealing with this commodity are going to find themselves thoroughly stuck in it before very long. I am speaking today, however, to the consumers of the United States who expect to drink milk this coming winter or to eat poultry, or steaks or pork products, and who will be very much interested to know that one reason why there will be a shortage in these products is definitely chargeable against the muddling of several Washington agencies which have to do with the administration of foodstuffs.

There are 355,000,000 gallons of molasses potentially available in the Caribbean area. One hundred and eighty million of these are obtainable from Cuba; 65,000,000 gallons are in San Diego; and 110,000,000 gallons can be secured from Puerto Rico. The Office of Economic Warfare made this estimate a few days ago and pointed out that this molasses for the manufacture of alcohol was urgently needed in the United States for both munitions and synthetic-rubber programs.

The consumers are interested because this molasses, if shipped to the United States, would release more than 50,000,000 bushels of wheat for food purposes. That amount of wheat, to put it into understandable language, is enough to provide twelve and one-half million men, women, and children with bread for 1 year, or to provide enough feed for the production of 375,000,000 pounds of pork. It could be translated just as easily into poultry or beefsteaks.

You understand, Mr. Speaker, that the ratio for the production of alcohol, between sugar, grain, and molasses, is a ratio of 2–3–4. That is, it requires two units of sugar, or three units of grain, or four units of molasses to produce the same amount of alcohol.

The New Deal seems to be stuck in molasses. During the past year there has been a very small movement of molasses from these areas because of the tanker shortage. In recent months about 5,000,000 gallons have been shipped monthly from Cuba, on smaller boats. However, a representative of the War Shipping Administration testified a few days ago before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Military Affairs that a sufficient number of tankers has now been allocated to move all the offshore molasses supply. The W. S. A. representative said in so many words, "The shipping shortage is not an obstacle at this time."

These ships have been available for more than a month, yet no molasses has been moved from Puerto Rico on W. S. A. vessels and the movement from Cuba has not been stepped up in accordance with the plans recommended by the O. E. W. and approved by the War Food Administration.

The reason is entirely one of price. For some unexplainable reason, which other Congressmen think is a mutual agreement between the governmental agencies involved, war agency officials have decided that they cannot move this molasses to the United States until it has been purchased by the Defense Supplies Corporation. D. S. C., however, has not yet succeeded in purchasing the molasses in question because, according to reports, the price to the owners of the molasses in Cuba and Puerto Rico is below that prevailing for molasses in the mainland markets.

This decision to move the molasses only after it has been purchased by the D. S. C. seems to be an arbitrary decision. Why cannot the individuals now owning the molasses ship it to the mainland on W. S. A. tankers and sell it here in the open market to available purchasers, most of them, the distilleries manufacturing alcohol? Yet, according to earlier press reports, war agency officials have stated that there is an informal agreement whereby no molasses will be shipped from the Caribbean, no matter how badly it is needed, until the present owners of the molasses come to terms with the Defense Supplies Corporation.

The current price ceiling on molasses, in Louisiana and Florida—the larger producing areas of the United States—is 18 cents per gallon. This is the ceiling price set by the O. P. A. At other mainland points the ceiling price is slightly higher. Yet the D. S. C. is offering only 5⅝ cents per gallon for the Cuban supply and was offering less than that for the Puerto Rican molasses. The farmers who grew the cane, and therefore own the molasses in Cuba and Puerto Rico, have taken the position that they will not sell at these levels in view of the much higher prices being paid for molasses produced on the mainland. Their position is understandable. However, in spite of protests, D. S. C. persistently refuses to yield.

A delegation came recently from Cuba to negotiate with D. S. C. and subsequently announced they were rejecting the offer and were returning to Cuba without making any sale. Negotiations with Puerto Rico owners were also broken off.

As a result of this confusion and delay, the alcohol distilleries of the United States continue to use grain for the manufacture of alcohol, thus seriously cutting into the supply of foodstuffs for cattle, poultry, and hogs, and into the supply of wheat for consumers in the United States.

The importance of releasing this amount of grain can be shown by a few figures. The demands for wheat last year approximated 950,000,000 bushels. The estimated demands for this year are said to be 1,250,000,000 bushels; that leaves us with an estimated shortage of 300,000,000 bushels. We have a carryover from last year of about 600,000,000 bushels which makes a net shortage of approximately 300,000,000 bushels. I have not checked these figures myself; perhaps the gentleman from the Wheat Belt will confirm them. The release of 50,000,000 bushels of wheat is not a small thing in view of the critical shortage of food in the United States.

Until the D. S. C. agrees to equalize prices, or at least to approximate prices between the mainland and the Caribbean areas, or until the Caribbean farmers give in and sell their molasses for a third of what they could get on the mainland, the molasses will remain in the areas where it has been grown and the alcohol distilleries will continue to use grain, thus seriously depleting the foodstuff supply for the men and children and women of this country.

To make matters worse, during this unexplainable and wasteful delay many thousands of gallons of molasses are simply going to waste in Puerto Rico. Storage facilities have been exhausted and the molasses is poured into ditches for lack of suitable storage space. Millions of other gallons are being used for the manufacture of gin and rum in the islands instead of being utilized to save grain for human consumption.

The responsibility for this muddle rests solely on the policy in Washington of dividing the administration of food between a half-dozen agencies instead of placing it, as during the last war, under one administrative head. The results of the same muddling, in connection with milk, citrus fruits, vegetables, and beef are already known, or should be known, to the consumers of the United States.

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee has been pointing out these facts to the consumers for about 6 months, and with some success so far as changes in regulations are concerned, and I point them out now not only to the consumers of the United States but particularly to that committee which announced itself the other day as being for the protection of the consumer. The best protection that can be given to the consumers will be: First, to increase production, which can never be done by subsidies as they are now proposed, and, second, to reduce the spread between the price paid to the producer and the price paid by the consumer in the local markets. It does not follow at all that the consumer will necessarily pay a higher price for necessities, if the producer receives the cost of production. That is, unless the O. P. A. continues to make regulations giving the handlers of the product, between producer and consumer, more money than these same handlers ever received in normal times, or expected to receive in this time of emergency.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman has made a very valuable contribution to the thinking of the House today and it has occurred to my mind that while we were having sinkings in the South Atlantic there was a shortage of coffee and sugar in this country. I understand that shortage has been met for both commodities, and yesterday I called the Office of Price Administration and asked what had happened when the limitations on the distribution of coffee were lifted and the reply was "Nothing."

I think the same thing would happen if all restrictions were lifted on sugar, that nothing would happen.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to thank the gentleman from California for his very fine statement concerning this matter. The molasses storage tanks in Puerto Rico are practically all filled at this time.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The grinding season will start, perhaps, in January or February at the latest, and such molasses as is produced, in the absence of some such arrangement as the gentleman has suggested, will have to go to absolute waste, and in and around these storage pits there will be additional wastage.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman from Michigan knows that from his own observation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There is another matter that we will probably have on the floor very shortly. Puerto Rico at the present time is participating in the tremendous rum market in the United States. There is a very heavy rum export tax.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Which tax is being paid by the people of this country, the consumers of the rum, into the Federal Treasury and later remitted by the Federal Treasury to the insular government. Those funds are now running around $4,000,000 to $4,200,000 per month.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I was not aware of the amount.

Mr. CRAWFORD. A fantastic sum of money is going into the insular treasury as a result of the previous act of the Congress, and this Congress should recapture control of that fund and use it as a part of the subsidy program, or rather, the relief program we are giving to Puerto Rico instead of letting the funds waste and then turn around and make direct appropriations from the Treasury.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his statement, which makes mine more complete.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CLEVENGER. Is it not true that sometime ago the House Agriculture Committee, with 100-percent support of the Republican members thereof, reported out a bill to put this food-administration program under one head, instead of seven or eight different heads, thus dividing their responsibility and operation?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman from Ohio is correct. Perhaps he will tell the House also what became of that bill.

Mr. CLEVENGER. About the time we reported the bill out, Mr. Chester Davis turned up as one of the casualties of this war and from that time on we have not seen the bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman from Ohio will agree with me that the bill should be brought out, will he not?

Mr. CLEVENGER. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman from California is a very able authority on all these matters.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman from California is not.

Mr. CURTIS. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us how it happens that even with seven or eight agencies handling food they can make as many mistakes as they are making?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No; I do not think anybody on this side of the House can possibly tell that.

Mr. CURTIS. Surely it could not be accidental.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The guess of the gentleman from Nebraska is as good as mine.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman from California has correctly stated that the paying of a subsidy will not increase the production of food.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It has not historically, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am satisfied that those who are advocating a subsidy and the paying of a subsidy will offer the same suggestion, but I am also convinced that the subsidy is being paid for political purposes, trying to garner in the consumer votes by making consumers believe that they are getting a lot under the program, in the hope of trying to get their votes through paying them something out of the Treasury to support of a fourth term.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix by including an article from the Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without out objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Raymond Moley.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without out objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE CANOL PROJECT

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, today we in the United States have a great liberal and generous Government—generosity personnified. Constantly we hear everlasting talk about the freedoms, freedom of the press, freedom of the air, freedom from fear, freedom from want. We should add another freedom, freedom with the taxpayers money, because if we continue to neglect the freedom with the taxpayers money, certainly we shall not have the other freedoms.

However, when there is anything that concerns the administration policies and programs that may be of a critical nature, the freedom that we boast about instantly ceases and secrecy prevails.

We have just been advised, through the press, of the return of the five distinguished Senators from their tour of the war zones, and if I interpret their public utterances correctly, our allies certainly have been taking a lot of freedom with Uncle Sam.

Along with the "four freedoms" and the propaganda we have been feeding the world, it is quite evident that the people of the stricken countries are of the opinion that Uncle Sam is a rich uncle whose pockets are inexhaustible. It looks now as though the freedom with the taxpayers' money may eventually lead us into national bankruptcy, because of our philanthropic, utopian ideas and that these countries we are so nobly assisting are of the opinion that after the war we are going to carry on a glorified W. P. A. project in every stricken country in the world. That this country is a gigantic smörgåsbord, as pointed out by the distinguished Representative from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], and our assignment will be to provide food and supplies for all the world, invite all the people in the world to partake of the feast, all except the Americans, who are permitted to produce the food, not participate in the feast, but pay the bill.

When the distinguished Senators returned to submit their report, I cannot understand why this branch of the Congress was not given an opportunity to listen to the executive session report. There are 435 of us, representing 135,000,000 people who are entitled to hear what the Senators had to say as well as the Senators themselves.

Now, when the distinguished Senators started to talk with that freedom of speech that we so gloatingly tell the world is one of our freedoms, Senator SCOTT LUCAS, of Illinois, according to the press, reminded the Senators that the penalty for disclosing events in an executive session of the Senate is expulsion.

Also, according to the press, the majority leader, ALBEN BARKLEY, and Senator FRANCIS MALONEY complained.

Now, if the American taxpayer sent these men on a tour of the battle fronts to secure information, then the public is rightfully entitled to a report as to what they found out as to conditions on the fronts in which American troops are fighting and dying, whether Uncle Sam is being played for a sucker or whether we are getting a square deal.

We, as Members of the Congress, are also entitled to this information so that we can tell our people what is actually happening.

It has recently come to my attention that this ambitious program of freedom with the taxpayers' money has not been confined to the stricken war-torn countries of the world, but we have become very generous on the North American Continent. I now refer to the Canol project in Canada for development of one of Canada's natural resources, oil.

I have here an article appearing in Maclean's magazine, Canada's national magazine, of August 15, 1943, the headlines as follows:

Story of the $138,000,000 project, which is lining Canada's Main Street to Asia with airfields, oil wells, highways, and pipe lines.

The editor's note states:

The Canol project described by Mr. Richard Finnie, is one of the most notable construction operations in Canadian history. It involves the opening up of an oil field on the Mackenzie River, only 75 miles south of the Arctic Circle, construction by the United States Army of 1,600 miles of oil pipe lines traversing sub-Arctic waste, intensive development of a 1,200-mile lake-and-river transport system, building of a refinery and many hundreds of miles of new highways, and construction of new key air routes through the Canadian Northwest. A Washington report states the project will cost $138,000,000.

Now, in view of the fact that I come from the oil country, where oil leases are

being abandoned, wells scrapped and sold for junk and a proven oil area that has a billion barrels of oil waiting to be drawn from the reluctant sands, that we cannot secure an increased price on oil to justify securing increased production of oil to fight this war, to give the people the necessary fuel oil to keep them warm, and gasoline to operate their cars, when a 50-cent price increase on a barrel of oil would mean less than a half-cent a gallon to the American people and would not cost the Government anything, so it occurs to me that it would be time to find out why we spend $138,000,000 in Canada to develop the oil resources of that country—to build pipe lines, highways, and airports, all at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Therefore, I requested the Petroleum Administrator for War, under date of September 17, 1943, to submit to me a copy of the contract entered into on May 20, 1942, for the development of the oil operations at Norman Wells, Canada, for the construction of pipe lines from Norman Wells to White Horse.

I received a reply from Deputy Adminstrator Ralph K. Davies, under date of September 27, 1943, as follows:

The contracts covering this project were made by the Army with the various companies involved, and the Petroleum Administration does not have copies of any of these documents. I would therefore suggest that you get in touch with the office of Gen. Brehon Somervell. I am sure that the War Department will be glad to supply you with the information you desire.

Well, for the information of the House the War Department was not glad to supply information as you will know later.

This letter indicates that even if Secretary Ickes may be the Petroleum Administrator for War, here is one instance in which he was not given very much consideration in determining whether or not this was a practical or an impractical project for producing oil for the war effort.

I then wrote Deputy Administrator Davies again and asked him why they were not permitted to participate in so important a project concerning oil for the war effort, and on October 4, 1943, he wrote me as follows:

It is true that the Petroleum Administration is supposed to be consulted on all foreign matters relating to petroleum and is charged with the responsibilty of directing the operations of American oil companies in the foreign field. The Canol project first came to our attention, however, after the plans were well advanced and the undertaking had actually been launched.

Upon making inquiry of the War Department, we were informed that the Army considered the development of sources of supply of military fuel for Alaska to be of such extreme military urgency and necessity as to warrant independent action. In the circumstances it felt that development could properly proceed without prior consultation with the Petroleum Administration. This view has thus far prevailed and, accordingly, the Canol project represents an exception to the regular procedure.

Now, I admit that production of new oil as a contribution to the war effort is essential and it should be considered for supplying our Alaskan base, providing the field his proved that there was enough oil to economically justify the expenditure of $138,000,000. I admit that after Pearl Harbor we were willing to grasp at anything; however, after this Jap threat was removed we should have proceeded more cautiously.

However, I was also interested in determining what kind of a contract was entered into with Canada and therefore wrote to Gen. Brehon B. Somervell requesting that he submit to me a copy of the contract between Canada and the United States and other interested parties, and I received a letter under date of October 5, 1943, from Maj. Gen. W. D. Styer, as follows:

General Somervell is absent on an extended inspection trip, and your letter to him concerning the Canol project has been referred to me for reply.

Contracts pertaining to the Canol project are classified as secret War Department documents for military reasons, and I regret that I am not at liberty to furnish you copies.

After receiving this letter I wondered why, in view of the fact that Maclean's magazine had given a very comprehensive and complete and detailed report of the project, with pictures and a map showing the highways, pipe lines and railways and the exact location, in fact, there is nothing secretive about it any longer. The American press did not carry the story, at least I never saw it, but Canada makes no secret about it and states in this article:

This was to be the Canol project (Canol from the words "Canadian" and "oil" telescoped), and participating in it were to be the Imperial Oil Co., Standard Oil of California, J. Gordon Turnbull and Sverdrup and Parcel (as architect-engineers) and Bechtel-Price-Callahan (as constructors). Fulfillment of the contract was to be aided and supervised by the United States Corps of Engineers with Col. Theodore Wyman, Jr., as officer in charge.

A week later Colonel Wyman and representatives of the constructors and architect-engineers were arriving in Edmonton—which was to be the control base—and 2,500 United States Engineer troops, most of them colored, were en route to Waterways, end of steel 300 miles north. Rolling with them over the second most northerly railroad with a main-line connection were 15,000 tons of pipe.

And, by the way, I may say that at that time not an oil producer in the United States could get pipe.

This was for the line from Norman Wells to Whitehorse and curiously enough, while it was the first thing sent, it was the last thing needed.

It is a very comprehensive, detailed story of the whole project, so there is nothing I can see that is very secretive about this Canol project any longer.

On October 7, 1943, I then contacted, by telephone, Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson and requested that he submit to me, in view of the fact there was no longer any secrecy, a copy of the agreements relating to the Canol project between Canada and the United States. He said over the telephone that he would take the matter under consideration and advise me later. Almost immediately, that is on October 8, 1943, I received a letter from Mr. Patterson as follows:

I have considered your request that we furnish you with the various agreements relating to the Canol project, so-called, for the drilling of wells, the construction of pipe lines, and the erection of a refinery in northwestern Canada, some of the pipe lines running also into Alaska.

I realize that articles have appeared recently in Time magazine and in Maclean's magazine published in Canada last August. I believe there have been some other articles as well. These articles, however, do not go into certain details as to capacity, etc., or specific features of the various agreements.

I find it necessary for the present to adhere to the position expressed by General Styer in his letter to you. Because of the military secrecy involved, I cannot now release the documents. I assure you of my desire to give you any information which I properly can and that if, at a later date, the situation changes so that the classification of the papers can be changed, they will be made available to you.

Now, I might also tell the Congress that on June 19, 1943, under a War Department release, it was stated:

Less than 100 miles from the Arctic Circle in the northwest territory of Canada, troops of the Army of the United States have overcome the difficulties of wilderness and rough weather to tap a huge source of oil to supply the armed forces in Canada and Alaska, the War Department announced today.

This, the Canol project, is going forward under an agreement with the Canadian Government, which retains ownership of the wells developed.

Now, I would like to know how much oil this field can supply and who authorized these agreements between the Canadian and United States Governments.

It is believed, from what I can learn, that this huge source of oil claimed is not so huge, according to Maclean's magazine:

In 1939 Norman Wells installed a modern straight-run 840-barrel refinery so that the field could fully supply the local market for engines on water, on land, and in the air, turning out not only fuel oil and motor gasoline but 87-octane aviation fuel as well. Part-time summer operation took care of the demand, and 1941's production was a little less than 24,000 barrels of high- and low-test gasoline and several grades of oil.

No doubt, I would say, the production has been greatly increased over these figures; but, whatever it may be, it is but a drop in the bucket. I might say our daily production in the United States is 4,250,000 barrels, our annual production 1,385,000,000 barrels, and the oil man is asked to up this in 1944 to 1,550,000,000 barrels.

A report submitted to me on September 28, 1943, from the Subcommittee on the Cost of Production prepared by the crude-oil requirements committee, composed of 40 producer associations covering the entire producing area of the United States, reports as follows:

We have estimated that the cost of finding, producing, and developing a barrel of crude oil as of June 30, 1943, was $1.244, which is an increase of 48 cents per barrel over the cost of the third quarter of 1941, as reflected by the Tariff Commission's report. We further estimate that application of the 48-hour week will increase the cost at least 5 cents per barrel. This would bring the cost

at the present date to $1.294, exclusive of interest for capital.

Now when we ascertain what the daily production is in the Norman Wells field of Canada and divide it into whatever the cost may be we can secure the cost per barrel to produce Canadian oil, and believe me it will be plenty. Then we can determine whether it is military secrecy involved or whether we should call it a case of poor judgment, write it off and put it down as something to be remembered but not talked about.

I would say there is no longer reason for suppression of the contract under which development of Canadian oil resources in the far north are being financed by this Government.

There can be no question of military secrecy. All the enemy cares about in this deal is the location of places to drop bombs. The War Department in its own press releases and Maclean's, Canada's national magazine, have removed such secrecy. It has told the entire world where the refinery will be located, where the pipe line is being laid and where the oil field is being developed. What more could the enemy wish to know? The enemy does not care about the terms of the contract.

But the taxpayer, that long-suffering, victimized and confused bearer of the burden of all these fantastic, impractical spending schemes, has the right to know. How much money, where it is being spent and what it buys and, in this case, what is to become of the property after the war is over and how much oil is actually being produced.

There can be no valid reason for refusal to tell exactly what our War Department has contracted to do in this petroleum venture up there near the Arctic Circle. The only reason for refusal now to make the matter fully public is the fear of letting the full truth be known—that or a tacit admission that the whole thing is a failure.

A widely read columnist on October 9, 1943, had this to say under the heading, "Alaskan oil":

Nearly 1 year ago this column called attention to the phantom oil pipe line which the War Department was laying from the Fort Norman oil fields in north Canada to White Horse, Alaska. It was pointed out that the pipe line had to be laid over icy mountains, on top of the ground at subzero temperatures, and that congealed oil could not be pumped at these temperatures.

Due to these and other difficulties, Petroleum Administrator Ickes wrote a letter to Secretary of War Stimson calling the pipe line impractical. As a result Secretary Stimson ordered its construction stopped. However, Gen. B. B. Somervell later was able to proceed with it and the line is now more than half built.

Recently the Truman committee sent a delegation of three Senators to Alaska and they have brought back an extremely critical report. They are in doubt whether the pipe line can be finished in time to serve any real military value in Alaska. When finished, they doubt whether it will be able to move oil at temperatures of 70 degrees below zero. Finally, they are not sure that there is too much oil in north Canada to pump anyway.

The Senators also report that oil prospectors are now busy in northern Canada looking for oil—at Government expense. They also report that although the cost of the pipe line was supposed to be $31,000,000—actually the cost of the entire project will be many times that much. They cannot get a figure from the War Department as yet, but it is whispered that it may run as high as $200,000,000.

The most amazing thing, however, is the report that after the war the pipe line and the wells in north Canada will be turned over jointly to Imperial Oil, Ltd., and the Standard Oil of California.

It is significant that the former head of Standard of California, Ralph Davies, now deputy petroleum coordinator under Ickes, acted vigorously to stop the Canadian-Alaskan project—apparently working against the interests of his own firm.

I might add at this point that Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Administrator of Oil, is a brainy oil executive and advised against it because he knew it was unsound and impractical, realizing that eventually if it were pushed through somebody would have a lot of explaining to do about tossing $138,000,000 down the hole into a project that in his judgment was economically unsound and which eventually would fall into disuse and be abandoned.

I recommend that the Lea subcommittee of the House on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should cause an immediate investigation of the Canol project.

The administration has adopted a policy of "hold the line" in our own country but dished it out everywhere else with the result that the O. P. A. continues to ration the ever smaller available quantities of oil and its byproducts, fuel oil, and gasoline, as best they can, while the people are crying for gasoline and fuel oil, when with a slight increase in the price of oil in the United States we could produce all of the crude oil necessary in this country for not alone the war effort and our allies but our own people; but the powers that be would rather dump $138,000,000 into a questionable and undetermined oil project to develop the natural resources of Canada at the expense of the American taxpayer, than look after our interests in their own back yard.

I would say that if such a huge sum as $138,000,000 were spent in United States oil fields it would have produced, every day, several hundred thousand barrels of oil. It will be interesting to find out how much production this Canadian exploration scheme is actually producing—this the American taxpayer is entitled to know.

I am fully convinced that if this field would give real value the oil companies would have gobbled it up long ago. That is, if in their estimation, sufficient production was evidenced to economically justify the expenditure.

The chances are that when the contracts are made public the only part the oil companies will have played will be to agree to take the oil, refine it, and distribute it. However, they have nothing to lose, and no doubt will end up with the properties which they will operate at a profit, otherwise they will be abandoned.

So the good-neighbor-minded boys playing loose with Uncle Sam's pocketbook have plunged recklessly into what now appears to be a bust. Time will tell. In any event, it has made a splendid development for Canada even if they never get any oil to speak of. It is all at the expense, I understand, of the American taxpayer who is entitled to know just what the set-up is. One hundred thirty-eight million is a neat little sum to spend in any man's country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein an article appearing in Maclean's, Canada's national magazine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

[From Maclean's magazine of August 15, 1943]

CANOL BLITZ

(By Richard Finnie)

STORY OF THE $138,000,000 PROJECT WHICH IS LINING CANADA'S MAIN STREET TO ASIA WITH AIRFIELDS, OIL WELLS, HIGHWAYS, AND PIPE LINES

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Canol project described by Mr. Finnie is one of the most notable construction operations in Canadian history. It involves the opening up of an oil field on the Mackenzie River only 75 miles south of the Arctic Circle, construction by the United States Army of 1,600 miles of oil pipe lines traversing subarctic wastes, intensive development of a 1,200-mile lake-and-river transport system, building of a refinery and many hundreds of miles of new highways, and construction of new key air routes through the Canadian Northwest. A Washington report states the project will cost $138,000,000.)

The Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor hastened the development of northwestern Canada about 100 years. It started the Alaska Military Highway and the Canol project—by far the biggest construction program, in respect to territory covered, in the history of the world.

"An aerial campaign against Japan could be pushed to best advantage from Alaskan air bases," said the late Brig. Gen. William Mitchell a score of years ago, and belated recognition of that opinion is reflected in the fortification of Alaska, in the building of the Alaska Highway, and in the undertaking of the Canol project.

With the Japanese occupation of Attu, Agattu, and Kiska, Americans and Canadians became suddenly and painfully aware of the proximity of Alaska and its Aleutian Islands to Japan; and many of them, studying global maps for the first time, saw that Fairbanks in the very heart of Alaska was only 3,500 miles from Tokyo. They saw also that from San Francisco to Japan the air route via the Aleutians was nearly 2,000 miles shorter than the Hawaiian route. They saw that Attu Island, last in the Aleutian chain, was 750 miles from the Japanese Kurile Islands, with their air and naval bases. They saw that the westerly tip of Alaska was less than 60 miles from Asia.

But to defend Alaska and, better still, to strike at Japan from Alaska, we would require tremendous quantities of equipment and tremendous quantities of fuel. Alaska was insular, attainable only by air or sea. Men and equipment and fuel could be shipped to Alaska—and they were—but freighters and tankers were needed elsewhere. And there was an ever-present threat of enemy action in Pacific waters.

There would have to be a road and there would have to be fuel. Alaska had petroleum but it was remote and undeveloped. The nearest ready source was in the lower

Mackenzie Basin in Canada, 700 air miles from Fairbanks.

The presence of oil on the lower Mackenzie had been noted as far back as 1789 by Alexander Mackenzie, the young Scottish fur trader and explorer whose name was given to the river down which he canoed to the Arctic. In 1919 the Imperial Oil Co. (subsidiary of Standard of New Jersey) sent a drilling crew to a location on the right bank of the Mackenzie 52 miles below the trading post of Fort Norman and 75 miles south of the Arctic Circle. The following summer a well was brought in but the local market was then too small to warrant production. Fur was still king and in the 1920's there was no industrial activity in the country. The largest fuel users were the steamboats and they burned cordwood. The Imperial Oil Co. capped the several wells that had been drilled by 1925 and withdrew.

In 1932 the fuel requirements of the new radium mine at Great Bear Lake justified the reopening of the Norman field and the drilling of new holes. From then on, Norman Wells (the present post office name of the camp) produced steadily. The development of gold mines around Yellowknife in 1937 gave an additional outlet for Norman oil.

In 1939 Norman Wells installed a modern straight-run 840-barrel refinery so that the field could fully supply the local market for engines on water, on land, and in the air, turning out not only fuel oil and motor gasoline but 87-octane aviation fuel as well. Part-time summer operation took care of the demand and 1941's production was a little less than 24,000 barrels of high- and low-test gasoline and several grades of oil.

But this could be increased many times with increased storage facilities if the refinery were kept going through the four seasons drawing from only the three wells which were then available. Because the Norman crude, which has a paraffin, not a bituminous base, will flow at 70 degrees below zero, winter operation would present no insuperable difficulties.

The United States War Department decided to develop Norman Wells and put a pipe line over the Mackenzie-Yukon Divide in a beeline to Whitehorse. Whitehorse was right on the Alaska Highway, where fuel would be needed for trucks and tractors as well as aircraft.

The Alaska Highway was already well under way from Dawson Creek to Whitehorse and Fairbanks when, on May 20, 1942, a United States War Department contract was executed in Washington for the further development of Norman Wells and the construction of a pipe line from the Wells to Whitehorse. This was to be the Canol project (Canol from the words "Canadian" and "oil" telescoped), and participating in it were to be the Imperial Oil Co., Standard Oil of California, J. Gordon Turnbull, and Sverdrup and Parcel (as architect engineers) and Bechtel-Price-Callahan (as constructors). Fulfillment of the contract was to be aided and supervised by the United States Corps of Engineers with Col. Theodore Wyman, Jr., as officer in charge.

A week later Colonel Wyman and representatives of the constructors and architect-engineers were arriving in Edmonton—which was to be the control base—and 2,500 United States engineer troops, most of them colored, were en route to Waterways, end of steel 300 miles north. Rolling with them over the second most northerly railroad with a main-line connection (first: Churchill) were 15,000 tons of pipe. This was for the line from Norman Wells to Whitehorse, and curiously enough, while it was the first thing sent, it was the last thing needed.

Exploring had to be done for the Mackenzie-Yukon divide area was among the least known in all the 1,300,000 square miles of the Northwest Territories, and an airplane was dispatched from Edmonton on June 6 to fly to Norman Wells and thence to Whitehorse.

But the biggest over-all problem was transportation. The Mackenzie River in length and drainage is second on the North American continent only to the Mississippi, the Yukon River coming third. Many thousands of tons of equipment and supplies along with personnel had to be moved 1,500 miles northward from Edmonton before the real job could be started. There were consultations with specialists in northern transportation and plans were made.

The season for river freighting was short. Everything had to be moved by rail 300 miles to Waterways, by boat and barge 285 miles down the Athabaska and Slave Rivers to Fort Fitzgerald, over a 16-mile portage necessitated by a series of rapids, then on down the Slave 190 miles to Great Slave Lake. From there it went another 125 miles across the lake to the head of the Mackenzie proper, and 550 more miles to Norman Wells, 75 miles south of the Arctic Circle.

A couple of hundred carpenters and laborers hastily recruited in Edmonton built a camp and loading facilities at Waterways. Prefabricated barges were assembled, and with troops operating pontoon rafts freight started to float down the Athabaska before the middle of June. Within a year the Canol project was destined to have thousands of people on its pay roll, in addition to troops.

Existing transportation facilities were mainly those of the Hudson's Bay Co. and the Northern Transportation Co. and they were geared to handle about 10,000 tons in a summer. Besides this normal quota there would be at least 30,000 tons for the project's first season.

The United States Corps of Engineers and the constructors, moving on to Fort Fitzgerald and Fort Smith (on the sixtieth parallel—the border between Alberta and the territories), set to work augmenting wharves and improving the roads. Hundred-ton, 200-ton, and 300-ton barges were lifted bodily from the water at Fort Fitzgerald, trundled over to Fort Smith, and launched. Everything had to go over—pipe, equipment, supplies.

Hack out airfields

Meanwhile, airfields were being built. Hitherto in the Northwest Territories all flying had been done on skis in winter and on pontoons in summer. Canadian Airways Ltd. and Mackenzie Air Service Ltd. and their predecessors, and now their successor, Canadian Pacific Air Lines, had safely flown millions of miles in the North. But their operation was handicapped by the limitations of their skis and pontoons for there were the in-between seasons of a month or two in fall and a month in spring when neither skis nor pontoons could be used. These delays could be overcome and large cargo aircraft employed only through the construction of airfields. So the Army and the constructors, with bulldozers, carry-alls, and scrapers, hacked out landing strips—all the way from Edmonton to Norman Wells. Most of them were ready for use 3 weeks or a month after the first trees had been dozed over.

Norman Wells is on the right bank of the Mackenzie and a camp—Canol camp—was established on the opposite side 5 miles away. In July and August surveyors, constructors, and Army engineers were making the first attempts at road building toward the Mackenzie Mountains, rising to a height of 8,000 feet, some 30 miles back from the river.

Aerial reconnaissance flights were being made between the Wells and Whitehorse, a distance of 550 miles, and photographs were taken of several possible routes. Real exploring had to be done, for knowledge of the Divide country was sadly limited and fragmentary. A few gold seekers had gone to the Klondike via the Keele River in 1897 and 1898, and the mountain Indians regularly ascended the Carcajou, farther north, on hunting forays, returning down the Keele in moose-hide boats. But the only published report on this part of the Divide was that of Joseph Keele, a Canadian Government surveyor, who traversed it in 1907–8.

Keele made his way from the Yukon up the Ross River, a tributary of the Pelly, reached the height of land at Christie Pass (4,525 feet), then descended the Gravel (the original name of his river) to the Mackenzie He found that "on the western slope the water flows from near the Divide for a long distance through valleys of mature erosion with an easy grade before reaching the master stream, the Yukon; while the streams on the eastern slope fall rapidly for a comparatively short distance and reach a much lower level at their junction with the Mackenzie."

Two salient facts emerged from preliminary investigations: Construction of a road and pipe line over the Divide would not be easy; and work should be carried on from both ends. But at the outset the shipping of materials to the Yukon was possible only through Skagway, and that port was already clogged with freight for the Alaska Highway. By August, however, after the Japanese situation in the Aleutians had been brought under control, arrangements were made to bring in equipment, supplies, and pipe via Prince Rupert, Skagway, and thence over the 110-mile White Pass & Yukon Railroad to Whitehorse.

Camps were established at Prince Rupert, Skagway, Carcross, and Whitehorse, and pipe was being strung and welded by October.

By the end of September a pipe line had been put across the Mackenzie between Norman Wells and Canol camp, and 600 colored troops, white troops, and a couple of hundred civilian workers were settling down for the winter. The colored troops, who had handled pipe and done general stevedoring all summer, now were building log cabins and cutting firewood to keep themselves warm. More than a dozen new wells, all of them producers, had been drilled and big storage tanks were under way. By the end of October when freeze-up began nearly all of the boats and barges that had carried freight and men until the last minute were drawn up on shore or safely berthed. Among these were the Hudson's Bay Co.'s sternwheelers, the *Mackenzie River*, built in 1907, and the *Distributor*, built in 1921. The latter, with a half dozen barges clustered about her, had on one trip taken the largest single load of freight down the river—1,300 tons.

The summer's operation, considering the haste with which it had had to be organized, was satisfactory. Some 2,900 tons had gone over the Fitzgerald-Smith portage. But not all of that had been delivered to the job site at Norman Wells. For instance, 9,000 tons of pipe for Canol lay piled at the delta of the Slave River. A great deal more freight would be needed at Canol camp before break-up. This led to another supplement.

In October the constructors built a camp at the town of Peace River, at rail's end in the Peace River country 310 miles northwest of Edmonton, and the troops who had been at Waterways and Fort Fitzgerald were moved there.

Pioneer 1,000-mile road

Then began work on a winter road from Peace River to the Mackenzie. There was already an all-weather provincial road 85 miles northward and a tractor trail to the mouth of the Hay River; but much of the latter had to be improved and relocated and a cut-off had to be run from Alexandra Falls on the Hay River to the lower end of Mills Lake below Fort Providence. Pioneering was done by white and colored troops, the constructors following. In December, truck convoys and tractor trains were rolling. They had 9,000 tons of freight to move. They were delayed

and plagued by Chinook thaws and lack of snow, but they kept going.

At the same time a civilian tractor crew was heading southward from Norman Wells to the north, crossing the Great Bear River on the ice, and continuing through unmapped wilderness 50 to 60 miles inland from the Mackenzie on the east side. The weather was bitterly cold and the men's only food was canned Army "C" rations which they heated in their tractor motors. An Army crew was working inland from Fort Simpson and another civilian crew was progressing northward from Mills Lake.

On February 24 a tractor from the north met a tractor from the south at Blackwater Lake. Their blades accidentally touched. One driver said to the other: "Why don't you look where you're going?" The reply was: "Why don't you learn how to run a cat?" Fisticuffs were narrowly averted—and that was the only ceremony attending the completion of a 1,000-mile pioneer road down the Mackenzie Valley.

Immediately truck convoys and tractor trains, having trekked northward 500 miles from Peace River to Mills Lake, continued another 500 miles to Norman Wells and over the ice to Canol. And they kept moving until the latter part of April when they began bogging down in spring mud. Most of them reached Canol; some were obliged to turn in 60 miles to Fort Simpson; but none were left on the road.

During the winter the Army had pushed a trail from Fort Smith to Hay River over which equipment needed on the Norman road was driven. Between February and late April thousands of tons of pipe were hauled on sleds pulled by tractors 220 miles across the ice of Great Slave Lake from the Slave Delta to Mills Lake, thence to be carried on barges to Canol camp after break-up.

There was still another operation. At Dawson Creek, 490 miles northwest of Edmonton, constructors and the Army engineers of the Canol project built a camp and in January they started freighting supplies and pipe over the Alaska Highway.

In December the Canol project was brought under the direction of the Northwest Service Command headed by Brig. Gen. James A. O'Connor of the United States Army. In March Colonel Wyman, who was given another command elsewhere, was succeeded by Brig. Gen. L. D. Worsham as division engineer, United States Corps of Engineers, northwest division, in immediate charge of the Canol project.

From November of 1942 through April of this year, dog team and tractor parties were working from both ends of the Norman-Whitehorse line. When break-up comes in May the stage was set for the long pull over the mountains. A route had been selected and access roads were already under way.

Communication was maintained by the United States Army with the cooperation of Royal Canadian Corps of Signals stations. There were mobile units operating with tractor crews wherever they went.

Meanwhile in the Norman Wells area, producing wells were drilled. Though many more would be brought in during the coming summer and fall, a more than adequate supply of oil was already assured to fill the original quota to be pumped through the line. The wells were shallow as oil wells go, averaging about 1,400 feet and taking 2 or 3 weeks each to drill.

Because of the low pour-point of the Norman crude, the line would not have to be buried or protected in any way from frost. It could lie right on the surface of tundra and rock.

To string and lay pipe you must have a road and this means it will soon be possible to drive a truck from Canol camp on the Mackenzie across the Divide to the Yukon.

Frontier pushers

What sort of people have done and are doing all this frontier pushing? Among the troops the colored boys are mostly from Georgia, Alabama, and Texas. The white troops are from almost every State in the Union. The colored troops at Canol camp faced the winter with forebodings—they expected to freeze to death, but came through unscathed and now look upon themselves as heroes.

Because of Canadian labor restrictions, the proportion of Canadians on the Canol project is small. They include famed bush pilots and bush surveyors, barren-land trappers and dog drivers, river pilots and road builders, carpenters, and catskinners. Among them are a few Indians (the project hasn't touched Eskimo country yet) who serve as boat pilots, canoemen, guides, and dog drivers.

The white troops—engineers, signalers, Medical Corps—have felt lonely at times, missing the amenities of the outside world, but numbers of them have become fond of the North.

The civilian workers—the carpenters, truck drivers, catskinners, riggers, crane operators, welders, cooks, etc.—are mostly from Oklahoma, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Texas, and some from California. Although they are making more money than most of them ever made in their lives before, there has been a 10-percent-per-month turn-over due partly to homesickness and restlessness. But among them are imaginative, visionary men who recognize the potentialities of the North. They feel they are in on the ground floor, and they talk of coming back after the war to settle down.

And women? Yes; there are women, too. From the very start secretaries, stenographers, clerks, nurses, all of them Americans, have been eager to go to Prince Rupert, Skagway, to Carcross, to Whitehorse, or to Canol camp and Norman Wells. Only recently, when accommodations were ready, did the first contingent of office workers go to Canol camp and the Wells, but all winter there were girl office workers in Skagway, Carcross, and Whitehorse. They loved it. Girls being an overwhelming minority, every one of them was a queen, and northern romances and marriages were frequent.

Away back at the beginning of the Canol project last summer this sign was posted in the constructors' employment offices:

"THIS IS NO PICNIC

"Working and living conditions on this job are as difficult as those encountered on any construction job ever done in the United States or foreign territory. Men hired for this job will be required to work and live under the most extreme conditions imaginable. Temperatures will range from 90° above to 70° below zero. Men will have to fight swamps, rivers, ice, and cold. Mosquitoes, flies, and gnats will not only be annoying but will cause bodily harm. If you are not prepared to work under these and similar conditions, do not apply."

That was, of course, to discourage the faint-hearted. While the facts could be at times as stated, the over-all picture was exaggerated. In practice, working and living conditions have been generally excellent throughout the project. Men have been well clothed, well housed, and well fed. Indeed the food—practically all of it brought from the outside—served in most of the northern camps is better than that to be found nowadays in the average city restaurant, and no rationing applies.

It is noteworthy that over the million and a half square miles or so that the Canol project covers and with all the hazards involved, there have been few casualties. Few men have been killed, and serious accidents have been negligible. Despite the 70 degrees below zero warning no one has been badly frostbitten. Indeed, the thousands of men doing outdoor work on the Canol project in the north are in conspicuously good health, and many of them have grown luxuriant beards to emphasize their virility. There are safety engineers whose responsibility is to forestall accidents, and the United States Army maintains well-equipped hospitals at all the camps.

True, it gets cold in wintertime in the north, but the men from Minnesota and Wisconsin were accustomed to weather just as cold at home, and the men from other States didn't suffer from it. In the summertime it gets warm, and the flies and mosquitoes are extremely annoying—though they seldom cause bodily harm. No: the chief hardships which project workers have had to face were not mentioned in the sign at all. They were homesickness and the infrequency of mail deliveries. Those hardships have prompted more men to quit than the cold or heat or flies or mud or ice.

Barge, jeep, dog team, plane

The vastness of northern Canada has amazed American construction men—even those accustomed to the open spaces of Texas and Oklahoma. Mackenzie District alone covers an area of 527,000 square miles. Before the advent of Canol in all that vast area there were only 4,000 Indians and half-breeds, about 500 Eskimos (in the delta and along the Arctic coast) and 1,500 to 2,000 whites—traders, trappers, prospectors, miners, missionaries, and Government employees.

The immense distances have entailed a major problem, that of transportation. The initial plans for the Canol project did not take this sufficiently into consideration. Nor did they allow sufficiently for the vagaries of climate and terrain. As one old northerner put it: "These Americans are all right; they'll succeed. But they'll have to learn that you can't beat the North. You can't batter it down. You've got to study it and work in harmony with it. Then you'll find that it's friendly and will help you."

So that is what they are doing. They are learning fast. The sign was wrong. Men mustn't "fight" swamps, rivers, ice, and cold, or mosquitoes either. They must deal with them methodically and intelligently. But it is never easy. In the winter you have to contend with darkness, storms, and cold-weather problems, keeping your motors operating. In spring, summer, and fall you must contend with rain or mud or dust or bush-fire smoke or mosquitoes.

On the Canol project for transportation almost every conceivable type of vehicle has been used—from canoes to barges and Diesel boats, from dog teams and pack horses to jeeps and command cars, from tractors and trucks to railroad trains and airplanes.

During the first stages of the project, while there were millions of dollars worth of ground and water equipment, there were no new airplanes available to carry freight and passengers and do reconnaissance. Second-hand planes were reconditioned and called into service. Among these were Bellancas, Fairchilds, and Fokkers of 1929 vintage—some of the very planes that had pioneered northern flying. Hardy veterans, they came back to sing their swan song before being replaced by up-to-date Norsemen and Douglas transports.

So the Canol project rolls on. It is one of the indisputably good things brought by the ill winds of war. Every well drilled, every foot of pipe laid, every mile of road built, every boat or barge launched, helps to crack open the North to enrich Canada and the United States. And however many millions of dollars the cost may be before the job is finally completed, it will still be less than the cost of a couple of battleships which can be sunk in 5 minutes. But first and foremost right now, the Canol project is pointing its

1,600 miles of pipe lines like spears at the heart of Japan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE DOMESTIC SITUATION

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, 30 days ago the Members of this Congress returned to Washington after the longest opportunity any of us has had in recent years to resume personal contacts in our home States and districts. Like most of the Members, I devoted the greater part of my time during the recess to my constituency. I visited in each of the 10 counties in my own district at least twice; and I was in the larger communities more often. I met with the folks at home individually, in small conferences, and in large meetings from daylight until dark; and I exchanged views during those visits with hundreds and hundreds of people. I know beyond question of doubt that I learned the true sentiment in my district, for I met in sufficient numbers people of all interests and in all walks of life to give me a true cross section of public thinking in our area.

The people are supremely confident of final victory in this war, but far from being complacent and overconfident, most of them are convinced that victory will not come easily. In fact, the general sentiment as I observed it is that by far the hardest part of the struggle is still ahead of us. I think the American people no more underestimate the caliber of the enemy than official Washington does. And no little part of the general concern arises from the growing doubts and fears about the home front. In fact, the average citizen makes it perfectly clear to anyone who takes the time to listen to him that any danger of defeat, any delay of the final victory lies not in our military forces, but in the grave weaknesses on the home front.

In all my experience, I have never seen a people's thinking on American domestic policies so amazingly uniform. As each of you doubtless found, the alarm over our domestic situation and the utter lack of confidence in this administration's willingness or ability to improve this situation is all but unanimous.

The general frame of mind is clearly reflected, as you also doubtless found, in a militant demand that Congress move forcefully, and even drastically to clear up the almost hopeless home front muddle. The people at home are looking to Congress to effect whatever changes are necessary, since they have become convinced that there is neither the will nor the ability within this bungling bureaucracy to save the home front from chaos.

In face of this clear public sentiment, in spite of this unmistakable public demand, what has happened since this session resumed a month ago? The answer, I regret to say, is that the majority in this Congress still clings, through political habit, to policies which have been clearly repudiated; and still condones and tolerates the growing bureaucracy which is crushing the American people. The result is that we have accomplished literally nothing in the past month. In the meantime this bureaucracy continues to multiply both in personnel and mistakes, and to become increasingly offensive in its attitude to the American people. Let me recite just one example of the intolerable manner in which this machine operates.

Late in September there spread through the Midwest the report that the Office of Price Administration had prepared another cut in the value of gasoline coupons. Naturally, our people in Indiana, particularly our independent oil dealers, turned to their Congressmen as their only source of possible information on this report. When the inquiries began to pour into my office, it was natural to turn to the Director of Gasoline Rationing for information for the people who would be most seriously affected by such a cut. The director was asked specifically what O. P. A. expected to do. The questions on the subject were posed in a quite detailed conversation with the director on Monday, September 27. Please mark that date. The director said that the report arose from the fact that gasoline consumption in district 2, of which Indiana is a part, was considerably over the quota allotted by the Petroleum Administration for War; and that O. P. A. was under heavy pressure to force consumption down within the quota limits.

He went on from there, however, to assure that O. P. A. did not, at least for the time being, intend to cut coupon values. Rather, he said, it was O. P. A.'s intention to try to drive consumption down by auditing out excesses from ration allotments already outstanding. Following that statement it was asked if we in Indiana might not safely assume that such an audit would take considerable time; and that it would also be safe to assume that it would at least be a considerable time before any further coupon cut was made, if it ever became absolutely necessary to make it. The director's reply to that question was a direct and categorical affirmative. In fact, if I can understand spoken English at all, I am sure I could not have misunderstood the director's statement of the matter.

Still believing that it is possible to accept the statements of responsible Federal officials at face value, I promptly transmitted that information to the many people who had written me on the subject. The result was that my assurances that there was to be no immediate coupon cut reached my correspondents almost exactly at the same time that they read in their local papers that the cut of October 1 was going into effect. Please remember at this point that this information from the director of gasoline rationing was on Monday, September 27, just on the eve of the official announcement of the cut by O. P. A.

If you are willing to grant that I can understand plain English, you can draw only one or the other of two unpleasant conclusions. The first is that a responsible Federal official would deliberately deceive and misinform Members of Congress without any plausible reason. If such is the case in this instance, it must be remembered that the deception was gratuitous since this official, under the circumstances, was free to decline to comment.

The only other reasonable conclusion is that responsible executives in this administration do not themselves know from one day to the next what they are going to do, and that authority is so hopelessly divided and scattered that no one individual, regardless of the position he holds, can make a decision or render an opinion which is not subject to change without notice in some other office.

Whatever conclusion you choose in this instance, I repeat that it is most disquieting to us and to the American people. It is doubtless unfortunately true, also, that my particular recent experience is by no means peculiar. In fact, I know all of you must share the people's sense of futility in dealings with this Federal machine, because it is utterly impossible at any point to cut through the doubt and confusion.

There simply is no way to appease and conciliate these bureaucrats, for they have tasted power and are insatiable. It has been amply demonstrated that there is not enough common sense and practical ability in the administration hordes of dreamers and planners ever to restore efficient, businesslike operation of government. The people at home know that just as well as we do, and they are sick and tired of submitting to this bureaucratic tyranny. They are so completely fed up with it, in fact, that they will hold the majority in this Congress responsible if it does not act effectively to relieve them of the little dictators. I urge all of you in the majority who place the will of the people above selfish partisan interests to join with us in getting at the tremendous job which must be done.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THERE IS NO CURTAILMENT IN FEDERAL CIVILIAN PAY ROLLS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, there is no more vital question before the American people today than that of fully utilizing our manpower. Considerable criticism has arisen because of the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, and charges have been made frequently that there has been hoarding, as well as ineffectual use, of manpower in our essential war industries. It has been recognized generally that the Federal Government itself has accentuated this problem by maintaining civilian pay rolls far in excess of the legitimate requirements of government, even in wartime.

The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures has advocated a reduction of at least 10 percent in the Federal civilian personnel, but it would appear that there have been no definite results because of the interest taken by this influential joint committee of the Senate and House.

Many months ago, the House authorized its Committee on the Civil Service, headed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] to investigate the various Federal agencies to determine whether there is any unnecessary personnel employed in the scores of bureaus, agencies, and boards. The chairman has already indicated that there have been some developments showing that the War Department has eliminated more than 100,000 employees from its civilian rolls. This House committee has not completed its hearings, and therefore it is impossible at this time to determine whether this investigation will accomplish the desired results.

In December of 1942, legislation was enacted by Congress to increase the workweek in Federal departments from 40 to 48 hours, with a 21.6 percent increase in salary schedules. The War Overtime Pay Act of 1943, which was approved on May 7, continued the foregoing temporary arrangement, so that the Federal Government would be operating on a comparable basis to private industry, with the longer workweek in effect. During the debate on this legislation, it was pointed out that the full utilization of civilian personnel in the Federal Government would make possible a reduction in the number of employees partially to offset the increased amounts required for the pay roll. Naturally, it was assumed that it would require fewer persons working 48 hours weekly to do the same amount of work when only a 40-hour week was in effect. It was anticipated that the various agencies and bureaus in the executive department of Government would cooperate in releasing unnecessary employees for the purpose of taking more essential employment in war industries or to join the armed forces of our Nation.

The United States Civil Service Commission has just released its official reports for June and July of this year, the delay for June being occasioned by innovations in the method of presenting statistical data. I urgently request every Member to procure copies of these two reports for the purpose of analyzing current trends in Federal employment.

Mr. Speaker, the June statement of the Civil Service Commission points out that on May 31, 1943, the total number of civilian employees in the executive departments was 3,030,659, reflecting a steady increase in personnel in each of the preceding months since June 1942, when the Federal pay roll embraced 2,206,970 employees. The civil service report pointed out that the net increase for June 1943 was 37,406, computed on the old basis, making a total of 3,068,065 on June 30, 1943. This figure is approximately double the number of employees in the executive department at the time of the Pearl Harbor attack, as total personnel was listed at 1,545,131 on November 30, 1941.

If you carefully check the figures, you will observe that since the longer workweek became effective last December, there has been a constant uptrend in personnel, with a net increase of 257,194 during the first 6 months of this year. In this same period, the monthly pay roll jumped from $470,334,353 to $657,791,453, an increase of about 40 percent. Thus, it is apparent that instead of retrenchment in personnel, there has been an average monthly increase of about 43,000 and a tremendous expansion in the funds required to meet the monthly pay roll, so that it now requires almost $8,000,000,000 annually for the civilian pay roll in the executive branch of government.

The foregoing figures prove conclusively that there has been little effort made in the various Federal agencies to cooperate in using the Nation's manpower advantageously. It is doubtful whether there has been any increase in the amount of work in the various bureaus and departments since last December, but it is obvious that there has been a criminal waste of manpower by the Federal Government at a time when fathers are being drafted and nationwide demands are becoming more urgent for a National Service Act. Apologists for the administration will probably contend that most of the increased civilian personnel is required by the War and Navy Departments. While these two departments on June 30 did employ almost 2,000,000 civilians, it is noteworthy that other departments and agencies employed in excess of 1,000,000 civilians, as compared with about 918,000 civilian employees in the entire executive department of Government at the peak of employment during the First World War.

The legislative branch of Government should not be held responsible for maladministration in the executive branch, but in view of the fact that Congress has cooperated with this administration in providing necessary funds and in complying with requests of the Bureau of the Budget, it is only reasonable to ask why the Commander in Chief permits his branch of the Government to set such a tragic example for the rest of the Nation. It is unfortunate that many thousands of Federal employees have received deferment from military service, and have not accepted more essential employment on farms and in war industries.

The American people today are fully aware of the tremendous burdens which have been placed upon this Nation in prosecuting this war. Charges have frequently been made that this administration is not efficient on the home front. While millions of our American boys are fighting in every battle zone, there is little need for maintaining Federal pay rolls which are actually retarding our war program. Today millions of Americans who are operating farms and small businesses are laboring under great difficulties because of the shortage of manpower. Nevertheless, the Federal Government is displaying almost criminal neglect and indifference in the operation of the executive branch of Government, and it is time that some effective action is taken by the Congress. For many months we have been receiving promises that some action will be forthcoming, but one must conclude that the war will be over before any retrenchment takes place.

Mr. Speaker, every legislative committee—and particularly the House Committee on Appropriations—should give careful consideration to this perpetuation of a bungling and inefficient bureaucracy when the Nation is facing many serious problems. Demands have been made by Secretary Morgenthau for $10,500,000,000 of additional tax revenue, but no reference was made to any contemplated plan to reduce the cost of operating the civilian branch of Government.

This is not a partisan question, and I appeal for the active support of all Members of the House who are interested not only in maintaining our present form of government on an efficient basis but who surely recognize that it is our duty to help preserve a public morale that will insure a decisive military victory. We must win this war on the home front while our fighting forces are waging a successful battle in the combat zones.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE PROPOSED UNITED NATIONS BANK

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department announced on the 4th of October a plan which it called: "Guiding Principles for Proposed United Nations Bank for Reconstruction and Development." This announcement was followed by an executive session before three committees of this House, following which exactly the same thing happened as happened after the executive sessions before committees of this House on the proposed currency stabilization plan: The Members of this House were required to keep quiet, to make no comment on what had happened, to hold their peace while sentiment was sounded out by the Treasury in various directions, but just as in the case of the currency stabilization program a news leak developed. This news leak, just as the other news leak, developed in London, and the British press, of course, again scooped the American press, and the Members of the American Congress who were not present at the committee hearings, and the American public by publishing the entire plan for the new world bank. I submit that these news leaks are not accidental; they do not occur purely through mischance or indavertence, and they work a great disservice to the American press and the American public.

Somebody, perhaps in the Treasury, I might even say probably in the Treasury, is, for some reason best known to that person or those persons, permitting information to escape through London before we in America are told about it. Since, however, through the courtesy of the British press we Americans are informed of the details 4 days after the executive committee session in Washington, I assume it is now proper for Members of this House to discuss the matter.

The purpose of the bank is stated as follows:

> The bank will encourage private financial agencies to provide long-term capital for the sound development of the productive resources of the member countries and when

necessary will cooperate with and supplement private capital for such purposes. The capital of the bank is $10,000,000,000. Member countries will make an initial payment of 20 percent of their share. The initial and subsequent payments are to be made partly in gold and partly in legal currency, the proportion paid in gold not exceeding 20 percent, will be fixed by a schedule which takes into account the adequacy of the gold holdings of each member country.

I leave it to you as to which member countries have the gold. If other member countries do not have the gold, from whom will they get it and on what terms? And, having got the gold from us perhaps by gift, perhaps by lend-lease, perhaps by some donation through the aid of the sources in London of which we know nothing, in some mysterious method the gold will be transferred to other countries.

They will take the gold which they get from us to contribute as their national contribution to the member banks.

Will they vote in this member bank in proportion to their holdings? Oh, no; they will not. The statement is: "The voting power of the member countries will be closely related to their share holdings."

Bear in mind I am referring now to the report which comes out of London, and it has to be assumed this is substantially correct because the New York Times on October 9 publishes the entire text and that text conforms to the information which I have and is word for word exactly the same text. We are told that the voting power of the countries will be "closely related" to their share holdings.

I suspect you will find out that the voting power of the United States will be substantially less than the contribution of the United States to the member bank. We put in the money, but the other countries will have a greater proportion of voting power.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If that were not true, they would not take us in. That is all they want us for, is it not?

Mr. SCOTT. Dr. White states that substantially, according to the New York Times. He says that we cannot hope to gain control even though we were willing to put up 51 percent because other countries would not stand for it. At the same time we are expected to stand for a proposal that gives us a lesser vote than our contribution, which is coming to be our historic position, I may add.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Have we been saving this gold, that I understand is down in the Kentucky hills, to finance this bank? Is that what we are getting that gold together for?

Mr. SCOTT. It seems to me that may be so. There seems to be no other reason for hoarding the gold.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Does the gentleman mean that a small nation, such as Holland or Belgium could acquire a great number of shares, more than Britain or the United States?

Mr. SCOTT. I think that is rather unlikely unless such nation proves to be unusually persuasive. I rather think that the persuasion may be on the part of Great Britain or some of the major nations rather than some of the smaller ones.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Can anyone think of a good reason why, when the United States is lending money to foreign countries, it should not make its own terms and have entire control of the loan rather than give it over to some group consisting of foreign nations or anybody else?

Mr. SCOTT. It is rather hard to answer the gentlewoman's question because our fiscal affairs move in a strange and mysterious way; the Treasury's proposal looks like some of the old magician's tricks: done with mirrors.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Does the gentleman know of any banker in his own private business who would ever exercise such lack of prudence about his own money?

Mr. SCOTT. I quite agree with the gentlewoman, I doubt very much if such situation would pass muster at any crossroads town or village anywhere in the United States, but we are dealing in international affairs and I understand in such case you are assumed to take leave of your fiscal sense when you do that.

Mr. ROLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. I am glad that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has brought up the question of this meeting and the fact it was an executive meeting. May I say I think it is a great mistake to have secret meetings such as we attended. I attended the meeting with the gentleman. I really believe that in the future we should do away with executive meetings because it is the people's business and the people should be informed of the situation at all times.

Mr. SCOTT. I quite agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman. I hope I can get a little more time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot see where the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] gets this idea that the people have any interest in this thing. All the people have to do, as I get the scheme of the administration, is to furnish the money, pay the taxes, and furnish what other countries want. There is no reason why the American citizen should know anything about what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. My responsibility, however, is to the people, I am serving the people here and this is the people's business.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is all right, but you are running contrary to the New Deal and we are at war. The whole theory of this administration is that the planners know it all; that the citizen knows nothing; that he has no rights.

Mr. SCOTT. I am going to get back to what the gentlewoman said in reference to the private bankers. Dr. White has his own idea about where the private bankers come in. I am going to quote again from the New York Times and not from the executive session, and this in turn comes from London. Dr. White says:

> The bankers would make their own international loans where they could get the high rates and good risks but in other countries where the risk factor is high they would probably prefer collaboration with the bank.

In other words, if the loan is no good, take it to the world bank, get American dollars, and the American major contribution of assets will apply to the hazard and the risks which are no good, but to the low risks let the bankers take those and charge high rates of interest, which is a rather surprising statement, as I read it.

May I go on a little further:

> The operations of the bank include these powers, that the bank may guarantee loans made with private capital to any member government—

And here we go back to repeat the mistakes made after the last war—

> and through the government to any of its political subdivisions and to business and industrial enterprise in the member countries. The bank may participate in loans made with private capital or make loans out of its own resources only when the borrower is unable to secure the funds from private investment sources on reasonable terms.

In other words, that is only when the loan, as I understand it, is not a good risk. If it is a good risk, private capital will take care of it on "reasonable" terms. "Reasonable," however, could be whatever the lender and borrower agreed on.

We are told also in this plan which comes to us from the Treasury by way of London:

> The decisions of the bank will be based exclusively on economic considerations.

We are not told what guaranty we have that the decisions will not be made on political considerations, and I suggest to you that when loans come before this bank from Brazil or from Argentina, how are you going to keep political considerations out? Suppose you had a loan from India, how would you keep political considerations out? Suppose you had loans from some of the Balkan states, if there are any Balkan states

left in the planning of our master minds, or from the Baltic states, if any of those are left, how are you going to keep political considerations out?

Now I come to what I regard as the main theme of what I have to say here, but before I get to it I want you to know that the plan of the world bank as propounded by the Treasury Department has been greeted with peals of joy in certain foreign countries. You, of course, can guess why the foreign countries are so glad to hear the news of a world bank. Let me tell you how it was received in Portugal. I am quoting from the New York Times, this time not by way of London, but by way of Lisbon:

A United States Treasury plan to help keep the world going after the war through united and associated nations' financial aid was welcomed by the newspaper Diario de Lisboa today.

I quote from the Lisbon paper:

It is a colossal effort that only a powerful, rich nation, full of generosity and capable of large-scale initiative, could realize—

Diario said. Then quoting again:

Peace would be another war just as dreadful and dangerous if victory should serve only to give satisfaction to plutocratic appetites.

I think the Lisbon papers and the American people ought to be told that satisfaction will be given to the plutocratic appetites; they are going to get the good risks at the high rates. The bank is going to get only the bad risks with American dollars at rates unstated. So if the plan goes through, Lisbon and London can relax.

The bank will impose no condition—

Says the text of the plan—

as to the member country in which the proceeds of a loan are to be spent.

What does that mean? Does it mean that the loans to one country may be used to advance that country's trade interests in another country, and, if so, will loans to Great Britain be used to advance that country's trade interests in Argentina? We are not told, but it is in the text.

I again call your attention to the fact that I am quoting from the text appearing in the New York Times of October 9 by way of London.

Payments of principal and interest—

We are told—

must be made in free currencies, or by agreement, in the currency in which the loan was made. In the event of an acute exchange stringency, payments of interest or principal may be made for a reasonable period in local currencies to be replaced subsequently with free currencies.

What does that mean? This is the catch in the whole proceeding. It means simply that we make loans in American dollars or in pounds sterling. These loans so made to other countries must be repaid either in gold or free currency, but if the other nation is unable to repay us in gold or in so-called free currency, it may repay us in the local currency of the nation, in reichmarks, in drachmas, in francs, or in yen, in any number of currencies, printing-press money, paper money, for a reasonable period of time.

In other words, if another nation should go bankrupt, they can repay us in their bankrupt currency for what somebody says is a reasonable period of time, not stated here, at the end of which time the bankrupt gets help from somewhere. I will give you only one guess as to where that bankrupt country again comes to get help. Then he resumes gold or free currency payment—maybe.

I do not know whether any of you ever heard of a bankrupt being allowed to pay in worthless paper, or proportionately worthless paper, for a period of years, and then be given the opportunity at the end of several years, say, to start paying again in good money; but so this plan proposes, and that is just one of its crackpot features.

But look how this plan works. These, by the way, are called reconstruction or rehabilitation loans. Dr. White in the New York Times' article admitted that it was a little hard to distinguish between reconstruction and rehabilitation. You will recall that after the last war so-called reconstruction or rehabilitation loans were made to South American countries and to European countries, and that after the last war every country except Finland defaulted. My question on that is just this. If all of the countries after the last war except Finland were unable to pay their reconstruction or rehabilitation loans, which last time the private bankers negotiated, what is going to happen to the world bank if, having received all of the dollars in the bank and all of the sterling in the bank, perhaps, then every country in the world again, we will say, with the exception of Finland, to preserve the analogy, defaults and alleges that it cannot pay in anything but printing press money. Then we have assumed the burden of all the reconstruction and rehabilitation loans, if I may use a famous phrase, "Everywhere in the world."

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman uses "rehabilitation" and "reconstruction" as if they were synonymous. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that relief and rehabilitation are to be handled on a free basis, as I understand, under the set-up that is to be created at the White House November 9, and reconstruction is to be handled under this bank. I should like to have the gentleman's opinion on whether it would not be better to have loans or some arrangement to pay for both rehabilitation and reconstruction, rather than to have two agencies vying with each other as to whether it should be done free or through the means of loans.

Mr. SCOTT. I think the gentleman makes a very sound and constructive suggestion. I did not know that I had given the impression that the fuzziness of distinction was in my own mind. I had reference to a quotation from Dr. White, in which he stated or admitted that it was difficult to draw a line between rehabilitation and reconstruction, but he says the purpose of the banks' loans would be to provide long term capital for such purposes as rehabilitating power plants, water systems and other capital structures.

I have just a word to say in conclusion. I regret very much that during the time that we are down here for this so-called "cooling off" period, we are given no legislation to act on. Most of us are waiting for the administration to send us something to do. We are not getting anywhere today. I cannot think of a better way to spend the time than to point out what the administration is busy doing behind the scenes, while pretending to the people that Congress is falling down on its job, and I say to the administration and to the leaders of the administration in the executive and legislative departments, give us the tools, and we will do the work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain articles from Maclean's magazine. I am informed that the cost will be $158, but I ask unanimous consent that it be done nevertheless.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief set of resolutions from the local grange.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of Highway Transportation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INFLATION CONGRESS NOW HAS PLENTY TO DO

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman preceding me said that Congress needed something to do. To my mind, Congress has plenty to do. Our No. 1 problem is winning the war. Fine progress is being made, and we are all of the opinion that everything is being done that can be done to win the war. Our No. 2 problem is keeping down inflation—ruinous, run-away inflation. It is possible for us to win the war on the 55 battle fronts where our soldiers are fighting today, and at the same time lose the war right here at home through ruinous or run-away inflation. It is possible for our dollars not to be worth more than dimes. To many people, to the very rich, that will not mean much, because they can go through inflation and they are the only ones who can. Inflation, however, will destroy the middle class of this country, the people who work

on fixed salaries, wages, and who live on dividend payments and fixed payments of any kind. They will be wiped out quickly by any kind of run-away inflation. Of course, the lower income groups will be wiped out right along with the middle class. There are several ways to attack this problem. One way is an unpopular way—that is, through price fixing, price control. You cannot attempt to fix prices on 8,000,000 different commodities, products, and different types of services in this country without doing things that will be unpopular, and mistakes will be made, but we should not point to just a few mistakes and say we should destroy the whole price-control law. If we do not have successful price control, we will have inflation in this country that will cause us to lose as much in property and money values as we would lose if we were to lose the war. That is a broad statement, but our country can be destroyed here at home through inflation. Here is where the duty of Congress comes in, and that is the power to levy taxes.

Our Constitution provides that the tax bills must originate in the House of Representatives, and under our parliamentary procedure they can originate only in the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives. A tax bill cannot originate in the Senate. It must originate in the House. That is a wise provision of our Constitution. That means that we will never have a dictatorship in this country as long as we have the Representatives of the people in this body, 435 elected every 2 years, and as long as a tax bill can originate only here in the House among Representatives elected every 2 years. That gives the people the power to control the policies of their Government, and, further, they are safeguarded by reason of the fact that only Congress can appropriate money. The Executive cannot tax the people and neither can the Executive take money that has been raised and expend it, unless this Congress, one House of which is composed of Members elected every 2 years, authorizes it to be spent. So there is a safeguard. Here is where Congress has a duty to perform, which Congress is not performing. The President has not said that Congress is to blame. But I think Congress is to be blamed because we are not making it possible for more of the cost of the war to be paid while the war is going on.

In England and Canada they are paying much more than 50 percent of the cost of the war as they go along. But we are not doing that here. We are paying probably 33⅓ percent—not nearly as much as England and Canada. Consequently in England and Canada price control is not a difficult problem. So much of the buying power of the people has been siphoned off through taxes that the people do not have the money to go into the markets and compete with one another for the scarce and limited supplies of goods that they have. That is not true here. People have lots of money and they are in competition with one another. Unless we do have successful price control we will have ruinous inflation.

In some countries of the world today, in Russia and China, for instance, it costs $1.25 in American money to buy a loaf of bread; $400 to buy an ordinary suit of clothes; $70 to $90 to buy a pound of butter; $7.50 to buy half a pint of milk—in our money. It can happen here.

Now, the Executive has asked us to pass a tax bill that would raise something like $16,000,000,000 this year. Of course, taxes are always unpopular. I guess the most popular Member of Congress is one who votes for all appropriations to spend all the money, and who votes against all tax bills that would raise money. That is a fine, popular record; but occasionally we have to vote for tax bills to protect and save our country. In this particular case I think the Congress is very vulnerable in failing to pay more of the cost of the war as we go along.

Much has been said about the returning servicemen; how it will be unfair to them to leave a debt of a half billion dollars on account of subsidies or for other reasons, that the returning servicemen must pay. I will tell you something that is even worse than that. For every dollar that we borrow on long-term bonds we will eventually pay $1 in interest on that $1. So that we will eventually have to pay $2 for every one that we borrow. If the debt is long enough it will be more than that. But judging the future by the past, we will pay $2 for every one we borrow. If we do not pay a sufficient amount of the cost of this war as we go along, and the serviceman comes back here after the war has been won, he has got to pay $2 for every one we have borrowed. So it is unfair to the serviceman who is winning the war on the battle fronts today to come back here and pay this cost of the war double and treble.

Furthermore, we cannot keep down inflation adequately and properly without adequate tax measures. I know it is unpopular to advocate price control. It is unpopular to advocate more taxes, but in a case like this I say that Congress has a solemn duty to perform that the Executive cannot perform, that the judiciary cannot perform, that no other branch of our Government can perform except the Congress of the United States, and that is to pay more of the cost of this war as we go along so as to keep down inflation, and also to keep the servicemen who win this war from being compelled to come back here and pay two or three times its cost.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. The gentleman says that England is paying half of the cost of the war and we are paying approximately one-third. That is true, but considering the population of the two nations how does the gentleman justify the fact that we should put up $120,000,000,000 this year as our war cost, compared with $21,000,000,000 for England?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not going to get into any fight with England or Russia or any other country allied with us in this war. I do not think that is creating unity. If there are any injustices or inequities our leaders should work them out so as not to have us get into a fight here in our legislative body in a way that would be displeasing to our allies. I think too much has been done in that direction already.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. We are getting back to the point that we must pay them to pacify them.

Mr. PATMAN. We will never have exact justice in international affairs or in domestic affairs. In other words, it is not contemplated under the law. You go over to the Supreme Court building and look at that inscription. It does not say "Exact Justice Under Law." It says "Equal Justice Under Law." So let us not expect to have exactness in everything.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. My thought is this, that it is not fair to the American public to take from them in the form of additional taxes in order to satisfy the allies.

Mr. PATMAN. I am personally willing to spend money to save lives.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Every one of us is.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not willing to get into a fight with them over money if we can save lives by going ahead and successfully prosecuting this war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

AMENDING THE SELECTIVE SERVICE AND TRAINING ACT

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill amending the Selective Service and Training Act to provide that any boy 18 or 19 in his senior year of high school, or any similar institution, shall, upon request, have his induction postponed until the end of such academic year.

Under the law as it now reads any boy 18 or 19 years of age may have his induction postponed if he should be ordered to report during the last half of any academic year at high school or a similar institution. Under my bill this provision remains as it is. The only change made is that if such a boy happens to be in his senior year, and should be called for induction at any time during the academic year, he shall, upon request, be deferred until the end of such year.

I have introduced this bill to clarify the situation concerning boys in their senior year who reach the age of 18 prior to the last half of the academic year. The present law has caused great confusion among high-school principals and students. Local draft boards have placed different interpretations on the same. In some localities high-school seniors who reach the age of 18 have been inducted. In other places the local draft boards have taken a more liberal

view and have deferred these boys until the second half of the academic year so that they could come under the provisions of this act.

I think we should permit every boy to finish his senior year in high school if possible. Many of these boys being drafted will never again enter school. Every boy should at least have a high-school education. A boy lacking a few months of graduating certainly should be permitted to finish his course.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Colorado be extended 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman please say what the situation is at the present time? Just this morning I wrote the Secretary of War and the Secretary of State and the head of the National Selective Administration asking them questions on the same subject which the gentleman is now discussing as to young men; that is, boys of 18 years, whose induction period comes in the last half of the school year. The fact is today there is no alternative to their being inducted if they are within 60 or 90 days of the end of the school year.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The situation is this: The present Congress, by Public Law 126, which was approved July 9, of this year, provided that a boy 18 or 19 who is ordered to report for induction under this act during the last half of one of his academic years shall, upon his request, have his induction postponed until the end of such academic year.

Mr. PHILLIPS. What does the bill of the gentleman provide?

Mr. CHENOWETH. My bill provides that if such a boy is in his senior year in high school he shall be deferred at any time during the academic year. This is to take care of boys who will reach the age of 18 during the next 2 or 3 months and before the second semester begins. My bill will permit these seniors to complete their last year in high school and graduate next spring.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I am referring to seniors in high school who become 18 during the first half of the academic year.

Mr. PHILLIPS. But if they are in their second semester, at the present time, they would be deferred?

Mr. CHENOWETH. That is correct. In most schools the second semester starts about the middle of January or the first of February. My bill protects those boys who are now reaching the age of 18, who are anxious to finish their senior year in high school, and who otherwise would be subject to induction.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and embrace therein a highly informative address made by Brig. Gen. James A. O'Connor, of the United States Army in command of the Northwest Service Command at Vancouver, B. C., on September 26, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3291. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 13, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold a hearing on H. R. 2994, Wednesday, October 13, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, 416 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 3334, to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 321. Resolution granting a gratuity to Mrs. Virginia Thrift; without amendment (Rept. No. 751). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 1951. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 760). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2199. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia", approved February 28, 1898, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 761). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2866. A bill to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to the carrying of concealed weapons; without amendment (Rept. No. 762). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3313. A bill to amend section 10 of the act of March 3, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor-vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia, increase the number of judges of the police court, and for other purposes", as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 763). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 3306. A bill to authorize the conveyance of Harrison Park in the city of Vincennes to Vincennes University; without amendment (Rept. No. 764). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. S. 425. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of J. C. Munn; without amendment (Rept. No. 752). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. S. 560. An act for the relief of Western Maryland Dairy, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 753). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2600. A bill for the relief of M. C. Roberts; without amendment (Rept. No. 754). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2627. A bill for the relief of Ruben M. Herren; without amendment (Rept. No. 755). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2730. A bill for the relief of Mrs. E. B. Neville; without amendment (Rept. No. 756). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2905. A bill for the relief of Walter R. Jones; with amendment (Rept. No. 757). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3076. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cecilia Martin, mother of Arthur J. Martin, Jr., a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 758). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3153. A bill for the relief of the estate of Jennie I. Weston, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 759). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2707. A bill for the relief of Henry White; with amendment (Rept. No. 765). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 3435. A bill to incorporate The Mothers of World War No. 2, to set forth and establish the purposes and aims of the organization, fixing its corporate powers, and establishing the rights of membership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. R. 3436. A bill to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 3437. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school students; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 3438. A bill for the relief of Skagway Lodge, No. 431, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of Skagway, Alaska; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARLSON of Kansas:

H. R. 3439. A bill for the relief of John Jehlik; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 3440. A bill for the relief of Agnes W. Bange; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 3441. A bill for the relief of R. H. Price, Ocoee, Tenn.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2805. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication from H. E. Sloan, independent oil operator of Fairfield, Ill., urging an increase in the price of crude petroleum as a necessary means to stimulate much needed oil production; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2806. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of Mrs. W. P. Connoss and 44 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2807. Also, petition of Eleanor E. Horton and 13 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the passage of the Austin-Wadsworth bill because it violates the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution, would reintroduce slavery, and is contrary to labor slogan, Free labor will win the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2808. Also, petition of Dr. Henry L. Holter and 36 other residents of Spokane, Wash., requesting that everything possible be done to encourage the passage of House bill 117 and Senate bill 100, regarding the securing of food and clothing for the starving children of Europe; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2809. Also, petition of Mrs. C. R. Tang and 20 other residents of Spokane, Wash., requesting that everything possible be done to encourage the passage of House bill 117 and Senate bill 100, regarding the securing of food and clothing for the starving children of Europe; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2810. Also, petition of Ida O. Harthold and 21 other residents of Spokane, Wash., requesting that everything possible be done to encourage the passage of House bill 117 and Senate bill 100, regarding the securing of food and clothing for the starving children of Europe; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2811. Also, petition of Karl A. Anderson and 19 other residents of Spokane, Wash., requesting that everything possible be done to encourage the passage of House bill 117 and Senate bill 100, regarding the securing of food and clothing for the starving children of Europe; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2812. Also, petition of Mrs. E. B. Engelhart and 19 other residents of Spokane, Wash., requesting that everything possible be done to encourage the passage of House bill 117 and Senate bill 100, regarding the securing of food and clothing for the starving children of Europe; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2813. Also, petition of A. G. Ryan and 29 other residents of Soap Lake and Ephrata, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2814. Also, petition of Fred Forsyth and 29 other residents of Soap Lake, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2815. Also, petition of Frank Morrow and 25 other residents of Mason City and Ephrata, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2816. Also, petition of H. Babcock and 29 other residents of Ephrata and Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2817. Also, petition of Augusta Moller and 30 other residents of Grand Coulee, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2818. Also, petition of F. W. Hogg and 29 other residents of Electric City, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2819. Also, petition of J. M. Vosbell and 30 other residents of Coulee Dam, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2820. Also, petition of Leon Dobson and 29 other residents of Odessa, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2821. Also, petition of Russell Pentz and 29 other residents of Okanogan and Omak, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2822. Also, petition of Byran E. Harris and 29 other residents of Omak and Tonasket, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2823. Also, petition of L. J. Wax and 29 other residents of Omak, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2824. Also, petition of F. W. Peir and 29 other residents of Okanogan, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 3082 and Senate bill 860, or any legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2825. Also, petition of Ray C. Woodward and 31 other residents of Omak, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2826. Also, petition of Keith Stewart and 29 other residents of Wenatchee and Omak, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2827. Also, petition of Lawrence Morris, of Monse, and 29 other residents of Okanogan and Omak, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2828. Also, petition of Lena Laughery and 29 other residents of Omak, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2829. Also, petition of Harry Baker and 29 other residents of Omak, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2830. Also, petition of Walter Fox and 29 other residents of Okanogan, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary

2831. By Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Petition of 79 citizens of Wilmington, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3832. Also, petition of 20 citizens of Cheviot, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2833. Also, petition of 20 citizens of Osborn, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2834. Also, petition of 40 citizens of Xenia, Ohio, protesting the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2835. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Annie Kriesche, of Joliet, Ill., and 21 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2836. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mrs. J. T. Steele and others, of Webb City, Mo., and vicinity, urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2837. By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of 700 residents of the Twelfth Congressional District of California, favoring passage of

House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2838. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of sundry citizens of Jasper County, Iowa, in the interest of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of material necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2839. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Olive Brown, of Washington, D. C., and 19 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2840. Also, petition of Robert H. Harrison, of Washington, D. C., and 119 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2841. Also, petition of John E. Reardon and signed by 160 citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2842. Also, petition of the Gilbert Brass Foundry and signed by 18 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2843. Also, petition of the National Association of Letter Carriers and signed by 21 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2844. Also, petition of Edward O. Herget and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2845. Also, petition of the Laclede Steel Co. and signed by 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2846. Also, petition of Arthur Lautner and 54 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2847. Also, petition of the Crunden-Martin Manufacturing Co. and signed by 43 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2848. Also, petition of the Cook Paint & Varnish Co. and signed by 38 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2849. Also, petition of the United States Cartridge Co. and signed by 101 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2850. Also, petition of John B. Ross and 22 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2851 Also, petition of D. M. Heinly, of Greenbelt, Md., and 19 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2852. Also, petition of Harry Rivetts, of Fort Belvoir, Va., and 19 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2853. Also, petition of Hammond Mattison, of Washington, D. C., and 18 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2854. By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Petition of 1,743 residents of the Fifteenth Illinois Congressional District, requesting the banning of alcohol and vice near military camps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2855. By Mr. CLASON: Petition of the Bogey Beverage Co. of Springfield, Mass., and several hundred other persons opposing the passage of House bill 2082, restricting the sale of alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2856. By Mr. DELANEY: Petition of 230 citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against consideration of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary

2857. By Mr. JENKINS: Petition signed by 135 members of the Fraternal Order of Eagles of Aerie No. 468, with headquarters at Glouster, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, or any other prohibition measure and requesting that Members of Congress vote against any and all proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2858. Also, petition signed by 20 members of the Fraternal Order of Eagles of Chauncey, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, or any other prohibition measure and requesting that Members of Congress vote against any and all proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2859. Also, petition signed by 19 members of the Fraternal Order of Eagles of Athens County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, or any other prohibition measure and requesting that Members of Congress vote against any and all proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2860. By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Petition of the Binghamton Grange, with 12 names, concerning House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2861. Also, petition of committee of citizens of Chenango Bridge, N. Y., with 50 names, with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2862. Also, petition of committee of citizens of Johnson City, N. Y., with 78 names, with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2863. Also, petition of members and friends of the Free Methodist Church of Brighton, N. Y., with 24 names, referring to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2864. Also, petition of committee of citizens of Castle Creek, N. Y., with 41 names, referring to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2865. Also, petition of Port Dickinson-Hillcrest Woman's Christian Temperance Union, with 42 names, referring to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2866. Also, petition of members and friends of the Hawleyton and Conklin Forks Methodist Church, with 59 names, referring to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the fairest among ten thousand and the bright and morning star, we pray Thee to send Thy redeeming force throughout this sick and agonizing world. As countless voices and songs may be gathered and blended into one strain of music, blessed Lord God, we pray that the dreams, the hopes, the aspirations and the wills of the United Nations may stand as one for the permanent overthrow of the devastating Huns and pagans of Christian civilization.

This day, Father, draw us into the harmonies of Thy law and into the blessings of Thy grace that we may hear the whisper of truth and the appeal of duty. Along the way of difficult tasks and in severe discipline, O let us perceive that the way of real life lies here. In all the conceptions of service there can be no loftier ambition, no deeper desire, and no sublimer purpose than to know Thy will and love to follow it.

Heavenly Father our hearts are again stirred, in this solemn stillness we are reminded of the brevity and uncertainty of our earthly pilgrimage. Again the summons has come and a faithful servant has left us. We pray for the blessings of Thy comfort to rest upon the fireside.

"There is a green hill far away;
Without a city wall.
Where the dear Lord was crucified
Who died to save us all.

"We may not know, we cannot tell
What pains He had to bear.
But we believe it was for us
He hung and suffered there."

In His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 128. An act to authorize a per capita payment of $10 to the members of the Santa Clara Pueblo of New Mexico from funds on deposit to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

H. R. 304. An act for the relief of J. E. Martin;

H. R. 305. An act for the relief of Howard Morgan;

H. R. 693. An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942;

H. R. 938. An act for the relief of Mrs. Robert C. Anderson;

H. R. 1222. An act for the relief of Jacob Wolozin;

H. R. 1869. An act authorizing the President to present in the name of Congress a Distinguished Service Cross to George F. Thompson;

H. R. 2250. An act to extend the provisions of the Reclassification Act of February 28, 1925, to include custodial employees in the Postal Service;

H. R. 2649. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.," approved April 20, 1942; and

H. R. 2734. An act for the relief of Kathleen B. Maier.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint reso-

lution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 714. An act for the relief of the commissioned officers of the U. S. S. *St. Louis* during the Spanish-American War, May 18, 1898, to September 2, 1898;

S. 771. An act to provide for payment of pensions and compensation to certain persons who are receiving retired pay;

S. 759. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of W. I. Dooly;

S. 862. An act for the relief of the Grafton Boat Works;

S. 950. An act for the relief of the Milford Trust Co. and Blanche R. Bennett, as administrators of the estate of Charles E. Reed, deceased;

S. 970. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably;

S. 1008. An act for the relief of Gerald G. Woods;

S. 1151. An act to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to the carrying of concealed weapons;

S. 1169. An act for the relief of Samuel Margolin;

S. 1246. An act for the relief of Ervin S. Finley;

S. 1255. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said Commission; and authorizing said Commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark., and for other purposes," approved May 17, 1939;

S. 1282. An act for the relief of Eric W. Rodgers;

S. 1293. An act for the relief of Cleo Pickrell;

S. 1309. An act for the relief of Pan American Airway, Inc.;

S. 1315. An act providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy of certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina;

S. 1336. An act to authorize the transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes;

S. 1346. An act for the relief of the R. B. Walker Funeral Home;

S. 1347. An act to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942;

S. 1348. An act to amend the second paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942;

S. 1349. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York certain lands within the Brooklyn Navy Yard in the city of New York;

S. 1350. An act to establish the grades of commissioned warrant officer and warrant officer in the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

S. 1351. An act to amend the act of May 27, 1908, as amended, authorizing settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps;

S. 1352. An act to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service;

S. 1354. An act to amend the act approved January 16, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United States Naval Academy";

S. 1382. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions;

S. 1386. An act making it a misdemeanor to stow away on aircraft and providing punishment therefor; and

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2299. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of W. M. Hurley and Joe Whitson;

H. R. 2859. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 2886. An act to provide for the removal of oysters from the waters of York River and Queen Creek, Va., affected by sewage disposal emanating from the construction battalion training camp, at Camp Peary, Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2888. An act relating to the application of the excess-profits tax to certain production bonus payments; and

H. R. 3208. An act to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 378. An act to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on Tuesday, October 12, 1943, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3291. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

THE LATE EDWARD W. CREAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN].

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I send the following resolution (H. Res. 322) to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. EDWARD W. CREAL, a Representative from the State of Kentucky.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad mission to announce to the House that this morning at his home in Hodgenville, Larue County, Ky., our respected and beloved colleague, EDWARD W. CREAL, passed from the paths of living men peacefully and quietly into the Great Beyond.

Mr. CREAL was elected to the House of Representatives at a special election on November 5, 1935, and had served with ability and distinction until today. The district represented by Mr. CREAL is one of the great historic districts of America. Within its confines are two of our best-loved shrines, the mansion of Judge John Rowan which was the inspiration of the soul-stirring melody of Stephen Collins Foster, My Old Kentucky Home, now a State shrine; and a few miles from the birthplace of Mr. CREAL, and the home in which he passed away, is another of our most cherished shrines, the log cabin in which was born that great American, that mystic mingling of clod and star, Abraham Lincoln.

Day before yesterday I spoke in the historic courthouse at Hodgenville. Mr. CREAL spoke, preceding my talk, in behalf of the election of the Democratic State ticket in Kentucky this year.

Mr. CREAL represented a district that has always upheld high standards in the selection of men coming to Congress, a district represented by such men as John Rowan, James Proctor Knott, Ben Hardin, whom John Randolph, of Roanoke, after serving with him in the House, called "the kitchen knife" because of his methods in debate, the sage of Bardstown, Ben Johnson, who is remembered by a number of our colleagues still in the House, and more recently by the late Judge Henry DeHaven Moorman, one of the founders in Paris, France, of the American Legion, the late J. D. Craddock, and our lamented late colleague, Cap R. Carden, the immediate predecessor of Mr. CREAL. Long before the days when Horace Greely gave the advice: "Go West, young man," James Buchanan left his home in Pennsylvania and crossed the Alleghany Mountains to seek fame and fortune at the bar and eminence in the public life of the new State of Kentucky. He afterward said that he found competition there in the person of Ben Hardin and such outstanding contemporaries of that great lawyer as Robert Wickliff and William Grigsby so strong that he decided to return to his native State, later to become President of the United States. The Fourth District sustained its best traditions in sending to Congress a man possessing the ability, character, and courage of ED CREAL.

ED CREAL was an ardent patriot. He was a stanch member of the Democratic Party which in his judgment was the greatest instrumentality for good government and for the perpetuation of constitutional government in this country. He belonged to the great fraternity of country editors, and owned and edited his home town paper until his death. He served with distinction as superintendent of the county schools, as county attorney, as commonwealth's attorney in his judicial district for many years. He was for 15 years a member of the Democratic State Central Executive Committee, the governing body of the Democratic Party in Kentucky, always performing yeoman service for his State and his

people and his party. He had an active part, although not then a member of any legislative body, in the most recent congressional redistricting of Kentucky, and except for him it is doubtful if the redistricting bill which was so badly needed would have been enacted by the Kentucky Legislature in 1932.

ED CREAL'S first object of devotion in this House and at home was the basic industry of agriculture. He represented a great burley tobacco producing district. He studied tobacco problems and understood them; he always fought the battles of the tobacco growers when their welfare was at stake. During the 20 years of my acquaintance with him he was always a sage in the councils and a flashing scimitar on the battlefields of democracy in Kentucky. He was an able lawyer, a gifted editor, a highly respected Member of this House, an effective public speaker who always commanded attention when he addressed this body, a public servant who regarded his office as a public trust.

It is with deep sadness that I announce his death to his colleagues who knew him, who respected him, and who were devoted to him in life.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, the beautiful tribute paid ED CREAL by the senior Member of our delegation from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] is certainly approved of and joined in by those of the Kentucky delegation. I wish to speak of ED CREAL for just a moment as a personality.

Our friend and colleague was deeply beloved by all who knew him, not only in Kentucky but elsewhere. He was a man who had the capacity for true and abiding friendship and he never disappointed anyone who placed confidence in him.

He was not well at any time while he was in the House. Some of his colleagues may not have known him so well as those who were in the delegation from Kentucky.

He had a brilliant mind, balanced by sound common sense. ED CREAL'S family owned the land upon which Abraham Lincoln was born and many times in my association with him I recognized a striking similarity. Both were distinguished by an extraordinary knowledge of their fellow man and a deep devotion to him. Both had a rare individual sense of humor, based upon an understanding and sympathy with the frailties of mankind. ED CREAL was a splendid lawyer and a man of the highest character.

The influence of his life will be felt for years to come and he will be missed always by those who knew him as a friend.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as a committee of Members of the House to attend the funeral the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. CHAPMAN, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. ROBSION, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. GREGORY, and the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. VINCENT.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 14, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet at 10:30 a. m. Thursday, October 14, 1943.

The national commanders of the veterans' organizations will present their general legislative programs.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads (full committee) will meet in open and executive sessions on Friday, October 15, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., for consideration of S. 970, authorizing the Postmaster General to use certain postal employees interchangeably.

Subcommittee No. 8 of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will hold public hearings on Monday, October 18, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., on H. J. Res. 49 and H. R. 2328, to amend section 18 of the Criminal Code relative to the mailing of certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings, etc.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 3334, to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 11 a. m., to hold hearings on the following projects: Connecticut River, between Hartford, Conn., and Holyoke, Mass.; Alabama-Coosa Rivers, Ala. and Ga.; Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway; and Trinity River, Tex.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

838. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a request for the withdrawal of the name Virginia Solis from the list of 256 cases involving suspension of deportation, because of the nature of new evidence; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

839. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an estimate of the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the General Accounting Office during the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

840. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in tent L-76 at the amphibious training base, Camp Bradford, Norfolk, Va., on March 15, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

841. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the outlying degaussing branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942; to the Committee on Claims.

842. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting copy of a quarterly estimate of the personnel requirements of the Federal Trade Commission for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

843. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting its quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the second quarter of the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

844. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the provision of the act authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of officers, enlisted men, or nurses of the Navy or Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

845. A letter from the Secretary, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting an estimate for the quarter ending December 31, 1943, of its minimum personnel requirements; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

846. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the appointment of Gregory Boyington a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

847. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting the fifth monthly list of registrants who have been deferred because of their employment in or under the Federal Government as of September 15, 1943, in accordance with the provisions of subsection C of Public Law No. 23, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved April 8, 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. Interim report on investigation of civilian employment pursuant to House Resolution 16, Seventy-eighth Congress. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Civil Service to investigate various activities in the departments and agencies of the Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 766). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 3442. A bill to amend sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other

purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 533; U. S. C., title 50, secs. 101, 102, and 103); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 3445. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico for school a certain building and lot known as the Mayaguez Barracks Military Reservation now under the jurisdiction of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 3446. A bill to provide for revocation of naturalization and deportation in the case of certain naturalized citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 3447. A bill to prescribe additional requirements for naturalization; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution for the purpose of prohibiting the imposition of conditions upon grants of moneys and rebates of taxes in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON:

H. R. 3443. A bill for the relief of Guy A. Utter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 3444. A bill for the relief of M. J. Beach, Sedgewick Kistler, J. H. Teas, and W. T. Teas, surviving directors of the Chesboard Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2867. By Mr. COFFEE: Petition of the Washington State Sportsmen's Council, Inc. (adopted at its regular session at Wenatchee, Wash.), asserting that game abounds in the wooded areas of southwest Washington; averring there is a tremendous shortage of meat food in the United States and, therefore, urging that Government agencies grant, on a ration basis, ammunition to all hunters and sportsmen to obtain wildlife for food purposes; also, pointing out that the McCarran bill (S. 1152) seeks to transfer control of all wildlife on Federal lands from the State governments to Federal agents in charge of such Federal lands; arguing that such control would permit the issuance of licenses without regard to residence; contending that this proposed piece of legislation appears to be a deliberate attempt on the part of livestock interests to take unfair advantage of the game situation, under the excuse of war; insisting that this appears as another effort to further centralize all activities in the Federal Government; and, therefore, resolving that the Washington State Sportsmen's Council, Inc., oppose the enactment of the McCarran bill; asserting that the McNary bill (S. 74), which has passed the Senate, provides for placing control of the salmon fisheries of the Pacific Ocean south of the fiftieth parallel north latitude in the hands of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; asserting that the bill is based on an unsound premise in that it does not and cannot control fishing; contending that the underlying purpose of the bill is an attempt to divert ocean-caught troll fish into the cans of Oregon packers on the Columbia River; and further insisting that such proposed bill is a violation of the sovereign rights of the States involved to regulate the salmon fisheries within their own 3-mile limits; therefore concluding that the Washington State Sportsmen's Council, Inc., go on record as opposing the enactment of such McNary bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2868. By Mr. TIBBOTT: Resolution of the Cambria County Pomona Grange, No. 51, Pennsylvania, opposing the program of Federal subsidy on agricultural products as detrimental to national prosperity and democratic principles of free enterprise since all such subsidies would lead to excessive inflation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2869. By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Petition of Pearl Reed, of Elsberry and 90 citizens of Lincoln County, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2870. Also, petition of Delbert Lee of Hannibal, and 78 citizens of Missouri, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2871. Also, petition of Laura Taylor, of Clarksville, and 94 citizens of the State of Missouri, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2872. Also, petition of Mary Brock, of Chamois, and 46 citizens of Missouri, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2873. Also, petition of Mrs. J. W. Farmer, of Briscoe, and 22 citizens of the State of Missouri, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2874. Also, petition of Mrs. H. V. Hunn, of Moscow Mills, and 51 citizens of the State of Missouri, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2875. Also, petition of Blanche Creamer, of Louisiana, and 84 citizens of the State of Missouri, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2876. Also, petition of Arthur Wheeler, of Eolia, and 113 citizens of the State of Missouri, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 12, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose dwelling place is the light of setting suns and the round ocean and the living air and the blue sky and in the mind of man: Shine into our darkness by the light of Thy truth; correct the dismal errors of our judgments and the false perspective of our prejudices by the wisdom Thou dost wait to give liberally to all who ask of Thee and who with pure hearts wait for Thy will and Thy word.

Inspire and guide with the spirit of understanding these Thy servants, the few among the many, in a great and crucial day, lifted by their fellows to high pedestals of power and influence. May their words and counsels, so laden with possibilities to affect this stricken generation, add to the world's store of good will, and may they be for the healing of the nations. May a consuming passion for the commonweal of the human family consume all the dross of unworthy ambition, knowing that without Thee, our God, as Architect our labor is in vain.

May we build, with all Thy wondrous gifts, a kingdom meet for Thee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Tuesday, October 12, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to submit a Senate resolution known as the post-war peace resolution which has been

considered by the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations for some months.

In submitting the resolution, I express the hope that all Senators will carefully and meticulously consider it. The resolution represents many months of very careful labor and consideration by the subcommittee, with a view to all foreign phases and aspects of our policy, and I think it represents, in the main, the views of the American people. I have no doubt that it will be approved by the full Committee on Foreign Relations by a very large majority, and, following that, by a large majority of the Senate.

I hope that the supporters of the so-called Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution will very seriously consider supporting this resolution. It is the best thing they can possibly get, and if they should offer their resolution, and it should be defeated, as it would be, there might ensue some inferences and suggestions which might not react very favorably in certain foreign quarters. This is a matter about which we ought to have harmony and unity. It is a matter that affects our relations with foreign countries, and no consideration other than the national welfare should be borne in mind.

I wish to say, Mr. President, as a personal word, that I have labored as a member of the subcommittee, and expect to labor as a member of the full committee, without any effort that spells exploitation. This is a matter that ought to represent the considered views of the committee, the Senate, and the country, and I submit the resolution in the hope that all Senators will give it very careful consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas desire to have the resolution referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. CONNALLY. I request that the resolution be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, and I should like to have the clerk report it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 192) was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States:

That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved;

That the United States cooperate with its comrades in arms in securing a just and honorable peace;

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bankhead	Bridges
Andrews	Barbour	Brooks
Bailey	Barkley	Buck
Ball	Bilbo	Burton
Bushfield	Holman	Radcliffe
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Reed
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Capper	Kilgore	Shipstead
Caraway	Langer	Smith
Chavez	Lucas	Stewart
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Taft
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Connally	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Danaher	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Davis	McNary	Tunnell
Ellender	Maloney	Tydings
Ferguson	Maybank	Vandenberg
George	Mead	Van Nuys
Gerry	Millikin	Wagner
Gillette	Murdock	Walsh
Green	Murray	Wheeler
Guffey	Nye	Wherry
Gurney	O'Daniel	White
Hatch	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Hayden	Overton	Willis
Hill	Pepper	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Conditions on the West Coast.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has been confined to a Madison hospital since September 13, where he is now recovering from virus pneumonia.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent on official appointments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

RECENTRALIZATION OF HEAVY INDUSTRY

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, last July I addressed a letter to a number of my colleagues in the Senate, proposing formation of a group to work for decentralization of heavy industry, particularly through the establishment of new or expanded facilities for the production of iron and steel. My letter apparently struck a responsive chord with many Senators.

Shortly after Congress took a recess, in July, I received a letter signed by Members of the House of Representatives asking that a joint meeting of Senators and House Members be arranged in view of the fact that many Members of the House were interested in the same ends and aims to which the Senate group is pledged.

Accordingly, a joint meeting was arranged and was held on October 4, 1943, in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building. More than 30 Senators and more than 50 Members of the House of Representatives were present. At that meeting, on my motion from the floor, which was carried without dissent, I was authorized to appoint steering committees of seven Members each from the House and from the Senate groups.

After consultation with numerous Members of both Houses, I have, under the authority vested in me at the October 4 meeting, appointed the following steering committees:

For the Senate: Senators MCCARRAN, chairman; BANKHEAD; GILLETTE; MURDOCK; NYE; ROBERTSON; and THOMAS of Idaho.

For the House: Representatives COFFEE, chairman; PATMAN; TARVER; MANSFIELD; KING; WINTER; CASE.

I make this statement for the benefit of all Members of either House of Congress who may be interested. An organization meeting of the Senate steering committee will be called in the near future, and I have asked the chairman of the steering committee of the House group to take similar action.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a petition of sundry citizens of Oakland and Berkeley, Calif., praying for the adoption of Senate Resolution 114 (submitted by Mr. BALL, Mr. HILL, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. HATCH on March 16, 1943), favoring organization of the United Nations to maintain peace, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1077. A bill for the relief of William A. Haag; with amendments (Rept. No. 465).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1288. A bill for the relief of Luther Thomas Edens; with amendments (Rept. No. 466);

H. R. 1907. A bill for the relief of Anthony J. Leiberschal; without amendment (Rept. No. 467); and

H. R. 2152. A bill for the relief of Rafael Torres; without amendment (Rept. No. 468).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on October 12, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 755) to amend the National Housing Act as now or hereafter amended, so as to give protection to persons in military service, and their dependents, as to certain mortgages.

FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION MINORITY VIEWS (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 323)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I submit, and ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point, minority views on Senate bill

637. I am submitting the minority views for myself and for the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], members of the Committee on Education and Labor. I may say that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] have not expressed their views on either the majority or minority side, and I have not been able to reach them today, but they may later join in the views.

There being no objection, the minority views were ordered to be printed and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We cannot give our support to the bill (S. 637) "to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools," which has been reported by the Committee on Education and Labor, and we are submitting this statement of our views as to this legislation and of the reasons why, in our judgment, it is both unwise and inexpedient for it to pass.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

The current bill differs in some important respects from the bills which have been presented in previous sessions of the Senate, but which have never been given consideration by the Senate. It contains two parts based on fundamentally different grounds.

First, it proposes an annual appropriation of $200,000,000 to be divided between all of the States in proportion to the average daily attendance of pupils in the elementary and secondary schools in each State. This money is to be used only for the payment of teachers' salaries. It is provided that the sum so used must be additional to any sum spent by the State for such purposes in 1942, and that the State must continue to pay out of its own funds the average annual salaries which it paid on February 1, 1943. This appropriation has no relation to equalization of educational opportunities nor to the special conditions which may exist in any of the poorer States. While apparently only a relief measure, and stated to be for emergency purposes, there is no time limit on the authorization.

The other portion of the bill appropriates $100,000,000 to be used for equalizing the amounts spent for education in the various States. This means, of course, a distribution to those States which have the lowest per capita income according to a certain formula established in the bill. It results in $58,000,000 of the $100,000,000 being paid to 13 States. The justification for this appropriation is based on the fact that, taking the country as a whole, existing educational opportunities and facilities are variable and unequal, and deficient in many particulars, due to a variety of causes, one of which, without doubt, is an insufficiency of funds; in other cases, indifference or neglect or poor economic conditions, or refusal by local communities to increase the tax burdens to the levy paid by other communities, or refusal by local communities to increase the tax burdens to the levy paid by other communities. No one who is open-minded and acquainted with the facts will dispute these premises. No one will deny that even though educational opportunities in the United States today are greater, and educational facilities are better, and our entire system of education more democratic, than anywhere else in the world, nevertheless there is much room for further improvement. There is some doubt, however, whether money alone will accomplish the betterment that is needed, or whether equalization is in anyway accomplished by the provisions of the bill which is offered to the Senate.

EDUCATION IS NOT A FEDERAL FUNCTION

Taking both parts of this bill together, it is a proposal to establish a Federal subsidy for common-school and high-school education, a function of the State governments and local governments for the last 150 years. There can be no doubt that common-school and high-school education is the obligation of the States and their local subdivisions under our constitutional system and that it is not an obligation of the Federal Government. There is nothing whatever in the Constitution which delegates to the Federal Government power to deal with questions of education. All authority for a Federal subsidy of education must be based upon the spending power, which is sufficiently broad to give a legal basis for the current bill, as for other subsidies to local government.

However, Federal subsidies to the States for matters which are clearly not within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government are certainly not justified on the ground that the States are unable to finance adequately the activities which are constitutionally assigned to them. It is undoubtedly true that the taxing powers of the States are somewhat limited and that under some conditions the Federal Government may be in a better position to raise money where it should be raised than the States themselves. It was on this ground that the Federal Government went so extensively into the financing of relief in the great emergency of 1932. Here was a tremendous new expenditure for which no provision was made in the State systems of finance, calling for a very large sum which the States were wholly unable to raise. But as the emergency declined, the Federal Government has gradually withdrawn its aid, and relief today is again administered by the States.

The same conditions do not at all apply to education. The States have always financed education. In nearly every State it has been given a prior consideration in dividing the funds which are available. One-third of all State and local taxes are spent for education. If the States and localities can't finance education, they can't finance any State or local activities. In many other States school boards are independent of cities, towns, and counties, and answerable directly to the people. In Ohio and elsewhere the people of each community are authorized to vote additional tax levies on themselves for schools if they feel that more money is needed for good educational facilities. There is complete home rule in the field of education, and that is what the people want. A curious result of this bill would be to grant additional money to many public schools in such a State as Ohio when often the people of the community have decided that the schools don't need any more money and have refused to vote extra levies for that purpose.

STATES ARE IN BETTER CONDITION THAN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

There is no real evidence today that the States are unable to finance their own educational system, certainly the many large States in industrial areas which are to receive money out of the $200,000,000 relief fund. We quote from the report made by the senior Senator from Wyoming on Tuesday, October 12, to the George post-war planning committee:

"While the national credit has been under great strain, the fiscal position of the States seems to be improving. The total debt of all of the several States of the Union as of June 30, 1943, was $2,909,000,000. Against this may be charged the growing budget surplus in the States. At the beginning of this year this amounted to $700,000,000, and it is now estimated by officials of the Census Bureau at about $1,000,000,000. The sinking funds of the States on general obligations total $430,000,000 as of June 1943, so that making allowances for the surplus and the sinking funds, the debts of the States amount to a little over $1,000,000,000 as compared with the national debt of $146,000,000,000. * * * I have not had an opportunity to examine the fiscal position of cities and other local subdivisions, but it appears that all of the cities in the United States with a population of 100,000 or more at this moment have an unused debt capacity amounting to $750,000,000. These figures immediately suggest the advisability of an inquiry into the ability of the States and of the cities to carry part of the burden of public responsiblity in the post-war world."

The Senator goes on to point out that many States are setting up post-war funds out of their surplus. The Senator's figures are fully supported by the bulletins of the Bureau of the Census issued from time to time dealing with State finances.

It hardly seems that the States are in a position to demand relief from the Federal Government. As a matter of fact, they are not demanding relief. No State has come before us affirming its inability to deal with the educational problem. No legislature has passed any resolutions requesting assistance. The entire proposal is placed before us by representatives of the teachers and other educational interests, who may or may not have exhausted their remedies within the States. How ridiculous it would be for these States, operating with surpluses, to ask for relief from a Government which is running a deficit of $60,000,000,000 a year! As far as we can see, there is not the slightest justification for treating the present condition as an emergency which requires Federal financial assistance.

THIS SUBSIDY WOULD BE A NONWAR ACTIVITY

This Congress has taken the position that all expenditures for nonwar purposes should be eliminated unless they are absolutely necessary, and that our whole attention should be devoted to the prosecution of the war. On that policy we have eliminated the C. C. C., the W. P. A., the N. Y. A., and many other nonwar activities. It is hard to see how any slight improvement in the educational system could be accomplished in time to have any noticeable effect in the present war. Of course every activity of the Government, if it is of any value at all, has some remote relation to the morale of the people and to the prosecution of the war, but certainly the education of minor children is as far from the war as any other civilian department of the Government.

THIS IS THE START OF A REVOLUTIONARY POLICY WHICH MAY COST FOUR BILLION DOLLARS

Apart from the nonexistent emergency feature, the Federal subsidy project has been before Congress for a number of years, promoted by the National Education Association and the Federal Office of Education, but not by the States themselves. Previous bills have been based entirely on the principle of equalization, and have all been based on the argument that because some States spend much less money per pupil than others, the way to improve education is to subsidize those States.

The whole project is based on the assumption that the more money is spent on education, the better the education is. This conclusion is perhaps open to question. Startling ignorance regarding American history, which was discussed in the Senate last spring, certainly could not arise from lack of financial resources. It appeared among students from all over the United States, and in many instances from students who came

from those States which spend the most money on education. Undoubtedly education in some States is handicapped by lack of funds, but there are other ways in which American education can be improved besides granting Federal subsidies.

The adoption of the present bill would undoubtedly embark the Federal Government in a gradually increasing expenditure from which it would never be relieved. If we once pay from two hundred to three hundred dollars of the salary of every school teacher in the country, how can we possibly ever withdraw that support? Even if the States become richer, they will never be willing to take over this burden. Having yielded once to a very strong pressure, there will be no way in which to prevent a further yielding.

The desires of the educators are almost without limit. The whole question of Federal aid to education is discussed in the report of the National Resources Planning Board for 1943, on page 68. That report takes the position that "the Nation is now spending less than 50 percent of the amount needed to provide a justifiable minimum educational program." Current expenditures and capital outlay for education in the United States are shown to be approximately $3,200,000,000. The "justifiable minimum annual expenditures in the post-war period" are said to be $7,385,000,000. The report then says:

"During the years immediately following the war it does not appear probable that the total revenue available for education from State and local systems combined can be greatly increased. * * * It is therefore evident that most of the increase in expenditures for education in the post-war period must be financed almost, if not entirely, by Federal funds. * * * The only agency that can remedy the inequality among the States in the tax burden for education is the Federal Government. It should accept this role."

This report was written by Dr. Floyd W. Reeves, who is also chairman of the Advisory Committee on Education, closely allied with the National Education Association and the original promoter of subsidy legislation. We see, therefore, that the real program of which this is the beginning calls for the Federal Government to finance the greater part of $4,000,000,000 a year.

This proposal is in fact the beginning of a revolutionary change in one of our most fundamental Government activities. It should not be considered except in relation to the entire post-war activities of the Federal Government.

WE SHOULD NOT NOW COMMIT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO ANY NEW TYPE OF EXPENSE

The Federal Government faces after the war a tremendously serious financial problem. The annual charge for interest alone will amount to $5,000,000,000. At least $5,000,000,000 will be necessary for the armed forces. At least $5,000,000,000 will be required for existing services, with some moderate increase in expenditures for social security purposes. Many other new items of expense will be clamoring for consideration. We do not know where the point is, but there is a point at which the burden of Government will become so great that it will choke all incentive, initiative, and enterprise. At some point we can kill the goose that lays the golden egg, and force the entire country into a socialistic strait jacket. It seems most unwise to commit ourselves now to any policy which will increase the difficulty of the post-war problem. If expenditures for education are to be undertaken, they should be undertaken when we have the whole problem before us, and can consider the relative merits of each proposal in relation to the over-all expense.

FEDERAL SUBSIDY WOULD DESTROY LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT IN EDUCATION

There is an even more important question. Can Federal subsidies to the public-school system be maintained without ultimately bringing about a nationalization of our educational facilities and federalized bureaucratic control? This is an eventuality which the proponents of the present bill insist is not intended and which they maintain can be avoided. They contend that by the provisions of section 1 the danger is removed. We seriously question this conclusion. We believe that in the complexity of reports, of plans, of State legislation to conform to Federal policies, of counsel and advice, and joint participation of the Federal Government and the States, and all of the other manifold details of the operation of the contemplated program of Federal subsidies, our public school systems would be gradually, but no less inevitably, drawn more and more under the thumb of a Federal bureaucracy.

We have pointed out that the ultimate plans call for the Federal Government assuming perhaps half the cost of education. Our experience with the social-security laws and many others lead to the definite conclusion that Federal subsidy in the end means Federal control. Those who put up the money and have the power to refuse it dictate the policies of the local officials. Federal bureaucrats travel the country, checking up on the expenditures and the policies of every school board and other local officials. Of course the very provisions of the act itself contradict in some respects the pious declaration of section 1 against any Federal officer controlling the administration of State schools. Under the provisions of this bill, schools would be unable to decrease their teachers' salaries or their current expenditures for schools, whether those expenditures had been extravagant in the past or not. Under the provisions of this bill, every cent of the $200,000,000 must be spent for teachers' salaries, and not for any other necessary school purposes. Under the provisions of this bill, a new system of reports must be set up from all local schools to a State Educational Authority. These provisions may not require substantial changes in school administration, but they illustrate the principle that it is impossible to give Federal money without controlling to some extent the expenditure of that money and the administration of the schools which spend it. If the amount is increased, it is inevitable that Congress and the Federal authorities will insist upon the natural right to state the conditions of administration on which Federal funds are provided.

Of course, the same thing is true of all Federal-aid programs, but the effect is much worse in the case of education. It is unnecessary to expand on the tremendous danger of centralized control of education, because the authors of the bill agreed to those dangers when they wrote section 1. Centralized control of education gives a power to the central government far beyond that of any other control, as Hitler has illustrated in Germany. It places the whole character and knowledge of the people in the hands of a Federal bureau. That bureau is more than likely to be guided by some small group of men who believe in this method of education or that method of education. It transfers the control from the people of each district to a man or men wholly beyond the control of public opinion.

The people don't want it. There is no matter upon which they are more insistent than local control of education. There has been difficulty in centralizing schools even on a township basis, because the people of each district want to run their own schools. We feel that the bill before us would be the beginning of the end of local self-government in education.

THIS BILL DOES NOT EQUALIZE

The strongest argument for the bill is that we must equalize educational opportunity throughout the United States by providing substantially the same amount of money for the education of each child. We have pointed out that money is only one of the factors in education. A $40 education in some places may be much better than a $60 education in another. But beyond that, this bill does not equalize. Some of the greatest discrepancies occur within a particular State. Some school districts may be very wealthy, where others may be very poor. State equalization does not exist in many States, and there is nothing in this bill to compel it. Within single States there may be wide differences in the money expended on children of different races.

Thus on page 19 of the hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor, we find that in Louisiana the cost per white pupil is $61.21, whereas the cost per Negro pupil is $12.62. Nothing in this act requires any equalization between white and Negro pupils. It is true that the bill requires the Federal funds to be distributed on an equitable basis between white schools and Negro schools, but it does not change the distribution of Louisiana funds. The result, as shown in the hearings under this bill, would be that white students would be educated at an expense of $76.40 apiece as compared to $23.61 per Negro student. The difference would be $52.79 after the passage of the bill as compared to $48.59 today.

The bill, therefore, does not do the very thing which it is supposed to do. Equalization, as a matter of fact, cannot be secured except by complete Federal control and direction. Everyone agrees that complete Federal control and direction are worse than the inequality which now exists. It may be fairly argued that if the States and local communities are to be left alone to run their schools as they see fit, and to spend Federal moneys for school subsidies as they see fit, such an arrangement is indefensible from the standpoint of the Federal Government and the taxpayers generally. Congress ought not to give away Federal funds to the States, with no Federal control over the spending of the funds. If on the other hand the Federal Government is to retain control over the expenditures and to dictate them, then it means Federal control of education—an alternative equally obnoxious. There is no middle ground.

Since the bill proposed does not in fact equalize, it is nothing except a subsidy for the increase of teachers' salaries. Such a subsidy is wholly unjustified when the States are better off financially than the Federal Government. We may admit that many teachers are underpaid, but there may be many who are not underpaid. This bill proposes to increase the salary of every teacher. Certainly Congress is not in a position to judge of the correctness of such a policy.

CONCLUSION

We do not subscribe to the doctrine that because our public schools and our educational facilities are a vital element in our national welfare, they thereby become the proper concern and implied responsibility of the national Government.

Our schools are one of the few remaining bulwarks of local self-government and community enterprise. They should so remain. They have on the whole been well managed and generously supported. We have today too much centralization of control over the affairs of our citizens in a Federal bureaucracy. We should not add to it by this new excursion into the field of education.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1437. A bill granting an increase of pension to Isabell Postlethwait; and

S. 1438. A bill granting a pension to Isaac Markum; to the Committee on Pensions.

(Mr. MAYBANK introduced Senate bill 1439, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1440. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in tents used as quarters by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion, Long Island, Alaska, on December 26, 1942, and May 26, 1943, respectively; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 1441. A bill to amend section 3 (d) of the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1442. A bill to amend section 1532 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1443. A bill to amend section 1 (a) of the Carriers Taxing Act of 1937, as amended;

S. 1444. A bill to amend section 1 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended; and

S. 1445. A bill to amend section 1 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S.1446. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clara Burks McCarthy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution to provide for the admission to the United States of aliens who are religious or racial refugees; to the Committee on Immigration.

(Mr. O'DANIEL introduced Senate Joint Resolution 86, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

PROMOTION ON RETIRED LIST OF CERTAIN LINE OFFICERS OF THE ARMY

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill, and also to present in connection with the bill a resolution adopted by the National Convention of the American Legion in Omaha through its national defense committee. I ask that the bill and resolution be appropriately referred, and that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill and resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and the resolution will be printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.

The bill (S. 1439) to promote on the retired list all line officers of the Army who have or may be specially commended for performance of duty in actual combat, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The following resolution presented by Mr. MAYBANK was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

That the Congress pass legislation whereby all line officers of the Army who have been specially commended for their performance of duty in actual combat by the head of the Federal Executive Department, under whose jurisdiction such duty was performed, when retired, be placed upon the retired list with the rank of the next higher grade and with three-fourths of the active duty pay of the grade in which serving at the time of retirement, as now provided for officers of the Navy and Marine Corps.

TENURE OF OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS—CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution limiting the tenure of office of the President, Vice President, and Members of Congress to 6 years, and so forth. I request that the joint resolution be appropriately referred and also printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 86) proposing an amendment to the Constitution limiting the tenure of office of President and Vice President of the United States and Members of Congress to 6 years and imposing limitations on the appointment or election of certain persons to office, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of both Houses concurring), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The term of office of each President of the United States and of each Vice President of the United States elected after the date this article takes effect shall be 6 years; and no person who shall have served as President or Vice President shall be eligible for election to the office of President or the office of Vice President.

"SEC. 2. No person shall be eligible for election or appointment to the office of Senator or Representative in Congress for any term which, if served by such person, would cause the aggregate service of such person as a Member of either or both the Senate and the House of Representatives to exceed 6 years.

"SEC. 3. Nothing contained in section 1 or section 2 of this article shall be construed to prevent any person who may hold the office of President, Vice President, Senator, or Representative in Congress, during the term within which this article is ratified from holding such office for the remainder of such term.

"SEC. 4. No person shall be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States who holds, or who shall have held within 5 years next preceding the date of such appointment, the office of Senator or Representative in Congress or of judge of any court under the authority of the United States, but nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent the appointment or assignment of a person who holds the office of judge of a court under the authority of the United States, to the office of judge of any other court under the authority of the United States.

"SEC. 5. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

FLOOD CONTROL ON THE RIO GRANDE NEAR CREEDE, COLO. (S. DOC. NO. 104)

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I send to the desk a report received from the Acting Secretary of War, Robert P. Patterson, addressed to the Senate Committee on Commerce with respect to the Rio Grande River and its tributaries, with the view to providing flood control in the vicinity of Creede, Colo., and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FLOOD PROTECTION ON SALT RIVER AT TAYLORSVILLE, KY. (S. DOC. NO. 105)

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Under Secretary of War, who is Acting Secretary of War, the Honorable Robert P. Patterson, has sent to the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, a report of the Chief of Engineers with reference to flood protection at Taylorsville, Ky. The report is quite comprehensive. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document with illustrations, together with the letter of the Acting Secretary of War.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING (S. DOC. NO. 106)

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the hearings before the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, on October 12, 1943, together with certain reports from the Treasury, the Federal Reserve Bank, and the Department of Justice be printed as a Senate document. I make the request for the reason that the demand for certain of this information is very great. The report itself made to the committtee was submitted by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF OKLAHOMA BEFORE NATIONAL FOOD CONFERENCE, CHICAGO

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the National Food Conference at Chicago, September 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BANKHEAD ON NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING BILL

[Mr. BANKHEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him to the Alabama Press Association at Birmingham, Ala., August 13, 1943, on the Bankhead-Cannon paid advertising bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

PLOTTING A SENSIBLE COURSE FOR PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Plotting a Sensible Course for Peace" delivered by him on the Congressional Record on the Air program on October 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FACTS, FIGURES AND PROMISES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HAWKES

[Mr. BUCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Facts, Figures and Promises", delivered by Senator HAWKES at the annual dinner of the Controllers' Institute of America, New York City, September 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHY AGRICULTURE HONORS JEFFERSON—ADDRESS BY M. L. WILSON

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Why Agriculture Honors Jefferson," delivered by M. L. Wilson, Director of the Extension Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, before the Nu Chapter of Epsilon Sigma Phi, Washington, which appears in the Appendix.]

AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY SHORTAGE—ADDRESS BY C. C. COGSWELL

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Effect of the Agricultural Machinery Shortage on Production," delivered by C. C. Cogswell, master of the Kansas State Grange, before the National Food Conference of Consumers and Producers, Chicago, September 17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR JOBS—ADDRESS BY ALFRED P. SLOAN, JR.

[Mr. TYDINGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Post-War Jobs," delivered by Mr. Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., chairman of the board of General Motors, before the Economic Club of Detroit, on Monday, October 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THOMAS GOODE JONES, OF ALABAMA—ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN S. TILLEY

[Mr. BANKHEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by John S. Tilley on June 23, 1943, before a joint session of the Senate and House of Alabama, on the occasion of the presentation of a marble bust of Gov. Thomas G. Jones, which appears in the Appendix.]

COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Covenant of the League of Nations, together with editorial comment, appearing in the October 15, 1943, issue of the United States News, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADMISSION TO THE UNITED STATES OF RACIAL AND RELIGIOUS REFUGEES

[Mr. BARBOUR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a joint statement by the National Democratic Club and the National Republican Club of New York City, dated September 9, 1943, relative to the admission to the United States of aliens who are racial and religious refugees, which appears in the Appendix.]

VOTES IN THE SERVICES—EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO DAILY NEWS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Votes in the Services," published in the Chicago Daily News of October 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE JUDGE IS STILL TOPS—EDITORIAL FROM COLLIER'S

[Mr. ANDREWS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Judge Is Still Tops," published in Collier's of October 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PALMER HOYT'S RULE FOR WAR REPORTING—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. MCNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Play-by-Play Account," published in the New York Herald Tribune of October 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN BUSINESS—LETTER FROM H. A. BENNING

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by H. A. Benning, president of the Amalgamated Sugar Co., of Ogden, Utah, relative to taxes and other problems confronting American business, which appears in the Appendix.]

SERVICEMEN AT THE PEACE TABLE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the Senate and out of the Senate we have heard a great deal of late about the Senate having representation among the plenipotentiaries who will deal for America at the peace table. We recognize, of course, that the matter of designating those who will represent America is an Executive function. We are sure, however, that the Executive is well aware of the growing feeling of the people in this respect. Today I want to say a few words about another group that I feel should have representation at the peace table.

Mr. President, a great national publication has an editorial in its current issue entitled "Soldiers Must Help Make Peace." This editorial was the inspiration for the following article which will appear in my weekly news release.

"The long files of young men march off to war, and as they pass the great men who are sending them into battle, they raise their arms in the salute of those who are about to die."

That striking paragraph appears in a book I just finished reading. It adds force to a suggestion recently made by a national magazine that the men who do the actual fighting be among the negotiators at the peace table. The great men have failed miserably in the past to evolve a formula for a just and lasting peace. Certainly there should be among the conferees at the peace table, those who know war from being actually in and with it.

The editorial upon which the foregoing article was based appears in the October 16 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, and reads as follows:

SOLDIERS MUST HELP MAKE PEACE

Although numerous peace plans are being proposed, little is said about who will represent us at the peace conference at which the final terms will be decided. With an election in the offing, we can hardly expect specific information on the make-up of the American delegation, but on one point we can be generally agreed. This time the negotiators certainly should include representatives of the men who actually fought in the war. The results of the 1919 peace conference have been widely criticized as the work of old men who had no part in the fighting. Now is a good time to make sure that the next peace cannot be assailed on that ground.

The peace conferees must, of course, include our political leaders, flanked by experts and observers versed in foreign affairs. We shall need them, but we also shall need men who know something about the consequences of war as well as its causes. And surely, with 10,000,000 men in the armed services, it is more than likely that the expert knowledge we seek will be found among those who fought. A man who has risked his life in Africa or Burma or continental Europe should be able to supply a kind of wisdom on such problems as frontiers or minorities which is often wanting in the academic student of these questions.

Such a man would also supply something even more important. He would bring in a moral fervor for future peace which academicians sometimes lack. It is his generation which has the most at stake in the success of the next peace conference. The men who are doing the fighting will want to see to it that the future is not compromised by any lack of faith and determination.

For our part, we hope that the grim experiences of the battlefield will contribute to the supreme wisdom necessary at this next peace conference. Most of us can think of individuals whose participation in the negotiations would energize and inspire such deliberations. The young men in the fighting forces of the United Nations share a common bond of feeling and understanding forged out of their mutual experiences. It is an international fellowship which can be turned to account by selecting some of our conferees from among their number.

We cannot know what our allies will do in this regard, but we can set an example. If each of our two major political parties were to announce now its determination to see that the men of our fighting forces are represented at the peace table, it would be a source of satisfaction and encouragement both to civilians and to the men who face the enemy.

Mr. President, more than a year ago, I submitted the following resolution providing for a liaison committee between the Senate and the Executive:

Resolved, That the Chief Executive be invited to join with the Senate in the creation of a foreign relations advisory council to be constituted of the following: The Secretary of State, the Under Secretary of State, other technicians whom the Secretary of State might designate; the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the chairman and the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and such other Senators as the President might from time to time designate.

This resolution was referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. It is still there. Inasmuch as I have spoken at length on the need of a foreign relations advisory committee, I shall merely supplement my previous remarks. If such a committee had been appointed, I believe it would have drafted a resolution on post-war collaboration which would meet with the approval of the Senate. Such a resolution, demonstrating to all the world that America is ready to cooperate with like-minded nations, would have a most important bearing on the coming Moscow conference.

Now the Saturday Evening Post suggests this other subject which such a liaison committee could well discuss. No thinking person can dispute the right

of our fighting man to sit at the peace table, nor the value of the contribution he would make toward a solution of the complex problems that will arise. I know of no group of men better qualified to have substantial representation at the peace conference than our 10,000,000 men in the Armed Forces.

They are sailing the seven seas, hearing strange tongues, meeting new philosophies, and getting acquainted with the rest of the world.

The heavens above them at night are strange, and the vegetation, the climate, the food, the habits and customs of the people are different. In close contact with their "comrades in arms" from the other Allied Nations, they will learn tolerance and understanding of the customs and beliefs of other peoples, and they will bring this tolerance and understanding back to America.

A new perspective will come to all of us out of their experiences. The world becomes smaller as the races and peoples of the earth are drawn closer together.

These much-traveled and experienced men in our armed forces will be a great help to America with their broadened outlook and their grasp on world conditions and affairs; we must use their counsel in the great adventure of finding the way to world peace.

It will be said that there have been representatives of the armed forces at every peace conference. That is true, if by this is meant the technical military and naval staffs who sit in as advisers. But these are not the men I have in mind, and they are not the men the Saturday Evening Post has in mind. I have in mind the civilian who left his job in the factory, the bank, the merchant establishment, and the schools to take up arms in defense of his country. I have in mind the buck private, the corporal, the sergeant, and the officers who do the bleeding, sweating, and dying. Great, public-spirited, understanding men have come from their ranks.

Some of our greatest industrial, spiritual, and civic leaders came out of the last war and the wars preceding it. A sizable percentage of our Senators, Representatives, and Governors proudly wear the badge of the American Legion or the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Who, may I ask, are better fitted or more entitled to sit, with equal voice and authority, at the peace table?

Before us there is a tremendous undertaking to provide adequate world leadership. Nothing is impossible for America if we have faith. Faith, as we know, is contagious. These boys of ours are doing the impossible all over the world. With their aid, we will continue the job.

I repeat that the men who are fighting the war and who are paying the real price of war should have something to say about making and maintaining the peace. With their contribution, we should find that formula for peace which is necessary for a war-sick world.

SEEPAGE AND DRAINAGE DAMAGES ON THE ILLINOIS RIVER, ILL.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, out of order I ask unanimous consent that there be taken up for present consideration House bill 3029.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be reported by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3029) to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damages on the Illinois River, Ill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no desire to take from the floor the very distinguished Senator from Illinois; I desire merely to ask a question. As I recall, along in the spring or late summer this bill was brought up in the Senate for consideration. I favored it at that time. I merely wish to know whether the bill to which the Senator now refers is the same measure previously brought before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the able minority leader that this is not the same measure. This measure was passed by unanimous vote of the House, sent to the Senate, and referred to the Commerce Committee, and the Commerce Committee by unanimous vote favorably reported the bill. It authorizes payment for damages which have accrued to landowners in certain drainage districts in the Twentieth Congressional District of Illinois where I live. The damages were caused by the building of the Alton Dam. That dam caused the seepage of water into these various drainage districts. The War Department has approved the measure. The House Committee on Rivers and Harbors approved it, and the House passed it by unanimous vote. It is now before the Senate by reason of a unanimous report by the Commerce Committee. The measure has long been delayed, I will say to the Senator from Oregon, and that is why I ask that it be considered at this time. I do not think there will be any objection to it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I shall not object to having Senate bill 637 laid aside temporarily, if consideration of the bill of the Senator from Illinois will take only 2 or 3 minutes, as the Senator suggests. If consideration of the bill shall result in debate, I think it will be improper for me to allow it to interfere with consideration of Senate bill 637.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah may make demand for the regular order at any time.

Is there objection to the immediate consideration of House bill 3029?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3029) to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damages on the Illinois River, Ill., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. EDWARD W. CREAL, late a Representative from the State of Kentucky, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 378) to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument, and it was signed by the Vice President.

FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 637) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the pending measure represents very important legislation, to my mind probably as important as any I have had anything to do with since coming to the Senate, and in my opinion probably the most basically important piece of legislation dealing with the welfare of the people of our country which has been presented to the Senate for some time. Every item of the bill has to do with the building of American citizens. Every item of the bill has to do with making our country stronger. I doubt whether anything better can be done for our country than what is proposed to be done by the pending measure.

Mr. President, as the debate proceeds no doubt many questions will be asked. I should like to answer questions and have no objection in the least to being stopped at any time during my discussion of the bill for the purpose of permitting questions, but I think for the welfare of the bill and for the orderly conduct of the debate, if my colleagues will permit me to make a rather formal statement, most of the questions will then be found to have been answered, and the subject matter will be placed in categorical shape in the RECORD. I will therefore proceed with a prepared statement in regard to the bill.

Mr. President, the bill is a very simple one. There is nothing complex about it. If I know anything about the fundamental theories of American government and the aspirations of the fathers who brought it into existence, I know that the very bases of our Government depend upon a universally trained citizenry. I know too from the studies which the Committee on Education and Labor has made and other studies dealing with migratory labor, with strategic materials and with the various types of war activities, manpower, selective service, and all kindred matters, about the economic problems with which we are faced and problems which may affect all the citizens of our country, that there is no problem which cuts so deeply into the basic fundamentals which we call Americanization as does the neglect of our public schools and the neglect of educational opportunity for large sections of our population.

In the midst of our great and unprecedented war for the defense of our ideals and institutions it is necessary that we give due consideration to the education

of our youth both for direct defense activities and for sustaining on a high level our economic and civic life. In order to do this we must look to the long future. The children and youth of today are the men and women of tomorrow on whom the Nation must rely for its very existence. Neglect yesterday of talent, health, and physical fitness has resulted in a mighty toll of losses today, and which similar neglect today is sure to result in other losses tomorrow. We should have learned long ago that it is futile to think that the education of any generation of children and youth can be delayed until they have reached maturity and are needed immediately to meet an emergency.

If we need any evidence of the truth of this statement we can look at the enormous losses of manpower to the armed forces because of the hundreds of thousands, perhaps a million men, who have been unable to take their places with our fighting forces simply because of the lack of education.

But the loss of manpower is perhaps not the consideration which ought to be uppermost in the minds of the American people and especially in the minds of a great deliberative body such as the United States Senate. We need to examine the obligations of the Nation to maintain policies of equalization of opportunity and not merely of equalization of sacrifice. About 2 years ago it was pointed out by the American Youth Commission, Mr. Owen D. Young, chairman, that as a Nation we of necessity have had to launch upon a program of selecting the most promising of young men "who will be trained to kill and to take the risk of being killed in order that the democratic community of free people may continue to exist." When that obligation of the citizens to the state is thus carried to the utmost extreme of duty that can be asked of him, it is imperative to all of us to reexamine the extent to which the state is carrying out its obligation toward the citizen.

Mr. President, in the minds of some there may be the idea that since this is wartime it is not an appropriate time to consider the Federal financing of education. I wish to point out, however, that some of the greatest advances which have ever been made during the entire history of our educational program came during a prior war. It came when Lincoln saw the necessity of equalizing opportunities in education for the people throughout the whole of our land.

When he accomplished what his predecessor, Buchanan, by vetoing what became the great land-grant college bill, had failed to accomplish, Lincoln instituted in time of war the greatest educational experiment the country or the world has ever known. As a result of the establishment of the great land-grant institutions, he brought to the world the greatest single blessing ever given to the people of the world by a single act of any Government. It was a war measure then. Aid to education is a war measure now.

In 1917, when we were at war, the United States Congress established our Federal system of financial assistance to the States for vocational education under the Smith-Hughes Act. We have witnessed the expansion of that program, and today there is scarcely an informed person who does not readily admit that the vocational education work in our public schools throughout the land has proved to be one of the greatest of our national assets in the winning of the war. If we had waited until 1939 or 1941 to begin that great educational program, the consequences might have been dire indeed.

I want to emphasize that one reason for proposing that the United States Government in this time of war adopt a financial policy looking toward the reduction of gross inequalities of educational opportunity is that such a policy is necessary to the success of the prosecution of the war. It is entirely conceivable that the young people who are now in the upper elementary grades of our schools will be called upon to enter the armed services before the present conflict is brought to a successful termination. It is a known and an indisputable fact, Mr. President, that there are millions of children who may within the next 3 or 4 years be expected to be in the armed forces of our country who are not now afforded the kind of education that will enable them to serve with the maximum efficiency required in modern warfare. If we are ever to do anything about that problem, now is the time to do so.

Furthermore, when the war is won, and when we enter again upon our peacetime pursuits, we shall have an enormous public debt to finance. In the final analysis the cost of the war will be paid by the people of the United States, and among those people are our school children of today. Not only the financing of public debt but the maintenance of our entire economic system is going to depend upon the productivity of the American people. It is utterly inconceivable that a highly efficient industrial system can exist without people of high educational attainments and standards of living commensurate with modern and industrial development. The proposal that public education be adequately financed is a proposal that the people through their chosen representatives make a modest investment in the future safety, stability, and development of our entire economic life.

In 1937 the late Senator Harrison, of Mississippi, jointly with the then chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, former Senator Black, of Alabama, introduced a bill to provide financial assistance to the States for public education. That bill was favorably reported after extensive hearings by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. While the bill was before the House Committee on Education, and hearings were being held, the President requested the Advisory Committee on Education, previously appointed by him to study Federal aid for vocational education, to give more extended consideration to the whole subject of Federal relationship to State and local conduct of education, and to prepare a report. Thereafter the Congress took no further action in the matter pending the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Education.

On February 8, 1938, the President's committee transmitted its report to the President. The report was published by the committee, and also as House Document No. 529, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session. The committee found by unanimous agreement that—

> The educational services now provided for a considerable percentage of the Nation's children are below any level that should be tolerated in a civilized country.

And that—

> Unless the Federal Government participates in the financing of schools and related services, several millions of children in the United States will continue to be largely denied the educational opportunities that should be regarded as their birthright.

The late Senator Harrison from Mississippi and I introduced a bill drawn in keeping with the recommendations of the President's Advisory Committee. Some persons have already assumed that the executive branch of our Government has had nothing to do with the bill which is before us. I repeat that the late Senator Harrison from Mississippi and I introduced a bill drawn in keeping with the recommendations of the President's Advisory Committee.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the Senator please state for the RECORD the persons who compose the Advisory Committee, together with their status in the educational world?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have not the complete list before me, but it is public. The first group of that kind was appointed by former President Hoover during his administration to look into the trends as they affected our social and cultural life, and education was one of their considerations. The President set up the Youth Commission, headed by Mr. Owen D. Young, which also has made recommendations.

The commission which the President appointed had representatives from the American Council on Education, representatives from such educational institutions as the University of Chicago and Columbia University, men who are professional educators separated from the public-school system and men who are leaders in our society. The commission was representative of the whole country. The American Council on Education is in no sense a public institution. It is a private institution, not connected with the public schools.

I imagine the Senator from Oregon wanted to know whether the President's Advisory Committee was a committee which was in favor of the proposition before it started to study it. It was not. It was in every way a bona fide committee, which went into the study from a purely scientific standpoint and drew its conclusions for the advice of the President.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I presume it is possible for the Senator from Utah to obtain those records for the RECORD; is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes. The House document to which I previously referred, Document No. 529 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, is published as a part of our library. It contains the complete report. It is a public document, and therefore is official.

Mr. HOLMAN. I thank the Senator.

I read again the two statements which I have taken from that document:

> The educational services now provided for a considerable percentage of the Nation's children are below any level which should be tolerated in a civilized country.

That was one of the conclusions. The other was that—

> Unless the Federal Government participates in the financing of schools and related services, several millions of children in the United States will continue to be largely denied the educational opportunities that should be regarded as their birthright.

Senator Harrison, of Mississippi, and I introduced a bill drawn in keeping with the recommendations of the President's advisory committee. After extensive hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor in the Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, the bill S. 1305 was reported to the Senate with the recommendation that it pass. Because of several circumstances which it is not necessary to relate here, the bill died on the calendar of the Seventy-sixth Congress. In 1941 Senator Harrison and I introduced another bill, Senate bill 1313, to provide Federal assistance to the States for education. Extensive hearings were held on the bill. One important aspect of that bill was the proposal to grant financial assistance to the States in providing for school facilities in defense areas. That provision of the bill was taken out of the bill and treated as a separate subject, and became what is known as the Lanham Act; so a part of the recommendations of the committee in regard to the defense areas has already become national policy. Since that time grants have been made available through Public Law 137, known as the Lanham Act, and sometimes referred to as the Community Facilities Act.

S. 1313 was later modified by the Committee on Education and Labor and submitted to the Senate with a favorable recommendation. No further action was taken.

On February 4, 1943, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and I introduced the pending bill, S. 637. This bill is designed to meet two distinct needs, and that is all: (1) to meet the current crisis in our schools arising from the inability of the schools to pay salaries necessary to hold the required teaching staff; and (2) to meet the long-standing need for a Federal policy of financial assistance to the States in substantially reducing inequalities of educational opportunities. Extensive hearings have been held and the bill reported favorably to this body (Rept. No. 323).

The pending bill has one distinct characteristic to which I wish to direct attention. It follows a simple constitutional method of Federal relations to the States. It will establish a comprehensive system of direct Federal aid with funds apportioned to the respective States on an objective basis to be administered under the constitutions, laws, and regulations of the respective States. Mr. President, there is not one iota of Federal control in this bill.

No new Federal administrative agencies will be created. No system of Federal patronage will be provided for. There will be no new jobs. We now hear a great deal about bureaucracy. The pending bill is the antithesis of bureaucracy. Federal power being prohibited under the provisions of the bill, it will make unnecessary any machinery through which bureaucracy in educational administration can thrive.

In this bill the technique worked out is as simple, distinct, and fine as the technique worked out in the child welfare bill, a measure which has laid down a model for harmonious relationships between the Federal Government and the various States in such a way that all the constitutional legal departments in the State are recognized, and all Federal activity is carried on under the advice of the Federal agency, but through the constituted State authority. This bill would operate in the same way, without the advice, because there is no need of advice in this connection.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Would it be feasible or possible to make an appropriation to the States which find themselves unable to raise sufficient revenue to bring them up to an agreed-upon standard, without giving the money to those States which feel that they are able to maintain an educational standard of the kind the Senator has in mind? The reason I ask the question is that we are trying by this bill, I believe, to lift up those States which, because of lack of natural resources, lack of industry, or what not, do not have sufficient revenues to maintain a high standard of education. Is it possible, in the Senator's judgment, he having made a study of the question, to limit the benefits of the bill to such States, and to exclude, for example, States which have sufficient revenues to carry on an educational program of the proper standard?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. In answer to that question I can say point blank that that is exactly what is contemplated. The Senator is speaking of the equalization provisions.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Let me answer the Senator from Maryland first, and then I will yield to the Senator from Ohio. I think it is very important that this answer be made. The Senator from Maryland was very courteous in asking the question, and he has given me an opportunity to point out that the whole theory of the bill is based upon need. The objections made to Federal aid in earlier years were always made to the practice of the Federal Government which grew up under a matching process. We all know that there is unequal distribution of children and unequal distribution of wealth; and in those States where there are the most children we sometimes find the least wealth. The operation of the formula in the bill would do exactly what the Senator suggests. Several States would not receive any money at all.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has anticipated me. I was about to ask him whether, under the arrangement which he visualizes, there would be some States sufficiently wealthy, and with a sufficiently high standard of general education, so that they would not share in this money.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true. There are several such States.

Mr. TYDINGS. How many States does the Senator think would share in the appropriation?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator please speak louder? I did not hear his answer to the last question of the Senator from Maryland. I am sure it is most important.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, this is the first time in 10 years that it has been suggested that there is any difficulty in hearing me. I assure the Senator from Connecticut that I will try my best. When I am considering a bill such as this I wish to be heard, because there has been a great deal of misinformation about the bill.

We are talking about the equalization provision in the bill not the first provision, which takes care of the present emergency. In the equalization provision, the technique which brings about the distribution of the money provided is built entirely upon the basis of need. There are several States which would not receive any of the $100,000,000 appropriation under the equalization provisions of the bill. All States would receive their share of the appropriation in the first part of the bill, which is to take care of the present emergency.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should be grateful if the Senator would tell us what States would not, in his judgment, share in the appropriations. When he names them, it will be assumed that all the remaining States would share. So if he will tell us the States which would not share, I think we will have a clearer understanding of just what is proposed to be done.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, on page 17 of the committee report is a statistical table dealing with the data necessary for the distribution of the funds under subsection B. That subsection is the equalization provision. On page 18 of the report there is a table setting forth a combination of allotments. The Senator is inquiring about

equalization. The States are listed on page 18 of the report. It shows that California will receive nothing, Connecticut will receive nothing, Delaware will receive nothing, the District of Columbia will receive nothing, Nevada will receive nothing, Wyoming will receive nothing, and New York will receive nothing.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I suppose that the States which the Senator designates as those which would receive no funds have an educational standard which is higher than the one which the bill attempts to establish in a general way. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I assume that is correct, but there are other standards. The possibility of taking care of children in those States, as compared with the number of children they have to take care of, is great enough so that there is no need.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, the Senator is referring in this discussion only to $100,000,000 of the proposed $300,000,000. But $200,000,000 would be distributed, regardless of need, simply as a subsidy to all 48 States in proportion to the number of children in each State regardless of what the wealth of each State might be. Is that not correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; that is not correct. It would not be in proportion to the number of students in the State. It would be on the basis of the average daily attendance in the States compared with the average daily attendance in the whole school system.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad the Senator asked the question, because I think it will emphasize what I have already said to the Senator from Maryland, namely, that we were talking only about the equalization provisions. When it comes to what the Senator from Ohio has called a subsidy, every State would share because it would receive its proportion.

Mr. TAFT. I call both the $100,000,000 and the $200,000,000 subsidies. I do not think there can be any question about that. The State of Ohio would receive approximately $10,000,000. We do not need $10,000,000. We have a large surplus in the treasury of Ohio. We have a surplus in our operations. Not only that, but is it not true that 44 of 48 States today are operating on a surplus basis?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I do not think that is correct, Mr. President, so far as the educational provisions are concerned. Everyone knows that when Federal taxation is increased, income taxation is taken away from every State which has an income-tax system. For example, if we double the Federal taxes, which we have done, in a State which may have a 5-percent maximum income tax, we immediately take away 5 percent of each person's tax from that State. That brings us to the question of the responsibility of the Federal Government in relation to this subsidy, as the Senator from Ohio calls it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Let me read to the Senator the statement which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] made yesterday to the Post-War Planning Committee after a very careful study which he had made:

> While the national credit has been under great strain, the fiscal position of the States seems to be improving. The total debt of all the several States of the Union as of June 30, 1943, was $2,909,000,000. Against this may be charged the growing budget surplus in the States. At the beginning of this year this amounted to $700,000,000——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, may I ask whether the Senator from Wyoming, when he used the word "States," had made a study of the 48 States of the Union.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. Incidentally, the statement is based on the Census Bureau reports which I shall be glad to read later to the Senate.

I continue reading the statement of the Senator from Wyoming—

> and it is now estimated by officials of the Census Bureau at about $1,000,000,000. The sinking funds of the States and general obligations total $430,000,000 as of June 1943, so that making allowances for the surplus and the sinking funds, the debts of the States amount to a little over $1,000,000,000 as compared with the national debt of $146,000,000,000. I have not had an opportunity to examine the fiscal positions of cities and other local subdivisions, but it appears that all of the cities in the United States with a population of 100,000 or more at this moment have an unused debt capacity amounting to $750,000,000. These figures immediately suggest the advisability of an inquiry into the ability of the States and of the cities to carry part of the burden of public responsibility in the post-war world.

The figures suggest even more strongly the possibility of asking the States to deal with the present emergency in their own management of education, which has always been a State and not a Federal function.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, the Senator has devoted a great deal of time and study to the pending bill, which I, not being a member of the committee, have not done. I do not have the information which the Senator has. But I should say as a matter of general approach to the subject that I believe he would receive much support for his bill if it were confined only to aiding those States which appear to be unable to aid themselves sufficiently to bring the educational system up to a desired standard.

In the case of my own State of Maryland, I believe we are fully able to pay for such educational system as we need. We have a large surplus in the treasury. We have materially reduced our debt, and, while I do not have a knowledge of all the States, I am of the opinion that we in Maryland can meet the needs of education. However, I know there are certain States in the Union which are not so fortunately circumstanced.

Without committing myself I would approach with friendliness a bill designed to aid those States in coming up to a desired United States level, but I do not believe it would be wise at this time of large expenditures in the midst of a war to appropriate funds for every State regardless of its ability to finance an adequate and proper educational system in the manner for which I understand this bill would provide. So I respectfully suggest to the Senator that if he wants to obtain support for his bill I believe he would receive greater support if the bill applied only to the States which have real need and are unable to meet that need, rather than to the country as a whole.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, if I correctly understand what the Senator from Maryland is saying, he is speaking in favor of the equalization provision of the bill, and against what the Senator from Ohio calls a subsidy for the present emergency.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Allow me first to answer the question of the Senator from Maryland.

In regard to what has been called a subsidy for the present emergency, that provision of the bill which would make it possible to increase the salaries of teachers, provide that schools be kept open for 160 days in the year, and meet decent standards throughout the Nation is framed in such a way that the need must be expressed to the Committee on Appropriations. Such aid would be continued only so long as the Congress might be willing to grant it. That provision is in the bill. Legislation would not be required to discontinue the aid. If conditions should become such that a subsidy should not be granted, it would not be granted. After the emergency is over, the aid will be reduced.

The equalization provision would be a permanent attempt to solve the problems which are now facing us.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. As to the equalization provision, is it not true that even that is modified from any relation to direct State financial need in the 65-percent formula? For instance, this gives the State of Ohio $2,357,000 out of $100,000,000. Ohio is above the national average; no one can claim that the amount of money Ohio spends on students is not sufficient for an adequate education. If I understand the provision correctly, the result follows from the fact that the direct relation to the financial need in proportion to population is varied by saying that practically every State, unless it is away out of line, shall get something, so that only about six States in the Union get nothing. Many States well above the average and providing a perfectly adequate sum still get some

payment under this provision. Is not that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true. The Senator has hit upon what was brought about by the result of study. Instead of selecting the whole amount, or 90 percent, 65 percent was hit upon as being the most just, taking into consideration all the needs in all the States so far as this provision is concerned.

Mr. TAFT. I may be wrong, but I thought it was hit upon as the result of the study of the situation, for if the formula suggested by the Senator from Maryland were followed, so few States would get money that the bill never could be passed. That is the impression I have always had as to the reason for the 65-percent formula. There have been various formulas. I might say that I do not accuse the author of the bill of that. This bill from the beginning has been sponsored by the National Education Association and by educators.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I do not resent the statement, but it is unworthy of the Senator from Ohio. He has been on the committee; he has heard the hearings; he has discussed them, and he very courteously allowed us to bring this bill forward; but for him to assume that this bill was in any way fixed up to bring about its passage is suggesting something which is unworthy of one who has been a kind of a model to the educators of this country.

Mr. TAFT. Perhaps the Senator can explain, if we are simply trying to equalize and to bring poor States up to a standard why we should put in the 65-percent provision and proceed to pay money to some 44 out of 48 States. What is the reason for that? I had never understood the reason except the one I gave.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If we had taken 100 percent we would not have corrected the evil because there would have been many States that would not have shared. Ninety percent was suggested, then 80 percent, and, finally, it was discovered that 65 percent brought about the most equal distribution of all.

Mr. TAFT. I do not understand what the Senator means by "equal." I do not understand the term. Why is it "equal" to give Ohio $2,300,000 when we are well above the national average and when we are perfectly competent to handle our own educational system? Why do we get $2,300,000 if we are proceeding on the theory suggested by the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Are the salaries of Ohio teachers equal to the advances we have given persons in the employ of the Federal Government, for example? Is there any illiteracy in Ohio? Is there any need of attempting to overcome conditions in Ohio?

Mr. TAFT. I might ask the same question about New York to which nothing is given under this program.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; we do give to New York under the first provision.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but we are talking entirely about the equalization provision.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; under the equalization provision New York does not get anything; but, under the other provision, New York does get something, for New York has illiteracy and illiteracy should be overcome.

Mr. TAFT. We were discussing only the $100,000,000 under the equalization provision, but I suggest that is not an equalization at all as between the States, because there is inserted the 65-percent figure, which means that many States get money although they are above the national standard, the national average, and there is no particular reason that I can see for them to receive any more Federal financial assistance.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me when it is convenient?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield now to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Utah brought out the point that the first part of this bill, the $200,000,000 provision, which gives some money to each State, ought to be supported because the State revenues might be cut by increased Federal taxation. The Senator implied in that observation that the States would be less able to pay for their educational program, and the Federal Government, because of the increase in Federal taxation, would be better able to pay for it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No, not the second statement; I implied the first.

Mr. TYDINGS. Well, the first. I do not believe that observation will bear the full light of scrutiny, for I can see no reason why the Federal Government should tax the people of a State and then give them the money back again. If we are going to proceed on that premise, I would rather tax the people of the State less and let them regulate their own affairs than to have the Federal Government take the money and then hand it back to them and have supervision over their affairs.

That statement is not to be taken as in opposition to the provision which sets forth that there ought to be a general educational standard in the United States and provides assistance where States are unable, because of physical, geographical or other impediment to raise revenue sufficient to bring about such a standard, but it is in opposition to the theory that we ought to appropriate generally because the States are unable to raise the money with which to support a sound educational system. In my judgment, a great many of the States can do exactly what the Senator from Utah proposes should be done by the National Government by dealing with the matter locally, and certainly when the national debt is going up, and the same people are going to pay it anyway, it seems to me rather short-sighted to collect money in Washington and turn it back to the States when the educational standard of itself is not the thing we are attempting to raise.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator is familiar with history and no doubt recalls the arguments used when the sixteenth amendment was before the various States for ratification. He will remember that at least one State refused to accept that amendment because by formal declaration it said that the income-tax field should be left to the States and should not be taken over by the Federal Government, because as soon as the income tax became a habit with the Federal Government the Federal Government would then have such control over taxation that inevitably the day would come when through direct taxes the Federal Government would curb the ability of the States to tax their own people. Incidentally, that statement, which was not the prevailing statement, has proved to be the fact. Then, it is a matter of arithmetic. For instance, if the States allow a write-off on the State income tax for the amount of the tax paid to the Federal Government, and if ordinarily a person pays the Federal Government a thousand dollars a year but under present extraordinary circumstances he pays the Federal Government $3,000 a year, then the write-off, so far as the State tax is concerned, is $3,000 instead of $1,000, and, of course, if the maximum State income tax is 10 percent anyone can figure the loss to the State through its own taxing technique as a result of the increased taxes. That is the only point the Senator from Utah made, and it is so plain as to be easily understood.

But to assume that the great increase of Federal income taxation has not cut down the amount of taxes which the individual States receive is, of course, wrong. The present gasoline situation shows how wrong it may be.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to have the Senator help me, if he will, by turning to the table on page 18 of the report, and for purposes of illustration, take the line which deals with the State of Texas. I assume that the item that is headed "Apportionment on basis of 1940–41 average daily attendance, section 2A" provides to the State of Texas $9,999,000, allotted under section 2 or 2A of the bill. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I assume that is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Then in column 3 we find an apportionment to the State of Texas on the basis of financial need in the sum of $8,136,254, and I assume that is referable to section 2B. Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator please tell us what the State of Texas itself appropriates for education to compare with that total apportionment of $18,135,000, which the State would receive under the pending bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I can tell in general terms by referring to the one State the figures as to which I looked up, as an example, but it did not happen to be Texas. It was the State of Alabama, which can be used just as well as any other State, and it happened to be the first one on the list. The figures which I give are figures which were told to me

informally, and are not exact, but they come from an authoritative source.

Alabama should receive $5,000,000 under the first category, and $5,000,000 under the second, a total of $10,000,000. As to the question which deals with State expenditures for education in Alabama, at the present time Alabama spends about twenty or twenty-five million dollars. I cannot give the figures any closer than that.

Mr. DANAHER. Does that twenty or twenty-five million dollars a year include only the Alabama State appropriation, or does it cover appropriations by the municipal subdivisions as well?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It includes all that is spent in Alabama, by all the political units, as I understand.

Mr. DANAHER. Then, let me ask the Senator one other question, which is suggested by his last answer. Suppose the State of Alabama should say, through its duly constituted authority, its own legislature, "The only education we want in Alabama is $25,000,000 worth." May the State of Alabama, under the pending bill, receive $10,000,000 from the Federal Government, and appropriate $15,000,000 itself to make up the total of $25,000,000?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. There are two answers to the question, and both of them lead to a negative response.

Mr. DANAHER. I assumed as much, and I wish the Senator would explain.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. As the Senator knows, I always try to explain.

None of this money is to be forced upon a State. There must be a mutuality before the matter goes into consideration.

To the second question, I refer, for instance, to Alabama, which happens to be a Southern State, where there is a dual system of education, one for the blacks and one for the whites. We will assume that a decision is made that "We will use the money sent for the blacks, and then we will use more money for the whites," or something of that kind, something which is not done, by the way, and I really have no right to make that kind of a reference. Every dollar of Federal money that goes to the States for either the subsidy system—and I may say to the Senator from Ohio that I am beginning to like the word "subsidy" or for the equalization system, must be in addition to the money spent by the State for the year 1943, when the provisions of the proposed act are accepted. The bill refers to 1942. To put it another way, there is no way for a State to say, "As a result of the money coming from the Federal Government, we will merely let the Federal Government take care of this matter, because $10,000,000 is a great deal of money. Therefore we will not use State funds." They cannot use a cent from the Federal Government if they get a State appropriation.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Let us finish with the Senator from Connecticut first.

Mr. GILLETTE. Very well.

Mr. DANAHER. The allocations thereafter would proceed in accordance with sections 2A and 2B, and for the purposes therein stated?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GILLETTE. Will the Senator now yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. I wonder if the Senator will assist me, as well as he can, in understanding the computation provided for the allocation of the $100,000,000 fund. One of the factors is the ratio percentage in the total estimated income payments of a State as compared with the total income payments in the United States under data furnished by the Secretary of Commerce. What is meant by "estimated income payments"?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. They are called "estimated" here, but they will be exact when the proposed act is in force. They are called "estimated" here for purposes of illustration.

Mr. GILLETTE. What are "income payments"?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Income payments are the total income receipts of the various States each year as reported to the Federal Department of Commerce. There must be some factor, so the factor decided upon was the child and the factor of the State wealth as reflected in the income-tax receipts.

Mr. GILLETTE. The income payments, then, will not reflect the living, for instance, of a farm family?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No. If a farmer has a wife and half a dozen children, when he makes his income tax return of course he is given a credit, the same as anyone else. It reflects what the total number of persons in the State pay as income taxes.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield for a question only for correction?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If it is for a correction, I should like to have the Senator from Ohio help me.

Mr. TAFT. I merely suggest that income payments, as I understand, and as I understand the testimony, mean the aggregate gross incomes of individuals in a State.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. The same basis on which we calculate national income at a $100,000,000,000, or whatever it may be.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TAFT. It is the gross income payments of individuals.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has handed me a statement which I shall read, and probably someone else can explain it to the Senator from Iowa better than I can. I read:

> Estimates of income payments to individuals are distributed among the States on a where-received basis. Income payments comprise (1) salaries and wages net of payroll deductions for social insurance, (2) other labor income, such as pensions, compensation for injuries, direct and work relief and social insurance benefits, (3) net income of proprietors, including farmers, before owner's withdrawals—

I must say I do not know what "owners' withdrawals" are—

> (4) dividends, interest, and net rents and royalties received by individuals. Only payments made to residents of continental United States are included.

All that adds up to what I thought I was saying when I said that the total income payments, as reported by the Department of Commerce, comprise the factor on which the payments are made to the States.

Mr. GILLETTE. Then they definitely exclude the receipts of a family which furnishes its table and part of its living from a farm. Those are definitely excluded in the computation by the use of the word "payments"?

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should like to yield, because I cannot answer the question.

Mr. HILL. The language is "net income of proprietors, including farmers." That would indicate, certainly to me, that, as the Senator has said, it is net income, what the farmer has after he gets through paying all his expenses.

Mr. GILLETTE. Let me ask a further question. In addition to that, the income payments are used in this factor regardless of whence they are derived. For instance, a resident of Utah, the honored Senator, for instance, could have in Iowa a large investment from which he received a large return. His returns would be reflected as income payments in Iowa, and also reflected as income payments in the national picture.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. GILLETTE. Then the factor does not reflect a true comparison between the State income and the national income.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, it reflects as nearly the truth as possibly can be arrived at. The task of working out this problem of need was a hard one. In fact, several techniques were used and several trials of methods were made. The method contained in the bill seems to be the best one. But this answer should be made, that there is reciprocity between the States. What Iowa loses in one case she may gain in other cases. All States are treated alike, so we do have a proper comparison and a proper factor to arrive at, as just a distribution as possible. I am sure no one in the United States would say that our income-tax system acts with absolute and complete justice to every individual, because we know it simply cannot do so.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator some time ago made the statement that everyone knows that State revenues are less than they previously had been, by reason——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No, Mr. President, I did not say that. Everyone knows when States are prosperous, taxes of various kinds go up. I said this and only this, that everyone knows that in a State which has an income-tax system under which deductions are allowed, with the increase of Federal taxation, there will be greater deduction from the State taxation.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to call the attention of the Senator, if I may, to the report of the Department of Commerce, entitled "State Finances, 1942", and a table which shows the total State revenues in 1941 and 1942. I do not want to interrupt the Senator's speech. I will ask to have the table inserted in the RECORD later. I may suggest that the table shows that in 1941 the total State revenues were $5,457,000,000, whereas in 1942 they were $6,113,000,000. So the effect of the war was actually to increase State revenues by more than 10 percent.

Let us take the State of Alabama. That State received $70,000,000 in 1941 by way of taxation, and in 1942 received $79,000,000. The same ratio of increase occurs in every other State. So I do not think the Senator's conclusions can possibly be borne out by the figures. It seems to me the war has made the States better able to pay their educational expenses instead of less able to do so.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I do not have the figures for 1941 and 1942. I do have, however, the figures for 1942 and 1943, which are very significant and indicative. I am reading now from the hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee, September 22 and 23, page 979, from a report entitled "State Finances: 1943, Bureau of the Census, United States Department of Commerce":

STATE TAX COLLECTIONS IN 1943

War conditions noticeably influenced State tax collections in 1943, although total collections of slightly more than $5,000,000,000 were not more than 3 percent above the 1942 figure.

Mark this, because it is important.

Without the unemployment compensation tax, the total was approximately $3,900,000,000, about the same as in 1942 collections.

In determining the financial conditions of the States, and what are surpluses, we have to bear in mind, of course, what the revenues are, what funds they go into, and for what those funds are available. The report speaks of the unemployment compensation tax which has lifted up State incomes by $1,100,000,000. No one would, I take it, suggest that that money be expended for school purposes, for the payment of teachers' salaries. That money goes into a special trust fund for unemployment insurance. We know, of course, that with the employment situation as it is today more money is going into those funds than ordinarily, and there is much less drain on them.

Consider the matter of highway funds. As we know, because of the shortage of critical materials, because of the shortage of manpower, we are doing very little with our highways at the present time. Naturally the highway funds are building up. But, in the first place, under the constitutions and the laws of many States such funds cannot be expended for any purpose other than for highways. In the second place, we know that such funds should not be expended for other purposes for the reason that we are not able now to keep our highways up as we should. We are certainly not expanding our highways. When the war is over we will have to repair the highways, indeed, many of them will have to be rebuilt, and then we will also face the problem represented by many men coming out of the armed services and out of war industries who are going to need very badly jobs on the highways. So taking the over-all figures they do not present the true picture.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think it may be said that all taxes have increased in the States with the exception of gasoline taxes. The only decrease in tax collections that I can find is in connection with gasoline. And certainly there is no showing of any emergency that I can see in dealing with teachers' salaries.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield further?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I have here a report of the Federation of Tax Administrators, Research Report No. 16, 1943. This association is made up of all the tax administrators of the different States, and, I understand, representatives of the Treasury, and some representatives, perhaps, of cities and towns. The report makes this significant statement:

There is general agreement, in view of the uncertainties of the entire revenue picture, that the importance of present budget surpluses should not be overstressed.

I see present the distinguished former mayor of Cleveland, Ohio, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. He was a great mayor of that city, and I am sure he agrees with that statement because he knows how rapidly the situation may change.

The report continues:

It is very well possible, indeed probable, that declining yields and—what may prove to be more important—rise of expenditures * * * will all but erase the surpluses in many cases.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I was going to bring this subject up in another place, but I shall refer to it now. I want the RECORD to show that in regard to loss to the States of income tax by reason of the high taxation on income by the Federal Government I was making one single point. The point is that the States could not receive what they have received had not the national income been increased.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Permit me to finish, because it is rather hard to make a point when one can make only one-third of a point without being interrupted. State taxes have increased in what are called prosperous times. Some people might call such times a time of inflation. Statistics show, however, that there are counties in many States in the country where the property tax has greatly decreased. I doubt whether anyone can accurately make a complete break-down of the taxation of our country at the present time because there are too many unknown factors. We do, however, have statistics up to the end of 1942, which is as far as we go. Comparisons are made between 1932, 1941, and 1942. In 1932 the State tax was $1,886,000,000. In 1932 the Federal tax was $1,391,000,000. In 1941 the local tax was $4,605,000,000—a slight increase. In 1941 the State tax was $4,498,000,000—a great increase, due to a number of factors. In 1941 the Federal income tax had increased almost six times—$7,813,000,000.

When we come to 1942 we find that the local tax had increased to $5,000,000,000, but the State tax had remained practically constant, increasing to $4,952,000,000, while the Federal tax had increased to $13,700,000,000.

Mr. President, I revert to the only point I have tried to make: With a Federal tax amounting to $13,000,000,000, as compared with $1,800,000,000, anyone can see that if a write-off is allowed on a State income-tax return for Federal income-tax payments the States will not, and cannot possibly, receive what they would have received had the Federal income tax not increased. That is the only point I have made.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that one small point?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest first that most States do not permit the deduction of Federal income-tax payments in calculating State income taxes. In fact, I do not think any of the States do. The Federal Government permits the deduction of State income-tax payments, in the calculation of Federal income taxes; but the States do not permit the deduction of Federal income-tax payments in the calculation of State income taxes—that is to say, most of them do not.

Mr HILL. My State does.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. My State does.

Mr. TAFT. I say most of them do not. In Ohio we have a 5-percent tax on income from securities, but the Federal tax has nothing whatever to do with that.

In the second place, I suggest that if the Federal income tax is deducted, the total national income is so much greater than it was a year ago as to be almost inconceivable. As a matter of fact, the national income has increased by three times. Our Federal income taxes do not begin to take up the increase in income.

So, as a matter of fact, even if Federal income taxes are deducted, the income is much greater, and the State income is much greater.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, let us see how much greater. In 1941 the State tax revenues amounted to $4,491,000,000. In 1942 they amounted to $4,952,000,000—an increase of $400,000,000. That is the only increase, and it is apparent that the increase is not in any way substantial, nothing like the increase which has occurred in the Federal revenues.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest that, of course, we are talking about a minor point, because the percentage of State revenue coming from State income taxes is almost negligible, in terms of the total State income.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is the only point I made, Mr. President, and I made it not as one of my arguments, but in answering a question propounded by the Senator from Maryland; because that argument is so small that I would not use it in support of the bill, except for the fact that I was asked a question regarding it.

From the earliest days of the Republic the Federal Government has made financial contributions, directly or indirectly, to the States for the establishment and maintenance of public educational institutions on all levels. From the Revolutionary War to the Civil War the Federal Government endowed common schools and secondary schools with lands, and made grants of surplus tax moneys.

Following the Civil War land grants to new States were continued, and a policy of direct money grants was begun. I am saying these things because of the statement that we are moving into a revolutionary period. Mr. President, there is nothing revolutionary in meeting the demands of the times, and the pending bill has come into existence as a result of the demands of the times.

The Morrill-Nelson Act of 1862 and 1890, appropriating funds for land-grant colleges and universities had exactly the same opposition as that which is being given to the pending bill. The same things were said. The Morrill-Nelson bill was passed by Congress during the administration of President Buchanan. President Buchanan vetoed the bill on the score that education was not a Federal function. President Buchanan felt it was not proper for the Federal Government to enter into the field of education.

However, when the bill became law under the administration of a great statesman, Abraham Lincoln, in the midst of war, Lincoln had foresight, he had statesmanship, he knew the need of his country, and he knew, above all other things, the inequality of educational opportunity, because he had experienced it. Lincoln was not one of those men who said to themselves, "I have made good against all kinds of adversities and all kinds of disadvantages. Therefore, we should not bother about attempting to overcome such disadvantages." Lincoln said, "That which I suffered was not good for me, and not good for the Nation, and it is not good for the people of the Nation."

Lincoln, who had studied Jefferson as he had studied probably no other great American, knew that the very security of the Nation, of democracy itself, rested upon the theory of a trained citizenry, and he knew what it meant. Of all the things Lincoln did, probably the most far-reaching of all, the one which has done the most for his country, and has given opportunities to many million boys and girls of our land, was his act of statesmanship in undoing what Buchanan had done. I think a mistake is made by any Senator on the other side of the aisle who undertakes to oppose a bill which seeks merely to make democracy work, merely to give an equal opportunity to every boy born in the United States, merely to carry out the provisions of the fourteenth amendment, in which was laid down our definition of citizenship:

> All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield, although I was going fairly well then. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAFT. Yes, Mr. President, the Senator has stated that the object is to give every child an equal opportunity. I call the Senator's attention to the fact, appearing in the hearings, that today in the State of Louisiana the amount spent for a white child's education is $61 per child; the amount spent for the education of each colored child is $12. The discrepancy is approximately $48. I do not understand that after the pending bill is passed and becomes law we shall by any means be requiring the State of Louisiana to correct that discrepancy. I do not understand that we shall be giving any colored child in Louisiana an opportunity equal to the opportunity of a white child in Louisiana. Will the Senator state his conclusion on that question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the $100,000,000 of course would not bring about equality. The reason why it would not, however, is no reason for not doing some good and not attempting to overcome an evil which exists.

I will say—and here is where the Federal Government comes into the picture again—that in its decisions the Supreme Court of the United States has laid down the principle that in States which have a dual system of education there must not be a differential on account of race, color, or religion, and that, therefore—to use the State of Louisiana as an illustration—if a colored teacher meets all the requirements laid down for white teachers, the colored teacher can demand equal treatment so far as salary is concerned.

Mr. President, if an attempt were made to enforce that decision, it would ruin the educational system of the entire Southeast.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The table on page 19 of the hearings shows that whereas without this bill the cost per white pupil would be $61, and the cost per Negro pupil $12.62, after the passage of the bill the cost per white pupil would be $76, and the cost per Negro pupil would be $23. As I understand, the bill requires that this particular Federal money be distributed in equal proportion between white and colored pupils.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; that is not correct.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator correct me?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes. The provision is that a State may not say, "We are getting enough money from the Federal Government now; therefore we will not give any more money to colored pupils." The bill would not result in inequality. It provides that no Federal money may be given to a State for use in paying colored teachers or white teachers if the amount they now receive is reduced in any way. So the subsidy would result in an increase and not a reduction.

Mr. TAFT. It appears from this table that whereas the discrepancy before the bill was some $48, the discrepancy after the bill would be some $53. It is true that the position of the colored child would be improved, but it is also true that the position of the white child would be improved even to a greater extent. It appears that Alabama, for example, has plenty of money to educate the white children. Sixty-one dollars per child is a very reasonable expense. However, it has not chosen to educate the colored children on the same basis. Yet the bill, which purports to be an equalization bill, does not attempt to equalize.

The same thing is true with respect to the Northern States. There are more differences between a rich district and a poor district in some States than there are between the State of New York and the State of Alabama; yet the bill would not in any way correct that inequity, any more than it would correct the inequity as between colored and white children.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is not true, Mr. President. Everyone knows that if the white child could have $20 instead of $10, the inequality of opportunity would be greatly reduced, and everyone knows that the opportunities would be increased. As the Senator says, the proportion would not be changed, but the general standard of both would be raised to such an extent they would be given something which they have not had. That is all we can do.

Mr. TAFT. The point I am trying to make is that we are now talking about inequality of educational opportunity. I take Louisiana as an example only because it happens to be set out in the tables. The same thing is true of practically all the States which have separate schools. The inequality is far greater among the children within that State than it is between the children of Louisiana and the children of Ohio. Until we had State equalization in Ohio—which condition does not exist in many States—the differences in Ohio were far greater than the difference between Ohio and New York. The inequalities of education are within the States, and the bill would not even begin to correct those inequalities in any manner.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It would begin to do it. The argument of the Senator from Ohio is similar to that which is advanced in connection with many other things. We cannot have absolute equality; it is utterly impossible. We cannot have absolute justice; it is utterly impossible. We cannot have real democracy; it is utterly impossible. We cannot have any of those things in the absolute sense. Such things are impossible, in the nature of man and in the nature of circumstances. But we can have a pretty good democracy if we work it right. We can have a fair degree of

equality if we work it right. If we overcome abuses, we make a closer approach to equality. This bill is not a bill to usher in the millennium, Mr. President, and I am sure it would not do so.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Let me invite the attention of the Senator to these further inequalities:

In the State of Alabama, for example, in 1939 and 1940 the cost per white pupil was $47. The cost per Negro pupil was $14. In Arkansas the cost per white pupil was $36; the cost per colored pupil was $13. In Florida the cost per white pupil was $69; the cost per colored pupil, $26. In Georgia the cost per white pupil was $55, and the cost per colored pupil, $16. The figures for Louisiana are on a different basis. They are on the basis of average daily attendance, so the figures are somewhat different from those appearing in the record. The cost per white pupil was $77; the cost per colored pupil was $20. In Mississippi the cost per white pupil was $52; the cost per colored pupil, $7. In North Carolina, which is the best of the States with separate schools, for which the figures are given in the census reports, the cost per white pupil was $46; the cost per colored pupil, $28. In South Carolina the cost per white pupil was $57; the cost per colored pupil, $15. In Texas the cost per white pupil was $72; the cost per colored pupil, $28.

So it appears that even the poorer Southern States are perfectly able to educate white children on a level comparable with that of other States, but they are unable to educate colored children on the same level.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. They are not educated on a level equal to the others. I think, if the Senator wished to be completely fair, he would compare Louisiana with some of the other States, instead of making this comparison.

There has been no attempt in this bill to equalize the pay of the Negro teacher with that of the white teacher in a given State. There is no attempt to interfere with the State management of such affairs, because they are too complex for us to handle. Objection would be raised if we should attempt to do so. We have other kinds of minorities in our schools besides the Negroes. Certain provisions of the bill should probably be read in connection with this discussion. On page 14, under the heading "Definitions" we find the following:

(c) The term "minority race" or "minority racial group" shall mean any race or racial group that constitutes a minority of the population of the continental United States.

That means, for example, that the Spanish schools in New Mexico are considered as minority schools, as are the black schools in the South. From the Federal standpoint, this is all the bill attempts to do and all it could do.

I read further from page 14 of the bill:

(d) A just and equitable apportionment, allotment, or distribution of the funds provided under this Act for the benefit of a minority racial group in a State which maintains by law separate educational facilities for such minority racial group, means any plan of apportionment, allotment, or distribution which results in the expenditure, for the benefit of such minority racial group, of a proportion of said funds not less than the proportion that each such minority racial group in such State bears to the total population of that State.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It occurs to me that once the Federal Government goes into the question of white and colored schools, we shall never stop. We shall go on until we require every State to permit colored and white children to go to the same schools, as we do in Ohio. If a bill of that sort is proposed, we shall have exactly the same problem presented that we had in connection with the poll-tax bill and other measures. I think it is a subject on which the Federal Government should not begin to legislate. That is only an example. In my opinion, once we start, we shall never stop until the Federal Government is regulating every detail of the education of our children throughout the 48 States.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio has made the best argument for the bill that we have yet heard. That question is left entirely in the hands of the States. It is a State matter. If, for example, in the State of Georgia, a bill were introduced into the Georgia legislature to equalize—as has already been done in the State of Ohio, according to the Senator—that would be none of the Federal Government's business. That question should be handled in Georgia, in the way in which the Georgia legislature wishes to handle it. That is the scheme of this bill. The bill would not attempt to dictate in any way to any legislature or to any State official. The line is drawn absolutely, and it is adamant. There is no Federal control. There is no Federal supervision. There is no Federal attempt to change any State law. However, there is a Federal attempt to help to make things easier for those who are not getting along very well in an educational way.

Mr. WILEY and Mr. MILLIKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield first to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am sorry that I was called from the Chamber several times during the course of the Senator's remarks. I have not had the privilege of hearing all he has said. As I understand, his last statement is to the effect that if the bill should become a law the money which would be appropriated to the various States would be appropriated unconditionally so far as the use of the funds by the States is concerned. Am I correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The money would not be appropriated unconditionally. The funds would have to be used for the purposes defined in the bill.

Mr. WILEY. Perhaps my question was not clear. The bill designates the purposes for which the funds may be used.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. But when the funds are used for a certain purpose, is it the contention of the Senator that there is nothing in the bill which would in anywise give the Federal Government authority or power to determine or regulate any of the educational processes of the States?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true. The Federal Government could not dictate any rules concerning the standards of teachers, the employment of teachers, the curriculum, the building of schoolhouses, or anything of that type.

Mr. WILEY. In order to complete the record, can the Senator state very succinctly the purposes for which the money would be appropriated?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The answer to the question is set forth in the bill better than I myself can give it. It is section 5 (a) under the heading of "Availability of appropriations" on page 6 of the bill, and reads as follows:

SEC. 5. (A) The funds paid to a State from the funds appropriated under section 2 (A) of this act shall be available for disbursement by that State to local public-school jurisdictions or other State public-education agencies for the payment of salaries of teachers in public elementary schools (which may include kindergartens and nursery schools) and public secondary schools (which may include through the fourteenth grade) for any or all of the following purposes: (1) To keep public schools open for a term of not less than 160 days or to make suitable provisions for the education of the pupils affected by closed schools; (2) to raise substandard salaries; (3) to reduce overcrowded classes by the employment of additional teachers; (4) to adjust the salaries of teachers to meet the increased cost of living during the emergency.

Mr. WILEY. So far as those purposes are concerned, they simply channel the direction in which the funds must go, but there is no control otherwise in the bill, as I understand it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. WILEY. And there is no designation of what proportion of the fund to be assigned to any State shall be used for any one of the purposes mentioned in the bill? Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct. That is left entirely to the local State jurisdictions.

Mr. WILEY. Then, it is the Senator's conclusion that the power which is vested within the State to regulate its own educational system is not in anywise impinged upon or interfered with.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Not in any way whatsoever. That is the fundamental theory on which the bill rests. The bill rests on the fundamental theory in regard to education in America that the State, the home, and the church shall always and forever have an opportunity to take part in educational work. That is all. We do not allow one jurisdiction to interfere with another. Just as the State of Colorado could not dictate to the State of Utah what it should do in

regard to its educational policy, the Federal Government, under the pending bill, could not dictate to Colorado.

Mr. WILEY. Then may it be stated from the Senator's viewpoint that the only activity the Federal Government would have in connection with the bill would simply be to apportion the funds to the various States according to the methods set forth in the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It is substantially true, is it not, that so far as the $200,000,000 is concerned it must be used to increase the salaries of teachers?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. That is the purpose of the bill, is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Four uses are provided to be made of the funds.

Mr. TAFT. It is a subsidy. All the uses set forth in the bill relate to salaries of teachers, and the $200,000,000 would be a subsidy for the salaries of teachers, would it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, the $100,000,000 may be spent for any school purpose.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Perhaps we should read from the bill so that we will know exactly what we are talking about. I read the provision of the bill concerning the subject to which the Senator from Ohio refers:

(B) In order more nearly to equalize educational opportunities, the funds paid to a State from the funds appropriated under section 2 (B)—

That is the equalization section—

of this act shall be available for disbursement by that State to local public-school jurisdictions, or other State public-education agencies, for all types of expenditures for public elementary schools (which may include kindergartens and nursery schools) and public secondary schools (which may include through the fourteenth grade).

That is, any purpose.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. So far as increasing the salaries of teachers is concerned, under the provisions of the bill the money might be used to pay all the higher-paid teachers, might it not, and not the lower-paid teachers? I am following up the question of the Senator from Wisconsin. Let us put it this way: There is no requirement that the money shall be used to equalize inequalities within a State. Is that not correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, that cannot be correct because the use of the money would be limited entirely to the secondary and elementary schools where the salaries of teachers are the lowest in all the school systems. But under the bill a State could—I know a State would not and everyone knows that it would not—use all its money to pay its principals. Senators know it would not be done. It cannot be done under our system of local control. If a State should attempt to be unfair in the distribution of the money to its teachers, there would be no doubt in the mind of anyone here that the State would not continue to be unfair very long.

Mr. TAFT. Why would that be? I do not understand why it would not continue to be unfair very long. Does the Senator mean that the Federal Government would step in and say, "You must change your method of administration of the funds?"

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No, the Federal Government would not step in. It would point out what was being done and the people of the individual communities would bring about a change, as they have brought about many other changes in this democracy. The force of public opinion constantly and forever would maintain a decent and fair administration.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. In his prefatory remarks I assume that the Senator has covered what he claims are the needs of certain areas of this country for the Federal aid proposed in the bill. Has he covered that subject?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I have not covered that subject as yet. I have not gone into it because the questions asked have not dealt with it.

Mr. WILEY. Does the Senator expect to cover that field?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I can, but I have assumed so far that there is a great inequality of educational opportunity in our country and we have handled it only in that way. The bill itself assumes that fact. I have not tried to prove it.

Mr. WILEY. I should like to say to the Senator, if he will yield further to me, that I have received letters from my own State for and against the bill. Some of the writers have expressed fear, as suggested by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, that the proposed legislation would be an entering wedge whereby the Federal Government would put its "clutching hands," as the writer of one letter said, upon the educational system of the States. The Senator has replied to my question indicating that there is no clutching hand; that in fact the hand of the Federal Government will not be involved at all after the funds have been distributed to the State. I understand that to be his conclusion.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. WILEY. In this period of change in this country in many sections the white-collar workers, such as school teachers, are almost "the forgotten men," and I presume the opportunity provided by this bill to enable school teachers to get an increase in their salaries or wages would, in the judgment of the distinguished Senator, be applying not only the rule of equity to a situation which merits it but would make possible the continuance of the school system, because teachers are leaving their jobs for more remunerative positions in war industries. While the national income has greatly increased, perhaps to one hundred and forty or one hundred and fifty billion dollars, the school teachers' incomes have decreased because of the increased cost of living. Is that true?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is very true. We can furnish statistics on that matter, but I should like to say in answer to the Senator's question as positively as I can that any Senator who votes against this bill in essence votes against giving to the public school teachers of the United States an increase of $100 a year; that is all. That probably makes it a little too simple, but when I give the statistics it will be seen that, even with such an increase, the teachers are not being adequately taken care of.

Mr. MILLIKIN and Mr. BROOKS addressed the Chair.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I promised to yield to the Senator from Colorado. Then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am willing to defer to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I notice that the title of the bill is "to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency," and so forth. Can the Senator suggest that this emergency will ever end so far as this kind of an appropriation is concerned? Is there any thought in the mind of any member of the committee that when the war is over this will be discontinued?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. There is, so far as the bill is concerned; and, in my mind, judging from the experience of the last war, I am sure that the condition will not continue. There are two aspects of the bill: One, the first appropriation is entirely of an emergency character; the other is permanent. The emergency feature can come to an end as soon as the State's ability to take care of its teachers becomes apparent.

Mr. BROOKS. Which part of the bill is the emergency part? The $200,000,000 provision?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes, the $200,000,000 provision is the emergency feature; the $100,000,000 provision is permanent.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There have been a number of questions which have circled around what I am about to ask, and I think they probably had the same intent; but the answers have always gone off on statistical matters. So I should like to frame the question in this way: Assuming that a State has a budget surplus which could be available for educational purposes, on what theory should we put Federal money into that State?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the question, of course, is a difficult one to answer. In theory we have attempted our very best to make it impossible for a State that can take care of its educational facilities to receive

more than a State that cannot take care of them. The working out of the idea is quite another task. In the equalization part we can provide for the difference, and we do so, to the extent that some States will receive nothing; but, on the other hand, there is not a single State or Territory in the United States that does not need some adjustment to take care of illiteracy or to take care of failure on the part of their educational systems to educate persons at least to the point where they could properly serve their country at this time. For example, we have recently discussed the so-called fathers' draft bill, or an amendment to the Selective Service Act which would exempt fathers from the draft. I doubt very much whether Senators of the United States realize that nearly a million men, most of them able-bodied, have been rejected because of their lack of educational qualifications to serve under the draft, and I doubt very much whether the Senators present realize the fact that if all the people of the fourteen Western States were removed, those States could be repopulated in the numbers they now have by locating in them persons in the United States who have not completed the fourth grade in school. It is necessary to have about an eighth-grade education in order to pass the simplest demands made by the Selective Service System for taking men into the armed forces.

They must have sufficient education to be able to read orders and understand what is meant. Our loss of manpower as a result of the fact that certain segments of our population have been neglected is a deadly and costly loss to our people. The sad part of it is that we knew of such a condition in the last war, and did nothing to rectify it. I hope the war will end long before we can increase in sufficient measure the educational qualifications of our selective-service men; but we are today, Mr. President, detailing majors and captains of the Army to teach reading, writing, and arithmetic; we are spending more money in teaching the 10 percent of illiterates which the Army is willing to receive than it would cost to enable such persons to complete elementary- and high-school education.

Mr. President, from the economic standpoint we are so penny-wise and pound-foolish that anyone who understands the simplest aspects of the economic life of our country cannot help but be ashamed. I think it is a disgrace to this country to call a man to the service and give him the bars of a captain or the oak leaf of a major, and call upon him to teach reading, writing, and arithmetic to boys who have been deprived of the first four grades of school.

I am probably a little worked up over this matter because in the last war I saw it on all sides; I know about it, and for a whole generation have understood it; but we have not been able to do anything about it until we find ourselves in a crisis such as we now face. And now we are going to draft fathers, many of whom have several children, because we have failed to make it possible for nearly a million boys to meet the A, B, C requirements, the lowest requirements of the Army of the United States.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, may I make an observation in connection with the Senator's remarks?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Excuse me. I apologize; I must admit I am a bit enthusiastic for this bill. Of course, I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The distinguished Senator from Utah, who is a member of the Military Affairs Committee, will recall that that committee in its very extensive hearings on the anti-drafting-of-fathers bill heard considerable testimony on the illiteracy situation in the United States. Personally I thought that a very large number of men could be combed out of those who had been rejected for illiteracy. However, after we had detailed to us at that committee hearing the Army tests which are given to men, it became apparent, at least to me, that the eight or nine hundred thousand remaining illiterates who have been rejected are not illiterates, but for the most part are morons who are uneducatable.

For example, one test was one of the more or less conclusive tests. They would show a man three circles and a square and ask him if he could see any difference in them. Those who were rejected were those who could not see any difference between three circles and a square. So I do not believe we can charge that part of the problem to any lack of education. I respectfully suggest that most of those men—not all of them, but most of them—are uneducatable, if there is such a word.

Following the question I first propounded to the Senator, I asked our Legislative Reference Service to give me some statistics on the surpluses in State treasuries. There is some confusion in the figures, but I have here a list of all the States, with their treasury positions as of the present time, there being some confusion, as I have said, as to just exactly what the figures mean, whether they cover general surpluses available for any expenditure which the State might care to make, or whether they are funds already committed to educational or other specific purposes. There is some little confusion in the classifications. But out of the whole list it is apparent, I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Utah, that almost all our States have some surplus in what might be called their general funds, available for educational purposes within those States.

The summary of the data furnished me says:

> Bearing in mind the above qualifications, the total surplus in the States derived by adding the data below—
>
> The data below being the itemized surpluses of the States, and deficits in a few cases—
>
> amounts to approximately $1,000,000,000.

Without being overpersistent, I must say to the distinguished Senator from Utah—and I have been following him very closely—I at least am not satisfied with the answer to the question as to how we can put Federal funds into any State, under proper principles, for educational purposes, when the State itself has a surplus available for that purpose.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Colorado should not use his last three words "for that purpose," because of course if there were a surplus in any State used for the purpose of equalizing educational opportunities, for raising teachers' salaries, for example, there would be no need for our acting.

The argument which the Senator has put forth is very much like the argument which one might use in the Army appropriations subcommittee, when the Army comes in and asks for several million dollars more for next year, and we say, "Have you spent all you have?" They reply, "No; there are several million dollars which have not even been allotted." Then we say, "There is such a large surplus there that you should use that up first." I am sure the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] will bear me out in the statement that such testimony has been given in the Committee on Appropriations many times.

States are as complex as the Nation, and to get a State to take care of its teachers in the proper way would require 48 different endeavors. They have not done it. They should do it, I know.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me suggest to the distinguished Senator from Utah that the surplus point which has been made bears with especial relevancy on the emergency features of the bill. It seems to me difficult to explain how a State can have a surplus in its general funds, available, under its laws, to meet these emergencies, and then to say, "Take Federal money from us before you have applied your own funds to your own emergency."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It is very easy to answer that. Let us take my own State, for instance. The only State funds which can be used at all for any of the elemental schools come from a 5-mill tax. It would not make any difference if there were $100,000,000 of surplus in Utah, until the legislature acted and did something about it, it would be improper to use that in increasing the salary of a teacher in one of our poorer counties.

I hope the Senator will realize that most of these surpluses have been brought about by the extraordinary taxes we impose upon the people of our country for special benefits, for roads, social security, and other things. In some of the States all those funds go into the general fund. In some they are kept separate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. May I make just one more observation?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I shall be glad to have it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The list I have shows that the State of Colorado has a general fund surplus of $4,800,000, and we have an institutions-building-fund surplus of $1,500,000. That, it is stated, is on hand to meet post-war needs. I do not recall whether it has been especially committed to that purpose by legislation, or whether

that has been an executive or an administrative decision. My State has $4,800,000 in its general surplus, and if we have any educational emergencies in my State, that surplus will have to be fairly apportioned to that emergency before I vote to put any Federal money into Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator whether under his State law any money could be used, for example, to increase the salaries of teachers.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Every dollar of that general surplus could be used for that purpose. We also have special mill commitments for other educational purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Insofar as the existence of surpluses in the State treasuries at this time may have any bearing upon the merits of the pending bill, I think it should be stated for the consideration of us all that many of these surpluses have been created because of the inability of the States to carry on many of their functions, for instance, improving and enlarging their charitable and eleemosynary and penal institutions because of the lack of critical materials, and because of their inability to obtain certain materials for the construction of highways. In my own State the road program has been very greatly curtailed because of the inability of the State to get certain critical materials necessary in the construction of highways, especially Federal-aid highways.

My State has a surplus of $10,000,000 in its treasury, which has grown out of the fact that it imposed certain taxes for the purpose of paying off an existing debt, and because it has not been able to get critical material for the construction of highways and for the enlargement of penal and eleemosynary institutions. The surplus has been created, in part—I would not say altogether—because of that situation. That surplus will undoubtedly be dissipated when the post-war period comes, and the State proceeds with its normal activities. I think all States, as well as all communities and cities, must cooperate with the Federal Government in public improvements in order that the whole burden may not fall upon the National Government, and every political subdivision in America must cooperate with the Federal Government in trying to find employment for men coming back from the armies. That covers, of course, insofar as the States and Nation and the counties and cities are concerned, the public improvements, the roads, and the institutions which are supported by the States. The surpluses which are in existence now do not indicate any permanent condition on the part of the State treasuries. They are temporary, growing out of the situations to which I have referred, and the surpluses will be largely dissipated when we get into the post-war period and the States and counties begin to discharge their part of the public duty in regard to the post-war situation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. My only suggestion, I say to the distinguished majority leader, was that on any theory of emergency within the States we cannot allow to remain undisturbed a general surplus available for the purpose of meeting the emergency. That, I may state, is one of the reasons why we have State governments and State revenue systems.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is undoubtedly a legitimate argument, I may say to the Senator from Colorado. It probably is likewise true that in some States the surpluses cannot be used for educational purposes because the taxes have been levied for some special purpose. They could not be transferred from that purpose to the general education fund without legislative enactments on the part of the legislatures, and in some States it may even require constitutional amendments.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I recognized those distinctions in my questions as originally asked.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I have been loath to turn to States and give State statistics concerning teachers, and I will not do so if the Senator does not want me to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts in a moment.

Mr. WALSH. I was going to suggest that the Senator might desire to rest a few moments, and that a suggestion of the absence of a quorum might be in order.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No, Mr. President; I love the discussion in which we are engaged.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to ask the Senator a question or two before he concludes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his suggestion. As the Senator knows, I have lived with this subject for 10 years, and between us, as he also knows, I am rather full of the subject, so I am having a good time.

Mr. President, I do not desire to say anything about Colorado if the Senator from Colorado does not want me to do so.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am delighted, Mr. President, to have the distinguished Senator from Utah bring to the special attention of the Senate anything he has to present with respect to Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The point is that if Colorado has this great surplus I simply do not believe the State could leave conditions as they are, because slightly over 60 percent of all the school teachers in Colorado receive less than $1,200 a year. I repeat that to the teachers in Colorado the practical aspect of voting the bill down is simply this: It will result in denying to underpaid teachers of Colorado an increase of between $100 and $200 a year. Sixty percent of them are now being paid less than $1,200 a year.

Mr. MILLIKIN. My point is that the State of Colorado, through its legislature, and through its school districts, in my judgment, is able to do justice in any situation where injustice prevails; and that I do not feel that it is my function as a Federal legislator to pass judgment on those school districts or on the conduct of my State government as a whole.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I shall now be glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, there are several questions I should like to ask the Senator from Utah. One relates to the matter of Federal contribution to increase in salaries of teachers throughout the country. That is a very laudable purpose. The Senator from Utah knows that in some of the earlier bills there was embodied the proposal to place teachers under civil service, or at least there has been some agitation to put all the teachers of the country under civil service, the same as postal employees, clerks, and letter carriers. I ask the Senator if he does not feel that the commencement of a contribution of $100, more or less, from the Public Treasury to each of these teachers, is ultimately going to lead to a demand for a uniformity of salaries all over the country the same as exists with respect to postal employees?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, of course I cannot project myself into the future, and I can only answer for myself, but no educational bill with which I have had anything to do since the first Harrison-Black bill contained a provision of that sort. Under the pending bill there is simply no way by which these funds would cause the development of that sort of proposition. It simply would not happen. It simply cannot happen. There would have to be an entirely different sort of bill passed, a bill built up on an entirely different theory.

There is no change proposed in the status of the teachers. The grant is to the State, and the teacher is paid by the State. The teacher is not paid by the Federal Government.

Mr. WALSH. There is no doubt in my mind, as I recall the evidence and agitation on this subject, that there has been a feeling and a movement which has not as yet crystallized to have a uniformity of salaries throughout the whole country with respect to teachers. But let us pass that for the moment.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. In relation to that subject, let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts that grants have been made to land-grant colleges for nearly 100 years. There has never been an attempt made to equalize salaries between the professors in one land-grant college and the professors in another land-grant college. We have had the Smith-Hughes Act and we have had the Smith-Lever Act, and we have had other acts making grants which have been given to the colleges and the universities by the Federal Government. There has never yet been an attempt made to equalize in any way the pay of teachers in various States.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, the legislation to which the Senator refers was not so broad in its scope as is the proposed legislation.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think the previous legislation is broader in its scope. I think the land-grant-college legislation is even broader than the pending legislation.

Mr. WALSH. It is limited to only a few colleges.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. One in every State and Territory of the Nation.

Mr. WALSH. Does it apply to every college in every State?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; not to every college in every State, but land-grant colleges exist in every State.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; there are land-grant colleges in every State. This bill applies to every teacher in every State.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. There is no State which is delimited.

Mr. WALSH. No; but the legislation to which the Senator referred does not apply to every college.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; it does not apply to every college, and the pending legislation does not include every school in the country. It applies merely to public schools.

Mr. WALSH. I wish to ask another question with respect to increase in salaries. Many of the municipalities of my State during the depression felt obliged to reduce the salaries of policemen, firemen, and school teachers. Later the reductions were restored. Would not the pending bill, if enacted, prevent first of all the municipal authorities or the State authorities from reducing salaries which they themselves pay to teachers?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Would it not prevent them from reducing salaries?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Of course, the provisions of the bill have nothing to do with that. If the State authorities accept a grant from the Federal Government they must, under the provisions of the bill, use the fund toward payment of the teachers, in addition to what is paid them in 1943.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The States cannot receive the Federal money if they reduce the salaries lower than those the teachers received in 1943.

Mr. WALSH. If there develops in this country such a situation as to cause a severe financial depression, and the municipalities which raise their revenues for educational purposes feel they are unable to pay the present salaries, they would lose this contribution from the Federal Government if they reduced the salaries; is that not a fact?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If they reduced the teachers' salaries for the purpose of substituting the Federal fund for the amount of the reduction, that would be the case, because the purpose of the bill is an attempt to increase salaries and an attempt to equalize them.

Mr. WALSH. So it amounts to this, that a State or a municipality cannot in the future, no matter what the emergency may be, reduce the salaries it pays without losing the Federal funds?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; I think that is not so at all.

Mr. WALSH. I understood the Senator to say that.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No.

Mr. WALSH. I understood that the contribution was based upon retaining the present salaries of 1943.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If a State accepts this money to increase teachers' salaries it would be wrong for the State to substitute this money and not increase teachers' salaries. If the State is not going to increase teachers' salaries it should not take this money, because the purpose for which the money is given is to increase teachers' salaries. If a State decides, for example, that it shall no longer have any schools, and do away with teachers entirely, it cannot receive any money with which to increase teachers' salaries. If a State decides to reduce teachers' salaries of course it cannot receive any of this money.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator contend that the States or municipalities must retain the present scale of wages to their teachers in order to receive any of this fund?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; they would have to retain the present scale.

Mr. WALSH. That is the point I make. That means that if such a situation develops that the taxpayers do not feel they can pay the salaries which they have been paying to teachers, as it developed in my State in the case of firemen and policemen and others, if the State attempted to reduce the salaries it would lose this contribution from the Federal Government?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes, but the prevention is provided for the purpose of——

Mr. WALSH. I understand.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator understands the purpose; does he not?

Mr. WALSH. I understand that. I am talking about the future.

Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Let me ask the Senator a further question: Suppose the municipalities and States decide they must economize and must reduce salaries; does not the Senator think there would be a movement in the Congress—and probably a successful one—to appropriate larger sums of money so as to offset such reduction?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. There might be. Our appropriations have increased for everything I can think of, in our country.

Mr. WALSH. I greatly fear that the bill will result at least in a retention of the salaries that will be fixed by the localities at present levels, plus the amount of money given out of the Federal Treasury and increases through Federal aid in the future. Those are some of the objections I have to that feature of the bill. The bill appears to me to be transferring to the Federal Government the fixing of teachers' salaries through its contributions.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Those objections are mere assumptions, I may say to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. That is true, they indicate a plan of future decisions upon the Public Treasury because of the new policy we propose to inaugurate.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. They are not based upon facts.

Mr. WALSH. It is a fear of the problems which may arise in the future to embarrass us if once we enter into this field of Federal contributions.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If the Senator fears a problem of that kind more than he fears a complete breakdown of our public educational system, which may occur because of other factors——

Mr. WALSH. I do not consider there is any complete break-down of our educational system. I think my State has an excellent educational system. I think nearly every other State in the Union has, insofar as it is able within its available means to educate its youth.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. But the Senator knows that many thousands of teachers are leaving their jobs because of the salaries paid, and are going into defense plants. The Senator knows there is the greatest turn-over of teachers that has ever occurred in our history, and that that situation is threatening nearly all the schools of the country.

Mr. WALSH. That is also true; but firemen, policemen, letter carriers, and all other public servants who are essential to the preservation of order, as well as to the education of youth——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in that connection I should like to state that as a result of the shortage of essential employees we have increased the salaries of essential Federal employees. The salaries of school teachers have been increased merely a few dollars, while the salaries of factory workers have increased from an average of $1,200 to nearly $2,100 a year. The salaries of Federal employees have increased from an average of a little more than $1,800 to an average of considerably over $1,900. Those are the ordinary computations which enter into the matter.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator does not contend that uniform salaries should be paid teachers everywhere in the United States; does he?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Certainly not.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator would agree that the teachers in the city of Washington, where the cost of living is exceedingly high, should be paid more than teachers in many rural communities should be paid; would he not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The theory of the bill is to attempt to equalize such injustices.

Mr. WALSH. There is another feature of the bill about which I should like to inquire. I call attention to the report of the committee which summarizes what the language of the bill undertakes to provide. It is the matter of apportionment——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. To what page does the Senator refer?

Mr. WALSH. I read from page 15 of the report:

From not less than 98 percent of the $100,000,000 made available under section 2 (B), apportionments will be made to the respective States by the United States Commissioner of Education according to an objective formula for finding the financial need of the respective States. Financial need is determined statistically by two factors: (1) The number of inhabitants from 5 to 17 years of age in the respective States—

I think I understand that formula. The other is the one about which I have difficulty—

and (2) the financial ability of the respective States as measured by the total estimated income payments in each of the States.

Will the Senator explain that, please?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator understands the factor relative to the number of children; does he not?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; I understand the first one.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The second is an attempt to get at the usable wealth of a State.

Mr. WALSH. Will the Senator please give us an illustration?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Bureau of the Census gathers, every year, figures on the amount of income taxes paid by the various States. The second factor is based on that amount; so that if in one State there is $1,000,000 worth of tax receipts, but only a few pupils, and if in another State there are many pupils, but only half a million dollars of tax receipts——

Mr. WALSH. Is the formula based only on the income-tax revenues? Is that the formula?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. On the reports by our Department of Commerce of taxes collected.

Mr. WALSH. As reported by the Department of Commerce?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes. There are Federal statistics. This seemed to be the best of all possible ways to work out the distribution on the basis of need.

Mr. WALSH. Is the net result to grant to States with small incomes more of the money than States with large incomes would be given?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true. The States with small incomes and with many children would receive more of the money than would States with great incomes and few children.

Mr. WALSH. The first part of the formula in the bill is new, I believe—the one which attempts to fix the number of inhabitants between the ages of 5 and 17. I do not think that has been contained in previous bills, has it?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think the whole formula is new, I may say to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. However, I think the second formula is somewhat of a repetition and is along the lines of other bills. At any rate, it works out so as to provide more money from the fund for the so-called poor States than for the so-called rich States. We agree about that, do we?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. Now, I should like to ask the Senator if he thinks it fair and equitable for the National Government to give funds to certain States which have, for reasons of their own—and I am not criticizing—given a small percentage of their revenues for educational purposes as compared to their total revenues.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, if it were true that the States which have trouble in obtaining sufficient money for their educational systems have allotted to education smaller sums as compared to their total wealth, then the proposition the Senator from Massachusetts lays down is a proper one. However, it happens that the States which are doing the most in comparison with their wealth are providing the least for the number of children.

Mr. WALSH. Providing the least?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Providing the least; yes.

Mr. WALSH. I do not understand the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. There are States whose resources are such that the amount of money they use on education is actually less than the amount of money other States, whose resources are little, use on education as compared with the total money received.

Mr. WALSH. The statistics do not show it. I have an incomplete table which I received a few years ago. It shows the educational expenses of States. The State of New York pays for education 27 percent of its total revenues. My own State pays 21 percent. Another State which is named in the table pays 24 percent; another State pays 25 percent; another State—the small State of Nevada, incidentally—pays 30 percent.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. WALSH. But other States pay 10 percent or less. How can the Senator justify compelling States which are contributing to education 27 percent, 25 percent, and 30 percent of all they collect in taxes to pay more in the way of taxation, and to permit the taking from the Federal Treasury, out of the funds they pay, sums of money to increase the percentage of education in the other States?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am sure that if the Senator will study further, he will discover that that rule does not follow at all. There are States with certain taxable values and certain taxable income which are actually doing more, when we consider the wealth of the States, than States with much greater wealth, in comparison with other expenditures.

Mr. WALSH. I do not follow the Senator; but I know that the proposed legislation is for the purpose of giving funds to those States which give the least of their income toward education. Is not that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Not the least of their income.

Mr. WALSH. The smallest proportion.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. That is the point I am urging.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The children are simply not in those places where the States can afford to take care of them. Where we find poor States, we find a great number of children; and where we find rich States, we find fewer children.

Mr. WALSH. I challenge the statement of the Senator when he uses the word "afford." I have contended for a long time that we cannot tell whether one State needs Federal aid, as compared with another State, unless we make two surveys; first, a survey of the system of valuing assets; and second, a survey of the rates of taxation. If a so-called poor State valued its property at 100 percent, and had a tax rate such as we have in the city of Boston, of over $40 per thousand, and then were not able to educate its children, it ought to have Federal aid. But taxation values and rates vary in the several States. In some cases the valuation is on the basis of 40 or 50 percent of the real valuation, and the tax rate on that valuation is very small as compared with $40 or $50.

I cannot see the justification of compelling those States whose citizens make great sacrifices by permitting large valuations of property and imposing high rates of taxation to give aid to those States which value their property at a low percentage of its real value, and which have low rates of taxation.

Of course, we cannot equalize taxation. It would be abhorrent for the Federal Government to undertake to equalize taxation. It would be a violation of the most fundamental principle of local government. It cannot be done. We are confronted with the situation that some States and some communities are taxing themselves to the limit to give every possible benefit for the education of their youth, while other communities, lackadaisically, indifferently, or negligently, are resisting the burden which would be involved if they were to impose taxes on an equality with other States, or if they were to spend the same percentage of income for the education of their children.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. In connection with the idea developed by the Senator from Massachusetts, is it a fact that some States actually have higher assessments on taxable property than have other States?

Mr. WALSH. There is no doubt about it. No two States and no two communities value their property on the same basis, or have the same rate of taxation.

Mr. STEWART. Has that question been explored? Do we have information upon it?

Mr. WALSH. It is a matter of rather common knowledge that the taxing authorities in the various communities and States have fixed values according to the judgment of their assessors. The assessed value may be 40, 50, 60, or 100 percent of the real value. In the city of Boston and other large cities, in some cases the valuation for tax purposes has been found to be 400 or 500 percent above the real value.

Mr. STEWART. That question might be open to debate. Take my own State of Tennessee as an example. In assessing real property in the various counties, the idea of valuation in one county might differ somewhat from that in another county.

Mr. WALSH. I am not objecting to it. I think it is a local right. I am citing it simply as an argument that we should not ask a county or State which assesses to the limit to contribute to another county or State which does not do the same thing.

Mr. STEWART. Is it correct to say that such a condition actually exists? Is there such a wide variation, for example, that the State of Massachusetts actually assesses property for taxation at 100 cents on the dollar, while the State of Texas, the State of Tennessee, or the State of Nevada assesses property at only 50 percent of its actual cash value? Is that a correct statement? Does the Senator have facts to bear that out?

Mr. WALSH. In my opinion it can be easily borne out. There is no doubt about it. The Senator himself cites the example of two counties in his own State which assess on a different basis.

Mr. STEWART. That condition might exist within the borders of one State.

Mr. WALSH. I do not raise the question for the purpose of requiring the States or communities to fix a common level for valuing property for I believe in local self-government. I raise the question to define what is a poor State, from the standpoint of needing Federal aid for educational purposes.

Mr. STEWART. My question is, has that point actually been explored by the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It has been explored, and the bill is based on precisely the theory which the Senator from Massachusetts presents. If he will study the statistics and the reports, he will find that, taking all the factors into consideration, the States which need this aid are doing their level best. They are doing even better than the rich States. The very thing for which the Senator contends is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I understood the Senator to say that the apportionment in the second bracket in the bill is based upon the incomes of the several States, as shown by the income-tax returns.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; but, Mr. President, we must not lose sight of the factor of children.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that. I am speaking of the second bracket, not the first.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If there are few children in Boston and many children in Salt Lake City, for example, and both cities have exactly the same tax rate, and assess on exactly the same basis, Salt Lake City has a greater task than has Boston.

Mr. WALSH. Undoubtedly that is true. The same situation is true in my own State. In the mill towns there are large populations of foreign-born people who have large families and the tax bills in such towns are very much heavier than in suburban cities that are merely residential cities.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If the States had not done their level best, I would not be interested in this bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to emphasize what the Senator from Utah has said, and that is that the States which are making the smallest expenditures are making the greatest efforts in behalf of their schools. The hearings before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor are full of testimony showing clearly and conclusively that the States which are making the smallest expenditures are making the greatest efforts. I could spend a long time calling attention to charts, figures, and statements by various witnesses to this effect. However, I wish to invite the Senator's attention to the statement of one witness. I choose him especially because he is not an educator. He is one of the greatest businessmen in America. I refer to Mr. Henry I. Harriman. Mr. Harriman was formerly chairman of the board of the New England Power Association. As I understand, he is a former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. He was vice chairman of the American Youth Commission.

As a member of the American Youth Commission, Mr. Harriman offered to testify before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor as to the findings of the commission, and to testify in favor of Federal aid for education, speaking, as I understand, for the American Youth Commission, which was presided over by none other than a distinguished citizen of New York State, Mr. Owen D. Young, the chairman of the General Electric Co.

Mr. Harriman stated:

> It cannot be said of the States that support their schools meagerly that they do so from lack of effort. Almost without exception these States are making a greater effort than the States whose educational expenditures are highest. They are devoting a large part of their resources to educating their children, but these resources are much less than those enjoyed by our more fortunate States

Mr. Harriman continued:

> In 1934 the wealthiest State had more than six times the economic resources, based on wealth per child 5 to 17 years old, than the poorest State had. Lack of resources available for school support is a handicap affecting large areas of the country—areas which have the task of educating a very considerable proportion of the Nation's children. In the rural Southeast, in 1930—

I assume he used 1930 because that was a census year—

> the farm population included 13 percent of all the children of the country, but it received only 2 percent of the national income. The nonfarm population of the Northeast—

That is Mr. Harriman's own section of the country—

> which had only twice the child population of the Southwest farm area, received 21 times as much income, or 42 percent of all that received by the whole Nation.

Mr. Harriman continued:

> In my opinion, perhaps the most telling argument for Federal aid to the States for educational purposes is the fact, now well established by authoritative research, that a substantial number of the States simply cannot, from their own resources alone, support a minimum defensible program of public education. They could not do so even if all the available tax moneys they might raise were applied to that purpose. You are doubtless acquainted with the estimates of Dr. Paul R. Mort, of Columbia University, which indicate that this situation would have been true of nine States even in the prosperous year of 1930. Assuming the application of a model uniform tax system in all States, Dr. Mort finds that in these nine States 100 percent of the general-purpose taxes that would have resulted from the operation of the model law—

He was referring to the model tax law—

> would have been insufficient to maintain the schools at an acceptable minimum of efficiency. Even in about two-thirds of the States—

"Even in about two-thirds of the States," Mr. Harriman says—

> the minimum program could not have been supported from the estimated yield of this tax plan without seriously encroaching upon the amount needed for other governmental services.
>
> The present situation clearly calls for action, and I see no way to remedy the evils I have pointed out other than assistance from the Federal Government. The need has now become unmistakably apparent. We cannot afford to delay action longer.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from Alabama state when that statement was made?

Mr. HILL. It was made in 1941 before a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. It did not relate to the $200,000,000 provided for teachers, did it?

Mr. HILL. It related to equalization.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I invite the attention of the Senator from Utah to the words used in line 17 of section 5 on page 6 of the bill, which read as follows:

> To adjust the salaries of teachers to meet the increased cost of living during the emergency.

We all recognize that there is a need for increasing salaries of teachers, but I invite the Senator's attention to the words "during the emergency". That is a very indefinite expression. The members of the Appropriations Committee have to watch these matters in order to comply with the authorizations contained in any bill such as that now pending. I hope the Senator will feel agreeable to amending that part of the bill by inserting some such language as "6 months after the war is closed," or say "after the signing of the armistice."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Does the Senator wish to have inserted in the bill an amendment similar to that which we have put in nearly all the war bills?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. I think it would have to be a little longer in this

instance, because it ought to go through the school term for the particular year. However, I think it should be made definite, because otherwise we would have to pass on the question when it comes before the Appropriations Committee, and it might well be made definite here at this time. I merely call it to the attention of the Senator, and I hope that he will make the language more definite.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, most of the military bills have carried some such formula, limiting the application of the act to 6 months after the peace, or 6 months after the end of the war, or 6 months after Congress, by concurrent resolution, shall have declared the emergency over.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have no objection to such a provision being inserted in the pending bill, because the bill has been drawn to take care of the need which has been brought about as a result of the war.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator really think that if Congress pays $200 of every teacher's salary in the United States—and that would be the effect of the provision in the bill for the use of the $200,000,000—we will ever stop paying the $200, and that the States will ever assume the burden of paying the $200 or that we will undertake to reduce the salaries of teachers once having undertaken to pay $200 to each of the teachers in the United States?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I answer the question of the Senator from Ohio by asking another question: If the Congress of the United States pays $50 a month to 10,000,000 or 13,000,000 soldiers, which is probably more than some of them have ever received, will Congress ever cease to do so? Of course it will, and it will continue to refrain from doing so. The Senator fought the N. Y. A. and the C. C. C. They had a great many more employees, and a great many more persons were employed by those agencies, but under the Senate's direction we stopped paying them.

Mr. TAFT. I think the case is different. We will have to stop paying soldiers the salaries we now pay them. We will have fewer soldiers after the close of the war. That is the only difference.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I say to the Senator from Ohio that whatever may be the result of the bill, it seems to me that we ought to have a definite time fixed in it as to when the pay will no longer apply.

Mr. TAFT. I fully agree with the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It is hardly in order at the present time, but when the Senator wishes to offer the amendment to which he has referred, I should like to have him do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will prepare an amendment in accordance with the one covering the subject which we have put in other bills. That will be satisfactory so far as I am concerned.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact, which he already knows better than I do, that during the dark days of the depression we paid out of Federal funds the salaries of many hundred thousands of teachers in this country. The truth is that through the use of Federal funds we kept open and operated schools attended by one-eighth of all the children in the United States attending school. We faced a great emergency, and we met it. When the emergency ended, we no longer appropriated money for it. I submit to the Senator that the same situation would result with respect to the pending bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I probably cannot deal with probabilities with exactness, but, like the Senator from Alabama, I could cite instances in which we have changed our minds and have done things differently.

Mr. TAFT. The difference in these cases, for one thing, is that the pending bill involves a million people, compared with the staff of about a thousand or possibly 2,000 in the N. Y. A. This would be a larger subsidy to more people than we have ever granted. Funds appropriated for the W. P. A. could hardly be called a subsidy. That was for the purpose of employing persons.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I sometimes wonder if the Senator from Ohio is afraid of the people back home? Whom do we represent here? Who, in the final analysis, sit here? The people of the United States. Therefore, if the people want to cut this off at any time they can cut it off; the Senate can cut it off. The Senator from Ohio is not afraid of the people whom he represents, is he?

Mr. TAFT. Not at all.

Mr. HILL. Yet the Senator talks as if we are something different from the people, and as if the people were trying to make a raid on us. We represent the people; we are the people. Certainly, that is the way I conceive my representation here.

Mr. TAFT. However, it is very much more difficult, once having increased a man's salary, to take it away from him than it is not to give it to him at all.

Mr. HILL. When it is provided that it is for a particular purpose, when that purpose ceases to exist, it may be taken away.

Mr. TAFT. As a matter of fact, the people of this country are not asking for this bill. There never has been any demand from any State for it. The governor of no State has come here, and said, "My State cannot afford to pay the salaries of its teachers." The demand comes entirely from the National Education Association and the Office of Education. There is no public demand for Federal aid to education. If the people of Ohio were asked about the bill, I venture to say that 9 out of every 10 would say "No, we have a good educational system, and the State of Ohio is perfectly able to take care of it." I have faith in the people, and that is why I am quite confident that this bill is not going to pass; but, after all, at best, the argument should be fully presented.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Utah yield to me further? I do not desire to trespass on his time unduly.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I deny the statement that it is only the National Education Association and the teachers who are supporting this bill. The mothers and the fathers of this country, speaking in large measure through their parent-teacher organizations, the mothers and fathers who have children in school, the mothers and fathers of the boys and girls who are going to be the citizens of tomorrow, are demanding the passage of this bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in this connection I should like to read where the support for this bill comes from. The organizations supporting it are as follows:

American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation.
American Association of University Women.

Those women are not teachers and they are not members of the National Education Association.

American Home Economics Association.
American Teachers Association.

That association is not a part of the National Education Association.

American Vocational Association.
Association for Childhood Education.
Association for Colleges and Secondary Schools for Negroes.
Board of Superintendents of New York City.
Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen.

The Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen does not belong to the National Education Association.

Civitan International, Alabama, Mississippi District Convention.
Delta Kappa Gamma Sorority.
Department of Adult Education, National Education Association.
Department of Classroom Teachers, National Education Association.
Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association.
Department of Supervisors and Curriculum Development, National Education Association.
General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Would it be possible to find a cross section of the country representing the women of the United States in a broader way than the combination of the American Association of University Women and the General Federation of Women's Clubs?

Great Lakes Education Conference.
Music Educators National Conference.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

That association has nothing to do with the National Education Association.

National Association of Secondary School Principals.
National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Which represents the parents of every school child in the United States.

National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education.
National Council of Chief State School Officers.
National Council of Executive Secretaries of State Education Associations.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Council of Social Studies.
National Education Association of the United States.
National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

That organization is not connected with the National Education Association.

National Kindegarten Association.
National Negro Council.
National Society of College Teachers of Education.
National Women's Trade Union League.
New York City Bakers and Confectioners Union (American Federation of Labor).
New York State Industrial Council (Congress of Industrial Organizations).
New York Teachers Union.
Public Education Association, New York.
Quota Club International.
Railway Executives' Association.
Service Star Legion.
Southern Conference on Teacher Education.
United Government Employees.
United Stone and Allied Products Workers of America (Congress of Industrial Organizations).
Young Women's Christian Association, national board.
Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

Then there are listed other organizations that are supporting Federal aid for education:

American Association of School Administrators.
American Association of Teachers Colleges.
American Farm Bureau Federation.

In every State in the Union there is a chapter of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

American Federation of Labor.
American Federation of Teachers.
Associated Women of the Farm Bureau Federation.
Committee for the Care of Young Children in Wartime.
Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Every one of the three major labor organizations of the United States has supported this bill from the beginning.

Department of Rural Education, National Education Association.
Executive Committee of the Federation of the Churches of Christ in America.
Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America.
Farmers Union.
National Child Labor Committee.
National School Service Institute.
Phi Delta Kappa Educational Fraternity.
Southern Tenant Farmers Union.

The pending bill is actively supported by the education associations, or State teachers' associations, of the following States, Territories, and outlying possessions—the associations may or may not be affiliated with the National Education Association, but for the most part I think they are not—Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

Mr. President, in view of the recital I have just made, I think it is somewhat unfair, to say the least, to charge that this great Nation-wide bill is supported by only one organization.

I should like, if I may, Mr. President, to finish my formal statement, and then I shall be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Has the Senator a table indicating the percentage that each State pays of the Federal tax dollar? The reason I ask the question is that, as I see it, in many States there is levied on the citizens of the States a tax which, substantially speaking, is equivalent to the sum that is paid back to those States. In other words, the Federal Government really operates as a collecting agent for the so-called school fund that goes back to the States. What I am asking is, has the Senator such a table?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If the Senator will look at page 17 of the report he will find listed by States the income payments of 1941. Each State is listed, with the amount it pays. Then there is shown the proportion it might get back. The Senator could use a little arithmetic and obtain the answer.

Mr. WILEY. Is it on page 17?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; of the committee report.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think that all can be worked out with a pencil, without much trouble.

Mr. President, the Morrill-Nelson Act, 1862 and 1890, appropriating funds for land-grant colleges and universities; the Hatch Act, 1887, appropriating money for the establishment of agricultural experiment stations in connection with land-grant colleges; the Smith-Lever Act, 1914, and the Capper-Ketcham Act, 1928, providing for agricultural extension work through land-grant colleges; and the Smith-Hughes Act, 1917, and subsequent similar acts for vocational education in agriculture, trades, and industries, and home economics, all illustrate a fundamental interest of the Federal Government in the fostering of public education.

I should like to say to the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Massachusetts, with respect to whether States take what is offered them, that I know nothing about any experience outside my own State, but the institution with which I was connected was permitted to share appropriations under the Smith-Hughes Act, and it gave up the privilege, it did not take the funds, because it would have been inconsistent with the type of thing it was doing. When we are dealing with the educational institutions of our country, we are dealing with people who are rational, who are intelligent, who understand needs, and who are interested in developing the country.

Mr. President, since 1921 a number of authoritative and scientific studies have been made on the question of Federal aid to education. All of them have arrived at the same conclusion, namely, that Federal aid to education is absolutely essential to the attainment of a fair degree of educational opportunity among and within the States. That is, all the studies, whether made by teachers' associations or nonteachers' associations, have all favored Federal aid to education.

In 1929 President Hoover appointed the National Advisory Council on Education, composed of a number of outstanding laymen and educators. The conclusions of that council were wholly favorable to Federal aid to education.

In 1938 the Advisory Committee on Education appointed by President Roosevelt "to study the whole question of Federal relations to State and local conduct of education," after extensive study and research, made the strongest possible case for Federal aid to education.

The American Youth Commission, working under the auspices of the American Council on Education, gave extensive consideration to this subject, and on May 10, 1938, voted unanimously that Federal aid to education is necessary and desirable. The American Youth Commission was composed of such persons as Owen D. Young, chairman; Mrs. Dorothy Canfield Fisher; Chester Rowell, editor of the San Francisco Chronicle; and H. A. Harriman, former chairman of the United States Chamber of Commerce. These persons are patriotic American citizens, who desire to build up their country

In the early part of 1942 a report entitled "After the War Full Employment," by Dr. Alvin H. Hansen, special economic adviser to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, was issued as an official report of the Board. This report laid down a six-point program essential to the economic stability of the Nation in the post-war period. One of these points called for Federal aid to the States in financing public education.

From the Committee on Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations, appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury, came a report released on April 5, 1943, in which the committee presented extensive data on educational problems, and concluded and recommended that the Federal Government should aid the States in financing public schools. Said the committee report:

> Much weight needs to be given to the view held by many people that education is a part of their way of life and that national participation means regimentation and loss of important minority rights and interests. Concessions can and should be made to this feeling, but in recognition of the overwhelming national interest in the maintenance of minimum standards of educational opportunity, the concessions should not extend to a vote of Federal aid for general education with equalization features. Nor should it block a control program necessary to secure

the Federal objectives. It is not an acceptable feature of our way of life to keep a large section of our population in ignorance. * * * Wise Federal leadership with regard to educational development in the United States can make an impressive contribution to the economic, political, and cultural life of the country.

Senate bill 637, the Educational Finance Act of 1943, is a bill authorizing the appropriation of funds to assist the States and territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and public secondary schools.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know whether it is the pleasure of our able chairman that he be not interrupted during his discourse. If he is disinclined, I certainly should not care to ask him to stop the splendid statement he is now making.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If the Senator will permit me to finish the statement, then I shall be glad to yield the floor to him, or be happy to answer any question he may propound.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the bill provides Federal funds with which to make possible assistance to the States, at the same time guaranteeing State and local control of education. This bill unequivocably safeguards State and local control of public schools. In section 1 it declares:

No department, agency, or officer of the United States shall exercise any supervision or control over any school or State educational agency with respect to which any funds are expended pursuant to this act, nor shall any term or condition of any agreement under this act relating to any contribution made under this act to or on behalf of any school or State educational agency authorize any agency or officer of the United States to control the administration, personnel, curriculum, instruction, methods of instruction, or materials of instruction.

Senate bill 637 reaffirms faith in the people back home by writing into the law the principle of Federal aid to public education without impairing State and local control. For more than a century the principle of Federal aid without Federal control has been successfully embodied in American educational practice. Land-grant aids, beginning with Ohio in 1803 and the two Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890, prove that important Federal assistance without Federal encroachment upon State and local governments is an arrangement which on the basis of our national experience can be and should be continued.

Opposition, based on the claim that S. 637 gives the Federal Government control of public education, fails to apprehend one of the chief objectives sought by this bill—the nonfederalization of our public-school system. The way to prevent that development is to prohibit its occurrence through law. If our national experience proves anything at all, it is that Federal control follows Federal aid when the law is written that way, and that Federal control does not thus follow when the law forbids. The issue is just as clear as that, and Congress, not a bureau in Washington, will determine what the policy shall be.

The enactment of Senate bill 637 will accomplish two great objectives—it will extend aid to meet existing emergencies in public education, and it will go a long way toward equalizing educational opportunities among the States by making a minimum acceptable school program possible in every section of the country.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to enable States and their local public school jurisdictions to meet emergencies in financing their public elementary and public secondary schools by providing funds for the payment of the salaries of teachers to keep schools open, to employ additional teachers to relieve overcrowded classes, to raise substandard salaries of teachers, and to adjust the salaries of teachers to meet the increased cost of living. For this purpose the bill authorizes to be appropriated for each fiscal year in which Congress shall find a need therefor $200,000,000 to be apportioned to the States on the basis of the average daily attendance of pupils attending all types of public elementary and public secondary schools. The amount apportioned to each State from the funds appropriated will be an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount made available that the average daily attendance of pupils attending public elementary and public secondary schools in that State bears to the total of such average daily attendance for all the States.

For the purpose of more nearly equalizing public elementary and public secondary school opportunities among and within the States, the bill authorizes to be appropriated $100,000,000 to be apportioned to the States on the basis of two factors—first, the number of children between the ages of 5 and 17 years to be educated, and, second, the financial resources within the State adequately to educate those children. The formula is so written that the lower the income of a State the greater the amount of money that State will receive in proportion to the number of children to be educated.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am at the great disadvantage of not having heard all the able addresses made by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. I know it was as thorough a job as the able Senator from Utah always does. But since in the part of the address which I heard, the able Senator was referring to the Federal interest in education, as it were, I was wondering if the Senator had gone into the matter of the number of rejects from selective service on account of educational deficiency in this war so far.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Only informally. It has been stated that nearly a million men have been rejected as a result of educational deficiency. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], I may say, made the statement that he was sure many men out of that million were noneducationable, if there is such a word.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator now speaking is a member of the Military Affairs Committee, I believe the ranking Democratic member, and I am sure he knows better than I that the Army is taking in a considerable number of illiterate men and running them through a short course of 6 weeks trying to teach them enough to be able to read simple signs that might make it possible even for them to observe road directions and a few of the essentials that would be necessary to their Government. It seems to me that no one would question the fact that it is the province of the Federal Government to provide the soldiery with which to defend the country, and that in modern warfare it has been determined to be necessary in order for a soldier to be an effective soldier to be an intelligent soldier, at least a literate soldier. If the States are permitted to determine the educational qualifications of their people it would be within the power of the States, by neglect, to keep the country from being capable of defending itself. That is aside from the relationship between education and physical qualifications.

I do not at this time, Mr. President, desire to address myself to this subject, although I shall a little later. I merely rose to say that it would seem to me that as vividly as could be shown the present emergency has shown the necessity for the Federal Government interesting itself in the minimum literacy level of its citizenry, if on no other ground, upon the pure ground of national defense.

EMPLOYMENT OF EXPERTS AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS BY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations I report an original resolution and ask that it be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Without objection, the resolution will be received and referred as requested.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the committee has already been advised with respect to the resolution, and has passed upon it. I ask that the resolution be read for the information of the Senate, after which the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] proposes to report it back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 193), as follows:

Resolved, That for the purpose of obtaining and laying factual data and information before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, or any subcommittee thereof, for its consideration in the discharge of its functions, the chairman or acting chairman of said committee is hereby authorized and directed to appoint and employ such experts as he may deem necessary to obtain such data and information, and such experts, upon the written authority of the chairman or acting chairman, shall have the right to examine the books, documents, papers, reports, or other records of any department, agency, or establishment of the Federal Government

in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; be it further

Resolved, That the said committee, through its chairman, is hereby authorized to appoint additional clerical help and assistants; be it further

Resolved, That the salaries and expenses of such experts, and of such additional clerical help and assistants, shall be paid out of the appropriation for expenses of inquiries and investigations, contingent fund of the Senate: *Provided*, That the total of such salaries and expenses for the remainder of the fiscal year 1944 shall not exceed $30,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to make a report of the resolution from the committee, if he will.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I will say to the Senate that I have conferred with members of that committee on both sides of the aisle and they have agreed that a resolution of this nature should be adopted. It strikes me that it makes provision for something which is very necessary. Therefore, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back, without amendment, Senate Resolution 193, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], I shall have to object.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from South Dakota will not object. I spoke to the Senator from Oregon before he left the floor, and told him the purpose of the resolution and what was proposed to be done, and the resolution has his entire approval.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Then, Mr. President, I have no objection.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under those circumstances, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the resolution, as reported by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not object to immediate consideration of the resolution. I merely wanted to ask the Senator what he thought might be saved by the proposed investigation? How much does the Senator think might be saved?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is very difficult to say. The Committee on Appropriations last year saved up to $200,000,000 and by the adoption of the resolution additional expert help can be secured by reason of which I am quite sure the committee can save a very large sum of money. It is very difficult to say in figures how much can be saved, but I think it will certainly mean hundreds of millions of dollars. It is a step in the right direction and I hope very much the Senator from Ohio and other Senators will not object to adoption of the resolution, because we want to have its provisions in operation by the first of November if possible; and considerable activity, energy, and time will be required to put it into effect.

Mr. TAFT. I simply wondered if the committee's entire work would not be nullified by the passage of the bill providing for the addition of $300,000,000 to the Federal Budget, for the purpose of aiding education. After all, is there any use to investigate and attempt to reduce expenditures, and then turn around and in 1 day add $300,000,000 additional to the expenditures of the Federal Government?

Mr. McKELLAR. If we saved it, and voted $300,000,000 too, we would still be saving money for the Government.

However, regardless of that, that is a matter yet to be passed upon by the Senate. I hope the effort of the committee to lessen the expenditures of the Government may proceed, so that the Senate will have an opportunity to pass upon the matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I might suggest to the Senator from Ohio that the passage or defeat of the educational bill would be in no way affected by agreeing to the resolution. If the resolution is as effective as we hope it will be, it might result in the saving of sufficient money to pay the cost involved in the educational bill.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The able senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has asked the able senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] about the saving, and he has referred to its being a net saving for the country to save dollars and to gain the illiteracy of the Nation's children. I am sure he will not mind my reminding him that I remember the time when on the floor of the Senate he was personally and to a considerable extent responsible for saving money but losing critical materials which our country later badly needed for its national defense.

Again, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is proposing to save the children of the country, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] speaks of that as he spoke about the laying up of critical materials before the war started—as an extravagance.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered and agreed to.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 193) was considered and agreed to.

IDENTIFICATION CARDS FOR SENATORS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if I may do so, I shall trespass upon the time of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for a moment longer to ask for immediate consideration of a resolution which is lying on the table, and which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 86), as follows:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate is authorized and directed to issue to each Senator an identification card bearing a photograph of such Senator, the signature of such Senator or a facsimile thereof, and the words "the person whose photograph and signature appear hereon is a Member of the United States Senate." Each such identification card shall be signed by the Sergeant at Arms.

SEC. 2. When any identification card issued under the foregoing section is presented or exhibited by the Senator to whom it was issued, such Senator shall be admitted to any building or other property occupied or used by any department or agency of the Government, and shall be so admitted without regard to any rule, regulation, or requirement of such department or agency relating to the admittance or identification of persons entering such building or other property.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before bringing up the resolution I talked to both the majority and the minority leaders. They said they had no objection to it. I simply desire to say that the situation calling for consideration of the resolution largely grows out of conditions at the War Department. Of course, we all recognize that there must be some regulation about entrance to the departments; but for a Senator, a representative of the Government, who goes to one of the departments on official business, to be held and detained for some little time and to be examined as a stranger because, without the fault of anyone, the examining person does not know the Senator, and examines him just as he examines everyone else, means the loss of valuable time. Furthermore, the Department requires that a large, white, saucerlike arrangement be pinned on the coat of each visitor; the visitor has to be very careful not to break it, and the regulations provide that it must be given to a certain officer when the visitor leaves. All that takes a great deal of time.

The resolution, if agreed to, would simplify the situation very much, and would save the time of Senators in performing their official duties. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate situation of the resolution, and ask that it be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution? There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senate.

FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 637) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it had been my desire to speak this afternoon. The hour is rather late. We have had a very able and excellent address on the pending bill by the distinguished Chairman of the Committee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I doubt if I could

conclude my remarks this afternoon. If agreeable to the majority leader, I shall wait, and shall begin my remarks in the morning.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, that is entirely agreeable.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in the Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, there was pending before the Senate a bill relating to Federal assistance to the States for the support of public education. On June 13, 1939, in conjunction with the then Senator Donahey of Ohio, I filed minority views. While the bill then under consideration is not comparable in all particulars to the bill presently pending, and in fact is different, I feel it might be a contribution to the discussion to have a portion of the minority views which Mr. Donahey and I submitted at that time printed in the RECORD in connection with the present debate.

There being no objection, the minority views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I cannot give my support to the bill (S. 1305) to promote the general welfare through appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public education which has been reported by the Committee on Education and Labor, and I am submitting this statement of my views as to this legislation and of the reasons why, in my judgment, it is both unwise and inexpedient and ought not to pass.

Its purpose is stated in the title as—"to promote the general welfare through appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public education."

It rests upon the premise that the education of our youth is of the highest importance to our national welfare and the economic and social advancement of society; that, taking the country as a whole, existing educational opportunities and facilities are variable and unequal and deficient in many particulars due to a variety of causes, one of which, without doubt, is an insufficiency of funds; in some cases due to indifference or neglect and undoubtedly, in other cases, to poor economic conditions.

No one who is open-minded and acquainted with the facts will dispute these premises. No one will deny that even though educational opportunities in the United States today are greater and educational facilities are better, and our entire system of education more democratic than anywhere else in the world, nevertheless there is much room for further improvement, and, in my opinion, more money alone will not accomplish all the betterment that is needed.

Educational opportunities are not and never have been uniform except in totalitarian states, and that is so because from the earliest day to the present day, public education has been primarily a local responsibility and largely supported by local taxation. The States have collaborated with the local communities and have supported State institutions for higher learning, but the Federal Government has not heretofore had any direct connection with the public-school system.

No one will deny that present-day concepts of social responsibility and present-day social and economic conditions raise grave and fundamental questions with respect to the scope and efficiency of our educational system. However, I repeat, mere spending of more money will not correct the present defects.

The premises upon which the present bill and its predecessors—which have been before the Congress intermittently for the past 20 years—rest, and its professed objectives, which are stated to be "to assist in equalizing educational opportunities" are widely applauded. Everyone will subscribe to the general proposition that equality of educational opportunity is a desirable objective.

THREE MAJOR QUESTIONS

The bill, however, and all others of its pattern present three other questions of far-reaching import.

The first question is whether the Federal Government, as a matter of sound public policy, ought to assume responsibility for public education throughout the Nation and contribute substantially to the same out of the Federal Treasury and exercise an oversight thereof.

If we answer that question in the negative, we need go no further.

The second question is whether Federal subsidies to the public-school system can be maintained without ultimately bringing about a nationalization of our educational facilities and federalized bureaucratic control. This is an eventuality which the proponents of the present bill insist is not intended and which they maintain can be avoided. They contend that by the terms of the present bill that danger is removed.

I seriously question that conclusion.

The third question is whether it is safe and prudent for the Federal Government to embark at this time upon the financial outlays and the future financial commitments comprehended in the program embodied in the present bill.

In my judgment, most emphatically it is imprudent and dangerous to do so at the present time. With the public debt increasing at a tremendous pace, with a long-continuing yearly deficit in income, it is no time, however meritorious the proposal may be, to begin new and far-reaching financial undertakings. With the unemployment problem still far from solved and relief expenditures continuing to be a primary necessity, it is imprudent, as a sound fiscal policy, to plunge into new undertakings.

QUESTIONS AS TO METHOD

There are, in addition, several questions as to method which are of deep concern. One is the question of whether, with respect to the series of subsidies provided in the bill, the method of their allocation to the several States is fair and equitable to all concerned.

I believe that it is not.

Another is the question of the participation, or the exclusion from participation in the grants, of American youths who attend elementary and secondary schools maintained by private rather than by public funds.

The present bill as reported to the Senate operates to exclude the privately supported schools and their pupils from participation in the authorized distribution of the funds, notwithstanding the fact that the States are to receive their grants of Federal funds not on the basis of school attendance but on the basis (at least in part) of all inhabitants from 5 to 19 years of age.

It is to be noted in this connection that there are 2,638,775 American boys and girls today who are receiving their schooling in private, elementary, and secondary schools—nearly all because of a desire upon the part of their parents to have them taught the fundamental principles of Christianity. To require these children to abandon these schools as a condition of their participation in the bounties which it is proposed to distribute out of the Federal Treasury is unconscionable. It is a discrimination which is indefensible and incidentally runs counter to the considered judgment and recommendations of the President's Advisory Committee on Education, upon which the present bill is predicated.

PREVIOUS BILLS FOR FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The present effort to initiate a program of direct Federal subsidies for education and Federal oversight of our public-school system is not new. It is a revival upon a larger scale of the objectives sought and the program contained in the bill introduced in the Sixty-fifth Congress in 1918 by the late Senator Hoke Smith, of Georgia, and in the Sixty-sixth Congress by Senator Smith and Representative Horace Mann Towner, of Iowa, in the House, and then widely publicized as the Smith-Towner education bill.

It undertook to create a Federal Department of Education and to authorize $100,000,000 annually in Federal subsidies to the States for five specified educational purposes. This became the Towner-Sterling bill in the Sixty-seventh Congress and the Sterling-Reed bill in the Sixty-eighth Congress. These bills never came to vote in either branch of the Congress. Then there was a 10-year interval of subsidence so far as Congress was concerned in these demands for Federal subsidies to education.

POLICY OF ASSISTANCE TO YOUTHS RATHER THAN SCHOOLS ADOPTED

Meantime the Federal Government was not showing any disposition to ignore the needs of the youth of our land nor to be ungenerous in financial provisions for their assistance. Two major programs were initiated and are now being maintained on a semipermanent basis, through which the Federal Government is attempting to meet the needs of youth for aid, for work experience and for guidance, and for educational training.

One of these is the Civilian Conservation Corps for unemployed youths of welfare families and for which upward of $300,000,000 is now being appropriated annually; and the other is the National Youth Administration for youths of welfare families at school, which is costing upward of $50,000,000 annually. It is to be noted that in the distribution of these funds no distinction is made against students attending private schools.

* * * * *

CONCLUSION

I do not subscribe to the doctrine that because of public schools and our educational facilities are a vital element in our national welfare that they thereby become the proper concern and implied responsibility of the National Government.

Our schools are one of the few remaining bulwarks of local self-government and community enterprise. They should so remain. They have on the whole been well managed and generously supported.

We have today too much centralization of control over the affairs of our citizens in a Federal bureaucracy. We should not add to it by this new excursion into the field of education.

We cannot undertake to subsidize our public schools out of the Federal Treasury and still leave the schools free of the taint of Federal control. Federal domination of education will be the ultimate and, in my opinion, the inevitable consequence. The present bill is the opening wedge—the camel's nose under the tent.

Let it be remembered that the most potent weapon of dictators and revolutionists is the control of the schools and the education of the youth. Let us be on our guard against putting the public schools in our own land under the yoke of a centralized bureaucracy and thereby provide the mechanism for possible abuse in the years to come.

And if these reasons were not enough for the rejection of the present bill and others of its kind, let us give heed to the financial

implications. The appropriations authorized by the present bill over a 6-year period aggregate $900,000,000, an average of $150,000,000 annually.

This is only the beginning. The advocates of this program of Federal grants-in-aid to the States for educational purposes freely concede that very much larger Federal subsidies in years to come will be essential if the objective sought—of equalized educational opportunities—is to be attained.

In my judgment it is utterly unconscionable at this time of dire need and general business depression to superimpose this new and permanent financial load upon the already staggering total of Federal expenditures for relief, better housing, national defense, and the other long list of Federal activities and Federal responsibilities.

Where is this new money to come from? It will come in the first instance from new loans floated by the Treasury to be met in years to come, sometime, somehow, by taxation. The money is not in reality a gift by the Federal Government to the local communities for their schools. It comes in the end out of the pockets of all our citizens in taxes, direct or indirect, drawn into the Federal Treasury and then passed back in the guise of a gift but with strings attached—the strings of Federal control.

If we are to spend increased sums of money for education of our youth it must be provided in the end by the people, out of their earnings and their savings. Let the people determine the amount with their eyes open and let them regulate and oversee the spending of it, in their own way.

I have already said the apportionment of the funds to the several States under the formula contained in the present bill is in my view open to serious criticism and is patently inequitable.

RICH AND POOR STATE

Aside from the underlying implications of nationalization of education, the financial aspects of this Federal subsidy program is in the final analysis a device whereby it is intended that funds shall be siphoned out of the communities and the States that are presumed to be rich and poured into the communities and the States that are presumed to be poor, via the Federal Treasury.

The cost of education is one of the principal expenditures of the State and local governments. It is the chief item in the financial budgets of States and their municipal subdivisions. Tremendous financial sacrifices are made by some States and communities to maintain a reasonably high standard of education. Staggering costs are met by many citizens with meager incomes to provide an education for their children in private educational institutions because of a particular or special training desired which the public schools cannot provide. Upon what principle of justice can the people of such States or communities have to place an additional tax burden on them in order to improve the educational system of some other State, unwilling or disinterested in striving for the best educational facilities?

In many States the principal source of revenue for support of the public educational system is the tax on real estate. In communities where the valuation on real estate for taxation purposes is high and the tax rate is also high, better educational systems exist. In communities where the valuation on real estate for taxation purposes is low and the tax rate is also low, inferior educational facilities prevail. This is true even within the States. We are now attempting to make the first pay more taxes to help the latter group or else lower their standards to help bring up the standards of the latter. They are "bled white," now. Many of our large cities today are in desperate financial circumstances. Why punish them because of their generous financial sacrifices in the past by demanding aid from them for those communities which may have made little or no effort in the past?

Statistics have been compiled by students of taxation which indicate that there is a variation in the various States of the ratio of existing true value of general property from 20 to 125 percent. The same spread also exists between the several States and their subdivisions in the tax rate levied on general property. Some States have income taxes and others have none; some States have sales taxes and others none. Indeed, there are a great variety of taxes that some States have that others do not have, the revenue from which, in many States, goes into the general fund out of which educational systems are maintained. I again inquire, How can you define a "poor" State needing Federal aid for educational purposes unless you take into account the burdens already assumed by some States and communities and the burdens that other States and communities have refused to assume for educational purposes by high assessed values and taxes levied against those values and the many special taxes imposed to maintain, directly or indirectly, the educational system of a particular community or State?

In other words, why should the taxpayers of the communities, who taxed themselves excessively to maintain high standards of education, be further taxed to assist in uplifting the educational systems in the so-called poorer communities—"poorer" because in many instances their tax values and tax rates are low?

It is either the financial limitations which States and communities impose upon themselves—and have a right to do—or actual neglect in some cases, that is responsible in many cases for the so-called substandard school. If property is valued much below its real value for taxation purposes and but a small percentage of the State or community income is expended for educational purposes, how can it be claimed a community or State is poor and needs assistance from another State that is expending generously upon its educational system?

The people of one State have the right to demand, before having additional taxes imposed upon them to help improve such a distinctly local function as education, that the valuation of real estate for taxation purposes and the money raised by taxation for educational purposes be equalized everywhere and operated on pro rata basis.

What this bill is undertaking to do is to actually punish by further taxation the States, communities, and citizens who have sacrificed most in the past to improve the educational opportunities for their children. This means that to apply this plan of national aid to education, we must enter into the field of interference with what has been the most basic and fundamental of all local rights—the right of allowing people to levy taxes according to their own needs and desires.

For all of the above reasons, I dissent from this bill and urge its rejection.

DAVID I. WALSH.

I concur in general with the views set forth in this minority report.

VIC DONAHEY.

TABLE SHOWING RANGE IN EXPENDITURES OF CITIES

I submit some illustrations of the extensive range in expenditures by different cities, for public-school education. These figures were taken from a publication entitled "Per Capita Costs in City Schools, 1936–37," published by the Office of Education, Department of the Interior.

Educational expenses per pupil

Of 68 cities over 100,000 population:	
High: Yonkers, N. Y.	$155.17
Low: Norfolk, Va.	51.32
Average	112.08
Of 82 cities, 30,000 to 99,999 population:	
High: New Rochelle, N. Y.	198.09
Low: Gadsden, Ala.	28.62
Average	87.04
Of 79 cities, 10,000 to 29,999 population:	
High: Hempstead, N. Y.	137.86
Low: Waycross, Ga.	27.17
Average	69.37
Of 79 cities, 2,500 to 9,999 population:	
High: Swarthmore, Pa.	166.44
Low: Dublin, Ga.	27.90
Average	73.26
Average of 308 cities	105.60

EDUCATION EXPENSES OF STATES

I submit some figures taken from the financial statistics of State and local governments, published in 1932 by the United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Only a few States indicate the percent of education expense and therefore this information is not available.

State	Total revenue	Education expenses	Percent
New York	$1,388,734,000	$381,350,000	27
Georgia	99,829,000	10,637,000	10
Massachusetts	384,019,000	81,008,000	21
Ohio	506,534,000	124,747,000	24
Wisconsin	256,457,000	65,787,000	25
Nevada	12,568,000	3,745,000	30

SEVEN PRINCIPLES OF WORLD PEACE—STATEMENT BY CATHOLIC, JEWISH, AND PROTESTANT GROUPS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, on October 6, 1943, distinguished representatives of the three major religious groups of the country—Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant—signed an identical statement of seven principles of world peace. Each group has prefaced the statement with a special introduction to indicate its special approach to these seven principles. This is a welcome event in the present war for a peaceful and just world. The statement is as follows:

1. The moral law must govern world order: The organization of a just peace depends upon practical recognition of the fact that not only individuals but nations, states, and international society are subject to the sovereignty of God and to the moral law which comes from God.

2. The rights of the individual must be assured: The dignity of the human person as the image of God must be set forth in all its essential implications in an international declaration of rights and be vindicated by the positive action of national governments and international organization. States as well as individuals must repudiate racial, religious, or other discrimination in violation of those rights.

3. The rights of oppressed, weak, or colonial peoples must be protected: The rights of all peoples, large and small, subject to the good of the organized world community, must be safeguarded within the framework of collective security. The progress of undeveloped, colonial, or oppressed peoples toward political responsibility must be the object of international concern.

4. The rights of minorities must be secured: National governments and international organization must respect and guarantee the rights of ethnic, religious, and

cultural minorities to economic livelihood, to equal opportunity for educational and cultural development, and to political equality.

5. International institutions to maintain peace with justice must be organized: An enduring peace requires the organization of international institutions which will (a) develop a body of international law, (b) guarantee the faithful fulfilment of international obligations, and revise them when necessary, (c) assure collective security by drastic limitation and continuing control of armaments, compulsory arbitration and adjudication of controversies, and the use when necessary of adequate sanctions to enforce the law.

6. International economic cooperation must be developed: International economic collaboration to assist all states to provide an adequate standard of living for their citizens must replace the present economic monopoly and exploitation of natural resources by privileged groups and states.

7. A just social order within each state must be achieved: Since the harmony and well-being of the world community are intimately bound up with the internal equilibrium and social order of the individual states, steps must be taken to provide for the security of the family, the collaboration of all groups and classes in the interest of the common good, a standard of living adequate for self-development and family life, decent conditions of work, and participation by labor in decisions affecting its welfare.

The Protestant introduction is as follows:

In a world troubled to despair by recurring war the Protestant churches have been seeking to show how moral and religious convictions should guide the relations of nations. Their conclusions are in many important respects similar to those of men of other faiths. In this we rejoice, for world order cannot be achieved without the cooperation of all men of good will. We appeal to our constituency to give heed to the following proposals enunciated by Protestants, Catholics and Jews, which must find expression in national policies. Beyond these proposals we hold that the ultimate foundations of peace require spiritual regeneration as emphasized in the Christian Gospel.

It and the statement were signed by the following:

Rt. Rev. Henry St. George Tucker, New York City, president, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and presiding bishop, Protestant Episcopal Church.

Rev. Ferdinand Q. Blanchard, Cleveland, Ohio, moderator, General Council of the Congregational Christian Churches.

Rev. P. O. Bersell, Minneapolis, Minn., president Lutheran Augustana Synod and National Lutheran Council.

Bishop A. R. Clippinger, Dayton, Ohio, president, Board of Administration of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ.

Rev. Henry Sloane Coffin, New York City, moderator, General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Rt. Rev. S. H. Gapp, Bethlehem, Pa., president, Provincial Elders' Conference of the Moravian Church.

Rev. L. W. Goebel, Chicago, president, General Synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church.

Rev. C. E. Lemmon, Columbia, Mo., president, International Convention of the Disciples of Christ.

Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Boston, Mass., secretary, Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church.

Rev. W. W. Peters, McPherson, Kans., moderator, General Conference of the Church of the Brethren.

Rev. Jacob Prins, Grand Rapids, Mich., president, General Synod of the Reformed Church in America.

Rev. Donald W. Richardson, Richmond, Va., moderator, General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States (South).

Rev. Joseph C. Robbins, Wollaston, Mass., president, Northern Baptist Convention.

Rev. Albert N. Rogers, Yonkers, N. Y., president, General Conference of the Seventh Day Baptist Churches.

Bishop John S. Stamm, Harrisburg, Pa., president, Board of Bishops of the Evangelical Church.

Allen U. Tomlinson, Whittier, Calif., presiding clerk of the Five Years Meeting of the Society of Friends.

Bishop P. A. Wallace, Brooklyn, N. Y., senior bishop, African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church.

Bishop James C. Baker, Los Angeles, Calif., chairman, International Missionary Council.

Frank S. Bayley, Seattle, Wash., president, National Council of Young Men's Christian Associations.

Rev. G. Pitt Beers, New York City, chairman, Christian Commission for Camp and Defense Communities.

Mrs. J. D. Bragg, St. Louis, Mo., president, Women's Division of Christian Service of the Methodist Board of Missions.

Dr. Arlo A. Brown, Madison, N. J., chairman, International Council of Religious Education.

Rev. Rex S. Clements, Bryn Mawr, Pa., president, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Rev. Charles E. Diehl, Memphis, Tenn., chairman, National Commission on Church Related Colleges.

Dr. John Foster Dulles, New York City, chairman, Federal Council's Commission to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace.

Rev. Robert M. Hopkins, Indianapolis, Ind., president, United Christian Missionary Society.

Mrs. Henry A. Ingraham, Brooklyn, N. Y., president, National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations.

Dr. Rufus M. Jones, Haverford, Pa., chairman, American Friends Service Committee.

John T. Manson, New Haven, Conn., president, American Bible Society.

Rev. William P. Merrill, New York City, president, Church Peace Union.

Bishop Arthur J. Moore, Atlanta, Ga., president, Board of Missions of the Methodist Church.

Dr. John R. Mott, New York City, honorary chairman, International Missionary Council.

Rt. Rev. G. Ashton Oldham, Albany, N. Y., president, American Council, World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches.

Commissioner Edward J. Parker, New York City, National Commander of the Salvation Army.

Mrs. Norman Vincent Peale, New York City, president, Home Missions Council of North America.

Rev. Charles P. Proudfit, Chicago, president, Council of Church Boards of Education.

Dr. Leland Rex Robinson, Bronxville, N. Y., president, American Committee for Christian Refugees.

Rev. Russell H. Stafford, Boston, Mass., president, American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.

Rev. Henry P. Van Dusen, New York City, president, American Association of Theological Schools.

Rev. A. Livingston Warnshuis, Bronxville, N. Y., chairman, Foreign Missions Conference of North America.

Rev. Luther A. Weigle, New Haven, Conn., chairman, World's Sunday School Association.

Miss Amy Ogden Welcher, Hartford, Conn., president, United Council of Church Women.

Rev. Herbert L. Willett, Wilmette, Ill., president, Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity.

Also the following representatives of eastern orthodox churches:

Most Rev. Antony Bashir, Brooklyn, N. Y., Metropolitan of the Syrian Antiochian Orthodox Church.

Rt. Rev. Bohdan, New York City, bishop of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of America.

Bishop William Y. Bell, Cordele, Ga., president, Board of Evangelism, Colored Methodist Episcopal Church (after Bishop Tucker).

Rev. Frederick May Eliot, Boston, president, American Unitarian Association (after Dr. Coffin).

Bishop Francis J. McConnell, New York City, chairman, Christian Conference on War and Peace (after John T. Manson).

Rev. Daniel A. Poling, Philadelphia, president, International Society of Christian Endeavor (after Mrs. Peale).

Charles P. Taft II, Cincinnati, Ohio, chairman, Friends of the World Council of Churches (after Dr. Stafford).

The Jewish introduction is as follows:

The American Synagogue commends to the attention of its own constituency and to all men of faith the following principles as a guide to thought and action in dealing with the grave world problems of our time. These seven principles, while they do not exhaust the teachings of the Jewish tradition on issues of social relationships, have their sanction in Judaism both Biblical and rabbinic. Judaism's highest goal has ever been "to amend the world through the Kingdom of God." The Synagogue therefore calls upon its adherents, both as citizens and as Jews, to seek after the implementation of these principles. They will thereby act in faithful conformity with the moral values of the Jewish religion, and at the same time serve the best interests of country and of mankind.

It and the statement were signed by the following:

Dr. Israel Goldstein, New York City, president, Synagogue Council of America.

Dr. Louis Finkelstein, New York City, president, Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

Dr. Julian Morgenstern, Cincinnati, Ohio, president, Hebrew Union College.

Rabbi Saul Silber, Chicago, Ill., president, Hebrew Theological College.

Dr. Stephen S. Wise, New York City, president, Jewish Institute of Religion.

Rabbi William Drazin, Savannah, Ga., president, Rabbinical Council of America.

Rabbi Solomon B. Freehof, Pittsburgh, Pa., president, Central Conference of American Rabbis.

Rabbi Louis M. Levitsky, Newark, N. J., president, Rabbinical Assembly of America.

Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman, St. Louis, Mo., chairman, Commission on Justice and Peace of Central Conference of American Rabbis.

Rabbi Joseph Zeitlin, New York City, chairman, Social Justice Commission of Rabbinical Assembly of America.

Louis J. Moss, Brooklyn, N. Y., president, United Synagogue of America.

Adolph Rosenberg, Cincinnati, Ohio, president, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Mrs. Isidore Freedman, New York City, president, Women's Branch of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.

Mrs. Hugo Hartmann, Cincinnati, Ohio, president, National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods.

Mrs. Samuel Spiegel, New York City, president, Women's League of United Synagogue of America.

Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, New York City.

Rabbi Barnett R. Brickner, Cleveland, Ohio.

Rabbi Henry Cohen, Galveston, Tex.

Dr. Samuel Nirenstein, New York City, president, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations (after Louis J. Moss).

Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, Washington, D. C.

Rabbi B. Benedict Glazer, Detroit, Mich.

Rabbi Samuel H. Goldenson, New York City.

Rabbi Solomon Goldman, Chicago, Ill.

Rabbi Herbert S. Goldstein, New York City.

Rabbi Morris Goldstein, San Francisco, Calif.

Rabbi Julius Gordon, University City, Mo.

Rabbi Simon Greenberg, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rabbi James G. Heller, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Rabbi Leo Jung, New York City.

Prof. Mordecai M. Kaplan, New York City.

Rabbi C. E. Hillel Kauvar, Denver, Colo.

Rabbi Jacob Kohn, Los Angeles, Calif.

Rabbi Isaac Landman, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Rabbi B. L. Levinthal, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rabbi Israel H. Levinthal, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Rabbi Felix A. Levy, Chicago, Ill.

Rabbi Joshua Loth Liebman, Boston, Mass.

Rabbi Joseph H. Lookstein, New York City.

Rabbi Edgar Magnin, Los Angeles, Calif.

Rabbi Louis L. Mann, Chicago, Ill.

Rabbi Abraham A. Neuman, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rabbi David de Sola Pool, New York City.

Rabbi Irving F. Reichert, San Francisco, Calif.

Rabbi Herman H. Rubenovitz, Boston, Mass.

Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, Cleveland, Ohio.

Rabbi Milton Steinberg, New York City.

Rabbi Jonah B. Wise, New York City.

The Catholic introduction is as follows:

We present for the consideration of all men of good will the following postulates of a just peace as embodying the principles of the moral law and their prime applications to world problems of our day. To our mind they express the minimum requirements of a peace which Christians can endorse as fair to all men. They are the foundation on which Catholics in a free world can work from deep motives of Christian justice and charity for the building of a better social order.

It and the statement were signed by the following:

Most Reverend Edward Mooney, Archbishop of Detroit, chairman, administrative board, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Most Reverend Samuel Alphonsus Stritch, Archbishop of Chicago, vice chairman, administrative board, N. C. W. C., chairman, Bishops' Committee on the Pope's Peace Points.

Most Reverend Karl J. Alter, Bishop of Toledo, chairman, social action department, N. C. W. C., honorary president, Catholic Association for International Peace.

Most Reverend Edwin Vincent Byrne, Archbishop of Santa Fe.

Most Reverend John J. Cantwell, Archbishop of Los Angeles.

Most Reverend Michael J. Curley, Archbishop of Baltimore and Washington.

Most Reverend Edward D. Howard, Archbishop of Portland, Oreg.

Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey, Archbishop of San Antonio.

Most Reverend John T. McNicholas, O. P., Archbishop of Cincinnati.

Most Reverend John J. Mitty, Archbishop of San Francisco.

Most Reverend Joseph F. Rummel, Archbishop of New Orleans.

Most Reverend Constantine Bohachevsky, Bishop of Ukrainian Greek Catholic Diocese, Philadelphia.

Most Reverend John A. Duffy, Bishop of Buffalo, N. Y.

Most Reverend John M. Gannon, Bishop of Erie, Pa.

Most Reverend Richard O. Gerow, Bishop of Natchez, Miss.

Most Reverend Aloisius J. Muench, Bishop of Fargo, N. Dak.

Most Reverend John F. Noll, Bishop of Fort Wayne, Ind.

Most Reverend Edwin V. O'Hara, Bishop of Kansas City, Mo.

Most Reverend John B. Peterson, Bishop of Manchester, N. H.

Most Reverend Charles Hubert Le Blond, Bishop of St. Joseph, Mo. (after Bishop Gerow).

Most Reverend James H. Ryan, Bishop of Omaha, Nebr.

Most Reverend Basil Takach, Bishop (Greek rite), Diocese of Pittsburgh.

Most Reverend Emmet M. Walsh, Bishop of Charleston, S. C.

Most Reverend Francis J. Haas, Bishop-elect of Grand Rapids, Mich.

Rev. Edward A. Conway, S. J., Denver, Colo., Regis College.

Rev. John F. Cronin, S. S., Baltimore, Md., St. Mary's Seminary.

Rev. Hugh A. Donohue, San Francisco, Calif.

Rev. Vincent C. Donovan, O. P., New York City.

Rev. Cyprian Emanuel, O. F. M., St. Louis, Mo., Franciscan Monastery.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Reynold Hillenbrand, Mundelein, Ill., rector, Mundelein Seminary.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. George Johnson, Washington, D. C., director, Department of Education, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Rev. John La Farge, S. J., New York City, executive editor, America.

Rev. Daniel A. Lord, S. J., St. Louis, Mo., editor, The Queen's Work.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Patrick J. McCormick, Washington, D. C., rector, Catholic University.

Rev. J. Hugh O'Donnell, C. S. C., Notre Dame, Ind., president, Notre Dame University.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. Ryan, Washington, D. C., director, Social Action Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, Washington, D. C., Catholic University.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Matthew Smith, Denver, Colo., editor, Denver Catholic Register.

Rev. Edward V. Stanford, O. S. A., Villanova, Pa., president, Villanova College.

Rev. Paul F. Tanner, Washington, D. C., director, Youth Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Mrs. Robert A. Angelo, York, Pa., president, National Council of Catholic Women.

Frederick P. Kenkel, St. Louis, Mo., director, Central Bureau, Catholic Central Verein.

Francis P. Matthews, Omaha, Nebr., Supreme Knight, Knights of Columbus.

Francis E. McMahon, Notre Dame, Ind., president, Catholic Association for International Peace.

Charles P. O'Donnell, Washington, D. C., chairman, Post-War World Committee, Catholic Association for International Peace.

Wilbert J. O'Neill, Cleveland, Ohio, president, National Council of Catholic Men.

Harold A. Stevens, New York City, president, Catholic Inter-racial Council.

Let me point out something of the significance of the three separate groups of signers.

The protestant signers lead off with the president of the Federal Council of Churches, himself the Episcopal Bishop of Virginia and head of the federation of the chief Protestant bodies of the United States. The Jewish signers lead off with Rabbi Israel Goldstein, head of the Synagogue Council of America, which is a federation of the chief rabbinical bodies of this country embracing the Jewish religious groups of the United States. The

first Catholic signers are Archbishop Mooney of Detroit, the chairman of the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, a central organization of the Catholic Church in the United States; Archbishop Stritch of Chicago, chairman of the Bishops' Committee on the Pope's Peace Points; and Bishop Altar of Toledo, chairman of the department of the Welfare Conference and honorary president of the unofficial organization that deal with this critical subject.

In examining the statement one notices at once its wide compass. The program begins with a declaration of the sovereignty of God over peoples and over the world. It passes on to treat in three points of the rights of persons, minorities, and subject nations. It goes on to proclaim in two points the necessity of world governmental organization and world economic collaboration for world justice and world peace. It closes with a separate principle on the internal life of each country.

In examining the principles it will be noticed that they are really principles. These religious leaders are not telling the citizens of the country or Congress or the Executive the detatils of world organization or the detailed methods of economic action. They are thus not invading the sphere of either government or the citizen or the economic forces of the country. But they do insist on their prerogative of teaching the law of God to the people of the country and to persons in positions of responsibility in the Government.

It will be noted also that all the three religious groups have agreed on an identical statement. Each would add, no doubt, additional points. Each in its introduction gives a special reason for affirming them. But the seven principles are identical with each group.

The three religions which speak to us have a long record of separate adherence to all of these seven points. They have not signed this identical statement without a record of long and separate thought in their search to state briefly and tellingly basic points of the law of God for the nations.

This statement of seven principles of peace confirms the deepest and best aims of our country in this war. We entered it, and the war itself struck the world, because the nations were not following these principles. We shall have World War No. 3 within another 25 years if the countries again reject these principles. Should only the United States reject them, World War No. 3 will quickly come, so important is the United States in the discordant family of nations.

The first of the prinicples declares the supremacy of God and his law over nations and over the world. Statesmen and whole countries have long led a kind of Dr. Jekyll-and-Mr. Hyde existence. In their personal lives they have believed in one code and in many respects a good code. In the relations among nations and in economic life, they have either believed in or accepted in practice, a code which as Dr. Jekyll they repudiate. This is the poisoned well from which the nations have drawn up wars that in our time have become world wars. Religious leaders of the country call us back to what is basic if we are not to have a succession of devastating wars and famines that will ruin civilization.

Points two, three, and four deal with the rights of individuals, minorities, and subject and oppressed peoples. These are fundamental in any moral code of the nations.

The Nazis deny human rights. They deny the dignity of man; the internment camps are proof of that. They deny the rights of minorities; their treatment of the Jews is proof of that. They deny the fundamental rights of subject and oppressed peoples; the treatment of the Poles is proof of that.

Yet the non-Nazi world, ourselves included, have not observed the rights of persons, minorities, and subject and colonial peoples. We have been in no way so cruel or so consistently cruel; but we have not always done right, and in not doing right have inflicted not only injustice, but paved the way for war.

There follow two principles or means of assuring the supremacy of the moral law and establishing the rights of man and peoples. One is the principle that international institutions must be established to develop international law, to guarantee treaties and revise them, and to assure collective security. The other is the principle that international economic collaboration must be set up to assist all peoples to obtain an adequate standard of living.

Some, even among those who adhere to international economic collaboration and world organization, might question that these are moral principles. Yet, in fact, they fall into the same class as the moral principle that a country must have a political government. For the necessary means of obtaining an obligatory purpose is itself obligatory under the law of God. An anarchic world is at least as evil as an anarchic country.

This statement of the religious leaders comes at a propitious time. We are still debating what forms of world governmental organization and economic collaboration we shall help to set up after this war so as to prevent the recurrence of World War No. 3. This statement should end any surviving debate among us that world governmental organization and world economic collaboration are not themselves necessary and obligatory and that the United States should not shirk its duty. It should center the debate upon what form of world organization and collaboration is best.

The final point of the seven deals with equilibrium, harmony, and justice within each country for the security of the family, for national collaboration in behalf of the common good, for a decent standard of living for all, and decent conditions of work, and for participation by labor in all decisions affecting labor.

One of the deeper causes of war has been that governments and economic organizations have not succeeded in securing, and sometimes have not even tried to secure, the welfare of the people of their own country. It sometimes happens that governments and peoples, in order to satisfy needs at home which could have been met but were not realized, wage wars of conquest abroad rather than do justice at home. These religious leaders know that injustice at home ends with injustice abroad. They tell us a principle of peace as well as a principle of national decency.

In the past religious leaders and organizations have often joined together upon internal economic life. They have done much to help the people of the country change their minds upon the moral bases of our economic thinking and practice. This is the first time that they have signed their names to an identical statement on the moral bases of peace and world justice. They do so at a most propitious time.

Mr. President, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the preambles to the Declaration on World Peace, by the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish leaders whose names are signed to the statement I have just read into the RECORD, namely, the statement setting forth the seven points subscribed to by the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish leaders of our country.

There being no objection, the preambles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREAMBLES TO THE DECLARATION ON WORLD PEACE

PROTESTANT

In a world troubled to despair by recurring war the Protestant churches have been seeking to show how moral and religious convictions should guide the relations of nations. Their conclusions are in many important respects similar to those of men of other faiths. In this we rejoice, for world order cannot be achieved without the cooperation of all men of good will. We appeal to our constituency to give heed to the following proposals enunciated by Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, which must find expression in national policies. Beyond these proposals we hold that the ultimate foundations of peace require spiritual regeneration as emphasized in the Christian gospel.

CATHOLIC

We present for the consideration of all men of good will the following postulates of a just peace as embodying the principles of the moral law and their prime applications to world problems of our day. To our mind they express the minimum requirements of a peace which Christians can endorse as fair to all men. They are the foundation on which Catholics in a free world can work from deep motives of Christian justice and charity for the building of a better social order.

JEWISH

The American synagogue commends to the attention of its own constituency and to all men of faith the following principles as a guide to thought and action in dealing with the grave world problems of our time. These seven principles, while they do not exhaust the teachings of the Jewish tradition on issues of social relationships, have their sanction in Judaism both Biblical and rabbinic. Judaism's highest goal has ever been "to amend the world through the Kingdom of God." The synagogue therefore calls upon its adherents, both as citizens and as Jews, to seek after the implementation of these principles. They will thereby act in faithful conformity with the moral values of the Jewish

religion, and at the same time serve the best interests of country and of mankind.

CATHOLIC, JEWISH, AND PROTESTANT DECLARATION ON WORLD PEACE

1. The moral law must govern world order: The organization of a just peace depends upon practical recognition of the fact that not only individuals but nations, states, and international society are subject to the sovereignty of God and to the moral law which comes from God.

2. The rights of the individual must be assured: The dignity of the human person as the image of God must be set forth in all its essential implications in an international declaration of rights, and be vindicated by the positive action of national governments and international organization. States as well as individuals must repudiate racial, religious, or other discrimination in violation of those rights.

3. The rights of oppressed, weak, or colonial peoples must be protected: The rights of all peoples, large and small, subject to the good of the organized world community, must be safeguarded within the framework of collective security. The progress of undeveloped, colonial, or oppressed peoples toward political responsibility must be the object of international concern.

4. The rights of minorities must be secured: National governments and international organization must respect and guarantee the rights of ethnic, religious, and cultural minorities to economic livelihood, to equal opportunity for educational and cultural development, and to political equality.

5. International institutions to maintain peace with justice must be organized: An enduring peace requires the organization of international institutions which will (a) develop a body of international law (b) guarantee the faithful fulfillment of international obligations, and revise them when necessary (c) assure collective security by drastic limitation and continuing control of armaments, compulsory arbitration and adjudication of controversies, and the use when necessary of adequate sanctions to enforce the law.

6. International economic cooperation must be developed: International economic collaboration to assist all states to provide an adequate standard of living for their citizens must replace the present economic monopoly and exploitation of natural resources by privileged groups and states.

7. A just social order within each state must be achieved: Since the harmony and well-being of the world community are intimately bound up with the internal equilibrium and social order of the individual states, steps must be taken to provide for the security of the family, the collaboration of all groups and classes in the interest of the common good, a standard of living adequate for self-development and family life, decent conditions of work, and participation by labor in decisions affecting its welfare.

REEMPLOYMENT AND REHABILITATION OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR NO. 2

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, recent newspaper articles on the problems of reemployment and rehabilitation of veterans of World War No. 2, while giving a good general picture of the procedures set up for handling that important question, have inadvertently conveyed the impression that it is only recently that the Government agencies charged with responsibilities in this matter have started their operations.

I believe it is advisable, therefore, to have printed in the RECORD, for the information of the Congress, a synopsis of the manner in which the Government has prepared to fulfill its obligations to the members of the armed forces. The plans for doing so were actually prepared in October 1940, and organization for carrying them out was started in November and December 1940.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a synopsis of the plans, showing what has been done by the Government of the United States looking to the reemployment and rehabilitation of veterans of World War No. 2. The synopsis was prepared by Col. Lewis Sanders, Chief of the Reemployment Division of the Selective Service System, under the War Manpower Commission.

There being no objection, the synopsis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OPERATIONS FOR REEMPLOYMENT AND REHABILITATION

By act of Congress three organizations have been created, each of which is concerned solely with the interests of veterans and are without conflicting obligations. These are:

(a) The Veterans' Administration: Responsible for hospitalization, providing prosthetic appliances, pensions, and for service-connected disabilities vocational rehabilitation.

(b) The Veterans Employment Service: Charged with providing a special employment service for veterans by operating within the United States Employment Service.

(c) The Reemployment Division of the Selective Service System: Established by the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 and by that act charged with general responsibility for reinstating veterans in their former jobs or assisting them to new jobs.

The Veterans' Administration and the Veterans Employment Service are permanent organizations with many years' experience, and staffed by professionals. They are organized essentially to function under "between wars" conditions and with staffs adequate to meet such conditions.

The Reemployment Division of the Selective Service System is a temporary emergency organization created for war-time conditions only and it will go out of existence after the emergency has ceased, leaving the normal load to be carried by the Veterans' Administration and the Veterans' Employment Service.

All the other agencies dealing with veterans are primarily permanent Government organizations created for the benefit of the entire population and the service they render is on the same basis for veterans and nonveterans alike. Examples are the United States Employment Service and the State vocational rehabilitation agencies.

The Selective Training and Service Act in establishing the Personnel Division (which was renamed the Reemployment Division to avoid confusion with the personnel section existing in all Government departments), gave the Director of Selective Service the option of establishing a division with adequate facilities to accomplish the task, or of utilizing the services of existing Government agencies and of accepting the services of State and private agencies. The latter policy was adopted.

The Reemployment Division has therefore been constituted primarily as a planning, liaison, and inspection organization and has confined its operating sections to a volunteer system adapted to supplement and support the existing Government agencies without duplicating or rivaling them.

The two volunteer groups of the Reemployment Division are:

(a) The reemployment committeemen; a minimum of two per local board with others added as the volume of work requires: At this date there are over 15,000 reemployment committeemen engaged in supervising the interests of the returning veterans.

The function of the reemployment committeeman is to act as the personal friend and adviser and liaison agent for the returning veteran in the latter's home community. He is not an employment interviewer. He sees that the veteran's records are complete and puts him in touch with the proper Government agency to look after his needs.

He is the direct agent for reinstatement in a former job.

He refers the veteran to the Veterans' Employment Service and the United States Employment Service, if a new job is wanted, and then follows them up to see that prompt action ensues. If they are unable to place the veteran, then he calls in other resources, which do not conflict with the job-placement work of these two, in order to secure employment. He refers suitable cases to the Veterans' Administration, Vocational Rehabilitation, the Red Cross, as the case indicates, and follows them up.

(b) The clearing house committees consist of representatives of every organized civic group in a community which it is thought can contribute to the task of reintegrating the veteran into the civic life of the community. The organization is described more in detail in the attached copy of Reemployment Bulletin No. 1.

The purpose of these committees is to place the organized resources of each community behind the efforts of the reemployment committeemen, the Veterans' Employment Service, and the United States Employment Service in their task of reinstating the veteran in civil life with a satisfactory job.

For details of operation, see attached copy of Reemployment Bulletin No. 1 and reprint of article from Yank, the Army paper.

CHRONOLOGY

Veterans' Administration (formerly Veterans' Bureau) established in 1921.

Veterans' Employment Service established in 1933.

Reemployment Division of Selective Service System: Planning started September 1940, plans approved by the Director of Selective Service November 1940.

Liaison and operating arrangements established with the Army November 1940.

Liaison and permanent working arrangements established with United States Employment Service and Veterans' Employment Service November 1940.

Liaison and working arrangements established with the Red Cross December 1940.

First operation, December 1940: Instructions sent to all State directors of selective service as to plans for handling reemployment problems.

Second operation, January 1941: Special registration offered men called by Selective Service at United States employment offices.

Third operation, March 1941: Circularizing of the Army for the Federal Security Agency to secure information protecting the men's unemployment insurance.

Fourth operation: About April 1941 for the Department of Agriculture regarding farm loans; later abandoned by the Department of Agriculture.

Fifth operation: Completion of appointments for minimum number of reemployment committeemen with each local board and issuance of detailed instruction to committeemen as to performance of their duties.

Sixth operation, September to December 1941, discharge of more than 100,000 men from the Army because over 28 years of age. At the request of the Reemployment Division the Veterans Employment Service together with the United States Employment

Service opened interviewing offices in more than 50 camps and traveling offices to all other camps, to interview and refer to jobs the men being discharged. (These offices were established and operating within 16 days after the first conference on the subject.) The Reemployment Division supplied the Army with forms for recording the discharged man's education, job experience, job preference. It also furnished each man (through the Army distribution system) with a letter advising him of his reemployment rights and the facilities set up for his use by the Government. After Pearl Harbor, the number of discharges from the armed forces dropped abruptly, and at the same time, due to the rapid expansion of war industries, work opportunities increased rapidly Hence those who were discharged found employment without difficulty and the reemployment load was correspondingly light for several months.

Seventh operation, establishment of National Clearing House Committee, October 1942.

Eighth operation, October 1942, set up a system of interviewing men before their discharge from Army or Navy hospitals. Interviews conducted by Red Cross, diagnosis supplied by Army and Navy medical authorities, forms supplied by Reemployment Division which then transmitted the information to the proper reemployment committeemen, the Veterans Employment Service or the United States Employment Service, the Veterans' Administration, etc.

Ninth operation, May 1943 and continuing, Veterans Employment Service asked to take over the pre-discharge interviews in the hospitals with interviewers trained especially for this purpose. The Reemployment Division agreed to turn this work over to them as fast as they had trained personnel available to take over each hospital. They are likewise supporting them before the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committees of the Congress in requests for additional funds for this work.

Tenth operation, September 1943, in cooperation with the Adjutant General's Department and with the concurrence of all other agencies interested have developed a new report of discharge which will shortly go into effect. One of the new forms takes the place of 12 forms and letters now having to be made out with each discharge.

VOLUME OF WORK

An average of 6,500 discharges per week are now being handled through the Reemployment Division in cooperation with the various operating agencies previously mentioned. Copy of report attached. The number of cases is steadily increasing and is expected to reach 10,000 per week by the end of the year.

COORDINATION

As a result of planning and close coordination, during the past 3 years, the Army and Navy, the Reemployment Division, Veterans' Employment Service, United States Employment Service, Veterans' Administration, State vocational rehabilitation systems, the Red Cross, Army Emergency Relief and the newly formed Clearing House Committee are working together under a closely integrated program. While there are many details still to be perfected they are only those that always require time and experience and no defects have developed in the basic features of the plan.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The Seventy-eighth Congress, by Public Law 16, enacted March 24, 1943, charged the Veterans' Administration with vocational rehabilitation for veterans with service-connected disabilities. They have been rapidly organizing their facilities for this since passage of this act and are also speeding up their procedures as much as possible under existing law for rapid action on claims presented by World War No. 2 veterans.

For many years the Veterans' Administration has cooperated with the Red Cross, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled Veterans' Association in providing facilities for them to prosecute pension and disability claims for veterans. This service has been rendered by the veterans' organizations and the Red Cross to servicemen free of charge.

The Veterans' Administration is cooperating with the other agencies concerned to integrate procedures so as to eliminate loss of time to the maximum possible extent.

VETERANS' EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Established in 1933 as a Federal agency, operating within the United States Employment Service, but with its own special staff, having representatives in each State, for the purpose of insuring that veterans receive adequate and prompt attention from the Federally financed State employment offices.

This service is now expanding its aid to veterans through placing especially trained interviewers in the Army and Navy hospitals as rapidly as personnel can be obtained, for the purpose of giving preexit interviews in order that the man discharged for physical disabilities may have full advantage of occupational advice and guidance prior to discharge, and that he may be placed at as early a date as possible in contact with a job, or the proper rehabilitation agency.

The results of these interviews are fully coordinated with the United States Employment Service and with the reemployment committeemen, making their joint service available to the veteran. The service is being established with the approval and cooperation of the Reemployment Division.

THE UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Originally this was under the Department of Labor, then transferred to the Federal Security Agency. It comprised a national organization which planned, supervised, and set standards, and through which State-operated employment agencies received the bulk of their financing. In December 1941, the employment system was federalized, and all the employees of the State agencies went directly on the Federal pay roll, but with salaries limited to the State level. The return of the agencies to the several States is required by the Congress after the termination of the emergency.

The United States Employment Service was set up to afford a Nation-wide cost-free employment service to all citizens alike, without discrimination or special favors.

As the emergency has increased, the United States Employment Service has steadily become more and more an agency for supplying the industrial war effort with manpower.

In December 1942, the Veterans' Employment Service, United States Employment Service, and the Selective Service System, with its Reemployment Division, were all transferred to the War Manpower Commission under its Chairman, Gov. Paul V. McNutt, and since then the U. S. E. S. has become the direct war agency for handling the supply of manpower to war industries, and the load on it has increased to many times its normal peacetime load.

THE WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The War Manpower Commission continued the working arrangements and the division of the fields of activity already existing between the Veterans' Employment Service, the United States Employment Service, and the Reemployment Division as they existed before they were all brought under the authority of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission. This re-grouping of the agencies, has, therefore, not in any way interfered with the coordinated teamwork already established between them. As experience has been gained through actual operations in the field, the liaison and teamwork between these agencies has been steadily improved as defects have been discovered and eliminated.

OPERATING RESULTS

Since June 1940 to date, approximately 700,000 men have been released from the armed services.

Up to September 1941, the number of discharges was small, and the men released were absorbed by industry almost without effort on their part.

Commencing in September, owing to the change in the Selective Training and Service Act by Congress, as of July 1, 1941, the Army transferred to the Reserve over 100,000 men over 28 years of age. The referral offices established by the Veterans' Employment Service and the United States Employment Service for the convenience of these men have been previously described. The bulk of these men proved to have already been contacted by employers, mainly their old employers, and had jobs before discharge. Only about 10 percent of them actually sought assistance through the reemployment committeemen. Men seeking return to their old jobs were assisted, when they desired, by their reemployment committeemen, and those seeking new jobs were placed through the United States Employment Service, where the application is followed through by the reemployment committeeman.

Then came Pearl Harbor, after which the flow of men from the armed forces materially decreased, while the pace of industry was stepped up tremendously, and men were literally "sucked up" into war jobs as fast as they were released from the Army, with the result that very few cases came before the reemployment committeemen.

In the fall of 1942, the rate of discharge from the armed forces began to mount, as the strain of intensive training for war produced its inevitable results, in minor physical breakdowns which, while rendering men unfit for full military service, in the main did not incapacitate them for full industrial service.

At this time, the hospital interviewing service was inaugurated, as previously described, and out of 125,000 reported discharged, nearly 60 percent have responded to the inquiries of the reemployment committeemen, as against only some 10 percent in the fall of 1941.

The same procedure as was applied to the original discharges is continued; namely, the reemployment committeemen handling directly the placement of veterans in their old jobs and referring applications for new jobs to the United States Employment Service, and backing up and assisting that service in the placement of these veterans, as well as keeping track of the veterans' interests to insure that their needs receive prompt attention.

The new clearing house committees which will comprise representatives of every suitable civic organization in each community will support the work of the United States Employment Service, the Veterans' Employment Service, and the reemployment committeemen by placing behind them the organized resources of each community. These clearing house committees will be particularly charged with straightening out local disputes involving reemployment rights in accordance with principles established by the national headquarters in Washington, in creating job opportunities for handicapped men, both veterans and civilians, and making these available through the Employment Service, and of distributing the employment load throughout the community when jobs become scarce.

These committees will also be closely integrated with such bodies as the committee for

economic development and other groups engaged in the creation of jobs.

A leading example of the teamwork spirit animating all of the agencies involved in servicing the veterans in their reintegration into civil life is that in New York City, where all conditions are extreme, including the fact that until very recently the city has been a surplus labor market with several hundred thousands unemployed, making veteran placement the most difficult in the country.

The New York City director of selective service has established a reemployment advisory office which is staffed by volunteers under a paid director. This is closely integrated with the veterans' employment representative and the United States employment office, the latter sending over their experts to train the volunteers and the volunteers being furnished United States Employment Service offices to assist in their operations. The reemployment advisory office has a volunteer staff of physicians and psychiatrists and occupational guidance experts who carry on work which relieves the United States employment office of a considerable load and facilitates its operations. The employment services send their interviewers over to conduct employment interviews of veterans at the reemployment advisory office.

The regional director of the War Manpower Commission for New York State has established a permanent rehabilitation committee to promote rehabilitation of both military and nonmilitary handicapped people. On this committee are representatives of the principal welfare agencies and foundations of New York City and representatives of selective service, including a representative from national headquarters of the Reemployment Division. The War Department has cooperated with this committee in the matter of a test to determine what can be done in the case of a man rejected at the induction station for physical or mental disabilities.

ENFORCEMENT OF VETERANS' EMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

A coordinated team has been created to service this field consisting of the Department of Justice, which is represented in the field by the local United States attorneys, the reemployment committeemen, the officer at each State headquarters charged with reemployment problems, and the Reemployment Division at the national headquarters of Selective Service in the War Manpower Commission.

Decisions as to interpretations of the act in regard to cases presenting special problems are made in Washington to insure uniformity of decisions and avoid the confusion that would inevitably ensue from having 48 interpretations of the same problem which would be the case if decisions were made at the State level. Aside from this matter of interpretation of the act, its operation is completely decentralized to the local level.

The fullest cooperation has been afforded by both employers and organized labor in carrying out the intent of Congress as covered by the reemployment provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. Both the responsible heads of the national labor unions and the rank and file of the locals have cooperated in the return of veterans to their old job; even in cases where they did not feel that the veteran was actually entitled to reinstatement under strict interpretation of the law and where they have waived their own interest in so doing.

Employers have met the act in the same liberal spirit and have tended to perform more than their own legal obligations rather than to attempt to construe the act in a narrow and limited spirit.

Where opposition has been encountered with either employers or organized labor it has always been in subordinate levels where men were not in a position to have a broad view and a sense of perspective and they have been invariably reversed by their superiors when the problem was taken to the top men.

In only one case has it been necessary to place the matter in the hands of United States Attorney for prosecution and that case was merely filed and without going to trial the employer reinstated the man with $648 back pay for the time he had been kept out of his job.

In all other cases except the 10 or 15 current cases, which are in process of adjustment, the man has been reinstated in his job with the full cooperation of the employer or labor union in every case where the Reemployment Division has felt that the man was entitled to his job, an amicable discussion of the case having been all that was necessary in order to insure reinstatement, except some three or four cases in which it seemed helpful to mention the legal powers available to enforce the provisions of the act.

This does not mean that every veteran desirous of returning to his old job has been reinstated by his employer, since not all men refused their old jobs have reported their cases to their reemployment committeeman.

The principal difficulty in serving the veterans is their habit of not making contact with the established Government agencies when they need assistance, particularly in this critical labor market where there are several jobs open to each man able to work. Many of them if refused their old job simply get a new job in preference to presenting their case. Others have reported their cases to us only after they had given up their old jobs and obtained a new job.

Through the clearing house committees with the aid of the veterans' associations it is expected to close this gap through arranging a personal interview with each returned veteran to insure that he is fully aware of all the services provided for his benefit by the Government and to place him in contact with them if he is in any need of assistance in solving his problems.

REHABILITATION

The vocational rehabilitation of the veteran with a service-connected disability is now provided for by the authority recently conferred on the Veterans' Administration. There remains the need for a wartime procedure which will eliminate the time now required for the Veterans' Administration to legally assume the expense of treatment. Some enabling legislation may be needed to permit them to accomplish this.

The Labor Federal Security Appropriations Act (Public, 135, 78th Cong.) has now provided funds for the various State vocational rehabilitation agencies through the Office of Education of the Federal Security Agency so that they can provide rehabilitation for nonservice-connected disabilities.

The coordinated plans already in operation provide for channeling the cases of veterans requiring rehabilitation to the proper one of these two agencies. After rehabilitation has been accomplished the same teamwork is available for securing a suitable job for the rehabilitated veteran.

As the size of the organizations and the scope of their operations have been steadily increased in the past to meet an increasing load so it is expected to increase the voluntary personnel and add additional functions as the need arises in connection with still larger numbers of veterans to serve. All of this was provided for in the original plans adopted in October 1940.

Mr. HILL. The following is the latest Instructions to Reemployment Committeemen, numbered Bulletin No. 1, which brings up to date instructions issued to them in memorandum form more than 2 years ago. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the instructions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., September 29, 1943.

To State Directors, Local Boards, Reemployment Committeemen:

From inquiries received from a number of State headquarters, some of which have forwarded questions from reemployment committeemen, it seems advisable to issue a new bulletin on the work of the Reemployment Division.

A new procedure covering discharges from the Army will go into effect about the first of January, which is expected to be followed shortly by adoption of a somewhat similar procedure by the Navy and Marine Corps. Accordingly, a new Reemployment Bulletin No. 1 has been prepared covering the work of the Reemployment Division under the new procedure. Sufficient copies are being forwarded to you to furnish one for each local board in your State and one for each reemployment committeeman and a reserve stock for future uses.

In addition to the new procedure covered in the Reemployment Bulletin No. 1, the War Department has under consideration, and has given tentative approval to, a policy under which it will in the future refuse to furnish medical records of veterans to prospective employers, even though accompanied by a waiver from the veteran. Since the military exit examinations are far more thorough than those given by any employer, access by employers to these records is tantamount to saying that the veteran must pass a far more thorough physical examination than the nonveteran. The cases in which employers are demanding Army or Navy medical records of veterans should be reported to this headquarters.

It would be appreciated if you would forward this bulletin to each newly appointed reemployment committeeman at the time of his appointment.

For the Director:

LEWIS SANDERS,
Colonel, Field Artillery,
Chief, Reemployment Division.

REEMPLOYMENT BULLETIN NO. 1 ISSUED SEPTEMBER 29, 1943—SUBJECT: REEMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

I. REEMPLOYMENT ORGANIZATION

1. Statutory authority: Paragraph (g) of section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, directs that a Personnel Division[1] be established to protect the reemployment rights of veterans, and pursuant to that mandate, the Director of Selective Service established the Reemployment Division. This Division is charged with the responsibility of replacing in former positions, or aiding in securing new positions for, those persons satisfactorily completing service in the armed forces. In fulfilling its functions, the Reemployment Division is authorized to utilize the services of any or all departments and any or all officers or agents of the United States, and to accept the services of all officers and agents of the States and Territories. Reemployment rights apply to all honorably discharged veterans, male and female, whether inducted,

[1] Called "Personnel Division" in the act; name changed to "Reemployment Division" to avoid confusion with the personnel division existing in all Government departments, including the Selective Service System itself.

enlisted, or commissioned, subsequent to May 1, 1940.

2. War Shipping Administration included: At the request of the War Shipping Administration, the Reemployment Division of Selective Service will handle all the reemployment benefits accorded men discharged from the Merchant Marine pursuant to Public Law 87 of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

3. Reemployment program decentralized: The Reemployment Division has been and is operating under a decentralized plan, in which operations are at the local level, supervision is at the State level, and planning and interpretations of the act are at the national level. At the local level, reemployment committeemen attached to each local board serve as the agents and counselors of the veterans with direct responsibility to restore them to their old jobs and serve as liaison agents and contact men with other Government agencies which provides specific services for the veterans. Clearing house committees are being formed in each community to make available the organized resources of the community in reintegrating veterans into civilian life.

4. National headquarters: National headquarters of the Selective Service System prepares the general plans and makes all decisions in interpreting the application of the act. This is necessary in order to secure uniformity of interpretation, since many organizations affected are interstate and a lack of uniformity in the application of the act would make it unworkable. National headquarters maintains liaison with all the national bodies interested in employment. National headquarters under the new separation procedure, when in effect, will furnish the State headquarters with classified tallies of its reemployment committeemen's reports.

5. State headquarters: State headquarters of the Selective Service System selects and recommends the appointment of the reemployment committeemen, inspects their activities, sees that those not functioning are replaced, and arranges for the appointment of additional committeemen in any locality where the reemployment load necessitates it, the object being to have sufficient committeemen in each locality so that every veteran receives immediate and personal attention to his needs. It transmits the reemployment committeemen's reports to national headquarters. The State clearing house committee, when formed, will maintain liaison with the State director in handling State-wide problems. The service of one officer, in whole or in part, and one full-time secretary should be adequate to handle the reemployment problems at the State level.

6. Local boards: Local boards are the mailing addresses of the reemployment committeemen attached to them, and local boards should refer only honorably discharged veterans who report to them to their reemployment committeemen. The reemployment committeemen should turn over to the local boards their records after final disposition of the cases. In case a reemployment committeeman resigns, all his records should be turned over to the local board for transfer to his successor. Reemployment committeemen are entitled to local board stationery and have the franked mailing privileges of the Selective Service System.

7. Reemployment committeemen: The reemployment committeemen attached to each local board are the veterans' personal representatives, agents, and advisors. They have direct responsibility to return veterans to old jobs, see that they are properly serviced by the Government agencies set up to help them, and report to their State headquarters the disposition of all such cases. They should be informed of the veterans' reemployment rights as specified in section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. They should report all reemployment cases with controversies that they cannot adjust to the clearing house committees, when formed, in their respective communities; maintain close liaison with them, and, until these committees are formed, report all such cases to their State headquarters as at present. They should refer all new placement cases to the veterans' employment representatives of the United States Employment Service and follow up each case until satisfactory placement is accomplished. They should, through their community contacts, especially through the clearing house committee, make the organized resources of the communities available in replacing the veterans in civil life, particularly in creating preferential employment opportunities for veterans and occupational opportunities for the disabled.

8. Cooperating agencies: Reemployment committeemen must maintain personal contact with the local representatives of the several governmental agencies which are established to serve the returning veterans and be familiar with their functions. These agencies and their functions are as follows:

(a) The Veterans' Administration: This agency adjudicates pension claims of all honorably discharged persons who served in the active military or naval service after December 7, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war. It provides, in service-connected cases, hospitalization, if necessary, and domiciliary care, disability pensions, and vocational rehabilitation of all types, such as shop, commerce, university, etc., and cooperates in eventual placement with the United States Employment Service.

(b) The United States Employment Service: This agency operates under the War Manpower Commission and carries out the policies of the Commission in channeling employment to essential occupations and handles the releases of those transferring from one occupation to another, with the exception of honorably discharged veterans who have the right to reemployment in their old jobs.

(c) The Veterans' Employment Service: This agency has a State employment representative appointed to supervise the veterans' employment representatives attached to each local office of the United States Employment Service, through which the actual placements are made. They are responsible for the employment interests of all veterans registered with the United States Employment Service, except those veterans who desire reemployment in their old jobs.

(d) The Vocational Rehabilitation and Training Division of the Federal Security Agency: This agency, in connection with the State department of education in each State, operates vocational training in nonservice-connected cases. It will assist in the training and education of those men who must learn a new trade or profession before returning to a civilian occupation and who do not come under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration.

(e) Red Cross: The home service of the American Red Cross in every community will assist veterans and their families in solving their personal problems. It is familiar with processing the necessary papers involved with the Veterans' Administration, if this has not been done at the discharging point.

(f) Civil Service Commission: The reemployment committeemen should inform any veteran who is seeking a Federal Civil Service position that he may obtain information regarding such positions at any post office or civil-service office.

(g) Army emergency relief: This agency will extend temporary financial relief to soldiers and their dependents, including veterans discharged since September 16, 1940, in cases that cannot be taken care of by the Red Cross. They can be contacted through each Service Command.

(h) United States Armed Forces Institute, Madison, Wis.: This agency will undertake to provide records of courses taken by military personnel while in service, for submission to civilian educational institutions, employers, and other properly interested agencies, and will, on application, give to military personnel and those recently discharged special examinations which will serve as a basis for the granting of academic credit by civilian schools and colleges.

9. Clearing House Committees.—

(a) Formation and organization: The National Clearing House Committee has been formed and is now organizing State and local clearing house committees. Fifteen National organizations constitute the National Clearing House Committee. In most instances, State clearing house committees will contain most of the organizations represented on the National committee. The clearing house committees are autonomous, and no Government official is eligible for membership, except in ex officio or liaison capacity as may be desired under certain local conditions.

(b) National Clearing House Committee: The National Clearing House Committee consists of representatives from each of the following organizations: American Farm Bureau Federation, American Federation of Labor, American Iron and Steel Institute, American Legion, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Disabled American Veterans, Kiwanis International, Lions International, National Association of Manufacturers, National Exchange Club, National Grange, Railway Labor Executive Association—(Invited—acceptance pending). Rotary International, United States Chamber of Commerce, United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

(c) State clearing house committees: State clearing house committees, now being formed, will consist initially of representatives from the organizations of the National committee. After the State clearing house committees are formed, they will establish liaison with State headquarters of Selective Service and will organize the local clearing house committees, which in turn will establish liaison with all Government agencies at the local level.

(d) Local clearing house committees: Local clearing house committees are to be organized in all the cities and towns of the Nation. These will consist of representatives of the National Clearing House Committee organizations and such other groups as are available and in position to render assistance in the local communities.

(e) Function of clearing house committees. The functions of the clearing house committees will be to handle, as community problems, all reemployment cases that cannot be adjusted by the reemployment committeemen and to make available the combined resources of the community in supporting the efforts of the reemployment committeemen and the United States Employment Service.

II. REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS AND BENEFITS OF THE DISCHARGED MEN

1. Application may be made at any local board: The discharged man may, at his own option, have his employment problems handled by a reemployment committeeman attached to the local board at which he is registered (if he is a registrant) or by a reemployment committeeman attached to any other local board, if reference to the local board at which he is registered would be inconvenient.

2. Assistance of reemployment committeemen: The veteran with an honorable discharge has the right to the services of his reemployment committeemen in securing re-

instatement in his old job or in assistance in securing a new job through placing him in liaison with the Veterans' Employment Service and United States Employment Service, and for assistance with the Veterans' Administration.

3. Veterans' Administration vocational rehabilitation: Those persons who served in the active military or naval service on or after December 7, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war and are honorably discharged therefrom, have the right to file an application with the Veterans' Administration and are entitled to the following benefits, provided the requirements of the law and regulations issued thereunder are met; (1) Hospitalization and Domiciliary Care. [2](2) Disability pension. [2](3) Vocational rehabilitation. The reemployment committeemen will place such veterans in contact with the Veterans' Administration. The Home Service of the American Red Cross is familiar with processing the necessary papers involved.

III. NEW PROCEDURE AND REPORT OF SEPARATION W. D. A. G. O. FORM 53

(This new form should be in the field by January 1, 1944, and should eliminate duplication of efforts now occurring.)

1. W. D. A. G. O. Form 53.—The Adjutant General, working in conjunction with Selective Service, has developed and adopted a new report of separation officially identified as W. D. A. G. O. Form 53. The servicing of seven forms and five letters has been eliminated and consolidated into the writing of this one simplified form by the discharging authority, six copies being required, which will be a part of the Army's basic discharge procedure.

2. Disposition of W. D. A. G. O. Form 53.—

(a) Insurance notice: To Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C. (To be accompanied by soldier's qualification card, W. D. A. G. O. Form 20, when pension claim is made.)

(b) Posting copy: To The Adjutant General's Office, Washington, D. C. (Then to be transmitted to National Headquarters, Selective Service System.)

(c) Board of registration copy: To State director of Selective Service for the State of registration; to be transmitted to the local board of registration.

(d) Reemployment committeeman copy: To the proper State director of Selective Service for transmittal to the reemployment committeeman at the address of employment. (To be accompanied by soldier's qualification card, W. D. A. G. O. 20, when no pension claim is made.)

(e) Veterans' employment representative copy: To the State veterans' employment representative of the War Manpower Commission through the State director of Selective Service for the State shown in item (d) above.

(f) Soldier's copy: Copy to be handed to the discharged soldier. This copy has the soldier's duties, rights, and benefits printed on the back, and will serve as a certificate to identify the soldier with his reemployment committeeman, his veterans' employment representative (whether or not they have received their respective copies); also with the United States Civil Service Commission, and shows that he is entitled to a veteran rights, such as registering as a veteran with the United States Employment Service.

3. Medical information: Diagnosis is on copy for local board of registration. (This is confidential.) Statement of employment handicap is on the forms for the reemployment committeeman and veterans' employment representative. This information is not on the veteran's copy.

[2] In service-connected cases only.

IV. DISPOSITION AND USE OF REEMPLOYMENT COMMITTEEMAN'S COPY OF REPORT OF SEPARATION (W. D. A. G. O. FORM 53)

1. Reemployment committeeman's use of W. D. A. G. O. Form 53: The Report of Separation, W. D. A. G. O. Form 53, and soldier's qualification card, W. D. A. G. O. Form 20, should be retained by the reemployment committeeman for future reference in the event the veteran concerned requires further assistance. The disposition of the case should be noted on the form, including referrals made, together with dates and other pertinent information. Every effort should be made by the reemployment committeeman to make personal contact with the veteran for the purpose of determining whether assistance of any kind is required. Information will be forwarded later regarding special contact service that will be made available through the clearinghouse committees as they are formed. In cases where the veteran reports to a reemployment committeeman before the report of separation on the man concerned is received the reemployment committeeman will accept the soldier's copy as evidence of the veteran's rights to consideration.

2. Reports by reemployment committeeman.—The reemployment committeeman will forward all reports on disposition of cases through State headquarters to national headquarters. These reports on disposition of cases will be made as at present, pending the issuance of a new form to be used for this purpose. Reports should be made as soon as possible, and in no case should they be delayed beyond 30 days from receipt of report of separation.

3. Final disposition of records.—In all closed cases, W. D. A. G. O. Forms 53 and 20 should be deposited with the local boards to be held separately by them.

For the Director:

LEWIS SANDERS,
Colonel, Field Artillery,
Chief, Reemployment Division.

Mr. HILL. The following is the current weekly report covering men discharged from the Army and Navy on disability grounds. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEN DISCHARGED FROM ARMY AND NAVY HOSPITALS UNDER C. D. D.'S, WEEK ENDING OCTOBER 9, 1943

Total number of cases: October 1, 1942, through October 9, 1943, 132,606; last week, 125,366.

Number of cases for week: October 4 to October 10, 7,240; last week, 6,011.

Number of cases employed or rehabilitated or did not require assistance: To date, 78,981 (59.5 percent of total); last week, 74,612 (59.9 percent); for week, 4,369; last week, 4,451.

Number of hospitals reporting, 277; Army, 248; Navy, 29.

Mr. HILL. The following is the latest edition of the letter furnished the armed forces to give to each member about to return to civil life. Such a letter has been furnished for distribution ever since September 1941. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C.

To Each Member of the Armed Forces About To Return to Civil Life:

For your benefit the Government is glad to give you the following information. Section 8 of the Selective Service Act of 1940, as amended, provides that the Government will render aid in the replacement in their former positions, or in securing positions for, men who have satisfactorily completed their military or naval service. The carrying out of these provisions of the act is made a part of the responsibility of the Director of Selective Service, and a Reemployment Division in the Selective Service System has been set up to make this part of the act effective. If desiring your former employment and entitled to it, you should apply to former employer within 40 days after discharge.

Attached to each local board in the United States are one or more reemployment committeemen who are to act as your personal representatives in your home community and aid you in reestablishing yourself upon discharge whether you entered the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard as a volunteer or selected man.

There are several Government agencies also involved in aiding you, and the reemployment committeeman cooperates with them all and will act with them on your behalf when you report to him through your local board on your return to your home community. These agencies and their functions for your benefit are as follows:

1. The American Red Cross is the official medium of communication between the people of the United States and the Army and Navy. Field directors at Army and Navy camps and hospitals, and chapters in each home community assist servicemen and veterans and their families in solving their personal and family problems; arrange temporary financial assistance when required; and help in filing and presenting claims for pensions and other Government benefits.

2. The Federal Security Agency, whose Rehabilitation and Vocational Training Division operated by the State Department of Education, provides for the employment adjustment of physically impaired persons.

3. The Veterans' Administration maintains hospitals for the care of men incapable of being rehabilitated to reenter civil life, and provides them with artificial limbs or other appliances, if needed, and handles their pension claims.

4. The United States Employment Service has special veteran placement representatives at all offices and maintains contact with employers and their specific needs.

Your agents then for information and help are:

(a) The Red Cross. While in the hospital, maintain contact with their representative or their camp representative if you are returned to your unit for discharge.

(b) The local reemployment committeeman. Upon your discharge and arrival at the place to which you go, you should establish communication with the reemployment committeeman attached to the nearest local board and with the local Red Cross chapter.

Keep your contacts with them and let them know where you are.

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the men in the armed forces are kept informed of reemployment provisions made for their benefit by the Government as far as is practicable during active operations.

Following is a reprint of an article appearing in Yank, which is estimated to have some 3,000,000 readers among the armed forces. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT HAPPENS AFTER YOU'RE DISCHARGED?—IF THE ARMY HANDS YOU A C. D. D. TOMORROW, THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM, WHICH PUT YOU IN UNIFORM, WILL SEND YOU BACK TO A GOOD JOB IN CIVILIAN CLOTHES. HERE'S HOW THEY WORK IT

(By Corp. H. N. Oliphant)

Less than 3 months ago on a makeshift cot of planks and dry grass in an improvised field hospital somewhere in the south Pacific, a young corporal from Illinois lay critically wounded.

Although he knew he eventually would recover, the future looked pretty black. An Army doctor had told him that as soon as his condition permitted he would be shipped back to the States for further hospitalization. Then, upon his recovery, he would get a Certificate of Disability Discharge—the same C. D. D. any G. I. might get at any time, whether he's taking an azimuth on a Jap in New Guinea, strafing Nazis in North Africa, or dodging jeeps in a United States replacement center.

The soldier looked down at his right hand. It had got in the way of a Jap slug and two fingers and a thumb had been lopped off. As a former skilled instrument maker, he knew he would never work again at the only trade he knew.

"I got a great future," he said, staring at the three scarred stumps. "With a mitt like that, I'll never be able to make a living."

The doctor tried to reassure him: "It's tough, I know. But you'll make it all right. I'll bet you have a good job lined up before you're even discharged."

"Yeah? Who's gonna toss off that little miracle?"

"The Selective Service System."

"The Selective Service System? Are you kiddin'?"

The doctor wasn't kidding. Today, scarcely 3 months after he was wounded, the ex-corporal is back in civvies, plying a newly mastered trade in an essential industry, living in circumstances better than those he left to don the olive drab.

The Selective Service System, the organization which took him out of civilian life, had put him securely back into it.

The story is being repeated every day as wounded men return to civil life.

Inasmuch as the same machinery ultimately will operate to reestablish all returning Yanks in the Nation's economic and social life, it is a story which specifically affects every one of us—soldier, sailor, marine, and coast guardsman. To get this story, Yank went to the top of the Selective Service System. The doors were thrown wide open. The result is the first inside picture of the unprecedented Reemployment Division, which, under Federal law, has been established to make sure every man honorably discharged from the service either

1. Gets his old job back and keeps it;
2. Gets one just as good and keeps it;
3. Gets a better one after special training at Government expense; or
4. Is properly cared for if unemployable in competitive work.

WHEELS OF THE DRAFT IN REVERSE

Visualize the wheels of selective service turning backward, selectively withdrawing men from service instead of putting them into it. At the war's end, that's what will happen. The entire mechanism of the draft will function in reverse.

Here's how the set-up works.

First of all, to each man, well in advance of his discharge from service, goes an Army occupational and educational record. You are required to fill out this questionnaire, giving the complete dope on your background, training, and experience, to show what kind of work you can do.

In addition, you indicate your preference both as to the type of work you'd like to do and where you'd like to do it. For example, if you were a farmer before the war but have lost interest in milking cows and planting corn, you write down that fact, and it will be seriously considered when your record is acted on.

The form, of course, also includes your military record. In case of casualties, a statement describing any handicap is appended, but this will be confidential and will not be shown to anyone without your O. K. The Reemployment Division then indicates to potential employers whether you can do heavy, medium, or light work.

The next step is a letter from the Selective Service System to all men about to be discharged. This letter points out that the Reemployment Division is no political football to be kicked back and forth by vote-hungry politicians. It is firmly set in Federal law (sec. 8, Selective Service Act of 1940, as amended) and has only one reason for being—to see that you either get your old job back or one just as good or better. To accomplish this, the letter explains, special reemployment committeemen have been appointed to serve on the 6,450 local draft boards in the United States. One of these men—there will be 1 to about every 20 servicemen—will act as your personal representative and will help you get a new start as a civilian. Several other agencies will cooperate with the reemployment committeemen—the American Red Cross, the Federal Security Agency, the Veterans' Administration, and the United States Employment Service. The letter concludes:

"Your agents, then, for information and help are (a) the Red Cross. Maintain contact with their hospital representative or their camp representative. (b) The local reemployment committeeman. Upon your discharge and arrival at the place to which you go, you should establish communication with the reemployment committeeman attached to the nearest local board and with the local Red Cross chapter. Keep your contacts with them, and let them know where you are."

Meanwhile, the information obtained on the Army occupational and educational record is carefully analyzed at national headquarters in Washington and each man is classified according to—

1. His background, training, and experience;
2. His job preference, whether he wants his old job back or wants a new one;
3. His availability for vocational training and rehabilitation;
4. His preferred location;
5. His physical limitations, temporary and permanent.

The original of this form is kept in Washington, and as you return to civilian life every step is recorded so that your progress will be rapid and sensible. A copy of the record is sent to one of the reemployment committeemen of your home-town draft board, and he acts as your adviser and friend, sticking by you until you are satisfactorily reestablished in the community. If you decide to live in another community, you will get the same friendly assistance from local offices of the agencies mentioned above.

On the other hand, if you have a business, profession, or special job waiting for you after your discharge, or if you just want to loaf around for a while, you're completely free to go right to it. There won't be any annoying reports to make, and no officials will bother you in any way. Filling out the Army Occupational and Educational Record is the only thing you're required to do. After that, it's up to you to decide whether you want Federal help in getting a job.

Broadly, according to the Reemployment Division, returning soldiers fit into one of four categories.

First, there are those who want their old jobs back. In most of these cases so far there has been no trouble. Nor is much serious trouble anticipated. If, however, a hitch should develop, say by a former employer's blunt refusal to rehire a veteran, the national headquarters is prepared to step in and use Federal laws to protect the discharged soldier's rights. In cases of this sort they are backed up solidly by the Department of Justice, which, through the United States Attorney General, recently assured Yank that the United States courts and district attorneys will "do everything in their power fully to protect the serviceman's rights."

Here is a recent case to prove this point. A private from Cleveland, Ohio, was given a certificate of disability discharge. He had been an operator in a movie theater. As soon as he got home he reported for work. The employer, either unaware of the law or believing he could violate it, said he was sorry but no go. In the soldier's absence another operator had been broken in, and the employer didn't want to make a change. The ex-private reported this to his reemployment committeeman who in turn reported it to national headquarters. On the following day, the employer received a little note from the Government. In its way it was very charming and—persuasive. Substantially, the meaning of the letter was this: "We have heard that ex-Private G—— applied to you without success for the position he held with your firm before he entered the armed forces to defend his and your country. It is reported that you positively refused to rehire him. We hope, of course, that this report is erroneous, because we're sure you wouldn't want us to turn the matter over to the law-enforcement authorities in the Department of Justice." The ex-private was back in his old booth in less than a week, grinding out the latest Abbott and Costello comedy.

Actually the division has encountered very few uncooperative employers. An official says, "Almost without exception we have found an amazing willingness on the part of employers to cooperate. Large and small, in city and town, these people are playing the game."

Some discharged men want the same kind of jobs they had before their induction but want to work in new and different localities. These cases are all handled by the United States Employment Service, which is in constant touch with all employers and is regularly informed of the specific labor needs in any given region. So far it has been highly successful in placing honorably discharged soldiers.

Some men want to better themselves by further training before going back to work. Others have physical handicaps that require them to learn a new trade or profession. These men are directed to the Rehabilitation and Vocational Training Division of the Federal Security Agency, where at Government expense they are taught the skills of the jobs they want and are best adapted to learn. After their training, the Federal Security Agency with the U. S. E. S. accepts the responsibility of getting them jobs.

Explaining this procedure, one of the district supervisors of the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation, Frederic G. Elton, told Yank:

"The selection of the type of work is made on the basis of a careful analysis of individual qualifications. It follows, therefore, that these types of jobs are extremely varied and the kind of training equally varied.

"Having determined upon the job the man can do best, the bureau then contracts for the training with the agency best prepared to give that training. It finances the course and supervises the man's progress. It accepts

the responsibility for seeing that he is placed in a job when his training is completed."

Mr. Elton cited a couple of recent cases:

A 20-year-old private was discharged from the Army because of a head injury. His only previous work experience had been as a soda clerk. Aptitude tests were given to find out the kind of a job he was best fitted for. On his record he had written that he wanted to learn a craft of some sort. On the basis of his tests, he was trained in aircraft instrument work. Today he is a production control man with a company manufacturing recording instruments.

Another man, aged 26, was discharged from the Marines because of stomach ulcers incurred in service. Before his induction he had been doing clerical work. He wrote on his record that he wanted to learn precision tool making. Today he is learning the trade, and the Government is footing the bill for his training. A good job awaits him when he finishes the course.

Finally there are those who because of wounds, injuries or illness are incapable of working. These men are expertly cared for by the Veterans' Administration. The facilities for that care are the best that science has developed.

CLEARINGHOUSE COMMITTEES

To complete the structure of rehabilitation are national, state, and local clearinghouse committees composed of representatives from civic and national organizations, including labor unions, the American Legion, Chambers of Commerce, clubs, etc. These committees cooperate with all of the other agencies to solve each soldier's problem as a personal, individual, and community matter.

As one reemployment committeeman, a lawyer in Pennsylvania, told Yank: "There will be none of this case-number-so-and-so business, as if a discharged soldier were nothing but an ex-serial number. No, sir. It will be Joe Smith, American, getting a good job because he wants, deserves, and can handle it."

Another committeeman, a doctor in the Middle West, interviewed by Yank, voiced similar feelings: "I went through the first one back in '18, and I've got three boys in this one. I think I know a little bit about what they're going through, and I certainly know what they've got a right to expect when they come home. Each returning veteran in our community is going to be an integral part of our life, and he's going to be made to feel that he shares its benefits and problems to the same degree that his fellows share them."

These expressions are typical of the men, from the top officials at national headquarters down to the reemployment committeemen in the smallest communities, who are shaping the reemployment division for the time when, after the war, the plan of systematic and selective demobilization will be put to its big test.

To head such an organization someone had to be found who was more than a dreamer. He had to be a soldier with a lot of down-to-earth experience in social work.

The chief of the reemployment division was with the famous Seventy-seventh Division in France during the last war. After the war he helped his buddies get back into civilian life. In fact, the reemployment division as it stands today is built largely on the lessons he learned with the old Seventy-seventh. Ten days after the armistice in 1918 a reemployment and rehabilitation plan for the outfit was in effect.

A voluntary subscription among the officers and enlisted men raised $23,000, and an officer was sent back to the United States ahead of the division to set up an employment office. As a result, 3,000 jobs were promised for the Seventy-seventh before the men landed on American soil. In a matter of weeks all but 50 of the 27,000 men were employed. For 1 guy, obviously the restless type, they got 22 different jobs in as many weeks.

The chief's aide served with the One Hundred and Fifth Machine Gun Battalion in the First World War. Shortly before being called to active duty on the Reemployment Division he helped to reorganize the local draft boards of New York City. Speaking of the reemployment committeemen, he told Yank: "All of these men have been chosen with extreme care. They have been selected only after their personal integrity and responsibility as citizens have been established beyond all doubt."

GOAL OF 50,000,000 JOBS

The fanciest reemployment plan wouldn't get far if there were no jobs for discharged soldiers to come back to. So the problems of creating such jobs and insuring full postwar employment are part of the Selective Service System's problem. The Reemployment Division cooperates with several postwar planning organizations.

The most imposing of these is the Committee for Economic Development. Composed of the country's leading businessmen, industrialists, and economists, and functioning with the active support of several Federal agencies, the committee's goal is 50,000,000 jobs for post-war America.

Many of the world's top-flight scientists are at work finding the best means of converting the Nation from war back to peace. This does not mean these men are not helping now to win the war. Paul G. Hoffman, the committee's chairman, made this clear. "The war," he said, "has had and will continue to get triple A priorities, but the job of winning the peace need not be neglected, and, for business, that means planning to create jobs for returning soldiers, sailors, and war workers."

Most economists agree that jobs will be plentiful. They see a post-war America hard at work forging the tools of a new civilization; developing new techniques of production, distribution and transportation; building new cities, clearing slums, erecting power projects, carrying out programs to conserve the land and forests and control floods. There will be plenty to do.

The Reemployment Division reveals that so far 111,000 copies of the Army occupational and educational record have been filled out by soldiers and returned to the headquarters at Washington. Some were from men who have since received C. D. D.'s or whose releases are imminent. The rest were from men still in the service, for it is the Division's intention to secure as much information as possible on each man long before his discharge.

QUESTIONS GET SERIOUS ANSWERS

It is interesting to observe that of all the 111,000 records submitted, not one evoked phony or wise-guy responses. They were uniformly serious and proved that the men were willing to cooperate.

Officials expected at least a few wags to try for a laugh or two, especially on the question asking what sort of a job they would like upon return to civil life. But in the whole lot there wasn't a single "I wanna be a bank president" or "I wanna work nights for Hedy Lamar."

There was, however, a temporary flurry of suspicion at national headquarters the other day when the record of a New Orleans private was examined. His questionnaire showed he had been a fisherman, but after the question, "What is your preferred occupation?" he had written, "To be a big retail merchant like Napoleon."

This looked like a gag, so a man went to interview the ex-fisherman in an Army hospital. It seems that before he got in the Army he had been fishing 12 to 15 hours a day in the Gulf of Mexico. He had sold his daily catch to a certain retailer for 2 cents per fish. The day before his induction he had gone in to bid good-bye to the first retailer, one L. Napoleon, and he saw a price sign in the market's window which he had never seen before. The fish he had been selling at 2 cents each were being sold, by Mr. Napoleon at 18 cents.

"Well, I got to thinking," he said, "if that feller was gettin' 18 cents for the same fish he gave me 2 cents for, and me doin' all the work, that, I says to myself, is the job for me."

HERE'S HOW YOU MAKE AN EXIT TO CIVILIAN LIFE

If you're about to get a C. D. D. or another kind of honorable discharge, here's what you should do at once:

1. Contact a representative of the American Red Cross. There are accredited representatives at all camps, posts, and hospitals. They'll advise you at all times.

2. Study carefully and answer the questions on the Army occupational and educational record, which you will be required to fill out before your discharge. This record is vitally important and may decide your future status as a civilian. If you're in doubt or puzzled by any of the questions or the form in which to put your answers, see your C. O., your chaplain, or a Red Cross representative.

3. After you get your discharge get in touch as soon as possible with your local reemployment committeeman. He is attached to the local draft board in your home town. He knows all the benefits you're entitled to, and he knows the quickest way for you to get them. If for any reason you do not return to your home community, you should establish contact with the nearest agency of one of the following: The American Red Cross, the United States Employment Service, the Federal Security Agency, the Veterans' Administration, or the local draft board of the community where you are staying. Any one of them can set the right wheels in motion for your readjustment.

BRITISH COMMENT ON AMERICAN POLITICS

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I am hopefull that our British friends are not abandoning judgment altogether. I read in this morning's newspapers accounts of developments in Britain which are disturbing, to say the least. A United Press story appearing this morning under the heading "Churchill Aims Barb at Political Disputes in United States," dated "London, October 13," declares:

Prime Minister Winston Churchill today by inference rebuked the United States for its political squabbles in the first official British statement bearing on the controversy touched off by five American Senators on their return from a tour of the battle fronts.

Speaking to the House of Commons in connection with the British coal crisis and its threat of a Labor Party revolt against the Government, Churchill said:

"As soon as the war is ended, the soldiers will leave off fighting and the politicians will begin. Perhaps that is rather a pity. But, at any rate, it isn't as bad as what goes on in some countries, which I shouldn't venture to name, where the soldiers are fighting abroad and the politicians are fighting at home with equal vigor and ferocity."

Churchill's sally was accepted as veiled criticism of the reports made public by the American Senators.

In the same newspaper, under date of October 14, is another United Press dispatch from London, reading as follows:

BRITISH PAPER REBUKES AMERICAN SENATORS

LONDON, October 14.—As a follow-up to Prime Minister Winston Churchill's implied rebuke to American politicians in the House of Commons yesterday, the Daily Mail today published an editorial cartoon parodying the three "no evil" monkeys.

The drawing showed five sad-faced, monkey-posed Senators squatting on a log with the legends: "I saw no good; I heard no good; I said no good; I want no good; I'm up to no good."

Mr. President, I am sure I am not the only Member of the Senate who is thoroughly resentful because of British insults thrown at our colleagues who spent the weeks of the past summer visiting the various theaters of war. I am doubly resentful, in view of my conviction of the objective manner in which those five colleagues approach their duties. It seems to me that our British allies are losing, if they have not completely abandoned, their good judgment, in more ways than that to which I have just referred. I cannot be other than resentful when I find the British nosing into American politics at this time, to the extent of urging what the American people should do in the next Presidential campaign. There was a time when Americans stood up and fought back against action of that kind.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. I shall be glad to yield when I finish my statement, which will be very brief.

Mr. President, there was a time when Americans stood up in their places and freely expressed resentment of the action of those of other lands who would come meddling into American politics. Back in 1888, while Grover Cleveland was President of the United States, a Lord Sackville was British Minister to the United States. In 1888 Lord Sackville wrote a letter to an American urging that American by all means to get behind and encourage the reelection of President Grover Cleveland. That incident occasioned the American Government's asking the British Government to recall their Minister to the United States. The British made representation that since this minister had been so long in the service it would be doubly embarrassing to him and embarrassing to the British Government to have to recall him, but there would not be any incident in the event the United States Government dismissed him and sent him out of the country. Whereupon the then President of the United States, Grover Cleveland himself, insisted upon the Minister's departure from the United States and sent him his passport, a rather forceful way of dealing with an incident of that kind at that time.

A splendid account of this incident is recorded in a volume entitled "A Guide to Diplomatic Practice," the author of which is the Right Honorable Sir Ernest Satow, formerly envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary in His Britannic Majesty's diplomatic service. The chapter is found in volume 1, pages 336 to 338 of the volume, and I ask unanimous consent to have an extract from it printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The extract is as follows:

SEC. 428. In 1888, Lord Sackville, the British Minister at Washington, received a letter purporting to come from a naturalized citizen of English birth, named Murchison, asking for advice as to the way he, and many other individuals in his position, should vote in the pending election of the President. The writer said they believed the Republican candidate to be a high-tariff man and an enemy to British interests, while Mr. Cleveland's policy had been favorable and friendly toward England. To his letter Lord Sackville at once replied that "any political party which openly favored the mother country at the present moment would lose popularity, and that the party in power was fully aware of the fact"; that with respect to the "questions with Canada, which have been unfortunately reopened since the rejection of the (fisheries) treaty by the Republican majority in the Senate, and by the President's message alluded to (by the writer of the letter), allowance must be made for the political situation as regarded the Presidential election," and he enclosed an extract from a newspaper in which electors were distinctly advised to vote for Mr. Cleveland.

The letter of Lord Sackville found its way into the newspapers, and caused a lively discussion in the press. The New York Tribune published a report of an interview with him, in which he was represented to have said that "both the action of the Senate and the President's letter of retaliation were for political effect," but in a private note to Mr. Bayard he said that his words were so turned as to impugn the action of the Executive, and added: "I beg to emphasize that I had no thought or intention of doing so, and I most emphatically deny the language which is attributed to me by other papers of 'claptrap' and 'trickery' as applied to the Government to which I am accredited."

Apart from the question whether the reply to "Murchison" was being made use of by the other party to influence the pending election, the President, it must be admitted, was entitled to regard the assumption by a foreign diplomatist of the function of influencing elections as improper, and in Mr. Bayard's despatch of January 30, 1889, to Mr. Phelps, the American Minister in London, it is qualified as an "intolerable offense."

On October 25 and 26, 1888, Mr. Bayard telegraphed to Mr. Phelps, complaining of the letter and of the language used at interviews with newspaper reporters. He suggested that Her Majesty's Government should take appropriate action without delay. Lord Salisbury declined to act until he should be in receipt of the precise language of Lord Sackville and his explanation. Lord Salisbury appears to have said also that the Minister's recall would end his diplomatic career, which would not necessarily be the case if he were dismissed by the United States, for which there were precedents. This reply was telegraphed back to Washington, and 2 days later Mr. Bayard addressed a note to Lord Sackville, informing him, by the instructions of the President, that he is convinced that "it would be incompatible with the best interests and detrimental to the good relations of both governments that you should any longer hold your present official position in the United States," and enclosing a passport.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, my occasion for reciting this incident grows out of the alleged representation by Winston Churchill when he was last in the United States to the effect that it would be a tragic catastrophe if the American people failed to elect President Roosevelt next year for a fourth term and that it would be even worse if he should be reelected with a Republican Congress.

I repeat, Mr. President, that, as one, I completely resent the insistent manner in which those of other lands who are so resentful about what some Americans are saying about their countries are nosing into American politics; I resent their seeming determination to influence, so far as they can, the election of public officials in the United States.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, by a strange coincidence, before the Senator from North Dakota began his remarks, I had been reading an article in the American press. I desire to read that article to the Senate at this particular point, and I ask the attention of the Senator from North Dakota. The article appears in the Washington Evening Star of today, and is entitled "I'd Rather Be Right," by Samuel Grafton. This is what the article says:

I'D RATHER BE RIGHT

(By Samuel Grafton)

I suggest that a wide search is under way in this country to find an anti-English issue. A number of antiadministration forces are probing in this field with their long, delicate fingers, looking for a weak spot.

We hear, suddenly, that the English are burning up our oil in the war, but hoarding their own. (We are not reminded that the English burnt up their foreign investments long ago to fight this war while some of us view this war as a chance to acquire new foreign investments.)

We hear that the English resell our lease-lend goods, in private channels, at a profit. We hear that English diplomats are "smarter" than ours, and that they "work themselves" into occupied territories better than we do. These critics seem to think that a display of competence in this field is a foul.

SOME SECRET CASABLANCA?

We hear that the British ought to give us, forever, the island bases which they have turned over to us for a mere 100 years. We hear that the British are only half-hearted about the Burma offensive, because they don't really want to fight in Asia. We hear that they are hoarding millions of idle armed men in England, because they don't really want to fight in Europe.

There is a flood of this stuff now. I do not suggest that some secret grand council of isolation has met at its own Casablanca and decided on an anti-English offensive. Yet the attack is insistent. It has a nervous, questing character, as if many approaches were being tried out, studied, then discarded for others. The anti-English trend runs through them all, and unifies them all.

Why England? The attack on England has been so consistent that it has forced one antiadministration commentator, Mr. Arthur Krock, to write two articles proving that there is no attack on England under way in antiadministration circles. If there were really no attack on England under way, one should judge that a single article would have been enough to cover the subject, or that even no article at all would have covered it quite adequately.

Again, why England? Can it be that the isolationist press, which has made such extravagant use of the famous five traveling Senators and their farmer's daughter stories about lease-lend, really wants to disrupt our relations with an ally?

But, come, that can't be true. That's not subtle enough. It's too ornery. It's unbelievable. It's too raw, coarse and brutal.

WE'VE BEEN HAD

But, once more, why England? The English can't seem to understand why they have

so abruptly been picked out for attack; they appear dazed. All of a sudden, the American press is full of the sins of England, just as if England had never been around before.

At this point several strange thoughts occur to me. That the attack on England, which seems so irrelevant, really is irrelevant. That the motive behind it isn't even anti-English. That it is anti-Roosevelt. That England is merely the John Bovingdon of the moment. That the search for spectacular antiadministration issues has moved over, temporarily, into this area. That we have all been misled into accepting as a serious debate on foreign policy, and as a serious American flare-up of anti-English feeling, something that is only a cynical chapter in domestic politics.

Look at that man, he hires a dancer as an economist. Look at that man, he lets England get fat on our lease-lend. And the most profoundly isolationist aspect of the current debate about England is that it really isn't about England; those fomenting it haven't even been thinking about England. They have been looking inside, not outside. They know what they have been thinking about.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I desire to ask if the able Senator from North Dakota in the concluding portion of his remarks quoted what purported to be some remark of Prime Minister Churchill in this country relative to the election of a President of this Nation next year, and, if so, what is the source of that quotation?

Mr. NYE. Yes, Mr. President; I was quoting a radio broadcast of Drew Pearson, and since that time I have learned what his authority was, and I am ready to abide by that authority as being quite accurate and as of some consequence.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have the same right totally and wholly to disbelieve that the Prime Minister of Great Britain ever made such a statement and the same right to assert in the Senate that he never made such a statement as the able Senator from North Dakota has to believe that he made it or to assert that he did make it. I am sorry the able Senator, in his first remark, did not qualify the source of the quotation and indicate that it was a hearsay report from a radio commentator upon which, by implication, he based the assertion that the Prime Minister of Great Britain was trying to influence the election of a President of the United States in 1944. In fact, that is no greater perversion of the responsible facts than the able Senator deduced from the newspaper report from which he read. The able Senator purported to find authority in the United Press article for the statement by Prime Minister Churchill of something that reflected improperly upon politics in the United States; yet, in reading the article itself and noting the quotation of the Prime Minister one finds—and I am reading from the article which the able Senator handed up to the desk—

As soon as the war is ended, the soldiers will leave off fighting and the politicians will begin. Perhaps that is rather a pity. But, at any rate it isn't as bad as what goes on in some countries which I shouldn't venture to name, where the soldiers are fighting abroad and the politicians are fighting at home with equal vigor and ferocity.

It is my opinion that the remark the able Senator from North Dakota made was a political corroboration of what the Prime Minister said. It was intended as a jab in the side of our British ally, a blow at the President of the United States and the present administration in the conduct of the war, and a further revelation of the consistent anti-British policy which the able Senator from North Dakota has maintained since long before the present contest was ever inaugurated.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I do not know that there is any call for me to go any further than what the record itself will reveal as the basis of my information. The fact remains that here is this quotation of Winston Churchill, from his address in Parliament yesterday, representing him as having been very unhappy, and labeling as politicians those who brought back reports which have found their way to the public, and we have these accounts which at one and the same time reveal the British press making the nastiest kind of references to the five honorable colleagues of ours who returned here from an objective visit, and made objective reports to the Senate, the accounts seeking now to make monkeys of them and belittling men who have stood staunchly in support of the British-American cause all the way through these years of controversy. Yet today they are made the targets of the ridicule of people who evidently, I repeat, have lost all judgment, in an hour when judgment would be of such extreme value to our United Nations front.

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will permit me to say just one word, I should like to make the commentary that the Daily Mail, which I believe the able Senator from North Dakota quoted in commenting about what the Senators said, never in all its long history, never in all its most sinister moments, never in any diabolical attitude it ever conceived of, was able to say or infer as much against the United States as the Chicago Tribune for more than a decade has constantly and vitriolically poured out against the personality of the leaders of Great Britain.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think it regrettable that on any pretext it is found expedient in the Senate to magnify either statements or cartoons which may appear in foreign journals regarding ourselves as a body, or as individuals. I presume that there are irresponsible journals in England, as there are in the United States. We should not allow such circumstances to cloud our own judgment with regard to the propriety of our actions in conjunction with our allies in this great crisis of human history.

I have seen Mr. Churchill on every occasion when he has been in Washington, and I have no knowledge, and never even heard, that he ever expressed any opinion, either public or private, regarding the next presidential election or any presidential election in the United States.

Regarding the so-called injection of the English people into a United States presidential election, my recollection is that 3 or 4 days ago there appeared in the newspapers an account of a Gallup poll which had been taken in England with reference to some phase of the political situation in this country. I do not know by what right a Gallup poll is taken in England on a presidential election in the United States. I suppose it is like all other Gallup polls; they are looking for means of taking a census among some people about something. Certainly we should not take the result of any such poll, gratuitously taken by any poll taker, as evidence of the desire of the people of any other country to inject themselves into a presidential election in this country.

As to Mr. Churchill's remarks in the House of Commons a few days ago, I read them. Of course, the United Press, which carried them, puts the interpretation upon them that he was referring to the United States, or to what had happened in the United States Senate. As I gather from the news article, he was debating with his colleagues in the House of Commons a question which pertained to English unity in regard to some legislation, or some action, or some investigation, or some criticism that was being indulged in by the people of England, or by the Members of Parliament, regarding English activities in the war, and it was in connection with that that Mr. Churchill made a remark in such a way as to deprecate the fact that either in his country or in any other country, while the soldiers were fighting at the front, politicians were fighting at home.

I do not take what happened here as any justification for any insinuations or innuendos or allusions, not by name, but by interpretation, in the British Parliament or in any other parliament, but if in the House of Commons, in the House of Lords, or in any other parliamentary body anywhere in the world, the United States had been attacked or its good faith questioned by a member, because of its war activities or its contribution to the war, or if any question had been raised in debate, however, irrelevant it may have been, as to our contribution or our activities or our all-out effort in behalf of winning the war and the peace, I can very well imagine that what would have happened here on the floor of the Senate would have made Mr. Churchill's remarks in the debate about the home situation a few days ago look exceedingly mild.

I hope we will not become excited over the ebullitions of politicians or statesmen of any country involved in the present great war, or in this great crisis, and I do not think we should magnify beyond their real implications, and out of proportion, remarks made in any legislative body, in the heat of debate, regarding the conduct of any of our associates in this great conflict. I hope we will keep our feet on the ground and our heads erect, and recognize the fact that in all countries and in all legislative bodies we must display a tolerance which may not

always be wanted, but which is so essential in the great enterprise in which we are all engaged.

THE LATE REV. ULYSSES G. B. PIERCE

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, last Sunday a former chaplain of the Senate, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, passed away suddenly while serving as the pastor of the All Souls Unitarian Church, in Washington. This afternoon a memorial service is being held in that church in memory of his long and inspirational service to his church and to his Nation.

Dr. Pierce was born in Providence, R. I., in 1865, and ever since his ordination to the Unitarian ministry in 1891, he has devoted himself to his profession and to public service in its broadest sense. He filled a pastorate in Pomona, Calif., from 1893 to 1896, and in Ithaca, N. Y., from 1897 to 1901. However, since 1901—42 years ago—he has been the pastor of the All Souls Unitarian Church, in Washington, D. C., where he has inspired not only the members of his congregation residing in this city, but also countless people coming to the church from all over the Nation.

The former President and Chief Justice of the United States, William Howard Taft, was a member of Dr. Pierce's church, and a great admirer of him. In appreciation of President Taft's high regard for Dr. Pierce, and in recognition of the general high regard in which Dr. Pierce was held in the Nation, he was selected as chaplain of the United States Senate. He served with distinction in that capacity from 1909 through 1913.

His prayers were marked with deep religious feeling, coupled with the broadest tolerance and understanding of religion in its deepest and most inclusive sense. Both in his prayers and in his sermons, he always has contributed to the clear thinking of those who have listened to him and to their faith in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. It is therefore fitting that there be recorded in the proceedings of the Senate today an expression of appreciation of his contribution to the proceedings of this body and to the uplifting of the ideals of all who have had the privilege of knowing him or of listening to his interpretation of God to man.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Frank C. Squire, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 29, 1948, vice M. Roland Reed.

By Mr. WHEELER (for Mr. TOBEY), from the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Nelson Lee Smith, of New Hampshire, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1945 (vice Seavey).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of JAMES PATRICK MCGRANERY to be Assistant to the Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Luther M. Swygert to be United States district judge for the northern district of Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. Edwin C. Kelton, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be president and member of the California Debris Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. Rufus W. Putnam, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be a member of the California Debris Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CREAL, OF KENTUCKY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives which will be read.

The resolution (H. Res. 322) was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
October 13, 1943.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Honorable EDWARD W. CREAL, a Representative from the State of Kentucky.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before I send to the desk a resolution following the message from the House of Representatives, I wish simply to say that I regret exceedingly to learn of the death of Representative CREAL, who has for many years represented the Fourth District of Kentucky in the House of Representatives. Mr. CREAL was a very able, very conscientious, and very industrious representative of the people who had honored him. Before he came to the House of Representatives he had been prominent in the political, legal, and social history of his district and of his State. I do not recall any Representative from any district in my State who worked more arduously for the welfare of the people whom he represented than did Representative CREAL. His background, his association, his history, and his life were all such as to qualify him admirably for the public service, and he measured up to the highest standards of that service.

Mr. President, I ask for the present consideration of the resolution which I now offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 194) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. EDWARD W. CREAL, late a Representative from the State of Kentucky.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER appointed, under the second resolution, the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER] as the committee on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, October 15, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 14 (legislative day of October 12), 1943:

COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

Preston Delano, of Massachusetts, to be Comptroller of the Currency. (Reappointment.)

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Thomas M. Carey, of Cleveland, Ohio, to be collector of internal revenue for the eighteenth district of Ohio, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FEDERAL BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Dr. Clarence Poe, of North Carolina, to be a member of the Federal Board for Vocational Education for the unexpired term of 3 years ending July 17, 1946.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARIZONA

Lucy H. Contreras, Bellemont, Ariz. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Nellie Moss, Marana, Ariz. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lenore Hoopes, Sacatan, Ariz. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

C. Herrold Higgins, San Carlos, Ariz. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

CALIFORNIA

Edwin B. Morrell, Arlington, Calif., in place of W. E. Robb, removed.

Loie M. Ford, Calipatria, Calif., in place of J. H. Moore, resigned.

Felix G. Young, Desert Center, Calif. Office became Presidential January 1, 1943.

Norma H. Wilson, Keene, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Margaret O. Quandt, McKittrick, Calif., in place of C. D. Myers, resigned.

Genevieve Frahm, Palmdale, Calif., in place of Genevieve Frahm. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

James W. Wilson, Planada, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

COLORADO

Winnie Hasty Maclin, Hasty, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Esta M. Fuson, Saguache, Colo., in place of L. C. Marold, deceased.

DELAWARE

Lena C. Poore, Hartly, Del. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Pauline M. Hamp, Hollyoak, Del. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mattie J. Greenly, Lincoln, Del. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

GEORGIA

Julia C. Casey, Kingsland, Ga., in place of C. G. Russell, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Vernon F. Jones, Thawville, Ill., in place of W. W. Jones, transferred.

INDIANA

J. Custer Loveless, Clarks Hill, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Leland C. Swinford, Clermont, Ind. Office became Presidential January 1, 1943.

Ilena M. Lawyer, Oolitic, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Edward O. Elrod, Pekin, Ind., in place of E. R. Rickard, transferred.

Rose K. Hubers, St. Meinrad, Ind., in place of R. K. Hubers. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mary A. Kaiser, Schererville, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Martin Brink, Wanamaker, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Shirley A. Williams, Westport, Ind., in place of N. R. Billieu, transferred.

Frank Donaldson, Wheatland, Ind., in place of L. L. Langdon, resigned.

IOWA

Leslie Fahrner, Keosauqua, Iowa, in place of C. B. Richardson, transferred.

Edith M. Wehrle, Middletown, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Kathleen A. Elbert, Whittemore, Iowa, in place of J. S. Cullen. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1942.

KANSAS

William E. Thornhill, Cunningham, Kans., in place of R. E. Wetherall, removed.

Ray K. Hockaday, Hutchinson, Kans., in place of R. L. Russell, resigned.

Richard S. Ikenberry, Quinter, Kans., in place of R. S. Ikenberry. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

George L. Baker, Tonganoxie, Kans., in place of G. P. Allan, transferred.

KENTUCKY

Kate S. Keesee, Belfry, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Bernice C. Tully, Big Clifty, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Nellie Spalding, Bradfordsville, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Clarence F. Nordwick, California, Ky. Office become Presidential July 1, 1943.

Golda Martin, Drift, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mary Dee Diuguid, Ghent, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

George W. Bleidt, Golden Pond, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Eunice Vincent, Hitchins, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mike Staley, Lackey, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

John A. Vaughan, Majestic, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Corinne Owen, Mount Washington, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

T. Harold Skaggs, Prospect, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Grant B. Smith, Verda, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Conley Johnson, Virgie, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MAINE

Fred Elsmore Glew, Fort Fairfield, Maine, in place of W. G. Chamberlain, deceased.

Merle R. Pitman, Lovell, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Milton Edes, Sangerville, Maine, in place of Milton Edes. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

MARYLAND

Orlando E. Corsa, Henryton, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Anna R. Rogers, Riderwood, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Norman W. Clark, Severn, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MASSACHUSETTS

James F. Brennan, North Attleboro, Mass., in place of T. F. Coady, retired.

Edward C. Harney, Pepperell, Mass., in place of G. A. Rice, resigned.

MINNESOTA

George Zahn, Bellingham, Minn., in place of W. F. Priem, transferred.

Oscar T. Lokensgard, Boyd, Minn., in place of H. H. Lukken, transferred.

Gertrude C. Thompson, Cyrus, Minn., in place of A. W. Danielson, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

Shelby O. Taylor, Union, Miss., in place of W. L. Collins, removed.

MISSOURI

Kathryn Q. Brown, Hallsville, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEBRASKA

Lulu M. Kennedy, Bradshaw, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Hjalmar A Swanson, Clay Center, Nebr., in place of H. A. Swanson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Frances C. Rotherham, Ewing, Nebr., in place of L. P. Dierks, resigned.

Thomas A. Siefken, Harvard, Nebr., in place of T. A. Siefken. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ray M. Guilford, Marquette, Nebr., in place of M. P. Hemmingsen, transferred.

Minnie M. Mason, Salem, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Elta Evans, Shubert, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

NEVADA

Doris E. Larson, Stewart, Nev. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW JERSEY

Anna T. Heus, Demarest, N. J., in place of A. T. Heus. Incumbent's commission expired April 22, 1941.

Rose F. Ricci, Murray Hill, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Karl H. Schlupp, Westwood, N. J., in place of T. J. Lyons, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

James Henry Hill, Hickory, N. C., in place of G. F. Bost, removed.

Pearl E. Linville, Oak Ridge, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Arthur E. Briscoe, Union Mills, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

NORTH DAKOTA

Arthur E. Bean, Donnybrook, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Max A. Wipperman, Hankinson, N. Dak., in place of M. A. Wipperman. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

OHIO

Ella M. Manson, Apple Creek, Ohio, in place of E. M. Manson. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1942.

Edgar K. Brown, Arcanum, Ohio, in place of Edward Wild, resigned.

Jesse H. O'Roark, Covington, Ohio, in place of J. B. Neth. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Fred L. Diffenderfer, Greentown, Ohio, in place of R. K. Myers, resigned.

Howard J. Swearingen, Kensington, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

O. Pauline Myers, Long Bottom, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mary Doman, Lyndhurst, Ohio, in place of J. A. Drew. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1942.

Joann E. Johnston, Macedonia, Ohio, in place of E. L. Griswold, resigned.

Frank W. White, Milford, Ohio, in place of R. R. Riehle, transferred.

Mary C. Melody, New Paris, Ohio, in place of W. F. Engle, resigned.

Emma Duff, South Solon, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Robert S. McKelvey, Toronto, Ohio, in place of James Connor, deceased.

Elinor E. Arick, Valley City, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

OKLAHOMA

William T. Barnes, Mountain Park, Okla., in place of L. L. Bennett, resigned.

Ella Miller, Ramona, Okla., in place of A. A. Powell, removed.

OREGON

Eugene E. Mulcare, Canyon City, Oreg., in place of E. M. Hoare, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Marjorie Lowery, Boston, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Amidee T. Seese, Markleysburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Emma J. Roof, Monroeton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Harry C. Mickle, New Paris, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Esther Smith, Renton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Dennis A. Phelan, St. Marys, Pa., in place of Frank O'Neill, deceased.

Alice B. Smith, Shawnee on Delaware, Pa., in place of C. W. Callaway, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Hilda J. Gross, Doland, S. Dak., in place of A. E. Paine, retired.

Iva M. Bowen, Egan, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Gustave I. Honsey, Hecla, S. Dak., in place of G. I. Honsey. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

TEXAS

David F. Stamps, Dime Box, Tex., in place of D. F. Stamps. Incumbent's commission expired April 6, 1942.

Gorden S Barker, Sulphur Bluff Tex Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Vaughn M. Price, Three Rivers, Tex., in place of H. D. House, transferred.

UTAH

Edna F. Nicholls, Farmington, Utah., in place of M. J. M. Smith, resigned.

Reuben J. Peterson, Santaquin, Utah, in place of R. J. Peterson. Incumbent's commission expired December 7, 1941.

VERMONT

Mabel M. Hemenway, Jeffersonville, Vt., in place of M. M. Hemenway. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Rosa M. Stewart, Tunbridge, Vt., in place of R. M. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Timothy J. Murphy, Windsor, Vt., in place of T. J. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

VIRGINIA

Louis C. Dawson, Afton, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mabel C. Harris, Gladstone, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Elza S. Cave, Madison, Va., in place of A. H. Cave, deceased.

Charles G. Arey, Mount Solon, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Gilbert T. Allen, Wakefield, Va., in place of L. E. Stephenson, retired.

Annie R. B. Knight, Whaleyville, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WASHINGTON

Willene M. Ratliff, Electric City, Wash., in place of O. N. Handel, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Harry E. Riddleberger, St. Albans, W. Va., in place of H. E. Riddleberger. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

WYOMING

John W. Powell, Superior, Wyo., in place of John Barwick, removed.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 14 (legislative day of October 12), 1943:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

James Patrick McGranery to be The Assistant to the Attorney General.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Luther M. Swygert to be United States district judge for the northern district of Indiana.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Edwin C. Kelton, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be president and a member of the California Debris Commission.

Col. Rufus W. Putnam, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be a member of the California Debris Commission.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Herbert F. Leary to be vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from November 1, 1943, and to continue during his assignment as commander, Eastern Sea Frontier.

RETIRED LIST

Rear Admiral Adolphus Andrews, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral when retired on November 1, 1943.

Rear Admiral Roland M. Brainard, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral when retired on November 1, 1943.

POSTMASTERS

FLORIDA

Stanley V. Buss, Vero Beach.

HAWAII

Francis Hughes, Lanikai.

LOUISIANA

Girtherine Evans Lloyd, Grambling.

MISSOURI

W. Lloyd Wiley, Crane.
Parks Bacon, El Dorado Springs.
Lewis A. Newkirk, Everton.
Cecil E. Schwartz, Hannibal.
James R. Daily, Schell City.
Ernest C. Buehler, South St. Joseph.

OKLAHOMA

Maude A. Cumming, Adair.

WASHINGTON

Jehu O Patterson, Pullman.
John O. Mills, Woodland.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal Father, from whom all blessings flow, who breathes hope into hopeless hearts and unto whom little children may come and the patriot with his victory, consider and hear us. Reassure us that the paths we are passing are starlit and the days which sweep our country onward are true and safe. Grant that we may meet the soul of the world without blot or shame, prophesying the coming of Thy kingdom and the parliament of man.

O wondrous Saviour, whose holy feet touched the scarred earth at Bethlehem and whose spiritual impulse lives, cross the hearts of men like the shaft of a great light. Let us beware of the atrophy of victory and understand that liberty of speech, thought, and act is our eternal possession and stamped with the blood of our fathers and not to be pierced by any weapon nor withstood by any barrier. Blessed Lord, lead us to be grateful for the great mass of laboring people who are reaching the high note of patriotic devotion and service. Our privileges and opportunities are countless and we pray that Thy benefactions may be upon all like the good river of water of life whose streams are for the healing of the nations. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committees:

OCTOBER 11, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation from the following committees and ask that the same be accepted: Territories, and the Select Committee to Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Beyond the Scope of Their Authority.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. BENNETT.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

OCTOBER 12, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT J. ENGEL.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

OCTOBER 12, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Cordially yours,

HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 102, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Select Committee to Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Beyond the Scope of Their Authority,

the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 323) and ask for its immediate adoption.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That JOHN B. BENNETT, of Michigan, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

REPEAL OF THE CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. REED of New York addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND, DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MAGNUSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial concerning our former Postmaster General.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do this, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of inquiring as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday there will be the call of the Consent Calendar, which is brief, and then the further consideration, under the 5-minute rule, of the bill which will come up today.

On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called and there will also be considered the Bulwinkle resolution giving to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce power to investigate certain aspects of air transportation.

On Wednesday the Chinese Exclusion Act will be brought up.

On Friday—I see the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs here; if I make any observation about this which he feels should be corrected I hope he will do so—the fathers' draft bill will be brought up. I understand the report on this bill will soon be completed and filed, and if a rule is granted for the consideration of this bill, which I hope it will be, it is my intention to bring it up on Friday next.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Does not the gentleman mean Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I am sorry, but a change has been made in the program since I conferred with my distinguished friend.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. When will the bill S. 1279 be called up?

Mr. McCORMACK. That bill comes up today.

On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called, which will be brief, and then, if general debate on this bill has not been concluded today, that will be finished Monday, and the bill will then be considered under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The bill that is being called up today will be the order of the day until its consideration is concluded?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered in Brooklyn, N. Y., by the Reverend Joseph R. N. Maxwell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMANENT MEDICAL CORPS IN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on May 27 I introduced in the House a bill (H. R. 2820) to create a permanent medical corps in the Veterans' Administration. That bill has been before the Veterans' Committee. It has not yet been reported, because we have been waiting for a report from General Hines and the Bureau of the Budget. We are short 258 doctors in the veterans' hospitals, and 500 nurses. General Hines says they are trying to get help from the Army and the Navy from time to time, but nothing has been done. In the meantime men disabled in the First World War and men disabled in the present World War are not receiving adequate attention. There is no excuse for it. I believe the committee will soon act if the Administration does not. It is an inexcusable situation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a brief newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE EDWARD W. CREAL

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and extend my remarks by the inclusion of a resolution passed in respect to the Honorable EDWARD W. CREAL, of Kentucky, by the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in the death of EDWARD W. CREAL the House Committee on Agriculture has suffered an irreparable loss. This is no idle statement. His gentle nature, his innate sense of justice, his detestation for sham and pretext, and his ability to think clearly and express himself concisely, were the outstanding attributes of this great American. On more than one occasion I have witnessed his clear thinking and concise expression bring to our committee order out of confusion. I do not think I ever came in contact with a mind that could detect error more quickly or pierce it more effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I incorporate at this point in my remarks the resolutions passed by our committee on yesterday in tribute to our former friend and colleague:

Whereas the members of the Committee on Agriculture of the United States House of Representatives have learned with profound sorrow and regret of the untimely death of the Honorable EDWARD W. CREAL, a Representative in Congress from the State of Kentucky, and

Whereas the said EDWARD W. CREAL was for several years a distinguished member of this committee and by his great fidelity to duty, the calm dignity of his presence, the courtliness of his manner, the courage and impartiality of his judgment, his lovable personality and capacity for friendship, his forceful, logical, and persuasive manner of expression, his integrity and sterling traits of character,

endeared himself to every member of this committee; now, Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the death of our late and beloved colleague, our committee has lost one of its most valuable members, the country an outstanding statesmen, one who was at all times inspired by a superiority of purpose and a supreme devotion to the ideals of this democracy, and each of us has suffered a deep personal sorrow; Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the family of the deceased and the original resolution made a part of the permanent records of this committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD regarding the splendid work done by Brig. Gen. Joseph Barzynski, commander of the United States Army Quartermaster Depot at Chicago, Ill., in his effort to secure cooperation of our American womanhood for service in the WAC, WAVES, SPARS, and Marines, and to include therein a letter he received from the Most Reverend Samuel A. Stritch, D. D., archbishop of Chicago, in support of his work.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAFOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include three speeches, one delivered by Governor Dewey of New York, one by Mayor LaGuardia, and one by Mr. G. Pope, of New York City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes on the subject of free speech and the radio industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address delivered by our colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain resolutions adopted by the Poweshiek County Farm Bureau.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the acting dean of Cornell University, Mr. Myers, on the subject of the food shortage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of business and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

STAFF OF EXPERTS TO FOLLOW UP APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I note that the Senate has become very much interested in the appointment of a staff of experts as agents and representatives of that body to follow up appropriations and see how the money is expended.

In February of last year I introduced a similar bill for the establishment of an office of fiscal investigators as agents of the House of Representatives to follow up expenditures that are made under appropriations. I think we could save a great deal of waste, extravagance, and duplication and relieve the burden on the taxpayers of this country by the adoption of such a policy.

Several conferences were held last year, and I have the assurance of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] that hearings will shortly be held upon the measure which I introduced last year and have reintroduced in this Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

DECENTRALIZING OF HEAVY INDUSTRY

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COFFEE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a statement on post-war planning by Mr. Carl Swisher, of Jacksonville, Fla., and also a press release thereon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this afternoon, after the disposition of other matters on the Speaker's desk, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an article from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield back the special order granted me for today, and I renew my request to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DR. RUHLAND

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, you will have noticed in this morning's paper that the Senate committee is suggesting that Dr. Ruhland, Health Officer of the District of Columbia, should be disposed of. Possible as it may be that unfortunate situations exist, I would like to suggest to the House that before we dispose of men who have a reputation throughout the country as being among the first in their profession, we take some of the responsibility for inadequate service. We have not given to the District sufficient funds to have an adequate service either in Gallinger Hospital or throughout the city.

I would like very much to recommend to the House a more thoughtful study of the situation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BENDER was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial from the Omaha Stock Journal on Hog Ceilings Bog Down.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REREFERENCE OF A BILL

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization be discharged from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 162 and that the same be rereferred to the Committee on Education. I have conferred with the chairmen of both committees and they are agreeable.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHMENT OF APPROPRIATE ADDITIONAL NATIONAL MILITARY CEMETERIES

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WILLEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial appearing in the Mount Vernon News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

REALISM VERSUS WILD PROMISES

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

BREWSTER AERONAUTICAL CORPORATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, no one ever dreamed of questioning the courage and determination of the men who are in the Navy or who are in the various forces by the hundreds of thousands fighting on every front.

Yesterday before the Committee on Naval Affairs I heard Under Secretary Forrestal tell the committee that because the Navy was in dire need of planes, in spite of the fact that there was but little production at the Brewster plant, the contract was being continued in the hope of something better.

This morning I heard Assistant Secretary Bard make the most humiliating, and to my mind the most discouraging, statement that any one man could make. It was to the effect that the Navy, in spite of the fact that production at that plant is being held up by De Lorenzo and in spite of the fact that they were not getting planes which the fighting men must have, the Navy could not do anything to get production. To state the situation in different language, Assistant Secretary Bard and his political boss have surrendered to a union racketeer. Just read the record yourself.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today at the conclusion of the legislative business and any special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 15 minutes and revise and extend my remarks and include certain correspondence and editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects and to include in each of them an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three different subjects and include some articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

JENNIE I. WESTON

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests. I have discussed this matter with the majority and minority leaders. I am making this at the request of the clerk of the Claims Committee.

First, I ask unanimous consent that H. R. 3153, for the relief of the estate of Jennie I. Weston, deceased, now pending on the Private Calendar, be recommitted to the Commitee on Claims.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

JOHN P. VON ROSENBERG

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 533) for the relief of John P. von Rosenberg, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

Pending that request, Mr. Speaker, I will say that the Senate has reduced the amount in the bill that was passed by the House and I am advised by the clerk of the Claims Committee and the author of the bill that the amount is satisfactory to them.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$8,972.64" and insert "$3,772.64."

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out "on account of personal injuries and expenses incident thereto and."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "expenses incident thereto," and insert "on account of all property damages, medical, funeral, and other expenses incurred by the said John P. von Rosenberg and wife."

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and any orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include some observations concerning the oil situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by our former colleague, the Honorable Martin Smith, at the Leif Erickson festival.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the Civil Service Commission.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DROP IN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, on last Tuesday the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] extended his remarks on page 8283 of the RECORD in reference to employment in the Federal service and made some statements with reference to the fact that we had extended the working time of Government employees in 1942 and given them extra pay, but we had no decrease in employment on account of the extension of hours. When the Pay Act passed many employees were working 48 hours and most of the remainder were on a 44-hour workweek.

I am putting in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement from the Civil Service Commission bearing upon that subject which I think is interesting. I call the attention of the House to the fact that the Civil Service Committee on yesterday filed an interim report, Report No. 766, indicating that there has been a reduction of 145,000 civilian employees in the War Department. I also call attention to the fact that for the first time in 3 years, in July, we had a net reduction in the number of Federal employees of 29,000; so we have reversed the trend as to civilian employment in the Government. The committee expects to continue its effort further to reduce the total of civilian employees in the Government. We have already saved on an annual basis almost a billion dollars. The House is entitled to the credit for this saving to the taxpayers, since it authorized and directed the investigation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a speech I made recently.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered in Baltimore last week by Mr. Carroll B. Huntress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article from the New York World-Telegram.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BATTLE OF HASTINGS, OCTOBER 14, 1066

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, today is one of the most important anniversaries in the history of the English-speaking race. Eight hundred and seventy-seven years ago today, October 14, 1066, the Battle of Hastings took place, at which time the English were conquered by the invading Normans. That was the last time a foreign enemy was ever able to set foot on English soil. Shakespeare says:

This royal throne of kings, this sceptred isle,
This earth of majesty, this seat of Mars,
This other Eden, demi-paradise,
This fortress built by Nature for herself
Against infection and the hand of war,
This happy breed of men, this little world,
This precious stone set in the silver sea,
Which serves it in the office of a wall
Or as a moat defensive to a house,
Against the envy of less happier lands,
This blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this England.

Let us hope that after this war, England, which is now our gallant ally, may enjoy those blessings Shakespeare visioned, and that no invading foe may be able to set foot on her soil for another thousand years.

ALLOWANCES AND ALLOTMENTS FOR DEPENDENTS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 315.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SABATH: On page 1, line 12, after the period, insert the following: "It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs; that such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute bill as an original bill; and on page 2, line 2, after the word 'adopted' insert a comma and the words: 'and any Member may demand a separate vote on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or the committee substitute'; and on page 2, line 3, strike out the word 'and' and insert a period; strike out the word 'the' and insert 'The'."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman from Ohio has asked me if it will be possible to consider any other amendments in lieu of the committee amendment to the bill?

Mr. SABATH. I will explain that. Under my amendment to the rule the House bill will be considered under the 5-minute rule in lieu of the Senate bill and will give Members the opportunity to offer amendments and to speak to the amendments for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Then it will be possible for the gentleman from Ohio or somebody else to offer an amendment including the Sadowski bill and have that amendment considered.

Mr. SABATH. This amendment will so permit. Now, Mr. Speaker, in further explanation of the proposed amendments to the rule, I wish to say that they are necessary by reason of the fact that the Committee on Military Affairs has not fully complied with the Ramseyer Act. There is printed in that committee's report on the bill the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 and the provisions of the Senate bill, all of which has been struck out after the enacting clause by an amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs and in lieu thereof the provisions of the House bill have been substituted.

I fully appreciate that it is the desire and purpose of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], who is one of the ablest parliamentarians of the House, and who, I recollect, supported the passage of the Ramseyer Act, to give to the membership complete information on any bill proposing to amend any law or Senate bill.

The amendment which I have offered to the pending rule will waive any point of order which, by strict construction, might lie. I feel that the reason for the gentleman's position is to force committees to prepare their reports in compliance with the Ramseyer Act so that the membership might easily understand without undue study and research the changes proposed to existing law.

A further proposed amendment to the rule will give members the privilege to secure a separate vote on any amendment that might be adopted in the Committee of the Whole. This is necessary because the House bill is being substituted for the Senate bill and is really an amendment to the Senate bill.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment merely broadens the rule so that a separate vote may be had on any amendment to the House bill. It will be observed that instead of a "gag" rule, as so frequently charged, the amendments make it a liberal rule.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the amendment to the rule.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order an amendment to the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act and provides for 4 hours' general debate and for the consideration of the House bill under the 5-minute rule. I take it that nearly every Member is in favor of the bill.

The principal provisions of the bill are known to the membership, who have evinced great interest in this legislation. Therefore, I shall not go into a detailed explanation of the bill, leaving that to the chairman and subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, both of whom arduously worked in the preparation of the bill and explained the effect of its provisions to the Committee on Rules. They are in better position to more clearly and intelligently explain the various provisions of the bill, and I desire to compliment them on their convincing and able presentation to the Committee on Rules which brought about the prompt reporting of the rule providing for the consideration of the bill by the House.

During all of the years of my service in this House I have never observed such a general demand and plea for legislation as I have for the bill now before us proposing to amend the 1942 act. The House bill increases the allowances to the dependents. It allows:

ALLOWANCES FOR DEPENDENTS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

(1) $50, if such enlisted man has a wife but no child;

(2) $75, if such enlisted man has a wife and one child, $95 if a wife and two children, and an additional $15 for each additional child;

(3) $42, if such enlisted man has no wife but has one child, and additional $15 for each additional child;

(4) $50, if such enlisted man has one parent dependent upon him for chief support; $68 if such enlisted man has one parent and one brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support;

(5) $68, if such enlisted man has two parents dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support;

(6) $42, if such enlisted man has no parent but has a brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support.

The servicemen who have large families naturally will receive a larger allowance, which I hope will be sufficient to enable them to live without too much sacrifice and deprivation of the ordinary necessities of life.

We all recognize that the cost of living has increased, which makes this legislation necessary. If there ever was a time when the wives and children of our fighting force deserved to be taken care of and properly provided for, this is the time.

The cost of living has gone up and even with the increased allowances provided this bill will not permit the dependents to live in as decent a manner as they deserve and are entitled to.

You gentlemen who have read of the trials and tribulations of these brave and courageous men, I know, feel as I do that we cannot do too much for them and that we should relieve them of the worry as to whether their wives and children will be provided for. This bill will do just that.

There are a few who will claim that the allowances are not large enough, and there will be some who will claim that they are too large. In view of the fact that the cost of living has increased, especially in the large cities, from 40 to 60 percent, it is absolutely necessary that something be done so that the wives and children of servicemen will not be in want.

Feeling that everyone is in favor of this legislation and appreciating that everyone is familiar with the provisions of the 1942 act as well as with the committee bill now before the House, I shall not take up any more time.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I yield now 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us enjoyed and appreciated the remarks of our genial friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] in regard to the many individuals here in Washington who have taken upon themselves the responsibility of feeding, clothing, and housing the world. At this particular time, thank goodness, we have not a bill before us which would take hundreds of millions of dollars to follow out the false theories, principles, and ideals of many men in high places in Washington. I unhesitatingly add, I trust that time never arrives.

As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has just stated, this bill does not deal with feeding and clothing the world but to take care of men and women who are doing an admirable and splendid job in our armed forces. We all have been home and we know that there have been many hardships placed through no fault of our servicemen upon the wives, children, and parents of those servicemen. It pleases me a great deal that the Committee on Military Affairs of the House has brought forth a bill to take care of and to provide the necessities of life for the wives, children, mothers, and fathers of our servicemen. I cannot think of one thing that would work to the detriment of our Army and Navy personnel, and there are hundreds of thousands of them, than to have their wives and families at home not receiving the necessities of life and I feel that the House of Representatives here today will overwhelmingly adopt a more liberal allowance for the dependents of our servicemen.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. In other words, we expect the fathers to go into the service. Now, we must see to it that those fathers do not go into the service with fear and trepidation that their loved ones will not be taken care of properly. That is why this bill has been brought forth?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentleman is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does it not seem to the gentleman that the American people want this legislation? The First World War came and there were not so many in it, after all, but today, in this terrible Second World War, almost every home in the country is touched and we realize that we should give adequate care to the dependents of our soldiers and sailors. Not only the Congress thinks that is necessary but the American people feel that way too.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts always speaks wisely.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the remarks I make will be directed at the rule and the bill, and not at the merits of the bill.

In the first place, there seems to be some misunderstanding as to just what the procedure will be under the amended rule. Under this rule, the committee amendment, or the committee substitute, which begins on page 11 of the bill (S. 1279) will be read as an original bill. It is an open rule as to that bill or substitute. Any germane amendment will be in order.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. When we reach the consideration of the substitute, it will take the place of the original bill?

Mr. MICHENER. When the Clerk begins to read for amendment under the 5-minute rule he will begin on page 11, which is the substitute bill. The substitute bill then will be read as if it were the original bill and perfected. After all amendments offered to the substitute bill have been voted on, there will then be a vote as between the Senate bill and the substitute bill. In other words, the question will be, Shall the committee bill be accepted as a substitute for the Senate bill? If the committee substitute is accepted, then the House is through with the consideration under the 5-minute rule and the Committee rises. If the motion is voted down, then the Senate bill, through which the lines are drawn in the print before us, will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule just the same as if there had been no committee substitute proposed.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. As to the rule, the gentleman is right, and he has explained it thoroughly with this exception. We will consider the committee bill under the 5-minute rule. If any amendments are adopted on the floor and the bill is reported with the amendments to the House bill and a vote is taken and the bill is approved, naturally it will take the place of the Senate bill. Is not that right?

Mr. MICHENER. I think I probably used clumsy language. I am glad the chairman in his usual lucid way has made the matter clear. He is quite right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If the gentleman will yield further, if the House substitute is adopted in Committee, then there will be no consideration of the Senate bill, will there? The Senate bill will not be read and there will be no right to amend it.

Mr. MICHENER. The Senate bill will not be read, provided the committee substitute when perfected is adopted as a substitute for the Senate bill. I cannot make it plainer.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I propose to offer some amendments to the bill reported by the House committee. Let me get this procedure straight. The gentleman says that under the 5-minute rule, if we move to adopt the House bill as a substitute to the Senate bill, that will not bar me from offering my amendments to the House bill?

Mr. MICHENER. I think I can answer the gentleman's question. As I recall, the gentleman has a bill dealing with the same subject pending in the House.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. If the gentleman from Michigan desires to have that bill considered in lieu of the committee substitute bill, his procedure would be, upon the completion of the reading of the first section of the committee substitute, to offer his bill as an amendment to the first section and give notice that if his amendment prevails he will move to strike out each subsequent section of the House substitute as they are read.

Mr. SADOWSKI. That is not exactly what I wanted to do. I would rather have the provisions of my bill offered as amendments to increase the allowances in the House bill. They will be in the form of three amendments.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman will have the same privilege to amend the committee substitute as he has to amend any bill under the general rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. That is what I wanted to have understood.

Mr. MICHENER. Now just one other thing. I call the attention of the Military Affairs Committee in particular, and of the House in general, to the manner in which this bill is drafted. I have called attention to this practice on numerous occasions and the condition has been remedied by most committees. To illustrate what I mean, section 2 of the committee substitute reads:

> That section 102 of such act is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the words "except as to the initial family allowance provided by section 107 (a) hereof."

Therefore, if this bill is enacted said section 2 will be written in the statute books of the United States as a law.

The reader of the law will be confronted with a formula which he must follow. By the process of elimination and addition of commas, periods, and words to an existing law, he will be able to find out what the Congress intended when it enacted said section 2. In no other way will he be able to know what the law is.

In short, section 2 suggests what should be done to existing law to give expression to the intent of Congress. Each individual seeking to know the law must perform a mechanical operation before he knows. If he makes no mistakes, and eliminates the intended periods and commas and inserts the additional words in the proper places, then he can feel that he knows what the law is. This is ridiculous, is it not? We all know it should not be. I have faith enough in the good sense of this House to believe that it will remedy this situation before a final vote is taken on this bill.

The next section in the substitute reads as follows:

> SEC. 3. That section 103 of such act is amended to read as follows:
> "SEC. 103. The dependents of any such enlisted man"—

And so forth. That is as it should be, because anyone reading section 3 of this bill will know exactly how section 103, as amended, will read, and how it will appear in the statute.

Imagine your constituent asking you for a copy of this law after it is enacted. You send over to the Document Room and get a copy of the public law and send it to him. If he happens to be a lawyer and happens to have the United States Statutes handy, he may be able to figure out just what section 2 means. If he were not so qualified and equipped, he would be compelled to seek the advice of a lawyer who has a set of the United States Statutes. Things like this should not happen, and the House is entitled to nothing but censure if it permits such a thing to transpire.

Then again, imagine a judge on the bench trying a case where this law is involved. The judge asks the attorney for a copy of the statute, and the attorney hands him up the law embodying section 2 as above quoted. The judge must then get the original law, superimpose the amendatory statute upon the original statute and, if he makes no mistakes in the process, he will then know what the law is about which he has inquired. Such procedure is inexcusable, if not asinine. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this committee substitute must be amended before it leaves the House.

This strike-out-and-insert practice became prevalent a few years ago when legislation was being drafted in the departments and agencies by inexperienced draftsmen. Possibly they are not to blame, because they drew up in bill form the changes they desired to make in existing law. They wrote the formula and expected the Congress to do the mechanical work before the law reached the books. The Congress in many cases simply approved the bills sent up to it without any changes whatever and, as a result, we find upon the books today some of this type of legislation. Maybe there was some excuse at a time when "must" legislation was the order of the day, and when bills were passed after reading by the clerk, before they were ever presented to the House in print. Whatever the excuse was in the beginning, it does not exist today.

In the first instance, this criticism should be leveled at any committee reporting a bill in this language. In the second place, the House is not only entitled to criticism but condemnation if it passes any such unintelligible statute.

When the substitute bill is read under the 5-minute rule I am going to offer amendments. On page 21 of the committee report you will notice that in one column is printed the law as it now is and in the second column is printed the law as it will read if amended. For instance, when we get to section 2, instead of saying that we strike out a comma, and then hunt up two or three other lines and find a period or something, and then do something more, I am going to move that section 102 of this bill be amended to read as follows, and then include section 102 in full as it appears in the second column of the report.

I shall offer succeeding amendments to every section in the substitute where this improper method of draftsmanship obtains. These remarks may appear rather technical, but I have attempted to point out to the Military Affairs Committee just what we all realize should be done, and I hope that the chairman of the committee will offer these perfecting amendments as committee amendments, and that we may send an understandable and well-drawn bill to the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I favor the principle embodied in this bill. I am in sympathy with its objectives, and these remarks are made in a spirit of helpfulness and cooperation. I feel sure that the Military Affairs Committee will so accept them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] have explained this rule so lucidly that I am sure it would be a waste of time to discuss it any further. I am sure everyone is in favor of the adoption of the rule. I shall use this opportunity to call to the attention of the House a matter in connection

with the law concerning our Military Establishment, which is very badly in need of correction. In 1940 before the beginning of the war, when the Army was smaller and we had too many Army officers and that prevented the younger men from coming up through promotion, we enacted a law that required the compulsory retirement of officers at the age of 60 years. That law is still on the statute books, and today in this critical situation with respect to manpower we are retiring some 900 experienced officers, men who have been educated by the Government at great expense, who have gained knowledge and information in the conduct of war through the World War, and through the present war. We are doing the utterly silly thing of retiring those men on three-quarters pay, and bringing back here to desks, men necessarily who are available for the front line. Is not that a condition that this Congress ought to do something about? I have in mind, for instance, an officer at West Point, who is engaged in teaching young men. God knows he must have had experience and knowledge that would make him a useful man at that place, and yet because of the mere fact that he has become 60 years of age this Congress says that he is disqualified, and is officially dead. As I look around me I wonder how many of us are officially dead and thoroughly debilitated under the rule that we have laid down for the Army. I see the gentleman from Illinois, the distinguished dean of the House on his feet, and he is an excellent example of what I have in mind.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Only this morning my attention was called to a man who has been in the service for 34 or 35 years, who is a graduate of West Point, but he has been released because of his age, when he looks younger than 50 years, and his father and mother are still living. Yet he has been retired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am very glad to know that the gentleman from Illinois agrees with me on this very obvious situation, and I hope that he will do something to help me get it corrected. I have in my pocket a copy of the order retiring one of these men, a man with a splendid, a distinguished record. What does the order say? That order says that under the mandate of statutory law, "To our deep regret we are required to retire you," so that he may sit on his front porch while men of less ability will fight this war. This situation is properly laid at the door of Congress, because Congress passed the law and has not changed it.

Mr. MAY rose.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am going to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs in a moment, but I hope the gentleman does not think that I have reference to him when I referred to the fact that by action of his committee all men over 60 years of age are of no further use to their country, and are officially dead.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Of course the gentleman from Virginia knows that the House Military Affairs Committee is no more responsible for that statute that authorizes the retirement of colonels at the age of 60 years than is the House of Representatives, but I think the gentleman is entitled to an explanation from the committee of what steps we took or what we tried to do to prevent it, when we found that there would be this retirement as of the first day of October, when only 15 days before that time we were assembled here. We found we could not have time to enact an amendment to the retirement law to prohibit their discharge during the emergency, and we had the Chief of the Personnel Section of the Army before the committee and had extended hearings in an effort to prevent this.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The Congress did this thing and the Congress can correct it. The reason I have obtained this time is not to hear myself talk, but we have here a bill affecting the military establishment, and I propose under the 5-minute rule to offer an amendment to suspend the operation of that utterly ridiculous, yes, tragic law, as it now exists. I propose to offer an amendment that will suspend that law and give to the Secretary of War the discretion to keep men in the service who are virile and active and experienced and available for the war effort. I am afraid that somebody may rise and say that it is not in order on this bill but I hope that will not occur, because, as I said before, the War Department says that this is the fault of the Congress.

The Congress has got an opportunity at this time without further delay to change the law and stop this utterly ridiculous situation.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I will say to the gentleman that I am fully in accord with what the gentleman has just said. In fact, I have gone so far as to prepare and introduce a bill several months ago that would cover that particular subject and give the War Department more discretion in the retirement, waiving the age limit. The War Department has rendered an unfavorable report on that bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. But they still say the Congress is responsible for it, and of course Congress is responsible.

Mr. BROOKS. If it is ever passed it must be passed in face of the opposition of the War Department.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, why not? The War Department is every day issuing these orders saying that they regret that they have to do this but that Congress makes them do it by statutory law.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think we should give a little explanation to show that any statement that the War Department has got to do it, is not accurate, for this reason: This law was passed in 1940. I happened to be a member of the subcommittee that drew up the law. We made it mandatory in peacetime to retire colonels at the age of 60, brigadier generals at the age of 62 and major generals at the age of 64, in order to give an even and steady flow to our officer personnel, and to prevent a recurrence of the hump such as we had following the World War. That applied to peacetime and that remained in effect until we got into war. One of the very first acts that was reported out of our committee and was passed in this House gave to the Secretary of War the right to call in any retired officer that he wanted to or to retain on active duty any officer who had reached the age limit.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. To demonstrate the fact that the War Department does not have to retire them under a mandate of Congress but can now exercise its discretion, let me say that out of 900 officers who reached the age limit, the War Department actually kept on active duty 267 of them.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know anything about that, but I know that is the official order, and I am going to read from it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I want the gentleman to understand I was not questioning him at all.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I understand; but I think it should be straightened out in the debate. I will read from this order:

By order of the Secretary of War, and pursuant to the requirements of statutory law, the following-named officers of this command are relieved.

Now, what does the Navy do? The Navy does not do that. The Navy has called back into active service every capable and qualified retired man that they can get. They do not retire them, as I understand, when they are physically and mentally able to perform their duties.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] largely presented the thought I wanted to ask you about. My information was that while they had to retire them, yet they had a right to call them back, and had called them back.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I know of instances where they are not doing it. If they do not have to do it, then we ought to pass a law that would compel them to do it at this particular time when we need every man that we can possibly get.

[From the Army and Navy Register of August 21, 1943]

ARMY RETIREMENT PROGRAM

Almost simultaneously official releases show that approximately 900 efficient, overage retired officers, actually performing duties of great responsibility, will be placed on inactive duty, while thousands of officers are being promoted, ordered to active duty, and newly appointed, with several hundred more in sight next week.

The economic unsoundness of wholesale retirement and promotion is apparent when it is understood that the 900 officers already are on the retired list because of an average of over 30 years' active service or physical disability, disqualifying them for field duty, though still permitting them to perform limited administrative duty at a desk in an efficient manner because of their long years of technical training. At the outbreak of the war these experienced administrators were recalled to active duty at the relatively small additional cost to the taxpayer of the difference between their active-duty pay and retired pay. When these officers are returned to retired status, they will resume their retired pay and will be replaced by other officers, many years their junior in age and training, who will get the full duty pay of the positions vacated by this retirement.

It requires no imagination to foresee what action would be taken by the directors of a corporation on a proposal to place on one-half-pay pension keymen, shop foremen, and managers of 25–40 years' service solely on the basis of age and replace them with men of 10–75 percent of service at the same active pay in the midst of contracts quadrupling the corporation's business.

The Army policy in regard to utilizing retired officers is radically different from the sound economic position taken by the Navy. The Navy has consistently called to active service every retired officer, without regard to age, who could competently fulfill the duties and responsibilities of an administrative job. Naval officers over 70 years of age are reported performing highly satisfactory duties, so that the retired pay roll in the Navy is confined mostly to the infirm, bedridden, and crippled personnel. The recent Army orders force on to inactive-duty status practically every regular retired officer over 60 years of age in the grade of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel, sweeping about 900 officers out of offices and administrative positions they are now handling and placing them again on the retired pay roll. Further, these 900 retired officers represent only that part of the overage retired Regular Army officers able to do limited administrative duty in an efficient manner who were fortunate enough to secure active duty since Pearl Harbor. Many others of overage officers, experts in their line, never succeeded in their ambition to be returned to active duty. Positions these retired officers might have filled successfully were filled by citizen soldiers of much less technical training, who were withdrawn from civilian war effort activities, at considerable cost to business establishments, to add avoidable cost to the Army pay roll.

It would appear an elementary economic principle that every retired officer capable of doing an administrative job efficiently should be detailed on that job instead of making further drain on civilian manpower and adding additional expense to the Army pay roll. In its last analysis this is purely a question of getting a technical job done at the least expense to the taxpayer, since there is no question that these retired officers are handling their administrative jobs in a competent manner, since the positions vacated include scores of post commanders of large posts, staff officers at the heads of important supply branches, commanders of depots handling hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of property, and chief of staffs of service commands, all of whom were elected for their positions because of their long training.

At times such as these, it would appear that officers with a background of training, understanding, judgment, and foresight would be more readily found among the older officers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I have made and include therein an editorial from the Army and Navy Register.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made previously on the same resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the Appendix a very important article entitled "Airways For Peace," written by Mr. Edward Warner, vice chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, for the current issue of Foreign Affairs. I have a printer's estimate and it is estimated it will require $157.50 to print the article.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection, the matter may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There was no objection.

ALLOWANCES AND ALLOTMENTS FOR DEPENDENTS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, apparently there is no opposition to the rule as amended.

If I understand the rule correctly, we will be given an opportunity to vote for one of three proposals, the House committee bill, the bill that passed the Senate, and the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI]. It seems to me that the amounts carried in the House bill are inadequate in some parts of the country. I do not think anybody can deny that it costs a great deal more to live in the colder parts of the country than it does in the warm and sunny South. We have recognized that in previous legislation. I had hoped that the committee might recognize that in the bill that they reported out. However, inasmuch as that has not been done, it seems to me that the only way we can adequately provide for the wives and dependents of the men in the Army and the Navy is to vote for the higher amounts in the three proposals that will be before us.

I hope those amounts will be continued for some time after the war, or at least that the men will be kept in the service until such time as they can find employment. That is a problem that this House will have to deal with and should deal with in the very near future. So that these men will know that when they come back here we will not repeat the performance we went through in 1919, and discharge men from the Army and Navy on Thursday and require them to go to work the following Monday if they were going to eat the second week they were home.

We can save millions of dollars that will have to be paid out in future pensions and compensation if we will now take time to provide a reasonable time for the men who come back from the fighting fronts to rehabilitate themselves, to make the very difficult adjustments that are necessary when a man leaves the turmoil and excitement of combat and comes back to the quiet of civilian life, quiet of their own communities. There is hardly a Member of this House but who could testify that they have seen men come back after the last war apparently in good health, but because of the necessity of getting back into the tremendous competition of earning a living for themselves and their families, many men, who otherwise would not have broken down, broke down, suffered mental and nervous disorders, and many of them have been on the pension rolls for the last 25 years who, in the opinion of competent psychiatrists, would not have broken down if they had been given 3 or 4 months in which to make this readjustment.

Mr. Speaker, those who lived through that experience can realize the tremendous nervous strain involved in the adjustments that must be made at the end of the present war.

When we passed the Selective Service Act this House itself included a provision which made it mandatory for the War and Navy Departments to give each of these men at time of discharge who had been hospitalized or wounded while in service a statement showing wounds, of any, and showing all periods of hospitalization. Unfortunately—I say unfortunately advisedly—the Seventy-seventh Congress repealed that provision, so today it is no longer mandatory for the Departments to issue such a statement.

I am convinced that it was a mistake to repeal that provision of the selective-service law. It was a law under which men who came back and who had filed claims for compensation for disabilities incurred in the service only to be confronted by a statement by the Veterans' Administration that the A. G. O. records showed no hospitalization.

I recall the War Department gave as a reason for recommending the repeal of that law the fact that it involved handling a lot of papers; not a very good reason, in my opinion. Another reason given was that in many cases, in the opinion of psychiatrists, it is not wise to tell a patient just what his disability really amounts to or to reveal the diagnosis. There was nothing in the amendment that made it mandatory upon the War Department to make known to the patient his diagnosis. It was merely a statement showing that he had been hospitalized on such and such a date, which would be adequate for the purpose, so that later on the Veterans' Administration or the Adjutant General's Office would not be faced with that certificate given to the man when he was discharged and came back, as they did many times after the last war, and find the man was not hospitalized.

Many cases could be cited to prove that this contention is sound and I hope the Military Affairs Committee, in spite of the fact that the Seventy-seventh Congress repealed that section of the Selective Service Act, will, in the near future, give further consideration to it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate and am grateful to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] for call-

ing attention to the manner in which section 2 has been drafted. I think the admonition or suggestion or advice he has given to the House is timely. Many committees, not only the Military Affairs Committee, are a little reckless as to complying with the Ramseyer rule. The Ramseyer rule provides that the committee shall set forth, not only the difference between the two bills, but also how the final bill should read.

I realize, and I address myself to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], and he realizes that the Military Affairs Committee has been an extremely busy committee. It has had many, many important bills that it was obliged to consider and report, and, therefore, I hope that he will not feel too strongly concerning this omission.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. In just a moment. However, I will join with him in the amendment that he states he will offer, because it will make clearer to everyone what the amendment means as it is written instead of the present amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I am sure the House will accept the apology from the Military Affairs Committee made by the distinguished dean of the House. I agree with the gentleman that there are splendid lawyers on the Military Affairs Committee, some of them are good draftsmen, and certainly they should not permit a bill to come before the House in the manner in which this bill is drawn.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. In just a moment. And furthermore I apologize to the House, as a member of the Rules Committee, for voting for the rule which brings this bill up for consideration in its present form.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAY. Under the Ramseyer rule there are two ways of reporting such a bill: First to set out in parallel columns the sections of the bill and the law it amends; the other is to include the changes in italics. If the gentleman wants to raise a point of order he has the right to.

Mr. SABATH. The only thing that was not printed in the report is the Senate bill; that is the only thing that was omitted.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. My remarks had reference to the draftsmanship of the bill, but so far as the report is concerned it does not comply with the Ramseyer rule, first, because it prints the substitute in parallel columns with the law and not the Senate bill which should have been printed; and in the second place it does not carry out the purpose of the Ramseyer rule which is to present a visual picture by the use of italics, roman letters, and parentheses so that Members may see at a glance what changes are contemplated by the amendments.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I desire to say I am perfectly satisfied that the Committee on Military Affairs has done a splendid job. They naturally did not print the Senate bill, but I congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] on the able manner in which he presented the matter before the Committee on Rules. He is a man well informed on this as, indeed, he is always on any legislation that is entrusted to him. I hope, therefore, that anything I have said will not be taken by either him or the committee as a criticism; it merely called attention to a slight omission.

I did not explain the bill because I knew the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Alabama could do it so much better, so much clearer, and so much abler than I. I have made my remarks short and not gone into the merits of the bill as I generally do.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House, pursuant to House Resolution 315, resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I am sure there is nobody on the floor of this House, in fact nobody in Congress, who does not want to do all possible under the circumstances to take care of the dependents of servicemen while these men are fighting the battles of our country. I am certain I do not want to do anything that would in the slightest degree bring hardship or injustice to any dependent of any man in our fighting forces; at the same time in the consideration of legislation of this character under existing circumstances and conditions I think we ought to move with extreme caution, exercise sound discretion, and not allow ourselves to be persuaded into doing something unreasonable on account of our feeling of sympathy for those who are dependent upon our fighting men. I should like briefly to state the parliamentary situation with respect to this legislation. It is this: The Senate of the United States passed this bill originally, S. 1279, and it was sent to the House, I believe, on the day Congress recessed, and therefore the House committee could not reach it until after the recess.

Your committee has given this bill very careful study and in order that there might be no mistakes, immediately after the hearings before the whole committee the matter was referred to a special subcommittee to draft and return to the whole committee a bill they thought would cover the subject and grant adequate compensation to these dependents.

The Senate passed a lower rate of schedules in S. 1279 than the schedule of rates provided by the House amendment to that bill. Since that time the Senate in the consideration of what was called the Bailey-Clark substitute for the Wheeler bill relating to the induction of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers into the Army of the United States attached to that measure a new schedule of rates to be allowed to the dependents of servicemen. That schedule is still considerably higher than the schedule of rates adopted in this House committee amendment. In this House amendment the increases in the amount of the allowances to servicemen's dependents are substantial ones.

It is an increase which I think meets the question of subsistence of these people based upon the latest estimates, the latest figures, and the latest cost of living. It is not of course as much as a good many of us would like to allow, but it is generous when you consider that under the law as it exists today the cost to the Government of the program covered by this legislation is more than a billion dollars a year, in fact around a billion two hundred million, this bill increases that cost, exclusive of what the servicemen provide out of their own pay to their dependents, by $659,752,000. This is a rather substantial increase, and when you take into consideration the fact that they are going to induct fathers perhaps in the upper age bracket where the families are going to be larger than in the younger age brackets, the increase in the amount of the bill will perhaps exceed that by the time we induct them into the armed services.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Is the allotment made to the wife and the children of a soldier in service based on need? By this I mean such a case as the following: I hold in my hand a letter from the friend of the court in my county of Oakland complaining bitterly about $50 a month being allotted to the wife of a soldier who is either a Government employee or who is working in a defense plant and earning $50 a week or better in addition to that allotment. Is it based on need?

Mr. MAY. As to the class A dependents, which consists of a man's wife and children, it is mandatory, and it is fixed largely on the evidence in reference to not only the cost of living but the average of the conditions existing throughout the country in the various sections.

For instance, the cost of living in Detroit or Chicago or New York would probably be far in excess of what it might be in certain parts of the rural sections.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman has misunderstood my question. Is it based on the need of the individual? Suppose she is the wife of a man who has a million dollars in the bank, does the $50 go to her just the same?

Mr. MAY. It certainly does, but I would call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that this bill covers only enlisted men and we do not have very many millionaires in that group.

Mr. DONDERO. I have read this bill carefully. Does the bill recognize the decrees of the courts in regard to the welfare of the children of divorced wives of men in the service?

Mr. MAY. It certainly does, but it provides that the allowance shall not exceed the amount of the decree of the court.

Mr. DONDERO. I have a case where children have been allowed $10 a week by the court. That has been found to be a reasonable sum. In this bill the children average about $20 a week. Will the court's decrees supersede and take precedence over the provisions of this bill at the time it becomes law?

Mr. MAY. Not as to the children. The children will be allowed whatever this bill provides for them.

Mr. DONDERO. Regardless of the court order?

Mr. MAY. Yes; even though the court order is less than what the bill provides. As to the wife, she is bound by the court decree.

I might call attention to the fact there are 4,356,350 beneficiaries or dependents now receiving these allotments and allowances from the Treasury of the United States. That is as to both the Army and Navy, as I understand it, and when we increase the Army, as we are planning to do right along month after month, the number of these beneficiaries will increase in proportion to the number of men taken in, based, of course, on the size of their families. So that it may be estimated that by the first of next January there will be at least 5,000,000 people on the pay roll of the Government receiving these allowances. That is, men, women, and children.

In the first instance we allow a wife without a child $50, $22 of that to be paid by the soldier and $28 by the Government. I would like to compare that figure with some of the other governments of the world and see how they match up.

In France a wife is paid $9 a month. A relative, which includes members of the family, as I take it, and parents, $9 per month, and a child $4.05 per month in Paris and $3.30 per month elsewhere. In this country we found that the cost of living was so variable and so different in the various sections of the country that there was nothing we could do except take evidence and determine what the average cost of living is, so far as we could, for the country as a whole.

We could not say with any degree of certainty or propriety that the people in South Carolina, for instance, where the climate is favorable and where the cost of living is far below that of Michigan, should have one sum and those in Michigan should have another sum. So we struck a medium between the two conditions based upon the subsistence idea for the necessary support of these dependents and with that we have this vast increase of $659,752,000 which, to my mind, means that when we come to the reading of this bill under the 5-minute rule and somebody offers an amendment to make the provisions of this bill, which is now $20, $30, we ought to think quite a bit before we vote to raise these rates. I know it is unpopular to argue against raises for these people, and none of us like to do that, but I think we ought to have an adequate and proper regard for the financial condition of the Government.

When these men return from the battle fronts and lay down their guns and when the diplomats and statesmen start to negotiate the terms of peace, unless we have a free country and a Government that is able to protect our citizens in their individual right to freedom, not merely the "four freedoms" but every freedom and any freedom that might be discovered, we will make a tragic mistake if we do not move with caution in these matters and save as far as we can any unnecessary expenditures.

I know that in some sections of my district there will be wives and children receiving money under this bill far in excess of anything that they have ever had before, but I do not think that ought to be a ground for complaint against the committee bill nor do I think that the committee bill ought to be raised $1 in any instance; however, if you can convince me that the bill is wrong in any particular, of course, I will consent to changing it.

I would like to call attention to another country, Great Britain. We think she is a rich country. Perhaps she is rich. She is at least an English-speaking nation and ought to live on the same kind of a standard we live on. What does she pay to these people? To a wife Britain pays $5.60 per month, to the first child $6.80 per month, to the second child $6.40 per month and to each additional child $5.60 per month. That is far less than 50 percent of what we propose in the pending bill.

To my mind the bill ought to be adopted as it is written. It should not be amended except where amendments are necessary to make effective the legislative provisions of the bill. I am speaking only on the question of the amount to be allowed. When the time comes for a vote, I hope the Members will bear in mind that this is a very liberal Government and that these allowances will amount at the end of this year to four times what the Veterans' Administration, that has to do with all compensation, hospitalization, and pensions for the last war, is costing us annually, and that is a huge sum of money.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I have two questions. Has the committee any statistics that could be made available to us indicating how the committee arrived at this average?

Mr. MAY. The committee hearings are full of facts we gathered in the subcommittee, which included, I believe, the latest figures of the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. What figures were used?

Mr. MAY. And all of the information we could get from the Manpower Commission and any other department of the Government that had statistics on that subject. The head of the Children's Bureau testified at length.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Did the committee give any consideration to the formula that was adopted at the time of W. P. A., not as to rates but as to the difference in the cost of living in various parts of the country?

Mr. MAY. I think we searched the situation as to what the cost of living was in the cities, in the urban communities, and in the rural communities very thoroughly. We had three different subjects of inquiry, the cost of living in the larger cities having certain populations, then cities of less population, then the urban communities, and then the rural communities.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish first to compliment the distinguished chairman for this word of caution which he has given us with reference to stepping up these pay rates materially. Second, may I say that I very much want to go along with him on a reasonable proposal such as here submitted, but it seems to me that in addition to what the chairman said about this increasing number that will go on the pay roll, we must bear in mind that perhaps in the near future a material acceleration will occur with reference to the dependents of fathers who will be inducted into the service a little faster than they have heretofore been inducted. On the basis of 5,000,000 payrollees, would it be unfair to assume an average of $75 per enlistee? Is that a little high, would the gentleman say?

Mr. MAY. To include all the dependents, wives, children, parents, and all?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Certainly it would be too high. That would amount to $4,500,000,000 annually.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the estimate? The gentleman may have mentioned it, but what is the estimated average as applied to the 5,000,000 figure the gentleman has used?

Mr. MAY. That is including all the dependents?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; everybody.

Mr. MAY. I do not have the average of that at all.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I was just wondering if any average is available.

Mr. MAY. I doubt if it is available to anybody, because there are so many $20 allowances, so many $15 allowances, and so many $50 allowances that we have no average of it in the testimony, I think.

I hope the bill as reported by your committee may be approved and passed.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, it is my firm conviction that our Nation cannot afford to adopt a pinch-penny policy when it comes to providing adequate allowance for the wives and children of men who are being inducted into the military service. At the present time the United States Government, through Selective Service, has enacted a policy which proposes to draft immediately thousands of heads of families. Many of these fathers have a number of dependent children. In view of the Government's determination to call these fathers into the armed service I insist that it is the duty of Congress to see that their dependents do not suffer hardships. It is time that we take immediate action to carry into effect what I believe to be the unanimous opinion of a majority of the Members of this House. The money we invest in the care of these children will pay large returns to our Nation in future years. It is a sound investment. These allowances should be generous enough to provide adequately for the wife and children of the men called into service. A father who must continually worry about the welfare of his family will not make a good soldier. Some will no doubt say that this is a very expensive program and cost a lot of money. That is true, but it must not be the determining factor. When we are giving away money all over the world and when we propose to feed the people of the various nations all over the world by setting up relief agencies for their benefit at a time when we propose the establishment of an international bank which will no doubt cost us billions of dollars, it seems to me we can afford to be more liberal with the wives and children of men who are called into military service.

Recently a mother of two children from my own congressional district wrote me in regard to this problem and enclosed a statement showing the actual cost of maintaining herself and two sons. Her husband expects to be called into the service immediately and she will be left with two boys, one 7 and the other 18 months. I want to call the attention of the House to this proposed budget submitted by this mother. You will find that every item mentioned is essential to the welfare of this family. There are no extravagant items in it and would only furnish the bare necessities of life.

Actual cost of maintaining mother and 2 sons (7 years and 1½ years of age)

		Per year
House (at $25 per month rent)		$300.00
Fuel (coal)		60.00
Utilities (gas, electricity, and water)		60.00
Insurance:		
Mother, $1,000 policy costing (annually)	$26.98	
Son, $500 policy costing (annually)	11.05	
Son, $500 policy costing (annually)	11.05	
		49.08
Food:		Per year
Milk, 2½ quarts a day, at 12 cents (365 days)	$109.50	
Eggs, 2 dozen per week, at 40 cents	41.60	
Butter, 1 pound per week, at 50 cents	26.00	
Meat, $1 worth per week	52.00	
Potatoes, 30 cents worth per week	15.60	
Vegetables, $1.25 worth per week	65.00	
Bread, 4 loaves per week, at 10 cents each	20.80	
Oranges, 2 dozen per week, at 40 cents per dozen	41.60	
Fruit (home canned, 1 quart per day, 365 quarts per year)	107.03	
		$479.13
(Below is listed fruit I canned this summer and actual cost.)		
3 bushels pears (60 quarts), at $4.90 per bushel, $14.70, plus $1.05 sugar	15.75	
3 bushels peaches (60 quarts), at $6.25 per bushel, $18.75, plus $1.05 sugar	19.80	
2 bushels apricots (60 quarts), at $8.50 per bushel, $17, plus $1.05 sugar	18.05	
12 large pineapples (17 quarts), at $5.50 per dozen, $5.50, plus 30 cents sugar	5.80	
60 pounds pitted cherries already sugared (25 quarts)	11.00	
3 bushels plums (90 quarts), at $7.20 per bushel, $21.60, plus $1.58 sugar	23.18	
2½ bushels apples (53 quarts), at $5 per bushel, $12.50, plus 93 cents sugar	13.43	
		107.03
School books and supplies for 7-year-old boy (estimated)		6.00
Cod-liver oil for both boys, per year		6.00
Dentist (twice a year) for all three of us (average)		20.00
Medical attention (low estimate)		10.00
Clothing:		
Son, 7 years old:		
Shoes, 2 pairs, at $3.50 per pair	$7.00	
2 half soles and heels for 2 pairs a year	3.00	
Underwear, 6 pairs	6.00	
Galoshes	2.25	
Winter trousers, 4 pairs, at $2.98 each	12.00	
Summer trousers, 4 pairs, at $1.98 each	8.00	
Jacket, winter	7.00	
Cap	1.00	
Gloves	1.00	
Shirts (4 summer and 4 winter)	8.00	
Sweater	3.00	
		58.25
Son, 1½ years old:		
Shoes, 2 pairs, at $2.50 per pair	5.00	
2 pairs half soles	2.00	
Underwear, 6 pairs	4.00	
Galoshes	1.50	
Winter trousers, 4 pairs, at $1.98 each	8.00	
Sun suits, summer, 6, at $1 each	6.00	
Gloves	1.00	
Snow suit	7.00	
Clothing—Continued.		Per year
Son, 1½ years old—Continued.		
Shirts, winter, 4, at $1 each	$4.00	
Sweater	3.00	
		$41.50
Mother		87.00
(The above estimate for my own clothes includes 2 pairs shoes, half soles, underwear, hose, house dresses, 2 good dresses per year, and a coat and hat.)		
Incidentals (including soap for bath and laundry, flour and other foodstuffs too numerous to mention)		25.00
Total cost of maintaining very moderately a mother and 2 small children for 1 year		1,201.96

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Military Affairs in its work today, like many of the other important committees of the House, is divided into subcommittees. This question, which on the face of it may not seem so involved, is underneath a very complicated one as to administration. I want to pay my compliments to the members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs who have devoted themselves so closely to this subject, not only at the present time but during the past year in the development of the original bill, notably on our side the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON], and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE]; and on the Democratic side the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

I am going to suggest to the Members on this side, at least, that on detailed questions as to specifications you reserve your questions for the members of the subcommittee when they make their explanations to you today. They are better informed than are some of the rest of us, and I know they are in a much better position to give you the exact answers that some of you may require.

Generally speaking, I may say this:

Numerous House bills were considered and public hearings were held with the view to giving thorough consideration to all phases of the question of family allowances which has become of increased importance because of the drafting of fathers. Representatives of the War and Navy Departments and the Federal Security Agency were among those who testified.

Although formal reports on the bill have not been received from the service departments, and its relationship to the program of the President has not been ascertained, the committee understands that the provisions of the bill, except the matter of rates, are favored by the War and Navy Departments as being necessary and desirable on the basis of their year's experience in administering the Family Allowance Act. Such departments, other than confirming a need for

some overhaul and increases in the schedules of payments, do not make specific recommendations as to rates.

The principal changes which the bill, with the amendments recommended by the committee, will effectuate, are as follows:

(a) Increase greatly the family allowance for children.

(b) Increase family allowance for parents, brothers, and sisters who are dependent upon the enlisted man for chief support.

(c) Grant an initial family allowance for the month of entry into service in a pay status to wives, children, and parents, brothers and sisters, who are dependent upon the enlisted man for their chief support without any deduction from the pay of the enlisted man for such initial allowance.

(d) Include female enlisted personnel of all grades and aviation cadets within the provisions of the act.

(e) Make dependents of enlisted personnel of the upper three grades eligible for family allowances and suspend monetary allowances in lieu of quarters for dependents, as authorized by section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, for the period during which such family allowances are paid.

(f) Define the eligible dependents of female enlisted personnel.

(g) Remove limitations as to amounts payable to children where living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order, written agreement, or divorce decree.

(h) Provide for prompt and equitable payment by the Secretary of the department concerned of amounts due on death of a dependent.

(i) Clarify penal and administrative provisions.

AMENDMENTS OF S. 1279

A more extended study by the administering departments has brought to light some necessity for clarification of provisions of the bill as recommended by them to the Senate committee. These matters have been inquired into, and have resulted in several amendments of S. 1279 of a clarifying nature. Amendments of sections 6, 7, 7a, and 11 of S. 1279 as received by this committee are of this nature.

Aside from such clarifying amendments, S. 1279 is changed or modified in the following essential particulars:

(a) Rates in section 5 are increased.

(b) In section 6 the limitations upon allowances to children living separate and apart under court orders or written agreements are eliminated.

(c) In section 7 the reduction from pay of enlisted man having separate quarters is reduced and restricted to the upper pay grades.

(d) In section 7 a uniform rule is provided to govern termination of entitlement to family allowances, incident to any change in status of the enlisted man or dependent.

(e) Section 11 has been modified to insure inclusion of dependents of female enlisted persons and aviation cadets as eligible for family allowances.

(f) A new section is added defining the dependents of enlisted females and fixing the allowances for their husbands and children.

(g) A new section has been added to provide an effective date for all provisions of the act with suitable protection to payees and to disbursing agents during the period of transition to new provisions of law.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to spend most of my time explaining some of the features of the bill. They are not particularly difficult to understand, if a Member will go over it and relate them to the provisions of the basic law. If each one will get his copy of the bill and go over it with me, I shall explain more in detail some of the provisions that we have changed, and try to tell you as best I can just what the changes are and how they will work out if this bill is enacted into law. Starting on page 11, the very first amendment makes the benefits payable to the dependents of all enlisted grades, whereas the present law restricts it to the four lowest grades. Only the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades are entitled to it at the present time. That is, the buck private, the first class private, the corporal, and the line sergeant. All grades above that under the law as it stands now are not entitled to dependent benefits, and the reason for that is that under the law those grades are entitled to commutation of quarters, if there are dependents, and, therefore, they were not included originally. That works a hardship in the case of a person who has as many dependents as a wife and one child, and certainly it becomes more difficult the greater number of children, because, under the law as it stands now, those persons in the first three grades get $37.50 a month as rental allowance. If he were allowed to get the family allowance, he would contribute $22, and the Government would contribute $28 for the wife alone. For a wife and one child under the present law, the Government contributes $12 additional for the child. That puts the Government's contribution up to $40, which is in excess of the rental allowance. Of course, the greater number of children, the greater is that discrepancy, resulting in a manifest inequity. That will become more greatly accentuated, in the case of a man who has incurred heavy family responsibilities, and who may be eligible for the higher grades. This law would make it available to all. We propose to do away with rental allowances for those who take family allowances, but that comes in a later section, and I will explain it more in detail, when we get to it.

We next take section 3, where there is a material change. That divides the dependents into three rather than into two classes. At present we have class A and class B. Class A includes wife and children, and class B includes collateral dependents. The only thing necessary to show now in the case of collateral dependents is that he is dependent on the man for a substantial amount of support, and it has been held by the Office of the Comptroller General that as much as $10 a month would be substantial support.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. What is the basis for the $10?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That was not set necessarily as a dividing line, but where a soldier had been contributing $10 to his family, the Comptroller General said that that should be held to be substantial support. We did not set any dividing line or standard.

Mr. CELLER. Is a standard set up whereby a soldier would have to show dependence in any way?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Only to a substantial degree. We do this. We still keep that substantial feature. We call that class B, but we provide that no contribution can be made to a class B dependent in the event there are class B–1 dependents. The class B–1 dependents are those collateral dependents who are dependent on the serviceman for chief support. They must show that the man was their chief support. We have liberalized the amount payable under class B–1. We come to that in the next section. I call attention to the fact that under the operation of this particular amendment a good many of these collateral dependents will be dropped from the rolls because if there are class B–1 dependents, there cannot be a class B dependent, and, furthermore, a good many of those now carried as class B dependents will be relegated to this new class B dependent and if there are B–1 dependents, they will not be eligible to draw.

Mr. CELLER. So when it comes to class A dependents there need not be actual proof of dependency or chief support but there will have to be that proof in the case of class B?

Mr. SPARKMAN. There must be proof of substantial support when you come to class B–1. It must be chief support.

Mr. CELLER. Suppose a soldier has a wife?

Mr. SPARKMAN. And no dependents—no proof of dependence—just the record of marriage. I come to that later.

The next provision relates to the change of the rates. As I see it, this is the only controversial section in the whole bill. We have not increased the amount payable to the wife. Rather strange to say, no recommendation came to us except in one or two bills, proposing an increased amount to the wife. It is our theory that the wife need not depend entirely upon the allotment that is made to her, if there is no child. In fact, she should be encouraged in this time of manpower shortage to work and help support herself. So for her this becomes assistance rather than subsistence.

We have changed the amount payable to the wife and one child. Under the law as it stands now the amount payable is $62. We propose under this bill to make it $75. Under the law now there would be $10 additional for each additional child. We provide there shall be $20 for the second child and $15 for each additional child thereafter.

We have increased the amount that is payable to a child living with a divorced wife.

By the way, the definition of "divorced wife," as given in the basic law is a wife who is separated from her husband, living under a divorce decree or order, which allows her alimony, and that she has not remarried. Therefore when we use the term "wife divorced" that is what is meant.

In no event, however, will a wife be allowed to draw more than the amount provided for in a court order or decree or written agreement between her and the serviceman.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. I have had my attention called some time ago to a case where a divorce decree was granted and the child was awarded $5 a month.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me come to that a little later. That comes in a later section, and if you will just withhold your question I will take it up then.

Well, I will answer the gentleman now. Regardless of whether the children are living under a court order or not, we propose to treat them all alike and to give the child the full amount to which the child is entitled under the bill, regardless of whether there is a divorce decree setting the amount at $5, or being absolutely silent as to the payment. We propose to treat all children alike and to pay them the full amount regardless of court orders, court decrees, or written agreements. We do not do that with reference to the wife. We take care of the wife who is living under a divorce decree just as I have mentioned.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. DEWEY. Is there any over-all sum that will be allowed to a soldier, considering his collateral and direct dependents?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No aggregate. The law as it stands now does have an aggregate limit, but we took that out for the simple reason that under the proposed order we are going to take servicemen in without regard to the number of dependents. Therefore we felt that the limitation ought not to apply. Then in the next section are set out the rates for Class B, $37, payable only in the event there are no B–1 dependents. The next section deals with Class B–1. There is a small change there and that is liberalizing the amount that may be due to the dependent parent of a serviceman. We have given to that dependent parent exactly the same amount we have given to the wife. Whereas under the law now that dependent parent should have gotten either $37, or $20 depending upon circumstances. If there are two parents we now propose to give them $68. The payment that may be made to any Class B dependent must be paid all to one person.

The next section has to do with wives who are living under divorce decree. There is a limitation there which I explained a few minutes ago.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. We have a number of complaints where soldiers are a little disturbed that their wives did not receive their allotments until sometimes as much as 2 or 3 months after they enlisted, thereby creating trouble and difficulty. Does this bill remedy that situation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; it does. That is in a later section that I will come to.

I have explained about a wife living separate and apart from her husband. The next provision is the very one that the gentleman just inquired about, the initial allowance. We provide under this bill that the Government shall pay the initial allowance. It is the intention for it to be paid from the induction center and to be paid probably within 2 or 3 days from the time the man goes into the service.

That goes directly to his dependents and is in the same amount as the schedule that was set out in section 5 that I just explained a few minutes ago. No part of the soldier's pay is taken for that initial payment. The Government assumes the responsibility of making the whole payment without charging anything to the soldier. We felt it was well for the Government to do it. According to Mr. Taft's testimony, it would relieve a great majority of the hardship cases that they are running into. Hereafter there ought not be any great delays.

General Gilbert testified before us when this bill was being considered, and he told us something about the enormous load that had been carried by the Office of Dependency Benefits, the new organization that has been set up within the last year; the new office space which had to be obtained at Newark, N. J., and the whole machinery started out new. There were considerable delays in the beginning, but they have been straightened out now except in a relatively small number of unusual cases where the proof has not been submitted or where some difficulty has come up in getting proper proof. So I think we can expect all of those claims to be handled expeditiously from now on.

Mr. CELLER. You might have a little difficulty later on. With reference to the soldiers who have been heretofore inducted, who did not get this additional allowance, would they have a right to make a claim against the Government because technically they would be discriminated against, would they not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No, because the act takes effect, these new rates take effect subsequent to the enactment of this bill and, of course, there would be no backtracking. According to your argument men who were in the Army back in the days of the Spanish-American War would have a right to get the benefits of any increased rates subsequently provided, and it just would not work.

Mr. CELLER. I am glad to get the benefit of the gentleman's explanation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Next we get to the question of commutation for quarters; we give it to the three highest grades of enlisted men, and just here let me say that if they are already drawing commutation for quarters, they are given the right to choose whether or not they wish to continue to draw rental allotment or whether they will take the family allowance. And to the explanation I made a few moments ago may I add that there will be an advantage to some of them to choose family allowance.

Mr. Chairman, I propose to offer an amendment when this bill is returned to the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I propose to offer an amendment in connection with this particular feature which would require those men in the first three grades who elect to take rental allowance, rather than the family allowance, to show that they are actually paying under some kind of an allotment scheme an amount equal to the rental allowance to the dependents, the reason being that in the first place the rental allowance is paid on the basis of taking care of dependents, and this allotment bill is being proposed in order to take care of his dependents back home, and it is not right or fair for some man in the upper grades to be able to choose to take the rental allowance, which is being paid for the benefit of his dependents, and simply put that in his pocket.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I wish to compliment the gentleman for his proposal to add that amendment to the bill. I think that there is need for such an amendment in order to clarify and eliminate the danger of abuses through a soldier or sailor in the first three classes claiming the allowance, pocketing the money, and not using the funds for the support of his dependents.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure the subcommittee would have agreed to adding that amendment had it had time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman kindly indicate the three grades he refers to?

Mr. SPARKMAN. There are seven grades.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will take them in order.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In any way the gentleman wishes to make the explanation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The seventh grade starts at the top and comes down; we start in the higher grades and come down to the lower. The buck private, so-called, is in the seventh grade. The first-class private would be the sixth grade; the corporal would be in the fifth grade; the sergeant, sometimes referred to as the buck sergeant, or the line sergeant, would be a fourth grade.

Then we come into the staff sergeant, which would be the third grade; the technical sergeant, I believe, would come next, in the second grade, and the master sergeant and the first sergeant would be in the first grade.

In the Navy we have a similar classification, which goes through the chief petty officers, and which includes all classes, as I understand it, with the exception of commissioned officers and warrant officers. I think I am correct in that statement.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I think the gentleman is incorrect with respect to the second grade; I think we included the technical sergeant in the second grade.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The staff sergeant would be in the third; the technical sergeant would be in the second, and the master sergeant and first sergeant would be listed in the first grade.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First sergeants were put in first grade about a year ago, and now they are in the first grade.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are two other provisions: First with reference to dependents of WAVES, WAC's, and other women who are in the service. The husband and the children of women in the service may be their dependents, but we do not pay it to them automatically; it is necessary to prove actual existence of dependency. It is realized that the wife may have children or a husband who are dependents, but payment cannot be made without proof of dependency of the husband or the child or children of the woman in the service, and they will have to prove actual dependency or chief support.

The only other provision relates to the effective date of the act. We make the act effective on the first day of the calendar month following its enactment. In other words, if it is enacted during the month of October, it will become effective November 1, and that is true, I think, in reference to payments and to the initial payment.

We do provide there shall be an adjustment period and we give to the departments concerned 4 months in which to make any adjustments; we also protect them against any overpayments that may have been made during that time because they just simply cannot adjust overnight.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I just want to ask the gentleman one question with reference to dependency of women in the service: Is it not true that as to all women in the service they are precluded from enlisting in the service if they have a child, dependent child, under 18 years of age?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not believe that is true; I think probably the age is 14 years, as to the WAC's; I am not sure what it is for the WAVES. But, the gentlemen can think of cases in which there might develop cases of dependency of a husband or a child after they went into the service.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I want to make sure that I heard the gentleman correctly with reference to the question of the cases arising out of divorce where there are children. I understood the gentleman to say that the compensation fixed by this act will be paid regardless of the amount allowed by the court, that under this law the Office of Dependency Allowance will pay the full amount allowable under this law and disregard any lesser amount which might be made by the court.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct, even if the court decree is silent and does not give anything.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What do the hearings disclose as to the differences between the proposed allowances and the allowances that similarly obtained during the First World War?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sorry; I do not know that; someone else may have the information, but I have not.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And this second question if the gentleman will permit: What do the hearings disclose as to the differences in the cost of living now and the cost of living in the First World War?

Mr. SPARKMAN. We spent our time trying to study the levels of the cost of living at the present time rather than comparing it with World War No. 1. We did not try to arrive at the rates by comparing the present situation with that in World War No. 1; we tried rather to tie it to the present cost of living. I was going to come to that in a moment, how we arrived at our rates.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would assume that the committee did give consideration to the matter of the cost of living inasmuch as the committee proposes to increase the amount of the benefits.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We did that but we did not try to tie it to the First World War.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; unquestionably not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We already had the law; we were trying to meet conditions growing out of this war.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Then how does it compare to the time we first fixed the benefits?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me state how we arrived at the figure that was finally agreed upon. The gentleman, of course, must know that in such legislation any particular figure arrived at is the result of conciliation and compromise. Some 15 or 20 different bills relating to this same subject have been introduced. They started out with a 10-percent flat increase. I do not remember just whose bill that was. I remember that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] was one of the early leaders, and if I recall correctly—I do not have his bill before me—but if I recall correctly, it provided for a 15-percent horizontal increase. Other bills then came along with different figures. As it happened, we did not arrive at any quotient product on this but it happened that the average of all those bills would have been almost identical with what it provided in this bill. That, however, is just an accident, as I say; we did not arrive at it in that way.

Miss Faith Williams, the head of the Cost of Living Division of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, appeared before the subcommittee. You will find her testimony in the back part of the hearings. She testified that the average cost of living in 33 cities in the United States amounted to approximately for the wife about $64 and for each child about nineteen dollars and some odd cents.

In addition to that she further testified that some items were included in those figures that probably would not have to be included in the Budget such as we were trying to set up here. For instance, she said, as I recall, that she allowed $46 for life insurance. The Government takes care of life insurance under the Soldier's and Sailor's Civil Relief Act. Furthermore, the Government offers to the servicemen as much as $10,000 life insurance, taking the premiums out of the soldier's pay if the soldier wants it. So about $4 a month could come off of that figure.

Mr. MAY. Was that $46 for insurance a monthly allowance or annual?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was on a annual basis; it was approximately $4 a month.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield while he is on that subject?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. May I suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that on page 60 of the hearings is a full tabulation of the cost of living in 33 of the large cities of the United States. I think the gentleman from Mississippi may be interested in these data.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. Miss Williams further on, however, made the flat statement as to cost of living. You will find it a little more specific in the testimony that she gave; so we tried to tie this increase just as nearly as we could to the cost-of-living figures. We realized that as practical matter that we could not possibly reach the highest level. We could not legislate, for instance, to meet the San Francisco level or the New York level. I think the table shows New York to be the highest, but recently it develops that San Francisco has the highest cost-of-living index. The amount we have allowed may be too much for some sections of the country but we arrived early in the consideration of this bill at the decision that we could not place this strictly on a need basis; in other words you could not have varying grants in varying parts of the country; we had to have a uniform level and after checking the various figures, I say very frankly some lower and some higher, we

arrived at the particular figures that are included in this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With respect to need, does the gentleman care to add anything to the statement that where there is no need at all for the wife and children, the committee gave consideration to that?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is the only remaining point I wanted to touch on. We discussed in the subcommittee and in the committee as a whole whether or not a need test should be applied as to the wife and children and we decided against that. There were two compelling reasons for that.

First, it would be practically impossible to administer with anything like expedition. If you went out to take proof of dependency of wives and children, it would take 3, 4, 5, or 6 months. As a matter of fact, I believe that the experience in World War No. 1 was a very unhappy one in connection with that. We had the spectacle of many dependents, such as would be classified as dependents under this law, not getting their dependency allowance until the war was over, even though the husband had been in the service many, many months before that time. Also, the law imposes upon the husband a legal obligation to support his wife and children regardless of their immediate need. I believe those were the principal reasons that caused us to say that we should not apply any dependency test to the wife. Of course, they must prove the status of marriage and of childbirth. When that is proven, then they automatically become entitled to the payments.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. In administering these class B and B–1 dependents, is there not a likelihood of a lot of confusion in the administration of the act between class B and B–1?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman, perhaps, has seen some of the Navy affidavits that have been sent out. The Army proposes to use a similar plan, and let the serviceman and also the supposed dependent both fill out a sworn statement showing the exact amount of income that those persons have had in the past and the part that the serviceman has contributed to it. Of course, there will be some irregularities—you cannot escape that—but there will be a checkup from time to time and the cases in which there has been fraud or in which there have been irregularities when called to the attention of the Office of Dependency Benefits or the department concerned will be rectified. If it is found that the dependents are not entitled to the allowance, they will be cut off and appropriate action will be taken.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. There is perfect understanding on the part of those who administer this law as to who shall be class B dependents and class B–1 dependents?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, in all probability upon final passage of this bill (S. 1279) to increase and liberalize family allowances of servicemen, there will be few, if any, votes against it, and under ordinary circumstances I would not take up the time of the House to discuss what is conceded to be a noncontroversial bill. My vote itself would be sufficient to indicate my interest and my approval of the measure. However, since I am a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs, which is scheduled to leave for the west coast next Monday to hold hearings on critical naval production problems in that area, and since I am advised that there is a probability that a vote may not be reached on this bill by Monday, I want to take this opportunity to advise you, Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues, that I am most thoroughly and heartily in favor of this bill, and that I hope it will pass without any opposition whatever.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, when this bill for allowances for dependents of servicemen is read for amendment, I intend to offer an amendment providing certain changes in the figures contained in the committee bill now before us. The amendment which I will offer will be to page 12, line 14, of the committee bill and will strike out the language in lines 14 to 19, including the word "child", in line 19, and inserting in place thereof the following language:

> $50; a wife and one child $80, with an additional $20 for each additional child. A child but no wife, $42, with an additional $20 for each additional child. A wife divorced but no child, $42; a wife divorced and one child, $72, with $20 for each additional child.

The purpose of my amendment is to bring back the payments to be made to the wife and to the children of servicemen to the exact figures contained in the Senate bill which was passed on October 6, 1943, by a vote of 78 to 1 in the Senate. The House committee had the Senate bill before it at the time that it had under consideration the amounts which should be paid in the way of allowances and, so far as I can recall, there was no particular discussion which would indicate any reason whatsoever why there should be the particular difference between our bill as offered and the Senate bill. For instance, so far as the wife is concerned, the Senate bill and the committee bill are the same. So far as the wife and one child are concerned, the Senate bill provides for $80, the committee bill $75. There is no reason that I know of for that deduction of $5. For the second child the Senate provides for $20 and the committee bill provides for $20. They are in exact agreement. When we come to the third and subsequent children, the Senate bill provides $20 and the committee bill provides $15.

In other words, the difference between the Senate bill, which has already been passed by the overwhelming vote of 78 to 1, and this committee bill which has been brought in here amounts to no difference in the wife's allowance, $5 for the first child, no difference for the second child, and a difference of $5 for the subsequent children. There is no economic reason whatsoever for that. In view of the fact that the Senate has adopted what I believe to be fair figures I believe that the House ought to accept them. Then there will be no question at issue in conference and we will know exactly what these dependents are to get.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I understand the gentleman is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. If I were a member of that committee I would introduce a similar amendment to what the gentleman has suggested. I understand he will get recognition on the offering of the amendment because he is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. May I say it is a worthy amendment and I hope the House will support it.

Mr. CLASON. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I also was rather bewildered at the change of allotment for the first child as compared to the third child. We might be led to assume the third and fourth child would eat less than the first child. I do not agree with that assumption. They all eat pretty well.

Mr. CLASON. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. Miss Williams, to whom the gentleman from Alabama referred, testified before the committee, and it is presumed that she was the Government's own witness. She testified that because of the small amount of money the family is going to have, no matter how many children there are in the family, you cannot decrease the cost of living for each child after you have the first child. She stated that the amount each child must have is $19.56. I see no reason why this House should try to make the child live on $15, when as a matter of fact the child needs the $19.56 to get just ordinary maintenance.

In offering this amendment I do so not only for myself but for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], and the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON], all members of the House Committee on Military Affairs, all of whom agree that the Senate figures ought to be retained in this bill when it is passed.

While I am satisfied that other cogent arguments can be offered in its support, I am ready to rest the adoption of this amendment upon the evidence received

at the hearings, particularly that of Miss Faith M. Williams, Chief of the Cost of Living Division of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. Her testimony appears at page 157 of the hearings. I heard her testify and am satisfied that her figures are more satisfactory than any other evidence I heard on the question of allowances. She testified that on figures compiled for 33 cities from all over our country—and they were not all the larger cities, some were smaller cities of less than 100,000 population—as of August 15, 1943, the actual expense of a wife without any children at a maintenance level was $64.39. If the wife has one child to support the cost increases $19.56. There is no change for each additional child.

It seems to me that wives who are without children may very well be given somewhat less than what the statistics show, because we know that a very large percentage of them, a vast majority of them, I may say, can and will go to work and will not depend upon this $50 for their livelihood. On the other hand, if the wife has one or more children to take care of, in most cases she will not be able to work. So I believe that $50 is fair for the wife alone and, if she has a child and her situation has completely changed, we should then add to the $64.39, which Miss Williams testified is necessary for her support, the $19.56 necessary for the first child. This is a total of $83.95.

The Senate says that $80 is fair. My amendment provides for the $80. It cuts this woman $3.95. I feel that she is entitled to the full amount of $80, and this is supported by the statistics of our Government.

When we come to the additional children, we find, as I have said, that the wife cannot supply them with ordinary maintenance for less than the $19.56. Therefore, I believe the Senate is well warranted and I believe the House will be well warranted in adopting that additional sum of $20 for each additional child as provided in the Senate bill.

It is possible, of course, as we did in the present law, to provide $10 for these additional children. The War Department in its bill suggested $11. As I see it, the $15 in the committee bill can be nothing more than a compromise between the existing law and the Senate bill for the third and additional children. In other words, they see fit to compromise on the child's means for actual subsistence. I do not want to compromise on any such issue, so I am willing to accept the Senate's figure, which is absolutely in line with competent testimony that was heard by the committee.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I wonder if the gentleman would repeat those figures. You are going to leave the wife without any children at $50?

Mr. CLASON. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Then the wife with one child will receive $80?

Mr. CLASON. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. How about the wife with two children?

Mr. CLASON. She would get $20 more for each additional child.

Mr. STEFAN. That would be $20 for each child uniformly all the way through?

Mr. CLASON. After the first child. The first child would get a $30 allowance and each subsequent child $20.

Mr. STEFAN. Would the gentleman say anything about Class B? Would his amendment have anything to do with the change in Class B?

Mr. CLASON. No, my amendment affects only Class A. It will be necessary to put in some clarifying amendments further in the bill to bring the other sentences in the bill into line with my amendment. I attempted to cover only the class A dependents. If my amendment is accepted by the House, it will result in the Senate and the House being in absolute accord.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman has referred to the testimony as to the cost of living in 33 cities of the country. What testimony, if any, was there as to the relative cost of living in the country on the farms of the United States?

Mr. CLASON. I would say that the testimony was general and indicated that the cost of living in the smaller towns and smaller cities and in the rural sections, outside of certain northern places like Alaska, would be less than the amount indicated for these 33 cities. Nevertheless, we are in the position where, as to Detroit, for instance, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI], of that city, can make a splendid argument in favor of even higher figures, and he is doing so in connection with his own bill. However, I do not believe we want to leave the children generally on the lower level. Remember, there will be hundreds of thousands of them, probably millions of them, if there are 2,000,000 fathers in the service in the next year.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that one of the principal items in the cost of living is rental, and that rentals are very much lower on the farms than in the towns?

Mr. CLASON. There is no question about that. For instance, Miss Williams testified that the rental in the allowance is 20 percent of the total; that a wife with one child is going to be allowed $16 per month in order to house her child, wherever she is. It is impossible for me to believe that any wife can get decent accommodations in the city of Washington or in New York, Detroit, or any important city smaller than those cities on $16 a month for a wife and child. I do not think we want to go any lower, because while it is true that in the smaller cities and in the rural districts people are going to have a better standard of living than they have been accustomed to, or at least have the money for it, in some of the cities they are going to be worse off. Many families are going to be far worse off. I think it will be a good thing for this country, in the few months more which we at most hope this war will last, to make this additional sacrifice of perhaps $15,000,000 a month.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Did the gentleman's committee give attention to the thought that there might be a tendency for those in the country to go to the cities because of the increased amount provided for their living?

Mr. CLASON. There is no room for them in the cities, if the conditions in cities elsewhere are as they are in mine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who served as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, which gave full and careful consideration to this bill, has covered the technical and administrative features of the measure so ably and fully that I do not propose to discuss them at this time. I do expect to make a few observations when the bill is read for amendment, but it seems to me that, at this stage of the bill, general debate seems to be lagging, and so my remarks will be brief. This is a highly important bill, and yet at the same time it is a complicated measure that carries with it a good many serious difficulties, about which there are many honest differences of opinion, but I want the RECORD to show at this point that I am heartily supporting this bill as reported by the committee, and I also indulge the hope that the House support the committee in the bill which it has reported, because I assert with confidence that it is a fair bill, and one that has been very carefully considered. No sum of money would adequately provide for some dependents of the men in our armed forces, but it seems to me that it should not be forgotten that in war, and especially in a war such as the terrible one in which we are now engaged, all of us, every man, regardless of his marital or family status, has certain obligations which he owes to his country, and that they necessarily carry with them a certain amount of sacrifice. And so it is just impossible to adequately pay enough in dollars to take care of his wife and children, but this committee was unanimous in wanting to make sure that it did adequately provide, at least reasonably so, for the wives and children of our gallant men in the service. We cannot support them in luxury but we must and will support them in decency. However, as I said, the matter presents very serious and complex difficulties. Many fathers have been drafted and more will be, so it is our duty to amend and make more liberal the existing law. Questions have been asked in the last few minutes about differences in the cost of living, which differences are apparent to all, because in the busy war-plant cities of the North and East, where the winters are very cold, like Buffalo, New York, Pitts-

burgh, Philadelphia, Chicago, and Detroit, the weather is much colder than it is in Florida, Mississippi, south Texas, or California, and where rents are incomparably higher, there is a differential there that is apparent upon its face. The same is true about living conditions in the cities as contrasted with living conditions in the country, especially in warm climates where they do not use so much fuel or clothing and many have vegetable gardens and a cow.

Then another question came before the committee, and that is, that there are many wives who have independent or comfortable fortunes or incomes while many thousands have good jobs. The women of the country have shown a marvelous spirit of patriotism and cooperation. Under Secretary of War Patterson testified before our committee a few days ago that forty-five percent of those now employed in the airplane industry are women. There are differences in pay and living conditions that we would like to compose, but it is impossible. I was one of the members of the committee who expressed regret that there was not some fair and just administrative method that could be worked out to see to it that those who are truly dependent be adequately provided for, but that those who do not need it should not receive so much. I know hardship cases that I would allot twice as much as provided by this bill, and I know some wives of independent means or with fat jobs I would not give a cent. In fact a suggestion has been made by those in social security, and I think encouraged by Mr. Charles Taft, who appeared before the committee and made a most favorable impression, that that would be the ideal way to work it out, on the same basis perhaps as you work out old-age assistance and other dependent claims under the Social Security Act; but the War Department seems to think that is impracticable and difficult of administration and that everybody must be put on the same basis. I am inclined to agree for fear it would create bad morale. So to that end the committee accepted the views of the War Department, and of this subcommittee, who gave it much study, and then the full committee went into the matter extensively, and I invite members to read the hearings on the bill, which are full, fair, and exhaustive. We have brought this bill back here with the almost unanimous vote of the committee, although the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] and others have indicated that they want to raise the figures up to the amount that is provided for in the Senate bill passed three or four days ago. I feel, however, that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] does not make a very strong argument when he talks about what the Senate did, because if you will look at the bill we are considering you will find that on July 8th the Senate passed a bill on this very subject raising the allotment of the first child from $10 to $18, with $11 to each additional child thereafter. They then thought a general sliding scale raise of 15 percent would be fair and just.

Yet while the House committee was giving careful and detailed consideration to this very bill, the body at the other end of the Capitol came along and amended the draft-the-fathers bill, giving the first child $30 and every additional child thereafter $20, when they had not held one minute's hearings on the bill and had no facts or record to support their views.

Somebody has got to pay for all this. We would all like to go much higher than this bill goes in truly dependent cases, but, after all, I have an idea that these boys of ours who are in the service, and their children, will have to pay for a large part of this sooner or later. This bill itself will cost in round figures nearly $1,000,000,000. So while we want to be fair and just and as generous as we can be under the circumstances, yet I think we ought to be consistent and reasonable with some regard also for the taxpayers. We must, of course, first be sure that we do justice to these dependents of men who are in the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. At the same time we ought not to be overly generous with wives and children who do not need it. We ought to bear in mind the differences in climate, rents, and the difference in the cost of living in various parts of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. THOMASON. We are not generous enough with the hardship cases and we are too generous with many who are not dependent or deserving. We have done the best possible under the circumstances and I think it a fair bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I have in mind an enlisted man who left a wife and two children and entered the service. Since he has been in the Army he has married another woman.

Mr. THOMASON. Under this bill both wives are entitled to the allotment.

Mr. GROSS. They both will get it?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. That case needs consideration. How would it be handled under this bill?

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. The divorced wife is going to draw the allotment as well as the other one.

Mr. GROSS. But he was not divorced. He has got two wives and two children.

Mr. THOMASON. None but a legal or divorced wife could get an allotment. A woman who was never legally married would not draw anything. All children are entitled to an allotment.

Mr. GROSS. Each wife will get it, or will both get it and both children be cared for?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; any wife who was ever legally married, and regardless if divorced. All children by any wife are covered.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Soldiers pay taxes just as the rest of us—enormous taxes. They are not taxed on their salaries, but hundreds of thousands of those soldiers own property and they will have to pay heavy taxes, levied by the States and the counties as well as by the Federal Government upon their property. We seem to be inclined to think about all the soldiers as little boys who may be taxed through their children, but thousands of them are paying taxes now. Thousands of them are giving their lives to their country, and then the country through the estate-tax law will confiscate their estates after they lose their lives.

Mr. THOMASON. Well, what I have tried to say is that this bill has been given most careful consideration, and while there are some who think the figures are too high, I know others who think they are too low. Yet, when you investigate the record, and I refer you to some remarks which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] put in the RECORD a few days ago, you will find there is no country in the world paying anything like the amount to cover allotments and allowances to wives and children as is covered by this bill. That may not be anything like what is fair and just in some cases, but you must have an over-all picture. We must have regard for the taxpayers of the country, which include most of the men in the service. They and their children will have to help pay for this. So we must be fair and use our best judgment. We cannot let our feelings and our desires completely run away with us. There is not a member on this committee who did not give careful consideration and study to this bill. They wanted to be fair and just. That is the reason why I again express the hope that the House will support the committee in this bill that is now before us.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. How does the gentleman arrive at the figure of a billion dollars annually?

Mr. THOMASON. I believe the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has those figures. But for the Army alone under this bill the cost will be around $600,000,000. Including the Navy and the Marine Corps it will run in round numbers close to $1,000,000,000.

Mr. KILDAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. The figure which the gentleman gave is the cost for all services. It cannot be accurately estimated at this time, because there is no way of telling the number of fathers who will be drafted into the service. The best figure we are able to get is $659,000,000 plus.

Mr. THOMASON. I do not have the figures before me, but I think they will run more than the figure the gentleman gave.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman was referring merely to the Army, in fact?

Mr. THOMASON. I believe my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] was reading from the record. He said that covered all those in the armed services.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course it is merely an authorization bill. I am a member of the Appropriations Committee and I would like to get some information. This is an annual expense. I wonder what the administrative cost would be. Does the gentleman have any idea about that?

Mr. THOMASON. I do not have that and I do not believe the hearings disclose it, but the hearings do disclose the probable cost in the allotments proper.

Mr. STEFAN. Is there any estimate as to the number of individuals who are participating in this allotment?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; 2,800,000 now, and of course there will be a lot more.

Mr. STEFAN. That will increase, in view of the figures we received the other day regarding maternity care.

Mr. MAY. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman explain as to the original figure of $50 per wife, without child, whether that would be the total amount this wife would receive or does she receive an additional sum in the way of an allotment from her soldier husband?

Mr. THOMASON. No; that is all the wife would receive. There is no change in the present law with respect to the wife, or in any bill that has been proposed. The wife continues to draw $50.

Mr. STEFAN. I am referring to the present arrangement whereby the soldier receiving $50 usually makes an allotment of around $20 to his wife.

Mr. THOMASON. Under the present law he allots $22 and this bill carries the same amount.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. THOMASON. In any event that goes to his wife, if he has a wife, and the Government puts up $28.

Mr. STEFAN. Is that included in this $50?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. So this will remain, under the present arrangement whereby the soldier puts up $22 and the Government $28?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes. Under this bill the wife will continue to draw $50, of which the soldier pays $22 and the Government $28. And if this bill prevails and becomes law, the first child will draw $25 and the second child will draw $20, and any child after that would draw $15.

Mr. STEFAN. How about those in class B where a mother has two sons in the service?

Mr. THOMASON. I am not sure about that.

Mr. STEFAN. Does she get $15 from each son?

Mr. KILDAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. Where a mother has two sons in the service, or more, in the class B category in this bill, does she draw $50 from each son?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] to answer that.

Mr. KILDAY. Does the gentleman's question refer to the pending bill or existing law?

Mr. STEFAN. To this measure.

Mr. KILDAY. Under existing law substantial support entitles the parent to draw $37.50 per month, but hereafter she could only draw chief support from one and draw substantial support from the other. In other words, she could not draw her chief support from her two sons; she would not be entitled to draw chief support from more than one son; she might be able to draw chief support and substantial support.

Mr. STEFAN. The present arrangement whereby she draws support from each son is eliminated by another amendment that is going to be put in this bill?

Mr. KILDAY. She would still draw from both, but in the same amount.

Mr. STEFAN. Which would amount to $37?

Mr. KILDAY. The way the bill is drawn she would draw the same amount as a dependent wife.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. KILDAY. Where she is dependent; the amount of the allowance drawn by the mother would be the same as the wife, $50.

Mr. STEFAN. That is the class B dependent?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes; this bill provides for class B and class B–1 dependents.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to the gentleman from Texas and to the gentleman from Nebraska that this point under discussion was debated and covered in the hearings on page 37, where I ask that question, the very question, of General Benedict. On page 37 of the hearings I ask this question:

> So that if this mother had five sons in the service, each of them declaring her a class B dependent, she could then get $37 from each of the five?

To which General Benedict said:

> Yes, sir; if none of the five had any other dependents.

Mr. THOMASON. I am supporting this bill as it is reported to the House by the committee, and again I express the hope the House will not amend this bill, so that if there are any differences the bill can go to conference where we can work out something that is fair to the dependents of our fighting men and also fair to the taxpayers.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to compliment the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], and the chairman of the subcommitee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], for the very splendid hearings and very thorough study made by the subcommittee, and for the high caliber of the witnesses appearing before the committee. I got a great deal of valuable information from the testimony of the several witnesses, and if there is any document that each Member of the House should put away in his permanent files bearing upon the pay and allowance question for the Army and the Navy, I would suggest that he put the hearings and the committee reports on this bill in his permanent files, because there is some information here of far-reaching importance and value. I want, also, to state that the Army has been most fortunate, in my opinion, in having Brig. Gen. H. N. Gilbert as Director of the Office of Dependency Benefits. He has done things in the administration of this allowance program for the Army on a larger scale and a more efficient scale than any similar undertaking in our Nation. The administration of the program for the Navy and for the Marine Corps has also been very efficient, but the number of accounts and the size of the job, of course, has been much larger in the Army, and the job certainly has called for the utmost ingenuity, diligence, and care.

Mr. Chairman, the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, has been found to be inadequate in its provision for family allowances for other dependents. The bill (S. 1279) under consideration at this time has for its purpose increasing the allowances to a point that will provide the family and the dependents of the members of our armed forces with the necessities of life insofar as it is felt possible.

The hearings developed the fact that the provisions of our present law for class A dependents are fair enough as to a wife with no children, but that the allowance for children in the present law is very inadequate. The comparison of present rates and the rates proposed in the bill before us today is set out very clearly and briefly on pages 7 and 8 of the committee report—House Report No. 734.

The subcommittee made a very vigorous effort to determine the minimum maintenance costs for families and for other dependents and during the course of our hearings we secured some very valuable information for our guidance from the Cost of Living Division, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor. The Chief of that Division, Miss Faith M. Williams, came before the committee and her testimony is of special interest in the matter of determining the allowances needed for the maintenance of families and dependents. Her testimony appears in the hearings starting at page 157 and continuing to page 166 followed by a number of tables which she brought before the committee and which are set out in the hearings, pages 166 to 179, inclusive. I know all of you are interested in the information and data on which the judgment of the committee was based in the establishment of the proposed allowances and I suggest that each of you make a special point to place in your permanent files a copy of the hearings on this bill

so that you will have available for your future reference and use the data and the information therein.

The census reports show that there are 197 cities in the United States having a population of 50,000 or more. The Department of Labor has kept statistics and data for 33 cities of more than 50,000 population and they have selected these cities from a list of 59 cities on which the best records were available from the Works Progress Administration study of living costs starting in 1935. Miss Williams used this list of 33 cities which appears on page 179 of the hearings for computing the estimated cost of maintenance, and in her testimony on page 159 of the hearings you will find that the average cost of living on August 15, 1943, for a wife in those cities is $64.39, and for each child in those cities, $19.56.

On page 164 of the hearings, in reply to my question, Miss Williams stated:

> The budget includes food—a monotonous but nutritively adequate diet—clothing, housing, fuel, light, refrigeration, essential house furnishings, and such miscellaneous items as medical care, laundry, a newspaper, and a visit to an inexpensive movie once a week. It does not include an automobile, and it includes no savings except a small insurance policy.

It was then brought out that the allowance for insurance premiums per family was computed at $46 a year, and the committee considered that this item could be struck from the estimates in view of the provisions made for insurance protection by our Government in the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. In other words, the total for a wife and one child, which was given as $83.95, could be reduced to $80 a month and cover the average cost of maintenance for wife and one child for the 33 cities listed.

I mentioned earlier in my discussion that there are 197 cities of 50,000 or more population. The 33 cities in which the survey of the Bureau of Labor Statistics has been made, range in size from Portland, Maine, at 73,643 to New York City at 7,435,000. However, most of the very large cities have been included in their list. For example, 24 of the cities on their list have more than 300,000 population each, whereas there are only 30 cities in the United States above 300,000 according to the 1940 census. This situation leads me to conclude that the figures compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics more nearly represent the cost of maintenance in the larger metropolitan centers of our country. We have reason to believe that the cost of living is higher in these large metropolitan centers than it is in the smaller cities and the rural areas. However, we most certainly should not undertake to establish any variable allowance on the basis of variable living costs in the home communities of the families and other dependents of our service men and women. I believe we should give full consideration to the cost of living in these larger metropolitan centers, even though it results in a very liberal payment for family maintenance costs elsewhere. We are reaching into those cities for large numbers of men and we are requiring them to leave whatever occupation they may have been following, to serve in the armed forces, whereas they must continue to support their families in the metropolitan centers in which they have been living. I firmly believe that is the obligation our Nation owes to the families and the dependents of the soldiers and sailors who are taken into the armed forces to fight for us in this war. For that reason, I not only voted for the increase in allowances provided in the bill as submitted to the House by the Committee on Military Affairs, but I also supported the motion in committee to set the allowance for the first child at $30 per month.

I requested Selective Service to give me the total number of inductions and enlisted registrants from the 33 cities appearing in the Bureau of Labor Statistics list. I cannot release the numbers credited to each city but I am authorized to state that the total number of inducted and enlisted registrants from the 33 cities is 1,991,674 men. This figure does not include enlisted men who were serving in the armed forces at the time of the first registration for selective service. These men were not required to register for the draft. This number also does not include the women who are serving in the WAC's, WAVES, MARINES, and SPARS. This figure also does not include any inducted and enlisted registrants from the 157 cities between 50,000 and 300,000 population not included in the list and whose families likewise live in metropolitan areas. The figures do prove, however, that a very large number of our armed forces are looking to this bill and to this Congress for justice to the extent of providing a living for their families and their dependents at a maintenance level and I submit that it is our obligation to provide at least this maintenance level for the families and dependents of those who are serving actively in our armed forces.

The need for this increase in allowances is even more urgent and immediate as we face an increase in the drafting of fathers. The bill is of far-reaching importance and already strikes home to a very large number. Gen. H. N. Gilbert, Director of the Office of Dependency Benefits for the Army, testified that 3,900,000 applications for family and dependency allowances have already been made by men and women serving in the Army and that 2,800,000 accounts are being paid to approximately 8,000,000 dependents.

This bill is entitled to our vigorous support and I will also support an amendment that has for its purpose the increase of the allowance for a wife and one child to $80 per month in keeping with the Department of Labor figures for modest maintenance of the families in those areas where they have made a careful study of living costs. I hope this bill will be speedily enacted into law as the need for it is most urgent.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. I think, Mr. Chairman, that every Member of Congress is agreed on the proposition that an increase in allowances to dependents should be granted. The only question before us is how much and to what extent these allowances should be increased. I think that we should all agree that the children of a serviceman should receive the same food, care, clothing, and attention as the children of a civilian receive. I am sure that this Congress does not intend to penalize the children of a father who is called into the armed service.

When the present act was passed by Congress there was no consideration given to the fact that we should be drafting fathers. In fact, a study of the testimony taken by the Military Affairs Committee at that time will show that the bill was designed primarily to assist the childless wife of a young I–A inductee. Now, we face the necessity of drafting pre-Pearl Harbor fathers as a military imperative. We already have more than 440,000 post-Pearl Harbor fathers in the service—and more than half a million men who have dependents other than wives and children. It is necessary to meet this changed condition by providing for a substantial increase in benefit payments to the dependents of these servicemen and the pre-Pearl Harbor fathers who will now be called into the service.

The present bill as reported by the House Military Affairs Committee will give $25 to the first child, $20 to the second child, and only $15 to each additional child. I am wondering if we are, therefore, to assume that the third or fourth child must eat less than his brothers and sisters, or that he must be compelled to receive less clothing and other care. Frankly, I do not know how the committee arrived at this conclusion. Likewise, the committee bill provides for only $11 for each additional brother or sister who is chiefly dependent upon the serviceman for his or her support.

On the basis of $15 per month per child, we are telling the father who is being called into the service that we expect his wife to feed and clothe and house these children on the sum of 50 cents a day. Now, we can assume that one-half of this amount will go for food, and the other half for shoes, clothing, bus fare, school supplies, tooth paste, soap, medical and dental care, cod-liver pills, anticold tablets, a movie, comic magazines, or a little toy or trinket that every child hopes to get once in awhile. That means 25 cents a day for food, and 25 cents a day for clothing and care and these other incidentals.

To break it down further, it means that we expect the mother to bring this child up on 8-cent meals. Now, if any mother can feed a child on a basis of 8 cents a meal in any city, town, or village in the whole United States of America,

I would like to hear about it. For my part, I do not propose to experiment on the children of these servicemen. Now, when we take the $11-per-month allowance that is being granted to chiefly dependent brothers and sisters under the provisions of the bill reported by the House committee, the situation becomes even more ridiculous. Allowing $5.50 per month for food out of this $11, it would mean that we propose that these brothers and sisters must live on 6-cent meals. Now, mind you, these are the provisions that are laid down for the B-1 dependents—the chief dependents.

I am not proposing any increases or changes for the class B dependents, or those dependent for substantial support. I am hoping that they can get by somehow under the provisions of the House bill. I do propose, however, a minimum allowance of 17 cents per meal per person for those dependents in class A and class B-1—that is, for the children of a serviceman, or for his brothers and sisters who are dependent upon him for support, and I certainly hope that no one in this House will accuse me of demagoguery in proposing an allowance of 17 cents for a meal.

To back up my position that 17 cents per meal, or 51 cents per day, food allowance is not exorbitant, I want to state that the Army discloses by its own figures that it costs the Government 57 cents a day to feed a soldier. This is done on a mass feeding basis, where food is bought in carload lots at wholesale or jobber's prices. It costs the Navy something like 62 cents a day. If this food were to be provided at retail prices, on an individual basis, you can be sure that the cost would be more than double the amount. And it is a known fact that a growing child will consume just as much food, and in many cases more food, than will an adult.

Canada has insisted on fair and decent allowances for the children of servicemen. Canada is not nearly the country that we are, and living costs are not nearly as high in Canada as they are in the United States. Yet Canada has seen fit to give $99 to a wife and two children, and takes nothing from the soldier's pay to do so. Under the committee bill, the Government would pay only $73 to a wife and two children, and $22 would be contributed by the soldier, to make a total of $95. In other words, $73 from $99 would mean that our Government would contribute $26 less than the Canadian Government contributes. My amendment proposes a contribution of $98 on the part of the Government, and $22 from the serviceman, making a total of $120 for a wife and two children.

I have read and studied various family budgets and charts and surveys prepared by various organizations, universities, and Government departments—yes, maintenance budgets, bare necessity budgets, emergency budgets, American standard of living budgets, health and decency budgets—yes, all sorts of budgets. Some make sense and some are silly and ridiculous. So I have prepared my own common-horse-sense budget—no frills—just enough to provide a very modest standard of living or just the minimum standards to keep a soldier's family together in any part of the United States.

The schedule is as follows for a wife and two children:

	Cost per month
Rent	$25.00
Food, 17 cents per meal, 3 persons	45.90
Clothing, dresses, shoes, stockings, underwear, etc., for wife and children all included	15.00
Gas, electricity, heat, etc., for operating the home	8.50
For kitchen utensils, furniture repair, laundry supplies, minor tools, linens and general house furnishings and needed things for the home	4.00
For medicine, cod-liver-oil pills, anti-cold tablets, doctors, dentist, hospital, general medical care for all three	10.00
Haircuts for children, tooth paste, tooth brushes, toilet soap and personal hygiene articles (and I am not including any beauty parlor waves, or beauty parlor manicures, perfumes or cosmetics which the husband would ordinarily furnish the wife)	3.00
Movie once a month, daily newspaper, a magazine, a comic or children's book, a concert, school play, church social or bazaar, including all recreation for the three	3.00
Bus fare to school, church, or shopping, or to a picnic on holidays, including all transportation of any kind	4.00
Total	118.40

That makes a total of $118.40, so in order to stay within my $120 figure, we have left $1.60 for all other miscellaneous articles and incidentals, such as an ice cream cone, stick of candy, birthday gift for the children, an Easter egg from the Easter bunny, a doll or a popgun from Santa Claus on Christmas, a meager contribution to the family church on Sunday, or perhaps a piano lesson for sister. Well, I do not know how you will do all of those things on $1.60, but that is all that is left under my budget and the amendments that I shall make to increase allowances.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADOWSKI. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I notice the gentleman has charged $10 a month for medical services. Does the gentleman assume that a wife and two children will all three be sick each month in the year?

Mr. SADOWSKI. No; that is on a $120 a year basis. I am allowing $10 as a monthly average for dental and medical expenses, hospitalization, everything that they may need. The kids need injections for diphtheria, antitoxins, and various things. One hundred and twenty dollars a year for medical and dental services is very little.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Will not the gentleman from Illinois on the minority side yield me a few minutes?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, the House committee bill proposes to do all of these things on $25 less per month. Do you think it can be done?

Am I high on any of the allotments that I have submitted in this breakdown?

I should now like to read a letter from Mrs. James Roach, of Columbus, Ohio:

I am a woman, left with two children to raise, on a Government allotment. My husband was drafted into the army last March and since then it has been a struggle for me to keep my children in shoes and the necessities of life.

I am allowed $72 a month to feed, clothe, and house two children. And it certainly can't be done. Different agencies have suggested that I go to work and help myself. Not only am I unable to work, but it's hard to find suitable places in which to put your children.

I don't think it fair to the children to deprive them of their mother and father both. It's hard enough on them to do without a father. And I couldn't take interest in them and work at the same time.

There are hundreds of mothers just like me, without a home and hardly enough to live on.

I have been to housing projects, which were supposed to be for people with limited incomes, asking about an apartment. At each one I received the same answer, "We're terribly sorry, but we can't rent to a person depending on such a small amount of money. And besides these apartments are for defense workers only."

If my husband isn't doing defense work, then no one else is. And he's getting the least pay, too. The ones who are in defense jobs are making better money than they ever did in their lives.

Because they buy bonds and are helping in the war effort, they get the privilege of renting homes where I can't. And I am sacrificing a whole lot more and getting so little. No one realizes what we sacrifice. I have given up my husband, broken up my home, and the essentials of life which I did have are gone. I haven't clothes fit to be seen on the street.

What are we women supposed to do? Do others have these same difficulties finding housing?

Can a person pay rent, gas, electric, doctor, medicine, clothes, and insurance on $72 a month? If it can be done, then how?

And this letter from Corp. R. J. Payne, Seymour Jackson Field, N. C.:

Amen, for your efforts to obtain a reasonable hike in our family allotments. Have wife and two children, and they have been having tough sailing trying to get by on present allotment. My greatest worry is the welfare of my family, as I prepare to go overseas from this replacement center. Again, thanks.

And also one from a grandmother, Mrs. Carey, of Detroit, Mich.:

I read with much interest your article about an increase in allowances for soldiers' dependents, and I want you to know I and hundreds of others appreciate your efforts. I am an old grandmother and the allowances don't affect me, but I feel so sorry for young mothers struggling along and trying to make ends meet on the meager allotments. Twelve dollars a month doesn't even pay the doctor's bills for the shots children must have for whooping cough and diphtheria. They are doing without baby beds, carriages, bassinets, and strollers. They can't buy all the clothes a baby really needs if they get the proper formulas and baby powder, soap, and oils they need. The only way they have of getting all the necessities is having friends give showers.

Please do your best to give them a larger allowance. It's hard enough for them having their husbands away fighting for us.

Now, I wish to submit to the Membership of the House that I am not asking for substantial increases in allowances. My amendments take into consideration only the actual costs of bare living necessities; and I want to assure the Members of this House that I would not offer these amendments if I felt that the committee bill would only meet the primary needs of the servicemen's dependents. My colleagues who meet household expenses will agree, I am sure, how totally inadequate are these provisions in the committee bill. Why a man is allowed $350 per year income tax exemption for each child or dependent even under the new tax bill. This is $30 per month. And who is it who will arise and say that this exemption is too much, that he can take care of his dependents for less? Yes, and for the wife and home maintenance we have allowed a great deal more, and I have heard no one say that the exemption for the wife and maintenance of the home was too great an allowance. Then why shall we look for new budgets—new allowances to bring down the allotments for these fathers, these soldiers who are going into the service for their country? Are their children going to eat less or wear less clothes, when the father goes into the Army? The members of the Ways and Means Committee who have made these income-tax exemptions for dependents after many years of study know full well that the exemptions that they have submitted for dependents are awfully skinny and cut to the bone. Why should we come here now and tell the father who is in the service or going into the service, that we will take care of his children on half of this amount? It just does not make sense, and it will not make good soldiers.

Of vital importance to the winning of the war, which has only entered its bloodiest phase, and to the future of the country after we have won the war, is morale. Not only here at home, but morale on the battle fronts—in the Pacific, in Italy, and on all our far-flung battlefronts. Adequate allowances to the wife and children will strengthen the home front, which, as President Roosevelt has so rightly said, "cannot be considered apart from the fighting front." A man's family is the closest thing to his heart. We cannot allow our servicemen's families to suffer want. We owe our fighting men, "who give their lives, while we give our dollars," the satisfaction and comfort of knowing that their loved ones are not being deprived of the necessities of life, while they offer their lives to preserve our democracy. It would be denying their families the very thing these men are fighting for.

Oh, I know that certain Members have said, and will say, "Yes, but look at the tremendous increase in cost that these allowances will bring." This, to me, is the weakest argument of all. I admit that it will cost more money. Yes, and perhaps a lot of money, depending on the number of fathers with dependents that we take away from the family and home, but in answer, I submit that this is a big war—a total war. It is a war to save all that we have built over more than three centuries. In answer, I say that America's children are her future, and this future must not be denied by any Member of Congress to the children of a soldier. What is money when weighed against stunted, sickly bodies and sickly minds, which, to my mind, would be the inevitable result of our failure to increase dependency benefits to the actual amount required for the bare necessities of life. Oh, yes; we have money to take care of children all over the world under lend-lease. I definitely am not criticizing our action in this respect, because I think that it is the proper thing for us to do. But I cannot, and never will be able to, agree with anyone who brings up the question of costs and expenses when it comes to taking care of our own children, and especially those children who are left behind by the fathers who have taken arms to fight for our country. Certainly our first obligation is to the children of our own fighting men.

In conclusion I wish to submit a schedule showing the exact changes in allotment increases that my amendments will make to the House committee bill:

Sadowski amendments compared with House committee allowances

Dependents	Committee bill	Sadowski amendments
Wife	$50	$55
Wife and 1 child	75	90
Wife and 2 children	95	120
Additional children (each)	15	30
A child but no wife	42	42
Each additional child	15	30
A wife divorced but no child	42	42
A wife divorced and 1 child	67	77
Each additional child	15	30
Class B dependent or dependents (payable only while there is no allowance payable to any class B–1 dependent)	37	37
Class B–1 dependent or dependents:		
1 parent but no brother or sister	50	55
2 parents but no brother or sister	68	90
1 parent and 1 brother or sister	68	90
Each additional brother or sister	11	30
2 parents and 1 brother or sister	79	120
Each additional brother or sister	11	30
Brother or sister but no parent	42	42
Each additional brother or sister	11	30

I also wish to submit an article from the Washington Times-Herald and a letter which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of October 13, 1943, from a father soon to be drafted:

[From the Washington Evening Star of October 13, 1943]

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

The drafting of fathers has been making a lot of headlines lately—to the detriment, I am afraid, of the patriotism of the vast majority of the men in this category. It seems that almost everybody has been heard on this subject excepting those most vitally interested in it, namely, the fathers themselves. As one of them, I am becoming pretty well fed up with all of this controversy, which, in my opinion, is being carried along the wrong lines of reasoning.

I am a Government employee, having given up in 1941 a small business in the Middle West to accept a moderate-salaried position in a permanent agency here in Washington. There are 2 small children in my family, aged 18 months and 42 months. I am nearly 37 years old, and my local board in my former home town recently has reclassified me into 1–A. I have no objection to the board's action, because it had no other choice. My home community is principally agricultural, to which several new munitions and ordnance plants have been added in the last 2 years. The blanket deferment of farmers and the occupational deferment of the workers in these plants have exhausted my local board's supply of single and childless married men. And, in accordance with regulations, any ideas to the contrary notwithstanding, draft quotas are levied without regard to the number of available single men in any given board area.

Inasmuch as I have a very low order number, I am expecting to be called for induction this month. My family can expect no help, financial or otherwise, from either my wife's or my family. My wife could work outside of the home if the children could be well cared for at a reasonable cost. But it seems to be impossible to secure the services of a trustworthy maid at a figure which would allow my wife a net increase in income after assuming the additional expenses of clothing, transportation, and other incidentals so necessary when a mother returns to a business or professional field. Therefore, if I pass the physical examination at the induction station, my family is doomed to what is actually a starvation income.

POP.

[From Washington Times-Herald of October 7, 1943]

DOCTORS REFUSE BABY CASES AT ARMY PAY, WIVES CHARGE

(By Howard Whitman)

Pregnant wives of enlisted men are having troubles—plenty of troubles—trying to take advantage of the Government's plan for free prenatal and obstetrical care. A survey of eastern cities has revealed that these stumbling blocks are impeding the smooth functioning of the plan:

1. Doctors in many cases, according to complaints registered by enlisted men's wives, have refused to work for $50 maternity fee which the plan provides in most States. The doctor is forbidden to receive any additional payment from the patient.

2. The extreme shortage of hospital facilities makes it difficult for Army wives to get accommodations at the figure which the Government allows—approximately $60 for 10 days in a maternity ward.

Last March 18 the emergency maternity and infant care plan was passed by Congress and approved by the President with an initial appropriation of $1,200,000.

An additional appropriation of $4,800,000 was made in July and last week $18,620,000 was added. The money is used for Federal grants-in-aid to any States which join in the plan. So far more than 40 States have joined.

A pregnant woman is entitled to free care if she is the wife of an enlisted man in the lower four grades. If her husband is in the upper three grades she also may have the benefits by supplying a certificate of financial need.

Now if—and this is a big if—the pregnant wife finds a doctor who will take the case for $50 and a hospital which will make room for her, she gets the application signed up and returns it. It then is sent to the State department of health, which makes the payment.

Newspapers have received numerous complaints that the future mamas were stymied when it came to getting a doctor. "When they find out it's a serviceman's wife they refuse the case," was one typical remark. "They don't want to deliver our babies for $50 when they can get $150 from somebody else," was another.

A spokesman for Army Emergency declared that his organization and the Red Cross had received numerous complaints of a similar stamp.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON].

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have consistently taken the position that only as a last resort should men with dependent children be inducted into the armed services. That the American home is the foundation of our social system would scarcely be denied by anyone. That it would be threatened by ignoring dependency in the induction of men with children into the military service is equally obvious. It follows as a matter of course that if the allowance we provide for in this bill is inadequate a decent standard of living cannot be maintained for the dependents of a soldier. Should a wife be compelled to accept employment in order that such standards be maintained, a juvenile delinquency problem is presented.

In the very near future it is estimated that 446,000 fathers will be called into military service. During the year 1944 this number may be considerably increased. The question of whether pre-Pearl Harbor fathers should be inducted is no longer a debatable issue, for already such inductions are under way, and a measure in the other body to prevent or to delay their induction has been overwhelmingly rejected—rejected no doubt because of the opinion of the Army and Navy high command that the armed services must reach a certain size if victory is to be assured.

Congress wisely will not set up its judgment against that of General Marshall and Admiral King as to the needs of the Army and Navy. At the same time Congress and the country will hold to strict accountability those who have brought the manpower situation to its present sorry state. This much is certain, Congress is not to blame. When Congress was asked to provide the machinery for the selection of men for military service it acted with dispatch. Obviously, Congress could not undertake the administration of the law. This power was properly delegated to the President, who was given full authority under the Selective Service Act to make necessary rules and regulations to carry the provisions of the law into effect. These delegated powers, however, were not without reservations, and one of those reservations was that dependency should be a ground for deferment.

For a time dependency was recognized by Selective Service as a ground for deferment, and the declared intentions of Congress were respected. With the transfer of Selective Service to the War Manpower Commission, however, the picture quickly changed. With characteristic bureaucratic arrogance the War Manpower Commission has completely ignored the will of Congress. The plain provisions of the Selective Service Act have been violated by this agency. Although Congress specifically provided that dependency shall be recognized as a ground for deferment, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, Mr. Paul V. McNutt, in his so-called work-or-fight order, declared that dependency should no longer be recognized. The ordering of men from one industry or occupation to another under penalty of being inducted into the armed service, regardless of dependency, is perhaps as glaring an example of bureaucratic usurpation of power as we shall ever witness.

The Selective Service Act was passed solely for the purpose of raising an Army and Navy. Not a syllable of its terms even remotely authorizes the conscription of men for industry. Yet it has been and is being used for that purpose. It has been many months since men with children have known what their status is under the selective-service law. Perhaps no group has been more confused than the fathers of this Nation by the never-ending series of conflicting orders and news releases which have emanated from the War Manpower Commission. I think we can say without fear of serious contradiction that the bungling of the manpower situation by this agency has largely been responsible for the drafting of fathers. The War Manpower Commission permitted Government departments to be loaded with men of draft age. Thousands of them would still be there had it not been for the protests of Members of Congress, particularly the Draft Deferment Subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee of this House. Industry has likewise been permitted to hoard labor, with no sound over-all program designed to provide replacements for those eligible for military service. Where replacement programs have been adopted it was because industry itself acted and not because of any sensible action on the part of the War Manpower Commission.

Neither General Marshall nor Admiral King are asking for fathers. Undoubtedly they would prefer men with lighter obligations. They are asking only for men. The responsibility for supplying them rests solely with the War Manpower Commission, and the inability of this Commission to supply needed military personnel from single men and married men without children is largely responsible for the legislation before us today.

Some persons will argue that the passage of this bill will greatly add to our already-heavy financial burden. This, of course, is true. But I for one do not feel that the wife of any serviceman should be compelled to seek charity if perchance it is necessary for her to remain at home in order to care for her children. This Nation has not been niggardly with the millions now employed in war plants. We have appropriated hundreds of billions of dollars for the conduct of the war. Our appropriations for lend-lease exceed $60,000,000,000. Notwithstanding a price-control act, prices of some commodities have doubled and trebled in the last year or two.

No one is more for economy in government than I. No one will vote more readily to abolish every useless governmental bureau, activity, and employee than I. This must be our policy if we are to escape national bankruptcy or avoid taxation beyond the ability of the American people to pay. But I am not willing, under the pretense of economy, to deny to the dependent wives and children of those who must do the fighting and the dying that which is necessary for them to live in health and decency. I am, therefore, in accord with the provisions of this bill. In the subcommittee which drafted this measure and before the full committee I proposed an amendment to pay to wives with one or more children, amounts slightly in excess of that provided for in this bill, beginning with $80 for a wife and one child. The amounts finally agreed upon represent the combined views of the members of the committee and I believe are the least we should approve.

In this connection I would call your attention to the very complete testimony furnished the committee by the Chief of the Cost of Living Division of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. The record furnished by this Division discloses that on a Nation-wide average $83.95 is required for a wife and one child to live in a fair state of health and decency. As a small part of this amount represents insurance, premiums on which are guaranteed under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, this amount can be slightly reduced, but certainly not very far if proper standards of living are to be maintained.

Except for very slight differences of opinion as to the allowances which should be paid to wives with one or more children I believe I am correct in saying the Military Affairs Committee was in complete agreement upon this bill. It was approved after extensive hearings with a view to doing justice to those who might be beneficiaries under the act, as well as those who must pay the bill. In a number of respects we have exceeded the recommendations made by representatives of the War and Navy Departments. Moreover, our figures are below those recommended by some of the witnesses who testified before us.

Obviously the allowances provided for under this bill, together with the pay of servicemen, will be insufficient in many cases to meet the financial obligations of affected families. In this connection, however, it should be borne in mind that the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act would apply so as to prevent mortgage foreclosures and the like, and will protect private insurance up to $10,000.

It necessarily follows that many inequities will result from the passage of this legislation. As it is not essential that wives and children be actually dependent, some allowances are bound to be out of proportion to actual need, but this cannot be helped. Under the existing act it is mandatory that an allotment be made to a wife regardless of her financial status. She may be employed at a salary many times the pay of an enlisted man and in equity and good conscience not be entitled to anything. There is only one way these inequities can be avoided and that would be to require dependency in fact to be established in all cases. This, of course, would be a tremendous job. To accomplish it a gigantic administrative agency would have to be set up. This would not only be costly, but would result in a further drain

upon manpower. In the end, the cost in dollars and cents would probably exceed the amount of the inequities, to say nothing of the delay that would be encountered in paying allowances if every case had to be investigated. I am sure this House neither wants to set up another bureau nor delay the payment of allowances to dependents of enlisted men and women.

Among other things, this bill for the first time makes it possible that allowances be paid to the dependents of women in the armed services. So far as they are concerned, however, dependency must be established. As to a husband or children of enlisted women, dependency in chief must be proven. This, for example, would make it impossible for a WAC or WAVE to make an allotment to a husband serving in the Army or the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we all realize the urgency of this legislation, particularly now that fathers are being inducted and women are now a part of our armed forces. The increased allowances provided for in this measure are supported by evidence before our committee, and are necessary if this Government wants the children of its soldiers and sailors to live in a state of health and decency while their fathers are offering their lives in order that the Republic might be preserved and all of us be permitted to live as free men and women.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, from the very beginning of the expansion of our armed forces Congress has realized the necessity for providing for the financial and moral obligations of those who were to be taken into the service. At about the same time the Military Affairs Committee reported the Selective Service and Training Act it also reported the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act.

I am afraid that in the debate here this afternoon we have lost sight of the fact that under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act many benefits accrue to those in the armed forces. Under it, for instance, the payments on a soldier's home during the time he is in the Army are frozen. Payments under any chattel mortgages he may have, whether they be on a washing machine, automobile, furniture, or what not, are frozen. Premiums on private insurance are guaranteed up to an amount sufficient to carry $10,000. This is in addition to the national service life insurance issued by the Veterans' Administration. The private insurance premiums are guaranteed by the Federal Government during the time he is gone. When that act went into effect during a time of peace its provisions were regarded as sufficient to provide for the type of man then subject to military service. Very shortly after war was declared we realized that millions of men must enter the service. The allotment and allowance bill was reported out of the Military Affairs Committee and passed by the House. The payments provided then were regarded as sufficient, considering the family status of the men to be taken into the service. In my opinion, however, in violation of the plain letter of the law the Selective Service System has seen fit to provide that dependency shall be no longer regarded as ground for deferment. As I say, I regard that as being in total derogation of the plain letter of the statute. This House has stated that it regards it as being such and passed a bill to prevent the disregard of the dependency status. Notwithstanding our objection, practically unanimously expressed by this House, the other body did not see fit to proceed with that legislation. We are now therefore faced, even though it be in apparent violation of the law, with an undetermined number of fathers entering the service. When that situation arose we all agreed that there was a real necessity to revise the allowance and allotment law now in effect. As soon as we reconvened after the recent recess the Committee on Military Affairs went into session on this very question. There has never been any disposition on the part of the committee or any of its members to be niggardly about the proposition. There has been a sincere effort to provide as nearly as possible for the situation in which we find ourselves.

It is true that those who appeared before the committee, including social workers, those from the security agencies of the Federal Government, and the representatives of organized labor agreed that there is a wide variance in the cost of living in various parts of the country. There can be no doubt but that the cost of living in those parts of the country in which we have a more equable climate is far less than in the parts of the country where there is a rigorous winter. It is also true that there is a wide variance between the urban centers, particularly those where the pay rolls have been so enormously increased by war production, and the rural areas. I see our friend the Delegate from Alaska here, who has told us of the urgent problem in Alaska, in which the cost of living is even in excess of the highest places in the United States. Then we have the situation in Puerto Rico in which the cost of living is far below the lowest places in the United States. So we have here a problem which has challenged the sincerest attention and the very best efforts of the Committee on Military Affairs. We do not want to be niggardly, as I said before, and at the same time we want to keep it as nearly within bounds as possible.

What is the alternative? Should we fix a reasonable amount which would be static throughout the United States, or should we grant to some administrative agency the right to say that an additional amount shall be allowed in hardship cases or an additional amount be allowed in those areas in which the cost of living exceeds the normal or average cost of living? After a very careful consideration, and some of those considerations I expect to detail to you, the committee came to the conclusion, and I believe I am correct in saying it came to the unanimous conclusion, that it is better to make it a fixed amount to apply uniformly throughout the Nation.

Some of those considerations were these: If you delegated it to an administrative agency you would have a situation in which that administrative agency would have the power to determine what families of what service men shall receive what additional amount of money and the length of time that they shall receive it. I think on its face this House would not agree to a proposition of that kind. It contains far too many dangers to commit to any bureau or to any agency that might be headed by a politically ambitious individual. That is only one of the considerations.

There is another consideration. All of the members of the armed forces who appeared before us agreed that it would be destructive of the morale of the service if one man in the service with a given family status should be receiving more than another man in the service with the same family status. It would be destructive of morale. I can see that if a sergeant on duty in the headquarters of the service command should be drawing more for himself and his family than the tail gunner on a Flying Fortress we would be in a situation quite difficult to explain to the soldier, and to his family as well. So we were driven to the necessity of bringing in the type of bill that we have brought in here, believing that it is not possible for us to go to any other system which would be workable.

What should the amount be? It should be adequate, or as nearly so as possible, for the situation in which we find ourselves. Figures appear in the hearings. I call your attention to the fact that they show the cost of living in 33 cities in the United States, and I wish all of you would look at that list of cities very carefully, because I think you will agree that it contains practically every city you have ever heard of in which there are now tremendous war activities. It is a fact that the cities in which the average per capita income in the United States is the highest, also have the highest cost of living. We have the following cities shown: Atlanta, Baltimore, Birmingham, Boston, Buffalo, Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Houston, Indianapolis, Jacksonville, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Manchester, Memphis, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Mobile, New Orleans, New York, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Portland, Maine, Portland, Oreg., Richmond, St. Louis, San Francisco, Scranton, Seattle, and Washington, D. C.

I grant you that they vary in size, but there is not a congested war area not included in those 33 cities. The allowance is based upon those figures. I do not know of any other place that you could go if you wanted to be sincere to provide a family maintenance level if you did not go to that agency which the Government maintains to provide the index on the cost of living. That we have done.

The figures appearing in the schedule of payments in this bill are not in all instances as large as those appearing upon the cost-of-living index. But the family maintenance level shown on the index is based upon many northern cities and cities in which there has been a

tremendous expansion in pay rolls. The index figures will show that the average in those 33 cities for a wife alone is $62.94 and each child $19, so that under that, figuring a family of four, the cost would have been $120. Under this bill the allowance totals $110. I say that is a pretty fair average when you take into consideration the cities upon which the figures and the cost of living index are based in the Nation as a whole.

Something has been said here about the Canadian figures. I am not in a position to state exactly what was said, but my recollection is it was a little higher than is in fact the case. I have the Canadian figures. It is not possible to state the exact total contribution for families under the Canadian system. They have a very cumbersome system which they themselves have found to be unworkable and they have recently been working with our Office of Dependency Benefits in Washington and in Newark in an attempt to revise their plan and to install our system. Under that system the soldier contributes what amounts to one-half of his pay. He contributes 15 days of his pay, never less than $20 a month nor more than $33 a month, no matter what his rank may be. The only instance in which Canada pays a family allowance more than ours is to the wife alone. I am talking now of the Government contribution because it is not possible to have a comparison of the family payments due to this sliding scale under the various grades of the Army in Canada. The Canadian Government contributes for a wife alone $35 a month, whereas under the proposed bill we contribute only $28, the soldier contributing $22 for the total payment of $50. For a wife and one child, Canada contributes but $47 per month. We contribute $53 per month under the proposal contained in this bill. In Canada for a wife and two children, $59 per month, whereas under this bill the Government contributes $73 per month. Then for six children, which is the maximum in Canada, the total of the Government contribution would be $93 per month, whereas under the proposal now before us the Government's contribution in the United States for a wife and six children would be $133 per month, and there is no limit upon the number of children under this proposal. To each of the above Government contributions under this bill must be added the $22 paid to dependents but deducted from the soldier's pay. So that we are in excess of the contribution made by any other nation in the world.

I agree, Mr. Chairman, that we should do all possible. As I said when the pay bill was before us here, there is no compensation adequate for those who are engaged in active combat. Those tens of thousands of my fellow Texans who are in the Army and Navy and Marine Corps and rendering such an excellent account of themselves are not hired at $50 a month, nor could they be hired at $5,000 a month. They are fighting for something far greater than that. They are attempting to maintain the Nation to which they want to return.

True, what we propose here is not sufficient to maintain a family in luxury. The social workers say it is sufficient to constitute the family maintenance level. It is based upon what they regard as being sufficient to maintain a family not in luxury, it is true, but in decency and in health.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON].

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss one aspect of this bill that I think is a little different approach than anyone has taken today. In considering a bill of this kind I think there are two primary things to take into account. One is, What is the cost of living of the people whom we are trying to benefit? How much does it cost them to live? Does this bill give them enough to maintain that standard of living?

The other question is, Is there any discrimination practiced by the operation of the bill? I believe there is distinct discrimination practiced by the way this bill operates upon the people who receive its benefits. This is why I say that.

The opportunity to volunteer in the Army is gone. Everybody that goes into the armed forces now is taken under the Selective Service Act. It is my opinion that when a man is deferred by the operation of the Selective Service Act that is virtually the same as selecting him to do some kind of industrial or necessary nonmilitary work in the war effort.

Let us see how this operates. How does this work? The men who are deferred go into war plants. We know that the great bulk of workers in America today outside of the farmers are working in war plants. My area is a good one to take as an illustration. These men under governmental edict and by governmental permission are getting very high wages. I do not begrudge them high wages. They are doing important work. But remember, they are living at home, they can stay with their wives and their children, and their lives are not disordered. They can plan their lives. In other words, they are carrying on about as they did in ordinary civil pursuits. They are performing important work, we realize that, but their lives have not changed much because of the fact that they are now engaged in war work and before that were engaged in other kinds of work. Neither the family nor the man who is deferred for war work by the selective-service law suffers any material inconvenience because of his deferment for war work. Also, their actual net pay in most cases is higher than it was before.

Let us look at the man across the street, of the same age and similar physique, with a family. He is taken into the military service by the selective-service law. What happens to him and his family? He is taken away from home. His entire life is disordered. Neither he nor his family can plan for the future. He may be taken abroad, he may get into military combat, he may be maimed, he may be killed. His family does not have the benefit of his company or of his earning capacity. So I say when we take this man away we ought to try to provide reasonably for his family and pay them enough to keep body and soul together while their loved one is away fighting to preserve the Republic.

In my judgment, the allotments provided in this bill are not reasonable, they are not sufficient, they do not meet the cost of living in the United States. My particular area borders on San Francisco Bay. I notice that the cost of living in San Francisco is the highest in the United States. I notice that all the 33 cities in which we have the millions of war workers show that their cost of living exceeds by about 20 percent what we allow in this bill for the wife, and a similar proportion as to the allowance for the children. It seems to me that if we want to be fair, if we want to do the right thing, we ought at least to take care of the women and children who remain here, not in a substantial manner but in an adequate way, in view of the increased cost of living. The tables on which we base the conclusion of the inadequacy of our proposed allowances to dependents were supplied by the statistical bureau of the Labor Department.

I have the utmost affection for our chairman, and I hate to differ with him on this matter, although I must. It has been mentioned here by him and others that we should take the average cost of living as a basis. Do you not see what that will do to us? It means that a great segment of our population, perhaps half of them, will be given an allowance, a subsistence pay, that will be below the actual cost of living in the place in which they live. This is so because the average is obtained by lumping together the low standard of living and the higher standard of living, and the cost thereof, and taking an average thereof. That is absolutely unfair. To make up the difference they will have to go on the relief rolls, they will have to go to friends, they will have to go to relatives, they will have to tap their little savings accounts and drain away the money which they have saved for a rainy day.

Remember, these particular persons are the ones that are making the greatest sacrifice of anybody in the war effort. They are the very ones that have to look to outside sources to maintain themselves in order to have the bare necessities of life.

The bill that I think is fair as a very minimum is the one suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON]. I suggested an amendment of the identical nature during the committee meetings. In that bill we provide $50 for the wife, $30 for the first child, and $20 for each additional child. If you look over the figures in the reports here and review the cost-of-living statistics, you will find that that is just barely enough to maintain a family in the United States in the great industrial war plant areas like Vallejo, Sacramento, Stockton, and San Francisco, Calif.

For instance, the figures show that in my area, the San Francisco Bay area, the cost of living as computed by the Department of Labor is $1,807 a year for a family of four. Under the bill we sponsor, with this slight increase over the com-

mittee bill, they would get only $120 a month; in other words, they would get $30 a month below the actual cost of living in San Francisco, as computed by the Department of Labor. But those war workers in our area are receiving adequate pay to live under those conditions. Right in the same community are the very people whose sons and fathers have gone away to war, but whose allowance is far below the earnings of those who have not been sent away, with the attendant hazards and uncertainties.

Another matter that was mentioned here that requires some attention and some answer is this: The gentleman from Texas mentioned many benefits that men in the service get, and they do get some benefits. But remember that the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act does not wipe out their obligation on the mortgages on their homes and on their notes and their papers. It merely suspends the payment thereon. Neither does it wipe out the interest. For instance, a $3,000 note a serviceman might have every year that he is away accumulates $180 in interest, which he must pay back within 12 months after his discharge, unless a court grants him an extension.

So, in every way, I say that this bill does not measure up to the requirements that I think a bill of this kind should. It does not meet the cost of living in the great cities and the war areas of this country where millions and millions of men are working, and where we have also side by side with the war workers hundreds of thousands and perhaps millions of widows, and the children of service workers; it does not meet the challenge that is ours that we should pass laws that do not discriminate in their operation, for I believe the operation of this law and the facts that men who are selected by this law are taken by the Selective Service Act and that that act also selects men for the armed forces make its operation clearly discriminatory.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may not have understood the gentleman correctly, but I am sure that he wants the RECORD to speak the truth. I understood him to say that insurance payments that were made by the Government or guaranteed by the Government had to be paid back by the insured within 12 months after discharge.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I made no comment on insurance. I made a comment on promissory notes on which the interest is merely suspended and the payment suspended for the duration of the war, to 1 year thereafter, and I did say that in those cases all that accruing interest must be paid by the serviceman when he comes back. I made no comment upon insurance payments.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It must not necessarily be paid within 12 months. He can go into court with reference to any kind of indebtedness that may accrue and have the court work out an amortization plan for him. I would not want the country to get the idea that we are going to have a great amount of debt piled on these servicemen that they have to pay within 12 months.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Oh, no. The law provides it must be done within 12 months, or he may make legal arrangements, but he does not have any of his debts or any of his interest wiped out. I do admit that the court may give an extension of time to pay them, but the burden will be rather heavy to make up these back payments, plus accrued interest.

We see then that the very act, that is, Selective Service Act, which selects men for the military force is the one that also virtually places and holds men who are subject to military service, in war industry by granting them deferment from military service.

The first group of men receive small pay, although no one is now objecting to their pay schedule. Their dependents are given allowances and allotments to take care of themselves because the man who supports them has been taken away. At the same time the family of the man who is deferred have their source of support (father, husband, brother) intact. He is working and drawing good wages, which have been fixed by Government in most instances.

The very group who make the greatest sacrifice, both physically, socially, and financially we do the least for. The wives and children and mothers of these men should be given enough to enable them to get the bare necessities of life without going to the relief agencies or becoming the victims of the generosity of friends or relatives. Under the committee bill I know the payments will not be adequate to maintain most of the dependents in my district at the present cost of living in that area. Consequently, we should raise it to the amount suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON]. That is the very minimum that will enable these people to live adequately. The defenders of the Republic, who are willing to lay down their lives for our country, have a right to expect that from their Government.

It seems obvious to me that the very operation of this proposed law will constitute a grave discrimination against the dependents of our men in the military service. The only way to correct this discrimination is to give as a minimum the amounts suggested in the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCCORD].

Mr. McCORD. Mr. Chairman, if this were a controversial question I would forego an engagement I have which takes me out of town on Monday, but since it is not, and since the country looks on this with as much interest as any legislation that will be presented here during this war in which we are engaged, I do want to stand here and be on record as favoring wholeheartedly the bill before the Committee.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, as we move further into this war we realize more and more the sacrifices which, often times unexpectedly, must be made by our people. The present war is the greatest struggle which the human race has ever seen, and we have reached the point in the mobilization of our resources, as our Selective Service headquarters tells us, that the induction of fathers on a large scale is imminent. Those of us who have given the matter much thought realize what this means to the Nation. It means the establishment of an additional large class of persons, namely, children of servicemen, who will be dependent upon the United States Government and for whom we will feel an obligation for perhaps the next 100 years. At this point we feel that a revision of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act, which we passed in 1942, is necessary so as to more adequately take care of the new group of dependents which will shortly, in large numbers, become in effect wards of the United States Government.

In 1942 we passed the first Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act, in effect blazing a path for legislation of this character. Prior to that time enlisted men in the armed services could make an allotment to dependents, but the entire sum allotted came out of the pay of the soldier, the sailor, or the marine. The purpose of the initial act, which purpose is adhered to in the present legislation, is to so supplement the pay of the enlisted man that those who had been dependent upon him at home would not suffer from want while he was in the armed services. This is a proper obligation of the United States Government to take care of the loved ones of the Nation's defenders, and this purpose certainly contributes toward the raising of the morale of the men in service, as well as to the efficiency and operation of the Army itself.

This bill provides for three classes of dependents, namely, class A, class B, and class B-1. In the category of class A dependents it permits the allotment to a wife to remain at $50; to a wife with one child it raises the allotment to $75; to a wife and two children it raises the allotment to $95, and permits payment of an additional $15 for each additional child. This is a considerable increase for the children of men in the armed service and should help a great deal toward paying the heavy expenses the wife of the serviceman must sustain in caring for her family in the absence of the father.

Class B dependents, as described in the original Servicemen's Dependents Allotment Act, is now divided into two parts known as class B dependents and class B-1 dependents. The class B dependents include any parent, grandchild, brother, or sister who is found to be dependent upon the enlisted man for a

substantial portion of his support. The class B–1 dependents include any parent, brother, or sister who is found to be dependent upon the enlisted man for the chief portion of his support. Allotment shall not be paid to dependents in both class B and class B–1 for the same serviceman.

One of the unfortunate things under the law is that a grandchild partially dependent upon a serviceman may receive support, while a grandchild wholly dependent upon a serviceman under this act will receive no help at all. Therefore, when we come to this particular provision, it is my purpose to offer an amendment to correct that inequity which I think will be recognized by everyone.

One of the greatest problems which concerned the committee in drafting this bill was that of dealing with a wife living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a decree of court or a written agreement. In such cases, it is extremely difficult to be entirely fair to the enlisted man who makes a contribution and at the same time work substantial justice in favor of the estranged or divorced wife. In finally deciding this matter the committee provided that the allowance to the wife living separate and apart from the enlisted man should not exceed the order or decree of the court or the written agreement previously existing. Another important change in the law, with which I am not altogether in sympathy, is that which requires an enlisted man in such a case to pay the entire amount of any allotment made under this subsection out of his own meager earnings should the allotment to the estranged or divorced wife be less than $22 per month.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman understand that this bill provides that the amounts specified in the bill are to take precedence over any court order which may be made in this country for support of the child of divorced parents?

Mr. BROOKS. That is my understanding.

It has not been an easy job to so standardize the needs of the families of these men (and women also, as the families of WAC's, WAVES, and other women's service organizations are included in this act) that no injustices may be done to various groups of dependents which we feel to be truly in need of help, and at the same time be fair with the taxpayers of the Nation who are paying the cost. Each group of dependents has its own special appeal to the members of the Committee on Military Affairs, and each group has had its reasons for claiming some increase or some adjustment in the amounts paid. Those which I think reached down into the hearts of the members of the committee as being worthy of every consideration were the children of the men who go out and offer their lives for the Nation in this war. The committee felt that no amount of money would in fact be adequate for the sacrifices which these youngsters are making in giving their fathers to the service in these perilous times, but we have sought to establish rates of pay that will provide for their necessities and their current needs even during the period of high prices to which we are going.

Much of this act is very technical in its nature. We have studied the manner in which the original act has been administered, realizing as we do the tremendous job which Congress has placed upon the Allotment and Allowance Division of the War Department. The figures on this matter are very illuminating, and I believe will be most interesting to you. General Gilbert, who heads this division, testified that about 3,900,000 applications for allotments have been received by his office, and that there is in effect at this time 2,800,000 applications upon which current monthly payments are being made. While it was testified that approximately $2,225,000,000 have been paid out in allotments, it is only fair to state that this figure includes all allotments and for all purposes, many of which were voluntarily made by the serviceman without Government contribution. In the category of allotments toward which the Government makes a contribution, the hearings disclose that the War Department in the last 14 months has paid out a total of $1,053,409,398.16, and the soldier has contributed roughly 44 cents out of each dollar paid to these dependents. In other words, out of the total paid, the Government has contributed $593,000,000 while the soldier out of his meager pay has contributed $465,000,000. These figures alone give some idea of the Herculean job which the War Department is handling in the field of the dependents of the enlisted man.

General Gilbert, who handles this work, testified that the average allotment is now being processed in about 5 days, and, judging by the mail which I receive from my own area, I am satisfied that the Division of Allotments and Allowances of the War Department is doing a magnificent job. This Department is handling this work with dispatch and without delay; it is handling it in such a way as to relieve suffering and distress throughout the Nation, and General Gilbert is entitled to receive the gratitude and appreciation of this Congress for handling a very technical law in a most businesslike and practical way.

As we proceed with this debate, in passing upon the amendments, I hope that this body will not lose sight of the fact that the bill is very technical in its nature and is balanced one part against the other. While personally I would like to see one or two amendments adopted, I do not want to see such changes in the bill as will throw it completely out of adjustment, the one section with the other. I believe it is a good bill which will relieve hardship, suffering, and want among those near and dear to our men in service, and I hope then it will pass by a unanimous vote.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and include a newspaper editorial.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to ask special permission in the House to include the newspaper editorial. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman to revise and extend his remarks?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON] expressed a desire which we all have. It is his idea, and that thought has been expressed many times before in the House, that the Congress should make provision for all those who are dependent upon the men who fight our battles and who are in service. It is just unfortunate that adequate provision cannot be made for all of them. That is one of the penalties of war. It is my intention to go along with any bill which is introduced for the appropriation of money for these dependents. That may not be a sound policy, but the excuse for following it is this, that if we are not bankrupt now, we will be before we are through with the New Deal. I voted for the soldiers' bonus not because I thought we could stand it, not because I thought it was a good policy, but because it was my opinion that the administration intended to spend every dollar it could put its fingers on.

I believed then, as I believe today, that any dollar that can find its way into the pocket of an American serviceman or any man or woman who is dependent upon him is just a dollar saved for an American, instead of being spent somewhere else.

To digress, it is my opinion, after listening to the testimony of the Under Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Forrestal, and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Bard, before the House Committee on Naval Affairs, that it is time the politicians in this administration did a little something for the men who are doing the actual fighting while Congress is trying to take care of their dependents.

BREWSTER AERONAUTICAL CORPORATION—A MONUMENT TO POLITICAL EXPEDIENCY—A NIGHTMARE TO THE TAXPAYER

The Brewster Aeronautical Corporation, Tom DeLorenzo and the leadership which he represents—not the individual employees who belong to his union—might well be viewed as monuments to the memory of the loyalty owed to the American taxpayer by the Administration and to the duty owed to the American fighting men by labor leaders, for both lie buried at Brewster.

This administration, carrying on a world-wide war, is under a solemn obligation to see to it that every dollar contributed by the hard-pressed American taxpayer is economically spent and that every dollar brings forth the utmost in production. The administration having failed in this duty, it now devolves upon the shoulders of the Republican minority in Congress.

The men who are fighting our battle all over the world have the right to demand that every American worker remaining here at home, every labor leader, do his utmost to furnish the munitions of war, including planes, which the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation is supposed to be making.

Every thinking individual knows that the munitions of war, and especially planes, must be supplied to those in the battle line in the quantity and at the

time when needed, and that, at times, even a few minutes' delay in the arrival of a plane may mean the loss of American lives.

This being true, there is—there can be—no excuse for the failure of any American, either in management or on the production line, to render his full measure of service.

The overwhelming number, both in management and on the assembly line, are doing just that thing. Only a few—a very few—fail to realize the tragic result which follows inefficiency or loafing on the job.

The man who in the service willfully fails to bring up needed supplies to the men in the battle line would be shot, and the man, either in management or in a responsible position in a labor organization, who deliberately, either for profit or to advance his political position with the union, delays production should be exposed and ostracized by every decent American.

From the well of the House, on the 27th of April 1942, that human dynamo from Michigan, our colleague, ALBERT ENGEL, who has so often conducted a one-man investigation exposing those who were failing to wholeheartedly support the war effort, called attention to the fact that the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation had paid to Alfred and I. J. Miranda and F. William Zelcer, under a contract made by that corporation, $5,400,000 as commissions. The two Mirandas also received, as pointed out by our colleague, $250,000 as a commission from the Hayes Aircraft Accessories Corporation, which they and Zelcer formed while they were in jail.

Our colleague demanded and secured the cancelation of that contract. But that did not wholly remedy the situation. From that day down to the present moment, the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation has been used as a vehicle to rob the taxpayer and advance the political fortunes of Tom DeLorenzo, president of CIO United Automobile Workers Local No. 365, at the Brewster plant.

The administration has placed the Navy in charge of this corporation and there have been successive changes of management, a part of the story having been placed in the RECORD on October 4, 1943, on pages 8046 to 8051.

On October 13 one of the Washington papers carried a story headlined "Labor problems at Brewster already eased, Kaiser says." The story contains the statement by DeLorenzo, who said:

> Yesterday Mr. Kaiser and I visited all the Brewster plants in Long Island City. The trip was most productive in that we both agreed that it was absolutely essential that we both, almost as one family, give our utmost to the Navy in its efforts to produce the greatest number of planes. I am convinced that the absolute cooperation between the Navy, management and ourselves, acting as one unit, can and will get excellent results. Discussions between Mr. Kaiser and myself threw new light upon the situation, which makes it clearly evident that my paramount duty under the present war conditions is to support the Navy and the Kaiser management, and do everything within my power to be useful. I am certain that every one of the Brewster employees and myself will take this position.

If Mr. DeLorenzo made that statement in good faith and if he intends to, and does, carry it out, that is all to the good, and the taxpayer may expect value for his dollar; the soldier, the sailor, the Marine, the men in the air corps, the loyal support to which they are entitled.

Too much faith cannot be placed in DeLorenzo's statements. It was only a few days ago that, speaking of the policy of the union which he represents, he said: "Our policy is not to win the war at any cost," and then continued with statements to the effect that the production of planes would be delayed unless management and the Navy complied with union demands, as expressed by DeLorenzo.

Unfortunately, however, at the instance of the Navy, controlled as it is by Administration politicians who from time to time overrule the decisions of Navy officials who would bring about production, managements, because of DeLorenzo's activities, have come and gone, while he has remained supreme and in control of union activities.

No one who is familiar with the situation at Brewster doubts for one moment but that the overwhelming majority of the workers desire the opportunity to render full measure of service and would give it, were it not for the demands of a few who will always, for one reason or another or for no reason at all, hinder production.

While the management has from time to time been changed, DeLorenzo has continued in power. It would have been far better if the Navy, when it took over control and insisted upon a change in management, would have kicked DeLorenzo out. But that, there is reason to believe, was not done because of the political hookup with prominent New York politicians.

The old contract between management and the union still remains in force and no one, not even Kaiser, can make the plant fully productive if that contract continues and union activities which have heretofore prevailed are longer permitted.

Note this section of the 1942 contract, which, although it has expired by limitation of time is, under the direction of the Navy, still in force from month to month. The provision, from page 10, under management, section 4, reads:

> The company may discipline or discharge any employee for just and proper cause, except that before any employee is disciplined or discharged, there shall be a hearing and mutual agreement between the shop committee and a representative or representatives of the management appointed for such hearings. The decision, if mutually agreed upon, shall be final and binding upon both parties.

The joker lies in the four words, "if mutually agreed upon," in the last sentence of that paragraph, which reads: "The decision, if mutually agreed upon, shall be final and binding upon both parties."

Under that section of the contract, DeLorenzo has been in absolute control of the manpower problem at Brewster. He has so exercised that power as to prevent management and the Navy from getting full production. He has exercised it in such a tyrannical and dictatorial manner that the loyal workers in the factory dare not, because of fear of him, give full measure of production to the company, their Government, and the men they have sent to the front.

Proof of this is found in the fact that, time and again, when management has given orders; when the Navy, through its officers, has given directions, they have been flouted, ridiculed, and disobeyed by those under DeLorenzo's protection.

Let me cite just one instance.

During the week of June 21, 1943, a foreman in one department at the Johnsville plant discharged three women for loitering. The three women had been reprimanded the previous week for the same offense. None belonged to the union. All three were serving the usual 60-day probationary period provided for in the union contract before becoming members of the union. They not being members of the union, under the contract the company could discharge them at any time, for the union had no jurisdiction over the matter.

The three women had attended a union meeting the night before they were discharged, and members of the union claimed that they were discharged because they had attended a union meeting, and thus the union was discriminated against. That charge was not true.

On Thursday of that week, the union stewards went through the shop and ordered the employees to quit work at 4:30 p. m. and not to work overtime. That would have resulted in a 40-hour week.

The employees did quit at 4:30 on Thursday afternoon and the shop committee, on Friday, told the management that, regardless of the fact that the discharged employees were not members of the union, they would not stand for employees working more than 8 hours a day, 40 hours a week, on regular pay. The dispute was settled by the reemployment of the three discharged employees.

Some of the employees, stenographers, did not go out at 4:30 p. m., as ordered by the union. Later, the union wrote some of the stenographers, telling them that charges had been preferred against them for not leaving work at the specified time of 4:30 p. m. on Thursday, June 24, 1943. They were then ordered to appear before the trial board to answer those charges.

Later, the union agreed to withdraw the chages, but the employees were required to appear and they did appear and they were fined $50 each. When the attention of the union officials was called to the fact that they had agreed to withdraw the charges, the union officials then claimed that the stenographers were not fined for not leaving work at 4:30, but because they did not speak to another girl who did leave at 4:30 p. m.

It is evident that those stenographers who did not walk out at the request of the union officials were fined by the union for not obeying orders. They stayed to aid in making bombers and fighters for the men who had gone to the front. They obeyed the management and the Navy, both of which were seeking production, and because they did, because

they violated the order of the union to walk out, they were fined.

What action, may I ask, was taken against those who walked out—virtually a strike—in violation of the Smith-Connally Act?

A man who remained at his job, in defiance of a union strike, was suspended for 30 days.

Guards, who had taken an oath to support the Government, violated that oath, defied the orders of the Navy, were sentenced by a court martial, but DeLorenzo had enough political pull with this administration to nullify the sentence.

Other instances might be cited, and it is hoped that the subcommittee of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, which is investigating this situation, will dig them up and lay the facts on the record.

THE SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM

We are asked, What is the remedy? It is plain and simple.

The Government has poured millions of dollars into this plant, which is not giving even a decent percentage of production in return.

The people who work there—many of them—men and women in the assembly line, at the production machines, engineers and technical workers, are ashamed of the fact that they work at Brewster's, and they are ashamed of the production record of Brewster.

One of two things should be done. The Government should either write off the loss and close the plant, or it should abrogate the contract now existing between the union and management, place someone with absolute authority in charge of the plant, and open up the jobs in the plant, from janitor and floor sweeper to the top technical men, to all Americans who want to work to support the war effort, and this regardless of membership in any union.

If Brewster can be made to produce, there is a valid objection to a cancelation of the Government contract with it and junking the plant.

James V. Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy, appearing before the Subcommittee of the House, Naval Affairs, on October 13, stressed the Government's vital need of every single plane it could procure. He admitted that, as a business proposition, the Government's experience with Brewster had been and now is bad, but in substance he said that in spite of the high cost, in spite of weak management, in spite of labor trouble, the Government had continued to hope that Brewster would do better and had continued its contract with them.

He said that the Government had invested nine million in the plant and had loaned Brewster fifty-five million more. The substance of his statement in that respect was that it was only because of the dire need for planes that the Government continued its effort to get them from Brewster.

It was clear from his testimony that there was no other place where the planes could be produced. It is equally clear to those who know the facts that they are not being produced at Brewster and that they will not be produced as long as the present manpower situation is controlled by Tom DeLorenzo.

What the Under Secretary did not explain was the reason why certain high officials in the Government refused to give support to Brewster management but went along with Tom DeLorenzo in his obstructive tactics.

The situation never will be remedied, the troubles at Brewster never will be solved by Kaiser or anyone else, until the Navy turns over to management, whoever that may be, the problems that belong to management.

Certainly production cannot be had when the manpower is under the domination of a man who thinks first, as has DeLorenzo, of union rules, union activities, the advancement of labor politicians, rather than of production.

This administration in a day could break the dictatorial power of Tom DeLorenzo and others like him who, by slowing down production or transportation—as in the present strike in the South, where 10,000 teamsters are refusing to haul merchandise needed in the war; or the strike on the west coast, where 2,000 carloads of freight jammed the shipping yards—are lessening the fighting ability of our men who every day are giving full measure of service—yes, even to loss of life itself—to preserve the Government which is giving these men jobs, if an end were made to the closed shop; to the maintenance of security-of-membership contracts, to the contracts, under whatever name they may be called, which deny, in violation of the provisions of our Constitution, the right of every man not only to earn a livelihood, but to work in defense of his Government.

Cancel the present contract between the union and Brewster Aeronautical Corporation; throw the plant open to every man who wants a job, and the power of Tom DeLorenzo to interfere with the efficiency of the Navy and the Army will be destroyed.

The solution of the trouble at Brewster rests with the administration, which clings like a bulldog to its corrupt political alliance with labor politicians.

We know that the C. I. O. at a convention recently endorsed the President for a fourth term, but that endorsement is too high a price to pay for the continuation of a policy which denies to our men who are fighting and dying day after day the planes which they must have if this war is to be won.

Once more I call attention to the fact—and it is a fact—that the fourth-term campaign is standing in the way of all-out production.

The President can call the Senators who attempted to give us the facts from the fighting fronts "fellow travelers" if he wishes, but he and labor politicians are fellow travelers along the road which so far, in the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation at least, has been reducing production of planes so vitally needed by the Navy.

The administration and its political cohorts having made a mess at Brewster, having wasted the taxpayers' money, having failed to get production there, the Republican minority should have the courage to solve the problem.

It was my privilege to hear the testimony of Assistant Secretary of the Navy Ralph A. Bard given before the House Subcommittee on Naval Affairs.

No one would venture for a moment to question the courage of the men who are on the battle front with the fighting naval forces, nor would anyone question the willingness to serve of the other personnel of the Navy who for one reason or the other are compelled to serve in noncombat areas. Nor would any true American with knowledge of the situation fail to condemn the actions and decisions of the politicians, who at the top of our Navy, direct its policies.

As was pointed out yesterday, Undersecretary of the Navy James V. Forrestal stressed the dire need of the Navy for bombers and for fighters. It was evident from his testimony that our men may be dying because of lack of production at the Brewster plants; that our war effort is being slowed down and the day of ultimate victory delayed.

As has been pointed out, he said that, in spite of the high cost, the weak management and labor troubles, which had so seriously interfered with production at Brewster, the need of the Navy was so great, the ability to procure planes elsewhere so slight, that the Navy had continued its contract with Brewster in the hope that the situation would be remedied.

Today, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Ralph A. Bard testified. It is evident from his testimony that, while the management has been weak; while it has frequently been changed by the administration, the manpower situation has during this period of underproduction or nonproduction been under the control of Tom DeLorenzo and that never has the Navy taken any steps to change that situation by the removal of DeLorenzo. DeLorenzo, as has been shown repeatedly, is the man who places the welfare of his union above the production of planes.

Bard, when his attention was called to that fact and to the failure of the Navy to act, said in substance that DeLorenzo had dictatorial power over the members of his union. It was apparent from Bard's testimony that the security guards, who are supposed to protect the plant, when the pinch came gave allegiance to and obeyed the orders of their union, instead of obeying the orders given by the Navy.

Bard attempted to excuse the disobedient guards and said that their sentences were lessened because, as Bard said, it was thought they did not understand their duty or the obligation which they owed to the Navy.

Of course, these men obeyed the orders of their union leaders and Tom DeLorenzo is directly responsible for this lack of production, for the disobedience of the guards. But Bard admitted that the Navy had not taken action to remedy the situation, although the remedy—the removal of DeLorenzo—is apparent. Why not cite DeLorenzo for sedition?

The Navy is about to meet in combat, either on or under the sea or in the air,

the picked fighters of Japan and Germany, and we have no fear of the result; but it cannot, or will not, and that is Bard's confession, meet Tom DeLorenzo in Philadelphia at the plant of the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation and from him win a victory.

If there is anything more disheartening to the fighting forces in the Navy than this humiliating admission on the part of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Bard, I do not know what it can be. However, there is a precedent for it.

You will recall that as long ago as 1939, the then Acting Secretary of the Navy, Edison, followed a similar course and for 42 days surrendered to the C. I. O. of Detroit.

When will the administration forget political expediency; insist upon an all-out war effort?

Bard and Forrestal are in charge, ostensibly at least, although from the testimony of Mr. Bard, I suspect that over and above him, hampering him and staying his hand, is a master politician who is in on the deal through which support is given to labor politicians at the expense of the prosecution of the war.

The testimony shows that four of those guards disobeyed the orders of the Navy. They were court-martialed and sentenced. The sentence was set aside and those same four men, according to the papers yesterday, are back at work in that plant. Now, Bard excuses them by saying that they did not understand the enormity of their offense. All right. He says they only followed orders. Again I say all right. But if he is going to excuse those four men then he should get the man who incited them to stop production and to disobey the orders of the Navy.

Now, what is the use of appropriating billions of dollars? Why appropriate money for the dependents of those who go to war and do the fighting, when down here at the other end of the Avenue in their offices sit men who condone, who do not remedy, the conditions which prevent men who are giving their lives every day all over the world from having the planes that they need? I ask you in all sincerity and in all good faith how long are you going to stand by those two high officials of the Navy? Bard expressing his personal opinion said, in substance, he would not stand for it if he could have his way.

Both Bard and Forrestal know that Brewster is not producing; that it has not produced. Change in management, without a change in the Navy's policy, gives no assurance of production.

Bard and Forrestal should either change their policy or they should resign, or they should be removed from office. If in their case there is the same reason for a failure to perform their duty that applied to the case of the four Coast Guard guards who disobeyed orders and were court-martialed, then they may be excused for failure to follow a course which would insure production.

It is obvious, and they know, that the real trouble at Brewster lies at the door of Tom DeLorenzo. All they need to do to end the intolerable situation is to cancel the contract with Brewster, take charge of the plant, install management and throw open the doors to patriotic workers, regardless of union membership. Make the place an open shop and patriotic Americans, if protected in their right to work, will work, not only because of the high wages, but because they are patriotic and because they want to produce planes.

There is no reason in the world why the production of fighters which are needed this very minute on the fighting fronts should be held up until American citizens have complied with the orders of, paid the various sums demanded by, Tom DeLorenzo or any other man.

If Bard and Forrestal cannot follow that kind of a policy because of orders from someone higher up, then Congress should follow that line back to its source and remove or impeach the individuals, whoever they may be, who are sabotaging our war effort.

It is reported now that Mr. DeLorenzo has promised that he will no longer sabotage the production of planes. Now, that is fine. Presumably the Government, until he changes his mind, may go ahead, with his permission, and make fighters for MacArthur and others who need them.

My remedy would be to kick Tom DeLorenzo not only out of the plant, not only out of the picture, but into some country where his ideas will not be so destructive of national unity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, about fourscore years ago, within 200 feet of this Chamber where we are convened today, Abraham Lincoln stood on the steps of this Capitol and advised the people of his day and time: "to care for him who shall have borne the battle, his widow and his orphans."

Today we have convened for the consideration of a bill to provide not only for the three classes of people that he mentioned in his remarks in his second inaugural address on March 4, 1865, but to include another class and that is the dependents of the men who are wearing the uniform of our country. To the Committee on Military Affairs and its able chairman we all pay our tribute of respect for the very great care and consideration that they have devoted to this difficult and complex problem. No matter how carefully they have planned and presented this bill to the House, undoubtedly inequities, inequalities, and injustice will appear sooner or later.

I join with the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] in the statement that he made earlier this afternoon when he pointed out, regardless of what those in this body might think, that a more liberal sum should be provided, that one of the things necessary to protect the men who wear the uniform of our country is that they might come back to a country and to a Government which is still solvent and able to meet its obligations to them and their dependents. Therefore, I join with the committee and the other Members of this House in voicing my approval of this bill for a reasonable and adequate program devoted to taking care of and providing for the dependents of the men fighting our Nation's battles.

I received a letter from the friend of the court, and by that I mean the circuit court for the County of Oakland, at Pontiac, Mich., within the congressional district which I have the honor to represent in this Chamber, pointing out some of the difficulties that he, as friend of the court, and charged with the responsibility of looking after the dependents and the children of divorced people, is confronted with from day to day. With the permission of the committee I want to read into the RECORD a few excerpts from this letter, which will point out some of the problems involved in the question of allotments to dependents of men in the armed service. This letter is dated October 11, just a few days ago, and I quote:

> I can see no justice in giving to a wife $50 a month when that wife is perhaps working either in a Government job or in civilian work at $50 or more per week from which she should be self-sustaining.

You will remember that I asked the able chairman of the committee a question earlier in the day whether or not these allotments to wives are on the basis of need. He replied that they were not. This bill provides that it is mandatory and is granted to all alike, rich and poor, regardless of whether there is need or not.

Quoting further from this letter:

> Many of the women married a soldier so that they can get that allotment and then give little or no regard to their marital status after the soldier has been inducted into service.
>
> In some instances the office of Dependency Benefits has reduced the small monthly payments previously allotted to the soldiers' children after the soldier has remarried in order that they can keep up the $50 per month and thereby build up the morale of the new wife so that the husband would make a better soldier if he felt he had home ties through a wife who was pulling for him while in service.
>
> * * * * *
>
> It is not for me to dictate to you and the Congress what amount shall be allotted for a mother and children a soldier has divorced and left to shift for themselves while he goes into service and then marries some other woman. However, I have the problem to face every day and if I can assist in doing something that will bring about justice for these children, I feel it my duty as a citizen to speak through you. Our tax burden is increasing already by leaps and bounds, and the additional annual cost of over $650,000,000, estimated by this amendment is a large sum for the overburdened taxpayers to have to assume. However, as a taxpayer I am not opposing the additional burden, but do ask for a reduction in the original act and the elimination in the increase in the proposed act of wives who have recently married the soldier, and especially where they are employed as Government employees or in civilian defense work at $20 per week or more.
>
> I also ask due consideration in the amended act for the divorced children of a

soldier, and that the allotment to them be the maximum amount paid for the support of the child or any wife of any soldier.

Personally I feel that the act should apply to every man in the armed services, be he a private or high ranking officer. Some of the men who have risen to the rank of commissioned officers have cut off the allotment for support of their families as soon as they received a commissioned officer's salary, and there is no way whereby a soldier can be compelled to pay for the support of his dependent children until he returns to civil life.

These observations come from a public official who meets the problems of allotments in his official capacity first hand and knows what he is talking about.

Every consideration should be given to the abuses pointed out by him. It is the plain duty of a grateful people to provide reasonably for the dependents of those who fight the Nation's wars.

I shall vote for the committee bill reported to the House and urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, this is the second time in almost 10 months of this Congress that I have risen to speak my mind on pending legislation, and I want you all to feel sure that were it not for the fact that this legislation affects me and the people of my district very seriously, I would hesitate to speak now. This legislation affects me and the people of my district very seriously for two reasons:

First of all I have to laugh up my sleeve every time I hear the statement made to the effect that the drafting of fathers is imminent. For example, in the debates which lasted for days in the Senate there were arguments as to whether we should or should not draft fathers after October 1, 1943.

I wonder how many people realize they have been drafting the fathers in my district for the last 18 months—1 year and 6 months they have been drafting fathers in my district. But the debate still went on. Therefore there are many people in my district affected by the pending legislation perhaps more so than the people of any other district. Let me give you some figures.

In the county in which my home is located, 15 percent of the population of that county today is in the armed forces of the United States of America. For the 14 counties that I represent, 12 percent of the population of those 14 counties is already in the armed forces of the United States of America. In many cases we have fathers with as many as 4 or 5 or 6 children, in my district, already in the armed forces of the United States of America.

If the draft figures were prorated throughout the entire country as they are in my district, we would have a standing army today of 15,600,000 men; and for my particular county, if these statistics were prorated through the entire county to the draft-per-capita population we have in my home county, we would have a standing army today of 22,000,000 men. My district has a very large percentage of its men in armed forces who are married and have families.

I am interested in this bill for another reason. In the last mail that I have read I have received this letter and this is typical of the many problems I am getting, and the biggest source of worry to me is this matter of dependency allotments. Let me read from this letter I got in my last mail:

I've been in the Army almost 4 months, as you know. My dad is blind, my mother is in ill health, and I have a daughter. My wife stayed at home to try and take care of the folks, but there's no work around Ironwood and Hurley, so she worked 3 nights a week at the Iron Inn. I never knew this until recently. You can understand my views on that. I also have learned that they haven't received 1 cent of allotment money since I have been gone. By they I mean my wife and daughter. Each pay day it was taken out of my pay but no money was received at home. My wife and I finally borrowed a few dollars and we arrived out here where I hope she can get work. Once again we are just about out of cash, and unless something is done soon it will be tough.

Here is a blind father, a disabled mother, a wife, and a daughter dependent on this soldier for aid. How can all these live on $62 per month? This is typical of the many cases I am getting. It takes time to solve them. I have no complaint to make about the local liaison office of the dependency bureau. They have been most fair with every case, but it takes time. In this particular case I have just got off the long-distance telephone. This case was so typical, in fact so pitiful, that I have just returned from the Western Union telegraph office where I wired him a sum of money. This is the forty-fourth case where I have dug down in my own pocket to help these people who have been so destitute. I mention this case not in criticism of the administration of dependency allotments—but I do offer this case to show how inadequate the law is for providing for those who depend on the men who are giving their lives for us.

This bill clears up a lot of the difficulties encountered by the present law. The Dependency Allotment Division has a mammoth job on its hands. The proposed bill removes some of the obstacles and will enable the Dependency Allotment Division to expedite its work.

I think this bill we are considering is a good one. Personally, I hope we will adopt the Sadowski amendment. I think the maximum he proposes is the amount that ought to be passed. I am seriously concerned about this legislation. I think it ought to have the unanimous approval of each and every Member of this House. We will certainly be doing nothing more than justice if we pass it and we shall certainly place ourselves in a position to be denounced if we do not take such action.

It will certainly be helpful to the people of my district. We have no defense plants there where dependents could secure employment as is the case in many districts. Wives and children and mothers of my district must have increased allotments to carry on. The fact that many fathers in my district have already been drafted makes this legislation from my point of view most imperative. I plead with each and every Member of this House to support this bill with the Sadowski amendment—which in my judgment is the fairest allotment of any offered thus far.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a radio speech by the gentleman from Alabama, Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN, on the sponge-iron process of making steel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MUST WE WIN THE WAR IN 3 YEARS OR QUIT BUILDING AIRSHIPS FOR LACK OF ALUMINUM?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I called to the attention of the House the critical situation we are facing in the production of aluminum for airplanes. No one responsible for the prosecution of the war fails to realize that without airplanes we cannot win the war and without aluminum we cannot have airplanes. Many of you, no doubt, do not realize that our own supply of bauxite in the United States, from which aluminum is made, is being rapidly exhausted and within some 3 years may be completely exhausted. We will then be dependent entirely on foreign importations. We have been getting our foreign supply from Dutch and British Guiana in South America, where a considerable portion of our raw material is now being secured. Our only local supply of high-grade bauxite—in Arkansas—is dwindling, and if the war lasts over 3 years, according to experts we will be completely at the mercy of foreign governments for our supply and the ability to keep our sea lanes open for importing bauxite from 2,500 to 3,000 miles from South America.

One-third of our aluminum is now being produced on the Pacific coast, largely

in the Columbia River area. This means a long railroad haul of 2,500 to 3,000 miles from Southern States, where bauxite is now reduced to alumina, to bring the alumina to the Pacific coast plants.

When the Federal Government took up the question of an aluminum supply early in the war these facts were canvassed and it was determined that it would be necessary to develop a supply of raw material from which alumina could be made within our own borders; otherwise, we would be subject to the hazard, if the war continues for some 2 or 3 years, of being completely out of aluminum for airplanes. Scientists were called in to study the problem and all of the available sources of raw material from which alumina could be made were surveyed, tested, and processes developed for utilizing these raw materials. Fortunately there are many huge deposits of clay throughout the United States, and particularly the west coast, which bear aluminum content and which scientific investigations have now disclosed are available and suitable as raw material from which to make alumina. Accordingly, the Federal Government, through appropriate agencies, adopted a program which covered the construction of five semicommercial or pilot plants for demonstrating conclusively the processes and the suitability of the respective clay deposits for use as a raw material. These five projects are as follows:

Kalunite, Inc., Salt Lake City, Utah, alumina from alunite.

Aluminum, Inc., Marysvale, Utah, alumina from alunite.

Columbia Metals, Pacific Northwest, alumina from clay.

Ancor Corporation, Harleyville, S. C., alumina from clay.

Monolith Midwest, Laramie, Wyo., alumina from anorthosite.

The first two of these projects have been constructed or now are under construction.

We on the Pacific coast are particularly interested in the Columbia Metals project to be located in the Northwest, where surveys, tests, and scientific investigations have been made determining the suitability of the several deposits of clay available. This project, after long and careful examination, was approved by the Alumina Committee of the War Production Board; the Young Coordinating Committee; the Aluminum and Magnesium Division of the War Production Board; the War Department, and preliminarily by the Defense Plant Corporation. When the project was ready for beginning construction, a stop order was issued, presumably based on the Byrnes directive and through the office of War Manpower Commission, on the alleged ground that manpower was not available and that there was a shortage of manpower on the Pacific coast and no new project should be initiated in that area. This objection was proven to be untenable.

At the previous hearing before Charles E. Wilson, Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, it developed, however, that this so-called reason, lack of manpower, was not the real reason why the project was stymied, but the stop order was issued because there was a sufficient supply of aluminum on hand or in sight to last some 3 years under present plans, and that the War Production Board did not deem it advisable as a war measure to permit the construction of this plant. It is admitted that if the plant is constructed, it would take a year or a year and a half, and it would employ only 300 men for construction, and if found successful it would take another year to construct operating plants of sufficient size to supply the necessary alumina for feeding the aluminum plants.

In other words, it would take 2½ years, if this program is followed out, to make the United States self-sufficient to meet our needs for aluminum to carry on the war. It was further demonstrated that the manpower problem was not involved because ample manpower is available in the territory where the plant will be constructed. These workers would not be taken from other war industries and are not available for other war work.

The whole matter is still pending before the Production Executive Committee composed of Charles E. Wilson, chairman; J. A. Krug, William L. Batt, G. H. Batchelor, Admiral Robinson, Admiral Vickery, Admiral Pace, General Clay, and General Echols. Representatives from the delegations in the Congress from Oregon, Washington, and Idaho have been heard by this committee, at a hearing where it was urged that the adverse decision canceling this program be reversed and that the green light be given for the immediate construction of the plants heretofore approved by the several boards to which I have called your attention.

A. H. Bunker, who is Director of the Aluminum and Magnesium Division of the War Production Board, the best informed Government official on the aluminum program, made a report to Charles E. Wilson, Vice Chairman of W. P. B., on September 3 last, urging that the action of the Board be reversed and the program be permitted to go forward immediately. I believe anyone who will take the time to read this memorandum of Mr. Bunker which was submitted for the consideration of the Production Executive Committee at our hearing, will be convinced that his conclusions were correct and that we are playing with fate, and jeopardizing the very success of the war on an ill-advised, indefensible policy in refusing to carry out a program to provide within our own territory for the necessary raw materials for the production of aluminum. As shown by Mr. Bunker's memorandum, which I will include in my remarks, within a very few years—perhaps 2 or 3—we will completely exhaust our own bauxite and be dependent upon importations from foreign sources. The submarine menace, which again is becoming most critical, may completely cut off our supply from South America, as was partially done in the beginning of this war, in the treacherous, submarine-infested waters of the Caribbean. Who can say we can win the war in 2 years, or 3 years, or when the war will end? Should we adopt a program that depends on ending the war in 3 years or exhausting our aluminum for aircraft unless we can import sufficient raw material from foreign countries through 2,500 miles of submarine-infested waters?

Mr. Bunker's memorandum is as follows:

MEMORANDUM

SEPTEMBER 3, 1943.

To: Mr. C. E. Wilson.

From: Mr. A. H. Bunker.

I am deeply disturbed by the minutes of the production executive committee meeting of September 1, which have just come to hand, insofar as they have voted to cancel out all of the projects for producing alumina from nonbauxitic domestic material and the balance of this program still under consideration. I believe this decision is a grave mistake.

The history leading up to the sponsorship of this program is a long and complex one, dating from almost the moment of my arrival in Washington in June of 1941. The very first step which I took upon arriving here was to cause a careful and thorough examination of domestic bauxite reserves to be made. It was immediately apparent that these reserves were inadequate to bear the full weight of a long and difficult war. The amount of high-grade ore, or that type of ore then regarded as commercial, was extremely limited, and even the lower grades of ore represented by no means extensive reserves. As soon as we had provided initial facilities for expanding the production of both alumina and aluminum by standard processes, we turned our attention to providing ways and means of successfully using all of the lower grade bauxite ores and also to developing and selecting those processes which would lend themselves to the recovery of alumina from nonbauxitic materials. We realized that this latter program would be a long and arduous one.

We enlisted the active help of the National Academy of Sciences, who immediately formed an alumina committee to devote itself to this problem. This work involved an examination of countless processes, recommendations, and suggestions for improving processes, pilot plant work under the direction of the war metallurgy committee largely at Government expense, and encouraging corporations not then engaged to enter into research work on clays, mine tailings, and many other available aluminous materials.

There was, of course, at that time no particular concern as to the safety of shipping in the Caribbean, as this had always been regarded by the Navy as highly defensible territory. However, we were very definitely concerned over the enormous requirements that might be placed upon shipping to conduct any large-scale war. We for that reason felt that every step should be taken to make this country entirely self-sufficient in supplying all of its necessary alumina from domestic raw materials, whether these were to be low-grade bauxites heretofore not used in the commercial production of alumina, or other nonbauxitic materials which we then knew to be extremely abundant.

As far as high-grade reserves of bauxite are concerned, they are being depleted with almost frightening rapidity; as far as the very low-grade reserves are concerned, we have not yet placed in operation our lime-soda-sinter facilities and therefore have no final proof of the degree of effectiveness of those facilities. In any event it is quite evident that another 2 years of war will so seriously deplete both high-grade and low-grade bauxite reserves that the rate of mining is likely to become sharply reduced to such an extent that the output of these ores may be quite inadequate to support the present aluminum system at full scale

operation. Short of ability to use domestic nonbauxitic raw materials this would immediately make us again dependent upon importation of foreign bauxite.

It is true that within recent months the Navy has suggested that conditions are very much easier due to substantial correction of the submarine menace and to the large amounts of merchant tonnage which are being constructed and put into service. Of course I am in no position to judge whether the correction of the submarine menace may or may not be of a temporary nature, and I am certainly not in the final position to judge whether those amounts of merchant tonnage which are now being put into service will all be needed to conduct future military campaigns or whether there will constantly remain a surplus available for the movement of very large tonnage of bauxite. I can only know that the pressure upon us has been constant to reduce imports throughout the entire last 2½ years. There has never been a suggestion that either the Navy or the War Shipping Administration would be willing to commit themselves to an adequate program of imported foreign bauxite. That condition as far as we are concerned would still obtain today even if we did receive some temporary assurance that larger tonnages of bauxite could be moved from South America. This still would seem to me to be an inadequate guaranty that we could continue to count upon such movements over the next few years.

Without being a military strategist I can conceive of any number of vicissitudes which would make it extremely difficult to undertake the importation of the millions of tons of bauxite necessary to maintain the operation of the present North American aluminum system. Any consideration of this problem must include not only the United States but Canada. There are many thoughtful people who consider it quite possible that Russia might engage in a separate peace and that the consequence thereof would be to prolong this war on the part of the Allies by a great number of years. I, of course, have no way of knowing how much substance there may be in a premise of this sort.

However, any decision now made which would eliminate the construction and operation of those plants projected for the treatment of nonbauxitic aluminous metals and would cancel the rest of this program now in progress must, in my opinion, be predicated upon a series of optimistic assumptions and possibly a combination thereof. It must be assumed, it seems to me, that the war will be a short one or that even if it should continue for a number of years shipping would at all times be relatively so free that it would not impose any burden upon military operations to continue not only to import several million tons of bauxite a year from South America, but to increase rapidly the future rate of importation. These assumptions seem very hazardous to me, and if they should turn out to be wrong this country could easily be placed in a position of great jeopardy. It is a fact that we have already stripped the cream of the high-grade deposits from Arkansas and are continuing to strip them at an unparalleled rate. Each 12 months leaves this county's limited bauxite resources in a weaker condition.

It is a function of any process work, such as that under consideration, that it takes long periods of time to select and develop the means best suited to the solution of new technological problems, and from that point to the stage of commercial production requires further large periods of time. The whole program is now so timed that one has a right to assume that as our domestic bauxite deposits are being reduced we are preparing in a timely fashion to replace them with other raw materials as bauxite production declines. For example, 2½ years from now we could be in a position to produce on a large commercial scale such alumina as we might need to support the present aluminum system even with substantially decreased domestic bauxite production.

This whole question of preparing for the self-sufficiency of raw material supply for the continental aluminum system has received very extensive consideration by large numbers of technical people, and I think it is fair to say that all of those individuals and groups are in agreement that the steps we are now taking are justifiable and in order and that they should, if anything, be extended. It is my own personal opinion that we have not gone far enough and that to be entirely safe we should add at least two or three more processes of promise to our program.

In conclusion, if we cancel out this program we can claim self-sufficiency for the aluminum system, undoubtedly the most vital metal system in the entire conduct of the war, only provided we assume either a short war or a far greater degree of shipping freedom than we have ever enjoyed in the past 2½ years. Both of these premises seem to me to be extremely hazardous and are not assumptions upon which we should dare to risk the possible outcome of this war. I feel this matter deeply and have therefore taken this opportunity to present my views, opposed as they are to the action of the P. E. C., and to present them as vigorously as possible. Naturally, I should be very glad to appear before the next meeting of the P. E. C. if you would deem this a suitable method of reopening this important question.

A. H. BUNKER,
Director, Aluminum-Magnesium Division.

Mr. Speaker, those of us, who, like Mr. Bunker, are aroused over the critical situation that exists with reference to aluminum, have made and are making every endeavor to secure favorable consideration of a program which will make us self-sufficient in this strategic material which is necessary to win the war. We do not want to be caught in a box again as we were when our foreign importations of rubber were cut off. The same policy, it seems to us, is being followed now with reference to aluminum as was followed in the rubber fiasco. If we continue to refuse to make our country self-sufficient in aluminum for war planes after 3 years of war we may be without aluminum just as we found ourselves without rubber. I call attention to the following further facts with reference to this important problem, covering in some detail the various factors involved:

ALUMINA FROM NONBAUXITIC MATERIALS

In the past, all aluminum metal has been made from high grade bauxite, principally from Dutch and British Guiana, and to a lesser extent, from Arkansas. U-boat sinkings in the Caribbean and shortage of convoys and ships have forced the use of Arkansas bauxite almost to the exclusion, at times, of South American bauxite.

There are practically no known bauxite reserves in the United States outside the State of Arkansas, where they are estimated as follows:

	Tons
High grade (under 8 percent silica)	6,500,000
Medium grade (8–12 percent silica)	10,000,000
Low grade (12–16 percent silica)	11,000,000

The medium and low grade bauxite require special and nonstandard treatment, the effectiveness of which has not as yet been demonstrated. It is generally conceded, however, that a sufficient portion of the medium grade bauxite will lend itself to successful treatment so as to make a possible but not certain maximum total reserve of only from 10,000,000 to 12,000,000 tons suitable and available for the aluminum industry.

Total bauxite requirements for the United States are approximately 5,000,000 tons per year. Any consideration of this problem should include not only the United States but Canada whose requirements amount to an additional 2,000,000 tons per year.

With the advent of the war it became apparent that these reserves were inadequate to bear the full weight of a long and difficult war, and subsequently with importations from South America being not only threatened but at times practically stopped by enemy submarines and shortage of ships, it likewise became apparent that steps should be taken to develop a substitute for bauxite and thus render the country entirely self-sufficient in supplying all of its alumina from domestic nonbauxitic materials which are known to be extremely abundant.

Immediately prior to this war, total alumina production capacity in the United States was approximately 400,000 tons per year, all produced by the Aluminum Company of America. This capacity has been or is being increased, mainly with Government funds, to approximately 2,500,000 tons, 93 percent of which is to be produced by the Aluminum Company of America. All of these facilities require bauxite, either foreign or domestic, for base material.

Immediately prior to this war total aluminum metal production capacity in the United States was approximately 400,000,000 pounds per year. This capacity has been or is being increased, largely with Government funds, to approximately 2,400,000,000 pounds, 93 percent of which is to be produced by the Aluminum Co. of America.

For many years a great deal of time and money has been spent by Federal and State agencies and by private industry in an effort to develop a process, or processes, for the extraction of alumina from nonbauxitic domestic materials, i. e., mine tailings, alunite, clays, and many other available aluminous materials. About 2 years ago the War Production Board enlisted the help of the National Academy of Sciences, who formed a special alumina committee to devote itself to this problem. This work involved an examination of some 50 or 60 processes, recommendations and suggestions for improving processes, pilot plant work under the direction of the War Metallurgy Committee largely at Government expense, and encouraging corporations not then engaged to enter into research and pilot plant work on nonbauxitic materials.

Of the various processes examined six or seven have been determined as being commercially feasible and worthy of demonstration with Government funds, and under Government supervision and direction. Five small experimental plants, all using different processes, two for the treatment of alunite, two for the treatment of clays, and one for the treatment of anorthosite, were recommended by the Aluminum and Magnesium Division of the War Production Board for construction, as follows:

1.	Kalunite, Inc., Salt Lake City, Utah, alumina from alunite	$4,954,088
2.	Aluminum, Inc., Marysvale, Utah, alumina from alunite	775,000
		5,729,088
3.	Columbia Metals, Pacific Northwest, alumina from clay	4,086,500
4.	Ancor Corporation, Harleyville, S. C., alumina from clay	2,642,000
		6,728,500
5.	Monolith Midwest, Laramie, Wyo, alumina from anorthosite	3,965,000
	Total	16,422,588

No. 1 is practically completed and is expected to go into production immediately.

No. 2 is proceeding with construction without interruption.

Nos. 3, 4, and 5 had been working on design and ordering of equipment for the past 60 to 90 days until the Production Executive Committee of the War Production Board recently recommended their cancelation.

Quoting from a recent letter from Mr. C. E. Wilson, Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, and Chairman of the Production Executive Committee, to Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY:

"You very properly raised the question as to our bauxite supply for future years of the war's prosecution, and I shall outline our estimate of the availability of this commodity. For the purpose of determining our bauxite requirements through the coming 5-year period, I have quite arbitrarily estimated that aluminum requirements in these years will approximate the same exceedingly high demand estimated for 1944, namely, approximately 3,000,000,000 pounds, thus assuming that aircraft production would continue through these 5 years in excess of 100,000 planes. Accordingly, we plan on taking from our Arkansas deposits 5,000,000 tons of bauxite in 1944, and a similar amount in 1945, thus not requiring the importation of any Surinam bauxite during the coming 2 years for our domestic alumina production. In 1946 it is estimated we would be compelled to resort to use of a limited amount of Surinam bauxite as supply of domestice bauxite was reduced. Accordingly, we estimate that in 1946 we would use between 3,000,000 and 4,000,000 tons of domestic Arkansas bauxite, and 1,000,000 to 2,000,000 tons of Surinam bauxite in meeting our total estimated requirement of 5,000,000 tons in that year. In 1947 we estimate we would use 3,000,000 tons of Arkansas bauxite and 2,000,000 tons of Surinam bauxite; and in 1948, 2,000,000 tons of domestic and 3,000,000 tons Surinam."

Mr. Wilson assumes the availability of 18,500,000 tons of Arkansas bauxite as against the best estimates of not to exceed from 10,000,000 to 12,000,000 tons. He further assumes the availability and freedom of movement of shipping facilities to import 6,500,000 tons of bauxite from South America in 1946, 1947, and 1948. The first assumption is subject to serious challenge, based upon facts and information available. The second assumption presupposes a military condition that it would seem hardly wise to count on, but granting the availability and freedom of ships from enemy attack, would it not be safer if not actually cheaper to expand the alumina-from-nonbauxitic-materials plants, whose practicability can have been demonstrated by that time?

Both of the above assumptions presuppose the termination of the war within 5 years, which seems reasonable but by no means certain. There are many thinking people who consider it quite possible that it may continue for many years. No one, of course, has any way of knowing whether this war will continue more than 1, 3, 5 or more years, but it would seem that the cost of the proposed alumina program now being held up—$10,692,500—would be cheap insurance—less than four-tenths of a cent per pound of our annual aluminum requirements—as against such an eventuality. In this connection it can be fairly said that the present supply or oversupply of aluminum metal or of bauxite has no direct bearing upon the question of whether or not to proceed with the alumina-from-clay program. The program was not conceived with the idea that it would make any contribution to the supply of aluminum or alumina at this time, nor any substantial contribution for a year or more, and then only in the event of the realization of such likely eventualities as to make it seem grossly improvident—witness the rubber situation—for the Nation not to have taken those precautionary measures to establish self-sufficiency for the aluminum industry.

Quoting further from Mr. Wilson's letter:

"For the long pull, I believe there is unquestionably great merit in the determination of the feasibility of producing our own requirements of alumina from domestic materials, and particularly from clay, obviously because the latter material is in almost unlimited supply. The War Production Board's determination to refrain from allocating the material and labor for the above-mentioned pilot plants is based solely on the belief that the aluminum supply and requirements figures for the next 5 years are in good balance, and that therefore the expenditure of materials and labor for the pilot plants is not now warranted as a definite war requirement, desirable as is the objective of the United States ultimately being in position to supply a more substantial part of its raw materials for aluminum production from domestic sources."

There seems to be general agreement as to the merits of the program, but disagreement as to the proper time to do it. If the program is not carried out now it will either be done too late at greater expense and less effectiveness or not at all. The Government is presently equipped with all facilities including the best aggregation of technical talent that it could hope to assemble. The sponsors and engineers have prepared themselves at great expense and are ready to undertake the responsibility of carrying the program to a successful conclusion. Manpower and materials required are small by comparison with the over-all war requirements, and insignificant in relation to the consequences of a possible situation which the program is designed to avert. Moreover, why should we spend money, manpower, and materials for the construction of ships in anticipation of bringing raw materials from a foreign country when for lesser amounts of money, manpower, and materials we can demonstrate the practicability of utilizing our own abundant national resources and at the same time render ourselves capable of becoming self-sufficient in one of our most important industries? Furthermore, if at the present time any money, manpower, or materials are being spent for the construction of ships for the movement of large tonnages of bauxite from South America, those resources could be more wisely spent by diverting them to this program and thus obviate the necessity for the ships.

The record is clear and the facts are well known to those who are responsible for prosecuting the war effort. The program is recommended and endorsed by responsible and representative authorities. Abandonment of the program may involve the making of a grave mistake and will invite never-ending criticism of those responsible for its abandonment, the justice of which will be difficult if not impossible to determine. Conversely, approval of the program in light of the record and all the circumstances will receive popular and substantial endorsement as a well thought out and intelligent effort to protect the most vital industry of the Nation.

SOME REASONS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ALUMINA-FROM-CLAY PLANT IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

1. There is an abundance of suitable clays in the Pacific Northwest, the existence and character of which has been established by the Bureau of Mines and private interests at great expense.

2. There are five aluminum reduction plants in the Pacific Northwest with a production capacity of 600,000,000 pounds, and two in California with a capacity of 256,000,000 pounds of aluminum per year. This is over one-third of the total United States production.

3. There is a rolling mill at Spokane, Wash., with capacity to accommodate a substantial portion of the aluminum metal production.

4. Over half of the Nation's aircraft industry, principal user of aluminum, is located on the Pacific coast.

5. One million two hundred thousand tons of high-grade bauxite ore, or 600,000 tons of alumina are needed to supply the aluminum reduction plants in the Pacific Northwest involving tremendous water and rail transportation. At the present time, alumina is shipped by rail a distance of from 2,500 to 3,000 miles, much of which is made from Dutch or British Guiana bauxite, which in turn has to travel by water some 2,000 to 3,000 miles.

6. The Federal Government already has many millions of dollars invested in the aluminum industry in the Pacific Northwest, and many more millions invested in the several hydroelectric projects which depend importantly upon the aluminum industry for a substantial portion of the generating capacity.

7. There are several suitable locations in the Pacific Northwest nearby the clay deposits and having adequate facilities, including manpower.

8. All of the reasons for the over-all alumina-from-non-bauxite-materials program are magnified in their importance when applied to the Pacific Northwest because of the greater distances involved and the ready accessibility to cheap power, raw materials, and market.

There is something over $500,000,000 invested by the Government in the aluminum program, including power facilities, in the Pacific Northwest which may be seriously jeopardized if we fail to develop sources of raw material for the production of aluminum in the Northwest. Those of us who have fought through the years for the development of the natural resources in that great territory and for marshaling these resources in the work of winning the war are deeply concerned over this proposed program which will stymie our efforts, rob the Government of much of its investment, and spell doom for an immense industry in the post-war period. In fact, if we had not had this vast pool of hydroelectric power and the aluminum plants in the Columbia River area producing one-third of our aluminum for war we could not be meeting with the success we now are on every battle-front. This huge industry will fold up when raw material for alumina is cut off. I call to your attention also three editorials from the two leading local newspapers in my congressional district, which show the feeling in that territory against the canceling out of this aluminum program.

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of September 25, 1943]

THE ALUMINA PLANT

It should be clear from the testimony of the War and Navy Departments in regard to the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers that our high command is not confident of quickly winding up the war. If it were, much more could be gained from leaving the fathers at

their jobs than in putting them into training camps.

This being the judgment of the high command—proved by their testimony on the fathers, whether or not they say it in so many words—what are we to think about the delay in establishing a Pacific Northwest plant for reclaiming alumina from our native clays? Such a plant, to cost $4,000,000, has been approved by the War Production Board and the War Department. The War Manpower Commission meanwhile has held up the project because of an alleged manpower shortage—primarily, it is well known, because of the situation which existed at Boeing's.

But every reasonable person who has made any study whatever of the aluminum needs will realize that whether or not there is a manpower shortage, the question of the clay-reduction plant should hinge not upon the manpower situation but upon the probable length of the war. Which is to say that the bauxite deposits of Arkansas will not last long, and those of South America cannot be depended upon in case of an emergency or in case of success of the submarine campaign when it is revived. Consequently, if we are to fight a long war, nothing whatever should stand in the way of the clay plant. And since it is the admitted judgment of the Army and Navy that we may have to fight a long war, why the delay? The War Manpower Commission is endangering the Nation.

[From the Oregon Journal, Portland, Oreg., of September 30, 1943]

AN OBSTRUCTION OF THE WAR EFFORT

One of the most important war industries of the Nation and what may well become the most important industrial development in the entire Pacific Northwest—the Columbia Metals alumina-from-clay plant—is being held up by a theoretical shortage of manpower.

This plant has been approved by the Aluminum and Magnesium Division and the Mineral Resources Coordinating Committee of W. P. B., and by the War Department. The Defense Plant Corporation has signed contracts with Columbia Metals to operate the plant for the Government, and with Chemical Construction Corporation, which developed the process, as engineer-contractor. The alumina committee of the National Academy of Sciences has investigated and approved the process. Chemical Construction Corporation, a subsidiary of American Cyanamid Corporation, has proceeded with the design of the plant and the ordering of equipment under letters of intent from D. P. C., aggregating $1,100,000, has applied for another $1,000,000, and will apply for the balance of a $4,000,000 cost of the plant by the end of the year. The Pacific Northwest alumina committee, made up of representatives of business and civic interests, labor and agriculture, from Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, has agreed to allow experts to locate the plant where it belongs; that is, where raw materials, transportation, water, power, housing, and labor conditions are best, and is working wholeheartedly together to get the plant started. Actual surveys by both chambers of commerce and Federal agencies have shown that the 300 construction men needed to build the plant and the 150 men needed to operate it are available, at least, at two strategic points in Oregon, points too far away from Portland to interfere in any way with existing war production plants. This plant can be taken to an available labor supply and would actually add to rather than subtract from the war production labor supply of the region, which, while having an admitted over-all shortage of manpower, has areas in which an actual surplus of labor exists, one that cannot be utilized effectively unless a plant is set up near it.

This alumina-from-clay plant, designed to permit ready duplication of units, can prove and make available for the war effort at least 100,000,000 tons of aluminous clay in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. It can become the means of making us independent of far-away foreign bauxite, and supplement the almost exhausted domestic supply. It can feed aluminum to hungry Pacific coast warplane plants, and become the center of a new chemical industry. It can be built and in operation in less than a year, if it is started immediately. It should be started immediately. Precious months have already been lost. Further delay, more especially a delay based upon the assumption of a labor shortage that does not exist so far as this plant is concerned, is inexcusable. It represents actual obstruction, either witting or unwitting, of the Nation's war effort.

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of October 4, 1943]

THE ALUMINA FIGHT

When the War Production Board this week reviews the application of Columbia Metals Corporation for permission to establish in Oregon or Washington a small plant to produce alumina from native clays, it well may admit as evidence the news that Germany's submarine packs again are prowling the sea lanes, bearing new and vastly more destructive torpedoes. More lives may be lost in the sinking of one ship—a vessel which may be bringing bauxite from Dutch Guiana to the United States—than are required to build or to operate an alumina reduction plant.

The new Pacific Northwest alumina committee, in the last 10 days, has done a magnificent job on short notice of hammering home to the W. P. B., to McNutt's project-blocking Manpower Commission, and to Congress these primary facts: (1) The war is not over; (2) aluminum is needed in ever greater quantities to win the war; (3) renewal of Nazi submarine warfare shows the suicidal folly of our dependence upon bauxite ore shipped from Dutch Guiana; (4) the domestic supply of bauxite, in Arkansas, is sufficient to last only 1½ or 2 years if foreign imports are cut off.

This is a practical view of the alumina situation which rightfully subordinates the long-time need of the western light metals industry for an ore supply adjacent to the pig metal plants and rolling mills. The regional view on this matter has been adopted wholeheartedly by the northwest aluminum committee, on which are represented the chambers of commerce of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho (with one exception), the granges, labor, industry, and civic groups. This committee has swept away sectional considerations, espouses no one site, demands only that northwest clays be developed by an approved process for the northwest aluminum industry.

The only community which appears to be out of step with the rest of the region is Spokane, which has benefited most from the northwest's aluminum boom by acquisition of a reduction plant and a tremendously large fabricating mill. In recent statements published by Spokane newspapers, an ex-State senator and the president of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce have hinted at a plot to locate the alumina plant on the coast and seen a threat to the light metals capital of the West.

The astonishing proposal emanating from Spokane is that the fight for an alumina-from-clay plant be abandoned and that instead authorization be sought for a plant at Pasco to produce alumina from bauxite shipped from Dutch Guiana.

No one familiar with this region's lusty aluminum baby will oppose an alumina-from-bauxite plant either now or as a post-war project. After the war we will need both a bauxite and a clay development to keep our great aluminum plants operating against eastern competition. What Spokane's spokesmen do not seem to realize is that the clay plant is an immediate, a pressing war requirement. It is also a test for regional strength.

The only reason so far advanced at Washington, D. C., in objection to construction of the clay plant comes from the War Manpower Commission. It is that of a regional labor shortage. The argument has been thoroughly exploded. Construction of the plant would require 300 men, starting in about 6 months. Operation would need but 150 men, some of them skilled chemical workers brought from the East. Manpower Commission directors of Washington and Oregon have already certified that these needs could be met without tapping any war industry by selecting a site in Longview, Canby, Eugene, or several other communities.

The Spokane sectionalists who decry a sectional plot should realize that if the region is beaten in this effort to obtain an alumina-from-clay plant it might as well put aside any hope of obtaining other new war industries, possibly including a bauxite plant. And no one knows what difficulties will arise if we wait until the war ends before taking steps to protect and preserve the industries we already have.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the memorandum to which I have referred—that of Mr. Bunker under date of September 3—I call attention to another memorandum of October 5, giving additional data with reference to the aluminum situation:

OCTOBER 5, 1943.

MEMORANDUM

To Mr. C. E. Wilson.
From A. H. Bunker.
Subject: Alumina and Aluminum Expansions.

I am listing below answers to a number of questions which you submitted to me last Saturday:

1. How much alumina capacity was planned?

In July 1941, the first aluminum expansion program took place. This provided for an alumina plant at Hurricane Creek, with an annual capacity of 1,000,000,000 pounds a year, to be operated by the Aluminum Co. of America. It also provided for the privately owned plant of Alcoa at Mobile, Ala., to be expanded by 320,000,000 pounds a year. This expansion was paid for with private funds. As incidental alumina facilities, we provided for an alumina-from-alunite plant at Salt Lake City under the operation of Kalunite, Inc. This plant was to have a capacity of 72,000,000 pounds a year.

The second alumina expansion took place in February 1942. This provided for increasing the plant at Hurricane Creek from 1,000,000,000 to 1,300,000,000 pounds a year and the construction of a new Government-owned plant at Baton Rouge with a capacity of 1,000,000,000 pounds a year, to be operated by Alcoa.

In March 1943 the plant at Hurricane Creek was further increased by 255,000,000 pounds a year. This was made necessary by the fact that the reduction plants had demonstrated that they could produce more aluminum metal than they had been planned for. The Government alumina plants had capacities therefore of 2,555,000,000 pounds. The Mobile plant, as above stated, expanded by 320,000,000 pounds. The total of these expansions was 2,875,000,000 pounds.

In 1941 Reynolds Metals Co. completed the construction of an alumina plant having a capacity of 200,000,000 pounds. While this was a privately owned plant, the funds for the same had been borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

In addition, there exist the privately owned plants of the Aluminum Co., one at Mobile with a total capacity, including the expansion indicated above, of 1,300,000,000 pounds a year, and one at East St. Louis with an annual capacity of 800,000,000 pounds a year. The total capacity of both Government-owned and privately owned plants using the Bayer process is therefore 4,855,000,000 pounds.

2. You have asked who was to produce the alumina and where. All this information is contained under No. 1.

3. How much of this capacity is now in operation?

The privately owned plants of the Aluminum Co. at Mobile and East St. Louis and the Reynolds Metals Co. at Listerhill are all running at full-planned capacity. The Government-owned plant at Hurricane Creek is now running at the full capacity of the first planned expansion, including the first 300,000,000-pound addition. The last expansion of 255,000,000 pounds has not been brought into production. The Government-owned plant at Baton Rouge is running at an annual capacity rate of 800,000,000 pounds, or 80 percent of its ultimate planned capacity. It is estimated that its full capacity rate will be achieved by December 1943. There is no question that all of these facilities will operate at 100 percent of their planned capacities.

4. How much aluminum capacity has been planned by the Government?

The first aluminum expansion provided for 7 plants, 1 to be operated by the Olin Corporation at Tacoma, Wash., with capacity of 41,500,000 pounds a year; 1 to be operated by Reynolds Metals Co. at Listerhill, Ala., with a capacity of 62,200,000 pounds a year, the former being Government financed, and the latter being privately financed, although through direct loans between that company and the R. F. C. In addition, arrangements were made for the construction of D. P. C. plants, to be operated by Alcoa. Following are the capacities of these plants:

	Pounds
Massena, N. Y.	96,000,000
Troutdale, Oreg.	96,000,000
Jones Mill, Ark.	128,000,000
Spokane, Wash.	64,000,000
Los Angeles, Calif.	128,000,000
Total	512,000,000

Total capacity of the above plants in the first expansion was 619,700,000 pounds. These plants later proved themselves to be capable of producing approximately 640,000,000 pounds a year.

The second aluminum expansion provided for increasing capacities of the Aluminum Co.-managed defense plants at—

	Pounds
Los Angeles	32,000,000
Spokane	128,000,000
Troutdale	32,000,000
Total increases of	192,000,000

In addition, plants were provided by D. P. C. to be managed by Alcoa at Burlington, N. J., with annual capacity of 96,000,000 pounds; at Queens, N. Y., with annual capacity of 256,000,000 pounds; and at Riverbank, Calif., with annual capacity of 96,000,000 pounds. The combination of increases and new plants represented an aggregate capacity of 640,000,000 pounds. These plants have since shown a capacity to increase their annual output by about 7 or 8 percent, or in the aggregate can probably produce about 40 or 50 million pounds more metal than originally planned for.

5. How many of these aluminum facilities are now operating at full-scale operation?

All of these aluminum facilities are running at full capacity, with the exception of two potlines at Los Angeles having an annual combined capacity of 64,000,000 pounds; and the one unit at Riverbank, Calif., which is not yet completed, has an annual capacity of 32,000,000 pounds.

6. What are the estimated requirements for alumina for 1944?

In order to run all of the aluminum facilities in the United States at full capacity, both Government owned and privately owned, there would be required 4,653,173,000 pounds of alumina. There would be required, in addition, for abrasives, chemicals, etc., 166,000,000 pounds; or total requirements would amount to 4,819,170,000 pounds.

It is doubtful whether this amount of alumina will be required, inasmuch as the consumption of aluminum by the various military agencies is not as great as that which they estimated. Large amounts of aluminum metal have already been made available for stockpile purposes, and it appears that at the present rate of production, including imports from Canada, aluminum metal may accumulate beyond the consumption rate, at around 25 or 30 million pounds a month. In view of this, and in view of the serious labor conditions on the west coast, it has been decided at least on a temporary basis, not to undertake the operation of the two remaining potlines at Los Angeles. If metal continues to be produced at a rate substantially in excess of consumption, it is anticipated that after accumulating a reserve stockpile of 250,000,000 pounds, operations will be reduced so that production will be brought in line with consumption.

7. What are the plant costs?

Alumina

East St. Louis, Ill.:	
Bayer	Privately financed
Lime-soda-sinter	$9,300,000
Mobile, Ala.:	
Bayer	Privately financed
Lime-soda-sinter	$12,393,000
Hurricane Creek, Ark.:	
Bayer, original	16,480,000
First expansion	2,725,000
Second expansion	4,500,000
Lime-soda-sinter	10,340,000
Baton Rouge, La.:	
Bayer	15,900,000
Lime-soda-sinter	10,421,000

Aluminum ingot

Burlington, N. J.	$12,080,000
Los Angeles	21,788,000
Queens, N. Y.	34,657,000
Riverbank, Calif.	12,754,000
Spokane, Wash.	23,847,000
Troutdale, Oreg.	17,968,000
Jones Mill, Ark.	27,680,000
Messena, N. Y.	16,791,000

8. Why did we plan an alumina expansion of 600,000,000 pounds capacity and 2 months later cancel this planned capacity?

The Canadian Government requested permission to increase their alumina and aluminum facilities in Canada by a sufficient amount to increase their metal production by 180,000,000 pounds of aluminum a year. This would have required 360,000,000 pounds of alumina. The material coordinating committee decided that it would be unwise to create these facilities in Canada owing to the long hauls required for bauxite and the potential limitations of electric power, and agreed that the United States would undertake to supply the United Kingdom with this amount if it proved to be necessary.

An examination of the combined military requirements of the United Nations indicated that aluminum requirements would be approximately 4,400,000,000 and that aluminum supply would be approximately 4,400,000,000. It was evident that if these requirements were to be met there should be provided some margin of safety. There was, however, some doubt surrounding the over-all requirements as stated by the various military agencies.

Inasmuch as it requires about twice as much time to construct alumina facilities as it does to construct reduction plants, it was decided to proceed with plans for additional alumina facilities in the amount of 600,000,000 pounds, and to later on determine whether it would be necessary to provide reduction plants.

A new review of all military requirements for aluminum was again undertaken and 2 months after the decision had been made to increase the alumina facilities, the P. E. C., representing the Army, the Navy, and the W. P. B., was able to reach a conclusion that the over-all requirements of the Allied Nations had been overstated and that it would not be necessary to provide any aluminum capacity above that which was already under construction. The 600,000,000 pounds of facilities had only reached the drawing board stage, and, therefore, the cancelation of these facilities presented no problem.

9. You have asked what the estimated costs of the 6 alumina-from-clay plants are.

There are only 5 plants which have so far been projected for the treatment of non-bauxitic materials; only 2 of these are for the treatment of clays; 2 are for the treatment of alunite; and 1 for the treatment of anorthosite. The companies and costs are listed below:

1. Kalunite, Inc., Salt Lake City, Utah, alumina-from-alunite	$4,954,088
2. Ancor Corp., Harleyville, S. C., alumina-from-clay	2,642,000
3. Aluminum, Inc., Marysvale, Utah, alumina-from-alunite	775,000
4. Columbia Metals, Pacific northwest, alumina-from-clay	4,086,500
5. Monolith Portland Midwest Co., Laramie, Wyo., alumina-from-anorthosite	3,965,000

A. H. BUNKER,

Director, Aluminum and Magnesium Division.

Mr. Speaker, I only received this copy of Mr. Bunker's second memorandum to Mr. Wilson from Mr. Wilson yesterday, and my colleagues and I have not had an opportunity to examine the factual and statistical data set forth, and therefore I am not in a position at this time to discuss the merits of the contentions made therein, but I do feel that it is proper that this data be made available for study by you, my colleagues, who are so greatly interested in this critical problem.

Mr. Speaker, I most sincerely hope that every Member of the Congress and every Federal official responsible for carrying out the war program will give attention to this serious problem facing us, which may mean the winning or the losing of the war. At the end of 3 years must we be at the mercy of foreign powers for airplane material? We all know the appeal that came from General MacArthur in Corregidor for airplanes, and every American had to turn his face in shame when he realized what took place in that great American outpost, where we had spent so many millions, where that great soldier, General MacArthur, and his courageous band were called upon to defend American possessions with practically no air force and with no tools of war adequate for the occasion. The heroic fight they made without proper

war equipment has never been excelled. God grant that we may never be caught in such a box again. It was the first time we have ever hauled down the Stars and Stripes at the demand of an enemy. May we not pray that those in charge of our aluminum program will not be called upon later to justify a position taken now which will deprive us of the opportunity to secure aluminum with which to maintain supremacy in the air in the days ahead and to bring victory to our cause. That problem is the one we now face. It is your responsibility and my responsibility as Members of the Congress of the United States before it is too late to bring every resource we have to bear upon this problem to the end that we may not fail in providing airplanes for our fighting men, without which they cannot win. I plead with you, my colleagues, to urge upon the President, as Commander in Chief, and every official having jurisdiction over the aluminum program to approve this alumina-from-clay program to the end that we may become self-sufficient in aluminum for airplanes and not be made dependent on foreign sources after 3 short years.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. McKENZIE]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. WASIELEWSKI, for 4 days, on account of official and personal business.

To Mr. McCORD, for Monday, October 18, on account of business.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 714. An act for the relief of the commissioned officers of the U. S. S. *St. Louis* during the Spanish-American War, May 18, 1898, to September 2, 1898; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 759. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of W. I. Dooly; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 771. An act to provide for payment of pensions and compensation to certain persons who are receiving retired pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 862. An act for the relief of the Grafton Boat Works; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 950. An act for the relief of the Milford Trust Co. and Blanche R. Bennett, as administrators of the estate of Charles E. Reed, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 970. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

S. 1008. An act for the relief of Gerald G. Woods; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1169. An act for the relief of Samuel Margolin; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1246. An act for the relief of Ervin S. Finley; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1255. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark., and for other purposes," approved May 17, 1939; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1282. An act for the relief of Eric W. Rodgers; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1293. An act for the relief of Cleo Pickrell; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1309. An act for the relief of Pan American Airway, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1315. An act providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy of certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1336. An act to authorize the transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1346. An act for the relief of the R. B. Walker Funeral Home; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1347. An act to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942.

S. 1348. An act to amend the second paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1349. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York certain lands within the Brooklyn Navy Yard in the city of New York; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1354. An act to amend the act approved January 16, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United States Naval Academy"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1382. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 1386. An act making it a misdemeanor to stow away on aircraft and providing punishment therefor; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 123. An act to authorize a per capita payment of $10 to the members of the Santa Clara Pueblo of New Mexico from funds on deposit to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

H. R. 304. An act for the relief of J. E. Martin;

H. R. 305. An act for the relief of Howard Morgan;

H. R. 693. An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942;

H. R. 938. An act for the relief of Mrs. Robert C. Anderson;

H. R. 1222. An act for the relief of Jacob Wolozin;

H. R. 1869. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Cross to George F. Thompson;

H. R. 2250. An act to extend the provisions of the Reclassification Act of February 28, 1925, to include custodial employees in the Postal Service;

H. R. 2649. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.," approved April 20, 1942; and

H. R. 2734. An act for the relief of Kathleen B. Maier.

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 378. An act to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 18, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

848. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated April 28, 1943, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Boston Harbor, Mass., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on December 10, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

849. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualification therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service, for the period August 1, 1943, to September 30, 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

850. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Office for Emergency Management, War Production Board, fiscal year 1944 (H. Doc. No. 338); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

851. A letter from the Acting Chairman, War Production Board, transmitting a copy of the personnel requirements of the War Production Board for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1944, prepared in accordance with instructions of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

852. A letter from the Director, Office of Economic Stabilization, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of Economic Stabilization for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

853. A letter from the Secretary, the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in Europe, National Gallery of Art, transmitting copy of the report "Quarterly Estimate of

Personnel Requirements," called for by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget under Circular 421 dated May 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

854. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, transmitting two copies of a draft of a proposed bill regulating the commitment of insane persons to veterans, and other United States institutions and making applicable to Federal reservations certain State laws pertaining to administration of estates of decedents, guardianship of minors and insane persons, commitment of insane persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BUCKLEY: Committee on Pensions. H. R. 2350. A bill to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents; without amendment (Rept. No. 767). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 547. A bill for the relief of Kernan R. Cunningham; with amendment (Rept. No. 768). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SOUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2384. A bill for the relief of Frank A. McMenamin; with amendment (Rept. No. 769). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3064. A bill for the relief of Cleo Pickrell; with amendment (Rept. No. 770). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3098. A bill for the relief of Dr. H. H. Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 771). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3189. A bill for the relief of Thomas Lewis; without amendment (Rept. No. 772). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3299. A bill for the relief of Victor H. Loftus, disbursing clerk, American Embassy, Mexico, D. F., Mexico; without amendment (Rept. No. 773). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3329. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles H. Morhouse; with amendment (Rept. No. 774). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3330. A bill for the relief of R. B. Walker Funeral Home; without amendment (Rept. No. 775). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3331. A bill for the relief of Harry L. Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 776). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3332. A bill for the relief of Spencer Meeks; without amendment (Rept. No. 777). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 3448. A bill to provide an appropriation for the construction of the barge canal from the St. Johns River across Florida to the Gulf of Mexico authorized in Public Law 675, Seventy-seventh Congress, for the purpose of connecting the intracoastal waterways of the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic seaboard; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3449. A bill to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayments to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H. R. 3450. A bill relating to continuing the debtor in possession in certain reorganizations under the Bankruptcy Act of July 1, 1898, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 3451. A bill to provide for a jury trial with respect to the value of property condemned for certain flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3452. A bill to amend article 61 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 3453. A bill to provide for a jury trial with respect to the value of property condemned for certain flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 3454. A bill relating to overtime compensation prior to December 1, 1942, of certain per annum employees of the field services of the Department of War, the Panama Canal, the Department of the Navy, and the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 3455. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct a "T" tunnel as a means of communication and transportation between San Pedro, Wilmington, and Terminal Island, Calif.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3456. A bill to provide that retired Justices may serve on the Supreme Court of the United States when a quorum cannot be obtained because of the voluntary disqualification of one or more active Justices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3457. A bill to provide that the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 and the act of December 22, 1942, increasing the pay and allowances of Army and Navy nurses, shall take effect as of December 7, 1941; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 3458. A bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3459. A bill to authorize war bonus at time of discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3460. A bill to provide vocational training and college educations for veterans of the Second World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ARNOLD:

H. J. Res. 172. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the tenure of office of President and Vice President and Members of Congress to 6 years, and imposing certain limitations on the appointment or election of certain persons to office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution to enable soldiers to vote by proxy; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 3461. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amy Mulcahy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 3462. A bill for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Bertha Jacobs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 3463. A bill for the relief of Donna May McNulty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3464. A bill for the relief of Ralph W. Cooley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3465. A bill for the relief of Archie Berberian, Kurken Berberian, and Mrs. Osgetel Berberian; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 3466. A bill for the relief of the Mauger Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 3467. A bill for the relief of Miss Anne Watt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 3468. A bill for the relief of St. Vincent's Infirmary and Dr. Alvin W. Strauss; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 3469. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John E. McNellis; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3470. A bill for the relief of Maj. William T. Owens; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2877. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of J. M. Gailliot, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2878. Also, petition of Charles Lully, of Washington, D. C., and 16 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2879. Also, petition of Julius Lully, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2880. Also, petition of Charles A. Reed, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2881. Also, petition of Dorothy Throckmorton, of Washington, D. C., and 18 other citizens, protesting against the passage of

House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2882. Also, petition of Lillian Newson and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2883. Also, petition of Mrs. Fred Husmann and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2884. Also, petition of John D. Husing and 23 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2885. Also, petition of Mrs. L. Mandeville and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2886. Also, petition of the Oberjuerge Rubber Distributing Co., signed by five St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2887. Also, petition of the Ace Pattern Co. and signed by 15 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2888. Also, petition of John Rugger and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2889. Also, petition of Robert H. Brady and 24 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2890. Also, petition of H. Willenbrock and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2891. Also, petition of Joseph H. Buckholz and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2892. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of J. M. Sloan and others of Dubuque, Iowa, protesting against enactment of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2893. By Mr. POULSON: Petition of Neal D. Ireland and others, on the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2894. Also, petition of Jesse L. Luthi and others, urging the passage of House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2895. Also, petition of Rev. Robert B. Munger and others, favoring the passage of House bill 2032 prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2896. Also, petition of Ida Young and others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2897. Also, petition of Florence A. Babcock and others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2898. Also, petition of R. R. Detweiler and others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2899. Also, petition of Rev. Lowell C. Wendt and others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2900. Also, petition of R. E. Rose and others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2901. Also, petition of Rev. Robert E. Cordell and others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2902. By Mr. LEFEVRE: Petition of residents of Ulster, Greene, and Columbia Counties, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2903. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of Rev. James M. Dooley, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 31 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2904. Also, petition of William F. Woodard, of Pomono, Calif., and 39 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2905. Also, petition of Dr. C. E. Britton, of Alhambra, Calif., and 257 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2906. Also, petition of Alice Meyers, of Alhambra, Calif., and eight others urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2907. Also, petition of Gladys M. Jessup, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2908. Also, petition of Mrs. Daisy W. Howard, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2909. Also, petition of H. C. Scott, of Alhambra, Calif., and 12 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2910. Also, petition of Mary B. Sanborn, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2911. Also, petition of Mrs. H. S. Whiteman, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2912. Also, petition of Ida Belle Lenhart, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2913. Also, petition of Gordon W. McGreelcy, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2914. Also, petition of Gladys F. Fellows, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2915. Also, petition of Mrs. Oliver Wilson, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2916. Also, petition of Everett Ventrees, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2917. Also, petition of John S. Phelps, of Glendora, Calif., and 14 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2918. Also, petition of Edwin G. Sweet, of Glendora, Calif., and 11 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2919. Also, petition of Emma G. Wiff, of Glendora, Calif., and 11 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2920. Also, petition of Florence Nicholson, of South Pasadena, Calif., and 42 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2921. Also, petition of Mrs. J. M. Pearson, of Rosemead, Calif., and 14 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2922. Also, petition of Myrtle Farrar, of South Pasadena, Calif., and 17 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2923. Also, petition of Rev. J. Harvey Deere, of Alhambra, Calif., and 118 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2924. Also, petition of George T. Counts, of Altadena, Calif., and 19 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2925. Also, petition of Mabel L. K. Shireman, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2926. Also, petition of Sue TerMoot, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2927. Also, petition of Sydney E. Boyd, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2928. Also, petition of Saidee L. Culver, of Pomona, Calif., and 20 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2929. Also, petition of Etta Dunlap, of South Pasadena, Calif., and 30 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2930. Also, petition of Lottie E. Neher, of La Verne, Calif., and 284 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2931. Also, petition of Gertrude M. Reitz, of Monrovia, Calif., and 14 others urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2932. Also, petition of Mrs. Abbie Helms, of Whittier, Calif., and 39 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2933. Also, petition of Margaret I. Sheffey, and 52 others, of Whittier, Calif., urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2934. Also, petition of Mrs. Ivy C. Newland, of Wilmar, Calif., and 18 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2935. Also, petition of Laura M. Sanders, of Glendora, Calif., and 33 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2936. Also, petition of Margery E. Van Derpoel, of Wilmar, Calif., and 18 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2937. Also, petition of Ruth E. Lutz, of Wilmar, Calif., and 18 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2938. Also, petition of Beatrice M. Lolger, of Whittier, Calif., and 15 others, urging pas-

sage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2939. Also, petition of Lillian K. Church, of Whittier, Calif., and 12 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2940. Also, petition of Harriet B. Pyle, of Whittier, Calif., and 34 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2941. Also, petition of Arthur J. Morris, of Whittier, Calif., and 34 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2942. Also, petition of Rev. Galen K. Walker, of Glendora, Calif., and 53 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2943. Also, petition of Mrs. James F. Noble, of Alhambra, Calif., and 15 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2944. Also, petition of Shirley V. Tomkins, of Alhambra, Calif., and five others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2945. Also, petition of Miriam T. Knight, of Pasadena, Calif., and 22 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2946. Also, petition of R. J. Flanders, of Whittier, Calif., and 77 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2947. Also, petition of Olive A. Fitzgerald, of Whittier, Calif., and 36 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2948. Also, petition of Charles E. Johnson, of Whittier, Calif., and 28 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2949. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. A. M. Bell, of Whittier, Calif., and 33 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2950. Also, petition of Arline Lewis, of Glendora, Calif., and 43 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2951. Also, petition of Caroline L. Stone, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2952. Also, petition of Mrs. Wayne Hyde, of Whittier, Calif., and 21 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2953. Also, petition of Bernard Beck, of Montebello, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2954. By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Petition of Rev. Loy Snow and 42 other citizens of Terre Haute, Ind., urging Congress to pass House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic liquors for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2955. Also, petition of A. L. Watt and 76 other citizens of Hamilton County, Ind., urging Congress to pass House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic liquors for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2956. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Portland, Oreg., requesting the enactment of House bill 2082, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2957. By Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON: Petition with 1,151 signatures of citizens of the Fourteenth Congressional District, protesting against the moral and liquor conditions around the Army camps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2958. By Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of Sarah E. Ellsworth, Mrs. Charles Decker, and 193 other residents of Luzerne County, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by enacting prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2959. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of Joe Tessey, of Aberdeen, Wash., and 238 other citizens of Aberdeen, Hoquiam, and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2960. Also, petition of Peter Scure, of Aberdeen, Wash., and 119 other citizens of Aberdeen, Hoquiam, and vicinity, protesting passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2961. Also, petition of Christine Clark, of Hoquiam, Wash., and 119 other citizens of Hoquiam, Aberdeen, and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2962. Also, petition of D. N. Haydon, of Aberdeen, Wash., and 149 other citizens of Aberdeen and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2963. Also, petition of J. K. Sundstrom, of Aberdeen, Wash., and 189 other citizens of Aberdeen and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2964. Also, petition of J. C. Withrow, of Cosmopolis, Wash., and 29 other citizens of Cosmopolis and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2965. Also, petition of Burton Taylor, of Hoquiam, Wash., and 29 other citizens of Hoquiam and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2966. Also, petition of J. E. Owen, of Raymond, Wash., and 117 other citizens of Pacific and Grays Harbor Counties, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2967. Also, petition of W. G. Shumway, Raymond, Wash., and 29 other citizens of Raymond and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2968. Also, petition of Peter P. Perry, Raymond, Wash., and 29 other citizens of Raymond and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2969. Also, petition of Marius Eaton, Elma, Wash., and 83 other citizens of Elma and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2970. Also, petition of L. E. Jensen, Raymond, Wash., and 25 other citizens of Raymond and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2971. Also, petition of Ray Nouska, Aberdeen, Wash., and 119 other citizens of Aberdeen and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2972 Also, petition of D. I. George, McCleary, Wash., and 29 other citizens of McCleary and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2973. Also, petition of Rachel Miller, Raymond, Wash., and 16 other citizens of Raymond and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2974. Also, petition of Russell McCurdy, South Bend, Wash., and 29 other citizens of South Bend and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2975. Also, petition of Earl Biggs, Raymond, Wash., and 29 other citizens of Raymond and vicinity protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2976. Also, petition of Perry G. McGee, Montesano, Wash., and 58 other citizens of Montesano and vicinity protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860 or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2977. Also, petition of J. C. Winten, Montesano, Wash., and 29 other citizens of Montesano and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2978. Also, petition of W. E. Burkinshaw, Aberdeen, Wash., and 89 other citizens of Aberdeen and vicinity protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2979. Also, petition of L. L. Swaney, Bucoda, Wash., and 29 others protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2980. Also, petition of Fred Drebis, Centralia, Wash., and 59 others protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2981. Also, petition of T. Watson Ross, Shelton, Wash., and 29 others protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2982. Also, petition of W. B. Needham, Olympia, Wash., and 29 others, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860 or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2983. By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Petition of Society for Christian Service, First Methodist Church of Oneonta, N. Y., and 61 signers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2984. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Robinson's Tavern, Mokena, Ill., and 21 signers, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2985. By the SPEAKER: Petition of city and county clerk of the city and county of Honolulu, Hawaii, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to amending the immigration and naturalization laws so as to permit entry of Chinese into the United States and to grant them citizenship privileges; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2986. Also, petition of pastor, the Harlem Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Finnish-American Trade Union Committee; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 12, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Wiley J. Ferguson, of Wesson, Miss., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for the manifold blessings which Thou hast bestowed upon this great Nation. We are grateful for the ideals and benefits of the Christian democracy which we enjoy.

We come with humble hearts into Thy holy presence at this hour, O Father of all mercy, and pray that Thou wilt guide the Members of the Senate in the discharge of their duties.

Bless all the nations of the world and hasten the day when we shall have peace in keeping with Thy divine will. With faith in Thee we herald the coming of the new day of brotherhood throughout the world.

In this critical hour of the world's history we need Thee and the guidance which Thou alone canst give, O God of truth and justice and love and peace.

God be merciful unto us and bless us and cause His face to shine upon us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, October 14, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 128. An act to authorize a per capita payment of $10 to the members of the Santa Clara Pueblo of New Mexico from funds on deposit to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

H. R. 304. An act for the relief of J. E. Martin;

H. R. 305. An act for the relief of Howard Morgan;

H. R. 693. An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942;

H. R. 938. An act for the relief of Mrs. Robert C. Anderson;

H. R. 1222. An act for the relief of Jacob Wolozin;

H. R. 1869. An act authorizing the President to present in the name of Congress a Distinguished Service Cross to George F. Thompson;

H. R. 2250. An act to extend the provisions of the Reclassification Act of February 28, 1925, to include custodial employees in the Postal Service;

H. R. 2649. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.," approved April 20, 1942; and

H. R. 2734. An act for the relief of Kathleen B. Maier.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Danaher	Langer
Andrews	Davis	Lucas
Bailey	Downey	McCarran
Ball	Ellender	McClellan
Bankhead	Ferguson	McFarland
Barbour	George	McKellar
Bilbo	Gerry	McNary
Bridges	Gillette	Maloney
Brooks	Green	Maybank
Buck	Guffey	Mead
Burton	Gurney	Millikin
Bushfield	Hatch	Murdock
Butler	Hayden	Murray
Capper	Hill	Nye
Caraway	Holman	O'Daniel
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	O'Mahoney
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Colo.	Overton
Clark, Mo.	Kilgore	Pepper
Radcliffe	Taft	Wagner
Reed	Thomas, Idaho	Walsh
Reynolds	Thomas, Okla.	Wheeler
Russell	Thomas, Utah	Wherry
Scrugham	Tunnell	White
Shipstead	Tydings	Wiley
Smith	Vandenberg	Willis
Stewart	Van Nuys	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER] are absent attending the funeral of the late Representative Creal, of Kentucky.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has been confined to a Madison hospital since September 13, where he is now recovering from virus pneumonia.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent on official appointments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HIS EXCELLENCY, ELIE LESCOT, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF HAITI

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, His Excellency, Elie Lescot, President of the Republic of Haiti, is in the Vice President's Chamber and is about to visit the Senate as its guest. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess in order to greet the President of Haiti and to hear his address. I further ask that the Vice President appoint a committee to escort him to the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair appoints the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] as the committee to greet the President of Haiti and escort him into the Chamber.

Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate being in recess, at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.,

His Excellency, Elie Lescot, President of the Republic of Haiti, escorted by the

committee appointed by the Vice President, consisting of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], preceded by the Secretary of the Senate, Edwin A. Halsey, entered the Chamber, and took the place assigned him on the rostrum in front of the Vice President's desk.

The members of the party accompanying the President of Haiti, including Mr. Abel Lacroix, Secretary of State for Finance, Commerce and National Economy; Mr. Maurice Dartigue, Secretary of State for Public Instruction, Agriculture and Labor; Mr. Gontran Rouzier, Under Secretary of State for Information and General Police; Col. Durcé Armand, Commander of the Military Department of the National Palace; Mr. Daniel Heurtelou, Private Secretary to the President; Capt. Charles Lochard, Chief of the Military Household of the President; Lt. Roger Lescot, Special Adjutant to the President; His Excellency André Liautaud, Ambassador of Haiti; Col. A. B. Laroche, Military Attaché of Embassy; The Honorable John C. White, American Ambassador to Haiti; Brig. Gen. Eric S. Molitor, U. S. A., Military Aide; Capt. Andrew S. Hickey, U. S. N. (Ret.), Naval Aide, and Mr. Stanley Woodward, Assistant Chief, Division of Protocol, Department of State, entered the Chamber, and were escorted to the seats assigned them to the left of the Vice President's desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Members of the Senate, ladies and gentlemen, His Excellency, the President of Haiti.

[Applause, Senators and occupants of the galleries rising.]

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF HAITI

Messieurs les Sénateurs, c'est avec une profonde émotion que j'élève ma voix au sein de votre illustre Assemblée pour, en répondant à votre bienveillante invitation, vous apporter le salut cordial et sincère du Peuple Haitien dont je suis le Mandataire Constitutionnel.

Comme vous le savez, Messieurs, Haiti fait partie intégrante des Nations Unies qui luttent pour la sauvegarde des libertés humaines. Son bonheur le plus grand serait d'envoyer ses enfants s'aligner à côté des vôtres pour partager les sacrifices qu'ils consentent si généreusement à la cause du Droit et de la Justice. Les circonstances se sont cependant présentées de telle façon qu'il n'a point été jusqu'ici nécessaire que tous soient en première ligne, les armes à la main. Mais, il s'est avéré que, pour arriver à la victoire finale et complète sur les barbares du totalitarisme, il importait de réaliser la mobilisation industrielle et la mobilisation agricole intégrales.

C'est à cette dernière qu'ont répondu les hommes de mon Pays. Au nombre de près de 150,000, ils sont armés de pioches et de pelles, défrichant des terres propices et plantant des denrées stratégiques au profit des Nations Unies, particulièrement au profit des Etats-Unis d'Amérique. Nous arriverons bientôt à assurer des récoltes, jusque là jamais atteintes, de caoutchouc et de sisal. A la veille d'entreprendre ce présent voyage, j'ai signé un Décret dont l'économie est de pourvoir, proportionnellement à nos récoltes, au ravitaillement en vivres alimentaires des possessions américaines, anglaises et hollandaises du Bassin des Caraïbes.

Vous êtes, Messieurs, les dignes représentants d'un peuple puissant et généreux dont on peut dire qu'il est l'un des plus valeureux champions de la Liberté, cette liberté même qui est assurée par le sang de vos fils, les larmes des veuves et des orphelins, et pour la sauvegarde de laquelle vous nous trouverez toujours avec vous.

En cette circonstance solennelle, nous prenons plaisir à nous répéter, en vous disant que les moindres parcelles de notre territoire peuvent désormais être employées à la culture des denrées stratégiques si jamais pareille démarche s'avérait nécessaire. Lorsque nous avons permis aux forces américaines de pénétrer librement sur notre territoire en vue d'organiser une défense commune du Continent, c'est notre souveraineté même, dont nous sommes si jaloux, que nous avons mise au service de la noble cause pour laquelle vos sacrifices sont bornes.

Les descendants de ceux qui ont pris part à l'expédition de Géorgie, au siège de Savannah, à la capitulation de Yorktown, ont répondu présents depuis l'odieux attentat de "Pearl Harbour," ils sont a vos côtés aujourd'hui, comme hier le furent leurs pères. Rien de ce qui touche les Etats-Unis d'Amérique ne peut leur être indifférent.

Notre pacte d'amitié a été signé avec le sang de nos ancêtres versé sur les mêmes champs de bataille.

[Prolonged applause, Senators, distinguished visitors, and occupants of the galleries rising.]

The English translation of the address by the President of the Republic of Haiti is as follows:

Mr. President, honorable Senators, it is with the deepest of emotion that in response to your kind invitation I rise in the midst of this illustrious assembly to bring you the cordial and sincere greetings of the Haitian people, whose constitutional representative I have the honor to be.

As you know, honorable gentlemen, Haiti is an integral part of the United Nations, fighting together to safeguard our human liberties.

The height of Haiti's ambition would be to send its sons to take their place side by side with yours, to share the sacrifices they are so generously dedicating to the cause of right and justice.

The course of events, however, has been shaped in such a manner that it is not expedient for everyone to be in the line of combat. Nevertheless, it is an uncontested fact that final and complete victory over the barbarian forces of totalitarianism depends on the full mobilization of all the industrial and agricultural resources at our disposal.

It is to this latter call that the men of my country have responded. A vast army of 150,000 of them, armed with picks, spades, and other agricultural implements are clearing the lands suitable for the cultivation of strategic raw materials needed by the United Nations, more particularly the United States of America, and are now actually planting these lands.

Very soon we will be assured of harvests never reached before in such products as rubber and sisal.

On the eve of my departure from Haiti, it was my privilege to sign a decree law, the purpose of which is to enable us, by legislation, within the fullest limits of our production, to supply the American, British, and Dutch possessions in the Caribbean areas with vital supplies of staple food crops.

You are, honorable gentlemen, the worthy representatives of a generous and powerful people, a people ranking as one of the foremost champions of liberty, that same liberty now being preserved by the blood of your sons, the tears of their widows and orphans and for whose defense you will find me and my people always at your side.

On this solemn occasion we take pleasure in reaffirming anew that all or any part of our territory which can be devoted to the culture of these needed strategic raw materials, will be so devoted to whatever extent becomes necessary.

When we freely gave access to the American military forces to penetrate our territory in order to organize the common defense of this continent, it was our precious sovereignty, of which we are so fiercely jealous, that we placed at the service of the noble cause for which the American people are making such limitless sacrifices.

We, the sons of those who took part in the expedition to Georgia, in the siege of Savannah, leading to the surrender of Yorktown, have answered "Present" at the roll call made necessary by the infamous attack of Pearl Harbor, and so we are at your side today, as yesterday our forefathers were.

Never can we be indifferent to whatever concerns the United States of America, our pact of friendship having been signed with the blood of our ancestors shed on the same fields of battle.

Following his address, the President of Haiti and the distinguished visitors accompanying him were escorted from the Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m., the Senate reassembled, when it was called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. GILLETTE].

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 962. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Holehan, the Buffalo Insurance Co., and the Miller Insurance Co.; with amendments (Rept. No. 469).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1373. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico for school purposes a certain building and lot known as the Mayaguez Barracks

Military Reservation, now under the jurisdiction of the War Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 470).

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

S. Res. 185. Resolution to investigate the causes of, and means of relieving, the shortage of railroad cars for the transportation of grains in the Northwestern States (submitted by Mr. LANGER on October 4, 1943); with amendments (Rept. No. 471).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on October 14, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 378) to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1447 (by request). A bill to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayments to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 1448. A bill to clarify and define the constitutional rights of retired personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 637) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and myself, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by us to the pending bill, Senate bill 637, which is in the nature of a substitute for section 1 of the bill. I request that the amendment be printed. I think the Senate will not be able to vote on the bill today, and I should like to have the amendment printed in order that Senators may familiarize themselves with it. The amendment is to strengthen the provisions of section 1 of the bill, not to destroy or detract from it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS—RECISION OF ORDER TO PRINT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, yesterday I requested and obtained unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document the Covenant of the League of Nations. Today I learn that there are now in the Document Room of the Senate a great number of copies already printed of the Treaty of Peace with Germany, including the Covenant of the League of Nations in full, being Senate Document No. 49, Sixty-sixth Congress, first session. Therefore, in order to save duplication and waste, I now ask unanimous consent that the order made yesterday be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. I also suggest, Mr. President, that a copy of Senate Document No. 49, Sixty-sixth Congress, first session, be made available to each Member of the Senate.

A MORE PERFECT UNITED NATIONS: HOW AND WHEN?—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A More Perfect United Nations: How and When?" delivered by him in April 1943 before the forty-seventh annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, which appears in the Appendix.]

MORE FOR EVERYBODY OF EVERYTHING—ADDRESS BY EDMOND W. BROWN

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered at Riverhead, Long Island, N. Y., on October 13, 1943, by Edmond W. Brown, president, American Unity League, Inc., which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED SOCIAL-SECURITY LEGISLATION—ARTICLES BY FRED W. PERKINS

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a series of articles by Fred W. Perkins on the Wagner-Murray-Dingell social-security bill, which appear in the Appendix.]

COST OF PRODUCING MILK ON THE FARM AND THE PROPOSED MILK SUBSIDY

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a resolution in the form of an argument adopted by the delegates of the United Farmers' Cooperative Creamery Association, Inc., in annual meeting at Morrisville, Vt., October 8, 1943, dealing with the cost of producing milk on the farm and the proposed milk subsidy, which appears in the Appendix.]

JUST FOLKS—POEM BY EDGAR A. GUEST

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem by Edgar A. Guest entitled "Just Folks," which appears in the Appendix.]

WARREN OF CALIFORNIA—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW REPUBLIC

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Warren of California," published in the New Republic magazine for October 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

INVESTIGATION OF SHORTAGES OF GASOLINE, FUEL OIL, AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, the Special Committee to Investigate Shortages of Gasoline, Fuel Oil, and Petroleum Products last reported to the Senate on July 3, 1943.

At that time the committee told the Senate that the Nation could not count on any great improvement in fuel oil and gasoline conditions along the eastern seaboard. The committee recommended equalizing the burden of gasoline rationing between the east and other portions of the country if such equalization would result in more oil being brought to the Atlantic seaboard, so that people in all parts of this country could make equal contributions to the war effort. I am pleased to say that this recommendation has been acted upon by the Petroleum Administrator. I am sorry to say that our prediction concerning the amount of fuel oil and gasoline which would be available has unfortunately proven true. While it is not likely that we shall suffer as severely as we did last year, thanks to the vigorous efforts which have been made to correct conditions and to the wholly commendable attitude of officials in charge, who have been willing to recognize and correct their past mistakes, it is nonetheless perfectly clear that we are far from out of the woods.

The situation is now complicated by a shortage of coal. Both our distribution system and our mining facilities are falling short of the task. There have been reports in the press that coal may have to be rationed. One thing is clear. It is becoming increasingly difficult for small consumers to obtain deliveries.

Your committee has followed all of these developments carefully during the recess. We are now conferring with the officials in charge of the various phases of the fuel program, and we are scheduling a series of executive hearings with these officials in the hope of assisting them in dealing with the complex and difficult problems which they are now facing. The committee is probing into the coal shortage and into ways and means of distributing the available coal most equitably and plans an early hearing—we plan a hearing next week. The committee is attempting to obtain up-to-date data on the fuel oil and gasoline situation. We are attempting to ascertain what relief can be expected when the Mediterranean Sea is fully utilized to carry oil from the Middle East oil reserves to the battle fronts. In our recent report the committee stated that some relief might be expected from these developments in the Mediterranean, but cautioned that increased military requirements might more than offset the gain from the Middle East.

From time to time during this session, as in the past, the committee will continue to report to the Congress on the results of its investigations.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNOLLY] submitted a resolution known as the Post-War Peace Resolution. At the time when the resolution was submitted the able chairman of the committee said:

> I hope that the supporters of the so-called Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution will very seriously consider supporting this resolution. It is the best thing they can possibly get, and if they should offer their resolution, and it should be defeated, as it would be, there might ensue some inferences and suggestions which might not react very favorably in certain foreign quarters. This is a matter about which we ought to have harmony and unity. It is a matter that affects our relations with foreign countries, and no consideration other than the national welfare should be borne in mind.

As one of the supporters of the resolution to which the chairman of the committee referred as the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution, I want to assure

him, for myself, as I have no right to speak for anyone else, that most careful and serious consideration is being, and will be, given to the resolution he submitted.

I quite agree that the matter is one about which we ought to have harmony and unity. It is a matter which affects our relations with foreign countries, and no consideration other than the national welfare should be borne in mind. But Mr. President, I can say for myself and the other sponsors of Senate Resolution 114, that we have never had any consideration except the national welfare and the interests of our own country. We agree that those interests are paramount to any other concern or issue.

Yesterday I requested the chairman of the committee, Mr. CONNALLY, to permit us who sponsored another resolution to appear before the Committee on Foreign Relations at an early date and make certain suggestions which we hope will be favorably received. The Senator from Texas very graciously agreed that we should have the opportunity, and that it would be accorded as soon as possible.

Today I rise merely to say that we are as deeply concerned about harmony and unity as is any other Member of the United States Senate. Not only will we give the utmost consideration to the resolution offered by the Senator from Texas yesterday, but we have always been glad to listen to suggestions from any and every source. We have never believed that we had the final answer to the perplexing problems which confront the world today and which will grow more acute in the months which lie immediately ahead.

We strongly believe that the resolution offered yesterday could be made somewhat more specific and its meaning clarified, in line with exactly what I am sure the chairman of the committee has in mind, and also in accordance with the overwhelming belief and thought of this country.

When we appear before the committee we shall offer our suggestions in a spirit of helpfulness and with the desire to be of real service to our country, and perhaps to mankind. Today, therefore, I make the identical request which was made yesterday by the Senator from Texas, and express the hope that the Committee on Foreign Relations will seriously consider supporting the suggestions we shall make.

After all, we are all working and striving toward the same end for the same identical purpose, that is, that the Senate of the United States will take its full share of responsibility and obligation in trying to reach some plan, association, or agreement with other nations in the world, which will give mankind at least an opportunity for a just and lasting peace.

RELATIONSHIP OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on September 14 I made some remarks on the floor of the Senate which related to a compilation of figures furnished me by the Department of Labor. I said on that occasion that I would try to have the figures broken down. Yesterday I received a letter from the United States Department of Labor dated October 14. I ask that the letter, together with the table which was enclosed with it partially breaking down the statistics, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and the table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS,
Washington, October 14, 1943.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We have noted with interest your statements before the Senate on September 14, regarding the relationship of Federal and State and local governmental employment in several States. As the original source of most of the figures quoted, we should like to sumbit, if we may, the following additional information and data.

The attached table shows a partial breakdown of the Federal employment figures in which Mr. Lucas was interested. The data for the War Department include civilian employees at all types of stations including manufacturing arsenals, quartermaster depots, ordnance depots, air stations, signal stations, camps, ports of embarkation, and construction projects. The data for the Navy Department include all civilian employees including those at navy yards, aircraft factory, torpedo stations, ammunition depots, ordnance plants, training stations, operating bases, air stations, hospitals, supply and clothing depots. The figures for the War and Navy Departments, as well as those for all other departments and agencies, include manual workers as well as administrators, stenographers, and others on desk jobs. Of course, neither the War Department nor the Navy Department figures include employment in privately operated shipyards or airplane factories.

The figures which were referred to in the discussion as State and local employees actually represent employees of only the State governments and do not include employees of cities, counties, townships, and special districts within the respective States. For Wisconsin the figure shown in the table was only part of the employment of the State government. It did not include employees at the State educational institutions such as the University of Wisconsin at Madison, the State teachers colleges at Eau Claire, La Crosse, Milwaukee, Oshkosh, Platteville, River Falls, Stevens Point, Superior, and White Water, and the Stout Institute at Menomonie. Employment at these educational institutions amounts to approximately 4,500, and when added to the nonschool employees, raises the total Wisconsin State government employment to 12,300.

The attached table shows the total employees in State and local governments in the second column, and in the next two columns segregates employees of State governments from those of city, county, and township governments and special districts. It will be seen that employment in the Federal executive service exceeds total State and local governmental employment in four of the States quoted—California, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. All four of these States have large navy yards, ports of embarkation, and other important War and Navy Department establishments. The number of Federal employees was less than half the number of State and local public employees in four States—Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

If any further explanation of the figures is needed, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely,

A. F. HINRICHS,
Acting Commissioner of Labor Statistics.

Estimated employment in the executive branch of the U. S. Government and in State, city, county, and township governments, and special districts

State	Total	State and local[1]			Federal executive service[2 3]				
		Total State and local[3 4]	State government[5]	City, county, and township governments and special districts[4]	Total executive service	War Department	Navy Department	Post Office Department	Other
California	458,100	218,500	30,850	187,650	239,600	117,100	74,200	17,400	30,900
Indiana	111,800	75,400	11,900	63,500	36,400	17,900	3,900	6,800	7,800
Iowa	77,600	61,900	11,700	50,200	15,700	4,700	[6]	5,600	5,400
Louisiana	98,300	50,900	13,950	36,950	47,400	31,400	3,400	3,700	8,900
Massachusetts	257,500	127,800	21,350	106,450	129,700	50,800	53,400	13,600	11,900
Michigan	193,600	135,500	24,700	110,800	58,100	34,000	2,000	10,200	11,900
Missouri	124,200	73,200	12,700	60,500	51,000	25,600	800	11,800	12,800
Nebraska	54,500	34,100	5,700	28,400	20,400	10,100	200	4,300	5,800
Ohio	288,200	153,600	24,200	129,400	134,600	95,900	4,500	18,300	15,900
Pennsylvania	413,300	200,800	44,500	156,300	212,500	91,100	72,200	21,500	27,700
Tennessee	104,200	54,900	8,100	46,800	49,300	21,200	700	4,700	22,700
Virginia	176,900	57,200	17,000	40,200	119,700	27,900	72,600	5,200	14,000
Wisconsin	93,300	74,300	12,300	62,000	19,000	4,900	300	5,600	8,200
Wyoming	13,400	7,800	1,100	6,700	5,600	1,800	[6]	700	3,100

[1] Estimates for nonschool employees were based on data of the Bureau of the Census, and estimates for school employees on data of the U. S. Office of Education and the State, county, and municipal survey of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

[2] Estimates for the War and Navy Departments were based on reports as of December 1942 and March 1943, respectively, those for the Post Office Department on the retirement report to the U. S. Civil Service Commission of June 1940; data for the Selective Service System and U. S. Employment Service were estimated from reports for March 1943, and all other data were estimated from the report to the U. S. Civil Service Commission of June 1941. Data include force-account employment and fourth-class postmasters.

[3] Data are for May 1943.

[4] Figures exclude part-time employees of cities of fewer than 5,000 and townships of fewer than 10,000 inhabitants because such employees usually work only a nominal amount of time for which they receive only nominal amounts of pay.

[5] Data are for January 1943 except those for the State of Wisconsin which are for April 1943.

[6] Fewer than 50 persons.

SURPLUSES IN STATE TREASURIES

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point statistics furnished me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, on the surpluses in our State treasuries.

There being no objection, the statistics were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DATA OF SURPLUS IN STATE TREASURIES, 1943

Any data on Government surpluses must be interpreted with an understanding of both the lack of general agreement on a definition

of 'surplus' and the complexity of the financial structure of many States. (Bureau of the Census.)

The figures here presented are variously designated as general fund surpluses, highway fund surpluses, surpluses, excess revenues, balances, cash excess, post-war funds, War bond purchases, temporary investments, etc. Obviously they are not all talking about the same thing. It should be noted also that such designations as "balance" may not take into consideration outstanding obligations against the balance. The same is true of "cash excess." "Investments" may include sinking fund investments, which really should not be included as surplus. Many other possibilities may be suggested.

Bearing in mind the above qualifications, the total surplus in the States, derived by adding the data below, amounts to approximately $1,000,000,000.

Alabama: The contemplated general-fund surplus for year ending September 30, 1943, was estimated at $4,476,739. The special education trust fund was expected to contain a $14,702,327 surplus. (Commercial and Financial Chronicle, August 16, 1943, p. 621.) Surplus moneys as of September 11, 1943, totaled $44,161,526.09 in cash and bonds.

Arizona: Excess revenues for the year ending June 30, 1942, totaled $1,872,302. The estimated surplus for the 1943 fiscal year was $314,000. (Moody's Governments, February 6, 1943, p. 1433; Bureau of the Census, State Finances, State Budgets for 1944 and 1945, p. 14.)

Arkansas: Total balances for regular State and special funds on June 30, 1943, amounted to $36,861,607.17. (Commercial and Financial Chronicle, September 27, 1943, p. 1287.)

California: General fund cash excess on August 31, 1943, was $96,564,615, exclusive of $25,000,000 appropriated for a war-catastrophe fund. (Commercial and Financial Chronicle, September 27, 1943, p. 1287.)

Colorado: A general fund surplus of $4,800,000 and an institutions building fund surplus of $1,500,000 are on hand to meet post-war needs. (Wall Street Journal, September 2, 1943.)

Connecticut: Accumulated general fund surplus (probably as of June 30, 1943) was $16,469,468. (Commercial and Financial Chronicle, September 27, 1943, p. 1287.)

Delaware: Although regular receipts for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943, exceeded budgeted expenditures by $151,097.72, the budget may not be balanced for the next 2 fiscal years. (Commercial and Financial Chronicle, September 13, 1943, p. 1080.)

Florida: Florida began its new fiscal year July 1, 1943, with an estimated general fund balance of $1,300,000. (Moody's Governments, July 14, 1943, p. 1275.)

Georgia: Current cash surplus on hand June 30, 1943, was $8,368,219.81. After taking into consideration $6,881,895.17, State funds needed to complete highway contracts, the State had a $1,486,324.64 surplus. (Commercial and Financial Chronicle, August 2, 1943, p. 442.)

Idaho: Estimated surplus at end of last fiscal year, $130,000. (Bureau of the Census, State Finances, State Budgets, 1944 and 1945, p. 14.)

Illinois: Fiscal year ended June 30, 1943, closed with a balance of $66,052,470 in the State treasury's general fund. Most of this balance has been invested. Total investments (including balances in funds other than the general revenue fund) totaled $78,000,000. (Commercial and Financial Chronicle, August 2, 1943, p. 442.)

Indiana: Estimated cash balance for fiscal year ended June 30, 1943, was $26,386,022. (Moody's Governments, February 6, 1943, p. 1455.)

Iowa: The balance in all State funds amounted to $54,190,057 on June 30, 1943. The general fund balance was $11,284,790. (Moody's Governments, July 10, 1943, p. 1279.)

Kansas: Approximately $9,750,000 surplus in general fund. (Commercial and Financial Chronicle, September 6, 1943, p. 993.)

Kentucky: Not available.

Louisiana: Expected deficit fiscal year 1944 of $16,818,000. (Bureau of the Census, State Finances, State Budgets for 1944 and 1945, p. 14.)

Maine: Eight million nine hundred thousand dollars surplus estimated for fiscal year 1943. (Bureau of the Census, State Finances, State Budgets for 1944 and 1945, p. 14.)

Maryland: General fund surplus on June 30, 1943, was $12,600,932. (Moody's Governments, September 1, 1943, p. 1217.)

Massachusetts: General fund surplus on June 30, 1943, was $3,462,255. Highway surplus was $6,400,000. (Wall Street Journal, September 2, 1943.)

Michigan: Surplus in general operating funds approximated $35,000,000 on June 30, 1943, and all accumulated surplus up to $50,000,000 is being set aside for the post-war period. (Wall Street Journal, September 2, 1943.)

Minnesota: Balances in three major State funds as of June 30, 1943, were as follows: General revenue fund—$6,590,368; trunk highway fund—$12,339,034; income tax school fund—$12,464,793. (Commercial and Financial Chronicle, September 13, 1943, p. 1082.)

Mississippi: Treasury in September 1943 had surplus of $20,298,482, which is expected to reach $25,000,000 by June 30, 1944. A special or trust fund surplus equaled $6,342,632 on June 30, 1943. (Moody's Governments, July 7, 1943, p. 1283; Commercial and Financial Chronicle, September 20, 1943, p. 1184.)

Missouri: Expected deficit of $67,000 for 1943 fiscal year. (Bureau of the Census, State Finances, State Budgets for 1944 and 1945, p. 14.)

Montana: Expected surplus for year ended June 30, 1943, was $15,527,000. (Bureau of the Census, State Finances, State Budgets for 1944 and 1945, p. 14.)

Nebraska: Five million dollars has been accumulated for highway construction and for buildings. There is also a general fund balance of $3,000,000. (Wall Street Journal, September 2, 1943.)

Nevada: Not available.

New Hampshire: Current surplus for year ended June 30, 1943, was $8,488,691. (Commercial and Financial Chronicle, October 4, 1943, p. 1391.)

New Jersey: General fund closed its year on June 30, 1943, with a surplus of $1,000,000. Highway fund will close its year on December 31, 1943, with a balance of nearly $3,000,000. (Wall Street Journal, September 2, 1943.)

State ends year with cash balance of $4,974,943. (Moody's Governments, July 7, 1943, p. 1283.)

New Mexico: A post-war fund now totaling $614,000 is being built up. (Wall Street Journal, September 2, 1943.)

New York: A $69,000,000 surplus was on hand June 30, 1943, ready to meet post-war hazards. (Wall Street Journal, September 2, 1943.)

North Carolina: Combined surplus on July 1, 1943, amounted to $73,286,387, accumulated in three separate funds as follows: $39,370,633 in general fund; $33,379,378 in the highway fund; $536,376 in the agricultural fund. (Moody's Governments, August 11, 1943, p. 1241.)

North Dakota: The general fund balance is now nearly double its size in 1942. About $500,000 is now available under appropriations for post-war planning and rehabilitation. A reserve fund of $1,000,000 (half of it already on hand) is to be set aside to aid returned servicemen. (Wall Street Journal, September 2, 1943.)

Ohio: Surplus in general fund per year ended December 31, 1942, was $45,000,000. The next biennium is expected to add $35,000,000 to this sum. (Commercial and Financial Chronicle, October 4, 1943, p. 1393.)

Oklahoma: Surplus for year ended June 30, 1943, was $7,605,293. An additional surplus of at least $8,000,000 is expected for the year ending June 30, 1944. (Commercial and Financial Chronicle, October 4, 1943, p. 1393.)

Oregon: $5,000,000 will be allocated from surplus to school districts for property-tax reductions. Another $5,000,000 will go into a post-war tax-relief cushion. Oregon is also reducing bonded indebtedness this year by about $5,000,000. (Wall Street Journal, September 2, 1943.)

Pennsylvania: On May 31, 1943, Pennsylvania had a surplus of $18,000,000. Revenue for the 1944–45 biennium is expected to exceed expenditures by $25,000,000. This surplus will be available for post-war demands, and in addition there will be a motor-license fund surplus of at least $50,000,000. (Wall Street Journal, September 2, 1943.)

Rhode Island: The State's surplus now is $4,400,000, not counting a public-assistance reserve fund of $1,300,000. (Wall Street Journal, September 2, 1943.)

South Carolina: Expected surplus at close of 1943 fiscal year placed at $7,323,000. (Bureau of the Census, State Finances, State Budgets 1944 and 1945, p. 14.)

South Dakota: Surplus at end of 1943 fiscal year expected to be $3,099,000. (Bureau of the Census, State Finances, State Budgets 1944 and 1945, p. 14.)

Tennessee: A total of $34,000,000 in general, highway, and sinking funds was available as of June 30, 1943, as reserve for after-war shocks. (Wall Street Journal, September 2, 1943.)

Texas: War bond purchases of State governmental accounts total $70,207,370. Included in this sum are purchases from $10,000,000 surplus highway funds, $4,000,000 of permanent school money, and $3,025,000 of University of Texas made on September 9, 1943. (Commercial and Financial Chronicle, September 20, 1943, p. 1186.)

Utah: The State had a cash balance of $13,700,000 on June 30, 1943. (Wall Street Journal, September 2, 1943.)

Vermont: State ended fiscal year closing June 30, 1943, with unappropriated surplus of $1,176,664.29 and a total of $5,440,998.13 in cash and temporary investments. (Commercial and Financial Chronicle, August 23, 1943, p. 729.)

Virginia: State has invested $15,000,000 in short-term bonds and in addition has a current balance in Treasury of $17,966,000. (Commercial and Financial Chronicle, September 27, 1943, p. 1292.)

Washington: Outstanding general obligation debt is entirely offset by assets in sinking fund. Cash surplus at end of July 1943 stood at $63,000,000. (Wall Street Journal, September 2, 1943.)

West Virginia: There was a $12,111,198 balance in general fund on June 30, 1943, of which $10,091,505 was an unencumbered cash surplus. (Commercial and Financial Chronicle, September 20, 1943, p. 1187.)

Wisconsin: Had a balance of $7,766,275 in its general fund on September 1, 1943, exclusive of a $19,998,894 investment in United States bonds. The State had a total balance in all its various funds of $31,456,871, exclusive of Government bond investment, on September 1, 1943. (Commercial and Financial Chronicle, October 4, 1943, p. 1396.)

Wyoming: Is building up a small surplus. (Wall Street Journal, September 2, 1943.)

BONDED DEBT OF UNITED STATES CITIES

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, bearing on the question of of the capacity of States and cities to pay their own educational bill, the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] has presented an official compilation showing the balances in the State general funds. I now present an article entitled "Bonded Debt of 290 United States Cities as at January 1,

1943," published in the National Municipal Review for June 1943, showing that after 6 years of continuously declining debt, American cities of over 30,000 population report the greatest annual decrease in their history. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BONDED DEBT OF 290 UNITED STATES CITIES AS AT JANUARY 1, 1943—MUNICIPALITIES REPORT GREATEST DEBT REDUCTION IN THEIR HISTORY; NEW FIGURES SHOW 3 PERCENT DECLINE IN GROSS BONDED DEBT OVER LAST YEAR

(By Rosina Mohaupt, Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research, Inc., and School of Public Affairs and Social Work, Wayne University)

After 6 years of continuously declining debt, American cities over 30,000 population report the greatest annual decrease in their history. The estimated gross bonded debt of the 343 cities over 30,000 as of January 1, 1943, was $8,492,000,000. This represents a decrease of 3 percent below last year, or from $171 to $166.75 per capita, roughly one-fifth of the Federal per capita debt of $814.50.

Eliminating New York City because of its disproportionate size, the remaining 279 cities studied in 1942 and 1943 report a reduction in gross debt of $216,100,000, or 4 percent in the last year. This is a reduction of $5.47 per capita and is the largest decrease in debt reported since 1923. Net debt, excluding utilities, dropped $159,500,000 in the last year, which is $4.04 per capital or 4.7 percent.

Indications of this tendency were first noticed in the early thirties, but actual reductions in the total outstanding debt were not reported until 1935. Slight reversals in the trend were observed in the next two years, but since 1937 there has been a marked decline in debt at a rate which has been definitely accelerating.

This trend derives in large measure from the part taken by the Federal Government in the financing of local capital improvements during the depression and the present inability of local government to undertake improvements because of war restrictions. The policy adopted for the financing of post-war programs will do much to accelerate or counteract this trend.

Over the 5-year period, 1938 to 1943, the gross debt of the 240 cities reporting increased by one-half of one percent due to the extreme influence of New York City. When this undue influence is eliminated the gross debt dropped 10 percent over this period. The net debt, excluding utilities, decreased by 13.3 percent over the 5-year period.

The 4 cities over 1,000,000 population, except New York City, have shown the greatest reduction in debt over the last 5 years, but apparently are having difficulty in maintaining this enviable record. They were able to reduce their net debt only 2.8 percent in the past year in comparison with the 4.7 percent average reduction for all cities. The per capita net debt of these cities dropped $2.84, from $101.56 in 1942 to $98.72 in 1943.

The 9 cities between 500,000 and 1,000,000 population show substantial reductions in debt again this year, the percentage decrease for this year and last year remaining constant at 5.5 percent. Their reduction in debt over the past 5 years was 16.6 percent, second only to that of cities over 1,000,000.

Medium-sized cities, between 250,000 and 500,000 (Group III) again report a decrease in debt this year approximately equivalent to the average decrease for all cities—4.8 percent. This group reported the smallest 5-year decrease—only half of the 13 percent average decrease for all cities.

The smaller cities, between 30,000 and 250,000, show much improvement over last year in their debt reduction record. These cities which fall into population groups IV, V, and VI show reductions in net debt of 5.8 percent, 4.6 percent, and 6.4 percent, respectively, equal to or greater than the average for all cities of 4.7 percent. Last year these cities were considerably below the general average in their debt decrease. They have roughly maintained an average debt reduction program over the 5-year period.

METHODS OF TABULATION

1. Population groups

In the tabulations following this article cities are classified into population groups to conform with the break-down used by the Division of Population of the Bureau of the Census with the exception of group VI cities. The Bureau of the Census defines group VI cities as those between 25,000 and 50,000 population. In this tabulation, cities below 30,000 are not studied. Group I includes cities over 1,000,000; group II, cities between 500,000 and 1,000,000; group III, cities between 250,000 and 500,000; group IV, cities between 100,000 and 250,000; group V, cities between 50,000 and 100,000; group VI as defined above.

2. Debt of ad hoc units

The debt tabulated represents bonds issued in the name of the municipality except as indicated in footnotes. Where ad hoc units of government—such as school districts, park districts, sanitation districts, etc.—administer functions ordinarily performed by the city, the city's pro rata share of the debt of such districts is included with city debt as explained by the footnotes. The city's pro rata share is computed on the basis of the relative proportions of the assessed valuation of the district lying within and outside of the city limits.

3. Overlapping debt

Overlapping debt is not compiled in this tabulation except as indicated in the footnotes. In a few instances, notably in the larger cities, a combined city-county government makes it impossible to accurately report city debt. In such cases, no attempt is made to estimate the city and county portions of the debt. The total debt is reported and the situation is explained in the footnote.

4. Special assessment debt

Special assessment debt, except in a very few instances indicated in the footnotes, has not been included in the total or per capita debt figures. The last two columns of the tabulation show the amount of such debt and indicate what portion of it is backed by the full faith and credit of the city.

5. Per capita net debt

The per capita debt is net debt excluding all utilities and is computed on the basis of the 1940 census. Before 1939 the per capita debt excluding self-supporting utilities was reported, but the determination of whether a utility was self-supporting or not was complicated by so many varying factors in different cities and from year to year that it was decided to deduct all utilities. Adjustments have been made for this in the 5-year comparisons shown in this discussion.

6. Public utilities

For the purposes of this study a utility has been defined as a commercial enterprise operated by a unit of government, performing a service entirely outside the scope of purely governmental functions, serving the city as a whole rather than any small group, and earning a portion or all of its overhead, operating, and debt charges from revenues based on a rate structure. Water, light and power, gas, street, street railway, rapid transit, port and harbor facilities, docks, sewage disposal plants, and housing fall within the scope of this definition. Public-service enterprises such as golf courses, swimming pools, stadiums, convention halls, and airports are not included as public utilities. While such enterprises are often entirely or partially self-supporting, debt incurred to finance them is included with general public improvement debt.[1]

7. Method of compilation

Data for this compilation were gathered from questionnaires mailed to public officials, research bureaus, chambers of commerce, and other civic organizations in the 343 cities over 30,000 population. The Detroit bureau of governmental research wishes to acknowledge the cooperation of these agencies in making possible this compilation.

The author wishes to acknowledge the assistance of Miss Arla Weinert in gathering and summarizing the figures reported herein.

(See following pages for complete tabulations.)

TABLE I.—*Annual debt reduction in American cities (excluding New York City)*

Period	Decrease in gross debt		Decrease in net debt less utilities	
	Per capita	Percentage	Per capita	Percentage
1942-43	$5.47	4.0	$4.04	4.7
1941-42	3.63	2.6	3.72	4.1
1940-41	3.78	2.6	3.05	3.3
1939-40	1.01	.7	2.00	2.0
1938-39	1.43	.9	1.35	1.4
1937-38	1.59	1.0	1.84	1.7
1936-37	+.40	+.2	1.27	1.2

TABLE II.—*Total gross and net bonded debt less utilities—1942-43—280 comparable American cities (in million dollars)*

Population group [1]	Number of cities	Gross bonded debt		Net bonded debt less utilities	
		1943	1942	1943	1942
I	5	4,471	4,544	1,711	1,751
I [2]	4	1,483	1,544	835	859
II [3]	8	872	897	498	527
III	23	1,126	1,174	723	759
IV	52	837	873	550	584
V	83	568	595	417	437
VI [4]	109	324	344	232	248
Total	280	8,198	8,427	4,132	4,307
Total [2]	279	5,210	5,426	3,255	3,415

[1] For upper and lower limits of population groups, see discussion.
[2] Excluding New York City.
[3] Does not include Washington, D. C., which has no debt.
[4] Cities between 25,000 and 30,000 not included in this study. See discussion.

TABLE III.—*Per capita decrease in gross and net debt less utilities, 1942-43—280 comparable American cities*

Population group [1]	1940 population (000 omitted)	Gross bonded debt			Net bonded debt less utilities		
		1943	1942	Decrease	1943	1942	Decrease
		Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.
I	15,911	281.00	285.66	4.66	107.57	110.04	2.47
I [2]	8,456	175.37	182.55	7.18	98.72	101.56	2.84
II [3]	5,794	150.45	154.82	4.37	85.91	91.00	5.09
III	7,828	143.88	149.96	6.08	92.40	97.02	4.62
IV	7,444	112.47	117.31	4.84	73.93	78.45	4.52
V	5,741	98.90	103.55	4.65	72.69	76.20	3.51
VI [4]	4,226	76.70	81.35	4.65	54.89	58.65	3.76
Total	46,943	174.64	179.51	4.87	88.02	91.75	3.73
Total [2]	39,488	131.94	137.41	5.47	82.44	86.48	4.04

[1] For upper and lower limits of population groups, see discussion.
[2] Excluding New York City.
[3] Does not include Washington, D. C., which has no debt.
[4] Cities between 25,000 and 30,000 not included in this study. See discussion.

[1] For a more detailed discussion of public utility debt see The Bonded Debt of 289 Cities as at January 1, 1939, National Municipal Review June 1939.

TABLE IV.—*Percentage decrease in debt over 1-year and 5-year periods*

Population group [1]	1942–43 decrease			1938–43 decrease		
	Number of cities	Gross debt	Net debt less utilities	Number of cities	Gross debt	Net debt less utilities
		Percent	*Percent*		*Percent*	*Percent*
I	5	1.6	2.2	5	+9.7	6.9
I [2]	4	3.9	2.8	4	12.4	17.7
II [3]	*8	2.8	5.6	8	12.3	16.6
III	23	4.1	4.8	23	5.7	6.2
IV	52	4.1	5.8	51	7.5	12.4
V	83	4.5	4.6	72	10.7	11.0
VI [4]	109	5.7	6.4	81	13.6	15.4
Total	280	2.7	4.1	240	+.5	9.6
Total [2]	279	4.0	4.7	239	10.1	13.3

[1] For upper and lower limits of population groups, see discussion.
[2] Excluding New York City.
[3] Does not include Washington, D. C., which has no debt.
[4] Cities between 25,000 and 30,000 not included in this study. See discussion.

TABLE V.—*Total gross and net bonded debt less utilities—1938–43—240 comparable American cities (in million dollars)*

Population group [1]	Number of cities	Gross bonded debt		Net bonded debt less utilities	
		1943	1938	1943	1938
I	5	4,471	4,074	1,711	1,837
I [2]	4	1,483	1,695	835	1,015
II [3]	8	872	993	498	597
III	23	1,126	1,194	723	771
IV	51	823	890	540	617
V	72	505	566	375	421
VI [4]	81	239	277	174	205
Total	240	8,036	7,993	4,021	4,449
Total [2]	239	5,047	5,613	3,145	3,626

[1] For upper and lower limits of population groups, see discussion.
[2] Excluding New York City.
[3] Does not include Washington D. C., which has no debt.
[4] Cities between 25,000 and 30,000 not included in this study. See discussion.

TABLE VI.—*Per capita decrease in gross and net debt less utilities, 1938–43—240 comparable American cities*

Population group [1]	1940 population (000 omitted)	Gross bonded debt			Net bonded debt less utilities		
		1943	1938	Decrease	1943	1938	Decrease
		Dol.	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*	*Dol.*
I	15,911	281.00	256.05	+24.95	107.57	115.49	7.92
I [2]	8,456	175.37	200.28	24.91	98.72	120.00	21.28
II [3]	5,794	150.45	171.46	21.01	85.91	103.06	17.15
III	7,828	143.88	152.56	8.68	92.40	98.47	6.07
IV	7,336	112.15	121.26	9.11	73.68	84.12	10.44
V	5,045	100.10	112.09	11.99	74.26	83.47	9.21
VI [4]	3,283	72.77	84.24	11.47	52.88	62.50	9.62
Total	45,196	177.79	176.85	+.94	88.97	98.43	9.46
Total [2]	37,741	133.74	148.72	14.98	83.32	96.07	12.75

[1] For upper and lower limits of population groups, see discussion.
[2] Excluding New York City.
[3] Does not include Washington, D. C., which has no debt.
[4] Cities between 25,000 and 30,000 not included in this study. See discussion.

FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 637) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. HILL obtained the floor.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. At this time I desire to make a statement for the RECORD expressing my views on the measure now pending before the Senate. The statement will be very brief.

Education is primarily the function of the States. It is so closely related to the home and to community ideals that the development of individuality and character can best be accomplished only if control of educational processes is vested in the States. The encroachment of Federal Government into this field, best served by an unhampered State, should be resisted at all times.

It is true that the framers of the pending bill providing for Federal grants-in-aid to the States for purported relief in educational hardship cases have attempted to safeguard for the present against any interference by Federal Government with the operation of State educational processes.

The bill, however, authorizes the United States Commissioner of Education to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to facilitate its administration. It provides for annual reports to Congress giving an account of all moneys received and allocated by the Commissioner of Education under this act. The Federal Office of Education is at once raised from a $159,808,920 institution to a $459,808,920 institution, and the Congress is obligated, if it does its duty, to make an annual examination into the affairs of education in each State. It is not necessary to add that the present staff of the Office of Education will be augmented by a similar amount if the bill is enacted and is carried out in practice.

It has become a fixed principle, lately sustained by judicial opinion, that the authority to subsidize carries with it the power to regulate. The sponsors of nearly every one of our myriads of governmental-aid agencies disclaimed any intention of regulation. As a Washington newspaper said this week:

> The first Federal farm subsidies were without strings. But it wasn't long till Washington was telling farmers what to plant and how to reap.
>
> The first Federal relief grants permitted State and local governments to distribute and spend the money. Remember F. E. R. A. and C. W. A.? And remember how quickly they were followed by W. P. A., under which Washington told what leaves were to be raked and what ditches dug, determined what workers should be employed, at what wages and for what hours, and even tried to dictate how the workers should vote.
>
> So it would be with Federal school subsidies. Washington very soon would be telling the school boards what teachers to hire, telling the teachers what to teach—and trying to tell them how to vote.
>
> It's as inescapable as the law of gravity: Who has the purse holds the power.

This, in the light of experience, is the real reason to fear that the present measure, no matter how well safeguarded it may be, would be the initial step toward Federal regulation and regimentation of education. School units which become dependent on Federal grants would become numbed to the danger of Federal regulation if they should be threatened with loss of this support. Gradually they would lose their sovereignty in their home field, and local ideals and desires would be subordinated to the plans of a powerful and distant socialized influence. This danger is too great to be justified by the advantages which the present tender of aid would afford.

Of course, the war has produced hardships on our school system, and it has worked hardship in that great body of unselfish and patriotic servants—the public-school teachers. No function of our society and few groups of our citizens have not been called upon to sacrifice. These hardships must be borne by both the State and the citizen, rather than to attempt to alleviate them by sacrificing the basic principles under which our society operates.

The pending measure cannot be justified from an economic standpoint. From every nook and corner of our land come protests over the staggering burden of taxation which our Federal Government has already imposed, and against the greater burden now proposed. The representatives of the people have a responsibility to oppose all avoidable new expenditures. This request to add nearly a third of a billion dollars to the Federal tax or debt load is not consistent with the protestations of economy which so many of us have expressed. In the face of a balance of over $26,000,000 in the general fund of my own State of Indiana, knowing that my State is abundantly able to carry her own burden, my judgment directs me to vote against the pending measure.

Notwithstanding the intended advantages of the bill for the cause of education and morality, always potent objectives in the American way of living, my conscience forces me to conclude that the greater good lies in an unhampered State control of the education of our future citizens.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a telegram addressed to me by the Nevada Taxpayers' Association, bearing on the subject of the pending measure, Senate bill 637. I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an able editorial from the October 12, 1943, issue of the Reno Evening Gazette, an outstanding publication in Nevada, bearing on the same subject.

There being no objection, the telegram and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RENO, NEV., *October 9, 1943.*

HON. PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urgently request your opposition S. 637, public school subsidy bill and we wholeheartedly endorse action and resolutions submitted previously by Nevada State officials

and public bodies and private organizations which advanced arguments substantiating such opposition from standpoints of taxation and sound public policy.

NEVADA TAXPAYERS' ASSOCIATION.

[From the Reno Evening Gazette of October 12, 1943]

SENATE BILL 637

There is no doubt concerning Nevada sentiment on the bill pending in the Senate to appropriate $300,000,000 annually to pave the way for Federal subsidizing of education.

Directors of the Nevada Taxpayers' Association constitute the most recent local group to express unalterable opposition to the proposal contained in Senate bill 637. Similar opposition has previously been expressed in statements and resolutions from the Reno school board, State board for vocational education, State board of education, the Reno Chamber of Commerce, Gov. E. P. Carville, and the State superintendent of public instruction.

The proposal, which has been discussed editorially on this page before, would authorize the somewhat sizable appropriation to assist the States and Territories "in more adequately financing their system of public education during emergencies, and reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools."

Innocuous as those objectives appear, this plan would pave the way for practically complete Federal control of education. As Governor Carville pointed out in a statement last June:

"It is entirely probable that in future years the Federal Government would insist that since it appropriated the moneys it should direct how they be spent. The risk of such a condition arising would be forever present."

And at risk of being accused of stressing the financial side of this issue, we might point out that it would cost the people of Nevada $354,000 annually for $166,000 benefit. Those are amounts derived from figuring the contributions through income tax payments as compared with the proposed State allocations.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, yesterday I presented from the Committee on Education and Labor minority views on the current bill, Senate bill 637, signed by the Senator from Massuchusetts [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and myself. I am now authorized to state that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] concur in the minority views. I was unable to reach them yesterday, at the time when we wished to have the views printed in order that they might be available today.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, have the minority views been printed?

Mr. TAFT. In answer to the Senator from Massachusetts, let me say that the minority views have been printed and are on the desk of every Senator.

THE NECESSITY FOR THE ENACTMENT OF THE EDUCATIONAL FINANCE ACT OF 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I assume that there is no Member of the United States Senate who does not believe that the schools of this Nation are essential to the political stability and development, the economic welfare, the cultural attainment, and the promotion of the general welfare of our Nation and all its people. As a basis for the discussion of the bill under consideration, I would, however, have my colleagues and the citizens of the Nation reflect with me on a few of the elemental truths as to the fundamental place of education and of our educational system in the structure of this Nation, its political institutions, and its economic well-being.

POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY AND EQUAL EDUCATION

The national interest in public education arises from the very nature of our form of government. Ours is a government in which sovereignty resides in the people. The fundamental instrument of policy and control is the popular ballot based upon the suffrage of the people. Such a government must depend upon the degree of enlightenment and the loyalty of the masses of the people. Public education is the agency through which the citizens of the democratic nation are given the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and the will to serve effectively the ideals, aspirations, and institutions of the constitutional republic.

The public-school system is the agency through which the democratic state undertakes to perpetuate itself.

CITIZENSHIP—NATIONAL AND STATE

Ours is a Nation in which the people exercise a dual sovereignty. On the one hand, they are citizens of the Nation exercising their powers through the Federal Government, and on the other hand they are citizens of a State, a part of an indissoluble union, exercising their powers through State and local governments. But it should be remembered that a citizen of a sovereign State is nonetheless a citizen of the Nation. In times of crisis such as we now face, it is perfectly obvious that national citizenship takes precedence over State or local citizenship. At all times the Nation, along with the States, must interest itself in the education of its future citizens.

EDUCATION, THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, AND THE CONSTITUTION

According to the Declaration of Independence, one of the unalienable rights of man is the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. But the pursuit of happiness will be a very uneven race in life for those of our people who are denied the blessings of a free public-school education.

Scarcely any of the objectives of our Constitution, "to form a more perfect union, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity," is possible without the means of education equally available to all citizens of the Nation.

STATESMEN ON EDUCATION

It was George Washington who first advocated the establishment of a national university, and he dedicated a part of his personal fortune to that end. In his Farewell Address he admonished the Nation as a whole, not merely the individual States, to—

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion be enlightened.

It was he who said:

In a country like this * * * if there cannot be money found for education there is something amiss in the ruling political power.

Thomas Jefferson was the first American statesman to advance the idea of education as the duty of the Government in his Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge, 1779. Though universal education was first put into practice in New England, the proposal of universal education by the States was historically a southern one, first given tangible expression by Jefferson.

It was Jefferson who said:

If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be.

It was Jefferson, twice President of the United States, who, in writing his own epitaph, wished to be remembered by three things, one of which was his contribution to the cause of public education:

Here lies the body of Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, author of the Statute for Religious Freedom in the State of Virginia, and founder of the University of Virginia.

The responsibility of the Federal Government in the matter of education was well expressed by President John Quincy Adams in one of his messages to Congress in the following language:

The great object of the institution of civil government is the improvement of the condition of those who are parties to the social compact, and no government, in whatever form constituted, can accomplish the lawful ends of its institution, but in proportion as it improves the condition of those over whom it is established. Roads and canals, by multiplying and facilitating the communications and intercourse between distant regions and multitudes of men are among the most important means of improvement. But moral, political, intellectual improvement are duties assigned by the author of our existence to social no less than to individual man. For the fulfillment of those duties governments are invested with power, and to the attainment of the end—the progressive improvement of the condition of the governed—the exercise of delegated powers is a duty as sacred and indispensable as the usurpation of powers not granted is criminal and odious. Among the first, perhaps the very first, instrument for the improvement of the condition of men is knowledge, and to the acquisition of much of the knowledge adapted to the wants, the comforts, and enjoyments of human life, public institutions, and seminaries of learning are essential.

I invite attention to the words of our great wartime President and mighty leader, Woodrow Wilson:

Popular education is necessary for the preservation of those conditions of freedom, political and social, which are indispensable to free individual development. And * * * no instrumentality less universal in its power and authority than government can secure popular education. * * * Without popular education, moreover, no government which rests upon popular action can long endure. The people must be schooled in the knowledge, and, if possible, in the virtues,

upon which the maintenance and success of free institutions depend.

EDUCATION AND ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

But public education has not only a profound political significance in our Nation, it lies at the roots of our economic well-being.

I quote from a report of the Educational Policies Commission:

It is a lesson of history, as well as of contemporary times, that the human resources of a nation constitute its primary wealth. Nations have grown rich and powerful in the absence of outstanding physical resources by developing their human assets. Others have remained poor and backward in the presence of unusual natural resources. It is human intelligence which gives these resources value. To a savage, coal is black and a waterfall is merely a physical danger to be avoided. To an intelligent man they are the source of energy for power-driven industries of fabulous productivity.

A carefully planned and efficiently administered system of education significantly increases the intelligence and efficiency of labor.

Thus does education produce national wealth.

Data collected by the Federal agencies during the depression show that lack of education was one of the chief factors in the dire status of rural families on relief in the South. One-half of the Negro family heads and one-fifth of the whites in the eastern Cotton Belt had had no schooling, and four-fifths of the Negroes and one-half of the whites had had less than 5 years of schooling.

It is clear—

Says one of the official reports—

that lack of schooling of families on relief is one reason they are the first to be dropped from employment and the last to be employed. As long as so large a proportion of them lack sufficient education to manage their own affairs, there will be need for public relief and social case work.

Dr. Hoffsommer of our own State university, in a study of disadvantaged farm families in Alabama, reached the following significant conclusion:

Before further sums are spent on the various other angles for the alleviation of the difficulties of these households, it would seem highly desirable that their children be given a chance, when equipped with equal educational background, to work out their own problems. It is unreasonable to expect that they can do so without equal educational opportunity.

That observation was made at a time when the Federal Government was pouring out billions of dollars for relief. It was pouring out billions of dollars because it was dealing primarily with the effects of an unfortunate condition instead of going to its heart and dealing directly with the cause which was largely one of ignorance and lack of education on the part of people upon whom the Federal Government had to expend such huge sums of money.

The interdependence of education and industry has long been recognized by our leading economists. Typical of the conclusion reached by students of the economics of industrial prosperity is the following quotation from Dr. Arthur Thomas Todd in Industry and Society, page 457:

The relation of education productivity is most clearly understood when one looks upon them as complementary. The existence of a high level of productivity makes possible the financing of an extensive system of schools and colleges. Adequate provision for education is essential to a high level of productivity. Each makes the other possible. Modern economic productivity and popular education have developed concurrently and both are requisite to the maintenance and improvement of the Nation's economic well-being.

The sum of the matter, then is that the future of industry is so closely bound up with that of education that for industry to neglect education would be suicidal. The best service which industry can render to itself in the immediate future is not only to enrich the material resources available for educational purposes, to foster research and technical education, but to see to it that the whole structural system of education is not only left unimpaired through the inroads of industrial competition but is actually improved beyond anything we can imagine in the immediate present.

EDUCATION AND THE NATIONAL DEBT

We are now engaged in a stupendous and terrible war to preserve our democratic way of life and our free institutions. The cost of modern war is staggering to the imagination. The Congress has found it necessary to authorize a national debt of $210,000,000,000. This debt, an inescapable one, will stand as a charge against the future production of economic goods by all our people. If we assume that our Nation will maintain its stability in the future, and we dare not make any other assumption, the debt will have to be paid by us and our children. It can be paid only by the production of goods and by services. If we expect to pay the national debt we must see to it that the entire population reaches the highest possible productive capacity. Knowledge and skill are prime essentials. Thus the Nation dare not neglect the education of the people. Money spent now to educate all the children of all the people will be an investment in the preservation of our American way of life and its economic system of free enterprise. Federal aid for education is by no stretch of the imagination a matter of generosity and charity. It is the veritable life blood of the future.

EDUCATION AND THE WAR

Mr. President, our schools and colleges at this hour are essential to the winning of the war. I need not review in detail the millions of hours given by teachers and students to scrap collection drives, rationing, Victory gardens, War stamp sales campaigns, Red Cross activities, pre-induction training, war industry, and food production training, physical fitness programs, and dozens of other important phases of the war effort. But I should like to call the attention of the Senate particularly to what our educational institutions have done and will be called upon to do in the future for those men physically fit and otherwise qualified who have been rejected for military service because they lack even as much as a fourth-grade education.

Recently official reports of the United States military authorities and of the Bureau of the Census regarding the educational level of our population indicate clearly the need for Federal action to enable the States to remove permanently the causes and sources of functional illiteracy.

After the long debate in the Senate only a week or two ago on the Wheeler bill with reference to the drafting of fathers, need I remind the Senate of the United States that 3,412,000 between the ages of 18 and 38 years have been rejected for military service because of physical, educational, and moral defects? Three million, four hundred twelve thousand men who should be the very flower of our Nation's manhood have been rejected because of mental or physical deficiency. It is because of the necessary rejection of this great number of men that we are being forced today to draft fathers. These men are all nonfathers. If a substantial number of them could have qualified physically and mentally we would not today be forced to draft fathers, with all the consequences attendant upon that step.

Mark you, Senators, illiteracy and physical disability go hand in hand together. Where illiteracy is found there also physical disability is found. The higher the illiteracy rate the higher the rate of physical disability. The exact number of men rejected for educational deficiencies alone is estimated to be some 750,000. These men are equipped neither to fight nor to produce the weapons and implements for fighting. Instead of being a part of the Nation's human wealth, they are a burden of debt we must carry because of our shortsightedness.

For the Nation as a whole, the United States Army Induction Board reports that in the period May through December, 1942, 28 men per 1,000 called up for induction into the Army were rejected because they had not attained a fourth-grade education. These men were otherwise qualified for military service. The rate of rejection per 1,000 men ran from none in Wyoming to 136.32 in Georgia. The rate for white men ran as high as 107.11 in Tennessee, and for Negro men as high as 256.29 in Georgia.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. From the figures just quoted by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, it seems to me that when this great country of ours, this great democracy, needs the manpower of the country to defend its very existence and the American way of life and form of government, there is no corner of the United States too remote for the Federal Government to reach out and call the boys, regardless of where they may be. From the figures which have been quoted by the Senator from Alabama, it seems that in the search of the Government for manpower to defend the Nation it is found that, because of educational deficiencies 750,000 of our men subject to the selective service are disqualified. Does it

not logically follow that if the Government of the United States in times of emergency reaches out into the remotest corners of the country and demands that those remote corners furnish their quota of fighting men, the Government should be equally interested in seeing that the boys and girls in the remotest sections of the United States, have the same educational facilities as those afforded the boys and girls born in the most populous and richest centers of the country?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Utah for his observation. He expressed in eloquent words what is in my mind and what is in my heart. He has given emphasis to what I have been trying to say to the Senate.

Mr. President, one thing that makes this condition so tragic is that we had the picture presented to us 20-odd years ago at the time of the last war; we then had this same experience; and yet we seem to have learned nothing. We have failed utterly to profit from that experience; we have failed, in the light of that graphic picture of the last war, to take the step we should have taken to prepare and to make certain that we would not again be faced with the same tragic and inexcusable situation due to our neglect.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I merely wish to ask the Senator from Alabama a question, since he has brought out the fact that in the last war we learned the lesson but did nothing to correct the situation. In the last war we tried to make correction, but could not do so. It was before the great tragic War between the States that Buchanan vetoed the first land-grant bill, but in the midst of the Civil War, a tremendous civil war, a great President of the United States saw that there must be not only a willingness to heal, but an agency through which healing could come. He did not do what he might have done to make the era of reconstruction less tragic had there been more brotherly love on the part of former enemies. But let me ask the Senator from Alabama if any single thing done by the great North during that tragic fight contributed more toward giving the States ability to gather themselves together and start in a fine way to build up an economy which had been destroyed?

In this connection, since we are talking about history, and since the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] is present, is it not proper for us to point out that one of our greatest statesmen—one who, I may say, did not carry on properly during the reconstruction period, as we understand today—Mr. Thaddeus Stevens, never lost sight of the fact that the basis of American strength and the building up of the American people rested upon the public schools? He fought in Pennsylvania for an equality of opportunity for students, through the public schools, and Pennsylvania has gained as a result of his statesmanship.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. I should like to corroborate the statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from Utah. He has stated what made Thaddeus Stevens famous in his own State, and made him powerful throughout the Nation. A Member of the House of Representatives during the reconstruction period, he was one of the great parliamentary leaders of all time. He and John Randolph, of Roanoke, were the two outstanding leaders of the Congress in their day.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am glad the distinguished senior Senator from Utah has referred to the action of the Congress and of President Lincoln in the enactment of the bill establishing the land-grant colleges, the first Morrill Act. As the Senator from Utah has so well said, no action taken by the Federal Government made a greater contribution toward the rebuilding of the South after the War between the States. No act did more to help the South get back on its feet, to reclaim and rebuild its civilization, than the establishment of colleges throughout the South under the action of the Federal Government in the enactment of the Morrill Act.

Speaking of the lessons of the last World War, lessons which we so negligently failed to heed, the American Academy of Sciences reported that an examination of 1,500,000 men in the draft at the time of the First World War revealed that 25.3 percent could not read a newspaper or write a letter home. Think of it, one-fourth of the flower of American manhod of this Nation, which we like to think of and like to speak of as the greatest, the most intelligent, the most cultured Nation, which we like to think of as the mighty leader of all the nations of the earth, one-fourth of the very flower of the manhood of this Nation at the time of the last war could not read a newspaper or write a letter home. And we did nothing about it. We took no steps to correct the ignominy of such a disgraceful condition in this land, and so today we are confronted with practically the same condition.

Mr. President, the matter of illiteracy is not one of special favor for any particular section. It exists in some sections in greater degree than in other sections of our country, but illiteracy has chosen no favorites in the United States. The figures show that illiteracy exists generally throughout the length and breadth of the land. The figures show that illiteracy is a blot, a disgrace, upon the whole country.

The data from the 1940 census show that 10,104,612 persons 25 years of age and over have completed not more than 4 years of school. That number is 13.57 percent of that age group. Of people over 25 years of age, more than 13½ percent have not even completed 4 years of school in this, the mightiest, the richest nation on the face of the earth.

Official reports do not reveal the States from which the functionally illiterate draftees come, but it seems a safe assumption that they come from the States in about the same proportion as the persons reported by the Bureau of the Census. The census data show that every State has a sizable share of the persons of low educational status. The Southern States, including Texas, Oklahoma, and Kentucky, have 4,486,760 of them; the Northern States, east of the Mississippi, including West Virginia and Maryland, have 4,336,800; and the Western States have 1,281,052. The percentages run from 4.1 percent in Iowa to 35.7 percent in Louisiana. When it is recalled that our population is highly mobile, with nearly 25 percent of the native-born now in States other than those of their birth, it can be safely concluded that the States which have the most widely available educational opportunities import a share of their illiterates and near-illiterates from the States where educational oportunities are not as available as they should be.

I have said that illiteracy plays no favorites. Illiteracy knows nothing about State lines. Illiterates move from one State to another, and they constitute a burden on the State, even though they were not born or raised in it.

Illiteracy and near-illiteracy are the products of educational neglect in past years and must be stopped at their source. This can be done only by giving educational opportunity to "all the children of all the people" of America.

As our distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], said a year ago on the floor of the Senate:

> Illiteracy, wherever we find it, dulls our war effort. It is not possible to take an illiterate man into a factory and make a producer of him. The personnel staffs of our factories, our arsenals, and all the various industrial activities which are using their energies at the present time to make victory sure, are calling for an overcoming of the illiteracy which exists.
>
> Just as industry keeps the materials of war coming in ever-increasing amounts from the assembly lines, so must we keep the young people who come out of our schools trained so they will be available for the services demanded of them.

Until recently men who had not attained a fourth grade education according to Army tests were rejected. On the first of last June the armed forces' induction stations substituted intelligence tests for literacy tests formerly used in determining a registrant's acceptability to the armed forces, and on the 30th day of September the Selective Service Administration announced a program of community classes to aid illiterates to pass intelligence tests at Army induction stations. This was done in an effort to educate as many of these men as possible and prepare them, insofar as could be done, so that they could take their places in the armed forces, so we would

not be compelled to draft any more fathers than absolutely necessary. Through the United States Office of Education plans are being made to enlist the aid of local school systems in this program. Here as in numerous previous instances the Federal Government is asking the schools to assume new and vital duties.

Mr. President, how are the schools now lacking sufficient teachers adequately to meet this new problem unless they have financial help? In rural areas, where a substantial proportion of the illiterates live, the schools have been most seriously affected by the current emergency. Many schools are closed; a majority have had to curtail their programs and overload their teachers; and hundreds have staffed their classrooms with persons who in normal times would not be considered qualified for teaching. In small towns and even in cities these same conditions exist only to a lesser degree.

Without Federal aid how can the Nation's schools in the face of such adverse circumstances adequately meet the Federal Government's request that they attack illiteracy problems resulting from educational deficits which should have been met by Federal aid at least a decade ago?

No one knows where the "Unknown Soldier" was born. Whether he was born in a little log cabin, and attended a little school on a little hillside, taught by a little teacher with little training who received a little salary; or whether he was born in a good home, attended a good school, taught by a capable and well-paid teacher, makes little difference now. What does count is that the dead boy, be he from the cotton fields of Alabama, the mountains of Kentucky, the plains of Nebraska, or from up-State New York, gave his life for all of us in order to preserve the blessings of the liberty we all enjoy.

Almost an entire company of boys from Harrodsburg, Ky., were taken prisoners in Bataan, as were other boys from other States. Others lie dead in the Coral Sea, and near Midway, on the frozen wastes of the Aleutians, on the deserts of north Africa, on the fields of Italy, and in the waters of the North Sea. Still others are prisoners in German concentration camps, or in the hellholes of Japan.

We have sent these boys to fight our wars in order that we may continue to enjoy the blessings of liberty; and yet for more than 10 years Congress has refused to help the States from which these boys come so that the youth of the Nation might enjoy the American freedom of attendance at a good school taught by a qualified teacher. If we had given this help even 5 years ago, the Army would not have been forced to reject hundreds of thousands of men in raising an army to defend our liberties; if we had given this help even 5 years ago, we would not be forced at this hour to draft fathers, with all the consequences of this action—in fact, the overwhelming chances are that we would never have been forced to draft fathers. If we had given this help, the Army would not have been forced to expend on the illiterates who have been inducted from $300 to $600 per man in an effort to teach them to read and write, a sum of money more than sufficient to pay for educating a child for 8 years in many good schools throughout the Nation.

The "Unknown Soldier" symbolizes equality of sacrifice in American life. Certainly a nation that accepts equality of sacrifice must accept the obligation to provide equality of educational opportunity.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is concerned about equality. How does the Senator reconcile his earnest desire for equality throughout the Nation with the fact that the State of Alabama spends $47 on every white child and only $14 on every colored child? Is that not a complete denial of the principle the Senator is trying to maintain?

Mr. HILL. No. What the Senator from Ohio has said is the best argument in favor of the bill. I am pleading now for equality of educational opportunities, but there cannot be equality of educational opportunities in the States so long as the States have to rely on their own financial resources. Many of the States simply are not able to give equality of opportunity in education.

Mr. President, I wish to extend all courtesy to the Senator from Ohio, but I wish to say that later on in my speech I shall discuss this phase of the problem. If the Senator would permit me to continue, I should rather discuss the matter when I reach it later in my speech.

Mr. TAFT. I should like the Senator from Alabama to deal specifically with the State of Alabama, with the present income of the State of Alabama, and why the State cannot furnish equal facilities to white and colored students.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I shall do so later on.

In wartime good schools and good teaching are more important than ever. We must retain and strengthen our public-school program and support the schools if we are properly and fully to support our war effort. Federal aid to education is now a war measure. It is a war measure because it alone will enable the schools throughout the country to make themselves fully available in the education of those men and women who are to win the war.

Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, commanding general of the Army Services of Supply, emphasized the important role of education in the war effort in a speech on August 28, 1942, before the Institute on Education and the war sponsored by the United States Office of Education Wartime Commission at American University, Washington, D. C. He said in part:

> The job of the schools in this total war is to educate the Nation's manpower for war and for the peace that follows. We can lose this total war on the battle front as a direct result of losing it on the industrial front, on the home front, or on the educational front. Education is the backbone of an army. This was never more true than it is today—now.
>
> Our Army today is an army of specialists. Out of every 100 men inducted into the service, 63 are assigned to duties requiring specialized training.

They must have been educated in our schools throughout the land or they are worthless to our Army.

General Somervell further said:

> It is the job of the schools and colleges of America to provide the opportunity for every youth to equip himself for a place in winning the war. * * * The schools and colleges of America must become preinduction training centers for our armed forces, leaving the armed forces free to train men in the combat application of the training that you give.

Mr. President, today our schools are a part of the whole system of our armed forces. It is in the school that the boy receives the training absolutely necessary for him to have in order to become a soldier.

General Somervell further said:

> There must be an all-out effort on the education front. Let us be realistic. Every able-bodied boy is destined at the appointed age for the armed services. * * * I'm passing on to you, to the educators of America, these lines that every person in the Army responsible for the training of men constantly keeps before him: Be sure that no American soldier is killed or injured because you failed to do your part to provide adequate training.

General Somervell, the supreme commander for all the training of the Army, said that all the men under him responsible for the training of the armed forces must constantly keep in mind that injunction. When the boys are trained and educated, the danger to which they are subjected is decreased; they are given a better chance to come back alive and whole of body and of mind. It is not fair to send boys into battle in this age of specialization and of mechanism without giving them opportunities for education and training, without thereby giving to them the best chance to save their lives and their bodies.

It is not only not fair to the boy that he is not provided with proper education and training, and is sent into combat and battle without proper education and training, but it is not fair to any other person in his outfit. The chain is no stronger than its weakest link. A combat outfit is no stronger than the weakest man in it. One man in a military unit, be it a platoon, a company, a regiment, or even a division, perhaps, who is not adequately educated, and therefore is not properly trained, may well endanger the life of every other soldier in the organization. It is impossible, perhaps, unless a man has been in combat, to know how much his life depends upon the actions, the efficiency, and, most of all, the intelligence of the men who go into combat with him. So when men are not properly educated or trained, the situation is not only tragic in that they themselves, not trained and prepared, are subjected to greater danger, but it is tragic that every man in the unit is also subjected to greater danger. Let no parent hug the delusion that be-

cause his boy is properly trained he does not have to give concern to the training of the other boys who serve with his boy. One ignorant man, one man who, because of a lack of education and training, is ineffectual, may well cost the life of the best educated and best trained man in the whole Army of the United States.

In a letter dated January 15, 1943, addressed to "The high-school educators of the Nation," Rear Admiral Randall Jacobs, Chief of Naval Personnel—his position in the Navy corresponds to that of General Somervell in the Army—and he has the prime responsibility for the education and training of the men in the Navy, wrote as follows:

> It is of first importance that young men (and young women) expecting to enter the various branches of the naval service should come well prepared to fit into the Navy's system of special skills in the shortest time possible.

Mr. President, I would that at this hour it were possible for every Member of the Senate to visit a submarine or to visit a great battleship and to see how absolutely necessary it is that every man aboard a submarine or a battleship—indeed, every man on every kind of naval craft—be properly educated, properly trained, and properly prepared. As I have said, we are in a war of specialists. The educated man can be turned into an educated warrior. The ignorant man remains an ignorant and an ineffectual warrior.

I spoke of physical disability going hand in hand with educational deficiency. During the past spring Col. Leonard W. Rowntree, Chief of the Medical Division of the National Selective Service System, made a speech to the National War Fitness Conference at Cincinnati, in which he said:

> We are accustomed to regard ourselves as a healthy, vigorous Nation, full of rugged young men in the pink of condition.

Senators will remember that once it was said we could sound the bugle and a million men would rush to arms by next morning. Well, Mr. President, Colonel Rowntree said we have the idea that everyone in our country is strong, vigorous, rugged, and is prepared to go into the ring and meet Jack Dempsey today; but he said:

> Before Pearl Harbor, 1,000,000 out of 2,000,000 examined were rejected. Since then the standards of selective service have been lowered, but our total rejection rate has never dropped below 30 percent. Even in the 18- to 19-year-old group the rejection rate is 25.4 percent.

Think of it, Mr. President, one-fourth of the 18- and 19-year-old boys physically unfit for service!

Colonel Rowntree also said:

> The picture which the draft statistics show of the rapid decrease in fitness with age is alarming. At 36 years of age, 70 percent fail to meet the standards, and at 45 years of age, 80 percent are rejected.

Army and Navy officials whom I might quote endlessly stress the fact that the schools can do and are doing much to help improve the situation with reference to the physical condition of our men by establishing a foundation of physical and mental health in their pupils, giving them an intelligent understanding of the problems of health and hygiene, and discovering and remedying physical defects in prospective soldiers.

Major Ernest B. Smith of the Army Air Forces Physical Training Section says:

> The contribution high schools and colleges can make in establishing solid foundations of physical and mental fitness is immeasurable.

Rear Admiral L. E. Denfield, Acting Chief of Naval Personnel, comments:

> Any steps taken by the high schools and colleges toward the development of a high degree of physical fitness in men who soon will be in the armed forces will mean a shorter period of training, which could mean a more effective prosecution of the war.

This, Mr. President, would mean a shortening of the war. I am sure that we will all agree that it is not enough to win this war. We must win it in the shortest possible time, and save the life of every boy we possibly can. We must put an end at the earliest possible date to the death of our boys, the wounding and suffering of our boys, and the depletion of our wealth and our precious resources.

In a speech before the final business session of the representative assembly of the National Education Association at Indianapolis, Ind., on March 29, 1943, Dr. John W. Studebaker, the United States Commissioner of Education, remarked:

> Finally, and most important perhaps of all contributions of the schools and colleges to the war effort, has been their contribution in continuing to build the firm intellectual and spiritual foundations of American democracy; the love of country; the knowledge of our history and traditions; the integrating common knowledges and attitudes which are the social cement that holds us, a people of diverse origins, races and religions, together in unity and service.
>
> The idealism of a free people learned in their homes and churches and schools, has led our brothers and husbands and sons resolutely to enter the lists of battle against the new barbarism. By instilling in the oncoming generations of American youth a deep appreciation of their heritage and its cost in sacrifice, the schools, I say, have contributed to the faith and fortitude which are the distinguishing characteristics of fighting Americans.
>
> Faith and fortitude—these make up morale; a morale based on understanding and shot through with the moral dynamic of a belief in righteousness, justice, and equality of opportunity among men. In our homes and churches and schools was born and nurtured the spiritual compulsion to sacrificial action in the common cause.

I repeat, Mr. President, that the Nation's educational agencies are a major force on the home front. We Americans believe that we are fighting to achieve the promise of democracy. In order to attain that end it is necessary to wage war successfully on the foreign front to defeat the Axis Powers. It is also necessary to fight effectively on the home front. Our success abroad is based upon our success at home in maintaining the institutions that contribute to morale, to strong and effective manpower and womanpower, and to productive efficiency. America's schools and teachers are a part of the home army. It should be a major concern of the Federal Government to alleviate conditions which impede or hamper the full war effort of America's educational forces.

THE CURRENT CRISIS IN EDUCATION

One of the most serious problems on the home front is the distintegrating influence of the war emergency upon the personnel of school systems. Out of 900,000 elementary and secondary school teachers, at least 300,000 have held their present positions only since Pearl Harbor. This means new, untrained, inexperienced, unqualified teachers.

In the school year 1942–43 it has been estimated that some 13,000 teaching positions were vacant, and the reports for the present school year indicate that there will be at least 15,000 vacancies. The opportunities for education in those schoolrooms were denied to children throughout the country. These figures do not include the 12,000 to 15,000 positions which have been eliminated since last year. Because of the disintegrating influences, schools were forced to eliminate between 12,000 and 15,000 positions, closing schoolrooms, in addition to the other 13,000 closed because there were no teachers to teach the classes.

Obviously, as a result, there are few schools that have not had to curtail their programs. In many communities classes are overcrowded and teachers overloaded. My distinguished and able friend from Utah, one of the great leaders in the world of education today, and a great teacher himself, knows that there is a limit to the number of pupils that any teacher, no matter how able or gifted he may be, can teach effectively and well. When we overcrowd our classrooms, we impair the education of every child in them. In numerous instances—in the rural schools of several States as high as 30 percent—the vacant positions have been filled by persons poorly qualified for teaching.

The present educational emergency created by national conditions exists throughout the country in rich and poor States alike, although it may vary in degree in different sections.

This emergency has affected all the schools. It has affected the schools in the richest States, perhaps not in so great degree, but nevertheless has seriously affected the schools in the richest States, just as it has affected the schools in the financially poorer States.

In normal years in areas where salaries are maintained at reasonable professional levels, there are rarely any serious teacher shortages. Shortages usually exist in rural areas and in small towns where salaries, tenure, and living conditions are inadequate. This problem is intensified under war conditions when many teachers and newly trained students are attracted by the rapidly rising salaries in private employment. Who that is teaching today is not naturally attracted by the far better salaries in industry? The teachers of the country would not be human if they were not attracted by such salaries.

Kipling said:

If you can fill the unforgiving minute
With 60 seconds' worth of distance run—

What we are doing is denying many children the opportunity to fill the minute with 60 seconds' worth of distance run. Because of the closing of classrooms, and because of unqualified and inefficient teachers, they cannot have the opportunity for education or the benefits from education to which they are so justly entitled.

In the coming year tens of thousands of America's children will suffer from the closing of classrooms and the employment of poorly qualified teachers. Their educational opportunity is being reduced more drastically than statistics on teacher shortages or the lowering of qualification standards show.

To meet this need the pending bill would make possible emergency appropriations to provide funds to the States for adjusting teachers' salaries to meet the current situation growing out of war conditions. The authorization for this purpose is found in section 2 (A) as follows:

For the purpose of enabling States and their local public-school jurisdictions to meet emergencies in financing their public elementary and public secondary schools by providing funds for the payment of the salaries of teachers to keep schools open, to employ additional teachers to relieve overcrowded classes, to raise substandard salaries of teachers, and to adjust the salaries of teachers to meet the increased cost of living, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year in which the Congress shall find a need therefor, beginning with the year ending June 30, 1944, $200,000,000, to be apportioned to the States as hereinafter provided.

The emergency funds provided under section 2 (A) are for the purpose of furnishing money to the States for the payment of salaries of teachers (1) to keep schools open for a term of not less than 160 days a year or to make suitable provisions for the pupils affected by closed schools, (2) to raise substandard salaries, (3) to reduce overcrowded classes by the employment of additional teachers, and (4) to adjust the salaries of teachers to meet the increased cost of living during the emergency.

The States are not required to make separate allocations for any one of the enumerated purposes. The only requirement is that the funds must be used for the payment of teachers' salaries. It is specifically provided that States may expend money for any or all of the purposes enumerated but it should also be noted that the term "teacher" is defined in section 13 (F) to—

include any person who is engaged in instruction, or the supervision or administration of instruction, or in professional health or welfare services for children, by a local public-school jurisdiction or other public-education agency, and actually so employed.

It is believed that all of the professional employees of the school system should be entitled to salary adjustments from the funds received under this act.

The emergency fund received under the authorization of section 2 (A) would be apportioned by the United States Commissioner of Education to all of the States in proportion to the number of pupils in average daily attendance in each of them. The data as to the average daily attendance in the respective States would be collected annually by the United States Office of Education. Such data are already collected biannually by the United States Office of Education by uniform rules and regulations subscribed to by all the States.

Mr. President, emergencies are not new. It is a matter of historical fact that emergencies have appeared many times in the past. There is one now, and there will no doubt be others in the future. The last World War saw our public schools depleted to a dangerous point of inefficiency; and such depletion, as I have already suggested is one reason why 3,400,000 of the flower of our manhood has been rejected for service in the armed forces. We now are paying for our failure to help the schools in 1917–18 by the lost battalions of today who are too illiterate to be accepted as soldiers.

During the period 1933–35 the schools suffered from one of the most severe emergencies in their history. The schools attended by one-eighth of all the children of the Nation were closed short of a normal term because of lack of funds to pay teachers' salaries. The Federal Government found it necessary through the relief organization to pay the salaries of over 100,000 public school teachers in order to keep open the schools. To do this teachers were placed technically on relief. In excess of $21,000,000 was spent for this purpose.

The present emergency is becoming no less severe than those of the past, although from somewhat different causes. So far as data are available for the current year the crisis continues unabated.

TURN-OVER IN THE EMPLOYMENT OF TEACHERS

During the school year 1942–43 there were over 189,000 public-school teachers new to their positions. This turn-over ran as high as 40 percent in 5 States and 25 percent in 27 States. In other words, in 27 States of the Union new teachers occupied one-fourth of all the teaching positions. The States in which the turn-over is greatest now pay, and have paid for years, the lowest salaries to teachers, and have the least taxpaying ability to support schools.

During the school year just closed a total of 65,000 teachers actually left the teaching field. To replace these qualified teachers the States issued a total of 37,000 emergency certificates, which represents 9 times the number issued in a normal year.

As we know, these emergency certificates constitute a lowering of teaching standards. They mean that for the purpose of teaching our children today we are hiring persons whom we do not feel are qualified to do the teaching. The persons receiving the certificates do not have the training or other qualifications requisite to any type of license issued under the standard requirements established under State law. The issuance of the emergency certificates is indicative of the fact that thousands of our schools are rapidly retrogressing to standards of two or three generations ago.

Data from many States and numerous local school systems were presented to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor showing in many instances the most intolerable shifting and loss of teaching personnel. There are thousands of children who never know from one day to the next who their teachers will be when they arrive at school.

That this acute condition is true today as well as last year is shown by statements made this September by school superintendents in communities of varying sizes in all parts of the country. For example, a superintendent of schools in a Pennsylvania community writes:

To date we have lost 23 out of 41 high-school teachers. We expect to lose some more and we haven't any idea where to go to get replacements. The situation, I am sure, is similar in many parts of the country, and unless something is done soon schools will suffer very much.

The school superintendent of Meridian, Miss., says:

Our white schools opened this year with 22½ percent new teachers. Our Negro schools opened with 40 percent new teachers.

The superintendent of schools of Houston, Tex., writes:

Our percentage of new teachers for the Houston school system this year will be double that of any other year we have opened—possibly 30 percent in the elementary schools. We have had a very high turnover during the past year and in the last 2 weeks more than 60 resignations. Our problem of teacher shortage is becoming acute.

The superintendent of schools of Chehalis, Wash., informs us:

Napavine, Wash., high school opened this fall with 100 percent new teachers.

It seems obvious that this departure from the classroom and transferring of teachers, if not checked, threatens the serious crippling, if not the actual collapse, of large numbers of our schools. It is equally obvious that the schools cannot continue to furnish the vital war services expected of them if this migration of competent personnel is allowed to continue.

INADEQUATE SALARIES FOR TEACHERS

The chief factor in the loss of teachers in the public schools is the inadequacies of teachers' salaries. It is true that the armed services took 39,000 teachers from their positions last year, but many of these, especially women, in addition to patriotic motives, were attracted by the higher rates of pay to be obtained in the armed services. Higher salaries in war industries, private employment, and Federal Government service, induced 37,000 additional teachers to leave the teaching service. The chief element necessary to the retention of teaching personnel, an essential to the efficient performance of the obligation of the schools, is the increase of salaries consistent with the salary inducements in the fields to which teachers are being attracted. The disparity in wages is illustrated by the fact that in 1942–43, 40 teachers out of every 100 were paid less than $1,200 annually, and about 8 in every 100 were paid less than $600 annually.

The average annual salary of all teachers, principals, and supervisors in

the public schools in 1942 was $1,500, while for rural teachers the average was only about $900. These salaries can be compared with the average annual salaries of Federal Government employees, excluding military personnel, $1,926; employees in manufacturing industries, including wage earners and salaried workers, $2,043. In terms of current purchasing power as compared to the average purchasing power of the dollar in the period 1935-39, the average annual salary of teachers in 1942 was $1,288 which may be compared to $1,652 for Federal employees and $1,754 for employees in manufacturing.

In order to give a picture of the money we spend for the services of teachers, and do it so that it will be best illustrated, I shall give the figures in terms of weekly wages. I do this in order that Senators may compare the wages paid low grade laborers, skilled laborers, professional workers, and all persons who receive wages with the average wages paid school teachers on the basis of 52 weeks a year. The New York wage for teachers, which is the highest, is $50.08. It goes on down to $10.75 in Mississippi. I shall ask to have the table which is before me placed in the RECORD. It shows the decreasing scale of the average wages paid teachers in the various States, from $50 a week down to $10.75. Compare the wages of teachers with the average wage paid workers in shipyards, in industrial plants, and even the wages paid charmen and the charwomen employed by the Government of the United States.

Many teachers, principals, and supervisors of schools are paid less on the average than the Federal Government is today paying those who clean and sweep. Honorable as that work may be, it requires no such preparation, no such expenditure as that required for teaching.

The table shows what the teachers of American children received for each of the 52 weeks during the school year ending 1940, and remember, there has been no uniform increase since. Remember also that these figures represent teachers, principals, and supervisors in elementary and secondary schools, and that 50 percent of the teachers receive less than the average set forth in the table. I now ask that the table be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Average weekly wage of teachers

New York	$50.08
California	45.21
New Jersey	40.25
Massachusetts	39.17
Connecticut	35.79
Rhode Island	34.79
Washington	32.81
Illinois	32.69
Delaware	32.38
Maryland	31.58
Pennsylvania	31.54
Ohio	30.52
Michigan	30.31
Nevada	29.94
Arizona	29.69
Indiana	27.56
Utah	26.81
Colorado	26.79
Wisconsin	26.52
Oregon	25.63
Minnesota	$24.54
New Hampshire	24.19
Montana	22.77
West Virginia	22.50
Wyoming	22.48
Missouri	22.29
New Mexico	22.00
Texas	20.75
Idaho	20.33
Iowa	19.56
Kansas	19.50
Oklahoma	19.50
Florida	19.46
Louisiana	19.35
Vermont	18.87
North Carolina	18.19
Virginia	17.29
Maine	17.19
Tennessee	16.58
Nebraska	15.94
Kentucky	15.83
South Dakota	15.52
Georgia	14.81
North Dakota	14.33
Alabama	14.31
South Carolina	14.29
Arkansas	11.23
Mississippi	10.75

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have already referred to the loyalty and the service of our teachers in this time of distress and great danger to our country; but let me repeat that the loyalty of teachers of America has been demonstrated many times since the dark shadow of this global war was first cast upon our land. When the Government registered 20,000,000 young men for military service, it was the American teachers who did it, handled that gigantic task, and they did it free.

When the Government found it necessary to establish the rationing system in every city, village, community and hamlet, it was the teachers who launched the system and made possible the establishment of its framework through the length and breadth of the land.

Who made the scrap drives a success? Without 30,000,000 school children under the direction of a million devoted teachers, the scrap drives could not have been so quickly successful.

Yet, as I have said, 50 percent of the teachers, principals, and supervisors in 27 States get a smaller weekly wage throughout the year than the minimum wages established by an act of Congress on July 27, 1942, for unskilled laborers, elevator operators, and those who clean offices.

The Congress set $2,000 per year as the minimum wage paid for the lowest grade professional and scientific service; this applies to a college graduate in Government service without experience who works under direct supervision. It is estimated that more than 50 percent of all teachers in the United States are college graduates. Yet 44 States pay the average instructional employee in the elementary and secondary schools, including teachers, principals, and supervisors, less than the minimum the Congress has set for the lowest grade professional Government employee. Remember too, that a very large percentage of the instructional staffs in the schools in the low-salaried States have as much college training as many of those in the Government service who receive during peacetime a minimum of $3,800 to $4,600 per year.

In many sections of the country recent students are receiving more pay than their former teachers. The principal of the Central High School in Columbia, Tenn., writes:

> We have many boys receiving two and three times as much as their teachers of last year and the year before.

The assistant superintendent of schools of the great city of Portland, Oreg., reports:

> Our minimum salary is $1,600. We have a host of students making more money than teachers. The minimum wage of shipyards is 95 cents an hour.

Remember, Senators, the Government pays that wage—

> Employees work 48 hours and get paid for 54. Roughly that makes a weekly wage of $50. From a minimum of 95 cents an hour wages run on up to $1.50 an hour in the shipyards, so you have some idea of the discrepancy in salaries. There are thousands who have not yet finished high school or are recent high-school graduates who are receiving such wages. There are many teachers who have said that rather than go back to the rural areas and teach for low salaries they would stay in Portland and work in the shipyards.

The superintendent of schools of Provo, Utah, states:

> Many students in our community receive salaries in excess of teachers with M. A. degrees.

A prominent school man in Rossville, Ga., declares:

> We graduated several students last spring who are now making more money than their teachers. We have a few students who have part-time jobs still attending school who make as much as their teachers.

I could read a number of letters showing how universally throughout the United States this situation prevails.

Is it any wonder that the ranks of our teachers in this country are being depleted, that the personnel of our school staffs is disintegrating, and that the schools of the country are faced with this distressing situation?

EFFECT OF THE INCREASED COST OF LIVING

The cost of living from 1938 through 1942 increased about 21 percent in urban areas and 34 percent in rural areas, but teachers' salaries during that period increased on the average less than 7 percent. It should be remembered that the heaviest increases in the cost of living have occurred where teachers' salaries were already the lowest.

FEDERAL ACTION IN INCREASING SALARIES

The Government has done something about the salaries of Federal employees. I stated the average salaries of Federal employees a few moments ago, showing how much greater they are than are the average salaries of our teachers. Yet even the salaries of Federal employees which I have just cited have been increased far beyond the figures I gave. They have been increased about 20 percent, or one-fifth. The result of this action will be that under present conditions the average salary of teachers will be more than $750 per annum below that of Federal employees.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator. It has been suggested, in the course of the debate on this bill, first, that the bill itself undertakes to regulate, through the Federal Government, the administration of education in the States. That argument has been answered very conclusively by pointing out the provisions of section 1 of the bill. Anyone who will read section 1 of the bill cannot entertain any doubt whatsoever that there is not only not any attempt to regulate the administration of education of the schools of the different States by the Federal Government but that such power is absolutely negatived and denied unequivocally.

I am disturbed by another matter, to which I have given no investigation, and about which I should like to ask the able Senator from Alabama, who has given a great deal of thought and study to this bill and its ramifications. It has been suggested both on the floor of the Senate and by correspondents who have written to me, that, while the bill may withhold any power from the Federal Government to administer the local school systems in the various States, yet it is an entering wedge, and once the States receive an allocation of funds from the Federal Government it will be followed, sooner or later, by a bill introduced in the Congress under which the Federal Government will have authority to regulate our local systems of education.

What I want to ask the able Senator from Alabama is this: If such a bill should be introduced, a bill which would vest in the Federal Government the power to regulate the school systems in different States, either in whole or in part, is there any constitutional power vested in the Congress to enact such legislation?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is a far better constitutional lawyer than I am, but I would say there would be no authority in the Federal Government to take over and try to control or operate the schools of a State. The Senator well pointed out the first section of the bill, which makes very clear that the Federal Government will not under the bill and cannot under the bill in any way affect the administration or control of the schools. The whole structure of the bill is built on that basis. The Federal Government does not go to the schools with the money directly; it goes to the States and hands the money over to the States for the States to turn the money over to the schools for the purposes for which the money is appropriated.

Mr. OVERTON. There is no question that there is not the slightest attempt, so far as the bill goes, to regulate the administration of education.

Mr. HILL. If any State did not want to take the money, for instance, it would not have to take it. As the Senator has suggested, the Federal Government would not have the power to take over the schools of a State.

Mr. OVERTON. But the suggestion has been made, I think on the floor of the Senate, that the enactment of the bill into law would be followed by other bills, whereby the Federal Government would through congressional act undertake to take over the administration of the school systems in the States, either in whole or in part.

If we glance through the powers delegated to the Congress in the Constitution we find that there is absolutely nothing in the powers delegated to the Congress which would authorize them to provide for a system of education. The nearest approach to it is to be found in this language:

> The Congress shall have power—

And after enumerating various powers, the Constitution declares, repeating:

> The Congress shall have power to promote the progress of science and useful arts.

It may be contended that the vesting of authority in the Congress to promote the progress of science and the useful arts is investing in the Congress power to provide for a general diffusion of knowledge through a system of elementary school education, and there might be some force to that argument if what I have read were all that the Constitution declares. But the framers of the Constitution were very careful in the powers they did confer upon the Congress, so the framers of the Constitution did not rest with what I have quoted, they did not put a period after the word "arts," they did not merely say "to promote the progress of science and useful arts," but they said how Congress could do it, and this is the only way in which Congress can do it:

> By securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.

That is the only power along this line vested in Congress, to promote the progress of the useful arts and of science, and that is not only a grant of authority, but an express limitation of authority on the part of the Congress.

Of course, as the Senator has well pointed out, even if Congress should seek to impose certain regulations in a grant, if the Congress should say, "The Federal Government will grant to a State certain funds upon the condition that the State shall provide the administration of the school system under the following regulations," prescribing them, I doubt seriously that it would have such authority; but whatever Congress might do in that respect, any State could refuse the grant, and thereby escape the provisions, and therefore such a State would not be worse off than it is today.

The point I am making is that I am quite sure that Congress cannot undertake to regulate the administration of education in any State, but I doubt very seriously that it could couple with any grant of money administrative regulations as a condition to acceptance of the money.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. In a moment. The Supreme Court of the United States, passing on a similar act or grant of funds to a State, speaking through Mr. Justice Sutherland, said:

> Probably it would be sufficient to point out that the powers of the States are not invaded.

What is proposed does not involve an invasion of the States, any more than when someone desires to give us something it involves an invasion of our rights. We have a right to reject any proffered gift.

> Probably it would be sufficient to point out that the powers of the States are not invaded, since the statute imposes no obligation, but simply extends an option which the State is free to accept or reject. But we do not rest here.

Then he proceeds to discuss the fact that no burden has been imposed upon the State.

Mr. MALONEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Does the Senator know of any instance of the Federal Government giving money to States or municipalities for any purpose in connection with which it did not exercise power?

Mr. HILL. Yes. I hope the Senator will be able to remain in the Chamber, because I intend to discuss that point a little later in my remarks. I have done what I thought was wise, that is I have tried to have a little sequence in my discussion, and I shall discuss the matter a little later. As a matter of fact, at this point I will say to the Senator that I have three pages citing any number of acts in connection with which the Federal Government has helped schools and education in this country without any semblance of Federal interference, starting in the early days with the grants of land to the States. While I cannot be sure, perhaps one reason why my good friend the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] cannot see the necessity for the pending bill, and does not agree with us, is that in the early days the Federal Government was very generous to his State in the matter of grants of land for the schools and for the other educational institutions of the great State of Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. I intend to discuss that matter when I reach it. I will not stop now, but there are plenty of precedents for the pending proposal. It is not a question of Federal aid. We have had that all the way through. It is a question of how that aid is given, the process by which it is given.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. With reference to the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], it is perfectly simple for the Federal Government to regulate education, whether there is any reference to education in the Constitution or not. We have done so in many instances. What we do is to provide that a State shall get money only if it makes a certain plan, and the plan must involve certain things. We had before us recently a bill

which provided that part of the plan was that a State must conform to the regulations which might be made by the Federal Security Administrator. That, as I recall, was in a case dealing with vocational rehabilitation. So that, as a practical matter, the fact that the subject is not mentioned in the Constitution does not prevent the Federal Government making regulations in a case where it is contributing money.

The Supreme Court has said—and I hope to have the opinion, which I shall be glad to furnish the Senator from Louisiana—that as a condition to granting money, the Government may impose conditions, and may indirectly regulate the matter with which it is dealing, for which it contributes the money. It seems to me perfectly clear, therefore, that regulation may come.

The second point is, of course, that a State may refuse the money. That is perfectly true—a State may refuse any grants, but States never have, so far as I know.

Furthermore, think of the result as this practice grows, and the Federal Government contributes a greater and greater proportion of the State revenues. If, as I remember the figures, we contribute in the State of Alabama $10,000,000 to a total budget of $35,000,000, of which the State puts up only $25,000,000, the State of Alabama will have difficulty ever refusing that $10,000,000.

It will conform to the Federal regulations. So I think the argument suggested by the Senator from Louisiana is no answer to the charge, but that as this thing goes on and on we are more likely to have Federal regulation, and Federal regulation which will be upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The able Senator from Ohio admits, as I understand, that Congress would have absolutely no authority to undertake to regulate by statute the administration of education in the States. But he says that in his opinion it can be done by bestowing a grant upon the States and coupling the grant with any conditions that may suit the whim and fancy of the Federal Government acting through the Congress. The Senator from Ohio refers to some instances where conditional grants have been made by the Congress. I have not pursued the question any further than I am doing right now, and what I say is said without any investigation, and purely as an offhand expression of opinion of my own. The probability is that if the Congress has made a conditional grant, and especially if the act has been upheld by the Supreme Court, it will be found that the conditions which the Congress has imposed are such conditions as fall within the legislative authority of the Congress. Otherwise, Congress could add infinitely to its powers by bestowing huge grants upon States and saying that the grants can be accepted and can be enjoyed only upon the basis of the States in turn adopting legislation prescribed by the Congress of the United States for the enactment of which the Congress itself has no constitutional authority.

It requires no stretch of the imagination to conceive that that thought can be carried to the point where there would be little left of State rights; that the Federal Government could entrench itself so upon the authority of the States by making these grants based on their acceptance by the States, that the Federal Government could simply regulate anything and everything within the State, whether the Congress had authority to do so or not. It would be a very pernicious doctrine. If the Supreme Court of the United States has adopted such a doctrine I think it is a doctrine rather to be condemned, and I doubt very seriously that it has been done. I have not investigated the subject, but I do not think the able Senator from Ohio can point to any decision of the Supreme Court which extends a congressional authority to legislate over and beyond that vested in the Congress through the use of grants by the Federal Government.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The opinion to which I refer is that in the case of Wickard against Filburn, decided May 4, 1942, with reference to the imposing of penalties on wheat farmers for raising wheat in excess of the quota. In that case Mr. Justice Jackson says:

> We can hardly find a denial of due process in these circumstances, particularly since it is even doubtful that appellee's burdens under the program outweigh his benefits. It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes.

That may or may not be a pernicious doctrine. As a matter of fact, I disagree with the opinion reached by the Supreme Court of the United States in that case, in which they uphold the attempt to penalize farmers who were in no way involved in interstate commerce for raising more wheat than they were supposed to raise under the quota. But that is the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. OVERTON. Was not that done under the exercise of the power vested in Congress to regulate commerce? Was not the legislation passed under that power?

Mr. TAFT. No, I think not. If the Senator will examine the opinion I shall be glad to discuss it with him further. My understanding is that this was purely an intrastate case, that it had no relation whatever to anything that could be called interstate, and that the power to impose that penalty rested solely on the fact that the Government was subsidizing the wheat farmer under the general plan.

Mr. OVERTON. The general production and consumption of wheat is involved in interstate commerce. That conclusion cannot be avoided.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have not examined that decision, but I think that the decision and the act of the Congress which the decision construes, are unquestionably based on the power of the Congress to regulate commerce. It was under the commerce clause of the Constitution that Congress acted. Therefore, it was under the commerce clause of the Constitution that the decision of the Supreme Court was rendered.

Mr. President, some of the arguments seem to be based on the assumption that we in the Congress of the United States represent an entirely different people from those who make up our States. Whom do we represent in Congress? We represent the same people exactly who make up the States. The people, in the final analysis, determine this question. The people whom we in the Senate represent are jealous of the rights of their States and wish to preserve and safeguard them.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I am glad to yield to my friend the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to call to the attention of the Senator that, with the bill before us, right in our hands, we find in section 6 the following:

> In order to qualify for receiving funds appropriated under this act, a State—

And now I skip to page 8, line 6:

> In States where separate public schools are maintained for separate races, provide for a just and equitable apportionment of such funds for the benefit of public schools maintained for minority races, without reduction of the proportion of State and local moneys expended for educational purposes during the fiscal year ended in 1942 for public schools for minority races.

In other words, even before we enact the proposed piece of legislation, we find the hand of Congress extending within the State through that very language with reference to the basis upon which a State may qualify.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct about that. That is a provision with respect to the distribution of the Federal funds. There is no question in my mind that if Congress wants to give the States something, Congress can place a limitation such as that upon it. But the fact that Congress places that limitation on this money does not mean, and it does not follow, that Congress is going to attempt to take over the school systems of the country as they are now owned and controlled and operated by the States.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I wish to submit a simple illustration with respect to the question of attempt at Federal control, and with respect to cooperation between States and the Federal Government. As everyone knows, one of the provisions of the Land Grant Act was that there should be military training in the land-grant institutions. Since the creation of the R. O. T. C., military training has been established in a great number of non-land-grant institutions.

In many of such institutions military training is compulsory; in many it is voluntary. Even in one of the land-grant institutions I know of, it has been made voluntary, and the Federal Government has not in any sense attempted to overcome the will of the local institution.

A bill for the purpose of bringing about a condition whereby military training would be voluntary everywhere was introduced in the Senate, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, then to a subcommittee of that committee, and hearings were held. The committee refused to handle the bill and refused to have anything to do with it, on the ground that the committee would do nothing which would in any way interfere with the local control of the various institutions of the country. That is one incident which shows how a certain committee of the Congress decided in regard to an attempt by the Federal Government to control educational institutions.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his contribution, and what he has said emphasizes the thought to which I gave expression, that we who sit in the Federal Congress are elected by, and represent, the people who make up the States and who make up the governments in the States. I thank the Senator for the perfect illustration he has given. Of course, Mr. President, I must say it appears that some of us have more faith in the people than others of us do. Yesterday I suggested that perhaps the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] might even be a little afraid of the people.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I yield to my friend the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. In the light of the comment by the Senator from Alabama, would he also contend that the Congress has the power to say that no State shall be eligible to participate in funds provided under the proposed legislation in the event such State maintains separate public schools for separate races?

Mr. HILL. I think not, Mr. President, but I should want to consider that matter. However, I desire to give the Senator a frank answer, and that is that offhand I think the Federal Government, when it makes grant or a gift, can impose conditions on the gift. The State does not have to accept the gift; but when the Federal Government makes a gift in that way, it can impose conditions, I should think, on the gift.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so as to permit a question?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As I understand the pending measure, it is presented in the name of emergency. I suppose the emergency which is meant is a depletion in the resources of States and municipalities to meet their educational responsibilities.

What puzzles me is that I find no such lack of resources, for instance, in my own State and in other States in the north-mid-western area with which I am familiar. Then when I see the bulletin issued by the United States Department of Commerce showing the percentage increase in total income payments by States from 1939 to 1942, I find that in the main the States which would be the chief beneficiaries of the pending emergency measure would be the States which have had the greatest increases in income during the war period. How does that square with the necessity which is submitted in the name of current war emergency?

Mr. HILL. I wish my distinguished friend, the Senator from Michigan, were as much puzzled as he might indicate; if so, I would have some hope that he might give his support to the bill. However, he has asked me a question, and he is entitled to a frank answer to it. I will say that the only way one could pass on the conditions in the States and on the surpluses is to know exactly what the surpluses are, and what part of them, under the constitution and the laws of the State would be available for the schools.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator has misunderstood me.

Mr. HILL. If I have, I am sorry.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not referring to the exhibit which shows the State surpluses, nor am I referring to the exhibit which I presented for the RECORD earlier in the day, showing that during the last few years American municipalities as a whole have substantially reduced their indebtedness. I am referring to the bulletin to which I think no reference has heretofore been made, a bulletin issued by the United States Department of Commerce, showing the percentage increase in total income payments by States between 1939 and 1942, and indicating that the largest increase in internal incomes within the States, between 1939 and 1942, has been in the case of the precise States which would receive the chief and largest subsidy under the provisions of the pending bill.

So I submit to the Senator that my puzzlement is as to why an emergency arises in respect to the ability of States to pay their own educational bills, when the States in whose behalf the bill is chiefly urged apparently are those which have had the chief increase in internal total income during the last few years.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so as to permit me to ask the Senator from Michigan a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Let me ask the Senator from Michigan whether the increase referred to was a percentage increase. Is it a percentage increase in the various States?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is a percentage increase.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in view of the increased cost of living—and I have cited figures to show that the cost of living has gone up 22 percent in urban areas and 34 percent in rural areas—and inasmuch as there has been a very substantial increase in the income-tax rates, I do not know that the percentage increase in itself means so very much.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I know what it means. I have just submitted it to the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Yes. I have not seen the chart, so I am not in a position to make a frank answer to the Senator's question. However, without having seen the chart, I am not sure that the percentage increase means so much.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in connection with the question which has been asked, and the present trend of the debate, let me say that I hold in my hand a copy of the Washington Evening Star for today, October 15. On page B–1 there appears a report from Baltimore, which reads:

MARYLAND LOSES 805 TEACHERS IN 4 MONTHS; WORSE SITUATION SEEN—SOME INSTRUCTORS HAVE 50 TO 65 PUPILS IN ROOM, EDUCATIONAL CHIEF SAYS

BALTIMORE, October 15.—A critical situation which "will doubtless be a great deal worse" was created by the resignations of 805 Maryland school teachers between June 1 and October 1 this year, Dr. Thomas G. Pullen, Jr., declares.

"The eventual outcome is beyond prediction" and "it is impossible to say how many vacancies there are among the 5,275 teaching jobs in the State," the superintendent of schools added.

He said the situation changes overnight and that in some parts of the State classes are running now with one teacher assigned to 50 to 65 children.

Some 50 or 60 teachers who resigned and did not take war jobs or join the armed forces merely shifted from the schools of one county to those of another, Dr. Pullen explained.

He said that Prince Georges County, where 173 teachers resigned, was the hardest hit; Montgomery County was second with 82 and Baltimore County was third with 77.

The rate of teacher turn-over increased enormously in the last few months, he said, From June 1, 1942, to June 1, 1943, 1,306 teachers in the State resigned.

Mr. President, I read that not only to emphasize the need for the contemplated legislation, but especially in light of what the Senator from Maryland said yesterday that his State was not affected in the least by this emergency.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say I am interested in the exhibit submitted by my very able friend, the Senator from Utah, but I find nothing in it to indicate the source of or reason for the shortage. I would assume that the shortage in Maryland was similar to the shortage in my own State of Michigan, which I should say predominantly was a part of the general manpower shortage because of a shifting of personnel into either the armed forces or industrial operations where the rates of compensation are so infinitely swollen in comparison with ordinary teachers' wages that even the differential proposed in the pending bill would not have the remotest effect in holding teachers to their original teaching jobs. It does not seem to me that the mere assertion of a shortage in teachers supports the claim that a small Federal teaching subsidy would cure the manpower shortage in education. I think it is fundamentally a manpower shortage.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The testimony of several persons who have charge of rural schools was that the subsidy

would correct that evil. The teachers and others would not leave the small towns of the country for the cities if they were not almost forced to leave. A slight increase in their pay would keep them there. This bill is an attempt to preserve the rural schools.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not wish to intervene in the argument between the Senator and the Senator from Maryland, who can speak for himself; but on the basis of his own statement respecting the resources of his own State, it seems to me that if there is that sort of crisis in Maryland, there is no excuse on earth for Maryland not meeting it on the basis of its own available resources. I see no reason why the almost defunct Treasury of the United States should be the sole reliance in meeting a situation of that sort.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, earlier in the day I discussed the question of the emergency and its effect on our schools. I am sorry that my good friend from Michigan was not able to be present. I quoted from the testimony before our committee, and gave facts and figures to show how the war situation was depleting—I might even use the word "gutting"—our schools of their teachers. The only way to meet that situation is by a little fairer compensation, an increase in the salaries of teachers.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a further question on that point?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am very sorry that I missed his original presentation, because I know it must have been illuminating, considering its source.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the teaching manpower is depleted at the present time—and undoubtedly it is—so far as the depletion is due to persons entering into the armed services, of course, the pending bill would be no offset.

Mr. HILL. So far as persons entering the armed services are concerned, it would be an offset to this extent: When a man goes into the service, if a more equitable salary is provided there is a much better prospect of filling the vacancy with a person who is qualified to teach. Not only have our schools been drained of their teachers and closed down in many instances, but classes which are supposed to be carried on cannot be conducted because there are no teachers to teach them. It has been necessary to issue a great many emergency certificates, which means obtaining persons to teach who do not meet the standards and are not qualified to teach. So far as replacement is concerned, if a fairer salary could be offered, better replacements could be obtained, and there would be a better chance of securing qualified replacements.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That might be true, except that the replacement is particularly at the mercy of the economic factor, because in seeking replacements the educational system must compete with high industrial wage scales. I am sure the Senator will concede that the subsidy proposed in this bill is in no degree a measure of the gap between war wages and the educational wage which would be available even with the subsidy included.

Mr. HILL. I would not say that it is a measure of the gap, but it would be a distinct step toward measuring the gap, and a most helpful and constructive step.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In either event, the element introduced into the argument by my able friend from Utah is beside the point which I rose to submit to the Senator; namely, that I continue to be totally puzzled regarding the apparent feeling that there is a lack of local resources in State and municipal treasuries to meet the situation, and that it is fair and justified, in the face of a $60,000,000,000 Federal deficit, to turn to the Government of the United States for a subsidy at this time.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should like to make this statement to the Senator from Michigan in relation to our little discussion: The Senator knows that most of the public-school teacher's pay comes from local taxation. The Senator knows that, for example, if a county which is maintaining schools as best it can loses its teachers as a result of migration to another county because of the inducement of higher salaries, the resources of the first county are reduced. I can give him actual illustration from my own State. The ability of the county to tax is reduced.

Everything that has been said about local resources has also been said about the treasuries of the various States. I submit that so long as most of the rural school teachers are paid out of the treasuries of local units, from local taxation, in order for the argument about the resources of the various States to be valid, we must break down the comparison into local school units. I think that cannot be disputed by anyone. Therefore I am sure that the type of statistics which has been offered with respect to the resources of the various States is thoroughly invalid. The argument is not right, and it is not relevant.

Take, for example, the statements made yesterday with respect to the resources of one of the States. It was said that a certain State had a surplus of $4,000,000. But that does not mean that the teaching units or the school units have those resources. The Senator has said that we should not take from the Treasury of the United States and give to States which have full treasuries because the resources of the Treasury of the United States are depleted. Mr. President, the Treasury of the United States is not the local school treasury. The State treasury is not the local school treasury. Those things are proper in this argument only by implication.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree with the Senator that they are proper only by implication, and I agree that we must have a total finality of analysis in order to have a thoroughly dependable reply.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. We have gone as far as a committee could go. This study has extended over 10 years.

Mr. VANDENBERG. But in the presence of a report by the National Municipal League, which I presented today, showing that the municipal indebtedness of the country has substantially decreased in the past few years, and in the presence of what at least purports to be a disclosure of a substantial increase in State resources throughout the country, paralleling the obvious fact that the Treasury of the United States is the emptiest thing in the world, it seems to me that a general index is presented which very definitely places upon those who want additional subsidies from the Treasury of the United States the responsibility of clearly and conclusively demonstrating that it is impossible for this burden to be carried by State and local governments in the traditional American method of dealing with education.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Has the Senator offered a single statistic or statement from the rural districts of the United States?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have offered two exhibits which deal with States as units, and States as units are responsible for their rural areas as well as their urban areas. I confess to the Senator that when I see such showings I am unable to believe that it is impossible for a State which wants to meet its educational responsibility not to do so under existing circumstances. The States are in a better position to do so today than they were 3 or 4 years ago. Therefore, the present imminent emergency phase of the matter challenges my wonderment, and I am seeking information on the subject.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, the Senator from Utah has referred to local conditions, local situations, more particularly in rural areas. The whole trend of this war, the whole result of the war economy, has been to concentrate wealth to an even greater extent in the hands of a few than was the case before the war started.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HILL. In other words, the sections of the country which did not have wealth before the war, instead of gaining anything or at least holding their own in their relative wealth, have lost. The war contracts have been concentrated and have resulted in a greater concentration of the total wealth of the country than existed before we became engaged in war.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Alabama one final question on the point he just made?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I dislike to refer to individual States because to do so is more or less invidious, but it is not done in that spirit. It is done merely by way of an example.

The State of Arkansas possibly would receive the greatest relative benefit in terms of dollars under the pending bill. Yet, far from being affected by the war, as the able Senator from Alabama has just indicated, the State of Arkansas is

the first State in the Union, according to the United States Department of Commerce, in respect to the percentage of its total income increase from 1939 to 1942.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, that is the very point.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then we must both agree.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. When we talk about percentage we must remember that the percentage of increase is figured on the original base. Consider, for instance, the State of New York at the present time.

Mr. HILL. That is the reason why percentages do not mean anything. If one has $2 and receives $2 more, he has an increase of 100 percent, whereas if he has a thousand dollars and receives only $500, he has only a 50-percent increase. That is why, without explanation, without a break-down of the factors which enter into the percentages, they do not mean anything.

Mr. VANDENBERG. But if we do not have an emergency before we apply an increase of 120 percent, I do not see how we can have an emergency after applying the 120 percent.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The table referred to by the able Senator from Michigan shows that the average increase in income in the United States has been only 62 percent in 3 years, whereas the average increase in income in Arkansas is 118 percent over its former income payments. That is a substantial factor to be taken into consideration.

Let us take the State of Alabama. The increase there is 115 percent in its income payments over what they were in 1939, whereas for the whole United States the increase is only 62 percent. That, in general, is true of all Southern States; there the percentage of increase is greater.

If I may, I should like to refer to what the Senator from Utah has said.

Mr. HILL. The Senator was speaking about increases. I have some figures, which I was hesitant about using, with reference to the increase in Federal internal-revenue receipts. Let us take the Federal internal-revenue receipts for the State of Arkansas, for example. The Federal internal-revenue receipts from that State have increased 386 percent. In the great State of New York the increase is not 386 percent, but only 163 percent. But, as the Senator from Utah has said, it all depends on the base on which the percentage is figured, what it is taken from. The figures show, however, that the increases in percentages in the poorer States are much greater than the increases in the richer States. For example, Alabama's increase is 541 percent; South Carolina, 518 percent; Mississippi, 434 percent; New Mexico, 391 percent; Arkansas, 386 percent; Georgia, 304 percent.

Now let us take some of the richer States: Nevada, 262 percent; Delaware, 230 percent; California, 200 percent; Massachusetts, 173 percent; New Jersey, 165 percent; and New York, 163 percent. Thus, in six States with low economic ability to pay, Federal taxes increased an average of 400 percent, while in six States with high economic ability the increase was only an average of 172 percent. What does that show?

Mr. TAFT. It shows that there was a tremendous increase in the income of those States, that is, an increase in income on the part of their people.

Mr. HILL. No, none of these States received anything like a fair proportion of the increase in income which prevailed throughout the United States. Income has increased far more in the richer States than in the poorer States. It shows that the tax burden is resting more and more heavily upon the lower-income groups. We are reaching down, as we have done, more and more into the poorer income groups. That is what it shows.

The report from the Treasury Department, on the contrary, shows that the concentration of wealth has been more and more accelerated and increased in the richer States.

Mr. TAFT. It shows that the income of the State of New York has increased less than 40 percent, whereas the average has been more than 60 percent. The statement made by the Senator is not borne out by the facts. Without question the fact is that the Southern States, those which would receive aid under this bill, have benefited more from the war in their total income payments than the States which would not receive aid. The significance is that the figures show very clearly on their face that there is no emergency. The war has created no emergency so far as the financial condition of the poor States of the country is concerned.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. The war has simply accelerated, increased, and broadened the emergency.

I yield to my friend the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like first to say that I am opposed to the bill on more simple grounds than the financial considerations involved. However, I am curious to know if, in the gathering of his figures, the able Senator from Alabama ascertained the financial situation as of the moment in the so-called poorer States. Do they have a surplus; and if so, how much of it might be devoted to educational purposes?

Mr. HILL. I am glad the Senator used the phrase "how much of it might be devoted to educational purposes." We have figures relative to surpluses, but they do not show what might be used for educational purposes, and I do not have the figures with respect to the different States.

Mr. MALONEY. I wonder if the Senator would be willing, in connection with his collection and compilation of figures, to obtain for the Senate the financial statements, including the surpluses, if any, in those States, or in all the States?

Mr. HILL. The figures as to surpluses have been put in the RECORD. Whether or not the figures are available at hand without writing to the different States and getting a break-down of the surpluses, I do not know. But I shall be glad to ask the Treasury Department if it has a break-down of the States' finances, including surpluses, what the surpluses are, and what periods they are available for, and particularly if they are available with respect to schools.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Utah made what was to me a rather extraordinary argument, to the effect that we have not shown any figures regarding local subdivisions. He seems to assume that if a local subdivision does not have money the only recourse is the Federal Government. Here is a State constitutional system making education the primary function of nearly every State, and here also is a Federal Constitution which says that education is not in any way a Federal function. Certainly if there is a shortage in any locality their first appeal must be to the State of which they are a part, and it seems perfectly obvious to me that until that is done, so long as the State has funds, there is not even the beginning of a basis of appeal to the Federal Government. To show how unfair it is——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it may be that my State ought to ascertain just how much the Federal Government has given the State of Ohio. The State of Ohio got one of the first land grants; then it got another grant; it has received a great deal of Federal money, and, perhaps, we ought to see how much Ohio has received, and see if we cannot collect that much, and then a little interest on it, too.

Mr. TAFT. That would be very nice; but the point I want to make is that the State of Ohio has a State equalization system; the State of Ohio pays the salaries of its teachers. Why on earth should we pay money to some State that does not equalize its teachers and that has money but will not use it? The local subdivisions are without money, but the State has money, and will not use it, whereas our people are putting up money for poor subdivisions to see that such subdivisions are taken care of.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator that my State of Alabama has an equalization system, a wonderful system in theory, but the only trouble is we have not the financial ability to effectuate the system.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I did not hear the whole quotation of the Senator from Ohio, but I heard him refer to the constitutional provisions of several States which seemed to emphasize in his mind the duty of the several States to educate their children, and he seemed to make some reference to it being only an incidental duty on the part of the Federal Government to educate the children of the several States.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator from Alabama will yield to me, I said there was no constitutional power to deal with education in the Federal Constitution.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well; that is the comment I was going to make.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, is the Senator going to suggest that we proceeded unconstitutionally in 1802, again in 1803, and, I think, in 1785, although that was before the Federal Constitution and so was proper, I presume, and in other acts by which grants were made to the State of Ohio. Does he think in those instances we did an unconstitutional thing?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I did not say that this bill was unconstitutional; I do not so claim; but I say, as was pointed out by the Senator from Louisiana, that there is no constitutional right in the Federal Government to regulate or deal with education. There is a spending power, and, of course, it is said that the spending power is broad enough to enable the Government to spend for any purpose it may desire, and that is the basis of many of the Federal grants to the States. But, so far as that function is concerned, the Constitution is perfectly clear that is the burden and obligation of the States.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator from Ohio, being the distinguished lawyer that he is, knows fully the provision of the Federal Constitution which says that—

> All persons born or naturalized in the United States * * * are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.

If the United States Government does not have the power, indeed, the duty, to help educate its citizens, it seems to me there is something lacking in enabling it to perform its obligations.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the record shows that the Federal Government has been following such a course from the very beginning.

Mr. PEPPER. Exactly.

Mr. HILL. It may not have done as much as the Senator from Florida or I or some former Senator might wish it had done, but, from the very beginning, the Federal Government has done that very thing.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator well recalls also that among the principal premises of the Federal Government is the provision to provide for the common defense, and it has been brought out on this floor—and, of course, the Senate is aware of the statistics—that nearly 1,000,000 men otherwise eligible for selective service in the effort to provide for the common defense of the Nation, while physically qualified yet have been rejected because they were educationally deficient. If the Federal Government cannot educate its citizenry in order that they may contribute to the common defense, the Federal Government cannot effectively provide for the common defense, which is an elementary provision in the Federal Constitution. But, in addition to that——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I agree with everything he has said, but I also agree with the American Youth Commission, of which Mr Owen D. Young was the chairman and Mr. Henry I. Harriman was vice chairman. I do not have to tell the Senate who Owen D. Young is, and I am sure I do not have to tell it who Mr. Harriman is, but I want to remind the Senate that Mr. Harriman was former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce and vice chairman of the New England Power Association. Mr. Young and Mr. Harriman made a study of our school and educational system throughout the United States. They spoke about the question of national defense—that was before we were at war—and gave a construction to the words "national defense" to which I am sure the Senator from Florida agrees, that it should be not only defense from the enemy without but the enemy within. Here is what they said. I quote from Mr. Young and Mr. Harriman in the American Youth Commission report:

> In the larger view, the primary motive of any program of national defense is to protect our freedom and our democratic institutions. In this respect, education is established in public policy, not as a secondary interest, but as the first-line defense against that internal breakdown which in many nations has proved to be even more dangerous than external attack.

In connection with that statement from the American Youth Association, let me say that Lord Macaulay, the great English historian, cried out "America need not fear enemies without; it is vandals within that will bring about her destruction."

Mr. PEPPER. To that exceedingly able commentary, if the Senator will allow me, I should like to add only this: I think I have stated before on the floor of the Senate that a little while ago my secretary entered Camp Lee, Va., as a selectee. He was one of 600 white boys, all from Virginia, who that day entered that training camp of the United States to serve for the defense of the Nation in providing for the common defense. According to the story he told me, at the end of that day 193 of those Virginia white boys, otherwise qualified but ineligible because of illiteracy to be accepted into the armed services of their country, were put in busses and sent home.

Mr. President, does any Senator say that the United States Government does not have the right to see to it that those 193 able-bodied men are fit to serve their country in its defense and for its security? If the United States Government should find that they, as its citizens, have been handicapped in their capacity to defend the country because they have not had adequate educational opportunities, the Government would be remiss in the performance of its duties in providing for the common defense if it did not endeavor to make those boys eligible. I will say only this, Mr. President, that my secretary left a wife and a 6 months or a year old child at home. Many single men are out of the Army today, and many married men are in the Army who would not have to be there if the States of this Nation had been able to discharge and had discharged their duty to make those single men educationally capable of serving their country.

So, Mr. President, it can be pointed out that it is the duty of the Federal Government in many States to provide educational opportunity for the citizens without even resorting to the general welfare clause of the Constitution, to which the Senator has already so well referred.

Mr. HILL. Although the Federal Government may not have met its duty to the extent some of us would have liked, it has done so in part at least, and recognized certain obligations under the duty. I am sorry the Senator was not able to be present earlier, when I discussed this very matter.

During the last war more than 25 percent of the men called into the armed forces of the country could not read a newspaper or write a letter. More than 25 percent, one-fourth, of the flower of the manhood of this country could not read a newspaper or write a letter. The Federal Government failed in its duty, which is the reason why today 3,400,000 men who should be the very flower of our manhood had to be rejected because of mental or physical deficiencies, and we have been forced now to start calling fathers and breaking up homes.

Mr. MALONEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. Before I yield I should say that I have found here some data about the war contracts.

Mr. MALONEY. I will take only half a second, if the Senator will permit me to ask a question at this point.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

Mr. MALONEY. Does the Senator think we could simplify matters by a complete erasure of State lines?

Mr. HILL. No. I would not have the Federal Government do that, but, as I said earlier in the day, I would have the Federal Government meet its responsibilities and obligations to the citizenship of the Nation. Every citizen, every boy, and every girl, is not only a citizen of his or her State but he or she is a citizen of the Federal Government, of the United States, and today the Federal Government is imposing the first duty, the first responsibility, the first obligation, on its citizens, drafting them, sending them to far-flung battlefields to fight, some of them to die, for the Federal Government.

Mr. MALONEY. How intense is the Senator's feeling about State responsibilities?

Mr. HILL. My feeling about the States' responsibilities is just as intense as my feeling about the Federal Government's responsibilities. The only difference is that up to date the States have borne the major part, nearly all, of this burden, and the Federal Government has not played its part.

Mr. MALONEY. Let me ask the Senator one more question.

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator knows very well there is no surplus in the Federal Treasury. He also knows that there are surpluses in many State treasuries.

Mr. HILL. I have said time and time again, so far as the surpluses are concerned, that I should like to know what they are. We cannot forget that the same people who pay the State taxes are the ones who pay the Federal taxes. They are one and the same. To hear some of the arguments on the bill and

some of the views expressed, one would think that the people in the States are different from the people in the Federal Government. They are all one and the same.

Mr. MALONEY. And that brings me back to the statement I made a moment ago. I wonder whether or not, because of this great sameness to which the Senator refers, does not think it would be wise to abolish State lines completely.

Mr. HILL. No; I think the Federal Government has a distinct part to play and the State government has a part to play, the county governments have a part to play, the municipal governments, even down to the little local districts within the counties, have a part to play.

Mr. MALONEY. For hundreds of years the localities and the States have been paying for education. The local communities, and many municipalities, have better financial standing now than almost ever before in their history, at least in many instances. The States are better off financially than they have been in a long time. The Federal Government is now worse off financially than it ever has been in the history of the country. I should like to get some idea of the Senator's thought as to the degree of responsibility of the sovereign States and the Federal Government.

Mr. HILL. The Senator used the expression, "The States are better off." The Senator must remember, as the Senator from Utah has said, that the local communities or local governments are bearing the larger part of the burden. It does not follow at all, indeed, it is not a fact, that many of them are better off. Many of them really are not better off. Many of them have been drained of people who have gone into the highly concentrated centers for war work.

Mr. MALONEY. That creates no educational problem in those States.

Mr. HILL. They are no longer taxpayers. The children are still there, with the adults gone.

Now let us consider this situation: The Senator from Ohio referred to Arkansas, and he referred to his own State of Ohio. I do not want to forget Ohio, because it had about the first grant from the Federal Government, in 1802. Ohio was the first State to have advantage from that source.

Arkansas has received some $400,878,000 worth of Government contracts. Of the national total, Arkansas has received thirty-six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the amount of money which has been expended by the Government by way of contracts. Ohio did not stop with millions; Ohio has received $8,381,226,000 in contracts. Ohio has received 7.57 percent of the war contracts. That shows what I have stated, that the war situation, instead of helping the poorer States and the poorer communities, has concentrated the wealth more and more in the richer States and in the richer sections.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wanted to point out from the table I have that Ohio income payments in 3 years have increased exactly the national average, 62 percent, whereas the income of Arkansas has increased 118 percent, and the income of Alabama about 115 percent.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. So it cannot be true that there is any more concentration of wealth in Ohio as represented by individual income, than there was before. In fact, the opposite is true.

Mr. HILL. I repeat what I said before, that if one had $2 and received $2 more, he would have an increase of 100 percent, but if he had a thousand dollars and received $500, he would have an increase of only 50 percent. Forgetting the percentages, the figures show that Arkansas has received $400,000,000 in contracts, whereas the State of Ohio has received almost $8,500,000,000 in contracts.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator will yield a moment, of course these are industrial contracts.

Mr. HILL. War contracts.

Mr. TAFT. What about three large camps in Arkansas? They are not included. The war activities in Arkansas are substantial. Obviously, according to the figures, they have increased the economy of Arkansas more than the contracts let in Ohio have increased the economy of Ohio, because while a large number of contracts have been let to Ohio firms, it is also true that they have ceased a large production of other things which they made in peacetime. How much larger the total production is I do not know, but it is not substantially greater than it was for peacetime products. The plants in Ohio have been converted.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator speaks of Army camps. As I recall, there are a number of Army camps in Ohio. I know that one of the greatest concentrations is at Dayton, Ohio, where are located Wright Field and Patterson Field, and, as I recall, one other field. So I think Ohio has had her share of Army camps.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator does not hold to the notion, does he, that the wealth of a State is measured by the number of war contracts it has?

Mr. HILL. No. I will say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Connecticut, that I do not think the wealth of a State can be measured by the war contracts it has. I will say further that the debate led from percentages to figures, and from figures to percentages, and it gradually drifted into a discussion of war contracts.

Mr. MALONEY. The discussion of war contracts in connection with the question simply complicates the issue, does it not?

Mr. HILL. I will be perfectly frank and say that my friend, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] first raised the question with respect to percentages. Unless one knows all the factors, as I have said two or three times, which enter into percentages, or the factors which enter into figures, one cannot from the percentages or the figures know exactly what the real picture is.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I think the point made by the Senator from Michigan was quite sound. He was endeavoring to prove, as I understood him, that the States were better off now than they were before the war; that their financial situation was better, and that therefore there was no increased need for educational assistance at this time. I think the Senator from Michigan was on sound ground in that respect.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if I may be permitted, I should like now to proceed. At the time my distinguished friend, the Senator from Michigan, asked me to yield I had referred to the Federal Government employee receiving so much more than the average teacher. When I said Federal Government employee I was speaking in terms of the elevator operator, the charwoman, and the charman and persons in that type of employment. In 1938 the average annual salary of teachers was $125 above the annual wage of factory employees, but in 1942 it was $626 less. For the most part the increase in wages of factory employees has been underwritten by the Federal Government, since most industries are engaged in production for the Federal Government under war contracts. The Government in making the contracts takes into consideration the cost of wages. It has the power and machinery to fix wages. The Government has increased industrial wages in large measure and also given the manufacturer a good profit.

The school teachers of the country are the largest class of employees engaged in an enterprise essential to the winning of the war and to the peace to follow for whom the Federal Government has done nothing by way of adjustment of wages in order to meet the current cost of living.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more?

Mr. HILL. I have been on the floor since 12 o'clock and I should like to conclude my speech. However I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MALONEY. I wish to bring the matter down to as simple language as possible. The Senator knows that insofar as the salaries of teachers are concerned—and I quite agree with him that the teachers are greatly underpaid—it is simply a question of enough people going to town meetings or meetings of the board of finance or to the polls in any community in the land to bring about a proper adjustment of teachers' salaries. In many of the communities, particularly the small ones, an increase in tax of 1 or 2 mills would give the teachers the salaries they deserve.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am sorry I cannot agree with the Senator from Connecticut. In order to increase local taxes 1 mill in my State it would be necessary to have a constitutional amendment adopted, which means the legislature would have to meet for that purpose, it would have to be in session a certain time before the amendment could be submitted for approval, and then after its submission a certain time must elapse before the people may vote upon

it. Then further time would have to elapse before it could become effective.

Mr. MALONEY. Did [illegible] the very able Senator serve in the Legislature of Alabama?

Mr. HILL. I did not have that distinguished honor, I will say to my friend.

Mr. MALONEY. I think that he submits a rather weak excuse after all these years.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, we are speaking about an emergency, a distressing situation which confronts us. The Senator from Connecticut suggested one method that might relieve the situation, and I simply called his attention to some of the difficulties which would be encountered if we were to follow that method.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not agree that what the Senator has said represents a great difficulty.

Mr. HILL. I submit also the proposition that some of the districts are not financially able to levy additional taxes.

Mr. MALONEY Will the Senator permit me a moment to say that I think the difficulty to which he refers is a very convenient self-restraint?

Mr. HILL. I am sorry the Senator could not be present yesterday to hear the able presentation by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], at which time there was considerable discussion with respect to the financial ability of the different States and of the different communities. The whole record before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor shows that the poorer States and the poorer sections of the country are making the greatest efforts—much greater efforts than are being made by the richer States and the richer sections—to educate their children, and that the poorer sections and poorer States have much the larger number of educable children, children who must be educated. As has been suggested it seems that "the money is where the children aint."

Mr. President, I wish the Senator would read the hearings before the committee. I wish he would take the time to study them. I wish he would read what men like Mr. Harriman, from whose testimony I have quoted, have had to say about the situation. I wish he would note that President Hoover created a commission on education, and that the present President has created a commission on education. The American Youth Commission was created, of which Owen D. Young was chairman and Mr. Harriman was vice chairman. A number of commissions have been created composed of businessmen, men of different religious faiths, men representing all the different sections of the country. Everyone who has studied the question has inevitably come to the conclusion that there must be Federal aid.

Mr. MALONEY. Have all of them advocated the passage of this bill?

Mr. HILL. Their testimony is in the record. I will not say that all have advocated the passage of this bill. The Hoover commission was created some years ago, and I do not know if it advocated such a measure. As I recall the report made by that commission it did not advocate any particular plan, or say how in its opinion the matter should be handled; but in its report the commission stated that the only solution to the problem was Federal aid.

Mr. MALONEY. So the Senator is assuming that Mr. Harriman spoke for the Chamber of Commerce and is advocating the bill?

Mr. HILL. No, I did not say that Mr. Harriman spoke for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. I said Mr. Harriman spoke for the American Youth Commission, of which he was vice chairman. I did say that Mr. Harriman was a former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator does not mean to imply that the United States Chamber of Commerce has advocated the bill?

Mr. HILL. No; I do not mean to imply that Mr. Harriman spoke for the United States Chamber of Commerce. He spoke for the American Youth Commission. But in order that the Senate might know just who Mr. Harriman is and what his background is, I called attention to the fact that he was a former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me for one more question, and then I will subside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARAWAY in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HILL. Yes. I wish to finish my statement this afternoon, if possible, but I always wish to be courteous to my friend, the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I desire to have the Senator's judgment on another question which also bothers me. When the able Senator from Utah was reading about the great shortage of school teachers in Maryland, I vividly recalled the earnest statement made by the mayor of New York to the Military Affairs Committee—the able Senator from Alabama was present at the time—with respect to the terrific shortage of policemen and firemen. If the municipalities of this country, being unable adequately to pay their teachers, were equally unable adequately to pay their policemen and firemen—and I should think one might follow the other—at any rate that is the hypothesis upon which I base the question—would the Senator say that this bill is any sort of precedent for turning from municipal resources to Federal resources——

Mr. HILL. That was a hypothesis upon which the mayor of New York did not proceed. The mayor of New York did not proceed on the basis of the pay of firemen or policemen.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is quite correct.

Mr. HILL. He was here to say, "Do not take them in the draft; do not take them in the armed services," not because they were about to quit their jobs by reason of the fact that they are not adequately or properly paid, but "what I fear," said the mayor of New York, "is that you are going to take them into the armed services, and I will not have trained policemen; I will not have trained firemen."

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is quite correct. I did not mean to carry the parallel any further than the story from Maryland indicating that there was a shortage. Now I pose the question to the able Senator. If a municipality, being unable adequately to pay its own teachers, was also unable adequately to pay its own policemen and firemen, and lost them as the result, would the Senator say that this bill is any sort of a precedent for turning from municipal resources to Federal resources to pay for the police and fire departments of the United States?

Mr. HILL. No; I should say not.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not see why not.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has not yet gotten the picture. If he had, he would be for the bill; if he understood that, he would be for the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Madam President——

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely wish to suggest to the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan that education has always been understood to be a matter of very vital interest and concern to the entire Nation, and that basis cannot justly be overlooked by anyone who wants to discuss this matter. The question of local fire protection or the question of whether a local community will have a ditch dug and will engage in drainage work is an altogether different one.

It is somewhat discouraging to hear the discussion turn upon the very narrow basis that so many of the Senators seem disposed to let it turn upon. The basis of the whole case at last comes to the point that there is an unequal distribution of wealth and of income and of taxable resources in the country. Probably we shall always have that condition. Against that no one can justly complain; but, that being true, there is a responsibility for interposition by the Federal Government in a matter of vital concern—indeed, a matter which involves the very life of the Republic—the matter of public education.

The comparison of one State's income with another State's income, the suggestion that States are not doing their duty, of course, are pertinent observations. Every State ought to do its duty. Every State ought to do it without any qualification.

However, we are blind if we do not know that wealth and production and taxable income in our country have never been equal among all the States, and can never be equalized, except by the entry of the Federal Government into matters of vital national concern.

When we talk about taxes and about how great has been the increase of the percentage of Federal income taxes paid in many of the States, that is one of the real reasons why, if the activity covered by the pending bill is a proper function

for Federal activity, the Federal Government should now recognize it; because many sources of State income have been fairly well dried up. We have a sum-total increase in the percentage payments of the Federal income taxes, in many States, confined to a narrow locality—one great war enterprise, a few great war projects which enter into the general economy of the State, but which do not affect the economy of local communities, municipalities, and districts in which schools must be maintained.

Madam President, I rose merely to say that Federal interposition in the field of education stands upon an altogether different basis from purely local community enterprise. On that point I wish to say that I have no sort of fear that the Federal Government, either by direct legislative action or by restrictions or conditions, will ever be permitted to control education within the States, because the American people have jealously guarded that privilege, and always will; and, after all, the American people control the Congress, and they always will write the laws through those who sit in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, and eventually they will control the operations of the Federal bureaus, or else the people's liberties are gone.

Mr. MALONEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I should be glad to yield, but I do not have the floor.

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut, if he wishes to ask a question.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to observe that the senior Senator from Georgia, as always is the case, keeps the debate on a high plane. If I could believe, as he sincerely professes to believe, that the Federal Government would not one day, after providing the money, control the educational facilities of the land, I should support the bill. But I do not believe it. History, and particularly history of late years, belies that. We have regretfully watched the growing power of centralized government.

I am amazed at Senators who profess an unwillingness to believe that if we pour these millions and millions of dollars into local education, all over the land, the central government will not, one day, in a little while, exert an influence and exercise a direction over local education. I wish I could believe as does the Senator.

I apologized a moment ago for discussing cost in connection with the bill. It was a part of the argument, I understand, provoked by the proponent of the bill.

I do not want the Federal Government in local education. I do not want the power of the States over local education usurped by the Federal Government. That is the sole purpose of my opposition to the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Madam President, I understand and appreciate the Senator's position. If I may trespass a little further, I should like to say that heretofore the American people have regarded bureaucracy as an academic thing. Now they know it is a very real and a very tangible thing. It is being brought home to each local community—indeed, to every farmer, every merchant, everyone who deals with his Government. What does that mean? It means that shortly we will strip the bureaus of the powers we have loosely given to them without any analysis and without any thought. We are largely to blame for that. I undertake to say that the O. P. A. price control bill is the sloppiest piece of legislation ever passed by the American Congress. We allowed it to be written by inexperienced men and by men who had selfish purposes, but that is our fault.

I should not be able to convince my good friend, the Senator from Connecticut, but the field of education is a field in which the American people, from the first, from the days of the little red schoolhouse, from the days of the Pilgrim Fathers, all the way down, have jealously guarded the right of the local community to control its schools and its school system, and never, in my honest opinion, will there come a day when the American people will permit the control of education by any centralized authority in Washington.

As to whether a State or the Federal Government might influence education locally, I am not concerned about that, if the influence is good and if it is helpful. If so, I do not think it will hurt anyone. But I mean control of it. Even the people have not given up the control of their highway systems—a purely material thing. The American people have a deep devotion to the cause of education—a matter vital to any democracy. Even Washington, in the earlier days, recognized that there had to be universal education, and that there had to be religion, as the basis of all moral responsibility in a free country.

Mr. MALONEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to borrow the language of the Senator from Georgia to make my argument. The American people will prevent, as best they can, the usurpation of power, influence, or control over education. On behalf of those whom I in part represent, I wish to join in the attempt to prevent the first step, which I recognize as extremely dangerous.

Mr. GEORGE. Madam President, I fully appreciate the Senator's position. I know that he is quite sincere. If I believed as he does, I would stand with him. However, I believe that we are overexaggerating the possibility of undue and improper Federal control over such a vital, personal, intimate thing in the life and character of our people as our school system.

Mr. MALONEY. My distinguished friend has watched the parade of events in late years.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I have.

Mr. MALONEY. It has not been in keeping with the views and hopes which he now expresses.

Mr. GEORGE. I grant that, and I have tried to explain it. In a very large sense we are responsible for it, because we have not been at pains to write the proper restrictions into the law. We have hurriedly thrown it together. Under the pressure of war or the threat of war, we have granted various powers. But this bill does not go that far. If the proposed legislation stood alone, I doubt if anyone would be greatly disturbed about it, or express any fear about it. As the distinguished Senator from Connecticut says, it is regarded as a first step, as a possible opening. Based upon some of our unhappy experiences, we can foresee that the thing might get out of hand and that there might be Federal interference at the level of the home. That we would not tolerate.

I am convinced that we are nearing the time when unjustified and unwarranted control through bureaus and bureau methods will be practically at an end in this country. Bureaucracy is no longer an academic discussion. Any Senator can verify that statement by going back home. It is not merely something which public men talk about. The farmer knows about bureaucracy. The little merchant on the corner knows about it. He has read what the O. P. A. is doing to him, and it has become a personal, concrete, definite problem with him.

Let us not lose faith in the character of America. When the people understand an evil, they will correct it. The first sign of Federal interference with education will certainly demand immediate action by the people. They will hurry to end the great advance of bureaucracy in America.

The bill provides for a modest contribution by the Federal Government to the support of our common school system, based upon the broad ground that wealth and income are not universally distributed, and cannot be universally distributed.

Let me say to the Senator that my name happens to be attached to three of four measures having to do with vocational education in the United States.

There was a bill known as the George-Reed bill, which in addition to my name, also bore the name of a distinguished Representative from New York. Another bill, the George-Deen bill, bore the name of one of my Georgia colleagues, in addition to my name. When it was first proposed to increase the Federal contribution in that field, many fears were expressed. I do not believe that anyone can truthfully say that through the contribution made by the Federal Government to vocational education in the common schools in this country the Federal Government has controlled or has undertaken to control the policies of the schools.

Mr. MALONEY. Of course not. There would be no purpose in Federal control of vocational education in our schools.

Mr. GEORGE. It is a part of the public-school system.

Mr. MALONEY. That is true.

Mr. GEORGE. And the contribution goes directly to the public schools.

Madam President, I would rather keep education departmentalized, so to speak, with Federal contributions going into departments, for the reason which the Senator senses, namely, that under such a system it is more difficult for anyone

to interfere with the local school system if he has the disposition to do so. I myself have not the fear expressed by the Senator from Connecticut. If I had such a fear, I would stand with him. He is a very frank thinker, and is very frank in his actions in this body. He is one of the ablest Members of the Senate, and his purposes have always been above even the slightest question. If I had his fear, I would oppose this bill. But I have no such fear, because if the Federal Government should undertake to do anything with the home, or on the level with the home life, in such a vital field as education, the American people would see to it that some Senator rose in his place and said, "That was never contemplated, and must not be done." In my judgment that is what the American people should do.

I apologize to the Senator from Alabama for taking so much of his time.

Mr. HILL. Madam President, I thank the Senator for his very fine contribution to this debate. Of old it was said of a certain man that "he spoke with authority." If there is any man in the Senate or in the United States who can speak with authority on the subject of wealth, income, or relative financial ability, it is the able and distinguished Senator from Georgia, chairman of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate.

Madam President, I have occupied the floor for nearly 4 hours. I am anxious to conclude my remarks. The distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is very anxious to speak this afternoon. I fear that I have already trespassed too much on his time. If possible I should like to be able to conclude my remarks.

During the debate on the Wheeler bill dealing with the drafting of fathers, we recall that there was much discussion about juvenile delinquency abroad in the land today. We recall some of the statements as to how serious such delinquency is at this hour. A recent report of the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor emphasizes that crowded schools are a contributing factor in today's juvenile restlessness. As I have stated, there are hundreds of thousands of children in crowded schoolrooms, and in schoolrooms where classes are not conducted full time, which means that such children have far more opportunity for idleness and are far more subjected to conditions which make for juvenile delinquency than is ordinarily the case. Half-day sessions in schools and the draining off of teachers contribute to juvenile delinquency.

I have a number of letters from superintendents of education throughout the country stating the situation in their respective cities in reference to the increase in juvenile delinquency. I shall include some excerpts from those letters, without reading them at this time.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the F. B. I., recently made the following comment:

> As a nation, we have failed to realize the seriousness of the increase in youthful crime since the outbreak of the war. Here is a problem that is approaching a national scandal.

The schools are of even more importance today in the matter of proper care and education of children, because, as we know, many more fathers and, more particularly, many more mothers are at work, absent and away from their homes, than in normal times.

I invite attention to the words of Dorothy Canfield Fisher. In speaking of the dire consequences of educational neglect, Miss Fisher said:

> You can interrupt the improving of a road and 10 years later go on with it about where you left off, but if you interrupt decent care for children and 10 years later begin again to feel responsible for them, you can by no means begin where you left off. You find them irreparably grown up, and grown up wrong—enemies and liabilities of their communities rather than friends and assets.

Earlier in my discussion I quoted two lines from Kipling's poem with reference to filling the "unforgiving minute with 60 seconds' worth of distance run." When we lose any of those seconds, when we fail to fill those golden minutes, there is no power on earth which can reclaim them. If we do not properly care for, educate, train, and prepare the children of America their opportunities will be lost and gone forever.

Mr. DANAHER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I do not know whether the Senator was on the floor when I made a statement a few minutes ago. I have held the floor for 4 hours. I certainly should not wish to be in the position of delaying too long a vote on the bill of which I am coauthor. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] has been waiting patiently for sime time, because he has a speech which he desires to make this afternoon. The debate will likely continue for 2 or 3 days. I assume that the Senator from Connecticut will claim the floor in his own time, and I should prefer not to yield, unless he is insistent that I yield. I do not wish to be discourteous to him, but I wish to finish my speech, and to accommodate the Senator from North Carolina. As I have said, I have held the floor for 4 hours. Certainly, I should like to finish my speech this afternoon.

Mr. DANAHER. Madam President, in the light of the Senator's very reasonable willingness to allow me to ask a question if I choose to be insistent, at the risk of its being so construed, I should like to ask him a question. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. Very well; but I hope the Senator will propound a question, rather than make an observation.

Mr. DANAHER. I will. The Senator talked about opportunity and the denial of opportunity, and about what will happen if we do not grant equal opportunity.

Mr. HILL. I hope the Senator will ask a question, not make an observation.

Mr. DANAHER. I will. Is it not a fact that in the State of Alabama there is allocated only $47 per pupil for each white child, and only $14 per pupil for each colored child?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct, and I hope he will join with me in the effort to pass the bill, so that all those children, both white and black, may have a better opportunity to receive an education.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HILL. Madam President, I shall have to proceed with my remarks if I am to complete them this afternoon.

Section 2 (B) of the bill provides for more nearly equalizing public elementary and public secondary school opportunities among and within the States, and carries an authorization for an appropriation of $100,000,000 a year.

From the funds made available under the section to which I have just referred, not to exceed 2 percent would be set aside for apportionment to Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam. The apportionment would be made by the United States Commissioner of Education on the basis of the respective needs of the Territories and possessions, as determined by the Commissioner. Territories and possessions are thus placed in a category different from the State, chiefly because the necessary statistical data as to income in the former are not available.

As for apportionment to the respective States under section 2 (B), from not less than 98 percent of the $100,000,000 funds will be made available to each State by the United States Commissioner of Education according to an objective formula for determining the financial needs of the States. The formula involves two factors: First, the number of inhabitants from 5 to 17 years of age in the respective States; and, second, the financial ability of the respective States, as measured by the total estimated income payments in each. The basic statistics as to the number of children within the 5- to 17-year age group are to be furnished by the Bureau of the Census. The data on the total estimated income payments will be supplied by the Secretary of Commerce, through its Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, whose annual estimates constitute the most reliable data available on income payments.

For details on the application of the formula to the problem in any particular State, I would refer to pages 15–18 of the report of the Committee on Education and Labor on the pending bill. Let it be noted that the formula for distribtuion of funds to the States to equalize educational opportunity is written into the bill, and is not subject to interpretation or modification by any Federal agency or individual, except the courts.

For years great differences in educational opportunity have existed among the States. As I have said, the war has only served to aggravate them. While the full significance of those differences cannot be expressed in numbers, they at least are impressively reflected by such factors as school expenditures per pupil, average salary paid to teachers, per pupil value of school property, length of school term, and the ratio of high-school enrolments to the number of persons of high-school age.

In 1940–41, Mississippi spent only $28.03 per pupil in average daily attendance at public elementary and secondary schools. That is less than one-fifth of the amount spent per pupil in New York, and less than one-third of the amount

spent in the Nation as a whole. Eight States spent less than $50 per pupil, while 15 States spent $100 or more per pupil.

The average annual salary for all public, elementary and secondary school teachers, principals, and supervisors in 1940–41 ranged from $568 in Mississippi to $2,591 in New York. Seven States paid less than $800 on the average, while 15 States paid more than $1,600. If children in the different parts of the Nation are to have similar opportunities to get an education, they must have teachers with similar qualifications. Such conditions cannot be attained as long as salary levels differ as widely as they do today. Good teachers go where they can earn salaries commensurate with their abilities.

The value of public elementary and secondary school property per pupil enrolled in 1939–40 ranged from $80 in Tennessee to $526 in New York. In seven States such property was valued at more than $400 per pupil, while in four others it was appraised at less than $100 per pupil. Can there be any logical reason why boys and girls in one State should have the privilege of attending adequate, well-equipped schools, while young people in a neighboring State huddle together in shacks to acquire the same knowledge?

In 1940–41, the average school term in the country as a whole was 174.5 days, or 8¾ months. Among the States the average term ranged from 146 days in Mississippi to 187 days in Illinois and Maryland. For all States the average length of rural-school terms was only 166 days, as compared with an average term of 181 days in urban schools. And this condition existed long before the present war.

Finally, the differences in school enrollment of young people of high-school age show why the general educational level in some States is so much lower than in others. In 1939–40, for each 1,000 persons 14 to 17 years old in Mississippi, only 392 were enrolled in high school. Contrast this with 952 out of 1,000 in the State of Washington. Seven States had fewer than 500 students in high school for each 1,000 of high-school age; 12 States had more than 800 enrolled out of each 1,000.

The States on the unfavorable side of the above comparisons are for the most part in the southeastern and southwestern sections of the United States. With lower paid teachers, inferior equipment, and less time in which to teach because of shorter school terms, these States cannot offer their boys and girls the same educational opportunities available in other sections.

These great differences are not due to lack of interest or effort on the part of the less fortunate States. It is an indisputable fact, proven by the evidence submitted yesterday in the speech of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and by the testimony in the hearings that the States with the lowest taxpaying ability have the most children to educate and, comparatively, make the greatest effort to raise revenue for their schools.

The Survey of Current Business for June 1943 reports a range of per capita income for 1942 from $407 in Mississippi to $1,352 in Nevada, with a national average of $852. Between 1939 and 1942, the war boom has raised the average per capita income in Mississippi from $201 to $407 and in Kentucky from $297 to $477, but Nevada increased from $767 to $1,352; California, from $741 to $1,167; New Jersey, from $816 to $1,304. The richest State still has a per capita income more than three times that of the poorest State. The average per capita income in the seven Southeastern States is $522; in the Middle East it is $1,039; and in the far West, $1,157. It is not surprising that the Southeastern States can spend less for educating their children.

It is in the Southeastern States, moreover, that there are the most children to be educated. According to the 1940 census, South Carolina had 589 children 5 to 17 years old for each 1,000 adults age 20 to 64; California, on the other hand, had only 277 children of school age for each 1,000 adults. Of the 16 States having the highest ratio of children to adults, 13 were in the Southeast or the Southwest. All but 2 of the 12 States having the lowest ratios are in the New England, Middle Atlantic, or far western regions. This geographical distribution reflects in part the fact that farming areas and small towns generally have a higher ratio of children to adults than do cities. With the present trend in birth rates, States now having the largest proportion of children will continue the same proportion in the years to come.

Do the poorer States rest on the fact that they are poor and thus they should not be expected to do much by way of educating their children? No, indeed. Each of the 3 States which are exerting the greatest effort to support their schools is among the 12 lowest with respect to taxpaying ability. Of the 12 States spending for schools to the limit of their resources, not 1 is among the 12 making the largest current expenditures per pupil.

As has been brought out again and again during the debate on the pending bill, the appalling differences in educational opportunity, both among the States and within the States, are due to the differences in economic conditions that lie largely beyond the control of the different States. These differences are differences in wealth, in income, in taxpaying ability, in the extent of absentee ownership of natural resources and industries, and differences in the number of educable children in proportion to adults. The poor States and communities have the largest proportionate number of children.

With these differences, over which the States have no control and which they have no power within themselves to remedy, there cannot be equality of educational opportunity throughout the Nation except through Federal aid.

Many of the 3,400,000 men rejected from the draft came from these States, but it did not lie within their power to train and prepare and make such men ready to serve the National Government in its time of danger and of war. The only power that could make those men ready, prepared, and fit to go forth and help save the Nation is the National Government.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I was interested in the reference to absentee ownership which the able Senator from Alabama made. I should like to ask if it is not his observation that in most of the Southern States, at least, whose principal contribution to the national economy has been in form of raw materials, political conditions, or other conditions have been such that they have been unable even to collect excise taxes with respect to the national resources which have been serviced from their soil.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct. To a great extent the natural resources of those States have gone out of their borders, they have been drained away from them to enrich other sections of the country and in many cases they have not even been subject to an excise tax.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I have yielded to the Senator from Connecticut once and to the Senator from Florida once. I hope the Senator will let me finish my speech. I desire to have the bill passed. I will say to my friend from Connecticut that I certainly do not want to be placed in the position of filibustering against my own bill or doing anything which might seem to make me a party to delaying action on it.

Mr. DANAHER. Very well.

Mr. HILL. Even if we had a suitable uniform tax plan in all the States, there would be nine States which if they used every penny the plan would provide for education and education alone, without any expenditures whatever for other governmental purposes, still would not have sufficient revenue to provide an adequate program of public education. For instance, if my State of Alabama, one of the nine States, much of whose wealth, as the Senator from Florida has suggested, has gone elsewhere, had had such a tax plan, a model tax plan, if it had such a plan today and did not expend one single dollar derived from it for any governmental purpose except for education, Alabama would require for an adequate program of public education far more revenues than would be derived even from such a model tax plan; indeed, it would require an amount equal to 165 percent of such revenues.

Another factor of special significance in revealing the need for Federal assistance to the States in support of education because of inequalities among the States is the program of increasing Federal taxation. No data as to the actual incidence of Federal taxation among the respective States are available for later than 1937, but data as to the source of collection of Federal internal revenues are quite significant. Between 1937 and 1942 the percentages of increase in Federal internal-revenue receipts in six of the economically poorer States were as follows: Alabama, 541 percent; South Carolina, 518 percent; Mississippi,

434 percent; New Mexico, 391 percent; Arkansas, 386 percent; Georgia, 304 percent. In six of the economically richer States Federal receipts increased as follows: Nevada, 262 percent; Delaware, 230 percent; California, 200 percent; Massachusetts, 173 percent; New Jersey, 165 percent; and New York, 163 percent. Thus, in six States with low economic ability Federal taxes increased by an average of 400 percent, while in six States with high economic ability the increase was only an average of 172 percent.

These differences in the rate of increase in Federal tax burdens become more pronounced as the heavy program of wartime taxation develops. The load rests more and more heavily upon lower income groups. State sources of revenue are being tapped increasingly by Federal levies and the poorer States face possible reduction of State tax revenues in order that they meet the obligations placed upon them by the Federal Government.

Mr. President, as we know, 17 States provide separate public schools for Negroes. Recent rulings of the Supreme Court of the United States—rulings, may I say, of the Federal Government—hold that, under the Constitution, no discrimination on the basis of race or color may be made in the payment of teachers' salaries or in educational opportunities afforded. In the past many of these 17 States have not paid equal salaries because they have not had the funds to maintain white and colored schools at the same level. Now these States are faced, under a mandate of the Federal Government construing and enforcing the Constitution, with the necessity of lowering the salaries of white teachers in order to raise those of colored teachers, or of curtailing the present school program, or of obtaining Federal Government aid to help them bear the increased costs. Obviously, Mr. President, the third possiblity is the only constructive one.

These States do not have the financial ability to provide equality of educational opportunity. As I have said earlier, every commission which has ever studied this problem has inevitably and inexorably been forced to that finding. It seems a fair proposition that the Federal Government should take the financial steps necessary to make its constitutional requirements effective.

Lastly, Mr. President, the problem of equalization of educational opportunity is not merely the problem of Alabama, Mississippi, North Carolina, Kentucky, and other economically poorer States. It is the problem of the entire United States of America. The 750,000 physically fit men, of draft age, who are not fathers, and who have been rejected from military service because they could not read and write and may have come, in large measure, from the poorer sections of the country, but their absence from the fighting ranks places an added burden on every fighting man and affects the status of every man within the draft age in the entire United States.

The educational level of the men rejected affects the entire Army of the United States, and as I have said, affects every man, whether he lives in Ohio, Michigan, or in any other State, if he be within the draft age.

I have said it over and over again, but I repeat, if these men had been properly trained and educated, there would not have been the necessity of drafting many fathers. What would proper training and education constitute? It would mean 4 years in school in the case of most of the men. With some of them it might be necessary to have a little more, but in most of the cases the men were rejected if they had not been beyond the fourth grade in school. If they had finished the fourth grade, we would have had very few if any fathers drafted. Yet Senators will stand on this floor and say that the matter of education, the matter of the training and preparation of the citizenship of the country, is of no concern to the Federal Government, should be of no concern to the Federal Government, and that it has nothing whatever to do with our war effort. Of course, those who take that position are even more blind than Buchanan was when he vetoed the land-grant college measure. I can only hope that they will some day have the vision and the wisdom which Abraham Lincoln showed when at a little later date he signed such a measure.

We stand here today, Mr. President, debating Federal aid to education. I believe the pending bill will pass the Senate, and I hope it will pass the House, but whether the bill shall pass now or not, its enactment is as inevitable as that the day will follow the night.

The longer we live, the more our country develops, the more complex becomes our civilization, the greater and more compelling becomes the need, the absolute necessity, for the Federal Government to meet its duty, accept its responsibility, carry out its obligation, and play its part in the training and the preparation of the citizenship of America.

Is not California interested in the bill? About 10 percent of the population of California now is from other States. People swarm into the State from everywhere. We even heard a few years ago of the Okies who went there—people swarming there to get jobs. Is it not true that California passed a law setting up an immigration barrier, providing that certain people should not come into California? Of course, the Supreme Court did what it should have done; it said there never was any such barrier, that the law was null and void ab initio. That tells the story.

Between April 1, 1940, and March 1, 1943, California's population increased 7.7 percent. These people came from all sections of the country and their educational equipment is not only of vital concern to California's war plants but to all America's war production. The 27.5-percent increase in population in the District of Columbia since 1940 represents an influx of men and women to Government service from every State in the Union. The educational background they have brought to apply to the Government's war program and post-war planning is of utmost importance to the Nation and its future.

California felt that its economic life, its spiritual life, its cultural life, were being so affected, and, in its opinion, so adversely affected, by people who were coming into California, most of whom had not been properly educated and trained, that through its legislature it even tried to outlaw those people, and not permit them to enter. I say to California today that there is an answer to this problem, and that answer is not by immigration laws preventing people from moving from one State to another, not by saying to a citizen of the United States who is subject to call by his Government, subject to be sent to some foreign battlefield thousands of miles away, and subject to die for this Government, "You cannot come into this State." The answer is Federal aid to education. I could take other States and apply the same illustration. It applies throughout the country, and why should it not?

I have somewhere figures which show that in California there are about half the number of children to be found in other States of the Union. We know many senior citizens have moved there, many carried to California the property and wealth acquired by them in other States, and the proportion of adults is much greater in relation to children than in other States.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who, incidentally, has been one of the most devoted and ablest and most indefatigable supporters of the pending bill, reminds me that 57 percent of the people of California have come from other States or other sections, and were not born in California. The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], who has given his wholehearted support to the bill from the very beginning, from the time it was first suggested, has reminded me that in his State of Florida half the people living there were not born in that State, but have come in from other States.

Mr. President, the educational level of the people of the United States is not a State problem alone; it is a national problem. With the increasing mobility of our people, and the break-down of barriers of transportation and communication, it cannot be otherwise. We know what good roads and automobiles have done along that line. It must be an accepted principle of American Government that wealth, income, and privileges should be taxed wherever found, and the revenue spent for public services wherever needed. Chief among these public services, I should say first among them, is public education.

We hear much today and we are stimulated and inspired at the thought of the "four freedoms." I say there must be a fifth freedom," which is the freedom from ignorance, and unless we have the "fifth freedom," we cannot have the "four freedoms."

Mr. President, I am aware of the fact that friends of public education have been hesitant to support a proposal for Federal financial aid, because they fear

that there might be some Federal control of our public schools. I share in the opposition to Federal control of education, but I do not share the fear that control will be the result of financial assistance. As the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] so ably expressed it, I do not share that fear because I believe that the American people, represented by the Congress, can have and will have a policy of Federal aid free from Federal control. It is a matter of policy and intent which can be clearly stated in statutory law, and is so stated and amply established in the pending bill.

Mr. President, the first section of the bill is a statement of policy so clear as to leave no doubt as to the intent of the entire bill to preserve State autonomy in the conduct of public education. Section 1 of the bill is as follows:

STATE CONTROL OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

SECTION 1. No department, agency, or officer of the United States shall exercise any supervision or control over any school or State educational agency with respect to which any funds are expended pursuant to this act, nor shall any term or condition of any agreement under this act relating to any contribution made under this act to or on behalf of any school or State educational agency authorize any agency or officer of the United States to control the administration, personnel, curriculum, instruction, methods of instruction, or materials of instruction.

It should be observed, and I want it now to be made a matter of record, that the chief purpose of placing this declaration of policy in the very first part of the bill is to offer a point of reference for interpreting all other provisions found in the bill so that in the future any doubt concerning the control of education that might arise in interpreting this measure must be resolved in favor of the respective States.

Mr. President, the real danger of Federal control of education arises not from the fact that some Federal money may go to the States but from the fact that some of the States and thousands of communities throughout the Nation may not be able to support an efficient system of free public schools. The danger of external control comes from weakness, financial weakness, and lack of ability to support this necessary public service which is of vital importance to the national welfare, a public service whose importance transcends mere community or State boundaries. The surest way to preserve local autonomy in public services in this country is to make certain that local communities have the financial strength to perform the required function under consideration.

The real danger of Federal control of education comes from the failure of the Federal Government to have any consistent policy of aiding public education and aiding it through the established agencies of the State. It is not that we do not have any Federal aid for education, for the Federal Government has spent hundreds of millions of dollars for education; the danger lies in that the Federal Government oftentimes aids education by indirect methods, administering funds for educational purposes through noneducational channels.

During the depression schools in many States, and particularly in the less wealthy rural areas, encountered serious financial difficulties. Congress might have faced the problem frankly and established a system of Federal aid for schools at that time, but it did not. By 1934 the situation became so serious that the Federal Government felt impelled to do something to prevent a complete collapse in certain areas. The indirect method was used. Some of the funds set aside for relief were made available to the schools, but the Federal officials prescribed conditions for using the funds.

For example, where schools could only be continued with the use of Federal funds, teachers could be paid salaries only at the rates prescribed for persons on relief. The Federal Government thus took away from the participating States and communities during that period the control of a vital phase of school policies. It determined the salaries to be paid individual teachers and the salaries in most cases were lower than established local standards.

The need for nursery schools and kindergartens and for various types of adult education has existed for many years. Some communities have sufficient wealth to provide at least some of these services but many others do not have. A few years ago Federal agencies began to sense this need. Relief funds were made available to establish such services on a limited scale. But again there was no direct appropriation for education. In fact, the funds which were used in many cases were not even made available to established State educational agencies. Instead, a parallel and, to some extent at least, a duplicating agency, was established in each State. The Federal Government thus was controlling certain aspects of educational policy in each State by determining the functions for which funds could be spent and the communities in which they could be spent, by hiring personnel, and by spending the funds.

The poorest communities have always had the greatest difficulty in providing adequate school buildings. The Federal Government also became interested in this field, and is likely to become interested again. But the system of aid which was established through the P. W. A. tended to help the wealthy communities more than the most needy because of the matching requirement. Moreover, the funds were not made available to established State educational agencies, but the Federal officials dealt directly with the communities, in a few instances encouraging the construction of buildings contrary to State standards. Thus for several years we had a very real Federal control of school-building construction, sometimes to the consternation of State and local educational authorities.

Mr. President, within the past 2 years the Federal Government has had an excellent opportunity to face the problem directly instead of indirectly because of the urgent needs in numerous war industry and training centers throughout the Nation. In many communities the population has been doubled, trebled, or even quadrupled while vast amounts of valuable property have been taken over by the Government. Clearly the resulting school financial problem was not of local origin. Once more, however, instead of facing the educational problem directly, Congress chose the method which results in greatest Federal control. Funds were made available through the so-called Lanham Act to assist in maintaining normal community facilities in those areas. From the beginning pressure groups have sought to dominate the situation, resulting in a mad scramble for funds. The F. W. A. has in some instances ignored the recommendations of established State and Federal educational agencies regarding educational phases of the program.

Whenever appropriations are made direct to Federal agencies instead of to the States, instead of being spent through the machinery of the States, danger of Government control is invited. That is where the danger lies. Because of financial weakness in States, and because States cannot do the job properly, they have to turn to the Federal Government, and the Federal Government proceeds to do the work, not through the States and the machinery of the States, but by direct intervention on the part of the Federal Government.

Federal aid for education being necessary, there is a wise policy for the Federal Government to follow in making grants to the States for education. Grants should be made to the States for general elementary and secondary schools. Grants should be made according to an objective formula written into the law so that the amount of money going to a State will be a matter of arithmetic, and not subject to the discretion of any Federal official. The funds should be granted through the United States Office of Education, and expended by the States through their respective State departments of education according to the laws of the States.

The investigations of the Committee on Education and Labor have revealed that the type of Federal control that is most feared is the type which would permit Federal officials to interfere with or dominate the internal affairs of the schools such as the selection of teaching personnel, the determining of curricula, courses of study, and methods of teaching. All such interferences are positively prohibited by the provisions of the pending bill.

Investigations of the Committee on Education and Labor have convinced at least a majority of the members of the committee that this bill, this method of approach, is the surest protection and the best safeguard against Federal control. Testimony before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor shows conclusively that where grants have been made by the Federal Government to the States for educational purposes according to an objective formula written into the law so that the amount of money going to the State has been a matter of arithmetic, there has been no Federal interference, and not even any attempt at Federal interference. The experience of the Fed-

eral and State governments in connection with Federal aid for educational purposes, under the Federal provisions for land grant colleges and vocational education, demonstrates clearly that Federal aid for education can be had without interference with the internal affairs of public education. That experience over a long period of years emphatically demonstrates that Federal aid to education does not mean Federal control of our schools or educational institutions.

There are certain objective types of control which necessarily accompany any type of legislation involving the expenditure of funds. For example, it is provided in section 7 of the pending bill that the commissioner shall cause an audit to be made of the expenditures of funds under the act by each State educational authority, and each State educational authority is required to cause audits to be made of the accounts of the local public-school jurisdictions in his State with respect to the expenditure of funds received under the act. If funds are expended in a manner contrary to the provisions of law, the commissioner after notice and hearing is authorized to withhold funds from the State. The purpose is to be sure that the funds will be expended for the purpose provided for in the act.

STATE AUTONOMY ADEQUATELY PROTECTED

The plan of Federal-State relationships under the bill is simple and clear-cut. The bill contains the safeguards necessary to insure that the funds will be spent by the States only for the purposes for which they are appropriated. On the other hand, section 1 contains stringent provisions to prohibit any Federal administrative official from asserting control over the educational policies of the State and local school authorities.

In particular, the powers of the Commissioner of Education under the bill are so limited that it is difficult to see how he could assert control over educational policies even in the event he should desire to do so. In order, however, that there may be no doubt as to the intent of the bill with respect to the autonomy of the State and local authorities, the bill contains specific prohibitions as to things which shall not be done. Section 1 contains provisions that in effect would constitute a "bill of rights" for American education.

The witnesses appearing before the committee who had carefully studied the bill and who were thoroughly familiar with the problems involved in the administration of Federal grants to the States, were in agreement that the bill does not provide for Federal control, even in connection with administrative and financial matters, and that adequate safeguards for State autonomy are provided in connection with such vital matters as the actual management of local schools, the selection of personnel, and the determination of courses of study in the schools.

IMPORTANT PROVISIONS AFFECTING GRANTS TO THE STATES

In addition to the required audits mentioned previously, certain other provisions to aid the States in accomplishment of the purpose for which money would be made available are set forth in the act.

STATE ACCEPTANCE PROVISIONS

Section 6 (A) provides that a State in order to qualify for receiving funds appropriated under the act shall, through its legislature, accept the provisions of the act and provide for the administration of funds to be received.

The legislature is to provide that the State treasurer shall serve as trustee of the funds received under the act; that the State educational authority—namely, the State superintendent or commissioner of education, or the State boards of education, whichever is provided by the constitution or laws of the State affected—shall administer the funds and shall provide for the making of audits by the State educational authority, and for reports by the State educational authority to the United States Commissioner of Education.

The State, either through its legislature or through its State educational authority, if the legislature so directs, shall provide for the apportioning of the funds received under the act to the local school jurisdictions for the payment of teachers' salaries with funds received under section 2 (A), and for more nearly equalizing educational opportunities with funds received under section 2 (B). No specific requirements are made as to what specifications the State shall include in the plans adopted. The committee is aware that the problems of financing the public schools are by no means the same in all the States. It is both desirable and necessary that freedom be left to the States in using the funds received under this act in making the necessary financial adjustments.

STATE EFFORTS TO FINANCE SCHOOLS

It is not intended that money from the act shall be used to replace the States' efforts to support their public schools. Accordingly, and in order to qualify for receiving money under the act, a State will have to spend at least as much from State funds for the public elementary and secondary schools as it spent in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

LOCAL EFFORTS TO FINANCE SCHOOLS

Section 6 (C) provides that only those local school jurisdictions shall be entitled to receive funds under section 2 (A) of the act that continue to pay average annual salaries to teachers not less than the average annual salaries paid as of February 1, 1943, or the nearest prior date when school was in session. This provision does not apply to the salary of any individual teacher, but does apply to the average salary paid in the local school jurisdiction affected. It is also provided that any school jurisdiction that fails to comply with this provision due to acts of God or other circumstances entirely beyond the control of the local school jurisdiction, shall be entitled to recieve an allocation from the State from the funds made available under section 2 (B) of the act in order to keep the average salaries of its teachers up to the level of February 1, 1943. Clearly the purpose of that provision is to prevent the reduction of teachers' salaries customarily paid from State and local funds, and the substitution of Federal funds from section 2 (A) without the improvement of teachers' salaries. The immediate purpose of making funds available under section 2 (A) of the act is to increase teachers' salaries during the emergency in order to prevent the depletion of needed personnel.

FUNDS FOR THE BENEFIT OF MINORITY RACES

In 17 States and the District of Columbia, separate schools for whites and Negroes are maintained. The maintenance of separate schools for separate races is a matter the constitutionality and legality of which have been fully determined by decisions of the United States Supreme Court. However, it is held by the United States Supreme Court, as well as by numerous State supreme court decisions, that equality of educational opportunity is required, especially under the provisions of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

As a matter of statistical fact, equality of educational opportunity among the white and colored races in most of the States maintaining separate schools has not been a reality. There are many reasons why equality of educational opportunity has not been attained. All in all, the most potent of those reasons is that adequate funds have not been, and within any reasonable limits cannot be, made available for educational purposes in a majority of the States which are affected by that problem.

Recent decisions of the United States courts have declared that it is contrary to the requirements of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States to make any differential in the salary of teachers because of race or color. Explanation of those decisions and the citations of them will be found in the hearings on Senate bill 1313, held before the Committee on Education and Labor on April 28, 29, and 30, 1941, on pages 7–9 and pages 31–32.

The pending bill, in section 6 (A) (f), provides that in States where separate public schools are maintained for separate races, the State through its legislature shall provide a just and equitable apportionment of such funds for the benefit of schools maintained for minority races, without reduction in the proportion of State and local moneys expended for educational purposes, during the fiscal year ended in 1942, for public schools for minority races. In section 13 (c) the term "minority race" is defined as any race or racial group that constitutes a minority of the population of the continental United States.

In section 13 (d) "a just and equitable apportionment, allotment, or distribution of funds" is defined as any apportionment which guarantees to a minority race for which by State law separate schools are maintained, an amount of funds in proportion to the number of such minority race in the total population of the State.

EXPENDITURES FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

It will be noted that throughout the pending bill the word "public" is used in connection with the words "schools"

and "education." In section 5 (D), which is an amendment proposed to the pending bill, it is provided that all funds expended under the provisions of the act shall be expended only by public agencies under public control. The word "public" has often been interpreted by court decisions. Whatever else the word may mean, it does not include schools under private control, whether denominational or otherwise. It is taken to mean schools under the control of the authorities recognized or constituted by the laws of the State to manage and control schools recognized as being agencies of the State.

The availability of funds for public schools as contrasted with private or parochial schools has been raised in connection with the pending bill, as it has been in connection with previous bills on the same subject. In some States, such as Louisiana, Maryland, and New York, the State laws permit public-school authorities to furnish public transportation for children attending private or parochial schools. Usually such legislation results in making it permissible for children attending private or parochial schools to ride in a school bus operated by local school boards with children attending public schools. In no case is money allocated directly to private agencies. All money is expended by local boards of education, and the services furnished are wholly under public control.

In some States, such as Louisiana, Mississippi, and New Mexico, the State laws provide for furnishing free textbooks to children attending private and parochial schools as well as to children attending public schools. No money is allocated to any private school board or private authority. Books are not even given to any private school. Title to the books remains in the State. The children attending nonpublic schools are merely permitted to use the books. Such laws have been upheld by the courts of the States affected, and in the case of Louisiana by the United States Supreme Court.

The question of determining whether a State can furnish textbooks and transportation or other services through boards of education, in accordance with the State law, to children attending nonpublic schools, is a matter wholly within the province of the State, and is not a proper subject for congressional legislation.

The Education and Labor Committee was also of the opinion that it is not appropriate for the Congress of the United States to make appropriations directly to any schools, even to public schools. The proper province of the Congress of the United States in dealing with education is to appropriate money to the States for support of public schools, organized and maintained pursuant to the provisions of the State law.

REPORT

Under section 11 of the bill, the Commissioner of Education is required to make an annual report to show the status of education in the United States. To enable the Commissioner to have the necessary data for making the reports, section 6 (A) (1) (e) provides that the legislature shall require the State educational authority to make reports to the Commissioner with respect to the funds received and the progress of education in his State.

PROVISIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION

Section 5 (C) provides that not to exceed 1 percent of the funds received by a State under the act may be used to pay the expenses of the State department of education necessary for the efficient administration of the funds received under the act. Judging by the experience with administrative costs of other programs of service financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government, 1 percent for administration is a very moderate amount. This provision merely makes available to the States not to exceed 1 percent, but does not require the expenditure of even that amount. In fact it is a safeguard against any exorbitant use of funds for purely administrative functions, and guarantees that the maximum amount of the funds consistent with efficiency will go directly into the current operation of schools.

Under section 10 of the bill, it is provided that the Congress is authorized to make appropriations, not to exceed an amount equal to one-half of 1 percent of the funds made available under the act, for the use of the United States Commissioner of Education to do two things: (1) To pay the necessary expenses in connection with the administration of the act, and (2) to make surveys and other studies in connection with the best use to be made of the grants to the States.

Any of the funds made available under this authorization may be allocated by the Commissioner to State departments of education for making surveys and other studies pertinent to the best use of the funds received under the act. Such allocations are made by joint agreement between the Commissioner and the State educational authority. The amount of funds which could be appropriated by the Congress under this authorization could not exceed $1,500,000 annually. The amount could be as much less as the Congress might determine.

Mr. President, education is the strength we possess. It is the first power we put into this war. The war has taught us many things. We have been learning from our enemies. It is strange but true that the man who destroyed the great, free universities of Germany, who has degraded the German schools, who has hardened the minds of German children into patterns of ruthlessness and hate, has taught us the importance of the schools. His was an evil process, but a process which utilized the limitless power of the schools.

There never has been any doubt in Hitler's mind about that power, but Hitler is learning about it—and learning to his despair—in terms of the power of the free schools of such a free land as ours.

Has there been anywhere any failure in the heroism of the American? Has there been anywhere any demonstration of failure of the American as a fighting man? We give ready recognition to the ruthless fanaticism which Hitler has created among young Germans in his Hitlerized schools. We accept as a fact the superstitious fatalism of the Japanese soldier as the product of his training. It is time we begin to recognize, too, that the virtues of our soldiers, their courage, their skill, their willingness to die for America, all pay tribute to training in America.

The teachers of America were the first forces in our process in real preparedness. Bataan, Guadalcanal, New Guinea, north Africa, and Italy have answered the sourest and most stupid critics who said we taught softness to a soft American generation. The training of our pilots began in our first grades. The training of the builders of our ships began with the first reader. Our armies of fighting men and production workers began the winning of this war in the great, open public schools of America. The threat to our food supply is less menacing now because of the boys whose training in the schools was also training for the land.

We were taught to win this war in the free schools of free men. We were taught there, too, the meaning of peace.

Indeed, the courage and the dream are part of the same pattern. Something happened in America and America's schools in the same years in which Hitler undertook to make education a weapon for aggression. Here in our schools in the same years, not as a result of any power imposed from above but as a part of a developing American faith and dream, the schools taught what teacher and pupil saw together, the possibility of peace and decency and plenty for all in this American land.

In the young who fight this war there was planted the faith in a continuing American chance for a better America in which all might stand upright, well fed, well housed, in peace with their neighbor, and in security against the hazards of living. That was education shaped in an American pattern worth fighting for. It was education which set up a standard for peace—an American standard for a decent world.

Mr. President, as education is America's strength in war and in peace, we must sustain and fortify that strength. The Federal Government cannot escape its obligation to play its part in the great work. It must meet that obligation. It must meet it, that America may live and fulfill its promise to its sons and daughters and to all the peoples of this earth.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask the Senator's attention briefly. The Senator has discussed the matter of equality of opportunity. From page 19 of the hearings it becomes apparent that the cost per pupil for white children at present is $61, and for colored children $12, in those States where there is segregated schooling. According to the same table, if the bill should become law the disparity would be at the rate of $76 for white children and $23 for colored children.

The Senator also discusses the question of the possibility of Federal interposition, with resulting control of the funds appropriated under the act. On page 8 of the bill we find that in States where separate public schools are maintained for separate races, the State would be bound "to provide for a just and equitable apportionment of such funds for the benefit of public schools maintained for minority races." It follows that Congress has the power to say what is a just and equitable apportionment.

Were we to offer an amendment on page 8, in line 13, after the word "races," the amendment, which would carry over that type of control, might read as follows:

In determining what is a just and equitable apportionment of such funds, allotments shall be made in favor of public schools maintained for minority races in the ratio that the members of such minority races are denied the privilege to vote in such States, as compared to the total adult population of such States.

Of course, the Senator from Alabama may answer that in that event the State need not accept any contribution from the Federal source. It follows, therefore, that the entire objective for which he is arguing so eloquently would lapse. I respectfully invite the attention of the Senator from Alabama to this point.

APPROPRIATIONS DURING THE PAST YEAR

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a list of appropriations, by titles and amounts, for the past year, as prepared by the Appropriations Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Regular acts:	
Agriculture	$848,295,883.00
District of Columbia	55,466,565.00
Independent offices	2,621,366,879.00
Interior	104,608,921.00
Labor, Federal Security	1,137,167,010.00
Legislative and Judiciary	40,894,478.00
Navy	27,637,226,198.00
State, Justice, Commerce	221,405,400.00
Treasury and Post Office	1,100,691,275.00
Military (War Department)	59,034,839,673.00
Civil functions (War Department)	63,657,098.00
Total, regular annual acts	92,865,619,380.00
Deficiency and supplemental acts:	
Urgent deficiency	22,410,676.17
First deficiency, 1943	4,106,261,194.96
Supplemental Navy, 1943	3,836,176,119.00
Farm-labor resolution	26,100,000.00
Urgent deficiency resolution	7,246,700.00
Urgent Deficiency Act, 1943	143,430,591.56
Lend-Lease	6,273,629,000.00
National war agencies	2,911,697,224.00
Deficiency and supplemental acts—Con.	
Second deficiency, 1943	$253,256,179.72
Total, deficiency and supplemental acts	17,580,207,685.41
Permanents	3,891,310,446.62
Grand total:	
Regular annual acts	92,865,619,380.00
Deficiency and supplementals	17,580,207,685.41
Permanents	3,891,310,446.62
	114,337,137,512.03

Mr. MAYBANK. I desire to call attention to the fact that of the $114,337,000,000, which has been appropriated, nearly $100,000,000,000 concerns the war effort directly. Of this amount, in the regular annual appropriation acts, there was appropriated to the Army and Navy, $86,734,000,000. By supplemental acts there was appropriated to the Maritime Commission, the Navy, and Lend-Lease, $14,215,000,000.

I also desire to call attention to the First Deficiency Act of 1943, making appropriation of $4,106,000,000, which was principally appropriated to the Maritime Commission for the construction of ships.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Angus J. Gallagher, of Ohio, to be administrative officer, at $5,600 per annum, national headquarters, Selective Service System.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Nelson Lee Smith to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank C. Squire to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 29, 1948.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, October 18, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 15 (legislative day of October 12), 1943:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Nelson Lee Smith, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1945.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Frank C. Squire, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 29, 1948.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

William R. McKinnon, Livermore.
Gertrude S. Adams, Livingston.
Mayme Lea Jory, Manor.
Meneva S. Latham, Palm City.
Henry I. Marshall, Ross.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 12, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Roland Q. Leavell, D. D., pastor, First Baptist Church, Tampa, Fla., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, with praise in our hearts we look to Thee today, accepting every good and perfect gift as coming fresh from Thy creative hand. May we be as grateful for Thy blessings as we are dependent upon them.

Holy Father, grant wisdom today to the Senate and to all those who are charged with directing the affairs of our Nation, both at home and abroad. Enable Thy people to exalt the God of righteousness as the Lord of America, and may conformity to Thy divine purposes become the exaltation of our people.

Blessed God, we pray Thy protecting power for our citizens upon the battlefields of the world. We pray for a speedy return of peace, a peace based on righteousness and fraternal love. Hasten the day when the kingdom of this world shall become the kingdom of our Lord and His Christ.

We ask this in His name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, October 15, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on October 14, 1943, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 755) to amend the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, so as to give protection to persons in military service, and their dependents, as to certain mortgages.

NOTICE OF MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE—USE AND EFFECT OF AIR POWER IN THE WAR

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, some days ago the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] submitted Senate Resolution 182 authorizing the Committees on Naval Affairs and Military Affairs to hold joint hearings with respect to the use and effect of Allied air power against Germany and Japan. As Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate I have named a subcommittee to give immediate consideration to that resolution. As members of the subcommittee I have named the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON]. The subcommittee will meet in executive session next Friday morning at 10 o'clock in the Military Affairs Committee room in the Capitol.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Radcliffe
Andrews	Green	Reed
Bailey	Gurney	Reynolds
Ball	Hatch	Robertson
Bankhead	Hawkes	Russell
Barkley	Hayden	Scrugham
Bilbo	Hill	Shipstead
Brewster	Holman	Smith
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McFarland	Tobey
Caraway	McKellar	Tunnell
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Connally	Mead	Walsh
Danaher	Millikin	Wheeler
Davis	Murdock	Wherry
Downey	Murray	White
Eastland	Nye	Wiley
Ellender	O'Daniel	Willis
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Wilson
George	Overton	
Gerry	Pepper	

Mr HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Missouri, [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr CHANDLER] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has been confined to a Madison hospital since September 13, where he is now recovering from virus pneumonia.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent from the city visiting his son who is in the armed forces.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters and papers, which were referred as indicated:

OFFICERS APPOINTED IN THE ARMY FROM CIVIL LIFE

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualification therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service, for the period August 1, 1943, to September 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

VIRGINIA SOLIS, SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION

A letter from the Attorney General referring to the case of Virginia Solis involving suspension of her deportation and requesting that the case be withdrawn from Congress because of the nature of certain new evidence which it is believed makes unwarranted the suspension of deportation at this time; to the Committee on Immigration.

LEGISLATION BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

COMMITMENT OF INSANE PERSONS

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation regulating the commitment of insane persons to veterans', and other United States institutions and making applicable to Federal reservations certain State laws pertaining to administration of estates of decedents, guardianship of minors and insane persons, commitment of insane persons, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF DEPARTMENTS AND OFFICES

Estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1943, for the Office of Economic Stabilization, War Production Board, Department of Commerce (Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce), Interstate Commerce Commission, Office of the Coordinator of inter-American Affairs (Office for Emergency Management), Executive Office of the President (Liaison Office for Personnel Management), National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Board of Investigation and Research, the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in Europe, Office of Budget and Administrative Planning, Migratory Bird, and Expenses of Loans, Post Office Department (supplementing estimates forwarded under date of September 28, 1943) and corrected estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1943, for the Committee for Congested Production Areas (Executive Office of the President), and the Bureau of Selective Service, War Manpower Commission (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of Hon. Robert L. Owen, counsellor at law, Washington, D. C., relating to the use of English as a world language through the Global Alphabet and offering the use of such alphabet to the United Nations as a means of facilitating mutual intercourse and raising the productive power and standard of living of every nation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu, Hawaii, favoring amendment of the immigration and naturalization laws so as to permit the entry of Chinese into the United States and the grant of citizenship to the Chinese; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of members of the Dresden Methodist Church, of Dresden, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PROTEST AGAINST THE ENACTMENT OF PROHIBITION LEGISLATION

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD, omitting the signatures, and appropriately referred a memorial signed by 470 citizens residing in the vicinity of Lake Charles, La., remonstrating against the enactment by the Congress of any prohibition legislation.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

Whereas the professional prohibition organizations are attempting to force the consideration and passage of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war;

Whereas these same prohibitionists are also sponsoring legislation which would bring back prohibition by banning the sale of beer

to our fighting forces in and near military camps, as well as to civilians in zones around such camps;

Whereas the object of all such legislation is to reestablish complete national prohibition in the United States during the absence from their homes of more than 8,000,000 citizens in the military services of their country;

Whereas any such legislation is opposed by the War and Navy Departments as well as by the great majority of our soldiers, sailors, marines, and civilians;

Whereas national prohibition, during a test of 13 years from 1920 to 1933, brought upon the Nation the uncontrollable evils of the speakeasy and the bootlegger—the degradation of teen-age girls and boys—Nation-wide home manufacture of illegal liquor—widespread vicious crime, official corruption, and disrespect for law—all of which so outraged public decency that the eighteenth amendment was repealed by a majority of 10,000,000 votes;

Whereas the enactment of any such legislation would completely destroy all legalized control and cause the loss of Federal revenues of more than $1,500,000,000 a year and local revenues of $500,000,000 a year without any compensating benefits to either State or Nation:

Therefore, we, the undersigned citizens of the United States, protest against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress and herewith request our Senators and Representatives to vote against any and all such proposed legislation. We further respectfully request that this petition be referred to the proper committees and listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

S. Res. 187. Resolution authorizing an investigation of international communications by wire and radio [submitted by Mr. WHEELER (for himself, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. MCFARLAND)] on October 12, 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 472).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 3309. An act to suspend during the present war the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 473);

H. R. 3358. An act relating to Government and other exemptions from the tax with respect to the transportation of property; without amendment (Rept. No. 474); and

H. R. 3381. An act relating to credits against the Victory tax; without amendment (Rept. No. 475).

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 865. A bill suspending for the duration of the war the limitations upon the compensation of certain retired personnel employed by the Government; with amendments (Rept. No. 476); and

H. R. 2188. A bill to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 477).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MCNARY:

S. 1449. A bill to approve a contract negotiated with the Klamath Drainage District and to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. LUCAS):

S. 1450. A bill to amend section 602 (g) of the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1451. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the confirmation of the title to the Saline Lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush, and Others," approved March 2, 1861; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1452. A bill for the relief of J. H. Kerr; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1453. A bill for the relief of the City National Bank Building Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM:

S. 1454. A bill for the relief of Dr. George L. Servoss; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1455. A bill to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed; to the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce a bill, for appropriate reference, at the request of the Secretary of the Interior.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

S. 1456. A bill to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

(Mr. BANKHEAD also introduced Senate bills 1457 and 1458, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appear under separate headings.)

(Mr. HOLMAN introduced S. J. Res. 87, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and appears under a separate heading.)

NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING IN CONNECTION WITH THE SALE OF BONDS

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking and Currency will begin tomorrow morning hearings on Senate bill 1073, commonly known as the newspaper advertising bill. In view of certain suggestions and criticism I have prepared a new bill, so the committee may start with a clean bill. I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill for reference to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and referred as suggested by the Senator from Alabama.

The bill (S. 1457) to aid in the stabilization program and the war effort by paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States bonds, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CONTINUANCE OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. BANKHEAD. I also ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation, known as the antisubsidy bill, with certain exceptions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The bill (S. 1458) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

FORM OF GOVERNMENT FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, as a culmination of the investigation of Gallinger Hospital, which was authorized by Senate Resolution 178, offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], I ask consent to introduce a joint resolution intended to authorize an election whereby the bona fide citizens of the District of Columbia may recommend to the Congress the kind of government under which they choose to live, within the limits of the Federal Constitution. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and referred as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 87) to provide means of enabling residents of the District of Columbia to express their preference for a form of municipal government, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

GOVERNMENT PROPERTY AND MATERIALS NOT NEEDED FOR WAR PURPOSES

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 195), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the President is hereby requested to direct the appropriate executive agency or agencies to make a study and investigation with respect to (1) the types, quantities, cost, location, and custody of those war materials and other tangible property, real and personal, owned or controlled or hereafter acquired or controlled by or in behalf of the Government of the United States, which are or shall become no longer needed for war purposes, (2) the adequacy of current records and inventory controls to keep the Congress and the Executive informed as to the foregoing particulars with respect to such materials and property, and (3) those modifications in the methods of keeping such records and maintaining such controls which may be necessary to make the above information readily available to the appropriate Government authorities. The President is requested to report to the Senate within 3 months after adoption of this resolution and at intervals of not more than 3 months thereafter until such study is completed, concerning the results thereof together with his recommendations.

MILK RIVER, MONT. (S. DOC. NO. 103)

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, on July 23, 1943, the Acting Secretary of War by letter transmitted to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, a report dated March 29, 1943, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on Milk River, Mont., with a

view to flood control on Rock Creek and in the Milk River basin. I request that the letter and accompanying report and papers be printed as a document, with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT ON THE NAVY AND THE WAR (S. DOC NO. 107)

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate has recently requested the Office of Public Relations of the Navy Department to submit to it a report on the Navy and the war. The Navy Department has complied with the request, and I now present the report and ask that it be published as a Senate document.

The report covers 18 months of naval warfare beginning with Pearl Harbor. From then on the report includes naval activities in the Philippine Islands, the battle of the Java Sea, the first naval offensive on Japanese-held territory in which the Marshall and Gilbert Islands were raided on January 31, 1942, the battles of Coral Sea, Midway, Guadalcanal, and the Aleutians campaign, and finally the continuing action of the Atlantic, together with Mediterranean and north African operations which cannot yet be disclosed fully for reasons of national security. The report, therefore, should be accepted only as a broad historic outline of the Navy's activities to date.

Without any attempt to embellish the facts involving each phase of the war the report sets forth the losses of ships and aircraft and the damage to the enemy, the effects of each on subsequent developments, and shifting tides of war across the mid-Pacific to the Java Sea, and the highlights of progress of naval building and shore construction, as well as personnel expansion, since the war began.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be printed as a document as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

CEILING PRICES ON WHEAT AND FLOUR

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I wish to call attention of the Senate to the following telegram, just received by me from the Kansas Flour Mills Co., Kansas City:

> Circumstances of necessity again make it necessary for us to insist some action be taken immediately to loosen up intolerable flour squeeze now confronting us. Certainly it is inconsistent to have ceiling on finished product and wide-open market on raw material. This procedure might be workable on other commodities, but certainly not on wheat and flour.
>
> Congress has authorized Commodity Credit Corporation its holdings of wheat can be sold at parity or market if higher than parity. Certainly flour prices should be raised to reflect parity to enable mills to buy this wheat if necessary to carry on their business. Food and Food Products MPR 296 says in part:
>
> "Maximum prices established by this regulation are, in the judgment of the Price Administration, generally fair and equitable and will effectuate the purpose of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942."
>
> Certainly it is not fair and equitable now to have flour ceilings established that reflect wheat costs considerably lower than current wheat values, about 18 to 20 cents per bushel. We are opposed to subsidies, but we must have fair and equitable basis on which to do business, and we don't have it now. Do something about it.

Mr. President, I believe I can add a little that will give the Senate a clearer picture of what is going on with regard to wheat and flour.

The Office of Price Administration has fixed ceiling prices on flour based, according to my information, on wheat at approximately $1.36 a bushel, f. o. b. Kansas City. Actually the wheat price at Kansas City is approximately $1.50 f. o. b.

If the O. P. A. fixed a price ceiling based on wheat at $1.36, Kansas City, then O. P. A. should, and I presume did, have in mind that the difference between $1.36 wheat and the flour ceiling price fixed gave the millers a fair margin.

It necessarily seems to follow that when the actual wheat price is $1.50, the margin to the wheat millers has been cut 14 cents and is 14 cents less than what O. P. A. itself had determined to be a fair margin.

Under the law, again as I understand it, the O. P. A. cannot put a ceiling price on wheat itself at less than parity, and it has not attempted to do so. But it has—not under authority of Congress but under one of the Executive directives which are coming more and more to replace regularly enacted laws—fixed a ceiling price on flour based on wheat prices around 90 percent of parity.

The wheat market is not following either the O. P. A. ceiling price on flour or the parity formula or even the loan value fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture under acts of Congress. Commercial feed mixers and distillers, I am informed, are buying wheat in the open market in direct competition with millers, with the approval of Government agencies. I have no objection to that, but the result has been to force wheat market prices above the level on which the flour ceiling prices originally were based.

I say wheat ought to be allowed to go to parity price by this administration. For nearly a decade the avowed goal of the administration was to get parity price for the farmer, and that certainly included parity prices on wheat.

Now the ambition of the administration seems to be to hold wheat prices below parity. Every effort is being made to that end. So far as I am concerned, I think that market operations ought to be allowed to function in the wheat market until wheat reaches parity. Then let the O. P. A. fix a ceiling price at the parity level, if that is considered in the public interest. Congress has authorized the O. P. A. to do that.

But it is manifestly unfair and unsound to fix flour ceilings at levels below what the O. P. A. itself has decided is a level that will reflect a fair margin to the miller above the actual market cost of the wheat.

I say that the flour ceiling price should give the millers the operating margins that have been decided to be fair and equitable. If that means raising the flour price ceilings, then the ceilings should be raised.

I say, also, that the price of wheat should be allowed to go to parity and carry the flour ceilings along, with margins based on the wheat prices. Some action will have to be taken to meet this situation, and I hope it may be taken soon.

SIBERIAN BASES AND SENATORIAL RIGHTS

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to listen to the following paragraph:

> Unless Americans are to lose their perspective entirely, they must be brought to the realization that Great Britain and Russia are primarily concerned with protecting their own interests. To recognize this and to give some thought to our own interests is not to lose their friendship. On the contrary, it will probably gain us their respect, which is just as important as friendship in this hard world.

I have read the concluding paragraph of an article by Raymond Moley appearing in the Wall Street Journal of October 15, 1943, under the heading, "Siberian bases and senatorial rights," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIBERIAN BASES AND SENATORIAL RIGHTS—THE DANGER OF MIXING THE RIGHT OF A SENATOR TO TALK WITH THE DUTY OF RUSSIA TO FIGHT JAPAN

(By Raymond Moley)

President Roosevelt's humor will never make people forget Mark Twain, but he did get off a good one when he was discussing the traveling Senators' criticisms in his press conference. Asked about a report that some of the British in Africa were wearing American uniforms because trousers provided better mosquito protection than shorts, the President observed wryly that if it concerned a question of pants, it would be good for a Senate debate, while trousers called for a closed session.

In the discussion that the Senators have provoked, however, a distinction has been overlooked which involves much more than the difference between shorts and trousers. The question of whether Senators, especially Senator LODGE, were wrong to criticize Russia, is something quite different from the question whether Russia is wrong in not entering the war against Japan.

Some Americans, including the President, underrate the capacity of Russia and England to take criticism. Those two nations are not neurotic adolescents. They have been around a long time and are as able to take it as to dish it out. If the United States were weak, helpless and fighting for life, we might do well to consider every word we uttered about our allies. But to be perfectly blunt about it, beating Hitler means much more to England and Russia than it does to us.

Let's have the whole story of the five inquiring Senators in an open session of the Senate. Then let's have the answers from the administration, from England, and from Russia. Then let's print the whole thing for Americans to ponder. What has happened, instead, is that the excellent story of the Senators has come to the people only in disconnected pieces.

No more moral disapprobation attaches to Senator LODGE'S suggestion about Siberian bases than to Russia's repeated suggestions about a second front. Quite obviously, Russia will do what is best for her about Siberia, just as England and America will do what is best for them about a second front.

By not attacking Russia, Japan made possible the defeat of Hitler on the Eastern front. The Russians, as well as the Japanese, had learned two things by virtue of some preliminary short-of-war fighting on the Siberian frontier in 1939 and 1940. First, that the Russian forces were qualitatively superior to the Japanese, and, second, that the Japanese could not risk a winter campaign in Siberia. The latter fact enabled Stalin to move great Siberian forces to Stalingrad in the early winter of 1942, to defeat the Germans there and thus to turn the whole course of the war.

Russia's far-eastern diplomacy is probably based upon a few extremely simple assumptions. Unless, after the defeat of Japan, the United States or Great Britain want to take over Manchukuo and Korea, Russia may be invited to take them, whether Russia ultimately fights Japan or not. These territories can hardly be assigned to Japan unless we want another war in a few years. And China is hardly stable enough to take them over. So, Russia stands to gain in any event.

Unless Americans are to lose their perspective entirely, they must be brought to the realization that Great Britain and Russia are primarily concerned with protecting their own interests. To recognize this and to give some thought to our own interests is not to lose their friendship. On the contrary, it will probably gain us their respect, which is just as important as friendship in this hard world.

PROPOSED FEDERAL SALES TAX

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter dated October 16, 1943, from A. F. Whitney, president of the Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAND LODGE,
BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
Cleveland, Ohio, October 16, 1943.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: In my entire career of more than half a century as a representative of working people, I have never addressed a more important communication to a Member of Congress. I regret the necessity for the length of this letter.

I thought that, so far as our Federal Government is concerned, at least, we had passed out of the Dark Ages in taxation and had embraced the equitable principle of taxation according to ability to pay. The late Tom L. Johnson, mayor of Cleveland from 1901 to 1910, a man who went into public office rich and came out poor, whom Lincoln Steffens said was "the best mayor of the best governed city in the United States," served as a Member of Congress from 1890 to 1894. During this time an income tax law was enacted and declared unconstitutional in a United States Supreme Court decision which shames American judicial history. In debating the income tax, this great humanitarian leader epitomized a principle of taxation that must be accepted by all righteous men. He said:

"Let us tax the people on what they have, rather than on what they need."

It is shocking to discover some leaders in public life yielding to selfish interests in their demand for a Federal sales tax, the tax that imposes a levy on the poor man's bread, that is wasteful of administration, and that is positively immoral from an equitable social standpoint. Almost 100 percent of low incomes is spent for actual necessities of life, while only a small percent of high incomes is likewise spent. Thus, a sales tax applies 100 percent to low incomes, but only in a small and insignificant way to large incomes. In short, the sales tax completely reverses the just principle of taxation according to ability to pay. Citizens of Ohio are already burdened with a 3-percent States sales tax. Notwithstanding the serious paper shortage, measly little sales-tax stamps, printed at great cost, are passed out for every transaction, with some exemptions, involving a sale of 10 cents or more. There is also the great expense and nuisance to merchants and others in collecting and accounting for this shake-down method of taxation.

I refer to the sales tax as a shake-down, because it fleeces consumers without their direct awareness. I urge Members of Congress not to jump to the conclusion that this characteristic makes it an ideal tax to impose on voters. Voters of today are better informed and are persuaded by what they feel as well as what they see. Do not mistakenly believe that because some defense workers, by working as much as 2 or more days in 1, now have sufficient money to absorb a sales tax without complaint. Millions of people in America, including railroad workers, are still on wage and salary rates established before the Pearl Harbor attack. The consuming and voting people of America are sufficiently intelligent to recognize the sales tax as a shake-down of the poor by the rich.

In his syndicated column of October 8, 1943, Raymond Clapper, columnist for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, argued for a sales tax. He magnanimously admitted that somewhat more could be squeezed through income and corporation taxes, but declared:

"Although there is always the threat of a strike against production if they (corporations) are pressed too hard. It ought not to be that way but they can get away with it and just refuse to produce if there is not enough profit in it. So the corporations have to be babied."

Mr. Clapper does not advocate a no-strike pledge for corporations.

A sales tax must be paid from income, although Clapper makes the specious contention that individual and corporation incomes have already been taxed so much that we must now turn to a sales tax as the one big source of untapped revenue left. There can be only one reason for a sales tax—to shove the load onto the backs of those already burdened with frozen incomes, social-security taxes, bond deductions, and a greatly increased cost of living. Mr. Clapper calls for levies that bear down on individuals. Certainly the income tax precisely fits this requirement. It is tailored to fit the individual. It taxes an individual on what he has, not on what he needs.

It is shocking to realize that a program to place a constitutional limitation, or ceiling, of 25 percent on all income, estate and gift taxes has been somewhat secretly, if not mysteriously, promoted among the several States, the idea being to proceed under article V of the Federal Constitution and force the Congress to call a constitutional convention. Many Members of Congress know Mr. J. A. Arnold, who was well exposed by the Senate Caraway Investigating Committee, which expressed amazement that businessmen of ordinary sagacity can be induced to contribute to Arnold's purposes, a man who has had no training or experience either as an economist, a statistician or a tax expert that would fit him to be of service in any capacity in connection with revenue legislation. Working through the Western Tax Council of Chicago, which claims several States have already enacted resolutions calling for such a constitutional convention, Arnold now hopes to use the States to force the hand of Congress. Under such a tax exemption of wealth, our Nation would soon degenerate into feudalism, with a few billionaire lords and masses of serfs.

With sober judgment and measured words, I declare that the patience of the common people will be strained almost to the breaking point if they are saddled with the infamous Federal sales tax, of however small a percent. While labor patriotically adheres to its no-strike pledge, selfish interests are taking an outrageously unfair advantage. Leaders of Congress must sense this dangerous trend, which, if not promptly checked, surely will result in a reservoir of ill-will that will plague all of us in the post-war era, for which big business is now so feverishly planning.

Sincerely yours,

A. F. WHITNEY,
President.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY ON THE FIVE IMPERATIVES

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Five Imperatives," delivered by him on Friday, October 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LIBERATED NATIONS AND THE NEW ORDER—ARTICLE BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Liberated Nations and the New Order," written by him and published in the Free World of the issue of August 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR BREWSTER ON CRITICISMS OF TOUR OF SENATORS

[Mr. WHITE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an interview with Senator BREWSTER under the heading "BREWSTER Raps 'Traveler' Slur. Says Britain Is Going Places," published in the Washington Times-Herald of today, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORK OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—ADDRESS BY WILLIAM J. NEAL

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "R. E. A. Builds for Victory and Post-War Opportunities," delivered by Hon. William J. Neal, Deputy Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, October 12, 1943, at Atlanta, Ga., which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. TOM LINDER AT NATIONAL FOOD CONFERENCE

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Food With Democracy or Famine With Imperialism," delivered by Hon. Tom Linder, Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Georgia, before the National Food Conference, held at Chicago, Ill., on September 17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CORN AND HOG SITUATION—ADDRESS BY WILLIAM YUNGLAS

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject the Corn and Hog Situation, delivered by William Yunglas, president of the Iowa Swine Producers' Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERTERRITORIAL FREIGHT RATES—ADDRESS BY ROBERT E. WEBB

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Interterritorial Freight Rates," delivered by Robert E. Webb, vice chairman, Board of Investigation and Research, before

southern and western Members of Congress on October 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SLUMP IN PRODUCTION IN WEST COAST AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "West Coast Aircraft Industry. A Few Reasons for Slump in Production," by Earl L. Galbraith, published in the Machinists' Monthly Journal for October 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

"DON'T YOU KNOW THERE'S A WAR ON?"—ARTICLE BY EMILY POST

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Don't You Know There's a War On?", written by Emily Post and published in This Week magazine of October 17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 637) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, after line 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

(D) No provision of this act shall be construed to delimit a State in its definition of its program of public education: *Provided*, That the funds paid to a State under this act shall be expended only by public agencies under public control.

Mr. DOWNEY obtained the floor.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Subsidizing the Schools" which appeared in the Hartford Courant on October 15, 1943. I also ask permission to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a letter on the same subject issued by the National Grange.

The aforementioned editorial and letter which I have asked to have printed express opposition to S. 637, which is now under consideration.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hartford Courant of Oct. 15, 1943]

SUBSIDIZING THE SCHOOLS

That hardy perennial, the bill to provide Federal subsidies for common school education, is again before Congress; and the prediction is being freely made that this time it will be adopted. It authorizes the expenditure of $300,000,000 annually for the ostensible purpose of reducing inequalities of educational opportunities in the several States

The argument is advanced that some States are too poor to provide their children with a suitable system of elementary education or to pay teachers a salary anywhere nearly commensurate with the service rendered. The assertion is made that at least 10,000 teachers now receive less than $300 annually, while forty out of every hundred are paid less than 1,200 a year. Therefore, it is reasoned, the Federal Government should step in to correct the situation by appropriating as much money as may be needed to put the low-paid teachers on a par with the better paid and to insure every State's having as good school facilities as any other.

The bill has been so drawn as to stipulate that the Federal Government, although putting up $300,000,000, shall not exercise any supervision over the administration or curriculum of a State's schools. But how can anyone for a moment suppose that once the Federal Government begins to subsidize common school education throughout the length and breadth of the land, it will not sooner or later insist on having a great deal to say about school administration, about the subjects that shall be taught and the textbooks that shall be used?

Education has always been regarded as a State function, and it is safe to say that there is no State in the Union that cannot exercise its full responsibility toward its children if only it has the will to do so. An adequate school system should be the first care and consideration of every State, but as President Butler of Columbia University once remarked, "Too often the schools and their teachers are given what remains after other public needs have been provided for." States that are backward in this respect certainly will not be encouraged to take a more advanced attitude if they think they can rely on the Federal Government to take care of their educational needs while they spend their own money on objects far less important.

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., October 16, 1943.

To Members of the Senate:

We have read and carefully considered S. 637, known as the educational finance bill. We note that this bill authorizes appropriations for the public schools aggregating $300,000,000 a year. Of this sum, $200,000,000 is to be apportioned among the States to raise substandard salaries of teachers and to meet the increased cost of living occasioned by the war. The other $100,000,000 is to be a permanent appropriation for the purpose of equalizing educational opportunities as between the people of the several States.

The National Grange is in hearty sympathy with the idea that teachers, who are among the most worthy and indispensable of our public servants, should be properly compensated. However, as we see it, there is no justification for the enactment of this bill. The Federal Government has no money to appropriate for education except borrowed funds. The national debt has already passed the colossal figure of $160,000,000,000, and it is estimated that before the close of the fiscal year it will exceed the $200,000,000,000 mark.

On the other hand, the finances of most of the State governments are in good shape. Some of the State legislatures have already taken action to cope with the emergency situation in the schools created by wartime conditions. For example, at its last session the Legislature of Pennsylvania passed an act which provides an annual bonus of $300 for its lowest-paid teachers. Teachers in the higher salary brackets receive a smaller share of the funds appropriated for this purpose, but all participate in the benefits of the act. Every State in the Union that has not taken similar action should do so, rather than shift its responsibility to the Federal Government, which is already carrying a staggering load.

Elementary education is a State function. Any meddling in public-school affairs on the part of the Federal Government, even with the best of intentions, could not fail to have the most pernicious effects. It would infallibly destroy local initiative and control in school affairs. We may also take it for granted that in a short time it would result in the creation of another giant bureaucracy that would entail a perpetual drain upon the Federal Treasury. While the pending bill attempts to set up safeguards against these dangers, we do not believe that they would be effective beyond a year or two at the most. The demand for Federal funds would increase with each succeeding year, and in the end a Federal department of education would be established to supervise the expenditure of the Federal funds appropriated, together with the sums raised by local and State taxation. In other words, our public-school system would be nationalized and bureaucratized. This would work grievous and irreparable injury to the whole system. As Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, has expressed it:

"There is not enough money in the United States, even if every dollar of it were expended on education, to produce through Federal authority, or through what is naively called cooperation between the Federal Government and the several States, educational results that would be at all comparable with those that have already been reached under the free and natural system that has grown up among us.

"Bureaucrats and experts will speedily take the life out of even the best of schools and reduce them to dried and mounted specimens of pedagogic fatuity. Unless the school is both the work and pride of the community it serves, it is nothing. A school system that grows naturally in response to the needs and ambitions of a hundred thousand different communities will be a better school system than any which can be imposed upon those localities by the aid of grants of public money from the Federal Treasury, accompanied by Federal regulations, Federal inspections, Federal reports, and Federal uniformities."

We believe that our best hope of saving American democracy, the very thing for which we are fighting in this global war, lies in maintaining the sovereignty and independence of the States. In order that the States may remain virile and self-respecting, they must discharge the functions which naturally fall within their spheres. To say that the States are unable to cope with the prevailing crisis in education would be both absurd and untrue. It is in view of these considerations that we oppose the enactment of the pending bill.

Sincerely yours,

FRED BRENCKMAN,
Washington Representative.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President——

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have made a brief statement to the people of Michigan regarding my attitude toward the pending bill, S. 637. I ask that the statement be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have had a very large Michigan mail indicating large interest on both sides of S. 637—the bill proposing Federal subsidies for local education—which comes to issue in the Senate this week. Many of these correspondents favor the bill because they seem to believe it will help our own Michigan educational pay rolls. They are mistaken. Our Michigan share of the subsidy would be $10,100,000 per year. Our share of the tax to pay the total $300,000,000 subsidy would be practically $16,000,000 since Michigan pays 5.31 percent of all Federal bills. In other words, from a Michigan standpoint, we would do better to pay our own school bills and let others do likewise. This is by no means a conclusive argument against the bill because

adequate public education is a national necessity, and, normally, the richer States must help the poorer States. But no one should be misled into figuring that the bill offers Michigan any net advantage.

The major danger in the bill is its ultimate threat to subordinate State and local education to Federal control. The bill recognizes this hazard by attempting to assert textually that there shall be no Federal invasion of this "home rule." But the danger remains, because it is the invariable experience that sooner or later Federal funds are followed by Federal control. This trend is inherent in Federal subsidies. Numerous Michigan educators object to the bill for this dreadfully important basic reason. Others insistently support the bill on the theory that they can safely take this chance.

Meanwhile, responsible Federal officials cannot ignore the fact that, despite sky-high Federal taxes, we still face an annual Federal deficit of $60,000,000,000. We have not yet found a way to bridge this war gap. No amount of social or educational advantage could compensate for a bankrupt republic. I cannot escape the conviction that we dare not launch any new Federal subsidies for social progress—no matter how inherently worthy—until we have found the way, both by new taxes and new economies, to pay our present bills. The maintenance of the public credit is the maintenance of the first line of the national defense. This pending bill has been here, in one form or another, for 5 years. It is the beginning of a program which ultimately envisions an annual educational subsidy of $2,000,000,000. Under the terms of the pending bill, Michigan's annual share of such a subsidy would be $66,000,000. Michigan's annual share of the tax, however, would be $105,000,000. I repeat this is not conclusive because we must have a national point of view. But it again bears on the argument that Michigan financially needs the bill.

Much as I desire always to be a consistent supporter of adequate public education, I am unable to support S. 637 at the present time; and I frankly doubt the wisdom at any time of any trend in the direction of Federal control of education. Such a result will always be at war with prudent democracy.

COLLABORATION OF NATIONS AT WAR WITH THE AXIS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have before me an article published in yesterday's, Sunday's, New York Tribune, under the headline: "A deepened rift in Yugoslavia faces Allied parley in Moscow."

The first paragraph of the article is as follows:

> American and British experts on Balkan problems who attend the Moscow Conference will have to recognize the failure of all efforts to establish some kind of collaboration between the two resistance groups in Yugoslavia.

The article proceeds to inform——

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order. I understand the able Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] has been recognized. I should be happy to hear and enjoy the speech the Senator from North Carolina wishes to deliver, but I submit that no Senator can secure the floor and then farm it out and turn it over to other Senators. Either the Senator from California has the floor or he has lost the floor. I make that point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina wish to place something in the RECORD?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield the floor for the present?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am in an unfortunate position. I have a short statement which will require only 5 minutes to make. I have already given to the press copies of the statement. I shall be very happy to yield the floor so the Senator from North Carolina may present what he wishes to have placed in the RECORD, upon unanimous consent that I be recognized at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from North Carolina. Otherwise, I should not wish to yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California has the floor.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield the floor to me?

Mr. DOWNEY. I shall be very happy to yield the floor if I can secure unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks I shall again be recognized.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that is impossible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California has the floor.

Mr. DOWNEY. I may say to my distinguished friend from North Carolina that I am in the unhappy position of having given to the press copies of a statement which it will take me only 5 or at the outside, 10 minutes to make.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, may I complete the statement I had begun?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California has the floor. The regular order has been demanded.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the distinguished minority leader if he would allow the Senator from North Carolina to complete the statement he has begun?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it is always a great delight to me to hear the Senator from North Carolina. I am, however, in no position to turn over the floor to any particular Senator. I simply wish the rule of the Senate enforced. The able Senator from California has received recognition from the Chair. Who shall follow him depends wholly upon who shall be recognized by the Chair when the Senator from California shall have concluded his remarks.

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is up to the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. No; it is up to the Vice President.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Carolina thinks that what he has to present is of sufficient importance to justify my yielding the floor, particularly in view of the fact that I have already given copies of the speech to the press, with the chance that I may or may not be recognized immediately following the conclusion of the Senator's remarks——

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I shall make no further request at this time.

LESSON TO BE LEARNED FROM AIR ATTACK ON GERMAN WAR INDUSTRIES

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement, with the request that, in order to conserve the time of the Senate, I be not interrupted by questions but allowed to complete my statement.

On October 16 General Arnold, in a report upon the destruction of the Schweinfurt ball-bearing plant, declared that our air attack there was a "heart-damaging blow to the entire German war production" which, within a month, will begin to affect the Nazi war economy. General Arnold estimates that American planes in this attack destroyed one-half of all European ball-bearing capacity—and then points out that planes, tanks, trucks, submarines, and even antiaircraft guns cannot be operated without them.

General Arnold's facts and conclusions seem undeniable, and yet there still exists in the United States such a totally inadequate understanding of how rapidly German industry now crumbles under Allied air blows, that many of our important military analysts in their recent weekly reviews entirely ignore the destructive ability of air power, while many more seriously seek to determine whether the destruction of the Schweinfurt factories justified the loss of 60 bombers.

The annihilation of the Schweinfurt industries constitutes one of the most courageous and decisive battles in the history of mankind. Approximately 4,000 American flyers reached from Britain into the heart of Germany, and there, with perfect precision against tremendous resistance, accomplished their mission with results so catastrophic to the Nazi war machine that Hitler's doom is appreciably nearer. The battle lasted only 5 hours, but its American participants, moving at a speed of 200 miles an hour, maneuvered through a constant and desperate battle over 1,000 miles, in which they met the fiercest, largest, and most determined air attack ever hurled upon an enemy. It is estimated that engaged against the Flying Fortresses were 60 percent of all German fighters and tremendous antiaircraft power. But in spite of brave, bitter, and determined resistance, the assigned duty was accomplished, and a vital and perhaps fatal blow was given to the German war economy.

While the Schweinfurt battle marks the high tide, perhaps, of all aerial conflicts, it is only another one of many prior and devastating blows given to German production. Take, if you please, the 100 most important productive cities of the Reich. Sixteen of them have already been totally destroyed. Included in the number are 2 of the very greatest world centers from the standpoint of military production. I refer now to Hamburg and Essen. In addition to the 16 cities completely destroyed, more than half the productive capacity of 25 additional has been ended; thus in 41 great German cities, out of 100, we find capacity

totally or more than half destroyed, and in the remaining 59 substantial, serious, and far-reaching injury already has been accomplished, and remorselessly proceeds.

British and American flyers now have an accelerating air-power under which at least 10 huge air attacks can be made on Germany monthly. If these attacks are persisted in, by February 1, German flyers will be driven from the skies, the manufacture of all Nazi war equipment ended on the land, the German Army must disintegrate, the Hitler Government collapse, and the German Nation surrender.

In the Schweinfurt battle we lost fortresses valued at $18,000,000, we wrecked buildings and equipment which cost 10 to 20 times that much, and potentially we have prevented the manufacture of war goods which would have been valued at a hundred or a thousand times that amount. For every bomber knocked from the skies we hurled approximately two German fighters to the ground; and while bombers cost more to build than fighters do, today American-British plane production is substantially more than double German fighter production.

If the semi-official information which I have recently received is correct, our high command now intends, before April 1, 1944, to add another million men to the net strength of our Army. That 1,000,000 men will be of no value whatsoever in any attack upon Germany for 15 months, 18 months, or even 2 years from the present day. Admittedly, such an increased land army can never be used against Japan. We may say most conservatively that over the next 15 months the maintenance of the additional 1,000,000 men will burden our already overstrained resources to the extent of at least $9,000,000,000. That $9,000,000,000 is just 500 times the value of the flying fortresses lost in the Schweinfurt raid. We blithely spend billions of dollars on a land army that cannot be used until long after Hitler's defeat, that probably will never be used outside the United States, but we wonder with dismay if we should lose 60 bombers at a cost of $18,000,000 in a destructive and perhaps decisive blow at the heart of German war production.

I have received a semi-official estimate that the Italian campaign in no event can cost us less than $18,000,000,000. The expenditures may well run far beyond that huge figure. Thus, the cost of the Italian invasion will be at least 1,000 times the losses incurred by our flying fortresses when in 5 hours they struck a devastating, shattering blow to German production and German morale.

Yes, Mr. President; our increasing land Army will cost us 500 times the bombers lost at Schweinfurt, the Italian campaign a thousand times as much. Yet, plainly Germany cannot endure very many bombings like Schweinfurt.

FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 637) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools.

Mrs. CARAWAY. Mr. President, since I have been a Member of the Senate there have been many measures of great importance considered in this body. In my judgment, none of them have affected or will affect our future more than will the pending measure, which has for its purpose the proper educational training of our greatest national asset, the American youth of today and tomorrow.

We are making a wonderful war effort. There has never been anything like it in the history of the world. There may never be a greater one. And, yet, if we should overlook the opportunity to give to all our young people an equal educational opportunity, we would fail in one of the most vital items of the entire war effort.

The measure under consideration seeks to give to all our students, regardless of State lines, the educational training to which they are entitled.

Some States, because of conditions over which they have no control and because of lack of funds, are unable to do so. Always having found it difficult to give proper educational training to their youth, many States now, because of public and private competition, are unable to retain or secure teachers to do the work properly.

Mr. President, I doubt whether there are many Senators who realize the extent to which in some States educational managements have to go in competition with other employers in their efforts to secure teaching personnel. I am told that 40 percent of the Nation's school teachers are paid less than $1,200 a year. Seven percent still receive annual salaries of less than $600.

Charwomen in Government buildings at the Nation's Capital get $1,460 a year, counting their overtime pay. The lowest paid, untrained clerical workers on Federal jobs receive $1,535, and the minimum professional salary in the Federal service is $2,431. Factory workers average $43 a week, or about $2,150 a year. An average employee in the shipyards makes $59.80 a week, or approximately $2,900 a year.

In many of these States it is impossible to increase the pay of trained teachers, no matter how great is the effort to do so.

My State of Arkansas is one of the States of the Union which make available from State sources a very large proportion of the funds going to the support of public schools. More than 45 percent of the revenues for the public schools comes from State taxes as contrasted with local property taxes. The public-school appropriations made by the 1943 general assembly amounted to about $26,000,000 for the biennium 1943–45, as compared with $21,000,000 for the preceding biennium. For a number of years Arkansas has ranked above the national average in the percentage of State revenues devoted to education, the percentage usually being 35 or more. These facts certainly indicate that Arkansas has made a very material effort to meet the current crisis in the support of education.

The argument has been advanced that States that have surpluses in their treasuries should not be granted aid from the Federal Government until such surpluses have been utilized to relieve the current school situation. While I do not presume to know the fiscal situations of all the States, I should like to point out that in Arkansas there is no surplus available for educational use nor is there likely to be in any predictable future.

The State government of Arkansas follows the policy of levying taxes for specific purposes. The State revenues going to the public schools come from taxes specifically earmarked for that purpose. All the revenues coming from these sources are made immediately available for education. Other functions of the State government are, for the most part, also supported by earmarked taxes. Under the constitution of the State of Arkansas taxes levied for a specific purpose and collected cannot be diverted to other purposes, even by act of the legislature. If there were any surpluses in the State treasury, they could not be diverted to educational purposes.

I have received information from the State commissioner of education, Hon. Ralph B. Jones, showing that there is an acute crisis in the matter of obtaining qualified teachers for the schools of Arkansas. Normally there are 13,313 teaching positions in the State. Six hundred and twenty-two of these positions have been discontinued this year, largely because of lack of teachers. There are now 723 positions for which teachers are wanted but apparently cannot be obtained. There are 110 schools that would like to operate but are closed because of lack of teachers; and it is estimated that there are at least 200 other schools that will not operate a normal term because of lack of teachers.

For the school year 1942–43 there was a turnover of 58 percent in the teaching personnel of the State; that is, 58 percent of the teachers were new to their jobs during the year. Five thousand teachers have left the teaching profession in Arkansas since the beginning of the war. Of these only about 600 are away on leave of absence, the remaining number having actually withdrawn from the teaching profession entirely. Since December 7, 1941, more than 3,500 emergency teaching certificates have been issued. This represents a definite lowering of the standard requirements for teachers in the State.

I quote the following paragraph from a telegram sent by Mr. Jones to the editor of the New York Times:

> In many areas of the State, especially in the small rural schools, the situation has reached the point where it is a matter of authorities pleading with persons of reasonable literacy to take a school as a patriotic service. It is no longer a question of whether prepared personnel can be secured, they are not available. Standards have had to be lowered drastically. We estimate average preparation of teachers had declined one full college year since war started from a normal average of 2.6 college years, but because the majority of

schools have been able to induce somebody to fill an existing vacancy the public is unaware of this situation and assumes that the schools are being operated satisfactorily. In our judgment it is impossible to exaggerate the gravity of the situation.

Last spring, before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. Jones gave the following striking information as to the acute situation in some of the schools in Arkansas:

Another extreme case might be cited, an elementary and high-school unit beginning the year with 20 out of 21 teachers on the faculty serving for the first time. Since the opening of this particular school there have been 18 replacements in its faculty, thus the turn-over for the current year has been 38 out of 21 positions, or a percentage turn-over of 181 percent. The administrative unit in which the above-mentioned school is located, out of 152 white teaching positions, the school opened last year with 21 new teachers, and in the 152 positions since the opening of the school a total of 143 additional replacements have been necessary, thus out of 152 positions the turn-over for the school year has been 224, or 147 percent. It is interesting to note that this particular administrative unit is the Pulaski County rural school district, which embraces all of Pulaski County except the city of Little Rock and North Little Rock, and this community is located in the industrial and economic center of the State.

If it were not for the fact that many teachers have been held in their jobs in the hope their Government would aid them there would be a greater reduction in teaching personnel. Mr. President, I am sure there are many of them who stay in their underpaid positions because of their love for the work they do. America owes much to its teachers. There is no single group who have done more to make America great.

There is one objection to the passage of this measure to which I desire to call attention. It is that of expenditure. I believe the appropriation contained in Senate bill 637 could be justified for the war efforts of the schools alone, to enable them to compete with Government subsidized industry for the services of competent teachers to prepare the approximately 1,000,000 high-school seniors each year for their places in war industries and the armed service.

Mr. President, we have appropriated billions of dollars for war. The purpose of these appropriations was to preserve the future safety of our Nation. Certainly the amount carried in this bill is but small in comparison with the other great sums expended for that purpose. While it may be small in money, it will be great in benefits which will accrue.

We have spent millions of dollars for the improvement of agricultural crops; and yet if we do not pass this measure we will overlook the crop of greatest value to our future—our young people.

Mr. President, illiteracy in the United States is high in comparison with illiteracy in the countries of our two major enemies—Germany and Japan. Germany has for years claimed to have no illiteracy. Japan claims to have less than 1 percent. The percentage of illiteracy in the United States, according to the latest available figures, is 4.3 percent. I think it is time that something should be done about it.

The number of men in the United States who have been rejected for military service for lack of even an elementary education has been alarming. It does not reflect credit upon the most powerful nation on earth. Up to June 1, 1943, 120,000 men physically fit, between the ages of 18 and 37, were rejected because of illiteracy. Since that date, the Army has been seeking to train most of the rejectees at great expense and loss of time.

Every child in America, regardless of the State in which he lives, is worthy of being given proper educational training. Our Government makes no distinction in State or area when it calls its young men and women for military training and service. Answering these calls, the State of Arkansas has given generously of its sons and daughters to the service of their country. It has its share and more of those who are prominent in the war effort. It has contributed its share and more of its heroes. To me, they are all heroes. It should make no distinction in the education of its young men and women.

Mr. President, the time may have been when it was not so necessary to have a proper education. That time is no more. Competition in the post-war national and international field will be keener than ever. We must not fail to give each American boy and girl an equal opportunity to be educated, and meet this competition, regardless of the State in which he or she may live.

Having done this, we can look with confidence to the part America will play in the future. To make this possible, I hope the pending bill will be speedily enacted into law.

COLLABORATION OF NATIONS AT WAR WITH THE AXIS—LEND-LEASE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have before me a clipping from the New York Tribune of yesterday which I cut from that newspaper in view of the fact that it deals, one might say, in power politics, in which unquestionably we shall find ourselves interested, and perhaps bogged, in a short time to come. The title of the article is "A Deepened Rift in Yugoslavia Faces Allied Parley in Moscow."

In commenting upon the article I wish to invite the attention of Members of the Senate to the first paragraph, which I read:

American and British experts on Balkan problems who attend the Moscow conference will have to recognize the failure of all efforts to establish some kind of collaboration between the two resistance groups in Yugoslavia.

Mr. President, I ask that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DEEPENED RIFT IN YUGOSLAVIA FACES ALLIED PARLEY IN MOSCOW—TITO AND MIHAILOVICH, GUERILLA LEADERS, WIDELY SEPARATED BY QUESTIONS OF RACE, STRATEGY, AND IDEOLOGY; PARTISANS ARE CALLED REDS

(By Andre Visson)

American and British experts on Balkan problems who attend the Moscow conference will have to recognize the failure of all efforts to establish some kind of collaboration between the two resistance groups in Yugoslavia.

British intelligence agents were joined by American liaison officers with the guerrillas of General Mihailovich and with Tito's Partisans. Supplies for the two groups are sent from Allied bases in Egypt and in Italy. But the relations between them are worse than they have been since 1941. They fight each other in their battles over the radio and even with the rifles and machine guns they should use only against the invaders from whom they both desire to liberate their country.

The Partisans, headed by a Croat Communist, Josip Bros, known as Tito, use the radio station Free Yugoslavia, reported to be on Russian soil, to broadcast their communiques and propaganda. The fighters commonly described as Chetniks and headed by the Serbian Nationalist Draja Mihailovich broadcast from the station Woods and Mountains of Yugoslavia, established in August at Mihailovich's headquarters with the assistance of an American intelligence mission. The first message from this station, received by an American naval-communication base, was transmitted on August 16 to the Yugoslav embassy in Washington. Since then the messages have arrived daily. Recently they were suspended for a few days, but were resumed on September 7 after a message which explained that the station had to be moved because of a German offensive.

The two Yugoslav groups are divided by questions of strategy, by conflicting ideologies and by ethnographical differences.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In this connection, Mr. President, let me say that all of us are unquestionably aware of the fact that in Yugoslavia today, as recited initially by this article, there are two factions fighting for power. Unfortunately the factions are killing off one another with a view to taking charge of the Government of Yugoslavia and being all-powerful in that government when the Allies shall have chased the Axis Powers from the soil of Yugoslavia. To my mind, that is a very unfortunate situation, because as many newspaper writers have heretofore stated, at this hour those factions should be engaged entirely in annihilating our common enemy—the Axis Powers—rather than killing off one another with the objective of taking charge of the country after the war shall have been won.

Today, unfortunately, as all of us know, one of the great hindrances in Italy is that at this very hour our progress is being greatly impeded by the battle which is taking place between the Italian Communists and the black shirt Fascists, each faction hoping to control the political future of Italy after the Allies shall have driven the Germans from Italian soil. That is an unfortunate situation for if all true patriotic Italians were interested in the future welfare of their country, they would join hands in driving the enemy from their own cherished territory.

So I dare to say that when we shall have won the war, after we shall have driven the enemy from the oppressed countries of Europe for whose freedom our sons bleed and die, unfortunately there will be warring factions annihilating one another with the objective of governing the country and maintaining such party or parties as the factions desire. They should be united today in

driving the common enemy from their respective soils.

Mr. President, in the words of a great American who once represented a great State in the Senate, Hon. J. Hamilton Lewis, our beloved and departed colleague, I make bold to speak out today in what I believe to be the interest of my country.

I state in perfect candor that I shall not make now, or hereafter, any apologies whatsoever for speaking out for what I believe to be the interest of my country, the United States of America, in preference to the interest of any other country upon the face of the earth.

I love America more than I love, or am interested in, any other country in the world. Perhaps in the future that statement will prove to be a very unpopular one for me to have made, because it seems that those who make bold to speak out in what they believe to be the interest of America are vilified, crucified, and maligned.

As for myself, I have no hesitancy today in making mention of the Lend-Lease Act, which has been discussed upon the floor of the Senate. I have no fear that those who are determined to destroy some of those of us who have spoken out for America will proclaim to the people of the world that I, as an American Senator, am endeavoring to create world disunity at this critical hour. I say that I do not hesitate because I believe that all that could harm me has been said heretofore; all that could possibly be printed about me to my supposed detriment has already been printed libelously within the covers of two largely circulated books known as Sabotage and Undercover. I have read them both. My name is mentioned many times therein. I assert that they are libelous. These two books contain volumes of lies from page to page, not only in regard to myself but also in regard to a number of my colleagues in this body, some of whom are present at this hour.

Mr. President, it is true that I voted against lend-lease. I voted against it because I believed that it would lead us to war. I voted merely my conscientious conviction. Other Members of this body voted for lend-lease because they conscientiously believed that it was the best thing for America at that time, and they still so believe. I find no cause for complaint against any of my colleagues for any vote on that all-important question or any other vote which they have ever cast in this body, because having been a Member of this honorable body for nigh onto 13 years, I have had an opportunity to know and appreciate the fine character of those who make up this the greatest deliberative body in all the world, and I have never known any Member of the Senate to do other than vote his conscientious convictions. Therefore, having supreme confidence in my colleagues in this body, I cannot help but take offense at some of the comments which have been made in regard to Members of the Senate who recently were overseas in the interest of this, their country.

Those who constituted the committee of five United States Senators selected to make that world tour are perfectly capable of taking care of themselves; they do not need that I raise my feeble voice in this body in their behalf; but, nevertheless, I wish to say that I have but words of congratulation for those five courageous American Senators who returned to this forum and told us what they saw. Until such time as what they told us has been flatly denied and disproven, I shall remain in the belief of every word that fell from their respective lips.

But, in the first place, Mr. President, why should we not be permitted to make bold in discussing matters of interest to the American people? We surely are interested in lend-lease; we surely are interested, because we have appropriated to date, and authorized for appropriation, more than $60,000,000,000 in American money, to be distributed in every single part of the world for the benefit of our allies in whose success we are vitally interested. Merely because we are partners is no reason whatsoever why we should not be permitted, in a friendly, cooperative way, to criticize our partners from time to time if their action is deserving of criticism. If I am in business with a man, I want the man with whom I am cooperating in business to treat me as fairly as I would treat him. If I am engaged in the practice of law in a partnership, I feel it my privilige to make inquiry in regard to the fees collected by the partnership from time to time, and inquiries thus directed would be of a friendly cooperative nature for the future of the partnership and of the business.

Mr. President, little as we may think about it at this hour, when we are pouring out billions upon billions of dollars, the American people are interested in when this spending is going to stop. Those who are interested are not alone the industrialists or the financiers of our land but the great mass of American laboring men themselves, because, after all is said and done, the men who toil and sweat and make utilization of their muscles, the builders of America, are the ones who are going, ultimately, to have to pay every single dollar of this debt.

Let us see about this, Mr. President. I desire to bring a few facts to the attention of the Members of the Senate. The national debt will be equal to the combined public debt of the rest of the world by the end of next year if the present rate of spending shall be maintained. That assertion was made on the floor of the Senate only a few days ago by that outstanding spokesman for the great Commonwealth of Louisiana, the junior Senator from that State [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. President, the United States is carrying the major financial and supply burden of this war. The per capita debt of the United States and possessions as of September 1940, aggregated $293; today it stands at $935. On the other hand, the per capita debt of Great Britain today is only $164, as compared with a per capita debt of the United States of $935.

The able Senator from Louisiana, in reference to the manner in which we procure nickel, is quoted as having said:

> At the present time this is the way we get most of our nickel. The product is mined in New Caledonia, where the Free French have slapped on an additional tax of 17 percent; it is sold to an Australian concern which in turn sells it to a Canadian corporation, which sells it to us. Then we put the nickel into lend-lease material and send it back to New Caledonia for an IOU.
>
> We have been penalized for our progressiveness. We have been the sucker in the *n*th degree.
>
> We get an IOU from the British Government for lend-lease goods. The British sell the goods to wholesalers and retailers and collect ad valorem taxes, as well as income taxes on it. Is it a surprise, therefore, that the British can keep their debt so low? Perhaps we could keep our debt down too through the same practices.

Mr. President, I have before me a copy of the October 8, 1943, issue of the United States News. I read therefrom:

> Nearly six times the amount of Government loans to our allies of the last war now is authorized for the lend-lease program of this war.

The cost of our aid program may be compared, according to what they have to say, Mr. President, by using an old-fashioned silver dollar. The amount of lend-lease supplies our allies in the last war measured in silver dollars placed side by side would have reached around the world 11½ times. The amount of lend-lease to our allies in the present war under authorized appropriations would reach around the earth more than 60 times. That illustration will provide the American people some idea of the tremendous amount of money that is being expended. The article continues:

> First World War debt: Still on the Government's books at the end of 1942 was a World War debt, owed by 17 nations, of $11,436,000,000 in principal, plus $2,561,000,000 in accrued interest. Total payments on that debt amounted to $2,750,000,000, including $758,000,000 paid on the principal.

A subcaption reads: "Lend-lease outlays." I continue to quote:

> To the last war's debts now are added the lend-lease outlays of this war. The question of repayment of lend-lease has been reopened by the President's disavowal of the idea that "victory and a secure peace are the only coin in which we can be repaid." This attitude was expressed specifically in the July report on lend-lease operations. But the President now says that nations benefiting from lend-lease are expected to repay us, as far as they can, though not necessarily in dollars. Exactly how the repayment is to be made remains a question. The rest of the world does not have the gold to repay us; and an attempt to repay in goods is considered improbable because of the unfavorable effect on our domestic economy.

Well said is the sentence, "Exactly how the repayment is to be made remains a question." It remains a question with me, because I cannot understand how our allies in this war could possibly repay anything on lend-lease if they were not able to repay on lend-lease during World War No. 1.

Nevertheless, I share the hope of many to the effect that our allies may be able at least to repay in part because, Mr. President, if we do not watch our step, if we do not keep track from now on of every single penny we spend, we shall end this war certainly as a "have not" Nation; we shall end up without funds or resources, and as a consequence we shall not be able to rehabilitate and to make over our own native land.

Mr. President, I have no quarrel with our brothers across the seas; I have no quarrel with our allies, regardless of the fact that the London press, in commenting upon the statements of our five colleagues who made a recent tour of the battle fronts, said that their statements were merely a lot of childish prattle, and some of the newspapers went so far as to insinuate that we should keep our mouths shut, that we had no business looking out after our own interests, that they would take care of our interests, and that we could like it or lump it.

I have before me the Evening Star of today, Monday, October 18, 1943, the headlines on the front page, a double head, reading as follows:

London paper blasts Senators; calls for truth of lend-lease.

They are calling for the same thing for which we are calling, and all we, who are Members of this body want, and all the American people want, namely, the truth about lend-lease. The American people are entitled to know the truth, because we are authorizing and making expenditures for lend-lease alone, of $60,000,000,000 of the people's money, an amount virtually three times the national debt of only a few years ago.

I appeal to our British brothers not to take too early offense at what has been said here. I appeal to our British brothers to bear with us, and to consider many facts which we must consider if we expect to remain in this body by the vote of the people, because the hour is not far off when there will be a ground swell in this country, when the people of America will rise up en masse and demand to know what we have done with the billions upon billions of dollars we have poured out and authorized to be taken from the Treasury of the United States.

I appeal to our brothers across the seas to sympathize with us. I recognize that they no longer want us to join them, nor do they want to join us. There was a great movement on foot not long ago, what was known as Union Now, the proposed joining of our country, the United States of America, with Great Britain, under one flag, a great movement started by Mr. Clarence Streit and advocated very strongly by a member of the Supreme Court of the United States—Union Now—but that movement has fallen by the way. It has not fallen as the result of lack of enthusiasm on the part of Mr. Streit, the author, and the Supreme Court Justice, but the movement is dead and has fallen because our British brothers looked over the books and found that every man in the Empire owed only about $164, but that every man in the United States owed $935, and it is no wonder they do not want any union now, because what Britisher would want to undertake to carry the load every American citizen will have to carry after this war is ended?

Mr. President, I appeal to that great patriot, Mr. Winston Churchill, to explain our situation to his fellow members of Parliament this week when he appears before them to answer certain questions. I appeal now to Mr. Churchill to make plain to the members of his Empire the circumstances and conditions which we now confront and which we will continue to confront.

Let us see. We have not only authorized the expenditure of more than $60,000,000,000 to be given to all the nations in the world, but the Board of Economic Warfare is spending millions of dollars, I understand. I have before me another copy of the United States News, the issue of October 1, 1943, containing these headlines:

World R. F. C. in the Making; New Outlet for United States Dollars.

According to this article there is a movement on foot to organize a world R. F. C. and to rehabilitate the whole world, to pass our money abroad to be used in rehabilitating various unfortunate countries. If we do not authorize that outlay of funds, we will not be able to rebuild the entire world.

Mr. President, we all know that all the unfortunate people of the world expect us to feed them when the war is over. Did not the people of Italy expect us to feed them? Proof of that is offered by the great demonstrations which occurred in Sicily and southern Italy when our troops came in. We want to feed the people of Italy who today are hungry. If we can do so, we wish to help them in their misfortune. The people of all other countries of the world are expecting us to provide them with food.

Mr. President, our brothers across the sea must understand that when the war is ended we will probably in many senses be a bankrupt nation. We will in all probability in many senses be a have-not nation. We will then be deserving of the interest of the world by reason of the fact that we shall have depleted ourselves in order to help our brothers in the World War struggle in which we are all jointly interested.

Mr. President, a strong editorial dealing with the lease-lend situation was published in the Shreveport Times of Shreveport, La., on Sunday, October 10, 1943. The editorial calls upon the Congress of the United States to investigate the situation and let the American people know what is going on. Shreveport is in the State of a Senator who has interested himself in this subject, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I understand that the editor of the Shreveport Times is a son of Colonel Ewing, who was formerly editor and publisher of the New Orleans State. His son is now living in Shreveport. I have received many editorials from that newspaper. Mr. Ewing is an able editorial writer. I ask that the editorial be published in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial is as follows:

INVESTIGATE THIS SCANDAL

The shocking and disgraceful mismanagement and incompetency in lend-lease administration of such supplies as trucks, gasoline, and tires, as revealed by members of the special Senate committee returning from inspection of overseas fighting areas, should bring searching Senate investigation of the whole lend-lease set-up and of the gas rationing confusion and inefficiency under Secretary Ickes.

The revelations of the Senators are flame-producing fuel on lend-lease fires which already have been smouldering in many directions, with obvious indications that Washington bureaucrats are using this war agency to play global Santa Claus for political self-glorification regardless of waste, extravagance, hampering of the war effort, or needless suffering in civilian and business life here at home.

Lend-lease shipping of 30,000 trucks per year to Australia for civilian use there, as reported in the Senate, while permitting only 15,000 to be made available to civilians here at home, is by itself a major scandal. Australia is a country with only 10,000,000 population against our 130,000,000, and our business, agriculture, and commerce are expected to take care of much of the world while Australia fundamentally has little more than its own small self to handle. These truck allotments are entirely for civilian use and not for uniformed forces—and certainly the small handful of United States troops in Australia would not necessitate any such great truck need, by comparison with our own here at home, to haul supplies in Australia for our fighters over there.

In the meantime there are literally thousands of farmers in this Nation whose food production for home and global civilian use and for our own uniformed forces and those of our allies is being hampered by truck shortage. There also are literally thousands of business firms either lacking trucks or operating with makeshift, run-down, rattletrap equipment. On those suffering the shortage here at home rests much of the burden of keeping our own domestic economy going so that our home front can do its share in winning the war and help maintain the economy of the nations fighting with us.

To add to the general incompetency and inefficiency the senatorial report reveals such muddling as shipping of wrong-size truck tires overseas when our own people often cannot get tires even with a ration certificate showing that they are operating in war-essential business. Elsewhere in Washington there are charges that many billions of dollars appropriated by Congress to other purposes have been diverted to Lend-Lease for its global Santa Claus role without any legalizing action by Congress and in addition to the billions of dollars which were appropriated by Congress for lend-lease.

This whole scandalous situation becomes even more amazing and disgraceful when it is added to the previous senatorial reports that civilians of French Africa have been allotted more gasoline than is made available under Mr. Ickes' rationing set-up to civilians in some of our own domestic areas of the United States. On top of this comes a recent statement from the head of a British refinery saying his plant could increase gasoline production by a full 60 percent "if it became necessary." Of course it hasn't been

necessary—from the British view—because the blindly groping bureaucrats in Washington would rather take gasoline from our own civilian population and deplete our own national resources and give it away overseas than to even suggest to these foreign nations that they turn to their own resources and production facilities before calling on us.

On top of the senatorial reports come such additional revelations as recent dispatches from Italy describing agents of Washington bureaucracy as tossing chocolate bars to the Italian children along the roadside while our own American children here at home rarely can get a chocolate bar for either food or pleasure—and of shipment by the bureaucrats of long underdrawers to the Arabs, who throughout centuries were quite content with a sheet and a turban until the lend-lease Santa Claus began cavorting around their valleys and deserts. There are many other angles also, such as recent return of millions of cases of food sent to the overseas army, of shipping butter to Russia when it was little known there and we were short, of using our canning and packing factories for special food preparations for foreign civilians with resulting shortages in supplies of our own food for our own people. The same irrational policy, confusion, and incompetency have permeated our whole rationing effort, starting with sugar and coffee. There is plenty of indication also that the Army supply work under Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell also may have a lot of holes in it in connection with allocating our home production. General Somervell is the man now reportedly backed by the inner clique of new dealers for the Chief of Staff job of Gen. George C. Marshall if a way could be found to "promote" the latter to a global command.

The picture presented by these various revelations is not only shocking, scandalous, and ridiculous, but it is certain to break home morale and disrupt the whole domestic war front if it continues. There should be searching investigation—now—by the Senate under a policy of letting the chips fall where they may regardless of their size or of what officials may be hit.

As a policy of getting equipment to the fighting forces of our allies and of maintaining war-essential civilian strength overseas, the purposes of lend-lease may be excellent. As a practice of ripping open the welfare of our own American people here at home—the people whose taxes pay the cost of all of it—in order that a few bureaucrats may gain a few cheers from the British, the Arabs, the Australians, or anyone else, the whole thing is shameful and disgraceful.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have in my hand an interesting editorial dealing with the subject of taxation as it relates to lend-lease. I read as follows:

> Lend-lease shipments * * * have now reached a rate of $1,250,000,000 a month, or $15,000,000,000 a year. For the fiscal year ended last June 30, collections of individual and corporate income taxes and excess-profits taxes totaled about $15,000,000,000.

So our income taxes, Mr. President, are being used mainly to pay for gifts of arms, ammunition, clothing, food, drugs, and so forth and so forth, to our allies and to nations we hope to make our allies. To train, clothe, feed, ship, and supply our fighting boys, according to my understanding, the Government mainly borrows the money by way of War bonds.

Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to call attention to an article in a box published in the Washington Evening Star of today under the headline—

NEW LEASE-LEND PACT WILL BE SIGNED BY UNITED STATES AND BRITAIN

(By the Associated Press)

LONDON, October 18.—A new British-American lease-lend agreement will be signed here tomorrow—

Meaning Tuesday, October 19—

And will be announced simultaneously in London and Washington.

All details of the document have been kept secret, but it is understood several significant changes will be made.

The third lend-lease protocol with Russia also is to be signed in London.

For the first time, Canada will join the United States and Britain in signing the aid agreement with the Soviet.

The first agreement was made in Moscow in 1941 and October 6, 1942, and the second one was signed in Washington.

Mr. President, I hope there finally may be an understanding with respect to the lend-lease issue. The question has been discussed on the floor of the Senate. Today, it is being discussed everywhere in America because the American people are awakening to the fact that they finally will be called upon to pay the enormous debt which is being saddled upon their shoulders. I hope we may have further discussion concerning lend-lease and that we may be able to adjust our differences and act together in harmony for the benefit of all who are involved in the world controversy.

UNFAIR TREATMENT OF RAILROAD WORKERS AND FARMERS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, nearly half a century ago this Nation was shocked at what were termed the Pullman riots, which grew out of a fight between railroad builders and their employers. Many died in the riots. President Cleveland sent troops to restore order. Then men put their heads together and declared that there was some peaceful method in a Republic to settle their differences.

Out of those conferences came model laws affecting all the railroad workers, both the operating workers, such as engineers, firemen, conductors, and trainmen, and the nonoperating workers, such as car builders, track-repair men, clerks, tradesmen in all the building crafts, metal workers, machinists, and so forth.

We adopted the Adamson 8-hour law in my State of North Dakota. We later adopted a law which provided that a certain number of men should be assigned to each type of train, and that freight trains must not exceed a certain number of cars. That is known as the full-crew law.

Most important, because the railroads are vital to the well-being of the whole Nation, to both farmer and city dweller, we adopted a plan of mediation between the railroad workers and their employers, in which the Government sat as the third party and the final arbitrator.

The findings of this national panel were to be final and binding on both sides.

Radical employers and radical workers have complained from time to time at the slowness of this method of wage negotiation, but the history of the past 50 years shows no general rail strike.

And today, here, now, we have a situation in which both sides, the employers and the workers, have gone through a process according to law. Both sides agreed, both asked the chairman of the panel to wait upon the President of the United States, and to say to him:

> Your Excellency, we have met. We held long hearings. We came to a decision. We have been excellent models of how, in a great republic, process according to law and order works. And now, if you don't mind, sign here.

Presidents McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, Woodrow Wilson, Warren Harding, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, and Franklin Roosevelt signed. Strikes were averted and the process of a great republic had operated and we went on to other things.

But a few days ago President Franklin Roosevelt refused to sign.

Instead he sent certain findings to former Representative Fred Vinson, who holds a title conferred upon him by Presidential ukase. Mr. Vinson reversed the action taken by the employer, the worker, and the representative of this Republic. Mr. Vinson then issued his own directive.

Today here in the capital of the Republic a group of earnest sincere American men are meeting. They are the leaders of workers. They will also meet with the employers. But it is too late.

Why is it too late? Because from a very important railway center in the South, Atlanta, Ga., there has gone to the President a telegram, which I understand says:

> Unless you follow your own precedent and the precedent established by the men who preceded you in office, since Grover Cleveland's time, at midnight, November 1, less than 13 days from this hour, every railroad wheel in or out of Atlanta will cease to roll, engines will go cold. Passengers will be marooned, vital war supplies and food for our workers will halt.

Everyone in America has the right of petition. Obviously, any citizen of this Republic had a right to sign such a telegram, for, from the President down to the lowest office holder, we are all servants of the people. However, that notice is not signed by officials of the workers' unions or organizations. It is signed by men who held a town meeting.

There you have it, Mr. President. Employers and workers, after long hearings, had agreed to settle their differences according to a process set up under the law of this Republic, but now the President, through Fred Vinson, a man who holds no office by any lawful right, and who calls himself, with sarcasm, "stabilization director No. 2," or some such title, is about to bring about disunity, bloodshed, starvation, and revolution.

Some may say there is another side to this question, that the facts I have recited are not true. I simply say they are mistaken. They are true. They are the facts.

Some may say, "Why fulminate?" I say let us resolve here and now to re-

quest the President and his underling, Fred Vinson, to step aside, to return to republican processes, to search under the mounds of papers on the desk of the President, and to find the original settlement; and I say, let the United States Senate further resolve that the President be requested to sign those findings, and to prevent riot, strikes, bloodshed, or to immediately declare martial law, take over the railroads, and operate them through the Army and through Harry Hopkins' friend, Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, head of the Army Service Forces.

Finally, I warn the Senate that history will show, as the history of the Republic of Rome shows, that if the senate of a great republic remains supine, in the face of what is known to be in the twisted minds of plotters in high places, the nation as we know it will forever perish from the earth.

God knows, Mr. President, enough of our young men are dying everywhere in the world; so let us find out now if the purpose is to kill their fathers and brothers as strikers. I say either let the President follow the law of the Nation, which provides for peaceful settlement of disputes, and which law has been slowly and painfully complied with by both the employers and employees, or else give us martial law now, before we have bloodshed.

Let me say, Mr. President, that the treatment accorded the workers I have just described is similar to the kind of deal the farmers, particularly the wheat farmers all over the Northwest, are receiving today at the hands of those in authority. Time and time and time again upon this floor I have warned the Senate that the farmers of the Northwest could not possibly survive at the price they were receiving for their grain. That price is substantially one-half of what the farmers received during World War No. 1. Today the men who raise wheat are the only farmers in all America who are getting about half the cost of production of their crops. The price they are paid for their wheat is far below the parity price. I have warned the Senate time and time again; I warned when I said that the wheat was piled up by the thousands of bushels, with no railroad cars available, with railroad cars being sent to Canada, to bring in wheat from Canada. I warned when I said the farmers could not get any rubber tires for their tractors, for their automobiles, or for their trucks, while on the boundary line of North Dakota, at Portal, I, myself saw thousands of farm implements, with rubber tires and well supplied with rubber, going into Canada. I said that although the farmer was being paid only about half the cost of production, nevertheless he was doing the best he could, but that he would quit farming. If it had not been for the exceptionally large crops we have had in the Northwest in the last 2 years, nearly every farmer would be broke.

What is the result, Mr. President? I hold in my hand a recently published newspaper. I call it to the attention of every Senator on this floor. In it are advertised 13 auction sales—13 auction sales advertised in one weekly newspaper. Just notice what are being sold: Fine milk cows.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That advertisement is in a North Dakota paper, is it not?

Mr. LANGER. It is in a North Dakota newspaper. The newspaper is the Wells County Free Press, published at Fessenden, N. Dak., on October 7, 1943.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is quite typical of what is going on in Minnesota. The Minnesota newspapers have the same kind of business, printing auction advertisements.

Mr. LANGER. For the same reason; is not that true?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes; for the same reason.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I call the attention of every Member of the Senate to these advertisements of auction sales—13 in 1 weekly newspaper.

For example, one advertisement reads:

AUCTION

The undersigned will sell at public auction the following-described personal property, located 1 mile north and 2 miles east of Cathay on the William Haedt farm, on Thursday, October 14, commencing at 1 o'clock p. m.:

Four head of good work horses.

Fifty head of cattle.

In another auction sale advertisement, 16 head of cattle; in another, 25 head of cattle; in another, 25 head of cattle; in another, 20 head of cattle; and so on.

Another advertisement is of an auction to be held by M. O. Miller, owner—34 head of cattle.

On almost every page of the newspaper published in Wells County, which is in the very center of the State, similar auction-sale advertisments appear.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the particular advertisements published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUCTION

The undersigned will sell at public auction the following-described personal property located 5 miles straight north of Bowdon, and 6 miles south and 3 west and 1 mile south of Fessenden, on Tuesday, October 12, commencing at 1 p. m. sharp:

Seventeen head of Guernsey cattle, consisting of 8 milk cows, some fresh and some coming fresh soon; 9 head heifers and calves of various ages.

Five head horses; 36 turkeys; 20 ducks.

Farm machinery: 15-30 McCormick tractor; Case 4-bottom tractor plow; new No. 9 McCormick-Deering mower; 1 Deering mower; new I. H. C. hay rake; 1 hay bucker; 1 wagon with hay rack; 2 wagons with boxes; Emerson gang plow; 10-foot quack machine; John Deere 1-row corn cultivator; I. H. C. 1½-horsepower gas engine; 1 harrow with cart; I. H. C. cream separator No. 3, nearly new; McCormick-Deering binder, almost new; 1 smut machine; Van Brunt drill; 2-bottom P. and O. tractor plow; 2 sets work harness with collars; and other articles too numerous to mention.

Twenty-five tons prairie hay; grindstone; 5 pigs; some household goods.

Terms, cash.

EMIL RITTMILLER,
Owner.
ADAM ZUBER,
Auctioneer.
ERWIN ENGBRECHT,
Clerk.

AUCTION

The undersigned will sell at public auction the following-described personal property located on the SE¼ of section 1-149-71, 7 miles northeast of Manfred, and 5 miles southwest of Heimdal, on Wednesday, October 13, commencing at 1 p. m. sharp:

Five head of work horses, consisting of good farm mares and geldings.

Sixteen cattle, consisting of 7 head of registered and high-grade milking shorthorn cows, 3 now fresh and others will be fresh soon; 2-year-old registered shorthorn heifer and calf, 2 registered bull calves about 7 months old; 1 registered heifer calf about 10 months old, 4 head of high-grade calves.

Farm machinery: Van Brunt disk drill with shoes; McCormick-Deering mower, nearly new; John Deere gang plow; P. and O. triple plow; McCormick hay rake; 9-foot springtooth harrow; 2 cultivators; 5-section steel harrow; 1 wooden harrow; 1 harrow cart; 1 low wagon with rack; 1 truck wagon with rack; 1 wagon gear; 2 bobsleds; 1 cattle rack for wagon or trailer; Letz 6-inch feed mill; 3 sets of work harness; 1 gasoline range, nearly new; 1930 McCormick-Deering manure spreader in good shape; P. and O. sulky plow; McCormick-Deering 3-horsepower gas engine; 2 steel gates, 12 feet wide.

Terms, cash. All property to be settled for before removing from premises.

EMIL E. NELSON,
Owner.
A. F. BELCHER,
Auctioneer, Fessenden.
FIRST STATE BANK, HARVEY,
Clerk.

AUCTION

The undersigned will sell at public auction the following described personal property located on the northeast quarter section 20-145-69, 10 miles southwest of Sykeston and 10 miles southeast of Heaton, on Tuesday, October 12, commencing at 1 p. m. sharp:

Eight cattle, consisting of seven good milk cows and one 2-year-old bull.

Horses consisting of one team, 6 and 8 years old.

Farm machinery: McCormick corn cultivator; John Deere corn planter with one-half mile wire; one John Deere hay rake; McCormick mower; five-section iron harrow; 10-foot Moline grain drill; hayrack on good tires; four-wheel trailer with grain box; one corn sheller, hand or power; 8-foot disc; one size 16 DeLaval cream separator; chicken coops; chicken feeders; chicken water fountains; hog troughs.

Household goods: One heater, one kitchen cabinet, one cupboard, and many other articles too numerous to mention.

Terms: Cash.

GRANT HARDING,
Owner.
A. F. BELCHER,
Auctioneer, Fessenden.
H. I. TURNER, *Clerk.*

AUCTION

The undersigned will sell at public auction the following described personal property at farm 3½ miles south on highway 52, ½ mile

east of Fessenden, on Monday, October 11 commencing at 1 o'clock p. m.:

Two head of horses, black mares, 7 and 9 years old.

Thirty-four cattle, 9 milk cows, 3 coming fresh within next month; 3 Hereford cows with calf of good breeding; 1 purebred Hereford bull 10 months old; 4 head of heifers, with calf; 3 Hereford calves; 14 head of young cattle.

Farm machinery: Fifteen rolls of new hog and sheep wire, never been used, still in original roll; two hay rakes; two mowers; P & O plow; McCormick-Deering binder; 10-foot disc; one 14-foot power double disc drill; five-section steel drag; hayrack on steel-wheel wagon; one steel wagon running gear; model D John Deere tractor; choice of one of two 15-30 McCormick-Deering tractors in excellent shape; grain elevator; 1½ horsepower engine; 3 horsepower gas engine; two single-row corn cultivators; one corn binder straight McCormick; 12-foot windrower; 1930 McCormick-Deering 12-foot combine.

Alfalfa in stacks, salted.

Terms: Cash.

M. O. MILLER, *Owner.*
ADAM ZUBER,
Auctioneer.
ERWIN ENGBRECHT,
Clerk.

AUCTION

The undersigned will sell at public auction the following described personal property located on the NE¼ of section 15-148-71, 3 miles west of Fessenden, on Saturday, October 16, commencing at 1 p. m. sharp:

Nineteen cattle, consisting of 10 head of purebred and high-grade Guernsey cows; 5 yearling heifers; 1 2-year-old heifer; 2 bull calves; 1 Guernsey bull.

Eight head of work horses, consisting of good farm mares and geldings.

Farm machinery: 1942 Case Model S tractor; McCormick-Deering mower on rubber; Case 3-bottom 14-inch tractor plow; 1 P. & O. corn planter; new 24-foot Boss harrow; 1 wagon and rack; 1 tractor sweep; 1-row cultivator; McCormick-Deering 8-foot binder with tractor hitch; manure spreader; 3-bottom plow packer; John Deere gang plow; 4-wheel trailer with pole for horses; 1 set of new harness; 1 set harness; 1 tank heater; good brooder house; 1 coal brooder stove and chick feeders; 4 rolls snow fence; electric fence; some woven wire; 6-volt Wincharger, tools and other articles too numerous to mention. The above machinery is nearly all new and has been used only a short time.

Hay and corn fodder.

Some household goods: 1 base kitchen cabinet; 1 front room set; 1 breakfast set; 1 kitchen gas cook stove; 2 rugs, 11½ by 12; chairs; new Remington .22 caliber rifle, repeater; International cream separator used only 3 months; 3 cream cans; new cistern pump; 6-volt radio; ironing board, and other household articles and kitchen utensils.

Terms: Cash. All property to be settled for before removing from premises.

Mrs. OTTO LEITNER,
Owner.
A. F. BELCHER,
Auctioneer.

AUCTION

The undersigned will sell at public auction the following-described personal property at my residence in Fessenden, on Saturday, October 9, commencing at 1 p. m. sharp.

Household goods, etc.: 3 beds with springs; chest of drawers; dresser, chairs, utility cabinet; medicine cabinet, Majestic range; show cases; several tables, Melotte separator; 2 rifles; 9 by 12 Congoleum rug; flower stands; fern stand; 2 stone jars; several oil barrels; wagon with 500-gallon steel tank; tools; dining room set; book case.

Seventy-five young pullets; 2 milk cows.

Terms, cash.

LARS KRO,
Owner.
ADAM ZUBER,
Auctioneer.

AUCTION

The undersigned will sell at public auction the following described personal property, located 3½ miles northeast of Cathay on the NE¼ of section 8-147-68, on Wednesday, October 13, commencing at 1 p. m. sharp.

Five horses—One bay gelding, 6 years, weight 1,400 pounds; one black mare, 3½ years, weight 1,200 pounds; one black mare, 9 years, weight 1,500 pounds; one black mare, 9 years, weight 1,500 pounds; 1 bay gelding, 5 years, weight 1,500 pounds.

Seven cattle—Three milk cows, two freshened in late August; other will be fresh in December; four 2½-year-old heifers, all have been bred this summer. All above cattle are purbred Brown Swiss, not registered.

Farm machinery—John Deere 8-foot binder, 10-foot disc, 8-foot disc, corn planter and wire, three-horse two-row corn cultivator; one wide-tire wagon gear, one garden plow, one spring-tooth harrow, five-section six-bar drag, one 22 double disc Moline-Monitor drill.

Some household goods, including one Kitchen-Cook five-burner gas range.

Terms, cash.

W. A. DENISON, *Owner.*
ADAM ZUBER,
Auctioneer.
ERWIN ENGBRECHT,
Clerk.

AUCTION

The undersigned will sell at public auction the following described personal property, located on the late Griff Lewis farm, being the NW¼ of section 4-145-69, 4 miles west and 3 miles south of Skyeston, on Monday, October 11, commencing at 1 p. m. sharp.

Three horses, consisting of two good farm mares 8 years old, and one yearling horse colt.

Farm machinery—1937 Boss harrow; John Deere three-bottom tractor plow, with three sets of lays; Van Brunt pony drill and packer; McCormick-Deering mower; McCormick-Deering header; John Deere power binder with canvases; one wagon; John Deere 14-foot press drill; 10-foot McCormick rake, new; 10-foot tandem disc; one lister with damming attachment; smut machine; two full sets of harness; one wagon with 250-gallon gas tank; gasoline barrels; pick-up guards; some roofing paper; and many other articles too numerous to mention. Nearly all of this machinery has been used only a short time and is in first class condition.

Terms of sale, cash.

JAMES GAMBS,
Owner.
A. F. BELCHER,
Auctioneer.
H. I. TURNER,
Clerk.

AUCTION SALE

The undersigned will sell at public auction the following-described personal property, located on NW¼ section 27-145-71, 8 miles south of Bowdon, on Thursday, October 14, commencing at 1 p. m. sharp. Ladies' aid will serve lunch.

Four horses, consisting of 1 bay mare, 8 years old, weight 1,450 pounds; 1 sorrel mare, 13 years old, weight 1,400 pounds; 1 bay gelding, 10 years old, weight 1,200 pounds; 1 bay gelding, 17 years old, weight 1,200 pounds.

Twenty-five cattle, consisting of 11 good milk cows, 2 2-year-old heifers; 6 yearling calves, and 6 calves.

Farm machinery: John Deere binder, Deering corn binder, 1 double disk drill, 1 mower, hay rake, 2 wagons, 1 wagon and rack, 1 disk, 1 manure spreader, 2 gang plows, 2 one-row cultivators, 24-ft. wooden harrow, 20-ft. iron harrow, 1 buggy, 1 feed grinder, 1 grass seeder, 2 brooders, 2 incubators, 1926 Fordson tractor with plow and breaker bottoms, cream separator, 3 sets work harness; blacksmith tools, and many other articles too numerous to mention.

Terms, cash. All property to be settled for before removing from premises.

HERMAN SCHULTZ,
Owner.
A. F. BELCHER,
Auctioneer.
TILLMAN FORTNEY,
Clerk.

AUCTION

The undersigned will sell at public auction the following-described personal property, located on the NW¼ section 29-146-68, 1 mile east and 1 mile south of Sykeston, on Saturday, October 9, commencing at 1 p. m. sharp.

Six head of horses, consisting of good farm mares and geldings.

Twenty cattle, consisting of 7 good milk cows, 3 heifers coming 2 years old, 3 steers coming 2 years old, 6 calves, 1 shorthorn bull 3 years old.

Farm machinery: John Deere binder, 1 disk, 1 McCormick-Deering corn binder, John Deere mower, 1 rake, 1 bobsled, 1 fanning mill, 1 wagon with box, 1 low wagon with rack, 1 water tank, a one-row cultivator, 1 gang-plow, John Deere triple-plow, some tools, and many other articles too numerous to mention.

Terms, cash.

FRANK GARHOFER,
Owner.
A. F. BELCHER,
Auctioneer,
T. I. TURNER,
Clerk.

AUCTION SALE

As I have decided to quit farming, I will sell the following property at public sale in South Viking Township, section 31-151-69, 7 miles south, 1 mile west, one-half mile south of Maddock, and 4 miles north and 4 miles east of Heimdal, on Friday, October 15; sale starts at 1 o'clock sharp:

Ten horses: Bay mare, 7 years, weight 1,500; black mare, 8 years, weight 1,400; 1 black team, 5 and 3 years, weights 1,200; 1 gray horse, 13 years, weight 1,300; 2 black mares, 12 years, weights 1,300; bay gelding, 7 years, weight 1,100; black gelding, 8 years, weight 1,300; 1 sorrel colt, 2 years old.

Twenty-five cattle: 1 red cow, 8 years; 3 roan cows, 6 years; 1 black cow, 5 years; 1 black cow, 2 years; 1 spotted heifer, 2 years; 2 red heifers and sucking calves; 2 red Hereford heifers, 1 year; 2 roan Hereford heifers, 1 year; 3 good Hereford bulls, 1 year; 6 spring Hereford calves.

Farm machinery: 1 low wagon with rack, 1 high wagon with box, McCormick mower, Deering rake, 1 light draft Kentucky drill, 1 Boss harrow, 1 riding cultivator, 1 McCormick-Deering binder, 3 sets of harness.

Household goods: 1 good range, 1 good round oak heater, 1 DeLaval cream separator in good shape, Florence 3-burner kerosene stove, 1 bed and mattress, and other articles too numerous to mention.

Terms, cash.

ALFRED BRANDVOLD,
Owner.
ADAM ZUBER,
Auctioneer.
ERWIN ENGBRECHT,
Clerk.

AUCTION

The undersigned will sell at public auction the following-described personal property, located 1 mile north and 2 miles east of Cathay on the William Haedt farm, on Thursday, October 14, commencing at 1 o'clock, p. m.:

Four head of good work horses.

Fifty head of cattle: Mostly purebred black Angus, including 2 black Angus bulls, 18 months old, and 1 registered black Angus bull, 4 years old.

Farm machinery: John Deere hay loader, side-delivery rake, 2 McCormick-Deering 8-foot binders, 1 Monitor 11-foot double-disc drill, 2 wagons with grain tanks, 3 wagons with racks, International 12-foot field cultivator, 5-section wooden harrow, 1 McCormick 5-foot mower, McCormick 10-foot hay rake, 2 one-row corn cultivators, 3-bottom P. & O. tractor plow, John Deere manure spreader, 14-foot single-disk tractor drill, 5-foot John Deere pony drill, Moline pony drill, 5 sets work harness, 1 cream separator.

Terms, cash.

WILLIAM HAEDT ESTATE,
Owner.
ADAM ZUBER,
Auctioneer.
ERWIN ENGBRECHT,
Clerk.

AUCTION

The undersigned will sell at public auction at his farm 6½ miles east on Highway No. 15, and 1 mile north of New Rockford, on Wednesday, October 13, commencing at 10 o'clock a. m. sharp.

Forty-six head of cattle: 10 Shorthorn milk cows, 3 to 7 years old; 10 Hereford milk cows, 3 to 6 years old; 25 winter and spring Hereford calves; 1 purebred Hereford bull, 3 years old. Eight head of horses: Team matched bays, smooth mouth, weight 3,200; black gelding, smooth mouth, weight 1,700; gray gelding, smooth mouth, weight 1,700; team black geldings, 7 years, weight 3,000; sorrel gelding 4 years old, weight 1,400; saddle horse, strawberry roan, 7 years, weight 900.

Farm machinery: International ¾-ton truck, 1941 model; Minneapolis-Moline 21-32 tractor on rubber; Minneapolis-Moline model R row crop tractor on rubber, 1941 model; 2-row power cultivator with hydraulic lift; 7-foot power mower; Case thresher, complete with belts; Minneapolis-Moline 4-bottom high-speed plow on rubber; Minneapolis-Moline 21-foot disc harrow, 18-inch discs; Minneapolis-Moline 8-foot Wheatland plow, 26-inch discs; portable grain elevator with 8-horse Cushman engine; 2 McCormick-Deering grain binders, 1940 and 1941 models; McCormick-Deering trailer binder hitch; overshot hay stacker; McCormick-Deering 12-foot sweep rake; McCormick-Deering 12-foot hay rake; McCormick-Deering 6-foot horse mower; 37-foot Boss spike-tooth harrow; Minneapolis-Moline manure spreader; Massey-Harris 16½-foot, 33-run double-disc drill; all steel power grain drill; single-row corn cultivator; Letz 10-inch feed mill, complete with elevator; trailer wagon, grain box, on rubber; wide-tired wagon with grain box; 2 hay racks and wagons; pump jack; pumping engine, ¾ horsepower; 80-bushel hog self-feeder; 14-foot spring-tooth harrow; Hero 40-inch fanning mill; McCormick-Deering cream separator, No. 5; 10-foot round-stock watering tank; Deering corn binder; 3 sets of Concord harness; heavy stock saddle; 3 sets of rope hay slings; wide-track bobsled; P & O gang plow; 30-foot windmill tower; 125-foot 7-inch 5-ply thresher belt; 100-foot 7-inch 4-ply thresher belt; 5 steel oil drums, 50-gallon capacity; gasoline pump; large size dehorning clipper; gravity type seed grain treater; 8-inch McCormick-Deering feed mill electric fence unit, and other farm tools and equipment too numerous to mention.

Most of this machinery was purchased new in the last 4 years.

Seventy-five bushels of potatoes, 200 tons hay in stack, 300 bushels hog millet.

Some household goods. Several dozen fruit jars. Purebred English shepherd stock dog, 16 months old. Few dozen chickens.

Free lunch will be served at noon.

Terms of sale: Sums of $25 and under, cash. On sums over $25, time will be allowed until October 1, 1944, on acceptable paper bearing 7 percent interest. Anyone desiring terms must make arrangements with the clerk before the day of sale. No property to be removed from the premises until settlement is made.

W. O. PICKETT,
Owner.
SYLVESTER WALLACE,
Auctioneer.
FIRST STATE BANK,
Clerk.

AUCTION

The undersigned will sell at public auction the following-described personal property located on the SE¼ section 13-146-72, 3½ miles west of Bowdon, and 2½ miles east of Chaseley, on Friday, October 15, commencing at 11 a. m. sharp. Lunch served by Chaseley Ladies' Aid:

Eight horses consisting of 6 head of good farm mares and geldings ranging in age from 3 to 11 years, and 2 yearlings.

Sixteen cattle consisting of 6 good milk cows, one 2-year heifer, 2 yearling heifers, 1 yearling steer, 1 yearling bull, 5 head of calves, 32 head of hogs, 100 chickens.

Farm machinery: John Deere binder, McCormick-Deering mower, International drill, McCormick-Deering hay rake, 1 drag and cart, 1 spring-tooth harrow, Oliver gang plow, corn cultivator, 1 potato plow, 1 fanning mill, 15-30 International tractor in good shape, 1 tractor plow, 1 wood saw, 2 sets harness, 1 water tank, 1½ horsepower engine, 1 smut machine, 2 wagons, International 10-inch feed mill, 1 hay rack, McCormick-Deering cream separator with 32 motor, and many other articles too numerous to mention.

Household goods: Washing machine with 32 motor, Coles hot-blast range, Sav-Oil kerosene stove, kitchen cabinet, dining-room table, 12 chairs, china closet, 1 buffet, 2 chiffoniers and mirror, 2 dressing tables, 2 dressers and mirrors, 1 big mirror, 3 beds with mattresses and springs, 1 dinette table, 3 rocking chairs, 2 electric lamps, 1 leather couch, 2 smoking stands, 1 writing desk, 2 kitchen tables, 2 flower stands, 1 ironing board, 32-electric iron, pictures, and other household goods and kitchen utensils.

Terms, cash.

WILLIAM JAKLE,
Owner.
A. F. BELCHER,
Auctioneer.
H. I. TURNER, *Clerk.*

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a newspaper which is published in the western section of North Dakota, in McKenzie County, the McKenzie County Farmer and Watford Guide, published on October 7, the same date on which the newspaper I just referred to was published. In it are advertised three big auction sales.

I have on my desk a copy of the Turtle Mountain Star, published at Rolla, N. Dak., on the same day, October 7. In it, again, three big auction sales are advertised.

I call attention to a copy of the La Moure Chronicle, published in the southern section of North Dakota. In it Senators will find four big auction sales advertised.

Mr President, I now hold in my hand a copy of the McLean County Independent. published in approximately the center of the State. In it, again, three big auction sales are advertised.

I have on my desk a copy of the Ward County Independent, published at Minot, N. Dak., on the same day. In it seven auction sales are advertised.

I hold in my hand a copy of a newspaper called the Towner County Record-Herald, published on the same day, with advertisements of more auction sales.

I hold in my hand a copy of the Mouse River Farmers Press, published on the same day, with five auction sales advertised.

I now hold in my hand a copy of the Napoleon Homestead, a newspaper published in the central portion of the State. In its edition published on October 8 additional auction sale advertisements appear.

I now hold in my hand a copy of the Renville County Farmer, also published on October 7. Every Member of the Senate can see the auction sales which are advertised in that issue.

I now hold in my hand a copy of the Lansford Leader, published at Lansford, Bottineau County, N. Dak. This newspaper also contains advertisements of a number of auction sales.

I now hold in my hand a copy of the Bottineau Courant, published on October 6. It contains advertisements of six big auction sales. If any Member of the Senate wishes to see the advertisements, I shall be glad to show them to him.

I now hold in my hand a copy of the Steele County Press, published on October 7, containing advertisements of a number of auction sales.

I hold in my hand a copy of the Kulm Messenger. On the front page there is a headline "Three farm sales this week."

Then it tells the reason for the sales.

I now hold in my hand a copy of the Foster County Independent. Foster County is the smallest county in the State. In the newspaper six big auction sales are advertised, and invariably there will be found a large number of cattle advertised for sale at auctions.

I have before me a copy of the Bowman County Pioneer——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Are those sales enforced sales, under mortgages?

Mr. LANGER. No; they are voluntary sales, because the farmers know that they cannot continue farming and make a living.

Mr. McKELLAR. They are not forced sales?

Mr. LANGER. They are not forced sales—not one of them.

The Bowman County Pioneer is published in the southwestern part of North Dakota. Bowmar County is on the North Dakota-Montana border. In this newspaper there will be found advertised

a number of auction sales. Conditions are practically the same in Montana and North Dakota.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to know what these farmers do after they sell out. What becomes of them?

Mr. LANGER. I can tell the Senator. They do one of several things. It depends somewhat upon their age. If their equipment is mortgaged and they are broke and they move to town, a few of them go on relief. In other instances they go farther west and obtain employment in the shipyards at wages ranging from $10 to $20 a day.

Mr. AIKEN. Would not that be the principal reason for selling out? They can get twice as much money for doing half as much work somewhere else. Is not that the principal reason?

Mr. LANGER. That is not the principal reason. The Senator was not present when I began my remarks.

Mr. AIKEN. No.

Mr. LANGER. The principal reasons are these, among others: In the first place, they have not had enough farm machinery during the past 12 months to do a really good job. If they had farm machinery, they were unable to obtain competent help to operate some of the high-priced farm machinery. Another reason is that 1,100 elevators have been clogged. Time and time again I have asked that the railroads do something about it. I have met with representatives from Mr. Eastman's administration.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. What kind of prices do those articles bring? If they are not sold at forced sales, or under mortgages or liens, and the sales are widely advertised, and the articles which are thus advertised bring large prices, I can understand that as a motive for the sale. Perhaps that is true. Can the Senator tell us whether the farmers are receiving small prices for the articles which they thus advertise in the newspapers at large expense, or whether the prices are adequate?

Mr. LANGER. Not having attended any auction sales, the sales to which I refer having taken place since I came to Washington, of course I do not know. However, I do know that, for example, with respect to second-hand tractors, the O. P. A. has set a ceiling, and the farmers have been obliged to sell second-hand tractors at prices much lower than they could have obtained if there had been open competition at the time of the sale. I do not know whether that is true with respect to binders, harrows, rakes, mowers, and seeders. I do know it is true so far as tractors are concerned.

When it comes to selling cattle I know the prices they get, because if they do not get at least the price which the cattle would bring from the butcher they do not sell. So the Senator can be certain that they get as much as they would get from the butcher.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the distinguished Senator know what becomes of the land after the farmers sell out? Is it tilled, or does it lie idle?

Mr. LANGER. It lies idle, and will continue to lie idle unless something is done to give the farmers parity. The only farmers in the whole United States who do not receive parity are the farmers in the Northwest. Unless they can get machinery, and unless the O. P. A. changes its rules so that a farmer who needs a tire does not have to go to town three times before he can get it, the land will lie idle.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, those sales are not being forced because of any financial difficulties. The farmers are not going out of business because they cannot obtain credit.

Mr. LANGER. No; the sales are voluntary.

Mr. WHERRY. The result is that the land lies idle, and we reduce our agricultural production rather than aid it.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Are the cattle which are sold mostly milk cows?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; the advertisements show that most of them are milk cows.

Mr. WHERRY. Are they sent to the market to be slaughtered, instead of being resold as milk cows, or does the Senator know about that?

Mr. LANGER. I do not know. I cannot imagine very many farmers buying milk cows, because they cannot get help.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I wished to emphasize.

Mr. LANGER. Twenty-one percent of our people have left the State since 1940. They have gone because in the war industries they can get big pay as the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] stated a few moments ago.

Mr. WHERRY. That is exactly the situation in Nebraska. Because of satisfactory prices which they can obtain now, they can sell their equipment and stock at prices at which they can afford to liquidate; and instead of farming the land we are losing agricultural production. Instead of getting milk, we are losing the cows. Those who otherwise would farm are going into defense areas and getting wages which produce more for the family budget than they could ever earn on the farms.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

I wish to make one further point clear. We hear a great deal about the farmer receiving the loan value of his wheat. It is said that the farmer should not be badly off, because he is receiving $1.30 for his wheat. I have heard Senators state that the farmer is receiving $1.30 for his wheat. Mr. President, that is simply not true. Because the farmers could not get machinery, much of the wheat remained in the shock week after week. When rain came, some of that wheat sprouted. There are hundreds of thousands of bushels of such wheat in North Dakota. Some of the farmers in North Dakota are close to Montana and South Dakota, where the situation is the same. The result is that the farmer has to take 90 or 95 cents a bushel for his wheat. Compare that situation with the one which existed during the last World War, when the farmer received $2.26 a bushel in Minneapolis. Today the cost of farm machinery which he is able to get is higher than it was during the last World War. The cost of labor is just as high. The price of everything the farmer buys is just as high now as it was in the last World War. The records which I have obtained from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture, and which I have previously presented, show the situation. They show, for example, that since the last World War farm machinery has not decreased in price at all. As a matter of fact, the price is higher.

So we have a situation which I believe is identical all over the northwestern part of the country. I have before me an issue of the Lidgerwood Monitor. This newspaper is published in a town right next to the South Dakota line. Let me show it to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. It contains an advertisement of an auction sale which lists 202 head of livestock, including 25 head of high-grade Hereford cattle, 69 pigs, 99 sheep, 9 horses, and a good line of farm machinery. In other words, the farmer is quitting the production of cattle and hogs.

Here is another newspaper, the Traill County Tribune, published in perhaps the most prosperous county in the State, where there was practically no one on relief during all the time of the depression. This advertisement lists for sale 62 head of good Shorthorn cattle, 6 head of horses, all good work horses, ranging from 7 to 12 years of age——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. With respect to the stock cattle which were advertised in the various sales, because there is not a satisfactory feeding ratio and there is no profit in feeding cattle, they will be killed and put on the market as butcher cattle, unfinished in feed. Is not that correct?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. As a result, because there is no profit in producing meat we have a scarcity of feeder cattle going back to the feed lot. The same thing is true with respect to hogs and milk cows. The farmers are selling out, taking the prices which they can get, and going into defense industries, where they can make a more satisfactory income.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say to the Senator from North Dakota that, although the farmers in North Dakota cannot obtain more than 90 cents per bushel for their wheat, the farmers who are feed consumers in my State are now being forced to pay $1.70 a bushel for milling wheat out of which to make cattle feed. That causes the price of feed to be so high that it does not pay the farmers to produce milk. The

farmers are selling cattle in my section of the country just as they are selling them in North Dakota. About 2 weeks ago at an auction held in my community, cows which farmers could no longer afford to keep sold for 6 cents a pound as beef. Yet, because of price ceilings which had been established, consumers have paid as high as 60 cents a pound for parts of those same cows which brought the farmers only 6 cents a pound.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am very grateful for what the distinguished Senator from Vermont has said, because it confirms what some of us have been trying to bring to the attention of the Senate for months.

In conclusion, I wish to answer specifically the question of the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska. I have in my hand an issue of the New Rockford Transcript for October 7, 1943. It carries advertisements of auctions to be held. They are in addition to all the auction sales I have mentioned, which represent only a small portion of the total number of auctions advertised in newspapers of North Dakota on that day.

I wish to point out to the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska the difference in the advertisements. Here is an advertisement of H. N. Omholt of an auction to be held on Friday, October 15, 1943, of 27 head of livestock, 8 milk cows, 8 yearling calves, and 1 yearling Shorthorn bull.

On another page of the same newspaper appears the advertisement of an auction to be held by Wesley N. Cook of 41 head of livestock, 10 milk cows, 1 yearling heifer 1½ years old, and another heifer 9 months old. The advertisement lists for sale, among other animals, 5 steers and 16 white pigs.

In another part of the newspaper appears an advertisement of an auction to be held by Peter Swanson of 25 head of livestock, 16 head of cattle, 8 milk cows 3 to 8 years old, 1 heifer coming fresh, 2 years old, 6 calves 3 months old, and 1 black Angus bull 1 year old.

In another part of the newspaper is an advertisement of an auction sale to be held by Ralph Halaas & Sons.

Here is another auction sale to be held by Haas & Sons.

Finally, here is another auction sale on page 3 of the newspaper of 54 head of livestock; 46 head of cattle; 8 head of horses; 10 Shorthorn milk cows, 3 to 7 years old; 10 Hereford milk cows, 3 to 6 years old; 25 winter and spring Hereford calves; and 1 purebred Hereford bull, 3 years old.

Mr. President, that is the situation with which we are confronted, I believe all over the Northwest, and I repeat that unless something is done to correct it we shall have a tremendous drop in the amount of food products which will have to be supplied. I say again, as I have said from time to time, that the production of food for our armies is just as important as the production of ammunition.

FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 637) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. TAFT. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. HOLMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Radcliffe
Andrews	Green	Reed
Bailey	Gurney	Reynolds
Ball	Hatch	Robertson
Bankhead	Hawkes	Russell
Barkley	Hayden	Scrugham
Bilbo	Hill	Shipstead
Brewster	Holman	Smith
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McFarland	Tobey
Caraway	McKellar	Tunnell
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Connally	Mead	Walsh
Danaher	Millikin	Wheeler
Davis	Murdock	Wherry
Downey	Murray	White
Eastland	Nye	Wiley
Ellender	O'Daniel	Willis
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Wilson
George	Overton	
Gerry	Pepper	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the enactment of Senate bill 637 to appropriate funds to subsidize the State systems of primary and secondary school education. This bill is somewhat different from any bill on the same subject we have heretofore considered. All the previous bills in the Seventy-sixth, Seventy-seventh, and Seventy-eighth Congresses have been intended, primarily, to equalize educational opportunity, and have been entirely devoted, as the last bill was, $300,000,000, for equalization only. This bill has two distinct proposals and they are based on entirely different grounds. One proposes to appropriate $200,000,000, which is to be divided among all the States of the Union in proportion to the average daily attendance of school children. That portion of the bill, roughly, will give the States a subsidy of $200,000,000, and it must all be expended in the payment of teachers' salaries. It will give every teacher in the United States, approximately, $200 increase in salary a year. It has no relation to any need; it has no relation to what the teachers are now receiving; it is simply, in effect, a general placing of all the school teachers in the United States, somewhat less than a million, on the Federal pay roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I know the Senator from Ohio does not wish to be unfair. There are four propositions referred to in the first item, which are to be found in section 5a. The adjustment of salaries is one of the four.

Mr. TAFT. Well, the four are for the payment of the salaries of teachers to keep public schools open. That has to do with the salary of teachers. To employ additional teachers to relieve overcrowded schools; that has to do with teachers' salaries. To raise substandard salaries of teachers; that has to do with teachers' salaries. To adjust the salaries of teachers to meet the increased cost of living; that has to do with teachers' salaries. So, all four relate to teachers' salaries. It is rather clear that this fund must all be used for teachers' salaries. We say piously in the first section that no department, agency, or officer of the United States shall exercise any supervision or control over any agency of the State as to how the money provided by the bill shall be spent.

The first "crack out of the box" we say, "You can spend the money only for teachers' salaries." It may be that a State or a community will know that certain other things are more important, that if they want to give a proper impetus to education, the only useful thing is something else besides teachers' salaries, but the Federal Government says, "No; this money can be used only for teachers' salaries, and you must increase your teachers' salaries, regardless of other policies you may wish to pursue." It is of the very essence of the bill, and there results immediately a control over the methods by which the States and localities conduct their schools.

The other section is the section providing $100,000,000, which is to be divided among the States on the basis, roughly speaking, of the States' ability to support education. Later I shall deal more in detail with the exact method proposed. The $100,000,000 is to finance a permanent program, intended to continue indefinitely, so far as I can see.

I wish first to consider the $200,000,000 subsidy, which is said to be an emergency subsidy. In the first place, this whole proposed expenditure of $300,000,000 is the kind of expenditure we have up to this time considered a nonwar expenditure. It has no relation to the conduct of the war. We have abolished the C. C. C., the N. Y. A., the W. P. A., and under the demands of the people of the United States we have cut down just as much as possible every possible nonessential war activity. Now we are asked to step into a brand new field, in which the Federal Government never has operated, and nullify all savings which may have been made by an increase of $300,000,000 for education.

Even if the purpose were a worthy one, it is very hard to see how the money proposed to be appropriated would in any way affect the war. The fact that a boy of 17 gets perhaps a little better education, that his teacher gets $1,600 instead of $1,400, certainly is not going to affect materially the question as to what kind of soldier the boy is going to be in this

particular war. As a long-range policy, there might be some effect on war, but this is not a war measure, and Congress has heretofore decided that it is not going to consider expending Federal money for nonwar purposes, when there is an utterly tremendous drain on the Treasury for purposes directly connected with the conduct of the war.

The $200,000,000 subsidy is not defensible on any known ground that I can think of. Of course, education is not a Federal function. There is nothing in the Constitution of the United States which makes it so. On the other hand, all State constitutions contain educational clauses. The practice here for 150 years has established education as a State and local function, and it has been carried out by State and local governments.

It was suggested a few days ago by the distinguished Senator from Florida that this measure was justified under the common-defense clause of the Constitution because we had to educate boys to be soldiers; that a great many boys were rejected in the draft because they were illiterate. Of course, if the Federal Government is authorized to do anything which may conceivably affect a man who may conceivably fight in a conceivable war, then there is no limit to Federal authority. It would be necessary, beginning with the prenatal stage, to supervise birth, to supervise health, to supervise every possible activity from the time boys come into the world, in order that they may be physically able to be soldiers. The argument certainly proves too much. Incidentally that is very much Mr. Hitler's policy. His policy was to bring up German boys to be soldiers, and all his educational policies would have been justified, under the proposal of the Senator from Florida, as necessary for the common defense because it was necessary to make all German youth physically able to fight; it was necessary, in short, to so educate them that they would be, above everything else, soldiers.

I think the suggestion that this measure is justified under the clause authorizing the Federal Government to provide for the common defense is an argument which can be completely disregarded. I do not believe anyone seriously studying the proposal would consider it a justification for equalizing educational opportunities.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from Ohio opposed, just as violently as he is opposing the pending bill, a specific war measure, a bill to aid high school students in the Victory Corps, which was definitely aimed at the war, definitely a war measure, providing a fund to be used to train boys to be ready for the service. Then, however, the Senator used the argument that the States could perform that function themselves, just as he used the argument a few days ago in regard to the pending bill, that the States could take care of the matter. I wonder whether the Senator has changed his mind. We did have before us a bill entirely connected with a defense proposal, and the Senator opposed it quite as violently as he is opposing the pending bill.

Mr. TAFT. In my opinion, the High School Victory Corps did not amount to anything; it would not have helped any boy to be a better soldier. It was wholly unnecessary for war purposes. In the second place, I do not see exactly what that has to do with the pending bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It has nothing to do with the pending bill.

Mr. TAFT. I opposed it for the same reasons for which I am opposing the pending bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; not for the same reasons. The Senator is making the claim that the Senator from Florida has suggested that this measure is probably a defense measure. I am pointing out that when we had before us a defense measure, under which every cent was to be used for defense purposes, the Senator from Ohio opposed the bill just as violently as he is opposing the pending bill.

Mr. TAFT. I opposed it, as I tried to explain to the Senator, because I did not consider it in any way useful to the common defense. It seemed to me another hand-out to enable the States to put various people on the educational pay roll, to travel around the State, without any recognizable result. If the Senator had wished to submit that bill, if he had been sufficiently strong for it to submit it to the Congress, he could have brought it up before the Senate, but he did not do so. It is still on the calendar.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is not accurate, Mr. President. Every time there was a suggestion that the bill be brought up, objection was made from the other side, and it was made primarily, whether the Senator from Ohio was present or not, because the Senator from Ohio objected to the consideration of the bill.

Incidentally, all through the hearings on the bill the Senator from Ohio knows that he occupied 90 percent of the time in the questioning, and that there appeared no educator, no military man, and no one else who had educational or military standing in the United States who did not support the bill. My point is that the Senator fought that bill, which was purely a military bill, quite as hard and quite as successfully as he hopes to oppose the pending bill.

Mr. TAFT. I did not consider it to be a military bill, or in any way helpful to the common defense, and that still remains to be proven.

Of course, Mr. President, being illiterate does not necessarily make a man a bad fighting man, if we are considering the common defense. Many Russians and many Chinese who have done the best fighting in the war are entirely illiterate. It is simply that, in its selection of troops, the Army happens to desire to select those who are not illiterate before it takes those who are illiterate. Certainly it is not a ground for the Federal Government interfering in education. Incidentally, educational deficiency is only the eighth cause for rejection among white people. It is the first cause of rejection only among Negroes.

Mr. President, I say that there is no constitutional justification for the Federal Government entering into the educational field. Of course, the Federal Government has the spending power, and the spending power, as construed by the Supreme Court of the United States, affords the Federal Government authority to spend money on anything on which it chooses to spend it. It is the constitutional justification for all State aid. I do not maintain that the pending bill is unconstitutional. The Federal Government can spend money for State activities. The question is one of policy, how far we should spend money for State activities.

As a general thing, I think we have not attempted in the past to subsidize States for activities which are basically State functions. We have not gone outside the commerce field to subsidize, excepting in new fields in which the States have done practically nothing, and in which the State revenues are limited. The State revenues are limited, and that is the only justification of which I know for Federal aid to States. It is true their taxing powers are limited. One State cannot tax very much more than another State without driving people into another.

It is perfectly true that the States are more limited financially than is the Federal Government. Relief is clearly a State function, but when suddenly, as in 1932, a tremendous additional expense for relief is imposed on the States, it becomes so great a financial burden that the States cannot carry it. Their systems of finance were set up to take care of certain things, such as education, highways, and so forth, and when the States were suddenly flooded with a new demand they could not take care of it, and the United States Government had to step in.

We have had a number of new situations arise in connection with which the States have not extended their financial operations and could not very well extend them. But education has always been a State function. State financial systems are set up primarily to take care of education. I spent 8 years in the Ohio Legislature, and education was virtually a prior lien on the funds of the State. Why? Because the people of the State are interested in schools. They want their common schools to function properly. The demand is that the authorities of the States and the local government shall provide money for adequate schools. Education is the one thing for which above everything the people are locally organized and which the States and local financial systems have taken care of. The States today are spending in excess of two and a half billion dollars on primary and common school education. They are spending between $700,000,000 and $800,000,000 more on university education and incidental education of various kinds. More than one-third of all the money raised in the States is spent on education. If there is anything the States can finance it is education. If they cannot finance education, they cannot finance any kind of local activity. We must admit that

if the States cannot finance education, then we might as well prepare for grants to every other kind of local government, cities, school districts, counties, and so forth.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I agree with all the Senator has said with respect to Ohio in the way of education. Ohio has a wonderful program and appropriates a great amount of money for the teaching of children. But even in the State of Ohio 25 percent of the teachers receive less than $1,200 a year.

Mr. TAFT. Yes, Mr. President. In some parts of Ohio a teacher, particularly a young graduate of an educational college, living often at home with her family, working only 8 or 9 months a year, may be very well compensated by $1,200 a year. I do not mean to say that that sum is always an adequate salary, but that is not an argument which is necessarily conclusive to persuade Congress to spend $300,000,000 of Federal funds.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Are there not living with their families many young persons who work in defense plants and are engaged in other activities? Do we reduce their pay because they are living with their parents?

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator from Utah were to place the teachers of the country on the level with workers in defense plants, he would have to propose the appropriation of about $1,000,000,000 in order to equalize them. There are 1,000,000 teachers, and it certainly would be necessary to increase each teacher's pay $1,000 to equalize their earnings with those of workers in defense plants. It would certainly represent an expenditure of $1,000,000,000 to place the teachers anywhere near on a level with the workers in defense plants. It so happens that the workers in the defense plants will be through in a year or so, and then in what work they are to engage no one knows, whereas, after all, the teaching profession is a continuing profession, a highly respected profession, one in which there is employment for many years to come.

Mr. President, there is one curious feature in this bill. In the State of Ohio we have a system by which certain levies are made for education for the public schools. The public schools are independent of the cities and counties in Ohio. We permit the people in each district to vote an extra levy if it wishes to do so, and practically every district in the State of Ohio every year submits to vote the question of an extra levy of 2 or 3 mills on its property to increase its expenditures on the schools. Probably 90 percent of the proposed levies are adopted. With respect to the other 10 percent, the people think their teachers are receiving enough money, they think their schools are adequate, for one reason or another they think there is no need for additional expenditure, and they vote down the proposed levies.

Now it is proposed that Congress shall say to a local district, "No, you are wrong. We propose to make you pay $200 additional to every teacher in your school district, whether the people in the district like it or do not like it." That is a curious interference with local self-government which is a necessary effect of the proposed bill.

Mr. President, we have had presented to us figures showing that the States today are very well off. If the proposed additional expenditure should be made, the States are better able today to take care of it than ever before. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who has made a careful study of State budgets, submitted a report to the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning on Tuesday of last week. The Senator from Wyoming said in his report:

> While the national credit has been under great strain, the fiscal position of the States seems to be improving. The total debt of all of the several States of the Union as of June 30, 1943, was $2,989,000,000. Against this may be charged the growing budget surplus in the States. At the beginning of this year this amounted to $700,000,000, and it is now estimated by officials of the Census Bureau at about $1,000,000,000 * * * the debts of the States amount to a little over $1,000,000,000 as compared with the national debt of $146,000,000,000. * * * These figures immediately suggest the advisability of an inquiry into the ability of the States and of the cities to carry part of the burden of public responsibility in the post-war world.

Mr. President, why should the States not carry a part of the burden, by taking care of their own educational operations? I was informed today on excellent authority that the State of Pennsylvania has increased by $300 a year the salary of every teacher in the State below a certain grade. I do not know what other States may have done, but there has been a general increase of 7 percent in teachers' salaries in 2 years. That is not sufficient; the Little Steel formula justifies an increase of 15 percent; but why should not the States take care of that additional sum? I am not now talking about poor States; I am talking about great industrial States such as Ohio and Pennsylvania, States which have had a great increase of prosperity due to the war. Why should Congress now step in and say, "We are sorry, but we are going to subsidize your educational system"? There never has been a time since the present membership of the Senate has been in office when the States were better able to pay their own teachers.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Legislative Reference Service has furnished me with a tabulation which indicates that as of 1940 the school district debt throughout the United States was $1,705,000,000 in 1941, $1,691,000,000, in 1942, $1,562,000,000. It seems to me those figures might be pertinent.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator. The figures show that the school districts have actually decreased their debts by $140,000,000 in the last 2 years. They are not complaining that they do not have money with which to pay their school teachers. I am quite sure that no States have asked us to help them. Certainly that is true with respect to the Northern States. None of the larger States has done so. The request comes entirely, so far as I know, from the National Education Association and the Office of Education, endorsed by some other organizations referred to by the Senator from Utah last week, but so far as I know, no State and no State legislature has sent representatives here and said, "We are unable to handle the educational problem. We must have Federal aid."

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the Senator from Ohio has had to say. I wonder if I correctly understand his position to be that there are probably eight or nine States that apparently are not in a position economically to take care of their educational load. If a bill were introduced providing by its terms that the Federal Government would furnish an equitable amount, after the States had shown that they had spent all they could economically spend, would the Senator be in favor of equalization in those areas?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I intend to deal later with the equalization provision, and I shall explain why I do not think such a bill would accomplish even those purposes. However, if the Senator does not mind, I should prefer to conclude first my discussion of the $200,000,000 appropriation for all the States, before I consider the other question.

Incidentally, regardless of whether the 13 or 14 poorer States are able to finance education, it is absolutely certain that they are very much more able to finance education now than they were 2 years ago, because in nearly all those States income payments have almost doubled during that time, and the national income has doubled. Not only that, Mr. President, but the income has risen in greater percentage, as was shown in the debate Friday, in those States than it has in the larger industrial States.

So, if the bill is an emergency measure there is no justification for saying that those States are in any way harmed by the war, that any emergency is created by the war, or that they are not more able to finance education today than they were 2 years ago.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. The purport of my question was this: Assuming that some segment of our society—for example, some of the Southern States—is not able to carry the educational load, would there not be a national responsibility to provide supplemental aid?

Mr. TAFT. I shall state later, if the Senator will wait, that I certainly should be willing to consider that question after the war. I doubt whether the policy would be a wise one, even then; but, at least, I do not think there is any need today for such legislation. I shall deal

more completely with the whole subject the Senator is raising—which is quite an extensive one—later in my remarks. At present, I should prefer to finish my remarks on the particular subject I have been discussing, if I may do so.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, I should like to state that even in my own State of Wisconsin, which probably has as fine a system of education as there is in the United States, we find a good many migrants coming from other sections of the country. We find that illiteracy is very great among such migrants. It seems to me that, in a sense, we are all in the same boat; and if we do not impinge upon the fundamental rights of the municipalities or school districts or State, if a proper plan of assistance could be worked out so as to aid those who really are in need, after they have demonstrated their need, it would be our obligation nationally to provide assistance.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I shall deal later with that question.

First, let me say that it is alleged that the increase of $200 in the salary of each teacher is absolutely necessary because we are losing teachers from the schools to the war plants. I say if it is necessary, I know of no reason in the world why the States should not pay that amount; certainly, all the northern States which are perfectly able to pay it. On the other hand, it is also true that even if the teachers were paid an additional $200 each, I do not think that would cure the particular situation which now is stated as the reason why the bill should be passed. If the teachers were going to work in war plants, they would not stay in the schools because they were paid $200 a year more. I visited the Jackson Heights plant, in Cleveland, 10 days ago. Every girl who has been there 3 months is being paid approximately $375 a month. It certainly will not make much difference to those workers whether the Government increases the salaries of school teachers $25 a month by some form of subsidy.

No, Mr. President; in that situation we case the general problem of the manpower shortage in the United States, the problem of the dislocation caused by tremendous wages being paid in war plants and by other circumstances. The difficulty will not be cured by any Federal subsidy.

Finally, Mr. President, the provision is not really intended to be a temporary one. The measure is not really an emergency one. No time limit is set. The bill is called an emergency measure, but if the bill is passed in its present form it will go on forever. As a matter of fact, even with a time limit, it would go on forever. A million teachers receiving a total of $200,000,000 a year from the United States Government would not give it up, and I do not know that I myself would want to have them give it up. The burden could not be shifted back onto the States. Some States would not assume it, and we should be confronted with the proposition of reducing the salaries of a million school teachers in the United States. It should not be the responsibility of the Federal Government to make such payments, and we should not make it a responsibility of the Federal Government. If we do, the payments will become part of the permanent expenditures of the Federal Government.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Are not the high wages paid to defense workers one of the chief contributing causes of inflation, and would not the proposed addition of $200,000,000 to the funds going into the channels of spending be an additional factor leading toward inflation?

Mr. TAFT. Undoubtedly the Government would have to borrow $200,000,000 more than it now borrows, and that would tend to be inflationary. However, I never thought the argument relative to inflation was a sufficiently important argument to prevent the righting of an injustice, if it is an injustice.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. On that point, let me say that on page 59 of the hearings there appears a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. D. W. Bell. I should like to read a few lines of the letter:

> The Treasury Department has no information as to the necessity or desirability of the enactment of the proposed bill and, therefore, is not in a position to advise you as to its merits. However, since it would appear to involve a very substantial nonessential wartime expenditure of funds, and in view of the present budgetary position of the Government and the essential requirements for funds to support the war effort, it is recommended that the legislation be not given favorable consideration.

I omit a sentence, and then read:

> The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the enactment of this legislation would not be in accord with the program of the President.
>
> Very truly yours,
>
> D. W. BELL,
> *Acting Secretary of the Treasury.*

Let me inquire whether that matter came to the attention of the Senator from Ohio, in the hearings.

Mr. TAFT. Yes, Mr. President; and it was a real pleasure to find myself in agreement with the Treasury. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I realize that the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Connecticut do not want to be unfair in this matter. The Treasury Department was queried about the bill because the Treasury Department has a task to perform. All departments which might be affected by the bill were given a chance to comment on it. That is all the Acting Secretary of the Treasury was doing.

The Treasury Department issued a report on April 5, 1943. The letter of Acting Secretary of the Treasury Bell was dated March 23, 1943. In the report from the Treasury Department we find the following:

> With few exceptions, it said, the States lowest in financial ability are making the greatest relative efforts to support public education.
>
> The range of average school terms for different States was placed at 9½ to 6½ months, while in individual districts the terms sometimes are less than 6 months.
>
> Great disparity was revealed in availability of schools and libraries, in salaries paid teachers, and in the quality of buildings and facilities. Values of school property per pupil ranged from $445 in the highest ranking to $75 in the lowest ranking State.
>
> For a typical school year, expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance ranged from $134 in New York to $25 in Arkansas.

Mr. President, those two statements came from the same department. However, one statement came as the result of conditions found in a survey. The other statement merely came from an Acting Secretary of the Treasury, in response to an inquiry as to whether the Department had any objection to the bill, as it viewed the part which the Treasury Department would have to play in the administration of the proposed act.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not question the Senator's facts, or the facts stated in the Treasury report. The Treasury Department was asked whether or not it favored the bill, and it said, "No; we are against this bill." In spite of the facts appearing in another Treasury report issued at the same time, I do not see that we were in any way unfair in pointing out that the Treasury Department is opposing this bill on financial grounds.

I wish to point out that last year the figure of $300,000,000 was entirely for equalization. Now we have the same $300,000,000, but $200,000,000 is put into the so-called emergency war fund. This becomes a war measure of some sort. As a matter of fact, it is just as permanent as any other measure. It is a proposal to spend $300,000,000 a year on local education; and if the bill is enacted, the amount will never be reduced. So far as I can see, there is no emergency which would justify it. If it is justified today, it can be justified at any time in the future. If it is justified for the future, it is justified today.

Mr. President, the argument against the emergency feature of this bill has been so clearly brought out that I cannot believe that there are Senators who feel that the Federal Government should go into the whole field of education and distribute an amount equivalent to $200 a teacher to practically every State in the United States. It is proposed to give the money to the States and say to them, "You must increase the salaries of teachers. We do not tell you how. You may increase one and not another. You may increase the salaries of the higher-paid teachers, and not those of the lower-paid teachers. There is only one restriction. You must not reduce anybody's salary, but otherwise you may spend the money in any way you see fit."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. While I know that the Senator has addressed his last comment to the subject of salaries for teachers, under section 2 (A) the payments are not limited to teachers in any respect. Let me invite the Senator's attention to section 5 (A) on page 6. In line 15 we find subclause (2) authorizing the State agency to raise substandard salaries. It does not say substandard salaries of teachers. It includes every one in the board of education—clerks, janitors, and every one else.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I question the Senator's conclusion, because on page 2, line 14, where substandard salaries are mentioned, the language is "substandard salaries of teachers." I believe that where the expression "substandard salaries" appears in section 5 (A) it refers only to the salaries of teachers.

Mr. DANAHER. Anticipating that the Senator might raise that point, as he has, I now invite his attention to page 15, where we find the definition of the term "teacher". We find that it includes not only any person who is engaged in instruction, but also those engaged in the supervision or administration of instruction, or in professional health or welfare services for children.

Mr. TAFT. I stand corrected. That is a committee amendment, to which I had not paid close attention.

I wish now to consider the general question of Federal aid to education in an equalization bill. The bill provides an appropriation of $100,000,000 for that purpose. If we go into that field we embark on a tremendous new field of expense. We are starting with $300,000,000. We do not know how large the field is going to be. The National Education reports, as I remember them, always contemplated that that sum would gradually be built up to something like $2,000,000,000 a year Federal aid for education.

In the National Resources Planning Board report for 1943 there is a long discussion recommending a very large extension of Federal aid to education. Incidentally, that report was written by Mr. Floyd W. Reeves, who is also chairman of the Advisory Committee on Education, closely associated with the National Education Association, which I think prepared this bill. The Advisory Committee on Education certainly made the original recommendations for the extension of Federal aid to education.

The National Resources Planning Board report states that the present expenditure for current purposes on education is $2,817,000,000 and on capital expenditures $382,000,000, or a total of $3,200,000,000, roughly, for education. That amount is spent today by the States.

The report further states:

> The Nation is now spending less than 50 percent of the amount needed to provide a justifiable minimum educational program.

It is desired to double this expenditure, and more.

The report further states that—

> During the years immediately following the war it does not appear probable that the total revenue available for education from State and local sources combined can be greatly increased, although many States can and should increase the school revenue of their State governments. It also appears improbable that any great increase will occur in nongovernmental funds available for education. It is therefore evident that most of the increase in expenditures for education in the post-war period must be financed almost, if not entirely, by Federal funds. * * * The only agency that can remedy the inequality among the States in the tax burden for education is the Federal Government. It should accept this role.

They then recommend that this expenditure of $3,200,000,000 a year be increased to approximately $7,000,000,000 a year. In other words, they say that the expenditure for education ought to be increased from $3,000,000,000 to $7,000,000,000, and that by far the greater part of it ought to be financed by the Federal Government.

In other words, the National Resources Planning Board is proposing a program which would involve an expenditure of between $3,000,000,000 and $4,000,000,000 a year for Federal aid to education. Of course, if we reach anything like that figure it means complete Federal control of education in every State. The Federal Government cannot put up more than half the money and not have a voice in the control.

Furthermore, the bill proposes to open up a new and vast field of Federal expenditure at a time when the Federal Government is less able to take care of such an expenditure than it ever has been in the history of the United States. We are spending $100,000,000,000 a year. We are piling up a Federal debt of $60,000,000,000 a year for war purposes. Certainly this is no time to branch out into some new, vast field of Federal expenditure which is not directly related to the war.

The post-war situation of the Federal budget is as serious and dangerous as is the present condition of the Federal Budget. After the war we shall be faced with demands on the Federal Government for sums totaling between $50,000,000,000 and $60,000,000,000 a year. Every conceivable plan is now being put forward as something which the Government should finance. I have added up the things which we are going to face after the war. The Government must consider whether it is going to finance them or not. Certainly before entering a vast new field such as this, we ought to decide what the limit is to Federal expenditures.

The ordinary expense of the Federal Government is about $5,000,000,000 a year. Interest alone on the public debt will be at least $5,000,000,000 a year. The Army and Navy will certainly cost $5,000,000,000 a year. Of course, during the immediate post-war period, the Army and Navy will cost much more. I doubt if the figure ever gets back to $5,000,000,000 a year. At least that is a conservative estimate. In the matter of international loans, if we follow the general policy now recommended by the Federal Reserve Board and by the Treasury's international bank—the idea that we must finance loans all over the world in the rehabilitation of the world—that will cost us many billions of dollars a year. With respect to the social-security plan, I have estimated that if we should apply to this country the Beveridge plan, which has wide support in England, it would cost this country—the Government and its people—$20,000,000,000 a year in taxes.

Public works are urged as a means of putting every one to work. A public-works program of $5,000,000,000 a year would not provide employment for 5,000,000 men. Those who so glibly talk about promising every man a good job, and who say that if private enterprise will not give it to him the Government must give it to him, are not going to stop at $5,000,000,000 a year for public works. The amount will be a great deal larger than that. The cost of education here suggested would be $4,000,000,000. If we add $7,000,000,000 to be spent by the State and local governments we have a total tax burden placed upon the country of $56,000,000,000 a year, or more than half any estimated income of the people of the United States.

Mr. President, I do not think this country can support any such tax burden. I do not know where the point is, but certainly there is a point at which, if we increase Government expenditures any further, we shall force socialization upon the country. If 50 percent of the people are going to have to support the other 50 percent engaged in Government activity, then that 50 percent will soon stop working, because the situation will be such as to destroy any incentive to work. Somewhere there is a point where the scales will tip. Somewhere there is a point beyond which we cannot go without socializing everything, making all business so unprofitable by taxation necessary to meet the expense of running this vast Government that gradually people will get out of business. Railroads will become unprofitable, and the only solution will be for Government to operate them. Then there are various industries which would be unable to make a profit because of the tremendous taxes which would be necessary, until we socialized the whole country. Or, what is more probable, we could not pay the debts, but would build up our deficits until we had complete inflation which would lead directly to the same result, namely, the complete socialization of all the activities of the United States.

Mr. President, we should begin and we are now beginning to think about this, and we should sit down and ask ourselves how much we can afford to spend, how much the Government can spend and still maintain a system of freedom and liberty in the United States. I think that is a job that ought to be done, and is being done by the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning. We must sit down and consider all the expenditures and decide among them which ones are necessary, and which ones can be eliminated. We must say, in effect, "Here is the total we can spend, and that is all there is to spend." We have to divide it between the necessary activities of government and eliminate the others.

If we are going to consider Federal aid for education, that is the time we ought to consider it. I am willing to consider it, and I recognize there are perhaps emergencies in some of the southern and poorer States. I certainly regret the fact that colored students in Louisiana receive an education which costs only $12 a year a pupil. I certainly think there is an abuse, and that possibly the Federal Government should do something about it, but if so, we ought to do it when we can sit down and consider all the expenditures and the social-security measures. Possibly, through social-security measures and the proper stimulation of industry, we could assist the poorer States to reach a point where they would not need Federal aid for education. Possibly we could work out a program which would make Federal aid unnecessary. On the other hand, so far as I am concerned, if the choice is between spending a reasonable sum on the education of children in the poorer States as compared with the financing of rehabilitation in foreign countries to the extent of billions of dollars, I favor spending the money for education in the United States. But that is something we cannot judge. It is necessary to have before us the whole program and look over the whole field, and we cannot do that now. We should not be rushed in the midst of war into a great new field of Federal expenditure, when we do not know whether the Federal Government will be able to spend anything after the war in addition to what it will absolutely have to spend on the Army, the Navy, and other normal activities of Government, and meet the interest on the tremendous public debt which we shall then have.

So my inclination is to move to refer the pending bill to the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning for its consideration, when it considers the whole post-war budget situation and decides what the Federal Government can do and how to do it.

Incidentally, a study has already been made by one governmental committee or agency on the relationship between the incomes of the different States and the income of the Federal Government, and as to how taxes can be coordinated and divided. It may be that some of the poorer States can be helped in some way by a general tax and the payment of more of that tax to the poorer States than to the wealthier States. A report has actually been made. We are going to find that the States can raise effectively seven or eight billion dollars, and that is all. Then if we find there are functions which should be performed by the States, such as education, social security, and relief, and that the expenses of such functions add up to an annual expenditure of say ten or twelve billions, then we shall have to consider a Federal-aid program in order to furnish three or four or five billion dollars to the States for the various functions which are proper subjects of Federal aid. Personally, I should rather extend Federal aid to other fields than education, because I am afraid of the Federal control that ultimately comes from any kind of Federal aid. But I should be willing to consider the objectives of the pending bill along with other matters in the total post-war picture.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from Ohio will recall that I promised the Senator from Kentucky that an amendment would be offered to the first part of the bill making it definitely an emergency bill. The Senator from Ohio has already said there is no way of limiting it to an emergency, because if once the teachers received higher pay it would be difficult to take it away from them. At the same time, when the Senator suggests referring a bill which is impliedly and actually, so far as we are concerned, an emergency measure dealing with wartime, to a post-war committee, it seems to me the Senator is hardly consistent.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to explain further. So far as the $200,000,000 is concerned, I would eliminate that entirely. I am only suggesting a reference to the George committee of the question of equalization which is covered in the $100,000,000 feature of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from Ohio knows that a study of this great question has been in progress ever since the Hoover administration and that as much as $250,000 was expended for that purpose by the Federal Government at one time. I wonder if any committee on post-war planning could do a better job than has been done by the very able agencies which have already been studying the subject.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I did not intend that the George committee should examine the facts. I am putting it up to them as an over-all fiscal agency to decide whether the Federal Government can assume any more expenditures, and if there are two or three justifiable items of expense which the Federal Government should assume the committee would have to determine which ones were the more justifiable. We cannot pass the pending bill today merely because we like it, and pass a social security bill tomorrow, and pass an international banking bill the next day, because we like it, without inviting the most serious financial difficulties before we got through. After all, these subjects have been studied from the beginning by professional educators, by men who were in favor of and wanted to make a case for Federal aid to education, and who did everything they could to make a case for it. It is time for someone to sit down and try to decide whether the Federal Government can afford it, and whether it fits into the Federal program. The Treasury says it is not in accord with the Federal program.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Would the Senator from Ohio say that Mr. Henry L. Harriman and Mr. Owen D. Young started out with any preconceived notion about this matter? Their views are entitled to the highest respect.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Harriman and Mr. Young are typical of gentlemen who are appointed on committees which are conducted by other persons, committees in which the studies are made by other people, in which reports are submitted which they never examine, which they do not carefully study, and the adverse arguments against which they do not consider. But they add their names to the general recommendations which are made.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me further, I think that is a reflection on Mr. Young and Mr. Harriman which is in no way justified by the facts. Both Mr. Young and Mr. Harriman knew exactly the business of the commission on which they served; they knew exactly the recommendations of the commission; and Mr. Harriman himself appeared as a witness before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor as a spokesman for the American Youth Commission, of which he was vice chairman. Mr. Harriman knew so much about the report and so much about the facts disclosed by the report, that he himself came as the spokesman, testified, and made a rather full statement; and, then, of course, subjected himself to questions by members of the committee.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have one further argument to make regarding this equalization bill, and that is that it does not equalize. If we are going to adopt an equalization bill, at least it ought to accomplish the purposes it is supposed to accomplish. If I were to propose a State-aid program, in the first place, I think I would certainly confine it to those States that absolutely require assistance, if the object is equalization. If we admit that this is not a proper subject of Federal assistance except where the States are so poor that they cannot provide a minimum standard of education, then we ought only to give aid to the States that cannot provide such a minimum standard.

The figures show or purport to show that there are some States that cannot do that. I would think, on the basis of the figures, that there are not more than 13 or 14 such States. I see no reason for giving Ohio $2,357,000 out of this $100,000,000. We do not need it for equalization any more than we need it for any other purpose. If there is to be an equalization program, it ought to be based, it seems to me, on a very simple principle. It ought to be that the United States is concerned with seeing that every child gets an education of a certain standard; that cannot be interpreted in dollars, but, we will say, by the expenditure of $40 or $50 a child.

We should then take the income of the State and provide some formula by which we can determine how much the State ought to spend on education, what percentage of its income it ought to spend on education, and if that percentage is not sufficient to provide the minimum standard, the Federal Government simply make up the difference, and no more. That would be a perfectly simple

method. It would, of course, give no money whatever to some 30 States, from which there are 60 Senators, and so it might be difficult to secure the passage of such a bill, but, it seems to me, it is the obvious and logical way to do it, if we are going to do it. This bill does not do that. This bill, in the first place, as I see it, passes out a little money to many States that do not need the assistance even in the equalization feature. Then, in the second place, the bill does not require a State to spend any particular amount on education. All it says is, "You cannot decrease your educational budget."

The Senator a moment ago referred to the fact that the average expenditure for education in New York is $135 a pupil, while the average expenditure in Arkansas is $25 a pupil. In other words, New York spends on education five and one-half times more than Arkansas; but the 1940 income of Arkansas was $514 per person and the 1940 income of New York was $1,106 per person; so, New York had about two and a quarter times the income per capita that Arkansas had but was spending five and a half times more on its schools. Should New York be requested to help support Arkansas until Arkansas for the purposes of education puts up the same percentage of its income that New York puts up? It seems to me obviously that there ought to be some determination of that fact.

Consider, for instance, the fact that there are today no sales taxes in a number of States. I may be mistaken as to one or two of them, but I understand that, as of today, there are no sales taxes in Georgia, Florida, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, or Virginia. Ohio imposes a 3-percent sales tax and collects in excess of $50,000,000 from it. Why should the State of Ohio use the resources of her people to aid education in States that do not have a sales tax and are not willing to impose a sales tax on themselves?

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. As a matter of information, I may say we have no general sales tax in Tennessee, but we have a sales tax on gasoline of 7 cents a gallon, the proceeds of which, for the most part, are devoted to highway purposes. We have a sales tax on tobacco, including cigarettes, and certain other articles or commodities, although, as I have said, there is no general sales tax in Tennessee.

Mr. TAFT. I may say I do not regard the fact that a State does not have a sales tax as necessarily controlling, provided the State is making an essential contribution to the burden, but this bill does not seek to find that out. Florida has no personal income and no corporation income tax; Texas has no personal income tax and no corporation income tax. Are States that impose such taxes on their people to be forced to put up money to help other States until the others have exhausted their resources? There has been a general statement made that many such States use a greater percentage of their income for school education than do Northern States, and I think there are one or two in that category, but there are others that are not. I gave the instance of Arkansas. Let us compare Alabama to Ohio. Ohio spends $90 a pupil; Alabama spends $30 a pupil. In Ohio the per capita income is $957; in Alabama the per capita income in 1940 was $480. In other words, although Ohio has only two and one-quarter times the total per capita income of Alabama, Ohio spends three times as much per pupil. If we are going to have an equalization bill, we certainly ought to have one that provides some kind of standard. There ought to be a strict requirement, if we are going to give Federal money, that every State shall impose a certain percentage of its income, according to some formula to be developed, before any Federal aid may be extended, and, after that, the Federal Government might make up the difference.

Finally, certainly these should be a State equalization policy of some kind as a condition for any Federal aid. We have in Ohio a State equalization fund. In nearly every State there are poor districts and rich districts, and, as conditions have developed, the richer districts have spent much more money and provided better education than have the poorer districts. Gradually, I think, some 17 States have provided equalization funds, which they spread out, but many of the States which are to be assisted under the bill have no equalization fund, and some States are spending twice as much in a given part of the State as they spend in another part of the State. There is no requirement in the pending bill that that situation be corrected.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. Would the Senator object so much if the measure was altogether an emergency measure?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think that it is in any way an emergency measure. I may be mistaken, but I cannot see any emergency. It seems to me we have to consider it on the basis of permanent policy. I take it there is even more difference in equalization of cost per child between different sections of the same State than there is between a Northern State and a Southern State; but this bill does not require that such difference be ironed out before the Federal Government steps in. It does not require the money proposed to be appropriated to be spent in raising the standard in the poorer districts in the States. It does not require the State to have an equalization fund. If we are going to help the States, we certainly ought to require State equalization.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. If there were such a requirement in the bill, what agency of the Government would see that the requirement was met?

Mr. TAFT. The Office of Education of the Federal Government.

Mr. AIKEN. It would be the Federal Government?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, yes. In my opinion, if the Federal Government is going to subsidize common-school education, the Federal Government is going to have to control such education and control expenditures. I would be glad to guard, as far as possible, against any extension of the Federal power to the subjects which are taught, but certainly if the purpose of the Federal subsidy is equalization then we must necessarily impose Federal regulation which will bring about equalization. That seems to me to be a necessary concomitant of any Federal subsidy.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Ohio claims that the Federal Government could insure the equalization better than the States themselves could.

Mr. TAFT. The Federal Government could require, as a condition of receiving Federal aid, that a State take certain specified steps to secure equalization within the State.

Mr. AIKEN. Why cannot the States be trusted to provide the equalization themselves?

Mr. TAFT. They do not. I have spoken of the failure to equalize between different districts and sections of the same State. A few days ago I referred to the complete failure in many of the States to equalize as between white and colored pupils. For instance, the hearings, on page 19, show that the State of Louisiana spends $61.21 per white pupil and $12.62 per Negro pupil, and that if the Federal Government gave this aid Louisiana would still spend $76.40 per white pupil and $23.61 per Negro pupil, a greater discrepancy in dollars, though not in percentage, than previously existed. It would be required that the money we gave be fairly allocated between white schools and Negro schools, but it would not make any stipulation as to how in Louisiana the fund should be divided as a condition of receiving this Federal subsidy. The same thing is true as to many other Southern States.

In Alabama the amount spent for a white child is $47.59. The amount spent per colored child is $14.63. In Arkansas it is $36.87 compared with $13.73. In Florida it is $69.76 per white child, which would be an adequate amount for any Northern State. That is the amount spent per white child, and $26.95 per Negro child. In Georgia it is $55.56 per white child, $16.95 per Negro child. The Louisiana system is based on totals of average daily attendance, $77 per white child, and $20.49 per Negro child. In Mississippi it is $52.01 per white child, $17.30 per Negro child, approximately three times as much per white child, far more than any difference between Northern and Southern States. If we are to try to bring about equalization, the pending bill would not in any way correct that situation, or attempt to do so.

I realize the difficulties which are involved, and I realize that the equalization might have to be brought about over a long period. Many Southern States are rapidly improving the educational facilities for their colored children, but there should be some requirement, if the States are to get Federal money, that a policy of improvement be adopted as a condition of getting Federal money.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. On page 14 of the bill there is a definition of what shall be considered a just and equitable apportionment, and the bill itself perpetuates the very system of which the Senator from Ohio complains, because it provides that a just and equitable apportionment means any plan "which results in the expenditure, for the benefit of such minority racial group, of a proportion of said funds not less than the proportion that each such minority racial group in such State bears to the total population of that State." So that there is a population ratio established as the basis for the so-called just and equal apportionment.

Mr. TAFT. That ratio relates only to the Federal money the Federal Government gives. Incidentally, that is rather interesting. It means that the Office of Education would have to go into every State and go into the conduct of the white and colored schools, decide what was an equitable apportionment of Federal money between white and colored schools, and thereby have a very substantial voice in the manner in which the schools were operated. I do not object to that; I think that if it is necessary to contribute Federal money, there must be some control, that it is necessary to see that at least the purpose for which the Federal Government contributes the money is accomplished. But certainly section 1 of the bill, about the Federal Government not interfering with the administration of the schools, is completely nullified by the provision which gives the Office of Education power to supervise all the schools, and decide whether there is an equitable apportionment of Federal money between colored pupils and white pupils.

Mr. DANAHER. I am not limiting my comment solely to the matter of just and equal apportionment. I was merely pointing out to the Senator that with reference to the argument he submitted, the bill itself would preserve the same substantial disparity. But there is one other feature. In section 2 (B) we find that the bill would authorize equalization, not only within a State, but equalization among the States, and if the Senator will look at page 2, line 22, I respectfully call to his attention that the word "among" has not crept in there accidentally.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wonder whether the Senator has given any consideration to the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], which reads as follows:

Provided, That there shall be no discrimination in the administration of the benefits and appropriations made under the respective provisions of this act on account of race, creed, or color.

What would the effect of such an amendment be?

Mr. TAFT. I think the effect of the amendment would not be material. I think that is already provided in the section which we have just read, dealing with the apportionment between white and colored schools, because the amendment is limited, as I read it, to the administration of the benefits and appropriations made under the bill; that is, the Federal money. It does not undertake to correct any inequalities in the distribution of State money, so that I do not think the amendment would change the actual provisions of the pending bill.

The point I desire to make is that there is no respect in which the pending bill is really an equalization bill. All it does is to say, "This State is a poor State, under a certain formula, which has more children than its income will provide for." I cannot describe the formula which is prescribed, but it works out so that it gives some little money to some 42 or 43 of the 48 States, and gives it to them without the slightest requirement of any equalization whatever to be made within the States.

I submit that the failure to educate the children not provided for already is something which concerns all of us. I do not think it is a function of the Federal Government, yet it is within the power of the Federal Government. If we ever do come to the point of entering upon such an activity as is proposed, I think it should be based on very definite standards. I think that if the bill were referred to the George committee, that committee should go into those questions, which, after all, are not particularly technical. They may have to have a technician write the formula, but the theory is something any of us could pass on if we decided what the theory of such aid should be.

I myself do not know that I should be in favor of it even then, for reasons of which I have spoken, but I certainly think it should be considered only in connection with all other proposals for expenditure, and that it certainly should only be approved if it actually is certain to accomplish the purpose of reaching the people in whom we are interested.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have been impressed by some of the remarks of the Senator from Ohio, especially with reference to the revenue collected by the individual States, and the money that is spent for school purposes. Of course, we know that revenue is collected through taxation, and taxation may be upon real estate, perhaps upon improved property. What does the Senator from Ohio think about States such as there are in the West, wherein most of the real estate belongs to the Federal Government, and the States are unable to tax that property in order to collect sufficient revenue with which to perform their functions?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in making a formula to determine what a State's taxpaying ability is, I think, that question certainly would have to be taken into consideration. There is no question about it. I do not suggest that merely the total per capita income of the people of the State is necessarily the final guide as to what a State's taxpaying ability is. I quite agree that poorer States may have to spend proportionately more of their tax income on actual necessities, before they get to the schools, than the richer States. But I think the matter suggested by the Senator from New Mexico must be taken into consideration.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will explain the point I am trying to make. For instance, in Ohio all the property within the State is taxable, while in New Mexico 35 percent belongs to the Federal Government. Eighty-two percent of the property in the State of Nevada belongs to the Federal Government. About 60 percent of the property in Utah belongs to the Federal Government. The figure in Arizona is also about 60 percent. Where are those States going to get the necessary taxes? I will say to the Senator that we would prefer that the Federal Government turn over the land owned by it in the State to the State of New Mexico, and we would not ask for a penny of the money proposed to be expended under the pending measure. But so long as the best of the land of the State is not taxable we feel that there is some obligation on the part of the Federal Government to provide for our educational system.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I will complete the table I have been citing with respect to the discrepancy between colored and white students. North Carolina provides $46 per white child and $28 per colored child. I may say that there is a program in North Carolina now to equalize the salaries of all colored and white teachers. North Carolina already is much closer to equality than any other Southern State.

In South Carolina the figures are $57 per white child and $15 per colored child.

In Texas the figure is $72 per white child and $28 per colored child.

Mr. President, I feel that under the circumstances the proper course for the Congress to take is to refer the bill to the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, to consider whether when it shall make up the post-war program it shall consider how far the Federal Government can go in the matter of aid to States and whether it should or should not include Federal aid to education.

I have suggested the basis on which that aid should be given, if it is to be given at all, and if it is given on that basis it will not ultimately be an expensive proposition. As the financial condition of the States improves, and I think their financial condition is bound to improve, the discrepancy is bound to

become less and less. Under such a policy of the Government, I think inevitably the aid required by the States will grow less rather than grow greater.

Personally I think even then the policy is a dangerous one. I think it is dangerous because I do not see how we are to prevent Federal control of education in the States which receive Federal aid. It will be less dangerous if it is confined to 14 States and not extended to all 48 States. If the 14 States feel that they are willing to subject themselves to some Federal control, as limited as we can make it, in order to obtain the money that is essential, then perhaps that is their concern. There should not be a general attempt to control education throughout the United States.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I should like to know specifically which are the 14 States to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. TAFT. The proposal is based again on per capita income in dollars, which is not perhaps a final test, as the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has suggested. The highest State is the State of Nevada, with $1,352 of income for each person. The lowest State is Mississippi, with $407 income for each person, or less than one-third the per capita income of Nevada. Roughly speaking, the poorer States are in the Southeast. There are six States in which the per capita income is under $500. There are six States in which it is between $500 and $600 a person. There are four States in which it is between $600 and $700 a person. Eleven of these States are located in the Southeast. There are two or three in other sections of the country.

Mr. President, in any event the intrusion of the Federal Government into the field of education is one which threatens more than any other intrusion the control of the thoughts of the people in the localities. Education is something the people are interested in having complete control of at home. If we are to give aid to education perhaps it would be better to give it by way of erecting school buildings instead of the actual operation of the schools. Perhaps equalization could be effected in some other way by extending Federal aid in other fields, so that the independence of every locality to operate its own schools could be completely maintained. We have seen repeatedly that if the Federal Government gives aid in connection with any project it will control it. We have seen that happen with respect to unemployment compensation. We find that the Social Security Board tries to tell every State bureau of unemployment compensation exactly how it shall conduct its affairs.

We have seen the same thing with respect to road building. Every main road today is built on Federal specifications regardless of what the States may say. There is hardly a field in which the gradual extension of Federal aid does not bring Federal control. I think it is bound to be so. I think if we are to put up Federal money we must retain some hold over the manner in which the money is spent, and that will give more or less control depending upon the attitude of the Federal officials.

It happens that the Office of Education has always worked through the State departments of education and has to a large extent kept its hands off the various smaller grants which have been made for incidental education. But in these modern days we find more and more the new bureaus are insisting almost on Federal operation in some fields, and in the field of education, if the Federal Government provides large sums of money, we shall find the Federal Government attempting to control.

If the condition existing in States is to be equalized I should prefer to do it in some other way than that proposed under the bill. I should prefer to do it through other activities. It seems to me the extension of Federal control over education is a dangerous step which we should not take.

Mr. President, there is no justification for passing an equalization bill which does not equalize. It would be very dangerous to intrude into such a form of Federal expenditure at a time when the Federal Government has a deficit of $60,000,000,000 a year. I believe we should postpone enactment of the bill at this time; that we should refer it to the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning in order that that committee may consider, in connection with the whole picture, whether the Federal Government should go into this field, and undertake a new extension of operations, at a time when the Federal Government is going to be swamped with demands threatening destruction for the future welfare of the country.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I call to the attention of the Senator from Ohio, as a point in elaboration of the observation he has just made, that under section 6, subsection (C), on page 10, there is a most interesting escape clause. There is a proviso there to the effect that funds allotted to any State from the funds appropriated under section 2 (A) of this act shall be used by the State to pay for the annual salaries to its teachers not less than the average annual salaries paid as of February 1, 1943:

Provided, That for any local school jurisdiction that fails to comply with the provisions specified in this paragraph due to * * * circumstances over which such local school jurisdiction has no control—

I am reading now from lines 11 and 12 on page 10—

to * * * circumstances over which such local school jurisdiction has no control.

Then the 2 (B) funds, the so-called emergency funds, may be allocated to the States to provide for the deficiency. Obviously, let me say to the Senator from Ohio, the very conditions of war are certainly circumstances over which the local jurisdiction would have no control, and the local assessing or tax-levying body might very properly say, "We cannot under all circumstances, due to the war, maintain our administrative costs this year and at the same time pay the salaries scheduled under 2 (A). Therefore, we want our 2 (B), the so-called equalization funds, to be allocated to that purpose." Is that not so?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Then, if we turn to section 5 (B), we find that all the funds provided in section 2 (B) shall be available for disbursement by the State to local public-school jurisdictions, for all types of expenditure for public elementary schools, without any limitation on the amount which may be expended for administrative purposes, except the limitation of 1 percent for expenses of the State department of education necessary for the efficient administration of the funds. Is that not true?

Mr. TAFT. I think that is true. Of course, so far as the $100,000,000 is concerned, it can be spent for any State purposes of any kind.

Mr. DANAHER. That is precisely the point.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I was not privileged to hear all the argument of the able Senator. Did I understand him to assert that the pending bill would give the Government any control over the educational systems of the States, or did the Senator fear such control would come in the future?

Mr. TAFT. Undoubtedly the bill would give the Federal Government control in some respects. For instance, the bill provides that all the $200,000,000 must be spent for salaries. A school district may think it is paying enough for salaries, but that it needs the money very much for some other purpose. The bill says, "No; the money must be spent for salaries, and for salaries only." That is one respect in which the bill would provide Federal control.

Another respect is provided by the following language in the bill, relating to the distribution of the funds:

(d) A just and equitable apportionment, allotment, or distribution of the funds provided under this act for the benefit of a minority racial group in a State which maintains by law separate educational facilities for such minority racial group, means any plan of apportionment, allotment, or distribution which results in the expenditure, for the benefit of such minority racial group, of a proportion of said funds not less than the proportion that each such minority racial group in such State bears to the total population of that State.

Under that provision a representative of the Office of Education would have to go into the State to determine whether the State was allocating sufficient funds to this school district, sufficient funds to that school district, and sufficient funds to some other school district; and the representative of the Federal agency could, as they always do, take a very arbitrary position, and could say, "Here. You must give the people in this county a bigger allocation of these funds." The school authorities might say, "Well, there

are various reasons why we cannot do that; there are various conditions which affect that situation." The Federal agent would reply, "I do not care what you say. This is a matter of a just and equitable apportionment, and you will not get any money unless you do what I say." Those are some respects in which the Federal Government would have control. I think such control would expand. I think it should expand. I do not think we should give Federal money without prescribing the purposes for which it is used. I think we ourselves should lay down the rules, so far as possible. I think we should provide for as little administrative discretion as possible. However, I do not see how we can avoid taking some responsibility for making sure that the money is spent for the purposes for which it is appropriated.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in the first place the bill provides that the money appropriated is to be spent for salaries under section 2. Of course, if we wish to enlarge the statement of the purposes for which the money can be spent, we can do so in the bill.

In the second place, as I understand the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, the States are required to be nondiscriminatory as between various racial groups, in the expenditure of money for education. So the bill assures only that which would be required by the supreme law of the land anyway.

In the third place, in section 13 (d) the bill provides a definition of what is a just and equitable apportionment:

(d) A just and equitable apportionment, allotment, or distribution of the funds provided under this act for the benefit of a minority racial group in a State which maintains by law separate educational facilities for such minority racial group, means any plan of apportionment, allotment, or distribution which results in the expenditure, for the benefit of such minority racial group, of a proportion of said funds not less than the proportion that each such minority racial group in such State bears to the total population of that State.

So that would be a simple matter of arithmetic.

Mr. TAFT. When the Senator comes to determine what is a just and equitable allotment as between the various school districts, I am afraid he will find it is not simply a matter of arithmetic. Certainly, the exercise of judgment by someone will be required to determine that question.

Mr. PEPPER. In paragraph (d) to which I adverted, it is stated:

A just and equitable—

And so forth—

means any plan of apportionment, allotment, or distribution which results in the expenditure, for the benefit of such minority racial group, of a proportion of said funds not less than the proportion that each such minority racial group in such State bears to the total population of that State.

If that minimum standard were met—and that is determinable as a matter of simple arithmetic—I should not think the Federal authorities would have any right to interfere in the distribution of the funds.

Mr. TAFT. If they do not have, I think they should have. As a matter of fact, paragraph (d) does not say who shall determine what is a just and equitable apportionment. Obviously the Federal Government, handing out the money, is going to determine that, and the determination as to whether the apportionment is a just and equitable one will be made by some bureau.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to observe that the essential purpose of the bill is to provide for an equalization fund—an equalization of the disparity between the distribution of the Nation's wealth and the distribution of the Nation's children. That is essentially the equalization which is aimed at in the bill.

Mr. TAFT. No, Mr. President; I think the Senator is mistaken. The purpose of the bill is to equalize the education received by a colored boy in Louisiana and a white boy in Ohio. That is the purpose; but the bill does not require it and does not provide it. It simply would provide for the handing out of some money to the poorer States, and would say, "Here is some money, because you are a poor State."

No standard for the kind of education to be provided is established, so far as I know.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I think the Senator has misconstrued the purpose of the bill, or else I have. It seems that the purpose is to equalize the educational capacities of the States. The bill does not say anything about equalization of opportunity. The purpose of the bill is to try to equalize the ability of the several States to educate the Nation's children—not the white or the brown or the colored or anyone else, but to equalize the ability of the several States to educate the Nation's children.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me read to the Senator the title of the bill:

To authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. PEPPER. But the latter is the incident of the former, and the former is the objective of the bill: "To enable the States more adequately to provide for their children."

The last comment I desire to make is that the Senate is composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people of the several States, not by the Federal Government. If the Senators of the several States do not wish, in respect to their educational systems, as an incident to the equalization of the ability of the States to educate their children, to have the Federal Government control the educational processes in their States, it certainly will not be done by the Federal Government, and I think there is adequate safeguard against Federal control of schools in the fact that every State is represented in this body by two Senators, and that those Senators are not going to give to the Federal Government the control of the educational processes in their States.

All that is aimed at is to equalize the ability of the States to educate their children, who are at the same time the Nation's children. I do not know of any more worthy purpose to which the Federal Government could dedicate itself, and I do not know of any greater safeguard of the State's individuality, and that their prerogatives shall be retained, than the assurance that the Congress is made up of representatives of the States. If a majority of the delegations of the several States composing the two bodies of Congress wanted the Federal Government to have something to do with the educational process in their States, of course it is democracy for them to make such provision. But I believe that other Senators feel as strongly as does the Senator from Ohio that the Federal function is a function of equalizing ability to educate, and that we will not allow, we will not acquiesce in, we will not brook the intrusion of the Federal Government into the control of the educational system.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me that the doctrine enunciated by the Senator from Florida is most extraordinary. I have not the slightest interest in the ability of the State of Florida to educate its children. I am interested in the children of Florida obtaining an education. If there is any justification for this bill it is on the ground of equalization of educational opportunity, giving all the children in Florida an opportunity to obtain a minimum standard of education, so that they will have opportunity in the United States from that time on. I do not care whether Florida is able to do it or not. I am interested in whether Florida does it. I am interested in whether educational opportunity is provided. That is the only justification for this bill. I cannot see the object of a bill which simply says, "Florida is not able to educate her children, so here is $5,000,000 for Florida." That does not interest me. If it were to do it at all, I should want to say, "Here is $5,000,000, provided you equalize the educational opportunities in your State." Obviously, the bill says that the money must be used for education, but it does not say that it must be used for equalizing educational opportunities. Just as wide discrepancies can be left between a poor district and a rich district, or between white children and colored children, so far as the bill is concerned. Thus we would not accomplish the very purposes for which the bill is urged.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I was afraid that the able Senator from Ohio was not interested in the ability of my State and of other States to educate their children, because of the persistence with which he has opposed this bill.

Every State in the Union may be presumed to be willing to educate its children according to its ability. However, some States—and our Southern States are in that category—are spending a larger percentage of their wealth, and making a larger per capita contribution to educate their children, than are many other States. What we are striving for is equalization of the ability of the several States to educate their children.

The Federal Government, which shares sovereignty over the children with the State governments, has no right to ask the States to do more than their fair ability will permit. The thing we are driving at by the proposed legislation is for the Federal Government to equalize the disparity between the distribution of the Nation's wealth and the distribution of the Nation's greater asset, its children. That is the purpose of the bill, Mr. President.

Mr. TAFT. If that were the purpose, we might as well subsidize every poor State, because the poorer States are not well off for any purpose. As I understand, the only object of the bill is to see that educational opportunities are actually equalized. It makes very little difference to us whether a State is able to do it or not, if it does not do it. I think it is perfectly clear that if we are ever going to adopt a policy of assisting the education of children, we certainly are going to have to do it on condition that the educational opportunity be equalized. It is not equalized. I have read the figures with respect to the Southern States, showing that they spend from three to five times as much on every white pupil as they spend on a colored pupil. I understand the condition. That is the very condition which we desire to correct. This bill would not correct it. It is a condition which most of the Southern States would like to correct. No doubt if they get the money, many of them will do so. Some will not. Even on the basis of the argument that such a bill should be passed, I cannot see that the pending bill would accomplish the only purpose for which such a bill could be justified.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I enjoyed the remarks of both the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Florida. I agree with both of them. I think there should be ability to provide education; and I also think there should be equality of opportunity for education. I do not believe any Member of the Senate would disagree with the ideas of the Senator from Florida, or with those of the Senator from Ohio. I think they are both correct.

After having listened carefully to the addresses delivered by the able Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and by the diligent Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] on behalf of Senate bill 637, there is very little more to be said, and what few words are said in the future on behalf of this bill will, in my opinion, only contribute a spiritual help to the laudable efforts of the two Senators on behalf of the proposed legislation.

The reasons outlined by these able Senators as to the human necessity of the legislation, and as to the constitutional authority for it, cannot be improved upon or extended. May I add, Mr. President, that I fully agree with both Senators in all of their contentions and arguments.

Anyone thoroughly acquainted with the economic history of our country must admit that education has been the one feature of our social scheme which has made the United States what it is today. We all know the motivating impulse of the Pilgrim fathers in coming to this continent; we know the reasons for the immigration of the Huguenots; we know the reasons for the arrival of the Catholics in Maryland; we know why the Dutch came to New Amsterdam. But for fear that there might be someone who might not know why the colonial settlers of this continent left their homes in Europe, I will say that the answer is simple and easily understood. Whether they came from England, France, Holland, or elsewhere, those good people wanted to get away from some kind of persecution, be it economic, political, or religious. In this country they found that they could make their way through their own efforts, and worship God according to their own conscience.

But while they realized the necessity of political, religious, and economic freedom, they also accepted the fact that in order to arrive at that laudable peak it was necessary to have an educated and intelligent citizenry. Hence, while the Pilgrim had his flintlock in order to protect his family and his neighbors from what was then considered the savage red man, other fellow colonists and neighbors were cutting logs for structures in which to house their families and educate their children.

We know the history of the migration of the colonists from the Atlantic seacoast to the west. Families by the thousands left the eastern seaboard and the eastern section of Pennsylvania to settle the Ohio territory. The flintlock and the ax were their weapons, one for protection, the other to cut the logs with which to build houses and schools. The Cumberland Pass served as an artery into Kentucky, and we have a re-telling of the same story—the farm, the home, and the schoolhouse. The western portion of the Carolinas, that part of Georgia which is now called Tennessee, witnessed similar movements and actions.

Public education has always been in the hearts and minds of those who won the West, whether in the Oregon territory or in California. The idea of public education is deeply imbedded in the free American. But, by reason of our system of government and our economic structure and due to the industrial development and economic advantages of certain areas, some States have been able to provide better systems of education than have others.

All of this has been outlined by both the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Alabama, and I shall not extend my remarks further along these lines.

During the discussion of the bill by the Senator from Utah he recalled to the Senate the origin of grants to States and colleges for public education. He informed this body that President Buchanan had vetoed a bill for that purpose, but that the following administration, under President Lincoln, had seen to it that such a law passed the Congress, and the law was signed by Lincoln himself.

For many years now, we of the West—and as a matter of fact, the people in many States of the Union—have taken advantage of that law, which gave so much help to colleges and individual States.

I wish to devote a few moments, with the indulgence of the Senate, to giving a few more reasons why New Mexico and the Western States are entitled to Government aid of this type.

At the time of American occupation, what is now known as New Mexico was a vast territory, very sparsely populated. Of course, there was property ownership even in those days, but the property which was privately owned was a very small portion of the total. That which was not privately owned was supposed at one time to have belonged to the King of Spain, and later to the Republic of Mexico. That portion which was privately owned was composed of an area included in land grants, granted to communities or individuals, whether by the Kingdom of Spain or by the Republic of Mexico.

The treaty which ended the war between the United States and Mexico protected the rights of the individual owner to his private real estate and property, but the rest of the domain within what is now the State of New Mexico became public domain owned by the United States of America. Much of that class of land has now come into private hands under the various homestead laws of the Nation. The United States, however, still owns a tremendous portion of the area—millions of acres which do not contribute 1 penny to the cost of State government, including the cost of education in the State.

The same condition exists in many of the Western States wherein the Federal Government owns tremendous tracts of land that cannot be assessed or taxed under State government. So we see the reason why the Federal Government should contribute something for public education.

On January 16, 1939, there was created a special committee for the study of Federal ownership of real estate and its bearing on State and local taxation. During the Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, the House of Representatives had printed House Document No. 111, which contains the data submitted by the special committee. It is a most extensive and interesting study of federally owned real estate and improvements.

While I intend to mention only some of the figures concerning New Mexico, an investigation of that study will show conclusively the vast areas of public domain in the Western States which are owned by the Federal Government.

As of June 30, 1937, in the State of New Mexico, the United States Government owned 27,696,186 acres, or 35.32 percent of the total area. The estimated assessed valuation, as of the same date, is $42,449,639. The fair market value of the Federal real estate and improvements is $70,892,510; and the estimated tax levy, as applied on that real estate, based on the local New Mexico rate, would amount to $945,473 yearly. Those figures tell why, from that point of view only, the Federal Government should contribute something toward the cost of

State government and particularly for education.

Of course, we feel keenly about those inequalities of ownership of property. Practically every State in the East and in the Middle West includes property that is all privately owned, while we in New Mexico have to tolerate the ownership of 35.34 percent in the hands of the Federal Government.

Let this Congress pass legislation providing for the turning over to the State of New Mexico all of the public domain in New Mexico, and we will not ask the Federal Government for one penny—and we would prefer it that way. We would like to administer the lands which are within our State. We would like to use them, or the revenue derived from them, for the economic and social progress brought about by education. So long as we have such a system as now prevails, so long as the Federal Government insists upon retaining possession of property within the State of New Mexico, the people will feel that the least the Federal Government can do is to contribute a little amount for education in the State.

I shall give a brief break-down for the different agencies of the Federal Government which administer public lands in my State. For instance, the Department of Agriculture, through its various agencies, divisions, and bureaus, has a total of 8,949,752 acres. The Interior Department has 18,578,994 acres. The War Department, as of June 30, 1937, had 44,042 acres. The remainder administered by other departments amounted in all to 27,696,186 acres.

I may state that since June 30, 1937, when the study was made, the Interior Department has acquired several thousand additional acres of land, the Department of Agriculture has acquired hundreds of thousands of additional acres of land, and by reason of the war emergency, the War Department has acquired over a million additional acres of land in New Mexico. As a matter of fact, within the last 2 weeks the Army acquired one area alone 20 miles wide and 40 miles long, thus not only keeping the people of the State from using the land for the purposes for which it had been used—that is, the raising of stock—but compelling the owners of the stock to move 30,000 head of cattle—I do not know where, because no other area was left, and they had to sell the cattle in the market as best they could. In the same way, many sheep had to be sold.

While there is no complaint by the people of the State about contributing their land for the war effort, we certainly feel we are entitled to Federal aid for our educational system.

In order further to prove my point as to how the ownership of the public domain affects western States, I shall cite a few figures on Federal ownership.

The State of Nevada has a total area of 70,285,000 acres of land, of which the Federal Government owns 58,035,000 acres, or 82.6 percent. Is the Federal Government obligated, at least morally, to contribute something to the State of Nevada for that tremendous area which the State of Nevada cannot tax?

Arizona's total area is 45,183,000 acres. The total amount controlled by the Federal Government is 63.05 percent.

In the State of Utah, the State of the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the total area is 52,598,000 acres, 31,642,000 of which belong to the Federal Government. In other words, 60.45 percent of the land in the State is owned by the Federal Government.

In Idaho, 58.07 percent of the total area is owned by the Federal Government; in Oregon, 46.29 percent is owned by the Federal Government; in Wyoming, 42.72 percent is owned by the Federal Government; in California, 39.46 percent is owned by the Federal Government.

I have already stated the situation in New Mexico, but I shall repeat that 35.32 percent of its total area is owned by the Federal Government. In Colorado, 33.34 percent of the total area is owned by the Federal Government; in Washington, 32.28 percent is owned by the Federal Government.

Even in the District of Columbia, in the eastern section of the country, the land owned by the Federal Government amounts to 23.43 percent of the total.

And so on, down the line.

But the States which can afford to pay for education, which can afford to build schoolhouses, and can afford to pay relatively good salaries to the school teachers, are in a different category so far as the ownership of property is concerned. In the State of Ohio the Federal Government owns only twenty-seven one-hundredths of one percent of the entire area of the State. In Massachusetts the land owned by the Federal Government amounts to only twenty-five one-hundredths of one percent of the total area; in Connecticut, to only twenty-two one-hundredths of one percent; and in Rhode Island to only ten one-hundredths of one percent.

All the wealth of those States is devoted to private enterprises subject to local taxation, and thereby the people receive more money. As I have already said, if we in New Mexico could only obtain control of the area now owned by the United States we would not ask the Federal Government for a thing.

Mr. President, I have given a picture of the Government's neglect of its duty, so far as the West is concerned. Hence, and for the many sound reasons advanced heretofore, and for the ones I have outlined, it is my purpose to vote for Senate bill 637.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to ascertain if any Senator wants to address himself at this time to the pending bill? I have understood that some other Senators desired to be heard. As is usually the case when we reach about 4 o'clock, and the attendance begins to dwindle, the enthusiasm for making speeches dwindles accordingly. I appreciate that situation, and I belong in the same category, and cannot complain, but I wish to express the hope that tomorrow we may make some progress in the disposition of the pending bill. I think every Senator knows how he is going to vote on the bill. There may be amendments, which will occasion some discussion, but I hope that tomorrow we may dispose of the bill. I should like to see that done, and I think the Senate would like to dispose of the bill. So I am going to cease and desist in a moment with the exhortation that Members of the Senate come here tomorrow prepared to discuss the bill as briefly as possible, with a view of obtaining a vote on the bill and all amendments before an adjournment is taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Angus J. Gallagher, of Ohio, to be administrative officer, at $5,600 per annum, national headquarters, Selective Service System.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I also ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all nominations confirmed today.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), as in legislative session, the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 18 (legislative day of October 12), 1943:

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Capt. Horace Freeman Bigelow, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 10, 1942.

TO INFANTRY

Lt. Col. George Allan Miller, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel), with rank from August 18, 1940.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonels with rank from October 1, 1943

Lt. Col. Omar Nelson Bradley, Infantry (temporary lieutenant general).

Lt. Col. Paul John Mueller, Infantry (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. Leland Stanford Hobbs, Infantry (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. John Frederick Kahle, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Edwin Bowman Lyon, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Reinold Melberg, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Clarence Brewster Lindner, Finance Department (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Leo. H. Thebaud, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 21st day of June 1942.

Capt. Bertram J. Rodgers, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving on the staff of the supreme allied commander, southeast Asia, to rank from the 14th day of October 1943.

Capt. Stanley D. Jupp, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commandant, naval operating base, Auckland, New Zealand, to rank from the 13th day of October 1943.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Regular Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from the dates stated:

Harold B. Penne, from the 12th day of May 1941

Arthur K. Bourret, from the 18th day of August 1941.

Harold E. Allen, from the 30th day of August 1941.

Harry D. Pratt, a citizen of California, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of December 1942.

First Sgt. Arthur F. Wilson, Jr., a meritorious noncommissioned officer to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 21st day of April 1943.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of May 1943:

Warren B. Capron, a citizen of Kansas.

Luther A. Bookout, a citizen of Texas.

Theodore D. Vreeland, a citizen of New Jersey.

Platoon Sgt. Raymond S. McFall, a meritorious noncommissioned officer to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 5th day of May 1943.

Edward D. Miller, Jr., a citizen of Texas, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 5th day of May 1943.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 16th day of June 1943:

Edward H. Stauffer, a citizen of Iowa.

Robert K. West, a citizen of Montana.

Jack P. Stone, a citizen of Texas.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 30th day of June 1943:

Guy B. Mayo, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

Harry Feehan, a citizen of New York.

Richard Q. Lewis, a citizen of Oregon, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 14th day of July 1943.

Platoon Sgt. Cleveland C. Barry, a meritorious noncommissioned officer to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 28th day of July 1943.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 28th day of July 1943:

William E. Collier, a citizen of Louisiana.

Richard B. Smith, a citizen of Maryland.

George E. Lawrence, a citizen of North Carolina.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of August 1943:

Ralph E. Knight, Jr., a citizen of Mississippi.

William A. Barry, a citizen of Ohio.

Arthur E. Isensee, a citizen of California.

The below-named meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 25th day of August 1943:

Platoon Sgt. John R. Gibney.

Platoon Sgt. Charles H. Booth.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 18 (legislative day of October 12), 1943:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Angus J. Gallagher, to be administrative officer, at $5,600 per annum, national headquarters, Selective Service System.

POSTMASTERS

IOWA

Gertrude Hunter, Floyd.
Lillian V. White, Manilla.
Wilbur G. Flam, New London.
Ella L. Klopping, Underwood.

MASSACHUSETTS

James F. Brennan, North Attleboro.
Edward C. Harney, Pepperell.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Again, Almighty God, we take Thy holy name upon our lips and pray that it may never be in vain. We praise Thee that Thou art the God of the Beatitudes, infinite in wisdom and truth; on errands of deliverance do Thou be abroad in this dark-hued earth. In this most crucial period of its history, we pray that we may be most wise by precept and example to direct the nations out of the contending forces of evil, causing to be born a bond of international fellowship. If need be, dear Lord, level every throne with the spirit of humility; feed them with Thy strength and endow them with the power of Thy truth, then shall the masters of ambition and the autocracy of hate be no more.

Thou Saviour and Friend of man, we rejoice that the centuries have revealed no discord in Thy Word and no flaw in Thy beauty. O Master, from whom earth's greatest souls have borrowed their gifts, inspire us to love and to cherish Thy Holy Bible. We pray that the genius of its teaching may become the inspiration of our civilization; herein Dives is set face to face with Lazarus and they struggle not to escape the burden, but for the right of bearing it. O Book divine, which giveth wells of comfort for thirsty souls, vineyards for hungry wayfarers, light for those in darkness, and immortal life to those in death, fill our hearts today with new hope and peace, and Thine shall be the praise forevermore. In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 14, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3029. An act to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damages on the Illinois River, Ill.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 194):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. Edward W. Creal, late a Representative from the State of Kentucky.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution the Presiding Officer had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

SALES TAX

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a great deal in reference to the 10-percent Federal sales tax in connection with the pending revenue bill. Such a tax, Mr. Speaker, would lower the

standard of living of over 100,000,000 people, and it would cost the people of the State of Missouri, part of which I have the honor to represent, $170,000,000 annually. I base this statement on the fact that the official in charge of collections of the Missouri sales tax announces that for the calendar year about $34,000,000 will be collected. For the past 10 years we have had a 2-percent sales tax in Missouri. On the basis of $34,000,000 being collected under a 2-percent sales tax, if the Federal Government should add a 10-percent sales tax that, of course, would mean $170,000,000 for the Federal Government, or a total of $204,000,000, including the $34,000,000 collected by the State.

The burden of this falls on the great majority who live and spend the weekly earnings for the necessities of life. Take an income in the family of $200 a month after present deductions. Sales tax, 2 percent for the State and 10 percent for the Federal Government, would take $24 monthly from the table and for other necessities. It would be no burden for those whose income exceeds the amount they have been used to spending.

Mr. Speaker, over 100,000,000 people in the country have lived from pay day to pay day. They have no surplus. Their standard of living would be lowered if such a tax were levied. Ability to pay would be lost sight of and "soak the rich" would be changed to "take care of the rich," the soaking would affect the masses of the people. As you walk along the streets of a large city you pass one employer to several hundred employees and it is the latter upon whom this tax would really fall. There are still many ways we can raise revenue without resorting to the sales tax.

I want to express the hope that when the revenue bill is brought in it will not contain a provision for a Federal sales tax.

NEW YORK CITY POLICE AND FIRE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. O'TOOLE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article that appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe of yesterday, by Charles A. Merrill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(Mr. GOSSETT, Mr. HARNESS of Indiana, and Mr. DOMENGEAUX asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio speech I made on the Mutual network.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week the House gave me permission to insert certain extraneous remarks in the RECORD. The Public Printer has advised that this will cover 2½ pages of the RECORD and cost $112. In view of the fact that it is a discussion of the question of food, a matter of vital importance, by a person well informed on the subject, I feel that it should be in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two respects, in one to include a resolution from the Social Hygiene Society of Washington regarding Dr. Ruhland, and in the other to include an excerpt from the Iron Age of October 7.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address I recently made, and further to extend my own remarks and include therein an editorial from the Columbia State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein excerpts from editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COFFEE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

STATE OF ARIZONA

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the State of Arizona has done her full share and has done unusually well in many respects in time of war, both in former wars and in the present struggle, not only on the battle fronts, but on the home front, in production, in finance, and in every other way contributing to the war effort.

I hold in my hand a tabulation showing the result of the Third War loan drive just completed. The employees of the Treasury Department in the Internal Revenue service at Phoenix, Ariz., have gone far over the top in buying bonds. Of the 64 districts throughout the country, the employees of that Arizona district head the list. According to this tabulation, the employees of Internal Revenue service in Arizona have purchased bonds in this recent War loan drive—in addition to their regular purchases—more than 512 percent of their suggested quota. They take pride in this record of "Backing the Attack" and I take pleasure in announcing it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and insert an editorial from the Scranton Times, a paper published in Scranton, Pa., about our distinguished colleague, Congressman MCGRANERY.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an article from the Washington Post on Haiti.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative business of today and the other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after all other special orders and the legislative business is concluded I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial from DeWitt Emory, the national president of

the National Association of Small Business Men.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WHAT THE SEVENTEENTH DISTRICT OF OHIO WANTS OF CONGRESS

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McGREGOR addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Ohio Farmer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include in the Appendix excerpts from the War Food Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FERTILIZER

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Governor Sharp, in respect to rubber.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders today I be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes and include an address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on grade labeling.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the legislative business and any other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REDUCTION OF GOVERNMENTAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar on Wednesday be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

OFF-THE-RECORD MEETING OF HOUSE MEMBERS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I do this for the information of my colleagues, because this morning they received a letter from the Speaker in respect to a meeting to be held Wednesday morning, and in that letter it was stated that the meeting would be held in the Caucus Room of the old House Office Building, at which meeting General Marshall and other generals would appear in an off-the-record manner. The old Caucus Room has been looked over, as well as the auditorium of the Library of Congress. It is felt that the auditorium of the Library of Congress is a much more desirable place to hold the meeting, and I rise to announce that, instead of holding the meeting in the old Caucus Room, it will be held in the auditorium of the Library of Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if I remember correctly, the statement of the gentleman is that this would be an executive session?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, if we are going to hold executive sessions of the House, there is only one place that we are authorized by law to hold them, and that is in this Hall.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is not an executive session of Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. It is going to be a secret session, and it ought to be, and it ought to be held in the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is not an executive session of Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. It is unnecessary for the Congress of the United States to be going off to some other building to hear these leaders report on the war when we have the Hall of the House of Representatives built and equipped for that purpose.

Will not the gentleman modify his request to have that meeting here in this Hall?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would not recognize the gentleman for that purpose and the gentleman would not make such a request.

The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein two poems.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an article from the Washington News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain material from yesterday's paper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix a radio address by Mr. Cornwell Jackson before the Writers' Club.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next at the conclusion of other special orders and the regular business of the day I may be permitted to address the House for 35 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday of this week after the regular order of business my colleague from Missouri [Mr. MILLER] may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today after the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a letter from Gov. Arthur B. Langlie, and also one from William F. Devin, mayor of the city of Seattle, concerning the construction of a highway from Prince George, B. C., to Watson Lake, on the Alcan Highway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include two very interesting extracts from the Journal of the American Osteopathic Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include therein brief statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include several newspaper clippings and editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therewith an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Gary (Ind.) Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the Women's Democratic Clubs of Kentucky.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the termination of today's business and the disposition of other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after disposition of the business on the Speaker's desk and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any other special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the expiration of the legislative business and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House today for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SALES TAX

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, no one is more opposed to the sales tax than am I. Unfortunately, the Government must have more money. Where can we get it? The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], sitting to my right, probably expressed the opposition of those who are going to vote against a sales tax, but the gentleman and his colleagues during the last 10 years have been supporting an administration which has been spending and wasting money by the billions, and now we have to pay for that spending. The administration has been spending without thought of where the money can be found. The day of reckoning is now with us. More unfortunately, the administration has been drying up the sources of taxation that were available before by assaults on business, so where, other than by a sales tax, are we going to get the money after milking other sources dry?

We have been trying to make some savings to reduce the amount needed by investigations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, but the gentleman from Missouri does not want any investigation by that committee of those who have been wasting this money. Oh, no; he wants to spend the money, but he does not want a sales tax to get the money which the New Deal proposes to spend. If we could only save a little, it probably would not be necessary, if we have to pass a sales tax, to make it for more than 5 percent. Why yell all the time for new and additional spending and then oppose the levying of taxes to raise the funds for that spending?

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DOUBLE-HEADER DEPARTMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, some years ago we had the rather interesting spectacle of double-header Thanksgivings that were brought about by Executive order. Now we have a double-header Department of Agriculture.

On October 1, the Department issued a release commenting on the Executive order effected on March 26, and amended on April 19, and here is a statement from the release itself:

> The amendment to Executive order so defined the respective duties and functions of the Secretary of Agriculture and the War Food Administrator, that each has authority to exercise any and all powers vested in the other by statute or otherwise.

There are some interesting possibilities in having a Secretary of Agriculture who can exercise all the functions of the War Food Administrator and a War Food Administrator who can exercise all the functions of the Secretary of Agriculture.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

WARTIME CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF RECLAMATION PROJECTS

The Clerk called the first bill on the calendar, H. R. 3018, authorizing wartime construction and operation and maintenance of reclamation projects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York, Mr. KEAN, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM objected, and the bill was stricken from the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The calling of the Consent Calendar will be suspended for the moment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and move its adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved*, That JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan, and EDWARD J. HART, of New Jersey, be, and they are hereby, elected members of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2697, to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, objection was made to this bill on the last call of the calendar on the ground that the authority conveyed by the bill was too broad and unrestricted. We have since discussed the bill with the author, and the chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands, we are advised, has prepared an amendment which will impose limitations upon the exercise of this authority. With the understanding that this amendment will be offered, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we not have an explanation of what these restrictions will be?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have at the Clerk's desk an amendment in conformity with the discussion already had with the gentleman from New York. The power authorized was for the disposal of sand, gravel, and timber, particularly. In the amendment we are limiting the power to the period of the war; second, we are requiring that before disposition is made they shall advertise for 30 days in a newspaper in the community in which the property is situated, or if there is no newspaper in that county, then in a newspaper in the adjoining county; third, we do not authorize anything that is already prohibited by law; and, fourth, we limit the amount involved to $10,000.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, with the understanding that the limitation of $10,000 will be written into the bill as the

amount of natural resources that can be disposed of at one time, and that the power granted shall cease to exist at the cessation of hostilities, under the amendment that is proposed, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, under such rules as he may prescribe, may dispose of materials or resources, including sand, stone, gravel, vegetation, and timber or other forest products, on public lands of the United States which are under his exclusive jurisdiction, if the disposal of such materials or resources is not otherwise expressly authorized by law and if such disposal would not be detrimental to the public interest. Such materials or resources may be disposed of only upon the payment of adequate compensation therefor, to be determined by the Secretary, and only after public notice of the disposal has been given prior thereto in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to any national park or national monument or to any Indian lands or lands set aside or held for the use or benefit of Indians, including lands over which jurisdiction has been transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executive order for the use of Indians.

SEC. 2. All moneys received from the disposal of materials or resources under this act shall be disposed of in the same manner as moneys received from the sale of public lands.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2 add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 3. Before disposing of any such materials or resources referred to in section 1, the Secretary shall first gave public notice, published in a newspaper published in the county where such materials are located, and if no newspaper is published in such county, then in the county nearest thereto, for at least 30 days, of his intention to dispose of such materials or resources. No such materials or resources in excess of $10,000 shall be disposed of unless authorized by valid laws of the United States. The powers granted in this act shall cease to exist at the cessation of hostilities in the present war, as determined by the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution, and the provisions of this act shall not apply where disposal of such materials or resources have been expressly prohibited by valid laws of the United States."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPROPRIATION FOR SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF FISHERY COORDINATION

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1242, to authorize appropriations for salaries and expenses, Office of Fishery Coordination.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF AN ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2801, to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF A NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL JEFFERSON BICENTENARY COMMITTEE

The Clerk called the next bill, Senate Joint Resolution 47, providing for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out under the general direction of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson, appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice and I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD with certain enclosures.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. When this bill was called on October 4, 1943, it was objected to for the reason that it provided for the celebration therein held to be conducted under the auspices of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson, and it was suggested that it was not good parliamentary procedure to include in a resolution so many whereas clauses. I was present when the resolution was reported and I concur in the objection that there were too many whereas clauses, but raised no objection at the time the bill was reported.

I have drawn two amendments to the bill. First, to strike out all after the enacting clause and inserting the new resolution which eliminates many of the whereas clauses. I have also eliminated from the bill, all reference to the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson. These corrections, in my opinion, remove all objections urged to the bill. A further amendment has been to amend the title so as to conform to the resolution. The amendment to the title removes all reference to the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson.

Since the bill was called on the last calendar day, I have received two letters—one from the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, the pertinent portions of which are as follows:

The Department of Agriculture, the Land-Grant Colleges, and may of the agricultural, scientific, and educational institutions throughout the country are greatly interested in this proposal and in having some congressional basis for the promotion of Nation-wide programs and activities appropriate to honoring Jefferson for his services to American agriculture. I have advised with the representatives of a number of organizations that are interested in this proposal, and they, together with the Department of Agriculture, are agreeable to the modification of the language of the resolution whereby the whereas clauses and reference to the Bicentenary Commission will be eliminated.

I hope that appropriate action can be taken by the chairman of the Library Committee or you when the matter next comes up for consideration. We have endeavored to get in touch with Senator BYRD, who introduced the resolution in the Senate and who has taken great personal interest in the matter. Unfortunately, we have been unable to reach Senator BYRD, but we trust that he will understand the circumstances and that he will be agreeable to taking appropriate action in the Senate following the action by the House.

The general plans which have been made in connection with this matter have called for appropriate programs and exercises to be in the rural schools, in farm meetings, and in scientific meetings of agriculture which are largely held this coming winter. Preliminary programs have been made for carrying out the activity and the delay in connection with the program has not seriously interfered. However, speedy action in connection with the resolution is now necessary.

May I express to you and to the other members of the Library Committee our appreciation for your personal interest in the matter and for the action which you took in connection with it on the floor of the House on October 4.

I also received the following letter from the assistant to the president of the National Farmers' Union, Mr. Paul Sifton:

For the National Farmers Union, may I respectfully urge favorable consideration and action on S. J. Res. 47, relating to the observances of the Jefferson Bicentennial, providing for an agricultural committee to emphasize the great Jefferson's contributions to the development of American agriculture.

I believe that the above amendments meet all objections to the bill.

I have not been able to see the members of the Library Committee or other Members on the floor, but I am inserting these remarks in the RECORD with the hope that persons previously objecting may let me know this week that if there are any objections to the bill, and also that I may be notified so as to try to get the bill in satisfactory form at once, as I contemplate asking the Speaker, majority leader, and minority leader, for permission to call up this bill at any opportune time in the next few days.

I have also been advised over the telephone by other persons interested in the bill but not Members of Congress that they would be glad if I would bring the bill up at the earliest opportunity.

One amendment amends the text of the bill and the other amendment amends the title. The two amendments meet the previous objections made to the bill.

Amendments by Mr. BLAND: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The purpose of this resolution is to authorize in this year 1943, which marks the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, the creation of the National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee which, together with public and private institutions in the service of agriculture, the United States Department of Agriculture and the State colleges of agriculture and organizations composed of farmers and their families, is hereby authorized to hold, conduct, and participate in ceremonies and activities throughout the Nation not only to revere Thomas Jefferson as a patriotic statesman and philosopher, as author of the Declaration of Independence, as a private citizen and President of the United States but also in recognition of our great debt to him as a farmer, agricultural philosopher, inventive genius, educator, and leader in scientific agriculture: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That there be created the National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby appointed chairman of and is hereby authorized to organize such committee. The President pro tempore of the Senate shall appoint as members of the committee five Members of the Senate. The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint as members of the Committee five Members of the House of Representatives. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to appoint in his discretion an appropriate number of members of the committee representing the following agricultural organizations:

"United States Department of Agriculture.

"The land-grant colleges (including the colleges of agriculture, the agricultural experiment stations, and the agricultural extension services).

"National farm organizations.

"The agricultural press.

"Scientific and learned societies dealing with agriculture.

"The Office of Education.

"The Secretary of Agriculture is empowered to appoint a secretary for the committee. All members of the committee are to serve without compensation. The duties of the committee shall be to assist in bringing to the attention of the people of the United States the great services rendered by Jefferson to agriculture and to encourage and promote appropriate and timely activities in connection with the various agricultural organizations mentioned above and of the States of the United States, in the various agricultural meetings to be held during the current year, to encourage appropriate programs dealing with Jefferson and agriculture in the United States Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges, to encourage widespread dissemination through the press, the radio, farmers' meetings, the rural schools and agricultural high schools, and so forth, information about Jefferson.

"SEC. 2. The provisions of this joint resolution shall not be construed to authorize the making of any appropriation to carry out its purpose."

Amend the title to read as follows: "Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation."

FUR SEAL AGREEMENT OF 1942 BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2924, to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada; to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands; and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] is here. I wish he would give us an explanation of this bill.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, as the individual reporting the bill, I may say that the purpose of the bill is to carry into effect an agreement made between the State Department and Canada for the protection of the fur seal industry. The existing fur seal treaty or I should say the fur seal treaty that has existed for many years and that has served as a great protection to the furs of the world has been abrogated by Japan. The result of the abrogation would permit not only the people of our own Nation but others to fish in the waters affected without restrictions that are necessary for our protection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman explain what he means by "emergency" in this bill? Is that for the duration?

Mr. BLAND. It was deemed wise that this agreement, which was worked out between Canada and the United States, should be given effect. As the situation now stands the breach of the fur seal agreement of 1911, I think it is, leaves not only Canada without restrictions but leaves our own citizens without restrictions for the protection of the fur seal industry. There is no question but what the Secretary of State is in favor of this bill, the Canadian authorities desire to put it into effect, the Department of the Interior demands this legislation, and it is essential to protect the fur seal industry of the United States.

Mr. KEAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. I notice that the agreement will remain in effect for the duration of the present emergency and 12 months thereafter. Exactly what is the present emergency and 12 months thereafter?

Mr. BLAND. The present emergency is the war and the 12 months thereafter I would regard following the termination of the war. If there should be no protection for this agreement, unless protected in this way, there might be a breach of it by our own citizens and by others. I may say to the gentleman that the amendment referred to is an amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. Should this country or Canada withdraw from this agreement the part of bill which is designed to implement that agreement would cease to be effective.

Mr. KEAN. I refer to the question of putting legislation in for the duration of the emergency. Does the gentleman from Virginia expect that after the war is over the President will say not only that the war is over but will also issue a proclamation saying that the emergency is over?

Mr. BLAND. No. I think that the fur-seal problem in Alaska as well as the fisheries problem generally are going to be two of the most essential, valuable, and most important post-war problems we will have and we desire to have no situation whereby we would terminate this protection either as to the United States or as to Canada.

Mr. KEAN. Is the gentleman satisfied with the wording "for the duration of the present emergency and 12 months thereafter"?

Mr. BLAND. Yes; because the United States might not be bound except with this language, and action taken in Canada might fail to reach fishing on our side so that we would not have the protection that is accorded by this bill. The danger is in part a danger from our own people.

Mr. KEAN. The gentleman is such a profound student of these matters that if he is satisfied I am, but I just wanted to call his attention to it.

Mr. BLAND. That amendment made necessary an adjournment of our committee to consider the necessary language for the amendment.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand there are several emergencies effected by proclamations of the President that have not yet been terminated, emergencies that were declared in times gone by. It seems to me that the term "present emergency" as used in this bill is very indefinite. It does not say which of the several emergencies that have been declared.

Mr. BLAND. There is no protection now or at least not sufficient protection now and what we have provided or tried to provide constitutes more or less something of a stopgap, but thank God it is a stopgap.

Mr. HINSHAW. I recognize the desire of having this bill passed, but does not the gentleman think he ought to better define the term "emergency" in the bill?

Mr. BLAND. I think we had better watch the situation and if we find it is necessary, bring in additional legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That when used in this act—

(a) "Pelagic sealing" means the killing, capturing, or pursuing, or the attempted killing, capturing, or pursuing of fur seals at sea, whether within or without the territorial waters of the United States.

(b) "Sealing" means the killing, capturing, or pursuing, or the attempted killing, capturing, or pursuing, of fur seals in or on any lands or waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

(c) "Sea-otter hunting" means the killing, capturing, or pursuing, or the attempted killing, capturing, or pursuing, of sea otters at sea, except in waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States where other laws are applicable.

(d) "Person" includes individual, association, partnership, and corporation.

(e) "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(f) "Fur-seal agreement" means the provisional fur-seal agreement between the United States and Canada effected by an exchange of notes signed at Washington, D. C., on December 8, 1942, and on December 19, 1942, and any other treaty or agreement hereafter entered into by the United States for the protection of fur seals.

(g) "North Pacific Ocean" includes the Bering Sea.

(h) "Import" means land on or bring into, or attempt to land on or bring into, any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful, except as hereinafter provided, for any citizen or national of the United States, or person owing duty of obedience to the laws or treaties of the United States, or any vessel of the United States, or person belonging to or on such vessel, to engage in pelagic sealing or sea-otter hunting in or on the waters of the North Pacific Ocean; or for any person or vessel to engage in sealing; or for any person or vessel to use any port or harbor or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States for any purpose connected in any way with the operation of pelagic sealing, sea-otter hunting, or sealing; or for any person to transport, import, offer for sale, or have in possession at any port, place, or on any vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, raw, dressed, or dyed skins of sea otters taken contrary to the provisions of this section or, where taken pursuant to section 3 of this act, not officially marked and certified as having been so taken, or raw, dressed, or dyed skins of fur seals taken in or on the waters of the North Pacific Ocean or on lands subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, except seal skins which have been taken under the authority of this act or under the authority of the respective parties to any fur-seal agreement and which have been officially marked and certified as having been so taken.

SEC. 3. Indians, Aleuts, or other aborigines dwelling on the American coasts of the waters of the North Pacific Ocean shall be permitted to carry on pelagic sealing or sea-otter hunting without the use of firearms from canoes or undecked boats, propelled wholly by paddles, oars, or sails, and not transported by or used in connection with other vessels, and manned by not more than five persons each, in the way heretofore practiced by said Indians, Aleuts, or other aborigines, and shall be permitted to dispose of the skins of fur seals or sea otters so taken as they see fit, but only after such skins have been officially marked and certified as provided in section 2 of this act. The exception made in this section shall not apply to Indians, Aleuts, or other aborigines in the employment of other persons or who shall engage in pelagic sealing or sea-otter hunting under contract to deliver the skins to any person.

SEC. 4. In order to continue the proper utilization of the fur-seal herd of the North Pacific Ocean and to carry out the purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized to permit sealing on the Pribilof and other islands and on the shores of waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, by officers and employees of the Fish and Wildlife Service designated by him and by the natives of the Territory of Alaska, and to adopt suitable regulations governing the same whenever he shall determine that such sealing is necessary or desirable and not inconsistent with preservation of the seals of the Pacific Ocean. The Secretary is also authorized to permit pelagic sealing in the event of emergency circumstances by officers and employees of the Fish and Wildlife Service and by the natives of the Territory of Alaska under such conditions and for such periods as may be agreed upon by consultation between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada in accordance with the provisions of article II of the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942.

SEC. 5. Subject to the provisions of sections 3 and 15 of this act, all seal or sea-otter skins taken under the authority conferred by this act, or forfeited to the United States, and all seal skins delivered to the United States pursuant to the terms of any fur-seal agreement shall be sold under the direction of the Secretary in such market, at such times, and in such manner as he may deem most advantageous; and the proceeds of such sale shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 6. The Pribilof Islands, including the islands of St. Paul and St. George, Walrus and Otter Islands, and Sea Lion Rock, in Alaska, are declared a special reservation for Government purposes. It shall be unlawful for any person to land or remain on any of those islands, except through stress of weather or like unavoidable cause or by the authority of the Secretary, and any person found on any of those islands contrary to the provisions of this section shall be summarily removed and shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine not exceeding $500 or by imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or by both fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 7. Whenever seals are killed and sealskins taken on any of the Pribilof Islands the native inhabitants of the islands shall be employed in such killing and in curing the skins taken, and shall receive for their labor fair compensation to be fixed from time to time by the Secretary, who shall have the authority to prescribe the manner in which such compensation shall be paid to the natives or expended or otherwise used on their behalf and for their benefit.

SEC. 8. The Secretary shall have authority to establish and maintain depots for provisions and supplies on the Pribilof Islands and to provide for the transportation of such provisions and supplies from the mainland of the United States to the islands by the charter of private vessels or by the use of public vessels of the United States which may be under his control or which may be placed at his disposal by the President; and he likewise shall have authority to furnish food, shelter, fuel, clothing, and other necessities of life to the native inhabitants of the Pribilof Islands and to provide for their comfort, maintenance, education, and protection.

SEC. 9. Under the direction of the Secretary, the Fish and Wildlife Service is authorized to investigate the conditions of seal life upon the rookeries of the Pribilof Islands, and to continue the inquiries relative to the life history and migrations of the seals frequenting the waters of the North Pacific Ocean.

SEC. 10. Any officer or employee of the Department of the Interior authorized by the Secretary, any naval or other officer designated by the President, any marshal or deputy marshal, any collector or deputy collector of customs, and any other person authorized by law to enforce the provisions of this act shall have power, without warrant, to arrest any person committing a violation of this act or any regulation made pursuant thereto in his presence or view, and to take such person immediately for examination or trial before an officer or court of competent jurisdiction; and shall have power, without warrant, to search any vessel within any of the territorial waters of the United States, or any vessel of the United States on the high seas, when he has reasonable cause to believe that such vessel is subject to seizure under this section. Any officer, employee, or other person authorized to enforce the provisions of this act shall have power to execute any warrant or process issued by an officer or court of competent jurisdiction for the enforcement of the provisions of this act; and shall have power with a search warrant to search any person, vessel, or place at any time. The judges of the courts established under the laws of the United States, and the United States commissioners, may, within their respective jurisdictions, upon proper oath or affirmation showing probable cause, issue warrants in all such cases. All fur seals and sea otters, or the skins thereof, killed, captured, transported, imported, offered for sale, or possessed contrary to the provisions of this act or of any regulation made pursuant thereto, and any vessel used or employed contrary to the provisions of this act or of any regulation made pursuant thereto, or which it reasonably appears has been or is about to be used or employed in or in aid of the performance of any act forbidden by the provisions of this act or of any regulation made pursuant thereto, together with its tackle, apparel, furniture, appurtenances, and cargo, may, whenever and wherever lawfully found, be seized by any such officer, employee, or other person.

SEC. 11. Except where otherwise expressly provided in this act, any person violating any provision of this act or any regulation made pursuant thereto shall be punished for each such offense, upon conviction thereof, by a fine of not less than $200 nor more than $2,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or by both fine and imprisonment. All fur seals or sea otters, or the skins thereof, killed, captured, transported, imported, offered for sale, or possessed contrary to any provision of this act or any regulation made pursuant thereto shall be forfeited to the United States and shall be disposed of pursuant to section 5 of this act. Any vessel used or employed contrary to any provision of this act or any regulation made pursuant thereto shall, together with its tackle, apparel, furniture, appurtenances, and cargo, be forfeited to the United States and shall be disposed of as directed by the court having jurisdiction.

SEC. 12. It shall be the duty of all collectors of customs to enforce the provisions of this act with respect to the importation of the skins of fur seal and sea otter.

SEC. 13. Any person or vessel described in section 2 of this act in any of the waters of the North Pacific Ocean designated in any fur-seal agreement, including in any event the waters north of the thirtieth parallel of north latitude and east of the one hundred and eightieth meridian, violating or being about to violate the prohibitions of this act against pelagic sealing may be seized and detained by the naval or other duly commissioned officers of any of the parties to such fur-seal agreement other than the United States, except within the territorial jurisdiction of one of the other said parties, on condition, however, that when such person or vessel is so seized and detained by officers of any party other than the United States, such person or vessel shall be delivered as soon as practicable at the nearest point to the place of seizure, with witnesses and proofs necessary to establish the offense so far as they are under the control of such party, to the proper official of the United States, whose courts alone shall have jurisdiction to try the offense and impose penalties for the same. The said officers of any party to any such fur-seal agreement other than the United States shall seize and detain persons and vessels, as in this section specified, only after such party, by appropriate legislation or otherwise, shall have authorized naval or other officers of the United States duly

commissioned and instructed by the President to that end to seize, detain, and deliver to the proper officers of such party vessels and subjects under the jurisdiction of that government offending against any such fur-seal agreement, or any statute or regulation made by that government to enforce any such fur-seal agreement. Upon the giving of such authority by such party, such naval or other officers of the United States shall have authority to make the seizures, detentions, and deliveries described. The President of the United States shall determine by proclamation when such authority has been given by the other parties to any such fur-seal agreement, and his determination shall be conclusive upon the question; such proclamation may be modified, amended, or revoked by proclamation of the President whenever in his judgment it is deemed expedient.

SEC. 14. It shall be the duty of the President to cause a guard or patrol to be maintained in the waters frequented by the seal herds and sea otter in the protection of which the United States is especially interested, composed of naval or other public vessels of the United States designated by him for such service.

SEC. 15. The Secretary shall have authority to receive on behalf of the United States any ful-seal skins taken by any party to any fur-seal agreement and tendered for delivery by such party in accordance with the terms of such fur-seal agreement, and all skins which are or shall become the property of the United States from any source whatsoever shall be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of this act. The Secretary likewise shall have authority to deliver to the authorized agents of any government that is a party to a fur-seal agreement the skins to which such government is entitled under the provisions of such fur-seal agreement, and to do or perform, or cause to be done or performed, any act which the United States is authorized or obliged to do or perform by the provisions of such fur-seal agreement.

SEC. 16. Nothing contained in this act shall apply to the killing, capturing, pursuing, transportation, importation, offering for sale, or possession of fur seals or sea otters, or the skins thereof, for scientific purposes under special permit issued therefor by the Secretary.

SEC. 17. The Secretary shall supervise and direct the administration of this act through the Fish and Wildlife Service and shall make all regulations necessary for the enforcement of this act and any fur-seal agreement. It shall be his duty to provide for the enforcement of all of the provisions of this act and of the regulations issued thereunder, except to the extent otherwise provided for in this act, and to cooperate with other Federal agencies and with the duly authorized officials of the government of any party to any fur-seal agreement in the enforcement of such agreement. Out of such moneys as may be appropriated for such purposes, he shall employ in Washington, D. C., and elsewhere, such individuals and means as he may deem necessary for the administration of this act and of any other function imposed upon him by any fur-seal agreement.

SEC. 18. All acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act, including but not limited to the following, are hereby repealed: Sections 1956, 1959, 1960, and 1961 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; act of February 21, 1893 (27 Stat. 472, ch. 150); act of April 6, 1894 (28 Stat. 52); act of December 29, 1897 (30 Stat. 226, ch. 3); act of April 21, 1910 (36 Stat. 326, ch. 183); act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 499, ch. 373); and joint resolution of June 22, 1916 (39 Stat. 236, ch. 171), all as amended.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, lines 14 and 15: Strike out "District of Columbia."

Page 2, line 16: Insert a comma and the word "convention" after the word "treaty", and insert the word "other" before "agreement."

Page 5, line 2: Insert "fur" before "seals" and "North" before "Pacific Ocean."

Page 5, lines 4 and 5, strike out the words "officers and employees of the Fish and Wildlife Service" and insert in lieu thereof the words "officers, employees, and agents of the United States."

Page 6, line 2, after the word "person" insert the words "other than natives of the said Islands and officers and employees of the Fish and Wildlife Service."

Page 9, line 13: Insert "of" before "any."

Page 10, line 22: Strike out the word "subjects" and insert the word "persons."

Page 11, line 5: Strike out "parties" and insert "party."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

And with the following further committee amendment:

Page 13, at the end add a new section to be known as section 19 as follows:

"SEC. 19. The provisions of this act which implement the Provisional Fur-Seal Agreement of 1942 concluded between the United States of America and Canada shall remain in effect only for the duration of the present emergency and 12 months thereafter unless either the Government of the United States of America or the Government of Canada enacts legislation contrary thereto, or until 12 months after either Government shall have notified the other Government of its intention to terminate the agreement."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York to the committee amendment: On page 13, line 2, strike out "emergency" and insert in lieu thereof "hostilities."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING PENSIONS FOR CERTAIN WORLD WAR VETERANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3377, to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from $40 to $50 per month, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill will cost a great deal of money. I believe I am in favor of the proposed legislation, but I do not believe this is the proper kind of a bill to bring up on the Consent Calendar. It should have full debate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from New Jersey that these are men who are totally and permanently disabled and who are now contending that they are unable to sustain themselves on the small compensation allowed them. They are paid less than the soldiers of any other war. If they were Spanish-American War veterans they would be getting from $60 to $65 a month. They have asked for this increase to $50, and for an increase to $60 a month for those who have been held to be totally and permanently disabled for 10 years or who are totally disabled and have also reached the age of 65. This would be putting those men merely on a parity with the Spanish-American War veterans. They are just as disabled today, if they are totally and permanently disabled, as they will ever be. They feel that this proposed legislation is necessary.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Is not the request based entirely on the increased cost of living?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly, that is one thing. Another thing, it is based on the fact that these men are growing older. Many of them are above 65 and many of them above 75 years of age. They are being paid not more than two-thirds of what they would get if they were Spanish-American War veterans of the same age.

Mr. PRIEST. Does the gentleman have an estimate of what the annual increase in cost would be as a result of this measure?

Mr. RANKIN. I do not believe I have the estimate here, but that was gone into rather thoroughly before the committee. I may say to the gentleman that it will not break the Government by any means.

Mr. PRIEST. I am sure of that; I just wanted to have the estimate at this point for the sake of the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. We had hearings before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and the representatives of all the various veterans' organizations appeared in favor of this measure.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that we have pending in the House today for further consideration a bill to allow to the wives as dependents of the present personnel of the Army now in combat the sum of $50 a month. Thousands and thousands of these women are not at all dependent. Many of them hold jobs or have incomes. While I am opposing the raising of any of those allowances and shall continue to do so, I think that this raise of $10 to our World War veterans is amply justified.

Mr. RANKIN. These men are totally and permanently disabled. Many of them are totally and permanently disabled as a result of their service in the World War. However, because of conditions that prevailed right after the war they were not able to prove their disabilities or did not want to prove their disabilities because they hoped to get well. They are patriotic men who did not desire to get anything from the Government, until the time passed for them to make their proof. Therefore, they could not even be put on the roll as presumptively service-connected.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does not the gentleman believe that if the cost of living as far as foodstuffs is concerned is increased the provisions in the gentleman's bill for an increase will be inadequate?

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that they may be inadequate for the veterans, but it seems to me that they are more than adequate for the objectors. I did the very best I could with this bill, and I think it ought to pass. When you have examined the bill carefully, I do not believe there will be three men in the House who will object the next time it is brought up.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does the gentleman have any estimate as to the number of veterans who would be involved in this action?

Mr. RANKIN. No. I can get it, however. It is in the hearings. I do not happen to have it before me.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It would not be such a considerable sum?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly not.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. As has been pointed out, we are giving to the wives or other dependents of soldiers in this war $50 a month. Under the bill we have pending now we are even giving many of the divorced wives $42 a month. I think this proposition is fair and just and ought to be passed.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I must object to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey that the bill be passed over without prejudice, because that will merely prolong the proceeding. I ask that the bill be considered now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, for the reasons I have already given, I object.

ARTIFICIAL LIMBS OR OTHER APPLIANCES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3176, to regulate the furnishing of artificial limbs or other appliances to retired officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard and to certain civilian employees of the military and naval forces of the Regular Establishment.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 19, 1939, as amended by Public Law No. 365, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 22, 1941, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. In the administration of laws pertaining to veterans, retired officers, and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, who served honorably during a war period as recognized by the Veterans' Administration, shall be, and are entitled to hospitalization and domiciliary care in the same manner and to the same extent as veterans of any war are now or may hereafter be furnished hospitalization or domiciliary care by the Veterans' Administration and subject to those provisions of paragraph VI (A) of Veterans Regulation No. 6 (c), which provide for reduction of monetary benefits to veterans having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent while being furnished hospital treatment, institutional, or domiciliary care.

"Any retired officer or enlisted man of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard who lost a limb or the use thereof through injury or disease incurred or contracted in line of duty in the military or naval service at any time, may be provided with an artificial limb or other applicance found by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be reasonably necessary in medical judgment for such injury or disease, included necessary transportation to effect the fitting thereof, upon receipt of claim under such regulations as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe. No commutation in lieu of such artificial limb or other appliance shall be payable on and after the date of this enactment."

SEC. 2. The United States Employees' Compensation Commission, under such regulations as the Commission may prescribe, is hereby authorized to furnish any civilian employee of the military or naval service, Regular Establishment, who lost a limb or the use thereof through injury or disease incurred or contracted in line of duty as such prior to September 7, 1916, with an artificial limb or other appliance, or commutation in lieu thereof, at least once in every 3 years, upon the application of the person entitled thereto, or someone on his behalf, including necessary transportation to effect the fitting thereof and the compensation fund, established pursuant to section 35 of the act approved September 7, 1916 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 785), shall be available for expenditures under this section: *Provided*, That the commutation payable to any civilian employee in lieu of such artificial limb or other appliance shall be in the amount last paid to such employee under laws repealed by section 3 of this act.

SEC. 3. The act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act supplementary to an act to provide for furnishing artificial limbs to disabled soldiers' approved June 30, 1870," approved June 8, 1872 (17 Stat. 338); the act entitled "An act to regulate the issue of artificial limbs to disabled soldiers, seamen, and others," approved August 15, 1876 (19 Stat. 203, 204; U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 38, secs. 241, 242, 245); part of paragraph following semicolon making provision for direct payment of commutation under subject "Artificial limbs" under heading "Miscellaneous objects" in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 979; U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 38, sec. 244); section 4787 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 38, secs. 241–242); section 4788 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 38, sec. 243); section 4789 of the Revised Statutes; section 4790 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 38, sec. 243); section 4791 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 38, sec. 246); the proviso under the subject "Artificial limbs" under the heading "Medical Department" in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 901; U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 38, sec. 242); section 1176 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 38, sec. 247); section 1177 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 38, sec. 248); section 1178 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 38, sec. 249; title 31, sec. 583 (9)); the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for furnishing trusses to disabled soldiers,' approved May 28, 1872," approved March 3, 1879 (20 Stat. 353; U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 38, secs. 247 and 250), are hereby repealed, and any other acts, or parts of acts, in conflict or inconsistent with the provisions of this act, are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict or inconsistency.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 19, strike out "applicance" and insert "appliance."

Line 22, strike out "included" and insert "including."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO INCREASE COMPENSATION TO DISABLED VETERANS, ETC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3356) to provide for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service-incurred disability, and the widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This bill substantially changes the rate of compensation of disabled veterans, as well as the widows and dependents of those veterans. The bill is in the same category as the other bill that we have just discussed. I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, to say to the gentleman from New York that these are service-connected disabled veterans, whether disabled by gunshot wounds, or other injuries in this war or the last war. Many of them are struggling along on compensation too small for their subsistence, and I submit, that it is certainly incongruous, to say the least, to increase the allowances to which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] referred a moment ago, to the extent proposed, and then refuse to increase the compensation of these battle-scarred veterans, of these tubercular veterans, of these insane, shell-shocked veterans who are entitled to our highest consideration.

Mr. COLE of New York. Of course, the gentleman understands that our objection is only to the manner of the procedure in the passage of the bill and not to the merits of the bill. When the gentleman referred to the bill referred to by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], he was not aware of the fact, probably, that the gentleman from Kentucky went to the Rules Committee to get a rule, which permitted 4 hours' debate, and the bill will be taken up today later, so that 2 whole days of discussion will have been had upon that bill and it was not sought to be passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. RANKIN. And I will say to the gentleman, that I will be glad to have a roll call on both of these bills. I hope we can do so. Will that satisfy the gentleman from New York?

Mr. COLE of New York. My only objection is in trying to pass a bill of this

size and importance, as to which I feel every Member of the House should be advised, by unanimous consent.

Mr. RANKIN. And I say to the gentleman that they may come down here and debate this other bill for 4 hours and the chances are that there will not be 1 man out of 10 who will have heard all of those 4 hours of debate, and some Members will not hear any of the debate, because they know what is in the bill, and have their minds already made up. We might debate this bill from now until Saturday night, and we would not change the votes of half a dozen Members, because there will not be a half dozen Members who will vote against it on a roll call. So we might as well have the roll call now.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Occasionally there is some value in debate of these bills. I have a copy of the bill before me and I notice that it is proposed to offer an amendment, which would redefine widows, so that it may be that contained in section 6 of Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, passed July 13, 1943. We now find that in that particular act there was some language which apparently has reduced the pensions of Spanish War and Indian war veterans who might have taken a furlough and gone out from the Veterans' Administration or the State soldiers' homes, on the particular day, while those who were present in the institutions, and who on that particular day were not away, did not have their pensions reduced. The particular language in that particular bill reduced the pensions of those veterans who happened to be away from the institution. So that there is a real value in having these bills debated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

FURNISHING TRANSPORTATION FOR VEHICLES OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION EMPLOYEES

The clerk called the bill (S. 964) to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This bill would provide for transportation at Government expense of employees of the Veterans' Administration and their facilities in the field. There is nothing in the report that I have that would indicate what the cost of this would be.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Tennessee is in error.

Mr. PRIEST. It may be in the hearings, but I have not had access to the hearings.

Mr. RANKIN. This bill has already passed the Senate. The bill provides:

That during the present war and not exceeding 6 months after the termination of the war, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, whenever he finds such action to be necessary for the efficient conduct of the affairs of his administration, and under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized to utilize automotive equipment of the Veterans' Administration to transport its employees between field stations and nearest adequate public transportation at such reasonable rates of fare for the service furnished as he may establish.

It is not furnished free of charge, it is paid for, and the Administrator tells me that it is necessary. It certainly will not cost the Government anything.

Mr. PRIEST. They pay their fare when transported in vehicles furnished by the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. PRIEST. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, although I shall not object to the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has softened so rapidly I wonder if he would mind returning to the other bill.

Mr. KEAN. This bill provides for the furnishing of transportation to employees. I am wondering whether it might not be possible to provide that if there is room in the busses those relatives who want to visit veterans in the hospitals may use the busses, which might run some times empty. Has the gentleman given thought to that?

Mr. RANKIN. I think it is a pretty hard matter to look at a man and tell who he is related to. I am afraid that might throw these busses open to a great deal of imposition on the part of people who simply want to use them. I think we ought to confine it to employees of the Administration. I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey I think it would be unwise to make that change.

Mr. KEAN. I am sure the gentleman has looked into the matter very carefully.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That during the present war and not exceeding 6 months after the termination of the war, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, whenever he finds such action to be necessary for the efficient conduct of the affairs of his Administration, and under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized to utilize automotive equipment of the Veterans' Administration to transport its employees between field stations and nearest adequate public transportation at such reasonable rates of fare for the service furnished as he may establish. All moneys collected as fares from such employees shall be accounted for and shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts. The authority herein granted the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall be exercised with respect to any station only after determination by the Office of Defense Transportation that existing private and other facilities are not and cannot be rendered adequate by other means, and that its exercise will result in the most efficient method of supplying transportation to the personnel concerned and a utilization of transportation facilities consistent with the plan, policies, and purposes of the Office of Defense Transportation.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF HARRISON PARK IN THE CITY OF VINCENNES TO VINCENNES UNIVERSITY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3306, to authorize the conveyance of Harrison Park in the city of Vincennes to Vincennes University.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, several years ago the United States Government conveyed to the city of Vincennes, Ind., a certain tract of land to be used for park purposes, with the condition that if that land should no longer be used as a park, the title should revert to the United States. This bill authorizes the city of Vincennes to turn that property over to Vincennes University, with a provision in the deed that if it is no longer used as a university, the title shall revert to the city of Vincennes to be used as a park, but it does not reestablish the Federal Government's reversionary interest in the land. I have prepared an amendment which I think will correct this defect and have discussed it with the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, who is agreeable to the amendment. Therefore I withdraw my reservation of objection and will offer the amendment later.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to sell certain real estate belonging to the United States, and vesting the title to certain other lands in the city of Vincennes, in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1881, the city of Vincennes is authorized to convey all its right, title, and interest in and to the tract of land known as Harrison Park, title to which was vested in such city by such section 2, and all improvements on such land, to the board of trustees for the Vincennes University. The conveyance executed by the city of Vincennes shall contain the express condition that if such board of trustees shall at any time cease to use such property for school purposes, or shall alienate or attempt to alienate such property, title thereto shall revert to the city of Vincennes, and thereafter such property shall be used only as a park or for some other public purpose: *Provided*, That, in the event such conveyance involves the transfer of ownership or control over the Old Territorial Capitol Building or Legislative Hall, which was removed to a site in the park in 1919, the transfer of the aforesaid park land shall be contingent upon the making of arrangements satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior for the preservation of the structure.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: On page 2, line 7, after "Vincennes", strikes out "and thereafter such property shall be used as a park or for some other public purpose" and insert "subject to the same limitations as now exist."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING NAVAL AVIATION CADET ACT OF 1942

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1113, to amend section 11 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 11 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 738; 34 U. S. C. 850j), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows: "When first commissioned pursuant to this act officers shall be paid a uniform allowance of $150 if commissioned as ensigns in the Naval Reserve, and of $250 if commissioned as second lieutenants in the Marine Corps Reserve: *Provided*, That any officer who has heretofore received the cash uniform gratuity of $150 provided in section 302 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1180) shall not be entitled to this uniform allowance."

SEC. 2. This act shall become effective as of August 4, 1942.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING NAVAL RESERVE ACT OF 1938

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1132, to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 so as to provide for the payment of a uniform gratuity to certain officers recalled to active duty.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby further amended by inserting between sections 310 and 311 (52 Stat. 1183; 34 U. S. C. 855i) a new section 310a, to read as follows:

"SEC. 310a. Commissioned and warrant officers on the honorary retired list of the Naval Reserve without pay shall, upon first reporting for active duty (other than for physical examination) in time of war or national emergency pursuant to orders of competent authority, be paid the sum of $250 as a uniform allowance for the purchase of required uniforms in lieu of any other uniform gratuity allowed by law: *Provided*, That there shall be deducted from this allowance the amount of any uniform gratuity paid such officer within the 4 years immediately preceding his recall to active duty."

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective as of September 8, 1939.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAVAL MINE DEPOT RESERVATION AT YORKTOWN, VA.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1170, authorizing the conveyance to the State of Virginia for highway purposes only, of a portion of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, Va.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to convey to the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to a strip or parcel of land of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, York County, Va., containing 8.03 acres, more or less, metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAVY NURSE CORPS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2976, to grant military rank to certain members of the Navy Nurse Corps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REIMBURSEMENT OF OFFICERS, ENLISTED MEN AND OTHERS IN THE NAVAL SERVICE FOR PROPERTY LOST IN SUCH SERVICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3223, to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy and, subject to appeal to the Secretary of the Navy, such other officer or officers as he may designate for such purposes and under such regulations as he may prescribe, are hereby authorized to consider, and to ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay, in an amount not exceeding $1,000, any claim filed under oath of the commissioned, appointed, enrolled, and enlisted personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and of the Coast Guard when operating as a part of the Navy, and of civilian employees of the Naval Establishment, for loss, damage, or destruction of their private personal property occurring on or after December 7, 1941, when such loss, damage, or destruction is not due to fault or negligence on the part of the claimant and has occurred or shall hereafter occur under the following circumstances:

First. When the loss, damage, or destruction is due to operations of war, shipwreck, or other marine disaster, or the wreck of an aircraft or other disaster thereto: *Provided*, That the term "marine disaster" as used herein shall include an accident occurring on board a vessel.

Second. When the loss, damage, or destruction is in consequence of the serviceman or employee having given his attention to the saving of the life of another, or of property belonging to the United States.

Third. When such property is lost, damaged, or destroyed by reason of being shipped on board an unseaworthy vessel by order of an officer authorized to give such order or direct such shipment; or is lost, damaged, or destroyed, whether or not due to negligence on the part of Government personnel, while in shipment pursuant to orders issued by competent authority, but where the property was transported by a common carrier, the reimbursement shall be limited to the extent of such loss, damage, or destruction over and above the amount recoverable from such carrier.

Fourth. When such property is lost, damaged, or destroyed by reason of being furnished at the direction of competent authority to another person under conditions of immediate and urgent distress.

Reimbursement may be made in all such cases for loss, damage, or destruction of such articles as are required to be possessed and used by officers, enlisted men, and others, in connection with their service or employment, and such additional items of personal property as the Secretary of the Navy shall determine to have been reasonably and properly in the place when they were lost, damaged, or destroyed, in consequence of the service or employment in which the serviceman or employee was engaged.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to reimburse the claimant in kind out of available Government property, or to pay the amount, not exceeding $1,000 in any one case, determined to be due on claims under this act, out of any appropriation available for the purpose. Claims exceeding $1,000 which the Secretary of the Navy considers meritorious may be reported to Congress for its consideration.

SEC. 3. Separation from the naval service or establishment shall not bar the authority to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay any claim otherwise falling within the provisions of this act which accrued prior to such separation. In the event of the death of any person designated in section 1 hereof, whether occurring prior or subsequent to the time any loss, destruction, or damage occurs, reimbursement may be made to any dependent relative, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy.

SEC. 4. Existing claims shall be presented within 2 years from the date of this act and all such claims hereafter arising shall be presented within 2 years from the occurrence of the loss, destruction, or damage, except that any person missing who is not willfully absent, or any person who is a prisoner in the hands of the enemy, or who is interned in a neutral country, shall in addition be allowed 1 year from the time of return to the jurisdiction of the United States in which to file such claim.

SEC. 5. The provisions of this act shall apply to the personnel of the Coast Guard, military, and civil, when the Coast Guard is not operating as a part of the Navy. In such case the Secretary of the Treasury shall have and exercise as to claims of the personnel of the Coast Guard the authority conferred by this act upon the Secretary of the Navy, and payment or reimbursement in kind of such claims shall be made from appropriations available to the Treasury Department, which appropriations are hereby authorized.

SEC. 6. The provisions of this act shall apply to the personnel of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and Public Health Service when serving with the Navy.

SEC. 7. The determination of claims under the provisions of this act shall be final as to all matters necessary to the establishment and payment or settlement of any claim filed hereunder, and acceptance of payment thereof or reimbursement in kind therefor shall conclusively operate as acceptance of the determination thereof. No right to prosecute a claim or action before any court or agency of the United States, except as herein provided, shall accrue to any person hereunder: *Provided*, That claims arising in the manner indicated in this act and which have been

settled under the terms of a previously existing law shall be regarded as finally determined and no other or further right of recovery under the provisions hereof shall accrue to persons whose claims have been so settled.

SEC. 8. The appropriations available to the Navy Department and the Coast Guard for the payment of claims under the provisions of the act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 389), as amended, are hereby made available for the payment or reimbursement of claims determined under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 9. The said act approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 389), entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost or destroyed in such service," as amended, is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out ", in an amount not exceeding $1,000."

Page 3, line 11, after the word "property" insert ", including money or currency."

Page 3, line 15, insert before the period at the end thereof the following: *"Provided,* That reimbursement may be made for loss of money or currency only when such money or currency has been deposited for safekeeping as provided by regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Navy or as provided by orders of the commanding officer."

Page 3, lines 18 and 19, strike out ", not exceeding $1,000 in any one case."

Page 3, lines 20 to 22, inclusive, strike out "Claims exceeding $1,000 which the Secretary of the Navy considers meritorious may be reported to Congress for its consideration."

Page 5, strike out all of section 7, preceding the word "claims" in line 12 and capitalize the word "claims" in line 12.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMISSION WARRANT OFFICER AND WARRANT OFFICER, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3224, to establish the grades of commissioned warrant officer and warrant officer in the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in lieu of H. R. 3224 the House consider Senate bill 1350, which is identical.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the grades of chief marine gunner, chief quartermaster clerk, chief pay clerk, marine gunner, quartermaster clerk, and pay clerk in the United States Marine Corps are abolished, and in lieu thereof there are hereby established the commissioned warrant and warrant grades of commissioned warrant officer and warrant officer.

SEC. 2. From and after the approval of this act, and without the issuance of new commissions or warrants, all Marine Corps personnel in the commissioned warrant grades of chief marine gunner, chief quartermaster clerk, and chief pay clerk shall be known and entered upon the Naval Register as "commissioned warrant officers", and all Marine Corps personnel in the warrant grades of marine gunner, quartermaster clerk, and pay clerk shall be known and entered upon the Naval Register as "warrant officers."

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in this act shall change or modify in any respect the permanent or temporary status of any officer, nor the rank, precedence, rights, benefits, privileges, pay, allowances, or emoluments to which he is, or may hereafter be, entitled.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3224) was laid on the table.

SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF DECEASED OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3225, to amend the act of May 27, 1908, as amended, authorizing settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved May 27, 1908 (35 Stat. 317), as amended (52 Stat. 352; 34 U. S. C. 941), is hereby further amended by striking out the words "five hundred" appearing in line 35, page 373, Thirty-fifth Statutes at Large, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "one thousand."

With the following committee amendment:

At the end thereof strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "and by changing the colon after the word 'stirpes' in line 47 to a period and inserting 'Where the amount due the decedent's estate is $1,000 or more and no demand is presented by a duly appointed legal representative of the estate, the accounting officers may allow $1,000 of the amount due to the estate to the widow or legal heirs in the order of precedence hereinabove set forth.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAVY AVIATION CADET ACT OF 1942 AMENDED

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3220, to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 of the Aviation Cadet Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 738, 34 U. S. C. 850k) is hereby amended by inserting after the comma following the word "Navy", in line 6, the following: "or, if no beneficiary has been specially designated, the representative of the officer's estate,".

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective from August 4, 1942.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, following the comma at the end thereof insert the following: "the widow of such officer, and if there be no widow, his child or children, and if there be neither widow nor child."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PIPE LINES FOR STEAM-HEATING PURPOSES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3208) to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, after "use" insert "not more than two."

Page 2, after line 15, insert "Any repairs to streets, highways, or other public property necessitated by construction or alterations of said pipe lines shall be made in a manner satisfactory to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, at the expense of Lansburgh and Brother."

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPLICATION OF EXCESS-PROFITS TAX TO CERTAIN PRODUCTION BONUS PAYMENTS

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2888) relating to the application of the excess-profits tax to certain production bonus payments, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

On page 3, strike out lines 11, 12, and 13, and insert:

"SEC. 4. The amendments made by this act shall be effective as if they were a part of section 209 of the Revenue Act of 1942, on the date of its enactment."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLOWANCES AND ALLOTMENTS FOR DEPENDENTS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize the family allowances, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further

consideration of the bill S. 1279, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Military Affairs in reporting the bill pending before us today stated:

> We recognize the fact that the American home is the basic institution of our social system, and that dependency is the fundamental principle underlying the statutory laws of this Government, relating to the induction of men into the armed service.

I am heartily in favor of liberalizing family allowances in order to preserve the morale of our soldier boys and their families, and in order to take away from them the fear of want.

We have today more than 11,000,000 men in military service. Our boys throughout the world are doing a splendid job. It naturally follows that those who have dependents home have been worried as to whether the allotments now provided are sufficient. With the increasing of these family allowances our soldier boys, throughout this country and throughout the world, will have that fear alleviated, which, in itself, will tend to build up their morale.

It is estimated that by the 1st of January there will be at least 5,000,000 people, relations of our soldier boys, receiving these allowances. While we all agree that the United States should curtail to the limit all unnecessary expenses not conducive to the war effort, yet I think we can further agree that the liberalizing of family allowances does not come under that category. The least we can do to show our appreciation for the splendid services of American soldier boys throughout this country and throughout the world is to do everything humanely possible to preserve their home morale by bringing aid and assistance to the men, women, and children who are dependents of these soldier boys.

This bill, or its substitute, providing for a liberalization of family allowances, should pass.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the Members on this side of the House that if there are any others to whom I can extend the same privilege I shall be pleased to do so now.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, during this war, and during the time our boys and men are fighting for liberty and freedom, our obligation and duty is to see that their wives, children, and dependents are properly cared for. We must fulfill that obligation. However, in passing legislation on this subject of making allowances for the dependents of the military personnel we must not be unmindful of the financial condition of our country and of the burden which this legislation will impose upon the people generally. We have an empty Treasury, and the huge debt that is now upon the people of this country is far beyond the contemplation of any one of us. While the measure which has been presented here by the Military Affairs Committee, of the House, strikes a median line insofar as payments to dependents are concerned. It is my firm conviction that this measure takes cognizance of the need for larger payments to dependents, and, at the same time, it has given careful consideration to the financial condition of our country and the ability to pay the added burden which this measure will impose.

Mr. Chairman, we recognize the fact that our men who are fighting on every battle front must not be faced with the fear that their families and dependents are in want. They have one supreme job, and that is to win this war, and to win it as quickly as possible. Their attention should not be diverted from that objective. And, certainly, while the men in our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps are measuring their supreme effort against a ruthless foe—while they are making that great sacrifice, and some of them have already made the supreme sacrifice by giving all—they should not be faced with a constant fear that their loved ones are in need and in want. As they go forward, we want them to know that their dependents are cared for by a grateful Nation; that their children have the things they need, and that they are having the opportunities in life to which they are so justly entitled.

On the other hand, the people of this Nation realize the frightful financial condition of our country. Those in power have charted a course which has led us into an unprecedented indebtedness, and this debt will be the obligation of all of the people in this Nation. All will have their part to pay. Those who are now serving in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps will have their portion of this terrific indebtedness to pay. This is not the debt of any one, or of any class or group—but it is the debt of every citizen of the United States of America. Every dollar that is spent now, means that the same must hereafter be repaid with interest. Every serviceman will face the burden of the payment of his part of this debt when he returns from the service. Therefore, it is entirely proper that the measure of the absolute need and necessity be taken into consideration as we debate this bill, and as we ponder over the future.

The unalterable and the undeniable facts stand before us that we will face the high tide of debt when this war is over. I for one do not want the soldiers, sailors, and marines to return to the arts and trades of civil life with an unsurmountable burden of debt upon them as long as they may live. I hope they may have presented to them the opportunity to make progress in a free land, where their ability and their experience may carry them far and that their children may have an equal opportunity to make great progress in the future. While we consider this legislation, let us approach the final hour when this question is decided with the full understanding that we do not want to shackle and manacle the hands of those who fought by adding to their future burdens greater taxes. We will remember that whatever added burden we impose here and now will increase the taxes upon every citizen in our country. The men who are working in our factories and mills, our businessmen, our farmers, and the people of every walk in life will feel the weight of this burden, as they have suffered the shock of every other tax burden which has been imposed upon the people. That burden has now reached the point where it hurts. Every dollar that is wasted, every dollar that is spent for nonessential and needless things, every dollar that is used to pay the wage or salary of a needless and unnecessary employee by the Government, every useless board, bureau, and agency of Government which is now absorbing the money and resources of our people, every useless project advocated by those in power, has resulted in an increase of our huge debt. Those in power must stop the waste, and they must put an end to extravagance; they must forever demand that $1 in value be received for each and every dollar that is spent; they must weed out the great surplus of needless and unnecessary employees now on the Federal pay roll; they must get down to business, in a businesslike way, and run our Government on a sound and economical manner. I am convinced if this policy should be adopted and followed there could be a very material decrease in spending, which would be far in excess of any amount that would be called upon to increase the pay to dependents of the men in our armed forces during this war.

Mr. Chairman, as we go forward today facing an unknown future, while we must grant that which is needed and necessary for the dependents of our fighting forces, yet we must realize that our decision will have its ultimate effect upon the people of this Nation. All must participate in the final discharge of that debt, and we must meet the obligation of our Government's payments in the light of that final day when the people—all of them—are called upon to respond.

Lastly, in the final analysis of things, we must approach this problem with the will and determination to aid the dependents and to conserve insofar as possible our resources for war. The measure which is here presented from the Military Affairs Committee meets that demand, I am convinced.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in accord with the provisions of the bill now before the Committee. This bill does partial justice to the dependents of men in the armed forces now serving on many different battlefields throughout the world.

I congratulate the Committee on Military Affairs and thank them on behalf of the men in the armed forces throughout the world and for their dependents, for bringing this measure before the Committee.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration which has for its purpose the amendments to the servicemen's dependents' allowance act of 1942 so as to liberalize family allowances, is not only important legislation, but legislation that should receive the unanimous support of every Member of the House. Many fathers have been drafted into the service and the military authorities are now demanding that pre-Pearl Harbor fathers be drafted into service along with unmarried men. This means that there will be an increased number of children of servicemen who will be without means of support in many cases. We should not only make ample provision for the care of the wives and dependents of servicemen in order that no hardships may result by reason of the breadwinner and the father being called to the colors, but also to relieve the fathers in the service of their anxiety and mental suffering and worry over the problem of support for their wives and children left at home.

In order to keep our fighting men at full efficiency and keep the morale of our men at the front at the highest point, we should by all means make certain that adequate provision is made for their dependents at home. It is my purpose to support the amendments to the committee bill, which I understand will be offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON], so that the bill as amended will conform to the recent act passed in the other body earlier this month.

The increased cost of living under war conditions has made it necessary that increases for servicemen's dependents should likewise be provided. The allowances provided in the Clason amendments are minimums that we should provide. I hope that the Clason amendments will receive the support of the House and the bill as amended will then be passed.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this bill and believe it is the least we can do for these dependent people.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 1279 as amended by the substitute favorably reported by the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, with the exception that I shall support the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON], a Republican member of the Military Affairs Committee, in order to bring the House substitute bill in line with the action taken by the Senate. The Senate bill provides $50 for the wife, $30 for the first child, and $20 for each additional child. The House substitute bill provides $50 for the wife, $25 for the first child, $20 for the second child, and $15 for each additional child. The Senate adopted its bill with the rates to the wife and children as provided in the Clason amendment by a vote of 78 to 1. I sincerely trust that this allotment bill for the dependents of our servicemen may be approved by the unanimous vote of the House. This bill makes no change in allotments to wives.

The Military Affairs Committees of the House and the Senate held extensive hearings as to the amount necessary to maintain the wife and children of our servicemen. Investigations were made in 33 of the important cities in the country, and in smaller cities and towns and in the rural sections. It would be impractical to fix various different amounts of aid to different individual wives, children and other dependents. Under such a plan the delay would be such as to deny relief to the wives, children and other dependents of our servicemen, therefore, it was necessary to arrive at allotments that would meet the general situation, and this, of course, falls somewhat less than the requirements in our large cities and in some of our smaller cities, and it might be a little more than is really necessary in the rural sections of the country.

This legislation has been brought about by reason of the decision of the administration and those in charge of our armed forces to draft large numbers of fathers and to eliminate the deferment of men on account of dependents. This increase in rates is largely due to the fact that we will have hundreds of thousands and perhaps a million or more fathers in the service. Their wives and children must be cared for, and inasmuch as fathers and others will be drafted regardless of dependents, it is up to the Congress to provide adequate allotments to wives, children, and dependent parents, sisters, and brothers. Under the present law there can be no allotment for dependents of soldiers and sailors in the first, second, and third grades. These three grades must take care of their own dependents. This allotment law does not apply to officers in the Army or Navy. It applies solely and only to the several grades of enlisted men and women. Under the existing law, the dependents of soldiers and sailors in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades are allowed dependency benefits. This would include buck privates up to and including the line sergeants, with comparable grades in the Navy. This amendment will grant benefits to staff, technical, master, and first sergeants, provided that they forego the $1.25 per day for quarters allowance for dependents, and it is likely that all or practically all of our servicemen in the first, second, and third grades will take advantage of this amendment. The law is further amended by allowing the children of divorced parents $42 for the first child and $20 for the second child. Under the present law the children of divorced parents could not receive any more than the court had fixed in divorce proceedings for their support. We have cases in our own district where children are allowed not more than $5 each per month. This amendment places them on the same footing as children whose parents are not divorced. If the court in a divorce proceeding granted alimony to the wife, and the judgment of the court is still in force, the ex-wife under this measure would draw an allotment not to exceed $42 per month, but if in the divorce proceeding she received no alimony, she will be entitled to no dependency benefits under this act. If the children of the divorced parents are not living with their mother, then the person who has them in custody would be entitled to receive these benefits for their care and support. There are three classes of dependents:

a. Wives and children.

b. Parents, brothers, and sisters.

b–1. Parents, brothers, and sisters.

The reason we have b and b–1 is that in administering the Dependency Act the parents, sisters, and brothers come under section b, provided they are dependent upon the serviceman for a substantial portion of their support, and it is held that substantial portion means 30 percent or more and less than 50 percent of dependency. Class b–1 includes the parents, or either of them, and the brothers and sisters, or either or all of them, who are dependent upon the serviceman for the chief portion of support. It has been held by those administering the dependency laws that the words "chief portion" means more than 50 percent—in fact, as much as 56 percent. Class b dependent or dependents are payable only when there is no allowance payable to class b–1 dependents, and class b cannot receive more than $37 per month. Class b–1 dependent or dependents are allowed $50 to a parent where there is no brother or sister; two parents with no brother or sister will receive $68; one parent and one brother or sister $68, and $11 for each additional brother or sister; two parents and one brother or sister $79, with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister; brother or sister but no parent $42, with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister.

This bill makes another change in the present dependency law. When a man is inducted into the Army or Navy, he at once makes a list of his dependents and the checks are sent out during that same month and within a few days after his induction to the dependents of the enlisted man; this is for his first month's service and nothing is taken out of his pay. Of course, the wife and children will not have to show dependency, but the parents and brothers and sisters must at once establish their dependency or they will not receive these benefits in the future. The plan of taking care of the dependents of the servicemen during the first month is made necessary because of the delay that has followed the present plan. In my experience we have found many wives, children, and other dependents going for months before they receive any allotment checks, and thousands of wives, children, and other dependents had to depend upon public charity waiting for their dependency benefits to come in. I think this is a most desirable amendment. Only those who have been called from their families and homes and

work, business, and professions can fully appreciate what it means to be taken away suddenly and remain away from their loved ones for a year or several years, and to have their lives and plans disrupted, and how many of us can fully appreciate the grief, loneliness, and despair of the wives, children, and other dependents who are left behind. Our fighting men should be made to feel that this great Government is providing ample care and protection for their wives, children, and dependent fathers and mothers. They should not have to worry over their loved ones being the objects of public charity and wanting in the necessaries of life. This measure should greatly bolster the morale of our fighting men in this great and bloody war. We cannot do less than provide this care and help for their loved ones, and I indulge the hope that not a single vote will be cast against this bill with the Clason amendment incorporated in it.

Mr. Chairman and colleagues, today the Unanimous Consent Calendar was called and among the other bills called were two bills, one H. R. 3377, to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans of World War No. 1 from $40 to $50 and $60 per month. There was one objection made to the consideration of that bill today. Under the present law World War veterans who are now totally disabled to work and follow a gainful occupation are receiving $40 per month. H. R. 3377 provides they are to have an increase in pension to $50 per month, and it further provides where such veterans have been rated permanent and total and in receipt of a pension for a continuous period of 10 years or reach the age of 65 years the amount of pension shall be $60 per month. These are all veterans who served honorably and helped to win World War No. 1.

In order to receive the $40 per month they must be totally disabled to follow any gainful occupation and in order to receive $60 per month they must be rated permanent and total and draw a pension for a continuous period of 10 years or must be permanently and totally disabled and have attained the age of 65.

Most of these disabled veterans have families, and under the greatly increased cost of living $40 per month is grossly inadequate. They must have an increase or they must be the objects of public charity. We cannot afford to permit these men who contributed so much in winning World War No. 1 to become the objects of public charity, and I trust that the House Rules Committee will grant a special rule so that this measure and H. R. 3356 may come up at an early date for consideration.

There was also called H. R. 3356, to provide a small increase in the monthly rates of pension payable to disabled veterans with service-connected disabilities and to widows and children of deceased veterans. This measure would grant a 15-percent increase in pension for these veterans. In order to secure this increase they must have served honorably in World War No. 1 or World War No. 2 and must have received wounds or other disabilities in the service entitling them to compensation. This measure would also grant a small increase to widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars No. 1 and No. 2. A widow with no child, $35; a widow and one child, $45, with $5 for each additional child; no widow but one child, $18; no widow but two children, $27, equally divided; no widow but three children, $36, equally divided, with $4 for each additional child, the total amount to be equally divided.

These are widows and children of veterans of World Wars No. 1 or No. 2, both whose death was due to disability contracted in service in line of duty or who received disabilities in the service in line of duty. These widows and children cannot exist under the high cost of living without some increase of their compensation or pensions, and this is a very modest increase.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman does not understand, does he, that the World War veterans are concerned with this bill at all?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am referring to the two bills—H. R. 3377 and H. R. 3356—brought up by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], chairman of the World War Veterans' Committee, which bills were objected to on the floor of the House today. I think those increases ought to be given.

Our distinguished colleague, Mr. DISNEY, a Democrat of Oklahoma, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, according to a press report in a speech in Birmingham, Ala., on October 15, 1943, stated "We are spending money with raving insanity." Another distinguished Democrat of the State stated some days ago that the spending of this administration has no parallel in history, and a distinguished Republican Senator recently pointed out that there had been appropriated by the Congress for lend-lease sixty-three billion; eighteen billion given to the President to spend on lend-lease, and an additional forty-five billion dispensed by the Army and Navy in materials and services to other countries, and it now appears that Congress has voted more than three hundred and thirty billion for war purposes. We still have the vicious and indefensible cost-plus contracts. The press carried a story and report a few days ago of one concern having made 3,000 percent in profits on a ship deal with the Government, and a defense plant having made more than 1,760 percent in profits on a single contract, but these enormous sums of money are not going to the defenders of our country and their dependents. If we can give away sixty-three billion to other countries, we should not hesitate to provide for our own defenders, their wives, children, and other dependents, and should not refuse to grant an increase to these disabled defenders and to the widows and orphans of those who have passed on. We shall be discharging our debt of gratitude to them and the money will remain in our own country. At the same time, it will strengthen the morale of our boys in the service. It will be an inspiration for them to know that this great country will not forget its defenders and their dependents.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

WHO WANTS AND ADVOCATES THE SALES TAX AND WHY

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended by S. 1279, further increasing allowances and allotments at an estimated cost of approximately $685,000,000, will increase the total allowances to the wives and children and dependents of the personnel of our armed forces to about $2,000,000,000. I fully appreciate that this is a large sum of money, but never, during my long service, have I advocated a more meritorious and deserving bill. I feel and all of us should feel that the approximately 3,000,000 men overseas, on the seas, and in the air, instead of being softies, as has often been charged, are the bravest, best trained, and most determined men serving in any of the armed forces of the world today. They are fighting not only for the preservation of our liberty, freedom, and our institutions, but are fighting for humanity so that future generations will not suffer the anguish and horrors of and be obliged to give their lives in another war. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I have no words with which to express my resentment against the financial beneficiaries of this war—the war profiteers—who months ago banded together and through the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and other organizations, using certain newspapers, magazines, and other forms of publicity, and through their spokesmen in the House and on its committees, are advocating a 10-percent sales tax which, if enacted, will save them from contributing a small part of their great gains, profits, and reserves toward the payment of allowances and allotments to the wives, children, and dependents of our servicemen.

BIG CORPORATIONS CONDUCT PRESSURE CAMPAIGN TO DEFEAT ANY NATIONAL TAX PROGRAM EXCEPT 10-PERCENT SALES TAX

Mr. Chairman, there is documentary evidence that the big corporations of America decided months ago to conduct a pressure campaign among Representatives and Senators to defeat any national tax program except a 10-percent sales levy. It shows that over 9,000 heads of the biggest corporations of the Nation were asked by the National Association of Manufacturers to bring pressure on all Members of Congress during the recess; that President F. C. Crawford, of the National Association of Manufacturers, addressed these same 9,000 corporation heads August 16, sending each an outline of legislation the association wants passed, including its tax program; that a meeting of the Government Finance Committee and Tax Council,

United States Chamber of Commerce, and other organizations, met in Chicago September 20 under the auspices of the association to outline the tax fight. The resolutions adopted at that meeting called for forced savings, notwithstanding that the large corporations are spending millions for unnecessary newspaper, magazine, radio, and billboard advertising which they can deduct from their income or excess-profits taxes.

Then again on September 24 and 25 the board of directors of the National Association of Manufacturers met in Hot Springs and immediately sent out a confidential memorandum that in general all the big business interests of the Nation have been lined up secretly by the National Association of Manufacturers to use its pressure in Congress to put through its sales tax, rather than accept any other measure which might shift the burden of taxation onto the corporations and require them to pay their share.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, they are urging and attempting to force the passage of a sales-tax measure so that the moneys needed for servicemen's family allowances and allotments and other moneys needed for the prosecution of the war will be unloaded upon those who are already overtaxed and least able to pay. And please remember that most of these 9,000 corporation heads are receiving salaries ranging from $50,000 to $750,000 a year, saying nothing of the bonuses and dividends they receive and profits which they derive from their holdings. Yes; this is the same group that defeated President Roosevelt's recommendations to limit incomes to $68,000 a year, and they also opposed and defeated the plan for the filing of single or separate income-tax returns which would have netted the Government $500,000,000. It is the same group which defeated the proposed legislation for the recovery of approximately $300,000,000 from the mining companies which they had unjustly received for depreciation. Again they joined with financiers and bankers, under the leadership of Ruml, and got away with 75 percent of their income taxes.

I say now, Mr. Chairman, that the action of these approximately 9,100 manufacturers in cooperating with the National Association of Manufacturers and joining with the representatives of organizations acting in behalf of persons of high income and wealth, in advocating a sales tax, is tantamount to a refusal on their part to make a just contribution to share the cost of the war.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Treasury has made recommendations for the imposition of further taxes in the raising of $10,000,000,000 and suggested how this sum should be raised, and I feel that it is a fair recommendation. But the gentlemen from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], who advocates a sales tax, charges that this recommendation would aid the lowest-paid wage earners in being exempted in the paying of the Victory tax. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Virginia Mr. ROBERTSON also advocate a sales tax.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that I actually believe that the advocates of the sales tax cannot in justice urge this tax or lend an ear to the selfish appeal of these avaricious war profiteers.

I have read the statement of the Chairman of the United States Chamber of Commerce which has been advocating this tax monstrosity, and had I been a member of the Committee on Ways and Means before whom he offered his testimony, I would have asked him if it were not a fact that $42,000,000,000 has been put in reserve by the manufacturers and businessmen of this country in banks and depositories as a reserve for post-war reconversion. I would have further asked if it is not a fact that a large majority of these manufacturers have not already expended tremendous sums of monies in preparation for the reconversion of their plants to produce civilian requirements after the war, and whether such amounts are not being charged to the present cost of production? I would also have asked him whether it is not a fact that nearly all of these 9,100 manufacturers for whom he has spoken have not increased their profits from 50 to 200 percent, exceeding their profits in the banner year of 1929. This increase in profits has taken place notwithstanding the crocodile tears they have shed and their charge that they have been handicapped in their production operations by the Government. Oh, I wonder, if the renegotiation act had not been passed, and they had been left to their own free operation, how much more they would have mulcted from the Government.

Due to their being so grossly absorbed in making more and more money and accumulating greater surpluses, I fear they are not aware of the fact, or are indifferent to it, that we have over 22,000,000 people in our country who are earning less than $20 a week, and another twelve or thirteen million who are earning from $20 to $38 a week. For their information, I quote from an official report issued by the Bureau of Statistics, Department of Labor, which partially sets forth the number of employees in varying wage classifications, with their yearly earnings. It follows:

With wage or salary income, 1939	Present estimated wage or income (25 percent)	Total persons
$100 to $199	$250	2,920,280
$200 to $399	475	5,624,980
$400 to $599	750	4,757,900
$600 to $799	1,000	4,801,780
$800 to $999	1,250	3,739,500

Mr. Chairman, repeating from these figures, as will be observed, there are approximately 22,000,000 persons earning less than $1,000 a year, or $20 a week. Conceding that the wages and salaries of these low-paid workers have increased 25 percent since 1939, we still would have approximately 20,000,000 people earning less than $25 a week. To this number must be added the dependents of 9,000,000 soldiers, sailors, marines, Coast Guard men, and members of the auxiliary branches of our armed services. The allowances and allotments of these dependents are fixed and inflexible. With the ever-increasing cost of living this past year the dependents of those in our armed services find it almost impossible to exist and many wives with children, and aged mothers and fathers, who are more or less incapacitated, have been compelled to obtain employment. I ask, How can this deserving group exist or live half decently if they are compelled to pay a 10-percent sales tax?

Mr. Chairman, others who would suffer great hardship if subjected to a sales tax are the nearly 2,000,000 aged persons on State and public-assistance rolls; 1,000,000 disabled veterans and their dependents; 153,000 retired and disabled firemen, policemen, State and municipal employees; 53,000 blind persons; 700,000 retired workers, widows, and young children receiving social-insurance payments under the old-age and survivor insurance program of the United States Social Security Board; and the more than 400,000 persons who are drawing fixed annuities for which they had put away their savings during many years.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the sales-tax advocates are aware that even in the smallest of towns it costs a family of 4 over $1,200 a year to live. I have here the figures on the cost of living in 33 of our larger cities, and it shows the lowest cost is in Mobile, Ala., which is $1,424, and for the other 32 cities the range is upward to $1,758 for San Francisco and New York City, followed by Washington, D. C., Detroit, and Chicago. Of course, Mr. Chairman, the families of the sales-tax advocates are not as large as those of the wage earners, whose families in most instances average 5 or 6, and even 7, and frequently the parents of the husband or wife live with them. I insert the cost-of-living figures for the 33 cities, as follows:

Cost of living for family of 4 in 33 cities of the United States, Dec. 14, 1942

Atlanta, Ga	$1,580
Baltimore, Md	1,594
Birmingham, Ala	1,542
Boston, Mass	1,691
Buffalo, N. Y	1,593
Chicago, Ill	1,718
Cincinnati, Ohio	1,612
Cleveland, Ohio	1,690
Denver, Colo	1,549
Detroit, Mich	1,723
Houston, Tex	1,540
Indianapolis, Ind	1,554
Jacksonville, Fla	1,594
Kansas City, Mo	1,506
Los Angeles, Calif	1,602
Manchester, N. H	1,634
Memphis, Tenn	1,593
Milwaukee, Wis	1,651
Minneapolis, Minn	1,660
Mobile, Ala	1,454
New Orleans, La	1,543
New York, N. Y	1,758
Norfolk, Va	1,652
Philadelphia, Pa	1,601
Pittsburgh, Pa	1,642
Portland, Maine	1,636
Portland, Oreg	1,641
Richmond, Va	1,589
St. Louis, Mo	1,655
San Francisco, Calif	1,758
Scranton, Pa	1,640
Seattle, Wash	1,670
Washington, D. C	1,757

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the high living costs in the cities, I insert some official figures on food prices which have continuously risen since 1939 and which account for 40 percent of the increased cost of living to the city dweller. They are as follows:

Percent of increase in food prices

Commodity	Quantity	Jan. 1, 1941	Sept. 15, 1942	Today	Percentage
Chicken	Pound	0.21	0.29	0.44	104
Cabbage	Pound	.02	.03	.05	150
Apples	Pound	.04	.04	.12	200
Tomatoes (canned)	Can	.04	.05	.10	150
Oranges	Dozen	.15	.19	.45	200
Butter	Pound	.30	.49	.56	86
Pork chops	Pound	.23	.31	.52	120
Eggs	Dozen	.27	.33	.60	122
Coffee	1-pound bag	.13	.20	.26	100
Spaghetti	Pound	.07	.08	.15	114
Tomatoes (fresh)	Pound	.03	.04	.10	233
Beans	Pound	.05	.09	.11	120
Potatoes	Pound	.04	.04	.06	50

Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the increase in the cost of living to the families of wage earners residing in cities, the leaders of most of the farm organizations and many Members of Congress, wishing to demonstrate their influence and interest in the growers of food products, assail and attack the Office of Price Administration and insist that the price ceilings be increased or eliminated and this, despite the fact that the farmers themselves do not seek it. They, themselves, realize and appreciate the fact that today they are receiving from 50 to 300 percent more for their products, and never have been more prosperous in the history of our country. The country banks show tremendous gains in deposits in farmers' savings accounts and this condition applies from one end of the country to the other.

Mr. Chairman, the imposition of a 10-percent sales tax would not affect the farmers to any great degree because with few exceptions they raise nearly everything they need for food. Those items which they are obliged to buy—whether farm machinery, shoes, clothes, and so forth—have increased in cost but 25 percent. If the farm group succeeds in having the price ceilings eliminated, the already exhorbitant prices of foodstuffs will go still higher and will tend to bring, as is recognized by all economists, dreaded inflation.

In such event all forced gains and profits will not inure to the farmers' advantage because the value of the dollar which has been protected by the President will surely be reduced and the situation will be akin to what happened in the First World War to the German mark. Consequently, do the farmers not realize that, with the imposition of a sales tax, the greedy and avaricious groups—whether manufacturers or businessmen belonging to the organizations I have mentioned—would escape paying higher income or excess-profits taxes on the biggest incomes and profits they have ever enjoyed in the history of our country, and the sales tax, instead of being beneficial, will be detrimental not only to the farmers but to the entire Nation, and, especially, to the underpaid wage earners of our cities.

Mr. Chairman, I have received, and I take it other Members have also, appeals from Mr. A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, from Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and from Mr. Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and many others, justly protesting against the imposition of a sales tax. I have called attention to the fact that if such a tax law were enacted the 33,000,000 persons in the United States whose earnings or incomes are less than $2,000 a year will demand that their earnings be increased in order that they may be able to sustain themselves. In view of that I urge that the Members of this body be not led astray by this coterie of wealthy gentlemen who thus far have sacrificed nothing compared to the sacrifices of our brave fighting men on our far-flung fronts in all parts of the world who are undergoing indescribable hardships and the tortures of hell, or to the toiling and sweating men and women who are giving their all-out efforts in maintaining production schedules in our war plants.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I repeat the words of the late distinguished Tom L. Johnson, mayor of Cleveland, Ohio, and a Member of this House, who said:

Let us tax the people on what they have, rather than on what they need.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side, approximately 20 minutes, to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, today we are considering an increase in allotments and benefits to the dependents of men in the armed services of the United States. It is impossible to discuss this question without at the same time considering the drafting of pre-war fathers. These two questions are so intertwined, correlated, and interrelated that it is impossible to consider the one without considering the other. They are not two different questions, but like the two sides of a coin, they are two sides of the same thing, the heads and tails of the whole problem. As I have often said, no pancake is so flat that it does not have two sides. So I am hoping to give full and fair consideration to both sides of this controversial issue. Of course the House has put the cart before the horse. We should consider the drafting of fathers before allotments.

Mr. Chairman, that the manpower problem in the United States is in a miserable mess all will admit, and no one can deny.

Who is responsible for the tragic predicament in which we now find ourselves? The American people? Certainly not. Because the American people instead of being complacent about this war are most conscious of it. They are the ones who are paying the bill, doing the fighting and dying, and in many instances they have been far ahead of Government officials in Washington. Parents back home, whose sons had daughters are fighting and dying in order to keep our country safe and free, are painfully conscious that we are in a war that is taxing our strength to its limit. The American people today are taking orders and not giving them. It is evident they are not responsible for the present manpower muddle. Never blame the people for what their representatives should do.

Is the Congress responsible for our sorrowful plight? Perhaps to some extent, but not wholly so. Surely Congress cannot be blamed because it has voted this administration practically every power and all the money it has asked for. It has bent over backwards to go along with this administration in order that we might bring this war to a quick and successful close. This is but the wish of the people.

Who, then, is responsible for the present manpower chaos? This administration, with its overlapping bureaus, its duplication of agencies, and the conflicting statements and contradictory orders that they daily give. However much good and intelligent men may differ on the question of drafting pre-war fathers, all will agree that the uncertainty which hangs like a pall over the heads of these fathers should immediately end. They now cannot plan 1 day ahead.

When the War Manpower issues an order today and the Selective Service issues a different order tomorrow, and the next day the Army and Navy ask for something else, the time has come when we must have a unified and centralized manpower control vested with absolute authority and complete responsibility in a single head. We must stop pulling against each other and pull with each other, if we want to take the cheapest and quickest road to victory.

Mr. Chairman, we should be reluctant to criticize at such a time as this; in such a critical hour we should be charitable and tolerant with those who differ from us. The manpower problem covers not only the numerical size of our Army, Navy, and Air Forces, but it must necessarily take into consideration the men and women who work on farms, in forests, mines, mills, and factories to produce the weapons of war and the food and fiber with which to feed and clothe our Army, as well as our civilian population and our allies. The problem is a big, complex, and difficult one, which perhaps can never reach a wholly satisfactory, and certainly not a perfect solution. For this very reason it must have our most earnest, rational, and prayerful consideration.

The successes of our armed forces thus far in air, on land, on sea, and under the sea have proved that the strategy of our Allied command has been sound. It should give us renewed confidence in their leadership. It should make us eternally grateful for their achievements. With all their errors, they have won the first few rounds—but the fight is not yet over. We still have many rounds to go—and it is always the last round that counts.

No civilian, including Members of Congress, should act as an armchair strategist or a parlor tactician in fighting this war. The struggle on the field of battle and in areas of combat must necessarily be left to those experts who have been trained for and who are experienced in the art and science of warfare. Mr. Chairman, this war is as different from the first World War as that war was from the Civil War. We are living in a highly technical and scientific age. Only in those men who have lived and fought in this war should we put our trust. I place my faith in the doctors who are the generals and admirals, who, in spite of all their shortcomings and mistakes, are better prepared than I am to fight this war. They know the score; they are acquainted with the technicalities; they are versed in the problems; by intuition, inclination, training, experience, and knowledge they know this whole problem—modern, complex, and scientific—much better than I know it. I do not want to follow Members of the House, the Senate, the President's staff, the Supreme Court, Wendell Willkie, the Chamber of Commerce, the C. I. O., the National Manufacturers Association, or any other group. The Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are my doctors. Let no one, uneducated, young, and inexperienced, nor old men versed in other realms, dare tell them what to do.

But because of the very wide and complex nature of the over-all manpower problem, the generals and admirals alone cannot win this war. The trained captains of industry supplying the guns, planes, tanks, and ships, the foremen in mines producing the raw ore out of which the implements of war are made, the experienced farmers who know how to farm to produce the food and other by-products of war, are just as essential to the winning of this savage struggle in which we are now engaged.

Marshall and King, MacArthur and Halsey, Arnold and Eisenhower, and all the other gallant commanders should be given, and have been given, the authority and responsibility of conducting this war from the professional militarists' point of view. However, as the President, our Commander in Chief, has clearly and correctly pointed out on various occasions, the home front cannot be divorced from the battle front in this war. It is an all-out effort that requires the full and harmonious cooperation of our entire population. No chain is ever stronger than its weakest link, and the battle front can never be stronger than the home front. Remember, the moral collapse of Germany on the home front in 1918 preceded her military defeat. We are hoping that history will repeat itself.

Members of Congress, as well as others at home, I dare say, are as familiar, if not more so, with the urgent needs of our people on the home front as are any of the admirals or generals. They can learn from us as we can learn from them. We are just as anxious as they are to win this war in the shortest possible time, with the least expenditure of men and money. The problem of manpower is not so much one of procurement as it is of proper distribution and efficient utilization. On that question Members of Congress can perhaps speak with as full knowledge and with as wise judgment as the military leaders themselves whose energies and efforts are necessarily directed to their particular theater in this war. It is our contention, sir, that if full and efficient utilization were made of our present manpower we would not be forced to draft pre-war fathers.

Mr. Chairman, this afternoon I shall attempt to answer, in all too brief a time and in a very humble way, two most important questions that now confront the American people:

First. Shall we draft pre-Pearl Harbor fathers?

Second. If fathers are to be drafted what will be the compensation of their wives, children, and other dependents?

In spite of all the testimony I have heard, and the hearings that I have read, I am convinced, sir, that pre-war fathers should not be drafted at this time. Perhaps this is not popular, but I would rather be right than popular—and I shall give you the reasons for my position.

At this present hour we have 7,300,000 men in the Army of the United States. More than 2,000,000 of these men are now abroad, approximately the same number we had in the last World War. This leaves more than 5,000,000 men in the Army in continental United States. At least half of these men have been in the Army from 1 to 2 years, and many are growing stale from inactivity. It requires 6 tons of shipping to get one soldier abroad and 2 tons a week to keep him supplied. All the shipping in the world could not transport such an Army. Not more than 2,500,000 could be transported next year. That would leave two and one-half million at home. General Marshall testified before we entered the war that 500,000 were all who were needed to defend continental United States. Today fewer men are needed at home. Why should we induct more men into the armed forces when we already have a surplus of them? Soldiers in trains, in camps, in streets, in our cities could well be used to help on the home front, where we have such a sad shortage of manpower.

Mr. Chairman, I am not holding any brief for the pool-hall loafer, the curbstone warmer, or the ne'er-do-well who shirks his duty, and I naturally wonder, with many others, why so many men inducted are returned home when everyone knows they are capable of doing at least limited service. At this point I want to say that our civilian population should hesitate before criticizing young men of military age who are not in the armed services. Many of them are disabled and have been rejected. Many others are employed on the farm and in war industries that are just as essential as being a soldier. Personally, I feel that these young men are contributing as much to the winning of the war as any man in uniform and should receive some kind of insignia which would designate that they are doing their full share in order that they might escape the stigma, the opprobrium and criticism that might be offered against them by the unthinking public. They are not trying to hide behind a machine in the factory or a cow on the farm. They are doing their part.

Mr. Chairman, my chief reason for thinking that it is not now necessary to draft pre-war fathers is based upon three careful and thoughtful considerations:

First. The Government has been hoarding manpower. The Costello committee has pointed out that there are thousands of young men, single and eligible for draft, who, in spite of their eligibility are now employed by the Federal Government. Let us weed out these bureaucrats.

Second. Private industry has been hoarding manpower, due to the cost-plus-fixed-fee contract, which Congress long ago condemned, but it has not yet been ended. The bigger the contract, the bigger the fee, and while there was some excuse at the beginning of the program for this sort of contract, it no longer exists. Pools of laborers have been held on when they should have been in uniform and everyone knows it.

Third. The armed forces themselves have hoarded and wasted manpower. There is no excuse today to have pools of officers uncalled, or for lieutenants and captains to have private chauffeurs drive them around Washington and different Army cantonments. Even a Congressman is capable of driving his own car.

Mr. Chairman, I know that in a program so gigantic, moving with such speed as the one that has been thrust upon us, there is bound to be waste, extravagance, and, in some cases, fraud, We have been tolerant, sir, with all of these mistakes because we are human and know that others are human. But the time has arrived when we must say that if all the American people must pay for this war, they at least want their money's worth. This is not selfishness; it is just good business.

Mr. Chairman, while in my own mind I am convinced that the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers is not now necessary, I want it understood that I shall not disagree with our Chief of Staff. Has General Marshall ever said that he wanted pre-Pearl Harbor fathers drafted? No. Neither he nor any of his associates have ever asked that fathers be drafted. Indeed, they prefer single to married men. And they want them under 30. All that they have demanded is that we have an Army of 7,700,000 men. My contention is if we have a full and efficient utilization of the manpower now in the Government, in the armed forces, in private industry, and our civilian population, we will not need to call fathers. Let us hesitate to break up the homes in America and add to the alarming increase in juvenile crime. The moment you draft fathers, you will pay these men twice as much as you would a single man. But honest dollars in these days are not to be considered.

For myself I want it thoroughly understood that I hold no particular brief for fathers or for any other group of our American citizenry. Indeed, sir, I have seriously questioned in my own mind whether or not the deferment of any particular group is advisable, or the de-

ferment of an individual because he is a member of a particular group. I know that the fathers of this country are as willing or even as anxious to fight as any other citizen. Why? They have wives and children to fight for—more than the single men and they want to do it if they are needed.

In all of my contacts in and outside my district, in my State, and throughout the Nation, they have not asked to be deferred. But if they are drafted, Mr. Speaker, you can put it down that I am going to vote for a most liberal allowance to support their dependents. War is expensive and we all pay for it. I do not like to pay taxes, but if the fathers of this country are drafted, then I shall insist with my voice and my vote that their wives, children, and dependent parents shall receive something above starvation allowances. They will never receive what they justly deserve.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I want to say this. We have the best-fed Army in the world, the best-clothed, the best-housed, the best-trained, and the best-equipped. Congress has not acted in a niggardly way. If we pass the House bill as we reported it, it will add $645,000,000 annually to the pay roll, and that is more money than the Veterans' Bureau is now spending on all the veterans and their dependents of the first World War.

Mr. Chairman, it is painful but it is just. Let us cut down on lend-lease and take care of our own. Charity begins at home. This is not charity but only fair dealing.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH].

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, I approve of this legislation. I shall vote not only for the bill but also for the amendment which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] tells us he will offer when the bill is read for amendment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, this bill was considered very thoroughly before the Committee on Military Affairs. I was not in agreement with the amount of the allotment that was placed in the bill before the committee. The sentiment as to an increase was pretty evenly divided. I am of the same opinion still, that the least we can do would be to make an allotment by the Government to the families of those who are making the fight to preserve our democracy in keeping with the best living standards of America. I am convinced that an allowance of $50 to the wife, with $30 for the first child and $20 for each additional child, is just and not excessive.

As I listened to a witness this morning, speaking of the waste that is going on in this Government and of the kickbacks on renegotiations, I thought that if this Congress stays behind one Lindsay Warren enough will be saved to take care of the families of our patriots.

In reading the Holdenville Daily News yesterday there came to my attention an article about a Martha, Okla., marine who lost 25 pounds during a 5-day naval battle. This young marine's name is Pvt. Royce Doughty. He saw action in 14 major naval engagements. He appeared before the Altus Rotary Club and said:

> There's not a man on the fighting front who wouldn't be glad to come home and work in a war plant or coal mine for three meals a day and a bunk to sleep in.

He further said—

> I don't believe any of the war workers would strike or lay off their job for a single day again if they could experience a bombing raid and see men falling dead all around them. But you can't tell anybody what it's like out there. They've just got to go through it themselves to know what we're talking about when we get back home.

We have had occasion to meet several of our soldiers, marines in particular, from the Southwest Pacific. In each case we did not have to ask the question to see what these marines had gone through. It was physically evident upon every occasion.

I shall cast my vote for the Clason amendment for a larger allotment to take care of the families of those in the service and the married men with large families who in all probability are soon to be called to the colors.

Organized labor, big business, and industry are really getting along, but a different condition exists with the armed forces and their families and the farmers and cattlemen of the Nation, and it is indeed a privilege on my part to vote for the amendment to raise the family allotment by the Government of soldiers' families.

There is no comparison in the income of a soldier, marine, or a sailor and that of a defense and public worker than there is in day and night.

The news item appearing in the Holdenville News is as follows:

WOULD BE NO STRIKES IF WORKERS COULD SEE BATTLE, MARINE SAYS

ALTUS, OKLA.—A Martha, Okla., marine lost 25 pounds during a 5-day naval battle in the Pacific, he told the Rotary Club here while home on furlough.

Pvt. Royce Doughty saw action in 14 major naval engagements. The theme of his talk was a plea for labor not to strike during the time of war.

"There's not a man on the fighting front who wouldn't be glad to come home and work in a war plant or coal mine for three meals a day and a bunk to sleep in," said Doughty. "I don't believe any of the war workers would strike or lay off their job for a single day again if they could experience a bombing raid and see men falling dead all around them. But you can't tell anybody what it's like out there. They've just got to go through it themselves to know what we're talking about when we get back home."

Doughty was aboard an aircraft carrier that was engaged 5 days and nights in a running encounter. There was little time to eat or sleep; he lost 25 pounds in weight.

At one time, the Oklahoma marine didn't see land for 5 months.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I have heard with interest the remarks of the gallant and distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], but I must emphatically though reluctantly take issue with him. I believe the question of drafting pre-Pearl Harbor fathers must reside in the realm of military necessity. I cannot possibly gage the logic or the illogic of the drafting of those fathers. That is for the military to decide. We must have faith in General Marshall. He deplores delay in drafting fathers. I cannot question his judgment, his integrity of purpose. But there is something whose logic or illogic I can gage, and that is whether we are going to allow the fathers, pre-Pearl Harbor or otherwise, to be drafted with the fear and trepidation in their hearts that their loved ones will not be properly taken care of. Draft fathers, but concomitantly provide adequately for the wives and children left behind.

I shall vote for this bill because it in a measure does take care of the loved ones of those drafted fathers. I do not, however, believe it goes far enough. It may be that some wives are wealthy and may not be dependent upon the allowances the husbands may or must make to them; but that is neither here nor there. We must treat all the wives and all the husbands alike. That is the democratic way. If some millionaires may profit thereby, that is just too bad.

The tables of the standards of living that appear in the hearings on page 60 indicate the woeful inadequacy of the present allotments to the wives and families of these fathers. There we find the estimated monthly cost of living for a wife and child at maintenance level in 33 large cities as of December 15, 1942. The present allowance of $62.50 for a wife and child when compared with the monthly budgets indicated on page 60 indeed show the woeful inadequacy of the amounts we allot at the present time. In those cities a wife and child, for example, could not adequately maintain themselves on $62.50 per month. The minimum requirement in Baltimore is $79. The minimum requirement in Chicago is $85.18; in Detroit it is $85.36; in New York it is $87.10; in St. Louis it is $82.05; in San Francisco it is $87.19. And these figures for minimum subsistence for a wife and child in these cities do not take into consideration illness, accidents, ordinary insurance, education, books, magazines, sales tax, entertainment, bills for dentists, infant, and maternal care.

Some have said that we should only make the allowance where the wife and children are proven dependents, so that the well-to-do would not get the same allowance as those poorer in circumstances. Where should the line be drawn? Administratively, it would be most difficult to draw any line. All must be treated alike—rich and poor, citizen and alien, tall and short, fat and lean. The allotments are really a part of the soldiers' pay and the pay must, in all instances, be alike. Some wives are working and thus unduly benefit, but what of that? That is their privilege. It is the case of the greatest good for the greatest number.

Some have said that we should make different allotments depending upon geography. It is colder and more expensive to live in the North. In the South living standards are lower. Differences

obtain in urban sections. It is cheaper to live in rural sections. It would be utterly inconceivable to set up all these different kinds of standards.

Support for the families should not be mere lip service. It must be at adequate levels.

The Clason amendment which will be offered, I believe, would present adequate levels, and I shall vote for that amendment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time. I wish to caution the membership again on the question of the expense of this legislation. You have already heard the figures, but it is appropriate that I should at this time repeat that the Senate bill as passed and sent to the House increased the previous allowances of the dependents of our fighting men of all groups and all classifications. The House then considered the measure, and again increased the allowances over that which the Senate had allowed. Then we will be confronted when we come to read the bill under the 5-minute rule with some two or three proposals to again increase the amount, and I shall now call attention to what those increases mean if the amendments that are to be proposed should be adopted. I do not have the figures on the Clason proposal, but I do have them from the Bureau and the War Department on the Sadowski amendment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the difference between the Senate bill and the House bill?

Mr. MAY. The difference between the Senate bill and the House bill is that the Senate authorizes an increase of $394,656,000. The House bill proposes an increase of $659,752,000, or a difference between the two of $350,952,000.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. THOMASON. I think the gentleman from Kentucky is mistaken about the figures. I think the figures the gentleman desires are in the Senate bill which came to us the other day, and not the bill amended by the committee.

Mr. MAY. We have not considered the bill passed the other day. This is the original bill. The one passed before the Congress recessed.

Mr. THOMASON. I think the gentleman asked the question about the difference in the cost of the Senate bill, meaning the bill passed the other day as an amendment to the fathers draft bill.

Mr. DONDERO. What I mean is the amount asked for by the Senate bill as compared with the amount in the committee bill reported by the committee of which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is the chairman.

Mr. MAY. The difference is $350,952,000, and that is the amount that we increased it above the Senate bill, up to $659,752,000 above existing law. Under the Sadowski proposal, the increase over the Senate bill as originally passed by the Senate will be $1,301,410,000. In view of the fact that it is already costing the Government more than a billion dollars, then, if we adopt the Sadowski amendment or the Clason amendment, which is half way between the committee bill and the Sadowski amendment, we will have put on the Government more than two billion of cost each year, and as fathers are inducted, it will gradually increase until after a while we will be paying probably by the end of this year five times what the Government is expending for the Veterans' Administration for all of our World War veterans.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Is it not a fact that the House bill is $10 a month less for a wife and two children than the Senate bill?

Mr. MAY. It is $10 less than the proposed Senate bill, which the Senate tacked onto the Bailey-Clark Senate substitute for the Wheeler bill to defer drafting of fathers.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And they approved of it?

Mr. MAY. The Senate approved of it. We have not taken up that bill yet insofar as it relates to allotments and allowances.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 101 of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 381; 37 U. S. C. Supp. 201) is amended by striking out in the first and second lines the words "of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grades."

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHENER: On page 11, line 5, after the word "amended", strike out the remainder of the section and insert in lieu thereof to read as follows:

"SEC. 101. The dependent or dependents of any enlisted man in the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, including any and all retired and reserve components of such services, shall be entitled to receive a monthly family allowance for any period during which such enlisted man is in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after June 1, 1942, during the existence of any war declared by Congress and the 6 months immediately following the termination of any such war."

SEC. 2. That section 102 of such act is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the words "except as to the initial family allowance provided by section 107 (a) hereof."

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHENER: On page 11, line 7, after the word "amended", strike out the remainder of the section and insert in lieu thereof to read as follows:

"SEC. 102. The monthly family allowance payable under this title to the dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man shall consist of the Government's contribution to such allowance and the reduction in or charge to the pay of such enlisted man, except as to the initial family allowance provided by section 107 (a) hereof."

SEC. 3. That section 103 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 103. The dependents of any such enlisted man to whom a family allowance is payable under the provisions of this title shall be divided into three classes to be known as 'class A,' 'class B,' and 'class B-1' dependents. The class A dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the wife, the child, or the former wife divorced of any such enlisted man. The class B dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the parent, grandchild, brother, or sister of such enlisted man and who is found by the Secretary of the department concerned to be dependent upon such enlisted man for a substantial portion of his support. The class B-1 dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the parent, brother, or sister of such enlisted man and who is found by the Secretary of the department concerned to be dependent upon such enlisted man for the the chief portion of his support."

SEC. 4. That section 104 of such act is amended by inserting after the words "class B" in the sixth and thirteenth lines, respectively, thereof the words "or class B-1".

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHENER: On page 12, line 5, after the word "amended," strike out the remainder of the section and insert in lieu thereof to read as follows:

"SEC. 104. A monthly family allowance shall be granted and paid by the United States to the class A dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man upon written application to the department concerned made by such enlisted man or made by or on behalf of such dependent or dependents. A monthly family allowance shall be granted and paid by the United States to the class B or class B-1 dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man upon written application to the department concerned made by such enlisted man, or upon written application to the department concerned made by or on behalf of such dependent or dependents in any case in which the Secretary of the department concerned finds that it is impracticable for such enlisted man to request the payment of such allowance. The payment of a monthly family allowance to any class B or class B-1 dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man shall be terminated upon the receipt by the department concerned of a written request by such enlisted man that such allowance be terminated.

"SEC. 105. The amount of the monthly family allowance payable to the dependent or edpendents of any such enlisted man shall be—

" 'To class A dependent or dependents: A wife but no child, $50; a wife and one child, $75; a wife and two children, $95, with an additional $15 for each additional child; a child but no wife, $42, with an additional $15 for each additional child; a wife divorced but no child, $42; a wife divorced and one child, $67, with an additional $15 for each additional child.

" 'To class B dependent or dependents, payable only while there is no allowance payable to any class B-1 dependent, $37.

" 'To class B-1 dependent or dependents: One parent but no brother or sister, $50; two parents but no brother or sister, $68; one parent and one brother or sister, $68, with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister; two parents and one brother or sister, $79, with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister; a brother or sister but no parent, $42, with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister.' "

Mr. CASE (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE. Is the Clerk reading the Senate bill or the committee substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk is reading the committee substitute, and is now on page 11.

Mr. CASE. Under the rule adopted the other day, the original rule stated that

the Senate bill would be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. That rule was amended by an amendment adopted by the House, by which we provided for the consideration of the House committee substitute as an original bill. The question I ask is whether or not any proposal to offer a substitute for the committee bill would have to be offered during the time that this committee substitute is being read, or whether it should be offered at the conclusion of the reading of the entire substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. It could have been offered at the end of the first section, of the substitute, or it may be offered at the end of the reading.

Mr. CASE. So that there is no loss of right in not having offered it?

The CHAIRMAN. No.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That section 105 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 105. The amount of the monthly family allowance payable to the dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man shall be—

"To class A dependent or dependents: A wife but no child, $50; a wife and one child, $75; a wife and two children, $95, with an additional $15 for each additional child; a child but no wife, $42, with an additional $15 for each additional child; a wife divorced but no child, $42; a wife divorced and one child, $67, with an additional $15 for each additional child.

"To class B dependent or dependents, payable only while there is no allowance payable to any class B–1 dependent, $37.

"To class B–1 dependent or dependents: One parent but no brother or sister, $50; two parents but no brother or sister, $68; one parent and one brother or sister, $68, with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister; two parents and one brother or sister, $79, with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister; a brother or sister but no parent, $42, with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister."

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLASON: On page 12, line 14, strike out the language in lines 14 to 19, including the word "child" in line 19, and insert in place thereof the following language: "$50; a wife and one child $80, with an additional $20 for each additional child; a child but no wife, $42, with an additional $20 for each additional child; a wife divorced, but no child, $42; a wife divorced and 1 child, $72, with an additional $20 for each additional child."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAY. Was the Clerk reading section 6 at the time the amendment was offered?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk had just completed the reading of section 5.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to bring this bill into exact accord with reference to allowance to dependents of servicemen with the bill as passed by the Senate on October 6. The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs has referred several times to the bill passed by the Senate. The bill to which he refers is the bill which was passed on July 8, the day we recessed; but since that time another bill on this same subject has passed the Senate. The difference between the bill which passed the Senate on October 6 and the amendment which the committee has offered is something like $15,000,000 a month. The large sum which the gentleman mentioned of over $300,000,000 had reference to the difference between the Senate bill of July 8 and the present committee bill. So that in fact when you are speaking of the Senate bill you have to bear in mind that there are two Senate bills. The one to which I refer is the Senate bill which was passed on October 6.

The purpose of offering this amendment is because I feel that the Senate bill, which is the same as my amendment, contains the only provision with regard to allowances which is backed up by any substantial figures.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question.

Mr. CLASON. Surely.

Mr. DONDERO. Why should a divorced wife receive $42 a month?

Mr. CLASON. If the gentleman will look further in the bill he will find there is a provision which says that a divorced wife receives nothing unless at the time the divorce was granted to her, or at some subsequent time, the court granting the divorce also made an order in her behalf. So that if the divorce decree is silent as to the amount of money she is to receive, she receives nothing.

Mr. DONDERO. Suppose the divorce decree provided that the wife should receive $25 a month, does she receive $25 under the court's decree, or does she get $42 under this bill?

Mr. CLASON. She receives $25.

Mr. DONDERO. In other words, the court's order would take precedence over this act if we passed it?

Mr. CLASON. I would not say it takes precedence. This act states that she shall receive the amount that was fixed by the court decree.

Mr. DONDERO. I asked that question the other day and I think that was the answer.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. PACE. I understand that is not true in the case of a child; that the child would get the payment regardless of the amount fixed by the court's decree. Is the gentleman sure that it is not also true in the case of a wife?

Mr. CLASON. I am sure it is provided in the provisions of this particular act that she is limited to $42 in the amount that she can receive for herself. She cannot receive anything unless the court order provides that she shall receive something, and then she is limited to the amount fixed in the decree.

Mr. PACE. How about the child?

Mr. CLASON. So far as I know, they are not limited.

Mr. DONDERO. Then the child is not limited to the amount in the court's decreee?

Mr. CLASON. That is my understanding.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. I notice that the gentleman's amendment contains a very beneficent provision, namely, that as the family increases in number the unit cost per child increases. If I understand the testimony of Mr. Taft, of the Social Security Administration, he pointed that out, whereas the bill offered by the Military Affairs Committee takes the position that there is a descending scale of need as the family increases. Their bill provides $25 for the first child, $20 for the second child, and $15 for the third, whereas your bill provides for each child $20. It does not militate against what I call the beneficent principle of your amendment, namely, that as the number of children increases the cost per per unit increases in accordance with all social-security statistics that I have been able to find.

Mr. CLASON. You are right in the statement that the committee bill provides for a decrease for the children after the second child. In other words, the first child would receive $25, and in the Senate bill and in my amendment they are given $30. For the second child the Senate bill and the committee bill and my amendment are in accord at $20.

Then the Senate bill and my amendment continue the $20 for each subsequent child, while the committee bill goes to $15, and in so doing the committee goes directly in the face of testimony given by the Government witness, well qualified to state the facts. This testimony was given by Miss Faith M. Williams, Chief, Cost-of-Living Division, Bureau of Labor Statistics, in presenting figures to show that the wife must have $64.39 in order to maintain health, just for a maintenance standard of living—not what we call the ordinary American standard of living but just a maintenance standard—and that for each child she had to have, or should have, an additional $19.56. It makes no difference whether there is 1 child or 2 children or 20 children. This provides only for a maintenance standard of living, and that will cost her just as much to carry on for the 5 children as it will for the first child.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I want to tell the gentleman that I have been connected with welfare agencies for a great many years and we have found inevitably that where the number of children increases the cost of maintenance per unit child always increases and never decreases.

Mr. CLASON. The testimony before the committee certainly showed that it does not decrease.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I would like to complete my statement, and if I have time left, I will be glad to yield.

The figures on which we are making this request are based upon the figures for 33 cities. Those cities are listed on the back of the printed hearings, which are available to each of you.

The cities are not the 33 largest in the United States; they include some cities in the group of 50,000 to 100,000 in population. Those figures are certainly true for many cities in the United States with less than 50,000 in population; probably they are true for a great many cities all the way down around 15,000 to 20,000 population.

The point that I am making is this: We are, by legislation which is being adopted at the present time——

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I notice that the gentleman has not proposed any amendment to class B–1 dependents. Is it his intention to propose an amendment to increase those allowances?

Mr. CLASON. It is not. My amendment is directed toward the relief of the wife and child or children of the men who go into service.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Thank you.

Mr. CLASON. With reference to the figures, you will find that $64.39 is for the wife alone, assuming she has no child. Now, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, through its Chief of the Cost of Living Division, Miss Williams, stated that those are the correct figures, but the committee decided and apparently believed, and the Senate also, that a wife without children is likely to work. In the great majority of cases she will be able to get some additional revenue. Therefore, this bill, and my amendment, maintains that figure at exactly the same for the wife, $50. There is no increase in the cost of this bill under my amendment to the Government for the wife alone. Any increase comes solely for the child or children. With respect to children, the first child would get $19.56, and that, added to the wife's $64.39, comes up to $83.95.

The Senate and I, and others on the committee who are in the same position as I am on this amendment, feel that those two added together, making $83.95, should be made, in round figures, $80, and the $80 is not any more than the wife and child are entitled to. We are told by Miss Williams and by others that that sum probably will allow them to exist on this maintenance schedule, and that for other children the wife must have $19.56 for each, or else the child cannot continue to have the kind of maintenance support it is entitled to. And it is support of this kind, to provide a monotonous diet, made up of special foods in lists provided by the Labor Department of a sufficient nutritive value, and that is all they are going to get.

I feel certain that the majority of the House will not want to make it impossible for a wife with one child to secure a living even at maintenance level because of their vote this afternoon. Yet Miss Williams says no cut is possible. The wife will have $80 for herself and child. She is allocated 20 percent for rent, or $16. Try to find a decent room with kitchen privileges for two persons in Washington for less than $4 a week. That is what the wife must do or cut elsewhere. Yesterday's Post carried an advertisement for a Baltimore shipyard seeking employees. It emphasized that it was possible to rent over there a room, kitchen, and bath for $34 a month. I do not believe we wish to go below $80 for a wife and child. Their food will consist of a monotonous diet of foods sufficient in nutritional values. Do you want to deprive them of even that standard of living? I do not believe you will. Remember that these are average figures. They will not give even this standard of living in New York, Detroit, Washington, San Francisco, and many other cities. But it is an average figure for the cities of the Nation. People in the rural districts will be somewhat better off, but none of us will envy them whatever slight advantages they may secure by these new figures. They still, in most cases, will be living at lower standards than they would be if the father was back at home working in that Baltimore shipyard. Strangely enough the committee bill is in agreement both with the Senate bill and my amendment in providing $20 for a second child. The statistics say $19.56, so it seems that everyone is in line on those figures. But the committee bill then drops to $15 for each subsequent child, without any reason to support such figures, as if a family is to be penalized if there are more than two children in it. I think, if anything, the mother should be given more than the $20 allowed by the Senate bill and by my amendment. The child must have $20 to live on a maintenance diet, which is far below the average American standard of living. In most cases we are demanding of that child that he shall give up both his father and what we would consider a decent standard of living. We are compromising on a lower standard at $20. I am not ready to injure that child's health while his father is in the Army or Navy over a $5 bill each month. Nineteen dollars and fifty-six cents is right and you cannot compromise with the right in this case without causing human misery and suffering. I am asking you to support my amendment because it sets the allowances at the Government's own figures; because it already bears the 78-to-1 endorsement of the Senate; and because I know none of you will wish to cause unnecessary suffering to a generation of American children when the amount involved is less than $15,000,000 per month over the committee bill.

We are helping the people of every United Nation all over the world. Let us be fair to the wives and children of American men at the battle fronts for us.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SADOWSKI: On page 12, line 13, after the words "a wife, but no child", strike out the remainder of the paragraph up to and including the end of line 13, and insert:

"$55; a wife and one child, $90; a wife and two children, $120, with an additional $30 for each additional child.

"A child but no wife, $42, with an additional $30 for each additional child.

"A wife divorced, but no child, $42. A wife divorced and one child, $77, with an additional $30 for each additional child."

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that heretofore when these additional requests have been granted, the debate has dragged along until 4 o'clock or after and there was no opportunity for the rest of us to speak, I object.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I hope the gentleman from Michigan will withdraw his objection; there are only two amendments, the Clason amendment and mine. The gentleman from Massachusetts was allowed 10 minutes to speak on his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] objects.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have submitted increases the allowances for children up to $30, for the second, third, and fourth child. It increases allowances for dependent brothers and sisters—and there must be actual dependency, there must be real disability or real dependency—for the B–1 dependents it increases their allotments from $11 to $30. The benefits for mothers were increased from $37 to $55.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADOWSKI. Briefly.

Mr. PACE. That portion of the gentleman's amendment was not read.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I sent both amendments to the desk; they pertain to this section. In other words it will read like this: To class A dependents: A wife but no child $55 instead of $50; a wife and one child $90 instead of $75; a wife and two children $120 instead of $95; with an additional $30 for each additional child.

For a child but no wife $42 with an additional $30 for each additional child.

A wife divorced but no child $42. A wife divorced and one child $77, with an additional $30 for each additional child.

Going to class B dependents, that remains the same. The other amendment changes the benefits for class B–1 dependents; and let us realize that these class B–1 dependents must actually be dependents, be crippled or unable to earn their living, or be really dependent on the soldier, not just fake dependents; they must prove by affidavits and otherwise that they are dependent; they must submit their qualifications for dependency.

To class B–1 dependent or dependents: One parent but no brother or sister $55; two parents but no brother or sister $90; one parent and one brother or sister $90, with an additional $30 for each additional brother or sister; two parents and one brother or sister $120, with an addi-

tional $30 for each additional brother or sister. A brother or sister but no parents $42, with an additional $30 for each additional brother or sister.

I have in my hand a little clipping I took from one of the papers the other day which states:

Draft deferment and other measures intended to defer agricultural labor put 300,000 more men of military age to work on the farms during the first 6 months of this year than in the same 6 months of 1942, according to reports issued by the Department of Agriculture.

We did a very fine thing when we deferred those agricultural workers. We did that because we knew we had to produce more food and we did not want to rob the farms of workers and thus hamper our food-production program; but do you not see what is going to happen now? Where are these fathers who have dependents and these other men who have dependents coming from? They are coming out of the villages, out of the towns; they are coming out of the cities and not from the farms. A can of beans costs just as much in Podunkville as it does in Detroit; a pair of shoes costs just as much in Podunkville as it does in Detroit; clothes cost the same. About the only saving a man in the small village would have over the large city would be in the matter of rent, for you cannot buy food or clothing for less money in a small town than you can in a large city. When you take away the father, when you take away the breadwinner of the family, they will still have to pay as much for food and clothing as they did before you took him away. The same with a widowed mother, dependent father or brother, and children going to school.

If you take him away and do not make proper provision, it is not right. You cannot take him away and say, "We are going to give your dependent brother or sister only $11 a month." I had a breakdown here last Thursday. I showed what this meant. It means 6-cent meals for that brother or sister. I showed you the break-down of that $15 a month for the other dependent sons or daughters. That is 50 cents a day. We broke that down to 25 cents for food and 25 cents for clothing, shoes, and other necessities. Twenty-five cents a day for food means 8-cent meals for a growing child and it cannot be done even in a little town or a big city like Detroit. It just cannot be done. You cannot buy food for a child on the basis of 25 cents a day. We cannot take away these fathers and leave the family in this condition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I enjoyed the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], who hit the nail on the head when he said that none of us wanted to draft the fathers, none of us intended to take these men away from their families and break down the family life of America. I do not believe there is a Member in this House who actually would want to take and draft the pre-Pearl Harbor fathers or these boys who actually have dependent mothers or dependent brothers and sisters. It was not our intention to do that; we did not want to do it, but we are forced into this business because of the demands of the Army. The Army made the request and the Congress is being put in the position where it has to do something that it did not intend to do originally.

If we are going to take these fathers away from their families and not make provision to keep up the morale of their families at home by giving adequate allowances, we are not going to have good soldiers. We are not going to have a good Army. It only takes two or three men who are dissatisfied and disgruntled and who feel an injury has been done to them and to their families to spoil the morale of the whole outfit. You men who have been in the service know that. You also know how fast that discontent will spread.

I think the duty is plainly ours to take care of these dependents if we take away the fathers from their homes and their families. I for one do not want to indulge in the experiment of making the allowances submitted under the committee bill. For years we have allowed an exemption in our income tax laws for dependents. We started out originally with a $500 allowance as an exemption for a dependent child or some other dependent, then we reduced that to $400, and in the last tax bill we cut it down to $350. In other words, if you have a son or a child who is dependent upon you, you are allowed $350 exemption in your tax bill. That being so, it means that we have figured it out at $30 a month approximately as the right figure to allow for a dependent son or daughter or a dependent brother or sister or any dependent you may have. This Congress has figured out, the Treasury Department has figured out, that it takes about $30 a month to keep each dependent. Is it fair then to take a father away and say, "We made a mistake when we figured our exemption under the income-tax laws. When we figured that it would cost $30 per month to take care of a dependent, we made a mistake. We think now that you can do it on $15." With all the increases we have had in food costs and clothing costs, it just does not make good sense. You cannot send a man out to fight for you and the country and tell him, "You go and take care of your family for one-half of the amount that we have established for years as a reasonable allowance."

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my remarks unless there are some questions.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I pride myself on the fact that shortly after the Seventy-eighth Congress met I introduced a bill doubling allotments for dependent children of servicemen. I believe that the Clason amendment provides substantially what the Hall bill provides in that it doubles the allotment for dependent children. I am going to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, because I feel sure that this House must pass this amendment if we are going to draft fathers from the families of America.

May I say further that I could not vote to draft the heads of families unless as a Member of this House I had done everything I could to provide a substantial stipend for those children and for those dependent wives these men must leave behind. We must provide money for the food and clothing which those dependents need. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the House will be able to muster up enough votes to approve the Clason amendment so that the men in the service will have even greater morale than they have under the present situation. A man who has a wife and children back home can fight a hundred times harder for the cause he is espousing if he knows in his own heart that his loved ones are being taken care of while he is away at the fighting front giving everything he has for the greatest Nation in the world.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman made a mistake when he said that Clason amendment doubled the amount for the children. It adds only $5.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman will find that the Clason amendment doubles the allowance for the second and succeeding children and that is what the Hall bill, which he will find if he investigates was the first of its kind to be introduced, makes provision for.

Mr. DONDERO. It only adds $5 for the class A dependents. It is raised from $15 to $20 a month.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman will find that for the second and succeeding children the amount is doubled under the Clason amendment, and, for that reason and on the basis of the figures which have been presented by the gentleman from Massachusetts and others, it is absolutely necessary that we appropriate at least $20 a month for each succeeding child.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman means, I believe, that the Clason amendment doubles the allotment for the succeeding children as compared with the present law.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is right.

Mr. CASE. Not as compared with the committee bill.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is true.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members of the House will be solidly behind this proposal to increase the allotments as outlined in the Clason amendment, because a wife and child left behind, with their

husband as a serviceman gone to the front, cannot expect to make their way without sustenance, and we should increase these allotments that have been proposed in the committee bill. If we do not do that, we are going to see the wives and families of servicemen have a great deal of trouble economically, and the wives are not going to be able to support their children otherwise. I would like to see any one attempt to raise a family on the amount of money which has been provided previously with the father away. I would like to see any wife or mother support her children without additional sustenance. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I hope the Clason amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs why the committee bill discriminates against the second child in case the second child happens to be a semiorphan and his mother is either dead or divorced?

Mr. MAY. I do not understand that there is any discrimination against the second child.

Mr. CASE. There very definitely is. The language of the committee substitute provides for a wife and one child, $75, or a wife and two children, $95, thus providing $20 for the second child; but it provides in the succeeding lines that a child but no wife shall be allowed $42, with an additional $15 for each additional child.

Thus, the second child if motherless gets only $15 against $20 if the mother is living. Further, a wife divorced with no child gets $42, and with one child gets $67, which is the same $25 allotted for the first child when the mother is living and not divorced, but the bill then provides an additional $15 for each additional child. So that the second child of a divorced mother gets only $15 as against $20 for the second child if the mother is not divorced.

That certainly is discriminatory. If the mother of a second child is living and is married to the husband that second child is allowed $20, but if the mother of the child is dead and he is a second child, or if the mother of the child is divorced and he is a second child, he is allowed only $15. There is no justification for such a discrimination.

The facts are that if the second child is unfortunate enough either to have his mother dead or divorced he may need that extra $5 much more than the child whose mother is living.

I want to point out that in addition to that discrimination and that flaw in the committee's bill as presented, if you correct it and provide the same $20 for the half-orphan second child or the second child of divorced parents that you propose for the second child in an unbroken home, then you have provided the $20 that is proposed by the Clason amendment. I think it is fair to assume that most of the supposed additional cost for the Clason amendment would be found primarily attributable to second children.

So, if you correct the committee bill to provide $20 for the second child, in the case of a divorced couple or in the case where the mother is dead, then you have pretty nearly adopted the Clason amendment. The sensible thing it seems to me is to adopt the Clason amendment, in the first place, and give the second child $20, regardless of whether his mother is dead or divorced or whether she is living.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COSTELLO. I may state to the gentleman that where the mother is living the committee allows only $25 for the first child and $20 for the second and $15 for each additional child, but where the mother is deceased the committee allows, instead of $25, $42 to that first child and then $15 and subsequently; so the committee has not discriminated against the second child. Instead, the committee has allowed an enlarged amount for the first child in view of the fact that there is no mother, namely, increasing the amount from $25 to $42, and adding $15 for the additional child.

Mr. CASE. No; the larger allowance for the first child in case the mother is either dead or divorced is in recognition of the fact that if the mother were living and receiving $50 part of that $50 would provide the home and pay the rent for the children.

Mr. COSTELLO. That is quite right. For that reason we felt it was not necessary to increase the amount for the second child to $20, but left it the same as it would be for all additional children.

Mr. CASE. If that were so, why do you give the second child of the living and undivorced mother the additional $5? The effect of the language of the committee substitute plainly is to provide $20 for the second child if the mother is living and only $15 if the mother is either dead or divorced.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. My amendment will take care of those discrepancies and unfair conditions.

Mr. CASE. Yes; I think that is so, as far as the point is concerned which I have raised.

Mr. SADOWSKI. My amendment provides for $30 to each child, regardless of whether he is the first, second, or third.

Mr. CASE. I believe the gentleman's amendment does not have that discrimination against the second child who is motherless or the child of a broken home. Certainly the Clason amendment does not have that discrimination. All children after the first, regardless of their mother's status, are treated alike and are given the amount which the committee itself proposed for the second child in an unbroken home. Therefore, I think the Clason amendment should be adopted.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, this bill illustrates the difficulty of legislating equitably and fairly for all the people of the United States. We have before us three proposals—one embraced in the bill which was reported by the committee, another in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] and a third proposed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Even if the Sadowski amendment should be adopted, the result will mean hardship, misery, cold, and near starvation to the wives and children of men in Alaska who are married and who are drawn into the Army. A wife without children can secure employment and thus support herself in whole or in part. But a wife with children cannot possibly live in Alaska on the allotments provided.

On the last page of the printed record of the hearings on the bill appears a list of 33 cities of the United States, giving the cost of living in the various cities for a family of 4. Washington, D. C., is the base, rated at 100. We find by looking at this table that the only one above the base is New York, which is listed at 100.4. San Francisco comes near to it because it is listed at 99.9.

If we should list any part of Alaska here—I do not care where it is—it would be far above that base. The rating of Alaska in the southeastern part of the Territory would be at least 150 and the rating in the northern part in the vicinity of Fairbanks, which, as has been pointed out, is even now and will be in the future an important aeronautical center, would be at least 200. So no matter what the result is as to which one of these amendments is adopted, the wives and children of the men in Alaska who are drafted into military service will inevitably suffer unless they have private means with which to maintain themselves. They just cannot live on the money provided in any of these proposals.

Therefore, in order to get the best I can to help my own people, who are citizens of the United States just the same as are the people who live in the districts of the various Members, I hope and pray that the Sadowski amendment at least will be adopted, because that will give the most.

Even under the Sadowski amendment, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we are not being generous; we are not being even just to some of our citizens. But I understand that in a bill of this kind—since I am a member of the committee, by grace of the committee—it is very difficult, and the committee thought it impossible, to adopt the formula which has been adopted by the civilian agencies of the Government; that is, paying to the civilian employees of the Government who reside in the Territory of Alaska and who work in Alaska 25 percent more than is paid to similar employees who reside in the main body of the United States. At the present time, Mr. Chairman, nearly all the Federal departments and agencies operating in Alaska, with the notable exception of the Post Office Department, the employees of which always seem to receive the least

pay, while faithfully rendering the best possible service, are paid 25 percent more in compensation than they would be if they were serving in the States. That differential is completely justified, and, indeed, it has been found necessary to secure competent employees for work in Alaska. But the committee, for reasons deemed controlling, has decided that with respect to the allotments and allowances for wives and children of men in military service no such differential can be recommended. Therefore, we are compelled to ask for allowances sufficiently high to take care of wives and children, particularly the children, of servicemen in every part of the country. Surely it would not be becoming to have the children of men in military service face starvation in Alaska for lack of adequate food or face freezing for lack of adequate fuel because the same amount of money which is provided by the Government for their support would be adequate to keep them in food and fuel and the other necessary supplies in Alabama or Illinois or Kansas or California or some other part of the Nation. If a soldier drafted in Alaska learns that his children are not receiving enough to eat or wear or sufficient fuel to keep them warm he will not be consoled by being told that if they were living somewhere else in the United States they could live comfortably on the allotment and allowance granted.

It is impossible to equalize living conditions all over the country. Sharp differences are bound to exist between urban and rural areas, and, in fact, the information given at the hearings, on which the committee presumably acted, is largely based upon experience in the 33 cities listed on page 180 of the printed record of the hearings, cities in which the cost of living is from 33 to 100 percent lower than in Alaska.

May I invite attention to the testimony of Miss Faith M. Williams, Chief of the Cost of Living Division, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, Washington, D. C., commencing on page 157 of the hearings. Miss Williams asserts that very little enonomy can be expected for each additional child as the number of children is increased. She has further pointed out that with a husband and wife only the expenditure per person for food is 16.7 cents per person per meal, but where there is a family with husband, wife and three or four children the expenditure for food is reduced to 9.4 cents per person per meal. As I understand her testimony, however, there is no substantial reduction in the cost of food or other necessary supplies as to the addition of children so that cost of living of the second child will be as much as the first and the third as much as the second, and so on.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] in his speech of last Thursday, presented an illuminating budget for the support of a wife and two children amounting in all to $120 per month. This appears on page 8354 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 14. It will be noted that his estimate of the cost of meals is 17 cents per meal. Nowhere in Alaska can a nutritive meal be had for 17 cents and yet it is evidently contemplated that the child of a serviceman in Alaska is somehow expected to live on a meal costing something less than 10 cents. This is one of the things that just cannot be done. And so, in passing this bill, as reported by the committee, or as suggested by the Clason amendment, the wives and children of servicemen in Alaska will be unable to obtain the bare necessities of life from the allotments and allowances provided by legislation, and they must depend for part of their support upon private funds or upon local relief organizations or upon charity.

All Members of this body unquestionably wish to provide for our soldiers all that they would provide for themselves. So far as those in service are concerned this purpose has been amply fulfilled. The food and clothing provided for those in military service is just as good as that of the ordinary Member of the House of Representatives. That purpose, in justice to men in military service, should be carried further, and the children of men in service should be furnished with just as good food and clothing, in substance, as we provide for ourselves. And now it is scarcely necessary to say that we ourselves are not attempting to live on meals that cost 9.4 cents per meal or on meals that cost 16.7 or 17 cents per meal.

The Sadowski amendment would provide for a wife $55 per month. Candidly, I do not know of any reason why the $50 per month provided by the committee bill and by the Clason amendment should be expanded to $55 per month. After all, a wife in good health and without children can secure employment. But with the advent of children, the case is different for the children must receive care and ordinarily only the wife can provide that care. And so, the $90 per month for a wife and one child, as suggested in the Sadowski amendment, is certainly not too high. The Sadowski amendment provides an additional $30 per month for each additional child which, again, in my judgment, is probably the bare minimum required to support a child even in the large cities of the United States, and insufficient for the child's support in the Territory of Alaska.

Our problem would be solved, of course, if the House would entertain an amendment whereby those in Alaska and in other parts of the country where the cost of living is high would receive more than is paid in parts of the country where the cost of living is low, but I understand that no such formula can possibly be adopted. Therefore, I urge upon Members their sympathetic consideration of the Sadowski amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alaska has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on both the amendment and the substitute be limited to 30 minutes additional. Apparently there is not much disposition to debate the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. That covers what?

Mr. MAY. Both the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] and the substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. MICHENER. And does not cover other amendments to this section?

Mr. MAY. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry indeed to have to differ with some of my colleagues on the Military Affairs Committee with regard to this vital legislation. The distinguished and very able gentleman from Kentucky, for whom I have great respect and affection, and his capable subcommittee, headed by my brilliant friend from Alabama, have worked long and conscientiously to report to this House a measure which they deem embodies adequate allowances for the dependents of our servicemen. However, I am unable to bring myself to the view that the allowances provided for are sufficient, in fact the only evidence presented before the committee indicates clearly that they are insufficient. Moreover, the rates provided in this measure as reported are substantially below those contained in the Senate bill. In my opinion Congress should constantly keep in mind in considering this legislation the fact that our enlisted men and their families are not privileged at this time to participate in the very high wages being paid generally in war industry. We should constantly be mindful of the great disparity between the pay of enlisted men and workers in war industry, because certainly no one could challenge the statement that these boys and their families have been denied the privilege of participating in the very real benefits of high wartime wages.

Further, I am unable to render my support to this measure on asserted grounds of economy. I am for economy. I am for economy as strongly as any man in this House. I am for eliminating every nonessential governmental activity, every unimportant, duplicating bureau and agency in the Federal Government, of which there are legion. But I am not persuaded that we ought as a Nation to lay down the policy of instituting economy at the expense of the wives and babies of the boys who are serving their country on the global battle fronts, on the high seas and in the air, and who are offering their very lives, if need be, on the altar of American patriotism. There are many other ways available to us of saving money and reducing governmental expenditures that are not at the expense of these already distressed groups who have to worry constantly about the safety and ultimate fate of their beloved husbands and fathers.

If we are sincere about our desire for economy we can reduce the cost of government, as I believe the Congress is disposed to do. We can eliminate unnecessary and meddlesome bureaus. We can tackle and curtail the grandiose programs of world-wide relief, world-wide reform, and the bestowal of world-wide

largesse which have cost and are costing us unmeasured, unimaginable, and undisclosed billions, as well as depriving our people needlessly and indiscriminately of many of the necessities of life. The last thing I am willing to do as a Member of this body is to be niggardly and penurious with the wives and children of our heroic servicemen, who, next to our war heroes themselves, have first claim upon our solicitude.

I readily admit that increased allowances I propose to support may develop some problems because of the difference in standards of living in various places throughout the country. In some cases these increased allowances may seem and be more than required for particular communities—I will not dispute that. But, if Congress is to err in this matter, I prefer it should err on the side of giving too much rather than too little to the families and children of those who are sacrificing their careers and their lives to win this war and preserve our own democratic institutions. We cannot in justice adapt these allowances to our lowest standards. We must be liberal and generous beyond any question.

There is additional reason for my support of the higher rates. To keep the American family from disintegration while husbands and fathers are in the fighting services is certainly not the least of our objectives in this legislation. The allowances proposed by the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, which I am disposed to support, will enable the wives of servicemen to be free to provide care and supervision of their young children and thus keep families together under proper parental controls while fathers are in the service of our country.

For the most part the higher allowances which I am urging will relieve the necessity of any wife of an enlisted man leaving her family to supplement the family income by working in outside employment, whether this work is in defense plants or elsewhere. The increases I advocate are consistent with evidence furnished the Military Affairs Committee by statistical experts of the United States Department of Labor as being necessary and essential to minimum, healthful, comfortable, and decent standards of living and are the very least we should, in my opinion, to provide for the dear ones of our global heroes.

We have heard much talk about the gratitude and appreciation our people feel because of the sacrifices and matchless contributions of our boys and because of the great unpayable debt which we of the Nation owe them. Let no Member of this body, let no American, have any doubt about that debt.

On every hand we hear the phrase, "Nothing is too good for them." Let this Congress practically demonstrate some living, actual, and tangible evidence of this oft-expressed sentiment of gratitude and appreciation, which surely is shared by all of us, by voting in a true spirit of generosity, justice, and patriotism for genuinely adequate and liberal allowances.

If this Congress can authorize more than $1,000,000,000 a month—and we do not know accurately how much more it is—for bounties, gratuities, subsidies, and gifts to foreign peoples, it can provide at least $1,000,000,000 a year to nourish, care for, and maintain and support at decent American standards of living, the wives and children of the gallant boys who are fighting to save the country.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last clause.

Mr. Chairman, there is no difference of opinion in this House or in the country as to the principle of dependency allowances for the families of the men in the armed forces. Furthermore, there is no difference of opinion on the fact that after nearly 2 years of war, after a period of definite increase in the cost of living after experience with the legislation now on the books, the time has come for a revision of that legislation.

This whole subject matter has been a matter of careful study by a Senate committee, and that body, on October 6, passed a bill which is now before us with certain amendments from the Military Affairs Committee. In that bill figures were given for dependents, and particularly the allowances for children, which have been justified on this floor today, as based on sound estimates as to minimum cost of living.

I believe there is no difference of opinion as to the structure of the new bill. It has the approval of the War and Navy Departments, as to structure and procedure. The only difference between the two Houses in this matter is in the amount to be paid to dependent children.

I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] has justified the figures he has offered, and I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I am just as strongly in favor of economy as any Member of this House. I think we are in danger of going on the rocks if we do not find some way, even in time of war, to cut down Government expenditures. All of my interest, all of my support, is given to any measures tending to that end. But there is such a thing as false economy. In justice to the men who are serving in all quarters of the globe, we cannot do less than see that their morale is sustained by such allowances to their dependents as will relieve them, as far as possible, from anxiety when they are serving us on all battlefronts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Does a wife who has been divorced because of infidelity receive compensation just the same?

Mr. MAY. If it is covered by court decree; but otherwise she would receive it just the same.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If justice were done, of course, we would pay the soldiers compensation at least equal to that received by industrial workers—men in the factories. Even that would not put them on an equal footing with those of us who remain at home. That seems to be impossible, and it is doubtful whether or not we will be able to pay dependents of the soldiers the sum provided for in this legislation; certainly, we cannot make adequate payment to them for the service and sacrifice made.

I intend to support the bill the Committee sends back to the House. The men who are doing the fighting deserve all that we can give, and I shall on all occasions vote to protect and aid them and their dependents.

Mr. Chairman, let me now for a moment turn again to this question of doing something for the men who are in the armed service by way of getting to them the implements of war which they must have. Let us learn who is responsible for the lack of production at some of the plants here at home.

BOMBERS AND FIGHTERS FOR THE FIGHTING MEN OR VOTES FOR A FOURTH TERM?

Repeatedly, the President has called upon the citizens to wholeheartedly and with a singleness of purpose back him in the prosecution of the war.

Almost without exception, industrial workers, in unions and out; farmers; businessmen; industrial leaders—in fact, everyone—responded to that call, but there is a growing doubt as to whether the President himself and certain politicians who surround him are willing to forget everything but the war and devote themselves wholeheartedly to the single purpose of the winning of that war.

That may seem like a harsh statement, but consider the following facts, which give reason to that doubt and to the suspicion that the garnering of votes is interfering with the production of planes.

FACT NO. 1

The Government has furnished or advanced $64,000,000 to the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation, which was set up to manufacture aircraft for the fighting forces. It was engaged in the production of bombers. More recently, it was switched to the production of Corsair fighters.

FACT NO. 2

Because of a labor dispute the plant was taken over by the Navy, and, since that time, by direction of the Navy, the management has been changed; I think it was eight times.

During that period a union contract has been in existence and, while different managements have been one party to the contract, the union has been the same and labor disputes and strikes have continued.

This leads directly to the thought that if one management and a union could not agree there was a 50–50 chance that management was wrong. When, however, the same union finds it impossible to work harmoniously with any one of several—in this instance eight different managements, if I am correct—there is a growing doubt as to the soundness of the union's position.

It is improbable that each of eight separate and distinct managements was arbitrary, unreasonable, and opposed to giving labor a fair deal, especially as the management could pass on the cost of

any reduction of hours of employment, of increased pay, to the Government itself.

Put it in another way: None of these managements had anything to gain by quarreling with the union, by creating a situation which would cause a slowdown, a walkout, or a strike.

FACT NO. 3

According to the testimony of Under Secretary of the Navy Forrestal, the testimony of Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bard and of other officers of the Navy who have testified, the cost of production at Brewster has been excessively high, the management was weak, and there has been labor trouble.

FACT NO. 4

Inasmuch as the Navy has had supervision of managements; has frequently changed management; as the management is a management of its own selection, the Navy itself is directly responsible for the weakness of the management; or, if it is mistaken in its conclusion that the management has been weak, the Navy is to blame for the labor trouble, either because the management it installed has provoked that trouble or because the Navy itself has failed to deal adequately with those in the union responsible for the slow-downs and the strikes.

FACT NO. 5

The record will show, and the War Labor Board must have that record, that the officers of the Navy who are in direct charge have time and again called the attention of the Department to the situation, to the causes of the labor disputes.

The record will show that the fault lies not with the officers of the Navy who are in charge locally at the Brewster plants, but that it lies with the so-called higher-ups.

Proof of this charge is found in the testimony of Assistant Secretary Bard, who referred to the reinstatement of four guards who had disobeyed orders given by Navy officials; who were court-martialed and sentenced, had those sentences set aside and other jobs given them.

Pressed by a committee member, Bard admitted that he personally did not approve of the rehiring of the four disobedient guards. It is evident that, officially and undoubtedly because coerced, he did approve of it or at least did not officially protest.

Testifying before the subcommittee of the House Naval Affairs Committee, Bard sought to excuse the guards by the statement that, in his opinion, they had not been properly indoctrinated. But the record will show, as will the investigation by the F. B. I., that the guards were advised of their duty, that they took the oath of office, and that, in union meetings both before and after the strike of August 23, by a fellow member, their attention was called to the fact that they were obligated to obey the orders of the Navy, that they owed a duty to the Government, that their oath required them to obey the orders issued by the Navy officers on the ground at the plant.

Bard failed to mention that, no matter what indoctrination—whatever that may mean—was given to the guards, under the contract with the union, neither the management nor the Navy can discipline or discharge a guard who belongs to the union. The only exception is where the guard violates a Navy order. But when the guards did violate Navy orders and an attempt was made to discipline them, some politician in the Navy revoked the order punishing the guards for disobedience.

FACT NO. 6

The testimony of Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bard, of Forrestal, and of others so far heard by the subcommittee, discloses that, as a business proposition, Brewster is not sound.

It further appears that the only reason for continuing the Government's contract with Brewster for the production of fighting planes is the vital need of the Navy for those planes and its inability to get them elsewhere.

The lives of many of MacArthur's men can be saved, the war can be shortened, the return of the boys to their homes can be hastened if MacArthur and the Navy in the South Pacific can get the Corsair planes without delay and in sufficient number. It is up to Brewster to turn them out.

Some 21,000 workers, women and men, are employed there, and not 10 percent of them wish to slow down production. The overwhelming majority are disgusted, their feelings of patriotism outraged, by the delaying, obstructive tactics of a small minority which to date has slowed down production, called or caused strikes.

FACT NO. 7

The Navy knows who caused and who called the strikes. The one of June 24 was called by the officials of the local union. The one of August 23 was a union strike. The Smith-Connally law, forbidding strikes except on a 30-day notice, has been violated. The F. B. I. has investigated, and the facts have been before the W. L. B. and the Navy has them.

FACT NO. 8

(a) The Navy has under its charge a plant capable of producing Corsair fighters.

(b) The employees, some 21,000 of them, are ready and desire to work to produce those planes.

(c) Strikes have been called by the local union in violation of the Smith-Connally law and there have been slowdowns which hindered the production of planes.

(d) The management has sought to discipline those responsible for slowdowns and for strikes, but was prevented from doing so by the Navy and the union.

(e) The local Navy officers imposed sentences upon some of those responsible for slow-downs and strikes. Someone in the Navy higher up, and evidently it is not Bard or Forrestal, overruled the desire of both management and the Navy to discipline those who were sabotaging the production of these fighters needed by the armed forces.

The foregoing are facts and they lead to just one outer door, and that is the office of Secretary of the Navy Knox. Knox is a politician.

Naturally then comes this query: Is it Knox, Secretary of the Navy, who so far has supported the saboteurs in the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation in their efforts to prevent production; who has overruled Navy officials under him who imposed sentences upon the guards who disobeyed the Navy's orders, violated their oath to support the Constitution and the Government? If it is not Knox, who is it?

Is it Knox who is responsible for the reemployment of those four guards who would not have been reemployed had Bard been permitted to follow his judgment?

Is it Knox? Or is it the candidate for a fourth term who today is responsible for nonproduction of needed war equipment at the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation plant?

Certainly someone is responsible, and it is time that the responsibility be fixed.

The engineers, the production men in the Navy at the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation can get, and long ago they would have had, production, had not their hands been tied.

It is the old, old problem, which has existed in so many wars. It was with us in the Civil War. It is here again today. It is the situation all too familiar, all too dangerous, all too costly, where men on the fighting front, willing to do their whole duty, willing to give their lives if necessary; where those who are behind them at home, find their efforts hindered by someone higher up who cannot or who will not devote his whole thought to the defeat of the enemy because his attention is distracted by some political issue.

The C. I. O., to which the union which has caused these strikes owes allegiance, has promised to support the President in his quest for a fourth term.

Is it merely a coincidence that, throughout this land of ours, since the enactment of the Smith-Connally Act prohibiting strikes without a 30-day notice, an act which the President vetoed and which, by a two-thirds majority of both Houses, was repassed over his veto, strike after strike has gone unpunished?

In San Francisco, carload after carload of supplies destined for shipment to the South Seas fighting forces; in the South, truckload after truckload of war supplies, were held up by strikes. No one was punished.

The miners are again on strike and the Government has failed to act, although there has been ample time for an investigation to determine whether they were fairly and adequately paid when the cost of living and other wages were taken into consideration.

Is the President refusing to permit the law-enforcing agencies of the Government to breathe life into the Smith-Connally Act, which he vetoed, but which is the law of the land and which, under his oath of office, he is bound to vitalize?

We were told long, long ago, that no man can serve two masters. In the hearings before the Naval Subcommittee it has been made to appear that the loyal, patriotic workers who want to render a full day's service in support of

those they have sent to the war, have three masters—the Navy, the management, and certain union officials. In time of war, they should have but one, and that one is the Navy. And I predict that the Navy they would gladly serve, if given the opportunity and protection in that service.

Secretary Knox should forget politics and so should the President and one or the other should see to it, without further delay, that this great plant and its thousands of employees who desire to work, and who are capable of rendering aid which would shorten the war, make it less bloody, are put into full production.

Is Secretary of the Navy Knox, is the administration, interested in getting fighting aircraft for the Navy which needs them; or is it more interested in getting votes for a fourth term?

What happened at Brewster will give the answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to mention one point that I do not think has been touched on today, and which I mentioned the other day. That is, in trying to arrive at fair compensation for the wives and children of the servicemen we ought to consider whether or not what we propose to allow is discriminatory; whether or not they get disproportionately less than other segments of the population are receiving who are in the war effort also. That is exactly what I think the bill which the committee has brought out does. It is too low considering what other parts of our population are receiving.

On page 179 of the hearings is shown a list of the cost of living in 33 American cities. This list comprises the big cities, and it shows that the lowest cost of living in those cities for a family of four, under the Works Progress Administration's yardstick, is $1,541.

It runs up to $1,807 in San Francisco and is the same for those who are living in my particular area, which includes Vallejo, Sacramento, and Stockton, Calif. Look at the situation that confronts these people whose husbands are away from home some place in the war. A wife and one child under the committee bill will get $900 a year from the United States Government; a wife with two children gets $1,140 a year; a wife with three children gets $1,320 a year, and so forth. Under the Clason amendment they will get $960, $1,200, and $1,440 a year, and for additional children $240 a year more for each child.

Right across the street from the family of this serviceman is some man who is about 38 years of age or younger who has been deferred and is working in a war industry or is working in agriculture. I have no objection to the deferment principle; I think that is the only way we can get workers to man the various skilled tasks that have to do with the war. But when under the same law you make the selection of one man for a war industry and you make a selection of another for agriculture and right over here another man is selected for the Army, I think that it is only good grace for us to pay the women and the children of the men who are selected for the Army a little more than the bill that the committee has presented gives them. That is, when you consider the cost of living.

The amount provided under the Clason amendment is the very minimum that they ought to receive. Even that does not give them a minimum standard of living that prevails in that particular area to which I have referred. It is obvious that, if they do not get enough to meet their necessities, they must go to a relief agency, or they must go to friends, or go to relatives. I do not think that we should say to the wives and children of the men who are fighting this war that they must resort to that practice in order to get sufficient money to support themselves. The ones deferred in industry or agriculture are really selected by the Selective Service Act the same as the soldier is. To treat him impartially we should allow his family to subsist without resorting to charity or his saving account.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. ROLPH. Does the gentleman prefer the Sadowski amendment or the Clason amendment?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I prefer the Clason amendment. That is the amendment that a good many of us on the Military Affairs Committee suggested to the committee. I have no objection to the Sadowski amendment, but the Clason amendment is the one I favor, because I think it is exactly in line with what the Senate will do when this bill is sent over there, and if it is higher, they will cut it.

It passed the Senate by a vote of 77 to 1 and the figures are identical with the Clason amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, the preceding speaker has informed the House that the pay scale prepared by the Work Projects Administration for a family of four gives the figure of $1,496 a year for Mobile, Ala.; $1,809 a year for Washington, D. C.; and $1,807 for the city of San Francisco, the figure he used.

If you take the figures of the House bill as presented here to us today and add on the amount of money we are paying a private; that is, the pay of a private after deductions, together with the amount of allotment for a wife and two children, you will find that under the House bill he is going to receive, for a total of a family of four, the figure $1,476 annually, which is very close to the minimum figure that has been given, namely, $1,496. Considering the pay of a private, first-class, the next rank, you will find he is going to get $1,524, and when you reach the next grade it is $1,668. Then take a sergeant. It is $1,740.

The House bill takes the average pay of an enlisted man and approximates the average figure made up by the Work Projects Administration for the maintenance level of cost of living. If you are going to take the other grades—and mind you, this is the first time you have included the first three grades—you will find that in the Navy, for example, the third-class petty officer in the fourth grade would receive $233.50 per month as a result of this amendment; the second-class petty officer in the third class would receive $251.50 per month; and if you get up to the second pay grade it increases to $275.20; and when you get to the first pay grade, $307.30. Multiplying that by 12 months gives a figure of $3,600 that you are paying the top officers in the first grade with a family of four, and if anybody dares to say that the House bill has been niggardly in this respect I do not see how they can raise any such objection. That amount is exactly double the cost of living as shown for the city of Washington or New York, the two highest.

As a matter of fact you have got to keep this in mind that an ensign in the service of the Navy receives $250 a month; a lieutenant, junior grade, gets $283.67; a petty officer of the first pay grade is going to get more than either an ensign or a lieutenant, junior grade, under the figures of the existing bill as presented by the House. Moreover, the enlisted men in all seven grades are provided their own food and clothing, so these are not expenses he has to meet out of the monthly or yearly total of his pay combined with these allotments.

When you start to raise the amounts under the Clason amendment, and they would be higher under the Sadowski amendment, then the first-grade enlisted man will be receiving more, for a wife and two or three children, or as much as we are paying for a captain, a major, or a colonel.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield.

Mr. CASE. If the House bill is enacted how does the gentleman justify the discrepancy against the second child of a divorced wife?

Mr. COSTELLO. When the gentleman asked that question before I tried to make myself clear on that.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman overlooks the fact that in the case of a wife divorced the increase for the first child is only $15, and the total for a wife with two children, if living, is $95, but the total for two children of a divorced wife is $82; and $8 is for the cut because of the divorced wife, and $5 is because of the subsequent child or second child.

Mr. COSTELLO. I will say to the gentleman on that question that the bill ought to be amended to give an equal amount to the divorced wife as is allowed to the living wife.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the figures given by Miss Faith Williams, Chief of the Cost of Living Division of the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor, are the best authority that we have before us on the cost of living. Those figures establish without

any contradiction that it would cost a wife $64.39 and a child $19.56 in the 33 cities for which the figures were compiled. There are 1,900,000 soldiers and sailors serving from those 33 cities. It is going to be mighty little solace to those 2,000,000 soldiers to state that the cost of living is less in the other sections of the United States and therefore the family allowance must be held down to a figure representing the average living cost throughout the Nation.

My position on this bill is based on one objective, and one only, and that is to maintain the morale of our fighting forces. You cannot browbeat the family allowance of 2,000,000 soldiers down below the cost of maintenance in those 33 cities and say you are maintaining the morale of the fighting forces. The building of morale of our fighting forces is the ground on which we should legislate here. There are about 157 other cities in the United States over 50,000 population. They are not included in those 33 sample cities you have before you in these statistics, and the 2,000,000 soldiers and sailors from those 33 cities are only a part of the soldiers and sailors who have to face high living costs. Now, let us get busy and build up the morale of our fighting forces and give these soldiers and sailors an allowance providing their families at home with a maintenance cost. According to the only figures we have, the figures placed before us for consideration, it will take $80 for a wife and 1 child. We have held the figure to $50 for the wife alone, although the testimony shows it should be $64.39 for the wife. We did that because many of the wives find an opportunity to work, and we have held it down to $50 because we think that is equitable; but when the wife has a child to care for she can no longer work away from home and care properly for that child at home. It then becomes very necessary to lift the allowance for the wife and 1 child up to $80. That will give them maintenance support in the home.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I am sorry; I have not time.

That is the basis on which I have reached my conclusion to support the Clason amendment to give the wives and children at home maintenance support. In the sample cities we have accurate and dependable data concerning the amount it will take to support them at a maintenance level. That is not living on any extravagant scale in those cities, according to the testimony we have before us. I will not subscribe to any argument that strikes a general average over the United States. The general average of living over the whole United States is less than that figure, and such an allowance will not meet the maintenance needs in the cities listed. Let us keep the morale of all our soldiers and sailors at a high level by providing a maintenance level in the allowances for the families of our soldiers and sailors.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, first let me say I propose to offer a perfecting amendment to both the Sadowski substitute and the Clason amendment. My amendment is to add the word "former" before the words "wife divorced" wherever they occur. This is simply to perfect the language to bring it into line with the basic law.

Furthermore, let me say I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] that a second child in those cases he mentioned should have had the $20, and in the event these two amendments are voted down, if he does not offer such an amendment, I shall be very glad to do so.

The subcommittee decided to bring out a bill here that would take into account the cost of living, a reasonable cost of living. I believe that perhaps the best statement that has been made on it so far was the statement made by the gentleman from California, and that is that in voting this thing we have not overlooked the fact that the husband is still earning some money, even though it may not be a great deal. He gave the figures. A point to remember in this connection also is that when they go to foreign duty they get 20 percent additional.

When you start talking about your family of four, remember that includes the husband, the wife, and two children.

Miss Williams testified before our committee, and I suggest that every one of you read her testimony. She testified that it would cost approximately $83 for a wife and one child. She testified that that budget included items that might not have to be taken care of under the present arrangements. For instance, just one I happen to think of now is the item of insurance. The Government carries the insurance under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act for the serviceman and in addition allows him to take out $10,000 very cheap insurance under the National Life Insurance Act. I believe this budget she presented includes $46 a year or $4 a month approximately for that insurance item alone. There are a few other items, not a great many, but if you will study those hearings and compare our statistics you will see that the figures that came from the committee are just about as close to the figure for the country as a whole as we could possibly arrive at.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not have time; I am sorry.

Goodness knows, I would never stand in the way of paying to the dependents of our servicemen a single dime to which they were entitled. It is the cost of making war; but at the same time I think it is only right and fair that we keep our heads and not run away with this thing. I think we have a right to tie it to the cost of living, and we did not tie it to the lowest level. Three different levels of living costs have been established. The first was a mere subsistence level. We did not tie to that. The next was a maintenance level. I submit to you that our figures are tied just as closely to the maintenance level as they can be, based upon the testimony of Miss Williams and upon the budgeted family expenses established by a study that was made by the W. P. A. in 1935. We tied to that as closely as anybody could, taking into consideration the present cost of living; and I submit to you that the figures we give are fair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, the longer I serve in Congress and the more experience I have in dealing with difficult legislation the more I am convinced that the practice and rule of following a legislative committee as far as you can possibly do so is a wise one. We have here a situation where we have either got to strike a level of rates or we have to legislate one way for Alaska, another way for Puerto Rico, and still another for the whole of the United States.

Your committee gave careful consideration to this legislation. I have never seen a subcommittee work more diligently, more cautiously, and with a greater degree of energy and industry in all of my experience in this House than did the subcommittee dealing with this legislation. I am not going to repeat again the figures that I stated previously because it is not necessary. There are men here, however, who were not here when we engaged in general debate the other day and who perhaps did not get the table of figures paid to the dependents of the fighting men by foreign governments. I want to call attention briefly to two of them.

Great Britain is one example. A wife receives $5.60 per month, the first child $6.80, the second child $6.40, and each additional child $5.60. In that great country, Russia, with four times the area of the United States, $5 for a family of one, $5.20 in an urban community, $7.60 in a rural community, and likewise all the way down the scale.

When I was in my home town a few days ago, I asked a banker who is now cashier of the bank I operated for 20 years myself: "Where are you getting all of this money that you have in this surplus cash account in the bank?" He said: "That comes largely from allowances and allotments coming back to the dependents of our soldiers on the battle fronts." Then I walked out of the bank, and as I went across the sidewalk out into the street I met a lady who had written me a letter I did not know I had received. She was from a rural community, and she called my attention to it. When I got back to Washington I hunted it up, read it, and answered it. What do you suppose she was talking about? She is a member of a reputable farm family living on a farm in my county. She had written me a letter saying that she had been designated by a group of women who had asked her to tell me that we ought not to increase these allowances at all because the time had come when women were running the soldiers down

to marry them for the money they would receive and you could not hire a servant for any price. That is on the subject, too, of the manpower shortage. That idea prevails, too, in many sections of the country, in the rural and urban sections, and in the great cities.

There was nothing we could do but draw a level or scale, and we have drawn it to increase this allowance in the Senate bill by $350,952,000, which, I believe, is an adequate increase and will most likely go far beyond that when we go to inducting the fathers with additional families, so that the cost of this legislation will run far beyond $2,000,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the two amendments, the original and the substitute, will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SADOWSKI), there were—ayes 48, noes 140.

So the substitute was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk to the Clason amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPARKMAN to the Clason amendment: Before the words "wife divorced", wherever they occur, insert the word "former."

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to accept the amendment.

The amendment to the Clason amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAY), there were—ayes 163, noes 46.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SADOWSKI: On page 12, lines 23 and 24, after the words "One parent but no brother or sister" strike out remainder of paragraph up to and including line 5, on page 13, and insert "$55; two parents but no brother or sister, $90; one parent and one brother or sister, $90, with an additional $30 for each additional brother or sister; two parents and one brother or sister, $120, with an additional $30 for each additional brother or sister; a brother or sister but no parent, $42, with an additional $30 for each additional brother or sister."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Connecticut: On page 12, line 19, after the word "child" insert "No payment may be paid to any wife or divorced wife in class A, who has an income of $1,500 per annum. An affidavit from either the serviceman or his wife stating that they have an income of less than $1,500 per annum shall be accepted as proof of the right of a wife to receive such class A allotment."

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, this amendment may not be as popular as the amendment we have just adopted, the Clason amendment. I supported the Clason amendment. While I believe in economy, I do not want to practice economy at the expense of the dependents of men now in our armed forces. I fear we have reached the point in this country where from now on when appropriation bills are presented to us we must consider more than whether or not the proposal is desirable. We must determine whether we can afford everything that is desirable. In our own private lives during this period of war we all have things we would like to do, expenses we would like to undertake, improvements we would like to have at this time, but as prudent citizens we put off those improvements until this war is out of the way. I think this Congress has to consider these appropriations in that light.

I know it will be contended that this will make the act difficult to administer; that it will be hard for the War Department to determine whether or not the wife is eligible for an allotment under the act. However, in the amendment, I have stated as clearly as I know how that the affidavit of the soldier or of his wife that they have less than a $1,500 income will be accepted by the War Department as adequate proof of the truth of the statement. I believe the wives of our servicemen are honest, and I would be willing to accept their statement without affidavit and without having the statement notarized.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAVENS. Assuming a man would go into the service today and serve 3 or 4 months, and he or his wife would make this application, how is she going to know until the end of the year whether or not she will have an income of $1,500? Are you going to deprive her of that allowance for a year until you determine whether or not she has that income?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. If she had an income of $1,500 in the year previous and has a monthly income of that rate, all right, let her make the statement that she has an income of $1,500.

Mr. CRAVENS. What if she does not have it now?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. If the income stops, then she can file for the allowance.

Mr. CRAVENS. How can she know until the year is over whether or not she will have an income of $1,500?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. How does the gentleman know how much income he has on which to pay an income tax?

Mr. CRAVENS. I do not, although I doubt very much that it is going to be $1,500.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Net. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman. There may be a few isolated cases where there will be a slight delay, but if there is going to be an argument as to whether they have $1,100 or $1,500 a year they are not going to suffer any during the time that is being determined. We have that in connection with other allotments. We do that with parents who are dependents. In many cases the parents of men in the service are just as dependent, and have been just as dependent on the son in the service as any wife would be. I do not know of any great amount of delay with regard to the other classes of allotments. It seems to me from our experience with the parents, the class B and B–1 allotments, that the class A allotments can be proved just as fast as they can.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman's amendment require both the wife and the soldier to make the affidavit?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. No; either the soldier or his wife.

I have not touched the allotment for the children in any way at all. The only change I make, like the gentleman from Michigan, is in connection with the divorced wife. I raised that question as to whether it is wise to pay $42 a month to the divorced wife. I yield to the judgment of the committee on that.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the gentleman's amendment apply only in the case of the divorced wife?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. No, it applies to all wives. It simply means that if a wife has an income of $1,500 a year she does not get the allotment.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is basing that upon the equivalent of $1,500 a year after the husband is in the service?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Yes, absolutely.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BISHOP. Does not the gentleman believe that will discourage a lot of mothers from going back to work?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. How could it discourage them? It does not apply to mothers at all.

Mr. BISHOP. Just to wives?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Just to wives. It does not touch the other classes at all. It simply puts the wives on the same basis as far as the application is concerned as the other dependents.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman's amendment applies solely to divorced wives?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. No, to all wives.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. (a) That section 106 (a) of such act is amended by striking out in the sixth and seventh lines thereof the words "both class A and class B" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "more than one class of" and by striking out the last sentence thereof.

(b) That section 106 (b) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Whenever a division is made of payments of monthly family allowance among dependents of a class, the total amount payable under the provisions of section 105 of this title to or for the benefit, respectively, of two or more children, of two parents, or of two or more brothers and sisters, shall be equally divided among the respective children, parents, or brothers and sisters, or shall be otherwise apportioned and paid within the respective groups as the Secretary of the department concerned may direct. The monthly family allowance to class B dependents shall be payable to only one designated dependent unless the Secretary of the department concerned shall direct that the prescribed amount be apportioned among and paid to two or more of such dependents."

(c) That section 106 (c) of such act is amended by striking out the entire subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, in any case in which a family allowance is granted under this title—

"(1) to a wife living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a permanent or temporary court order or decree or written agreement, the amount of the family allowance payable to such wife shall not exceed the amount provided in such order, decree, or written agreement to be paid to such wife, and if such order, decree, or written agreement provides no amount to be paid to such wife, no family allowance shall be payable to her; or

"(2) to a former wife divorced, the amount of the family allowance payable to such former wife divorced shall not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or decree as the amount to be paid to such former wife divorced.

"In any case in which the application of the provisions of this subsection results in payment to a dependent or dependents of an enlisted man in an amount less than $22, the amount by which the pay of such enlisted man is reduced or with which it is charged shall be the amount of such payment. In every other case in which application of this subsection alone or in conjunction with other provisions of this title results in a payment or payments of $22 or more the amount of such reduction or charge shall be as provided in subsection 106 (a)."

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLASON: On page 13, line 17, after the second comma, insert "of a former wife divorced and one or more children."

Line 19, after "parents", insert "former divorced wife."

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to take care of a case where there is a divorced wife with children, and the children instead of living with the divorced wife, their mother, may be living with their grandparents or with some other person. Unless provision is made here for the money to be distributed by the Secretary of War as between the divorced wife and the children, wherever they may be living, it is possible that a divorced wife who did not succeed in securing custody of the children would obtain their allowance. The purpose of my amendment is to cure that situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHENER: On page 13, line 7, after the word "amended", strike out the remainder of the section and insert in lieu thereof to read as follows:

"SEC. 106. (a) For any month for which a monthly family allowance is paid under this title to the dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man the monthly pay of such enlisted man shall be reduced by, or charged with, the amount of $20, and shall be reduced by, or charged with, an additional amount of $5 if the dependents to whom such allowance is payable include more than one class of dependents.

"(b) Whenever a division is made of payments of monthly family allowance among dependents of a class the total amount payable under the provisions of section 105 of this title to or for the benefit, respectively, of two or more children, of two parents, or of two or more brothers and sisters, shall be equally divided among the respective children, parents, or brothers and sisters, or shall be otherwise apportioned and paid within the respective groups as the Secretary of the department concerned may direct. The monthly family allowance to class B dependents shall be payable to only one designated dependent unless the Secretary of the department concerned shall direct that the prescribed amount be apportioned among and paid to two or more of such dependents.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, in any case in which a family allowance is granted under this title—

"(1) to a wife living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a permanent or temporary court order or decree or written agreement, the amount of the family allowance payable to such wife shall not exceed the amount provided in such order, decree, or written agreement to be paid to such wife, and if such order, decree or written agreement provides no amounts to be paid to such wife, no family allowance shall be payable to her; or

"(2) to a former wife divorced, the amount of the family allowance payable to such former wife divorced shall not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or decree as the amount to be paid to such former wife divorced.

"In any case in which the application of the provisions of this subsection results in payment to a dependent or dependents of an enlisted man in an amount less than $22, the amount by which the pay of such enlisted man is reduced or with which it is charged shall be the amount of such payment. In every other case in which application of this subsection alone or in conjunction with other provisions of this title results in a payment or payments of $22 or more the amount of such reduction or charge shall be as provided in subsection 106 (a)."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, just a moment. Is the gentleman offering the amendment at this time, a copy of which was left with me?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. MAY. The amendment relates to sections all the way through the bill.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Michigan has prepared a series of eight amendments providing a redraft for eight sections of the bill. The amendments in no way change the language of the committee substitute. The gentleman from Michigan presented to the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the committee, carbon copies of his proposed amendments. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that what he holds in his hand are eight pages, with an amendment on each page, and the pages numbered 1 to 8, inclusive. He seems to be laboring under the misapprehension that I have proposed but one amendment rather than eight.

When the rule making this bill in order was before the House, I discussed the vague, indefinite, and improper method of draftsmanship. Those remarks will be found on page 8339 of the RECORD of October 14, 1943, and may I hope that the gentleman from Kentucky, as well as the other members of his committee, will do me the courtesy of reading those remarks?

I was called from the Chamber just before the general debate closed and was not permitted to offer my amendments to the first four sections of the bill. I have no amendments to section 3 and section 5. I have an amendment to section 6.

I can best illustrate the purpose of my amendments by calling attention to sections 2 and 3 of the bill. All that I attempt to do is to require the form of draftsmanship throughout the entire bill used in section 3. This eliminates such amendments as "changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the words," and so forth. I am sure that every member of the distinguished Military Affairs Committee will agree with the soundness of my proposals.

However, inasmuch as the Clason amendment has been adopted, and an additional amendment made to section 6, I am convinced that the best results can be obtained by simply offering my amendments at the proper places in the bill, in order that those who read the RECORD will know what the bill is intended to mean, and for the special purpose of calling the attention of the conferees to the advisability of redrafting the bill in intelligent, understandable, and comprehensive language.

Mr. MAY. The question that I am raising with the gentleman is not a technical question, as to waiving any amendment, but if you put in any part of the amendment, why not put it all in. I think the gentleman has let his foot slip a little on the draftsmanship himself, because if you will read the first one on page 11, line 5, you provide after the word "amended," to strike out the remainder of the section and insert "in lieu thereof to read as follows." That should be "insert in lieu thereof the following."

Mr. MICHENER. No; the gentleman is again wrong. If the gentleman will bear with me for a moment, if the amendment which I have suggested were included in section 1 of the bill, the section would read as follows:

"That section 101 of the Servicemen's Dependents and Allowance Act of 1942 (56 Stat., and so forth) is amended to read as follows:

There follows the section of the law as it will read as amended. Exactly the same form is used in section 3 of the committee bill, which is proper draftsmanship—instead of saying, "by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the words," and so forth, which is but the writing of a formula to be followed in the drafting of the law. How ridiculous to require the people who are to be controlled by a law to perform a mechanical operation before they know what the law is.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. MAY. I am not objecting to the gentleman's amendment at all. On the other hand I am inclined to agree with him, but I still insist his language is wrong, because he says to strike out the remainder of the section and insert in lieu thereof "to read as follows:" It should be "insert in lieu thereof the following," and then copy the section.

Mr. MICHENER. If the gentleman will look at the amendment, a copy of which I gave him——

Mr. MAY. I have it.

Mr. MICHENER. After the word "amended" on line 5, page 11, of the bill the section of the law is amended "to read as follows."

Mr. MAY. It does not read that way here.

Mr. MICHENER. It must read that way in the amendment the gentleman has before him, because it is a carbon of what I have before me.

The necessity for these amendments was spectacularized when I received an inquiry from a young man, subject to the draft, who has dependents, who wanted a copy of S. 1279, as amended by the committee. He was provided with a copy but was unable to work out the formula suggested in the bill, of striking out and inserting words and changing commas to periods, to find out just what the bill meant. There did not happen to be a lawyer in his home town with a copy of the United States statutes and, therefore, the bill was all Greek to this young man and the town lawyers. The Congress would be entitled to much censure if it placed such uncertain legislation on the statute books. That is my only interest in offering these amendments.

I shall offer my amendments to the subsequent sections of the bill as they are read; that is, provided I can get recognition before perfecting amendments to the text are adopted. Otherwise, I shall offer these amendments for the information of and consideration of the conferees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, did the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] couple with that a request to print in the RECORD all of the series of corrective amendments that he had in mind to offer? It seems if we are going to get any benefit from those we should have all of the amendments printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the suggestion of the gentleman from South Dakota and ask unanimous consent that following section 1, sections 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 12 of the committee bill where insert and strike-out language is used, that the amendments which I have sent to the desk may be read immediately following the reading of the respective sections by the Clerk and be printed in the RECORD at the points read. Let us hope that no more bills are presented to the House for consideration which are drawn in this manner.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. (a) That section 107 of such act is amended by striking out all before the first proviso, including the word *"Provided"*, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 107. (a) An initial family allowance shall be paid for the month in which an enlisted man enters a pay status in the active military or naval service of the United States, in the amounts and to the dependents hereinafter set forth.

"Such initial family allowance shall be paid to the designated dependent only when a written application therefor is filed by such enlisted man within 15 days after the date of his entry into active service in a pay status and shall be paid as soon as practicable after the filing of such application.

"No monthly family allowance shall be paid to any dependent of an enlisted man for the month for which any initial family allowance is paid to any dependent of such enlisted man.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of this title, the full amount of such initial family allowance shall be paid by the Government, and no reduction in or charge to the pay of the enlisted man shall be made for such payment.

"The amount of the initial family allowance payable to the dependent or dependents shall be—

"(1) $50, if such enlisted man has a wife but no child;

"(2) $75, if such enlisted man has a wife and one child, $95 if a wife and two children, and an additional $15 for each additional child;

"(3) $42, if such enlisted man has no wife but has one child, and an additional $15 for each additional child;

"(4) $50, if such enlisted man has one parent dependent upon him for chief support; $68 if such enlisted man has one parent and one brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support;

"(5) $68, if such enlisted man has two parents dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support;

"(6) $42, if such enlisted man has no parent but has a brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support.

"Payment of the initial family allowance shall be made to one payee for each class of dependents, as defined in section 103, for whom an allowance is requested.

"(b) The monthly family allowance provided for by this title shall be paid for the period beginning with the first day of the month in which application therefor is filed, or the first day of the month in which the dependent or dependents first become entitled thereto, whichever is later, subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, and shall be terminated or reduced, as may be required, on the last day of the month in which the disbursing officer paying the allowance receives notice of a change in status of the enlisted man or a dependent which terminated or limited the right of his dependent or dependents to receive such allowance: *Provided*, That the entitlement to family allowance shall terminate or be modified at the end of the month in which such change in status of the enlisted man or a dependent occurs: *Provided further*,".

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHENER: On page 15, line 6, strike out lines 6 and 7 and insert in lieu thereof to read as follows:

"SEC. 107. (a) An initial family allowance shall be paid for the month in which an enlisted man enters a pay status in the active military or naval service of the United States, in the amounts and to the dependents hereinafter set forth.

"Such initial family allowance shall be paid to the designated dependent only when a written application therefor is filed by such enlisted man within 15 days after the date of his entry into active service in a pay status and shall be paid as soon as practicable after the filing of such application.

"No monthly family allowance shall be paid to any dependent of an enlisted man for the month for which any initial family allowance is paid to any dependent of such enlisted man.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of this title, the full amount of such initial family allowance shall be paid by the Government, and no reduction in or charge to the pay of the enlisted man shall be made for such payment.

"The amount of the initial family allowance payable to the dependent or dependents shall be:

"(1) $50, if such enlisted man has a wife but no child;

"(2) $75, if such enlisted man has a wife and one child, $95 if a wife and two children, and an additional $15 for each additional child;

"(3) $42, if such enlisted man has no wife but has one child, and an additional $15 for each additional child;

"(4) $50, if such enlisted man has one parent dependent upon him for chief support; $68 if such enlisted man has one parent and one brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support;

"(5) $68, if such enlisted man has two parents dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support;

"(6) $42, if such enlisted man has no parent but has a brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support.

"Payment of the initial family allowance shall be made to one payee for each class of dependents, as defined in section 103, for whom an allowance is requested.

"(b) The monthly family allowance provided for by this title shall be paid for the period beginning with the first day of the month in which application therefor is filed, or the first day of the month in which the dependent or dependents first become entitled thereto, whichever is later, subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, and shall be terminated or reduced, as may be required, on the last day of the month in which the disbursing officer paying the allowance receives notice of a change in status of the enlisted man or a dependent which terminated or limited the right of his dependent or dependents to receive such allowance: *Provided*, That the entitlement to

family allowance shall terminate or be modified at the end of the month in which such change in status of the enlisted man or a dependent occurs: *Provided further*, That in the case of any dependent of an enlisted man in active service on the date of enactment of this act, if application is filed for a monthly family allowance within 6 months after such date of enactment or within such longer period as may be prescribed in special cases by the Secretary of the department concerned, the period for which such family allowance shall be paid shall begin with the date on which such dependent first becomes entitled thereto under section 101: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may, by regulations prescribed by them jointly, fix the dates of commencement and termination of any such family allowance on any dates not more than one month before or one month after the dates above prescribed. Such regulations shall in no event provide for the payment of such allowances for any period prior to June 1, 1942, or for any period when the United States is not engaged in a war declared by Congress and which is more than 6 months later than the date of termination of any such war."

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLASON: On page 16, line 7, strike out all of lines 7 to 12 inclusive and insert in place thereof the following language:

"2. Eighty dollars if such enlisted man has a wife and one child, and an additional $20 for each additional child;

"3. Forty-two dollars if such enlisted man has no wife but has one child, and an additional $20 for each additional child."

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, the whole purpose of this amendment is to bring these two paragraphs into accord with the amendment which has already been adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLASON. The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. That section 108 of such act is amended by inserting in the first line thereof after "SEC. 108", the subparagraph designation "(a)", and adding at the end of the section a new subsection to read as follows:

"(b) Except as otherwise herein provided, monetary allowances in lieu of quarters for dependents as authorized by section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 shall not be payable for the period during which family allowances to dependents of enlisted men of the first, second, or third grades are authorized by this title. An enlisted man who, on the effective date of this act, is receiving, or, being entitled to a monetary allowance in lieu of quarters for dependents, has applied therefor, may, at his option, receive or continue to receive such monetary allowance or elect not to receive such monetary allowance and to have his dependents become entitled to receive family allowance. No dependent of any enlisted man shall be entitled to family allowance for any period for which such monetary allowance is paid to the enlisted man. An enlisted man's election to have his dependents receive family allowance may be made at any time and when made shall be irrevocable during the period of entitlement to family allowance as set out in section 101: *Provided*, That the secretary of the department concerned is authorized to make the election on behalf of the enlisted man in any case in which he deems it desirable and finds it impracticable for the enlisted man to so elect, subject to termination at a later date upon specific request of the enlisted man. If an election is made the monetary allowance payments shall be discontinued at a date to be prescribed by the secretary of the department concerned. The monthly pay of any enlisted man of the first, second, or third grades who is provided with public quarters for his dependents and any of whose dependents is receiving a family allowance shall be reduced by, or charged with, 90 cents per day."

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair inquire of the gentleman from Michigan? The Chair understood that the amendments are to be inserted in the RECORD following each section?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. And not to be read?

Mr. MICHENER. No.

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHENER: On page 17, line 20, after the word "amended", strike out the remainder of the section and insert in lieu thereof—to read as follows:

"SEC. 108. (a) In any case in which any allotment from the pay of an enlisted man is already in effect at the time a monthly family allowance becomes payable under this title to a dependent or dependents of such enlisted man, such allotment may be continued, modified, or discontinued in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the head of the department concerned.

"(b) Except as otherwise herein provided, monetary allowances in lieu of quarters for dependents as authorized by section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 shall not be payable for the period during which family allowances to dependents of enlisted men of the first, second, or third grades are authorized by this title. An enlisted man who, on the effective date of this act, is receiving, or being entitled to a monetary allowance in lieu of quarters for dependents, has applied therefor, may, at his option, receive or continue to receive such monetary allowance or elect not to receive such monetary allowance and to have his dependents become entitled to receive family allowance. No dependent of any enlisted man shall be entitled to family allowance for any period for which such monetary allowance is paid to the enlisted man. An enlisted man's election to have his dependents receive family allowance may be made at any time and when made shall be irrevocable during the period of entitlement to family allowance as set out in section 101: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the department concerned is authorized to make the election on behalf of the enlisted man in any case in which he deems it desirable and finds it impracticable for the enlisted man to so elect, subject to termination at a later date upon specific request of the enlisted man. If an election is made the monetary allowance payments shall be discontinued at a date to be prescribed by the Secretary of the department concerned. The monthly pay of any enlisted man of the first, second, or third grades who is provided with public quarters for his dependents and any of whose dependents is receiving a family allowance shall be reduced by, or charged with, 90 cents per day."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPARKMAN: On page 18, line 10, change the period after the word "allowance" to a colon and insert the following proviso: "*Provided*, That payment of such monetary allowance shall be made only for such periods, from the effective date of this act, as the enlisted man has in effect an allotment of pay, in an amount not less than the amount of such monetary allowance, for the support of the dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, we agree to that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I desire some information from the Chairman or some other member of the committee.

I would like to inquire when and how the dependents get the first pay; what action is necessary for the enlisted or inducted man to take?

Mr. MAY. An earlier section requires the dependent shall ask for the allowance or even the soldier himself upon induction, if not already in the service, when he goes to the induction center shall be furnished a voucher which he himself fills out for this advance payment we have provided here, in order to facilitate payment of allowance to dependents.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The first payment or payment for the first month is not taken out of the soldier's pay?

Mr. MAY. If he has already made an allotment, it is taken out, but it is taken out after the first month that the inductee goes into the service.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What I have reference to is this: Is that all the inductee has to pay of this after the 1st of November? In other words, the Government pays for all that—does it not—and there is nothing taken out of the serviceman's pay for the first month?

Mr. MAY. Why, certainly not. He does not pay any part of the first allowance. But that is after the 1st of November, and not the 1st of October.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes. Then what is meant by the section that the soldier must, within 15 days, make a statement as to his dependents?

Mr. MAY. That relates to the first payment when he goes in; he must, within 15 days after he is inducted, make an allotment to his beneficiaries and designated dependents.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Those dependents who get the first month's pay receive that out of the Treasury, no part of which is paid by the soldier. Does that include all the dependents provided for in this bill?

Mr. MAY. That includes all for whom provision is made.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I mean after November 1.

Mr. MAY. All class A dependents.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is confined to class A dependents or all of them.

Mr. MAY. No; it is all of them. On page 16 is set out in detail the ones to whom it is given.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Would it include all the dependents provided for in this bill after November 1?

Mr. MAY. No, not all of them, but those that are listed on page 16, with the

exceptions thereto. I can go through that page if the gentleman wishes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. No, it is not necessary; it includes A, B, and B–1 dependents?

Mr. MAY. The list as contained on page 16 is intended to include all except the divorced wife.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. MAY. And class B dependents.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman first asked what part the soldier himself paid. I understand that is for the first $50, and for the second and subsequent amounts the soldier pays $22 himself, does he not, and the Government pays the $28 of the $50?

Mr. MAY. That is for the wife and child.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. For the first month, I understand, the Government pays it all.

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. For all dependents except the case of the divorced wife.

Mr. MAY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. That section 109 of such act is amended by inserting after "SEC. 109" the subsection designation "(a)" and adding at the end of the section a new subsection to read as follows:

"(b) In the event of the death of a dependent, any amount of the family allowance to which his entitlement ceases with the last day of the calendar month in which death occurs, and which is uncollected at the time of death, shall be paid to such person or persons as the Secretary of the department concerned directs."

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHENER: On page 19, line 4, after the word "amended," strike out the remainder of the section and insert in lieu thereof, to read as follows:

"SEC. 109. (a) Any family allowance to which any dependent or dependents of any enlisted man is entitled under the provisions of this title shall be paid on behalf of such dependent or dependents to any person who may be designated by such enlisted man unless the Secretary of the department concerned determines that the person so designated is not an appropriate payee. In any case in which the Secretary of the department concerned determines that the person so designated is not an appropriate payee or in any case in which the enlisted man has not designated a payee, such allowance shall be paid on behalf of such dependent or dependents to such person as may be designated in regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the department concerned.

"(b) In the event of the death of a dependent, any amount of the family allowance to which his entitlement ceases with the last day of the calendar month in which death occurs, and which is uncollected at the time of death, shall be paid to such person or persons as the Secretary of the department concerned directs.

"SEC. 110. (a) Entitlement to and payment of any family allowance authorized under provisions of this title to the dependent or dependents of any enlisted man shall not be contingent upon pay accruing to such enlisted man or upon the monthly pay of such man being reduced by or charged with any amount."

SEC. 10. That section 110 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 110. (a) Entitlement to and payment of any family allowance authorized under provisions of this title to the dependent or dependents of any enlisted man shall not be contingent upon pay accruing to such enlisted man or upon the monthly pay of such man being reduced by or charged with any amount."

SEC. 11. That section 119 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 119. Any person who shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, contract for, charge, or receive or shall attempt to solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee or compensation for assisting in any manner an enlisted man or dependent in obtaining a family allowance payable under this title, shall, upon conviction thereof, be guilty of a misdemeanor and for each and every offense shall be punishable by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $1,000 or by imprisonment at hard labor for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

SEC. 12. That section 120 (a) (4) of such act is amended by striking out the words "under oath" in the fourth line thereof.

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHENER: On page 20, line 10, after the word "amended," strike out the remainder of the section and insert in lieu thereof; to read as follows:

"(4) An illegitimate child, but only if the man has been judicially ordered or decreed to contribute to such child's support; has been judicially decreed to be the putative father of such child; or, has acknowledged under oath in writing, that he is the father of such child."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS: Strike out section 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 12 (a). That section 120 (c) (4) of such act is amended by striking out the words 'under oath' in the fourth line thereof.

"(b) That section 120 (d) is amended by striking out the entire subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(d) The term "child" also includes a person to whom the man stands in loco parentis and has so stood for not less than 12 months prior to the date of application on behalf of such child.'

"(c) That section 120 (g) be amended by striking out the word 'grandchild' in the first line thereof."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 11 of the bill for the purpose of making a corrective amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS: Page 11, line 21, strike out the word "grandchild."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely strikes out the word "grandchild," which now is surplusage in the proposed act. I believe the committee has no objection to doing that.

Mr. MAY. The committee will accept the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 13. That section 120 (i) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) The terms 'man' and 'enlisted man' mean any enlisted individual, male or female, of the first to seventh grades, both inclusive, and any aviation cadet, in any of the services mentioned in section 101 of this act, and any member, except the leader and second leader, of the band of the United States Marine Corps, but do not include any member of the Philippine Army, the Philippine Scouts, the insular force of the Navy, the Samoan native guard or band of the Navy, or the Samoan reserve force of the Marine Corps."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Section 13, on page 20, line 12, precludes the Philippine Army and the Philippine Scouts. They are precluded from the benefits of this act by reason of the establishment of the Army of the Philippine Commonwealth; but remember, the Philippine Scouts are in the Regular Army. I merely rise to ask why they were not included.

Mr. MAY. My understanding is that under the terms of a previous act when they are in service—which they are not at this time of course—they were paid on a rate based on foreign service, which is 20 percent additional. That is one reason. Another reason is that they are not now in position to receive the pay if we allowed it to them.

Mr. STEFAN. With that explanation I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 14. That such act be amended by adding a new section to title I thereof to be numbered 121 and to read as follows:

"SEC. 121. The dependents of an enlisted female shall be as prescribed by this title except that husband and children shall be included as dependents only when found by the Secretary of the department concerned to be dependent upon her for chief support. The amount of the family allowance payable to the dependents of an enlisted female shall be as prescribed by this title except that the amount for a husband or husband and children shall be that prescribed for a wife or wife and children. The provisions of this section shall be applicable to dependents of any enlisted female only insofar as such provisions are not inconsistent with the provisions of any law pertaining to the service of which she is a member."

SEC. 15. This act shall be effective from the first day of the calendar month following the month of enactment: *Provided*, That for the purpose of adjusting to the provisions of this act, any family allowance in force when the act takes effect, which is subject to change by the provisions of the act, may be paid without change for such period, not exceeding 4 calendar months, as the Secretary of the department concerned may determine: *Provided further*, That whenever such a family allowance is found to be subject to decrease or termination such change shall be effective at the expiration of the period of payment determined under the preceding proviso: *Provided further*, That

whenever such a family allowance is found to be subject to increase the effective date of increase shall be the effective date of this act.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PLOESER: At the end of the bill insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 16. That such act be amended by adding a new section to title I thereof to be numbered 122 and to read as follows:

"'SEC. 122. That, subject to the limitations specified in subsection 2, every person who (1) serves in the land or naval forces of the United States at any time during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending on the date the President proclaims the termination of the present war, and (2) is separated from such service under honorable conditions or is released from active duty, shall be paid monthly, for a period of 10 months in the case of a person receiving the base pay of an enlisted man and for a period of 5 months in the case of any other person, an amount equal to the monthly base pay plus one-half of dependency benefits payable under this act in the case of enlisted men, and an amount equal to the monthly base pay in the case of all other persons. Such base pay shall be determined by the grade or period in which the person had been serving immediately prior to such separation or release. Such dependency benefits shall be determined by the benefits allowable on the date of separation or release and in no event shall a greater amount be payable due to subsequent additional dependents. Such period of 10 months or 5 months, as the case may be, shall commence on the date of separation from service or release from active duty or on the date of the enactment of this act, whichever date is the later. In the event any such person has been receiving base pay at a higher rate than the base pay of seventh grade in the case of enlisted men or of the first period in the case of all others, as prescribed in section 1 of the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942, he shall for the purposes of this act be considered to have been receiving the base pay of the seventh grade, in the case of enlisted men, and of the first period, in the case of all others.

"'SUBSECTION 2. (a) A person shall be entitled to the monthly payments provided for by subsection 1 only after he files application therefor with the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, stating, under oath, that his monthly income is less than the amount of the monthly base pay as described in subsection 1.

"'(b) Monthly payments provided for by subsection 1 shall be made by check. Each check shall be mailed to the payee, together with a voucher to be filled out by him in which he shall state, under oath, the amount of his income for the month covered by the check. Such voucher shall be attached to the check by the payee and such check may be cashed at any post office only if accompanied by a properly executed voucher. The next monthly check shall be reduced to an amount equal to the difference between the amount of the monthly base pay which the payee had been receiving immediately prior to his separation from the service or release from active duty, as described in subsection 1, and the amount which the payee stated in such voucher that he had received during the month covered by the voucher. In the event any voucher discloses that the amount of income received by any payee for any month exceeded the amount of such monthly base pay, no further payment shall be made under this act unless another application is made in the same manner as the original application stating that the monthly income of the applicant is again less than the amount of such monthly base pay.

"'(c) The term "income" as used in this section of this act shall mean cash income from any other source whatever than that provided by this section.

"'(d) This section of this act shall become effective from the first day of the calendar month following enactment.'"

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve his point of order that I may explain my amendment?

Mr. MAY. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to give serious consideration to the immediate post-war period, that period of transition when we will be demobilizing millions of men from the armed services and endeavoring to return them into civilian jobs here at home.

The purpose of the amendment is to prolong for a limited period of time the pay of all members of the armed services, after the war has ended, in order to assure them financial independence while they are reestablishing themselves in private enterprise.

It is universally agreed that the first and most important problem that will face the United States after the war is reemployment.

This proposal is intended to avert breadlines or any return to the political subsidy method of the W. P. A. in the post-war period.

Any post-war plans must allow sufficient time for industry to reconvert from war to peacetime production. Some industries will need more time than others.

Demobilization of millions cannot be accomplished at one given moment. It probably will require many months. This proposal calls for the orderly reinfiltration of these millions into a peacetime economy.

No man or woman in the armed services wants to come home, take off an honored and glorified uniform and be compelled to put on the humiliating livery of a political slave.

What they do want—what they are entitled to—and what our Nation owes every one of them is a job, and a good job in private industry.

This amendment allows them to preserve respectability and independence while they are readjusting themselves to peacetime pursuits.

Specifically, the amendment would: Provide a simple formula for extending the base pay of all people in the armed services, from the date of their discharge. It divides everyone in uniform into two groups: First, all those below the rank of a commissioned officer; and secondly, all others.

For the first group, the amendment provides a flat extension of pay at the rate of $50 per month plus one-half of any allowances for dependents. This extended pay would be continued for a maximum period of 10 months.

For the second group, the amendment provides a flat extension of pay of $150 per month, regardless of rank and without any dependency allowances. This extended pay would be continued for a maximum period of 5 months.

To hold the ultimate total cost of the program to a minimum, the amendment requires recipients of the extended pay to deduct any earned cash income from each monthly allowance, after the first month. Whenever such income for any month exceeds the monthly allotment, the recipient automatically goes off the pay roll. In such cases, however, the person would be eligible—within the prescribed limited periods of 5 or 10 months—for restoration to the pay roll if his cash income fell below his allotment.

This feature of the amendment keeps the proposal outside the realm of a bonus and, instead, stimulates rehabilitation through individual enterprise.

Incorporated in the amendment is a carefully designed method for payment of the allotments intended to prevent maldistribution of Federal funds, either through bureaucratic political design or misrepresentations by individuals.

This provision, simplifying accounting procedure, has the approval of some fiscal officers in the armed forces, who point out that it would not require additional administrative personnel or expense.

The procedure set forth in the amendment calls for a voucher, as a part of the recipients' pay checks, on which they are required to make affidavits concerning their monthly cash income.

As of this date, Congress has done nothing to work out a systematic reinfiltration of the men in our armed services into civilian life; there has been total neglect of the post-war period on the home front, particularly where our armed forces are concerned. I see no more opportune time than today to put before this Congress something upon which we can vote, something which will prevent these men being demobilized into a new W. P. A. or a new breadline. The failure of this Congress to do anything to provide for their dismissal from the armed services speak loudly of the failure of the majority leadership. The leadership may care to procrastinate further. The fact remains that none of us knows when this war will end. It is possible that the war in the European theater may not last many more months. Time runs short while administrative and legislative leadership lags. The leadership on the majority side has done nothing to formulate such a provision. No program has been advanced whatsoever.

I want these men to come home and maintain their respectability. I do not want them to go back on a political

breadline. I want them to be respectable to themselves, to their families, and to be able to maintain those families while industry is working rapidly to provide jobs for them.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I had completed my statement of the point of order.

The point of order is that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] is not germane to the pending bill and, in addition to that, the proposed amendment would amend the Pay Adjustment Act rather than the bill now pending before the committee. I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to be heard?

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard briefly on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may be heard on the point of order.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I realized at the time that I proposed the amendment that it is possible that someone might contend that this is an extension of the Pay Adjustment Act instead of the Dependency Allotment Act, but I submit that my intention is to extend into the post-war period for a brief and necessary time such aid to dependents as may become necessary due to difficulties in reemployment. If this aid is to be extended to dependents, it becomes desirable and necessary to extend into the post-war period the vehicle upon which dependency allowances are necessarily attached. I could not extend one without the other. The dependency allowance is, by virtue of statute now, an attachment to the base pay. It therefore became necessary, in order to extend one to extend both.

On that basis I am hopeful that the Chair may find the amendment germane to the bill now pending before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BULWINKLE). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] offers might apply to the Pay and Adjustment Act of 1942. However, the pay of the enlisted personnel of the Army cannot be germane to a bill which provides for maintenance to the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to section 6, page 16, for the purpose of offering a perfecting amendment. In line 17, between the words "each" and "brother" add the word "additional", and in line 21, between the words "each" and "brother" add the word "additional", so that the language will read:

And an additional $11 for each additional brother.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 16, line 7, between the words "each" and "brother" add the word "additional" and in line 21, between the words "each" and "brother" add the word "additional."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 22, line 5, after the period, add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 16. That for the duration of this war, and for 6 months after the termination of the war, the provision of section 3 of act of June 13, 1940 (Public, No. 612, 76th Cong.), that relates to the compulsory retirement of brigadier generals at the age of 62 years and all promotion-list officers at the age of 60 years, is hereby suspended: *Provided*, That such suspension will be retroactive to June 30, 1942: *Provided further*, That no back pay will accrue to any officer affected by reason of such suspension: *And provided further*, That the officers retained in active service by reason of this action will be exclusive of those now authorized for the Army."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like very much to see that provision made the law, but I am compelled to make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is sustained.

The question is on the committee substitute for the Senate bill.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 315, reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments agreed to in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 389, nays 0, not voting 41.

[Roll No. 147]

YEAS—389

Abernethy	Andrews	Beall
Allen, Ill.	Angell	Beckworth
Allen, La.	Arends	Bell
Andersen, H. Carl	Arnold	Bender
Anderson, Calif.	Auchincloss	Bennett, Mich.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Baldwin, N. Y.	Bennett, Mo.
Andresen, August H.	Barden	Bishop
	Barrett	Blackney
	Barry	Bland
	Bates, Mass.	Bloom
Bolton	Gordon	McKenzie
Bonner	Gore	McLean
Boren	Gorski	McMillan
Boykin	Gossett	McMurray
Bradley, Mich.	Graham	Maas
Bradley, Pa.	Granger	Madden
Brehm	Grant, Ala.	Magnuson
Brooks	Grant, Ind.	Mahon
Brown, Ga.	Green	Maloney
Brown, Ohio	Gregory	Manasco
Bryson	Griffiths	Mansfield, Mont.
Buckley	Gross	
Buffett	Gwynne	Mansfield, Tex.
Bulwinkle	Hagen	Marcantonio
Burchill, N. Y.	Hale	Martin, Iowa
Burgin	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Martin, Mass.
Busbey	Hall, Leonard W.	Mason
Butler	Halleck	May
Byrne	Hancock	Merritt
Camp	Hare	Michener
Canfield	Harless, Ariz.	Miller, Conn.
Cannon, Fla.	Harness, Ind.	Miller, Mo.
Cannon, Mo.	Harris, Ark.	Miller, Nebr.
Capozzoli	Harris, Va.	Miller, Pa.
Carlson, Kans	Hart	Mills
Carson, Ohio	Hartley	Monkiewicz
Carter	Hays	Monroney
Case	Hebert	Mott
Celler	Heffernan	Mruk
Chenoweth	Heidinger	Mundt
Chiperfield	Herter	Murdock
Church	Hess	Murphy
Clason	Hill	Murray, Tenn.
Clevenger	Hinshaw	Murray, Wis.
Cochran	Hobbs	Myers
Coffee	Hoch	Newsome
Cole, Mo.	Hoeven	Norman
Cole, N. Y.	Hoffman	Norrell
Colmer	Holifield	Norton
Compton	Holmes, Wash.	O'Brien, Ill.
Cooley	Hope	O'Brien, Mich.
Cooper	Horan	O'Brien, N. Y.
Costello	Howell	O'Hara
Courtney	Hull	O'Konski
Cox	Izac	O'Leary
Cravens	Jarman	O'Neal
Crosser	Jeffrey	O'Toole
Cunningham	Jenkins	Outland
Curtis	Jennings	Pace
D'Alesandro	Jensen	Patman
Davis	Johnson, Anton J.	Patton
Dawson	Johnson, Calvin D.	Peterson, Fla.
Day	Johnson, Ind.	Peterson, Ga.
Delaney	Johnson, J. Leroy	Pfeifer
Dewey	Johnson, Luther A.	Philbin
Dickstein	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Phillips
Dilweg	Johnson, Okla.	Pittenger
Dingell	Johnson, Ward	Ploeser
Dirksen	Jones	Poage
Disney	Jonkman	Poulson
Ditter	Judd	Powers
Domengeaux	Kean	Pracht
Dondero	Kearney	Price
Doughton	Kee	Priest
Douglas	Keefe	Rabaut
Drewry	Kefauver	Ramey
Durham	Kelley	Ramspeck
Dworshak	Kennedy	Randolph
Eaton	Keogh	Rankin
Eberharter	Kerr	Reece, Tenn.
Elliott	Kilburn	Reed, Ill.
Ellis	Kilday	Reed, N. Y.
Ellison, Md.	King	Rees, Kans.
Ellsworth	Kinzer	Richards
Elmer	Kirwan	Rivers
Elston, Ohio	Kleberg	Rizley
Engel, Mich.	Klein	Robertson
Engle, Calif.	Knutson	Robinson, Utah
Fay	Kunkel	Robsion, Ky.
Feighan	LaFollette	Rockwell
Fellows	Lambertson	Rodgers, Pa.
Fenton	Landis	Rogers, Mass.
Fernandez	Lane	Rohrbough
Fish	Lanham	Rolph
Fisher	Larcade	Rowan
Fitzpatrick	Lea	Sabath
Flannagan	LeCompte	Sadowski
Fogarty	Lemke	Sasscer
Folger	LeFevre	Satterfield
Forand	Lesinski	Sauthoff
Ford	Lewis, Colo.	Scanlon
Gale	Lewis, Ohio	Schiffler
Gallagher	Luce	Schuetz
Gamble	Ludlow	Schwabe
Gathings	Lynch	Scott
Gavagan	McCormack	Scrivner
Gavin	McCowen	Shafer
Gearhart	McGranery	Sheppard
Gerlach	McGregor	Sheridan
Gibson	McKenzie	Short
Gifford	McLean	Sikes
Gilchrist	McMillan	Simpson, Ill.
Gillette	McMurray	Simpson, Pa.
Gillie	Maas	Slaughter
Goodwin	Madden	Smith, Maine
	Magnuson	
	Mahon	
	Maloney	
	Manasco	
	Mansfield, Mont.	
	Mansfield, Tex.	
	Marcantonio	
	Martin, Iowa	
	Martin, Mass.	
	Mason	
	May	
	Merritt	
	Michener	
	Miller, Conn.	
	Miller, Mo.	
	Miller, Nebr.	
	Miller, Pa.	
	Mills	
	Monkiewicz	
	Monroney	
	Mott	
	Mruk	
	Mundt	
	Murdock	
	Murphy	
	Murray, Tenn.	
	Murray, Wis.	
	Myers	
	Newsome	
	Norman	
	Norrell	
	Norton	
	O'Brien, Ill.	
	O'Brien, Mich.	
	O'Brien, N. Y.	
	O'Hara	
	O'Konski	
	O'Leary	
	O'Neal	
	O'Toole	
	Outland	
	Pace	
	Patman	
	Patton	
	Peterson, Fla.	
	Peterson, Ga.	
	Pfeifer	
	Philbin	
	Phillips	
	Pittenger	
	Ploeser	
	Poage	
	Poulson	
	Powers	
	Pracht	
	Price	
	Priest	
	Rabaut	
	Ramey	
	Ramspeck	
	Randolph	
	Rankin	
	Reece, Tenn.	
	Reed, Ill.	
	Reed, N. Y.	
	Rees, Kans.	
	Richards	
	Rivers	
	Rizley	
	Robertson	
	Robinson, Utah	
	Robsion, Ky.	
	Rockwell	
	Rodgers, Pa.	
	Rogers, Mass.	
	Rohrbough	
	Rolph	
	Rowan	
	Sabath	
	Sadowski	
	Sasscer	
	Satterfield	
	Sauthoff	
	Scanlon	
	Schiffler	
	Schuetz	
	Schwabe	
	Scott	
	Scrivner	
	Shafer	
	Sheppard	
	Sheridan	
	Short	
	Sikes	
	Simpson, Ill.	
	Simpson, Pa.	
	Slaughter	
	Smith, Maine	

Smith, Ohio	Taber	Welch
Smith, Va.	Talle	Wheat
Smith, Wis.	Tarver	Whelchel, Ga.
Snyder	Taylor	White
Somers, N. Y.	Thomas, N. J.	Whitten
Sparkman	Thomason	Whittington
Spence	Tibbott	Wickersham
Springer	Tolan	Wigglesworth
Stanley	Towe	Winstead
Starnes, Ala.	Troutman	Winter
Stearns, N. H.	Vinson, Ga	Wolcott
Stefan	Voorhis, Calif.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Stevenson	Vorys, Ohio	Wolverton, N. J.
Stewart	Walter	Woodruff, Mich.
Stockman	Ward	Worley
Sullivan	Wasielewski	Wright
Sumner, Ill	Weaver	Zimmerman
Sumners, Tex.	Welchel, Ohio	
Sundstrom	Weiss	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—41

Baldwin, Md.	Hendricks	Smith, W. Va.
Bates, Ky.	Holmes, Mass.	Steagall
Burch, Va.	Jackson	Talbot
Burdick	McCord	Thomas, Tex.
Chapman	McGehee	Treadway
Clark	McWilliams	Vincent, Ky.
Crawford	Merrow	Vursell
Cullen	Morrison, La.	Wadsworth
Curley	Morrison, N. C.	Wene
Dies	O'Connor	West
Fulbright	Plumley	Willey
Fulmer	Rogers, Calif.	Wilson
Furlong	Rowe	Woodrum, Va.
Hébert	Russell	

So the bill was passed.

The clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.

Mr. Curley with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Thomas of Texas with Mr. Rowe.

Mr. Steagall with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Willey.

Mr. Cullen with Mr. McWilliams.

Mr. McCord with Mr. Talbot.

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Fulbright with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Chapman with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Furlong with Mr. Burdick.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some addresses delivered before a meeting of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped at the National Press Club on the evening of July 9.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order to address the House for 10 minutes today. Due to the fact that there are a good many special orders for today, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELIZALDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech by President Quezon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Commissioner from the Philippines?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD with regard to the Argentine situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Rev. Andrew J. Krzesinski, Ph. D., which appeared in the Brooklyn Tablet on Saturday, September 4, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a poem by Mr. Horace Carlisle on the life of the late Edward Creal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article on the use of internee labor in building the Lewis and Clark Highway, and further to extend my own remarks and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by President Quezon of the Philippine Commonwealth delivered at the University of Tennessee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON] for 20 minutes.

SUGGESTED SOLUTION OF JAPANESE PROBLEM BY DEPORTATION PURSUANT TO TREATY AT WAR'S END

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I intend to talk a few minutes about the problem of the Japanese. Unfortunately, I have not all of the data that I wish I had with me, and I intend to make a more extended talk on this matter soon. In considering the matter of the Japanese and the problem that will present itself after the war is over, certain things must be kept in mind. One of them is this, that all of the problems of the W. R. A., and the placing of the Japanese in war relocation camps, are merely transitory problems. When the war is over, the camps will be abandoned, and the Japanese, in my opinion, will largely return to the place where they had their property, their friends, and their former homes. The result will be that most of them will return to the west coast, especially to California. Another thing we have to consider is the fact that two-thirds of the Japanese in America, and there are about 130,000 of them, are American citizens, and they have certain rights, the same as any other citizen, which we must recognize.

I have presented certain legislation that I think will solve the Japanese problem. In the first place, I point out that the Japanese are a nonassimilable race. They have been here for 40 years, and during those 40 years not one one-hundredth of them have been assimilated, and no matter whether they are here for 100 years or 200 years, they will never become assimilated in the way that European races assimilate with the rest of the Americans.

The result is that we will have a group of brown people living in the community who will always stand apart and who will never, in my opinion, be thoroughly

American, like the people who come from Europe and other places. Also, it is a well-known fact, by those who have studied the problem, that the Japanese live a dual life. They live a Japanese life and they live an American life. They have a Japanese religion, and the Japanese language, Japanese schools and Japanese music, and all those things. The result is that that accentuates their differences, and will perpetuate them as a separate and distinct group of people. I believe it would have been far better for the Japanese and also for us if they had never come here in such large numbers.

My proposal in handling the problem is based upon the assumption that we are going to win the war so successfully and so completely that at the end of the war we will be in a position to present a treaty of our own dictation. My plan briefly is this. I have introduced Resolution No. 29 in the House, that provides that in any treaty made with Japan it shall contain, among other provisions, the following two provisions: First, that all alien Japanese be deported; second, that all those American-born Japanese, citizens, who by a court or any other appropriate governmental agency shall be found to be disloyal to the United States, or who shall have engaged in subversive activities by advocating the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence, or who shall have given aid and comfort to any of our enemies, shall likewise, after public hearing, be deported to Japan. In order to implement that provision of this treaty I have provided for a Deportation Commission. It shall consist of three persons appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate.

This Commission shall review the files of all of those Japanese-Americans whose records indicate they have in any way been guilty of disloyalty to the United States during or before our entry into the war. Those persons shall be given a public hearing and at this hearing the evidence adduced against the particular person shall be presented by the Government first. That person shall have the right of subpena. He shall have the right to a lawyer of his own choice, and he shall have the right to hear the testimony against him and shall be permitted to submit testimony in his own behalf. Upon the adjudication of the public hearing, then the Commission shall make a finding, as to whether or not the particular person involved has been guilty of the different things which would denationalize him and make him subject to deportation. These things are whether he has been disloyal to the United States, whether he has engaged in subversive activities and recommended or advocated the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence, and, third, whether he has given aid and comfort to the enemy. For instance, I see by the report that the President made of the Japanese relocation camps that 6,300 Japanese have refused to sign the oath of allegiance to the United States and want to go back to Japan. In other words, those particular people, in my opinion, would be the type who will be deported to Japan and they should not now or later be allowed to change their mind. There are undoubtedly many more. I believe that this is a legal, a practical, and a constitutional way to solve the Japanese problem. We will take out all of the troublemakers, those who have created dissension, and the hostility toward the American Government on the part of the Japanese.

We will remove the aliens. It means that the Japanese who are left will be persons of whose record we can be sure, because if they had not had a good record they would have been called before the Deportation Commission, and the fact that they were not, shows that the bad group has been purged out and only the good ones are left. It will be a blessing to the white Americans; it will be a blessing to the Japanese-Americans.

I offer this as a very practical and common-sense solution of the Japanese problem. I trust that when I ask for hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs I will be able to get them to send the resolution to the floor of the House. I also trust that when the hearing comes on my bill, with some perfecting amendments, I may be heard and receive a favorable vote from the Committee on Immigration.

As I say, it is a very fair and very legal method of handling this problem. We have to admit that no matter how long the Japanese remain in America they never will become thoroughly amalgamated. I recognize that those who are here, who have lived loyal, decent lives should not have their rights infringed upon; that we should allow them to remain here like any other citizens, but those whose record has been proved bad in the hearings before the Deportation Commission should be moved out and taken back to Japan where their heart and their ideas and their religion is.

Therefore I think I have a practical, constitutional scheme that will do complete justice to the bad ones and will do justice to the good Japanese who have been loyal to America.

I have little more to add except that in my plan I recognize fully the rights of the Japanese the same as any other segment of the population. It has been stated that there is friction between the Japanese and the so-called white Americans. My plan proposes to give every man his day in court. Those who have been loyal, and many of them have been, will have no fear of any reprisals whatever. They can go back and live in their former abode if they wish to. I think after hearings and the removal of the bad Japanese it will be much better and much more healthful for the loyal Japanese to live in their own homes.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentleman think that the loyal Japanese themselves will object to the gentleman's proposal, or rather that they would welcome it?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I think a great many of them would welcome it. However, I do have one proposal that may be drastic and I would like to get the gentleman's reaction on that. It is the removal of all aliens, which constitute about one-third of the population.

Mr. JUDD. You mean all alien Japanese?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. All alien Japanese.

Mr. JUDD. Regardless of their behavior and so forth?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Yes. Of course, I have no objection to including any race that comes within the purview of my legislation; that is, any alien race.

Mr. JUDD. They might be Germans, Italians, or Japanese.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. JUDD. Offhand I would say I think those provisions of the bill which permit deportation after each man has had his day in court rather than on the basis that everybody who is an alien should be automatically removed, because a great many of those who are here came here because they were opposed to the regime that was in power in the old country. For instance, I talked to a man from Germany who was telling about the Germans who were admitted here after the last war. They are the saboteurs. They could not stand the republican regime in Germany. They were the old monarchists, so they migrated to this country and became citizens during the twenties, and many of them are not loyal.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. In response to the gentleman I will say that I am more interested in moving out these Japanese and other enemy aliens who have been disloyal during the period of the war, as I consider their action treasonable. If they had a hearing as I propose, there would be no curtailing of their rights, but we will have to prove that they were disloyal. If we do prove that, they ought to be deported promptly.

Mr. JUDD. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. In the other enemy alien groups there are some people who also respond to that same formula. By our exercise of the treaty power we have our one chance to deport disloyal citizens by denationalizing them, and under the treaty provisions with Japan, Germany, and Italy, the terms of which treaties we will be able to dictate, provide for their deportation.

Mr. JUDD. That is right, I am sure, as to those aliens who are not citizens. Put it on a basis of loyalty.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. There might be some way of sifting other aliens on the basis of loyalty.

Mr. JUDD. That would be my judgment.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I thank the gentleman for his reaction.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back such time as I may have not consumed with the statement that I shall soon submit a more comprehensive statement on the problem.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

JAPANESE IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, on October 11 the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] stated that he regretted my remarks with respect to the War Relocation Authority and the Japanese situation and implied to this House that I did not know whereof I spoke, and that I was un-American.

In reply to the gentleman I wish to state that I believe that 90 to 95 percent of the people of California who have had direct business dealings with the Japanese cannot all be wrong; and I will wager anyone that he will find, if he contacts people who have had direct business dealings with the Japanese over a period of years, that 90 to 95 percent believe the Japanese are tricky and treacherous, and believe that between the United States and Japan, the Jap's first loyalty is to Japan. I say people who have had direct business dealings with the Japs. I will admit there are a few school teachers, ministers, and possibly the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], who have come in contact with Japs through their activities, who believe there may be some Japs who are loyal to the United States, but, according to a poll taken in California answered by 1,468 people, there are many ministers and school teachers who do not believe that the Japs should be allowed to return to the west coast at this time, and only 2 people favored it. Also many of them who answered the poll went into detail as to why they voted that way.

The reason I made the statement I did on the floor of this House on October 11 was due to the fact that I wanted to prevent Japanese blood from being spilled in California, as it surely will be if the Japanese are allowed to return there. I do not blame the American people for bearing malice toward the Japanese race, and especially the people of my State, who know them so well.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that if his statement were true that the Japanese are loyal American citizens, then certainly it would seem that out of the 100,000 Japanese who were located on the west coast at the time of Pearl Harbor that at least one of them might have told us in advance that we were going to be attacked by the Japanese at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and saved thousands of lives; yet not even one of these Jap rascals gave us a warning, and yet thousands of them knew of the coming attack and even fortified themselves by having in their possession ammunition, guns, and dynamite, so when the proper time came they could destroy their neighbors and friends with whom they had lived. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania thinks my statement was un-American, I would suggest that he get ready now to accept in his own community the thousands of Japs, who I know would welcome his hospitality, but I doubt very much whether the people of Pennsylvania would like to have Japs moved in as their neighbors at the close of the war, when many of their sons, because of the Japs' treacherous attack, will not return home. I want further to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I will put myself up against him any time or any place as an American citizen.

A great many California people feel that there is danger to the safety of the released Japs if the Japs are returned to the Pacific coast at this time, and I do not believe that all these people are anarchists. Many of these people have close personal friends among the Japs, but this feeling, I believe, is for fear that some father and mother, sister or brother of some boy who has died—not having been killed in open battle but from some disease in prison camps as a result of refusal on the part of the Japanese to allow food and medicine to be sent through the Red Cross—might kill one of these Japs and as a result, through reprisals, cause the death of our boys who are still prisoners. For this one reason alone I, as an American, believe that for the protection of our boys the Japanese should be retained in our concentration camps where they are given adequate housing, food, medical care, and educational and recreational facilities, which is in vast contrast to the way our American prisoners are treated by the Japanese.

In Sacramento, Calif., on October 13, more than 1,000 delegates to the annual convention of the California State Grange heard State Grange Master George Sehlmeyer propose the removal of all Japanese from the Nation at the war's end. The Grange master said:

> It is next to impossible to segregate loyal from disloyal Japanese.

And summed up his post-war proposal for the Japanese in this statement:

> We believe from the standpoint of justice to all concerned to safeguard American institutions and ideals and at the same time avoid future difficulties, the best course to pursue is, when the war ends, to return all Japanese to their homeland.

It is true that no sabotage has been committed by the Japanese in the United States, but had Japan invaded the United States the saboteurs were on hand and ready to do their bit to destroy human life and property just the same as they did at Pearl Harbor and Manila.

I wish further to state for the safety of the small number of Japanese who might be good, although no one knows, that they should not be permitted for the duration of the war to return to localities where people are so adverse to their return.

MUST EUROPE'S CHILDREN STARVE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 26 I introduced House Resolution 244 having for its purpose the removal of the ban against sending food to the starving children in the subjugated countries overrun by the Axis in Europe. Thus far no action has been taken on this or similar resolutions. I most certainly hope that the Congress will enact soon legislation which will let down the bars and save these children from starvation. I have been urging early action and I hope that all of my colleagues will give the matter consideration and join in the request for the enactment of such legislation at the very earliest time possible before it is too late.

The objections usually raised against the bill are the following:

First. The Nazis would take the food.

Second. The Germans might not take the food which we send, but would take an equivalent amount of local food out of the country.

Third. The Germans would reduce the ration cards of the children whom we helped, so that although the child might exhaust his ration card, the card itself would call for less food, which would leave a residue by which the Nazis could profit.

Fourth. We cannot burden the American taxpayer with additional expense.

In passing I want to say that it would not cost the American taxpayer anything.

Fifth. Ships cannot be spared to send the food.

Sixth. In view of our own growing shortage, we have not the food to spare.

Seventh. No American can work in any occupied country and we would not be sure of careful supervision.

These various arguments against the enactment of this legislation and the opposition to a program to save the children of Europe from starvation were so well answered by Dr. Howard E. Kershner in a recent address that I am including Dr. Kershner's address as a part of these remarks. Dr. Kershner is exceedingly well qualified to answer these objections. He is director of the International Commission for the Assistance of Child Refugees and a member of the executive committee of the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies. He was director of relief in Europe from 1939 to 1942 for American Friends Service Committee. His long residence in Europe and his close contact and study of this most important relief problem have given him first-hand information which qualifies him to speak with authority. The address to which I refer is as follows:

HOW TO SAVE THE STARVING CHILDREN OF EUROPE WITHOUT AIDING THE ENEMY

Hitler's proud boast that the Germans are a superior race will come true to the extent that we allow him to destroy the freedom-loving people of Europe by starvation and to render those that are left, subnormal in mind and body. People who have eaten well are indeed superior to those who are undersized and riddled with disease.

It is not only good charity, but the best of strategy to save the starving children of the Nazi-dominated countries of Europe. These people are our friends and allies. They have fought for liberty for centuries before our country was born. They are still fighting for it. They crave our moral support and help. To save their children now would win their friendship and affection forever. We need their help now, and we shall desperately need it in the reconstruction days ahead. How will we ever reestablish democracy as the ruling philosophy of government if we allow Hitler to destroy the democratic peoples of Europe?

At no expense to ourselves and without using any ships or food which we or our allies need, it is possible to save many of these starving little ones. It is not only a human obligation, but it will help to shorten the war.

Having recently discussed this matter with many of the chief officials of the American and British Governments, with the heads of the governments of the Nazi-occupied countries, with the editors of the leading British and American publications, with thousands of individuals in the question periods following more than 100 public addresses in these

2 countries, and with a large number of correspondents in both countries resulting from nearly 50 previous radio talks, I should like to answer every doubt and difficulty that may be in your mind on this subject, and to show from experience how we can be sure that controlled child feeding would not aid the enemy, but would save the children, would give courage and strength to our friends and allies, and would make post-war reconstruction much less difficult.

OBJECTION 1. THE NAZIS WOULD TAKE THE FOOD

From 4 years' experience directing relief work in Europe, I am glad to report that the Nazis have never taken a mouthful of our food. Our own State Department is authority for the fact that the Germans do not take any of the 19,000 tons of food going to Greece each month, that the operation is of no benefit to Axis economy, and that it does save the Greeks. I received the same assurance from the Ministry of Economic Warfare in London last winter. Since the Germans do not take the food going to Greece and since they did not take our food in France, it is reasonable to assume that they would not take food which we might now send to Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France.

But assume the worst, suppose they did take it, what would be the result? As only small amounts would be sent at one time, they could not seize more than enough for one meal for the civilian population of Germany. This, of course, would immediately bring the operation to a close. The small gain accruing to Germany from having seized a little bit of food would be far outweighed by the psychological advantage on our side. Over the short-wave radio, we would tell our friends in Europe that we were anxious to feed their children, but that the Germans had taken the food, and the operation must, therefore, be stopped. We would have given them moral encouragement, we would continue to enjoy their affection and friendship, and we would have given the lie to the Nazi propaganda that these people are starving because of our blockade.

Thus, the very worst thing that could happen would be to our advantage. But experience indicates that the Germans would not take the food, and that the children would be saved.

OBJECTION NO. 2. THE GERMANS MIGHT NOT TAKE THE FOOD WHICH WE SEND, BUT WOULD TAKE AN EQUIVALENT AMOUNT OF LOCAL FOOD OUT OF THE COUNTRY

If the operation were properly controlled, they could not do this. Let me explain.

Every child helped should be required to exhaust its own ration card before being given a supplement of imported food. If the child eats all of the local food to which it is entitled—its full share—just as much as if no foreign relief were available, it is obvious that there is no equivalent left over as a result of the operation by which the Nazis could profit. True enough, the Germans take food from all of these countries, but the point is that they did not take any more as a result of our operations. In our colonies, we completely exhausted the French ration card of each child each month before drawing upon our supplies of imported food. We are certain, therefore, that this did not leave any indirect way by which the Germans could have profited.

OBJECTION NO. 3. THE GERMANS WOULD REDUCE THE RATION CARDS OF THE CHILDREN WHOM WE HELPED, SO THAT ALTHOUGH THE CHILD MIGHT EXHAUST HIS RATION CARD, THE CARD ITSELF WOULD CALL FOR LESS FOOD, WHICH WOULD LEAVE A RESIDUE BY WHICH THE NAZIS COULD PROFIT

From experience, I can tell you that the Germans did not do this. The children whom we helped continued to have exactly the same ration cards as the children whom we were not helping. This objection, therefore, falls down in the light of experience. The evidence on this point is very clear, for the children receiving our extra rations maintained their health and continued to grow and gain weight, while the other unfortunate children stopped growing, developed anemia, rickets, and tuberculosis.

We should have been feeding at least 2,000,000 children in southern France alone, but we were not permitted to bring food through the blockade and had to depend upon supplies which we had bought in Asia, Africa, and Central Europe in 1940 and the early part of 1941. This forced us to limit the number of children fed to 100,000, imposing upon us the terrible necessity of deciding which children should eat and which should starve. With the help of the school physicians we selected the most needy children who were admitted to our canteens. The others, who were suffering almost as badly, would ask in polite though weak little voices why they too could not eat. I never found a satisfactory answer to the question of why a hungry child should not eat, especially when I came home and found that we are wasting more food than would be required to save the lives of these starving innocent little victims.

Of course, if the Germans discriminated against the children being helped, that would constitute a violation of the agreement and the operation would immediately be stopped, but up to now they have not done so.

OBJECTION NO. 4. WE CANNOT BURDEN THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER WITH ADDITIONAL EXPENSE

We are not asking for any money from our Government or by private subscription. Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France have funds of their own in this country more than sufficient to pay for all of the food that it is proposed to send. The operation could be financed by unblocking a portion of these funds. The heads of these governments have all assured me of their eagerness to use some of their resources in this manner. It would cost the American people nothing. These four countries are mentioned because, until recently, at least, Denmark was not suffering so severely, help is already going to Greece, and it is not possible to reach Czechoslovakia, Poland, and occupied Russia.

OBJECTION NO. 5. SHIPS CANNOT BE SPARED TO SEND THE FOOD

We would not use a single ship available for the war effort. Neutral ships which cannot be hired for war purposes would be used.

OBJECTION NO. 6. IN VIEW OF OUR GROWING SHORTAGE, WE HAVEN'T THE FOOD TO SPARE

A few weeks ago, I saw a dispatch from the Department of Agriculture in Washington, stating that the American people are still wasting enough food to feed 20,000,000 people the year around. That is more than 3 times as much as we are asking permission to send to Europe. We are, therefore, in the unenviable position of not being willing to allow a portion of the crumbs which fall from our table to be used to save the lives of our neighbors' children, who are the hope of the future.

All that it is proposed to send from this country is a little grain, of which we still have a surplus, and the meat, fat, and milk required could be brought from South America. Our own food scarcity, therefore, is no excuse for inaction.

Quite rightly, we will now begin feeding the Italians. But how will it look to the people of the occupied countries who have fought on our side for more than 3 years for us to continue starving them while we feed the Italians, who have fought against us for over 3 years? What faith will any people have in our moral protestations if we starve our own allies and friends? Military necessity might require the starvation of all of Europe if by so doing we could starve the enemy, but we cannot do that in any event. There is enough food in Europe to feed the Germans, and we may be sure that they will get it. What we can do and are doing is to starve the democratic, freedom-loving people who are doing their valiant best for our cause.

OBJECTION NO. 7. NO AMERICAN COULD WORK IN ANY OCCUPIED COUNTRY, AND WE WOULD NOT BE SURE OF CAREFUL SUPERVISION

It is true that no American organization could work in these Nazi-occupied countries, but the International Red Cross, with a neutral personnel, which does it so well in Greece, is ready to undertake the responsibility of distribution. We may be sure, therefore, that the operation would be properly controlled.

These objections sum up the whole case against feeding, and they all disappear in the light of experience. There is, then, no reason why we should not send help to these children, and there is every reason of humanity and strategy why we should do so.

If these starving children were sitting on your doorstep tonight and you could see their piteous eyes, set in bloodless faces, begging even for the garbage from your kitchens, you would feed them. You could not eat yourself until you had done so. Because they are across the sea does not lessen their suffering or our obligation. Please help us mobilize public opinion on behalf of sending food to these tragic little victims of war. Tell your friends and neighbors how this can be done without aiding the enemy. Take the matter up in your societies, clubs, lodges, parent-teacher associations. Ask your ministers to preach about it. Write letters to your papers and ask our editors to write editorials. Make sure that your Senators and your Congressman, the President, and the Secretaries of State and War know how you feel about the matter.

Bipartisan House Resolution No. 117 asks the administration to take immediate action to save the children. I am sure your Congressman would welcome a letter from you, stating your opinion of this matter. Senate Resolution No. 100 is the same as the House resolution. I know your two Senators would be glad to have a letter from you on this subject.

Our officials in Washington are very favorably disposed toward making a controlled effort to help the children. Let us support and encourage them. I am not asking you to do anything opposed to the policy of our Government in beseeching you to help give a demonstration of the desire of the American people that these children be saved. Neither am I asking for any anti-British action, for I have overwhelming evidence that this cause is very popular in public and private circles throughout the British Isles.

On the platform, through the generous press, and over the air, I shall continue to report to you on various phases of the subject. Meanwhile, you can get copies of this talk and other literature from the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York 17. Please make your own influence felt in every possible way on behalf of these starving little ones. Remember the words of the Master, "It were better that a millstone were hanged about his neck and that he were cast into the sea than that he should offend one of these little ones." Will you do something about it?

With grateful thanks, good night.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for 45 minutes.

NEEDED: A CODE OF RADIO GOOD BEHAVIOR

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to revise and extend my remarks and to include some editorial and extra-

nequs printed matter, some quotations and citations from magazines and newspapers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in these days of global warfare news stories of great significance tumble over themselves so rapidly that frequently a matter of primary importance on the domestic front gets far from the publicity it deserves. As a result, many citizens are sometimes months behind in the business of getting caught up with far-reaching developments on the home front.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the recent announcement of the Columbia Broadcasting System by which it self-imposed upon itself a voluntary code of radio good behavior and impartial performance is an item of this kind. Judging from the almost universal acclaim which this public-spirited action has won from Members of Congress and from impartial editors who have commented upon it, I believe this move on the part of C. B. S. is an epochal step in the direction of protecting free speech and fair play on the American radio. C. B. S. should be congratulated and supported on its patriotic decision to protect its listeners against propaganda and politics and to give all sides of all controversial issues an equal opportunity to be heard over its great radio network. It is hoped that the other radio networks will quickly follow this wise policy as enunciated by the Columbia Broadcasting System.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the decision of C. B. S. to prevent the use of a semipublic monopoly such as radio by private individuals or commercial sponsors for propaganda or political purposes will do more to preserve private ownership and operation of radio in this country than anything which has happened since the advent of broadcasting.

Perhaps a few wealthy radio tycoons who own or control big radio outlets feel secure in their power and believe it to be reference to but a straw man when it is declared, as I am about to declare, that private ownership and operation of radio in this country is not a guaranteed certainty for even the next 4 years—to say nothing of the permanent future.

Let these big men of radio scoff if they want to—I happen to know that the danger that privately operated radio in this country may have a short life is not something to be blithely overlooked. Stockholders and officials of large radio corporations might well remember that indifference to danger signs along the way was precisely the attitude which trapped the great industrialists of Germany into becoming the servants of the Nazi political state. Indifference to public opinion and to public trends in this country may well do the same for our radio industry.

Those who are in authority for the moment in private radio have a responsibility to themselves, to their stockholders, to the cause of private radio, and to America itself, to discontinue flaunting bad practices in the face of public opinion and to take steps to eliminate them before they give cause to support existing plans to make radio a public instead of a private monopoly. For that reason, the far-sighted and public-serving decision of the executives of C. B. S. is not only gratifying to all those believing in the continuance of private radio but it is one which the executives of other radio networks might well emulate. It should not be forgotten that one persistent offender in the radio field may well break down the dike which is now holding back the flood waters of Government-operated radio.

As background for what I am about to say with regard to two important questions which must soon be settled by the radio industry, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Congress, Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention, briefly, to some previous considerations which I have given this subject and which appear in earlier issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In the RECORD for May 30, 1940, under the title of "A Question Radio Executives Should Ponder Seriously—and Answer Carefully," I set forth some suggestions which, if followed, I hoped and believed would tend to safeguard private radio in this country and prevent it from flaunting its way into complete Government control or even ownership. Permit me here to read you a few paragraphs from those remarks:

A CHALLENGE TO THE SELF-RESTRAINT OF RADIO

Mr. Speaker, I have a passionate devotion to the American principle of free speech. But should such freedom, when exercised over air channels which are privately owned and from which others are excluded by governmental regulations, get out of bounds to the detriment of the public morale, it would become a public problem of vital concern to the entire Nation. Wise self-restraint, now, by the radio companies themselves is, in my opinion, a far better solution to the problem of hysterical excesses and unduly exciting and provocative broadcasts than any laws which Congress could devise. Surely such restraint can prevent the necessity of new legislation to meet the problem propounded by the question of what is and what is not public-serving broadcasting of war news.

We can still too well remember the results of Orson Welles' purely fictitious broadcasting of a fanciful invasion from Mars. So real did the highly emotionalized speeches of radio speakers appear that a near panic developed in many localities in America. Wisely, radio executives themselves took steps to prevent a repetition of such a sensational program to unnerve large portions of the populace. Confronted, too, with the problem of how much emotionalism and hysteria to convey over the air waves in reporting war news, it is my hope these same radio executives themselves, with no legislative stimulus or restraint, will use equal discretion in not permitting factual reporting to be colored by hysterical or emotional commentators whose inflections and intonations can well induce emotional upsets and develop panicky thinking if they carelessly or deliberately engage in all the histrionics of their art instead of functioning simply as reporters of news.

COMMENTATORS CULTIVATE THE "ILLUSION OF INTEGRITY"

On the other hand, especially among radio commentators who inject their personal opinions and emotions into the news, too frequently an attempt is made to create an "illusion of integrity" which leads the unwary listener to believe that what he hears is more factual or fulsome and reliable than what he reads. Obviously, such is not the case because newspapers and radio stations, alike, are limited by the same conditions in foreign countries and all are circumscribed by the same foreign censors and the same propagandists who are in the business of distorting the facts for military or psychological purposes.

Following that discussion, Mr. Speaker, I received a telephone call and then a letter from Harry C. Butcher, vice president of the Columbia Broadcasting System. The letter from Mr. Butcher was dated June 5, 1940, and said in part:

To repeat what I told you on the phone, I think your statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD indicates that you have given a great deal of thought to this subject, as have the executives of the broadcasting networks and stations generally. We appreciate the responsibilities placed upon us by these trying times and are attempting, I believe, with considerable success, to inform the public honestly and conscientiously. Certainly Columbia is making every effort in that direction.

This letter was followed by conferences with representatives of the broadcasting industry and by considerable additional correspondence, with Mr. Kaltenborn and other commentators and officials personally interested in private ownership and operation of radio and its utilization in the best possible public interest. As a result of this correspondence and these conversations, I again addressed the House on June 18, 1940, summarizing my observations and proposing five specific factors to which it seemed to me the radio industry should give serious consideration and develop remedial policies. Mr. Speaker, I incorporate extracts of that speech at this point as a part of these remarks.

RADIO'S RESPONSIBILITIES EXPAND WITH RADIO'S PRIVILEGES

Mr. Speaker, all Members of Congress are aware of the severe charges recently leveled at the American radio industry by certain Government officials charging it with "monopolistic practices" and other unfair policies. Personally, I am unwilling to subscribe to these charges on the basis of available evidence. I think that the record of American radio, taken as a whole, is highly commendable. Great public service is rendered the public by radio through its practice of making available to speakers of opposing sides on controversial issues like periods of free time to present their arguments. To my knowledge radio has not yet been guilty of using its monopoly of favorite air waves and its protective licenses and permits to sponsor one set of protagonists against another or to freeze out opposing viewpoints. It is my sincere hope that radio will never permit itself to become guilty of such prejudicial practices because to my mind that would be a big step backward through providing potent arguments for more Government control or supervision and for substituting bureaucratic control—never very satisfactory and seldom very equitable—for self-restraint and fair-play codes which radio can much better provide for itself by a faithful recognition of the responsibilities which always attach themselves to such special privileges as radio presently enjoys.

With the hope that radio may redouble its efforts to avoid justifiable criticism and that it may reexamine its practices to the end that the best public interests may always be served, I summarize herewith some considerations which I believe radio executives should carefully ponder and not lightly shunt

aside on the basis that at this time no great complaint is evident in demands for legislative reforms or executive restraints. The time to eliminate a widespread public demand for governmental correctives is before the complaint is crystallized—once the crusade is on and a chorus of demands for Government action is apparent, it is frequently too late to stem the tide and all too often the alleged correctives go too far and impose new vices more pernicious than those they would eradicate. No business enterprise is ever so strong or so safe that it can afford to discard substantial segments of its good will by turning a deaf ear to sincere critics and trusting to time alone to quiet valid criticisms. For that reason, I list the following factors for whatever value they may have in stimulating thought leading to the preservation of free radio in America and the nipping in the bud of any proposals that Government action be utilized to eradicate such minor deficiencies as radio may now be heir to. American radio is good and it is getting better. It is entitled to a fair chance to demonstrate that its self-imposed regulations are adequate to serve the public interest and to protect the functions of democratic government in this great Republic.

A SUMMARY OF FACTORS FOR RADIO EXECUTIVES TO CONSIDER

1. Ninety percent of present-day radio programs are free from substantial criticism by the public. That in itself is a high tribute to American radio. The 10 percent of radio programs which cause concern are in the opiniated observations of speakers who are either on the pay roll of the radio companies themselves or who speak for hire for commercial sponsors. Radio cannot afford to ignore the significance as molders of public opinion which these opinionated observers have and the delicate problem growing out of them concerning how far radio or commercial sponsors go in employing speakers for hire to shape public opinion.

2. Radio executives should study the advisability of setting up self-imposed regulations whereby sponsored programs by commercial groups, professional commentators, speakers working for pay and salaried reporters on sustaining programs, should not permit their personal prejudices, their individual opinions, their political philosophies, and their own viewpoints to color the programs in which they participate. To expand this type of opinionated program to its full extent would be to permit the opinion backed by the biggest purse to propagandize America and dominate the air waves. Carried to its ultimate degree, a billion-dollar sponsor could purchase enough time and sponsor speakers and commentators enough to superimpose its philosophy or policies upon an entire people. Thus, such free speech on the air could be used to circumvent the free thinking of a nation.

3. Radio's current policy of permitting conflicting sides of controversial questions to have equal opportunity with free radio time to present its arguments is Americanism in action. It is the essence of democracy and is highly commendable. But if speakers on commercial programs and those speaking on the sustaining programs of the big radio chains themselves attempt to influence public opinion and present lopsided arguments on public questions they can well destroy and nullify the great democratic value of the prevailing policy of giving free time to all sides of a controversial question, because the professional commentators and speakers are on the air so much more frequently than the laymen.

4. Radio should recognize a responsibility for not permitting itself to be for sale to the highest bidder on controversial questions, which is not shared by the newspaper business. The difference is clear-cut and obvious. As many newspapers can present themselves for public approval in any State or community as the public will support, they seek and secure no governmental license and obtain no governmental monopoly of favored channels of presentation. Thus editors have an independence which radio systems cannot rightfully exercise because radio by its very nature is more monopolistic than are the newspapers. Too many radio stations find too few choice air waves to share for day and night broadcasting. Therefore the Government licenses some and must refuse concessions to others. While no legitimate complaint can attach to this necessity, it does impose upon those radio units favored by Government permit to own an air wave the obligation not to exercise that concession to plump for one opinion or to play down another.

5. Excesses and abuses in the realm of these optionated programs by speakers for hire are the danger zone around free radio in America. Government regulation could correct the abuses but I hope it will never have to come to that. In my opinion, such coercion is unnecessary. Radio deserves the opportunity to eliminate these abuses for itself where they occur and to guard against their extension. To say they never occur, is to blink at the facts; to say they are the prevailing practice, is to exaggerate the exception. Between the extremes of too many too highly opinionated commercial or sustaining programs, and a ban against all interpretative speakers and personal commentators there is surely a happy compromise at which point such speakers for hire can be selected who will exercise uniform good taste and opinions balanced by open-minded recognition that others equally wise may hold differing viewpoints. Such speakers can be secured, I believe, who will stress the factual over the prejudicial elements of news and who will avoid taking sides on issues of political importance or governmental significance at times and on points which comprise periods of our national history when the general public is seeking to formulate clear-headed and far-reaching decisions which may determine our national destiny for many years to come.

In view of the foregoing experience, Mr. Speaker, I am naturally gratified as are many other Americans, both in and out of Congress, at the progressive and forward-looking step in the interests of free speech and fair play which have been taken by the Columbia Broadcasting System in its recent declaration of policy assuring the listening public that C. B. S. would not permit its facilities to be exploited for propaganda purposes. A few radio commentators have utilized the facilities of other radio networks to condemn C. B. S. for forthrightly barring propaganda from its network. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I want at this time to read into the record an open letter written by Paul W. Kester, vice president and general manager of C. B. S. at the present time, which presents the C. B. S. point of view in this matter. The letter follows:

FREEDOM OF THE AIR

DEAR MR. WINCHELL: During the past several days you have commented critically on Columbia Broadcasting System's news broadcasting policies. There are at least three points not thus far mentioned in your column, which we think your readers should have in order to understand the real issue involved. In view of your own interest in freedom of expression and journalistic fairness, we urge that you publish this letter explaining why we feel that freedom of expression on the air is protected, not "muzzled" by Columbia Broadcasting System's policies of noneditorial news reporting and news analysis.

1. You have not mentioned the fact that, while keeping opinion out of news broadcasting as such, we invite the freest expression of opinion elsewhere in our broadcasting schedule. In other words, our air is wide open to the most partisan speakers on every major issue in the news. Proponents and opponents of lend-lease, post-war collaboration, price control, tax policies, etc., have championed their respective sides of public arguments in a constant battle of public opinion over the Columbia Broadcasting System network. But it is presented as opinion and not as news. This is most important because it eliminates the camouflaged propaganda that opinionated reporters could otherwise insinuate into a field which we think should remain simon pure, honestly objective, and utterly noneditorial.

2. Your comments, we think, imply that Columbia Broadcasting System's policies preclude straight news reporting on "controversial subjects" in the news. The opposite is true. For instance: The draft of fathers is one of the "hottest" controversies now before the public. It has been dealt with fully, freely, and fearlessly on Columbia Broadcasting System network news for the past several weeks. None of our news reporters or news analysts has sought to lobby for or against it. Nor has any one of them avoided accurate news reporting of the controversy's daily progress.

3. You should have told your readers the simple, physical fact that lies behind our policy of nonpartisan news broadcasting. The number of radio wave lengths is, at present, definitely limited. There are only a certain number of physical facilities, that is, of radio transmitters which can be linked into radio networks. Clock hours are also limited. And thus a small group of news commentators, commanding preferred positions and established audiences on nation-wide networks, could, if they opinionated their news broadcasting, exert a dangerous and dominating power over public opinion. Such power in the hands of a few, would destroy all fairness on the air—and in a domestic world, there is no freedom without fairness.

PAUL W. KESTER,
Columbia Broadcasting System.
NEW YORK.

THE C. B. S. POLICY STATEMENT

Mr. Speaker, the new policy statement of the Columbia Broadcasting System, to which Mr. Kester's letter refers, dated September 7, 1943, speaks for itself. I am incorporating it with my remarks at this point in the RECORD, since it deserves the study of every American who places the preservation of free speech high among the attributes of this Republic:

To C. B. S. news analysts:

This is a restatement of Columbia's policies in regard to news analysis, an explanation of their reasons for being, and a declaration of our intention to enforce them rigidly to the end that the American listening public will be best served.

Please do not expect anything new in this memorandum. No innovations are involved. It is sent you at this time merely because there have been occasional instances recently in which there seemed to be a lack of clear understanding of our policies both on the part of news analysts and of our editors. I trust this will clear up any confusion which may have existed, especially among newer members of our staff. If not, then I shall be all too happy to discuss these matters with you personally at greater length and

supply you with fresh copies of previous material dealing with our policies.

First off, let it be emphasized that Columbia has no editorial views except in regard to radio itself. By extension, those men selected by us to interpret or analyze the news must also refrain from expression of editorial opinion or our noneditorial position becomes an empty shell.

Each of you has been chosen by us because of your background and knowledge, insight, clarity of thought and special ability to make yourselves understood by vast audiences. We feel we have faced and met a considerable responsibility in your selection. We now feel that you must meet and face much the same responsibility in writing your analyses. For we have said to ourselves, "We will not choose men who will tell the public what they themselves think and what the public should think." And we ask that you say to yourselves, "We are not privileged to crusade, to harangue the people or to attempt to sway public opinion."

In our view, then, the function of the news analyst is to marshal the facts on any specific subject and out of his common or special knowledge to present these facts so as to inform his listeners rather than persuade them. The analyst should attempt to clear up any contradictions within the known record, should fairly present both sides of controversial questions and, in short, should give the best available information upon which listeners can make up their own minds. Ideally, in the case of controversial issues, the audience should be left with no impression as to which side the analyst himself actually favors.

The news analyst, so restricted in the expression of his personal beliefs, may argue that he is being denied freedom of speech, that if he were employed by a newspaper or a magazine, he would have much greater latitude in speaking his mind. This argument brings us to the reasons for the policies I have just enunciated and the best way to deal with those reasons is to declare at once that there is a very considerable difference between the radio station or network and a newspaper or magazine.

The essential contrast is supplied by the available opportunities for publication and for broadcasting. Nothing except lack of funds or unwillingness to risk them prevents anyone anywhere from starting a newspaper, a magazine, or a publishing house. Within the laws of libel, obscenity and sedition, the publisher is then able to say editorially anything he wishes to say, or to hire men to say it for him. But in the case of broadcasting, there are only a certain number of frequencies available for broadcasting stations and by the same token, only a limited number of networks can be created and maintained on a national basis. It is this limitation which makes for the basic difference between broadcasting and the press, from which stems our noneditorial policy. Without such a policy it is easy to see that a powerful and one-sided position on serious issues could be created for a small group of broadcasters locally, regionally, or nationally.

The threat of such unbalanced power is inimical to a democratic and free radio or to democracy itself.

As for those radio-news analysts who cry out that the limitations which our policies impose on them threaten freedom of speech, I think the opposite is true. For we have set aside regular broadcasting periods in which controversial issues of the day can be and are discussed first by one side, then the other. We have declined repeatedly to sell time for the discussion of these issues, so that the greater amount of time (and with it the effective control of public opinion) would not be at the disposal of the side prepared to spend the most money.

Actually freedom of speech on the radio would be menaced if a small group of men, some thirty or forty news analysts who have Nation-wide audiences and have regular broadcasting periods in which to build loyal listeners, take advantage of their "preferred position" and become pulpiteers. To permit these men to preach their own views would be to create for C. B. S. news a super-editorial page, instead of no editorial page at all. Then freedom of the air, within the genuine spirit of democracy, would be merely a hollow phrase. There is no sense to the idea of erecting a barricade that will protect publict opinion from one-sided assault and then drilling holes in that defense whereby men in our own employ are permitted just such assault.

Our policies are meaningless unless strictly enforced and every news editor is held accountable for their enforcement. We are quite aware that other networks and individual stations may not as yet have similar policies. We hope that in the interest of furthering a free and democratic radio all of them will come to agree with us. But whether or not they do, we want C. B. S. world news to continue to set the highest possible standards of news objectivity and to retain its leadership in public confidence.

PAUL W. WHITE,
Director of News Broadcasts.

SEPTEMBER 7, 1943.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. I just want to say that I believe the Members of Congress and others generally are in debt to the Columbia Broadcasting Co. for its readiness in attempting to solve the very serious situation existing in radio newscasting.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and in view of his well-known advocacy of free speech and fair play, it has extra significance. I am sorry, however, that I cannot yield further during these remarks as I have all the material here which I can cover in the time allotted me.

In this connection I would like to read from an article appearing in the October 18, 1943, issue of Broadcasting, the weekly news magazine of radio.

On page 22 of that magazine an article appears, written by Ed. Craney, general manager of Z–Bar Net, the radio network throughout the State of Montana.

Mr. Craney entitled his article "Free Speech, the Right To Be Heard," and I commend the reading of the entire article and editorial to Members of Congress and citizens who are interested in this problem of working out a radio code and a radio policy which will protect the rights and freedom of speech.

I will quote briefly from this article appearing in Broadcasting magazine of October 18: Mr. Craney says:

We of the Z-Net—

Montana's radio network—

recognized the above problems and strove to solve them in the year 1930 with the establishment of the Montana Radio Forum. CBS has just done so. Some say there is no problem—others say some other method must be found. All right—let's find it. I believe all of us are actually striving for the same goal—freedom of speech—the right for both majorities and minorities to be heard on American radio.

Then continuing in his article, Mr. Craney points out there is a definite distinction between the freedom of expression as it is applied to the newspaper field and how it is applied to radio, because of the differences which are obvious between radio and the newspaper.

He asks this question in his article:

Is radio like a newspaper?

Then he answers:

No—anyone with the funds can start a newspaper. Radio is limited and licensed by Government because of the present lack of frequencies. The good newspaper presents factual news of the day written by "on-the-scene reporters of events all over the world."

It has an editor who is free to express his views on any subject in its editorial columns.

Then he points out the differences existing because of limited facilities on the air, because the radio depends on licensing by the Government to enable a certain station to dominate specified air waves at stipulated times; and he points out further on down that radio broadcasts cannot be laid aside and read later; if the broadcast is not heard it is lost forever.

Still later in the article he calls attention to the fact that there are some who think radio can cure this commentator trouble by a device which has been tried in Montana, the home State of Senator WHEELER who has, himself, devoted a lot of study to the radio situation.

I quote further from the article again:

We of the Z-Net believe commentaries are healthy. We believe the public needs their ideas—we said "theirs," not his or hers. We have saluted C. B. S. on its stand because we know it has taken courage to recognize the problem and C. B. S. is trying to solve this problem. While we do not say our method is the ideal we nevertheless believe it is more practical than any other thus far devised for the protection of the right to be heard and the right to hear.

And I think the Members of Congress who are interested in the welfare of radio are interested in the fact that Mr. Craney recognizes that freedom of speech on the radio means that there must be a right to be heard as well as a freedom of the right to hear and it cannot be exclusively placed within the power of an individual operator on the air.

Continuing the quotation from Mr. Craney's article:

We have merely endeavored to build the columnist page of the newspaper into an air show. We never put a single commentator on the air. We insist on two or more peoples' ideas being expressed on the same or on adjacent shows or we don't carry the broadcast.

I hope the Members of Congress will take time to read this entire article, because it offers an approach to the solution of a very disturbing problem; that is, the alarming tendency of commentators increasingly to use their time and their position to attack individuals in both private and public life and to propagandize and lobby for public causes in which the speakers or sponsors may or may not have a selfish or ulterior motive.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us leave the problem of making free speech on the air a fact rather than a fiction for the time being and examine the recent Supreme Court decision which bears on the same subject. Later in this talk, I shall return to the original proposition in an

effort to show how the circumvention of free and impartial expression on the air by making it the sole privilege of the sponsors with the biggest purse buying up select time on a semipublic monopoly or of the radio companies themselves has a direct relationship to the implications and ramification of the Supreme Court decision of May 10.

On May 10, the United States Supreme Court in a decision of 5 to 2 with the majority opinion being written by Justice Frankfurter and the minority opinion being written by Justice Murphy made it the constitutional law of the land that the Federal Communications Commission should have the right to determine the composition of the traffic on the air. To use the exact words of Mr. Justice Frankfurter with reference to the Federal Communications Act of 1934:

It puts upon the Commission the burden of determining the composition of that traffic.

I think as we go along with this discussion, Mr. Speaker, it will become clear how this decision of the Court has a direct bearing on what should be considered broadcasting policies which are compatible with the best public interests and with considerations of free speech and fair play. It should also become clear how the Court's decision supports my contention that since radio is a semipublic monopoly exercised through preferential licenses granted to some and denied to others, it must either adopt for itself or have imposed upon it from without a public-serving policy which does not permit one group of citizens or one individual to have opinion-molding opportunities which are denied to those of opposing points of view.

RADIO IS NECESSARILY MONOPOLISTIC IN CHARACTER

In Mr. Justice Frankfurter's majority opinion we find some interesting evidence in support of these observations. In support of the statement that radio is monopolistic in character under its existing network system, Mr. Frankfurter makes this statement in a quotation from the Federal Communications Commission:

It pointed out that the station affiliated with the national networks utilized more than 97 percent of the total nighttime broadcasting power of all the stations in the country.

Under these conditions, it is obvious that if the networks are to be used for propaganda or political purposes, or to support or oppose programs of public policy, there must either be provided equal and suitable opportunity for reply or else we must reconcile ourselves to the fact that those who buy up the radio time are to be granted the exclusive right of indoctrination over the air waves in America. I think it will be generally conceded that to make indoctrination the exclusive right of the fellow with the fattest purse or the man with the best spot on the dial is not sound Americanism. And it is not conducive to the permanent operation of private radio in this country. It is, in fact, according a privilege to a few which will sooner or later draw penalties from the many.

The extent to which this monopolistic character of private radio, when coupled with the use of indoctrination and propaganda over the air, might be used or abused to distort or warp the thinking of America is further elaborated upon by subsequent statements in the prevailing opinion of Justice Frankfurter.

For example, he points out that the Federal Communications Commission found that network affiliation contracts usually contain so-called network optional-time clauses. Under these provisions, the network could upon 28 days' notice call upon its affiliates to carry a commercial program during any of the hours specified in the agreement as network optional time. The Commission reported:

We find that the optioning of time by licensee stations has operated against the public interest.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it can be seen how this could be true if networks permit sustaining or commercial commentators to engage in opinion-molding propaganda which could thus be "force fed" over station outlets which, in themselves, are out of sympathy with the propaganda line of the sponsor or the network. For example, many commentators on the air have seemingly joined in a crusade to discredit the farm bloc in Congress and to a certain extent the farmers of America by insinuating that they are demanding better prices for food products than are warranted. Quite apart from the merits of such contentions—and for one I believe they have no merit whatsoever—it is obvious that a radio station in a farm State might seriously object to being forced to broadcast a network program expressing antipathy to the farm element and broadcast by some city commentator who knows nothing about farming conditions and cares less.

It is also brought out in this decision of the court that net work affiliation contracts contain a clause defining the right of the station to reject network commercial programs. The F. C. C. is quoted as finding that "these provisions do not sufficiently protect the public interest." The F. C. C. further states:

We conclude that a licensee is not fulfilling his obligations to operate in the public interest, and is not operating in accordance with the express requirements of the Communications Act, if he agrees to accept programs on any basis other than his own reasonable decision that the programs are satisfactory.

Still another indication of the fact that chain broadcasting and network growth has made radio increasingly more monopolistic and consequently more subject to public regulation than ordinary private enterprise is the following statement included in the Frankfurter decision with reference to radio facilities in the major cities and primary news sources of this country. I quote:

Competition among networks for these facilities is nonexistent, as they are completely removed from the network-station market. It gives the network complete control over its policies. This bottling-up of the best facilities has undoubtedly had a discouraging effect upon the creation and growth of new networks.

SPECIAL PRIVILEGES REQUIRE PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITIES

Now, sir, let us get down to a discussion of how the monopolistic development of radio, which in itself has granted special privileges to some, demands the acceptance of special public responsibilities on the part of the radio industry if the present system of radio is to be public serving rather than public perverting.

In the gist of the prevailing decision of the Court, Justice Frankfurter said on May 10:

It puts upon the Commission the burden of determining the composition of that traffic.

In that, Mr. Speaker, he referred to the traffic over the air waves of this country. Continuing to quote from Justice Frankfurter, he further said:

The facilities of radio are not large enough to accommodate all who wish to use them. Methods must be devised for choosing from among the many who apply. And since Congress itself could not do this, it committed the task to the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, this responsibility for devising methods "for choosing from among the many who apply" for radio time as well as for station licenses is the crux of the whole matter insofar as demonstrating whether private radio is to serve the public interest or to serve as a propaganda vehicle for some sponsor, some commentator, some political administration, some network, or some cause.

If it is argued that the method of "choosing from among the many who apply" for time on the air, for example, shall be that of permitting the fellow with the fattest purse to buy advertising time and employ commentators or speakers to denounce or support individuals in public life, institutions of government, organizations of private citizens, or occupational groups, it simply resolves itself into a policy of favoritism to some and frustration for others. In like manner if this process of "choosing" is to be operated so that radio networks can employ commentators on their sustaining time to applaud one point of view and abhor another it means that freedom of speech has become a fiction instead of a fact. It would mean in short that radio networks were reserving to themselves a freedom to indoctrinate which is incompatible with real freedom of speech.

ACCESS TO THE MICROPHONE AN ESSENTIAL IN FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Mr. Speaker, let us keep always in mind the fact that freedom of speech must mean freedom of access to the microphone as well as freedom of acclamation insofar as radio is concerned.

In the concluding summary of the majority opinion as delivered on May 10 by Justice Frankfurter, this analysis of the true meaning of free speech is again emphasized. Says the prevailing opinion:

We come, finally, to an appeal to the first amendment. The regulations—

Of the Commission—

even if valid in all other respects, must fall because they abridge, say the appellants, their right of free speech. If that be so, it would

follow that every person whose application for a license to operate a station is denied by the Commission is thereby denied his constitutional right of free speech. Freedom of utterance is abridged to many who wish to use the limited facilities of radio.

RADIO FACILITIES ARE LIMITED

Mr. Speaker, that statement from the majority opinion should be high-lighted. Let me repeat it:

Freedom of utterance is abridged to many who wish to use the limited facilities of radio.

It is this elemental truth which the new policy of the Columbia Broadcasting System recognizes in its decision to keep all propaganda off its programs unless equal opportunities are given at the same hour and on the same coverage for expression of the other point of view. It is this same fundamental truism which the critics of the new C. B. S. policy ignore and which, when violated, gives cause for public demands restricting the use of radio for private propaganda purposes.

It is, of course, to be expected that a few commentators, Mr. Speaker, or radio officials who enjoy monopolistic privileges of free expression and who have at times used these individualized opportunities to lobby for or against this, that, or the other cause in accordance with their personal views or corporation outlook will disapprove of steps taken along the direction of the C. B. S. policy. Such men may wail that "freedom of speech is being curtailed" but they are not thinking primarily of freedom of speech in the aggregate but of their own personal freedom to use a semipublic monopoly as a personal opportunity to pontificate, propagandize, or pillory. They ignore the axiom that freedom of speech to be realistic when applied to radio must also include freedom of access to the microphone for opposing points of view. Otherwise, any other interpretation of freedom of speech over the air would be a restriction of freedom of thinking rather than an expansion of it. What the thought processes produce depends upon what information is provided as the basis for thinking. If radio is to do its just share toward developing sound and sane national thinking it must either refrain from projecting prejudice and propaganda or else provide for equal representation for all points of view.

RADIO DAILY QUOTES KALTENBORN AGAINST C. B. S.

In the Radio Daily for Thursday, September 16, Mr. Kaltenborn is quoted by this New York City publication which is read widely in radio circles as being severely critical of the C. B. S. policy of barring propaganda from its newscasts. Radio Daily quotes a speech which Kaltenborn made at a luncheon in the Waldorf-Astoria wherein he states in part:

The argument that commentators should have no opinions because only a limited number can be put on the air is false. Newspaper space is also limited. Only a certain number of columnists can get their material printed. Today, we have almost as many commentators with a national following as we have columnists with a national following. The radio news analyst cannot and should not function night after night as preacher or soap-box orator. He cannot constantly make himself a medium for passionate expression of personal or minority opinions.

Mr. Speaker, these statements by Mr. Kaltenborn warrant some analysis. It appears that there are some blind spots in his thinking. For example, his assumption that an exact analogy can be drawn between newspapers and the radio is inaccurate. While it is true that only a limited number of columnists may get their columns printed, it is equally true that most newspapers present their readers with a balanced diet by carrying columnists with conflicting points of view in the same issue so that the same set of readers get both sides of the question. Such is not the case with radio. It is also true that in a paper's editorial columns it frequently takes exception with something a columnist reports in another section of the same edition. And it is vitally significant that newspapers almost invariably accord to citizens the privileges of answering charges or criticisms by printing open letters in the paper in refutation of something a columnist may have said. This is a feature almost entirely lacking in present radio policy insofar as it applies to prejudicial newscasting, to slurs and criticisms on radio time sponsored by advertisers who sometimes have their own "ax to grind" or to attacks and lobbying propaganda projected by commentators speaking on sustaining programs provided by the networks and in which the nature of the news is colored either by the bias of the corporation officials or by the prejudice of the individual commentator.

The right of rejoinder, Mr. Speaker, is fully as important as the right of criticism insofar as freedom of speech is concerned. It appears that Mr. Kaltenborn overemphasizes a single side of the problem in his criticisms. It is significant, moreover, that even Mr. Kaltenborn notes the excesses to which his profession is heir by continuing:

The radio analyst should not function night after night as a preacher or soap-box orator. He cannot constantly make himself a medium for passionate expression or minority opinions.

That is sound advice. But like the best medicine in the pharmacopoeia, it can affect no cures if never taken.

One wonders, for example, how zealous Mr. Kaltenborn and certain radio officials would be for the "rights of free speech" about which they talk if regulations provided that any individual, group, or cause which is attacked on the radio should have the right to insist upon a like amount of time on an equally important program in which to make reply. I am afraid that those who now enjoy choice radio program periods and carefully selected wave lengths would be the first to protest if public policy insisted that those wont to abuse this privilege must provide those offended with an opportunity on the next regular program to present their side of the story. Advertisers would be less inclined to permit or instruct commentators to engage in crusades of indoctrination if they were compelled to give opposing points of view an opportunity to be heard "on this same station at this same hour next Sunday evening" or whatever the case might be. It is this inavailability of radio time of like importance to varying points of view which makes one of the big distinctions between a private enterprise like a newspaper and a semipublic monopoly like a great radio network which depends upon the perpetuation of its license to protect it in the use of a highly coveted wave length which it alone can utilize.

Radio officials and men like Mr. Kaltenborn should not expect to be able to enjoy all the privileges of a monopolistic hold on certain wavelengths which is assured them by the Government and at the same time to have all the opportunities for projecting purely personal points of view which would be theirs if they were engaging in a completely competitive enterprise. If government is not to step in to safeguard the public against the propagandist on the air, the radio industry itself must recognize its responsibilities in this matter and not fall back upon the weak alibi that anything which is fair practice for newspapers is also fair practice for the radio.

To conform with the standards of good manners and fair play on the air, it is not necessary to destroy the sparkle and spirit and pungency of radio reporting. It is necessary only to remove the malicious, the prejudicial, the inimical, and the purpose-serving tactics of certain broadcasters and to safeguard the interests of veracity by insisting that radio reporters follow the precepts of good reporting, anywhere, rather than color their reports with personal prejudice and individual bias.

Members of Congress and citizens generally can quickly bring to mind the commentators that they hear and make their own classifications as to whether they measure up to the responsibilities which are theirs as performers on an exclusive stage licensed by the public as a monopoly or whether they pervert their power for personal profit, political advantage, prejudicial acclaim, or just because of habitually bad radio manners. Occasional violations of good taste and good practice can be overlooked, but the repetitious offenders jeopardize the whole future of privately owned radio due to the fact that they abuse their control of a great public-opinion-forming institution which in its very nature is not available to all and which looks to government to protect it against infringements by competitors who frequently might covet a popular wavelength to propagandize a different party line or point of view. It is the hope of those of us in Congress who are working on this problem that the good judgment of enlightened leaders in the industry which has made radio strong will not too long delay taking the steps needed to make privately owned radio as secure as it is strong.

Justice Frankfurter points out, in this prevailing opinion:

Unlike other modes of expression, radio inherently is not available to all. That is its unique characteristic, and that is why, unlike other modes of expression, it is subject to government regulation.

There is no denying the validity of this conclusion.

Radio networks which permit speakers and commentators on either sustaining programs or commercial broadcasts habitually to belabor Congress or the executive departments, or to attack individuals, groups, or points of view are flagrant violators of their public responsibilities as the licensed operators of a semipublic monopoly. Continued flouting of this responsibility, Mr. Speaker, is certain to result in legislative curtailments of private radio or in similar action by the F. C. C. C. B. S. has taken the lead in attempting to avert this result by imposing a voluntary code of fair play and good manners upon itself. It is hoped other networks will do likewise, as I, for one, would deplore seeing private radio replaced by government radio in this country.

RADIO INDUSTRY MUST MEASURE UP TO ITS RESPONSIBILITIES

Mr. Speaker, the radio industry must measure up to its responsibilities as custodians of the public interest on the networks or by its own shortsightedness it will dig its own grave by its own indiscretions.

The serious offenders of good taste and wise policy on the air probably do not number more than five or six. But these five or six can ruin radio for the host of able and conscientious commentators who serve the public interest, and they can cause the stockholders and owners of radio facilities to find their investments becoming worthless and their period of ownership suspended by governmental interference.

ASSOCIATED PRESS DEMONSTRATES BEST REPORTING IS UNBIASED

Mr. Speaker, the phenomenal success of the Associated Press provides the complete rejoinder to those who insist that to be interesting radio reporting has to be biased, prejudicial, or opinionated. The Associated Press serves newspapers of every political preference. It gathers news for papers in every section of the country, and readers in every walk of life look to it for the complete and candid coverage of the news. Surely nobody would argue that the freedom of the press is curtailed because the Associated Press does not permit its great corps of reporters to use this agency of public service as a device for purveying personal spleen or propagandizing and lobbying for public policies. C. B. S. may not have found the final answer to the important business of keeping radio free and fair, but it has faced the problem and is approaching a solution. Perhaps radio might find something worth emulating by studying the reportorial habits of the Associated Press.

CONGRESS WAITS TOO LONG—THEN GOES TOO FAR

It is the history of government in this country that we in Congress wait too long before taking corrective action in matters like this, and when we act we go too far. All this can be avoided if radio management will cooperate now in eliminating the causes for growing discontent before they compel corrective legislation. Simply to ignore the situation is to court disaster.

Before concluding this address I wish to emphasize that it is my conviction that private radio is much to be preferred to government radio in a Republic such as this. Even with its present deviations from proper policy at times I must prefer radio as it is to radio as it would be under government ownership, operation, or domination. However, there is no use of our ignoring the signs of the times.

There are many who prefer a system of radio such as operates in Britain. I do not. As a believer in private radio, however, I am growing steadily more convinced that either through voluntary steps or through legislative channels arrangements must be made to discontinue propaganda activities on the air by speakers utilizing sponsored advertising time or enjoying monopolistic privileges as commentators on network sustaining programs.

It is not the exclusive province of the U-tell-'em Soap Co., the We-fool-'em Lotion Co., or the We-know-all What's It Co. to indoctrinate the American public with the peculiar personal views of the men and women they engage to capture the attention of the audience and to propagandize it between sponsor "plugs" for this or that particular commercial product. Nor is it the inherent monopoly of speakers representing the networks themselves on sustaining time continuously to criticize or commend, to applaud or abhor, to propagandize or to pillory without suitable and adequate opportunities being given for a similar expression of opposing points of view.

Radio provides this equal opportunity for all during political campaigns but it fails to do so in the day-to-day and week-to-week programs which come to us over the air.

THIS PROBLEM MUST BE SOLVED

A number of us in Congress, Mr. Speaker, have made and are making a study of the abuses of radio and proposals for correcting them. We ask the cooperation of all Members on this matter, since it is of vital concern to all. Government has a responsibility in this matter which we do not propose to ignore and which we must not dodge.

It is our hope that the radio industry will take steps to eradicate its own evils, but if Government must act it is felt that Congress can prescribe regulations which will make freedom of speech on the air an equally true privilege of all and not merely an opportunity for propagandizing to the privileged few.

The Columbia Broadcasting System has courageously and patriotically pointed the way for the preservation of private radio and free speech on the air in this Republic. In this effort it deserves the plaudits of all who believe in equal opportunity and fair play. If similar policies prevail or are adopted by the other networks one of the major causes of dissatisfaction with present-day radio will have been corrected. C. B. S. may not yet have found the perfect solution to a vexing problem, but it has made candid recognition of the problem and has taken courageous action to do something about it.

It is the hope of those of us who are devoting ourselves to this subject that these corrections will be made voluntarily by the great radio networks rather than to force congressional action by a continuation of the abuses which C. B. S. has so wisely set out to correct. America neither wants its radio information distorted by government domination, by party politics, nor by personal pundits with axes to grind and purposes to propagandize. Good judgment and fair play would seem better devices than censorship for preventing the monopolistic facilities of radio from becoming the devices for propaganda for a select few in this great Republic.

American citizens can form their own conclusions when they are given the undiluted and uncolored facts. It is the function of a semipublic monopoly such as radio to relay the facts rather than to fashion the thinking of America.

SUPREME COURT DECISION HAS DANGEROUS IMPLICATIONS

Before concluding, let me say that while I have quoted at length from the majority opinion of the United States Supreme Court in its decision of May 10, I am not at all pleased or satisfied with some of the implications of that decision. I am not happy over the prospect of having the Federal Communications Commission or any other body "regulate the composition of the traffic" over the air waves of America without some definite standards being set up in advance which circumscribe and direct those regulating powers.

A broad application of the "regulation of the composition of the traffic" on the air waves could mean outright government censorship. Its very existence as a right of the Commission operates as a silent threat of censorship to automatically tend to color and bias radio reporting. Now that the Supreme Court has decreed that this right exists, Congress should act promptly to define it clearly, and to limit it definitely so as to bar all possibility of censorship either direct or indirect.

If radio requires a traffic cop of the air America wants him to be bound by specific instructions as to what violations he can and cannot regulate. We must not have a radio traffic cop, whether it be an individual or a commission, with power to exercise personal discretion with regard to what is considered proper traffic on the air waves.

Congress should quickly act to set up safeguards, in the light of the May 10 decision of the Court, to be sure that private excesses of radio are not replaced by governmental censorship of nonmilitary broadcasts.

Regulations can and should be established which are clear to all, which operate equally in the interests of all, which will remove radio from all fear of governmental crack-downs, and which will conform with the principle that in this Government of laws and not of men the only rightful traffic cop of the air must be a code of prescribed behavior compiled in written form and free from any perversions by power-loving men, be they radio commentators, radio-management officials, members of the Federal Communications Commission, or members of the executive or legislative branches of our

Government. Only thus can we realistically enjoy genuine freedom of expression for all alike over the radio networks of this country.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of the legislative business for the day and other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLIOTT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE FOOD PROGRAM

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the food situation continues a muddle. For more than a year I have, along with others, been pleading in the well of this House for the appointment of a single food administrator with a competent organization to bring some semblance of order out of chaos. Bills have been introduced to accomplish the same purpose. Through the activities of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, H. R. 2739, known as the Jenkins bill, was introduced, but it still lies in the Banking and Currency Committee. Later the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, cognizant of the necessity for a single food administrator, reported out a similar bill from his committee, but I understand it reposes painlessly in the pigeonholes of the Committee on Rules.

All this time the muddling continues. Ten or more agencies or groups of bureaucrats have been handling, or I might say, mishandling, the food problem. Manpower, farm machinery, prices, rationing, and all other elements entering into the problem, instead of being correlated to the respective requirements of our fighting forces, lend-lease, and civilian needs, are still being juggled and jumbled by procrastination, indecisions, conflict of authorities, clash of personalities, and lack of understanding.

And what is the effect of this confusion and maladministration on our farm production and food supply? Let us take the dairy industry for example. In the last few weeks a frantic appeal has gone up from the producers, processors, and distributors of dairy products. We are told, and the facts seem to warrant the prediction, that the country is facing an immediate and Nation-wide shortage of that indispensable food product, milk. Not only has butter gone up to 16 points, but it is unobtainable throughout the country with either points or money or both. And what do those who understand the dairy situation claim is the cause of it? Their first concern is the two threats which have hung over the entire farm production and especially dairy production ever since the beginning of the war, namely shortage of manpower and shortage of farm machinery and equipment. As to the first, except in those channels where there are boys of military age, the manpower situation is acute. Many farmers are not only dependent on their own boys, but on neighbor boys and girls under 14 years of age for their farm help. The Army, Navy, WAC's, WAVES, defense plants, and industrial demands for manpower have drawn heavily on the farm supply. Recently there has been some consideration given farm boys so far as exemption from military service is concerned, but there are still many boys being taken from the farm. Then there is the element of pressure in the way people view boys of military age who are not in the Army that causes many farm boys to voluntarily enlist. The appeal for girls to join the military forces, while all voluntary, is even more effective in rural communities than in cities. Many girls who had otherwise been helpful on farms, especially with such work as assisting with dairying, have now joined the military groups. There is also the appeal from defense and industrial operations that is inducing a large number of available farm workers, both male and female, to leave the farm because of the higher pay in these fields. No farmer can hope to compete with this competition for his labor. Many thousands of auction sales, a record of all times, is a fair indication of farm help entering other activities. Farmers are reported to be working an average of 80 hours a week. They have done a splendid job providing our armed forces, the production line, and the Nation with food. But unless they get more cooperation from the administration through a single administrator, with a voice in the war council, we are inviting a serious threat to our food supply.

As to the second, shortage of farm machinery and equipment, it is no secret that the availability of farm machinery and equipment is almost nil. There are some promises that this situation will improve for the coming year, but so far it is not noticeable insofar as farmers' needs are concerned. All one needs to do is to look at the books and records of any machinery dealer to note that there was practically no machinery available for farmers during the year 1943. I have said there are some assurances of improvement for the year 1944. But with the present disorganized and scattered authority, the chance for improvement is a mere gamble.

W. P. B. reported a shortage of steel in the amount of 6,250,000 tons for last July, August, and September, which necessitated the War Department being cut 14 percent below its requirements. The Navy Department was cut 20 percent, the Maritime Commission 22 percent. The Office of Defense Transportation, which handles all the railroad allotments, was cut 40 percent. For the present quarter, October, November, and December, W. P. B. estimates that they will be short 4,800,000 tons, and this is probably optimistic. It may amount to more. In spite of these figures, Wilson, of the W. P. B., is alleged to have said on October 8 that there was no shortage of steel.

In the face of all this, farmers are promised that the increase to 40 percent from 20 percent of 1940 allotments for steel made in 1943 for farm machinery in 1944 will be further increased to 80 percent. However, manufacturers and dealers in farm implements and farm equipment are very skeptical of the value of these promises. And well they may be, in view of the already existing shortage of steel for actual war operations. Furthermore, under all the above-named conflict of authorities, what agency will see to it that the approximate one and a half million tons of steel needed for this program will be allotted to the industry, or at least so much of it as can, as a matter of necessity, be spared from actual war production? Much farm machinery has worn out in the past year, so the need will be greater than ever. The dairy industry has real cause for viewing the coming year with genuine apprehension.

Another disquieting condition that has arisen during the past year is dairy prices. Dairying is in an unfavorable position due to the fact that the cost of production, which includes labor and feed, has advanced far more than the price of butter, and as both are main factors in the cost of production of butter, the price of this product must be advanced in order to bring it on the basis where it will be equally remunerative for the farmer to produce this item. Butter, in this period of wartime inflation, is only 1.1 cents per pound higher than it was during the average period of 1921 to 1929. The average Chicago market during that period was 44.9 cents per pound. The market now including the subsidy is 46 cents, and the consumer is buying this product at a base price level of 41 cents, to which, of course, as in all previous times, the cost of packaging and delivery, retail and wholesale handling costs are added. But basically the consumer is buying butter today at 4 cents per pound less than in the period of 1921 to 1929, which certainly was not a prosperous time for agriculture.

Measuring the increase in price levels of all farm products on a basis of that period, you will note that butter is on the bottom of the list from the standpoint of price advance and on the top of the list from the standpoint of increased costs. Therefore, price adjustments must be made or the production of butter, grains, and feeds is out of the picture.

Another element of confusion and destruction is presented by rationing. Butter is now rationed on red stamps and is interchangeable with meats, cheese, cooking fats, lards, oleomargarine, and other substitutes. Even though the people's money is of no value without rationing stamps, the administration should see to it that no red stamps are issued unless upon their presentation with money to the merchant the butter is obtainable. But it is a known fact that in many of our cities removed from the

production areas, you cannot buy butter even though you have stamps authorizing its purchase. Butter has gone up from 8 to 10, from 10 to 12, and now to 16 points, and as above stated this does not mean that with sufficient stamps you can get any butter. It is claimed that this is due to the fact that those living nearest to the supply of butter use all or most of their red stamps for butter in preference to meats, cheese, and so forth, with the result that they have all the butter they want while those farthest from the source of supply cannot get butter even though they have stamps.

It has been suggested that butter stamps be issued for butter only, but this, of course, would require statistical information as to the supply of butter and the number of people there are to use butter. While it is my understanding that this is successfully accomplished in some countries using rationing, it seems to be way beyond the scope or capacity of our present conglomeration of agencies and especially O. P. A., whose business this would be.

This situation with reference to distribution is still more acutely confused and demoralized by other Government agencies, notably those making Government purchases for the Army, Navy, Lend-Lease, and so forth. Recently the American people were apprised of the fact that the Government had in storage about 90 percent of the 235,000,000 pounds of butter in the country. I am informed that this constitutes more than a year's supply for the 8,000,000 men in the armed forces; that the average civilian consumption is only 18 pounds a year, while the above stock would allow each soldier 25 pounds a year. It is my understanding that in view of this situation, the Government procurement agencies have released the current production of butter, and will not purchase any more until April of next year. Now while we want our armed forces to have not only plenty of butter, but a reasonable stock pile to insure the future, such buying for a year in advance is wholly indefensible, especially when this hoarding prevents millions of people all over the United States from securing any butter whatsoever.

This criticism applies to many other food products. It is reported that the Government will shortly release 130,000,000 dozens of eggs, not only because it has overstocked, but also to prevent spoilage. Similar reports have been made of an early release for civilian use of tremendous quantities of dried beans, as well as canned peaches, peas, and ketchup, and perhaps innumerable foodstuffs, the hoarding of which will come to light within the next few weeks.

In other words, the doctrine of scarcity is being advanced by the administration planners on both ends, namely discouraging production and processing on the one hand, and by administration hoarding of the visible supply on the other hand. It seems logical to assert that point system of rationing already shown to have been unnecessary for coffee, said to be unnecessary for sugar, is based not upon scarcity but largely upon the doctrine of scarcity artificially created by the Washington planners who seek to create an economy in which they will tell the American people when to sow and when to reap. In short, the present administration, which for years has posed as the superplanner of the world, has made a sorry mess of planning our wartime food program so that for the first time in our national life we are, like a shipwrecked crew, reduced to rationing.

The important question in this bureaucratic working at cross purposes is, Does this flow from mere lack of intelligence and efficiency of the President and his fellow travelers? Or is it still the workings of a deliberately planned economy of scarcity of the fellow travelers, which was begun in 1933 by the "brain trust" and is now being carried into successful operation by the "palace guards," Frankfurter, Hopkins, Wallace, Pritchard, Gilbert, Cohen, Rosenman et al.?

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. Will the gentleman explain what he means by the use of the term "fellow travelers"?

Mr. JONKMAN. I may say to the distinguished gentleman that I borrowed that from President Roosevelt. The gentleman will remember that the President applied that term a few days ago to five Members of another body. I think it is a very elastic term, it is broad, and takes in a great many things. We must of course bear in mind that things are not always what they are called. I think it is well illustrated by the following incident which is alleged to have occurred in a conversation between Abraham Lincoln and a friend a great many years ago as they were walking along arguing. In the course of the argument President Lincoln pointed to a sheep nearby and said:

> There is a sheep with four legs and a tail. If we were to call the tail a leg, how many legs would that sheep have?

His friend said:

> Of course, he would have five legs.

Lincoln replied:

> Oh, no, merely calling a tail a leg does not make it one.

So my connotation of the term is:

> Those who are associated with one upon a course.

It might mean many other things.

As to the first theory, I said in the well of the House over a year ago that—

> The President, after 9 months of war and nearly 10 years as Chief Executive of this great Nation, has utterly failed to recognize the fundamental truism acted upon for decades by all competent and successful executives; that the best way to get a difficult job done well and quickly is to assign it, together with power and responsibility, to a single component administrator with an efficient organization, reserving only the right to fire him if he does not deliver.

Since that time I have often heard as well as read in the public press that even his friends and admirers concede that the President is a poor administrator.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. JONKMAN. Gladly.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman overlooks some very important men in the administration, men like Mr. Justice Byrnes, Mr. Vinson, and Mr. Marvin Jones. I do not believe he could pick out better men for the places they occupy than those three men.

Mr. JONKMAN. Does the gentleman know whether they are working under directives of the "palace guard" or not?

Mr. PATMAN. They are all working under directives.

Mr. JONKMAN. I am asking the gentleman what he knows, whether they are working under directives or not.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know except in our form of government, with which I am familiar to a limited extent, I know that the Executive is in charge of the executive departments.

Mr. JONKMAN. The gentleman is evasive. I am asking the gentleman a direct question: Does he know whether these men are working under directives?

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman himself were the Executive everybody who worked for him would work under his direction. That is the way it is with the President.

Mr. JONKMAN. The gentleman is just evading my question. It would be naive and inane to believe that the President is so inefficient and incapable as to let the procrastinations, inefficiencies, conflict of authorities, clash of personalities, and lack of understanding of the various agencies he has created and ostensibly are under his control, proceed from year to year with a definite program of confusion to wreck the Nation's economy. This would be entirely illogical.

Far more logical is the rapidly gaining conviction of Congress and the American people that the President is so controlled and hemmed in by the "palace guard" that he cannot do otherwise. This group, as I have outlined on a previous occasion, has a definite plan to wreck the fundamentals of our 150-year-old economy by throwing it into confusion, chaos, and scarcity and then supplant it with a dictated economy from Washington under their control and ownership. For the last few weeks newspapers, commentators, and political writers have hailed with acclaim a tendency of the President to turn to the right. They cite his appointments of practical men with experience instead of theorists and idealists in key positions and policymaking offices. They frankly state that it is apparently done with an eye to the 1944 election. But no sooner are these appointees settled in their office than it is noticeable that they must either work under directives from the "palace guard" or be relegated to the background or ousted. The "palace guard" is determined to run the country.

That seems to be the picture and Congress at the present time is the only instrumentality to hold the line until the American people can act for themselves.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. Gladly.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if the gentleman shares with me the alarm that some editors seem to see in the President from the standpoint of turning to the right, it may be just a ruse, that he is following his customary procedure of turning entirely around.

Mr. JONKMAN. That may be the case.

After witnessing the activity and aggressiveness of this Seventy-eighth Congress in 1943, the American people for the first time in over a decade have a renewed confidence in the legislative branch of their Government. We cannot let the people down. It is the responsibility of this Congress to insist that not only the Fulmer bill, but all similar constructive legislation be brought on and passed immediately. This is must legislation and a vital necessity to save our constitutional American liberty and the American way of living from the maw of a bureaucracy which would destroy it for us and our posterity for generations to come.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

WASHINGTON—THE NERVE CENTER OF THE NATION

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, times of crisis call for energetic leadership. This Capital City has been through a wartime change which many thought would overwhelm the municipal government, handicapped as it is through lack of real power. It had a great obligation to house and protect wartime Government employees flocking here by the thousands. It had a great obligation to provide essential hospital, school, sewer, water, and other city facilities.

These employees were our boys and girls from your State and my State. We wanted decent accommodations for them and we were vitally interested in the city's progress and in its leadership. We were concerned in the great change that was taking place, not only from the selfish standpoint of a satisfied constituency but from the broader vision of Washington as the Nation's Capital—the nerve center now perhaps of the entire world.

Among other things for which this city is noted is its many periods of investigation, dramatically displayed by the press. Interest is aroused, not only here but throughout the Nation. Washington news is national news. The Home for the Aged, police department, traffic department, the charity hospitals, and other municipal service agencies all get their fair share of congressional investigation. One year this side of the Capitol starts an investigation; the next year another body gets all the publicity.

Interest on Capitol Hill is very easily aroused due to our proximity and to our accessibility. Complaints of all kinds are lodged here, and if consideration were given to all of them there would be no time for anything else except investigational work. We, who have been through these periods so often, suggest due caution before decisions are made.

We suggest further that an effort be made to familiarize yourselves with the municipal government, its intricate procedures and intricate set-up. Before we view the record for the purpose of determining if we have had energetic leadership, let us first ascertain if our Federal-District relationship is confused by misconceptions.

FEDERAL-DISTRICT RELATIONSHIP

My colleagues, walk to the window and look out. As your glance takes in those broad and beautiful avenues, the magnificent park areas, and the magnitude of the building projects within your view, you cannot help but feel that they all eloquently proclaim the fact that this city is not a local community but is a great national city existing for the millions of citizens throughout the Union.

The District government, with more than 15,000 employees, is not a municipal corporation composed of a clerical and official staff born and raised in the District of Columbia. Like Federal departments, its employees almost entirely come from the registers of the Civil Service Commission, and many thousands of them are from the various States in the Union, with reserved home ties and voting privileges. Many of these employees do not even live within the confines of the District of Columbia; they are residents of the nearby States of Maryland and Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, where is there a municipality in the entire world that could, or would, undertake to bring to fruition the mighty schemes of improvements that Congress has authorized for the District. Public, No. 284, Seventy-first Congress, discloses that an appropriation of $16,000,000 was authorized for the acquisition of land for a great park and playground system, and that that $16,000,000 was to be reimbursed to the United States by the local taxpayers at the rate of $1,000,000 a year.

Public, No. 856, Seventieth Congress, entitled "An act to provide for a municipal center in the District of Columbia," authorized the Commissioners to acquire that large site on Pennsylvania Avenue for a municipal center and construct thereon buildings for municipal activities. Thirty or more million dollars will be needed to complete the project. These projects, Mr. Speaker, would not be of this magnitude if this were a little local government.

SOVEREIGNTY RESTS WITH NATION

The sovereign power in the District of Columbia is lodged in the United States, and it possesses full and unlimited jurisdiction both of a political and municipal nature over the District. Its supreme legislative body is Congress. Crimes that are committed in the District of Columbia are not crimes against the District but against the United States.

The Supreme Court of the United States has on numerous occasions referred to the provision in the Constitution which empowered the Congress to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over the seat of the National Government, and has decided that the Congress has the entire control of the District of Columbia for every purpose of the Government, national or local.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we remember this fact, and meditate upon our individual responsibility because until some change is made the government of the District of Columbia is simply an agency of the United States for conducting the affairs of its government in this Federal district.

Justice Taft, in the case of *Frether* v. *Wright* (75 Fed. 742), thereafter Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, said:

> It was meet that so powerful a sovereignty should have a local habitation the character of which it might absolutely control, and the government of which it should not share with the States in whose territory it exercised but a limited sovereignty, supreme, it is true, in cases where it could be exercised at all, but much restricted in the field of its operation. The object of the grant of exclusive legislation over the District was, therefore, national in the highest sense, and the city organized under the grant became the city, not of a State, not of a district, but of a Nation. In the same article which granted the powers of exclusive legislation over its seat of government are conferred all the other great powers which make the Nation, including the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States. He would be a strict constructionist, indeed, who should deny to Congress the exercise of this latter power in furtherance of that of organizing and maintaining a proper local government at the seat of government. Each is for a national purpose, and the one may be used in aid of the other.

KNOW YOUR CITY

Do you know that the total valuation of all land and improvements in the District of Columbia as of July 1, 1943, is $2,255,452,295? Of this amount, $1,354,348,720 is taxable. Property owned by the United States and tax exempt amounts to $696,526,822; property owned by the District of Columbia and tax exempt, $90,466,248; and privately owned property tax exempt amounts to $114,110,505. The total land area of the District of Columbia, exclusive of streets and alleys is 31,060 acres. Of this amount 51.2 percent is taxable; 40.8 percent is owned by the United States; 3.3 percent is owned by the District government; and 4.7 percent is privately owned exempt property.

The Federal Government owns, as indicated, approximately 41 percent of the total land of the District of Columbia, exclusive of streets and alleys. The Federal Government also has title to all the original streets and alleys lying within the boundaries of the original city of Washington, which, generally speaking, is that area lying between Florida Avenue and the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers. In addition to tax exemption, the Federal Government is furnished water without charge, and is not assessed for special improvements, such as curb and gutter, sidewalk, alley paving, sewer and water mains.

Do you know that the enormous growth within the District of Columbia within

the last 3 years has imposed a tremendous burden upon the District government? The population in 1940 was 663,091; the population in 1943, 897,000. In the metropolitan area, the population far exceeds 1,318,000. This burden of increased responsibility is further evidenced by the fact that the total revenue collections in the general fund account during the fiscal year 1943 showed an increase of approximately $10,000,000 over the amount collected during the fiscal year 1940.

Do you know that the residents of this city paid $73,576,233 in Federal income taxes in 1942? This amount exceeds the payments of each of 28 States, and also exceeds the combined payment of 8 States.

Do you know that the two civilian Commissioners are appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the United States Senate?

Do you know that the Engineer-Commissioner is assigned by the President on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers of the Army?

Do you know that the District government is composed of approximately 70 departments, divisions, and agencies? When you consider this municipal structure with its intricate divisions, you are impressed with the fact that it is a vast business organization with an extremely heavy burden of complicated responsibilities upon the three men selected as its Commissioners.

Do you know that as of this date there are 15,228 employees with an annual pay roll of $35,934,731? Of these there are 3,412 school teachers; 1,796 policemen; and 920 firemen.

Do you know that the public-school system alone requires an annual appropriation of approximately $14,000,000? Do you know that in that system 2,323 pupils from the surrounding States of Maryland and Virginia are given free tuition?

Mr. Speaker, I am intensely interested in this city, not only because I am a member of the Appropriations Committee and a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia, but because this is my Capital City. The members of our subcommittee have frequently visited and personally inspected many District institutions, and I personally, without any fanfare, without previous announcement or any publicity, have made personal inspections. I have seen things to criticize and, on the other hand, I have seen many things to commend very highly.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have a very excellent police department in this city. They are doing a splendid work in their newly organized Police Academy, and I have attended their exercises and observed their operations.

Mr. Speaker, this city has a splendidly organized and most efficient fire department. You would certainly be interested in knowing that the total estimated fire loss during 1943 was $671,995, a decrease of $260,038 as compared with the loss for the year 1942. The per capita loss was 79 cents. This figure is considered to be exceptionally low by fire-control authorities, and is a decrease of 30 cents as compared with the 1942 figure.

You certainly must know how the Commissioners responded to the call for civilian-defense protection. What city has a more efficient or more splendidly organized civilian-defense department?

FINANCIAL OUTLOOK

Mr. Speaker, the District government, like many other municipalities, was very much disturbed at the beginning of hostilities as it considered its financial problems. It was thought that governmental restrictions on the sale of gasoline and appliances of all sorts would materially affect income, and although there has been a serious effect in some items, yet the local municipality's financial outlook is quite satisfactory.

Do you know that the annual revenue availability of the District of Columbia is at this time in excess of $60,000,000? This gives you some idea of the vast sums expended under the direction of Congress for municipal service here. This is big business, and you must bear in mind that the local executives are vitally concerned with the income as well as the expenditure.

The directing heads of our great governmental agencies have not this two-fold responsibility. The Federal Bureau of the Budget and District officials estimate revenue availability. The District Commissioners hear the departments' request for appropriations. The District Commissioners then hear the citizens, and obtain their reaction as to the request made by the departments. The Federal Bureau of the Budget supervises its budget preparation, the President submits it to the Congress, the House Appropriation Committee hears the Commissioners, department heads, and interested citizens. The Senate Appropriations Committee does likewise.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this system has worked well. Certainly we want our institutions inspected, but I am wondering if it is fair to expect men charged with such great responsibility, and whose duties are so arduous, to personally undertake periodic inspections of institutions and organizations under their supervision, and to personally and minutely check every complaint.

The General Accounting Office for many years has been auditing District accounts, yet never in the history of the municipality has there been a major scandal in its government. The Commissioners have a big job, and, in my opinion, their leadership has been energetic.

GALLINGER MUNICIPAL HOSPITAL

I have been interested in the investigation of our local hospital because I, and members of the committee on which I serve, have visited and inspected that institution on many occasions. I had thought that I would be interested in reading the report, but if the editorial of October 14 appearing in the Washington Star is correct in stating that the report ignores the records which show Gallinger as comparing favorably with similar institutions in other cities, that it ignores the statement made by the Gallinger staff of physicians, and that it ignores the testimony of Dr. William S. Ossenfort, Assistant Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, who made an independent investigation at the request of the chairman of the subcommittee, and who reported favorably on the hospital, then I have no interest in the document.

Gallinger Municipal Hospital is a charity hospital for the indigent and semi-indigent, and it is under the supervision of the health department, an agency which requires a total annual appropriation of approximately $3,500,000.

If the health department has fallen down on the job, we should give serious consideration to a change in administration, but do you know that in 1917, the local death rate was 16.4 per thousand population, as compared with 10.8 in 1942—the death rate from all causes being the lowest of all time? The deaths from pneumonia alone have shown a reduction from 139 deaths per hundred thousand in 1936, to 60.5 in 1942. Each year has shown a reduction in diphtheria mortality. For a period of 10 years there have been no deaths from smallpox. Typhoid fever is on the wane, and maternal mortality is the lowest of all time. The new low is 2.2 maternal deaths per thousand live births, as compared with 6.5 in 1936. The infant mortality rate struck a new all-time low in 1942.

As a general proposition, figures are just figures, but these figures, Mr. Speaker, are eloquent—they mean something.

Gallinger is a 1,450-bed general hospital. It has facilities and a staff to accommodate practically all types of patients. These facilities include surgery, with modern operating rooms, obstetrics, a new building for diseases of internal medicine, laboratory and X-ray, a pavilion for the treatment of tuberculosis, a contagious disease isolation ward, and buildings for the reception and temporary treatment of mental diseases. It has a pharmacy, and a supporting social service department. It has a department for hydrotherapy and physiotherapy, a large property and supply department, a dietetic service, and a laundry. Its visiting staff is composed of some of the most outstanding medical authorities in the United States.

On January 13, 1943, the following-named physicians were appointed by the Commissioners as members of the visiting staff to serve without compensation during the calendar year 1943:

PROFESSIONAL STAFF OF GALLINGER MUNICIPAL HOSPITAL, 1943

1. DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE

Dr. Wallace M. Yater, head of department.

(a) *Visiting physicians, general medicine*

Georgetown division: Dr. Hugh H. Hussey.

George Washington division: Dr. Harry F. Dowing, Dr. C. B. Ethridge (electrocardiography), Dr. Bernard L. Hardin, Dr. Walter K. Myers.

(b) *Associate physicians, general medicine*

Dr. Thomas Kelliher, Dr. Bertram Schaefer, Dr. Bernard Walsh, Dr. William C. Lambert, Dr. Stephen Nealon, Dr. Benjamin Manchester (electrocardiography), Dr. A. Fife Heath, Dr. Irving Winik, Dr. Beatrice B. Berle, Dr. Paul

Lichtman, Dr. John B. Marbury, Dr. Frederick D. Chapman.

(c) Visiting physicians, pediatrics

Dr. Harry Spigel, Dr. Harold Hobart, Dr. Abe Cohen, Dr. Herman Eisenberg (newborn service), Dr. B. Stein (newborn service), Dr. Margaret M. Nicholson, Dr. Aaron Nimetz, Dr. Caroline Pincock.

(d) Visiting physicians, tuberculosis

Dr. Malcolm Lent.

(e) Visiting physicians, contagious diseases

Dr. Richard Meredith, Dr. Carl C. Dauer, Dr. H. H. Diamond, Dr. Mabel H. Grosvenor.

(f) Visiting physicians, dermatology and syphilology

Dr. Walter Teichman, Dr. Alvin E. Wode, Dr. Russell J. Fields, Dr. Leon H. Warren.

2. DEPARTMENT OF SURGERY

Dr. Charles Stanley White, head of department.

(a) Visiting surgeons—general surgery

Dr. F. Fishback, Dr. Philip Caulfield, Dr. Leo Gaffney, Dr. Edgar W. Davis (thoracic surgery), Dr. Lloyd Collins, Dr. H. E. Cole, Dr. B. F. Dean, Dr. Alec Horwitz, Dr. W. R. Morris (thoracic surgery).

(b) Associate surgeons, general surgery

Dr. V. Hungerford, Dr. H. E. Newman, Dr. Michael DeVito (plastic surgery), Dr. J. J. Weinstein, Dr. D. C. Richtmeyer.

(c) Visiting surgeons, orthopedics

Dr. J. S. Neviaser.

(c) Visiting surgeon, orthopedics

Dr. E. J. Cummings, Dr. Thomas Egan, Dr. Walter Romejke, Dr. Ernest Sheppard, Dr. Leonard Goodman, Dr. Ronald Cox, Dr. Sterling Bockoven, Dr. C. R. Naples.

(e) Visiting surgeons, otolaryngology

Dr. J. Louzon, Dr. John H. Gilligan, Dr. John H. Trinder, Dr. E. M. O'Brien, Dr. Catherine Birch, Dr. James Lyons, Dr. P. S. Constantinople, Dr. Joel N. Novick, Dr. H. King Vann, Dr. Gordon J. Bell, Dr. L. B. Tibbetts, Dr. David Davis.

(f) Visiting surgeons, urology

Dr. W. P. Herbst (chief), Dr. Hilbert Sabin, Dr. J. S. Rosenthal, Dr. J. F. Rogers, Dr. Thomas C. Thompson (chief), Dr. Gilbert Ottenberg.

(g) Visiting dentists

Dr. J. Keaveny, Dr. C. N. Rodlun, Dr. Victor Skinner.

3. DEPARTMENT OF OBSTETRICS AND GYNECOLOGY

Dr. Radford Brown, head of department.

(a) Visiting obstetricians

Dr. J. B. Jacobs, Dr. Keith Cromer, Dr. George J. Ellis, Dr. Allan King, Dr. W. R. Thomas, Dr. Joseph Harris, Dr. George Nordlinger.

(b) Associate obstetricians

Dr. J. L. Conley, Dr. David Kushner, Dr. J. Francis Warren, Dr. Howard P. Parker, Dr. J. A. Dusbabek, Dr. W. Dandridge Terrell, Dr. B. Richwine.

(c) Visiting gynecologists

Dr. William J. Cusack, Dr. Roy Higgins, Dr. L. L. Cockerille, Dr. Roger O'Donnell, Dr. Bernard Notes, Dr. Radford Brown.

(d) Associate gynecologists

Dr. James Waters, Dr. Clarence K. Fraser, Dr. S. Hazen Shea, Dr. Julius Epstein, Dr. Floyd S. Rogers.

4. DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY

(a) Visiting physicians, psychiatry

Dr. R. W. Hall, Dr. H. E. Twombly.

(b) Visiting physicians, neurology

Dr. Antoine Schneider, Dr. J. J. Shugrue, Dr. Walter Freeman, Dr. Robert H. Groh (neuro-surgery), Dr. James W. Watts (neuro-surgery).

5. DEPARTMENT OF LABORATORIES AND RADIOLOGY

Dr. Eugene R. Whitmore, head of department.

(a) Visiting pathologists

Dr. W. N. Ransone, Dr. Richard Pucher, Dr. Olive Pippy, Dr. Roger M. Choisser, Dr. Thomas M. Peery, Dr. Richard Kelso, Dr. Irving Marks, Dr. Corrine Cooper.

(b) Visiting roentgenologist

Dr. Fred O. Coe.

6. SPECIAL CONSULTANTS

Dr. William G. Morgan, gastroenterology; Dr. William McC. Ballinger, gastroenterology; Dr. Joseph S. Wall, pediatrics; Dr. F. C. Schreiber, otolaryngology; Dr. Thomas S. Lee, cardiology; Dr. J. W. Peabody, tuberculosis; Dr. D. L. Finucane, tuberculosis; Dr. J. J. Mundell, obstetrics; Dr. Edmund Horgan, surgery, Dr. G. W. Ault, proctology; Dr. E. C. Rice, contagious diseases; Dr. L. A. Martell, gynecology; Dr. H. F. Anderson, dermatology and syphilis; Dr. W. A. Bloedorn, medicine; Dr. William T. Davis, ophthalmology; Dr. D. B. Moffet, otolaryngology; Dr. H. H. Donnally, pediatrics; Dr. Winfred Overholster, psychiatry; Dr. F. A. Reuter, urology.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to estimate the value of the service of this professional visiting staff. They are rendering a noble service, and are the ones who could really tell you about the conditions at Gallinger.

The development of what is now known as Gallinger Municipal Hospital began in the year 1920. Prior to that date, what there was of the institution was known as the Washington Asylum and Jail, which consisted largely of the jail, the almshouse, and a smallpox isolation building, all old buildings, and some of which were erected during and right after the Civil War.

Since 1920, Congress has appropriated for capital improvements $2,655,952. In addition, the District has received for capital improvements at the Gallinger Municipal Hospital, $2,562,161.22 P. W. A. money. The total capital investment at Gallinger Hospital is $6,213,311.64. The sums received from P. W. A., the original investment in the old Civil War buildings, $91,198.42, and $704,000 received since 1942 through Federal Works Administration grants make up this sum.

Until 1938, the hospital was under the Board of Charities, which in 1926 became the Board of Public Welfare. It was transferred to the Health Department in accordance with the Appropriation Act of 1938. Since that time, the health officer has had direct supervision, and an assistant health officer was appointed by the Commissioners to assist in this supervision.

The annual maintenance costs of this charity hospital approximates today $1,600,000. Five years ago the annual maintenance costs approximated $800,360.

The number of patients at Gallinger Municipal Hospital during 1942 are summarized as follows:

Total admissions	15,828
Total births	2,264
Total deaths	1,402
Total discharges	16,727
Daily average patients in hospital	1,051.8
Total number of patient days	383,903

In no month of the year did the average occupancy exceed 1,200 patients, and its bed capacity is 1,450.

Adverting to the figure on total births at Gallinger, which represents 11 percent of all the births in the District of Columbia during 1942, I wish to point out to the Members of the House that of the total of 2,264 only 2 births resulted fatally. In my opinion this record is one to be proud of.

The number of positions is 901 to 930, but you gentlemen must remember that the manpower problem is serious, and is becoming increasingly so, and I am informed that as of this day there are in excess of 170 unfilled positions at Gallinger, and many hundreds throughout the municipal service. Then again, the war demands have brought about such a terrific turn-over that our departments and institutions are becoming honeycombed with individuals who are not up to the standard in qualifications, who are inexperienced and frequently inefficient and unambitious. It is not a question of funds, for ample funds have been made available. It is the question of the war impact on personnel. Certainly the Capital building program has been materially interfered with, but on November 1, 1942, ground was broken for an obstetrical pavilion to house 150 mothers with adequate facilities for their entrance, including nurses.

Funds for these improvements were provided for by the Lanham Act. This Congress approved and authorized the renovation of the buildings located on Upshur Street as a convalescent home to help relieve the burden of Gallinger, as well as Glenn Dale hospitals. We have been aware of our responsibilities, and so have the District officials.

In the 1942 appropriation act Congress, upon recommendation of the Appropriations Committee, authorized the expenditure of $78,750 for a new kitchen at Gallinger Municipal Hospital, which kitchen would have provided for the feeding of 1,500 patients 3 times a day, whereas the existing facilities were built to feed approximately 300 patients 3 times a day. Following the appropriation a request was made by the Commissioners to the War Production Board, and this within 30 days, for preference ratings so that critical materials might be obtained to carry out promptly this much needed facility. On July 28, 1942, the War Production Board issued a preference rating for materials in the amount of $4,400.95, an amount sufficient to repair obsolete and dilapidated ice boxes. It refused preference ratings for the construction of the kitchen. On September 2, 1942, a further request was made to the War Production Board to allow ratings for this project. Again it was refused, but they did allow $4,300 for the repair of kitchen equipment.

Gentlemen, Gallinger today, with a load of 1,051 patients and a capacity of 1,451 patients, is compelled to use a kitchen built and equipped to feed 300 patients 3 times per day, and in addition to that other meals made necessary by special diets, formulas, and the staff.

That the hospital has managed to feed 1,051 patients in a kitchen, the capacity of which is around 300, is a remarkable tribute to the administrative skill of those in charge.

The full force of the war's impact on this situation was felt when food rationing, the inability to obtain certain food products, and the manpower shortage combined to accentuate the problem that had long existed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FULBRIGHT, for 1 day, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1347. An act to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1351. An act to amend the act of May 27, 1908, as amended, authorizing settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1352. An act to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 533. An act for the relief of John P. von Rosenberg; and

H. R. 3029. An act to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damages on the Illinois River, Ill.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 11 a. m., to hold hearings on the following projects: Connecticut River, between Hartford, Conn., and Holyoke, Mass.; Alabama-Coosa Rivers, Ala. and Ga.; Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway; and Trinity River, Tex.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on House Joint Resolution 39, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older, at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, October 20, 1943, in room 346 old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 786, a bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (to include chiropractic practitioners), at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, November 3, 1943, in room 346 old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the petroleum subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Thursday, October 21, 1943.

Business to be considered: To begin hearings on the petroleum situation.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The hearing which was scheduled for Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 10 a. m., on the bill, H. R. 3334, relating to certain benefits to trainees in the Maritime Service, has been postponed until Tuesday, October 26, 1943, at 10 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

855. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting substitution for page No. 1 of the Consolidated Report of Personnel Requirements for the Quarter Ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

856. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

857. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy of the following legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John: Bill No. 53, budget for the municipality of St. Thomas and St. John for the fiscal year July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

858. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in tents used as quarters by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion, Long Island, Alaska, on December 26, 1942, and May 26, 1943, respectively; to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Patents. H. R. 3130. A bill to prohibit proof of acts done by an inventor in foreign countries; without amendment (Rept. No. 778). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WARD: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. S. 970. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably; with amendment (Rept. No. 779). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 3471. A bill making it a misdemeanor to stow away on aircraft and providing punishment therefor; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 3472. A bill to permit the amount of charitable contributions made or to be made to be taken into account in computing the tax required to be deducted and withheld on wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3473. A bill to permit the amount of charitable contributions made or to be made to be taken into account in computing the tax required to be deducted and withheld on wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 3474. A bill to abolish certain fees to be taxed and allowed to attorneys, solicitors, and proctors in the courts of the United States and to district attorneys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 3475. A bill to provide monthly payments for unemployed veterans of the present war for a limited period after separation from the service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 3476. A bill to approve a contract negotiated with the Klamath drainage district and to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 3477. A bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WARD JOHNSON:

H. R. 3485. A bill to maintain on active duty during the present war officers of the Regular Army who reach retirement age; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 3486 (by request). A bill to amend the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 3487. A bill to reduce immigration quotas as determined and proclaimed under the Immigration Act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution establishing joint congressional committees to obtain complete information with respect to the functioning of the executive departments and independent agencies of the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE:

H. R. 3478. A bill for the relief of the estate of Edward P. McCormack, former postmaster at Albany, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 3479. A bill for the relief of Daniel N. Skeeters; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 3480. A bill granting an increase of pension to Jennie L. Empson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMBERTSON:

H. R. 3481. A bill for the relief of J. William Ingram; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3482. A bill for the relief of James F. MacKinnon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 3483. A bill relative to the military record of Charles C. Rascoe, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 3484. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pearl W Peterson; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2987. By Mr. ANDREWS: Letter from the Business and Professional Women's Club of the Tonawandas, New York, expressing their approval, by resolution, of equal rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2988. Also, resolution adopted by the Niagara Frontier Cooperative Milk Producers Bargaining Agency, Inc., of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against any further subsidy for the dairy industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2989. Also, resolution adopted by the Buffalo Association of Fire Underwriters, favoring the enactment of House bill 3269 and Senate bill 1362; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2990. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Eight petitions of the adult classes of the Calvary Baptist Church Sunday School, Charleston, W. Va., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2991. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Frances M. Cushman and Edward M. Polk, of Corsicana; Lottie May Walker and W. A. McMillan, of Bremond and Calvert, respectively; and Jno. A. Moore, of Bryan, all of the State of Texas, favoring House bill 3269 and House bill 3270; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2992. Also, memorial of Lois J. Martin, of Hillsboro, and Fred H. Clark, of Ennis, Tex., favoring House bill 3269 and House bill 3270; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2993. By Mr. TROUTMAN: Petition of 63 members of the Kiwanis Club, of Williamsport, Pa., protesting against the passage of House bill 2861 and Senate bill 1161, to amend and extend the provisions of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2994. By Mr. HESS: Petition of Gustav Pfeiffer, Thorpe R. Green, and other citizens of Hamilton County, Ohio, protesting against any legislation which would establish national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2995. By Mr. PLOESER: Petition of G. H. Keigel and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2996. Also, petition of E. J. O'Connor and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2997. Also, petition of Edna Messenger and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2998. Also, petition of Sebastian Kretschmann and 180 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2999. Also, petition of Al Offerman and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3000. Also, petition of Frank Schaub and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3001. Also, petition of Harry Salabay, Jr., and 39 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3002. Also, petition of Joseph J. Montrey and 80 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3003. Also, petition of Frank Zorevry and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3004. Also, petition of Bert Schader and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3005. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition of Gertrude F. McCulloch, of Jackson, Mich., and signed by 110 other residents of the community, urging repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3006. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of the members of the Christian Church of Mount Vernon, Knox County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3007. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of sundry citizens of Trinway, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary

3008. By Mr. MURDOCK: Petition of Fred R. Daehler and 26 other citizens of Globe, Ariz., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, which would stop the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and during demobilization and remove one of the chief causes of absenteeism, conserve shipping space, and prevent the waste of untold amounts of money and huge quantities of food, coal, iron, rubber, and gasoline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3009. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of George Vallos, of Washington, D. C., and 49 other Washington, D. C., citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3010. Also, petition of Mrs. A. Schmutzer, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3011. Also, petition of Albert Schmutzer, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3012. Also, petition of John Bowers, of Washington, D. C., and 40 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3013. Also, petition of Leo Santos, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3014. Also, petition of Mrs. Caylor and 23 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3015. Also, petition of Joe Cassulo and 22 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3016. Also, petition of Tom Bellino and 23 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3017. Also, petition of E. Hahn and 23 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3018. Also, petition of Adam Kohl and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition fo the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3019. Also, petition of Edward Wedel, of St. Louis, Mo., and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3020. Also, petition of Sebastian Kretschmann and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3021. Also, petition of Mrs. I. Speiss and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3022. Also, petition of George Doloon and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3023. Also, petition of Joe A. Busch and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3024. By Mr. WHEAT: Petition of sundry citizens of Lakewood, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3025. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Decatur, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3026. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Pana, Oconee, and Decatur, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3027. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Moweaqua, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3028. Also, petition of the Douglas County Woman's Christian Temperance Union, asking for the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3029. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Macon and Decatur, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3030. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Tower Hill and Shelbyville, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3031. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Decatur, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3032. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Tower Hill, Ill., asking for the passage of a

law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3033. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Findlay, Shelbyville, Moweaqua, and Decatur, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3034. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Stewardson, Mode, and Shelbyville, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3035. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Shelbyville and Pana, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3036. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Tuscola, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3037. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Mattoon, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3038. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Niantic, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3039. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Decatur, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3040. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Cowden, Herrick, and Shelbyville, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3041. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Tower Hill, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3042. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Tower Hill, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3043. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Tower Hill and Shelbyville, Ill., asking for the passage of a law protecting the service boys against alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3044. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution No. 3601 of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, memorializing the Congress of the United States to sponsor Federal legislation to permit of reduction in income taxes by an amount not to exceed $7,500 for construction or reconstruction of buildings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3045. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of Stauffer and Cummings, of Vinton, and sundry other citizens of Benton County, Iowa, protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3046. By Mr. WARD JOHNSON: Petitions signed by 42 residents of Long Beach, Calif., urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3047. Also, petition signed by 40 members of the California Heights Methodist Community Church of Long Beach, Calif., of which Rev. Rolland M. Tincher, Jr., is the pastor, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3048. Also, letter from Rev. D. W. Simpson, pastor of the North Long Beach Church of the Nazarene, of North Long Beach, Calif., and 2 petitions signed by 40 members of his congregation, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3049. Also, petitions received from Rev. Arthur A. LeMaster, pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church, of Long Beach, Calif., signed by him and 64 members of his congregation, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3050. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of Gouverneur Morris Post, No. 1209, American Legion, Bronx County, N. Y., urging the designation of St. Ann's Church of Morrisania, N. Y., as a national site; to the Committee on the Library.

3051. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Melvin O. Bradford and others, of Anson, Maine, favoring consideration of House bill 2082 to restrict the liquor sales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3052. Also, petition of Wesley Rickards, of Madison, Maine, and other citizens of the vicinity, favoring consideration of House bill 2082, to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3053. Also, petition of M. O. Bradford, of Anson, Maine, and other citizens of the vicinity, favoring consideration of House bill 2082, to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3054. Also, petition of Mamie E. Benner, of Waldoboro, Maine, and others, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for winning the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3055. Also, petition of George B. Ritchie, of Pittsfield, Maine, and others, favoring the adoption of the Townsend plan as embodied in House bill 1649, and to make it an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3056. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Fritz Bierstube, of Aurora, Ill., and 21 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3057. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce at Coeur D'Alene, Idaho, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to recommendation to take whatever means necessary to prevent the continuation of unnecessary Government bureaus after the war is won; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 12, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., assistant minister, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, Almighty and Eternal, who holdest in Thine hand the destiny of men and nations and from whom cometh every good and perfect gift: We beseech Thee to bestow upon all to whom Thou hast committed the Government of this Nation the gift of Thy Holy Spirit, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and strength, that in all their deliberations and decisions they may be guided of Thee. And to the people of this land grant the spirit of generous and courageous sacrifice, that in their response to the challenge of this day, they may labor for the work's sake without undue thought of gain, unspoiled by increase of income, seeking to give the best that is within them.

We beseech Thee also, O Lord, to behold and bless all who have gone forth in the defense of our country. Sanctify both them and the cause we have espoused, that they and all who are met together in the cause of freedom may go forward in the power of conscious integrity. We dare not pray for our victory, but we pray that Thou wilt guide us unto Thine own victory of righteousness, justice, and peace. Grant this, O Father, for the sake of Him who died to make men free, Thy Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Secretary, Edwin A. Halsey, read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., October 19, 1943.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. HATTIE W. CARAWAY, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. CARAWAY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. GERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, October 18, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. GERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Caraway	Green
Andrews	Chandler	Guffey
Bailey	Chavez	Gurney
Ball	Clark, Idaho	Hatch
Bankhead	Clark, Mo.	Hawkes
Barbour	Connally	Hayden
Barkley	Danaher	Hill
Bilbo	Davis	Holman
Brewster	Downey	Johnson, Calif.
Bridges	Eastland	Johnson, Colo.
Buck	Ellender	Kilgore
Burton	Ferguson	Langer
Butler	George	McCarran
Byrd	Gerry	McClellan
Capper	Gillette	McFarland

McKellar	Radcliffe	Tobey
McNary	Reed	Tunnell
Maloney	Reynolds	Vandenberg
Maybank	Robertson	Van Nuys
Mead	Russell	Wagner
Millikin	Scrugham	Walsh
Murdock	Shipstead	Wheeler
Murray	Smith	Wherry
Nye	Stewart	White
O'Daniel	Taft	Wiley
O'Mahoney	Thomas, Idaho	Willis
Overton	Thomas, Okla.	Wilson
Pepper	Thomas, Utah	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent from the city, visiting his son, who is in the armed forces.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1459. A bill to provide for the issuance of awards for service in the Civil Air Patrol; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1460. A bill for the relief of Rear Admiral Richard E. Byrd, United States Navy (retired); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1461. A bill for the relief of Frederick G. Goebel; and

S. 1462. A bill for the relief of Solomon and Marie Theriault; to the Committee on Claims

(Mr. HATCH, by request, introduced Senate bill 1463, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 1464. A bill for the relief of the estate of Charles Noah Shipp, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. ANDREWS introduced Senate Joint Resolution 88, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

ABSTRACTING, TITLING, ETC., OF FEDERAL LANDS

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill, by request, for reference to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys. In connection with the bill I also ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD at this point a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States explaining the bill and its purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and referred as requested by the Senator from New Mexico, and the letter referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1463) to amend the act of July 4, 1836 (5 Stat. 107) entitled "An act to reorganize the General Land Office," was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The letter presented by Mr. HATCH in connection with the bill is as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, October 5, 1943.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: Pursuant to the provisions of section 312 (a) of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 26), requiring the Comptroller General to make recommendations looking to greater economy or efficiency in public expenditures, I have the honor to submit this report suggesting legislation the purpose of which is to establish and centralize in the General Land Office of the Department of the Interior, the necessary facilities for the acquisition, abstracting, titling, recording, and disposition of federally owned and controlled lands.

The Constitution provides (art. IV, sec. 3, clause 2) that:

"The Congress shall have power to * * * make all needful rules and regulations * * * respecting property belonging to the United States * * *."

There is at the present time no satisfactory uniform control, administrative or otherwise, over the performance of the operational steps in the acquisition and disposition of real property for the uses and purposes of the United States and its various agencies, nor has any satisfactory procedure been established for the compilation of records whereby adequote administrative control could be effected.

While various attempts have been made in the direction of establishing logical acquisition and planning measures, and of effecting more adequate accounting control, there is still no central repository or record from which the factual situation as to real property holdings can be reflected so that new acquisition and disposition requirements can be met to the best advantage of the Government.

The unprecedented acquisitions of land, buildings and appurtenant facilities or fixtures, by the war agencies since 1938 have served to emphasize certain major defects of long standing in the handling of the Government's real estate transactions.

Without including land purchases of the Defense Plant Corporation for fifteen hundred-odd war plants and acquisitions by other agencies not referred to the Department of Justice for title opinions, the total acquired and pending acquisitions for defense and war purposes from July 1, 1938, to March 31, 1943, has been estimated at more than 20,000,000 acres and 20,000 parcels not computed on an acreage basis.

This recent tremendous volume of activity has been undertaken and conducted to date without the benefit of a central procurement agency or uniform procurement methods, because no means for compiling comprehensive current information concerning federally owned land and improvements have been established.

At the present time, as in the past, the real estate requirements of the Government are being met on the basis of acquisition and disposition powers delegated by the Congress to the various administering agencies and to other duly constituted authorities.

While our Constitution vested in Congress full control over the purse and property of the Federal Government, and a Bureau of the Budget and a General Accounting Office were established to improve control over the appropriation and expenditure of public funds, no facility for over-all management control of the acquisition, utilization, and disposition of Federal land and improvements has been established.

The fact that current and dependable real property data, needed by the Congress and others concerned, are not available through existing channels has been developed in recent hearings before congressional committees.

In hearings before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures on January 8, 1943, Mr. Norman M. Littell, Assistant Attorney General, Lands Division, Department of Justice, was a witness. The questions of the chairman and the answers of Mr. Littell are illustrative of the situation then and now existing. The discussion follows:

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Littell, how could the committee get a definite understandable statement of the purchases that are in process now and contemplated—purchases of land by each department of the Government?

"Mr. LITTELL. By directing that inquiry to each department of the Government.

"The CHAIRMAN. I assume you cannot get that right now. What the committee wants to do is to go to some central agency, if possible, such as the Department of Justice, that should have the records because all of the purchases are going through your Department.

"Mr. LITTELL. In this respect only: If it is condemned, it goes through our Department. We know exactly what is paid for it. If it is a direct purchase, we close it, and we can also give you that. In that respect both of them usually do go through our Department. But we are not absolutely positive that all the deeds we approve show the full consideration, so the safe thing to do is to direct the inquiry to each department of the Government. They can tabulate their own acquisitions much faster than we can. We can dig back through the records for the years past, of course.

"The CHAIRMAN. Can you give the information as to the items that are purchased, as to, for instance, a farm—how many acres in a farm? You have got all that, haven't you?

"Mr. LITTELL. The deed usually shows that; yes."

On March 2, 1943, the Commissioner of Public Buildings of the Federal Works Agency advised the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives, that the Federal real-estate records in his office had not been brought up to date, and that his office could not supply a general statement covering land acquisitions for military purposes.

The magnitude of the recently expanded problem of recording all land titles, and of currently maintaining an inventory of Federal real property may be more clearly understood in the light of the situation which existed prior to the declaration of a national emergency in 1939. On November 23, 1935, the Commissioner of the General Land Office in a letter to the Secretary of the Interior stated:

"No central office is keeping a complete record of the holdings of interests of the United States as a land proprietor. Numerous examples might be cited to show the lack of uniformity in the Federal title records, and the manner in which the same are scattered through various Government offices, both in Washington and elsewhere, with resulting

discord and confusion. * * * the complete records may not be secured without a thorough canvass of each bureau, office, or other Federal agency, both temporary and permanent, having jurisdiction over the land property."

Other evidence of past recognition of need for corrective action in this field is shown in a letter of the Director of Procurement, Treasury Department, to the Comptroller of the Currency, under date of April 3, 1936, wherein it was pointed out:

"The records which are of great importance to the Government and have given me much concern relate to the real property which has been acquired by purchase principally—or by any means other than an act of cession. * * * The Government should know with certainty the real property in its possession and be furnished with estimates of its value annually. Such information is essential to a financial statement showing the assets and liabilities of the United States. The item of real estate probably represents the largest value in the capital account of the Government."

On November 23, 1935, the Commissioner of the General Land Office further summed up the situation of the Government with respect to need of facilities for centralizing title, description, and ownership map records of federally acquired real estate, and in his letter of that date the following facts were set forth:

"It is assumed by many who are uninformed that the General Land Office has in its archives the description and other associated records of all lands transferred to the United States by deed or otherwise, but this is not the case, as the records of the General Land Office relate primarily to the public lands and no general plan has been adopted by Congress for the recording and indexing of all Federal land titles, nor for the maintenance of records concerning the status of such lands.

* * * * *

"It is to be noted that the need for a central agency was recognized years ago when the Bureau of the Budget organized a Federal Real Estate Board, which was authorized to compile a complete record of the real estate owned by the United States as used for ordinary governmental purposes. * * * The duties and records of that Board have since been transferred to the Procurement Division, Treasury Department; it is understood that the records are not complete, * * * nor does that record include the land acquired since the response to the questionnaire of 1929, excepting of course those areas in which the Procurement Division has cooperated in consummating the purchases. The latter office has a continuing responsibility with regard to surplus Federal real estate, for the sale or other disposition of such lands no longer required for governmental activities (Public, No. 351, 74th Cong., approved Aug. 27, 1935)."

Although no project of the type recommended by the General Land Office in 1935 for the centralization of records was undertaken, during 1939 the General Land Office took over from the National Resources Committee the supervision of certain W. P. A. projects for surveying publicly owned lands.

In 1939 the National Resources Planning Board, successor to the National Resources Committee, was delegated the function—

"To receive and record all proposed Federal projects involving the acquisition of land (including transfer of land jurisdiction) and land research projects, and, in an advisory capacity, to provide the agencies concerned with such information or data as may be pertinent to the projects."

In a summary of the work accomplished through the W. P. A. projects under its supervision the Commissioner of the General Land Office in his 1942 annual report said:

"The records of the General Land Office contain a great mass of original data on the public lands, in many cases the only existing data of the type. The new problems of disposal, protecting, and utilization, now confronting the Land Office require analysis and applications of these data not formerly necessary. It is imperative, therefore, that the sources be carefully studied and that the applicable data be compiled to derive statistics that will meet these new needs in a practical manner. Frequent requests by other governmental agencies and by persons outside of the Government service for current and historical data also evidence growing needs for such material. Much effort was devoted during the past year to investigating sources, making test compilations, and meeting as far as possible special current needs. Since the task of compilation of basic data is of such magnitude that it must await funds and personnel, it is being planned as a key project in the Land Office's post-war research program.

* * * * *

"The Federal land inventory project carried on by the General Land Office in cooperation with the Work Projects Administration was practically suspended during the latter part of the fiscal year, and the W. P. A. funds were transferred to projects more directly connected with the prosecution of the war. However, the inventory of lands recorded on the tract books of the District Land Offices, which lands constitute approximately 90 percent of the lands in Federal ownership, has been completed for all States except South Dakota. The plotting of these data on county maps is about 75 percent complete. Utah and Oregon have been finished. Idaho, California, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, and Nevada are about 90 percent complete, and Arizona, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Washington are about 65 percent complete.

"The completed maps have provided valuable information to those agencies, both Federal and State, administering public lands, as well as to the War and Navy Departments in locating, establishing, and planning many areas now used for military purposes. The completed inventory will also provide valuable data for post-war planning.

"Procedures and forms have been worked out to assist the several bureaus and agencies of the Department of the Interior in reporting for central recording in the General Land Office all Federally owned land under their respective jurisdictions whether acquired by purchase, gift, condemnation, exchange, or otherwise, as directed by Departmental Order No. 1441 of January 18, 1940. These procedures and forms have been developed in collaboration with the bureaus and agencies concerned."

That the regular activities of the General Land Office have been geared to meet war needs, in coordination with other agencies participating in the war effort, may be seen in a compilation as of March 5, 1943, with respect to the public lands, showing areas withdrawn for national defense purposes, and permits granted to the War Department for the use of public lands for military purposes.

An attempt was made to maintain a permanent record of all Federal real estate in the Public Buildings Administration but the condition of such record was referred to by Commissioner W. E. Reynolds on March 2, 1943, in hearings before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, as follows:

"Mr. WHITTINGTON. Since your activity has been organized have the various Government agencies that own land and buildings given you a list of the properties that they own; and have you such a list, or do you keep a record of it?

"Mr. REYNOLDS. We keep a general record of all real-estate holdings.

"Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is that down to date?

"Mr. REYNOLDS. It is not down to date; it will take some little time to assemble the papers because we have not had the personnel to do it."

To improve administrative control of the real-estate business of the Government, it is proposed that a new facility, and a new record-accumulating and fact-reflecting system, be made available which will provide what may be termed a current inventory of Federal real estate.

For these purposes it is desired to establish procurement and disposal services in such manner that a single office will act as the agent of the Government in filling the real property needs of the different departments and other agencies, and in disposing of such property as is surplus to their needs. From its records such office would be enabled to provide a wide variety of current information and reports to the Congress, the Executive, and others concerned, pertaining to the real property holdings and transactions of the Government.

Obviously the needed administrative control system cannot become operative without effecting a coordinated flow of information from various sources pending concentration of procurement and disposition activities in a single agency or office. Such concentration would have to be accomplished gradually and without undue interference with war-connected operations of other agencies. A most important task consists of reshaping and reforming certain administrative and routine procedures which exist at the present time, and in embodying in the new system procedures reflecting the thought given to this subject by those having the widest experience in this field. These specific immediate activities are only the starting point; however, new legislation is required in order to initiate the immediate program and provide adequately for its continuity and eventual expansion into the ultimate program of handling all land acquisition and disposition transactions.

At present there are over 60 departments, agencies, and independent establishments from which the Congress and the Executive must obtain information upon which to base decisions and execute plans and policies regarding the real property requirements of the Government. Of the more than 60 departments and agencies, all are on a parity as to administrative control and responsibility, and while each functions in its own separate sphere, none is equipped to assemble and correlate the vast information required by the Congress and the President for policy and administrative determination purposes, particularly with respect to new requirements, surplus property disposition, future utilization, and the custody of the greatly expanded Federal holdings.

Furthermore, if the present departments and agencies were relieved of the greater portion of the work involved in acquiring and disposing of real estate, by the transfer of the functional activities to a single facility, simplified control and accounting would result.

In this way, the various departments and agencies would be served in real-estate matters in a manner comparable to the existing arrangement whereunder the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department is responsible for providing materials and supplies needed by the different agencies of the Government and for the disposal of surplus material items.

Excepting for centralization of recording and reporting, the machinery for taking the above steps has been in actual operation for long periods in the Department having jurisdiction over the largest areas of Federal real estate. In this Department, the General Land Office has recorded in its tract books approximately 90 percent of the lands in Federal ownership. During its 130-odd years of continuous operations in the field of public lands the General Land Office has had experience in all phases of land activities not equaled by any other department or agency.

The Commissioner of the General Land Office now has in his employ cadastral engineers, topographers, appraisers, title examiners, attorneys, mineral examiners, timber scalers, and other qualified employees necessary to handle the acquisition and disposal of lands within the public-land States. The General Land Office now maintains five field examination offices, 25 local land offices, and field survey headquarters, strategically located throughout the public-land States; it has also established a system of recordation of Federally owned lands acquired or disposed of by the various activities of the Interior Department in the non-public-land States; it has the field notes and plats of survey of the public domain so far as surveyed, together with the record of their status under the various public-lands laws, reservations, withdrawals, and restorations by proclamation and Executive order; the tract-book records, plats, and field notes maintained by that office afford the legal description, acreage, and the means of identification of the boundaries of all legal subdivisions within the public domain. These records show the status of such lands from the basic grants, and much of the lands heretofore acquired, and now being acquired under the war emergency, are lands that originally passed from the public domain into private ownership, and the basic transactions are a part of these tract-book records.

With the present machinery for the acquisition and disposal of lands covering more than three-quarters of the area of the United States already in operation within the General Land Office, together with the close relationship which has existed between the General Land Office and other land-acquiring departments and agencies, affords a logical reason for concentrating within that office the routine work involved in future real estate and disposition programs of the Government.

As demonstrated by its broad experience in surveying and mapping the public lands, and by its proposals for establishing and maintaining improved real-estate record systems, the General Land Office is qualified to undertake the work contemplated, upon enactment of the necessary legislation.

Moreover, for the future rendition of a centralized service, the organization of the General Land Office, both in Washington and the field, could be augmented as needed by personnel of other Government offices experienced in various phases of real-estate acquisition, disposition, and title work. Unification of such work in the General Land Office would provide in large part the necessary machinery for handling the post-war disposition of real property acquired for national defense and other purposes.

To accomplish the recommendations herein made there is submitted for consideration proposed legislation in the form of an amendment to the act of July 4, 1836 (5 Stat. 107) entitled "An act to reorganize the General Land Office," to provide as follows:

* * * * *

Respectfully,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

PULASKI DAY PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF PULASKI CLUB OF OMAHA, NEBR.

Mr. BUTLER. Madam President, at least one-fourth of the population of my State of Nebraska is of foreign birth or parentage. The largest number in any single group are those of German extraction. The next in order in number are those of Czech origin; next come the Swedish, Danish, Polish, Russian, Italian, Swiss, and Greek groups. The total of all these groups approximates one-fourth of the population of the State of Nebraska.

Coming from each one of these groups are some of our most prominent and influential citizens, and men in the ranks of the Army today who are making a very creditable record, not only for the State but for the Nation.

A week ago last Sunday, on October 10, the Polish people of Nebraska, principally those in Omaha, held a public meeting, at which time they adopted a brief resolution, which I should like to read into the RECORD at this time. It is as follows:

Whereas citizens of Polish descent and their American friends, have duly assembled in the stately temple of the Joslyn Memorial, in Omaha, Nebr., on this 10th day of October 1943, to observe General Pulaski Day, the fourth anniversary of the brutal attack on Poland by the ruthless Nazi hordes, and the opening of the Polish exhibit from the Polish center of information from Chicago, Ill.; and

Whereas President Roosevelt recently said: "The Polish people may be certain that their sufferings and unceasing contributions to our common cause will not be forgotten when their hour of liberation strikes"; and

Whereas Prime Minister Churchill also stated: "The valuable contribution which the Poles have made to the common cause of the United Nations has not been achieved without heavy sacrifices, but these sacrifices will be crowned by the restoration to which we all look forward, of a great and independent Poland"; and

Whereas General Pulaski died for American independence, and Poland not only defended her own soil, but fought the enemy in France, and played a conspicuous part in the battle of Britain, and the Poles are fighting at home and abroad, to defeat our common foe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Poland's contribution and sufferings in this terrible holocaust; her courage, faith, endurance, and unconquerable spirit, be taken into account and properly evaluated at the conclusion of this war, and that Poland shall be restored as a free, independent, sovereign nation, and that her territorial integrity remain inviolate; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, to the Honorable Hugh Butler and Kenneth S. Wherry, Senators from Nebraska, and to the Honorable Howard Buffett, Congressman from the Second District of Nebraska.

Dr. ANDREW TERRY,
President, Pulaski Club.
A. ZALESKI,
Chairman.

MOBILIZATION OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RESOURCES—STATEMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the mobilization of scientific and technical resources made by the Vice President before the subcommittee on War Mobilization of the Senate Military Affairs Committee on October 14, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHIPPING FOR VICTORY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KILGORE

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Shipping for Victory," delivered by Senator KILGORE on October 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WASHINGTON REPORTS ON RATIONING—INTERVIEW WITH DEPUTY PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATOR RALPH K. DAVIES

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the script of a radio program entitled "Washington Reports on Rationing," being an interview with Deputy Petroleum Administrator Ralph K. Davies by Ernest Lindley, on October 17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FIFTH FREEDOM—ADDRESS BY CARL A. NORGREN

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an address entitled "The Fifth Freedom," delivered by Carl A. Norgren, of Denver, Colo., before the Manufacturers Association of Colorado on October 5, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR PEACE—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Peace Issue Leadership Seen Foggy," by David Lawrence, from the Washington Evening Star of October 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 964. An act to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation;

S. 1113. An act to amend section 11 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942;

S. 1132. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 so as to provide for the payment of a uniform gratuity to certain officers recalled to active duty;

S. 1170. An act authorizing the conveyance to the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, of a portion of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, Va.; and

S. 1350. An act to establish the grades of commissioned warrant officer and warrant officer in the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents' Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 533. An act for the relief of John P. von Rosenberg; and

H. R. 2888. An act relating to the application of the excess-profits tax to certain production bonus payments.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3208) to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2697. An act to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior;

H. R. 2924. An act to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada; to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands; and for other purposes;

H. R. 3176. An act to regulate the furnishing of artificial limbs or other appliances to retired officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, and to certain civilian employees of the military and naval forces of the Regular Establishment;

H. R. 3223. An act to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others, in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service;

H. R. 3225. An act to amend the Act of May 27, 1908, as amended, authorizing settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps;

H. R. 3230. An act to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942; and

H. R. 3306. An act to authorize the conveyance of Harrison Park in the city of Vincennes to Vincennes University.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore [Mrs. CARAWAY]:

H. R. 533. An act for the relief of John P. von Rosenberg;

H. R. 2888. An act relating to the application of the excess-profits tax to certain production bonus payments;

H. R. 3029. An act to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damages on the Illinois River, Ill.; and

H. R. 3208. An act to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 2697. An act to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 2924. An act to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada; to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 3176. An act to regulate the furnishing of artificial limbs or other appliances to retired officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard and to certain civilian employees of the military and naval forces of the Regular Establishment; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 3306. An act to authorize the conveyance of Harrison Park in the city of Vincennes to Vincennes University; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 637) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the first committee amendment, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, after line 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

(d) No provision of this act shall be construed to delimit a State in its definition of its program of public education: *Provided*, That the funds paid to a State under this act shall be expended only by public agencies under public control.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Madam President, the terms of the pending bill, S. 637, do not assure the performance of its professed objectives.

The stated reason for the annual appropriation of $100,000,000, passing for the moment the additional annual appropriation of $200,000,000, is to "more nearly equalize public elementary and public secondary school opportunities among and within the States."

Section 13 (d) of the bill provides that each racial minority group within a State shall realize not less than that proportion of the whole sum going to that State that the number of members of each such minority racial group bears to the total population of that State.

With that single exception, there is no language in the bill which requires or necessarily has a tendency to achieve a reduction of inequality in educational opportunity within the States. In fact, as will be developed, the bill holds the possibility of further exaggerating existing spreads in educational opportunity.

The bill provides in section 5B that the equalization funds shall be available for disbursement by the States—

for all types of expenditures for public elementary schools (which may include kindergarten and nursery schools) and public secondary schools (which may include through the fourteenth grade).

The very fact that the money may be spent for all types of such expenditures defeats the use of any sensible measuring stick for reducing inequality in educational opportunities. It is impossible, in terms of educational opportunity, to compare and value the respective merits of such dissimilar things for which Federal money may be spent under the bill, as, for example, a new swimming pool, a new gymnasium, a new health program, a new course in eurythmic dancing, a new schoolhouse, a new school bus, a teacher's salary.

But assuming that a sensible measuring stick could be found, its use is not required. I suggest that students of political science are well aware, that my colleagues who have been State legislators or Governors are well aware, of the fact that many of our legislatures habitually slant their laws to the special advantage of heavy voting districts, or to the special advantage of particular occupational or social groups, or to the special advantage of one geographical part of the State against the other, or of the urban against the rural areas, or vice versa.

There is nothing in the bill to prevent that, and we should not be naive enough to think it could not happen. For example, it is a well-known fact that, generally speaking, rural area schools have less money per pupil for education than do urban schools. Is anyone here so far out of this world as to assume that any legislature, in order to reduce that inequality, would, if necessary to do so, direct that all or a major part of this money should be spent in rural areas? Not so long as men run for office from the cities. And if the money is spread out proportionally, if it is spread out on a per capita pupil basis, education might be improved, but obviously inequality of educational opportunity will not be reduced.

The self-defeating feature of the bill, so far as it is intended to reduce inequalities in educational opportunity, is that, with the single exception already noted, having to do with apportionment between the races, the equalization process stops at the State lines, stops with the States as governmental entities; and the total funds apportioned to the races within a State, though figured on a per capita basis, are distributed on a group basis.

Because States as such and racial groups as such do not go to school, it results that the only place, I respectfully suggest, where we can actually reduce inequality of educational opportunity is at the level of the schoolhouse. There is nothing in the bill to require that kind of equalization by the States which accept the moneys to be appropriated.

Thus we see the possibility heretofore hinted that communities having the preferential regard of their State legislatures, which probably for that reason already have the best educational systems, may receive still further improvement of those systems at the expense of school jurisdictions having greater need of a better standard of educational opportunity, but which because they are out of statehouse favor will not be at the receiving end of this fabulous cornucopia.

The full discretion of the legislature to set up standards that would encourage the reduction of inequality in educational opportunity—and, of course, some legislatures would make a good faith effort to do so—or on the other hand, to require use of the funds within the States without regard to equalization, is further emphasized and stabilized by the proposed committee amendment to section 5 of the bill which provides that "no provision of this act shall be construed to delimit a State in its definition of its program of public education."

The other of the stated twin motives of the bill is that money should be appropriated to meet educational emergencies via the payment of teachers' salaries. The emergency feature is to render palatable an appropriation that goes on until it is stopped by Congress, of $200,000,000 a year. To me this emergency argument is completely destroyed and the proposed appropriation is rendered totally indefensible by the facts, which cannot be challenged, that our national income is the highest in history and that with few exceptions this has reflected itself in general fund surpluses of unprecedented magnitude in our State treasuries, in the reduction of municipal indebtedness, including school district indebtedness.

The list of general fund State surpluses was introduced by me into the RECORD of October 15. I shall not analyze in detail that intensely gratifying showing that vast sums are available for expenditure for education within the States by our State governments. Suffice it to say, it would appear that only 3 or 4 of the 48 States are on a deficit basis. The rest have general fund surpluses ranging from $500,000 to $96,564,615. The total State general fund surpluses have been estimated to approximate $1,000,000,000.

Could anything be more irresponsible or destructive of national morale than for us, in the face of a Federal Treasury deficit of appalling magnitude, to ask the people of this country to buy war stamps and war bonds so that we can play "Big Hearted Otis" to sovereignties rolling in surpluses available for the satisfaction of their own educational problems?

But if all the States were poverty-stricken we would not be warranted in making the contemplated annual appropriation of $200,000,000 under the bill as it is drawn.

All this money would go for salaries to teachers, to increase substandard salaries, to pay salaries to additional teachers, to adjust salaries to meet increased costs of living. This, it is stated in the bill, must be done to meet financial emergencies in our public school system.

The money may be spent for all or any of those purposes. But no standards are established for determining whether and where an emergency really exists; no standards for determining when it has been met. No standards are provided to determine relative priority or importance of emergencies. No formula is created for setting the standard salary and, hence, no way exists to estimate the deviations. There is no standard for determining allocations between the types of authorized expenditures. There is nothing to assure equitable treatment of all the teachers of any State.

Here, where we are dealing with an appropriation of $200,000,000 a year, the controls to assure performance of the proclaimed purpose are just as gutless, just as amorphous as the $100,000,000 a year appropriation to relieve inequality of educational opportunity. The appropriation is a gratuity accompanied by uplifting advice—as when one tosses a bill to a mendicant with the expressed palm-rubbing hope that it will not be spent for immoral purposes. Only here, we are creating the mendicant, we are forcing the tin cup into his hand.

All of this emphasizes the mutually destructive and quite equally unacceptable dilemmas of the bill. If we insert in the bill protective formulae for assuring the reduction of inequality in educational opportunity, if we insert protective formulae with respect to the expenditure of the emergency funds, we cross up the proclamation at the beginning of the bill that—

(Sec. 1) No department, agency, or officer of the United States shall exercise any supervision or control over any school or State educational agency with respect to which any funds are expended pursuant to this act, * * *.

And we cross up the prohibition heretofore noted against delimiting the authority of States in their definition of programs. And if we do not insert provisions that will assure the performance of the proclaimed purpose of the bill, we are crossing up the American taxpayer.

What are the real purposes of the bill? One of them, I respectfully suggest, is to put Federal money into a few States where educational standards are seriously below par no matter how we figure par, and where it is alleged that despite every corrective effort and despite the fact that the ultimate of financial sacrifice has been endured to raise the standard, substandard conditions continue to prevail.

For the purpose of discussion, let us assume that there are such States. There are not many of them. Also for the purpose of discussion, let us assume that we are warranted in helping such States with Federal funds—and at this point let me say that I am willing to put Federal funds into States, if there are any, which have exhausted their own abilities to clean up their own educational plague spots.

What would we do about it? Instead of moving straight to our objective, we would apply false assumptions of indigence to 40 or more States; we would apply the assumptions where their verity is refuted by acceptable standards of education and by bountiful treasury surpluses available for such education. Then we would by-pass those general fund treasury surpluses and reach into the pockets of the taxpayers of those States to collect and bring to Washington the money required by these appropriations. Then we would hand back that money to those States for the attainment of goals which in many of them have already been reached or surpassed. Truly, this bill follows the zany exaggerations, grotesqueries, and circumlocutions of a Rube Goldberg cartoon.

We have observed the provisions of the bill which are intended to remove the opposition of those Senators, including your speaker, who will never favor any scheme for Federal control, or that would encourage a tendency to Federal control, of our educational systems. But, in my opinion, that kind of control is inherent in, and is inescapable under the bill, whether or not it is intended.

The background and means for such control are present. First, there is the familiar technic of a claimed emergency or a claimed evil which the Federal Government alone, it is said, can remedy. Then there is a system of Federal administration which, by its nature, can be counted upon to aggravate and perpetuate the emergency or the evil which the system is intended to relieve. Let us examine these features of the bill.

The false claim of emergency warranting Federal intervention in the face of bulging State general fund surpluses has been sufficiently demonstrated. The feature of the bill which would perpetuate the emergency and the evils complained of has not been sufficiently explored. Section 6 (B) of the bill provides:

The funds appropriated under the authorization of this act shall be allotted only to those States which, during the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the apportionment is made, have provided from State revenues for all public elementary and public secondary school purposes not less than either the total amount, or the amount per pupil in average daily attendance, actually spent for such purposes in the fiscal year ended in 1942.

Section 6 (C) provides that:

The funds allotted to any State from the funds appropriated under Section 2 (A) of this act shall be paid by the State educational authority only to those local school jurisdictions that from State and local funds (which shall not be interpreted to include funds made available under this Act) pay average annual salaries to their teachers not less than the average annual salaries paid as of February 1, 1943, or the nearest prior date when school was in session.

Thus, by setting and by freezing, through the use of the fixed dates mentioned, a minimum standard of expenditure by the States and local jurisdictions as a condition precedent to the receipt of Federal funds, incentive to the States and to local jurisdictions to go beyond the minimum, to strive for better educational standards, and for the solution of their own emergencies at their own expense, is smothered, and is left without further encouragement.

The frozen-standard provision is also objectionable, whether or not it is an intended technique for the furtherance of Federal control, because it assumes falsely that every State and every local jurisdiction is doing its best, that what was done in our home States and in their local school jurisdictions in the fiscal year 1942, or as of February 1, 1943, could not have been bettered. Moreover, the frozen-standard provision holds the offensive assumption, also a well known part of the technique of Federal intervention, that we are in a frozen economy, and that the folks at home have frozen their ambitions for the education of their own children.

Were the bill not dominated by these false and defeatist assumptions, it would have been drawn to reward progress, and to penalize the lack of it.

Once accustomed to these Federal funds, with budgets and taxes and tenures and ways of life arranged accordingly, with the disappearance of local incentive to better local educational standards, the States and local school jurisdictions will have been conditioned for the encroachment of the Federal controls which appear in the bill on first sight to be uncoiled and harmless.

Let us take a closer look at these controls. Section 6 (A) (1) (e) says that the legislature shall:

Provide that the State educational authority shall make reports to the Commissioner with respect to the expenditure of funds received and the progress of education on forms to be provided by the Commissioner.

Who decides what shall constitute progress in education? There are, thank

goodness, as many opinions on what is progress in the teaching profession as there are teachers. But as time goes on that healthy and evolutionary fermentation will be shaped to the forms sent out by the Federal Commissioner of Education—forms containing the leading questions of the Commissioner for the led answers of the State authorities.

Oh, of course, no one can be forced to give a certain type of answer. And it is equally true that no one can be forced not to take the hint. Our experience with human nature, our experience with other forms of Federal encroachment, should tell us that after this thing gets firmly rooted, and pay rolls are based upon it, and local responsibilities can be avoided with it, a lively fear will develop that if the right answers are not given, the gravy train might pass without stopping. And thus the harmless-looking form, numbered, let us say, service 8–Z–21,199,999, becomes an adroit and far-seeing instrument for gradually conforming to the wishes of the Federal Commissioner, the administration, personnel, curriculum, instruction, methods of instruction, and materials of instruction in our local schools, despite all contrary protestations of the bill.

Thus one more death among the people's liberties through the creeping paralysis of Federal intervention—a mortal illness rendered almost pleasant by the continual and always enlarging doses of that beguiling narcotic, Federal money.

Let us take a look at another source of control which will encourage the right answers. Under section 5 (c) of the bill—

> A State may use not to exceed 1 percent of the funds received by it under this act to pay the expenses of State department of education necessary for the efficient administration of the funds received under this act.

This, it is apparent, will develop a new and sizable tenure and salary interest in the State officials who will administer the funds. Each Senator can figure it for his own State.

To that there has been added a provision for an extra portion—a sort of super dessert available for the faithful—which, through its deprivation, can serve also as a deterrent and as punishment for the impious. Section 10 says:

> For services and other expenses necessary to the administration of this act, and for the making of necessary surveys and other studies in connection with the best utilization of the grants to States authorized in this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year an amount not to exceed one-half of 1 percent of the total amount authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year under the provisions of section 2 of this act. Any of the funds appropriated under the authorization of this section may be allocated by the Commissioner to State departments of education for surveys or other studies pertinent to the best use of the funds received under this act. Such allocations shall be made by joint agreement between the Commissioner and the chief State educational authority. The amounts thus allocated shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury by the Commissioner, and shall thereupon be paid to the cooperating State department of education. Suitable provision for audits, reports, and repayment to the United States of amounts unexpended, lost, or misapplied shall be incorporated into the joint agreement.

Note, please, that studies and surveys are to be made in connection with the best utilization of the grants to the States. Note, please, that the grants are to be discretionary with the Commissioner. Note, please, that the allocations shall be made by a joint agreement between the Commissioner and the chief State educational authorities. Note, please, that the money so allocated shall be paid "to the cooperating State department of education."

Is it not perfectly clear that an agreement will not be reached that does not coincide with the notions of the Federal official who has the spending of the money? If the Federal Commissioner under the terms or spirit of the bill is precluded from having views and policies as to the best use of the money, why any agreement? Why not allow the State educational authorities to write their own tickets, to do their own surveying in their own way? Remember, the money goes only to cooperating State departments of education.

Let me emphasize especially that this cooperation—this mutual determination of best use—is not limited to bare statistics as to the application of the money. If that were all that were wanted, this could be provided by simple provisions in the bill.

Whether the best use of the money is being made goes to the heart of conflicting theories of education. It goes directly to what shall be in textbooks, to what shall be taught, how it is to be taught, and who is to do the teaching—the precise things which the bill in other sections vehemently proclaims will never be inflicted.

The Commissioner may make agreement with his views a very tempting thing to uncooperative persons. He has up to $1,000,000 a year for the purpose. He is not bound by any fixed formula of distribution.

It has been strongly impressed upon me that we can never overlook the precedent value of Federal legislation. Again and again in the relatively short time that I have been here, I have seen requests for this, that, and the other type of relief out of the Federal Treasury, on the ground that, having already relieved the troubles of one group of our people with Federal funds, therefore we are required in fairness to relieve the troubles of all other groups which by skillfully presented analogies can bring themselves into comparable positions.

No one would deny the importance in our national life of education. It properly ranks as a necessity. But along with education we have other clamorous demands on our energies and money, equally necessitous. I refer to food, clothing, shelter, health. Without these, education would be a mocking irrelevancy.

In brief, every argument here advanced for this bill is equally applicable for persuading Federal Treasury intervention in what has always been the primary responsibility of the individual citizen for the supply of his food, clothing, and shelter and the protection of his health.

Confronted with this bill, if it is enacted into law, confronted with it as the precedent and used as it would be as a philosophical springboard, there could be no just grounds for refusing appropriations—and, in my judgment, they would not be refused—to cover all of those other fields.

Thus we would blot out all pretense of Federal solvency, blot out the sovereignty of our States, the sovereignty of home rule, and individual sovereignty. We would then have the equalized squalor of communism. It would be the final, lethal blow to what is left of the American system of government. Because this bill is the premise in action to that conclusion and because I want to help to preserve and restore the American system, I must oppose the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAVEZ in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I have been very much interested in listening to the outstanding address of the distinguished Senator. Let me ask him whether Colorado is one of the States in the Dust Bowl.

Mr. MILLIKIN. A portion of our State is in the Dust Bowl.

Mr. LANGER. What is the financial situation of the State of Colorado now, as compared with what it was, say, in 1934 and 1935?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Our condition is much better. We now have a general fund surplus of approximately $3,800,000.

Mr. LANGER. What about teachers' salaries?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think we have an acceptable standard. I am not satisfied with the standard in many places in the State. We are trying to improve the standard with our own funds. For example, yesterday the city of Colorado Springs voted an increase in teachers' salaries.

Mr. LANGER. I wonder if the situation in the Senator's State is not analogous to that in the State of North Dakota. In North Dakota in 1933 and 1934 we loaned millions of dollars to school teachers who could not cash their warrants anywhere. At that time nearly half our people were on relief. Hundreds of school districts were insolvent. We have had four or five good crops since then, and the teachers who formerly were not able to cash their warrants now have no trouble in cashing them. Is that the situation in Colorado?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think that in general there is no trouble about teachers cashing school warrants. For a few years we did have some difficulty in a few of our school jurisdictions, but I think that by legislative appropriation, through the diversion of income taxes to our school districts, we have largely remedied that condition.

Speaking personally, as a citizen of Colorado, I am not satisfied with the level of teachers' salaries prevailing in some sections of my State. I may say that as early as 20 years ago I took an active part in a movement in Colorado to increase the salaries of teachers and to bring about pensions for teachers. I am utterly sympathetic with efforts to raise the standard of teachers' salaries; but I believe that the primary place for achieving that end is, first, in the school district; second, in the State; and then, if a State demonstrates that it is unable to clean up its educational plague spots, I am willing to consider some sort of legislation designed to help a State in such a predicament.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator tell me how much of the $300,000,000 would go to the State of Colorado?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I cannot, offhand. I think Colorado would get somewhat in excess of $2,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. The figure for Colorado is $2,701,000.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It may seem strange that I cannot give the Senator at once the amount which would go to the State of Colorado. However, my objection to this bill, in point of principle, regardless of what Colorado might or might not get, is so deep that I have not given much thought to what the State might receive.

Mr. LANGER. Whatever the amount may be, is it not true that in the final analysis the people of Colorado would pay that amount into the Federal Treasury in the form of Federal taxes, and then the Federal Government would return it to the State of Colorado out of the $200,000,000 appropriation, and possibly out of the additional $100,000,000?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Of course, all the money comes from the people of the States.

Mr. LANGER. In the last analysis.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct. However, under the terms of the bill it would come in different percentages and go back in different percentages. The awkwardness of it, and the foolishness of it, is what prompted me to use the figure which I used a while ago. In its grotesqueries and exaggerations it is like a Rube Goldberg cartoon.

Mr. LANGER. Let me inquire further from the distinguished Senator if he knows what the attitude of the rank and file of the people of Colorado is toward the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I can only answer that question by saying that I have not had a single request from the rank and file of the people of the State of Colorado to support the bill. Every request I have received has come from the teaching profession.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator believe that the situation to which he has referred is indicative of the situation obtaining in the States surrounding Colorado?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I could not pass upon that.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator have any letter from any of those States bearing upon that question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have not received any letters from them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, the pending bill seems to be based upon a misunderstanding or disagreement as to the present situation. I have listened rather carefully to the speeches which have already been made on the subject, and it seems to me that there is a disagreement as to whether there is any unusual situation or any unusual emergency.

On Monday last I cut from the New York Times an article entitled "Teacher Shortage Cuts Into Schools—Many in Rural Areas Unable To Open and Others Must Curtail Their Classes—the South Is Hit Hardest."

The article reads as follows:

Faced with an acute teacher shortage, public schools throughout the country have been forced to curtail classes, eliminate various subjects, employ poorly qualified instructors, and resort to overcrowding. Many rural schools have been unable to open this fall.

Reports from various sections of the country indicate that the schools are confronted with an extremely critical situation. Leading educators warn that unless remedial steps are taken immediately America's school system will suffer serious harm. Millions of children, it is feared, will receive substandard education during these critical years.

During the school year ending last June 112,000 teachers left the profession. It is estimated that 105,000 more will leave during the current year, making a total for the 2 years of 217,000, or approximately 1 out of every 4 teachers in the profession. For the 2-year period, 1943-44, 65,000 teachers will be drawn from the colleges and training institutions. This means that 162,000 vacancies are to be filled by teachers with inadequate or no preparation. Normally this country employs 850,000 regular teachers. Today only 700,000 are available for classroom service.

Yet Senators stand on this floor and say that there is no emergency, and that there is no connection between the war and the pending bill.

I continue to read:

SHORTAGE AREAS

The most critical teacher shortage areas are in the open country and small-town schools. A minimum of 110 small schools will not be able to open this year in Arkansas, while 200 others will operate on a part-time basis. Since December 7, 1941, Arkansas has issued 3,500 emergency certificates. Teaching standards have been drastically lowered.

During the past year 37,000 emergency teaching certificates have been issued, with all signs pointing to a greater increase this year. Alabama, for example, has issued 3,100 temporary certificates this fall, as against 2,200 last year, an increase of 40 percent.

Although the Southern States are hardest hit, they are not the only ones to suffer. Maine is short 150 teachers, which will mean the closing of various types of schools unless new instructors can be recruited. The State Department of Education, through paid advertisements, is trying to locate former teachers' college and normal-school graduates.

We have heard a great deal about the situation in Ohio and of the tremendous surplus in the State treasury. Particularly in view of the statement made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] I read the following as bearing on the situation in Ohio:

Nearly 5,000 teachers are needed in Ohio. To meet this demand 3,000 emergency certificates have been issued thus far this year to undertrained teachers.

The Senator from Ohio has told us that there is no sense in giving to Ohio its proportion of the funds proposed to be allotted under the pending bill, because its finances are in fine condition.

The remainder of the article is as follows:

Many schools have been forced to drop vocational agriculture, home economics, music, and some of the offerings in science and mathematics. Dr. J. S. Vandiver, State superintendent of public education in Mississippi, reports that 1,200 teachers are needed in his State.

NEED IN SOUTH

Georgia is faced with a serious situation, lacking 3,000 teachers. Five hundred classrooms in the State are without instructors. The shortage is acute in the fields of mathematics, science, and commerce. In Alabama 3,164 teaching positions are filled by persons holding war certificates. From Birmingham comes the report that "many teachers, both men and women, with inadequate training and experience have been employed and placed in teaching positions."

Kentucky has reduced the qualifications required for teaching certificates to high-school graduation on the elementary level and to 2 years of college for secondary-school teachers. In spite of this reduction, there are still unfilled positions. Harlan County is in search of persons with no more than high-school graduation to fill the positions in the rural schools.

Requests for more than 500 teachers have come to the Murry State Teachers College in Kentucky from 18 States. Only 100 could be supplied. Calls are continuing to come in daily, but no teachers are available. Standards have been lowered; any high-school graduate can secure an elementary certificate.

LOW SALARIES PAID

An important reason for the growing teacher shortage is the low salaries paid, Dr. Donald Du Shane, past president of the National Education Association and secretary of its commission for the defense of democracy through education, holds. In a survey conducted by his body it was found that 40 percent, or 360,000 of the Nation's school teachers, were paid less than $1,200 last year; 36,000 less than $600.

Unless some immediate provision is made for better salaries for teachers, the quality of American education will show a further marked decrease just at a time in the Nation's history when education should be at its best, Dr. Du Shane warns.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DAVIS. The teachers of the country, men and women, engaged in a noble undertaking, are performing essential and vital work, and deserve to have their salaries increased. I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware a question. If he does not care to answer it, the author of the bill, the Senator from Utah, is present and may answer it. I ask, Can the term "teacher" on page 15, line 3, be construed to include the various types of nonprofessional school employees, such as custodians, firemen, and other maintenance workers?

Mr. TUNNELL. I should like to have the Senator from Utah answer that question, because he has given deep study to the bill, and is familiar with all its provisions to a greater extent than am I.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in answering the question, I think the discussion yesterday brought out the fact that the answer should be "Yes," in order that schools may remain open and in order that justice may be done to those who are helping in their operation.

Mr. DAVIS. I should like to ask another question of the distinguished Senator from Utah. Once the funds provided by the Federal Government have been transferred to the State educational authorities, does the Federal Government have any further control over the manner in which the funds can be expended except under the broad provision that they must be used for educational purposes? By this I mean, Can the Federal Government exert any control over the curriculum, teaching qualifications, or other similar matters regarding the administration of education within the respective States?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The answer to the last part of the question is definitely "No." The first part of the question deals with Federal action in checking up on Government expenditures. The theory of the bill is that there shall be no Federal control at all of the funds provided.

Mr. DAVIS. The fact is, then, that the Federal Government can only see that they have been expended for purposes prescribed by the bill, namely, education.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. DAVIS. I thank the Senator from Delaware for yielding.

Mr. TUNNELL. I am very glad to be interrupted to have the Senator ask questions along that line.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me further so that I may make a brief statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield further to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. The school teachers of America have long been recognized as probably the outstanding public servants of the Nation. It is a lamentable but historic fact that the American school teacher has never been properly compensated for the services rendered. I am sure the Senator from Delaware will agree with me in that statement.

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes; I do.

Mr. DAVIS. We have traditionally paid glowing, abstract tributes to our teachers, we have lauded their vision, we have praised their sacrifices, and we have heralded their great public service. But we have rarely extended our recognition of the American school teacher in any concrete form—a form, that is, which can be recognized and counted in the pay envelope.

This I repeat has been our traditional policy and the folly of that policy comes home to us today. The increased compensations now being paid for all other types of productive effort have drawn many thousands of experienced school teachers away from the schools and into other lines of endeavor. The prevailing rates of pay for teachers have, in many quarters, been such that they have not attracted competent replacements into the teaching field. As a result of all this, the educational standards in America are experiencing a slow but dangerous decline.

The proper education of its people is the keystone upon which any republican form of government such as ours must inevitably depend. This Nation will pay and pay heavily and continuously, if we permit the public education standards in America to fall. We shall pay for a decreased governmental efficiency, we shall pay for an uninformed electorate, and we shall pay for a lack of continuing educational and material progress.

In normal times, I would oppose the bill. But these times are not normal. As we fight to preserve our American standards from destruction abroad, so must we fight to protect them from disintegrating within. A continuing decline of American educational standards at home might well, in the long run, prove more devastating and more paralyzing than military disasters abroad. This is an emergency measure, and realizing that fact, we should take strong and definite action to meet the problems posed by the emergency.

Mr. President, if the bill contained any provision for Federal control over local education, if it undertook to build onto our great and stifling Federal bureaucracy, I would never vote to sustain it. But the pending bill contains no such provisions. There is no control, there is no coercion, there is no bureaucracy provided for in the bill. If any such developments should later appear, I should vote to strike them down in one fell and powerful stroke.

I have always felt that the matter of education is a fundamental concern of the States. That fact is recognized under the provisions of the bill. The States surrender neither power nor voice to the Federal Government. They remain the masters of their own systems. That is as it should be.

I believe in a full and proper education for every child in America, regardless of race, color, or creed. I believe that this equality of educational opportunity must be realized if the American Republic of the future is to stand upon the firm and sound foundation of an informed and qualified electorate.

The action which the bill contemplates will go far toward realizing those necessary conditions. It will, moreover, compensate the school teachers of America in some small measure for the fine and enduring service which they are now performing in behalf of the welfare of the Nation and its people.

I again thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware for his kindness in permitting me to interrupt him during the course of the excellent speech he is delivering.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I have before me another press report containing an article from the Wall Street Journal, published by Dow, Jones & Co., Inc. The article is headed—

CLOSED SCHOOLS—THOUSANDS WON'T OPEN THIS FALL; TEACHERS GO TO ARMY OR WAR PLANTS—OFFICIALS SAY LOW PAY MOST TO BLAME—PREDICT DROP IN EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS—RURAL AREAS ARE HARDEST HIT

(By V. C. Jones)

WASHINGTON.—Thousands of public schools throughout the country, most of them in rural areas, will be unable to reopen their doors this fall.

Since Pearl Harbor, schoolmasters and marms in increasing numbers have put aside their pointers, chalk, and erasers and gone off to war or to higher-paying jobs in war plants.

The National Education Association and the United States Office of Education consider the situation one of the most critical now facing the American public. Many schools were forced to close last session, but this year, they say, the number will be much greater.

The problem facing the reading, writing, and arithmetic industry is not greatly different from that which has slowed up laundry and other civilian services—employes being lured away by higher paying jobs.

Living costs have risen 22 percent since the war began. Teachers' salaries, in the meantime, have been increased only 8 percent, and in some places not at all.

LOW-PAYING PROFESSION

A recent survey revealed that 40 out of every 100 teachers in the country are getting less than $100 a month. Average pay for teachers is $1,500 a year, but 10,000 get less than $300—

Think of it, Mr. President, 10,000 teachers in the Nation get less than $300 a year—

66,000 less than $600, and 360,000 less than $1,200.

Charwomen in Government buildings at the Nation's Capital get $1,200. Store clerks are paid $1,300. Untrained clerical workers on Federal jobs receive $1,440; minimum professional salary is $2,000. Unskilled high-school pupils earn between $3,000 and $4,000 in war plants.

As an example of the attraction in war jobs, educators cite the Middle West school teacher who left a classroom where he earned about $7 a day for work in a tank factory in Cleveland. Now, employed alongside high-school boys of no technical training, his daily earnings have been boosted to $12.

SCHOOL OFFICIALS DESPERATE

Because of the alarming increase in desertions which has come during the last year, nearly doubling between October 1942 and March 1943, school superintendents and principals are reported desperate. A school district in Missouri has informed N. E. A. there is at present no hope of opening any of its schools, that it has no teachers for its high schools, and only a few for its elementary grades.

Arkansas difficulties are equally serious. A position in one school was filled 5 times during the last session. An elementary and high-school unit began the year with 20 out of 21 teachers serving on the faculty for the first time. The turn-over for the period was 38 for 21 positions, or 181 percent.

Of the teachers who go into classrooms this fall, 200,000 will be new to their jobs—some shifted from other schools, more than half strangers to the profession. Thousands of these will have substandard qualifications and will be admitted on emergency certificates issued as a last resort. The rate at which these have been given out has risen from 2,300 in 1940–41 to 37,000 in March of this year.

Education officials can see no way at present to eliminate this emergency recourse. They concede that it represents a serious decline in quality of teachers and quality of American education. They know of no source from which to fill between 70,000 and 80,000 vacancies now on record, let alone those which may develop during the summer as more teachers move into industry.

SOME POSSIBLE CURES

Meanwhile, school interests are working on these possible cures:

1. Appeal to teachers to remain in their profession. This has been done by N. E. A. with posters, bulletins, and letters, and will be furthered this month at a national meeting of school representatives at Indianapolis.

2. Appeal to former teachers to return to the profession.

3. A drive to increase enrollment at teachers' training institutions, now rapidly declining. N. E. A. is aware that the problem is not solely immediate, that the 200,000 increase in births last year will require 7,000 additional teachers 5 or 6 years from now.

4. Appeal to communities to increase salaries. There has been some improvement along this line—an average increase of $90 a year in the cities. But sore spots still stand out. A recent press dispatch from Chattanooga, Tenn., for instance, called attention to the fact that college graduates start teaching in that city at salaries no higher than $15 a week.

5. Passage of a bill now before Congress to provide $200,000,000 to increase salaries and $100,000,000 to be divided among communities which cannot offer children better than substandard educational opportunity. This measure has been recommended for approval by a Senate committee, but still has received no decisive action—possibly will not in time for its benefits to be distributed by the opening of school.

Education officials are insistent that the situation will continue to grow worse unless salaries are raised.

To keep teachers in the profession and at the same time to enable them to combat increasing living costs, some States are urging that they supplement their earnings by outside work during the summer. The Virginia Education Association, for instance, is cooperating with the State employment service in an effort to direct teachers to vacation jobs.

During the vacation months last year, 151,000 teachers—60,000 men and 91,000 women—left the schools for other occupations and did not return. Forty-five percent of the men entered the armed services, compared to 2 percent of the women, but officials point out that the latter figure has risen sharply during the last few months due to increased war fever and more widespread publicity for the auxiliaries.

CITY SCHOOLS DOUBLE UP CLASSES

Other percentages showing what has happened to the 151,000 follow:

War industry, 13 percent of men, 6 percent of women; marriage, no men, 24 percent of women; State and local governments, 7 percent of men, 6 percent of women; not reemployed for various reasons, 4 percent of men, 4 percent of women; retired, 2 percent of men, 5 percent of women.

The greatest number of vacancies has occurred in rural areas classed as communities with less than 2,500 population. These represent more than half the 116,999 school districts and about half the 1,000,000 teachers.

City schools in many instances have been able to double up their classes, increase the teaching load of individual teachers, or have high-school pupils fill in as elementary grade teachers. But these recourses are not open to the one- and two-room schools, where the burden already is heavy and where a vacancy can mean only one thing—closed doors—temporarily, at least. Also, it is in the small schools, especially in the South, where salaries are lowest.

The N. E. A. has no criticism for those who desert the classroom for the colors. It has the same sympathy for the rural school teachers, whose pay in most instances is so low they are forced to other schools or to other work in order to make a living.

This is a persuasive argument against what educators call their eleventh commandment: "Thou shall not covet thy neighbor's teachers."

Cities of more than 100,000 population pay salaries averaging $2,422 a year for elementary teachers and $2,887 a year for high-school teachers. The average in Mississippi is $578, while 27 percent of all teachers in the State get less than $300.

The greatest wartime drag on city teachers has been in the fields of science, mathematics, and physical education. This is because of the demand of the armed forces for people with such training.

Maine was thinking of increasing the pay of State police to $1,560 a year and, at the same time, of raising teachers to $720. Commented a N. E. A. correspondent, "It is now almost half as important in the eyes of the State to instruct a child as to arrest his father."

Mr. President, this last statement is the basis of one of the reasons why I am inclined to think there is an emergency. But we were told a few days ago that no one wants the pending measure passed except the National Education Association. I was somewhat amused when I looked at the record, after that statement, and found that the teachers' associations in 46 States had approved the bill, and that 60 national organizations had endorsed it. Yet, we are told no one wants it except the National Education Association. So the first decision that faces us is to determine whether there is an emergency or is not.

A few days ago the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] said that he did not believe those who were refused admission into the Army were refused because of their lack of educational qualifications so much as because of their moronic inclination, in other words, that they are morons, and are not merely people of less than 4 years' education or training. I should like to believe that. In my own State of Delaware, between May and the end of December 1942 no one was refused admission into the armed forces because of lack of educational requirements. I find that there were two other States in that class. One was Wyoming and the other Montana. In those States, together with Delaware, no one, either white or colored, was refused admission into the armed forces because of lack of education.

I notice that in Ohio 4.64 whites and 16.04 Negroes out of each 1,000 were rejected. In other words, 4 times as many colored were refused induction into the Army in the State of Ohio. Why is that? I do not know. Perhaps it might be said that most of those rejected came from other States. If so, it must be admitted that what I am contending is correct, that the matter of education is something which reaches beyond State boundaries.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. When the statement was made a few days ago about the persons who were rejected being of such character that they could not be trained, I meant to answer the statement then, because I knew, of course, that it was not accurate. If, for example, the million men who have been rejected because of lack of educational qualifications are untrainable, or, to follow the statement made by the Senator from Colorado, are morons, I am wondering whether the tendency would not show itself throughout the whole country.

I do not think the untrainable persons are all confined to one State or to one section of our country. I believe they are quite well distributed over the whole country. It would follow naturally that the feeble-minded and the untrainable are quite generally distributed over the whole country.

Mr. President, with respect to the number of white persons rejected because of lack of educational qualifications, we find, as the Senator from Delaware has stated, that the figures are from zero up to 107 out of 1,000. In one State 107 out of 1,000 white men were rejected by reason of lack of educational qualifications. But in a State which was almost a neighbor to the State in which 107 out of 1,000 were rejected, we find the number to be as low as 4 out of 1,000. State lines do not change personal characteristics.

It is said that the majority of the rejectees in the South are the blacks. It is true that throughout the country there are more Negroes rejected than whites. That is not true of all the States, however. I will select 1 State to show that it cannot successfully be charged that racial characteristics are such as to make the colored more untrainable. In 1 State 107 white persons out of 1,000 were rejected. In the same State only 45 out of 1,000 colored were rejected. When we find such great disparity I feel it is almost an insult to refer to 1,000,000 rejectees as untrainable. The facts bear out that this group is not made up of untrainables, but that it is made up of the rank and file of persons who have not had educational opportunities.

I thank the Senator from Delaware for yielding to me.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I am as much opposed as is anyone else to unnecessary Federal appropriations for lines of activity for which such appropriations are not necessary. We are told by Senators who oppose the bill that the treasuries of their States are filled. One Senator said his State had $10,000,000 in its treasury. What good does that money do to the poor child who has no teacher in his school? How is the Federal Government to compel action by a State which is too penurious to take care of its children though it has $10,000,000 in its treasury? I can understand how a State surplus can be used as the basis for a very nice argument, but it has nothing to

do with the facts. The Federal Government needs to have its boys and girls educated, and the boys and girls of the United States are not only citizens of States but they are citizens of the United States.

Mr. President, is it or is it not a situation requiring some consideration by the Federal Government? I am interested in the State of Colorado because the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] has just made such an excellent discussion from his standpoint of why the bill should not be passed. Colorado has 9,200 teachers, 4,460 of whom are paid less than $1,200 a year. Nearly one-half of its teachers are paid less than $1,200 a year. What good does the surplus in the State treasury do either the teachers or the pupils in the schools? It may be a matter of great satisfaction to those who are managing the finances of the State to point to the surplus. It is a matter of regret to the people of the Nation that there is such a surplus. If the same methods are pursued along other lines that have been pursued with respect to teachers I should think the State would have $40,000,000 in its treasury. Forty-eight percent of the teachers of Colorado receive less than $1,200. Seventy teachers in Colorado receive less than $600. That is a State which is advancing; it stands well up in the list of States of the Union.

Let us see about some of the other States. I see that Michigan has 34,500 teachers, and 7,590 of them or 22 percent, receive less than $1,200 a year.

I see that Minnesota has 20,700 teachers, and 10,155 of them, or 49 percent, receive less than $1,200 a year, and 63 teachers in that State receive less than $600 a year.

Let us consider the State of Maryland. We have heard a great deal about the fact that Maryland does not want any of the proposed assistance. In Maryland there are 9,000 teachers, and 610 of them receive less than $1,200 a year.

I read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for October 15, at page 8390, something about the condition in Maryland:

MARYLAND LOSES 805 TEACHERS IN 4 MONTHS; WORSE SITUATION SEEN—SOME INSTRUCTORS HAVE 50 TO 65 PUPILS IN ROOM, EDUCATIONAL CHIEF SAYS

BALTIMORE, October 15.—A critical situation which "will doubtless be a great deal worse" was created by the resignations of 805 Maryland school teachers between June 1 and October 1, this year, Dr. Thomas G. Pullen, Jr., declares.

"The eventual outcome is beyond prediction" and "it is impossible to say how many vacancies there are among the 5,275 teaching jobs in the State," the superintendent of schools added.

He said the situation changes overnight and that in some parts of the State classes are running now with the teacher assigned to 50 to 65 children.

Some 50 or 60 teachers who resigned and did not take war jobs or join the armed forces merely shifted from the schools of one county to those of another, Dr. Pullen explained.

He said that Prince Georges County, where 173 teachers resigned, was the hardest hit; Montgomery County was second with 82 and Baltimore County was third with 77.

The rate of teacher turn-over increased enormously in the last few months, he said. From June 1, 1942, to June 1, 1943, 1,306 teachers in the State resigned.

I think we can scarcely face that situation, and then say that no one except the National Education Association wants the proposed assistance.

Let us consider the State of New Jersey. It has 28,000 teachers, and 1,400 of them are paid less than $1,200 a year.

Indiana has 23,000 teachers, 3,450 of whom receive less than $1,200 a year.

Illinois has 47,500 teachers, 14,250 of whom are paid less than $1,200 a year.

Those are actual conditions; they are not theories. It does not do us any good to say that the State should attend to the matter. The State is not attending to it, and the States of the Senators who have spoken against the bill are not attending to it. It may be said that the States should attend to it, but that situation affects the entire Nation. Although certain boys and girls may be attending school in Delaware, for instance, very possibly they will later attend a school located in another State, and eventually they may live in still another State.

We hear many persons say that they have great sympathy for the colored man of the South, and I am glad they have, but I hope they will at least vote to aid the colored children in the South. We realize that sympathy goes out very nicely and very easily; sympathy is very cheap; but it does not help very much in the classrooms.

Again, there is gently injected into the argument the statement that it is only the South that needs the proposed assistance. Yet, Mr. President, a Negro who is being educated in one State may become a citizen residing in some other State of the Union, and I find that the other States which have a tendency to sympathize with the South have their own problems from an educational standpoint. If there is no problem, that is one thing. If there is a problem, then the Federal Government has an interest in it.

The Negro has advanced more rapidly than any other people of whom I have ever read; he has advanced from a state of savagery to one of intelligence and development. In a remarkably short time they have developed from a state of slavery to one of independence. I understand there are in this land many thousands of them who own fine homes. They are civilized home owners. They have earned the commendation, and deserve the assistance, of the white race. Whether a Negro lives in Mississippi or in Maine makes little difference; he is a citizen of the United States. The interest which the Senators who oppose the bill take in the Negro in the South is commendable. It is very touching. We realize their interest in the Negro during the years which end with an even number. We understand that the Negro is an object of their particular solicitude at that time. How are they in years which end with an uneven number? What is their interest then? How far does their sympathy go? Let us show how much sympathy we have.

Somewhere—I think it is in the Epistle of James—there is this injunction: "Shew me thy faith without thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works."

I am delighted that we have an opportunity to do something for the Negro, not alone in the South, but also in the North. I notice that in the State of Ohio the number of whites who were rejected for educational deficiencies is remarkably out of proportion to the number of Negroes so rejected. I notice that with 41,000 teachers, it has 8,000 changes in the teaching force. I notice that in the United States there are 360,000 teachers paid less than $1,200.

Yesterday the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] said that it would require $1,000,000,000 to place the teachers of the country on an equality with defense workers from a salary standpoint. Are we not in such a position that we have an obligation to pay the billion dollars if that is necessary? I do not know. I remember that a great statesman from Maine once made the headlines in every part of the United States when the appropriations of Congress were criticized on the ground that they had reached a billion dollars. He said that this was a billion-dollar country. Mr. President, the boys and girls of America are billion-dollar boys and girls, and they are entitled to the training that education provides.

The great body of American parents cannot afford to send their children to private schools. That seems to be the advice of those who oppose this bill. In my State a few years ago a man of great wealth built nearly all the schools of the State that are used by Negroes. Today they have wonderful schools. They were built by Mr. Pierre du Pont.

As I said a few minutes ago, there is great interest in the Negro in November. What is the interest in October? He has a place in society in both months. We have an obligation toward him.

There seems to be objection to one State helping another. That is a most peculiar argument for anyone to make in a country where so much of our revenue is raised by income taxes. When we pay our Federal income taxes we do not pay them because we are residents of Utah, Mississippi, or Arkansas. We pay them because we are citizens of the United States.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator has mentioned my State of Utah, and I think I can give him a fine example of the very point he now makes.

One mine in the State of Utah is today furnishing one-third of all the copper which enters into the war program. One-third of all the copper which is going into this Nation's war program comes from one mine in the State of Utah. In my opinion there will be in the neighborhood of $50,000,000 net profit from that mine this year after payment of all wages, salaries, and taxes to the State of Utah and other taxing units. Of the $50,000,000 net profit from that one mine in 1 year not one thin dime will remain in the State of Utah because all stock is held outside the State. That $50,000,000 will leave the State of Utah and find its way into the financial centers of the country. In the financial centers of the country it will be taxed by the Federal

Government under the Federal income-tax law.

What happens to my State of Utah? Every day, every week, and every month in this war program the great mineral resources of my State are being exploited. Once exploited, they are permanently lost as a resource of my State. Millions of dollars in the form of dividends go to the absentee holders of stock, who pay an income tax to the Federal Government, let us say, in New York City, Pittsburgh, or Boston. When it comes to a comparison of the payment of income taxes by States, what do we find? We find that on the $50,000,000 of net profits from one mine in Utah, the entire income tax paid by individuals who are the recipients of the $50,000,000 is paid by persons outside the State of Utah.

I ask the Senator, how are we going to equalize that kind of a situation? How are we going to take care of the boy and girl in San Juan County, Utah, or Duchesne County, Utah, where there is not a foot of railroad, where there is not a utility, where there is no one to pay the tax except the farmer and the little businessmen? In those same counties there are hundreds of Indians who are wards of the Government, and who own most of the farms in those counties. Those farms are nontaxable. I ask the Senator, how can we ask those people to bear the entire burden of educating the boys and girls in remote sections of the country?

I think the Senator makes a fine point when he says that it is not a question of where the income tax is paid. The question is: Where was the wealth produced on which the income tax is paid? When we take account of the income taxes paid directly in the State of Utah, of course they do not loom very large in the picture; but when we consider the great contribution from its mineral resources which the State of Utah is making to the war program, in new mineral wealth, that factor looms very large.

There is only one way to equalize that kind of a situation, and that is by asking the Federal Government to contribute to the education of boys and girls who, as the Senator so well says, are citizens of the United States. Regardless of where the citizen may live, whether in New York City, Seattle, or in the remotest part of Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, Montana, or any Southern State, the Federal Government should see to it that decent and reasonable facilities of education are made available to him. No child has a choice as to his or her place of birth, because of this the child should not be penalized by a failure of his Government, both State and Federal, to provide adequate educational facilities.

Mr TUNNELL. The Senator is correct. We in the little State of Delaware are so placed that we have a tremendous national income tax; and yet I do not see that we deserve any particular credit for that, because that money is raised by the Federal Government for the Federal Government; and we pay it as citizens of the Nation, and not as citizens of the individual State.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am in full agreement with the Senator. I thank him for allowing me to interrupt him.

Mr. TUNNELL. I am very glad to be interrupted in that way.

I believe that if we analyze the situation we shall realize that there is something more than opposition to States paying their part to help some less fortunate State. I believe that the State has a function. If it can fulfill that function, it should do so, but if it does not educate its boys and girls we are all sufferers, and particularly the boys and the girls. However, there are those who dislike change. By training, they simply cannot agree to do something which is different from what has been done. Paying for the teaching of the boys and girls in the State seems to be something about which they cannot agree.

Mr. President, we may assume that every Member of the Senate is anxious to improve the public schools of the Nation. From the doors of the schoolhouse there come not alone the leaders of the Nation of tomorrow but the average man and woman. The preparation which the boy and girl receive in school is necessary not alone in order that they may be prepared to earn a living, but it is necessary in order that they may be trained and allowed to make as good a living as their competitors.

The seeds of character sown by the teacher will grow fruit, either good or bad, depending upon the qualification and character of the teacher. But the development of schools is dependent upon the adult, rather than the pupil. The boy or girl is thrust upon the stage of human activity without any initiative on his or her own part. The training provided for the child is without its consent. It has no voice in arranging for the training. The creation and guidance of our school system is perhaps the greatest activity of man, and man is naturally influenced by his mental training. The same man is not likely to be a liberal in his educational viewpoint and a reactionary from a business standpoint.

From time immemorial humanity has had two principal schools of thought. One school believes in progress. The other is reactionary. One has faith in its fellow men that their future will be protected by intelligence equal to that of the present. The other school is entirely selfish and without confidence in the intelligence of others or of future generations. One of these schools of thought assumes that there is a duty of man so to work and plan as to benefit mankind. The other school asks the age-old question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" This division has been apparent in the government of people and in the regulation of man's business transactions. It has been through the first of these schools that human progress has resulted.

The first school has made possible the use of inventions, advancement, and progress in human life. The second school, representing in most instances the accumulated wealth of a more progressive generation, has preferred to remain in statu quo. George Washington, Samuel Adams, and Patrick Henry represented the first school during the Revolutionary period. The Tories of that period who opposed the separation from Great Britain represented the second school. They feared that in the shuffle which would result from the changes of conditions, thought, and government, some advantage to them would be lost. They feared that they would lose their already preferred and inherited position in the wealth, activities, and social life of the Colonies. Patrick Henry's bold prayer to give him liberty or give him death could not be shared by the cautious, conservative Tory who was the reactionary of that day. The Tory feared progress, change, and advancement of those he deemed to be of a lower class of society.

The ideals as set forth in the Declaration of Independence by Thomas Jefferson were believed to be futile by the reactionaries of that day. The Tory claimed that government founded upon the theory that sovereignty was in the people themselves could never thrive or even continue to exist. In spite of such dire predictions of disaster, government on the new plan was created and continued to thrive. Its population multiplied, its wealth increased, and its people became more prosperous. It became apparent that those who dared to trust in the wisdom of their fellow man had based their philosophy upon a sound foundation. There was created in America a real brotherhood of man. It was then that a great issue began to loom upon the political horizon which disturbed the great mass of the American people. This movement originated with the thought that all men in their political rights were intended to be free and equal in fact.

A great liberal arose in the West who dared to say that America could not continue to exist half free and half slave. A great political party formed around this progressive who dared to assert that human liberty should not be circumscribed because of the difference in color or race of those entitled to the benefits of the republican form of government. Again, the forces of reaction, inherited wealth, and stand-pattism were arrayed against the progressive Lincoln. Human feelings were aroused in America as never before or since. Brother was arrayed against brother, father against son, daughter against parent, husband against wife. But the eternal principle of right prevailed. The cost was heavy; the suffering was great; but again the progressives under the Stars and Stripes had placed America upon the sound basis of human brotherhood. Slavery, the bulwark of reactionary life and political thought, was destroyed. On this question men no longer asked, "Am I my brother's keeper?"

However, the reactionaries of the Nation were not destroyed. They simply moved their residences from the South to the North. They seized the reins of the new political party and made of it an instrument of reaction. Following the administration of Ulysses Grant

there followed a period of political unrest for a half century. During this period the liberals and conservatives were in constant combat. There was an alternation in the political victories between the two great political parties. A number of third parties arose. The originators of the third parties used the third-party method to impress upon the more conservative political parties of that time the necessity of progress. During this period Grover Cleveland was twice elected to the Presidency as a reformer. Great strides were made in liberal government under his leadership. There were great political movements sponsored by Bryan, Theodore Roosevelt, the elder La Follette, and others. These movements represented efforts on the part of the liberal elements in America to cause the republican form of government to work.

Internationally, the reactionary forces of the world were represented in the next great aggressive movement of the Kaiser. The military elements of the world combined, and under the flags of the Allies defeated this uprising of the reactionary forces of the world which attempted to wipe out the democratic form of government throughout the earth. The United States entered into this great struggle with all of its resources. At its head was the great leader, Woodrow Wilson. America in that struggle proved that the democratic form of government could be so centralized in an emergency as to make possible the organization and success of military forces trained to maintain democratic government. In this war, military bodies were organized under democratic forms of government. Totalitarian governments believed this to be impossible. However, by change of human sentiments, the old reactionary elements blocked the greatest possible permanent benefits from the First World War. The forces of reaction prevented the organization of any cooperative association among the nations to prevent a repetition of that bloody struggle. The sacrifices of men and money by which the military victory had been won were nullified to a very great extent by the reactionary forces which gained temporary control of the Government of the United States. Having no plan of their own to save mankind from future mass murders, they contented themselves by preventing all efforts of others to avert a repetition of such disaster.

The motives of those who were responsible for this calamity seemed to be personal, political, and partisan. However, beneath it all was a reactionary background. Woodrow Wilson saw the situation. He saw the triumph of ultraconservatism and reaction. He saw the triumph of personal animosity and partisan bigotry. Reaction had gone to seed. Then and there was sown the seed of World War No. 2. The greatest casualty of the First World War was Woodrow Wilson. Reaction struck down this hero of the First World War. Not only America but mankind were the sufferers from this blow. Reaction had won. Liberalism was trodden under foot. The Kaiser was beaten in battle, but his ideas prevailed at the peace table. Germany lost the war, but German ideas prevailed in both Europe and America.

In America, from the end of the First World War until the crash of 1929 there was a redistribution of wealth, a reactionary gala day. However, our Government and our statesmen failed to read and understand the signs of the times. In 1929 the inevitable crash in the United States came. Fortunes were swept away, homes were lost, families were broken up, suicides were the order of the day. Our reactionary leaders stood powerless and without suggestion. We saw the results of the life efforts of our people in government and business wiped out. Harding had died an early death. Coolidge, evidently sensing the coming crash, refused to continue as the head of a party which had no course and no objective of government.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I regret I was compelled to be absent from the Chamber, and, therefore, missed a part of the very able address of the Senator from Delaware. I have been told that the Senator has discussed some figures which I put into the RECORD the other day having to do with illiterates. With the Senator's permission, I should like to read from the transcript of the record of the recent hearings of the Committee on Military Affairs, which went quite thoroughly into that subject, and which formed the basis of my statement the other day that most of the men who are now being rejected are uneducatable. I read from page 154 of the record:

Senator DOWNEY. General, how would you describe in some other terms the mental standards or capacity, whatever is the proper word, of the men in this category 5 that you speak of who are acceptable to the armed services and those whom you would generally describe as the ones who are not acceptable in category 5?

General WHITE. I do not know whether I am qualified to do that or not. Captain Thompson, can you describe them?

I interpolate to say that Captain Thompson is their expert on classification.

Captain THOMPSON. I will try.

General WHITE. I might say Captain Thompson has done a great deal of this classification work. He has both given the test and instructed in giving the test. That is the reason I brought him in.

Senator HILL. Will the captain identify himself for the record?

Captain THOMPSON. Henry R. Thompson, Adjutant General's Department.

Senator DOWNEY. May I intrude to ask whether the captain is a Regular Army officer or is he a psychologist?

Captain THOMPSON. I am both, sir.

Senator DOWNEY. You are very fortunate.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, please, Captain.

Captain THOMPSON. Will you repeat the question?

Senator DOWNEY. What I desire to know is how you would generally describe the mental capacity of the two groups mentioned by General White as falling into category No. 5, those that are acceptable to the Army and those that would be rejected.

Captain THOMPSON. In developing the induction acception test that we are now using in induction stations we took a large number of items and gave them to men who were to be discharged from replacement training centers and others who had been declared untrainable or unacceptable for various reasons. We were able to differentiate between men who were discharged because they were useless and men who were able to become useful soldiers. That is the test being used in the induction station at the present time.

Senator WHEELER. Could you tell us what those items are?

Captain THOMPSON. It is not just one test. The procedure is that any man who is a high-school graduate and can prove it is inducted without question, as far as his mentality is concerned.

Senator WHEELER. If he can what?

Captain THOMPSON. If he is a high-school graduate and there is reason to believe that statement is true, then he is inducted without any test at all, as far as intelligence is concerned.

Next we give what we call the qualification test, which is a group of 17 items. If a man can pass 7 out of the 17 items, he is inductible without any further question.

Senator WHEELER. What are those items?

Captain THOMPSON. I will give you an example of them. One item is "What is 8 plus 8?" Another item is "Add 5 and 3"; another item is "What direction does this arrow point?" There is a picture of an arrow with N at the top and E at the right, the arrow is between them, and the answer is, "The arrow points northeast." If the man is able to read the arrow and say it is pointing northeast, he gives a correct answer. The other items are of a similar nature.

Senator DOWNEY. This is almost the first intelligence test I would have felt comfortable on. [Laughter.]

Senator WHEELER. If they cannot answer those tests, then you throw them out?

Captain THOMPSON. No; that is not right. I mentioned the fact that we take all high-school graduates without question; secondly, we give them this qualification test, and if they can pass 7 items out of 17 we take them without question. The men who have failed the test are then given what we call a visual classification test.

Senator HILL. That is, you give that to the men who cannot pass 7 out of the 17?

Captain THOMPSON. Yes.

Senator HILL. Then you give them the visual test?

Captain THOMPSON. Yes; we give them the visual test. It consists of a group of pictures. There is no language required—you do not even have to use language to give the test. We give the test in pantomime—by waving the arms we are able to give them the general idea. Here is a group of five pictures. Four of the pictures have something common in them and the fifth one is different, and the requirement is to cross out the one that is different. We have them do a large number of items like that. The idea is to cross out the one that is different from the other four. We start in with a picture of four circles and a square—the square is different from the four circles and therefore you cross it out. Then we give them four vessels containing water and one clothespin. Naturally that clothespin does not contain any water and you cross out the clothespin. Then we show them four shoes and a necktie, to show you how simple the tests are.

Mr. TUNNELL. I should like to know if the Senator is going to read all afternoon?

Mr. MILLIKIN. No. I have already imposed too long on the good nature of the Senator, but I simply wanted to put the excerpt into the RECORD to show the basis of my statement, that, in my opin-

ion, most of the men who are now failing on the educational tests are not educatable. I thank the Senator very much for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. TUNNELL. In reply, I will say that the strongest argument against that is the fact that we have no morons at all in Delaware according to that theory.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. TUNNELL. I think we must have some in Delaware, therefore I do not think the test is correct. We had neither morons nor those who had not taken the fourth grade work. But there would be a very large number of morons, it seems to me, according to the Senator's theory. One State had 191.73 out of each thousand, another had 70.16 out of each thousand, another 10.52 out of each thousand—I am reading from the Negro column—another had 114.67, another 256.29 out of each thousand. They were not morons; they were those who had not had the necessary training. Certainly if it were merely a matter of being morons, my State would have had some, I feel sure.

The campaign of 1928 saw the reactionaries of the Nation again secure the questionable leadership through an appeal to religious prejudice. "But truth crushed to earth shall rise again." In 1932 the American people again turned their faces toward progress, and in the 11 years since that time the United States has witnessed more domestic progress along humanitarian lines than it had witnessed since the death of Lincoln.

However, while the ideas of liberal Americans were prevailing, the reactionaries of Europe were manufacturing guns, building forts, airplanes, submarines, and other instruments of destruction, at the same time that they were organizing and drilling large armies. This could only have occurred because our own reactionary forces in the United States, in order to gain through the fortunes of war, made the attempt to place the world under the domination of conservative and reactionary forces. Internationally, reaction had a leader in Adolph Hitler. America again asked the question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" Isolationists in the Congress of the United States fought to prevent the preparation of the United States for the approaching world war. We were told that armies would cause war. We were told that battleships would lead to battle. We were told that forts would lead to sieges. We were told that submarines would lead to sinkings of ships. We were told that airplanes for the defense of our home and country were simply an extravagance. We were told that there was no danger to the east coast because of the Atlantic Ocean. We were told that there was no danger to the west coast because of the Pacific Ocean.

The forces of reaction and isolation boasted that we were protected by the oceans. They little realized that these oceans would be used as a means of conveyance of instruments of battle to our ships and people on the ocean. We were told that our great mountain ranges and great territorial distance made impossible the invasion of our land. Isolationism grew and waxed strong in the Middle West, where the great industrial and farming interests relied upon these misleading statements of their leaders.

The President of the United States realized the danger. He realized that the storm was approaching. The President called together the leaders of both parties and showed to them the indications of approaching international storm. His views were ignored. From every printing press there issued forth poisonous propaganda attacking the sincerity, the wisdom, and the patriotism of the President of the United States. From every opposition political stump these ideas were promulgated. From every radio commentator the same thoughts were broadcast. The United States attempted to hide behind an isolation bulwark.

After the war had broken out, we refused to trade with the nations at war. Hitler had planned well. He had dealt away the liberty, the lives, the homes, and the families of North America to the hordes of Japan. He traded away the North American Continent for the support of Japan in the coming world struggle. We in the Senate of the United States sat and heard every suggestion or plan of the Chief Executive fought by those who were not only wedded to the isolation idea, but blinded by partisan hatred or personal animosity. Preparation of the United States for the defense of its citizens and property was stopped.

When it became apparent that we could no longer remain out of the struggle, the reactionary forces in the United States attempted to hold back any aid to the democracies of civilization, and hid behind a screen of partisan and isolation abuse. They played international poker, in which the stakes were the security, happiness, and liberty of mankind. They lost, and what a loss it has been. Today those same false prophets are bemoaning the cost of the war in dollars and cents. They ignore the loss of life and limb to the youth of the world, and bemoan the expenditure of money to save the liberties of mankind.

Are we paying too high a price? What is the value of American liberty? What is the value of American youth? Can anyone appraise these two items in dollars and cents? There are none so blind as those who will not see. As we learned the preparations that had been made for this struggle by both Germany and Japan, we still ignore the age-old and world-wide struggle between progress and reaction. World War No. 1 is being fought over again because our reactionary elements in America saw fit to throw to the winds the victory that had been won by the money, tears, sweat, and blood of the American people. When the time was entirely ripe, and when it suited the purposes of Hitler and Hirohito, America was at war. We found that it could happen here. We were attacked. We were unprepared. Thanks to those who fought the preparation of the United States for this great struggle, after the storm clouds gathered, we were not ready. Thanks now to the wealth, patriotism, energy, and inventive genius of the people of the United States, democracy is now in a fair way to again win the military struggle.

The forces of reaction admit that we are winning the war. However, every partisan picayune criticism that can be aimed at the Federal Government in time of war is being fired at the United States Government at this time, notwithstanding the fact that those attacks will cost money, blood, and lives of America's youth.

I quote now from a statement by Senator Norris, who for so long was an honored Member of this body:

> Little things, little by little, every day and every hour, coming from somewhere, the finding of fault with something that is immaterial and which does not amount to anything, no matter which way it is done, are hurting us, are injuring our cause, and making it more difficult for our brave men to achieve on the battlefield the victory we expect eventually.

Mr. President, the surest way to gain publicity today in America is to make some charge which will be costly to the Allied war effort. One person shouts that Great Britain is not doing her part in the war. Another cries that Great Britain is planning to gain the trade of the world after the war. Still another one shouts that Great Britain is not anxious for China to win the war. We are told that Great Britain is using our money to aid her in winning the war. Again, we are told that Russia should give us bases in Hirohito's back yard, knowing full well that we could not hold the bases if given to us at this stage of the war effort. General MacArthur's request for trucks to be sent to Australia was warped into an appeal to prejudice America against our allies. We were told that a million American lives could be saved if Russia should turn over to us certain sites in Siberia. These sensation mongers, newspaper warriors, and radio strategists have risked the friendly relationships of our Government with the United Nations brotherhood for a little publicity, for a partisan appeal, for a personal stab at the President of the United States.

Mr. President, those who indulge in this sort of a campaign are risking civilization for a cheap prize. They may hate the President of the United States personally; they may desire to defeat him politically, that is their right, but they do not have the right to increase the risk to the lives, property, and liberty of the world in a gamble to attain political preference or party victory. The President of the United States is mortal. In the course of human events he will soon pass from his position of power and influence to the end of all men. History will praise his political victories. History will place his name high on the scroll of fame for a much greater success.

The democracies of the future will look upon the record of the American Nation under the leadership of Franklin Roosevelt, and long for similar giants to come upon the stage of the world's activities. There have been casualties in this war.

There will be many more. More than 100,000 casualties among our boys have already occurred. Perhaps many times that number may become casualties in this war. You and I, Senators, may yet be casualties in this struggle. We know not with what weapons or ingenuity our enemies may attack us. We know not who may be destroyed by them. We know that billions of money are being spent, and this is the basis for one of the criticisms of the United States Government that is being broadcast over the Nation. The per capita indebtedness is being advertised. Congress votes for increases in appropriations. Congress votes money for war expenditures. Congress votes these expenses, and from the floor we hear the criticisms of the United States and our great President for expending the appropriations to win the war. Perhaps these criticisms are natural and necessary accompaniments to great struggles.

One of the threatened casualties of the war, one organization that is threatened, is our great American public-school system. Some Senators tell us that their States do not need any Federal assistance. The Committee on Education and Labor has given us the figures as to the number of those who are not able to show a fourth-grade qualification for the armed service. The junior Senator from Colorado has told us that he believes these derelicts to be morons. I am not sure but what I should like to believe that. The table as to my State of Delaware shows that there were none refused induction into the Army from May through December 1942 for this cause. The States of Montana and Wyoming have a similar record. If the men who are rejected are morons, or if they are simply unfortunate enough to be unable to show a fourth-grade education, in the three States mentioned there were neither illiterates nor morons examined during the period I have named.

Some Senators have expressed their sympathy for the teachers of the United States. Such sympathy seems to me to be futile. They sympathize with the teachers and vote against measures for their improvement. Members of the Senate should not waste their sympathy upon the teachers. They should think of the future of the children of America; they should think of the effect on the adults of the next generation. We are told that 39,000 teachers have gone into the armed service. We are told that 37,000 teachers have gone into industry. We are told that the teaching force of the Nation has lost 112,000 men and women. We are told that 37,000 emergency certificates have been issued and that there are 13,000 vacancies in the United States. Fifty thousand classrooms in America are to have emergency teachers or no teachers at all. Fifty thousand classrooms, 2,000,000 boys and girls, are to have emergency substitute teachers. I suppose there are those who will say that these 2,000,000 boys and girls should be sent to private schools or to preparatory schools. Marie Antoinette, when told that her subjects could not get bread, said "Let them eat cake." Perhaps there are some today who would make a similar suggestion with respect to these 2,000,000 boys and girls.

Millions of boys and girls entitled to the best we have in the way of training and education are being refused a standard training. The great number of young men and women who have not reached the fifth grade is not a measure of this blow at the American pupil, for millions of others are not able to go above the fourth grade, where they belong. Millions of others will enter life without the preparation which you had and which your children had. Those who vote against Federal assistance to the public schools should consider well before they strike this blow not alone at American schools, but at American homes of the future.

Mr. President, is there anyone who can seriously contend that the pending bill is not a war measure, that it has no connection with the war? When our teachers are being drawn into industry by the higher wages which are being held out to them, is this not a matter of intense interest to the American people? We have heard Senators state on this floor that there is absolutely no connection between the teachers of the public schools at this time and the great war effort in which we are engaged. We are told that the subject of the bill is a matter for the States. According to some Senators the Federal Government has no interest in the education of its boys and girls. Such statements come even from members of the Committee on Education and Labor. I am unable to determine what the function of the Committee on Education in either House of Congress may be, if the Federal Government has no interest in the public school system. Certainly the Federal Government at least wants its boys and girls to be educated. Can the Federal Government compel the State to educate its boys and girls? Can any State compel another State to educate its boys and girls? Under our system of Government we are educating boys and girls for every State in the Union. Boys and girls who are being educated in Delaware may spend their lives in the States of Ohio, Pennsylvania, or California, and perhaps many of those educated in the three States mentioned will spend their lives in Delaware. Do the people of one section of the country have an interest in the education of the boys and girls of another section? Does the Federal Government have an interest in the education of the boys and girls of the Nation?

Whatever may have been the theory of our Government when transportation was slow or impossible, we are all today interested in the health, education, and wealth of the boys and girls of every State in the Union. No matter where we are, nor in what State we were educated, we are still interested in all the States. America is not simply a federation of sovereign States. It is a great Nation, and as a great Nation has insisted on the education of its boys and girls wherever they may live. However, one Senator stated the other day that this bill would take money from one State and use it for the education of children in another State. We in Delaware are accustomed to paying money for the benefit of the Nation. I have never believed that we were mistreated by this situation. On page 35 of the hearings on the bill held before the subcommittee it is stated that Delaware's internal-revenue receipts for the year 1942 amounted to more than $208,000,000, which is equivalent to about $780 for each man, woman, and child in the State of Delaware. Is this more than government is worth to our boys and girls? How much is the value of the protection of the Stars and Stripes to the boys of your State or of my State? It can hardly be seriously contended that a per capita assessment on the people of the Nation for the Government of the United States would amount to such tremendous sums as the individuals of my State pay into the Federal Treasury. Yet, Delawareans have not complained that we are raising money in Delaware to maintain the government for the State of Ohio, or the State of New York, or any other of the larger States. Neither do I hear any complaint that money is being collected in Delaware to be used in the poorer States or any other section. Your citizens move to my State, and our citizens move to your State, and everywhere and in every State they have the protection of our great Government, that Government which is not limited to the boundaries of any State. When the Federal Government takes from the school system of America its best teachers, there is an obligation due to the boys and girls who are thus deprived of their opportunity to make a living and to take their proper station in life. There is a Federal obligation to see that the boys and girls are fairly treated. When we realize that in many instances teachers' salaries are below $600 a year, that thousands of them are below $1,200, and that the average is only about $1,500, we pause and wonder. Does any Senator want his boy or girl to be trained by a teacher who can earn no more than $600 a year? When we compare the salaries paid to teachers with the payment of $1,926 to employees of the Federal Government, the unfairness becomes apparent. The factory worker is paid $2,043.

Yesterday the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] suggested that in many instances those who were teaching boarded at home. I am unable to understand how that affects in any way the question of the amount of compensation a teacher should receive. If a young man or young woman who is teaching is able to board at home, and thus is able to avoid some expense which he or she otherwise would incur, that is simply his or her good fortune. That has nothing to do with the matter of the amount of salary he or she is entitled to be paid.

Can we expect the young men and the young women of America who now are teaching to remain as teachers if they are paid less than charwomen are paid? Can we expect them to make their preparations for teaching and to continue in the work of teaching if they are paid less than the most menial worker is paid?

No, Mr. President; the teachers can quit teaching. Thereafter, they can at once live better and educate their children better, and better prepare themselves for their old age. As we all know, the teacher must not only do the work of preparation in the first instance, but must continually attend summer schools and other schools in order to keep in trim for educational work. Yet, the teacher is paid way below the standard. We are told that to raise teachers' wages to the standard would cost $1,000,000,000. It may be that it will; it may be that we shall have to pay $1,000,000,000 to educate the children of America. I do not think there is a Member of the Senate who would say he would not be willing to spend $1,000,000,000 to educate the American boys and girls. The schoolboys and schoolgirls are the ones who will suffer by the resignation of the teachers. Sooner or later the United States of America will realize that the boys and girls themselves are the casualties of the World War. Can we ease our consciences as to this duty by saying that the obligation rests on the States, and that we have nothing to do with it?

Can we say we have a right to take men and women teachers from the schools in the various States, regardless of their wishes, and leave the boys and girls without their teachers, and then heartlessly say that the matter is one for the States? Can we leave a generation of young Americans to grow up unprepared for the battle of life? Do we have a legal or a moral right to take away the teachers by the payment in other fields of the higher wages made possible by American customs and American law, and to say that the matter is one with which we have nothing to do, and that the States must take care of it?

Mr. President, what will occur if the States do not take care of the situation? Sooner or later the States may have to close a larger percentage of their schools than they now are closing. Perhaps in some States the schools will be more crowded than they now are. I can conceive of such a situation that the individual States will not be able to take care of their educational systems with the money it will be possible for them to raise, so that the deficiency will be much greater than it is now. At present, with 13,000 vacancies and 37,000 emergency teachers, our States are not taking care of their educational problems. No matter what we may say, they simply are not doing it. The boys and girls in our States are among the first casualties of this great war. Let us not deceive ourselves.

We are told that the danger is that the Government may take over our schools. I have not heard that the Federal Government has taken over our roads, our land-grant colleges, or the thousands of other activities in which the Federal Government aids and assists. So far as I have heard or know, there is no disposition on the part of the Federal Government to take over our schools. The Federal Government is interested in the schools.

Some question has been raised as to the amount of money the Southern States have spent on the education of their children. Is this or is it not a matter of interest to the Senators from the Southern States, or to the Federal Government? My belief is that all Members of the Senate should have an interest in the educational activities of every State, and in the educational activities of the Federal Government. The school situation is the result of the world-wide struggle. The boys and girls of the Nation are not responsible for it. We are responsible to the boys and girls of each State of the Union for the result upon them of the war we have declared. We are responsible to those who will be the men and women of the next generation. The members of the reactionary school of thought have gambled with the rights and prosperity of the men and women, not alone of the United States, but of the whole world. They have gambled with the lives and liberties of the nations of the world. They have gambled with the contentment of every man, woman, and child on earth. In most instances we have lost in that gamble. Let us not let them gamble with the lives and future of the American boys and girls. The war is the forfeit by which we are paying the gambling debt our predecessors in the Senate created. We are our brothers' keepers, we are our children's keepers, we are our Nation's keepers; and we have an obligation, as Senators of the United States, as representatives of the various States, to aid in the education and training of the boys and girls of America, regardless of whether the States train them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I was interested in some of the statistics the Senator presented a few moments ago with respect to the men who have been rejected from the Army because of lack of educational qualifications. Of course, the Senator is aware that that situation is changing. In the early days the Selective Service and the Army rejected men who had not passed the fourth grade. That was the first requirement, as I recall the testimony before the Senate Military Affairs Committee. Gradually that requirement was relaxed and changed. It is still nebulous. It is still being changed. Now men are being taken who previously would have been rejected because of the lack of educational qualifications. The Senator is familiar with that process of change, is he not?

Mr. TUNNELL. I am not interested in that feature. What I am interested in is the fact that there are a certain number who have not reached the fourth grade, notwithstanding the tremendous surpluses in the treasuries of the various States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is understandable, and I appreciate the Senator's point; but in interpreting what other Senators may say on this subject, I wish to be sure that the Senator understands that the military leaders of the country are gradually changing the educational qualifications for inductees.

Mr. TUNNELL. But that does not educate the boys and girls.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am not saying that it does.

Mr. TUNNELL. They are still illiterate, and they are illiterate because we do not educate them, in spite of the surpluses in the treasuries of the States. The Senator's colleague [Mr. MILLIKIN] referred to the surplus in the treasury of the State of Colorado. We stand by and allow the boys and girls to suffer. We say, "It is the duty of the States to educate their children. The Federal Government has nothing to do with it. We are not used to appropriating from the Federal Treasury for that purpose." We cannot see that it should be done. Yet the boys and girls are the ones who suffer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As the Senator states, the educational requirements for induction into the service do not educate the illiterates; neither do they call the person who is rejected a moron.

Mr. TUNNELL. I do not care whether he is a moron, or what he is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I care.

Mr. TUNNELL. What I am speaking about is the failure on the part of the Federal Government to take care of its boys and girls, whether they be morons or illiterates. I am thinking not only about those who have been morons or illiterates, but also those who will become the illiterates of the future, and who will be called morons because they have not been educated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator will recall that he cited some statistics with respect to the State of Delaware and other States. He stated that the figure representing the number of white persons rejected because of lack of educational qualifications was zero for Delaware. Of course, the Senator understands that the selective service operates differently in the various States. Different standards are applied. In one State there is one set of qualifications, and in another there is a different set of qualifications. I simply wished to clarify the RECORD with respect to the matter of educational qualifications for men inducted into the military service.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should not want any impression to be left in the RECORD that in my discussion having to do with intelligence tests I was applying the term "moron" to men simply because they did not meet certain prescribed standards of education. I was speaking entirely about the men who, whether or not they are educated, are unable to pass the simplest features of an intelligence test.

Mr. TUNNELL. I understood the Senator, but my reason for arguing that that could not be the case was that in the same tests no morons were found in three

States. My contention is that there are morons there. If that is what caused them to be eliminated, we have had them. We might not have had those who were lacking a fourth-grade education, but we certainly have had morons.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I hope not.

Mr. TUNNELL. I fear that we have.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator has made the point that a State surplus will not necessarily educate a child.

Mr. TUNNELL. Not unless it is used—any more than water will water a plant unless it is applied.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to make the complementary point that we cannot educate children and do everything else interminably with Federal deficits.

Mr. TUNNELL. We should not begin to economize at the expense of the children.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not know how long we can carry on the education of children with Federal deficits. If we continue to pile up deficits, I respectfully suggest that the time will come when all our institutions, including our educational system, will collapse.

Mr. TUNNELL. But let us not dwell so much upon economy at the expense of the child. That should not be the first of our economy objectives.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I respectfully suggest that it seems to me that we must dwell on the question of solvency of our Federal Treasury, or all forms of Federal aid to which we are already committed, many of which are highly desirable, will collapse.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator has heard criticism after criticism of the Federal Government for this thing, that thing, and the other thing. I particularly recommend to him consideration of the statement by former Senator Norris, that many little questions are being agitated which are injuring the war effort. I think common sense teaches us to conserve our financial strength; but I do not believe in doing so at the expense of the poor innocent boys and girls of the Nation. I do not care whether they are in Colorado, Delaware, Mississippi, Texas, or any other State. I think the Federal Government has an interest in those boys and girls; and I think that if my State fails to prepare them, the Senator's State may be the sufferer, or vice versa.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief statement in regard to this discussion?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think the discussion of statistics on this phase of the question may be misleading. We all know that the Army conditions can never be static. We know that standards have been lowered and that they will be further lowered. We also know that the Army has been willing to take 10 percent of illiterates. The Army is training such illiterates in the A B C's.

The question of expense has been mentioned. It seems to me that if we can save a dollar in one place, it reduces the expenditures of the Government quite as well as though we had saved a dollar in another place. If, for example, it costs the Army, to train up to the fourth grade, the 10 percent of illiterates which it has been able to accept, as much as it would cost under the scheme of this bill and the educational policy of the country, to take a boy or girl through the grades and through high school, it seems to me that when we talk about economy we are simply being foolish. We let the Army use its commissioned officers, any one of whom receives $1,000 more pay than the average salary of school teachers, to train the illiterates. There is no economy there.

The statistics which the Senator from Delaware has used, and which the committee has used, were assembled to show the need of Federal aid in education. They were not compiled to prove what the Army is doing or not doing. The statistical table used in this connection has the following heading: "Rejections for educational deficiencies in the United States Army induction boards, May through December 1942—Rate per thousand inductees."

The statistics cover the entire country. Yesterday the Senator from Colorado quoted from General White and General White's assistant, to show that certain persons who had been in the Army were not trainable, and that they had been rejected because they were not trainable. Therefore the assumption was made that very likely the 1,000,000 persons who have been rejected because of educational deficiencies were not trainable.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have tried to draw the distinction between those who have been rejected because of lack of intelligence and those who have been rejected because of illiteracy. I admit that in the earlier part of the process of induction many men with ample intelligence were rejected merely because they had not gone through four grades of school. I could not approve of that. I think the intelligence test is the correct test to apply.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Colorado said that according to the testimony of General White, the majority of the rejectees were not trainable.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If I said that, I meant to say that the majority of those who are being rejected under the tests now in force are not educatable.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad the Senator from Colorado has made that correction.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Oh, yes; because my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], has made it quite clear that the tests in the Army have been evolutionary.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That when they were first started, if a man had not had four grades of education he was automatically eliminated. Obviously some very fine soldier material would be eliminated by the use of such an arbitrary standard, and obviously, I submit, the character of test that is now being applied—namely, the intelligence test—is superior. If the RECORD is not clear that I was devoting my remarks to those men who were not meeting the present test, I am very glad to make myself clear at this time.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am making my argument entirely from the standpoint of the need for Federal education. I have lived through two wars in which an attempt was made to classify boys who were accepted and then rejected. The point we have made all the time is that even with our experience in the last war we did not do anything to overcome the difficulties involved.

From the standpoint of feeble-mindedness, or submorality, or being a moron, the statistics which have been compiled prove clearly what the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] has said, namely, that the group in question cannot be assumed to be of that class at all. These persons are generally trainable. Let us consider, for instance, two neighboring States. In one State there is a rejection of only four out of every thousand. Across the river from that State, among the same kind of people, due to differences in educational opportunity, rejections number 107 out of every 1,000.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to suggest that perhaps that disparity in the rate of rejections is due in considerable part to the different viewpoints of the various boards in the two States.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. We might assume that, but it does not happen to be the cause. I am talking about a State which we know needs help, and needs it badly because it has not been able to train its children.

Rather generally—and I am repeating, because the Senator from Colorado has asked the question—the rejectees in the South were usually among the Negroes. That is not true of all the States. It is generally true that there are more rejectees among the Negro groups than among the white groups. But in one State in which 107 out of 1,000 whites were rejected, only 45 out of 1,000 blacks were rejected.

It makes no difference what kind of argument is advanced for Federal aid; it makes no difference that men are rejected because their education extended only through the fourth grade, and that the Army itself gives training, the argument still holds that a need exists, that it is not being met by the States, and that the only way in which the situation can be corrected is through the extension of Federal aid.

The pending bill will not correct all the ills now existing. It is not sufficiently broad to do that, but it makes a start. There would be no public-school system in the entire United States if we had not at some time made a start. We would actually not be in the war if we had not made a start with the Selective Service Act at the time we did. We are arguing against the continuance of conditions during the present war which were allowed to exist during the last war. We are showing that there is a real emer-

gency and a real need for the proposed aid, and if we do not act now, as the Senator from Delaware has so well stated, we shall be actually cheating someone.

We should all remember, and I believe we do, that a school generation consists of only a few years. We all know of the trouble which came to Germany and to England as the result of the loss of a generation of heroes. But, to the body politic, the situation was more serious than was the loss of heroes; leadership in society was lost.

During the depression, schools were closed, and the American Government said in effect that the schools had to be reopened even if it required the expenditure of Federal funds, because a generation of children could not be deprived of elementary and college education without hurting the body politic.

Today the Army is training engineers, doctors, and other persons needed to carry on the economic and social life of our country. In this regard the Army is doing right because if in any generation there is a lack of proper training, the country is harmed for years to come; we never catch up; we simply cannot catch up.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S DEPENDENTS ALLOWANCE ACT—LIBERALIZATION OF FAMILY ALLOWANCES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 101 of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 381; 37 U. S. C. Supp. 201) is amended by striking out in the first and second lines the words "of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grades."

SEC. 2. That section 102 of such act is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the words "except as to the initial family allowance provided by section 107 (a) hereof."

SEC. 3. That section 103 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 103. The dependents of any such enlisted man to whom a family allowance is payable under the provisions of this title shall be divided into three classes to be known as 'class A,' 'class B,' and 'class B–1' dependents. The class A dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the wife, the child, or the former wife divorced of any such enlisted man. The class B dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the parent, brother, or sister of such enlisted man and who is found by the Secretary of the department concerned to be dependent upon such enlisted man for a substantial portion of his support. The class B–1 dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the parent, brother, or sister of such enlisted man and who is found by the Secretary of the department concerned to be dependent upon such enlisted man for the chief portion of his support."

SEC. 4. That section 104 of such act is amended by inserting after the words "class B" in the sixth and thirteenth lines, respectively, thereof the words "or class B–1."

SEC. 5. That section 105 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 105. The amount of the monthly family allowance payable to the dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man shall be—

"To class A dependent or dependents: A wife but no child, $50; a wife and one child, $80, with an additional $20 for each additional child; a child but no wife, $42, with an additional $20 for each additional child; a former wife divorced but no child, $42; a former wife divorced and one child, $72, with an additional $20 for each additional child.

"To class B dependent or dependents, payable only while there is no allowance payable to any class B–1 dependent, $37.

"To class B–1 dependent or dependents: One parent but no brother or sister, $50; two parents but no brother or sister, $68; one parent and one brother or sister, $68, with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister; two parents and one brother or sister, $79, with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister; a brother or sister but no parent, $42, with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister."

SEC. 6. (a) That section 106 (a) of such act is amended by striking out in the sixth and seventh lines thereof the words "both class A and class B" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "more than one class of" and by striking out the last sentence thereof.

(b) That section 106 (b) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Whenever a division is made of payments of monthly family allowance among dependents of a class, the total amount payable under the provisions of section 105 of this title to or for the benefit, respectively, of two or more children, of two parents, of a former wife divorced and one or more children, or of two or more brothers and sisters, shall be equally divided among the respective children, parents, former divorced wife, or brothers and sisters, or shall be otherwise apportioned and paid within the respective groups as the Secretary of the department concerned may direct. The monthly family allowance to class B dependents shall be payable to only one designated dependent unless the Secretary of the department concerned shall direct that the prescribed amount be apportioned among and paid to two or more of such dependents."

(c) That section 106 (c) of such act is amended by striking out the entire subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, in any case in which a family allowance is granted under this title—

"(1) to a wife living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a permanent or temporary court order or decree or written agreement, the amount of the family allowance payable to such wife shall not exceed the amount provided in such order, decree, or written agreement to be paid to such wife, and if such order, decree, or written agreement provides no amount to be paid to such wife, no family allowance shall be payable to her; or

"(2) to a former wife divorced, the amount of the family allowance payable to such former wife divorced shall not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or decree as the amount to be paid to such former wife divorced.

"In any case in which the application of the provisions of this subsection results in payment to a dependent or dependents of an enlisted man in an amount less than $22, the amount by which the pay of such enlisted man is reduced or with which it is charged shall be the amount of such payment. In every other case in which application of this subsection alone or in conjunction with other provisions of this title results in a payment or payments of $22 or more the amount of such reduction or charge shall be as provided in subsection 106 (a)."

SEC. 7. (a) That section 107 of such act is amended by striking out all before the first proviso, including the word *"Provided"*, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 107. (a) An initial family allowance shall be paid for the month in which an enlisted man enters a pay status in the active military or naval service of the United States, in the amounts and to the dependents hereinafter set forth.

"Such initial family allowance shall be paid to the designated dependent only when a written application therefor is filed by such enlisted man within 15 days after the date of his entry into active service in a pay status and shall be paid as soon as practicable after the filing of such application.

"No monthly family allowance shall be paid to any dependent of an enlisted man for the month for which any initial family allowance is paid to any dependent of such enlisted man.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of this title, the full amount of such initial family allowance shall be paid by the Government, and no reduction in or charge to the pay of the enlisted man shall be made for such payment.

"The amount of the initial family allowance payable to the dependent or dependents shall be—

"(1) $50, if such enlisted man has a wife but no child;

"(2) $80, if such enlisted man has a wife and one child, and an additional $20 for each additional child;

"(3) $42, if such enlisted man has no wife but has one child, and an additional $20 for each additional child;

"(4) $50, if such enlisted man has one parent dependent upon him for chief support; $68 if such enlisted man has one parent and one brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support;

"(5) $68, if such enlisted man has two parents dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support;

"(6) $42, if such enlisted man has no parent but has a brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support;

Payment of the initial family allowance shall be made to one payee for each class of dependents, as defined in section 103, for whom an allowance is requested.

"(b) The monthly family allowance provided for by this title shall be paid for the period beginning with the first day of the month in which application therefor is filed, or the first day of the month in which the dependent or dependents first become entitled thereto, whichever is later, subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, and shall be terminated or reduced, as may be required, on the last day of the month in which the disbursing officer paying the allowance receives notice of a change in status of the enlisted man or a dependent which terminated or limited the right of his dependent or dependents to receive such allowance: *Provided*, That the entitlement to family allowance shall terminate or be modified at the end of the month in which such change in status of the enlisted man or a dependent occurs: *Provided further*."

SEC. 8. That section 108 of such act is amended by inserting in the first line thereof after "SEC. 108", the subparagraph designation "(a)", and adding at the end of the section a new subsection to read as follows:

"(b) Except as otherwise herein provided, monetary allowances in lieu of quarters for dependents as authorized by section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 shall not be payable for the period during which family allowances to dependents of enlisted men of

the first, second, or third grades are authorized by this title. An enlisted man who, on the effective date of this act, is receiving, or, being entitled to a monetary allowance in lieu of quarters for dependents, has applied therefor, may, at his option, receive or continue to receive such monetary allowance or elect not to receive such monetary allowance and to have his dependents become entitled to receive family allowance: *Provided*, That payment of such monetary allowance shall be made only for such periods, from the effective date of this act, as the enlisted man has in effect an allotment of pay, in an amount not less than the amount of such monetary allowance, for the support of the dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed. No dependent of any enlisted man shall be entitled to family allowance for any period for which such monetary allowance is paid to the enlisted man. An enlisted man's election to have his dependents receive family allowance may be made at any time and when made shall be irrevocable during the period of entitlement to family allowance as set out in section 101: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the department concerned is authorized to make the election on behalf of the enlisted man in any case in which he deems it desirable and finds it impracticable for the enlisted man to so elect, subject to termination at a later date upon specific request of the enlisted man. If an election is made, the monetary allowance payments shall be discontinued at a date to be prescribed by the Secretary of the department concerned. The monthly pay of any enlisted man of the first, second, or third grades who is provided with public quarters for his dependents and any of whose dependents is receiving a family allowance shall be reduced by, or charged with, 90 cents per day."

SEC. 9. That section 109 of such act is amended by inserting after "SEC. 109" the subsection designation "(a)" and adding at the end of the section a new subsection to read as follows:

"(b) In the event of the death of a dependent, any amount of the family allowance to which his entitlement ceases with the last day of the calendar month in which death occurs, and which is uncollected at the time of death, shall be paid to such person or persons as the Secretary of the department concerned directs."

SEC. 10. That section 110 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 110. (a) Entitlement to and payment of any family allowance authorized under provisions of this title to the dependent or dependents of any enlisted man shall not be contingent upon pay accruing to such enlisted man or upon the monthly pay of such man being reduced by or charged with any amount."

SEC. 11. That section 119 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 119. Any person who shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, contract for, charge, or receive or shall attempt to solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee or compensation for assisting in any manner an enlisted man or dependent in obtaining a family allowance payable under this title, shall, upon conviction thereof, be guilty of a misdemeanor and for each and every offense shall be punishable by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $1,000 or by imprisonment at hard labor for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

SEC. 12. (a) That section 120 (c) (4) of such act is amended by striking out the words "under oath" in the fourth line thereof.

(b) That section 120 (d) is amended by striking out the entire subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) The term 'child' also includes a person to whom the man stands in loco parentis and has so stood for not less than 12 months prior to the date of application on behalf of such child."

(c) That section 120 (g) be amended by striking out the word "grandchild" in the first line thereof.

SEC. 13. That section 120 (i) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) The terms 'man' and 'enlisted man' mean any enlisted individual, male or female, of the first to seventh grades, both inclusive, and any aviation cadet, in any of the services mentioned in section 101 of this act, and any member, except the leader and second leader, of the band of the United States Marine Corps, but do not include any member of the Philippine Army, the Philippine Scouts, the insular force of the Navy, the Samoan native guard or band of the Navy, or the Samoan reserve force of the Marine Corps."

SEC. 14. That such act be amended by adding a new section to title I thereof to be numbered 121 and to read as follows:

"SEC. 121. The dependents of an enlisted female shall be as prescribed by this title except that husband and children shall be included as dependents only when found by the Secretary of the department concerned to be dependent upon her for chief support. The amount of the family allowance payable to the dependents of an enlisted female shall be as prescribed by this title except that the amount for a husband or husband and children shall be that prescribed for a wife or wife and children. The provisions of this section shall be applicable to dependents of any enlisted female only insofar as such provisions are not inconsistent with the provisions of any law pertaining to the service of which she is a member."

SEC. 15. This act shall be effective from the first day of the calendar month following the month of enactment: *Provided*, That, for the purpose of adjusting to the provisions of this act, any family allowance in force when the act takes effect, which is subject to change by the provisions of the act, may be paid without change for such period, not exceeding 4 calendar months, as the Secretary of the department concerned may determine: *Provided further*, That whenever such a family allowance is found to be subject to decrease or termination such change shall be effective at the expiration of the period of payment determined under the preceding proviso: *Provided further*, That whenever such a family allowance is found to be subject to increase the effective date of increase shall be the effective date of this act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, in connection with the motion, I ask unanimous consent to have remarks by me relative to Senate bill 1279 appear at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado are as follows:

S. 1279 is a bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, so as to liberalize family allowances. It was passed by the Senate July 8.

Later, when considering the Wheeler bill, S. 763, the Senate included therein and passed on October 6 a further amendment to the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 so as to increase the rates of allowances as follows:

A wife but no child, $50.

A wife with one child, $80, with an additional $20 for each additional child.

A child but no wife, $42, with an additional $20 for each additional child;

A former wife divorced but no child, $42.

The House adopted the foregoing rates in passing S. 1279, but added the following:

To a former wife divorced and one child, $72, with an additional $20 for each additional child.

With the exception of clarifying language, the House accepted the Senate bill and added a new section relating to the dependents of an enlisted female. The dependents of an enlisted female are husband and children, and shall be included as dependents only when found by the Secretary of the Department concerned to be dependent upon her for chief support. The amount of the family allowance payable to the dependents of an enlisted female shall be as prescribed by this title, except that the amount for a husband or husband and children shall be that prescribed for a wife or wife and children. The provisions of this section will be applicable to the dependents of any enlisted female only insofar as such provisions are not inconsistent with the provisions of any law pertaining to the service of which she is a member.

In the existing law the limited-service men of the Marine Corps Reserve serving as guards and members of the band of the United States Marine Corps are barred from receiving allowances for their dependents. However, in this bill they are provided for.

The existing law merely gave allowances to the four lower grades of enlisted men in the armed forces, but this bill provides that the allowances shall be given to all enlisted men from the first to the seventh grades, inclusive. The first three grades were not authorized to receive the allowances originally because they were entitled to receive monetary allowances in lieu of quarters for dependents. This bill gives them the option of accepting the monetary allowances for quarters or the dependency allowances provided for in this bill, but they cannot receive both.

It was known that some of the men of the first three grades while receiving monetary allowances for quarters did not provide for their families, and so one of the House amendments provides that payment of such monetary allowances shall be made only for such periods from the effective date of this act as the enlisted man has in effect an allotment of pay, in an amount not less than the amount of such monetary allowance, for the support of the dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed.

The Interdepartmental Committee of the War and Navy Departments, General Benedict, chairman, and Admiral Jacobs, the Navy's representative, have reviewed the amendment inserted by the House and are satisfied with its provisions.

FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 637) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public, elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I believe that Senate bill 637 ought to pass, al-

though I should prefer that the amounts in section 2 (A) and 2 (B) be interchanged. I come from a State which for generation after generation has contributed men and women, material and wealth, to the richer and more populous States of the Union. As a director of public schools for 15 years, I know something of conditions existing in my State as well as other States where similar conditions prevail. I know that we have taxed our people and our property almost to the limit to give our children as good an education as we can give them. Upon receiving that education our boys and girls migrate to the larger and wealthier States, which derive immeasurable benefits from the education which Vermont has furnished.

It is time that those parts of our country where wealth has become concentrated should restore some of it to the great rural areas from which it has been drained.

I have heard this bill called a subsidy bill. I do not regard it as such. If it is subsidy then all tax money allocated for certain purposes is subsidy. The pending bill simply makes use of a sound and proper function of government. It provides that the Federal Government shall collect money from those concentrated areas which control a large percentage of our Nation's monetary wealth, and redistribute a portion of the money so collected among the States which originally produced it and which need it most.

If all persons remained in the State which educates them and all wealth remained in the State which produces it, the arguments of the opponents of this bill might carry more weight.

The principal argument against this bill is that it may lead to Government control of education; that Government control of education would lead to centralization of government and the destruction of our so-called democratic way of life. I interpret section 1 of the bill by its express terms to prohibit control of schools by Federal Government. Those who contend that the reallocation of funds to the 48 States for educational purposes will lead to the establishment of a totalitarian state evidently fear that future Congresses will be subservient to the executive branch of the Government and amend the law to permit Executive control.

This is entirely possible. It is not only entirely possible, but wholly probable if the people of America are content to let it come to pass. I maintain, however, that a Congress so subservient as to amend an act of this nature for such a purpose would also lend itself to the enactment of a wholly new act.

At this point I should like to say that it was 80 years ago that a great Senator from my own State, Justin S. Morrill, secured the enactment of a law providing Federal aid to higher education in the States. I refer to the Land Grant College Act. I feel that I can say without fear of contradiction that no Member of this body would repeal the Morrill Act. I find upon examination of biographical sketches that the Vice President and 22 Members of the present Senate received their education in land-grant colleges. Whether they have any sense of shame because they were helped to receive their education by what opponents of this bill choose to call a subsidy, I cannot say. So far as I can see they are all useful and capable Members of the Senate, although, unfortunately, some seem to be opposed to the bill.

I have heard it frequently said that, in spite of the fact that the wording of this bill strictly prohibits the Federal Government from interfering in any way with each State's conduct of educational matters, we must not pass it because the administration would misinterpret or misapply the law.

Let us not talk about weak-kneed Congresses of the past or future if the time is now here when we dare not enact legislation because the executive department cannot be trusted to interpret and apply it correctly. The Constitution of the United States provides a means by which Congress can deal with executive officials who violate the law.

If the time has come when Congress is afraid to pass laws for fear the executive department will not obey them and Congress dares not execute its Constitutional authority then it may be that America is now ready for dictatorship.

I for one refuse to abdicate the authority vested in the legislative branch of our Government. I intend to vote to enact this bill into law. I stand ready to vote for removal from office of any executive official who violates or perverts such law. If the executive department will not obey the laws of Congress, the solution does not lie in refusing to pass legislation. The solution is to change the administration of government.

Mr. President, I believe that this bill, if enacted, will do more to prevent concentration of authority in the executive branch of our Government than will be the case if it is defeated. I am not willing to concede that Congresses of the future will be as weak and vacillating as some critics of the bill seem to fear.

There is a trend toward totalitarian government in America, a very rapid trend, a trend which must be brought under control. This trend toward an executive dictatorship synchronizes with the trend toward concentration of wealth, concentration of industrial power, and concentration of population in a few areas. Unless it is checked or reversed, we will continue to gravitate toward a form of government which rules by edict and not by law.

This trend toward an un-American form of government does not emanate from the rural areas. It comes from those centers where population, wealth, and economic power are concentrated. To check it we must restore a more proper balance among rural and urban population, wealth, and opportunity. If we continue to permit our people to be crowded into great centers of population with fewer and fewer of them owning their own homes, we are simply inviting trouble.

I hope to see the time in the near future when more of our people can own homes of their own away from the crowded cities of America. I want to see them living out in the country where people ought to live. In order to bring this about, we must make available opportunities and facilities comparable to those existing in the centers of wealth.

One of the things which we must do is to provide the opportunity of education. Equal opportunity for education in the rural States of America will do much to check the present trend toward centralization of political power.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

PLIGHT OF FARMERS OF THE NORTHWEST

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, yesterday I presented and had placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD numerous auction sale notices published in North Dakota newspapers from one end of the State to the other. I told the Senate then of the terrible situation now confronting the farmers of the Northwest in their attempt to produce food and showed how, because of inefficiency and improper use of railroad boxcars, hundreds of thousands of bushels of farmers' grain is spoiling and rotting on the ground.

Immediately after that talk I was informed by the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] that the Interstate Commerce Committee had considered the resolution I presented last week for an investigation of railroad equipment, distribution of boxcars, and that a hearing would be promptly held thereon, I know that the very able senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], who is chairman of that committee, and the other Members thereof, will delve to the very bottom of the situation and discover why for the first time in over 20 years those in authority chose to enforce a rule in the distribution of boxcars that discriminated against cooperatives and resulted in the closing of over 1,100 elevators in my State alone because they were filled and had no way to ship out their grain, while empty boxcars stood around other elevators. I am sure they will also discover that some of these cooperative elevators lost, as William Thatcher, president of the Union Grain Terminal Elevators Association, stated, all the way from $4,000 to $20,000 apiece. That is, that much was taken out of the pockets of the farmers and placed into the coffers of the millionaire owners of elevator chains.

But, Mr. President, I little dreamed as I talked upon this floor yesterday, when I particularly asked for the attention of the distinguished senior Senator from

Kentucky, the majority leader, who states that although a lawyer he is sympathetic with the farmers, that today I would have the proof which should result in the administration's moving heaven and earth to protect the farmer and dairymen of the Northwest, but, last night in the Evening Star, in an Associated Press dispatch, appeared the following item:

MORGENTHAU TO SELL DAIRY CATTLE AT AUCTION

EAST FISHKILL, N. Y., October 18.—The Secretary of the Treasury is going out of the dairy business, his farm manager announced today.

Arthur D. Hoose, who operates the 1,400-acre Henry Morgenthau, Jr., dairy farm on a share basis, said his employer would sell his 100 head of purebred cattle at public auction December 11.

And this morning, apparently in an effort to advertise the sale, the same story, word for word, appeared in the Washington Post.

Now, Mr. President, I briefly want to compare a farmer in the Northwest who is in the dairying business with Mr. Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, who is also in that business. It is obvious that Mr. Morgenthau can sell his milk and dairy products in New York City, the largest city in the United States, that he has a splendid market, while the farmer in the Northwest may have to haul his milk or cream to town 25 miles, and then ship it 600 miles to market. I understand that East Fishkill is only 55 miles from New York City, and if the Secretary of the Treasury should choose to ship his milk or cream, the distance is not only much less, but the shipping rates are lower.

Mr. Morgenthau, who handles billions of dollars each year, is presumably an expert in business and in money matters. He has a farm manager, Mr. Arthur D. Hoose, who operates the 1,400-acre farm. Because of his position, Mr. Morgenthau could have close, intimate—almost secretive—contact with the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Agriculture could tell him, or he could find out from them, how he could run this farm with the least possible expense. They could tell him the latest methods of milking cows, not only of providing feed for them, but getting just the right mix so that these 100 head of purebred cattle could produce the most milk.

The Department of Agriculture could tell him just what kind of lotion to use on the hides of these cattle so they would not be bothered by flies which might decrease the amount of milk produced. The Department of Agriculture could tell him just what kind of grass to plant, and where to get the seed the cheapest. They could advise him how to plow his soil so that it would produce more than the average that would be produced by the less fortunate farmer in the Northwest. Also the farm of Mr. Morgenthau is very close to—I believe adjoins—the farm of the President, and they could exchange sires, and Mr. Morgenthau, being the wealthy millionaire that he is, could buy the best sire available, and likely would, while the average farmer in the Northwest, with a few exceptions, could not afford to buy one that cost more than $250 or $300, and of course would not be available to exchange of sires with the President of the United States.

Then, too, Mr. President, Mr. Morgenthau was farming on a large scale. He had a farm consisting of nearly 2¼ sections of land, and with 40 acres more he would have 2¼ sections, while the average farmer in the Northwest has approximately 400 acres, so Mr. Morgenthau had the benefit of operating on a larger scale, and therefore presumably producing units of milk or cream at a lower rate.

In addition to this, the Secretary of the Treasury has had the advantage over the farmer of the Northwest of having business experts advise him on how to run his farm, and presumably he did so, because the Associated Press item states that he is operating the farm on a share basis, so that Mr. Morgenthau has had no labor problem. He just turned the farm over to Mr. Arthur D. Hoose, who operated on a share basis, and it was Mr. Hoose's lookout to take care of the labor angle.

In addition, Mr. Morgenthau being a millionaire, had 100 head of purebred cattle while the average farmer, in the overwhelming majority of cases, has only common herds, with very few, if any, purebred cattle among them, and as a purebred cow produces much more milk than a mongrel cow, although eating the same amount of food, Mr. Morgenthau again has had a tremendous advantage in that particular.

Yet, Mr. President, we find Mr. Morgenthau quitting the dairy business. He is going to quit. He is going to sell his herd at public auction on December 11. Anyone who wants a good purebred cow or a bull that is likely related to the bull that the President has on his cattle farm, can have a chance to purchase one or the other at East Fishkill, N. Y., on December 11, when the Secretary of the Treasury is going out of the dairy business, and selling his 100 head of purebred cattle at public auction.

But, Mr. President, the Secretary of the Treasury is going to have some competition in that sale, because I hold in my hand notices of mortgage foreclosure sales in addition to those that I quoted yesterday. I hold in my hand the Dunseith Journal for October 14, and note that E. M. and H. Holstad, owners, on Monday, October 18, sold all their farm machinery, their horses, 28 head of cattle, and 5 registered cattle; and on October 21, Georgia and Eldon D. Striker are going to sell at public auction, 11 miles north and a quarter mile west of Dunseith, N. Dak., in addition to all their farm machinery, 1 white-faced cow, 4 years old; 1 white-faced cow, 4 years old; 1 red cow, 4 years old; 1 red-and-white cow, 5 years old; 1 cow, 6 years old; 1 cow, 8 years old; 1 yearling heifer; 3 spring calves; 25 turkeys; 75 chickens, old and young.

That is not all. Mr. Morgenthau is going to have further competition, because I see in the Bottineau Courant for October 13 that William and Mary McMillan are going to sell, in addition to all their farm machinery, 1 cow, 3 years old, milking now; 1 cow, 2 years old, milking now; 1 cow, 9 years old, milking now; 1 heifer coming 2 years; 1 heifer coming 2 years. The above cows will all freshen in February. One heifer calf, 8 months old.

Also in the same paper I see that Damian Tanberg is going to sell 40 head of cattle, in addition to all his machinery. Like Mr. Morgenthau, he advertises that he will quit farming. His cattle are described as follows: 8 milk cows; 1 roan cow, milking, 7 years old; 1 Hereford cow, milking, fresh in December, 6 years old; 1 red cow, milking, 3 years old; 1 black and white cow, milking, 7 years old; 1 roan cow, to freshen soon, 7 years old; 1 roan cow, milking, 5 years old; 1 Hereford cow, milking, 5 years old; 1 roan cow with calf at side, 6 years old; 1 roan heifer with sucking calf, 2 years old; 1 Hereford heifer, 2 years old; 1 Hereford cow with sucking calf, 4 years old; 6 Hereford heifers with calves at side, 3 years old; 3 long yearling Hereford steers; 10 yearling Hereford heifers; 3 winter calves.

I notice in this newspaper that there are so many sales to be held there that an auctioneer has taken 3 inches of space in this newspaper to advertise what a good auctioneer he is. I particularly would like to have the majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] call the attention of Mr. Morgenthau to this outstanding auctioneer, Mr. Archie Lake, of Dunseith, N. Dak., whose telephone number is 4161. Mr. Lake, the advertisement says—and you can be assured the advertisement is true—is a graduate of the American auction college. He has had a lifetime of experience in livestock and farming. He says he has a thorough knowledge of your property value, that he sells purebred sales, reads and defines pedigrees, and he ends the advertisement with the admonition that you choose your auctioneer wisely.

I suggest, therefore, that this advertisement of Mr. Lake's be forwarded to the Secretary of the Treasury, and that at the same time some friend of the Secretary of Agriculture cut from the front page of the Bottineau Courier the article entitled "List Auction Sales for the Next Few Days," which shows that there are eight auction sales in the vicinity of Bottineau, the list being as follows:

Thursday, October 14, Henry Durdel, 6½ miles north and 1½ miles east of Willow City.

Friday, October 15, John Geiszler, 3½ miles east of Kramer.

Saturday, October 16, Ed Morgan, in Omemee village.

Monday, October 18, Albert Johnson, 2½ miles southeast of Roth.

Tuesday, October 19, Ed Kappers, 9 miles south of Souris.

Wednesday, October 20, A. M. Anderson, 3 miles north and 1½ miles east of Landa.

Wednesday, October 20, Damian Tandberg, 6 miles east and 3 miles north of Mohall.

Thursday, October 21, J. D. Dunbar, 4½ miles north of Souris.

Friday, October 22, William and Mary McMillan auction sale, 5 miles south and one-half mile west of Souris.

Also, Mr. President, the Secretary of the Treasury is going to have further competition because two advertisements appear in the Lansford Leader for October 14, showing that Mike Foley is going to sell, in addition to all his machinery, farm equipment, and horses, at least 10 head of cattle. Mr. Foley says:

Having decided to quit farming, I will sell the following described property at my farm, located 5 miles east of Lansford, N. Dak., Monday, October 18.

Of course, Mr. Foley is not going to get as good a price for his cattle as is the Secretary of the Treasury apparently, because Mr. Foley said the terms of the sale will be cash and that no property can be removed from the premises until settled for. Apparently he is not a millionaire and needs the money, very likely to pay a mortgage on his farm equipment.

The competition Mr. Morgenthau will have from Mike Foley is augmented by an auction sale to be held by LeClair Brothers, Wednesday, October 20, one-half mile east of Lansford, N. Dak. This advertisement states that the LeClair Brothers feel like Mr. Mike Foley because the advertisement also states:

Having decided to quit farming, we will sell at public sale the following property on our farm one-half mile east of Lansford.

And they advertise, in addition to their farm equipment and machinery, the following head of cattle: 1 white-faced cow, was fresh September 11; 1 red cow, was fresh in August; 1 white-faced cow, to freshen in December; 1 white-faced cow, to freshen in December; 5 white-faced heifers, aged 9 months; 3 small white-faced calves (2 heifers, 1 bull); 1 white-faced heifer, 2 years old, with full calf at side; 1 purebred white-faced bull, aged 3 years, with papers.

Then, in addition, there is to be an auction sale Saturday, October 23, a few miles southeast of the LeClair and Mike Foley places, at Granville, where they are going to sell horses, cattle, machinery, and household goods. Mrs. Lillian McFarlane is apparently the owner, and this is a very aristocratic sale, as I notice from the advertisement that the clerk is Mr. J. N. Hagen, for years secretary of agriculture in North Dakota, and one time a candidate for Governor.

Mr. Morgenthau will still have his 1,400 acres on his hands even though he sells his cattle, and he may want to go into the business of raising sheep, so I call to his attention the adv tisement of Mr. E. B. Talmadge, of Towner, N. Dak., who will have for sale at Towner Stockyards Monday, October 18–22, 200 2-year-old and 200 4-year-old white-face breeding ewes. He will sell any number wanted and will trade ewes for lambs. So if Mr. Morgenthau has any lambs, he can trade Mr. Talmadge a ewe for one, and if Mr. Morgenthau needs some bucks, I call his attention to the fact that Mr. Talmadge also will have for sale 11 cross-breed Columbia bucks. Evidently these Columbia bucks are the products of cross breeding by Columbia University, which is located right close to Mr. Morgenthau's farm, and are graduates of Columbia's splendid agricultural department.

If Mr. Morgenthau does not want to go as far northwest as the sales I have mentioned, there is going to be another auction sale at the Fred McDowell farm, south of New Rockford, on Wednesday, October 20, where 37 head of livestock are going to be sold and also a lot of machinery, and in this advertisement appear 9 grade Holstein milk cows, not purebreds—just grades, 10 calves and 3 yearling heifers—and if Mr. Morgenthau has decided to go out of the cattle business and wants to go into the pig business, there are also 10 spring pigs at this place.

In this newspaper, the New Rockford Transcript, for October 14, on page 2 there is also an advertisement by Lloyd Olson who is selling 9 milk cows, 3 to freshen in November; 2 yearling heifers; 2 yearling steers; 8 spring calves; 1 Shorthorn bull.

And also, in addition, for Mr. Morgenthau's pig and sheep farm, 34 spring pigs and 6 yearling breeding ewes.

Also, on October 22, J. J. and Kermit Brown are selling, in addition to all their farm machinery and household goods, 22 head of livestock, including 13 head of cattle, 10 Holstein milk cows, and 3 winter calves.

Another advertisement appears in this newspaper entitled "Dead Stock" stating that the Carrington Rendering Service of Carrington, N. Dak., will pay $1 for dead animals that have good hides on them.

Bearing out what I said that the average farmer could not have all thoroughbreds and is lucky to have a few, I call the attention to Mr. Morgenthau to an auction sale advertisement in the Renville County Farmer published on Thursday, October 14, of Mr. J. Courtney Keller, who states he also decided to quit farming and will sell at public auction Monday, October 18, 21 head of cattle (including calves), 4 registered Shorthorns, and who, in bragging about his cattle, stated that 8 were eligible for registration, the remainder being good grade.

Mr. President on the front page of the Renville County Farmer of October 14, 1943, there appears a telegram which shows the patriotism of the farmers of Renville County. The telegram is as follows:

E. ABRAHAMSON,
Chairman, Renville County War Finance Committee, Mohall, N. Dak.:

Report from Federal Reserve bank advises that Renville County has exceeded quota. The splendid work of you and your committee enthusiastically acknowledged.

The telegram is signed by F. L. Conklin, State chairman.

So we see that Mr. Morgenthau has appointed some good men to sell war bonds in North Dakota.

Also on the front page of the same newspaper is a news item entitled "Auction Sales." I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. It deals with nine auction sales to take place in that vicinity within a few days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

An auction sale of machinery, livestock, and household goods is being held today (Thursday) at the R. A. Axtell farm 5½ miles north and 1 mile west of Tolley. The complete bill appeared in The Farmer last week.

Saturday, October 16, at 1 p. m., has been set for the auction sale of livestock, farm machinery and household goods at the S. G. Smith farm 3½ miles east and 10 miles north of Mohall. Further details appear in an ad on another page of this issue. Mr. Smith has bought a home in Mohall and plans to move into town.

Monday, October 18, at 12 noon is the time for an auction of farm machinery, livestock and a complete line of household goods at the J. Courtney Keller farm 7 miles west of Sherwood. The complete bill appears on page 7 of this issue. The Keller family plan to leave soon for Bremerton, Wash., where Mr. Keller will be employed in the shipyards.

A complete line of farm machinery and household goods will be offered for sale at an auction at the John S. Johnson farm 1½ miles north and 8½ miles west of Mohall Tuesday, October 19, at 1 o'clock. Mr. Johnson also plans to quit farming, as he is getting along in years.

Next Wednesday, October 20, at 11 a. m. has been set for the start of the auction sale at the Tanberg farm 6 miles east and 3 miles north of Mohall. Property offered for sale includes household goods, 44 head of livestock, and a complete line of farm machinery. The complete bill appears on page 3 of this issue of The Farmer.

An auction sale at the Henton farm ½ mile east and 2 miles south of Mohall will begin at noon on Thursday, October 21. Further details are given in an ad on another page of this issue. Milk cows being offered at this sale are exceptionally good.

The Eckberg Bros. are planning a large auction sale for Tuesday, October 26. Further details will be given next week.

Lem Knowlton, who resides 3 miles south and 7 miles west of Sherwood, has set Monday, October 25, at 1 o'clock for his auction sale. The complete bill will appear next week.

Sixteen head of Percheron horses will be put on the auction block at a sale at the Dan Mullen farm near Mohall Friday, October 22. The complete bill will appear in next week's Farmer.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I do not wish to take further time of the Senate, but I have before me nine additional newspapers which contain material bearing out what the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] said yesterday.

I see the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] in the Chamber. I ask the Senator if it is not a fact that all over the State of Montana the situation relative to auction sales is the same as that which exists in North Dakota?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I think auction sales have been conducted, but the conditions have not been so bad in Montana as in North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. At the present time not many auction sales are taking place in Montana.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to ask the Senator from Montana whether the elevators are filled up with grain, and therefore closed to further storage of grain, which is badly needed?

Mr. WHEELER. There is not any question about that at all. There is an absolute shortage of freight cars to move the grain, the elevators all through that region have been filled up, and both flax and wheat have to be stored on the ground. That situation prevails from one end of the State to the other.

Mr. LANGER. I see present in the Chamber the senior Senator from the State of North Dakota [Mr. NYE]. In discussing this matter with him the other day he said his mail was filled with letters and telegrams dealing with the elevator situation. Am I correct in my statement, I will ask the Senator?

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, my colleague is quite correct. I do not think we have ever had a problem quite the equal of the one presenting itself now.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana is chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce. I understand the committee has given its approval to the resolution I submitted in the Senate a few days ago, calling for investigation of the terrible situation of the farmers all over the Northwest—the farmers in North Dakota, in Minnesota, in South Dakota.

In chatting with some of the Members of the Senate who represent some of the other farming States, I find that the situation in their States is analogous to that in mine. I appeal once more to the Democratic majority. Hundreds of boxcars have been taken from the Northwest into Canada. Canadian wheat is being hauled to the markets in Minnesota, while hundreds of thousands of bushels of North Dakota wheat are lying on the ground. The rain is falling on it. Within a short time the snow will fall on it, if it has not already done so. Already those farmers have suffered a loss of from 20 to 30 to 35 cents a bushel. The record I just read shows that those farmers are patriotic, that they are exceeding their quotas for the purchase of War bonds. I believe the people in that section of the country are entitled to have the grain they have raised taken care of first, before a single boxcar is sent to Canada to help haul the wheat raised by Canadian farmers. Time and time again I have brought this matter to the attention of the Senate. I do so again today, and I serve notice that until relief is secured for the farmers of the great Northwest, no matter how important may be the business before the Senate, I shall first, last, and everlastingly call the attention of the Senate to that terrible situation.

FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 637) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the first amendment of the committee.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I desire to address myself very briefly to a discussion of the business before the Senate, Senate bill 637. To my way of thinking, it is high time we were devoting ourselves to the strengthening of our common educational structure in America. The policy proposed in Senate bill 637 is a constructive approach to a challenge that threatens our vital educational front.

To me it seems that the money proposed for expenditure annually in the proposed Federal aid to education in the States, $300,000,000, is moderate. Certainly it is not wasteful, and it would constitute an investment that would be returned many times over by its production of benefits to the whole country. A country that can and does spend billions of dollars in the conduct of a war can surely afford a few million dollars for so constructive a service as that proposed in the pending bill.

I become somewhat alarmed when my colleagues find reason to believe that Senate bill 637 is destined to deprive the States of their right to determine the conduct of the school system in their States. Such belief causes me to pause in my inclination to support the bill, which I feel would bring to our country and its youth great benefits.

Following closely the argument of those who believe the bill would put the Federal Government in the position of dictating the course of education in the States, I feel quite sure that their fears are hardly warranted. If it were to be accepted as true that the bill is but a first step or an entering wedge in an undertaking to give the Federal Government control over the States in the matter of education, then I can only say that we need be on guard against the further steps counted necessary to win such control. I do not see in Senate bill 637 any encroachment upon State rights. I see in the bill a really forward step intended to equalize educational opportunity to the youth of America.

It is as important that the pending bill become law now as it is to stabilize wages and prices. The bill when passed would stablize wages in the only public agency devoted to foundation training of the young people who fight our war, and to the preparation of young people for the problems which will follow the war. Why the Congress has not passed the bill and made it the law of the land long before this time is difficult to understand. We should no longer neglect so great a duty to America.

The pending bill was not a war measure when it was originally introduced in the Senate. It was intended to help in equalizing educational opportunities among the States, and to help the States substantially to decrease educational inequalities within their borders. For many years—years before the present terrible war started—every person familiar with public affairs recognized the glaring inequalities among the States in their ability to support public education. Year in and year out, the difficulties faced by many States in providing adequate education for their young people have been recognized. So difficult has the problem become in a majority of our States that the call for help comes from every corner of our land.

Very recently a petition to the Congress and the President of the United States urging the immediate passage of Senate bill 637 was signed by the executive secretaries of State education associations or chief State school officers, or both, in 42 of the 48 States. Those signatures speak for more than 30,000,000 children and young people served by the public schools.

Bill after bill has been introduced in the Congress, each of which, if passed, would have helped the States meet the educational debt to their young people. Each bill provided for aid to be distributed to the regular public schools, but none of them has become law. Many of us excused ourselves from voting for the bills on the grounds that "education is a State function," or that "the bill did not provide a proper method of distribution," and for those reasons we let the bill die in committee.

For many years funds have been appropriated for land-grant colleges, for vocational education, and for specialized educational agencies. In general, the States have been required to match such funds. The Congress has never by law paid out one cent for regular aid for the elementary and high schools, for the purpose of equalizing educational opportunities among the States.

The Congress has been commended for appropriating funds for agricultural education, home economics education, industrial education, higher education, and other specialized education; but why the Congress should neglect to appropriate funds which will help all the young people in the elementary and high schools is yet to be explained.

All American children who go to school at all, go to the elementary schools; a smaller number go to high schools. It is not in keeping with the

principles of American democracy that any child be denied support of his educational birthright. We have fed the hungry, clothed the naked, housed the homeless, and provided jobs for those who had no jobs. We have done that out of the taxes collected from the American people. We have provided help—physical help—where it was needed. This social-minded Government must shut its eyes to facts if it does not help the States to provide opportunities to their children, not only so that they may stay free from hunger, nakedness, homelessness, and idleness, but free from the humiliation which comes to those who do not have adequate education.

We are faced with a condition which makes the present bill a war measure. The war needs make it imperative that the million schoolrooms under the leadership of as many teachers be placed in a position not only to become effective in peacetime pursuits, but be in a position to help win the war in which we are now engaged.

What are the conditions which call for the immediate enactment of S. 637? Let me point out some conditions that none need err in interpreting. The armed forces have rejected several hundred thousand young men because, while otherwise eligible, they did not have sufficient education to make them useful in a modern war such as we are fighting. Scores of lost divisions are made up of young men who, through no fault of their own, must suffer the humiliation of returning to their homes and saying to their families, "I did not have enough education." Next year another group of young men will be old enough to serve, and a large number of them will suffer rejection. This will keep up year after year until we have given every young person, no matter what his race, color, or place of residence, a real chance to learn.

What are the conditions? According to the 1940 census there were 12 States, largely in the low-income area of our country, in which 35 percent of the population 25 years of age and over had not gone beyond the fourth grade in school. This means that this area cannot furnish its part of the manpower to the Nation. S. 637 will help change this picture.

What are the conditions? It was stated by General Somervell in an address before the Institute on Education and War that the present Army is an army of specialists, and that 63 out of every 100 soldiers inducted must receive training which will enable them to do a specialized job. This means that in an army of 10,000,000 men 6,300,000 must be trained for specific service.

Are our schools keeping the educational assembly line so steady that this need can be met? Let us look at the record. In 16 States, mainly in the low-income group, more than 40 percent of the young people of high-school age are not in high school; and in 7 States more than 50 out of every 100 young people of high-school age are not in high school. Why? In some of the low-income States there are communities where there is no high school for the children to attend, and in many of the high schools which are provided the program does not meet the needs of young people.

If there is to be an army of specialists then the schools of all the States must be in a position to help keep the assembly line of humanity flowing into the specialized services. S. 637 will help provide programs for this service.

What are the conditions? Good teachers are being drawn into other occupations and their places are being taken by substandard persons. They are being drawn away because living costs are on a wartime scale and teacher wages are still on a peacetime level. Let us look at the facts. Teachers' salaries in most low-income States are practically the same as they were in 1939–40. Here are the levels that most teachers receive now: In nine low-income States more than 50 percent of the teachers, principals, and supervisors in both elementary and high schools received less than $16 per week on a 52-week year.

In 9 other States the average was less than $20.06 per week. Twenty-eight States paid an average salary of less than $25 per week. Compare these salaries with those of workers in other vocations in the same States, and it will be seen that education is menaced and why it is menaced.

What are the conditions? The schools are inadequate because not enough money is spent for their support, and not enough money is spent because it is not there to spend. Let us look at the figures. Nine States in the low-income area spend less than $50 per child enrolled, while in the high-income States 5 pay from $100 to $135 per child enrolled. In 12 low-income States there are from 478 to 590 children to be educated for every 1,000 adults, while in 12 high-income States the number runs from 280 to 347 for each 1,000 adults.

Let us look at the 1940 income figures: Four States had less than $1,000 income for every child of school age; 9 other States had less than $1,500 of income for every child of school age. On the other hand, 5 States in the high-income bracket had more than $1,400 of income per child of school age, and 8 other States in this group had $3,000 to $4,100 of income per child of school age.

What are the conditions? In the areas where there is a large number of persons who have not passed the fourth grade the school terms are relatively short. Let us look at the figures for 1940. In 4 States located in the low-income area, the average school terms are less than 160 days, and in 7 other States in the group the average school terms are less than 170 days.

We do not know whether low income produces poor schools or poor schools produce low income. We never are sure what it is that causes a condition to exist, but certain conditions seems to be found in the same area. In those areas where school terms are short, salaries are low, income is meager, school property is not up to standard, high rates of illiteracy exist, many children stay out of school, and there are more children per family.

We must face the fact that if we are to have good schools they must be housed in good buildings, be manned by good teachers, must have standard terms, a curriculum that meets the needs of the pupils, and must be accessible to the children. It costs money to have these things. Better support for schools will certainly get better results, because those States which have the money erect good buildings, employ good teachers, provide standard school terms, maintain curriculums which meet the needs of children, and keep schools accessible to all children, also have a low percentage of illiteracy and a larger percentage of children of high-school age in high school.

The low-income States spend more for schools in proportion to their ability than high-income States. If the low-income States should support what is considered to be a defensible-minimum program, 19 of them would have to spend from 5 percent to 314 percent more than they are economically able to spend.

What is the answer? Shall we continue to demand of all the States that they send their sons to protect the flag and then deny to them the rights that flag is said to protect? Or shall we come to ourselves and say that the 10-year-old boy in any State is America's son? Shall we see to it that he has his right to life and the pursuit of happiness? Shall we show him that the framers of the Constitution meant it when they said that it was "to promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty"? Shall we neglect him while he is yet a child, and then ask him to fight to save the liberty which we through negligence deny him?

Why wait longer? Cannot America pay for a war and the welfare of her people? Can we not preserve what we have while we fight the enemy? If this war cost $300,000,000,000, this three hundred million will be only a small percentage of that cost and will pay the greatest dividends of any appropriation we can make. It will increase the effectiveness of our manpower for all time to come, in peacetime and in wartime alike.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, on page 7, after line 6.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 6, after the word "intended," to strike out, "All funds expended under the provisions of this act shall be expended only for public agencies under public control."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 2, to insert:

(f) The term "teacher" may include any person who is engaged in instruction, or in

the supervision or administration of instruction, or in professional health or welfare services for children, by a local public-school jurisdiction or other public-education agency, and actually so employed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I was called out of the Chamber a moment ago. I did not know the bill had reached the stage of consideration of committee amendments. I thought the program which had been outlined earlier in the day had not yet been completed, and I thought the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] was to speak today. It is my desire to go as far as we can today to complete the argument in presentation of all matters, and then, tomorrow, have a limitation of approximately 15 minutes on speeches, and probably have consideration of a motion to be offered to recommit the bill to the committee—a motion which in itself would take precedence by seniority over all amendments, whether personal or committee amendments. So I did not want the amendments considered until we were ready to say we had completed the discussion of the program.

Mr. President, do not let it be understood that I am objecting to the committee amendments. They may all be satisfactory. The question I have in mind relates to the proper procedure. We should follow a procedure which has back of it some logic to support it, so that we shall know what we are doing as we go along.

If the able senior Senator from Florida wishes to proceed and to finish his speech, that will be quite satisfactory to me, and I shall retire.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, the Senator from Florida does desire to make a speech.

Mr. ANDREWS. Yes; a speech of approximately 5 or 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, Senate bill 637 has been under consideration by the Seventy-eighth Congress since last February. After exhaustive hearings it was reported favorably by the committee with amendments, on June 18, and has now been discussed in the Senate for several days.

This bill is similar to many others which have been repeatedly introduced, particularly during the last 10 years, and each measure has met with the same fate. It is safe to say that no bill has been passed providing funds for public schools operated by the various States, because of the fact that under what may be termed American policy it was felt that if the Federal Government provided an appropriation of funds for public schools they would ultimately be controlled from Washington as to their curriculum, personnel, and method and manner of teaching.

It may be that a uniform method of instruction controlled from Washington would be agreeable to some of the States, but it would meet with serious complications, as, for example, in Louisiana, which was carved out of French territory and still maintains some French customs; also in Florida, which was carved out of Spanish territory and still maintains some Spanish customs. The same suggestion might apply to a number of Western States.

In an attempt to alleviate the ever-present controversy the authors of the pending bill in section 1 undertake to guarantee that the States which would be the recipients of the appropriation would have full control. In fact, section 1 provides as follows:

> No department, agency, or officer of the United States shall exercise any supervision or control over any school or State educational agency with respect to which any funds are expended pursuant to this act, nor shall any term or condition of any agreement under this act relating to any contribution made under this act to or on behalf of any school or State educational agency authorize any agency or officer of the United States to control the administration, personnel, curriculum, instruction, methods of instruction, or materials of instruction.

This section undoubtedly states our fixed policy which has become almost the common law of the people of the United States. It ought to be a part of our fundamental law. The fear has been expressed by a number of Senators who have evidently given this measure much thought that while section 1 might eliminate much objection, according to past experience in the use of Federal appropriations in the various States, this bill would be only an entering wedge, and it would not be long before the biennial appropriations which are brought forth during each Congress would contain a provision that the States receiving Federal school aid must use the funds as prescribed by Congress.

In other words, it is believed that legislation of the kind proposed would ultimately mean that the Federal Government would control the administration, personnel, curriculum, instructions, and the method and manner of instruction, and that the States would be forced to acquiesce in such provision in order to obtain the funds. Past experience has shown that when a State begins to receive Federal funds for any purpose it is almost impossible to prevent Federal control.

There is but one way by which we can permanently eliminate this controversy, and that is to submit a constitutional amendment to the States. This method would save many weeks of argument and misunderstanding in Congress, and would fix the policy definitely. I am therefore submitting a proposed constitutional amendment which provides as follows:

> SECTION 1. No law shall be enacted authorizing Federal control over any funds appropriated by Congress for the use or benefit of the public schools of any State or county, nor control over the administration, personnel, curriculum, instruction, methods, or materials of instruction.

Frankly, I can see no reason why such a constitutional amendment should not be unanimously approved by Congress and submitted to the people. It is undoubtedly the established policy not only of the Congress but of the States and the people generally. It seems to me that the hour has come when a great impediment to meritorious legislation could, by such an amendment, be settled, and in the right way. It would not mean that we would be obligated to appropriate any money for public educational institutions. It would merely mean that if and when such appropriations were made, we could be assured that their application in the States would not be controlled by some bureau in Washington. It is my hope that this proposed constitutional amendment will receive immediate consideration by the Judiciary Committee and the Congress.

As an example of how well-informed and conscientious officials differ on this subject, I call attention to portions of a letter recently received by my secretary, Mr. Hal P. Phillips, from Dr. John J. Tigert, president of the University of Florida, who was the first national Commissioner of Education in the United States. It will be observed that Dr. Tigert opposes this measure even with section 1 in the bill.

His letter reads, in part, as follows:

> I have received the copy of S. 637 and your request for my opinion regarding it. I am strongly opposed to this bill and any bill which provides Federal funds for public schools in the States. In the first place, there is no necessity for it. Every State is economically in position to maintain an adequate school system if it wants to do it. No State expends any considerable part of its economic resources on schools, notwithstanding the fact that a considerable part of revenue from taxes is expended in this way.
>
> Federal subsidy of schools means Federal control and interference, notwithstanding section 1 in the proposed bill and notwithstanding what is asserted by the proponents of these Federal subsidies. Unless you have Federal control, the money will be used for other purposes and will become a source of political exploitation in the States. Of the two evils, Federal control would probably be the lesser.
>
> My greatest objection to this bill is that it paves the way for developing and controlling the thinking of the people through what may be injected into their schools. Hitherto, control of education in the United States has been vested in the localities and the States, and thinking has not been uniform or directed from a central source. Once we depend upon the Federal Government for the financing of our schools, we have forged the weapons for a system of nationalized control. I do not mean to say that there is anyone in the present Government who would do this. However, if the possibility is brought about, it will be only a matter of time until the schools are prostituted in this way by some unworthy personage who might happen to be in the center of things in Washington.
>
> I have written a number of articles opposing Federal subsidy for schools and, if you would like me to do so, will be glad to send you one of these articles.

I do not agree to all that Dr. Tigert says in his letter; but it illustrates the trend of thinking educators. I believe Dr. Tigert is a native of Tennessee. He had a Cecil Rhodes scholarship, and in matters of education is one of the best informed men that I know of in the United States.

On the other hand, I have letters and resolutions from public-school authorities in Florida taking the opposite view and requesting that I support the bill. Let us settle the question for all time by submitting the matter to the people by the time an appropriation comes up for consideration next year—if the bill passes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I was taken by great surprise when the Senator read the letter written by President Tigert on Federal control. President Tigert is dealing entirely in the realm of theory and apparently overlooking facts completely.

Mr. President, for nearly a hundred years there have been Federal grants to land-grant colleges. President Tigert cannot turn to a single case where the Federal Government tried to interfere with these colleges. For nearly 20 years in all the States there has been vocational education carried on through the medium of the schools. Never once has the vocational education policy been criticized because the Federal Government has been trying to dominate such education in the city schools, where most of the vocational education is taught, and no Federal official would ever go into a city of the first class where such systems are in operation and try to control them. I know the Senator does not agree with President Tigert, but it seems wrong to let the record stand in that way in the light of the history of the matter of Federal aid.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, the letter was read to show how the thinking and leading educational authorities of this country differ. It happens that the State superintendent of education in my State is in favor of the pending measure. We can see, however, what the trend is, and it will remain that way. The proposition I have just read to the Senate would certainly settle the question forever. It is the policy which has been followed for 150 years, and why not first settle the matter by adopting a short amendment to the Constitution and let it go to the people?

Frankly, I have told persons who have inquired of me if I would support this measure that I would support it provided it contained the provisions now found in section 1. I am in that position, and I expect to do that, but, let us send this proposition to the people and simplify this matter and not spend months here in Washington at each session discussing something without concrete result.

Let me say that for 6 years I was a school teacher, and, finally, had to take up another profession by reason of the unwarranted low salaries which were being paid to school teachers and which are still being paid them. I have been in favor of better pay for teachers for years because they are performing a more important and patriotic service for the perpetuation of the American way of life than any other profession or group of persons in the United States. Theirs is, in deed, a noble profession.

I realize, as almost every other Senator must realize, that if certain amendments are attached to the bill, as is now threatened, in my judgment it cannot pass. Very likely there are sufficient votes in the Senate to attach them, and if so, I shall be opposed to it and will do what I can against it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may at this time introduce the joint resolution to which I have referred and that it be printed in full at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res, 88) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting Federal control of funds appropriated for public-school purposes in the States, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. No law shall be enacted authorizing Federal control over any funds appropriated by Congress for the use or benefit of the public schools of any State or county, nor control over the administration, personnel, curriculum, instruction, methods, or materials of instruction.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think there is a general feeling that we should try to reach a conclusion of the matter now under consideration, and to that end I ask unanimous consent that during the further consideration of the pending bill no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes on the bill or any amendment which may be offered, or on any motion pertaining thereto.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, earlier in the afternoon, before the able Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] addressed himself to the very important matter we are considering, I stated that I did expect some Senator to make a motion that the bill be recommitted to the committee. I spoke to the very distinguished Senator from Kentucky, and I understand his request includes the bill, all amendments of every kind, and all motions which might be made pertaining to the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McNARY. If the request is in that comprehensive form, I am quite in accord with a limitation of 15 minutes on any speech which might be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for a limitation of debate? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read an editorial from the Louisville Courier Journal. It has relationship particularly to the address of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] a few days ago with reference to the pending bill. The editorial is very brief, and is pertinent to what we are now discussing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

MR. TAFT SHOULD KNOW OHIO HISTORY BETTER

Senator TAFT, of Ohio, prematurely opened the attack on the appropriation for Federal aid to public schools with a historical error not to have been expected from the representative of a State formed out of the old Northwest Territory. "It is an entirely new policy," he protested, "for the Federal Government to subsidize common school education. This is something we have avoided for 150 years and should continue to avoid."

Of course; Senator TAFT would not deny that the Federal Government subsidizes State universities and even certain courses in the common schools, nor would he refuse to admit that we do a great many things he approves which were not done 150 years ago. Yet, with these exceptions understood, he is entirely wrong as to the novelty of the policy. The Federal Government unhesitatingly started subsidizing common schools in Senator TAFT'S own State 150 years ago. Under the Ordinance of 1787, one out of every 36 acres of Government land in Ohio was set apart for the support of education, 640 acres in each township, 6 miles square.

That was quite a substantial subsidy in a rapidly growing commonwealth of remarkably fertile soil. This land had been ceded to the United States by older States, but they didn't insist upon sharing the benefits. There was no debate in Congress about the propriety of the act. Significantly, however, Congress did debate the question of Federal control over the schools and decided against it. That is the policy which has been adhered to throughout the Nation's history and is embodied specifically in the school-aid bill.

Pretended fear of Federal encroachment is without foundation. Congress has been subsidizing State universities and agricultural and vocational courses in public schools for years without interference. Not one of the 48 States, all of which are represented in both Houses of Congress, would stand for interference if it were conceivable that a single one of their Senators or Representatives would propose it.

Mr. BARKLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, a while ago I had read from the desk an editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal on the pending bill. I

ask unanimous consent that another editorial, entitled "Federal Education Bill Vital to the South," published in the same newspaper on Tuesday, October 12, be printed in the body of the RECORD following the editorial which was read from the desk.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL EDUCATION BILL VITAL TO THE SOUTH

Consideration of the Federal school-aid bill is being hastened by the emergency need for teachers, but as a general remedial measure for some of the inequalities under which the South must suffer, its need has long outdated any war-born problem.

While all States would participate on a per capita basis, the measure is frankly designed to aid Southern States, which must educate one-third of the Nation's children on one-sixth of the national income. For too long the educational facilities of the States have been based upon a theoretical ability to pay which has taken no account of the disparity in numbers of children between one State and another. California, for instance, has 277 school-age children for each 1,000 adults, and South Carolina has 589 children per 1,000. The per capita income of the 2 States differs in almost the same ratio, so that the schools of California are able to provide twice as well for half the number of children as do the schools of South Carolina.

Opposition to the bill has for a long time been based upon the supposed license it gives Federal education authorities to "interfere" in the school problems of the States. But actually the only interference the bill possibly could authorize would be supervision to see that the Federal grant was equitably distributed. States which might attempt to use the lion's share of Federal funds for the improvement of white schools only should properly be subject to supervision, but the bill makes no attempt to regulate the established educational processes of the Southern States, which include segregated schools.

Actually as the bill now stands, two-thirds of its $300,000,000 appropriation is earmarked for remedying the loss of teachers from low-paid States into higher-salaried industry. Kentucky has seen a segment of the teacher turn-over to which the Senate Education Committee refers as threatening the "serious crippling if not the actual collapse of large numbers of our schools." But Kentucky is only one of a number of States in which teacher salaries reflect the widespread poverty of educational opportunity.

Unless the bill is given favorable consideration by both Houses in the immediate future, not only must the long-range poverty of southern schools settle its blight still more firmly upon the largest child population in the United States, in addition, many of the meager schools now open are likely to close their doors, not for lack of willingness or an indifference to education on the part of the States most affected, but through sheer inability to cope, on a basis of lower income and higher birth rates, with the problem of keeping the poorly paid teacher in the run-down schoolhouse. Kentuckians have a particular interest in the status of this bill, but they are not alone. Every State which must face rising population figures on a static or declining income is equally touched by it, and every such State has a responsibility to let its congressional representatives know that the bill may mean life or death to the education of the children back home.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think the question before the Senate has been as ably debated as any question we have considered during my service in the Senate. From my reading of history, the great danger to liberty, the ever-present threat, has been through the concentration of power in an individual or a group, and restraint upon such individual or group has been exerted only by the people in defending their liberties, and where it has not been exerted, their liberties have always been in danger.

When a tyrant or a dictator appeared, the first thing he sought was control of the public purse, and if the one in control of the public purse can levy taxes without authority and without interference by the legislative body or from any other source, he can proceed almost unchecked. When the founding fathers came to write the Constitution of the United States they profited by the lessons of history. The Constitution diffused power so as to prevent any individual who might be the Chief Executive from having too much power. It lodged control over the purse, and over the levying of taxes, in the legislative body, and that has continued up to recent years. I am not so sure that the legislative body now has control over the public purse and the levying of taxes.

Mr. President, the one unique feature of our form of government is the dual system, whereby a central government and State governments operate side by side, at the same time, in the same nation. Aside from that, our experiment of government is not much different from other experiments recorded by history.

The Constitution very properly devolved the control of commerce between the States upon the Federal Government, and as our communities have grown closer and closer, through better means of transportation, naturally the power of the Federal Government has grown much beyond what anyone during the early history of the country thought would be possible.

We have now come to the time when about all that is left to the States is their schools, their highways, their fire and police departments, the local governments, and the enforcement of the local laws. At this time the fiscal position of every State government, almost without exception, is far superior to that of the Federal Government. I can think of no more unfortunate time to bring before the Senate a bill of the kind we are now considering than the present moment. There is less excuse today for a subsidy extending to the local schools than at any time during my long life. Therefore, I regard it as unfortunate that a serious attempt should be made toward that end at this time.

Mr. President, I merely desire to say, further, that on October 11 I telegraphed to the Governor of Kansas my views about the pending bill. On the 12th he sent me his reply, in which he indicated that he was in substantial agreement with the views I have just expressed, and I ask unanimous consent that my telegram to the Governor of Kansas dated October 11 and his reply to me dated October 12 may be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

Mr. LANGER. Has the Senator any objection to having the telegrams read by the clerk?

Mr. REED. I shall be glad to read them myself. I telegraphed the Governor of Kansas on October 11 to the following effect:

Senate bill 637 comes up tomorrow. State school superintendent undoubtedly has copy you can read. Its only purpose is to distribute money from Federal Treasury for State school purposes, including fourteenth or junior college grades. Along with numerous others, you and I have vigorously protested growing Federal power over local affairs and have insisted on reassertion State authority contemplated by Constitution.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Did the Senator from Kansas say that under the pending bill the Federal Government would contribute funds to junior colleges?

Mr. REED. Its provisions extend to the fourteenth grade, if I read the bill correctly.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The fourteenth grade is high school.

Mr. REED. I beg the Senator's pardon. In Kansas we have a junior college system. Primary education takes in the first eight grades, the high school takes in the next four, and the thirteenth and fourteenth grades are junior colleges. We have one in my home town.

I resume reading my telegram:

In my entire public life, in my own county, city, and State, I have vigorously supported all progressive school policies and taxes necessary to support them. I am profoundly reluctant to witness State and local authorities asking Federal Government for funds with which to operate local schools. The easy way for me would be to say "Yes" to my Kansas friends asking me to support this bill, even though some of the same friends have been vigorously protesting against further centralization of government in Washington and urging me to oppose every move in that direction.

I should be glad to have your advice, as my friend and as Governor of Kansas, as to the wisest course. There is not much left to the States except control of their schools, highways, fire departments, and local law enforcement. When the States begin to ask for money for support of these purely local matters, there is not much ground left upon which to oppose centralization at Washington. Provision forbidding interference in the control of State schools not very persuasive. That makes us a beggar instead of a partner, even a junior partner. Through the deep depression years I could find some justification of State acceptance Federal aid. This justification disappears in the highest income years Kansas and other States have ever known. Kansas will have to pay its share of increased Federal taxation to provide this money. Money does not grow on trees, even for the Federal Treasury. As a citizen of Kansas, I would rather have my State and local taxes increased, even if a special session legislature was necessary,

rather than ask the Federal Government for alms, a policy which I fear will still further weaken State responsibility and authority. If schools are having undoubted difficulties, so are all lines of government and business.

CLYDE M. REED.

The Governor of Kansas replied as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., *October 12, 1943.*

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
United States Senate:

Your wire received. I have not had the opportunity to study this bill carefully on this short notice. I would want to be doubly sure to what extent by direct reference or by implication the Federal Government, through its numerous agencies or bureaus, would control, direct or influence education in our State or the States in general. From the past record of this administration, Federal appropriations have meant bureaucratic control and power in Washington. Kansans have been in the forefront in providing for education and through their local communities have always met the needs for advanced educational facilities. I would want to look this over very, very carefully. Regards.

ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
Governor of Kansas.

DESIGNATION OF SENATOR CARAWAY AS ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to address a few brief remarks to a very significant event which took place in the United States Senate today. For the first time in the annals of this great deliberative, legislative body, a member of the gentle sex has officially opened the proceedings of the Senate and will continue for the day as its Acting President pro tempore. It is my pleasure to state that the lady of this distinction honors my State as being one of its United States Senators.

Senator HATTIE W. CARAWAY, whom we all know and revere, came to this body succeeding her distinguished husband, and has endeared herself in such a way as to have risen to the highest pinnacle of our esteem. Through the circumstances of the Vice President being away from Washington and the regular President pro tempore being detained by illness, it was our pleasure to see Mrs. CARAWAY named as our presiding officer.

Mr. President, it has been a great satisfaction to me to see the splendid women of our generation recognized by this administration. The present Democratic administration has done itself proud in honoring women by appointment to high posts—to the Cabinet, as judges, and as ministers plenipotentiary, and has accepted them here as distinguished legislators.

The world today owes much to women. They have performed courageously and brilliantly in every field of human endeavor. In the war movement there have been WAC's, WAVES, SPARS, and Marines, and the gentle touch of women as nurses has soothed many of the afflicted. In civilian defense women have been more than alert, and in the industrial world they have taken over man's work and have excelled in all these activities.

I may say that I am happy on this occasion to pay tribute to the women of this country, and to my colleague, the senior Senator from Arkansas. Women are nobly doing their part in the defense of our country. In every endeavor in which loyalty and human intelligence are required, they serve with our men supremely.

FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 637) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, whatever may have been the situation at any other time in our history, we all now would happily confirm the fact that we are a nation. Nothing can be clearer than that our destiny is cast together, and that we go up or down as a single people. Whether the individual citizen is an able leader or a recalcitrant follower, whether he is an aid or an obstacle to his country's progress depends upon the individual, but I think it can be established, Mr. President, that perhaps no other factor so much influences the ability of the individual to help, the capacity of the person to lend strength to his country, as the quality and the quantity of education which he has.

We, of course, know the figures which have been given with respect to the men deferred from armed service by reason of educational disqualification. I have before me a statement which identifies them. Two hundred and fifty-eight thousand men thus far have been turned down from selective service, men who are physically qualified and within the eligible age limit. By the standards applied to these men, 750,000 will find themselves incapable of serving the country in its greatest crisis because of educational disqualification.

Figures given from the 1940 census show that 2,799,923 adults in the United States completed no school years at all, and 7,304,689 did not go beyond the fourth grade in school.

The same 1940 census tells us that 10,104,612, or 1 out of 7 adults in the United States, are functionally illiterate. We are also told, Mr. President, that there are 3 times as many adults illiterate in the United States 25 years of age or over as there are college graduates. That, Mr. President, is the situation in what we are pleased to call the greatest Nation in the world.

Mr. President, I have a statement from Vernon Bowyer, who, in a comprehensive study entitled "Relation of Public School Support to Subsequent Per Capita Wealth of States", makes the following conclusion:

> In those States in which the percentage of wealth expended for public schools in 1890, 1900 and 1912 was greatest, the increase in the average per capita wealth during following periods was larger than the corresponding increase in States which had provided less adequately for their schools.

That conclusion was arrived at by Mr. Bowyer after making full adjustment for each State for other factors of economic growth and development of natural resources. So we find that educational training was responsible for the greatest increase in per capita wealth in the several States.

Mr. President, I wonder if all Senators are aware of figures given me by the actuary of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, dated October 12, in which the following information is given:

Estimated distribution of income recipients, by net income classes, at levels of income estimated for the calendar year 1944:

21,600,000 persons in the United States, or 32 percent of all the people who earn incomes in the United States, are estimated to receive less than $1,000 a year.

36,600,000, or 54.4 percent of our total income earners, will receive in the year 1944, according to the estimates, from $1,000 to $3,000 a year; or 86½ percent of all the income earners in the United States will receive less than $3,000 a year.

For the income bracket of from $3,000 to $5,000, the estimate is 6,700,000 income earners, or 9.9 percent of all income earners.

For the income bracket of from $5,000 to $10,000, the estimate is 1,830,000 persons, or 2.7 percent of the total income earners.

For the income bracket of from $10,000 to $25,000, the estimate is 460,000 persons, or seven-tenths of 1 percent of the total income earners.

For the income bracket of $25,000 and over, the estimate is 110,000 individuals—only two-tenths of 1 percent of the total income earners of the United States.

Think of that, Mr. President: That in the United States one-third of all the persons who earn incomes are estimated to receive a gross annual income of less than $1,000.

I have before me something which makes an interesting commentary. It is from the hearings of the Committee on Education and Labor on Senate bill 419, in 1937. I ask that pages 140 and 141 of the volume be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the pages referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Socio-economic relationships to education, by States

[William G. Carr, director of research, National Education Association, and secretary, Educational Policies Commission]

RANK OF THE STATES

State	On educational items as measured by—						On law observance as measured by—	On economic status as measured by—				On health as measured by—	On culture as measured by—		
	Literacy, 1930 [1]	Holding power of the school, 1930 [2]	School attendance, 1930 [3]	Average salary to teachers, 1934 [4]	Average value of school property per child, 1934 [5]	Expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance, 1934 [6]	Freedom from deaths caused by homicide, 1929 [7]	Freedom from relief [8]	Freedom from farm tenancy [9]	Per capita retail sales, 1933 [10]	Income per child 5 to 20 years old, 1929 [11]	Freedom from infant mortality under 1 year of age 1933 [12]	News paper circulation per 1,000 population, 1930 [13]	Number of telephones per 1,000 population, 1932 [14]	Per capita number of radio sets, 1934 [15]
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
Alabama	45	39	45	42	44	43	43	12	46	47	44	34	41	46	46
Arizona	18	31	35	13	29	12	38	38	11	31	18	47	25	37	37
Arkansas	38	28	44	48	43	47	37	34	42	46	45	19	46	44	29
California	7	1	6	2	4	3	19	18	17	1	3	19	7	1	4
Colorado	26	15	30	18	12	11	27	40	32	15	19	40	17	10	15
Connecticut	15	40	9	5	8	9	9	7	3	7	8	5	16	6	6
Delaware	33	29	18	8	5	7	21	1	29	10	2	30	26	24	6
Florida	39	34	39	32	33	38	46	38	23	26	29	32	19	34	34
Georgia	43	48	46	41	47	44	42	12	47	42	43	38	38	43	43
Idaho	9	6	33	34	31	30	13	44	24	27	28	4	33	30	33
Illinois	21	23	7	11	6	10	28	21	35	17	5	9	5	4	6
Indiana	28	10	13	20	17	27	22	21	27	30	25	15	11	23	15
Iowa	14	14	11	30	26	23	10	7	40	28	32	5	14	3	15
Kansas	20	11	26	28	19	26	20	28	34	32	27	19	27	8	27
Kentucky	37	41	41	40	41	42	40	34	30	43	41	29	34	40	39
Louisiana	47	44	42	39	38	39	39	12	45	41	37	43	31	41	39
Maine	30	18	4	33	30	34	1	5	2	14	23	35	24	19	23
Maryland	34	46	27	10	25	19	23	7	21	13	14	35	9	25	15
Massachusetts	13	17	2	4	1	5	5	25	1	4	6	13	2	4	4
Michigan	17	12	1	19	7	21	24	31	13	18	11	12	12	27	15
Minnesota	12	24	17	22	15	17	6	40	28	16	26	5	15	10	23
Mississippi	46	27	47	47	48	48	45	18	48	48	47	33	48	48	48
Missouri	31	37	15	17	28	28	29	25	31	23	20	23	3	15	9
Montana	3	9	16	25	21	14	34	36	22	24	22	13	32	31	29
Nebraska	11	13	24	37	32	33	11	18	39	25	30	9	18	7	23
Nevada	1	4	19	12	10	2	44	12	8	3	4	44	28	14	26
New Hampshire	23	22	10	16	16	13	4	4	3	11	17	26	39	12	12
New Jersey	24	35	8	3	3	4	14	25	11	8	7	3	30	20	1
New Mexico	41	30	34	23	42	29	35	47	13	39	36	48	43	42	43
New York	16	16	3	1	2	1	18	28	7	2	1	19	1	2	1
North Carolina	44	43	43	46	39	46	33	5	36	44	46	35	42	45	43
North Dakota	10	25	31	43	24	25	2	46	33	34	40	30	44	32	29
Ohio	27	7	5	9	11	15	25	31	25	20	13	15	8	21	9
Oklahoma	32	20	36	31	36	37	32	45	43	37	34	26	22	33	39
Oregon	5	5	28	26	18	18	12	12	17	12	12	2	4	12	9
Pennsylvania	22	33	20	6	13	16	16	31	10	22	15	15	10	22	12
Rhode Island	25	45	22	7	9	6	7	7	6	5	10	26	13	18	1
South Carolina	48	47	48	45	45	45	36	28	44	45	48	46	47	47	46
South Dakota	8	19	23	44	27	24		48	38	35	38	23	40	26	27
Tennessee	40	36	38	38	46	41	41	11	37	40	42	40	23	39	39
Texas	35	32	40	29	34	35		36	41	33	33	45	29	35	37
Utah	4	2	12	21	23	31	15	42	9	29	30	5	20	29	15
Vermont	29	26	25	36	35	32	3	1	5	19	24	15	35	17	15
Virginia	42	42	37	35	40	40	30	1	26	36	39	40	36	36	33
Washington	6	3	21	14	22	20	17	12	15	6	9	1	6	9	12
West Virginia	36	38	32	27	37	36	31	42	20	38	35	39	37	38	34
Wisconsin	19	21	14	15	14	22	8	21	16	21	21	9	21	15	15
Wyoming	2	8	29	24	20	8	26	21	19	9	16	23	45	28	29

[1] Rank of States as shown by percentage of literacy, Research Bulletin of the National Education Association, 1932, p. 125.

[2] Computed by dividing total number of pupils 14 to 17 years of age, inclusive, who were enrolled in school by the total population of the State at the same age levels. Ibid., p. 119.

[3] For formula used in computing these ranks see ibid., p. 116.

[4] Average salary of teachers, supervisors, and principals. From Office of Education Bulletin 1935, No. 2. Statistics of State School Systems, 1933-34, pp. 66-67 (col. 20).

[5] Average value of school property per pupil in average daily attendance (ibid., p. 71, col. 5).

[6] Per capita cost per pupil annually in average daily attendance. Ibid., p. 90 (col. 5).

[7] Ranked on death rates per 100,000 population, from homicide. American Mercury, October 1931, p. 183.

[8] Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1935 p. 327. Based on percentage of population on relief in December 1934.

[9] United States Census of Agriculture: 1935, pp. 4-9.

[10] Source materials on Federal aid for education, 1936, p. 61, col. 13. National Education Association, Research Division.

[11] Ibid., p. 64.

[12] Statistical abstract of the United States, 1935, p. 90.

[13] American Mercury for September 1931, pp. 12-13.

[14] Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1935, p. 334.

[15] Source materials on Federal aid for education, 1936, p. 62, col. 18. National Education Association, Research Division.

[16] No report.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the categories which are listed on the pages I have just referred to, to show how many other factors are affected by education. Take, for example, the State of Alabama, so ably represented in the Senate by the two distinguished Senators from Alabama. The State ranked forty-third in expenditures per pupil on the basis of average daily attendance in schools in 1934. It ranked forty-fourth in the average value of of school property per child, 1934. It ranked forty-second in the average salary to teachers in 1934. It ranked forty-fifth in school attendance, 1930. It ranked thirty-ninth in the holding power of the school, 1930. It ranked forty-fifth in literacy, 1930. It ranked twelfth in freedom from relief, forty-sixth in freedom from farm tenancy, forty-seventh in per capita retail sales, 1933; forty-fourth in income per child 5 to 20 years old, 1929; thirty-fourth in freedom from infant mortality under 1 year of age, 1933; forty-first in newspaper circulation per 1,000 of population, 1930; forty-sixth in number of telephones per 1,000 of population, 1932; and forty-six in per capita number of radio sets, 1934.

Mr. President, let me now read the statistics relative to the State of New York. The State of New York ranks first in expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance, 1934; it ranks second in average value of school property per child, 1934; it ranks first in average salary paid to teachers in 1934; it ranks third in school attendance, 1930; it ranks sixteenth in the holding power of the school, 1930; it ranks sixteenth in literacy, 1930; it ranks twenty-eighth in freedom from relief; it ranks seventh in freedom from farm tenancy; it ranks second in per capita retail sales, 1933; it ranks first in income per child 5 to 20 years old, 1929; nineteenth in freedom from infant mortality under 1 year of age, 1933; first in newspaper circulation per 1,000 of population, 1930; second in number of telephones per 1,000 of population, 1932; and first in per capita number of radio sets in 1934.

In the tables all the States are listed, and there is shown the vital relationship between education, infant mortality, number of newspapers in circulation, number of radios per home, and the other indicia of economic security and well-being in the United States.

Therefore, Mr. President, the conclusion is inescapable that the welfare of the people, the standard of living of the citizenry, the health of the Nation, and the capacity of the people to defend their country are all inextricably related to the educational opportunity they have enjoyed.

Yet it has been pointed out that 4.3 percent of the income of the 10 States with the highest illiteracy is spent for education, and that 4.9 percent of the income of the 10 States with the lowest illiteracy is spent for education. So the situation is not that the States with the highest illiteracy are trying to do less, it is not that they are less willing. Mr. President, it is not that their desire or their appreciation is less. It is because they are less capable of educating their children than are the other States more favored by income and wealth.

So, Mr. President, the pending bill is aimed at the equalization of the economic abilities of the several States to give educational opportunity to their children alike.

As has been so well said, the children of the States are the children of the Nation, they are the only security for the Nation's defense and welfare, they are the only hope for the Nation's future and progress, and the Federal Government can do no less than recognize its proportionate part of the obligation to see to it that at least all States have a comparable ability to educate their children.

Mr. President, I am one of those, and I know other Senators have the same sentiment, who hope that one day we may come to the happy period in this great Nation when, by adequate educational opportunity and advantage given to our boys and girls, each of them may grow to that excellence of manhood or womanhood which will make it possible for all men and women everywhere to recognize that they possess that distinction of education which was described by Mr. Huxley, when he said:

> I consider that man to have had a liberal education whose body has been so trained in his youth that it does with ease and pleasure the work that as a mechanism it is capable of; one whose intellect is a clear, cold logic engine with all of its parts of equal strength and in smooth running order, ready, like the steam engine, to be turned to any kind of work, to spin the gossamers as well as to forge the anchors of the mind; one whose mind is stored with the knowledge of the vast and the fundamental laws of nature and the laws of her operation; one who, no stunted aesthetic, is full of life and fire, but whose passions are trained to come to heel by a vigorous will, the servant of a tender conscience; one who has learned to love all beauty, whether of nature or of art; to hate all selfishness, to put away all vileness, and to respect others as himself.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in which I have been interested in a number of instances, and ask that it be read. In connection with this particular bill I am joined by the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Without objection, the amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following: *"Provided,* That there shall be no discrimination in the administration of the benefits and appropriations made under the respective provisions of this act on account of race, creed, or color."

INVESTIGATION OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS BY WIRE AND RADIO

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 187.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 187) was read as follows:

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate or a subcommittee thereof appointed by the chairman be, and it hereby is, authorized and directed to make a thorough study and investigation of international communications by wire and radio, and in particular of such communications from and to the United States; to receive and hear evidence as to (1) the ownership, control, the services rendered, the rates charged therefor, and the methods of operation of United States carriers engaged in such communications; (2) the extent and nature of the control and influence, direct or indirect, of foreign governments over communication carriers authorized by them, the extent to which foreign governments own and operate such foreign communication services, whether such operation by government is direct or otherwise, the character and extent of the competition between foreign companies, whether owned by governments or privately, in communications to and from the United States, and in particular the nature and degree of competition of such foreign companies with American companies in such communication services; (3) the character and adequacy of services furnished by American companies now engaged in international communications to the people and the diplomatic, military, and commercial interests of the United States; (4) the developments and improvements in the art of communication by wire or radio affecting, or which may be expected to affect, such international communications; (5) whether there should be competitive services between American companies in particular areas or circuits in international communications; (6) desirable forms and standards of organization of American communication companies, and in particular whether such companies should be permitted or required to merge or consolidate and the general terms, conditions, and obligations which should be imposed in the event of such permitted or required merger or consolidation; (7) the form and authority of the regulatory body of the United States to be charged with carrying out the policies in international communications declared by the Congress; and (8) generally to consider and to make recommendations to the Congress as to all other matters and things necessary in its judgment in meeting the purposes of the studies herein specifically set forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

REIMBURSEMENT OF NAVAL PERSONNEL FOR PROPERTY LOST IN NAVAL SERVICE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 3223) to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others, in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the bill just laid before the Senate is one of three House bills now on the Vice President's desk, dealing with naval legislation. A bill similar to this, and two other bills similar to the other two House bills, have already passed the Senate and have been sent to the House of Representatives. In the meantime the House passed identical House bills. The language is identical with that contained in the Senate bills, with the exception that the House has added an amendment to this bill, as well as an amendment to each of the other two bills. The amendments are noncontroversial and of minor importance. Therefore it seems to me that I am in a proper position to ask that the House bills be considered and passed.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think I understand the very excellent statement made by the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee. I understand that the amendments have no relationship whatever to the objectives of the bills.

Mr. WALSH. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. With the exception noted, the House bills are identical with the bills which heretofore passed the Senate.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; and for some unknown reason the House passed its own bills, with slight modifications, instead of amending the Senate bills.

Mr. McNARY. An inaccuracy committed in the House is cured, and the bills are precisely as the Senate bills were before they went to the House.

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3223) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF DECEASED OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 3225) to amend the act of May 27, 1908, as amended, authorizing settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Crops, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I make the same explanation with respect to

this bill that I made with respect to House bill 3223, and ask that it be considered and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF NAVAL AVIATION CADET ACT OF 1942

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 3230) to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I make the same explanation with respect to this bill that I made with respect to House bill 3223, and ask that it be considered and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 20, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 19 (legislative day of October 12), 1943:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Robert Kendall McConnaughey, of Ohio, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, vice Edmund Burke, Jr., resigned.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following to be assistant surgeons in the regular corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective date of oath:
Arthur B. Gravatt, Jr.
Martin G. Van der Schouw
Avery B. Wight
Harry F. White, Jr.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be temporary passed assistant surgeons, to rank as such from October 1, 1943:

William H. Errgong — Jack C. Haldeman
William L. Hewitt — Robert H. English
C. Dudley Miller — John J. Davies
John W. O'Donnell

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be temporary surgeons, to rank as such from October 1, 1943:

William J. Brown — Charles F. Blankenship
Wendell A. Preston — James A. Smith

The following-named passed assistant sanitary engineer to be temporary sanitary engineer, to rank as such from October 1, 1943:
Charles C. Spencer

The following-named surgeons to be temporary senior surgeons, to rank as such from October 1, 1943:
Michael J. Pescor
Ralph B. Snavely

The following-named senior surgeons to be temporary medical directors, to rank as such from October 1, 1943:
Edgar W. Norris
Fred T. Foard

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 19 (legislative day of October 12), 1943:

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Edwin B. Morrell, Arlington.
Loie M. Ford, Calipatria.
Felix G. Young, Desert Center.
Norma H. Wilson, Keene.
Margaret O. Quandt, McKittrick.
Genevieve Frahm, Palmdale.
James W. Wilson, Planada.

COLORADO

Winnie Hasty Maclin, Hasty.
Esta M. Fuson, Saguache.

INDIANA

J. Custer Loveless, Clarks Hill.
Mrs. Leland C. Swinford, Clermont.
Ilena M. Loyer, Oolitic.
Edward O. Elrod, Pekin.
Rose K. Hubers, St. Meinrad.
Martin Brink, Wanamaker.
Shirley A. Williams, Westport.
Frank Donaldson, Wheatland.

MAINE

Earl L. Garland, Carmel.
Evangeline L. McKenney, Clinton.

MISSISSIPPI

Eloise G. Stephens, Artesia.
Alice R. Alexander, Lexington.
Iola S. Boswell, Sanatorium.
Effie Abernathy, Shannon.

NEW JERSEY

Francis D. McHugh, Chatham.
Karl D. Alexander, Cliffside Park.
John A. Wheeler, Monmouth Beach.
William J. Ledger, Stockton.

PENNSYLVANIA

George F. Purpur, Danville.
Willard K. Allison, Hickory.
Armena Blumette, Harmarville.
Alice M. Prascsak, Indianola.
Chester M. Fies, Laureldale.
Mary B. Marr, Norristown.
Ethel C. Ufema, Slickville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Edward Gardiner Latch, minister, Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who art the light of all that is true, the strength of all that is good, and the glory of all that is noble, help us to walk in the light of truth, to be strong in the doing of what is good and to believe in the glory of a noble life. Strong have been the influences which have drawn us from Thee, and subtle have been the pressures which have undermined our faith. We have erred and strayed from Thy ways like lost sheep amid the selfishness, the sordidness, and the cynicism of our time. Yet, we are not satisfied apart from Thee. Forgive us not only our sins but the low aims we have cherished. Pardon, we beseech Thee, not only what we have done amiss but what we have failed to do. Grant us again the vision of Thee. "Touch Thou our dust with spirit hand and make us souls that understand."

We lift our hearts in prayer for our Nation, for those in the service of our country, and for all who lead our people in this critical hour. Grant unto us all the assurance of Thy near presence that we may love mercy, do justly, and walk humbly with Thee. We pray in the spirit of Him who humbles us, yet who makes us strong and gives us courage, Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ANNIVERSARY OF SURRENDER OF CORNWALLIS AT YORKTOWN

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BLAND addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address on civil aviation delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a number of editorials from newspapers in various States of the Union dealing with the Chinese Exclusion Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a copy of a letter from the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] to the editor of the Washington Post, together with the agenda of his committee as set up yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ANDERSON of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article entitled "Career in Politics" written by Miss Eve Garrette, appearing in the November issue of the magazine The Woman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by the Honorable William A. Gunter, and further to extend my own remarks and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement from the cattlemen of Nebraska on the shortage of protein feeds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered to the National Food Conference held in Chicago on September 16, 1943, by Mr. Lou Maxon, former Deputy Administrator of the O. P. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Moline Daily Dispatch, another from the Daily Times of Davenport, Iowa, and a third from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AIR TRANSPORT POLICY

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a statement on air transport policy by four Conservative Members of the British Parliament. I also ask that the preface to the statement be included.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HINSHAW addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

MILK

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the shortage of milk in this country is a problem that confronts not only the Congress but the American people. I read yesterday that the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, is selling his dairy herd of 100 milk cows and is going out of the dairy business on his 1,400-acre estate in the State of New York. If all of the dairy farmers of the country follow the example set by Secretary Morgenthau, to go out of the dairy business, it is going to be a bad proposition for the American people. There will not be any milk for them if the other dairy farmers follow his example. I know that most of the dairy farmers are patriotically continuing to milk cows, in spite of the shortage of feed and manpower. I am sorry to see Mr. Morgenthau going out of the dairy business. Of course, I realize that it is not profitable for any farmer to remain in the dairy business, and that may be the reason why Secretary Morgenthau is selling out and quitting milking cows. I wonder.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix in two different particulars; in one to include a brief editorial from the Washington Post, and in the other an article appearing in the New York Times with reference to Under Secretary of State Mr. E. R. Stettinius.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF HOUSE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors may sit today and tomorrow during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. As there is no legislative business today, except one resolution, and general debate tomorrow, without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs be permitted to sit during the session this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Lewis Bromfield.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MILK

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that I join with my able colleague from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] in deploring the fact that my distinguished constituent, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, has been forced to sell out his dairy herd of about 100 head on his farm at East Fishkill in Dutchess County at a time when the production of milk is so badly needed. I assume this is due to the fact that he is not able to get sufficient corn from the Middle Western States to feed them but nevertheless it sets a very bad example. For about 3 months I have been urging on the floor of the House that the Congress should act to take the ceiling price of $1.07 a bushel off corn and let it find its own level. The farmers in the Eastern States, both poultrymen and dairymen, are willing to pay the price if they can only get the corn. They have to have the corn to feed their poultry and dairy cows, and so does even the Secretary of the Treasury. Evidently there is no distinction between his blue-blooded, pedigreed cows and the cows of other farmers. All cows have to have corn to survive, and they are not getting the corn. I hope the Committee on Banking and Currency, or the Committee on Agriculture will do something before November 1 to take the ceiling price off corn if

the O. P. A. refuses to act. I do not blame the corn farmers of Iowa and the Middle Western States for not selling their corn at $1.07 a bushel when they can get $1.35 or more a bushel by feeding it to the hogs and turning it into pork.

The situation due largely to the muddling and the stupidity of the O. P. A. in setting a ceiling price of corn at $1.07 a bushel is becoming more serious every day. The production of milk is falling off rapidly, herds are being sold and an alarming shortage of milk is inevitable this winter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include letters from the commissioners of agriculture of seven Western States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DIRKSEN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

WENDELL WILLKIE

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the other day Mr. Wendell Willkie made a rather curious speech. He said, in effect, that the Republican Party has no chance of success, unless it adopts the foreign policy of President Wilson, and, with a few changes, the domestic policy of President Roosevelt. That leaves only one question it seems to me for the voters and that is "Which party is going to be able better to carry out these programs, the party which initiated them, or the party which copied them?" But there was one statement in his speech with which I think we should take issue. He refers to the Smith-Harness bill as a southern democratic bill, thereby reading the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], out of the Republican Party. I made a tabulation of the vote to override the President's veto of this bill and these are the results. Of 183 Democrats who voted, 67 voted to sustain the President, or 37 percent, and of the 165 Republicans who voted, 37 voted to sustain the President, or 22 percent. I think those figures are interesting.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] should not get excited over Wendell Willkie or anything he says or does. We can tolerate Mr. Willkie's attacks on us southern Democrats, since he is our secret weapon with which we are now breaking up Republican formations behind the lines.

A few nights ago we turned the big bazooka loose in the Republican china shop in St. Louis; and did he produce results?

He is said to be having himself heralded as a second Abraham Lincoln.

He reminds me of a fellow who came here once who thought he favored Henry Clay. He went and got an old Negro barber down in the old St. James Hotel, who used to shave Henry Clay, to give him a shave. He said to him, "Uncle, do you recognize any resemblance between me and Henry Clay?" He said, "Yassah, boss, I sho duz. Your breaf smells just like Mr. Clay's did."

Wendell Willkie's breath does not even smell like Mr. Lincoln's, because Abraham Lincoln never kissed a barmaid in his life.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

BLANCHE H. KARSCH, ADMINISTRATRIX

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar, S. 514, for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix, estate of Kate S. Hamilton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Blanche H. Karsch, of Memphis, Tenn., as administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton, the sum of $7,025.60, together with interest on such sum at the rate of 6 percent per annum from December 1, 1931, until the date of payment by the Secretary under the provisions of this act in full satisfaction of the claim of such estate against the United States for refund of the taxes erroneously paid upon a portion of such estate which was not subject to tax.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 9, strike out "December 1, 1931", and insert "November 23, 1939."

Page 2, line 2, after the word "tax", insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. G. CORNELL CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 694, for the relief of the W. G. Cornell Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the W. G. Cornell Co., of Washington, D. C., the sum of $840.65, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for the amount of the manufacturer's excise tax included in the cost of certain gas ranges purchased by the said company for installation in the Highland Defense Dwellings project of the Alley Dwelling Authority for the District of Columbia, a refund of such excise tax having been denied on the ground that such stoves were not sold directly to the United States by the manufacturer thereof: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. P. WOOLSEY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 841, for the relief of J. P. Woolsey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. P. Woolsey, of Madison, Wis., the sum of $500 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for property damage and personal injuries sustained by him as the result of a collision between his automobile and a United States Army motor vehicle on May 22, 1941, at Lake Deton, Wis.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT GRIFFIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 302, for the relief of Robert Griffin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Robert Griffin, Milton, Fla., the sum of $1,616.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by the said Robert Griffin on February 16, 1942, when a United States Navy vehicle backed into his automobile, which was parked on Highway No. 544, just outside the entrance to Saufley Field, near Pensacola, Fla., and pinned the said Robert Griffin between the two vehicles.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word injuries insert "medical and hospital expenses incident thereto."

Page 2, line 3, after the word vehicles, add the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAN CROTTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1311, for the relief of Dan Crotts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dan Crotts, of near Alma, Crawford County, Ark., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of his son, Paul Crotts, who died from the result of injuries sustained when struck by a truck owned and operated by the National Youth Administration, which striking occurred on September 26, 1941, on United States Highway No. 64, near the Vine Prairie School, approximately 2 miles west of Mulberry, Crawford County, Ark., and which said death was caused by the negligent operation of the driver of the truck above-mentioned in that said driver at the time of the injuries aforesaid was driving said truck without keeping a proper lookout and at a high, dangerous, and unlawful rate of speed, and on that part of the highway, which was then and there legally posted as a school zone: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. J. D. PRICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1640, for the relief of Mrs. J. D. Price.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. J. D. Price, of Lorman, Miss., the sum of $659.50, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and expenses incident thereto as a result of a collision between the car in which she was riding and a United States Army truck near Vicksburg, Miss., on June 27, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RONALD A. COX

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1933, for the relief of Ronald A. Cox.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ronald A. Cox, Emmett, Idaho, the sum of $3,955. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Ronald A. Cox against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by him on January 28, 1942, when the motorcycle on which he was riding was in collision with a United States Army truck on the Kalanianaole Highway, Island of Oahu, T. H.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, after the word Hawaii, insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES T. ROGERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3001, for the relief of James T. Rogers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James T. Rogers, of Birmingham, Ala., the sum of $300, the amount appropriated by Private Act No. 452, Seventy-fifth Congress, to G. D. Thornhill, and the further sum of $79.33, in full settlement of all claims against the United States in consideration of James T. Rogers having paid the judgment in the sum of $300 obtained against him by G. D. Thornhill in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama, and court costs in such proceeding in the sum of $79.33: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. C. MUNN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 425, authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of J. C. Munn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of J. C. Munn for the amount of the obligations incurred by him as guardian of William Taylor Hicks, on the recommendation of a representative of the Veterans' Administration, in providing medical and nursing services, food, household furniture, and other necessities for his said ward, and to allow in full and final settlement of said claim a sum not to exceed $171.75. There is hereby appropriated the sum of $171.75, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the claim: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WESTERN MARYLAND DAIRY, INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 560, for the relief of Western Maryland Dairy, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Western Maryland Dairy, Inc., of Baltimore, Md., the sum of $3,082.63, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for compensation for loss and damage to personal property resulting from a collision which occurred when a truck and tank trailer belonging to such company was struck by a United States Army truck at the intersection of routes 26 and 27 in Taylorsville, Md., on December 5, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and

passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

M. C. ROBERTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2600, for the relief of M. C. Roberts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to M. C. Roberts, of Tulsa, Okla., the sum of $1,784.90, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for medical and hospital expenses paid by M. C. Roberts on account of personal injuries sustained by his son, Pvt. Robert G. Roberts, United States Army, when the automobile in which he was riding was involved in a collision, in line of duty, near Sapulpa, Okla., on November 30, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUBEN M. HERREN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2627, for the relief of Ruben M. Herren.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. BUFFETT objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MRS. E. B. NEVILLE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2730, for the relief of Mrs. E. B. Neville.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. E. B. Neville, the sum of $1,485, as the amount to which she is entitled as the dependent mother of the late Second Lt. Gene P. Neville, United States Army Air Force, killed in action over France on September 28, 1942, same being equal to 6 months' gratuity pay of Lieutenant Neville: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALTER R. JONES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2905, for the relief of Walter R. Jones.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Walter R. Jones, Denver, Colo., the sum of $5,548.85. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Walter R. Jones against the United States arising out of the death of his wife, Hazel Belle Jones, as the result of a collision when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a United States Army truck at the intersection of Iliff Avenue and Colorado Boulevard, Denver, Colo., on July 23, 1941.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out the figures "$5,548.85", and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000; to pay the sum of $615.50 to Mrs. Norma S. McKinney, Littleton, Colo., and to pay the sum of $584.50 to Mrs. Ella Swenson, Denver, Colo."

Line 7, strike out "of the said Walter R. Jones."

Line 8, after the words "death of", strike out "his" and insert in lieu thereof "Walter R. Jones'."

Line 9, after the names "Belle Jones", insert ", and for personal injuries and expenses for Mrs. Norma S. McKinney and Mrs. Ella Swenson."

Line 10, strike out "she was" and insert in lieu thereof "they were."

At the end of bill strike out the period and insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Walter R. Jones, Mrs. Norma S. McKinney, and Mrs. Ella Swenson."

MRS. CECILIA MARTIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3076, for the relief of Mrs. Cecilia Martin, mother of Arthur J. Martin, Jr., a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Cecilia Martin, mother of Arthur J. Martin, Jr., a minor, of 671 East Broadway, South Boston, Mass., the sum of $3,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses sustained when Arthur J. Martin, Jr., a minor, was struck by a United States Navy truck on East Broadway, South Boston, Mass., on May 29, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated by this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Mrs. Cecilia Martin, mother" and insert in lieu thereof "the legal guardian."

Page 1, line 7, after the "$", insert "3,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Arthur J. Martin, Jr., a minor."

HENRY WHITE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2707, for the relief of Henry White.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission into the United States for permanent residence of Henry White as of August 25, 1942, the date on which he arrived in the United States, provided he is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws other than those relating to inadmissibility because of racial ineligibility.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 8 of page 1 substitute a period for the comma after the word "States" and strike out all of the remaining language in line 8, line 9, and line 10.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KERNAN R. CUNNINGHAM

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 547, for the relief of Kernan R. Cunningham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Kernan R. Cunningham, of Davenport, Iowa, the sum of $631.63, in full settlement of all claims against the United States as compensation for the loss of or damage to personal effects destroyed by fire on November 28, 1941, while en route from Plainview, Minn., to Moville, Iowa, on a United States Army truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "while" strike out the remainder of lines 9 and 10, and the word "truck" in line 11, and insert in lieu thereof "being transported incident to his change of station, when en route from Plain-

view, Minn., to Moville, Iowa, on a United States Civilian Conservation Corps truck."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK A. McMENAMIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2384, for the relief of Frank A. McMenamin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank A. McMenamin, the sum of $692.60, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him on November 28, 1941, at Portland, Oreg., when the car in which he was traveling was struck by a United States Army truck.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out the figures "$692.60", insert in lieu thereof the figures "$500."

At the end of bill, strike out the period, insert in lieu thereof ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLEO PICKRELL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3064, for the relief of Cleo Pickrell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $7,995.75, to Cleo Pickrell, of Tipton, Okla., in full satisfaction of his claim against the Commodity Credit Corporation for indemnity for the loss of 104 bales of cotton by fire on December 24, 1942, the insurance on which was canceled by Cleo Pickrell shortly before the fire upon the erroneous advice given him by an inspector for the Corporation that the cotton was protected against fire loss by the Government: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$7,995.75" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,670.75."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute for the House bill an identical Senate bill, S. 1293, for the relief of Cleo Pickrell, and to vacate the proceedings by which the House bill was passed.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $7,670.75, to Cleo Pickrell, of Tipton, Okla., in full satisfaction of his claim against the Commodity Credit Corporation for indemnity for the loss of cotton by fire on December 24, 1942, the insurance on which was canceled by Cleo Pickrell shortly before the fire upon the erroneous advice given him by an inspector for the Corporation that the cotton was protected against fire loss by the Government: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed. A motion to reconsider and a similar House bill were laid on the table.

DR. H. H. SMITH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3098, for the relief of Dr. H H. Smith.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $343 to Dr. H. H. Smith, of Fort Smith, Ark., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for medical services rendered the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army by the said Dr. H. H. Smith under contract No. W-643-eng-2663, dated April 11, 1942, the said Dr. H. H. Smith having fully performed all the obligations imposed upon him by said contract and payment of the above amount having been approved by the Corps of Engineers, but disallowed by the General Accounting Office: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, and it shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, either directly or indirectly, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the money hereby appropriated in excess of 10 percent thereof for or on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS LEWIS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3189, for the relief of Thomas Lewis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Thomas Lewis, of route 1, Martinsville, Va., the sum of $1,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injury sustained by him on October 16, 1941, when he was struck in the right eye by a piece of rock while on a work detail as an inmate of the Federal prison camp at Mill Point, W. Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VICTOR H. LOFTUS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3299, for the relief of Victor H. Loftus, disbursing clerk, American Embassy, Mexico, D. F., Mexico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Victor H. Loftus, disbursing clerk, American Embassy, Mexico, D. F., Mexico, the sum of $229.50, public funds for which he is accountable and which were paid to the Banco de Tampico (Tampico, Mexico) for purchase of a bill of exchange, the Banco de Tampico having been closed by the Mexican Banking Commission before the bill of exchange could be presented for payment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COL. CHARLES H. MORHOUSE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3329, for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles H. Morhouse.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of Lt. Col. Charles H. Morhouse, Medical Corps, United States Army, for reimbursement of the value of his personally owned automobile which was expropriated by Army authorities on January 14, 1942, at Bataan, Philippine Islands, for use by the United States Army, and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim not to exceed $350. There is hereby appropriated the sum of $350, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the claim: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Lieutenant", insert the word "Colonel."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

R. B. WALKER FUNERAL HOME

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3330, for the relief of R. B. Walker Funeral Home.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an identical Senate bill (S. 1346) for the relief of R. B. Walker Funeral Home be substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the R. B. Walker Funeral Home, Greenfield, Ohio, the sum of $200 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for funeral services rendered in connection with the burial of the remains of Artie William Benson, apprentice seaman, United States Naval Reserve: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider and a similar House bill were laid on the table.

HARRY L. SMITH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3331, for the relief of Harry L. Smith.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of Harry L. Smith, of Manteo, N. C., for $236.06, as the amount of damages to his automobile caused by transporting a wounded soldier to a hospital in Elizabeth City, N. C., on February 2, 1942, at the request of a lieutenant in the United States Army and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim not to exceed $236.06. There is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $236.06, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the claim.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPENCER MEEKS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3332, for the relief of Spencer Meeks.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Spencer Meeks, the sum of $3,475, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for damages for permanent injuries sustained on May 9, 1941, when he was struck by a bullet fired from the pistol range of the Savannah, Ga., Air Base of the United States Army Air Force while the said Meeks was performing his duties, as an employee of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co., in a building situated beyond the boundaries of the Savannah Air Base: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the call of the bills on the Private Calendar.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 307, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct an investigation and study of such matters related to present and probable future conditions and developments in and affecting air navigation and domestic and foreign air commerce as it may deem advisable.

The committee, as a whole or by subcommittee, shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations for legislation as it may deem advisable.

The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to conduct such investigation and study at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, as it deems necessary; except that in conducting such investigation and study outside the United States or at any place in the United States away from the seat of government such committee shall act by a subcommittee of not more than 11 members.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], and pending the use of that time by the gentleman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which seeks to authorize a general study of the aviation industry in this country. It may be said that we had a select committee for the study of aviation recently, known as the Nichols committee, but I would like to call the attention of the House, and I raise the question of that committee for that purpose, that it was not a committee to study the aviation industry, such as the committee proposed in this resolution, but rather it was a committee to study air accidents.

This resolution authorizes a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House to make a general study of the whole subject of aviation. I realize that there are some in the House who feel that we have entirely too many committees, and to that subject I want to address myself briefly.

We in the Congress are called upon to enact legislation regarding many complicated and complex questions, many questions of a highly technical nature, and we as laymen are not always sufficiently advised to intelligently legislate upon these subjects. We must make a study of these subjects before we can intelligently legislate upon them, and that is the purpose of this committee.

There was a very interesting article in the past week's issue of the United States News by David Lawrence which suggests that each Member of Congress, both Houses of Congress, should have a staff of experts to advise them upon the many subjects that we are called upon to legislate on. I do not know whether I would be willing to go that far, but I do say that the money invested by this Congress in enabling it to make a study of its own is many, many times justified. That is what is proposed by this resolution.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, one of the watchdogs of the Treasury.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman in his opening remarks said that this is a resolution providing for an investigation affecting air navigation in this country. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact it is not limited to this country by any means, either in the first paragraph

or in the concluding words of the resolution.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman for calling that to my attention. It was purely a slip of the tongue, as it were. The gentleman is correct. It is not confined to an investigation of that industry in this country; however, I may say to the gentleman that I understand from those who sponsor the resolution that it is not their purpose to go into foreign fields at this time. I say again to my distinguished friend that I do not know but what that might be justified before we get through. I am sure they do not intend to go into that field presently.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman knows that we have today over 20 select committees of this House. I think it is a good practice in a matter of this kind, when we are going to authorize an investigation, to let the committee having charge of the legislation make the investigation. There are a lot of committees that come on the floor of the House and tell the House that they are going to be limited in what they will do, but once you get the resolution passed they do not limit themselves. They go all over. It happens that it is up to the committee of which I am chairman to handle the resolutions appropriating the money to carry out the purposes of the resolutions. We are spending more money now by far than was ever spent in the history of Congress for investigations. We have committees that are duplicating work.

Just the other day, the House passed a bill having to do with the disposition of surplus property after the war. Still a few days after, your Committee on Small Business started an investigation of what is to be done with surplus property after the war. The bill is passed and is over in the Senate. It was handled by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. COLMER. Again I want to compliment my distinguished friend. I agree with him that we are spending entirely too much money, but I again call the attention of my friend to the fact that the Congress of the United States, while it authorizes the expenditure of these great sums of money, is not the offender in the spending of this money. What we spend here in the conduct of the Nation's affairs is infinitesimal compared with the good that we accomplish, because we must be advised in the premises before we can legislate intelligently. I am sure that when the sponsors of this resolution appear before my good friend's committee he will see that they do not get too much money, and I hope that they do not.

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say to the gentleman that I am in sympathy with this resolution.

Mr. COLMER. I thought the gentleman was.

Mr. COCHRAN. I realize what commercial aviation is going to mean after this war. Where we have 1 airfield today we are going to have 10 then. The sky will be filled with planes at the conclusion of this war. This is a most important subject. I may say further that the resolution that has been introduced providing for the money to carry on this investigation calls for only $10,000, and I do not believe the chairman of the committee will ask for more at the present time. Mr. BULWINKLE certainly was reasonable in asking for funds at the outset.

Mr. COLMER. I knew the gentleman would agree with me.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I feel obliged to make the observation that it probably may be that my good friend from Missouri thinks that his general committee of investigation ought to do these things.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman will yield, I may say that while I was absent from the House, ill, the Congress created select committees to do the job that was the duty of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. It is my viewpoint that the members of that committee, both majority and minority, including my friend from Massachusetts, slept on their rights, failing to fight the resolutions taking jurisdiction from the Expenditures Committee. Instead of creating select committees they should have gone ahead and done the job the Congress had given them jurisdiction to do. But now about 15 select committees of this House are making the investigations.

Mr. GIFFORD. This enthusiasm is rather recent, is it not?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] to submit a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the president of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Ernest Ingold, and a resolution adopted by its board of directors with reference to closing down gold mines in the State of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes, and ask unanimous consent to address the House out of order for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, as far as I can find out, there is no opposition to this resolution, which empowers the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make investigations of present and future conditions and developments affecting air navigation and domestic and foreign air commerce as it may deem advisable. It is a comprehensive resolution giving the committee very broad power to investigate the aviation industry and matters affecting air navigation both in this country and outside of America. To some extent it takes the place of a separate or permanent committee on aviation, which was proposed in the House and defeated a number of months ago. I agree that it is a wise policy to empower the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, that deals with aviation, to investigate, instead of having a separate small special committee doing additional investigating work. The members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce are competent and experienced, and there is no reason that this policy should not be pursued in this case and in others in the House of Representatives in order to promote efficiency and orderly and constructive investigations and sound legislation.

I have asked for 5 minutes out of order to discuss an important issue that has no connection with the proposed resolution. I introduced today the following House joint resolution authorizing and directing the Stabilization Director to grant an increase of a minimum of 8 cents an hour to all nonoperating and operating railroad employees:

Whereas the President's Emergency Board, after months of hearings, conclusively proved that gross inequalities now exist between railroad wages and wages paid in comparative industries; and

Whereas wages paid to nonoperating employees of the railroads are 25 percent below those in effect in war industries; and

Whereas the President's Emergency Board recommended, in May, 1943, an increase of 8 cents an hour to the 1,000,000 nonoperating railroad employees, reducing existing inequalities and bringing their wages to a level comparative to the increased cost of living; and

Whereas Stabilization Director Fred M. Vinson, in direct opposition to the recommendations of the President's Emergency Board, issued a ruling denying the 8-cent adjustment in wages to the nonoperating railroad employees, and has declined to reverse such ruling; and

Whereas the operating employees have been awarded a token increase of only 4 cents an hour to meet the emergency created by the increase in the cost-of-living which is inadequate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the 8 cents an hour increase in pay to 1,000,000 nonoperating railroad employees, and a comparative percentage of increase to all operating railroad employees, who are contributing loyally and effectively to the war effort by keeping war materials and food supplies rolling to war plants, ports of embarkation, and to consumers at home, is warranted due to the increased cost of living in wartime; and be it further

Resolved, That the Stabilization Director be and he is hereby authorized and directed to grant an increase of a minimum of 8 cents an hour to all nonoperating and operating railroad employees.

Mr. Speaker, a great injustice has been done to millions of nonoperating and operating railroad employees. The Congress of the United States set up through the Railroad Labor Act machinery to settle all matters in controversy, and that was carried out in this case by the railroad employees, who submitted their grievances in a proper and legal way. Finally the President set up an emergency board that again investigated all the facts and recommended an 8 cent an hour increase for all nonoperating railroad employees. That was discarded

by one man, almost in defiance of the Congress, because the Congress set up the Railroad Labor Act and provided machinery for the settlement of disputes. This procedure has been adhered to in every instance. The President's board recommended an increase of 8 cents. However, Mr. Vinson, the Stabilization Director, refused to agree to it.

Therefore, we are faced today with a very crucial situation throughout the United States. There is no more loyal and patriotic group in America than the railroad employees. They have contributed magnificently to the war effort by keeping the wheels rolling so that war supplies, munitions and food could be brought to the ports of embarkation for our soldiers overseas, as well as transporting food for our consuming population.

Now we are threatened with and are possibly on the verge of a Nation-wide strike. There has been no major railroad strike for the past 20 years due to the patience and willingness of the railroad employees to submit their claims to adjudication by tribunals set up under the Railroad Labor Act. Now, because of the gross injustice, which is apparent to everyone who has studied the situation including the Presidential board that recommended an 8-cent increase, we may be facing a strike on American railroads in time of war, a strike that would be legal under the act recently passed by the Congress. The administration should not permit the situation to get out of hand by continuing to ignore in an arbitrary way the just demands of all railway employees for a fair increase in pay. It is a serious matter and one for the Congress to investigate as it comes within the power of the Congress, in view of the fact that the railroad employees acted under a law passed by the Congress and submitted their grievances and claims in a legal manner.

Therefore, I submit that something should be done immediately to adjust these wages and to give this increase of 8 cents that was authorized by the President's Emergency Board set up by the President under the law, so that we shall not even be threatened with any possibility of a strike by the railroad employees who have been acting in good faith and are entitled to a square deal and to fair treatment by payment of adequate wages to both operating and nonoperating railroad employees.

During the last 20 years other industries have had serious strikes, including disorders and violence. On the other hand the Railroad Brotherhoods have stood firm for the settlement of all disputes in a legal way by impartial tribunals under the Railroad Labor Act. The Railroad Brotherhoods have set a fine example for many years by settling their claims by arbitration and through cooling-off processes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute more. I submit that there is no more loyal, patriotic, faithful, or more devoted group in helping to win the war than these American railroad employees. Their sons by the hundreds of thousands are in the armed forces of the United States today fighting on every battlefield, on land, on the sea, and in the air, but they, too, are entitled to justice here at home; they are entitled to fair treatment and to an increase of 8 cents an hour, which at that is not equal to the increase in other war or comparable industries. The increase of 4 cents an hour to operating railway employees is a mere token and more in the nature of an insult than a proper, fair, and adequate increase to meet the higher cost of living in time of war.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE. I compliment the distinguished gentleman from New York upon his deserved eulogy of the members of the Railroad Brotherhood.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman knows that every Member of the House, Republican and Democrat alike, knows that the operating and nonoperating railroad employees are 100-percent American and completely loyal and doing a splendid war job day and night and that a great injustice has been done to them and we hope and insist that before any threat or strike develops the matter will be settled on a fair and adequate basis, and that is all that the railroad employees are asking.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

INVESTIGATION TO ESTABLISH OUR FOREIGN AIR NAVIGATION AND WAR-PLANE PRODUCTION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this resolution, but I regret exceedingly that it does not go further, that it has not been made broader, and greater powers given to the committee, because, as I understand it, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] will be the chairman of the subcommittee which will make the investigation, and there is no more capable or sincere Member of this House than the gentleman from North Carolina. Many Members here were present when the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS], chairman of a special aviation investigating committee, made his report upon its investigation, and I know that most Members came to the conclusion that something should be done to safeguard the air interests of our country, against encroachment by those of other countries. I know that other countries are working sedulously to develop and obtain control of air navigation in foreign lands. It is of the utmost importance that we should not lose this opportunity ourselves, as we have heretofore.

Germany is working today through its I. G. Farben cartel to gain nearly complete control of South American aviation, as well as that of other countries of the world. Great Britain, too, some years ago, laid plans for world-wide air transportation, and we should no longer delay in formulating plans and establishing a policy that will place us in the forefront in world air navigation.

There are other reasons why this resolution should be made very broad. Of course, we have the splendid Military and Naval Committees, but they have not been furnished with the necessary staff personnel or sufficient money to go into extended investigations of the excessive costs and other important and newly developed phases of the subject of world air navigation, construction, and operation.

I think it is an outrage and a shame that we have had so many crashes and terrible accidents. Many of them appear to have been due to faulty plans and defective construction, amounting in some instances to nothing short of recklessness, costing the lives of many.

I am somewhat familiar with the methods of operation of some of the companies now being investigated, having had experience with them during the last war when the construction of planes was delayed until after the Liberty motor had been manufactured and ready to be installed. There was a delay of 9 months. The same group today again is operating in a manner that I think warrants careful scrutiny and thorough investigation. I think this investigation to be conducted by the subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] will accomplish much good. We should not permit Germany, which is now developing through the form of cartels and penetrating into every nook and corner of the globe, to grab the air commerce of the world. Certainly we must not lose our own opportunities. We have expended billions of dollars and lost thousands of lives, and for what? For freedom and liberty, yes; but it is our duty to preserve and protect our air commerce for the future.

I am in favor of the resolution, but, as I say, I only regret that it does not go further. I hope, after the ground work for this investigation and study is laid, the gentleman will come to the House and ask for greater powers to enable his committee to penetrate and investigate not only the expansion but the operation of all air lines. In fact, it should have jurisdiction and power to investigate faulty and defective constructions and the unjustifiable prices that have been exacted in the building of planes for the armed forces. I am aware that some of the largest corporations engaged in the manufacture of planes, after expending millions upon millions of Government money, have not produced the needed bombers and other types of planes in accordance with the production schedules set up when the Government agreed to advance the necessary funds. Not because they did not have the materials, as in the case of the Ford plant at Willow Run, Mich., where thousands and thousands of tons of material were on hand. And in this instance the materials were obtained by depriving other manufacturers of war items of needed materials and thereby delaying their production. I know that the gentleman from North Carolina,

Major BULWINKLE, has the courage to make an investigation of that situation as well as any other where similar conditions have been found.

Mr. Speaker, some of the Members now charge excessive expenditures and are clamoring for economy. I feel that if this committee has the power it will force renegotiations of the airplane contracts that will bring to the Government the return of thousands of dollars for every dollar it will expend.

It will be remembered that 3 or 4 months ago I delivered several speeches on the floor of the House, the last being on June 30, 1943, when I pointed out that the Army and Navy were reckless in their expenditures, spending millions and millions of dollars unnecessarily. I think that if such a committee as is now contemplated had then been in existence, many of these things could have been avoided. I only regret that the Military and Naval Affairs Committees did not obtain sufficient money, sufficient help, sufficient personnel to carry on the investigation in as fearless a manner as was originally contemplated and was expected would be made. The Truman committee is doing a good job and is greatly taxed in proceeding with investigations of other important war work and it cannot be expected to penetrate the wrongdoings of all the airplane manufacturers. Nevertheless, it is not to late now. I believe that we can still safeguard our interests and course for the future and bring about some economies, and more efficient business methods to displace the haphazard and reckless methods now in practice.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House during the last war I observed the carrying out of the war effort in its various production phases and it is by reason of the knowledge and experience I gained then that I have taken the floor during the past 2 years to direct attention to instances of reckless expenditures and ill-considered administration of War and Navy Department policies and plans.

I well recall in 1917 the meaningless efforts of a Colonel Deeds and a coterie of manufacturers who were collaborating in airplane production and the conditions were such that I was constrained to call them to the attention of the Secretary of War, Mr. Newton D. Baker, and the President.

Of course, after the war there were some prosecutions. What I believe should be done now, Mr. Speaker, is to stop certain practices that have resulted not only in reckless expenditures but in retarding production. We should go further and recoup as much money for the Treasury as possible.

Not that I do not favor criminal prosecution, if the evidence justifies it, of those who have conspired to rob the Government, but appropriate punishment should be meted out to those responsible for faulty or defective construction of planes that has resulted in the loss of the lives of our airmen, saying nothing as to the cost of the planes that have crashed.

Mr. Speaker, I also feel that the aviation subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should also thoroughly penetrate the matter of the selection of airfield sites, the contracts for the construction of airplane manufacturing plants, and the expansion of established plants, as well as the contracts covering all plane requirements.

Yes; it might also be well to ascertain to what use the expensive blimps have been put to. Over 2 years ago I urged consideration for an appropriation of $25,000 to complete a flying model of a helicopter that experts declared was practical, but neither the War nor the Navy Departments gave consideration, and, on the other hand, millions upon millions have been spent for experimentation and for the construction of blimps.

Only a few days ago I read that finally a helicopter had been perfected at great cost to the Government. I feel that if consideration had been given 2 years ago to this type of aircraft we would have been in the course of manufacturing helicopters long ago which would have meant the saving of many lives.

Mr. Speaker, I have the utmost confidence that the subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will do its full duty in vigorously and impartially delving into the ramifications that have retarded airplane production by some of the companies and that it will quickly investigate and propose suitable legislation with respect to establishing and safeguarding our foreign air navigation interests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may sit during the session of the House tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIKES). Is there objection?

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in connection with the understanding reached yesterday between the majority leader and the minority leader, may I ask the gentleman from Kentucky if it is now definite that the so-called fathers bill will not be called up in the House before Tuesday of next week and possibly not until Wednesday?

Mr. MAY. In answer to that I will say that if it does go over until next week, which it now must do, I would prefer that it came up on Wednesday instead of Tuesday, if possible. However, if it is not agreeable for everybody to have it come up at that time I will be willing to have it taken up on Tuesday. I am not contentious about it at all. The meeting tomorrow will be rather brief. It will be an executive session to try to get the bill out, relating to the drafting of men with children.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I think we should not delay that fathers bill any more. I think we should get it in here as fast as we possibly can. Our committee is meeting tomorrow afternoon. In view of that, we will probably arrive at some conclusion and approve the bill tomorrow. I do not see any reason why we cannot bring it up just as quickly as possible. The fathers are all upset. They do not know whether they are on foot or on horseback.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman understands I am one of the original friends of the fathers. We will get that bill out tomorrow sometime.

Mr. FISH. Could not the gentleman bring it up on Tuesday instead of Wednesday?

Mr. MAY. Well, we could. I said I would not be contentious about it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. FISH. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] saw fit to introduce a resolution to compel Fred Vinson, Director of Economic Stabilization, to live up to the orders of the special board appointed by the President and to allow the increase of 8 cents per hour to these railroad employees.

In the first place, to allow an increase of only 8 cents an hour was an insult. The increase should have been at least 22 cents an hour as the railroad employees asked. Their request was reasonable in the face of the fact that the cost of living has been soaring upward. If I had been a railroad employee I would have preferred that the special board appointed by the President in place of recommending an increase of only 8 cents per hour had recommended no increase at all.

No employees in any other branch of our industries have been paid less for actual services performed than the railroad employees. No employees have done more for the war effort than they. Yet for some strange reason one individual seems to defy not only the machinery set up by Congress but the decision of the special board appointed by the President.

Mr. Vinson substitutes himself as the all-wise one to delay what Congress intended should be done. He apparently thinks he is bigger than Congress and the Government itself. Of course, he is sadly mistaken. He has become so filled up with his own importance that he had the nerve to offer a compromise of 4 cents an hour. That is adding injury to insult. No man with common sense, not drunk with bureaucratic power, would be foolish enough to expect the railroad employees to accept any such offer.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Some of the railroad men have blamed Congress for their situation. In this respect I wish the gentleman would make it clear that Congress has nothing to do with it; that it is in the hands of the administration and the boards created by the President under the law.

Mr. LEMKE. It is true, it is in the hands of the boards created by law. Those boards have acted, and one individual, Mr. Vinson, is defying the board and the Government itself. The time has come for prompt action at the hands of Congress, to find out if that individual pretends to be a little czar. If he does we are going to bring him down to where he belongs.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact that he is solely responsible to the President and no other official?

Mr. LEMKE. I assume he is, but the President has a lot of things to attend to and I presume he does not even know now that Vinson exists. I will go further and say that the railroad employees and the people generally have a right to demand that their Government and every person in a responsible position, be as fair with them as they expect us to be with it. I repeat that the time has come for action. Congress must not permit this outrage toward the railroad employees to continue. There is neither reason nor sense to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] 5 minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. I have today introduced a House resolution requiring the employment of an examining staff to assist the Appropriations Committee. I will read the resolution at this time:

Resolved, That in order to meet the growing demand and the urgent necessity for greater economy and efficiency in the appropriation and expenditure of public funds, each duly authorized subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations (except the subcommittee on appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary) is authorized and directed to employ such examiners and other personnel as the Committee on Appropriations, acting as a whole, shall deem necessary to enable each such subcommittee to obtain adequate information for the efficient performance of its functions. Such examiners and other employees shall perform their duties under the immediate supervision of the clerk or assistant clerk of the Committee on Appropriations assigned as clerk to such subcommittee. The examiners shall be persons trained and qualified in, and having adequate knowledge of, the organization and financial operations of the executive branch of the Government, and shall, in particular, have knowledge of the way and manner in which appropriations of public funds are estimated and made.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of each subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations to utilize the examiners and other personnel attached to such subcommittee in the examination and analysis of the records, books, papers, documents, and memoranda (including all data with respect to appropriations already made and appropriations requested) of each executive department or independent establishment (including a corporation with the majority of the stock of which is owned by the United States) which is within the jurisdiction of such subcommittee. The subcommittee on deficiencies in appropriations may, with the consent of any other subcommittee, utilize the examiners and personnel of such subcommittee.

SEC. 3. The examiners attached to each subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations shall make reports of their examinations and analyses to the clerk of such subcommittee. Such reports shall be supported with such documents and proofs as the examiners shall deem adequate and proper or as the subcommittee shall require, and shall be submitted to such subcommittee by the clerk thereof on the first Tuesday of each month, and at such other times as the subcommittee may deem necessary.

Mr. Speaker, other Members of the Appropriations Committee and of Congress, as well as myself, have long advocated such reform, and with such examining staffs we can save the taxpayers many millions and possibly billions of dollars. Recent disclosures emphasize the urgent need of such a staff for each subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. Any business house of any size has examiners and certainly such expert examiners should be available for the committee members who are responsible for the spending of the largest business in the world.

I plead for quick action and adoption of my resolution, and I hope I can get it because it may well obviate the need for additional taxes, and I hope I can have the support of every Member of Congress in this endeavor to organize for an efficient procedure to stop waste and unnecessary spending of Government funds, in which every American taxpayer is so vitally interested.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the entire statement of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], but I heard the end of it, and I think I know what he is advocating.

We heard another speech today to the effect that we should have investigating committees to advise the House as to the expenditures of money.

When the Budget and Accounting Act was passed in 1921, specific provisions were included in that act for the Director of the Budget to have an investigative force to check up on every agency to determine whether or not their requests for funds were beyond that which they could get along with; also, in the Budget and Accounting Act, setting up the Office of the Comptroller General and the Accounting Office specific provisions were made for the Comptroller General to make investigations for the Congress. The Comptroller General is the one official of this Government who is the representative of the Congress. He is appointed by the President for 15 years. He cannot be reappointed. But he is not answerable to the President. He is answerable to the Congress of the United States.

A short while back I appeared before the leading members of the Appropriations Committee, most of them members of the deficiency committee, and at that time I had with me the Comptroller General, Mr. Warren, and his two first assistants, and others and we discussed the advisability of giving Mr. Warren funds to carry out investigations of the Congress and to report to the Congress only in reference to expenditures where there was waste or extravagance or where money was not being spent for purposes other than specified.

Frankly, I felt that I had sold that idea to the committee. I left the room thinking it would be carried in the next deficiency appropriation act, but to my surprise what came in? An appropriation for the Appropriations Committee to have investigators; $100,000 was provided for, Mr. Warren received nothing.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. In just a moment. You have the money for the Appropriations Committee to make the investigations, but the proper place in my opinion is in the General Accounting Office under the supervision of the Comptroller General. Three or four years ago we appropriated about $250,000 and have yearly ever since to provide the Budget officer with an investigation agency, but the Budget Director never gives Congress the information.

Mr. Warren has never received any money for such a setup. If we will give him the money he will make the investigations and he will provide the Congress with information that will enable us to save a tremendous sum. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee are the ones who hear all the testimony from the officials in all Government establishments who come before the committee to get appropriations.

Mr. COCHRAN. Absolutely.

Mr. JENSEN. We sit for weeks and weeks and finally we bring out an appropriation bill, which first goes to the full Committee on Appropriations for its approval and then it comes to the floor for passage. Then we forget it for a whole year. We have little or no contact, knowledge, or supervision over the expenditure of that money from then on. And, when these agencies run out of money they go before the deficiency subcommittee and get more money, generally speaking, and I am not condemning the deficiency subcommittee because they are also in the dark. This resolution sets up an examining staff for them also.

There is just no way we can have contact with the spending agencies except by having an examining staff directly responsible to and under the supervision of each subcommittee, such staff to be composed of from one to several experts who would be able to lay the facts before us every 30 days or oftener. If we do not now set up such staffs we will just continue to go along from year to year appropriating far greater sums than are needed in many, many cases.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Of course, the gentleman from Missouri is aware of the fact that at this particular time the whole ques-

tion of expenditures of the War, Navy, Maritime Commission, and all of the other executive departments of the Government is an issue in the hearings before the House Military Affairs Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Missouri 2 minutes.

Mr. MAY. The War Department is taking definite steps to see that in the future the Comptroller General can act. He tells us that he does not even have the money to carry on the investigation.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, if he gives the War Department the power wanted it will be a grave mistake. Give Mr. Warren what he wants. The final audit should come before the final settlement if we are to recover money that was illegally spent.

Now I will say in reply to the gentleman from Iowa who said they should have a chance to get that information by having an investigating committee for the subcommittee——

Mr. JENSEN. I would call it an examining or fact-finding committee for in reality the purpose is to save dollars.

Mr. COCHRAN. Well, an investigating committee or an examining committee, Mr. Warren and his office can set up an investigation division for this very purpose, namely, to serve you. Remember only the Congress will get this information for as I said he is a representative under the law of the Congress.

Mr. JENSEN. If he could give us the facts and figures it would be fine but I am convinced that it will never be done that way.

Mr. COCHRAN. I think you will get better results through Mr. Warren. No authorization is needed as far as Mr. Warren is concerned; it is included in the Budget and Accounting Act and has been since 1921.

Mr. JENSEN. I am willing that Mr. Warren exercise his authority in the act for he is an honest, able gentleman.

Mr. COCHRAN. What good is that if he is not given the money to do so?

Mr. JENSEN. I am willing to give him the money to carry on his lawful duties; it will tie in perfectly with my proposed examining staffs.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then go before the independent offices subcommittee and advocate that when the committee has its hearings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, it pleased me immensely to hear the gentleman from Missouri, my colleague on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, rise and call for an investigation of all these expenditures. I am sure he applauded the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'LEARY], when he indicated to the membership of his committee that at long last the committee would have something to do.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'LEARY] now, because he, as well as all majority and minority members, slept on their rights by not opposing the creation of about 17 select committees of this House that are doing the work that the gentleman from New York wants to do. Why duplicate it? If the investigations were not going on I would favor the suggestion.

Mr. BENDER. As far as select committees of the House are concerned, I do not know the committees to which the gentleman refers, but certainly this committee, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, was created for the purpose, the specific purpose, of investigating expenditures in the executive departments. You remember, those of you who are older Members, that some years ago three or four committees of the House were merged into this one. This committee was established, but it was loaded with administration advocates and every investigation proposed was tabled.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. I have been a member of the committee ever since it was organized; was its chairman for almost 10 years. It was organized when the Republican Party was in power. What is the gentleman talking about? When was it loaded?

Mr. BENDER. I understand about its organization, but I have been a member of it in recent years, and while the gentleman from Missouri was chairman it was never loaded better. The gentleman has always batted 100 percent for the New Deal.

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes, the gentleman has been an active member, always on hand. The Republican Party might have loaded it with antiadministration favorites, but when I was chairman I never dictated the majority members nor was I ever asked for suggestions.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman from Missouri was always the best engineer the New Deal steam roller ever had. Whatever may be said about the Republican Party in former days, most certainly in recent years that cannot be charged against it, because the Republican Party has not been in control of the House since 1930. Furthermore, expenditures had not reached the sky. Expenditures have risen to such heights that they are way beyond our vision and understanding. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'LEARY] deserves to be commended for establishing these subcommittees to check into the various departments of the Government. It is high time that the committee be used for that purpose. We have a good committee, and I am sure the gentleman from Missouri will reconsider his opposition to this proposal. I was afraid that possibly the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'LEARY] was acting without consulting somebody at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. I hope that they do not use the steam roller on him.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. In view of what the gentleman has said, he has admitted that the Committee on Expenditures has been inactive and has not accomplished the purpose for which it was instituted and organized. Did the gentleman hear my resolution?

Mr. BENDER. I heard the resolution of the gentleman, and I commend it. I think all of these investigations are good. Here is a regular committee of the Congress that was established for this specific purpose and we are not fulfilling that purpose because the committee is loaded with administration supporters who refuse to use their power to do a job that needs to be done. We do not need any special committee to carry on this work. We have the regular committees of the House. Whenever there is a special committee like the Tolan committee established and some administration spokesman disagrees with its conclusions, it is killed. Who told the Rules Committee to pigeonhole the Tolan committee? What has the gentleman from California, JOHN TOLAN, done to warrant such treatment? The Tolan committee needs no defense nor does the gentleman from California, JOHN TOLAN. The work of the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN] and his committee is one of the outstanding achievements of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

In conclusion, I say again here is a regular committee of the House. Why not use it to do the job that needs to be done? Lindsay Warren yesterday indicated very definitely that such a committee was needed because of wholesale extravagance, the outrageous expenditures that are not helping the war effort. I say it is high time that both sides of this House support the chairman of this committee in his desire to get to the bottom of this whole matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to note that this investigation we are now authorizing implies an investigation of domestic as well as foreign air commerce. In this connection, I hope that the investigating committee under the aegis of the gallant gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] will consider our merchant marine in connection with air transportation. It seems there has always been a disposition to keep the media of transportation separate so that, for example, railroad carriers were precluded from entering into air transportation and steamship companies were proscribed against air transportation, railroads were precluded from bus traffic, and so forth.

Situations are developing daily and will become emphasized after the war which will force us to the conclusion, inevitably, that steamship companies, if

they are to compete successfully with foreign steamship companies, must and should have the right to enter the airplane field.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. I wish to heartily endorse every word that the gentleman says, for when Mr. Kennedy was president or chairman of the merchant marine he made such a recommendation. The Committee on the Merchant Marine went into that and reported a bill that would have provided aviation in connection with ships. There was some pressure somewhere about the time of the formation of this Aviation Board that stymied that bill in the Rules Committee. We had to take out that provision in order to get through other very necessary purposes that could only be accomplished in that way. I do not think there is a gentleman on the Rules Committee today who was responsible for that.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman. We must make a distinction between foreign and domestic commerce. It may be that steamships should not enter the domestic air field, but when it comes to a consideration of, say, the Cunard Line, that is privileged to have airplanes traveling over Africa, Asia, and South America, our companies, in common parlance, would be in the hoosegow and could not possibly hope to compete with the Cunard Line in Africa, Asia, or South America, unless they, like the Cunard, had planes to compete with Cunard planes.

The same thing would apply, for example, to the French Line in Syria, Palestine, and Lebanon, in two of which countries the French is the mandate power. If we tried to compete with the French Line in the Mediterranean and we have not airplane transportation supplemental to our steamship transportation, again we will be in the doldrums. The French Line would beat us to the punch. The same would hold true with reference, say, to the Holland lines in the East Indies, Hong Kong, and India. Preservation of American steamship routes may require the aid of planes.

Mr. ROLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. I am very much interested in the statement that the gentleman is making. There is a company out on the Pacific coast that has steamships operating between the Hawaiian Islands and the mainland of this country, the Matson Navigation Co.

Mr. CELLER. That line certainly should have the right to supplement its steamship lines with air transportation. Weather conditions might preclude a steamship from going along a certain route, or it may wish to hasten the transportation of certain types of freight and it should have the right to use planes in that respect. Assuredly some foreign steamship line might easily force our American ships off the water, if in addition to ships they had planes flying from San Francisco, the gentleman's city, and Hawaii, whereas our line would be sans ships.

Mr. ROLPH. I thank the gentleman very much. May I say further that this Matson Navigation Co. started in with sailing vessels, developed the business, and now that air transportation has been developed it should be permitted to have the franchise.

Mr. CELLER. A company like that should have consideration in that respect.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the objection to doing that very thing? Will the gentleman enlarge upon that subject?

Mr. CELLER. In the Railroad Carrier Act, for example, there is a proscription and the various entities having control over transportation, be it water, air, or land, have carried out that proscriptive idea that was laid down in the statute originally that there should not be possible monopolies through two media of transportation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to airplanes, the airplane being a new invention, it was felt that there should not be the specter or the danger of railroads or steamship companies husbanding to themselves the possibilities of the new invention, namely, the airplane. There was always the fear of monopoly, there was always the fear that rose out of the horrors and the sordid tales of the old railroad days, and that sort of hangs over the airplane industry today. We have put those proscriptions in various enactments, but when it comes to foreign commerce I think we should pull them out. We want free and open competition, we want no monopolies, be it on land, sea, and air, or combination of any of the three. But we can still have competition and allow steamship companies to apply for air franchises over foreign land. The right to apply to some Federal body should exist and if public convenience and necessity exists the franchises for air routes should be granted.

Mr. BLAND. Another trouble was that the very time we were trying to press this matter before the Rules Committee, because I want to be just to them, there was the possibility that on account of the conflict between different and varying interests in the commercial field, particularly the foreign field, we would not get anywhere either with the steamship operations or with the commercial operations. The bill that was passed has done a great deal of good though.

Mr. CELLER. Let us take the Grace Line, which covers South America. It could not possibly continue in competition with say the Swedish lines, or other foreign South American lines which cover many of the South American ports, if the Swedish or other steamship companies could have airplanes and the Grace Line could not.

Take the Isthmian Line, which covers far-distant ports like New York, San Francisco, Hawaii, the Philippines, China, Singapore, and places in Africa and England. They could not possibly compete with the Cunard Line or a North German Lloyd Line, or a Norwegian line, or the French Line unless upon a competition basis; so that we must accord them the same type of privileges and immunities that the foreign governments accord to their particular nationals or companies.

I quote from a splendid ad of the United States Lines:

> In 1918, almost anyone would have told you this country never would be caught again without a merchant fleet sufficient to take care of its needs in war and peace. Yet, during the intervening years until Pearl Harbor, considerable opposition had met almost every proposal to strengthen our merchant marine.
>
> American steamship companies had to operate in face of the stiffest kind of world competition for years after the First World War. However, they kept the American flag flying on merchant ships despite handicaps and the competition of foreign companies which enjoyed large government subsidies, lower wages, and other advantages.

We must now render every aid to our American steamship lines in the interests of our strong and ever-growing merchant marine. The airplane may be necessary for the strengthening of that merchant marine. The United Fruit Lines, with their great white fleet, covers Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama, Colombia, Cuba, and Jamaica. If a competing foreign company can trace its air lines into the interiors of these pan-American countries, the United Fruit Lines should have a similar right. At least our Government should not prevent them from having equality with foreign competitors. It were absurd otherwise. The American-Havana Steamship Co. operates ocean freight services between various Atlantic and Pacific coast ports and Habana. That line would be driven off the map by some Portuguese or Spanish company if it did not have planes, and the Portuguese or Spanish line did have air franchises. The I. F. C. Lines cover Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina, and New York. It may wish to further its interests by the air line across Brazil, or by an airline up and down Argentina. It may not wish to do this. It should, at least, have the right either to procure such a franchise for such air route or routes or to enter into an agreement with another company that may own an air line or lines to work them jointly. There is the Atlantic Gulf & West Indies Lines covering Cuba, Puerto Rico, and other West Indies. There are the Moore-McCormack Lines, the United States Line, the Robin Line, the American Export Lines, the American-South African Lines, and others. The ships of these lines anchor in the ports of the seven seas. If they need airplane help, they should have it. Airplanes may be

essential to supplement our merchant marine to the end that our flag may fly the seas as in the days of the clipper ships, as in the days of the brigs and brigantines, in the spirit of Admiral Perry and Capt. John Paul Jones.

The American shipping industry has done a remarkable job. It has built veritable bridges of ships to all the theaters of combat operations. Those bridges shall not be destroyed as they were directly after the last war. Plans must be laid now to keep that immense merchant marine afloat. Those plans must be realistic, not idealistic. The airplane may be one of the aids to that realistic approach.

Of course, what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. It may be that existing or future airplane companies may likewise find it essential for them to apply for steamship-line franchises. So be it. That reciprocity would be a small price to pay in order to protect and augment our present merchant marine.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] to speak on the resolution.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I do not speak in criticism of the purposes which this resolution would serve. I am completely convinced that the subject should be investigated by a competent agency of this legislative body. But I do question the propriety of creating a committee from the membership of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, for several reasons.

If this subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should enter upon and become involved in an extended investigation of aviation problems in the light of conditions existing in all parts of the world, the remaining members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce might not be able to function in their absence, because an absence of but two of the remaining members of the parent committee would leave it without a quorum. Any person who wanted to block any legislation under such circumstances could do so by merely raising a point of no quorum. This is one of the most important committees of the Congress of the United States. Do we want to subject this great House committee to this possible difficulty during the absence of this subcommittee?

Another objection to the resolution arises out of the fact that the resolution does not insure to the committee the power to issue and to direct the service of subpenas. Any witness asked to appear before the committee who did not choose to come could snap his fingers at the committee and go about his business with impunity.

A third objection to the resolution as presented to the House arises out of the fact that the resolution itself carries no authorization for the expenditure of public funds or for the incurring of any expenses which the subcommittee might incur.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman knows that that comes up in the second resolution, which goes to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman from California is not at all certain about that. A resolution subsequently presented could carry an appropriation of money provided there was a preceding authorization of such appropriation, or such an authorization is necessarily implied. The legality of such an appropriation should not be left in such an uncertain condition insofar as future action of this House is concerned.

These are three very potent reasons, I think, why this resolution in its present form should not be adopted by the Congress of the United States, at least, not until it is appropriately amended.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I take this minute to ask the gentleman in charge of this resolution a question, in order that there may be a clear understanding on the floor.

I have been told privately that this resolution would not be used as a means of bringing in a recommendation to extend to aviation the same territorial freight-rate differential that exists in the railroad freight-rate structure of this Nation. I hope the gentleman can assure us that that is not the purpose of authorizing this investigation.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I can say to the gentleman that is not the purpose. I have never heard any rumor one way or the other about it.

Mr. POAGE. Let me understand the gentleman. He says that is the purpose?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I say it is not the purpose to go into anything like that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIKES). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE PETROLEUM CRISIS

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to address myself to the question of the serious petroleum crisis now confronting this country. I come not as an alarmist—it is not my purpose to cry "Wolf! wolf!" But I am gravely concerned with the rapidly depleting American crude-oil stocks and supplies.

A half dozen responsible committees of the Congress have investigated the situation. The Petroleum Administration for War has investigated the situation. The Petroleum Industry War Council has investigated the situation. All responsible and informed persons looking into the petroleum problem of this country have come to the conclusion that something must immediately be done to increase crude-oil production and supplies. It seems that the only agency of the Government that disagrees with this conclusion is the Office of Price Administration. O. P. A., like the private in the Army, thinks everybody is out of step but itself.

There are certain admitted facts in this case. It is admitted that since January 1, 1938, we have consumed more than seven and one-half billion barrels of crude, while we have discovered only something like four and one-half billion barrels of crude.

It is admitted that if our consumption continues at this rate, and consumption will doubtless increase rather than decrease, and if our discoveries continue at this rate, and discoveries will decrease rather than increase, then within a comparatively short time we shall have completely exhausted our reserves of crude petroleum.

It is further admitted that in 1937 there were drilled 31,106 new wells; in 1941, 29,070; in 1942, 17,934; and during the first half of 1943, 7,823.

In other words, the number of new wells drilled—the wildcats—have been decreasing rapidly from year to year. Furthermore, the percentage of discoveries through drilling has decreased. The percentage of failures in 1941 was 24, in 1942 it was 31, and in the first 6 months of this year it was 34 percent. In 1939 the cost of discovering oil, in barrels, was approximately 12 cents a barrel, and in 1942 the cost of discovering oil per barrel amounted to approximately 40 cents, and yet the price of crude oil during all this time has not increased.

I give you now a few figures of average wholesale prices, according to the index of commodity prices, published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for the month of June of this year. This is based on a par of 100 for the year 1926. All commodities, 103.8; farm products, 126.2; food, 109.6; hides and leather products, 117.8; textile products, 97.4; fuel and light materials, 81; metals and metal products, 103.8; building materials, 110.6; chemicals and allied products, 100; household goods, 102.8; miscellaneous, 91.8. Crude petroleum in the midcontinent field, 59.2; in Pennsylvania, 79.7; in California, 85.2; and in the midcontinent field, gasoline, 56.7.

So, while everything that goes into the production of crude oil has gone up, the price of crude oil has been held down. Assuming that the war is going to continue for several years—and no prudent person can assume otherwise—the amount of crude oil and petroleum products consumed by the war effort will increase. We were told last year—and I think truthfully—that it was necessary to ration gasoline in this country in order to conserve rubber. We are now told that it is necessary to ration gasoline in order to conserve gasoline. In other words, we are now confronted with a real shortage in gasoline.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman is raising a point that interests me and my constituents very much, inasmuch as I represent probably the only district in Texas that does not produce any great amcunt of crude oil. We are simply consumers, and I am terribly alarmed because of the fact that the production of oil is going down, and unless we are willing to pay a reasonable price, which will enable people in the oil business to make the necessary explorations, pretty soon we are not going to be able to buy gasoline at any price. Is not that correct?

Mr. GOSSETT. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. POAGE. And does the gentleman not think it would be better for my people and for other consumers, that we pay a reasonable price and get gasoline rather than that we be told that we can buy a pint a week, and not be able to get it at starvation prices?

Mr. GOSSETT. If the recommendation of the P. A. W. were carried out, and if the price of crude oil were increased 35 cents per barrel, that would amount to an increase in the cost of a gallon of gasoline of only eight-tenths of one cent, provided costs were also prorated among other products manufactured from crude oil. No one should object to this small increase. Better to pay even a few cents extra for gasoline than not to be able to buy gasoline at any price.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. I congratulate the gentleman on his fine statement, but is it not a fact that if this price increase is allowed, and carried to other byproducts of petroleum, it would decrease the increase in the price of gasoline?

Mr. GOSSETT. The gentleman means that it would decrease the increase in price?

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. GOSSETT. Yes; that is true.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has been interested in this problem for some time, and he will recall that recently a number of us met and a resolution was adopted to carry this matter to Judge Vinson, he being the proper person to appeal to when you want the O. P. A. overruled. Can the gentleman inform the House the result of that request to Judge Vinson, that he overrule the O. P. A. and grant the price increase requested by P. A. W.

Mr. GOSSETT. Several Members of Congress recently went to see Judge Vinson. He has been very courteous, but has not yet indicated when he will hand down a decision, or what it will be.

Mr. CURTIS. But one cannot run a tractor on courtesy, nor buy gasoline in that way.

Mr. GOSSETT. I agree with the gentleman, and that is why I am trying to bring the seriousness of this problem to the attention of the House, because I think 95 percent of the Members of this House feel that something must be done immediately. If this feeling and conviction is conveyed to O. P. A. and to Judge Vinson in strong enough terms, perhaps we can get desirable action before it is too late.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman have the figures on the amount of stripper wells that are now lying idle because of the fact that the revenue is not great enough?

Mr. GOSSETT. I have some figures. In my district alone there are approximately 15,000 stripper wells or marginal wells, wells producing an average of 3 or 4 barrels per day, most of which are now being operated at a loss, most of which will continue in operation in hopes that an increase in the price of crude oil will be granted. Unless such increase is granted, one-third of those stripper wells will be closed. That is a bird in the hand. The failure of the Government to authorize an increase in the price of crude oil is not only going to discourage exploration but it will absolutely eliminate a great many stripper wells. In other words, we will lose much of our production, as well as fail to get new production In fact many stripper wells have already been abandoned because they cannot operate profitably under present crude oil prices.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The distinguished gentleman who has the floor has given this problem a great deal of careful and diligent study. He has gone into it from various angles. He has attended the meetings of committees of this House having to do with this question and has examined the problem as carefully as any Member on the floor of the House. I believe it would be well to call special attention to the depletion of gasoline supplies and crude oil supplies, by reason of the requirements of our armed forces for gasoline.

At the present time it requires 600,000 barrels of gasoline per day to supply our armed forces. The demand is increasing. According to a statement by Secretary Ickes, it is possible that that demand may run as high as 900,000 barrels during the next year. It will take about 37½ percent of the amount of gasoline that is being used in this country east of the Rocky Mountains just for the armed forces alone. So, this is not just a matter of providing gasoline for home use and consumption, but more important, it is a question of seeing to it that we have a sufficient amount of gasoline for our armed forces to carry on this war. Does the gentleman know of any other way to remedy this situation except by legislation by which we may get a fair increase in the price of crude oil, so the production may be increased?

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank the gentleman for his observation. The best way, if not the only way, to get this increased production is to increase the price. The whole problem is now in the lap of Economic Stabilizer Fred Vinson. As I stated before, all agencies of the Government, with the exception of the O. P. A., now agree that such an increased price is vital.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It has been suggested by certain officials connected with the O. P. A. that a subsidy be paid for the purpose of drilling new wells.

What does the gentleman think of that suggestion? Personally, I do not think it practical and it will not solve the problem.

Mr. GOSSETT. Now that goes into a problem that I do not have time to discuss; I believe the proposal to deal with this crude oil shortage through subsidies for exploration is fraught with many evils. Even if wildcatting were subsidized it would not touch the problem of marginal wells. Subsidies will not have anything to do with this stripper production we are talking about. We will still lose that, notwithstanding a subsidy program. Frankly I do not believe that a subsidy program will get the job done. I think that is the wrong approach to the problem.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. As a matter of fact, the gentleman probably has more oil wells in his district than any other Member of Congress and has done a good job on this fight to get a higher price for crude oil. The gentleman knows that the industry does not want a subsidy.

Mr. GOSSETT. That is true.

Mr. RIVERS. Is it not known to everybody that most of the discovery of new fields is done by wildcatters—small independent oil operators?

Mr. GOSSETT. I do not have the figures, but I do know that about 70 percent of all discoveries are made by independents—that is, by wildcatters.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman knows that unless this price increase is granted they will be eliminated. They will be destroyed, and America will become a dependent Nation rather than an independent Nation with regard to petroleum. Does not the gentleman believe that there are some people in high places who want to import oil instead of developing our own resources?

Mr. GOSSETT. I am afraid there is something to what the gentleman has to say on that point. I know he is entirely correct in his statement that the small independents are being squeezed out of the picture under the present crude prices. Unless these independents can be kept on their feet the oil business in America will become a gigantic monopoly controlled entirely by the major oil companies.

Mr. RIVERS. He is being destroyed despite our efforts. I think the gentleman should be commended for his work in trying to preserve the small oil producers as well as trying to look after the welfare of the country in this matter of petroleum supplies.

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. I want to commend my colleague again for calling this matter to the attention of the House. The gentleman has been very active in an effort to relieve this situation.

I might say in that connection, that as chairman of the Texas delegation I am speaking for them, the entire delegation from Texas. All Texas Members of Congress from the Speaker on down, and including the gentleman who is now addressing the House, have been very active in their support of some sort of a measure that will bring relief to the crude oil situation.

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. THOMASON. The independents who, as the gentleman says, are largely responsible for bringing in new fields, already are going broke or are being gobbled up by the big companies. So, in view of the fact that the Secretary of Interior, Mr. Ickes, the Petroleum Oil Administration, and everybody else who seem to know the real facts about it, say that the situation is getting critical, it would seem to me that if Judge Vinson is not going to act, there is nothing in the world for the House to do except to pass legislation relieving the situation, and that is what I favor.

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank the gentleman; it may become necessary to legislate on that which should be handled by administrative action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may continue for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I will state to the gentleman that there are quite a number of other special orders. If there is no objection, the gentleman may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I just want to observe that in my opinion this shortage of crude oil is creating a situation whereby we might and could lose the war. Our whole armies today and all armies are operating with mechanized equipment that require oil, require gasoline, and they are a long way from their objective, and I think we should take no chance whatever, not a chance; and to repeat what has been said, Secretary Ickes has recommended twice now at least that the price of crude oil should be increased to solve the proposition. I agree also that this Congress owes it to the people and to the soldiers at the front to pass some legislation to see that they are not subjected to the hazards of a shortage of the necessary gasoline to operate our mechanized forces.

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank the gentleman for his valuable contribution.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, it may interest the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] to know that it is estimated in the Pennsylvania fields—and talking about stripper wells—that there are about 5,000 wells not on the pump; the leases are being abandoned and sold for junk. Our production is off about 15,000 barrels a day from last year which would be equivalent to about 9,000,000 gallons of gasoline a month, which would greatly relieve this shortage on the eastern seaboard, if available.

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I just want to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and the other gentlemen on the Atlantic seaboard who are now shivering in the cold, that if they had supported us in the building of the canal across the Florida Peninsula they would have had plenty of oil.

Mr. GOSSETT. May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I do not agree with him on that. As a matter of fact, unless the price of crude oil is immediately increased, we are not going to have enough oil to go into the barges and pipe lines. The Big Inch pipe line has now been completed from Texas to the eastern seaboard. Another big line from Texas is under construction. These lines have cost $187,000,000 to the Federal Government; and we are going to have the tragic spectacle of those lines running at half capacity within a very few months unless something is done to increase the production of crude oil.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say to the gentleman from Texas that all the crude oil is not brought from Texas; a great deal is produced in Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas, which could supply the oil requirements for the Atlantic seaboard, and if we had this canal across the Florida Peninsula that would have enabled them to meet the need.

Mr. GOSSETT. I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi that Texas produces over 50 percent of the Nation's crude, but unless the price of crude oil is increased there will not be enough crude in the whole Nation to supply the eastern seaboard.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. WORLEY. I would like to commend the gentleman from Texas for his discussion of this problem. Can the gentleman tell us just when is Judge Vinson expected to render a decision on this question?

Mr. GOSSETT. I have no idea. Of course, we are hoping it will be very soon.

Mr. WORLEY. Has he made any indication, official or otherwise?

Mr. GOSSETT. Not that I know of.

I want to make this observation in conclusion. Not only are all the Representatives from oil States concerned with this problem but Representatives from non-oil-producing States are concerned with it. It is not a problem of protecting the independent oil industry, although that is involved, the greatest problem is that of producing the necessary crude oil not only to carry on the war but to preserve our domestic economy. Mr. Speaker, unless something is done and done soon we are going to have a complete break-down within a few months in our domestic economy. It is time for action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time I had for today be postponed until Monday next after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders already entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address made by me before the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped at the National Press Club, Washington, D. C., July 9, 1943, and also some remarks about the address by Mr. Paul Strachan, president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I hereby will make a blanket yielding not to exceed 2 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the New York Times, and a short poem from the New York Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan, asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain resolutions of the Iowa State Grange.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Grand Rapids Press.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 25 minutes.

ANTITRUST SUIT AGAINST SOUTHEASTERN UNDERWRITERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3269 and H. R. 3270 have been introduced in the House along with companion bills in the Senate for the reason that unless such legislation is passed there will soon come before the Supreme Court of the United States an appeal carried by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice in an antitrust case against the Southeastern Underwriters Association, a group of fire insurance companies operating in the southeastern portion of the country. The legislation is frankly designed to prevent the Supreme Court from ever hearing this case.

Mr. Speaker, I am against these bills on principle. First, I am against them because I think it is one of the most dangerous precedents I can conceive of to have Congress consider the passage of legislation whose avowed purpose is to prevent a certain case from passing through courts of the country in the normal manner. If such a course is taken in one instance by the Congress, we will in the future be vulnerable to the demands of every conceivable group and individual in the country that we step in with a piece of legislation to prevent a matter in which they may have an interest from being carried to the courts of the country in the way provided by law. It occurs to me furthermore that if such a precedent is set, individuals seeking redress from what they may deem arbitrary action on the part of Government officials might find departments of Government, if the shoe were on the other foot, coming to Congress requesting that we pass legislation to prevent the individual citizen getting into the courts with his case.

Those who have concerned themselves with the growth of administrative law in this country and who express alarm over its extension ought, it seems to me, to be profoundly interested in defeating this legislation.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. Is there any difference in principle between that and bringing in legislation to close the courts under the gold clause?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am not sure what the gentleman has reference to exactly; I am sorry.

Mr. GEARHART. Some years ago we brought in legislation and passed it which closed the courts to damage suits by people who had claims under the so-called gold clause.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I was not a Member of the House at that time. The only difference is that that was a piece of legislation that was passed more as a substantive piece of legislation than this. I do not think there is any question about the repeal of the antitrust laws involved here. In that particular instance there was a question, arguable, perhaps, on two different sides, of the basic governmental policy involved.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman remembers the case?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I do.

Mr. GEARHART. Citizens of the United States who had gold were prevented from entering the courts and collecting the difference in value.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. As I remember it, that case was carried to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court upheld the Government's position in the matter.

Mr. GEARHART. On the ground that the congressional action prevented further consideration of the case.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And on the further ground, because I do know about this part of it, that no one had been damaged in the slightest degree for the reason they were unable to show any loss of purchasing power on the money involved.

Mr. GEARHART. That is beside the issue. What is the difference in principle between closing the courts against one class of litigants and closing them against another class of litigants?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I answered the question. If it were desired to come in here with a piece of legislation and to say that such-and-such a provision of law was repealed, it would be a proper thing for the Congress to consider. But I do not think that such things ought to be brought in here at a time when a case is already pending and has passed part way through the courts.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to get into this conversation. The Supreme Court at that time made its decision but cursed the proceeding. Put that down.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would be very glad to put that down but I would like to put alongside of it something else.

Mr. GIFFORD. Whatever you please, but that is the truth. They cursed it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. If that be true, then the Supreme Court of that day would be on my side of the present controversy and would have held exactly the position which I just set forth.

In the second place, Mr. Speaker, private monopoly is the death of both free enterprise and political democracy. Therefore, freedom for the people of any nation, particularly for our own, must rest upon one of two grounds. The first of these and the one which should be depended upon in every case where it can be effective, is clean and untrammeled competition in various lines of business as a means of protecting the public interest. The antitrust laws of the Nation are the major means we have therefore to inject the element of freedom into the business life of this Nation. The only other manner in which the public interest can be protected, if competition has been destroyed by private monopolies or combinations is by means of governmental regulation. Nor can such governmental regulation begin to be effective in the case of the huge industrial and financial lines of business of the Nation if it is exclusively limited to the States. In other words, vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws is in a very real sense the only alternative to a further extension of Federal regulation and control. And the only valid argument that can be advanced by any industrial or financial group against enforcement of the antitrust laws is that it is already subject to effective public regulation.

I cannot vote, Mr. Speaker, to restrict the operation of the antitrust laws. On the contrary I would be inclined to vote for their extension if I believed such extension would be important in preventing monopolistic combinations from depriving our country of the beneficial efforts of vigorous competition in any important line of business or industry.

I am also against these bills on practical grounds. Let me quote in this connection from an editorial by the Honorable Josephus Daniels, former Secretary of the Navy of the United States, appearing in his Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer:

> The attempt of the fire-insurance companies to be exempt from the antitrust law can be understood from the statements made in the indictment by the Department of Justice. They allege that fire-insurance companies charged $52,000,000 to policyholders and only returned $18,000,000 in losses in the States of Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia. It also says that in the years 1931 to 1940, inclusive, the companies received $436,000,000 and paid out only $197,000,000 for losses.
>
> It is little wonder that, being caught with the goods by monopolistic fixing of rates, these over-rich companies wish to escape punishment for violation of the antitrust law.
>
> They ask Congress, by act, to give them this special privilege and are said to be maintaining a powerful lobby to secure exemption from prosecution by the Department of Justice.

Presumably the Department of Justice figures are correct. At any rate they have not, so far as I know, been challenged. If they are correct, or anywhere near correct, then no more than 40 percent of premiums collected by these companies has been used to pay claims for losses. And if that is true, it would appear to me on the face of things that the premium rates are inordinately high and that if competition were really at work these rates could come down substantially without hurting the companies one bit. This would be, of course, precisely the sort of service which the antitrust laws are supposed to render to the American people.

Another editorial by Josephus Daniels seems to me to sum up this situation very well and to completely answer, in a few lines, the whole States' rights argument that has been injected into this question:

> In a speech to a group of State insurance commissioners at Harrisburg, Pa., last night, Governor Broughton made an eloquent plea

for State rather than Federal regulation of insurance companies.

Although the Governor did not mention the bill now pending in Congress to exempt insurance companies from the antitrust laws, the speech will no doubt be construed and cited as support of that bill.

Such a construction would be unwarranted. Federal regulation of insurance companies is not an issue. No one has proposed to substitute Federal for State regulation, although there may be some dissenters to the picture of perfection which the Governor paints for State regulation as it has been applied in the past.

The only issue raised by the pending bill of mixed House and Senate parentage is whether or not insurance companies shall be exempted from a criminal statute applying not alone to them but to all citizens of the United States, corporate and individual. Such exemption would constitute class legislation of the worst sort. The bill should not be given serious consideration.

I am opposed to H. R. 3269 and 3270 which would exempt the insurance business from the scope and operations of the Federal antitrust laws, then, primarily because I believe that if we are to have a free economy at all in the United States our first task is to break the power of monopoly wherever it exists. I find it hard to conceive a situation where I would vote for legislation narrowing the field of antitrust enforcement. On the contrary, I believe that what is needed is a much more strenuous enforcement of antitrust legislation.

The insurance business is the largest single business in the country and as such it requires in many respects closer public supervision rather than immunity from enforcement of antimonopoly laws. There is no supervision of rates in 25 States and only partial control in 9 others. If the Federal antitrust laws are repealed as to insurance the public in these States will be left absolutely without protection against possible discriminatory or monopolistic practices by the companies.

The Department of Justice commenced its action against combinations of certain of the fire-insurance companies at the insistence of scores of aggrieved persons throughout the country.

I have seen many of the complaints received by the Justice Department and they seem to me very serious. I shall have occasion to refer to some of them in a few moments.

Many attempts have been made to overcome monopolistic practices in the fire and marine insurance business. These have usually failed because the approach to the problem was by locality or State rather than on an interstate or national basis. The business of most insurance companies, and of all the larger ones, is predominantly written outside their respective home States. Efforts at reform have generally failed because State legislatures have overlooked the fundamental fact that no fire-insurance company could exist without the reinsurance capacity of other companies.

The essential of fire insurance is uniform distribution of liability; in other words, striking an average to have the same amount on numerous risks. The Insurance Executives Association, the South-Eastern Underwriters Association, the Pacific Coast Board of Fire Underwriters, and the other great rate-making bodies do not overlook this vital point. One of the written rules of each of these organizations is that no member company shall reinsure the business of a nonmember company.

That these insurance companies realize the importance of control of reinsurance is further emphasized by the activities of the Insurance Executives Association or its subsidiary organizations in sponsoring laws in every State designed to make Lloyds reinsurance a nonadmitted asset. Lloyds is the greatest aggregate of insurance capital in the world, and even under war conditions its American deposits alone vastly exceed the assets of any other reinsurance company or group. There is not a major American fire-insurance company which does not have a material portion of its business with Lloyds, and particularly there is not a major American company that does not have its excess and catastrophe reinsurance placed with Lloyds. The State laws prohibiting the use of Lloyds reinsurance as an asset work to the advantage of the board companies. By board companies I mean those fire- and marine-insurance companies which compose the memberships of the monopolistic combinations in those fields. In the main, the board companies are those which have been in business longest and have accumulated the most money. It is, therefore, to their interest to freeze things as they are in order to maintain the present high schedule of rates and inordinate expense allowances to management.

These companies have large surpluses, and when they place reinsurance with Lloyds, as a nonadmitted asset, it merely becomes a bookkeeping charge against their published surpluses.

Thus the Home Insurance Co. of New York can easily place $10,000,000 in premiums with Lloyds and still have ample surplus, but if a comparatively small independent company wishes to write the business and avail itself of the same reinsurance facilities, the fact that Lloyds is a nonadmitted asset would mean that that company's surpluses would be wiped out and its capital impaired. This is true under the laws of many of the States. Thus, the greatest reinsurance market of all is indirectly kept from the smaller companies.

The second great instrument of control which enables monopolistic controls to work is generally known as separation. The South-Eastern Underwriters Association, for example, which is a company-controlled monopoly operated by the leading companies, employs rating engineers and passes on all basic rating schedules establishing the rates for all classes of business in each of the Southeastern States and also establishes the basic rates for each city or territory therein. Furthermore, it establishes the rates of commission to be paid to all board company agents in every city, town, or district in the Southeast, in addition to requiring uniformity of forms used by each member company. Through a subsidiary organization, controlled in the same manner, the South-Eastern Underwriters Association arranges all of the inspection and engineering reports of all important risks under its jurisdiction. It has its own loss-adjustment bureau and under its rules all major losses must be settled and adjusted by this bureau and not by the individual company or companies carrying the liability.

Separation enters the picture if any member company writes a risk at a lower rate than that prescribed by the South-Eastern Underwriters Association, pays a commission to an agent higher than that prescribed, or reinsures a nonmember company. Separation means that the offending company will be excluded from the organization, will not be allowed the use of South-Eastern Underwriters Association rating schedules, and that every member company will immediately retire from any agency which represents it.

Since a fire-insurance agent usually needs from 3 to 15 companies to handle his major business, this, in effect, means that the offending company loses its agency plant overnight. Of course, it also means that the agent's business is often ruined and his means of livelihood impaired or destroyed.

Complaints received by the Department of Justice from insurance agents in all parts of the country dramatically demonstrate the impact of this vicious practice. For example, a southern insurance agent writes:

> The insurance companies I represent are threatening to close me out because my brother works for me and represents an insurance company that does not belong to their organization. In other words, I must either make my brother give up his business or I must give mine up. My brother could not make a living competing in a market where all his prospects bought cheaper insurance so he got a company, a good company, that would enable him to progress.

This man appealed to the commissioner of insurance of his State for relief but was informed that:

> The matter to which you refer appears to be that of contractual relationship between insurance companies and their agents, which is not controlled by the insurance laws.

In concluding his letter to the Department the agent voiced a plea:

> I sincerely hope and trust that there is some law in this country of ours that will protect even an insurance agent against the ruthless power of organizations when that power is used to discriminate, throttle, and leave abandoned those who are denied the identical privileges granted in other sections.

The obvious answer was given by another complainant who said: "I know of nothing except the Sherman Act that would control this, and the insurance companies' bill would repeal that act."

A California insurance agent writes:

> They—
>
> The board companies—
>
> tried to fine me $50 for a rule violation. I had placed a policy for my son, who was a nonboard agent, and I kept the commission. They informed me I could appeal the

fine, but would have to pay it first and then appeal. What a chance I would have had. I have letters from the various companies saying that they had to withdraw from my office for this violation, also letters from the Board of Fire Underwriters of the Pacific regarding the situation.

I was particularly impressed by a letter from the wife of a California insurance broker, who said:

It is high time that the practices of various insurance companies and their boards were investigated and brought before the public's attention. Their attempts to dominate and control the insurance business have worked a decided unfairness on the insuring public.

My husband, who is now overseas serving his country, has worked for 17 years in this city as an insurance broker. He realized many years ago the injustice of a few large insurance companies controlling the business, and laying down rules and charging rates which were to their own advantage and no one else's.

All the so-called board companies are banded together by membership in the Board of Fire Underwriters of the Pacific. This board promulgates rates and rules which remove any possibility of honest competition between these board companies at the expense of the insurance purchaser.

These facts you may already have, but I wanted to put in my bit in behalf of my husband who is doing his bit to make the world a better place to live in.

When no agent has the right to contract individually with a board company for the terms on which he will represent it; when his contract is already printed and has been approved in advance by a combination of all board companies; when in order to become a general agent of a board company he must be voted on and accepted by the combination to which the company belongs—is this the liberty on which this Republic was founded? I am in thorough sympathy with an insurance agent representing board companies who recently wrote:

I am not for the bill. It cannot be held in maintaining States' rights that the rights of man can be reduced. The South-Eastern Underwriters Association reduces the rights of insurance agents. They do seek to monopolize and control. States' rights or no States' rights, what I want to know is who looks after personal rights?

A local agent, formerly president of a State association, writes:

We all talk about the profit motive, but I sometimes wonder if that very profit motive hasn't run away with itself in the fire-insurance business. The companies are principally interested in making a profit for the stockholders. The branch office managers and general agents are principally interested in making a profit for the companies, and the agents are, of course, principally interested in their commissions. Who, pray tell me, has been interested in the poor guy that pays the premium?

The large risk can take care of itself. So can, perhaps, those insureds who belong to trade organizations which have paid officials to look after their interests, but the single-shot risk, the little fellow, has had no one to look to but the agent, and the agent has been in no position to help much, even if he were so inclined.

No; I don't think the Federal investigation is going to ruin our business and I don't think it's going to turn into any national scandal. The business is essentially honest and aboveboard, but there are some things that should be changed and perhaps this is the only way that it can be brought about. We all remember the awful squawk which came from the power companies a few years ago when the Government started after them. Well, they are still doing business and making money, but the public is paying much less for power and the stockholders are going to be better off in the end.

Another Californian wrote:

There are good companies which are not "board" companies, but a licensed insurance broker dare not place his client's coverage with one of them at a less rate, for if he does, no "board" company will do any business with him. It is the greatest and most effective conspiracy in restraint of trade not only against competitors but also against the people since the Standard Oil Trust.

The Insurance Executives Association, to which I have referred, is the nominal head of all fire-insurance organizations in the United States. It was organized in 1931 to unify the action of the four major regional organizations. It has disciplinary authority over each of the original bodies, and appellate jurisdiction where an original body is unable to act effectively. Thus, if the South Eastern Underwriters Association could not control an offending company because of State laws, the Insurance Executives Association would decree national punishment for them. Its rules provide that it may require a company to cancel a policy and withdraw from a State for a definite length of time upon failure to comply with any ruling of the governing committee.

It is interesting to observe that the arguments now being used by the big fire-insurance companies are the same as those which they used as long ago as 1868, with reversed emphasis. At the second annual meeting of the National Board of Fire Underwriters held in New York on February 19 and 20, 1868, the committee on legislation and taxation reported on the first duty assigned to it, namely, proposing some practicable plan to rid the country of unfair State legislation, and of securing, if possible, one general law for the governing of insurance companies throughout the Union. The committee reported that there was then before the House Judiciary Committee and the Senate Committee on Commerce a bill for the creation of a national bureau of insurance, whose primary purpose was to secure the relief to which the business of insurance is entitled. The committee also urged the necessity for a test case in opposition to the most monstrous exactions of some of the States and to obtain the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States thereon, with the view to settle forever the unconstitutionality of all such unequal and proscriptive State legislation. During the preceding year, the executive committee of the national board of fire underwriters was advised that the underwriters' agency of New York had some time since determined to test the constitutionality of such laws, and that it had taken a case from the State of Virginia to the Supreme Court of the United States involving, it is believed, every important point on the subject. This was the now celebrated case of *Paul* v. *Virginia* (8 Wall. 168). When it exploded in the laps of the insurance companies, their bill, which it was designed to aid, died in committee. Now the positions are reversed but the technique is unchanged. Ignoring the antagonism to State legislation which they maintained for half a century or more in the face of an indictment charging them with conspiracies in restraint of and to monopolize interstate commerce, a Federal offense, the insurance companies now swear allegiance to the very States whose laws they repudiated. In this Janus role, they have brought forth a bill to oust the jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and thus prevent the Government's case from ever being heard.

The cry of States' rights raised by the insurance interests to conceal the real purpose of these bills is unsound in law and in fact. First, as evidenced by a long line of Supreme Court cases there is no basic inconsistency between the existence of a Federal power and the exercise of a State regulatory power, in the absence of the Congress having preempted the field by specific regulatory legislation. This is further exemplified by the recent case of *Parker* v. *Brown* (317 U. S. 341), holding that a State authorized program restricting competition is not contrary to the Sherman Act. Second, the argument that existing State regulation is wholly inconsistent with the Sherman Act and the philosophy of free enterprise, is not borne out by an examination of present State legislation affecting the insurance business.

The basic device through which fire-insurance rates are determined and promulgated is that of private rating bureaus. These bureaus are established and operated in 43 States by combinations of the fire-insurance companies themselves. The laws of 22 States permit the insurance companies to operate rating bureaus, but of these, 7 States have antitrust or anticompact laws prohibiting rate-fixing agreements. Twenty-one States have no laws applicable to insurance-rating agreements. Two States prohibit privately operated rating bureaus altogether and, in addition, have antitrust laws embracing insurance. In 3 States the control of rate making is an official function of government. Two of these also have insurance antitrust laws. In all, 17 States have antitrust laws designed to prohibit rate-fixing agreements among fire-insurance companies. Furthermore, the laws of no State, except Texas—which establishes maximum rates only—prevent any insurance company from individually determining and charging its own rates. Thus, at a glance it is clear that instead of being in conflict with State laws, the Federal antitrust laws are rather in aid thereof and that the contention is unsound that the principles of State regulation are incompatible with the philosophy of free enterprise exemplified by the Sherman Act. State regulation of rates, where it exists, has the same objective as the Sherman Act but the trouble is that such local regulation, while salu-

tary as far as it goes, is powerless to deal effectively with restraints in operations concerning more than one State and in interstate commerce.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman think that Government officials would render the same services under any social-security scheme for less money?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not think that is involved in this question at all, I may say to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is kicking about the high cost of insurance, or high premiums.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would kick about any cost that I felt was higher than fair competitive conditions ought to place it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What about the cost that the Government imposes on us, for instance, through the O. P. A.? The gentleman is not objecting to that.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I made a rather exhaustive speech here on the floor on September 23 in reference to the O. P. A. and pointed out in that speech that in my opinion the O. P. A. had, in some cases, actually increased the margins between what farmers receive and what consumers pay for foods.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am always here when the gentleman is talking, always.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman is here a good many times.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The only trouble is I try to take too much of your time and I apologize, but let the words of wisdom flow forward.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not want the gentleman to apologize. I am trying to make a consecutive speech, however, and would like to get on with it.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. May I say to the gentleman that I hope he will stay on this subject because there are a great many of us in the insurance business who are interested in it. Thus far the gentleman is making a good statement and I am interested in it. In addition to what he has already said I suggest that when the gentleman revises and extends his remarks he include the entire last issue of Best's Insurance Manual which will confirm what he has said about the amount of losses on fire-insurance policies all over the United States.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I appreciate very much the gentleman's contribution. I have only one more point I am going to make at this time.

My final argument against this legislation concerns the inevitable practical effect of its passage. If Congress should enact these bills our action could hardly, I think, be interpreted in any other way than as a direct invitation to the fire-insurance business to go ahead and engage in monopolistic practices. To declare the antitrust laws do not apply to an industry or a line of business means, does it not, that we do not care if there is monopoly in that business. Does Congress want to say that? Well this Member of Congress certainly does not. And I cannot believe others do either.

This is not an issue of Federal regulation or bureaucracy. It is an issue of whether or not monopolistic practices are to be allowed and encouraged by act of Congress. Enforcement of the antitrust laws is the only alternative to regulation and control—not a first step in that direction.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I read in the paper just a very short while ago an article by a very well-known columnist who stated that a slush fund of $700,000 had been collected to pass this legislation. Certainly nobody with an ounce of sense would think that money will secure the passage of legislation here. It did not do it in connection with the Holding Company Act.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. COCHRAN. I was wondering if that had ever been denied.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not know. I want to say several things about that, if I may. In the first place, I think the gentleman is eminently correct when he suggests that the expenditure of a large amount of money either to pass or defeat a piece of legislation in this body will inevitably boomerang and cause precisely the opposite result from that desired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Absolutely.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I know the gentleman probably has the same experience that I do when any group or individual comes in my office and attempts to make threats about the consequences that will result to me personally if I do not vote for or against a certain piece of legislation. My inevitable reaction is to say to myself, Am I a man or a mouse? If I am a man, I will do just the opposite of what people tell me to do who talk to me that way.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does not mean that, does he?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I do. I mean that I have that tendency. I do not say I always do it, because I try to do what I believe is right. I hope I would do that even if people were trying to force me to do it. But I say that when somebody comes along and tries to threaten a Member of Congress, the natural reaction of that Member of Congress, if he is a man of principle, is to lean over backward in the other direction.

The next point I want to make is that I do not personally object in the slightest degree to having people engaged in a certain line of business or interested in a certain kind of activity coming to see me to argue their case. I think it is part and parcel of our democratic system. I have a great many very fine friends who are engaged in the insurance business. Some of them have been to see me to discuss this bill. I appreciated their coming. I was glad to consider the points they had to make, and they were very decent about listening to the points I had to make. I have made this speech subsequent to such conversations, and I feel my position on this matter is sound.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. In connection with the gentleman's remarks, has he inserted anything in the RECORD with reference to the life-insurance companies? They are involved in this picture and they are still competitive, and they are growing and are sizable and are getting along very well with State regulation and free competition on rates.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I have not injected anything into my speech about it, I may say to the gentleman, but I appreciate very much his having brought that up because it is my understanding—and the gentleman can perhaps correct me if I am wrong—that the life-insurance companies have very definitely refused to go along with this legislation and have separated themselves from it. Is that true or not?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I do not believe that is entirely correct, but I do think it is entirely correct to say that thus far the life-insurance companies have taken no attitude on it. If they felt they were the subject of attack, I think very properly they would be here, but thus far there is nothing in this legislation that interests the life-insurance companies. They believe in competition as to rates. They believe very firmly in State regulation, as I do. But the very point the gentleman makes is an extremely good one, that if we refuse to have competition we inevitably bring ourselves under Federal regulation. I think that all the people in the insurance business who do not want Federal regulation—and as president of a small insurance company I am one of them—believe that we must continue to have some sort of competition or we shall find ourselves under the Federal Government.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am much obliged to my distinguished and very able and conscientious colleague from New Mexico, and I know he speaks from long experience in this very line of business. He has emphasized one of the two main points of my speech and I thank him very much.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair

recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] for 10 minutes.

A BILL FOR THE INCORPORATION OF THE MOTHERS OF WORLD WAR NO. 2

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time today to inform the House that on October 12 I introduced a bill to incorporate, by an act of Congress, the Mothers of World War No. 2. This bill is H. R. 3435, and it is now pending before the Judiciary Committee.

The mothers of the boys and girls who are now serving, have served, or will serve in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and in the various auxiliaries and branches thereof, have already organized in many of the States under the guiding hand of Mrs. Gretta Roush, of Indiana, who is serving as their national president during the initial year of this organization. Many local units have already been organized in many States, and the work of organizing additional units in every State of the Union is now in progress. With a potential membership among the mothers, stepmothers, and foster mothers of those who serve in this war, which is far greater than that during any other period in our Nation's history, this organization is charting a course which will redound to the honor and glory of our Nation. This organization of mothers has outlined its objects and purposes which is both laudatory and commendable. In the short space of time allotted to me today I cannot go into all of the details of this proposed legislation, but for the moment I desire to call the attention of the membership to only a few statements contained in the aims and purposes of this praiseworthy organization, all of which are set forth in the pending measure, and I quote them in part and briefly:

To maintain the ties of fellowship born of that service and to assist and further patriotic work in our country; to unite fraternally all mothers who have or have had, or may have, sons or daughters in the service of the military or naval forces of the United States, or its allies, during World War No. 2, who have the will and desire to work with and for those sons and daughters in maintaining both morale and courage and to aid in perpetuating the American way of life; to aid and assist in teaching the advantages of freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and the duties and obligations of citizenship; to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation; to aid and assist all those who have suffered injury or disability during the war; to foster and promote good will and understanding among the nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the mothers of the boys and girls who are bearing the brunt of battle in this war have a common cause and an abiding interest in maintaining and perpetuating the ties of fellowship which are born in that great service; they have a fervent desire to promote and further every patriotic endeavor within the confines of our land. They have made great sacrifices during this tragic war. Some of them have placed upon the altar of war their own flesh and blood—they have given their all—the greatest sacrifice one can make for her country. It is their fervent desire to weld into an organization their united efforts in order that they may render greater aid to our complete victory in this war, and that they may render all possible aid in healing the wounds of the disabled when this frightful war is over. These mothers desire to give their united aid during the period of this war and, after this war is over, to our fighting forces and to our country; and, may I ask, who is better equipped to render that outstanding service than the mothers of those who serve?

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that all Members may carefully read and give diligent study to this pending legislation, and it is my hope that this measure will receive a prompt and favorable report from the committee, and that when it comes on the floor of the House it will receive the unanimous support of the membership.

That all may read the pending measure, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to include herein at this point in the RECORD a copy of such proposed legislation:

H. R. 3435

A bill to incorporate The Mothers of World War No. 2, to set forth and establish the purposes and aims of the organization, fixing its corporate powers, and establishing the rights of membership, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the following persons, namely: Mrs. Gretta Roush, founder, Indianapolis, Ind.; Mrs. Ruby Dinwoodie, Gary, Ind.; Mrs. Cora Maybaum, Gary, Ind.; Mrs. Ethel Martin, Gary, Ind.; Mrs. Robert Usher, Gary, Ind.; Mrs. J. W. Whitlow, Gary, Ind.; Mrs. Bernice Kewley, Geneseo, Ill.; Mrs. Reta McDonald, Elkhart, Ind.; Mrs. John Lind, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mrs. Bernice Kewley, Illinois; Mrs. W. B. Jones, St. Joseph, Mich.; Mrs. Marian Scott, Wellston, Ohio; Mrs. Lola M. Agal, Bellflower, Calif.; Mrs. Gertrude Warrick, Valentine, Nebr.; Mrs. B. F. Kinman, Williamstown, Ky.; Mrs. Bertha Clow, Kahoka, Mo.; and Mrs. Georgia Kellogg, Hutchinson, Kans., and their associates and successors duly chosen are hereby incorporated and declared to be a body corporate is a national association of women, who are the mothers of the men and women who have served, are serving, or will serve in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps or any auxiliary or branch thereof during World War No. 2, by and under the name of The Mothers of World War No. 2, and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession with the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained.

SEC. 2. The persons named in section 1 of this act, and such other persons as may be selected from among the membership of The Mothers of World War No. 2, an association of women whose sons and daughters served the Allied cause in the Great World War No. 2 between the dates of December 7, 1941, and the termination of such war, are hereby authorized to meet and complete the organization of said corporation by the selection of officers, the adoption of a constitution and bylaws, and to do all other things necessary to carry into effect the provisions hereof, at which meeting any person duly accredited as a delegate from any local or State organization of the existing organization known as The Mothers of World War No. 2 shall be permitted to participate in the proceedings thereof.

SEC. 3. The objects and purposes of this corporation shall be as follows: Founded on our faith in God, the Constitution of the United States of America, and the national traditions that gave birth to our Nation of free people banded together for the purpose of enjoying life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and living under a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, will aid in keeping alive the spirit that prompted world service in World War No. 2; to maintain the ties of fellowship born of that service, and to assist and further patriotic work in our country; to unite fraternally all mothers who have, or have had, or may have, sons or daughters in the service of the military or naval forces of the United States, or its allies, during World War No. 2, who have the will and desire to work with and for those sons and daughters in maintaining both morale and courage, and to aid in fostering and perpetuating the American way of life; to aid and assist in teaching the advantages of freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and the duties and obligations of citizenship; to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation; to aid and assist all those who have suffered injury or disability during the war; to foster and promote good will and understanding among the nations of the world.

SEC. 4. The corporation shall hold its meetings at such time and place as the incorporators or their successors shall determine.

SEC. 5. The corporation hereby created shall have the following powers: To have succession until the membership, as hereinafter provided, shall become extinct, with power to sue and be sued in courts of law and equity; to receive, own, hold, use, and dispose of such real estate and personal property as shall be necessary for its corporate purposes; to adopt a corporate seal and alter the same at its pleasure; to adopt a constitution, bylaws, and regulations to carry out its purposes, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or of any State; to use in carrying out the purposes of the corporation such badges and emblems as it may adopt; to establish and maintain offices for the conduct of its business; to establish State, Territorial, and local subdivisions if it so elects; to publish a magazine or other publications, and generally to do any and all such acts and things as may be proper and necessary to carry into effect the purposes of the corporation.

SEC. 6. All of the real and personal property and funds of the corporation held or used for the purposes hereof, pursuant to the provisions of the act, shall, so long as the same is so used, be exempt from taxes by the United States or any Territory or District thereof. This corporation shall not accept, own, or hold, directly or indirectly, any property, real or personal, except such as may be reasonably necessary for carrying out the purpose of its creation.

SEC. 7. The membership in this organization is limited to women, and no woman shall be or become a member of this corporation unless she is a citizen of the United States, and unless her son or sons, or daughter or daughters of her blood, or that she stand in the relation of a stepmother to those who serve in this war, or that she is a foster mother, after legal adoption, of a son or daughter, who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States, or some auxiliary or branch thereof, or in the military or naval service of its allies, during the Great World War No. 2, at some period between the 7th day of December 1941, and the date of the termination of such war, both dates inclusive, he or she having an honorable discharge from such service, or who is still in the service.

SEC. 8. This organization shall be nonpolitical, and as an organization it shall not promote the candidacy of any person seeking public office.

SEC. 9. The corporation shall, on or before the 1st day of January in each year, make and transmit to the Congress a report of its proceedings for the preceding calendar year,

including a full and complete report of its receipts and expenditures. Said report shall not be printed as a public document.

SEC. 10. As a condition precedent to the exercise of any power or privilege herein granted or conferred, the corporation shall file in the office of the secretary of each State the name and post-office address of an authorized agent in such State upon whom local process or demands against The Mothers of World War No. 2 may be served.

SEC. 11. This charter shall take effect upon its being accepted by a majority vote of the incorporators named herein, who shall be present at the first meeting of the corporation, due notice of which meeting shall be given to each of the incorporators named herein, and a notice of such acceptance shall be given by said corporation, causing a certificate to that effect, signed by the president and secretary, to be filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the city of Washington, D. C.

SEC. 12. Congress may from time to time alter, repeal, or modify any and all laws with respect to this incorporation, but no contract or individual right made or acquired shall thereby be divested or impaired.

Mr. Speaker, this war is not yet over. While it is our fervent hope that victory will soon be ours, yet that happy day has not yet arrived. We must win this war as quickly and as completely as possible. This great organization of mothers, after it has been duly and properly incorporated by an act of Congress, will go forward as a united force, waging the fight for the better things in our country, instilling a finer morale and an undaunted courage among our fighting forces and our people, and rendering that timely aid which will be lasting as a contribution to our ultimate victory, and, when the war is over, to aid in healing the scars of war when victory comes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] for 15 minutes.

COMPENSATION FOR SHIPS PURCHASED, CHARTERED, OR INSURED BY WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, lately a Washington newspaper published the announcement that the President has appointed three Federal judges to act as a special board of review on just compensation for ships purchased, chartered, or insured by the War Shipping Administration for war purposes. The President appointed Judge Hand, of New York; Judge Parker, of North Carolina; and Judge Hutcheson, Jr., of Texas.

NO DOUBT THEY ARE CAPABLE MEN

I am interested in these appointments and the creation of this review board from the standpoint of the institution of Congress and the legislation of the last great deliberative body in the world. In the first place, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, section 902, as amended, provides the formula for just compensation to the shipowners for the ships requisitioned by the Maritime Commission. That law is in full force and effect today.

On June 10, 1943, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House had before it for hearings H. R. 2371, which its chairman says is a bill to facilitate the award and payment of just compensation for property requisitioned under said act. I called the clerk of the committee this morning and learned that the Merchant Marine Committee has not made any report or public findings on the bill as a result of the hearings and there is no legislation recommended by the committee on the subject matter for the Congress to act upon.

Numerous ships have been requisitioned, chartered, and insured by the Government and the question of value revolves around three dates. Admiral Land has stated the date controversy on June 10 before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee as follows:

> The Comptroller General has ruled that the causes necessitating the taking developed on September 8, 1939. War Shipping Administration believes that the causes did not begin to develop until late in 1940. The owners feel that the causes did not develop until the general emergency was proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941, or perhaps not until after December 7, 1941.

This controversy of dates, the controversy of values, notwithstanding the positive mandates of the Merchant Marine Act, has existed from the date of the first taking of ships for use in this war. If there is anything wrong with section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, as amended, this Congress should legislate on the matter and directly meet the issues.

I am disturbed from the standpoint of the integrity of the Congress of the United States by the following pertinent chronology of facts:

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, puts upor the Maritime Commission the responsibility of determining and paying the proper and statutory values of ships taken for national emergency and the war. The Maritime Commission is a five-man Commission.

In February of 1942 the President, by Executive order, created the War Shipping Administration and transferred to it certain powers vested by the Merchant Marine Act in the Commission—among them, some of the functions of determining the value of ships taken for emergency and war purposes.

Admiral Land, as head of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration, has not followed the ruling of the Comptroller General with reference to the payment of just compensation. Shipowners have written to me and have stated that they have not gotten their money for many months after their ships were taken for emergency and war uses. As head of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration, Admiral Land apparently does not see the justice of the law or the date of September 8, 1939, set by the Comptroller General as the basis for arriving at a just compensation for ships taken and is a ready witness on indirect methods to amend the law or to skirt it.

On June 10 and 11, the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee held hearings on H. R. 2371 and has not recommended legislation. During the week of October 11, the President appointed Judge Hand, Judge Parker, and Judge Hutcheson, Jr., to act as a special board of review on the just compensation.

The chronology of facts to me presents a very plain case of dissatisfaction with the plain provisions of the Maritime Act of 1936, as amended. The Maritime Commission has the power to set values. It has the power to requisition ships at those values. If the values are inadequate for the ship owners, the plain language of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, provides the shipowner may accept 75 percent of the amount determined and offered by the Maritime Commission and then sue for whatever amount they consider proper. Questions that come into my mind after this factual chronology are: Why has the Maritime Commission not set values and offered them? Why not let the shipowners and the shipping interests bring their cases into the courts to test the constitutionality of section 902–a as amended? Why is Admiral Land testifying that section 902–a involves a constitutional question?

It is hard to understand why the Maritime Commission fears that the shipowners will sue their claims in court. It is further hard to understand why the Maritime Commission does not carry out its duties providing values in accordance with the plain terms of the statute. If the Congress in 1936, enacting the Merchant Marine Act, and later Congresses in amending it are to be repudiated now in World War No. 2, why do not we positively amend the act?

Without any further explanation to enlighten me, it seems to me that the stage is being set for circumvention of section 902–a of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, without repealing or amending the law now. The Maritime Commission is given a definite formula by this section and if the Maritime Commission is not doing its duty, the members should be removed rather than keeping them on the job and appointing an advisory board to review their work or referee their findings of values.

I am terribly distressed at new boards and commissions and bureaus appearing overnight through Executive fiat or claiming the authorization for their birth in the War Powers Act. To me, it all adds up to a comprehensive question, Shall the Congress of the United States become impotent by attrition of Executive orders, boards, bureaus, and commissions?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House heretofore granted, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] for 10 minutes.

SUBSIDIES AND FARM PRICES

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the other day the Commodity Credit Corporation bill was reported by the Banking and Currency Committee. This bill continues the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for a period of 2 years after the war. I do not think anybody has any quarrel with continuing the life of this Corporation. The controversy is entirely on one

section of the bill, section 3. If the bill as it is reported is enacted and becomes a law it will be unlawful for any maximum or ceiling price to be placed on any food commodity which is less than the support price.

In other words, section 3, as it is written, destroys the possibility of using subsidies in the production and consumption of food. There is merit in the contention of those who oppose the use of subsidies. Subsidies have two vices, I believe. One of them is that they tend to disguise from us the actual cost of production and are rather inclined to make us go along in a fool's paradise, oblivious as to what the war is actually costing. The second objection is that insofar as money which is paid out by the Government in subsidies must be paid in taxes, and insofar as it is not taken to cut down the excess purchasing power of the consuming public it is, to that extent, inflationary. I think these are just arguments against subsidies, but I contend there are other arguments which counterbalance them. In the first place, we are living in a tight, unnatural, and false economy at the present time. In order to increase the production of aluminum, in order to get oil to the Atlantic seaboard, in order to import or produce many vital materials the Government has found it necessary to pay for either a certain portion of the cost of production of the commodities, or of their transportation cost. In order to secure a maximum production of food, the Government is encouraging the farmers by contracting with them by means of a pledged support price, and if the market does not pay the amount of that support price, the Government will step in and either buy the commodities, or pay the difference. That is very good. We have production of food in this country greater than any production of food that we have ever had, and I think that without the use of these contracts, the offer of the Government to indemnify the farmer against loss, that we could not possibly otherwise have had it.

I hesitate to speak with any authority about the farmer because I know so little from practical experience about farming. However, I have tried as best I could to acquaint myself with the subject, because it is of interest not only to the farmer but to the American consumer and producer, and also of interest to our national economy. As I take it, the farmer is faced with many problems he never was faced with before. He is faced with a shortage of skilled labor, with a shortage of machinery, and in consequence, it is more expensive for him to produce than it was before. Articles that the farmer buys cost more than they did before, and to that extent also the farmer must be promised a better return for his work in order that he may operate and operate not at a loss. But, in addition, there are several other factors that enter into the increased cost of food, and into this support price the Government is promising the farmer. One of them is the fact that there are certain articles of production we need badly, and consequently it is wisdom on the part of the Government that it should encourage the production of those commodities, and ask the farmer to grow those scarce commodities rather than other commodities which the farmer is used to growing.

To that extent the use of support prices is justified. Then I am told there are certain marginal lands which are placed in production, which are responsible for giving us a larger yield, which under normal circumstances would not be farmed.

I am stressing these points to try to bring out the fact that the cost of food production at the present time includes two factors: One is the normal cost of production and the other is the abnormal cost brought about by the war. To the extent of the abnormal cost I feel that, as a matter of justice, the money which is spent by the Government in order to get into production the margin which makes the difference between almost meeting our food demands and meeting them should not properly be charged against the consumer. When the Government's program steps in and pays for a certain percentage of food cost the amount paid by the Government cannot fairly in every instance be passed on to the consumer.

One objection to subsidies which I have heard voiced many times in the hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency is the inflated income of the country. Witnesses say this is the worst time in the world in which we should pay a portion of a person's food bill. I remarked a few minutes ago that we were paying a part of New England's fuel bill, and that it is only fair that we should. We are building houses close to industry in order that industry can get men to work; industries which are producing munitions and instruments of war. Those houses would not be considered economic investments under ordinary circumstances. The amount that people are paying to live in those houses does not in all instances reflect an economic rent. Therefore, the Government's loss is in effect a subsidy.

I will admit that the money for which there is no outlet in consumers' goods is greater now than it has ever been. It is obvious that this money constitutes a constant pressure against the effort to hold back inflation. But this excess income is not equally divided.

I was very much interested the other day, and I succeeded in getting some statistics compiled, which showed me that if you add the people of fixed incomes in this country to the people whose income has gone up in some instances but not as far as the cost of living, you have a total of 33,350,000 people in this country who are less able to pay their daily expenses than they were before. Those people of fixed income include people on public assistance, Government salaries, allotments, veterans' pensions, railroad retirement, and civil-service pensions. They amount to 14,000,000 people. The workers whose wages have gone up, but not as fast as the cost of living, include people in transportation, trade, Government, finance, services, and miscellaneous. They number 19,000,000. The total of these low-income groups is therefore 33,000,000 people.

In addition to those 33,000,000 there will be the dependents of those people. Obviously in this group I have named, many of them do not have any dependents. However, some of them do. It is fair, also, to say that this figure does not take into consideration any family income in which there are two or more people working. Consequently, it should be adjusted down to a certain extent, but at any rate, you have upward of 30,000,000, plus their dependents, in this country who are not as able as they were before, to meet their ordinary expenses. It is upon this class that the increase in the cost of living will effect a hardship. They already are laboring under a hardship, and an increase in the cost of living will increase the hardship for many to the point where it becomes unbearable.

It is my hope to be again permitted to address the House on the general subject, at which time I would like to discuss several other aspects of our battle against inflation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

CANOL PROJECT

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss further with the House the one hundred and thirty-eight million Canadian oil project known as the Canol project. It is interesting, as will be noted, to see how Canada and the British Isles are insisting that the Canadian and British people understand that Canada is not making any investment in this oil development.

Recently when an appropriation was up before the Canadian Parliament for $1,755,000, Mines and Resource Item in War appropriation, the Canadian Government was going to be certain where the money was to be expended, as you will note from a news item later.

[From the Petroleum Times of September 4, 1943]

ALASKAN HIGHWAY AND JOINT UNITED STATES-CANADA OIL PROJECT

Canada's rights in connection with the Alaska Highway and with the large project for piping oil from Fort Norman to White Horse in the Yukon, two important war projects, are fully protected for post-war use, Premier Mackenzie King assured the Canadian House of Commons recently.

He said the United States was paying the cost of the Fort Norman oil development project, and that Canada was providing sites for plants and right-of-way for the pipe line. Equipment, labor and managerial personnel were being brought in from the United States. But title to the lands affected would remain with Canada, while the pipe line and the refineries could be purchased by Canada at the end of the war.

"The United States is paying the costs of the oil project," the Prime Minister said, "and is also making oil rights available under proper regulations. The Canadian Government has also agreed during the war to waive import duties, taxes, and license fees.

"Royalties on oil produced under this project," the Prime Minister said, "are also waived for the duration of the war. The United States Government retains ownership of the pipe line and refinery until the end of the war, at which time they will be offered for sale, with the Canadian Government being given prior right of purchase. Failing a satisfactory sale being made, the disposition of the pipe line and refinery will be referred to the Permanent Joint Defense Board. It is impossible at this time to estimate the amount of money involved in the construction of the pipe line and refinery.

"Title to the land through which the pipe line runs remains in the Crown in the right of Canada," Premier King explained. "Under the agreement between the two Governments the pipe line and refinery will be offered for sale at the conclusion of the war at a valuation set by two appraisers, one named by Canada and one by the United States."

THE GREAT "CANOL" PROJECT—UNITED STATES, NOT CANADIAN, MONEY INVOLVED

A great wartime oil-development project in the North known officially as "Canol," involving the drilling of scores of wells, the laying of more than 1,000 miles of pipe line and other work, will be completed probably this year, it was announced by Capt. Freeman C. Bishop, public relations officer for the Northwest Service Command of the United States Army.

The project is said to rival the Alaska military highway in scope and the rapidity with which the entire area has been expanded to meet the increasing need of war.

Captain Bishop said the Canol project—an abbreviation for Canadian oil—would go down in wartime development history of the Northwest as a project comparable to the Alaska highway in difficulty and in results.

The undertaking is a vast program for the development of Canadian oil resources, coupled with the building of a pipe line more than 1,000 miles long through which gasoline and oil can be supplied to the fleets of trucks using the Alaska highway, to the planes which use the route to Alaska, and to steamships in Alaska ports.

The project, heretofore little mentioned outside the area of the Northwest Service Command, headed by Brig. Gen. James A. (Patsy) O'Connor, who is in active charge of the entire undertaking, is well advanced.

With drilling under way, and constantly increasing in extent, in the area of Fort Norman, 400 miles northeast of Whitehorse on the McKenzie River, the project is uncovering an oil field which has already surpassed all geologists' expectations, and is believed by some to give promise of becoming one of the most important fields on the American Continent.

General O'Connor stated recently: "From the beginning the possibilities of the project have grown almost day by day. When it was undertaken, the experts predicted that the wells of the Fort Norman field would yield only a few hundred barrels of oil a day. As drilling progressed, actual production surpassed these figures by leaps and bounds. Wells have been drilled in scattered locations, in an attempt to outline the extent of the field. The field is still not outlined. So far not one well has failed to produce oil."

In this connection, Hon. T. A. Crerar, minister of resources, told the Canadian House of Commons recently that the Dominion Government had not spent a dollar on the development of oil wells at Fort Norman or on the pipe line to Whitehorse and other Alaskan points.

The development at Fort Norman was initiated by the United States Government to provide petroleum products for war operations in Alaska, with the Imperial Oil Co. doing the drilling and producing, he said.

The discussion arose during consideration in committee of the $1,755,000 mines and resources item in the war appropriation for the current fiscal year.

Mr. Crerar said all the Canadian Government had done to further the development was to give the Imperial Oil Co. permits to drill in certain areas. The drilling brought results which justified the big production and pipe-line project recently announced. He said the Government had discouraged applicants for permits from purely speculative prospectors.

P. E. Wright (C. C. F. Melfort) said it appeared the Government had placed in the hands of one big company a natural resource which might prove of great commercial value.

Mr. Crerar said there was an agreement, described to the House of Commons earlier in the session by Premier King, safeguarding Canada's rights to the development when the war emergency ends.

A partial explanation of the Fort Norman, or Norman Wells, development was issued on October 14 by Mr. R. W. Gallagher, president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, as follows:

The United States Government stands to be reimbursed in full for expenditures on the development of the Fort Norman oil field out of oil produced from the field, R. W. Gallagher, president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, asserted yesterday in answering criticism which has arisen with respect to large Government expenditures on war projects in western Canada.

The Government, he said, is underwriting direct expenses incurred by Imperial Oil, Standard of New Jersey subsidiary in Canada, in developing the project, but this money is to be repaid to the Government through a reduction to 50 cents a barrel of the price of crude it buys. This reduction will begin after the Government has purchased 1,500,000 barrels of oil at the regular price of $1.25 a barrel, and will continue until the Government has been reimbursed for all outlays to Imperial.

Mr. Gallagher explained that expansion of the Fort Norman (also called Norman wells) oil field was first suggested to Imperial by the United States Army in April 1942. Imperial was the only organization with oil-producing experience in that area, having operated in the far north since 1919.

Mr. Gallagher, while explaining the position of Imperial Oil with respect to the Fort Norman project, was flanked by two of the leading oil geologists of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, who are also directors. One of them, Wallace Pratt, explained in detail the Fort Norman development "off the record" and it was explained that Standard of New Jersey has long sought to make public all the facts concerning its activities in northern Canada but has been prevented from doing so by Army censorship.

Eugene Holman, the other Standard Oil geologist, outlined the circumstances under which the Fort Norman oil project was launched through discussions between Government officials and Standard Oil men at which the noted Arctic explorer, Vilhjalmur Stefansson, was present, as advisor to the United States Government.

This statement was made 2 days after I had made my remarks in the House concerning the Canol project, of which the Fort Norman field development is a part. Fort Norman field is the supply end of the project, and it is being linked with Whitehorse, in Canada, by about 600 miles of pipe line, and at Whitehorse a refinery is being built, or is to be built.

The statement by Mr. Gallagher supplies a few details concerning the field development only. It leaves unanswered some questions which I raised. What are the terms of the contract? Between whom and under what authority was a contract made? What becomes of this gigantic investment after the war?

Since I spoke I have received the following letter from Julius H. Amberg, special assistant to the Secretary of War:

Judge Patterson has asked me to inform you that since he wrote to you on October 8, the Truman committee of the Senate has asked permission to examine the documents relating to the Canol project. Inasmuch as this was asked by a congressional committee, Judge Patterson has authorized such examination, the committee to maintain the secrecy classification, at least for the present.

Judge Patterson wishes you to know that his granting the request of the Truman committee shortly after his letter to you was solely because the request was made by a committee which one of the Houses of Congress had expressly authorized and directed to inquire into the war effort. The same right to examine the documents would be granted to the House Military Affairs Committee, which has similar authorization by resolution of the House of Representatives.

I am not consumed by personal curiosity in this matter, but I doubt that any question of military security exists which calls for continued secrecy. As I said, the enemy is concerned only with the location of the installations and the War Department has itself revealed these in a former press release and further particulars were given in published articles, including the extensive account published by Maclean's magazine of August 15, which I quoted in my remarks of October 12.

There was only one other point on which the enemy might be curious and that was the extent of the supply which might be obtained at Fort Norman. Mr. Gallagher tells about this. He said:

By January 1943, enough new wells had been drilled to produce 3,000 barrels daily. Additional wells have been drilled since that time and this capacity is being expanded still further to meet United States Army needs.

That is not an adequate explanation, but I doubt that the contract or agreement goes any further as to the "United States Army needs." It doubless does have something in it of interest to the taxpayers of the United States who will pay the bill for this project.

They are paying the bill on the field development, which is the only phase of the project discussed by Mr. Gallagher. He makes it sound very attractive by saying that while the United States Government is—

underwriting direct expenses incurred by Imperial in developing the project—this money is to be repaid to the Government by a reduction to 50 cents a barrel of the price of crude it buys. This reduction will begin after the Government has purchased 1,500,000 barrels of oil at the regular price of $1.25 a barrel, and will continue until the Government has been reimbursed for all outlays to Imperial.

The bargain price will not prevail, however, until one and one-half million barrels have been delivered. That may be a long time off, for I have heard that they are by no means ready with the pipe line.

Even the $1.25 a barrel price seems low, but let us not be misled. There is only one fair way to keep the books on this project and that is to charge the entire cost, field development, pipe-line construction, refinery construction, and any other expense such as the building of the roads and airports that were needed along the pipe-line route, to the production of the oil. Lacking any other explanation, that is a fair assumption. If the whole affair is costing $138,000,000, as Maclean's magazine said it was, then every barrel of oil produced will cost the amount represented by dividing $138,000,000 by the number of barrels, or the cost will be about $46,000 a barrel against $1.294 a barrel cost to produce new oil in the United States. Let us not be diverted by quotations as to the field price. I do not assume that the Standard, through its subsidiary, Imperial Oil, Ltd., is going to make any profit. Mr. Gallagher says that the United States Army suggested the expansion of the field. The field had been known since 1919; it was 1,500 miles from any substantial market and little use had ever been made of it. Certainly, there can be no profit in that wilderness country at $1.25 a barrel; producers here at home go broke on that price.

What we want to know here at home is what we have agreed to do. We are hearing entirely too many reports of commitments made around the world that will have to be cleaned up later. When the necessity for military secrecy has passed, or has been removed by the military itself as in the Fort Norman case, the people of this country have the right to know what is going on.

For 2 years we have been trying here at home to get a price increase on crude oil so that the producers could develop the supply for the war and the essential civilian needs. Nothing has been done and we have moved into a Nation-wide shortage that has been created by the Government. In the name of "holding the line," the consumer has been denied the privilege of getting gasoline and fuel oil at a little additional cost, while his money has been scattered far and wide in foreign countries on impractical ventures.

Now, as already stated, Mr. Gallagher, president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, states that there is under production as of January 1943 about 3,000 barrels a day. This is a drop in the bucket. As I have already pointed out we are producing 4,250,000 barrels daily in the United States and he states that the United States Government is underwriting directly expenses incurred by the Imperial Oil Co. in developing the project, also that this money is to be repaid to the Government by a reduction of price of 75 cents a barrel on the crude it buys and that this reduction will begin after the Government has purchased 1,500,000 barrels at the regular price of $1.25 per barrel, and will continue until the Government has been reimbursed for all outlays to Imperial.

Well, if the estimated production is 3,000 barrels a day, and the Government is going to be rebated 75 cents a barrel, that would be $2,250 a day. At $2,250 a day into $138,000,000 it would take 61,333 days. Well, with 365 days a year into 61,333 days, it will take 168 years to get our money back, and there is nobody in this Congress who will be very much concerned 168 years from now, nor will Mr. Gallagher.

Now, I understand the Canadian Government, according to the statement of Premier Mackenzie King in the Petroleum Times under the agreement between the two Governments, the pipe line and refineries will be offered for sale at the conclusion of the war at a quotation set by the two appraisers, one to be named by Canada and one to be named by the United States.

Now, if the contract of May 20, 1942, permits Canada to buy the property outright at the termination of the war, I cannot figure out how Mr. Gallagher, of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey can determine how we are going to get the American taxpayer's money back, because all the whole outfit will bring only scrap prices for the pipe line and refinery as there is no local market to speak of for the oil so it would be better to continue the good-neighbor policy and give Canada the whole setup outright as it will have no marketable value to speak of. I would suggest that Mr. Gallagher be careful with his statements because he might have a lot of explaining to do to the stockholders of his company for being associated with such an impractical oil venture. It appears from Mr. Gallagher's statement that he is greatly concerned so he throws out a smoke screen to confuse public thinking. He knows if there was any oil at Norman Wells that the Imperial Oil Co. would have been up there long ago and developed these properties.

It will be also noted in a newspaper report that the Arctic explorer, Vilhjalmur Stefansson, was present when the news story was given to the press, and that he was adviser to the United States Government. Now, I think it would be interesting to know who conceived this idea. Maybe it originated with the explorer. Now, it is all right to explore the Arctics and chart icebergs, but when you explore and chart for oil, you better be right and know what you are talking about or someone will pay through the nose, and in that case it happens to be the American taxpayer who is the goat in this exploration project.

I suggest that whatever committee of the Congress—the Lea petroleum committee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or Military Affairs, as suggested by Under Secretary of War Patterson—that this committee bring in the Arctic explorer and see what he can tell us about this oil project—how much oil he thinks is up in the Arctic Circle. This because it is stated that he is adviser to the United States Government—but I want to tell the Members of Congress the only way anyone can tell how much oil there is at Norman wells is when the oil drill bites deep into the rock and the results tell the story.

In this instance what the American people are entitled to know are the terms of the contract—whether or not this is really a contribution to the war effort, or whether it was an opportunity to ascertain whether this field had any oil up in the Canadian wilderness. To me, it looks like a grand old Work Projects Administration project. Now, I do not object to a W. P. A. project if the money is expended in the United States, but I cannot reconcile the spending of the taxpayers' money up in Canada on a project of this type requiring not only our men and money but thousands of tons of material, such as pipe, 15,000 tons of which was the initial shipment, which could have been used in this country to good advantage and contributed very greatly to increasing the production of oil in the United States. Also, I have been advised that the Board of Economic Warfare sent Robert Coghill, petroleum consultant, up to Norman wells to look the job over. I talked to Mr. Coghill and he stated his report had been submitted to the Board of Economic Warfare, and I am of the opinion that Mr. Wayne Coy, of Bureau of the Budget, also completed a report. Now, whatever committee of the House handles the matter, it ought to request that Secretary Ickes, of the Petroleum Administration for War; Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Administrator for P. A. W.; Under Secretary of War Robert Patterson; Robert Coghill, of the Board of Economic Warfare; Wayne Coy, of the Bureau of the Budget; R. W. Gallagher, president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, and the War Department petroleum experts make public the facts concerning this Arctic oil exploration in northern Canada, and, last but not least, Arctic Explorer Vilhjalmur Stefansson, who evidently has turned from ice to oil; that they all be called in before the committee, and we should hear what they have to say about this little expenditure of $138,000,000.

A 50-cent price increase on oil in the United States, I might say to the Members of Congress—and this is an estimate—will produce more oil in a year than they will produce at Norman wells in the next 50 years, and this without cost to the taxpayer.

I repeat my assertions of last week that there should be a thorough investigation of this Fort Norman project.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Brooklyn Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an address by the secretary of the American Livestock Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AUTOMOBILES

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that when "Boss" Flynn had an area on the grounds of his private home paved with city-owned paving blocks and used the services of employees on the public pay roll to do the job, his defense was in part that he knew nothing about the transaction and that he subsequently made good by paying for the blocks and the labor. Every effort was made at that time to belittle the charges as being insignificant in character. Later, when the President nominated Flynn to be United States Minister to Australia, objections were filed and testimony was taken in the other body in support of the charges. As a result, the incident, declared by his friends to have been trivial in character, assumed national importance, and public sentiment against Mr. Flynn became so pronounced that his nomination was withdrawn by the President.

I refer to this incident only because it may be alleged by someone that the facts which I am about to present may disclose an incident trivial in character. Because the facts which I shall relate involve what I conceive to be the integrity of the House of Representatives and because the American public are entitled to know that an overwhelming majority of the membership of this House are alert and determined to protect the public interest, I feel obligated to my colleagues and to the public to relate the facts. I shall be guided by the Rules of the House, and without statement of conclusions will let the facts speak for themselves.

Public Resolution No. 53, of the Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 23, 1935, established a commission to be known as the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission for the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formation of the Constitution.

The resolution provided for 18 commissioners, to be headed by the President of the United States. The resolution provided that the commissioners should receive no compensation for their services but should be paid their actual and necessary traveling, hotel, and other expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties. The resolution further provided that the commission might appoint a director and such associates and subordinates as the director might deem necessary. The commission was directed to make a report to the Congress in order that enabling legislation might be enacted. It further provided that the commission should expire on December 31, 1939. It authorized an appropriation of $10,000.

Thereafter, and on June 1, 1936, Public Resolution No. 97 of the Seventy-fourth Congress was approved to carry out and give effect to certain approved plans for the observance of the formation of the Constitution of the United States. In this resolution provision is again made for the payment of actual traveling, subsistence, and other expenses incurred by the commissioners in the discharge of their duties. The sum of $200,000 was authorized to be appropriated.

Public Resolution No. 63 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, approved August 19, 1937, increased the amount of the authorization from $475,000. Public Resolution No. 92, Seventy-fifth Congress, made available additional funds for the commission.

Several appropriation acts were passed by the Congress appropriating sums of money pursuant to authority contained in the joint resolution heretofore referred to. It will be observed that a careful reading of these authorizations and appropriation acts discloses no authority that would permit the commission or the director general of the commission to purchase a passenger automobile. I might say that our colleague, Hon. SOL BLOOM, was appointed director general, and functioned as such during the life of the commission.

It will be observed that the Congress for years has attempted to restrict the use of passenger vehicles purchased with public funds. As early as 1904, the Congress legislated on this subject, providing that—

> No part of any money appropriated by any act shall be used for purchasing, maintaining, driving, or operating any carriage or vehicle (other than those for the use of the President of the United States, the heads of the executive departments, and the secretary to the President, and other than those used for transportation of property belonging to or in the custody of the United States) for the personal or official use of any officer or employee of any of the executive departments unless the same shall specifically be authorized or provided for in terms by appropriation of money, and all such carriages and vehicles so procured and used for official purposes shall have conspicuously painted thereon at all times the full name of the executive department or other branch of the public service to which the same belong and in the service of which the same is used.

This attitude of Congress, clearly expressed in the law, has been maintained and strengthened by subsequent enactments down to the present date. In fact, section 202 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1944, Public Law 90, Seventy-eighth Congress, clearly enunciates the will of Congress, prohibiting the purchase or use of motor-driven passenger vehicles without specific legislative authority. The Appropriations Committee of the Congress has diligently sought to prevent the appropriation for private use of vehicles purchased with public funds.

I call attention to the various enactments of the Congress and the attitude of Congress upon this subject because no one familiar with the law could be mistaken as to the plain wording of the law, or of the spirit and intent of the Congress itself.

A few days ago I observed a Ford sedan bearing Government tag 847, driven by a colored chauffeur and occupied by the Director General of the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission.

This car was proceeding in the direction of my home. I observed that it was driven only to the home of the Director General.

Because this car bore a Government license and was occupied by a Member of Congress, my interest was aroused to ascertain to what department of government the use of this automobile was assigned. I could detect nothing on the car indicating the name of the executive department or other branch of public service to which the same belonged, as the law specifically requires. In order that there might not be any chance for mistake, I investigated the ownership of this car bearing Government tag 847 and found that on July 7, 1936, an application was filed for a certificate of title signed "SOL BLOOM, Director General." This application listed the ownership of this car in the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission and stated as the source of ownership that it was acquired new on July 1, 1936, from the Cherner Motor Co., Washington, D. C., payment being made in cash. Further investigation discloses the fact that a car was purchased on July 1, 1936, by the Director General of the Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission.

I further discovered that this same car has borne the same Government license tag from that day to the present.

Further investigation disclosed that when the General Accounting Office received the voucher of that purchase for audit, it was turned down by the General Accounting Office because there was no authority in law permitting the purchase of such an automobile.

Thereafter and in 1937 a resolution was submitted to the Appropriations Committee—I think in one of the deficiency bills of 1937—and authority was requested almost a year after the purchase of this car to authorize this Commission to purchase a motor-driven vehicle.

My colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has been kind enough to supply me with the testimony which he gave at that time before the Deficiency Committee on April 6, 1937. The facts developed that at the time the car was purchased there was no legal authority in law for this Commission to purchase it. Despite the plain prohibition of the law it was purchased on July 1, 1936. Thereafter, on or about April 6, 1937, the passage of a joint resolution, No. 214, which afterward became Public Law No. 121, of the Seventy-fifth Congress, authorized or ratified this illegal purchase which had been made nearly a year previous.

So it appears without question therefore, from the record, that the automobile in question bearing Government tag 847, is the property of the United States Government, paid for with public funds.

After the ascertainment of these facts some questions began to run through my mind. By the terms of the original resolution the commission itself expired December 31, 1939. Oh, yes, I have since ascertained that there were a few little things that had to be cleaned up and that the Appropriations Committee authorized funds for reprinting of this volume or another volume published by

the commission; and a small appropriation of $500 for "personal services" was made to see that this work was finally finished and closed up.

Now it appears that the Director General very properly, after securing authority from the Congress, had the right while on official business, to use the automobile which the Congress provided. At no time has the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] ever had the right to use this publicly owned car for his private business. I am wondering, when the commission finished its real work and had ceased as a commission, why that car was not returned to the Government as surplus property in the same manner that the typewriters and other equipment that was purchased for the use of the commission were returned.

In fact, and upon occasion after occasion not only the gentleman who is addressing you but many Members of Congress have observed this car bearing a Government tag license driven on the streets of the city of Washington in a manner that evidenced clearly that it could not be, by the wildest stretch of the imagination, be in use for "official business." This car has constantly been in use to carry the gentleman from his home to the Capitol and take him home at the end of the day.

I also observed the day that I first noticed this car upon the streets that it was driven by a colored chauffeur whom I recognized as an employee of the Foreign Affairs Committee of which the Director General of this commission is also chairman. In my judgment this again constitutes a flagrant misuse of public funds.

My colleagues, this situation raises a fundamental question in my mind: First, what funds are presently being used to pay for the upkeep and maintenance of this automobile, which is Government property; whose funds pay the chauffeur; in whose name is the public liability carried on this car, the commission having gone out of business. In the event of negligent use of this automobile who would be responsible, in view of the termination of the activities of the commission, the title to the car being in the commission.

This raises some very interesting questions, and I asked some of those questions of the distinguished gentleman from New York, as he will recall.

He advised me that he had a C gas card issued in the name of the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission and that his gasoline for this car was purchased by virtue of that gas-ration book. I wonder, in view of the questions asked, when a gas-ration book is issued how it is possible for a gas-ration book to be issued to a public agency that is out of existence by the very terms of the resolution creating it, in 1939.

It is also interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that pursuant to section 843 of the District of Columbia Code no vehicle is entitled to be equipped with a Government tag unless the same is owned and officially used by an agency of the United States Government. I think it is a fair question of inquiry. While the facts are conceded that this car is owned by the United States Government or an agency thereof, whether its present use is sufficiently official in character to justify having issued to it a Government-tag license without cost.

Mr. Speaker, these simple facts and my investigation of them clearly demonstrate that this automobile bearing Government tag 847 has been used in large part at least, for the personal convenience of the Director General of this Commission. The facts further demonstrate that an employee of the Foreign Affairs Committee has performed fairly continuous functions as chauffeur in the private use of this car.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I have presented some simple facts as I have been enabled to marshal them and verify them. I trust that the distinguished gentleman from New York may be able satisfactorily to answer the questions which I have propounded.

It may be contended that because the Committee on Appropriations authorized a republication of the history of the Constitution that the Director General may have felt he was entitled to the continued personal use of this automobile. May I say that the personal use of publicly owned cars has always been prohibited by law.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin has consumed 20 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute longer.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman may proceed for 1 additional minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. As I have previously indicated, however, the last appropriation act set up only $500 for personal services in connection with this republication. That fact alone should indicate the rather inconsequential character of the services still remaining to be performed by the Director General.

Members of Congress have repeatedly criticized bureaucrats for the unauthorized use of publicly owned motor vehicles. It is my settled conviction that these facts should be carefully scrutinized in order that we may keep our own doorstep clean.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be granted 10 minutes at this time to answer the gentleman from Wisconsin. What he has stated is partly true, but I should like to explain the reasons for it.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from New York may proceed for any part of 10 minutes that he desires.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with the gentleman from Wisconsin, who has just spoken. I think the House is entitled to know all of the facts, and I am very glad and happy to give them.

I do not believe I have really erred in any way. I have just tried to do my duty. In the early part of the life of the Commission I was told it was permissible to buy a car, and I bought the car. When the bill was presented to the General Accounting Office they stated: "You can buy a wagon, that is, a truck or delivery vehicle, but not a passenger car unless it was specifically authorized in the appropriation to the Commission."

That was news to me. I appeared before the Committee on Appropriations and asked to have the item corrected, which they did. At that time there were many other things the Commission desired that the appropriation did not specifically provide for.

I should like to have you understand that I have my own car and I have my own chauffeur. The car is used down here and has never been used by me for any personal trips or for any visits anywhere. It is used for whatever it is necessary for in case we have to deliver something or do something of that kind. Outside of that it is little used. If I wanted to hide anything I would not park it right out here in front where every Member of the House passes it and sees it.

Let me give you the whole story. This is the testimony before the Committee on Appropriations under date of April 6, 1937. I appeared before the Appropriations Committee and explained to the committee about the car and other things and I would like to read the following:

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1937

(Hearings conducted by the subcommittee, Messrs. Edward T. Taylor, chairman; Clifton A. Woodrum, John J. Boylan, Clarence Cannon, Louis Ludlow, Thomas S. McMillan, J. Buell Snyder, John Taber, Robert L. Bacon, and Richard B. Wigglesworth, of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, in charge of deficiency appropriations, on the days following, namely, Tuesday, April 6, 1937)

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION—STATEMENT OF HON. SOL BLOOM, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Authorization for certain miscellaneous expenses

Mr. WOODRUM. We have under consideration House Joint Resolution No. 214, which was referred to the Appropriations Committee and in turn referred to the deficiency subcommittee for consideration.

The resolution is as follows:

"*Resolved, etc.*, That the appropriation for the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission, contained in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1936, shall be available, in addition to the objects of expenditure for which available under existing law, for rent in the District of Columbia, individual photographs, books, periodicals, newspapers, newspaper clippings, purchase, maintenance, repair and operation of a motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, notarial seals, per diem allowances in lieu of actual expenses of subsistence within and outside the District of Columbia, and including payment of obligations for the foregoing purposes heretofore incurred in connection with the work of the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission."

You may proceed, Mr. BLOOM.

Mr. BLOOM. Gentlemen, I might say at the outset that we are very anxious to have this resolution passed so as to enable us to go ahead and pay bills that have already been contracted for.

This resolution was introduced primarily because the General Accounting Office sent

back quite a few of our bills stating that under the act we did not have the authority to buy these different items and obligate the Commission for these sums.

We have encumbered, or rather we have bought and obligated the Commission for the many items I have outlined on this sheet thus far. In fact, all the items that we have are not listed. For example, they will not allow us to buy individual photographs. Well, of course, you cannot run this Commission without buying individual photographs, such as photographs of the individual signers of the Constitution, and, I might say, that we sell these in sets.

We bought a four-passenger Ford car to be used in going around to the different departments and the printers. This was the cheapest car we could find. Then the General Accounting Office said: "This is a passenger car and you must have special legislation. If it was a truck you could buy it." But, we had already bought it.

Just to illustrate how things are, they do not permit us to buy any cars or press clippings.

Mr. WOODRUM. Have you a list of the items that have been challenged by the General Accounting Office up to the present time?

Mr. BLOOM. Up to a certain date, but we have been buying them because we could not get along without them. In other words, we would have to stop all this buying if we had waited for them to put their approval on all of the necessary items that we needed.

Mr. WOODRUM. How will you pay for them if they are not authorized?

Mr. BLOOM. I will then pay for them myself. I have done it before.

Mr. WOODRUM. Have you a list?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; I have a list.

Mr. WOODRUM. But do you have a list of all of the items that have been challenged by the General Accounting Office?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM. What changes in the present law does the present modification make?

Mr. BLOOM. It merely specifies the things we are allowed to buy.

Mr. WOODRUM. What does it permit you to buy?

Mr. BLOOM. Photographs.

Mr. WOODRUM. Individual photographs?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; books, periodicals, newspapers, newspaper clippings, purchase, maintenance, repair and operation of a motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, notarial seals, per diem allowance in lieu of actual expenses of subsistence within and outside the District of Columbia, and including payment of obligations for the foregoing purposes heretofore incurred in connection with the work of the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission.

Mr. TABER. Where does "per diem" in the United States come in? Does that mean people working in the District of Columbia?

Mr. BLOOM. We were entitled to people in the District. You do not allow me any expense. During the bicentennial you allowed $25,000 for entertaining expenses and I paid it all myself and you did not pay a cent.

Mr. TABER. Would it be actual expenses in the District of Columbia?

Mr. BLOOM. If I pay all the expenses I should get them back.

Mr. TABER. Yes; but how would that expense be incurred, that is "subsistence within and outside the District of Columbia"? You would have to bring people here from outside to qualify under that, would you not?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; then suppose I am here and a committee comes here from any other part of the country and I pay all the expenses. I mean, if I give any lunch or dinner; I pay for it and I should get it back some way.

Mr. LUDLOW. As I understand, Mr. Bloom, you are not asking for additional funds?

Mr. BLOOM. No.

Mr. LUDLOW. You just want to cover objects that you were unable to cover under the other resolution?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; and this does it.

Mr. LUDLOW. And you do not want another dollar?

Mr. BLOOM. No, sir; not yet.

Mr. LUDLOW. Leave out the "not yet."

Mr. BLOOM. I do not want to have it on the record that I will not come later and ask you for more money.

Mr. WOODRUM. I do not understand the language. You are talking about its authorizing you to be reimbursed for entertaining people. It seems that language would authorize you to "receive per diem allowances in lieu of actual expenses of subsistence within or outside the District of Columbia."

Mr. BLOOM. That is what the General Accounting Office informed me should be in the bill for me to be reimbursed.

Mr. WOODRUM. It would seem like subsistence allowance of employees working for you, if you were paying them an allowance.

Mr. BLOOM. No; that is not for employees.

Mr. WOODRUM. It is a very indefinite allowance.

Mr. TABER. How much money is embodied in these disallowed items?

Mr. BLOOM. I do not know up to date what it is; this goes back some time. There is one item of the clipping bureau in the amount of $613.24 that they have in this one item to the Burrell Clipping Bureau. Of course we continued that service right along.

Mr. TABER. You have quite a lot of items down there [indicating].

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. TABER. The total you have down to that date is about what?

Mr. BLOOM. It would be about $1,500 or $2,000.

Mr. TABER. And that was down to about what date?

Mr. BLOOM. I say August 25, 1936, in this. But I am talking about up to date it is about that sum.

Mr. TABER. It is about $1,500 or $2,000 to date.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. LUDLOW. You say that the profits from the receipts equal the amount of this appropriation?

Mr. BLOOM. It more than equals it.

Mr. WOODRUM. Is it the intention of the Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission to place on sale any documents, publications, or exhibits that you are getting up?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM. Do you expect to realize any consideration from those sales and will there be a profit from them?

Mr. BLOOM. I expect to realize the cost of production of the different articles and books and pamphlets that the Commission is issuing and there will be a profit for the Government.

Mr. WOODRUM. Will that profit substantially take care of the cost of the celebration?

Mr. BLOOM. It will.

Mr. WOODRUM. Those funds will be covered into the general funds of the Treasury and will not come to you?

Mr. BLOOM. No; we would not handle any money. All checks are made payable to the Treasurer of the United States and the cash which comes in the office of the Commission, a check is made out, a double check, and cash registered, and that cash is deposited every day to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States.

Mr. WOODRUM. As I understand it, the necessity for this legislation is that in the language making the appropriation they failed to set out those general items.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM. And there is a general law to the effect that no funds can be expended for these items unless they are set out in the appropriation.

Mr. BLOOM. Absolutely.

Mr. WOODRUM. If they had been set out in the appropriation bill that would be all right.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; and we would not be here today.

Mr. TABER. Do you figure that you could pay for all these items under this resolution?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; the General Accounting Office gave me these different items and told me practically what I should do. I have sent different things up on a preaudit and they have sent it back to me. Here is one which they sent back, and here is one for the clippings that they would not approve.

Mr. TABER. I think, in regard to those official cards that you would like to have, that if you inserted in the resolution the words "official cards" after the word "newspapers," that would take care of that particular item.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM. Are there any further questions? If there are not, we thank you, Mr. BLOOM.

In other words, during the bicentennial I paid for the automobile and the upkeep of the automobile, the running of it and everything else, and when it came time for the Constitution celebration I told them: "I used up one Lincoln car. I do not think I should do it again. I think they should supply a car for that purpose." And I went and bought the cheapest automobile I could, a cheap Ford. That is all there is to it.

I would like to have the Members read the complete testimony before the Appropriations Committee. The gentleman could have found full information if he had so wanted. I sent him a letter and showed him everything and the Appropriations Committee has all of the testimony and evidence that anyone would want to have.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I would prefer not to.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to say to the gentleman that I stated I have that testimony right before me.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no.

Mr. KEEFE. I have that testimony right before me.

Mr. BLOOM. No; no. It is not printed, and I told you so in the letter. I mentioned that the most important testimony is contained in the unprinted transcript of the hearings held by the Appropriations Committee on March 16, 1938.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD I may be permitted to place a letter I wrote to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. I hope he will not object to that because it gives a pretty fair explanation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

OCTOBER 19, 1943.

Hon. FRANK B. KEEFE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: In compliance with your verbal request the other day, I am enclosing herewith a copy of the final report of the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission which is embodied in the volume entitled, "History of the Formation of the Union Under the Constitution."

I wish to call your attention to the original act creating the Constitution Commission, approved August 23, 1935, which appears on

page iv. The report section of this volume begins on page 581, and you will notice on page 583 that the Congress authorized appropriations totaling $485,000, of which only $360,000 was appropriated; $15,000 was appropriated in addition for the publication of the final volume, instead of the $50,000 requested. Because of this reduction in appropriation from the amount originally authorized, the original plans for a three-volume set, to contain the historical matter and data compiled by the Commission and a detailed report of the Commission's activities, were necessarily condensed into one volume.

You will notice in the pages following 581 that a comprehensive report of the activities of the Commission and the various commemorative items issued by the Commission is shown in as much detail as practicable. Funds were appropriated for the Commission in the following acts:

Public Law No. 440, Seventy-fourth Congress (supplemental deficiency bill for 1936), $10,000.

Public Law No. 739, Seventy-fourth Congress (first deficiency appropriation for 1936), $200,000.

Public Law No. 121, Seventy-fifth Congress (second deficiency appropriation for 1937), additional authorization.

Public Law No. 354, Seventy-fifth Congress (third deficiency appropriation for 1937), $100,000.

Public Law No. 416, Seventy-sixth Congress (urgent deficiency appropriation for 1940), additional authorization.

Public Law No. 361, Seventy-sixth Congress (third deficiency appropriation for 1939), $15,000.

Public Law No. 150, Seventy-seventh Congress (second deficiency appropriation for 1941), additional authorization.

Public Resolution No. 92, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, $50,000 (H. J. Res. 623).

Public Law No. 763, Seventy-seventh Congress (second supplemental national defense appropriation for 1943), additional authorization.

I am also enclosing photostatic copies of pages from the following appropriation hearings from which you will note that extensive reports regarding activities and disbursements made by the Commission were submitted from time to time to the Committee on Appropriations.

Second deficiency appropriation bill for 1937, pages 1, 2, 3, and 4.

First deficiency appropriation bill for 1938, pages 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31.

Third deficiency appropriation bill for 1939, pages 695, 696, 697, and 698.

Second supplemental national defense appropriation bill for 1943, pages 291 and 292.

The most extensive report is contained in the unprinted transcript of the hearings on Public Law No. 92 of the Seventy-fifth Congress. During those hearings, on March 16, 1938, I submitted full and conclusive statements which had been prepared with the assistance of special auditors from the General Accounting Office.

I might mention here that all purchases and contracts for materials were handled strictly in accordance with General Accounting Office regulations and procedure and all vouchers issued had to be approved by the General Accounting Office before payment was made. In other words, vouchers in payment of bills against the Constitution Commission were drawn, approved by me, and sent to the General Accounting Office, where a check was issued and sent the payee only after the General Accounting Office approval had been given.

In order to obtain greater distribution of commemorative publications and items, the Commission secured congressional approval to sell items and to use the proceeds of such sales in a revolving fund for the purchase of additional items for further distribution. A total of $158,115.33 was deposited in the United States Treasury from the proceeds of such sales. Four thousand nine hundred and fifty-five dollars and twenty-one cents of this amount has been deposited since January 1, 1943, and helped make possible a reprint of the volume entitled "History of the Formation of the Union Under the Constitution," 10 copies of which will soon be distributed through the House folding room to each Representative and 20 copies to each Senator. There is an unexpended balance of funds in the United States Treasury of $493.85.

For your information, I am enclosing copies of specimen deposit sheets showing how deposits were made in the United States Treasury of the sums received from the sale of books, pictures, etc.

If there is any further information you may desire, kindly let me know and it will be a pleasure to see that it is furnished you promptly.

Sincerely yours,

SOL BLOOM.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I did get permission from the Appropriations Committee to buy this automobile. The members of that committee asked other questions.

I would like to explain about this. I have never been allowed a petty expense account. Mr. Speaker, I want you to believe me when I say this has been a labor of love with me. I have tried to do my duty, and if I made a mistake I am sorry for it. I can assure you I do not need any automobile of the Government, and I would not be seen going up to any place with it unless it was on official business.

The gentleman spoke about a C card. I told him I did not know anything about that. I know I, personally, am paying for the gasoline. That is all I know. He says I am not entitled to it, but I do not know anything about that.

Let me refer again to this testimony:

Mr. TABER. When this per diem in the United States comes up, does that mean people working in the District of Columbia?

Mr. BLOOM. We were entitled to have people in the District. You do not allow me any expense. During the Bicentennial you allowed $25,000 for entertaining expenses, and I paid it all myself and you did not pay a cent.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry this whole thing came up. Let me explain this.

Mr. Speaker, the commission did expire on June 30 of this year, and we had some money left over. The Appropriations Committee said: "Sol, the members have been asking for more books on the formation of the Union under the Constitution. If we allow you this appropriation, why do you not get out additional books and distribute them to Members?" I said I would love to do that and I told them: "I will revise it and bring it up to date."

It was only recently that I corrected the last proof. Every Member of the House will receive 10 copies of it and 20 copies will be allotted each Senator. This work I did in my spare hours. I do not have time to do this. I was not allowed any further expenses for clerical assistance. Where else can I get it except through the messenger boy allowed the committee? I have not spent any money for anything else.

It might appear that the Commission went out of existence on June 30 of this year, but I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to do everything I can to give all of the information and valuable material to the Members without 1 cent of cost to the Government. If I am to be criticized for that, I am sorry, but I do not think I have made a mistake.

That is the story. The automobile was purchased by me in good faith, but I purchased a passenger car instead of a truck and the General Accounting Office would not allow it. The Congress later approved my actions. We are working on these things to give them to you and within the next 3 or 4 weeks you will each receive 10 additional copies of this volume. This has been sold for $2.50 by the Superintendent of Documents.

That is my story and I want you to believe it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mrs. SMITH of Maine, indefinitely, on account of Naval Affairs Committee assignment to hold hearings on the west coast.

DR. GEORGE C. RUHLAND

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, when I read in the local press a few days ago that Dr. George C. Ruhland, the health officer of the District, is under attack and his removal from office is being demanded by a senatorial investigating committee because of certain unsatisfactory conditions at Gallinger Hospital, I took the trouble to gather a few facts regarding his record here and heretofore. I cannot permit the reputation he has earned by outstanding service in the field of public health for many years to be ruined without saying a word in his defense. I do this on my own initiative, without any request from him or anybody else, because I have known Dr. Ruhland and his work for 20 years.

Before coming to Washington he was the commissioner of health in my home city, Syracuse, N. Y. He held that position when I was corporation counsel of the city and we were closely associated in our official life. As a member of the city board of estimate and apportionment, I frequently heard him argue for larger appropriations for public health. He usually won his point and the results he obtained in my home town fully justified his demands. Our health records were vastly improved, our mortality rates substantially lowered. We took pride in the fact that during his regime our infant mortality rate was lower than that of any comparable city.

Dr. Ruhland came to Syracuse in 1924 as director of the Milbank fund health demonstration. The demonstration was a complete success. It taught us that

public health can be purchased when adequate funds are placed at the disposal of a competent public health officer, and that appropriations for public health are a splendid investment from the economic as well as the humanitarian point of view.

When the demonstration was completed Dr. Ruhland was retained as commissioner of health of Syracuse and, although his appointment was at first unpopular with the local medical profession, he had the respect and the confidence of the profession and the people of the city when he resigned in 1935 to accept the bigger job with a smaller salary as health officer of Washington.

Dr. Ruhland was born abroad of American parents. His brothers and sisters were born here and he came to this country as a babe in arms. He graduated from Concordia College in 1897 and from Marquette University Medical School in 1904 after a brief career as a newspaperman and a war correspondent during the Spanish-American War. He practiced medicine, taught in the medical college in Milwaukee, directed the laboratory work in the Milwaukee Health Department, and in 1912 was made health commissioner of Milwaukee. His work there was interrupted by the First World War when he served at Fort Sill as director of laboratories in the base hospital with the rank of major.

In Milwaukee, as in Syracuse, he reorganized the health department, improved and enlarged public health clinics, nursing, instruction, and service. Although both are industrial cities, their mortality ratings are in the lowest group.

In 1934 the District of Columbia found itself in need of a public health officer of proven ability. A committee of distinguished physicians was appointed to canvass the country and select the best available man. The committee included such men as the president of the District of Columbia Medical Society and the American Medical Association, the dean of George Washington University Medical School, the Assistant Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, and the dean of the medical school of Howard University.

Dr. Ruhland was recommended and appointed. There was no politics in his appointment. If he has any political affiliations, I do not know what they are.

Now, let us see what kind of a record Dr. Ruhland has made as Health Officer of the District. Here are a few facts:

Despite the overcrowded conditions in Washington due to the war, the death rate in 1942 was 10.8 per thousand population, the lowest in the history of the city. The rate has been reduced from 14 per 1,000 in 1937 to 10.8 in 1942, including the deaths at Glenn Dale Sanitarium in Maryland.

The deaths from pneumonia have fallen from 139 per 100,000 population in 1936 to 60 in 1942.

Since 1935, when there were 29 deaths from diphtheria, the rate of mortality from this disease has steadily declined. In 1942, with an increased population there were only three victims of diphtheria.

For 10 years there have been no cases of smallpox and, of course, no deaths.

Typhoid fever took 3 lives in 1942, as compared with 10 in 1936 and 12 in 1937.

One of the most serious health problems in Washington is the prevalence of tuberculosis, particularly among the colored people. Deaths from this disease have dropped from 107 per 100,000 population in 1936 to 72.8 in 1942, which is the lowest mortality rate in the District's history.

The maternal mortality rate in 1942 was also a new low for the District. It dropped from 6.5 per 1,000 live births in 1936 to 2.2 in 1942.

Infant mortality shows a similar decline. In 1936 there were 72 infant deaths per 1,000 live births; in 1942 there were 44.8.

The health officer of the District cannot claim entire credit for the improvement in the health records, but these facts and figures ought to be sufficient to prove to any fair-minded person that Dr. Ruhland has supervised and directed a job of incalculable value to this city during his incumbency.

I think the record shows that he has tackled his job manfully and successfully despite the difficulties of dealing with legislative committees and appropriation committees of both the Senate and the House. There have been improvements in the departments of his office dealing with administration, health education, vital statistics, maternal and child health, public health nursing, sanitation, food inspection, preventive diseases, tuberculosis control, venereal disease control, health of school children, dental services, laboratories, and social service.

I have not any doubt that many of the criticisms leveled at Gallinger Hospital are well taken. Public institutions are seldom administered as well as those under private control and sponsorship. If there is not a local board of good citizens charged with the responsibility of visitation and inspection, there ought to be. A voteless District cannot hold its public officials to strict accountability, but enlightened public opinion is an irresistible force.

Congress cannot escape its share of responsibility for any defects there may be in the equipment and management of Gallinger Hospital. Ever since he has been in Washington Dr. Ruhland has asked for appropriations sufficient to permit him to discharge the heavy duties of his office. He has not been given them.

During the past 6 years the health officer has requested budgetary increases for buildings, repairs, and personnel at Gallinger Hospital amounting to $1,424,757. He was allowed $428,560, although some additional funds were provided in deficiency appropriation bills and sources other than regular appropriations. In that same period he asked for 497 additional employees—medical officers, technicians, nurses, dieticians, attendants, clerks, stenographers, janitors, domestics, laborers—and was given an increase of 206. To be more specific, recommendations were made when the 1944 District of Columbia bill was being considered for an assistant superintendent, a secretary, a clerk, 2 associate medical officers, 2 social workers, and 2 clerk-stenographers, a total of 9 new employees. Two were authorized—1 clerk and 1 associate medical officer.

The members of the Appropriations Committee of the House are, without exception, men of high character and ability doing their conscientious best to eliminate waste and extravagance in Government expenditures. I admire and respect them all. I respectfully suggest, however, that the conditions at Gallinger Hospital which have caused so much criticism are due in large part to inadequate appropriations. I believe in economy, but not at the expense of national defense or public health.

Despite the attacks being made on Gallinger Hospital and the men responsible for its administration and management, the medical service there is recognized as being of a high order, and it is known as an institution for advanced study in surgery, orthopedics, urology, and obstetrics. It is unfortunate that current publicity has so besmirched the reputation of the hospital that many poor people dependent on its facilities are refusing to accept its services.

The investigation of Gallinger Hospital will undoubtedly have a salutary effect. Its shortcomings as well as its needs have been brought to light. I think they may be ascribed almost entirely to lack of manpower and funds.

It would be the height of folly and rank injustice to victimize Dr. Ruhland, the exceedingly able health officer of the District, for a situation he did not create and has struggled to correct.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2888. An act relating to the application of the excess-profits tax to certain production bonus payments; and

H. R. 3208. An act to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 20, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on House Joint Resolution 39, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older, at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, October 20, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 786, a bill to amend section 40

of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (to include chiropractic practitioners), at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, November 3, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the petroleum subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Thursday, October 21, 1943.

Business to be considered: To begin hearings on the petroleum situation.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The hearing which was scheduled for Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 10 a. m., on the bill, H. R. 3334, relating to certain benefits to trainees in the Maritime Service, has been postponed until Tuesday, October 26, 1943, at 10 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

859. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated June 5, 1943, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on, and a preliminary examination and survey of, the Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okeechobee drainage areas, Florida, with a view to the construction of side channels; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

860. A letter from the Director, War Relocation Authority, transmitting a copy of the Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements for the second quarter of fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

861. A letter from the administrative officer, Office of Defense Transportation, transmitting one copy of Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements, which represents the revised request of this agency for approval of a personnel ceiling during the quarter ending December 31, 1943, consistent with the needs as now determined; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

862. A letter from the Chief, Budget and Accounts Division, Department of Commerce, transmitting corrected form regarding estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

863. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting with reference to his letter dated January 7, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 541), reporting similar cases, a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 445 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

864. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to cancel drainage charges against certain lands within the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1854. A bill for the relief of Ethel Cohen; without amendment (Rept. No. 780). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1442. A bill for the relief of Lafayette Gibson; with amendment (Rept. No. 781). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 3488 (by request). A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 3489. A bill relating to certain Japanese residents of the United States and to certain citizens of Japanese descent found to be unfriendly to the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 3490. A bill to extend certain reemployment benefits of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and certain benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, to persons who enter employment classified as essential by the War Manpower Commission; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 3491. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 3492. A bill to authorize the removal of Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve officers from the honorary retired list under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 3493. A bill relating to the retired pay and retired grade of certain commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FISH:

H. J. Res. 174. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Stabilization Director to grant an increase of a minimum of 8 cents an hour to all nonoperating and operating railroad employees; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. Res. 325. Resolution providing examiners and other personnel necessary for the acquisition of adequate information for the use of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 326. Resolution providing for expenses of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations in carrying out the provisions of House Resolution 325; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. Res. 327. Resolution to amend the rules of the House to provide for a question period at which heads of executive departments and independent agencies are requested to appear and answer questions; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 3494. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lillie L. Woolfolk; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARTER:

H. R. 3495. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Constantino Arguelles, Concha Arguelles, wife, and four minor children; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 3496. A bill for the relief of Ernest A. Grottke; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H. R. 3497. A bill for the relief of Antonios Athanasiu Kantaras; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 3498. A bill for the relief of Doris Bertha Goodridge (nee Luis); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 3499. A bill for the relief of Julia Randall; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3058. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Veronica Baethke, of Elmhurst, Ill., and 21 other citizens, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3059. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Ellensburg, Yakima, Cowiche, Harrah, Wapato, White Swan, Touchet, Pasco, Wallula, and Freewater, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3060. By Mr. MAHON: Petition signed by J. T. Curb, G. W. Roach, and 203 other persons of Garza County, Tex., urging passage of House bill 836; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3061. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Resolution signed by Fred A. Noah, president, and L. A. Johnston, secretary, of the Egyptian Chapter No. 1, American War Dads, of Albion, Ill., and unanimously adopted October 7, 1943, by said organization, urging the immediate passage of House bill 3203, providing for an increase in the price of crude petroleum in order to stimulate that production much needed in the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3062. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of Etta Nutting, of Clermont, Iowa, and sundry other citizens, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3063. By Mr. FISH: Petition of Mrs. Edwin A. Lloyd, of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., and 40 other residents of that city, requesting that Congress pass House bill 2082, a measure introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, having for its purpose the reduction of absenteeism, conserving manpower, and the speeding of the production of material necessary for the winning of the war by the prohibition of the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3064. Also, petition of E. Barthel, proprietor, Union Hotel, and 19 other residents of Fishkill and Dutchess County, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation, and contending that professional prohibition organizations are attempting to force consideration and passage of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war, bring back prohibition by banning the sale of beer which is opposed by the War and Navy Departments as well as by the great majority of our soldiers, sailors, marines, and civilians, and would destroy legalized control and cause the loss of Federal rev-

enues without benefits to either State or Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3065. By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois: Petition of Evangelist E. L. Banta and 10,484 residents of the Twentieth Illinois Congressional District, requesting the banning of alcohol and immorality around Army camps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3066. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of the Charles Schneider Bakery, Washington, D. C., and signed by 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3067. Also, petition of N. Karras, Washington, D. C., and signed by six other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3068. Also, petition of Frank H. Kane of Washington, D. C., and 146 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3069. Also, petition of B. J. Rommal, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3070. Also, petition of the Monroe Grill, of Washington, D. C., and signed by 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3071. Also, petition of Melvin Eccardt and 21 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3072. Also, petition of Mrs. Leonard Kohr and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3073. Also, petition of H. P. Koenig and 39 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3074. Also, petition of Henry Will and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3075. Also, petition of William H. Kellermann and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3076. Also, petition of Herman V. Juergens and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3077. Also, petition of Edward Schenkel and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3078. Also, petition of Mrs. A. Kimerle and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3079. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Weiner and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3080. Also, petition of Joseph King and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3081. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of 536 citizens of the State of Iowa, urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3082. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of Frank E. Fox, of McCleary, Wash., and 13 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3083. Also, petition of Julia Kangas, of Aberdeen, Wash., and 89 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3084. Also, petition of R. K. Weir, of Cosmopolis, Wash., and 59 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3085. Also, petition of Emma E. Meissner, of Aberdeen, Wash., and 59 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3086. Also, petition of Helen Richards, of Hoquiam, Wash., and 25 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3087. Also, petition of E. K. Snider, of Vail, Wash., and 29 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3088. Also, petition of H. J. Steele, of Olympia, Wash., and 59 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3089. Also, petition of W. H. Amsbary, of Olympia, Wash., and 59 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3090. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Defense League of Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3091. Also, petition of the Puerto Rico Farmers Association, San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to amending the Organic Act for Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

3092. Also, petition of the Central Committee of the Finnish Societies of Greater New York, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Finnish-American Trade Union Committee; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 12, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who art to be surely found if with all our hearts we truly seek Thee; Thou art known by those who love; Thou art seen by those whose hearts are pure; Thou art heard by those who hush earth's blatant noises and in the quietness listen with reverent hearts. Thou hast given us thoughts that wander off into eternity. From the deepest valleys of distress and despair we lift our eyes to lofty heights on the far horizon, because Thou hast so made us that the glory of our life can never be beneath.

O God of Light, as we face a darkened world, grant to our minds that illumination without which we grope in a night from which the stars are gone and know not whither we go. May no blighting unbelief lie like withered leaves in the hidden hollows of our hearts. Forbid that when radiant human hopes are flaming in the skies we should be blinded by the smoke of our own campfires. When great ideas whose time has come beckon us to be their servants, save us from giving ourselves to the dead past, rather than to the living future. We ask it in the name which is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, October 19, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 19, 1943, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 378) to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Barkley	Butler
Andrews	Bilbo	Byrd
Bailey	Brewster	Capper
Ball	Bridges	Caraway
Bankhead	Buck	Chandler
Barbour	Burton	Chavez

Clark, Idaho	Kilgore	Scrugham
Clark, Mo.	Langer	Shipstead
Connally	McCarran	Smith
Danaher	McClellan	Stewart
Davis	McFarland	Taft
Downey	McKellar	Thomas, Idaho
Eastland	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Maybank	Tunnell
George	Mead	Tydings
Gerry	Millikin	Vandenberg
Gillette	Murdock	Van Nuys
Green	Nye	Wagner
Guffey	O'Daniel	Walsh
Gurney	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Hatch	Overton	Wherry
Hawkes	Pepper	White
Hayden	Radcliffe	Wiley
Hill	Reed	Willis
Holman	Revercomb	Wilson
Johnson, Calif.	Robertson	
Johnson, Colo.	Russell	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is detained on important public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is detained on official business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent from the city, visiting his son, who is in the armed forces.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

INSIGNIA FOR HONORABLY DISCHARGED MEMBERS OF ARMED SERVICES

Mr. WALSH. Madam President, on March 1 last I called to the attention of the Navy Department the importance and necessity of authorizing and permitting honorably discharged members of the armed services to wear insignia. I stated that many young men who actually entered the armed service and later were discharged because of some physical condition discovered after entering the service or developed in the service were often embarrassed because they were in the selective service age limits, could not wear a military uniform, and were unable to explain to the public their absence from military service.

Thereafter the Joint Naval and Army Personnel Board considered the proposal. After several meetings and after a survey of the problem had been made the suggestion was favorably received, and steps are being taken to issue to officers and enlisted personnel of the naval and other military services, including the Women's Reserve, an honorable-service button, to be awarded without cost upon separation or discharge. In the near future regulations authorizing the issuance of such buttons will be promulgated, but it will require some time to obtain adequate supplies of lapel buttons. As soon as they are available for distribution and other details are settled the permission to wear these insignia will be publicly authorized.

POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING (S. DOC. NO. 106)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Madam President, so many requests have been received for copies of the material which was presented last Tuesday to the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, headed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], that I am taking the liberty of announcing that there has been printed as a Senate document the entire proceedings of October 12, before the special committee. Copies of this Senate document arrived from the Government Printing Office today. There are a thousand copies in the Senate document room, and a thousand copies in the House document room. The Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, has also ordered a supply of this material in document form, and it will be on sale at his office at 15 cents a copy.

I take the liberty of making the announcement so those who read the RECORD may know where they may obtain copies of the material.

PETITION

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Oberlin, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1465. A bill for the relief of Dr. A. R. Adams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1466. A bill for the relief of T. H. Richardson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1467. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Jason McVay Austin; to the Committee on Claims.

AID AND BENEFITS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of legislation enacted by the Seventy-sixth, Seventy-seventh, and Seventy-eighth Congresses providing benefits for members of the armed forces and their dependents. I desire to make a brief statement concerning the subject matter.

Early in 1939 the Congress of the United States wisely initiated a series of legislative acts providing aid and benefits for the members of the armed forces and for their dependents. Before the beginning of the conflict and now, during its progress, Congress has been "on the alert" regarding the present and future welfare of the citizens of the Republic who are serving their country under arms, and of the welfare of those dependent upon them.

To date, they have enacted, since 1939, 45 public laws of vast importance to members of the armed forces and to their dependents. Out of the personal dislocations and burdens necessitated by the fighting and winning of a war for self-preservation, such as we fight today, has come the obligation to develop a sound and vigorous body of law devoted to the solution of the problems now faced and to be faced after the peace is won. Congress is vigilantly watching and constantly providing for the immediate needs and anticipating future requirements of the members of the armed forces and of their dependents. The assistance now extended and contemplated for the period of readjustment upon demobilization, the legal aid and relief directed to the preservation of the American home, the rehabilitation, pension, hospitalization, and insurance benefits of these laws, guarded by sound financial and economic reasoning, look toward the enlargement of the democratic way of life. Even the unborn dependents of our servicemen have been provided for in laws dealing with maternal and infant care.

In the transformation of the civilian to soldier, sailor, marine, or coastguardsman, new responsibilities are acquired and the old civilian responsibilities are left to be dealt with by the dependents. The dual aspect of this situation has been carefully surveyed, weighed, and acted upon by Congress in the light of experience resulting from the last great war, and with an abiding determination to establish better, more lasting, and sustained benefits for servicemen and their dependents than have before been attained.

As indicated by the great volume of correspondence received by me, and which I judge has been the experience of other Members of Congress, there exists an appreciable number of servicemen and servicemen's dependents who are ill informed or totally unaware of the privileges which Congress has provided for their special benefit and assistance. It is for this reason that I deem most necessary and important the outlining, in the form of a summary, quotations or excerpts of public laws of recent enactment for distribution to those who have relatives in the armed forces. This summary I ask be included as a part of my remarks. In this way the affected citizenry of my State and other States and possessions will be able to determine their rights and privileges under law.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION I

SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS, 1939–40

1. Public Law 18, Seventy-sixth Congress; chapter 35, first session; H. R. 3791:

"*Provided further,* That all officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army, if called or ordered into the active military service by the Federal Government for extended military service in excess of 30 days, and who suffer disability or death in line of duty from disease or injury while so employed shall be deemed to have been in the active military service during such period and shall be in all respects entitled to receive the same pensions, compensation, retirement, pay, and hospital benefits as are now or may hereafter be provided by law or regulation for officers and enlisted men of corresponding grades and length of service of the Regular Army." (Sec. 5. Approved, April 3, 1939.)

2. Public Law 179, Seventy-sixth Congress; chapter 284, first session; S. 1021:

"An act to extend the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act to members of the Officers' Reserve Corps and of the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army who are physically injured in line of duty while performing active duty or engaged in authorized training, and for other purposes." (Approved, July 15, 1939.)

3. Public Law 250, Seventy-sixth Congress; chapter 408, first session; H. R. 4647:

"An act to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States." (Approved, August 1, 1939.)

4. Public Law 257, Seventy-sixth Congress; chapter 415, first session; S. 522:

"An act to provide pensions to members of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who become disabled by reason of their service therein, equivalent to 75 percent of the compensation payable to war veterans for similar service-connected disabilities, and for other purposes." This law increases pensions for service-incurred disability. (Approved, August 4, 1939.)

5. Public Law 783, Seventy-sixth Congress; chapter 720, third session; S. 4164:

Section 8 (b) provides for the reemployment of exservicemen in the same or similar position held before entry into the service if still qualified and if application for the position previously held is made within 40 days after he is relieved from training and service.

Section 12 lists the monthly base pay of enlisted men of the Army and the Marine Corps. (Approved, September 16, 1940.)

6. Public Law 801, Seventy-sixth Congress; chapter 757, third session; H. R. 10413:

Title VI, National Service Life Insurance, part I, stipulates those eligible for insurance, eligible beneficiaries, and the manner in which such insurance will be payable.

Part II provides for the crediting of military service for annuity purposes under the railroad retirement acts. For amendments to this law see Public Laws Nos. 401 and 667, both of the Seventy-seventh Congress. (Approved, October 8, 1940.)

7. Public Law 846, Seventy-sixth Congress; chapter 859, third session; H. R. 8621:

"An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act and other retirement acts." This amendment is with respect to war veterans, and establishes the aggregate period of service which forms the basis for calculating the amount of any benefit provided, and for the computation of accredited service in the civil service of the United States or under the municipal government of the District of Columbia, in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, and other establishments. (Approved, October 14, 1940.)

8. Public Law 861, Seventy-sixth Congress; chapter 888, third session; S. 4270:

"An act to promote and strengthen the national defense by suspending enforcement of certain civil liabilities of certain persons serving in the Military and Naval Establishments, including the Coast Guard." This act is known as the "Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940," and provides for "the temporary suspension of legal proceedings and transactions which may prejudice the civil rights of persons in such service during the period herein specified over which this act remains in force." (Approved, October 17, 1940.)

9. Public Law 866, Seventy-sixth Congress; chapter 893, third session; H. R. 8930:

"An act to amend section 202 (3), World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws, and for other purposes." This act increases benefits for veterans and provides more uniform procedures under veterans' laws. (Approved, October 17, 1940.)

SECTION II

SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS, 1941–42

10. Public Law 182, Seventy-seventh Congress; chapter 307, first session; H. R. 1094:

"An act to grant pension for disability or death resulting from service in the United States Coast Guard before July 2, 1930, and for other purposes." This act is known as the "Coast Guard Pension Act of 1941." (Approved, July 18, 1941.)

11. Public Law 193, Seventy-seventh Congress; chapter 329, first session; H. R. 2855:

"An act to provide for payment of pension to certain dependent parents notwithstanding remarriage, and for other purposes." "The fact of remarriage of the mother or father shall not operate to terminate such pension, provided that dependency exists notwithstanding such remarriage." (Approved, July 30, 1941.)

12. Public Law 262, Seventy-seventh Congress; chapter 425, first session; H. R. 3484:

"An act to provide retirement pay and hospital benefits to certain Reserve officers, Army of the United States, disabled while on active duty." This act applies specifically to Reserve officers "who are now disabled from disease or injury contracted or received in line of duty while so employed, shall be deemed to have been in the active military service during such period and shall be in all respects entitled to receive the same retirement pay and hospital benefits as are now or may hereafter be provided by law or regulation for officers of corresponding grades and length of service of the Regular Army." (Approved, September 26, 1941.)

13. Public Law 359, Seventy-seventh Congress; chapter 598, first session; H. R. 6009:

"An act to provide pensions at wartime rates for officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard disabled in line of duty as a direct result of armed conflict, while engaged in extra hazardous service or while the United States is engaged in war, and for the dependents of those who die from such cause, and for other purposes. This act shall not be construed as to reduce any pension under any act, public or private." (Approved, December 19, 1941.)

14. Public Law 360, Seventy-seventh Congress; chapter 602, first session; H. R. 6215:

"An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes." This act provides for retroactive application for disability insurance. (See Public Law No. 801, 76th Cong., which this act amends.) (Approved, December 20, 1941.)

15. Public Law 365, Seventy-seventh Congress; chapter 612, first session; H. R. 4853:

"An act to amend section 4, Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, July 19, 1939, to authorize hospitalization of retired officers and other enlisted men who are war veterans on a parity with other war veterans." (Approved, December 22, 1941.)

16. Public Law 451, Seventy-seventh Congress; chapter 69, second session; S. 1935:

Providing for advancing amount of first premium on national service life insurance as a loan to men in the armed services. (Approved, February 11, 1942.)

17. Public Law 490, Seventy-seventh Congress; chapter 166, second session; H. R. 6446:

Provides for continuing payment of pay and allowances for certain missing, interned, or captured personnel of the armed services. (Approved, March 7, 1942.)

18. Public Law 507, Seventy-seventh Congress; chapter 199, second session; S. 2208:

Providing free postage for persons on active military or naval service: Providing for naturalization of former citizens serving in the armed forces of allies of the United States in World Wars Nos. 1 and 2. (Approved, March 27, 1942.)

19. Public Law 513, Seventy-seventh Congress; chapter 208, second session; S. 2339:

"An act to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through service with the Allied forces of the United States during the First or Second World War." (Approved, April 2, 1942.)

20. Public Law 517, Seventy-seventh Congress; chapter 220, second session; H. R. 6023:

"An act to provide for the payment for accumulative or accrued annual leave to certain employees of the United States, its Territories or Possessions, or the District of Columbia, who voluntarily enlist or otherwise enter the military or naval forces of the United States." (Approved, April 7, 1942.)

21. Public Law 523, Seventy-seventh Congress; chapter 240, second session; H. R. 6554:

This law is known as the Marine and War Risk Insurance Act of 1942, and amends war-risk insurance provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to expedite ocean transportation and assist the war effort. It authorizes the Commission to insure against loss or damage by the risks of war, persons, property, or interest. (Approved, April 11, 1942.)

22. Public Law 556, Seventy-seventh Congress; chapter 314, second session; H. R. 4402:

Amends World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide for renewal of the 5-year level-premium term insurance policies without medical examination. (Approved, May 14, 1942.)

23. Public Law 607, Seventy-seventh Congress; chapter 413, second session; S. 2025:

This law is known as the Armed Services Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and adjusts the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service. (Approved, June 16, 1942.) (For amendments, see Public Law 785, 77th Cong., and Public Law 95, 78th Cong.)

24. Public Law 625, Seventy-seventh Congress; chapter 443, second session; S. 2467:

This law is known as the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, and provides family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States. (Approved, July 11, 1942.) (For amendments, see Public Law 705, 77th Cong.)

25. Public Law 667, Seventy-seventh Congress; chapter 504, second session; S. 2543:

"An act to amend subsection (3) of section 602 (d) of the National Service Life

Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes." (Approved, July 11, 1942.) (This act amends Public Law 801.)

26. Public Law 690, Seventy-seventh Congress; chapter 539, second session; H. R. 1030:

"An act to provide increases of pension payable to dependents of veterans of the Regular Establishment, and for other purposes." (Approved, July 30, 1942.)

27. Public Law 705, Seventy-seventh Congress; chapter 554, second session; H. R. 746:

"An act to amend section 107 of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942." The law amended is Public Law 625, Seventy-seventh Congress, as follows: Section 107 "is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof which reads as follows: 'Any allowances which accrue under this title for the period preceding November 1, 1942, shall not be actually paid until after November 1, 1942.'" (Approved, August 20, 1942.)

28. Public Law 712, Seventy-seventh Congress; chapter 561, second session; H. R. 7461:

Providing ways and means of voting for persons entitled to vote in national elections who are absent on military or naval duty. (Approved, September 16, 1942.)

29. Public Law 732, Seventy-seventh Congress; chapter 581, second session; H. R. 7164:

"An act to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 (Public Law 861, 76th Cong.) as amended, to extend relief and benefits provided therein to certain persons, to include certain additional proceedings and transactions therein, to provide further relief for persons in military service, to change certain insurance provisions thereof, and for other purposes." (Approved, October 6, 1942.)

30. Public Law 762, Seventy-seventh Congress; chapter 628, second session; H. R. 7455:

"An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to enable Filipinos to qualify for service thereunder." (Approved, October 26, 1942.)

31. Public Law 785, Seventy-seventh Congress; chapter 669, second session; S. 2723:

"An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942." (Public Law 607, 77th Cong.) "In computing the service for all pay purposes of officers paid under the provisions of this section, such officers shall be credited with full time for all periods during which they have held commissions." (Approved, December 2, 1942.)

32. Public Law 848, Seventy-seventh Congress; chapter 828, second session; H. R. 7844:

"An act to amend sections 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the act approved March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, 77th Cong.), providing for continuing pay and allowances of certain missing persons." (Approved, December 24, 1942.)

SECTION III

SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, 1943 TO DATE

33. Public Law 13, Seventy-eighth Congress; chapter 19, first session; H. R. 2023:

"An act to amend section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to authorize renewal of expiring 5-year-level-premium-term policies of those in active military or naval service and certain others outside the continental limits of the United States, and for other purposes." (Approved, March 23, 1943.)

34. Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress; chapter 22, first session; S. 786:

"An act to amend title I of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the Veterans Regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, and for other purposes." (Approved, March 24, 1943.)

35. Public Law 33, Seventy-eighth Congress; chapter 47, first session; S. 427:

"An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the Army of the United States assigned to diving duty." (Approved, April 10, 1943.)

36. Public Law 36, Seventy-eighth Congress; chapter 56, first session; S. 903:

Liberalizing National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940. (See sec. 10, Public, 360, 77th Cong.) (Approved, April 12, 1943.)

37. Public Law 51, Seventy-eighth Congress; chapter 95, first session; H. R. 1936:

"An act to provide for the expansion of facilities for hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel, and for other purposes." (Approved, May 10, 1943.)

38. Public Law 52, Seventy-eighth Congress; chapter 96, first session; H. R. 2281:

"An act to provide for the issuance of devices in recognition of the services of merchant sailors." (Approved, May 10, 1943.)

39. Public Law 87, Seventy-eighth Congress; chapter 142, first session; H. R. 131:

"An act to provide reemployment rights for persons who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine, and for other purposes." (Approved, June 23, 1943.)

40. Public Law 95, Seventy-eighth Congress; chapter 151, first session; S. 1067:

"An act to amend the first paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 to provide for allowances of midshipmen of the Naval Reserve for quarters and subsistence when not furnished in kind." (Approved, June 26, 1943.)

41. Public Law 99, Seventy-eighth Congress; chapter 176, first session; H. R. 2292:

"An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war'." This act provides further that supplies that may be tendered as a gift and accepted for use by the land and naval forces shall be transported at the cost and charge of the United States. (Approved, June 29, 1943.)

42. Public Law 101, Seventy-eighth Congress; chapter 178, first session; S. 219:

"An act to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers." (Approved, June 29, 1943.)

43. Public Law 114, Seventy-eighth Congress; chapter 191, first session; H. R. 2349:

"An act to adjust the pay status of warrant officers temporarily commissioned in the Army of the United States." (Approved, July 7, 1943.)

44. Public Law 135, Seventy-eighth Congress; chapter 221, first session; H. R. 2935:

This law provides funds to the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency and related independent agencies to provide maternity and infant care for the dependents of members of the armed services. (Approved, July 12, 1943.)

45. Public Law 144, Seventy-eighth Congress; chapter 233, first session; H. R. 2703:

"An act to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes." This act clarifies veterans' laws relating to compensation, pension, and retirement pay. (Approved, July 13, 1943.)

46. Senate bill 1279 has been finally approved by both Houses of Congress. This bill amends the Servicemen's Allowance Act of 1942, so as to liberalize family allowances and for other purposes. Under Senate bill 1279, when it is finally signed by the President, the allowances will be as follows:

Sec. 105. Class A dependents

Wife	$50
Wife and 1 child	80
Each additional child	20
Child but no wife	42
Each additional child	20
Former wife, divorced, but no child	42
1 additional child and wife	72
Each additional child	20

Class B dependents

1 parent but no brother or sister	$50
2 parents but no brother or sister	68
1 parent and brother or sister	68
Each additional brother or sister	11
2 parents and 1 brother or sister	79
Each additional brother or sister	11
Brother or sister but no parents	42
Each additional brother or sister	11

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 425. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of J. C. Munn;

S. 560. An act for the relief of Western Maryland Dairy, Inc.;

S. 694. An act for the relief of the W. G. Cornell Co.;

S. 841. An act for the relief of J. P. Woolsey;

S. 1293. An act for the relief of Cleo Pickrell; and

S. 1346. An act for the relief of the R. B. Walker Funeral Home.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 514) for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 302. An act for the relief of Robert Griffin;

H. R. 547. An act for the relief of Kernan R. Cunningham;

H. R. 1311. An act for the relief of Dan Crotts;

H. R. 1640. An act for the relief of Mrs. J. D. Price;

H. R. 1933. An act for the relief of Ronald A. Cox;

H. R. 2384. An act for the relief of Frank A. McMenamin;

H. R. 2600. An act for the relief of M. C. Roberts;

H. R. 2707. An act for the relief of Henry White;

H. R. 2730. An act for the relief of Mrs. E. B. Neville;

H. R. 2905. An act for the relief of Walter R. Jones, Mrs. Norma S. McKinney, and Mrs. Ella Swenson;

H. R. 3001. An act for the relief of James T. Rogers;

H. R. 3076. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Arthur J. Martin, Jr., a minor;

H. R. 3098. An act for the relief of Dr. H. H. Smith;

H. R. 3189. An act for the relief of Thomas Lewis;

H. R. 3299. An act for the relief of Victor H. Loftus, disbursing clerk, American Embassy, Mexico, D. F., Mexico;

H. R. 3329. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles H. Morhouse;

H. R. 3331. An act for the relief of Harry L. Smith; and

H. R. 3332. An act for the relief of Spencer Meeks.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore [Mrs. CARAWAY]:

S. 964. An act to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Vet-

erans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation;

S. 1113. An act to amend section 11 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942;

S. 1132. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 so as to provide for the payment of a uniform gratuity to certain officers recalled to active duty;

S. 1170. An act authorizing the conveyance to the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, of a portion of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, Va.;

S. 1279. An act to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes;

S. 1350. An act to establish the grades of commissioned warrant officer and warrant officer in the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3223. An act to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others, in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service;

H. R. 3225. An act to amend the act of May 27, 1908, as amended, authorizing settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps; and

H. R. 3230. An act to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 2707. An act for the relief of Henry White; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 302. An act for the relief of Robert Griffin;

H. R. 547. An act for the relief of Kernan R. Cunningham;

H. R. 1311. An act for the relief of Dan Crotts;

H. R. 1640. An act for the relief of Mrs. J. D. Price;

H. R. 1933. An act for the relief of Ronald A. Cox;

H. R. 2384. An act for the relief of Frank A. McMenamin;

H. R. 2600. An act for the relief of M. C. Roberts;

H. R. 2730. An act for the relief of Mrs. E. B. Neville;

H. R. 2905. An act for the relief of Walter R. Jones, Mrs. Norma S. McKinney, and Mrs. Ella Swenson;

H. R. 3001. An act for the relief of James T. Rogers;

H. R. 3076. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Arthur J. Martin, Jr., a minor;

H. R. 3098. An act for the relief of Dr. H. H. Smith;

H. R. 3189. An act for the relief of Thomas Lewis;

H. R. 3299. An act for the relief of Victor H. Loftus, disbursing clerk, American Embassy, Mexico, D. F., Mexico;

H. R. 3329. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles H. Morhouse;

H. R. 3331. An act for the relief of Harry L. Smith; and

H. R. 3332. An act for the relief of Spencer Meeks; to the Committee on Claims.

FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 637) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the unanimous consent agreement entered into yesterday.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

That during the further consideration of S. 637, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes on the bill, on any amendment, or any motion pertaining thereto.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 15, beginning in line 3, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, after line 2, it is proposed to insert:

(f) The term "teacher" may include any person who is engaged in instruction, or in the supervision or administration of instruction, or in professional health or welfare services for children, by a local public-school jurisdiction or other public-education agency, and actually so employed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Madam President, there are one or two other slight amendments which should be made. They involve merely the changing of dates.

On page 8, line 12, the date "1942" should be changed to "1943", and I move that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. On page 9, line 18, the date "1942" should be changed to "1943", and I move that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. A parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. What is the pending business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The present order is the offering of perfecting amendments.

Mr. TAFT. My understanding was that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] offered an amendment yesterday which is now in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment was merely read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. We are still considering committee amendments, and I shall offer another amendment, if that is in accordance with the custom.

On page 10, line 7, the date "February 1" should be changed to "October 1", and I move that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Madam President, in a discussion with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] I promised him that I would offer an amendment making it more certain that the emergency feature of the bill should be limited to the emergency, and that the appropriation authorized for the emergency should cease when the emergency had ended. I have conferred with the Senator from Tennessee, and he suggests that the amendment I am about to offer is agreeable to him. It would follow the sentence ending on line 20, page 2, following the authorization provision. The proposed amendment reads:

This authorization shall last only until 1 year after the President has declared the emergency due to the war to have come to an end, or until 1 year after the Congress by concurrent resolution has declared the emergency to have ended.

To make the matter as positive as it can be made, I have combined the provisions which have been used in the war measures heretofore enacted. I therefore move the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, Madam President, I have no objection to the amendment now offered. I merely wish to restate what I said a few days ago, that once we begin paying $200 of the salary of every school teacher in the United States, we never will stop, it will be almost impossible to refuse another appropriation. I do not know that I myself would be in favor of refusing to continue such a practice. I have no objection to the amendment now offered by the Senator from Utah.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 20, after the word "provided" and the period, it is proposed to insert the following:

This authorization shall last only until 1 year after the President has declared the emergency due to the war to have come to an end, or until 1 year after the Congress by concurrent resolution has declared the emergency to have ended.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That concludes the committee amendments.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Madam President, on behalf of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] as well as on my own behalf, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an able and comprehensive address by Charles E. Greene, superintendent of schools of Denver, Colo., on the subject Should Public Education Be Directed From Washington?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A new social order has descended upon the people of the United States. This new order is in the form of constantly increasing Federal activity in every phase of American life. In the roads we build, in the crops we plant, in the charity we dispense, in the goods we buy or sell, in the food we eat or should like to eat, in the taxes we pay, everywhere is the Federal Government. This activity of our National Government is ever increasing and moves forward with a mighty momentum. It is a new broom. Which of our old institutions will the new Federal broom sweep away? Will local government survive or be swallowed up by the National Government? Will the public school survive as a locally controlled institution or become a nationally directed school system? What of the public school if the new Federal broom sweeps clean?

People never go back to the old after they have tried the new. They may not like the new and may suffer it only because it is

forced upon them. But when pressure is released and all are free to return to the old ways, they find that the old are mildewed and unsuited to new requirements. Some semblance of the old flavored by new ways is generally the basis for a still newer pattern of life. The old, old ways look clumsy and absurd. What yesterday was new looks to be poorly conceived, raw, and badly formed. Only what is new today is acceptable, and not acceptable to all at once either. So no one can be secure in his reliance on either the old or the new. When the war is over, we shall face new conditions that will have to be met, conditions different from any we have ever known. The pre-war days will not return. They were depression days, and who wants them to come back? The predepression days will not reappear either, and who wants back those times of blatant self-assurance that America was born to eternal prosperity? No; we have learned too much about the world since 1929. We have been disillusioned; we have been financially bankrupt; we have lost faith in our hope that preparation for peace would insure peace. After the war it will be our task to gather together all that we have learned during the depression and during the war and, guarded by our free traditions and guided by the exigencies and demands of the moment, to build our new world. In building our new society, we shall call for our freedom and rights harking back to the glorious declarations of the founding fathers. Those concerned with public institutions will insist upon the maintenance of these institutions as the necessary bulwarks of the people's freedom.

Those concerned with private institutions will hail the importance of free individual and minority group enterprise. Just as every man and every group of men are now fearful lest they lose their rights to live independently and make money, so they will grasp for the preservation of all the privileges that in the past they have called good. We are all concerned about what will survive in a new peace economy. Which of our institutions will be a part of the new order and which will be lost to us?

The day in which we fashion our new social order will be a sort of judgment day. Those social, economic, and political institutions that have well fulfilled their purpose in past times will, we hope, receive the blessings of a thankful people. Those that have been wasteful, selfish, harmful, barren of results, stupid, obstinate, and generally a brake on the wheel of progress, will be cast in outer darkness. Or will it be that way?

It will not be just that way. Remaking a social order will not be so simple as that. At least two strong social forces will prevent the bad from all being consigned to Gehenna and the good from being made the sole basis for social reorganization. One of these forces is pressure politics, and the other is the power of a new social order already under way with a driving momentum. About pressure politics little need be said, as all of us know it is an operative force in social, economic, and political life. But a new broom sweeps clean. A new social order already organized and well under way is likely to sweep before it all existing social institutions that get in the way. This new social order is with us in the form of constantly increasing Federal activity in every phase of American life. The Federal Government has so far failed to sweep away the various local governments and local governmental institutions. Federal activity has rather met needs that local governments have left untouched, and given help and direction to some local government activities that appeared to need help from the outside. The flood of Federal activities has therefore gone into, and all around, local government spheres of operation.

All who are concerned about the public-school system in the United States should be aware of what is happening in the relations of local to Federal Government. Many attacks have been made recently on both local and Federal governmental activities. Local forms of government have been criticized as inefficient. They have been accused of failing to adjust themselves to meet new needs. They are said to have done too little. Federal Government has been accused of doing too much. Since the program of the present administration was inaugurated, the Federal Government has attempted to deal with the problems of the depression and of the war. The Federal Government has set up one office after another to operate not only in Washington but in every community throughout the land. No hamlet is too small and no living abode is too remote to be included in the control of some, or many, offices of the Federal Government. The critical times and the emergencies of the war are cited as justifications of the establishment of these multitudinous offices with their many officials. So many Federal offices have been established, and so many maintained even after the conditions which called them into being no longer exist, that many people fear we may in the future be ruled entirely by the Federal Government.

Article X of the Constitution of the United States says, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." Under existing conditions one would expect the Constitution to read, "The powers not actually exercised by the States nor by the people are hereby reserved to the Federal Government, and those powers not effectively exercised by the States or by the people shall be controlled and directed by the Federal Government." These comments are not made in criticism of the activities of the Federal Government to meet pressing problems in times of financial depression or war. But the people under a form of government which has placed its chief powers in local government should be conscious of what is happening when a complete change of the whole structure, or almost the whole structure, occurs.

Local government has lately been severely criticized as existing chiefly as a career for politicians, who are trained in political ways but not in the techniques of government. Local government has frequently been criticized as being so faulty in structure as to encourage graft and general inefficiency. The charge has been made that legal restrictions and custom have fashioned local government into a groove so that changes and adjustments to meet local and national needs cannot be made. The personnel concerned in local government has been accused of being uneducated, untrained, ignorant of governmental needs, and unconcerned about its responsibility to society. It is charged that local governmental employees are incapable of handling large sums of money.

In our representative form of government the people feel free to criticize their various governments and governmental officials. Not all criticisms are fair or true, but abuses have existed that have aroused doubt and suspicion in the minds of many people. Some governmental activities bring praise and develop confidence in the people. But the American people have been censured as being always too ready to find fault with their government, whether local or national. Individuals and groups with selfish interests have often directed criticisms against government officials. No doubt many injustices have occurred. On the other hand, many instances of public approval of governmental action are on record. People have to have some confidence in their governments to be able to live with them. As a matter of fact, the public does take great pride in all its local public institutions, its city and county governments, its courts, its libraries, its schools. One way to state the case would be to say that the public takes such an interest in its own institutions that it speaks often and loudly about them.

What has actually happened in the relation of local and Federal governments can be illustrated by a study of the expenditures made by them respectively. The Department of Revenue of the State of Colorado has prepared a chart to show the flow of Federal, State, and local funds in the State in 1940. In that year—and 1940 was before war was declared—the Federal Government raised, to be spent in Colorado, $66,600,000. This amount was 45 percent of all public moneys raised, and spent, in the State. The State raised $41,300,000, or 28 percent; while all local forms of government raised $39,900,000, or 27 percent of the total. But although the Federal Government collected $66,600,000, it spent $47,900,000; while the remainder—$18,700,000—was distributed to the State, counties, cities, and public schools to be expended by them.

When we consider that all these moneys are collected by public taxation, or if borrowed will later be collected by taxation, we must recognize these dollars as Colorado money in effect. Whether or not the Federal money spent in Colorado is actually raised in the State seems of little importance when we are reminded that Colorado pays more than its per capita quota of Federal taxes. The fact, then, is that Colorado was, in 1940, before the days of high income taxes, turning over for Federal taxes millions of dollars, and that $66,600,000 of that amount was coming back to be spent in this State; which is just another way of saying that the Federal Government, even before war was declared, found it necessary or desirable to operate in Colorado on a larger scale than either the State government or the local governments, with all their forms of service.

In other words, the Federal Government had been so extended and multiplied, even in peace times, that its activities dwarfed all the work of the State government, including all departments, highways, State educational, penal, and eleemosynary institutions; all boards, commissions, etc. The activities of the Federal Government were 70 percent greater in expenditures than the work of all counties, cities, towns, and school districts. This is not a condemnation of the Federal Government nor of local governments. It is just a fact, and one that not only Coloradans but all Americans should think about.

This expansion of the activities of the Federal Government has been rapid, and is still going on. But the pace of the expansion has not been too fast to be noted. Taxpayers' groups and many others have criticized local government for expansion in the 1920's, and have pointed out inefficiencies and extravagances, and, even in some cases, graft and embezzlement. Their tendency has been to say that governments should become simplified and not more involved. But the Federal Government has paid no attention to the exponents of simplified government. It has in effect said, "What you need in this country is not less regulation and control but more. If your local governments cannot furnish you with this regulation and control, either because you will not allow them to do so or because they are too inefficient to do so, we, the Federal Government, will take over; and we will give you the regulation and control you need, and do it with the money you pay in taxes."

What is the picture that looms up for the future? Will local forms of government be-

come more impotent? Will their activities become more stratified and routine, and will the Federal Government take the responsibility in all communities for meeting emergencies of whatever character? Will the Federal Government be the only public agency able to cope with local as well as national economic problems? Will the Federal Government find it necessary to take the responsibility for dealing with social problems? Will local communities become impotent as organized groups? Strangely enough, if that happens, it will be no new story in the world's history. Federalization has already gone to extreme lengths in other civilized countries. America remains an outstanding example of what can be done through local initiative and interest in government as well as in industry.

The University of Denver government center, which has for several years been directing graduate students in the study of local governments—cities, counties, schools—takes the position that the hope of local governments lies chiefly in securing trained leadership. The point of view of the government center is that those who occupy governmental positions in city, county, and State offices should be trained specifically for the jobs they are to hold. The position is taken that the public schools hold out the greatest hope for local autonomy and government, because teachers, principals, and superintendents are trained for their jobs and have to be certificated as prepared to teach before they can be hired by a local school district. It should be stated that many other forms of local government are now requiring trained administrators and technicians in all departments.

My reason for these comments about the relation of Federal and local governments is concerned with the position of the public schools in the picture. If local initiative can be said to have been successful in governmental activities, that success is certainly evident in the American public schools. The American public school, locally controlled and financed, is a unique institution in the world's educational institutions. In no other country do you find the local board of education with complete control of personnel, finances, and courses of study of the public school. Authorities agree that this system of local control is responsible for the fact that we have in the United States the finest public-school system in the world. Visitors from Australia, a country much like ours, marvel at America's fine school buildings, the splendidly trained teachers, and the courses of study that are made to meet the problems of the day as well as to pass on the cultural heritage of the race. When a community wants a new school building in America, the district school board builds the building. When a community in Australia wants a new school building, the interested parties must consult the government representatives at the provincial capital, much the same as when a town in America wants a Federal post-office building.

The result is political maneuvering, one community against another, to get Federal funds for a new building. As might be expected, the school buildings of Australia are far inferior to those of the United States. A similar situation exists in Canada, where control of schools also rests in the provincial capital. If you want to see the results, visit the public schools of the Province of Ontario in Canada and compare them with those of New York State. Or a more striking example of this may be seen in the two cities of Seattle, Wash., and Vancouver, British Columbia. Both cities claim lumbering and fishing as their chief industries. They are near the same size and are situated less than 150 miles apart. The stores and office buildings, the restaurants, hotels, and residences of Vancouver are like those of the cities of the United States, and much like those of Seattle. The great difference is apparent when you look at the school buildings. Then it is that you know that Vancouver is not in the United States and Seattle is.

The public schools of the United States are close to the people. Because American parents are so much interested in the education of their children, they have insisted upon having schools located close to their homes, and they have also insisted upon keeping the control of the schools in their own hands. One result of this has been that in many rural districts schools are too small, and lack the advantages of larger and better organizations. In addition, there are great differences in the ability of districts to support public education. There has been widespread effort made to correct these deficiencies, and some progress has been made in the form of consolidation of small districts, and in county and State financial aid. But some people interested in better school support have apparently forgotten the advantages in local school control. The principle of local control is fundamental to the American plan of public education. These statements about local control of schools are being made because intensive Federal activity requires us to examine local government to see whether it can endure, and if so in what forms and institutions.

The tangible evidence of the interest of the people in their schools is the kind of buildings that are built to house public education. The splendid school buildings that you see in almost all American cities, towns, and hamlets bear brilliant testimony to the interest of the people in their schools. But the most important consideration in public education has to do with what goes on in the schools.

What would be the effect of federalization upon the curriculum of the schools? We have already learned one thing from Federal control and direction in this country, and that is that the thinking and planning, and the exercise of initiative in general must, if the program is to be federally controlled, come from the central controlling Government head. Local initiative, local planning, and local activity must follow along the lines laid down by Federal leadership. The Federal office in charge might attempt to stimulate local activity and planning, but always within certain definitely restricted bounds. Complete variation from the Federal plan cannot be tolerated. Uniformity is the keynote of any centrally controlled organization. A limited amount of variation from a proposed program may be allowed so long as the central objective of the plan is met. No matter how much a local activity may seem to vary from the central plan in a federally directed program, close inspection will always reveal a uniform core running through all the local organizations. What would be the effect of federally imposed uniformity, no matter how it might be sugar-coated and softened, on a public-school program?

Federally imposed uniformity, even if the uniformity is to be noted chiefly in objectives and purposes, is deadening to local initiative, local inventiveness, and enterprise. The American public-school system has grown and developed because of local interest and local effort. As all local government is responsive to the people, so are the schools. They are constantly being improved through the combined efforts of teachers and people of the community. The Federal Government might conceivably make many improvements through able leadership. It might even make changes that are needed but which are not yet recognized by local school officials and patrons. If the Federal Government through its foresight could hasten needed improvements in the schools, to that extent might Federal control seem to be an advantage. It is just at this point that we are likely to be short-sighted. We must answer the question of whether progress should be introduced to localities from the outside and the people educated to appreciate the new things, or whether it is better to build up a desire for needed improvements as the needs appear.

The first plan requires very little local leadership since the Federal authorities will furnish the thinking and the planning. The latter plan implies local leadership almost, if not quite, as able as Federal leadership. America's schools have been operating on the plan of local autonomy, local leadership, local financing of the program. To date, America has had a more progressive school system than other countries that have relied on Federal direction. Whether the schools of the United States can continue to advance and meet the educational needs of this and coming generations will depend upon the leadership of the thousands of school districts in this country. To date the same energy and vigor that have made America's industrial progress possible have characterized those concerned with public education. Cities and towns have studied their educational problems and have singly and in groups developed new programs. That is the way America has gone ahead in public education. There is no reason why the present system should be junked for a Federal plan.

What would a nationally directed curriculum be like? Would it resemble the curriculum of a totalitarian state? Would those in charge of the Federal Government seek to use the schools to further their points of view? Would the various Federal offices seek to use the schools as channels to bring about public understanding of their programs? Would they try to have the objectives of these programs taught in the schools? Would teachers be called upon to represent and uphold the Federal Government in the community? I do not believe that the time has come when the schools should belong to any group except the local community.

City and county governments and public schools are the most local of governments. They stand as an expression of the people's interest in each locality. City halls, courthouses, fire-fighting equipment, and schoolhouses express in a visible way the people's pride in their ability to govern themselves. Nearly all the people in the community get some experience in government. Many serve as officials in some capacity. What we have learned about effectiveness in local government has come from the experiences people have had in city, county, and school organizations. The character of local government in an American community is one important factor in making the community desirable from a residence point of view.

The war makes necessary our present program of Federal activity and Federal control. Whether more or less governmental direction is going on than necessary is not a question for discussion here. But there is always a danger that any far-reaching change in our governmental structure, whether temporary or not, may result in permanent change. Because of this, all change should be carefully examined from every point of view. Our point of view is that of the public school.

What Federal domination in all phases of life and work may mean to the future of the public schools has not been a cause for concern to most teachers and educators. Most of us have been more concerned with the immediate effects of the war upon our social structure and our schools. Quite aside from new governmental activity and its ultimate effects, many new developments are evident that affect our work, our habits, our attitudes and the general welfare.

The new war economy to date has consisted chiefly of a period of prosperity, the greatest for many wage earners that this country has ever known. Many of us are keenly aware that many businesses and many white-collar employees have not shared in this prosperity. Teachers generally have realized little or no increase in salary, only increased costs. But many industries and millions of workers are prospering, and their buying power is so great that it is recognized as a problem; to some even a menace to the stability of our economic life. Many people are satisfied with the war, or at least complacent about it, because they benefit so substantially in the pocketbook. An atmosphere of geniality and good will pervades the Nation. How can people hate war when it brings them the good things of life? Coupled with this satisfaction with the war is the conviction that we Americans are all that anxious-to-please column writers say we are: We are producing munitions and goods in amazing quantities. We are turning the defeat of the Allies into victory. We are the best people on earth, individually or in groups.

Where is the spirit of idealism that was so evident the days following Pearl Harbor? Where is the eagerness to sacrifice? Our idealism has been replaced by a feeling that there is no need to sacrifice. We can whip the Axis and enjoy the good things of life at the same time. The war will soon be over, we say, and we can return to a life of complete ease. Our present attitude of overconfidence in our own abilities and our good luck is characteristic of democracies. It is one of the most serious weaknesses of democracies. England suffered from it even as late as the capture of Singapore and Malaya by the Japanese. In the United States during the Civil War in the sixties, both the North and the South suffered from overconfidence. Neither thought the other would fight or could fight very long. In any case, the war has to date turned out to be much less unpleasant for us than we anticipated. But we may feel different about it in the near future.

Contrasted with this easy complacency of some is a deadly earnestness on the part of others. These are the ones who take with great seriousness our part in this war. They include those in the armed services and their families, volunteers for war work, many workers in industry, professional and businessmen, teachers, and many, many others. Some of these people are allowing the war to affect their health and in some cases their efficiency. What should be the emotional state of those who would be most effective in war work? It is a fact that while some are satisfied and complacent, others are suffering from nervous strain, and still others from overwork.

Among those who are earnest and thoughtful about the war situation are the teachers. Teachers feel deeply their obligation to their country. Teachers have proved themselves ready to work and sacrifice for the community in which they work and live. Teachers have accepted with enthusiasm every request to aid the war effort and have volunteered their services wherever they were able to help. The war and its vicissitudes have absorbed much of the energy of teachers. For teachers and for many others a need exists for the conserving of energy and nerve power for work. If this is not done, there is danger that earnest people will overwork or that the creative abilities to do their regular tasks will be lowered. We face the problem of how to enlist the earnest effort of all without laying too heavy burdens on the overconscientious. If all the energy of all the people concerned with this war could be directed to the daily tasks that are closely or remotely related to the war effort, we could hasten the day of victory. But if people are able only to worry and suffer nervous tension because of the uncertainties and insecurity brought on by the war, then energies are wasted. A big responsibility rests upon teachers to control their own emotional states and to guide their energies into channels productive for the national war effort.

If in the near future a move is made to direct public schools from Washington, it will probably take shape in the form of a program to continue the education of boys returning from the war. When millions of young men and women do resume peacetime ways, the problem of reeducation will be so tremendous that the National Government will have to take a hand. Shall the public schools be used for this purpose; shall a separate national system of public education be set up; or shall the Federal Government cooperate with the public schools in a program like the present war-training program, in which the Federal Government pays a part of the cost and the local school system, aided by the State, plans and carries out the program?

What is the war doing to youth? No matter where they are—youth still in school, youth at work in industry, or youth in the armed services—all are affected by the war. Those who have spoken on the topic of war during the last quarter of a century have told us about the evil effects of war. War excites, degrades, brutalizes, stupefies, terrorizes all who are affected by it, they said. During World War No. 1, however, we heard a different story. War, we were told, uplifted men to great sacrifices; it led them to daring and brave deeds. War for an ideal was a crusade for a holy cause. But when World War No. 1 was over, this point of view did not last long. Too many people were disillusioned, too many disappointed. All of us hate war; all dread it. All humanity wants peace and good will. But are there no good things about war? Even war for a righteous cause? Yes, war is destructive and fundamentally ruinous, but so is a surgical operation; it is only to be entered into when the whole body is sick and an offending part must be removed. The whole body suffers from the operation. Sickness and pain result. A surgical operation is a destructive process and in desirability cannot be compared to a state of good health. But good results can come from surgery, even during the period of sickness and pain. Equally so, it is futile to compare war with peace as a desirable state of existence. Of course, peace is desirable, but war is here, and we must adjust ourselves to it and get the best social and individual gain we can from it.

War affects people intensively. In war time, great feats of energy appear. Men, women, boys, and girls surpass their greatest expectations in achievement. What did World War No. 1 do to us?

In the short period of World War No. 1, boys who went to war became men. Maturity comes fast in wartime. Boys leave home, have new experiences, meet new kinds of people, find themselves dependent upon their own responsibility, undergo hardships, and face death—all in a few months. The result is maturity in a short time. Is this forcing of fast growth a good thing? And are those concerned better men than they were boys? Or did their forced maturity make them lesser men than they would have been? We cannot answer these questions.

The men who were in World War No. 1 have had 25 years to test the effect of war on human beings. To them, their war experiences are extremely important. They have met people of other lands. They have developed convictions. All this happened by their being subjected to the disciplines and work of the armed services, and then being released to find their places in society practically without guidance or aid. The sharp break in their habits of life that came when they were discharged made adjustment difficult for many of them.

Millions of young men and women who today are in the armed forces came directly from educational institutions, with their plans for education broken and incomplete. Whether or not their military experiences are to be beneficial or harmful to them will depend in large measure on the educational opportunities they find when they return from war. Their military training has been excellent and should be valuable to them in peacetime provided their educational programs can be continued and completed, so that they will be definitely prepared to find their places in a peacetime economy. Our responsibility for the education of our youth at war is tremendous. It is dumfounding. It requires of us no less than a program of guidance to help youth adjust from a thrilling war experience to a satisfying and productive career in the new economy that faces us after the war is over.

Are the public schools prepared to carry on a program of education and rehabilitation of millions of young men whose valor, strength, and character have been molded and tested by the fire of warfare? Are the public schools so organized and administered that they are best qualified to develop courses of study in peacetime occupational training and adjustment, and in further education for good and useful citizenship? Are the colleges of the land prepared to adjust to the needs of youth for higher education? Is education of men just released from war a task in which the Federal Government has the only responsibility, or is this responsibility shared by all who are organized and prepared to carry on educational programs? The combined educational institutions of the United States are better prepared to undertake the task of education of those who return from the armed forces than the Federal Government operating alone. The present war-training program represents a cooperative effort of the Federal Government and the public schools. An expansion of the present cooperative arrangement will best meet the needs of youth.

Nobody today doubts the certainty that a new order of life awaits us when the war is over. Every institution of democracy needs to be represented when changes occur. The Federal Government has found it necessary or desirable to extend its activities to all communities and to furnish service in many avenues of need. Local governments were unable to meet the ravages of the financial depression before the war. Local governments contracted their services when economic stringency appeared, while the Federal Government expanded its services. Is there a stopping place for Federal expansion, or shall all governmental functions be performed by our national Government? What is to happen to the locally controlled and administered public school system? Is it to be a local institution still, or is it to be directed from Washington?

Our form of government in the past has been strongly democratic in the sense that local governments of various kinds attended to the governmental needs of the people. The Federal Government was far away, but the city, county, State, and school organizations responded to local needs. One man's voice could be easily heard, and the feeling of the community colored the administration of public affairs. Local interest and pride built strongly or weakly, according to character of sentiment.

The rights of the people in each and every community are to be strengthened or lost in the new peacetime order. What we can do about it depends in part at least upon our alertness and intelligence about the conditions that actually exist. One test of the future's course will reside in the plan that is used to meet the educational needs of those returning from the armed forces.

The public schools of the United States constitute one of the essential institutions

of democracy, and one of the main safeguards of freedom. Let us examine closely this school system and see to it that it is preserved, especially in its most important and crucial aspect—an institution of the people; a system of locally controlled schools.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Madam President, on behalf of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and myself I offer to the pending bill an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, beginning with line 6, it is proposed to strike out through line 7 on page 2, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over or prescribe any requirements with respect to, any school, or any State educational institution or agency, with respect to which any funds have been or may be made available or expended pursuant to this act, nor shall any term or condition of any agreement or any other action taken under this act, whether by agreement or otherwise, relating to any contribution made under this act to or on behalf of any school, or any State educational institution or agency, or any limitation or provision in any appropriation made pursuant to this act, seek to control in any manner, or prescribe requirements with respect to, or authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to direct, supervise, or control in any manner, or prescribe any requirements with respect to, the administration, the personnel, the curriculum, the instruction, the methods of instruction, or the materials of instruction.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Madam President, I do not care to discuss the amendment at length. Its purpose is to try to strengthen the provisions of section 1 of the bill. A great deal of the opposition to the bill has been predicated upon a fear that by its enactment into law the public schools of the Nation will be turned over to Washington bureaucracy, and that it will be the entering wedge of Federal control of our public-school system. I hope such a fear is unjustified. But it cannot be said that it is without any foundation or basis whatsoever, and in order to try to make certain under the terms of the bill that Federal aid can be granted without Federal control, the junior Senator from South Carolina and I have offered the amendment as a substitute for section 1. The purpose of the amendment is not to weaken that section, but to strengthen it and, if it is possible by language, to make certain in the bill that there shall be no Federal control of our public-school systems. That is the objective of the amendment. I trust the able Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] sponsoring the bill will agree to accept the amendment and that it may be adopted.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Madam President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I understand the high purpose of the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina and himself, and no doubt it would be very helpful with respect to the first appropriation made under the measure, but it would not be binding in any sense upon any future appropriation or any condition that may be tied into any future appropriation, would it?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I hope it will. The Senator will note one provision in the amendment. On page 2, in line 2, the following language will be found:

Or any limitation or provision in any appropriation made pursuant to this act.

In other words, the hope is that by the adoption of this language we cannot legislate on an appropriation bill hereafter without changing the basic act.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator, of course, understands that the action of the present Congress, however much we may desire to influence the course which shall be taken, cannot be binding upon future Congresses which may desire to make appropriations under this measure.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The provision of the amendment which I have just read is that any attempt to legislate on a future appropriation bill dealing with this matter would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. MAYBANK. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Madam President, after much study and deliberation, it is our understanding that attempts to legislate on this matter on a future appropriation bill would be subject to a point of order. Senate rule XVI, section 4, prohibits legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Madam President, it is the purpose of the amendment, I will say to the Senator from West Virginia, to try to make certain, insofar as we can at this time, that such a thing will not occur. I appreciate very much the remarks made by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] 2 days ago in discussing the bill. He said that after all the future rests with future Congresses, and we must be on guard, we must be alert at all times with respect to encroachments which we do not intend to permit, and I desire to make just as certain as it is legislatively possible at this stage of the proceedings that we shall prevent such encroachments upon strictly State prerogatives.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think my question has been answered by the statement that the future will rest in future Congresses. Whatever provision for limitation we may attempt to place on legislation dealing with appropriations in the future, by way of control thereof, can be undone by action taken by any Congress in the future.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course, it can be done by changing the basic law.

Mr. TAFT. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I favor the Senator's amendment, but it seems to be a perfectly vain effort, because after providing that nothing in this act shall authorize any department or employee of the United States to direct, supervise, or control in any manner the administration of schools, the bill then proceeds to provide that they must do so. In this very bill it is provided that the money authorized to be appropriated must be spent for increasing teachers' salaries and for no other educational purposes. The bill provides that where separate public schools are maintained for separate races the money must be distributed in such a way as to provide a just and equitable apportionment. Who decides that? The Federal Office of Education does, as a condition of the grant. While I am in favor of protecting the grant in every way possible, I maintain it is not possible to protect it, and that in this very measure the terms of the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas are contradicted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course, Federal aid to schools or anything else cannot be granted unless the purpose for which it is granted is stated in the act itself. I regard the bill as stating the purpose for which the aid is offered, and that is a matter of legislative determination. That is what we are doing by enactment of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] for himself and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

Mr. WALSH. Madam President, there has been presented to me a communication from the American Federation of Labor requesting certain amendments to the bill. As I am opposed to the principle of the bill, I personally shall not offer the amendments, but I call attention to them. Let me add that the American Federation of Labor is opposed to the bill unless these amendments are incorporated in it. I shall read the amendments which are requested, for the purpose of calling attention to what may be expected in the way of future demands after the pending legislation is enacted.

The first proposed amendment is:

On page 10, at the end of line 8, insert the following proviso: "*Provided*, That in the States that maintain separate schools for minority races that the average annual salary paid to a teacher in any salary or group for one of the races shall be held to be the average salary for that salary group or class for all races."

That is one amendment which the American Federation of Labor wants incorporated in the bill; and if the bill becomes law, the American Federation of Labor will in the future continue, of course, to agitate for such a provision.

A second amendment requested by the American Federation of Labor is:

On page 15, beginning with line 3 (f): "The term 'teacher' shall include any person who is actively engaged in bona fide classroom instruction in any subject in the curriculum authorized by the State," and substitute the language given for the language in the bill as reported for (f) on page 15.

I read now from the memorandum handed to me by the legislative representative of the teachers' branch of the American Federation of Labor:

The first amendment regarding the average salary for minority races would actually

give to the Negro an equitable and just share in educational expenditures. The bill as reported does not guarantee the Negro an equitable or just share.

Incidentally, the memorandum has been prepared by a woman who was a successful teacher and who, as I said before, is now the legislative representative of the teachers' union of the American Federation of Labor.

I read further from the memorandum:

The second amendment would guarantee to the bona fide classroom teacher the money which he thinks he will get from the bill; however, the bill as reported gives such a broad definition to the term "teacher" that practically all of the money in the bill could be used for administrative officials and practically none be used for the teacher.

The amendment defining "teacher" in its limited sense is opposed by the majority of the National Education Association because they are interested in raising the salaries of the administrators.

I now ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a complete statement submitted by the legislative representative of the American Federation of Labor, which shows that they favor the general principle of Federal aid to education when need is shown, but that they are opposed to the bill unless the amendments I have read are incorporated in it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

S. 637 in its present form does not have the support of the American Federation of Labor. The American Federation of Labor opposed S. 637 in this form at the time of the hearings. The opposition of the American Federation of Labor is not to the principle of Federal aid to education. The American Federation of Labor actively supports the principle of Federal aid to education. It has supported this principle longer than any other Nation-wide organization in the country.

However, the American Federation of Labor believes in Federal aid to education as a means for actually equalizing educational opportunities throughout the Nation; it believes that Federal aid should be a means whereby teachers who are properly professionally trained can be paid somewhere near what their services are worth. The American Federation of Labor believes that a well-planned program, which would be based upon a recognition of the relative need of the States and the relative desire of the States actually to assist and promote education should be the basis upon which the money is allocated and distributed among and within the States.

The bill now before the Senate, S. 637, does not observe any of these principles.

The American Federation of Labor recognizes the fact that during an emergency the money must be given rapidly and simply to meet the acute emergency. It, therefore, urges that immediate emergency aid be given to keep our schools open at this time. However, it does not believe that a makeshift program, which in no way recognizes the equities of a sound program, should be confused with an emergency immediate grant.

The American Federation of Labor, at its convention just ended last week in Boston, went on record unanimously in the following manner regarding S. 637:

I. It urges the separation of a permanent program from an emergency program.

II. It urges an assurance in no way set forth in the bill, at present, that the funds appropriated should be used for the most part of the payment of teachers' salaries. It urges protection of the interests of teachers who are not politically valuable to a State machinery, but whose work is socially of importance to the entire Nation.

It is, therefore, suggested that to meet these principles that the following amendments be offered to the bill:

1. An amendment striking from this bill the provision for a permanent program and leaving only an emergency grant, to be allocated and distributed on a basis of the relative immediate need.

2. An amendment earmarking three-fourths of the money appropriated for the teachers' salaries.

A. The bill as drafted sets aside a certain sum for each State, and in no way assures that the teachers for whose benefit the bill is supposedly drawn will receive one cent of increase.

B. The bill as now before the Senate, by giving a lump sum to the States, in no way protects the interests of the Negro. Under this bill the State may use the entire grant from the Federal Government to establish and maintain a State research department which would serve both the Negro and the white teacher; to conduct a large portion of the State administrative educational machinery for the Negro and the white and then be free to use State money, as before, to continue to discriminate against the Negro, with this one additional consideration: That by having additional State money now available, because Federal money could be used for State administrative machinery, the money for the State could then be used to give a slight increase in pay to those teachers who in the opinion of the State merit the political support of the State educational organization. (This condition would prevail because the word "teacher" has been construed to mean any employee in the educational department who is not a custodial employee or a superintendent of schools. The word "teacher" is definitely held to mean supervisory officers, research workers, etc.)

C. An assurance that Federal money given to equalize opportunities among and within the States is actually to be used for that purpose could hardly be regarded as a violation of States' rights, even though many of those who support the bill may hypocritically claim that the earmarking of funds for the teachers would be.

3. Offer an amendment establishing a minimum salary of $1,500 for professionally qualified teachers in those States which accept the aid. The very low salary of teachers which have been quoted repeatedly (the salaries below $1,000 a year) are, for the most part, the salary of Negro teachers in the South and the salaries of teachers in other States, which States do not have a State equalization program but which use the State money to assist further the politically desirable parts of the State.

The American Federation of Labor is eager to support any measure which would actually equalize educational opportunities among and within the States. The organization, however, fears that by establishing, on a permanent basis, a system of distribution which continues present gross inequities the likelihood of developing a sound, truly social program would be much more remote.

Mr. WALSH. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Massachusetts Federation of Taxpayers Associations, and a letter from the Springfield Taxpayers' Association.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MASSACHUSETTS FEDERATION OF TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATIONS,
Boston, October 13, 1943.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: There are several reasons, from the viewpoint of Massachusetts citizens, why the Federal education subsidy bill, S. 637, the subject of our recent wire to you, should be defeated. This bill, as you know, is scheduled for immediate Senate consideration.

For these reasons, among many others, the bill should receive your negative vote:

1. By its own terms, and in spite of protestations that such is not the intent, it becomes an effective instrument for Federal control of local education.

2. Its second manifest purpose is to raise teachers' salaries regardless of their present levels, as in Massachusetts where they are among the highest in the country.

3. The devices contained in the bill to "equalize educational opportunity" are ineffectual.

4. The proposed method of distributing $300,000,000 annually among the States for pay raises and other purposes is inequitable and unreasonable.

5. The whole proposal is completely out of step with the national wage policy freezing wages as a necessary anti-inflationary step.

6. The country hasn't got the money, and cannot meet its current costs without enormous borrowings.

7. The taxpayers of Massachusetts would be called upon to pay $12,000,000 a year more than they now pay for their educational system in order to receive $5,000,000 a year which they do not need.

Senate 637 would distribute $300,000,000 annually among the States regardless of need, and largely to increase teachers' salaries. Only those States complying with Federal regulations to be made by the Federal Commissioner would be allowed to participate. Thus Federal control would be accomplished.

The principal support for the measure comes from teachers who are willing to sell out the American system of locally controlled education for pay raises, regardless of whether they are now being adequately and reasonably paid.

The bill pays no more than lip service to the ancient cry of "equal educational opportunity," so intent are its sponsors in their brazen attempt to get pay boosts during the national emergency to go on top of the increases they have received in nearly all States during the past year. They are saying to the Senate in effect, "It is all right to freeze the wages of everyone else to defeat inflation, but now is the time to take care of us because we have a large and vocal lobby."

Most outspoken proponent of the measure is the National Education Association, which is really a powerful Nation-wide pressure group, here working in the interest of higher teachers' salaries. Support of school teachers is being bought through the provision for using $200,000,000 of the $300,000,000 fund almost entirely for salary raises for teachers, regardless of their current levels. This attempt to obtain wage raises for school teachers is particularly reprehensible at this time, when all our efforts are, or should be, directed toward winning the war.

While recognizing that we face many problems in our school systems, it is a serious mistake to think we can solve them simply by turning on the spigot of Federal funds. The problems of education cannot be solved by a subsidy bill. It must be solved in our home communities by citizens who are familiar with local problems and best suited to deal with them in a constructive manner.

This bill would penalize 31 States for the benefit of the remaining 17. Under its operation Massachusetts taxpayers would have to contribute $7,000,000 largely to increase teachers' pay in those States which have not yet seen fit to bring their educational standards up to those of this State.

For these reasons the Federal education subsidy bill should be defeated. We feel you are fully aware of the dangers lurking in this bill and that you will vote against it.

Very truly yours,

NORMAN MACDONALD,
Executive Director.

SPRINGFIELD TAXPAYERS' ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Springfield, Mass., October 15, 1943.

Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: The Federal education subsidy bill (S. 637) was discussed at a recent meeting of the board of trustees of this association and it was voted to inform you of our opposition to its passage.

This bill is an opening wedge which if permitted to go through will result in increasing Federal control of our school system. It is an unnecessary subsidy for our present salary level is among the highest in the country and our school system one of the best. Moreover, even if an increase in our school budget were desirable it would cost Springfield taxpayers much less to raise the funds locally than to participate in the proposed distribution of funds.

We have learned to beware of the Federal Government bearing gifts. What appears to be an outright grant to the State usually turns out to be another strand in the bonds that strangle home rule. Local school officials are better able to run our educational system than Federal bureaucrats. We in Springfield have developed one of the finest school systems in the country without Federal interference and we prefer to maintain our present independence.

There is no possible benefit to Massachusetts or to Springfield in such a Federal subsidy. Under the bill Massachusetts would receive $5,000,000. The amount Massachusetts taxpayers would be taxed to raise the $300,000,000 required by the bill would be $12,000,000 per year. In other words, this bill proposes to tax Massachusetts taxpayers $12,000,000, retain $5,000,000 in Massachusetts. and distribute the other $7,000,000 to teachers in other States. Even if we needed to increase our educational budget by $5,000,000, it would be far wiser to raise the money locally than to have the Federal Government tax us two and a half times as much.

One other factor should be taken into consideration at this time. The Federal Government is operating at a deficit. This deficit is being financed by the sale of War bonds to patriotic American citizens. There is no justification for using money loaned for the purpose of prosecuting the war to accomplish such an alien purpose.

Today's newspapers report you to be in agreement with our stand on this question. However, we wished to let you know the reasons for our opposition.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY W. CONNOR,
Executive Director.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to ask the Senator a question. I was unable to understand what he was reading. Is the Senator offering an amendment to the bill?

Mr. WALSH. No. I was reading a communication handed to me, relating to certain amendments which the American Federation of Labor requested to have offered. The request came from the American Federation of Labor. I said I would read the request because it would indicate the trend of the legislation or the direction in which the legislation, if enacted, will go in the future. I said I am not offering the amendments, because I am opposed to the principle of the bill.

Mr. STEWART. Did the Senator say that such amendments will be offered? Does he have information to that effect?

Mr. WALSH. I do not know. In fact, the amendments I read were sent to me from my office within the last minute, and evidently were sent there this morning. I have conferred with no other Senators, but I assume they have received similar information.

Mr. President, at this time I desire to state very briefly my objections to the proposed legislation. They are summarized, and are 10 in number:

First. We have had too much centralization resulting in bureaucratic control over the affairs of our citizens. We should not add to it by this new excursion into the field of education. Our schools are one of the few remaining bulwarks of local self-government and community enterprise. They should so remain. They have, on the whole, been well managed and generously supported.

Let me divert from my objections, to say that one of the earliest impressions of my life, and one which gave me an illustration of the benefits of our democratic institutions as illustrated by the operations of town meetings, was received when I, as a high-school student, visited a New England town meeting in the town hall, and heard the discussion and proceedings relating to the various local matters which were under consideration there. I particularly observed the interest which all those New England citizens had in educational questions—the building of a school, the number of teachers, the number of pupils to each teacher, the amount of money to be appropriated. I was particularly impressed with the keen interest they took in those particular problems, as well as in all other local questions.

Likewise, I recall most vividly—I wish I had the exact words here—a brilliant address made by the late Senator Borah, of Idaho, in which he eloquently portrayed the advantages of maintaining and keeping within the grasp of the local communities of the country their own problems of local self-government. He said that to do so was educational, that it would awaken their interest in public affairs, and that if their interest was removed from the problems closest and nearest to them—problems such as education—it would inevitably lead to complete centralization of government and to lack of interest in political questions. Maintaining an interest in local political questions is one of the best ways of preserving democratic institutions.

However, my time is limited, and I must proceed with the other objections:

Second. If the bill becomes a law Federal domination of education, notwithstanding the language contained in the statement of policy in the bill, will be the ultimate consequence, and in my judgment, the inevitable consequence. The present bill is the opening wedge.

Third. The most potent weapon of dictators and revolutionists is the control of schools and the education of the youth. At the beginning of the extensions of Federal aid, we should vigorously oppose taking the control of the education of our youth away from the parents and local communities and placing it under the yoke of a bureaucracy, thereby providing the medium for possible abuse in the years to come.

Fourth. It is quite apparent that educational opportunities are not uniform, and that is so because from the earliest days to the present day public education has been primarily a local responsibility largely supported by local taxation. This bill is a movement to make educational opportunities uniform throughout the Nation, that is, to lift up the standards in those communities where educational opportunities are inferior to those in other communities. This can be done only by removing local responsibility and support through local taxation. The conclusion is inescapable that in the manifold details of the operation of developing uniform education opportunities our school system would be gradually, but no less inexorably, drawn more and more under the thumb of the Federal bureaucracy.

Fifth. The appropriation of $300,000,000 is only the beginning. The advocates of this program of Federal grants to the States for educational purposes do not deny that very much larger grants to the States will be necessary if the objectives sought are to be attained.

Sixth. In my judgment the bill places an immense and unnecessary additional burden at this time on the already staggering total of Federal expenditures for relief, better housing, national defense, and the other long list of Federal activities and responsibilities.

Seventh. The bill deliberately confuses the issue of whether or not the Federal Government should assume a large responsibility for the support of general education in the United States with an entirely different issue, namely, by attempting to meet an alleged emergency in American education due to teacher shortage. If there is need for any type of Federal aid to education in the emergency, this matter should be considered on its own merits and not used as a subterfuge for facilitating the passage of legislation which would bring about a permanent change in the method whereby the American people support their schools.

Eighth. Every State in the Union should take steps to cope with the emergency situation created in the schools by wartime conditions. Some of the State legislatures have already taken action to cope with the emergency situation. For example, the last session of

the legislature of Pennsylvania passed an act which provides a bonus of $300 to its lowest-paid teachers. Similar action has been taken by most of the other States and communities. The bill provides that the money appropriated for teachers' salaries is to be distributed to the States on the basis of average daily attendance and not on the basis of need. This means that the money will go to the wealthier States as well as those that are poorer. There are large surpluses gathered in some of the State treasuries, as pointed out yesterday by the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and even some of the so-called poor States are reporting surpluses in their State funds. There is no justification for distributing money to increase the income of teachers except on the basis of need.

Ninth. If the Federal Government undertakes to guarantee a minimum salary to public school teachers it will ultimately lead to a movement in favor of uniform salaries to teachers in all parts of the country; it seems certain to me that it will be an invitation for the teachers of the Nation to organize into labor unions and make demands upon the Congress for appropriations to provide uniform and equal salaries to teachers everywhere, just as the Federal Government has provided uniform salaries for letter carriers and postal clerks in every postal area in the country.

Tenth. In the final analysis this bill is a device whereby it is hoped that funds shall be siphoned out of the communities and the States already excessively taxed for educational facilities, that are presumed to be rich, and poured into the communities and States that are presumed to be poor, via the Federal Treasury. What the bill undertakes to do is actually to punish by further taxation the States, communities and citizens who have sacrificed most in the past to improve their educational systems. If justice and equity are to be done to the taxpayers of the country, the Federal Government must ultimately enter into the field of interference in that which has been most basic and fundamental—the right of allowing the people of the States and the several communities to levy taxes for educational purposes according to their own means and desires.

Mr. President, Federal control of education will end the long struggle for the defense and preservation of State rights.

Originally, appropriations of Federal funds to aid the States were made in the form of grants. In recent years the Bureau of the Census has made a distinction between grants and subventions. It designates as "subventions" those contributions for specific purposes made by the Federal Government to the States which are granted subject to the formal compliance by the recipient with certain prescribed conditions, whereas "grants" it refers to as contributions made with the prior establishment of conditions. Since 1914 grants have not been the practice of the Federal Government. Since that date there has grown up a vast system under which recipient States surrender their authority to conduct and manage activities of purely local concern, transferring that authority to some Federal bureau or commission in exchange for a gift of money to supplement their own appropriations. This practice has grown so rapidly that there is grave danger that the autonomy of the States will completely disappear.

In my opinion the transfer of control of education from the States to a Federal bureau would lead to the Federal principle upon which our Union stands becoming but an historic memory.

The pending bill recognizes the opposition to the transfer of control over education from the States to a Federal bureau, and therefore the advocates of federalization of education have temporarily abandoned the policy of subvention contributions. All the earlier bills introduced by these advocates contained the subvention principle. One must be politically unsophisticated who does not realize that the pending bill would lead to advocating the larger and broader and more dangerous principles of the earlier advocates of Federal education. As certain as the sun shines, the enactment of this bill would lead to exercising the same authority and control now exercised by other bureaus, and to ever increasing Federal appropriations, uniform educational curricula, and uniform salaries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] for himself and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I expect to vote for the pending bill if it is allowed to remain substantially in its present form. Like a great many other Members of this body, I have always had the fear that the Federal Government might at some time undertake to control education throughout the Nation and in the various States by undertaking to select courses of study, methods of teaching, and perhaps even the teachers themselves. For that reason, in the past I have refrained from giving my support to any measure of this character

However, this bill as it now stands contains the following express provision in section 1:

> SECTION 1. No department, agency, or officer of the United States shall exercise any supervision or control over any school or State educational agency with respect to which any funds are expended pursuant to this act, nor shall any term or condition of any agreement under this act relating to any contribution made under this act to or on behalf of any school or State educational agency authorize any agency or officer of the United States to control the administration, personnel, curriculum, instruction, methods of instruction, or materials of instruction.

Without undertaking to read the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas for himself and the Senator from South Carolina, or to differentiate between that amendment and the provisions of section 1, let me say that they both have the same purpose in view. It seems to me that the provisions of section 1 of the bill, which I have just read, are amply strong to prevent Federal control of schools. As I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from South Carolina, it would tend to improve section 1. Therefore, I expect to vote for the amendment.

As I have already stated, like most other Members of this body, I have always had a great fear with respect to Federal aid to schools, based upon the possibility that the Federal Government might undertake to control the schools. However, if the bill should become a law, either with the provisions of section 1 as they now stand, or the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from South Carolina, I do not see how anyone could claim that there could be Federal control over the management of the schools, the selection of the curricula, the selection of teachers, or anything of that sort. If those words do not express a definite policy of the Congress, then I do not know what words could be chosen to express a policy of this body so as to prevent Federal control.

It has been stated that even if the bill should become law as it is now worded, there would be an attempt on the part of some of those who would have the enforcement of the act in charge to bring about Federal control or operation of the schools.

If those who would have charge of the administration of the proposed law on behalf of the Government should undertake to assume control of the public schools in the various States, or in any of them, either directly or indirectly, in my judgment such assumption would be absolutely unauthorized and would probably be classed as a dishonest act.

The question of control has been debated in this Chamber for the past 2 or 3 days, since the bill has been under consideration. It has certainly been made very plain in the record of the discussions that the purpose of section 1 of the bill is absolutely to prevent and prohibit any effort looking toward Federal control of schools in the various States, or in any one of the States, as I construe it, either by direct or indirect methods. I cannot conceive that anyone who would have charge of the administration of the law in behalf of the Government, if the bill should become law, could at the present time have in his or her mind the purpose or desire to bring about Federal control of the public-school system in the various States, or in any one of the States. I am convinced, therefore, that the Federal Government will not undertake to control the public schools in the various States, or in any one of them.

I agree completely with those who have stated that they do not wish to see Federal control of local education, or a usurpation of the power and control over the schools now vested in the various States.

Realizing the great need at this time for aid to schools in most of the States of the Union, largely because of the ridiculously low salaries being paid to teachers, I am anxious to see Congress enact the pending bill as it now stands.

The report filed by the Committee on Education and Labor when the pending bill was placed on the calendar, shows that there were actually 13,000 vacant

positions for teachers in elementary and secondary schools throughout the country at the close of the present school year. It shows further that a total of 65,000 teachers gave up their positions during the present school year and sought employment elsewhere because of the low salaries paid them. The report also shows that 37,000 of those teachers were replaced by teachers who held what have been referred to as emergency certificates. Such emergency certificates do not certify to the fitness and qualifications as teachers of the persons holding them, which would put such teachers upon the same basis of qualifications as those required of the holder of a permanent teacher's certificate.

The report further states that if something is not done to relieve the financial situation with respect to teachers, during the present year, probably another 75,000 teachers will seek employment elsewhere, and thus increase vacancies among teachers in the common schools throughout our country.

If such conditions do not constitute an emergency, I do not know what it takes to constitute an emergency. If the situation which I have briefly described—and I have quoted from only a very small portion of the report—does not tell of an emergency, I do not know how one could be described. "There are hundreds of thousands of school children," the report also states, "who never know from one day to the next who their teachers will be when they arrive at school." Thousands are unable to attend school at all.

We have recently seen a report made public, I believe, by the Office of War Information, which stated that crime was on the increase among the youth of our land, and that even children under high-school age were being picked up here and there for violating criminal laws. Certainly such conditions as idleness and absence from school constitute an emergency.

I expect to support the pending bill for the reason, chiefly, that the need for the money to be expended on behalf of the schools of the country is great and serious, and that the situation constitutes a state of emergency.

Many other distressing conditions are referred to in the report, which, of course, has been carefully read by every Member of the Senate. To undertake to restate them would simply involve repetition. The need for education of the youth in our land is recognized by us all. When I say the youth in our land I refer to the education of the youth of all races within the 48 States which comprise the Union. We all realize the need for education. From the beginning our Government has recognized education as one of the things which bring about the civilization of mankind. I believe that when we are faced with a condition such as has been described during the past several days of debate on the pending bill, and by the report to which I have referred, we must recognize the extreme seriousness of the situation as an emergency. I believe that in view of the knowledge which has been afforded us as a result of the efforts of the committee which made the report, we, as one of the branches of the Government, must accept the responsibility which lies upon our shoulders to correct the situation with which we are confronted.

I believe that the idea of Federal control of schools is more or less exaggerated. Certainly such control can be prevented by the Congress. It can be prevented now and is by the language of the bill which we are asked to pass. Future sessions of the Congress, in the event that additional legislation should be enacted, can likewise control the situation. If the pending bill should become law, future appropriations to carry it out could be made by the Senate and by the House of Representatives with provisions against Federal control. Whether the Department of Education or any other branch of the Federal Government shall have anything to do with the control of schools within the States is a matter which always remains within the control of the Congress. I do not fear it, and I expect, Mr. President, to support the bill unless an obnoxious and unacceptable amendment should make it impossible for me to do so.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, may I ask that the amendment which I have sponsored be read by the clerk for the information of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment would be out of order at this time as there is an amendment pending. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] for himself and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, at this point in the proceedings I ask that paragraph 4 of rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Paragraph 4 of rule XVI is as follows:

4. No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill, nor shall any amendment not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in the bill be received; nor shall any amendment to any item or clause of such bill be received which does not directly relate thereto; and all questions of relevancy of amendments under this rule, when raised, shall be submitted to the Senate, and be decided without debate; and any amendment to a general appropriation bill may be laid on the table without prejudice to the bill. (Jefferson's Manual, sec. XXXV.)

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senators from Arkansas and South Carolina is in complete keeping with the theory of the bill as has already been expressed by the Senator from Arkansas. If it is possible to make the words of the bill any stronger to show that the bill is built upon the theory of local control of schools, I should like to make it stronger than it is, and since these two Senators and many other Senators have spoken to me about the matter, I am happy to accept the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] for himself and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment I have offered be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, line 23, after the word "States", it is proposed to insert "(except Wyoming)"; and on page 15, after line 7, to insert the following new section:

SPECIAL PROVISION FOR STATE OF WYOMING

SEC. —. (a) The provisions of this act shall not apply to the State of Wyoming and in lieu of participation in amounts appropriated pursuant to the provisions of this act there are hereby granted to said State 500,000 acres of the public lands in said State to be selected by the State of Wyoming in the same manner as is provided in the case of school sections granted by section 4 of the Enabling Act, approved July 10, 1890: *Provided*, That lands which are under mineral withdrawal, national-park areas, forest reserves, and reclamation withdrawals, shall not be subject to selection under the provisions of this section.

(b) All proceeds received from the leasing or sale of such selected lands shall be earmarked and set aside and used only for educational purposes in the State of Wyoming.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. May I ask the Senator from Wyoming whether this amendment has received departmental consideration?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No, it has not.

Mr. OVERTON. Has it received committee consideration?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No, it has not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inquire if the Senator from Wyoming has offered the amendment for consideration.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Not for consideration. I asked that it be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the proponents of the pending bill, S. 637, seek to convey an impression that if it should become law, it would give $300,000,000 worth of better education to the young people of the Nation. A most laudable idea if it were true, which it is not; a noble idea if it were true, which it is not; and also if it were true, it should and probably would receive the support of every Senator, but again, it is not true.

The full and open debate which has taken place on this bill has brought to light the true character of the measure, its inward, sinister, and hidden purpose, that is, hidden for the time being.

I imagine that I am one of few Senators who have received more mail against this bill than for it. An analysis of that mail reveals, that those against the bill feel that the expenditure of $300,000,000 at this time, when the Nation is at war,

is not consistent with an all-out war effort; that there is no justification at this time for any such expenditure which does not directly contribute to the war effort; and that in supporting this bill we are not keeping faith with our boys on the fighting fronts. The mail received in favor of the bill does not in any single instance reveal any desire or thought for better education of the young people of the Nation. It does not refer to the war effort or to the possibility of this money being used for better or more equipment for our fighting forces, and there is no mention at all of where this money is to come from or how we are to get it.

The refrain of the mail received in favor of the bill is "Give me more money," and in some cases there is the query, "How am I going to buy bonds unless I have more money?" A few letters contained a thinly veiled threat, and reminded me that there were a number of teachers in my State. That is true. There are also from my State a great number of boys who are fighting for their country at $50 a month, and I did not receive a letter from any one of them asking me to vote for this bill.

There is one object, and one object alone, of this bill, and that is to pay each of the 1,000,000 school teachers in the Nation from $200 to $300 a year more than they are receiving today. There are 15 pages in the bill, but that is the sum total—from $200 to $300 a year more to 1,000,000 people. Does anyone seriously contend that if we pay our school teachers $200 or $300 a year more than they get today, the education of our children will be benefited; that thousands of new "Quiz Kids" will result? The administration has no such thought in its mind. The sole object of this bill—and I look for many more like it—is an attempt to purchase the votes of 1,000,000 people and to use the Federal funds to do so.

This is an administration bill and is in keeping, in perfect step, with many that have gone before it in the last 10 years.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator says it is an "administration bill." When did it become an administration bill, and by what process?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I understand it is sponsored by the administration.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is mistaken. The administration, as such, has taken no hand whatever in the sponsorship of this bill and is neutral, so far as I know, in regard to its passage.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for that information.

The bill is clever, cunningly clever, in an attempt to gain the support of a majority of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. President, the New Deal has not lost its cunning. Take a moment to consider who are to be the recipients this time, whose vote is to be bought with money out of the Federal Treasury. That of the school teacher who molds the character and thoughts, economic and political, of our children, while the father and the mother are building ships and planes and tanks and guns to keep our boys in Italy and New Guinea and over half of the world. No, the New Deal has not lost its cunning—$300,000,000, or from $200 to $300 a vote. Where is the Hatch Act? Where is the Connally-Smith Act?

The bill before us does nothing for education. Why was it referred to the Education and Labor Committee? It has nothing to do with either education or labor. It is purely a finance measure—$300,000,000 cash on the barrel head.

I am anxious that my State, Wyoming, should have the finest educational system and facilities possible. I want every boy and girl in my State, regardless of their financial standing, to have the opportunity of the finest possible education. It is plainly evident that no such state of affairs can possibly come about through this bill.

The State of Wyoming is one of 11 public-land States. The Federal Government owns roughly 50 percent of the acreage of Wyoming, none of which is on the tax roll. Thus, the entire State is supported by taxation on only half its acreage. To achieve the end of complete education for every citizen of the State, it is essential that the basic foundation of education in that State be continued and enlarged. I have therefore suggested an amendment. The object of the amendment is to replace, as far as the State of Wyoming is concerned, the basic idea of the pending bill, which is unsound, with something that is basically sound.

It is basically unsound to pour out from the National Treasury $300,000,000 to the various States at a time when every cent we can raise is needed for our war effort, at a time when the individual income of our citizens is greater than ever before.

During the recent Third War Loan drive, with other Senators, I was asked to make several 1-minute recorded talks, to be broadcast in my State, and so help the drive. In my 1-minute speech I asked the people of my State to buy bonds, and told them that I would do all in my power to see that the money they subscribed to the war loan would be used in the manner they intended it should be—namely, to win the war.

The expenditure of the $300,000,000 authorized in the bill would have nothing to do with winning the war. It would not help shorten the duration of the war by 1 minute. It would not help save the life of one of our boys. It would not bring our boys home one moment earlier. It would not stop the drafting of one father in America.

When the State of Wyoming was admitted to the Union it received from the United States a land grant for educational purposes as did other States. In every township, sections 16 and 36 were conveyed to the State, on the understanding that the income derived from those sections was to be devoted to educational purposes. Today throughout the State those sections are known as "school sections," and the income derived from them is earmarked and used exclusively for school purposes. That is basically and nationally sound.

The State of Wyoming covers approximately 62,500,000 acres, and about 50 percent of that area is today federally owned and controlled, some 37,000,000 acres. My amendment seeks to convey to the State for school purposes 500,000 acres of that 37,000,000 acres of federally owned land.

The State would select the acreage in the manner that is used in selecting existing land grants. The Federal withdrawals, such as national parks, forest reserves, reclamation withdrawals, and mineral withdrawals, would not be affected. Practically the only land that would be subject to selection would be grazing areas.

Today the State of Wyoming has a minimum annual grazing rental charge of 5 cents per acre. On 500,000 acres this would produce a minimum of $25,000 a year, all to be devoted, not for 1 or 2 years, or until 6 months after the war is over, but for all time, exclusively to the education of our children. Could the income from this land be used to any better advantage? I do not think so.

The amendment does not call for the expenditure of 1 cent of Federal funds; rather, it would reduce the $300,000,000 authorization by the amount allocated to the State of Wyoming.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment at the proper place in the bill to insert the following:

Provided, That there shall be no discrimination in the administration of the benefits and appropriations made under the respective provisions of this act, or in the State funds supplemented thereby on account of race, creed, or color.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated by the clerk.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That there shall be no discrimination in the administration of the benefits and appropriations made under the respective provisions of this act, or in the State funds supplemented thereby on account of race, creed, or color.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in support of the amendment, I very respectfully call the attention of the Senate to the time when we were debating the anti-poll-tax bill on the 21st of November last. Every Senator will remember that that fight was led by the distinguished George W. Norris and the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. I now desire to quote from what the Senator from Florida stated upon that occasion, when he was speaking against the poll tax which was being levied in eight southern States. I read from page 9046 of the RECORD:

I foresee a South which will come to the bar of the Congress with clean hands asking justice, which will practice democracy and seek it from its Congress and fellow countrymen.

Mr. President, on the same page, a little further on, the distinguished

Senator from Florida is reported as saying:

I envision, Mr. President, the passage of Senate bill 1313, which will provide equality of educational opportunity to the people of my South who, happening to live in impoverished areas, are not afforded minimum standards of education in the ordinary public schools.

Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that Senate bill 1313 was a bill in very many respects similar to Senate bill 637, which we are now considering. Then the distinguished Senator from Florida said:

What kind of a reception is it likely we—

And he was speaking for the South; he was addressing these remarks to the southern Senators, who had been discriminating against the Negro boys and girls and against the poor children of share croppers of the white race, millions of them. The distinguished Senator from Florida said:

What kind of a reception is it likely we shall be accorded in the Senate when we come in advocacy of Senate bill 1313, providing Federal aid for public education, when it is said, on the one hand, "What happens in the States is none of your business," and, on the other, "You must give it your primary concern."

The distinguished Senator from Florida continued:

I, therefore, believe in bringing the South with clean hands to the bar of the Congress and the country, striving before God and our fellow men to do justice, and asking it from those whose duty it is likewise to dispense it.

Mr. President, in spite of the eloquent plea made by the distinguished Senator from Florida, in spite of his logic, which in my opinion was absolutely irrefutable, in spite of the fact that the Senator from Florida planned for the poor boy or girl in the South, whether white or black, I ask Senators to examine the votes cast by some Senators who today are pleading for the passage of the pending measure, and begging for the appropriation of $200,000,000. Why is that money asked for, Mr. President? So they can discriminate more and more and more against the poor children of the South.

I have before me the record, and what does it show? On page 19 of the hearing before the Committee on Education and Labor we find the statement that one State spent $61.21 for the education of each white pupil, and $12.62 for the education of each Negro pupil. I say it is a disgrace for any State so to discriminate.

Mr. President, I am proud of a State such as North Dakota, which does not discriminate between whites and blacks, or whites and Indians, which does not discriminate between Protestants, Jews, or Catholics. When we were short of money for educational purposes in North Dakota we levied a sales tax. We set up an equalization fund so we could pay our teachers a decent salary.

I contend that the language of my amendment simply provides that all the money any of the Southern States shall receive shall be expended dollar for dollar equally for poor white and for poor black children.

Mr. President, I have received a telegram from the Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The telegram says substantially that the association likes my amendment, but that the bill in its present form is satisfactory to the association, and that it is against my amendment.

Mr. President, I have changed the language of my original amendment respecting which the association sent me a telegram. My original amendment, which is printed, is as follows:

Provided, That there shall be no discrimination in the administration of the benefits and appropriations made under the respective provisions of this act on account of race, creed, or color.

After I received the telegram it occurred to me that a bigoted State administration might expend all the Federal money it received in the way it had previously been expending its money for education. The State administration might even go further and expend a greater proportion of it for educating white pupils than for educating colored pupils. The State administration, on the other hand, could use a slightly larger portion of the money received from the Federal Government for educating colored children as well as poor white children, than in the past, and thus say it was carrying out the pledges made by some Senators who have discussed the pending measure.

Mr. President, I do not want to take any chances with respect to that matter. I wish to have written into the measure before us an absolute direction to every single State in the Union with respect to the use of the money. I wish to have inserted in the measure language which shall carry into effect the statement of the Declaration of Independence that "all men," which includes boys and girls, "are created equal." So that they shall in reality be treated equally, and that no State shall discriminate against poor white children or against poor colored children.

So, Mr. President, feeling as strongly with respect to this matter as I do; believing as I do in education and in the expenditure of money for education; having while Governor of my State seen to it that the State received enough money for educational purposes from a sales tax which was passed specifically for the purpose of giving teachers good salaries; believing generally in the principle of higher education and the giving to every boy and girl in this country a good education; believing as I do that that should be done, I beg every Senator upon this floor to give earnest, thoughtful, careful consideration to the amendment I have proposed.

I wish to state to the distinguished Senator from Utah, in charge of the bill, that I have received numerous requests from colored people asking that the amendment be proposed to the pending measure.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I can assure the worthy Senator who asks that a yea and nay vote may be had on his amendment that I shall not occupy very much time, but I believe that every amendment offered should have some discussion, and therefore I do not feel that I am imposing upon the time of the Senate.

The great Negro group which the amendment is supposed to help appeared, by its representatives, in connection with the hearing, and supported the bill from the beginning. Yesterday, when the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota became public, I received two telegrams. One was from Mary L. Williams, president of the American Teachers' Association. That association is an organization made up of the Negro teachers of the United States, and is the largest organization of its kind in existence. The telegram is as follows:

CHARLESTON, W. VA., *October 19, 1943.*
Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The American Teachers Association endorses Senate bill 637 and urges upon the entire membership of United States Senate its immediate passage. This association, representing the national organization of teachers in Negro schools, is entirely satisfied with the provisions of the pending bill respecting equitable distribution of its benefits to minority groups. The association is convinced that the bill should be enacted without any amendment on this point.

MARY L. WILLIAMS, *President.*

The largest Negro association in the United States, headed by Walter White, who is secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, also sent me a telegram. This organization was represented at the hearing. It offered no amendment similar to the pending amendment when it had an opportunity to suggest amendments, because the great mass of Negroes in our country realize that education is a State matter.

Mr. White has sent me the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 19, 1943.*
Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS,
Senate Office Building:

We have just sent the following telegram to Senators W. WARREN BARBOUR and WILLIAM LANGER. "Your proposed and well-intended antidiscrimination amendment to S. 637 adds nothing to protection against discrimination already appearing in sections 6f and 13c and 13d of the bill now before the Senate. Therefore your amendment would not strengthen the bill. It might lead to misunderstanding jeopardizing the passage of bill and inviting the introduction of partisan political considerations into this vital legislation. For these reasons the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People urges that you not introduce your proposed amendment." We urge passage of S. 637 in its present form.

WALTER WHITE,
Secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No, Mr. President; I cannot yield, because my time is limited, as the Senator knows.

Those two great organizations, as I said before, have sponsored the bill without the amendment. The amendment is clearly inconsistent with the spirit and the wording of the bill. While in the case of States which maintain two systems of education there should be a proper and equitable distribution between the two systems, that is taken care of in the bill; and if the salaries of the various teachers are to be increased according to percentage, the class of teachers who receive the lowest salaries will of course be benefited the most in terms of percentage. So anyone can see there is no attempt, and there could not possibly be an attempt, to provide equality there. There is no attempt in the bill to interfere in any way with the State administrations of the various school systems. The bill recognizes the fact that there are States which maintain minority group schools. Such schools are maintained in accordance with State law. The bill will help the teachers in both the minority-group and the majority-group schools; but it cannot, it will not, it does not, and it is not intended that it should in any way interfere with State administration.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has made the point very much stronger by actually providing in his amendment for supervision of State funds—a matter which is thoroughly inconsistent with all the Federal Government has ever done in regard to education and in regard to almost everything else. It would immediately strike down our whole State system, which of course is the most cherished thing we have, no matter how one may look at it. We must maintain, and the bill does maintain, State and local control.

While I am on that subject, let me say that in spite of the statements and the efforts which have been made to belittle the pending bill and to make of it something which is insincere, something tricky, something which is an attempt to do something that the people of the United States do not want to do, we have had years and years of experience with Federal funds which have gone to the benefit of States, for State-controlled education in our country; and in the whole history of such transactions, going back to the Civil War when the land grants were given to land-grant institutions, there has not been and could not be a single instance in which the Federal Government has attempted to interfere with a land-grant college. Even during the reconstruction period in the South, at the time when certain northern Members of Congress were sponsoring and when the Congress was proposing such measures as the Force Act, when there was great zeal regarding administration of laws to protect the Federal Government, to protect the Union, to protect the theory of State rights and the proper relationship between the State and Nation, never once was the South interfered with in the maintenance of its land-grant colleges and the use of the funds it obtained for them from the Federal Government. At the time when Congress was legislating and was adopting amendments to attempt to bring about absolute and complete equality between the whites and the blacks, the South was allowed to go forward with its land-grant colleges, because it was the South's way of doing it, and the land-grant colleges were set up primarily for the benefit of white college students.

Mr. President, one could go on and could talk almost forever about this matter. There never has been an attempt to control State administration of the millions and millions of dollars of vocational funds which have been allotted to the States and which are administered primarily by the educational boards of large cities, because that is where most of the vocational training occurs. Not only has there never been an attempt to control the State administration of such funds, but there never has been a single attempt, so far as I know, to control the city administration of them so far as curriculum, teaching, and the administration of the schools are concerned.

Mr. President, that cannot be said any more positively. The reason why I am opposing the amendment is because it would definitely break down the barrier we have attempted to create in the law, so as to leave control of the schools entirely in the hands of the local administrators.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate but a moment. As a matter of fact, the only reason I have for rising to say anything is to emphasize an amendment which I have proposed to a number of prior pending bills, which amendment provided that there should be no discrimination on account of race, creed, or color in the administration of the benefits granted or the appropriations made by the provisions of this or any other bill. My distinguished colleague the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has already covered, so far as the discussion is concerned, the general subject matter of my amendment, and I think the changes he has made to my amendment are in line with my amendment. So I do not want to complicate the situation but I do not want to remain silent, for the reason that my amendment would be the seventh amendment of this nature that I have had incorporated in seven different pieces of legislation. I feel that it is something which is very obviously necessary. Certainly in the broad field of education there cannot be any principle more important than that of having no discrimination so far as race, creed, or color is concerned.

I simply desire to say that inasmuch as the Senator from North Dakota has made the presentation he has made, I do not want to be entirely silent on the subject, inasmuch as I originated the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a few moments ago I rose to ask a question of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I was going to point out to the Senator, when he refused to yield to me, that the amendment proposed by the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is not the amendment in its entirety as to which the Senator from Utah received telegrams from the Negro Teachers' Association and from Mr. White, of the National Association for Advancement of the Colored People.

The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota, as modified, reads as follows:

> *Provided*, That there shall be no discrimination in the administration of the benefits and appropriations made under the respective provisions of this act or in the State funds supplemented thereby on account of race, creed, or color.

That is a very different amendment from the one to which the telegrams read by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] referred.

It is interesting to me that the Senator from Utah has received telegrams from two Negro groups opposing the Langer amendment. I have been a Member of the Senate for the past 7 years, and I know that Negro groups, associations, and organizations in this country have always desired, in various types of legislation, amendments providing that there shall be no discrimination on the ground of race, creed, or color. I have always supported such amendments. I am rather interested to know of the change in policy which has come about. I am interested in that change of attitude on their part.

On the other hand, while the distinguished Senator from Utah was speaking, a memorandum came to my desk from the National Negro Council, which is said to represent more than 4,000,000 Negroes. The National Negro Council desires the amendment to prevent discrimination in the administration of the benefits and appropriations made under provisions of the act on account of race, creed, or color.

It is interesting to me to know that one of the organizations from whose statement the Senator quotes is an association of Negro school teachers who would benefit to the extent of $200 a year apiece. Of course, the Senator would not expect them to telegraph to him opposing the bill.

I think we might as well be fair in the matter of this amendment and in the consideration of the bill. I think the Senator from North Dakota, has offered a constructive amendment. I do not see how anyone can find fault with it. I hope it will be adopted.

After all, it is the Negro children in whom we are interested, and not Negro teachers, or professionals who head various Negro organizations. We are interested to see that the Negro children of this country are given a fair break in education. That is what the Langer amendment would do. To scoff at it is not a very becoming way of answering the constructive suggestion of the amendment. My attitude on Negro rights has long been known. I have al-

ways been for giving them a fair break. My position today has not changed.

Mr. President, I did not intend to speak on the bill, but I cannot support this measure, for various reasons. I believe it is a dangerous bill. It is the first step toward Federal control of education. I know that in Germany, Italy, and in certain other countries, control of education and control of the youth was the first step on the road to trouble and bringing a country under the grip of fascism and nazi-ism. I know that he who controls the purse eventually influences or controls all situations. Even if safeguards were written into the bill, it would not stop for long this Washington administration or some administration of the future.

We are fighting a world war. We are fighting it for our very existence. We are spending more money for war than any nation in the world's history. Today we ought to be thinking about ways to save money, instead of ways to spend more money for other purposes. We are faced with a great tax problem. The American people are faced with back-breaking taxes. Therefore we ought to be thinking of methods of saving funds, rather than spending more money. Ten million American men and women are fighting for their very lives to protect this country. Many of them have already given up their lives. This is no time to seek out new ways and methods to spend money on problems which have been before us for many years. Let us just once in a while think of saving money.

I started in my working life after college as a school teacher. I taught school for 1 year. I am just as much interested in education as is any other Senator, and more so than many of them. With one exception, the letters which have come to me in support of the bill have been from educational associations or school teachers. They have a right to their views—I respect them for their views—they are most sincere. On the other hand, I have heard from organizations such as the National Grange, which represents a large group in this country, in opposition to the bill. I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter from Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., October 16, 1943.

To Members of the Senate:

We have read and carefully considered S. 637, known as the educational finance bill. We note that this bill authorizes appropriations for the public schools aggregating $300,000,000 a year. Of this sum, $200,000,000 is to be apportioned among the States to raise substandard salaries of teachers and to meet the increased cost of living occasioned by the war. The other $100,000,000 is to be a permanent appropriation for the purpose of equalizing educational opportunities as between the people of the several States.

The National Grange is in hearty sympathy with the idea that teachers, who are among the most worthy and indispensable of our public servants, should be properly compensated. However, as we see it, there is no justification for the enactment of this bill. The Federal Government has no money to appropriate for education except borrowed funds. The national debt has already passed the colossal figure of $160,000,000,000, and it is estimated that before the close of the fiscal year it will exceed the $200,000,000,000 mark.

On the other hand, the finances of most of the State governments are in good shape. Some of the State legislatures have already taken action to cope with the emergency situation in the schools created by wartime conditions. For example, at its last session the Legislature of Pennsylvania passed an act which provides an annual bonus of $300 for its lowest paid teachers. Teachers in the higher salary brackets receive a smaller share of the funds appropriated for this purpose, but all participate in the benefits of the act. Every State in the Union that has not taken similar action should do so, rather than shift its responsibility to the Federal Government, which is already carrying a staggering load.

Elementary education is a State function. Any meddling in public-school affairs on the part of the Federal Government, even with the best of intentions, could not fail to have the most pernicious effects. It would infallibly destroy local initiative and control in school affairs. We may also take it for granted that in a short time it would result in the creation of another giant bureaucracy that would entail a perpetual drain upon the Federal Treasury. While the pending bill attempts to set up safeguards against these dangers, we do not believe that they would be effective beyond a year or two at the most. The demand for Federal funds would increase with each succeeding year, and in the end a Federal department of education would be established to supervise the expenditure of the Federal funds appropriated, together with the sums raised by local and State taxation. In other words, our public school system would be nationalized and bureaucratized. This would work grievous and irreparable injury to the whole system. As Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, has expressed it:

"There is not enough money in the United States, even if every dollar of it were expended on education, to produce through Federal authority, or through what is naively called cooperation between the Federal Government and the several States, educational results that would be at all comparable with those that have already been reached under the free and natural system that has grown up among us. * * *

"Bureaucrats and experts will speedily take the life out of even the best of schools and reduce them to dried and mounted specimens of pedagogic fatuity. Unless the school is both the work and pride of the community it serves, it is nothing. A school system that grows naturally in response to the needs and ambitions of a hundred thousand different communities will be a better school system than any which can be imposed upon those localities by the aid of grants of public money from the Federal Treasury, accompanied by Federal regulations, Federal inspections, Federal reports, and Federal uniformities."

We believe that our best hope of saving American democracy, the very thing for which we are fighting in this global war, lies in maintaining the sovereignty and independence of the States. In order that the States may remain virile and self-respecting, they must discharge the functions which naturally fall within their sphere. To say that the States are unable to cope with the prevailing crisis in education would be both absurd and untrue. It is in view of these considerations that we oppose the enactment of the pending bill.

Sincerely yours,
FRED BRENCKMAN,
Washington Representative.

Mr. BRIDGES. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have received from George M. Putnam, president of the New Hampshire Farm Bureau Federation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW HAMPSHIRE
FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Concord, N. H., October 15, 1943.

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: I hear a great deal of discussion regarding the merits of Senate bill 637 and from what I have been able to learn I believe our people are pretty generally opposed to this bill. I am reliably informed that many States which are able to support their schools adequately, both as to salaries of teachers and school standards, without any excessive tax burden would receive large Federal grants if this bill were to become a law.

It has always been the position of our State farm bureau that equalization of school costs between the towns and cities of our State should be provided for through State appropriation where costs to operate in accord with State requirements placed an excessive tax burden on any township or school district. As you know, we have such a law now in force which provides that the State shall meet the cost of operation in excess of 50 cents per hundred dollars on the equalized valuation of the town or school districts of the State. This law has worked very satisfactorily. This does not apply to the cost of schools beyond the eighth grade. I believe additional assistance should be extended to include high schools. If this would be an excessive burden on the State it might be desirable for the Federal Government to appropriate funds to go to States where educational costs were excessive, and I am sure we do have many States that are financially unable to provide the standard of schools which we all agree are desirable.

If the Federal Government is to provide such assistance such funds should be appropriated and allotted to the States without any requirements except that they should be used to equalize the cost of education and to improve the standards of the schools of the State. This has always been the position we have taken in this State through our farm bureau, and in the past it has been the position of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

I realize we have many States that need better schools and because of financial conditions are unable to provide them. In such cases I believe the Federal Government should allocate funds without strings attached, except as above stated. It might be desirable to establish a standard of costs beyond which the Federal Government should assist. I understand the National Education Association is the leading sponsor of this bill, and I fear the motive is not only to increase the salary of teachers, but underneath is the desire to be in a position to exert an influence and have a hand in the management of our schools which in my opinion should be a function of the States.

I hope you will express yourself in opposition to this bill in its present form.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE M. PUTNAM,
President.

Mr. BRIDGES. The National Catholic Welfare Conference is a large religious group, representing millions of Catholic members all over the United

States who feel very strongly about the proposed legislation. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter dated May 24, 1943, written to the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] by the National Catholic Welfare Conference in opposition to the bill; and also a letter addressed to me from William S. Montavon, enclosing a copy of the letter to the Senator from Utah.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL CATHOLIC
WELFARE CONFERENCE,
Washington, D. C., October 12, 1943.

The Honorable STYLES BRIDGES,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: S. 637, now being debated in the Senate, would authorize grants of Federal funds for the public schools. Voluntary schools which render a public service comparable to public schools would be excluded from the benefits of this bill.

I am, therefore, submitting for your consideration a letter filed with the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor by the director of the department of education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Very sincerely yours,
WILLIAM F. MONTAVON.

NATIONAL CATHOLIC
WELFARE CONFERENCE,
Washington, D. C., May 24, 1943.

The Honorable ELBERT D. THOMAS,
Chairman, Committee on
Education and Labor,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: I am instructed by the Administrative Committee of Bishops of the National Catholic Welfare Conference to communicate to you their opposition to Senate bill 637, which is entitled "A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools."

This bill deliberately confuses an issue which has been before the Congress and the American people for a number of years—namely, the wisdom and desirability of the Federal Government assuming a large degree of responsibility for the support of general education in the United States. The bill confuses this issue by attempting to meet an alleged emergency in American education due to teacher shortage and at the same time introducing a permanent pattern for Federal aid to education. If there is need for any type of Federal aid to education in the emergency, this need should be considered on its own merits and not used as a subterfuge for facilitating the passage of legislation which would bring about a permanent change in the method whereby the American people support their schools.

With regard to the emergency aid, which would provide $200,000,000 "for the payment of the salaries of teachers to keep school open, to employ additional teachers, to relieve overcrowded classes, to raise substandard salaries of teachers, and to adjust the salaries to meet the increased cost of living," it may be pointed out that the information which is supposed to establish such need has been brought together by the groups that are promoting this legislation and would be beneficiaries thereof. As a consequence, it is open to question. Not until Congress has before it a disinterested factual study of this whole situation can it properly consider legislation of this nature.

Other factors than low salary schedules are responsible for the fact that teachers are leaving their positions and seeking employment elsewhere. In rural districts restrictions over the social life of teachers, unpleasant living conditions, lack of tenure, all contribute to dissatisfaction. These factors are inherent in the situation, particularly where the district system of school organization prevails.

Incidentally, if the Federal Government guarantees a minimum salary to public school teachers, equity would seem to demand that it also guarantee a minimum salary to other persons whose work is quite as important, as far as the welfare of the Nation is concerned, as is that of school teachers.

The amount of money which this bill would appropriate for teacher salaries is to be distributed to the States on the basis of average daily attendance and not on the basis of need. This means that the money would go to the wealthier States as well as to those that are poorer. At the present time State and local governments, due to the great rise in the national income, are in a position to increase their tax revenue for the support of education. There are large surpluses gathering in some State treasuries and even the poorer States are reporting surpluses in their State funds. In most of the States of the Union the crisis with regard to teacher shortages could be met without recourse to Federal aid. In the others emergency aid might be made available on the basis of existing Federal legislation. If any new legislation is required, it should provide for aid on the basis of need.

Senate bill 637 provides, secondly, that $100,000,000 annually be apportioned to the States permanently for the purpose of equalizing public elementary and public secondary school opportunities among and within the States. This is an issue of deep and critical importance to the American people and they should not be asked to face it when they are in the midst of a war whose ultimate effects on their whole economy and manner of living cannot be foreseen. Even though this bill specifically provides that no supervision or control over any school or State educational agency shall be vested in any agency or officer of the United States, experience proves that, wherever there is Federal aid, there must of necessity be some measure of Federal control.

In defining the type of schools to be aided by Federal funds, the bill throughout uses the word "public." In other words, it explicitly excludes aid to privately supported schools. In effect, this means a prohibition on the part of the Federal Government that would prevent the States, if they so pleased, from using Federal funds for the aid of private or parochial schools. The fact that in most States the constitution and the laws prohibit such aid is beside the point. Even if a State changed its constitution and its laws, it could not under this bill use Federal funds except for the support of public schools.

The Catholic people of the United States are maintaining 2,105 secondary schools and 7,944 elementary schools, enrolling 2,396,305 children. They are supporting these schools out of their own resources and at the same time paying their share of the taxes which maintain the public schools. If this bill were enacted into law, their burden would become increased because it is only through additional taxation that the Federal Government could obtain the funds it would require. The more of their income Catholics are required to give to their Government, the less will remain to them for the support of their religion and the education which is an integral part thereof.

Catholics maintain their own schools because their conscience requires that they bring their children up according to the tenets and in the spirit of the religion that they profess. Their right to maintain schools is protected by the constitutional guarantee of freedom of religion. In the degree that added tax burdens render it more difficult for them to support their own schools, their freedom of religion and conscience is interfered with.

The Catholic position is one of opposition to any measure for Federal aid to education that would: (a) interfere with local control of the purposes and processes of education, and (b) fail to make mandatory the inclusion of Catholic schools in its benefits.

Very sincerely yours,

———— ————,
Director.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have sorted from the various editorials published throughout the country several outstanding editorials on this subject, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. The first is from the Washington Daily News of October 14, 1943, and is entitled "Who Pays Fiddler Calls Tune." The next is from the Manchester Union, of Manchester, N. H., and is entitled "The Federal Education Bill." The third is from the Concord (N. H.) Monitor of October 13, 1943, and is entitled "A New Pressure Group."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of October 14, 1943]

WHO PAYS FIDDLER CALLS TUNE

Another thing about that proposed $300,000,000 Federal subsidy for public schools—

To stop some very effective criticism of the legislation, a provision has been added stipulating that the Federal Government shall have no power to prescribe courses of study.

But would that actually stop Washington from running the schools? Not for long.

The first Federal farm subsidies were without strings. But it wasn't long till Washington was telling farmers what to plant and how to reap.

The first Federal relief grants permitted State and local governments to distribute and spend the money. Remember F. E. R. A. and C. W. A.? And remember how quickly they were followed by W. P. A., under which Washington told what leaves were to be raked and what ditches dug, determined what workers should be employed, at what wages and for what hours, and even tried to dictate how the workers should vote.

So it would be with Federal school subsidies. Washington very soon would be telling the school boards what teachers to hire, telling the teachers what to teach—and trying to tell them how to vote.

It's as inescapable as the law of gravity: Who has the purse holds the power. Many public schools are closing down because of the inability to hire teachers at the prevailing low salaries. But the solution is not in turning to Washington for subsidies. Much better that the people dig down into their own purses for money to hire teachers—that is, if the people want to keep control of their own schools.

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union]

THE FEDERAL EDUCATION BILL

The American public generally feels justifiable concern over the Federal education subsidy bill now pending before the United States Senate. This bill calls for an appro-

priation of $300,000,000 to aid the States in preventing their public school systems from deteriorating under the impact of the war. Two-thirds of this amount would be used to match equal sums from the states to keep teachers on the job by increasing their pay, and in adding teachers for overcrowded classrooms. This part of the bill is supposed to be a temporary emergency war measure. The remaining third would constitute a permanent annual equalization fund to supplement the educational advantages of the poorer States.

The danger involved in Federal subsidies for education as part of the process of centralizing the powers of government in Washington has long been apparent. Under our system of government, the States are semi-independent commonwealths with control over certain lines of activity. Education is one of these State-controlled areas. Of late the Federal Government has been steadily encroaching on fields normally reserved to the States. This encroachment is deplorable. But there is no field where this encroachment can be more dangerous than in placing our school system under the authority of Federal bureaucrats.

The sponsors of the education subsidy bill now before the Senate believe that they have sidestepped this objection by declaring at the very start of the bill that the Federal Government shall not exercise any supervision over the administration or study courses of a State's schools. But a mere declaration of this kind is no guaranty against the steady encroachment of Federal control. It will be noted that under the bill only those States complying with Federal regulations to be made by the Federal commission would be allowed to participte in the Federal appropriation. And since the bulk of the money given by the Federal Government would go to help schools in the South, what guaranty would there be that local politicians would not use it to perpetuate school standards of their own choice?

No one wants the schools of the country dragged into politics, and above all, into national politics. The people must be constantly on their guard against any move, like the present one in the Senate, that points in that direction.

In this connection the question of white and Negro education in the South is an important consideration. At present Louisiana schools spend $60 for every white child and $12 for every Negro child. Senator TAFT has pointed out that if Louisiana should get funds under the bill before the Senate, it would spend $76 for every white child and $23 for every Negro child. The Senator maintains that this situation would compel the Federal Government to insist on a change in Louisiana's school methods, and no one can deny that claim. At least, the Louisiana situation helps to reveal how numerous the complications involved in the application of a Federal subsidy would be.

If financial poverty is resulting in illiteracy in some sections of the country, that is a matter for serious consideration. But it is no excuse for extending Federal bureaucracy over the Nation's schools. Nor is there any guaranty that the situation will be remedied simply by the Federal Government taking money from the taxpayers of other States and turning it over to the politicians of States where education is backward. Many of the States where educational standards are now higher went through periods of poverty in their early days and later, without sacrificing education. And backward communities today could greatly improve their schools if they would set themselves earnestly to that task. A few cash subsidies will not make up for a lack of this kind of effort and a real understanding of what education means.

Where financial poverty exists, moreover, it cannot be corrected by subsidies, but only by raising the economic standards of the community. When that it done, with an intelligent purpose on the part of local officials, other community problems will take care of themselves.

[From the Concord (N. H.) Monitor of October 13, 1943]

A NEW PRESSURE GROUP

Congress, dangerously close to bowing to another minority pressure group, is considering a bill which would grant to rich New York State $17,000,000 with which to raise the average wage paid its school teachers from $2,604 to $2,804 a year. The bill would appropriate $300,000,000 in all for a new form of Federal subsidy to each and every State. Little New Hampshire would receive $931,000 a year, or about $2 per capita, in order that all its public school teachers might be granted $200 a year increases in pay.

Not long ago we protested the passage of a nurses cadet law which accomplished virtually the same sort of thing, subsidizing students in nurses training schools by providing for graduated monthly pay for them. Under that law many hospital schools of nursing have applied for the subsidy and they have been approved by the Federal authorities. Then the authorities have come around and said: "We don't like this or we don't like that about your school and if you are to get this subsidy you must do this and you must do that."

The teacher bonus law, no less than the nurse cadet law, would nationalize public education so much more, a dangerous step in a democracy created as was our own with sovereignty divided between the Federal or central Government and the States and people for the express purpose of permitting and encouraging local support and direction of most human activities in which government is required to participate.

Under our concept of a workable democracy (and it has worked to the amazement of the rest of the world) public education is a natural requisite. We have had such education, entirely upon a local basis except for part of the college level, where the land-grant universities have submitted to Federal rules and restrictions in order to obtain certain subsidies.

The States have progressively taken over more and more responsibility for public education, a responsibility which formerly rested pretty much with each town or city. Even this tendency has created a standardization which is not in all its particulars either desirable or beneficial. Part of the process of standardization has been the organization of a national educational association, and it is this society which is providing the pressure behind the Federal teachers' bonus bill.

The association, in literature published to encourage passage of the bill, says "the Federal Government must aid public schools to meet the crisis of underpaid teachers and to lessen inequalities of educational opportunity." There is the usual palaver about a living wage, etc., etc., but the law proposed disregards whether the teachers individually or by States have or have not living wages. Every State would get its share of the Federal money entirely on a basis of population. Only a third of the appropriation would be disbursed as a wrongly designated equalization fund.

The nurse cadet law at least tied strings to its beneficiaries by pledging them to service as the Government directs, and the Government does need nurses. But the teacher bill hasn't even that slim pretext for being. Besides, it is contrary to the general war policies of this Nation, which would stabilize wages for the duration. The percentage of increase proposed far exceeds that permitted by law for industrial workers and it takes no account of bonuses already granted by local educational authorities, such as the $100 bonus in Concord. As usual, New Hampshire would get less than it would contribute. Our subsidy would be $930,000 and the cost to New Hampshire taxpayers would be more than $1,000,000. If New Hampshire teachers are underpaid it would be cheaper to give them bonuses ourselves, as we actually have done in part.

The biggest threat in the bill, however, is the federalization of public education. The youth of Germany and of Italy have been brought up by centralized educational authority. That youth is among the most vicious so-called civilized element on earth. Of course the national educational association says the bill would provide for no Federal control of any sort. Yet the very fact of the disbursement of moneys is a form of control, and a most insidious form morally.

Why the people of this country should continue to believe that Washington can spend their money more ably than their State or local governments is beyond our comprehension. As a matter of fact they don't. But when a selfish group wishes to obtain some public monetary concession it is easier for it to get it in one swoop than to seek it through the thousands and thousands of local school districts.

We hope no representatives of this State will fall for this legislation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, legislation of this kind must be considered on its merits. We are fighting a terrible war. The outcome of that war will determine our existence as a free country and a free people. The backs of our citizens are almost broken by the heaviest taxes America has ever known. This bill would mean $300,000,000 a year more to start with. The school teachers of this country are a fine, patriotic group of citizens. In my own State of New Hampshire, they are particularly outstanding. I want to do everything I can to advance the cause of education, but in the end this bill could only bring ruin to the very principles free schools are teaching today, for it would be a step toward Federal control of education. I hope the so-called Langer amendment will be adopted, and that the bill will then be recommitted to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the Senate has just adopted an amendment to section 1 of the bill. Section 1 provides that there shall be no Federal control or regulation of the schools in the various States. The amendment which the Senate adopted strengthened and reinforced the provisions of section 1 as reported by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. So far as I could observe, that amendment was adopted by a unanimous vote. There was no yea-and-nay vote. It was a viva voce vote, but the responses were all "ayes," without a single "no."

The amendment now proposed is in direct opposition to the action just taken by the Senate. It undertakes to provide for Federal administration of Federal funds authorized to be appropriated, and of all State funds supplemental thereto.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Why is there any more Federal interference in seeing that all funds are distributed equally than there is in sending a Federal officer into a State, as would be permitted under the terms of the bill, to see that the Federal funds are distributed equally to every school district? How can we escape Federal supervision if we really expect to accomplish equalization, which is said to be the object of the bill?

Mr. OVERTON. The answer is that the bill we are now considering, in its present form, does not undertake to direct any State with reference to the method by which it shall educate its school children. It does not undertake to provide for mixed schools. The Langer amendment undertakes to foist the conception of mixed schools upon Southern States and other States in which such a system would be obnoxious.

I favor the bill and I have so stated to my constituents. If, however, the Langer amendment shall be adopted, I will not vote for the bill.

At some more opportune time I expect to make some observations upon this question, but I wish to state very frankly that it is to be regretted that the question of race, color, and creed is injected in much of the legislation which affects the South. I think that at some time it may perhaps result in a very bitter controversy on the floor of the Senate and perhaps in the other House.

Mr. President, in any event the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota is unconstitutional. The Congress of the United States has no constitutional authority to undertake to regulate a system of public education in any State. It does not have the authority to provide for or regulate elementary schools, or any kind of a school system. Since it has no authority itself to pass legislation in that respect, it certainly has no authority to undertake to prescribe what kind of an administration a State shall undertake in respect to its school system. It cannot undertake to direct that the State shall, either by law or administratively, prescribe any rule or regulation affecting its school system.

If there is no constitutional authority in the Congress to regulate the administration of the schools in the various States, and if there is no authority in the Congress to require that the States shall administer schools in a certain way, then Congress cannot constitutionally undertake to do anything indirectly which it cannot do directly, and it cannot couple with a grant conditions which are repugnant to its constitutional authority.

If the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota should be adopted, it would be an undertaking on the part of Congress to require that there shall be no distinction in the administration of the public-school systems in the different States on account of race, creed, or color.

I believe that it will be conceded by anyone, whether he be a layman or a lawyer, that the Congress of the United States could not enact a law declaring that in the administration of schools in the different States there shall be no discrimination on account of race, creed, or color. Yet this is what the proposed amendment undertakes to do. It undertakes to do it indirectly. But, as I observed the other day to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], it would be a pernicious doctrine for the Supreme Court of the United States to hold that the Federal Government may couple with a grant to a State conditions which it could not prescribe constitutionally.

The Senator referred to a certain decision, which I read. I have forgotten the name of it, but I read the entire report. It was a decision which related to the administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. The act was upheld on the ground that the Congress had authority to pass it because it dealt with interstate commerce. For that reason, and no other, the provisions of the act were upheld.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States is an exception. I mean that under the fourteenth amendment I assume that regulations can be made and have been made. As I read it, the proposed amendment does no more than to assert in a very direct and forceful way the provisions of the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. OVERTON. Does the Senator have the fourteenth amendment before him so that he can read it? I should like to have it put in the RECORD. Section 1 of the fourteenth amendment—and I assume that to be the section to which the Senator from Ohio is referring—declares as follows:

> All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

I see no application of the fourteenth amendment to the Langer amendment. I assume that the able Senator from Ohio had in contemplation the fifteenth amendment which is probably more appropriate than the fourteenth amendment. Section 1 of the fifteenth amendment provides as follows:

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Therefore, the Constitution prohibits discriminations on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, only in respect to suffrage, and no more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Overton
Andrews	Gerry	Pepper
Bailey	Gillette	Radcliffe
Ball	Green	Reed
Bankhead	Guffey	Robertson
Barbour	Gurney	Russell
Barkley	Hatch	Scrugham
Bilbo	Hayden	Shipstead
Brewster	Hill	Smith
Bridges	Holman	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McCarran	Tunnell
Caraway	McClellan	Tydings
Chandler	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wheeler
Connally	Maybank	Wherry
Danaher	Mead	White
Davis	Millikin	Wiley
Downey	Murdock	Willis
Eastland	Nye	Wilson
Ellender	O'Daniel	
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I shall not delay a vote very long. I could not do so if I wanted to, and I do not want to. But I desire to take a minute to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the amendment before the Senate, as now modified, provides:

> That there shall be no discrimination in the administration of the benefits and appropriations made under the respective provisions of this act or in State funds supplemented thereby on account of race, creed, or color.

The amendment seeks to reach not only the benefits of the appropriations made under the proposed act but also attempts to control funds which come entirely from State treasuries and which today are, of course, entirely under the control of the States.

The bill in its present form as it is now before the Senate, and as reported by the committee, provides for a fair, a just, and an equitable distribution of the funds provided by the bill as between whites and Negroes and insofar as any minority races are concerned.

Those who speak in this country for the Negroes recognize this fact. They recognize that the bill is fair and just and equitable to Negroes and to all minority groups. They have advised the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] that they are opposed to this amendment and that they are opposed to all amendments of this character and kind.

The Senator from Utah called the attention of the Senate a little while ago to a telegram which he had received from Walter White, secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which telegram em-

bodied a telegram which Walter White, as secretary of this association, had sent to the author of this amendment. The telegram of Walter White, the secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, to the author of the amendment, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], is as follows:

Your proposed and well-intended antidiscrimination amendment to S. 637 adds nothing to protection against discrimination already appearing in section 6 (f) and 13 (c) and (d) of the bill now before the Senate. Therefore, your amendment would not strengthen the bill. It might lead to misunderstanding, jeopardizing the passage of the bill, and inviting the introduction of partisan political considerations into this vital legislation. For these reasons the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People urges that you do not introduce your proposed amendment.

A letter along similar lines was written to the chairman of the committee by Howard H. Long, chairman of the legislative committee of the American Teachers Association. In his letter Howard H. Long, as chairman of this association, which is the association of the Negro teachers of the country, states:

We urge the passage of this bill without any amendments or changes that may weaken it or jeopardize its passage.

J. H. Johnston, president of the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools for Negroes, has also telegraphed the chairman of the committee urging the passage of the bill without changes, without any amendments such as the pending amendment, which jeopardizes and endangers and invites the defeat of the bill.

Mr. President, let us be frank about this matter. No Senator can vote for this amendment and then go back to the Negroes in his State and say to them that he voted for the amendment in an effort to serve them, in an effort to do something for them. A vote for this amendment——

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I have only 15 minutes. If I get through in time, I shall be glad to yield. A vote for this amendment would be a distinct disservice to the Negroes of the country and to any other minority group; a vote for this amendment would be a vote against the best interests of the Negroes and any other minority group, because we know that if this amendment goes on the bill it will seriously jeopardize the bill, and, most likely, defeat the passage of the measure, and deny to the Negroes and to all other minority groups the benefits to be derived from the passage of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I have only 15 minutes. Let no Senator think that he can vote for the amendment and then return to his State and say to the Negroes there, or to any other minority group in his State, "I voted for this amendment by way of doing something for you," or "I voted for this amendment in an effort to try to do something for you," or "in an effort to take care of your best interests." As I have stated, the amendment is directly contrary to the best interests of the Negroes, directly contrary to the best interests of all minority groups. The leaders of the Negroes, those who ordinarily speak for them in matters of this kind, have so advised the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor in order that he might advise the Senate, in order that each Member of this body might know that the Negroes know the harm and what may be the deadly effect embodied in the amendment.

As I have said, the bill now provides for a fair, a just, and an equitable division as between whites and Negroes, a fair, a just, and an equitable division so far as all minority races are concerned. A vote for the amendment would serve but one purpose; that is, to take from the Negro, and to take from all minority groups, the benefits which they would derive under the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 2, after the word "provided" and the period, it is proposed to insert the following: *"Provided,* That there shall be no discrimination in the administration of the benefits and appropriations made under the respective provisions of this act or in the State funds supplemented thereby on account of race, creed, or color."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. BAILEY. On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is detained on important public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are detained in Government departments on business concerning their respective States. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who is absent because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

Mr. MCNARY. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, these Senators would vote "yea."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent from the city, visiting his son, who is in the armed forces.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—40

Ball	Gurney	Shipstead
Barbour	Holman	Taft
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Vandenberg
Buck	Langer	Van Nuys
Butler	McCarran	Walsh
Capper	McNary	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wherry
Danaher	Mead	White
Davis	Millikin	Wiley
Ferguson	Nye	Willis
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gillette	Reed	
Green	Robertson	

NAYS—37

Aiken	Eastland	O'Daniel
Andrews	Ellender	Overton
Bankhead	George	Pepper
Barkley	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hatch	Russell
Burton	Hayden	Smith
Byrd	Hill	Stewart
Caraway	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Tydings
Connally	Maybank	
Downey	Murdock	

NOT VOTING—19

Austin	La Follette	Scrugham
Bailey	Lodge	Tobey
Bone	Lucas	Truman
Brooks	Moore	Wagner
Bushfield	Murray	Wallgren
Glass	Revercomb	
Hawkes	Reynolds	

So Mr. LANGER'S amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the Langer amendment was adopted be now reconsidered.

Mr. REED. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that Senate bill 637 be recommitted to the Committee on Education and Labor. Yesterday when I spoke I suggested that it might be referred to the Special Committee on Post-War Economics and Planning, headed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I am informed, however, that that is not a legislative committee, and that such a reference is not in order. However, even though the bill is recommitted to the Committee on Education and Labor, the so-called George post-war committee can

consider it, and so far as I am concerned I want to say that I think it should consider the bill for the postwar period in connection with all the other vast expenditures which are proposed for the Federal Government to make.

I therefore move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Education and Labor, and on that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I suppose there will be no opposition to recommitting the bill to the Committee on Education and Labor, because certainly no Senator who had any genuine fear of Federal control of schools in the States would now vote for the bill. I presume that Senators who voted as they did on the Langer amendment were themselves not afraid of Federal control of the schools in their States, and that they merely used the amendment as an argument to frighten those of us on this side of the aisle, as well as Senators on the other side of the aisle who believe in the proposed legislation, into refusing to do something which we thought should be done.

Certainly, Mr. President, in view of the adoption of the Langer amendment, no Senator who really appreciates the necessity for keeping the schools under the control of the local authorities, would vote for the bill. I take it, therefore, that Senators who are opposed to the proposed legislation sought that method of killing the legislation.

Mr. President, Senators who voted for the amendment have not done a service to the Negroes. I want to make that very plain, and the Negroes themselves will realize it. The Negroes in America will know it. By voting as they did, Senators have taken away from the Negroes a fund in which they would have participated in all the States where there are Negroes, and especially in those States where there are Negroes in large numbers. No one has contended that the passage of the bill would hurt the Negro. But Senators who voted for the amendment have definitely done a disservice to the Negro in the South. If the amendment finally became law and was sustained by the courts, the vote by which the amendment was adopted would be a definite disservice to the cause of public education in the South.

Mr. President, it is through the public school in the South that the Negro has received his greatest consideration. Yet I undertake to say here and now that the wide difference between the Negro in the South and those who occupy the highest point at the other end of the scale is by no means as great as the difference which exists between the two races in some of the other States of the Union.

Perhaps some Senators do not like that statement, but what I wish to say to them is that every intelligent Negro in this country will definitely understand that Senators who voted for the amendment were voting against the Negro's interest, because they have killed the proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I wish to say to those Senators now that they would do the cause of public education in the South irreparable harm if, under the Constitution, there should ever be found by them any way to prevent the South from controlling its own schools. If Senators who voted for the Langer amendment think they have commended themselves to the Negro voters of this country, I am simply advising them now, Democrats and Republicans alike, that they are badly mistaken. I can fully appreciate the reason for the vote cast by any Senator who desired first and foremost to kill the proposed legislation, and sought the Langer amendment as the means by which he would effectuate the demise of the bill.

I can fully appreciate the reason for voting for the amendment by Senators who for one reason or another think the legislation is unwise, and particularly those who think it is unwise to increase the public debt at this time. But it is a wholly inconsistent position, it seems to me, for any Senator to vote that the Federal Government may take direct charge of State funds, appropriated out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the States to operate their own schools, if his opposition to the proposed legislation is sincerely based upon a fear that through this legislation the Federal Government would ultimately come to exert an improper and an unwholesome influence on the schools. I congratulate all those who may have thought they were voting in accordance with the wishes of the intelligent Negroes of the country. If that were the reason, I simply am saying to them that they will find out, and will find out in a very concrete and a very definite way, that they were wholly mistaken, that the Negroes are very intelligent, they know that the bill would have helped them, they know that when by an amendment it is sought to undertake to control the schools of the South, where so many Negroes live, definite disservice and positive harm are being done to the cause of public education in the South. That, Mr. President, is inevitable.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I take the floor for the purpose of resisting and speaking against the motion of the Senator from Ohio. Everyone knows that the greatest objection to the pending bill has been that it will give the Federal Government power to interfere with the conduct of the affairs of the States.

Senator after Senator who spoke against the bill because of the imagined powers it gave the Federal Government over the States, voted for the Langer amendment, which actually gives Federal power over the disbursement and control of State funds. As the result of a slip of the tongue by one of the Senators who spoke on the bill, we are charged with insincerity in bringing forward the bill. We are actually charged with trickery. Those two charges are unworthy of any Senator of the United States, and every Senator in the Chamber certainly knows that this bill has been before Congress, in one form or another, for more than 10 years.

Mr. President, I ask you about the sincerity of the Senator who suggested that the sponsors of the bill are insincere and who argued against the bill on the score that it gave the Federal Government power to control the use of Federal funds in the States, but who actually voted for an amendment which would give the Federal Government such control—that is, if it were constitutional. Every Senator who voted for the amendment knew it was not constitutional and, likewise, every boy in the United States who has taken a primary course in American Government knows that the very essence of American Government depends on the maintenance of the proper relationship between the States and the Nation, that our Federal system is by all odds the greatest factor in our whole governmental theory.

Imagine a Senator talking about sincerity and being against the bill, and yet voting to give the Federal Government the very power he says is an insidious power, and might wreck our dual system of government.

I desire to confirm what the Senator from Georgia has said. There has been a disservice to the Negro of the South by the amendment, because it deprives certain underprivileged persons of the help the bill would grant them. There has been a disservice to the Negro of the North, because the amendment deprives the teachers there who are underprivileged, who are teaching blacks and whites alike, of a chance to overcome an economic situation which is a hazard to their very livelihood. But above all, Mr. President, the amendment has hurt the Negro in general, everywhere, because it has shown that great body of our citizens that an opportunity on the part of the Congress of the United States to help a group which everyone who has spoken against the bill realize deserves help at this time because its members are underprivileged in the economic affairs of their lives, has not been availed of.

Mr. President, no great political party, no great Senator, no great person who faces the American people, ever does himself a service by trickery. We read the telegrams from the leaders of the two greatest Negro groups in the United States—groups of Negroes whose associations had plead for the bill, and who had heard of the amendment, and actually told the Senate the ill which the amendment would cause.

The practical aspects of the defeat of the bill are very simple. In the United States we have taken care of the soldier, we have increased his wages, we have increased twice the payments made to his dependents. We have taken care of the banks; we have taken care of the railways; we have taken care of industry generally; we have taken care of the mortgage loan associations; we have taken care of the home builders; we have recognized the needs of all of them. Now comes a group of our people who are underprivileged due to certain circumstances, such as the increased cost of living, and no increase in their pay. After doing all we have done for all other groups of our people, we fail to help the group of teachers—a group to which even the opponents of the bill have already paid the lip service of saying that in the

150 years of American history there has been no more loyal, no more patriotic group, no group of public servants with any greater desire to be of help, or with greater need to be helped. Such lip service will not rest well in the minds of those persons, any more than the lip service in regard to the discrimination referred to by the Langer amendment will rest well in the minds of the Negroes. I think Senators have done a disservice to the Congress of the United States and a disservice to the people of the United States by talking insincerely about trying to enact a bill which has been brought forward in an effort to take care of a need which everyone recognizes.

There are only three States or Territories which do not have teachers receiving less than $1,200 a year, and more than half the States have teachers who are receiving less than $600 a year. The practical result of killing the bill by sending it back to the committee is simply to deprive this group of worthy American citizens, worthy American servants, of even a little bit of consideration, although the Congress has done a great deal for everyone else. We know that to be a fact. It cannot be disproved.

We face now a motion to recommit the bill to the committee, a committee which has, in Congress after Congress, reported similar bills, a committee which has acted as a result of studies made by a commission created by the President of the United States, a committee which has undertaken the task in all sincerity, and has done its best. I say that to kill the bill by that method is just about the worst thing the Senate of the United States could do at this time.

Mr. President, the yeas and nays have been ordered on this motion. I hope that it will be voted down. If a Senator is against the bill, let him stand against the bill, and go before his constituents and say, "I do not favor equalization of public education in the United States; I do not favor helping the underprivileged teacher at this time as an emergency measure." Let us face the issue. Let us not do the type of thing which is done by the adoption of the Langer amendment; and let us not do the type of thing which is suggested by the motion to recommit the bill.

The motion was made by a Senator who has fought the bill harder than any other Senator. We know his reason. I say to that Senator, let us vote on the bill, and if he is against the proposal, let him show his constitutents and the people of the country that he is against it. Let us kill Federal aid to education if that is the will of the Senate. Let us not say, however, that we are in favor of Federal aid to education, but after a 10-year struggle still find objections to prevent the passage of such legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the motion made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I voted against the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] for two reasons. One was that I was not willing to play politics with the subject of education. The other was that I was not willing to encumber the bill with an amendment which might endanger its passage.

I do not suppose that it is necessary for me to stand on the floor of the Senate and proclaim my friendship for the Negro people of the United States. I have made it known on former occasions when measures were before the Senate in which they were vitally involved, more vitally involved than they are in the amendment which the Senate has just adopted.

The amendment was adopted by a combination of those who are opposed to the bill in its entirety, and resorted to that sort of device to bring about its defeat, if possible, thinking that the chances would be better to defeat it with such an amendment on it than without it, and of those whose minds constantly dwell upon the next election. To that group were added some who were sincerely fearful that there might be discrimination under the terms of the bill if the amendment were not adopted; but there were not enough of them to have adopted it without the other two groups.

In discussing the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota the Senator from Ohio made the statement that it made no difference; that it was without meaning; that under the terms of the bill as it was written by the committee the Langer amendment was unnecessary, and did not change the situation with respect to the distribution of the funds authorized by the bill. Notwithstanding his statement to that effect, the Senator from Ohio voted for the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. That statement referred to the original Langer amendment. Of course, when there was added the provision that there should be no discrimination in the distribution of State funds supplementary thereto, it undoubtedly went further than the original amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. I was not referring to the same amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. It went further, that is true, but it went further in the direction which the Senator from Ohio has objected to and opposed.

Mr. TAFT. I have not opposed it. I have said that Federal control is an inevitable accompaniment of Federal subsidy.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is one of the reasons why the Senator has opposed the enactment of the legislation altogether; and he voted for an amendment which fortifies his own objection to the passage of the bill.

Mr. President, it has been my duty and pleasure, and my privilege to labor in the Senate, not only with Members of the Senate, but organizations on the outside whose primary purpose has been to aid and advance the welfare of the colored race. Two of those organizations sent messages here protesting against the amendment. One of them was the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which is not a political organization in its inception and in its conduct. I have great respect for that organization. I have respect for its opinions. I believe it to be genuinely interested in the welfare of the colored people of the United States.

The other organization was the organization of colored teachers, which certainly is not a political organization, but an organization interested in the welfare of the colored people and in the education of their children.

Because I was unwilling to kill the bill, because I was unwilling to cast a political vote, and because I respect the opinions of these two organizations, I voted against the Langer amendment. I intend to vote against the motion to recommit the bill, because I do not share the fears entertained by perfectly sincere Members of this body who, although for the bill, now feel it their duty to vote against it.

I hope the motion of the Senator from Ohio will be defeated, because I believe that if this bill is sent back to the committee, the Senate will not soon again have an opportunity to enact legislation for the better education of our people. If the motion of the Senator from Ohio is defeated, I shall then vote for the bill, as amended. I hope that the motion will be defeated, and that we can have a straight vote on the bill, as amended. I hope that, as amended, it will pass.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have made the motion because a great many Senators felt that there was a chance to try to re-form the bill and meet the dilemma which the advocates of the bill have confronted in this amendment.

The only justification for the bill is the contention that the Federal Government has an obligation to equalize educational opportunity. We adopt an amendment which says, as a condition to the States obtaining this money, "You shall equalize educational opportunity." The advocates of the bill show that they are not sincere in the purpose which they have alleged as the main purpose of the bill, when they refuse to accept the bill with this amendment.

Mr. President, the bill does not equalize. The question of white and colored schools in the South is only one phase of the question. The bill would not result in equalization in individual States. Seventeen States have equalization laws. The remainder of the States do not equalize. They have some rich districts and some poor districts. In some States, the difference in educational opportunity is even greater than the difference between white and colored students in the South. This condition is not peculiar to the South. The bill simply says, "Here is the money. Do with it as you please. You must distribute this money fairly, but so far as existing inequalities are concerned, we do not care. You may continue those inequalities."

Mr. President, this amendment illustrates the fact that the bill is not an equalization bill. In my opinion, the advocates of Federal aid to education are on the horns of a dilemma. We cannot give Federal aid to education without the Government controlling education.

The present situation shows that as soon as someone comes forward with a principle which he thinks should be applied throughout the Nation in the public schools of the country, the Senate may or may not vote for it, but the fear of Federal control of schools does not result in much restraint. The power to give the schools money inevitably carries with it the control of the schools. Yet, this body, which in theory is opposed to Federal control of the schools, has today adopted an amendment which would actually result in Federal control of the schools.

I go further than that. I say the authors of the bill wrote into it a provision for Federal control of schools. When they provided that the funds must be equitably distributed between Negro and white students, they inevitably gave the Federal Government power to go into every school district and ascertain whether the Federal funds were being fairly distributed. How can they tell whether the funds are fairly distributed unless they also consider the funds which are distributed for State purposes? Those funds are mixed. Funds come from the Federal Government to the State, the State passes them out to all school districts within its jurisdiction, and there is no way to separate them. The authors of the bill wrote into it Federal control of schools, and a bill cannot be drawn providing for a Federal subsidy for education in the United States without giving to the Federal Government some control today and complete control tomorrow.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I voted against the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, and I did so purposely. I believe that I feel as strongly on this subject as does the Senator from North Dakota, or anyone else, but in my opinion the only effect of the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota would be to kill the bill, and I do not want that to happen.

The Senator from Ohio has stated that the decision all hinges upon whether or not the Federal Government has an obligation to take part in the educational systems of the various States. I say the Federal Government does have such obligation. Why do we quibble about a few million dollars to give equality of opportunity for education to the people of the United States when we are willing to pass legislation which may result in many of them being shot? At the time we passed the draft bill no one quibbled about whether the soldiers would come from Ohio, New Mexico, Arkansas, or any other State. Does anyone say at this particular moment that when the emergency arrived the Congress did not have authority to pass legislation requiring, if necessary, that every person in the country make the supreme sacrifice? But we now worry as to whether or not the Federal Government has any obligation in the matter of education. I say it has.

The Senator from Ohio has also said that the proposed legislation would not do very much, or as much as it should. But it would at least do something. It would help to some extent. The individual States and the Government have neglected the matter of education long enough.

Mr. President, I invite Senators to look at the records of the draft boards throughout the country and see how many thousands of good boys of the Nation, willing to do their duty, are being rejected merely because someone wanted to quibble as to whether or not the Federal Government had any responsibility to educate the citizens of the country. The youth of our country are citizens of the United States. The interest of education is the interest of the Government. Of course, under our system what is done with the individual State is amply protected under the provisions of the pending bill. I am wondering if my friends on the other side of the Chamber will now vote for the bill. I do not doubt their sincerity of purpose. I feel they voted for the Langer amendment because they were in favor of the Langer amendment. I feel they voted for the Langer amendment because they wanted to do that for which the Langer amendment provided, namely, to afford equality of opportunity and do away with discrimination. Now let us see them stand up and vote against the motion of the Senator from Ohio so we may be able to join them and give that protection to the citizen which is included in the Langer amendment. I feel confident of the sincerity of purpose of my friends on the other side of the Chamber, and I know they will vote against the motion.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, if I earnestly believed that under the proposed act and succeeding appropriations the public-school systems of the States would be protected against Federal control, I would vote to appropriate money to aid them. I make that statement even though I have taken the position that the time has come when the money of this country must be devoted only to the winning of the war and other essential functions of government.

I am convinced that if this bill is passed it will be the first step toward the eventual control of the free-school systems throughout the country. I am not willing, at any price, that the free schools of my State, or the free schools of any other State, shall be controlled from Washington. That they will be controlled and may be controlled by succeeding appropriations has been recognized as a power by judicial decree and by judicial pronouncement. The Supreme Court of the United States has expressly recognized the right of the Federal Government to control the use of funds it gives to the several States. To know that it will occur we have only to recall the history of former subsidies. In the beginning the subsidy which the Government gave to the farmer had no strings attached to it, but in a short time the farmer had to turn under his acreage, plow under his crop, or allow his land to remain idle, in order to receive a subsidy.

Today the Federal Government gives money to the States for State road systems, but before the money can be used upon any road approval has to be obtained from the resident Federal engineer of the State.

I am perfectly willing, Mr. President, that the Federal Government shall control the roads to some extent, but I am not willing, at any cost, that the Government in Washington, regardless of who may succeed the present Government, shall control the education of children throughout the States of the Union.

Ah, Mr. President, it is easy enough to say that there are safeguards in the present bill, and I respect the sincerity of action of those who have tried to put safeguards in the bill. But up to the present time we know that the safeguards are only for the first appropriation, and that succeeding appropriations may carry any condition which it may be desired to impose, or which this Congress may impose.

Take the case of my own State. It would receive under this bill about six and one-half million dollars. Today it spends on its schools approximately $28,000,000, or a little in excess of that amount. If this new money were received it would build up a school structure to cost $35,000,000. Once that structure has been built does anyone believe that any school system in any State would refuse an appropriation even if the Federal Government dictated what textbooks must be bought, or what subjects must be taught, or what the school system of the State should be?

So I submit, Mr. President, that this bill, however long it may have been considered by Congress, should be returned to the committee for further study to see if it is possible to aid the schools without the danger of dictating their conduct from the seat of government in Washington. If that can be done, then help the schools. If it cannot be done, then do not, at any price, take over the operation, and consequent dictation, of the free school systems of the States.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio a question, if I may. What program or plan has he for increasing the salaries of public-school teachers throughout the United States other than through the pending bill?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, am I speaking in the time of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GUFFEY. The Senator may speak in my time.

Mr. TAFT. My statement has been throughout that I think education is not the function of the Federal Government. As a matter of fact, the State of Pennsylvania has already increased the salaries of its teachers receiving below a certain figure $300 a person within the last 6 months.

Mr. GUFFEY. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. The State of Pennsylvania has assumed its duty, and I compliment it. Every other State should deal with the problem as the State of Pennsylvania has dealt with it.

Mr. GUFFEY. Let me ask the Senator, What is the average salary paid to teachers in Ohio? Does the Senator know?

Mr. TAFT. No, I do not know; but I do know that——

Mr. GUFFEY. The Senator is opposed to giving the public-school teachers $200 a year more.

Mr. TAFT. I am opposed to the Federal Government giving any money for subsidies to education or to teachers. The State of Ohio has a present surplus in its treasury of approximately $50,000,000. If the people of Ohio wish to increase the salaries of their teachers, they have the money with which to do it; but no one in Ohio, with the exception of individual teachers and the teachers' organization, has ever requested me to vote for the bill. Every newspaper that has had anything to say on this bill has opposed the bill, and I know the people of Ohio agree with the position I have taken in opposing Federal subsidies to education.

Mr. GUFFEY. But the State of Ohio took Federal subsidies under the P. W. A. and the W. P. A.; it took over a billion dollars in those two subsidies, and no one in the Senator's State objected to that.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I was opposed to that system. However, I do favor Federal subsidies to some things. I explained my position the other day. I said I would not be opposed to Federal subsidies to assist the poorest group of States, but certainly not at the present time when they are better off than they were, and certainly not until we consider after the war the tremendous demands of more than $50,000,000,000 for all purposes which will be made on the Federal Government.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall recapitulate the Langer amendment which was adopted a few moments ago. I read it:

> At the proper place in the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That there shall be no discrimination in the administration of the benefits and appropriations made under the respective provisions of this act or in State funds supplemented thereby on account of race, creed, or color."

Mr. President, I call attention to the Appendix of the RECORD, page A3759, which contains the extension of remarks of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in which he put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution adopted at a national conference of his party at Mackinac entitled "Liberty at Home." There are certain passages of that resolution to which I should like to call the attention of the Senate and of the country. I quote from the resolution, as follows:

> A military victory abroad without preservation in America of the fundamental principles on which our way of life depends will be no victory. It will be a defeat. The way we meet the problem of reconstruction will determine whether the American way of life shall survive.

Again, Mr. President, reading from the same resolution:

> It would extend—

Referring to the New Deal, the present administration in Washington—

> It would extend the power of Government until ultimately no man or woman could act, write, speak or work without approval. It would substitute for American liberty the regimented existence of a subject people.

Continuing, Mr. President—

> The Republican Party is devoted to the Federal system of government by which basic rights and duties are reserved to the States free of dictation and subject to the control of their people. These rights and duties the New Deal has arrogated to itself.

Mr. President, the able Senator from Ohio who was the chairman of the group which wrote that resolution, which reaffirmed the faith of the Republican Party in States' rights, has led in the adoption of the amendment which has just been agreed to which provided that not only should the Federal Government control the distribution of Federal funds but should reach out and actually control every dollar of State school funds in the whole United States of America.

Not only that, but a majority of that party's membership in this distinguished body has voted for that declaration of principle constituting the greatest violation of States' rights in a formal amendment upon a formal vote this afternoon in the Senate of the United States.

Yet, Mr. President, they claim to be the champions of States' rights; they champion the cause of individual enterprise and private initiative; they champion the cause of what they call "the American way of life." Let the country know, Mr. President, that the very chairman of the committee who wrote the Mackinac resolution has led the fight on this floor for the Federal Government actually reaching into the school treasury of every State of the Nation and telling the State authorities by Federal mandate how they may spend their own tax money.

So, Mr. President, when Republican leaders talk about sincerity, when they speak of offering new hope and new encouragement to private enterprise and States' rights in America through the instrumentality of the Republican Party, all we need to do is to measure their professions by their formal conduct and legislative action here in the Senate of the United States this afternoon.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I shall vote against the motion to recommit the pending bill. If that motion is defeated and a vote comes upon the passage of the measure, I shall vote for its passage.

I desire to place in the RECORD, if I may have permission, a telegram which I have just received from the superintendent of public instruction in my State of Oklahoma. Second, I ask permission to place in the RECORD a telegram received from the president of the A. & M. College of my State. Third, I ask to place in the RECORD, at this point, in connection with my remarks, a list of the telegrams and letters received in support of the pending legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matters referred to are as follows:

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *October 14, 1943.*
HON. ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Re tel October 14 have contacted authorities of Oklahoma Education Association. The professional organization of approximately 20,000 teachers. The executive committee of school administrators representing approximately 900 county and city superintendents; authorities of the State P. T. A. organization and I am pleased to report that reaction from each source is favorable toward Federal aid to education. The State board of education, of which I am chairman, endorses and recommends passage of the bill. As State superintendent of public instruction I see no opportunity for significant improvements and expansion of our educational program in the State without Federal aid. I heartily recommend passage of Federal-aid bill now before Senate.

A. L. CRABLE,
State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

STILLWATER, OKLA., *October 14, 1943.*
SENATOR ELMER THOMAS,
U. S. Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The school people of Oklahoma are solidly favorable to Senate bill No. 637, titled "Education Finance Act of 1943." I am personally deeply interested in its passage. It avoids undue interference with local and State control and provides an objective basis for the distribution of funds. Federal aid is necessary if we are to avoid a near break-down in our school system. Federal aid is a basically sound policy. It is our only means of securing a minimum educational opportunity for all children, a principal to which the Government is committed. I hope you and our delegation will support this bill to the limit.

HENRY G. BENNETT,
President of the Oklahoma A. & M. College.

Mrs. B. R. Hubbard, Shawnee, Okla., representing 140 members of the Junior High School Parent Teachers Association.

Mr. Homer S. Anderson, Ponca City, Okla., N. E. A. committeeman for northern Oklahoma.

Mr. Harry D. Simmons, Stillwater, Okla., president, Oklahoma Education Association.

Mrs. Glenn North, Blackwell, Okla., president, Lincoln Parent Teacher Association.

Mrs. Oral DeCamp, Blackwell, Okla., president, P. T. A. Council.

The teachers of Tillman County, Okla.

Mr. Arch Thompson, Blackwell, Okla., president, Teachers Organization.

The Washington School, Blackwell, Okla., Teachers Association.

Miss D. Edna Chamberlain, Tulsa, Okla., representing some 19,000 school people of Oklahoma, as State director of National Education Association.

Mr. Wheeler Mayo, Sallisaw, Okla.

Mr. G. R. Hurd, Sallisaw, Okla., president of northeast district, Oklahoma Educational Association.

The teachers of the Jefferson School, of Shawnee, Okla.

Miss Dorothy Pugh, Muskogee, Okla., president of the Northeast Teachers Classroom Association.

Mr. Ralph Lester, president of the Ponca City (Okla.) Teachers Association.

Mr. John Vaughan, president of the Northeastern State College, Tahlequah, Okla.

Mr. Clarence Scott, Comanche County Superintendent of Schools, Lawton, Okla.

Mr. G. T. Stubbs, Durant, Okla.

Messrs. Hugh Barothers, F. W. Brewer, and John Bland, members of the Board of Education of Lawton, Okla.

Rev. Oren C. Reid, the Ministerial Alliance of Lawton, Okla.

The superintendent of the Woodward, Okla., schools.

Mr. Scott Amend, superintendent of Antlers, Okla., schools.

Mr. J. Grady Simmons, president of East Central Teachers Association, Holdenville, Okla., representing 11 counties.

Mr. Birney D. Herrin, Creek County, Okla., superintendent of schools.

Mr. Clay Miller, president of the Board of Education of Cache, Okla.

Mr. W. Alva Wells, State president of the department of classroom teachers, O. E. A., of Shawnee, Okla.

Mr. Frank Parman, county superintendent of Washita County schools.

Mr. Willis Morgan, superintendent of Garvin County, Okla., schools.

Mr. O. U. Campbell, president of the Oklahoma Education Association, of Pauls Valley, Okla.

Mr. C. B. Frederick, Poteau, Okla., representing 200 teachers of Poteau.

Mrs. Elmer Carter, president of Sapulpa, Okla., chapter of Classroom Teachers Association.

Mrs. Neva Wilson, superintendent of Alfalfa County schools, Cherokee, Okla.

Mr. Claude Harrie, superintendent of Seminole County, Okla., schools.

Mr. Jim Frazier, superintendent of Wewoka, Okla., schools.

Mr. Fred L. French, president of Superintendents and Principals Club, of Washita County, Okla.

Mr. O. W. Davidson, Chandler, Okla., superintendent of schools.

The Tulsa Classroom Teachers Association, Tulsa, Okla.

Mr. Roy Windle, Sterling, Okla., superintendent of schools.

Mr. Ray Claiborne, Altus, Okla.

Mr. Jow Gary, president of Johnston County (Okla.) Teachers Association.

Mr. Rex Johnston, Indiahoma, Okla.

Mr. G. L. Allen, Lawton, Okla., president of Lawton Board of Education.

Mr. J. S. Kuntz, Lawton, Okla., secretary of the Kiwanis Club.

Mr. Reece Russell, Lawton, Okla., president of Lawton Rotary Club.

Miss Ethel F. Dowell, superintendent of Oklahoma County, Okla., schools.

Mr. A. Max Holcomb, Eufaula, Okla., superintendent of schools.

The faculty of the Kingfisher, Okla., schools.

Mrs. Lena McDonald, Johnston County, Okla., superintendent of schools.

Mr. E. LeRoy Baker, superintendent of Carter County, Okla., schools.

The junior high school faculty of Shawnee, Okla.

The teachers of the Healdton, Okla., public schools.

Miss Clara Mansfield, Ardmore, Okla., president of Ardmore Classroom Teachers Association.

Mr. Lee J. Rhodes, president of the Comanche County, Okla., Teachers Association.

Mr. J. S. Landers, Medicine Park, Okla., superintendent of schools.

Mr. Norman Farris, Lookeba, Okla., superintendent of schools.

Mr. Innes Ellis, a teacher, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Mr. P. M. Friesen, superintendent of Caddo County, Okla., schools.

Mr. Maynard Blackard, Gore, Okla., president of N. Y. A., Sequoyah County.

Mr. Sabin C. Percefull, president of Northwestern State College, Alva, Okla.

Mrs. Ethel H. Reed, teacher of Central School, Holdenville, Okla.

Miss Rosemary Locke, president of the Muskogee, Okla., branch of the American Association of University Women.

Mr. James Humphrey, Muldrow, Okla., superintendent of schools.

Mr. E. B. Wilson, Vian, Okla., high school English teacher.

Mr. T. E. Allen, president of Osage County, Okla., Teachers Association.

The Pawhuska Classroom Teachers Association, of Pawhuska, Okla.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have received many telegrams and letters in support of the bill and 1 telegram and 2 letters against it. There are good reasons for the support accorded the bill. We have in Oklahoma a very large number of colored children attending the public schools. We have in my State a very large number of Indian children likewise attending the public schools. The total Indian population of Oklahoma is approximately 140,000. The Indian children go to the Indian boarding schools where such schools are provided, and where they are not provided they must depend upon public schools if they are to have any facilities for education. Where the Indians live, as a rule, the lands are allotted, and allotted lands are not on the tax roll; so that Indian lands in the Indian settlements do not contribute to the support of education and the school districts in such localities are unable to find sources of taxation to raise sufficient money to pay teachers fair and just salaries. In the rich oil sections we do not need assistance, but in some of the poorer sections Federal aid is needed. I am supporting this bill in order to secure more and better qualified teachers in the poorer sections of my State and to similarly assist the poorer localities in the other States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Education and Labor. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], who has been called away because of illness in his family. If he were present he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is detained on important public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to the State of New York.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who is absent because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who, if present, would vote "nay," is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who would vote "yea." Both of these Senators are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], who, if present, would vote "nay," is paired on this question with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], who would vote "yea." Senator BUSHFIELD is absent from the city, visiting his son who is in the armed forces.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent from the city. I am advised that if present and voting, these Senators would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—53

Andrews	Green	Reed
Bailey	Gurney	Revercomb
Ball	Hill	Robertson
Bankhead	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Barbour	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Bilbo	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bridges	McCarran	Smith
Buck	McClellan	Stewart
Butler	McKellar	Taft
Byrd	Maloney	Tydings
Caraway	Maybank	Vandenberg
Connally	Mead	Walsh
Danaher	Millikin	Wheeler
Eastland	O'Daniel	Wherry
Ellender	O'Mahoney	White
Ferguson	Overton	Willis
George	Pepper	Wilson
Gerry	Radcliffe	

NAYS—26

Aiken	Davis	Murdock
Barkley	Downey	Nye
Brewster	Gillette	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Guffey	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Hatch	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	Hayden	Tunnell
Chavez	Holman	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Langer	Wiley
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	

NOT VOTING—17

Austin	La Follette	Reynolds
Bone	Lodge	Tobey
Brooks	Lucas	Truman
Bushfield	McNary	Wagner
Glass	Moore	Wallgren
Hawkes	Murray	

So Mr. TAFT's motion to recommit the bill (S. 637) was agreed to.

BLANCHE H. KARSCH, ADMINISTRATRIX OF THE ESTATE OF KATE E. HAMILTON

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 514) for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton, which were, in line 9, to strike out "December 1, 1931" and insert "November 23, 1939"; and in line 13, after "tax", to insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount apropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof

shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the two amendments of the House. They are very proper. One is in reference to the amount of attorneys' fees which might be allowed, reducing the amount to 10 percent, and the other amendment changes the date of the beginning of the interest. I hope the Senate will concur in the amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

THE MILITARY SITUATION TODAY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, tomorrow the War Department will present the military situation as it is today to those Members of the Senate who care to hear the presentation, which will occur at 2 o'clock p. m. in the auditorium of the Library of Congress. General Marshall will be present in person, accompanied by members of his staff.

Mr. President, I have not had opportunity to hear this presentation, but the substance of it was given to certain industrialists who were in Washington some 10 days or 2 weeks ago, and I have heard from some of those gentlemen that it was a very interesting and timely presentation. The War Department made the presentation this morning, for the benefit of the Members of the House of Representatives, and I am advised that a large percentage of the membership of the House was present. I have talked with two House Members who were present and they have advised me it was certainly well worth while to hear this presentation.

My distinguished colleague from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] asks me a very pertinent question; why it is necessary to go to the Library of Congress instead of having the presentation in the Capitol. I will say that along with the talk certain pictures will be shown, as well as charts, and an auditorium is needed for that purpose, such as exists in the Library of Congress.

The War Department invites every Member of the Senate to come tomorrow at 2 o'clock to the auditorium of the Library of Congress. No one but Senators will be admitted. The invitation and the admission is for Senators only.

The distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] asks me how much time is required for the presentation. I understand it will take perhaps a couple of hours. I wish to emphasize again that the Members of the House who were present this morning felt that it was most beneficial and most informative, and they were very much gratified that they had had the privilege of being present.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in a moment I shall move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow, and tomorrow I expect to move that the Senate adjourn until Monday. There is no legislation scheduled for tomorrow except that there are a few bills on the calendar which have been reported since the last call of the calendar. I think we might dispose of them tomorrow and then adjourn until Monday. I make that statement so Senators may arrange their programs accordingly.

INDUCTION IN THE ARMED SERVICE OF RANCH WORKERS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, supplementing my remarks made on October 18, which are to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 8418, and which had to do with auction sales, sales of livestock, sales of farm machinery, and so forth, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a telegram which I have just received from Henry P. Hansen, rancher, of North Platte, Nebr., consisting of five lines, dealing with the situation I previously discussed. Mr. Hansen's telegram needs little or no explanation, but should be of particular interest to the Members of the Senate at this time because it shows that the people at home are alert and aware of what is taking place in America. We would do well to pause and take inventory with respect to pending legislation.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH PLATTE, NEBR., *October 20, 1943.*

Senator KENNETH WHERRY,

Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

We lost the fight to exempt married men. Now the boards are trying to take our married ranch help. If they do and leave the 675,000 hiding in Government jobs we will quit production of beef. Disgusted with Congress. We also demand death for the subsidies bills on all products and oppose borrowing to hold price down. Let's use horse sense.

HENRY P. HANSEN.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting two nominations of marshals in the State of California, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Preston Delano, of Massachusetts, to be Comptroller of the Currency. (Reappointment.)

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Several persons to be assistant surgeons in the Regular Corps, United States Public Health Service; and

Sundry officers for temporary promotion in the United States Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be immediately notified.

That completes the calendar.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 21, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 20 (legislative day of October 12), 1943:

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Robert E Clark, of California, to be United States marshal for the southern district of California. (Mr. Clark is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 21, 1942.)

George Vice, of California, to be United States marshal for the northern district of California. (Mr. Vice is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 21, 1942.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 20 (legislative day of October 12), 1943:

POSTMASTERS

INDIANA

Mary A. Kaiser, Schererville.

KANSAS

William E. Thornhill, Cunningham.
Ray K. Hockaday, Hutchinson.
Richard S. Ikenberry, Quinter.
George L. Baker, Tonganoxie.

KENTUCKY

Kate S. Keesee, Belfry.
Bernice C. Tully, Big Clifty.
Nellie Spalding Bradfordsville.
Clarence F. Nordwick, California.
Golda Martin, Drift.
Mary Dee Diuguid, Ghent.
George W. Bleidt, Golden Pond.
Eunice Vincent, Hitchins.
Mike Staley, Lackey.
John A. Vaughan, Majestic.
Corinne Owen, Mount Washington.
T. Harold Skagg, Prospect.
Grant B. Smith, Verda.
Conley Johnson, Virgie.

MARYLAND

Orlando E. Corsa, Henryton.
Anna R. Rogers, Riderwood.
Norman W. Clark, Severn.

OREGON

Eugene E. Mulcare, Canyon City.

VIRGINIA

Louis C. Dawson, Afton.
Mabel C. Harris, Gladstone.
Elza S. Cave, Madison.
Charles G. Arey, Mount Solon.
Gilbert T. Allen, Wakefield.
Annie R. B. Knight, Whaleyville.

WASHINGTON

Willene M. Ratliff, Electric City.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Edward Gardiner Latch, minister, the Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, who art the creator and the sustainer of life, without whom no one is strong, no one is pure, and no one is good, we bring ourselves to Thee. Lift us out of the ruts of our selfishness, our indifference, and our self-satisfaction. Help us to hear the music of the spheres, the song of life, Thy call to all mankind in Christ to be trustworthy, strong, and true. May no pressure of the world dim our certainty of the coming of Thy kingdom on earth. May the life of our Nation, and the life of the nations of the world, be richer in possibilities because of the vision which has ruled our minds and the spirit which has reigned in our hearts.

Keep our minds free from all prejudice and pettiness, our hearts from all bitterness and bigotry. May our lives ever be open to Thee, sensitive to every human need and ready to forsake all else in the doing of that which is noble and generous and good. Lead us through Christ to know Thee and to be instruments of Thy redeeming love among men and nations.

"Spirit of God, descend upon my heart;
Wean it from earth; through all its pulses move;
Stoop to my weakness, mighty as Thou art,
And make me love Thee as I ought to love."

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3223. An act to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service;

H. R. 3225. An act to amend the act of May 27, 1908, as amended, authorizing settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps; and

H. R. 3230. An act to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1279. An act to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes.

PEACE PLAN

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BURDICK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST SUCCESSFUL AIRPLANE FLIGHT

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker 40 years ago an event occurred which startled human imagination. In fact the press of the day largely refused to credit the story. It is not too much to say that that event has altered the course of history. It has modified man's mode of living and changed his outlook on the universe.

On December 17, 1903, Wilbur and Orville Wright conquered space by the first successful airplane flight. For centuries man had dreamed of flying through space. Now it was an accomplished fact. These two brothers built in their native city of Dayton, Ohio, and flew on that day a heavier than air machine on the sands of Kill Devil Hills near Kitty Hawk, N. C.

Today the surviving brother, Orville Wright, lives in his native city of Dayton, Ohio, the home of aviation.

To commemorate the fortieth anniversary of this epochal event, I have introduced a joint resolution. This resolution expresses the gratitude and respect of the people of the Nation for the achievement of these two great Americans. Its adoption will be another mark of our enduring admiration and esteem.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the completion of business on the Speaker's table and all special orders heretofore granted, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include several resolutions passed by the national encampment of the Veterans of the World War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I am in complete accord with the purposes of the bill repealing the Chinese exclusion laws to place Chinese persons on a quota basis and to make persons of the Chinese race eligible to become naturalized United States citizens and I hope that the measure will be passed by the House with a substantial majority.

This will remove discriminations against the Chinese, which have been a source of misunderstanding in the relations between our nations for over 60 years and have aroused widespread resentment among the Chinese people. The original act of exclusion, however, was not born of ill will toward the Chinese people. The motivation was exclusively economic. Profound changes have taken place during these 60 years. We have had time and abundant occasion to reflect on the extraordinary qualities of the Chinese people and above all, the tenacity and courage, which they have revealed during their terrible ordeal of the past 7 years.

It is fitting, therefore, that this legislation, inconsistent with the dignity of both our peoples, should be repealed and eliminated.

THE 9-HOUR SHIFT AT BOSTON NAVY YARD

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend by remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LANE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a report of the committee on Federal legislation of the Brooklyn Bar Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 314, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3070) to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is recognized.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader, who desires to control the minority time on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule. It provides for 4 hours' general debate, giving everyone who believes he may have

some reason for opposing this meritorious bill which the resolution makes in order an opportunity to be heard.

I presume that nearly all Members realize that all this bill aims to do is repeal the old Chinese Exclusion Acts. I am pleased to say that with the exception of one or two letters, all communications, all resolutions I have received, even from some of the most resolute restrictionists' organizations, favor this proposed legislation. I feel that anyone who has heard the President's urgent appeal for this proposed legislation will agree with him as to its need. This bill will permit only 105 Chinese to enter the United States and be naturalized. We are simply repealing about 13 acts that operate against the Chinese. The present law allows our most contemptible enemy, the Japanese, including their overlords, to create prejudice against our country in China. Their propaganda stresses that we are not in fact a friend of China because we discriminate against her nationals. I do not see how anyone who was present and heard the urgent plea of that great woman, Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, in this House, can possibly oppose this meritorious, just legislation.

The first Chinese Exclusion Act was passed in 1882, when certain interests were importing Chinese coolie labor into the United States. At that time the railroads were under construction between Minneapolis and the Pacific coast; and after they were completed cheap Chinese labor did injuriously affect us. People in California, as everywhere else, resented the action on the part of those corporations or individuals who were taking advantage of permissible Chinese immigration to import cheap labor. Since that time many efforts have been made to repeal these unfair excluding acts, because they and the gentlemen's agreement give Japan greater privileges under present conditions than they give to China. We all realize that China has suffered great humiliation by being stigmatized an unequal of not only our own citizens but of the Japanese. We are all very friendly to the high cause of China. We know that China deserves our cooperation, our compassion, and our material and spiritual assistance. I feel it is our duty to remove, and justice demands that we should as speedily as possible remove, from the Japanese propagandists and opportunists the opportunity to create resentment by China, and, therefore discord in our joint Allied Nations' effort. In China, as in the United States, there are some men, aided by Japan, naturally, who are utilizing this exclusion against China to advantage, and have created prejudice against us in the minds of many of the Chinese.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The evidence before our committee definitely establishes the fact that there is a short wave propaganda by Japan almost daily and weekly, advising the Chinese that we are just using them as a means to our own end, and that we do not intend to use them in the proper way; that they belong to Japan and that they should form oriental unity with Japan to fight the United States.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman for calling my attention to those activities. Some of them are known to me.

As I understand, outstanding naval officials and many national leaders appeared before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and pleaded for the enactment of this proposed legislation. Shall we deny favorable action at this time when it will be of real aid and benefit to China, and materially strengthen their morale after 7 years of continuous war, when we profess such great friendship and admiration for them, as we should? The Chinese people cannot be charged with being derelict or disloyal. They cannot be charged with not being law abiding. It cannot be charged that they are repugnant and dishonest, because everyone who has come in contact with the Chinese people recognizes that they are so much different from the Japanese that there is no comparison. As I have said, the Chinese people, everywhere, are law abiding and patriotic and are doing everything they possibly can to continue an unequal struggle and contribute in large measure to our joint war endeavors.

I have received hundreds of letters from outstanding organizations urging that I support and vote for this bill. Among them are the Illinois League of Women Voters, the Congregational and Christian Conference of Illinois, the National League of Women Voters, and others. I was particularly impressed with a letter which I received from the National Conference of Christians and Jews, which was signed by James M. Yard, director of the Midwest area office located in Chicago, Ill., and I insert excerpts from it which I feel gives briefly, yet most effectively, reasons why the bill should be passed. That letter is as follows:

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE
OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS,
Chicago, Ill., September 26, 1943.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SABATH: One of the first things that you will have to decide when you return to Washington will be the question of Chinese immigration. You know, of course, that the Japanese have a very powerful psychological weapon in our Chinese exclusion laws. Their propaganda is powerful because it cannot be denied.

We need to do two things: First, to strengthen Chinese morale, and, second, to defeat Japanese propaganda.

* * * * * *

Putting Chinese on a quota basis would allow only 105 to enter this country each year.

The Chinese people, by their heroic resistance to Japan, have certainly proved themselves a great and noble people. Surely they are worthy to be treated as we treat the citizens of other nations.

I hope you will do all you can along this line.

Very sincerely yours,
JAMES M. YARD, *Director.*

I have said that I would not take a great deal of time. The only request that I make of the Members is that they try to recall the great appeal on the part of that great Chinese lady and try also, if they have not read it, and if they have not heard the message of the President, to read it and then, having done so, I cannot see how they can oppose this bill unless it be in order to gain some publicity and play up to the uninformed.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me the minority report, and it is really amusing, and I know if those Members who signed it had had a little more experience and knowledge of conditions, they never would have subscribed their names to it. Nevertheless, I am going to read the last paragraph of the minority report to you:

None of the Members signing this report has any prejudice against the Chinese as a race. We feel that we should extend all the material aid possible to China in order that the Japanese military machine be crushed and the war in the Pacific ended and China freed.

That is from the minority report and in view of that statement I cannot see how they can in logic oppose this bill.

I hope that nothing will be said by any Member in this debate that could in any way be used by the shrewd, conniving Japanese propagandists to create resentment against us in China.

Although peaceful China has suffered tremendously at the hands of the conceited, treacherous Japanese, who have used the most contemptible practices and procedures to gain the support of some of the Chinese Quislings, she continues under great disadvantage and handicap to defend herself, in which effort she has the wholehearted sympathy of nearly the entire world. I hope when the vote is taken every Member who loves justice and condemns Japanese atrocities and dastardly machinations will vote for the bill, proving that we are united in all our efforts that may aid the cause of the Allied Nations who are fighting for self-preservation, freedom, and independence.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] has asked me for some time and it would be manifestly unfair to deny him the right to be heard at this time because of his interest and the study he has given to this matter and his desire to effect justice for China and at the same time aid our country.

With these remarks I conclude, Mr. Speaker, and reserve the remainder of my time.

Now I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SABATH. I have yielded the time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. I do not know why the gentleman should have any fear of yielding time to me.

Mr. SABATH. I have no fear.

Mr. FISH. Because certainly I have no intention of criticizing what the gentleman from Chicago said.

Mr. SABATH. Having yielded to one, I did not feel that I should yield twice.

Mr. FISH. I have been over listening to the officials of the War Department discussing our war operations.

Mr. SABATH. I hope it has been helpful.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be very little demand for time on this important resolution under the rule.

I have risen to discuss it for a few minutes, although I have an open mind upon it.

It comes here with a favorable report from the Committee on Immigration which held hearings, and also of the Rules Committee, and I am inclined to support it. Someone has observed that it may be a gesture and probably will be denominated as a political gesture. Whether it is or whether it is not a gesture, certainly it is a gesture of friendship and good will to a very gallant and heroic nation that has been fighting for the last 6 years, almost without arms, against one of the strongest and mightiest armies in the world. Therefore, in my humble opinion, this so-called gesture could not possibly do any wrong. it would cement further the traditional friendship between China and America.

For years as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I urged and introduced resolutions—oh, I assume 10 years ago—to do away with the extraterritorial rights that we had in China, a sovereign and independent nation, and also resolutions that I introduced and spoke on years ago, long before the war, to recall the 10 gunboats which we had on the Yangtze River.

Why should we, as a sovereign nation, maintain warships upon a Chinese river that is entirely within another sovereign nation, especially one that is a friendly nation, such as China has been with us?

So when we consider today the repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws, some of which were enacted over 40 years ago—call it what you will—it certainly must be a gesture of friendship.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. My distinguished friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has said he was inclined to support the bill. While I disagree with him on the question of it being a gesture—I think it is more—nevertheless, I respect my friend's views.

He has proceeded to make such a very able, eloquent, forceful, powerful argument in support of the bill that my question is whether or not my friend is not now prepared to strike out the word "inclined" and say: "I intend to support the bill"?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman embarrasses me. What he wants me to say is that I have convinced myself by my own compelling arguments.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; my point is that the gentleman has made such an able argument that his mental processes have approached the point where "inclination" no longer exists, but has been supplanted by a positive intent to support the passage of the bill.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman from Massachusetts, one of the most distinguished Members of the House, knows very well that we are more or less in the position of judges on all the measures before us. I prefer that we listen to the full debate and the arguments of other Members, that we listen to both sides, and then come to a just conclusion. As I said, I have not made an extensive study of this subject; in fact, I have taken this time because there were no other requests for time on the rule. Members are coming into the chamber, however, and it was my hope that by the time I had concluded other Members of the committee might be here and wish to use a little of the time, and that we might have a comparatively full attendance. I do believe, however, that issues of this kind should be approached more or less from a judicial angle, that we should listen to the facts and arguments from both sides, profound arguments that will be made by those who have studied this bill from every possible angle, and then come to a final conclusion which necessarily must be a just and right one.

Mr. McCORMACK. But that time of decision, of course, is only a short distance away, and the gentleman from New York, by reason of his leadership in the House, is one to whom the Members listen and one whom they follow.

Mr. FISH. The justness of the case presented by the majority leader is such that I find myself every minute coming nearer to the conclusion that the proper thing to do when the final vote is reached on a roll call is to vote in favor of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, as long as we are discussing—and time does not seem to be of the essence just now—the whole Chinese problem and our friendship with China, I should like to take a few minutes to suggest that we might concentrate more of our efforts at the present time to get arms, airplanes, and tanks into China. This is no new suggestion on my part. I do not claim to be a prophet, but at least 10 months ago I spoke upon the floor of this House, not once, but on three different occasions, imploring the administration to do three things out in the far Pacific: To get airplanes, arms, ammunition and tanks, if possible, into China so that we could start bombing the Japanese cities. I do not think this war will be won until we are in position to bomb the Japanese cities and industries from China. Therefore, believing that as I did then and do more so now, I think every possible effort should be concentrated to drive the Japs out of Burma and open a road into China so that our vast resources of arms, ammunition, airplanes, and tanks can be poured into China to carry the war to Japan. That was suggestion No. 1. Suggestion No. 2 was that General MacArthur should be placed in supreme command in the far Pacific of the Army, the Navy, and the air forces, so that we could start a major offensive instead of an island-hopping campaign—and those are the words I used at that time. I believe that Republicans and Democrats alike will agree with these two suggestions. Time has proved that I was right when I made these two suggestions 10 months ago.

The third suggestion may be controversial. I suggested that we fly airplanes from the Aleutian Islands, from Alaska, to Siberia not for the purpose of bombing Japan, but for the purpose of getting them into China; to at least get the permission of the Soviet Government to let our airplanes fly from the Aleutian Islands to land in Siberia and then hop over into China so that we could use Chinese air fields to bomb Japan without bringing Russia into the war. That was the suggestion I made long ago. I still make it. I do not know whether it is completely feasible in view of some of the statements that have been made by high military authorities, but at least it is a compromise against asking for air bases in Siberia that would mean war for Soviet Russia with Japan, and we are told we could not maintain or defend those bases in Siberia if we did have them. Those were the three suggestions I made on the floor of this House almost a year ago. Two of them I am positive are correct; the third one is debatable, but I believe there is a great deal of reason and logic in making that request even now, and urging that there be no further delay in putting them into effect.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should observe that our colleagues are probably still in session over in the Library of Congress listening to confidential information with reference to the war effort in all the active theaters of war. That should go in the RECORD to explain the absence of a whole multitude on the floor of the House at this moment. I assume they will return from that labor directly, which is also an official labor.

There are just a few things I want to observe on the matter that will come up after a while. Some years ago I amplified a rather interesting incident about an American marine who got into difficulty in China, either in Shanghai or Tientsin, which provoked something of a controversy. Finally it reechoed on the floor of the House in the form of a bill to reimburse some lady in China for sundry physical repairs and hospital expenses occasioned by the action of that marine.

At that time I wondered what that marine was doing there, so I went back and chased up the whole history of that period from 1899 on, when we left a regiment of marines over there. I wondered at the time also what would have happened if a regiment of Chinese marines were stationed in New York, Cleveland, or San Francisco. I thought then that, in spite of the exigencies of disruption in China, there was no reason why they should be there, and they should have been withdrawn long ago. A year or more ago that action was taken. So that China from now on will exercise her own

internal destiny without the watchful eyes of soldiers from another country, when the V of victory is finally written in the eastern and western skies.

I do not agree with the President that a mistake was made on Chinese exclusion 60 years ago. The essential point is that the condition was different from what it is today. Chinese exclusion back in 1879, which was the date of the first act that was enacted, was aimed as much against the abuses of our own people as it was against the Chinese. It was, after all, John Sutter who brought John Chinaman to this country, because when gold was discovered in 1849 there was a great exploratory effort in California that required labor, and in consequence the Chinese contract labor was brought into this country, not that they wanted to come particularly but because there were some people who were sweating a profit out of that contract labor among our own citizenry. As a result, our people and our country had to be protected against our own people as much as they did against those of a foreign country. So when the President observes that a mistake was made 60 years ago I do not agree, for all those early statutes in 1879, 1881, and 1882 referred in the main to Chinese laborers.

Congress got at it in a very piecemeal fashion. I do not see the first bill recited in the report in connection with this bill, but it came in 1879 when the Congress passed a bill to limit the number of Chinese who could be brought into this country on a single ship. That is like the technique of adding a restrictive proviso to an appropriation bill. They did not know how to go about it under certain treaty obligations, so the Congress limited the number of Chinese that could be brought in on a single ship at a given time. But that did not solve the problem. President Hayes vetoed that bill.

In 1881 there was a treaty arranged giving us the power to suspend the immigration of Chinese and to limit the number, but always they encountered that veto. Finally they did get out a bill in 1884, but there again it dealt principally with Chinese laborers. This whole effort was a throw-back to that earlier condition which started as a result of gold being discovered in the valleys of California.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wonder if I could secure a little additional time?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. JENKINS. I want to develop further that the treaty of 1882 also only applied to Chinese labor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other thing that ought to be clarified here. That is the number of Chinese who are in the country now, or were here at any given time. Insofar as I could determine, there were 34,900 Chinese in the United States in 1860. For round numbers we can say that in 1860, which is 83 years ago, we had 40,000 Chinese in the country. In 1890 it had gone to 107,000. In 1940 it was 77,504; 40,262 of those were born in the United States and 37,000-plus were born in China. So for easy figuring we can say that of the 77,000 Chinese who are in the country at the present time about one-half were born in China and the other half were born here.

There is just one other observation I want to make about this. It was rather interesting to see what a political issue this became long ago. Both the Democratic and Republican Parties made great recitals on this matter starting away back in 1884. I want to quote first from the Democratic platform and then from the Republican platform.

In the Democratic national platform of 1884 it is stated:

> American civilization demands that against the immigration or importation of Mongolians to these shores, our gates are closed.

In that same year the Republican platform denounced the importation of contract labor and stated further—

> We pledge ourselves to sustain the present law restricting Chinese immigration and to provide such further legislation as is necessary to carry out its purpose.

That was carried in the Republican platform, or substantially that same language, for a matter of 12 or 16 years, and it is all an echo of the labor situation that developed in California in 1879. They first undertook to deal with it by local legislation which was clearly unconstitutional and later by congressional enactments which were vetoed, first by President Hayes, and then by President Arthur, finally culminating in the act of 1882 as modified by the act of 1884 which puts it on its present basis. That is the picture that I see.

The reason I am going to vote for the repeal of this act is that the original reason for the act has disappeared. It was aimed at contract labor in the first instance. If you want to see how well we have done in that field, you examine the contract-labor statute which is on the books today. Any labor organization, any citizen, any individual can appear before a governmental agency today and protest permitting any person to come into this country if somebody of like talent and skill can be found to do that kind of work. And they do exercise that right before the agencies of government today. Consequently, we are thoroughly protected against the importation of contract labor, so that the original purpose of the Chinese Exclusion Act has disappeared. I believe it is high time to put that great republic in the Orient on the same basis with some of the other countries and give them the benefit of our quota statute.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES].

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] have until midnight tonight to file a minority report on the bill H. R. 3420.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], a member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to take this time under the rule to clarify our understanding of what a quota is and how it is established, because I am quite sure that 90 percent of the Members of the House who were not here in 1924 and were not here when the quota was adopted do not know what a quota is or how it is arrived at.

I want to read the law on the quota and then illustrate it by the figures on the blackboard here. The law states:

> The annual quota of any nationality for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1927, and for each fiscal year thereafter, shall be a number which bears the same ratio to 150,000 as the number of inhabitants in continental United States in 1920 having that national origin (ascertained as hereinafter provided in this section) bears to the number of inhabitants in continental United States in 1920, but the minimum quota of any nationality shall be 100.

Therefore the law itself establishes a quota formula upon which quotas are fixed and determined. This formula takes the number 150,000 as a basis. The law states that the quota for any nationality, X, shall be to the 150,000 established in the law as the number of persons of that racial extraction or nationality who were here in 1920 is to the total population of the United States in 1920. So it is entirely based upon our population census of 1920.

Taking that formula which is established by law, and from which all the quotas are derived, we work out the Chinese quota as all other quotas are worked out and find that X is to the 150,000 as the number of Chinese who were here in 1920, 74,000, is to the population of the United States in 1920, 105,710,620. Working out that formula, we arrive at the value of X, which is 105.

When we hear talk about opening the doors and when we hear talk about lowering the barriers, let us understand that neither one of those two things can be done unless we change the law which established the quota and which has been on the books since 1924, and which has worked out wonderfully well. As far as the Chinese are concerned, they are put on exactly the same basis of equality with any other nation on earth that has a quota. With their 105 they are on the same basis as England, that has 60,000 who may come in here each year.

The erroneous understanding by most people is that a quota is arrived at on the basis of the number of people in that country, not here. Of course, on the basis of four hundred or five hundred million people in China, that is a different story; but our quota law is based upon this formula and it cannot be changed unless we change the quota law.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. Right on that point, may I ask the gentleman if there was not testimony before the committee advocating a larger quota for China and a change in the law?

Mr. MASON. Of course, but it was not even considered, and that is not the question that is up here. We now have before this House the question of establishing the quota for China on the same basis as the quota for all other nations, that is all. That is the only thing that is up.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Considerable has been said at many different times about the restriction of immigration for the purpose of preventing unemployment in this country, a principle with which I am very much in sympathy, but may I ask this question of the gentleman: A vote against the Chinese sharing in the quota of 150,000 immigrants does not in any appreciable way add to or detract from that problem?

Mr. MASON. It does not at all.

Mr. CURTIS. The only way you can reach that problem is to change the law from 150,000 to 100,000 or 50,000 or zero?

Mr. MASON. That is right. May I also say right here, that bills have been introduced to reduce the quota or cut it in half for a period of 10 years. That is the way to handle the restriction on immigration.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The passage of this bill would in no way detract from the power of Congress to make whatever decisions about over-all immigration it may see fit to make?

Mr. MASON. Not at all.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. It is a fact that previously China has had a quota of 100?

Mr. MASON. No.

Mr. JENKINS. Under this law—and your report shows it—you are going to give China something that no other country has; you are going to give China 2 quotas, one of 105 and one of 100. No other nation in the world enjoys that privilege.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. JENKINS. I am not mistaken.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman has not read the law right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPARKMAN). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I regret that we are now discussing formulas on which quotas are based, rather than the big point at issue which, in my opinion, is the removal from our immigration laws of the specific prohibition making the Chinese ineligible for admission to the United States. Regardless of the number of Chinese immigrants that may be involved, we should erase from our statute books the objectionable language citing, by name, the citizens of China. I have a deep interest in this legislation and on February 17 of this year introduced bill H. R. 1882. As students of the law, you will be interested to know that my bill, H. R. 1882, was the first one introduced in this House, since the original Exclusion Act was passed in the year of 1882, aimed to repeal outright the Chinese Exclusion Act. I did not insert the figure 105 in my bill, which figure has been mentioned as China's quota, and for a good reason. I felt the existing quota law would regulate the number of admissions and I am equally sure the quota would work out to the same result as that shown on the blackboard by the previous speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

We must admit that the present law excluding Chinese is unfair and discriminatory. The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization held extensive hearings on this subject and before that committee there appeared representatives of all the religious groups of our country and the Chinese Roman Catholic Bishop, Yu Pin, as well as many other humanitarians and profound students of international affairs. They all approved of the legislation. The Immigration Committee of this House had before it several bills, and the bill that we are to consider, H. R. 2309, is the one recommended by our committee. I am heartily in favor of this legislation because of the principle that is involved, and that is the principle of equal treatment to all men. I am fortunate in having, as I expected I would have, the wholehearted endorsement of President Roosevelt in my efforts to secure the repeal of the Exclusion Act.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the passage of this bill would do much toward eliminating Japanese propaganda against the United States among the Chinese. It will be a further evidence of our good faith with our friends in the Orient. And China is and has been our real friend. I hope that the vote on this measure will be unanimous. I believe it is one of the most constructive legislative proposals that has been before the House of Representatives this year. It is and always has been a difficult thing to intelligently explain the Exclusion Act to Chinese people. Let us, by our action today, make explanations unnecessary in the future. Our experience in America with the Chinese people has been a happy experience. They are industrious, hard-working, and law-abiding people. If at any time throughout the years, this Nation had any differences, diplomatic or otherwise with China, the Governments of the two countries have always been able to resolve the differences in a satisfactory and statesmanlike manner.

I should like every Member to read and carefully consider the message of President Roosevelt, a letter to Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, and the reply of the First Lady of China:

To the Congress of the United States:

There is now pending before the Congress legislation to permit the immigration of Chinese people into this country and to allow Chinese residents here to become American citizens. I regard this legislation as important in the cause of winning the war and of establishing a secure peace.

China is our ally. For many long years she stood alone in the fight against aggression. Today we fight at her side. She has continued her gallant struggle against very great odds.

China has understood that the strategy of victory in this World War first required the concentration of the greater part of our strength upon the European front. She has understood that the amount of supplies we could make available to her has been limited by difficulties of transportation. She knows that substantial aid will be forthcoming as soon as possible—aid not only in the form of weapons and supplies, but also in carrying out plans already made for offensive, effective action. We and our allies will aim our forces at the heart of Japan in ever-increasing strength until the common enemy is driven from China's soil.

But China's resistance does not depend alone on guns and planes and on attacks on land, on the sea, and from the air. It is based as much in the spirit of her people and her faith in her allies. We owe it to the Chinese to strengthen that faith. One step in this direction is to wipe from the statute books those anachronisms in our law which forbid the immigration of Chinese people into this country and which bar Chinese residents from American citizenship.

Nations like individuals make mistakes. We must be big enough to acknowledge our mistakes of the past and to correct them.

By the repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws, we can correct a historic mistake and silence the distorted Japanese propaganda. The enactment of legislation now pending before the Congress would put Chinese immigrants on a parity with those from other countries. The Chinese quota would, therefore, be only about 100 immigrants a year. There can be no reasonable apprehension that any such number of immigrants will cause unemployment or provide competition in the search for jobs.

The extension of the privileges of citizenship to the relatively few Chinese residents in our country would operate as another meaningful display of friendship. It would be additional proof that we regard China not only as a partner in waging war but that we shall regard her as a partner in days of peace. While it would give the Chinese a preferred status over certain other oriental people, their great contribution to the cause of decency and freedom entitles them to such preference.

I feel confident that the Congress is in full agreement that these measures—long overdue—should be taken to correct an injustice to our friends. Action by the Congress now will be an earnest of our purpose to apply the policy of the good neighbor to our relations with other peoples.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 11, 1943.*

FEBRUARY 17, 1943.

Mme. CHIANG KAI-SHEK,

The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MME. CHIANG: To the First Lady of China, and, by universal acclaim, one of the greatest women in the world, our proud and wholehearted welcome.

We welcome you also, as a daughter is welcomed by her foster mother, to the land where you received an American education,

where you spent years far more carefree than those of late, and where by your charm, your modesty, and your intellectual attainments you won the hearts of so many. And now, both for yourself and as a flaming symbol, your unflinching courage and patience and faith, through 5 years of relentless aggression and horror, arouse the admiration of liberty-loving people the world over.

The bomber, while it has destroyed boundaries, has shortened distances. Today we can, like Samuel Johnson, "survey mankind from China to Peru" with the twist of a radio dial, and with agony and resolution in our hearts.

You Chinese are a nation of 450,000,000 souls. Your land is about one-third larger than ours. Several millions of you, including the President himself, are Christians. You have a cultural background of more than 4,000 years. Today you have compulsory education at the age of 6, and your hundreds of universities, colleges, and technical schools exchange brilliant students with our own.

You are brave and stoical, industrial, honest, and honorable. Save for one minor interruption, we have always been at peace with you. During the difficult period of the settlement of our West, the importation of "cheap Chinese labor" brought with it a wave of alarmed misunderstanding and prejudice on the part of some of our people. There was no justification for this fear. Even under the 1930 census there were only 46,129 Chinese people in our country. We have more than that number of European refugees in a few months.

Since February 12, 1912, China has been a member of the family of republics. I take this auspicious occasion, in your gracious presence, as an indication of my unbounded admiration of a nation's courage which has amazed the world, to introduce, this day, a bill to grant to the Chinese rights of entry to the United States and rights of citizenship. A people which have shared with us the common danger, and will share with us the eventual victory, a people which have earned our friendship, our gratitude, and our respect, have by the same token surely earned our franchise.

Long live the Chinese Republic.

I have the honor to remain, dear madame,

Respectfully yours,

MARTIN J. KENNEDY.

CARE OF CHINESE EMBASSY,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1943.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: Your letter dated February 17 enclosing a bill which you propose to introduce to Congress has just been received.

I am indeed gratified that as each day passes, better understanding between our two peoples is brought about by farsighted leaders on both sides to further solidify the traditional friendship between our two great countries. It is my sincere hope that this unexcelled friendship should shine as a torch to guide mankind for generations to come toward peace and good will.

I am happy to say that Americans are always warmly welcome in my country where they will find my people ever ready to receive them as friends from afar. I am pleased, therefore, to take this opportunity to convey to you my hearty congratulations for your farsightedness.

Cordially yours,

MAYLING SOONG CHIANG.

I trust that I shall have the cooperation, active support, and vote of the entire membership on the passage of this bill to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address by a distinguished friend and colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MCWILLIAMS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and include some excerpts from the bill and the report of the hearings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us, H. R. 3070, proposes to change our immigration laws and grant a quota to China. This bill will permit a certain number of Chinese to come in every year and in due course become American citizens and it also permits Chinese to come in as merchants, students, and so forth. This changes our entire immigration laws as to approximately 1,000,000,000 people residing in the continent of Asia. If this measure becomes law then it is the first time we will have granted a quota and permit to become citizens the people from the continent of Asia.

Persons appeared before the Committee on Immigration and urged that quotas be granted to other peoples such as the people of India, Korea, Burma, Indochina, the Malay Peninsula, and Tibet. All of these various people are supposed to be friendly to us as is China.

I regret the question of changing our immigration laws has come up to be considered while we are in this great war struggle and 10,000,000 or more of American boys are away from home fighting in defense of our own country and to preserve our own liberties. Before the war is over perhaps more than 12,000,000 will be so engaged. This question should not have been brought up for consideration until after the war is over and our boys had returned to their homes. We then could better determine whether or not we wished to open up our gates and bring in people from other countries to compete for jobs and business opportunities with our own defenders and our other citizens.

It is urged that we should do this now in order to encourage China in her war effort. We have been encouraging China. We have loaned her more than $500,000,000 which more than likely she will never be able to repay. We have sent her more than $200,000,000 worth of food, munitions of war, and so forth, under the Lend-Lease Act, and American boys have been fighting and dying on Chinese soil to help protect and save China, and in the next year or two thousands and thousands of American boys will give their lives, their health or their limbs in helping China. Under present war conditions the Chinese could not come to this country. What China needs is more planes, tanks, guns, ships, food, and other munitions of war.

This question was not brought up in China. It is being developed here in our own country, and some of the sponsors have been for years trying to break down our immigration laws, and they are using the war as a vehicle in this instance to help accomplish their purpose. As much as I desire to see China win and as greatly as I sympathize with her in this war and appreciate whatever efforts she has or may make, I do not feel that we should set out now to break down our immigration laws, either as to China or as to any other country.

Mr. DICKSTEIN, of New York City, submitted the report of the committee in favor of this bill. I have read his report and also the report of a number of members of that committee expressing opposition to it. In reading the hearings I observe that the American Legion's national organization expressed opposition to this measure and similar measures. They went on record in resolution at their national convention held at Kansas City, Mo., in September 1943, expressing opposition to this proposed legislation. Their representative appeared before the Immigration Committee on these bills relating to the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act and emphasized the opposition of the American Legion in the following statement, which is found on pages 168 and 169 of the hearings:

> The American Legion at its national convention held at Kansas City, Mo., in September of last year, went on record favoring drastic restriction in immigration following the war until jobs have been provided for those returning to civil life from war service. Certainly our most immediate and most important job after the cessation of hostilities will be to find jobs for the millions of men and women who are or will serve in our armed forces, and no one can now predict what economic conditions will prevail in this country at that time.
>
> We appreciate and commend the Chinese people for the wonderful service they have performed in holding the Japanese at bay. One argument we have heard advanced favoring enactment of these bills is that such action will raise the morale of the Chinese people. It is our opinion that very few of the Chinese who are carrying on the war in China have given any thought to the repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws. The naturalization and immigration question as it affects the Chinese can well wait until the war is over when basic and sound consideration can be given it without the influence of war hysteria.
>
> The American Legion has been disturbed by the efforts of certain groups to force through legislation at this time which would confer citizenship on large numbers of aliens or to make drastic changes in our immigration laws.
>
> Bills are pending to effect a number of these changes and others no doubt will be introduced. The sum total of this proposed legislation if enacted by the Congres would go far toward the breaking down of the safeguards provided by our immigration and naturalization laws, which have been so carefully worked out and placed on the statute books after many years of work and study.

We feel that naturalization and immigration rights granted the Chinese at this particular time will be used as an opening wedge toward following through with similar rights for other groups.

We are very definitely of the opinion that such a procedure would not contribute to our war effort and would certainly jeopardize the providing of jobs for our servicemen after the war.

The Director of our National Americanism Commission, Mr. Homer L. Chaillaus, in a letter addressed to the National Legislative Committee of the Legion stated:

"Instead of trying to pave the way to bring more and more refugees and immigrants to America now and after the war, we had best start passing legislation which will provide the first 12,000,000 jobs immediately after the war for returning soldiers and sailors.

"We must not start giving post-war work to alien immigrants ahead of those men who have honorably served our country in war."

The national organization of the Veterans of Foreign Wars likewise appeared before the Committee on Immigration and pointed out that this great veterans' patriotic organization was also against this legislation. The representative of the V. F. W. stated to the committee:

For many years and for good reasons it has been the policy of this organization to oppose any and all bills to liberalize existing immigration laws and there is no apparent need for the radical revision of such laws during this wartime period. The organization sincerely believes that the consideration of legislation to amend immigration laws may well be postponed until hostilities cease (Hearings, pp. 175 and 176).

Hon. John D. Trevor of the American Coalition, of Washington, D. C., appeared before the committee and stated that he represented the American Coalition, which is an association of delegates representing about 100 patriotic societies. He, speaking for these patriotic organizations, expressed strong opposition to this proposed legislation. He said in part:

Now, I think it is a very deplorable thing that any question of this kind should be agitated during a period of war.

Hon. James Wilmuth, representing the national organization of Junior Order of United American Mechanics, and Hon. Roscoe C. Walker, also representing the Junior Order United American Mechanics and the Daughters of America, appeared at these hearings and expressed strong opposition of themselves and their organizations to this proposed legislation. Their testimony is found on pages 48–49, 100–101, and so forth, in the printed hearings.

Hon. Lewis G. Hines, legislative representative of the American Federation of Labor, also appeared before the Immigration Committee and pointed out the unwisdom of this legislation and voiced the opposition of this great organization to this legislation.

All of these witnesses strongly urge that legislation proposing to change our immigration laws should not be considered until after the war is over.

ARE WE DOING OUR PART?

The American people are now spending more in this war than all of our allies and all our enemies combined. Furthermore, the American people are paying more than three times as much in taxes as Great Britain and, of course, many times more than China or any other Allied country. I doubt if all of them together are paying as much in taxes as the American people. Our national debt now exceeds that of any one of our allies. We have more men in our armed forces than Great Britain or China. We have a great many more men in our armed forces than Great Britain or China. Congress has appropriated over $63,000,000,000 for lend-lease. This is three times the total cost to the United States of World War No. 1 from the beginning up to the signing of the armistice. China has been, is, and will be the beneficiary of all of these sacrifices and efforts of the American people, but it is insisted in order to keep the good will of China we must break down our immigration walls and open the gates.

The committee of Senators who made the trip around the world investigating our war efforts and other matters related to the war have announced that this country is being "milked" by the nations associated with us in the war. There is no doubt about that. I remember very well conditions that prevailed following World War No. 1. Many persons who had not worked in shops, mills, factories, or mines took employment during the war. Many of them remained on their jobs after the war, and we found literally millions of our veterans of that war and their children walking the streets seeking employment that they could not find. Some of them stood on the streets selling apples. Under the urge of war, many millions of girls and women have taken jobs and are carrying on in every activity. When the war is over, millions of these women will still continue in business and industry. What I am worried about, Will we have jobs and opportunities for our 12,000,000 defenders when they come home after the war? Will we again have millions walking the streets and highways, looking for jobs and opportunities to make a living but will not be able to find them? When the last war was over, millions of persons in Europe were trying to get to the United States, the land of opportunity, and, in order to protect our own people, we passed the first important immigration law in 1921 and the second in 1924. The various countries of the world tried to prevent these laws from being passed, but we passed them. Ever since the passage of the act of 1924, certain individuals and groups in this country have been trying to break down those salutary measures. I want to strengthen these laws instead of weakening them.

The bill before us is an entering wedge to aid in further efforts to break down our immigration laws and take away their protection for our own citizens. Our boys are coming back home battle-scarred and they will face a country with the highest taxes in all history and they will face a country practically bankrupt. Can we do any less than to preserve our immigration laws and keep open as many opportunities and as many jobs as possible for our defenders and their sons and daughters and for the other citizens of this country? It seems that from day to day we are called upon by our allies to give and give and it is urged all along that these things are necessary in order to hold their friendship and cooperation.

We have been giving billions in lend-lease to Russia. However, we were anxious to have a conference with Russia as to present problems and as to post-war problems. You will observe that this conference was not brought together until we had signed a new lend-lease agreement greatly increasing our gifts of food, war materials, and credits to Russia. We have become not only the arsenal of the democracies but also the bank, the food storage house, and manpower of more than 10,000,000 American boys, providing their equipment. I want our country to do her part. She is doing that and more, but we should not be called upon to take from the American people the protection to our workers and our markets.

The President now says that we must not protect our synthetic rubber plants and workers, but must give the native industry and workers in other countries a market for their rubber. If that course is followed then our synthetic rubber plants and workers will suffer. Let us win the war but let us not overthrow or disrupt our fixed economic domestic policies.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] has taken the position that he has, as evidenced by his remarks of a few moments ago. I am a member of the American Legion. Two brothers and myself served in the last war. Many Members of this body are members of the American Legion and of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It is true the American Legion last year did take a position in opposition—I do not say all the Legion—but in the last conviction they certainly did not take any position one way or the other on this matter. That is a very marked piece of evidence as to a change of mind among the executive committee of the Legion which passed upon this question a year or so ago. Certainly the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which is a very progressive organization, which I respect and admire very much, would not oppose this legislation. I doubt very much, if a referendum were submitted to the members of both organizations, that there would be very many opposed to this bill after they understood the facts involved.

As far as the American Federation of Labor is concerned, at their last convention in Boston, if my memory serves me right, they did not take a position against this bill. These actions all took place

subsequent to the time the gentleman from Kentucky referred to. That is all evidence of a powerful nature, as far as these organizations are concerned, but even if they did take a position in opposition, each and every one of us has to live with his conscience and to make up his own mind. We know from a practical angle that it is a small group in organizations that determines the position on matters of this kind. Oftentimes a position taken by that small group does not represent the minds of the great majority of the members of an organization.

Now, there are just a few simple facts that appeal to me in this case. Not only is this bill justifiable from the angle of justice, not only is the passage of this bill justifiable from the angle of sentiment, but its passage is justifiable from the angle of the interest of the United States. Nations act on interest, not sentiment. Nations must respond to interest, not sentiment. Where sentiment and interest conflict, nations of necessity, must follow the pathway of interest, but there are occasions where in following the interest of a nation, and of our nation, we can also express our sentiment and we can also extend justice to the people of another country. The passage of this bill is for the interest of our country and I am sure the great rank and file of Americans sentimentally favor the passage of the bill.

And certainly it is removing from our statute books an ignoble act, and in that respect constitutes, on our part, an act of international justice.

This bill only permits 105 persons of Chinese blood to enter the United States each year after its passage. It removes the insult of an ignoble act committed some years ago of excluding by name from admission into the United States anybody from China.

How would we like it if any other country in the world, by express act of its legislative body or those in control of its government were to say that no American should be admitted into that country as an immigrant. Without regard to whether or not we wanted to go or whether we thought any other American should enter that country as an alien, you and I as Americans would feel insulted if we were picked out from among the other nations of the world as the one nation excluded expressly from admission as immigrants into any other country.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. It is an established fact, is it not, that doctors and ministers and educators can come from China just as they can come from Turkey or Italy or anywhere else?

Mr. McCORMACK. That does not answer my observation. That is not a fair reply or an attempt to try to knock down the statement I have just made.

Now certainly 105 is not going to create the alarming situation that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] referred to when the boys return from the war and look for employment. Certainly that is not going to keep anybody out of employment.

But what are the facts? The facts are that we are engaged in a global war. The facts are that our country is interested in winning this war for ourselves and for a future decent world. But our primary interest is in winning the war, to preserve our own institutions and our Government.

Another fact is that China is an ally of ours. Another fact is that China, for a period of 6 years, the people of China, have been resisting with bravery, one of our main enemies in this conflict.

Another fact is that that main enemy is using the situation existing by reason of the laws of America as a powerful weapon of propaganda against our best interests. As one of our able naval men, who has served for years in the Navy of the United States, said—he is now in retirement—that our present law, now upon our statute books, is worth 20 divisions to the Japanese Army.

This is of interest, and to our immediate interest. The sentiment which we talk about in our respect for the bravery of the people of China is often emphasized and we have now the opportunity, through the passage of this act, to express our sentiment for the people of China by removing the ignoble statutory provision that exists in our laws, which excludes all Chinese people by name, by placing them upon the same basis as the smallest nation in the world. The smallest country in the world, under the immigration laws, is entitled to have admitted into the United States 105 immigrants each year and that is all we are giving to a nation of over 400,000,000 persons.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts think we should have a quota for India?

Mr. McCORMACK. Is India an independent nation?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does he think we should have a quota for Korea?

Mr. McCORMACK. Is Korea an independent nation?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. They certainly are on our side.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is not an answer to my question, which is that we must deal with other nations as sovereign nations, and they are not sovereign nations.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. They are fighting on our side.

Mr. McCORMACK. But my question to the gentleman is whether either of them is a sovereign nation.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I will let the gentleman himself decide that.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is another evasive attempt, and the gentleman does not fool me a bit by the question he asks and his refusal to answer the plain question that I asked him.

India, whether we favor it now or in the future, is not a sovereign nation we can deal with.

Korea, whether we favor its independence at the present time or in the future, is not a sovereign nation that we can deal with.

China is a sovereign nation and if the gentleman does not recognize that fact, I think he is closing his eyes to an indisputable fact that even the most ignorant person who has the slightest knowledge of current history would have to admit.

Now, I will proceed.

The legislation under consideration would grant to the Chinese right of entry to the United States and right of citizenship. It is a step toward salutary internationalism based upon justice and understanding. It is a denial of the false doctrine of racism and a reiteration of the American principles of equality of opportunity for life, liberty, and happiness for all mankind. The enactment of this legislation at the present time will prevent future irreparable injury to America and promote a spirit of international cooperation which will greatly strengthen the foundation of universal peace so devoutly desired.

The war continues in unabated fury. As we are gathered here in session, conscious of our personal safety, sons of America are fighting on battlefields around the globe, being injured and lying dying on those fields, in a vicious struggle to death that we here may be able through our efforts under divine guidance to plan for the peace that is to come with Allied victory. America standing alone cannot win this war. America, through her cooperative effort will end this war. And when the noise of cannon and shell has ceased, the post-war quiet must fall upon an America surrounded by friends—international friends looking to America in trust and confidence and faith that her spoken ideals were the real ideals for which the war was fought, and with hope that democratic ideals will be applied to international differences. China is one of those friends. China, a new virility, regenerated by the bloodshed of labor will look to America.

Time will not permit, were this the occasion and the scene, for a rhetorical discussion of the historical background of our relationships with China. The story of extraterritoriality in China is too well known to all of us to repeat at length. On October 9, 1942, America and Great Britain announced their readiness to negotiate the abolition of the right granted foreigners in China to be tried in their own courts in accordance with their own laws rather than in courts in terms of the law of China propounded by Chinese officials. Less than a year ago, on January 11, 1943, after nearly a century of differences between nations, treaties were executed by and between China and the United States and Great Britain ending extraterritorial rights and special benefits and privileges in China for American and British alike. China, by treaty, became an equal in the family of nations—not by false promise of idle hope but by the word of our national bond. Remembering this fact of our

American-Chinese relationship, what must we do with the Exclusion Act?

The legislation proposed in this bill is for the purpose of repealing the Chinese exclusion laws, to place Chinese persons on a small quota basis, and to allow persons of Chinese races to become naturalized citizens of the United States.

China is more to America than an ally. She is our friend, united in her sentiment of friendship for the people of the United States. Our Constitution has been her governmental inspiration. Her children quote with pride our constitutional guaranties of liberty and equality. They are taught to believe that America believes that all men are created equal, with rights and privileges which the State did not create, but which the State is bound to safeguard and protect. The Stars and Stripes to the children of China is the flag of a generous Nation protecting human rights from tyrannical intolerance. The American Constitution means to China equality of race, religion, class, and liberty under the law for all. The principles of the Government of China of today flow from their understanding of the principles of American Government. China is essentially a democratic people. Are the Chinese more democratic than Americans? Certainly a claim that they are would have solid foundation in fact if our answer is to bar the passage of the bill before us for our consideration. We would be forced to admit that certain fundamental conceptions of American belief are different from what they appear to mean. It is time for us to realize that if nations cannot be gracious to each other, cannot respect each other's race, all talk of democracy is in vain. Democracies are supposed to keep faith and the passage of this bill is an act of faith on our part.

The treaty of 1880 was perhaps the most effective treaty on the question of immigration entered into between America and China, recognizing as it did the necessity of control over the Chinese labor situation in the United States. Various statutes have been passed by Congress subsequent to these treaties of an unfavorable nature to the Chinese. These statutes have been the source of misunderstanding for over 60 years. Based upon motives purely economic, the Chinese Exclusion Act has caused untold resentment. Time marches on and the economic situation has changed. Impressed with the heroic struggle of China over the past 6 years, inspired by their extraordinary tenacity and idealism in her struggle against the encroachment upon her sovereignty, America favors the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act.

President Roosevelt, the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, in the position of the President of these United States has asked the passage of this law and the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act as a war measure. For 6 years China has courageously fought off the savagery of our enemy, Japan. China is tired, China is hungry, and there are those of her children who know starvation. China knows sickness and the death that follows disease—China knows what inflation is. China is a nation, made up of human beings with souls just as yours and mine: Human beings, brave but tired, hungry, and without money, and must be affected, and seriously so, by the propaganda. Axis-inspired, continuously droned in her ears. The Tokyo radio never hesitates to seize a single opportunity to besmirch America to China. How long can tired minds withstand such propaganda—when hearts are heavy and stomachs empty? If one should doubt the childish fury of this propaganda, read the testimony given before our Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and see therein the direct quotations from the Japanese press and radio.

China needs our help today. The true friendship of tomorrow can be cemented today. If we must descend to selfish argument in favor of this bill remember that when this war is over and victory is ours China will be the outstanding power of the Far East. We are troubled now by such problems as surplus commodities, renegotiations of contracts, small plants, and labor. China will need our goods—manufactured as now. Let us not forget our "loss of face" in the Far East—let us remember that Mme. Chiang Kai-shek has said:

> We in China, like you, want a better world, not for ourselves alone, but for all mankind, and we must have it. It is not enough, however, to proclaim our ideals or even to be convinced that we have them. In order to preserve, uphold, and maintain them, we should throw all we cherish into our effort to fulfill these ideals, even at the risk of failure. * * * Man's mettle is tested both in adversity and in success. Twice is this true of the soul of a nation.

The question is being propounded, "Has America's face been permanently lost in the Far East?" In these crucial hours of our Nation's history we must not be too lightly indifferent to the answer. The average American may not care what the average oriental may think of him. But beware of the attitude of the peacock in our international relationships. The future world must respect the opinions of the half billion citizens of the Orient.

The first Asiatic slap at the authority of the whites was the defeat of Russia by Japan in 1905. Respect for white "face" was lowered. It was increased by the presence in increasing numbers of British and American remittance men and ne'er-do-wells in the oriental countries. The fair treatment of the Filipinos by America was termed "race treachery" by the white imperialists of other countries. Japan, by her sudden rise to militaristic greatness, completed the loss of American "face" with her campaign of Asia for the Asiatics. This propaganda began years ago as part of Japan's fight for her greater east Asia coprosperity sphere.

Let us not underestimate the Nipponese in their propagandizing of the natives in captive countries. Japan is stressing in the Philippines, as in all Asiatic countries, the word which has meant little to orientals under white rule—"freedom." Japan places emphasis on our nationalistic tendencies and accuses us of imperialistic design. We are charged with having for 19 months forgotten the Filipinos because they are colored peoples and America is rushing all her troops to the aid of other white men in Europe. This poison is being circulated among men and women who saw their brothers and sons die while struggling to keep on high the flag we love. Japan has rid Burma, French Indochina, Thailand, and the Dutch East Indies of white authority. She has given these peoples the illusion of liberty and has made them in their present state of dependency fertile fields for dissatisfaction with America as evidenced particularly by our Exclusion Act. Race hatred is the master weapon of the Nippon as well as the Nazi. It is our greatest threat to world peace.

The enactment of the proposed legislation is legally obligatory, morally necessary, and economically indispensable for our own best interests. It is not only an act of faith but of interest, sentiment, and justice on our part. By its passage we are showing ourselves big enough nationally to admit and correct a mistake. We remove the sting of Japanese propaganda. We eradicate the stigma of the enduring insult America gives to the people of China. We prove to a watching world that we believe China to be not a partner in word alone, but a valued friend and helpmate in war and peace.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that a quorum is not present.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 148]

Andrews	Furlong	Reed, Ill.
Arends	Gifford	Rivers
Baldwin, N.Y.	Hébert	Rogers, Calif.
Bates, Ky.	Hendricks	Rowe
Bulwinkle	Holifield	Scrivner
Carlson, Kans.	Hope	Sheridan
Chapman	Jennings	Simpson, Pa.
Cullen	Kleberg	Smith, Maine
Dewey	Lambertson	Stanley
Dies	Landis	Steagall
Dingell	Larcade	Taylor
Ditter	Lea	Towe
Domengeaux	Lewis, Colo.	Treadway
Douglas	McGehee	Vincent, Ky.
Eaton	Merrow	White
Ellsworth	Mott	Wilson
Elston, Ohio	O'Brien, Ill.	Winstead
Fogarty	O'Connor	Woodruff, Mich.
Ford	Plumley	Woodrum, Va.
Fulmer	Reece, Tenn.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 370 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

REPEAL OF CHINESE EXCLUSION LAWS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3070) to repeal the

Chinese exclusion acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3070) to repeal the Chinese exclusion acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes, with Mr. O'NEAL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, first, I wish to give a little of the historical background of this legislation. Second, it shall be my purpose to outline the technical provisions of this bill and to explain just what the bill does. Third, I want to enumerate a few of the reasons which seem to me to make this legislation highly desirable.

First, in 1880 a treaty was made between China and the United States, giving the United States the right to exclude Chinese from immigration to this country. This right doubtless was possessed by the Congress without treaty, but nevertheless the treaty was negotiated. From May 6, 1882, until June 23, 1913, the Congress of the United States passed 13 laws or parts of laws dealing with the exclusion and deportation of persons of the Chinese race. While Orientals generally have been excluded from admission to this country, it is interesting to note that the Chinese are the only nationals repeatedly specified by race in our statutes. These acts are replete with the expression, "Chinese persons or persons of Chinese descent." Even the Japanese are largely excluded under a so-called gentleman's agreement. In other words, under our existing laws the Japanese are given a preferred status to the Chinese. To date we have been more considerate of the vicious, treacherous Japs than we have of the kindly, heroic Chinamen. At the time the original Chinese exclusion acts were passed our immigration laws were very lax, we had no quota system, and the Chinese were immigrating to our west coast in hordes. There was great fear throughout the country, especially in the West, that cheap Chinese labor was going to vitally affect the American standard of living. In the intervening 60 years since the original Chinese exclusion acts were passed local and world conditions have vastly changed. In the meantime, we have greatly improved, strengthened, and tightened our immigration laws. We have adopted a quota system under which the citizens of various nations are admitted on a quota basis. Quotas are calculated not upon the number of persons living in the country from which the immigrant comes, but upon the number of the nationals of that particular country resident within the United States when the census of 1920 was taken, in relation to a total fixed quota of 150,000.

Now the second part of this discourse. H. R. 3070 was reported by the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization after careful and extensive hearings and deliberations. This bill first proposes to repeal all acts or partial acts which specifically exclude the Chinese from immigration to this country. The second section of the bill gives the Chinese a quota under which no more than 105 Chinese per year could enter the United States. This places China on an equal basis with other countries permitted immigration rights into America, with one exception. Whereas the quotas of other countries are based upon nativity, the quota given China by this bill is based upon nationality. In other words, no more than 105 Chinese could come into this country, regardless of where they live or where they were born or from whence they seek admission. However, section 2 gives a preference of 75 percent of this quota of 105 to Chinese born and resident in China proper. Section 3 of this bill permits Chinese legally resident within this country to become naturalized under existing naturalization procedure. At this time there are 40,000 Chinese aliens in the continental United States and about 5,000 in Hawaii. Only a select few of these could become American citizens under our naturalization laws. It seems to me this is a desirable provision. If a person is legally resident in America, if he is to continue living among us, he becomes a more desirable resident through citizenship. As a citizen he naturally has greater pride and interest in his community and in his adopted country.

Now for the third section of these remarks. Let me say just here that in matters of immigration I am a restrictionist. I have introduced a bill, on which I expect to demand hearings, to reduce all immigration quotas into this country for a period of 10 years by 50 percent. The bill now under consideration is not an immigration bill. This bill is a war measure and a peace measure. This bill has my wholehearted support, first as a matter of principle, second as a matter of policy. While I have always felt that anything right in principle is also good policy, I want to say a bit concerning policy before the principle involved is discussed.

It is a notorious fact that for many years the Japanese have been carrying on a propaganda campaign seeking to aline the entire oriental world behind Japanese leadership, seeking to set the oriental world against the occidental world. They have called it a campaign of Asia for Asiatics. This propaganda has generally been based upon two propositions insofar as the Chinese are concerned. And mind you just here, there is no propaganda quite so effective as true propaganda. The first leg of Japanese propaganda was that of extraterritoriality. The second leg has been the Chinese exclusion laws. Extraterritoriality, as most of you know, is an arrangement under which foreigners are not amenable to local law. Under extraterritoriality, Americans living in or traveling in China who committed a crime could not be tried by Chinese courts or punished under Chinese law. Americans, and for that matter Englishmen and certain other nationals, who committed crimes in China were tried in courts organized by their own country. Some months ago extraterritoriality was abrogated by Executive order. Thus this leg was pulled from under Japanese propaganda. Only the outmoded, no longer needed, discriminatory Chinese exclusion laws remain. Since Pearl Harbor the Japanese have greatly intensified this propaganda campaign. They have made and are continuing to make many overtures to the Chinese people. They have said and are saying that the English and the Americans have no interest in and no concern for China, that they are simply trying to use China for their own ends. They tell the Chinese that the American looks down upon him with contempt, that all of our professions of admiration and friendship for a courageous and heroic ally are hypocritical eyewash, that tributes paid to the Chinese by Americans are just so much lip service, that our only interest in the Chinese is one of exploitation, that our diplomacy is only a veneer of politeness, and that after all it is dollar diplomacy and Yankee imperialism.

To back up this tremendous campaign of propaganda, to give credence to their professions of being the champions of the Orient, the defenders of the weak against the strong, the Japanese have recently offered very generous peace terms to the Chinese, bending every effort to knock China out of the war or to greatly weaken the Chinese war effort. They have offered to return all Chinese territory occupied since the beginning of the present Jap-Chinese war, and to throw in Hong Kong to boot. They have continuously increased the Chinese Army under the puppet regime. This army is reputed at this time to number around 2,000,000 men. While it may sound a bit fantastic, if the Japanese could in fact break down the resistance of the armies of Chiang Kai-shek and knock China out of the war they would doubtless have at their disposal a considerable Chinese army to use in fighting the Americans. Therefore reason number one for this bill is to pull the second leg from under Japanese propaganda, to blast their campaign of Asia for Asiatics, to bolster Chinese morale, and to stimulate the fighting spirit of the Chinese. It would help to prepare a friendlier reception for American troops that will one day be moving into China for the use of Chinese bases. Military experts familiar with the present situation are confident that the enactment of this measure will save, in the last analysis, many American lives and will hasten the successful termination of the war.

Just here let me remind you, my friends, that China is much larger in area than any other nation in the world save Russia, and that China has by far the greatest population of any country in the world, approximately 500,000,000 persons. On a basis of enlightened selfishness, if we wish to put this act upon that basis—and I would not support this bill if I were not convinced that it would benefit America—on a basis of enlightened selfishness, therefore, I say

that anything that improves our relationship with China is beneficial to America. In personal relations, in business relations, and in national relations, good will is of tremendous value. The vast, undeveloped area of China and her 500,000,000 people offers to us by all odds our greatest potential market in the post-war world. China offers a vast market for the industrial output of this country. Billions of dollars of goods and equipment that may rust and rot in this country might well be marketed in China. Incidentally, China is by far the best potential market for many agricultural products of this country, including cotton, upon which my section of the country is so greatly dependent. Think for a minute what this trade and commerce with a resurrected and going China can mean in helping to solve the unemployment problem that will face this country in the post-war world. Good will and a tremendously profitable trade relation is certainly another good reason for the passage of this legislation.

Now, speaking of the post-war world, here is another thought about which little or nothing has been said. Madame and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek are great, democratic, Christian leaders of a new and awakened China. Since his election as President of the Chinese Republic, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek has announced that within a year of the end of the war a constitutional convention will be called to draw up and enact a constitution for the new republic of a new China. Is there anyone so callous and indifferent to the welfare of this great people as not to wish to strengthen the hands of these great leaders? To remove this stigma of Chinese exclusion will not only strengthen the hand of the Generalissimo in his war effort, but it will certainly strengthen his hand in his important program of post-war rehabilitation and stabilization of the politics and economy of China.

Now I want to talk briefly of the principle of this thing. Of course America is fighting for America, China is fighting for China, England is fighting for England, and Russia is fighting for Russia. Yet all are fighting to rid this world of barbarism and slavery. If we are so callous of soul as to be unappreciative of the sacrifices made by our allies for a common cause, then victories to be won will be of little meaning insofar as ultimate consequences go. China is now in her seventh year of war. She has suffered more than two and one-half million casualties to her military personnel, and approximately 10,000,000 casualties in civilian personnel. All of her great industries have been destroyed, her leading cities looted and occupied by the enemy, her schools and churches destroyed, yet China has fought on. Just where would we be today but for the sacrifices by China? China is our only independent, fighting ally who is not permitted immigration to this country. If there were no other reasons for the passage of this legislation it should be done as a small tribute to a gallant and courageous people.

This bill is the simplest, most inexpensive investment in world peace that has yet been proposed to this Congress. We are being flooded with literally thousands of post-war plans, many of them gargantuan in their scope. Much is being said about world banks, world R. F. C.'s, world commodity pools, and I understand that a $5,000,000,000 loan for the industrialization of China is now under consideration. Now, here is a simple act of friendship and good will toward one of the potentially great nations of the earth and it does not cost a cent. In my opinion it will pay greater dividends economically and spiritually than will nine-tenths of the serious post-war proposals. We have spent billions of dollars trying to promote good will and buy friendship around the world. This money is largely wasted because good will and friendship cannot be bought. Now we have a chance to perform a simple act which does not cost a thing, and which we know will bear much fruit of the kind we have been trying to purchase.

In summary, and in conclusion, this bill has my support because it will help to destroy Japanese propaganda of Asia for Asiatics, and to defeat their campaign of alienating the oriental world from the occidental world, because it will add substance to our professions of friendship for and admiration of a gallant, fighting ally, because it is shrewd psychology and smart international politics, because it will promote a sovereign and stable China in the post-war world, because it will help lay the groundwork for a tremendously profitable trade and commerce with China, thus helping to solve our problems of unemployment and economic stability in the post-war world, because it will help to win the war and then to win the peace, and finally, it is an act of equity and justice for which I hope my country will always be reputed, not only for her own sake, but for the safety and security of all people.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman has made a very fine statement. I wonder if there are now on our statute books any other instances of exclusion of nations or races by name.

Mr. GOSSETT. I think the Japanese are named in some particular acts, but they are excluded largely by a "gentlemen's agreement."

Mr. MASON. If the gentleman will yield, there is no nation named in our laws as to exclusion but the Chinese.

Mr. GOSSETT. May I say to the gentleman right here that China is the only independent fighting ally we have in this war that is not permitted immigration into this country.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I think that if we are establishing a precedent of removing the only named exclusion and doing it for a nation that is fighting for us, that is a very good precedent to establish.

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. My friend from Texas had something to say about the resident Chinese. I do not know just how many of them there are, but there are probably a good many resident Chinese who are not American citizens. Does the gentleman mean to tell the committee that he would agree to go as far following this as to grant citizenship to all resident Chinese?

Mr. GOSSETT. I would be willing to permit resident Chinese to become naturalized under our naturalization laws, those lawfully here and who are permitted to continue to remain here. I would prefer a naturalized citizen, who can qualify under our naturalization laws, to a resident alien.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. In other words, the gentleman would support a blanket bill to grant citizenship to all of the Chinese who are here and who are not citizens?

Mr. GOSSETT. No; I did not say that.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. What did the gentleman say?

Mr. GOSSETT. I said I would be willing to extend our naturalization laws to resident Chinese now lawfully residing in this country.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. That is the same thing.

Mr. GOSSETT. That is far from the same thing. Our naturalization laws are very exacting, if the gentleman will read them.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I wonder if the gentleman would not be willing to give us a little more information on section 2, which limits the quota to 105. I have heard it discussed among some of the Members here that under this bill a great many Chinese that live in, say, Hong Kong, could come in under the British quota. I think some of us would like to have that point cleared up.

Mr. GOSSETT. I am glad to have that question asked. Under that section no more than 105 Chinese can come in from England, France, Germany, Italy, or from the ends of the earth. Section 2 is based on race. Only 105 persons of the Chinese race can come into this country. Seventy-five percent of this quota of 105 is given to China proper, to persons born in and resident in China. In that particular this quota provision differs from existing quotas granted other nations now permitted immigration. In other words, an English Chinaman, a Chinaman who is a citizen of England, would have to come into this country under this quota of 105. I wish our other quotas included this formula.

Mr. BUSBEY. He could not come in under the English quota?

Mr. GOSSETT. He could not come in under the English quota.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the gentleman would like to have for the information of the House some figures he has compiled. The alien registration of Chinese in 1940 in this country was 40,244. The alien registration of Japanese was 91,858; of Filipinos, 83,677; of Hindus, 3,896; and of Koreans, 3,552. This makes a total of 223,197 Asiatics of alien registration. The total census figure of Chinese in this country as of 1940 was 77,504.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. May I supplement the statement of the gentleman from Washington by saying that of the total of 77,504 Chinese in the United States as of the 1940 census approximately 40,000 were foreign-born and 37,000 native-born, whereas the census shows as to the Japanese people a much higher proportion of native-born. At the same time it shows that in the period from 1890 to the present time the number of Chinese of foreign extraction has dropped from over 100,000 to 40,000. They are dying off. They are the old people of the Chinese race in this country.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The census figures as to the Japanese in 1940 showed there were 126,947.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The able gentleman from Texas has made a very able statement on this subject. I rise to ask this question. The Chinese people are not only a peace-loving people but a people who have always sustained themselves. Can the gentleman give the House any figures as to whether or not any Chinese in this country ever asked for maintenance or sustenance from the United States Government?

Mr. GOSSETT. I do not have any figures as to that, but I have never heard of one being on relief, and I have never seen any of their pictures in the rogues' galleries; that statement cannot be made as to some other races who have sent many thousands of immigrants here.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the gentleman will yield, I may say that I have a large number of Chinese in my home city of Seattle. It so happens that during the trying days of the depression as a matter of curiosity one time I did check the W. P. A. roll. We had some 40,000 people on the W. P. A. roll in King County, in the State of Washington, and there was 1 lone Chinaman on that roll.

Mr. GOSSETT. How many Chinese are there in the gentleman's community?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should say there are from 15,000 to 18,000 Chinese there.

Mr. DONDERO. I wish we could say as much for ourselves.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. Yes.

Mr. HOBBS. The gentleman has made a very fine statement in which I have been very much interested. I ask the gentleman how the quota of the Chinese was fixed at 105.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, our quotas are based on an intricate formula. I cannot explain it offhand, but it is based on the number of persons of that nation here in the census of 1920. The formula was explained to some extent by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], and it has been very carefully worked out. It is a definite figure, and no more than 105 can come in under the act.

Mr. HOBBS. I was wondering whether, with the formula as written on the statute books, the insult could be removed.

Mr. GOSSETT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MASON. I yield now to myself and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, in considering a bill to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act, as in the consideration of all other legislation that affects the welfare of this Nation, we should keep before us first, last, and all the time the question, What effect will this legislation have upon the general welfare of our people? On that point there can be no difference of opinion and no argument.

Therefore, keeping the interests of this Nation before me as the primary objective, I want to consider the effect of the passage of this bill from two different angles:

First. What will be the effect of its passage upon the war effort? Will it help or hinder the same?

Second. What will be the effect of its passage upon the post-war period? Will it aid or hinder us in providing jobs for our returning soldiers? Will it help us to preserve our American standard of living after the war is over?

I confess at the outset that in limiting myself to these two points of view, I am being entirely selfish and practical. I am deliberately ignoring the ethical questions involved and the moral justness of the measure. I am also excluding all sentimental arguments that might be made for lifting a stigma we placed upon a great people 60 years ago, the only people that can preserve peace in Asia in the years to come, and help us keep Japan in her place.

Mr. Chairman, taking up my first question, "Will the passage of this bill aid our war effort, and help bring the war to a speedy and successful end?" I am not a military expert nor a military authority; therefore in finding the answer to this question I must depend upon those who can qualify in those respects. Our military experts tell us that because of transportation difficulties we cannot today send China much material aid in the shape of guns, tanks, planes, food, and so forth; aid that she needs so badly in order to carry on her heroic resistance against the Japanese aggressor. These military experts tell us we must first recapture the port of Rangoon, now in Japanese hands, and reopen the Burma Road before we can send China the aid she needs so badly. Chinese military experts tell us that the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act will do much to stiffen up the morale of the Chinese people and to help offset Japanese propaganda against the United States concerning our treatment of the Chinese people over the years.

Mr. Chairman, Admiral Yarnell, an authority on the war situation in the Far East, considers the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act as a very necessary and vital part of our war effort. He testified before our Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to that effect.

And so, Mr. Chairman, judging from the testimony of these expert witnesses, the answer to my question, "Will the passage of this bill aid our war effort and help bring the war to a speedy and successful conclusion?" is an emphatic "Yes."

Mr. Chairman, I now come to my second question, "What will be the effect of the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act upon the post-war period? Will it aid or hinder us in providing jobs for our returning soldiers? Will it help us preserve our American standard of living after the war is over?"

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY], perhaps the best informed man in the House on international finance, international credits, and international trade, testified before our committee on the possibilities for American commerce in the post-war period. His testimony was complete, convincing, and irrefutable. In substance, he stated that China, with her 450,000,000 people, now on the verge of a great industrial awakening, offers the only real post-war market for American manufactured goods. He also stated that China will need billions of dollars worth of American products, and that she can pay for these goods because she has vast amounts of raw products that we need, and so can establish the international credits that go with a favorable balance of trade. On the other hand, Congressman DEWEY pointed out that while Europe after the war will need vast amounts of American products of all kinds, Europe will have nothing to pay for them, neither raw products, nor cash, which means, of course, a repetition of what happened in our trade relations with Europe after the last war. Congressman DEWEY left no doubt in my mind that the answer to this second question, or series of questions, is as emphatic an affirmative as the answer we gave to the first question.

Mr. Chairman, China is awakening from her long sleep. She is on the verge of an industrial revolution. She will need billions of dollars worth of machine tools after this war is over to help in her industrial development. She will need railroads built, railroad engines and railroad equipment for those railroads, farm machinery for modernizing her agricultural methods, road-building machinery to build the vast system of hard roads that will be required, and mining machinery to develop her vast mineral

resources. Best of all, China will have the raw materials and consequent international credits to pay for these things. So, Mr. Chairman, our potential trade with China after this war is over should furnish jobs to hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of our boys when they return from the war.

During the hearings on the proposal to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act the testimony showed that the act was passed in 1882 to prevent a flood of cheap labor that threatened at that time. Since then we have passed laws that restrict immigration by placing all European countries on a quota basis. Under a quota only 105 Chinese people could enter this country each year. Therefore, if the Chinese exclusion laws were repealed and China were placed upon a quota basis like other nations, at the rate of 105 Chinese immigrants per year, cheap labor from China—the problem of the 1880's—could never become a problem in the future.

Looking at the question before us—the proposal to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act—and keeping in mind the best interests of our people as our primary objective, I say we should repeal the act and thereby place China, our ally and friend, upon an equal footing with other nations that have been placed upon a quota basis. This, in my judgment, is the least we can do at this time to rectify our past mistakes in dealing with China, and to do justice to our most friendly ally in the present war.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the pending bill primarily because it nullifies a basic, thoroughly sound, and long-established rule of immigration in the midst of a world war. Fundamental immigration policies are irrevocably connected with social and economic questions which are usually disrupted in time of war. I am not opposed, however, to repealing those parts of our exclusion acts which specifically name the Chinese. In fact, I intend to offer an amendment to the present bill which will accomplish this very thing. We will then have placed the Chinese on equal ground with all other Asiatics which is as far, I think, as we may safely go at this time.

It is admitted that our policy of furnishing Japan with materials of war prior to Pearl Harbor was unfair to the Chinese and that we ought to make amends for it. But, is this the proper way to achieve that result? The Chinese are in desperate need of food and other munitions of war and gestures and the diplomatic maneuvering contemplated by this bill are pitifully inadequate to fill this desperate gap. It is conceded by everyone that this legislation will give the Chinese no material assistance. Its value is purely psychological and esthetic and it is very difficult to appreciate the esthetic things of life on an empty stomach and equally difficult to fight a war without adequate guns and supplies.

The question of whether our general immigration policy needs revision is going to be one of our most perplexing post-war problems and Congress should not attempt to deal with it piecemeal while the war is still in progress. Furthermore, I think it is desirable to await the return of our soldiers and sailors who are fighting on all of the world battle fronts before embarking on a radical change in our immigration laws. We ought to have the benefit of their judgment and advice based upon the experience they have gained in contact and association with peoples of other nations. We can be sure that they will have some definite and positive ideas on this whole general subject which will deserve, and should have, the serious consideration of Congress before definite conclusions are reached.

What is the real urgency of making this drastic change in our rules of immigration now? Those who favor this legislation say it should be passed now because it will accomplish two very important and necessary objectives; namely, that it will cement our relations with China and make her more friendly to us in time of mutual peril and, that its passage will deprive the Japanese of a potent propaganda weapon to the effect that we discriminate against China in favor of other allies insofar as immigration and naturalization are concerned. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this legislation will not accomplish either of these objectives and that it is dangerously unsound to say it will do so. In the first place, this bill does not give the Chinese equality on immigration with any European nation. So, when you talk about being fair to China by giving them immigration equality with our other allies the present bill is not the answer; for it very definitely discriminates against the Chinese in the following manner: Europeans may enter this country as nonquota immigrants if they were born in another country. For example, an Englishman born in South America comes to the United States as a nonquota immigrant whereas, a Chinese born in South America would be charged to the Chinese quota. Thus, you compel the Chinese to come here by race and permit Europeans to come on the basis of nativity. This result did not come about by accident. It was brought about by a studied and intentional limitation in this particular bill which says in the one breath to China, we are treating you on the basis of equality with Europeans, but in the next breath, it positively limits the number of Chinese by restricting their entry to race regardless of the country of their birth.

Now, you speak about fairness and equality to the Chinese. I assert, Mr. Chairman, as a matter of common sense and cold logic, that this legislation does not even approximate fairness or equality for the Chinese. Do you think for 1 minute that they are so abstruse that they will not discern the emptiness of this gesture. No, Mr. Chairman, the Chinese who understand what we are endeavoring to do here will not appreciate this meaningless action. Let us not proceed on the assumption that we are fooling anyone about this legislation. Let us rather act in entire good faith with China on this and all other propositions, for they deserve such treatment at our hands.

I would much prefer, Mr. Chairman, to tell the Chinese the truth; namely, that our immigration policy, from our own economic and social standpoint, cannot safely be treated piecemeal and their situation is just one part of our over-all immigration system. Let us tell China that we will consider this problem at the proper time, when the war is over and when we are called upon to consider the revision of our entire immigration system in the light of the facts and conditions as they exist in the post-war era and our own relation to other countries of the world. China is an understanding nation and will appreciate our position if it is stated in simple, plain, and direct language. So much for the first phase of this proposition.

The next important reason for the urgency of this measure—according to the advocates—is that it will cure enemy propaganda. I assert, Mr. Chairman, that it will create additional propaganda material which the enemy does not have at present, while it will do nothing to check the present Japanese propaganda. In the first place, this bill, while discriminating against the Chinese so far as the white race is concerned, does place them in a preferential class insofar as other Asiatic nations are concerned. The Japanese have been telling the Chinese that we are prejudiced against them because we do not treat them on an equality basis with the white race so far as immigration is concerned. This bill will do nothing to correct that criticism by the Japanese because, while we pretend to give the Chinese equality in this legislation, we do not do so for the reasons which I have heretofore pointed out. What we are attempting here is nothing but a sop to the Chinese and the Japanese will certainly tell them so, and, unfortunately, they will be telling them the truth.

While this fails to cure the propaganda situation as it presently exists it creates an additional propaganda weapon with respect to the Asiatics, particularly the Filipinos. By the provisions of this measure we put China in a favored position as against all other Asiatics, including the Filipinos who have been and are at present our own nationals. The Philippine Independence Act of 1934 gave the Filipinos a quota of 50 per year for entrance to this country but not for citizenship until the date of their independence and, thereafter, no quota for entry here or for citizenship. Do you see then what further difficulties this legislation creates for us? As far as I can observe, if we are to place China on a quota basis there is no valid reason for refusing to do likewise for other Asiatics and, particularly, the Filipinos.

Are not the feelings of the Filipinos to be considered in our deliberations and

actions on this subject? If we cannot do anything for them by way of liberalization of our immigration policy should we by deliberate act discriminate against them as we do in the pending legislation. Are not the Philippines an important sector in the Pacific theater of war? We have already witnessed the program of the Japs in their efforts to alienate the friendship of the Filipino and to make him prejudiced against us. Are we by our action today going to permit the Japs to make additional capital of their propaganda campaign in the Philippines? Certainly, and irrevocably, we will have done that very thing if we put this measure on the statute books.

I think we should pause, Mr. Chairman, and carefully consider the whole effect of this proposed action on our part. Will it not create more headaches than it cures? And is it not something that we may not later reflect upon with profound regret?

Why are we constantly being placed in a position where this country must do something to placate and assuage the feelings of other nations with too little realistic regard for our own interests. Are we doing nothing in this war effort, Mr. Chairman? Judging from their statements some of our leaders seem to feel that we are not. But what are the facts? At this very moment we are showering our money and resources upon the countries over the far parts of the earth—to such a degree in fact that when we have finished we shall have spent on this war more than the combined belligerents on both sides of the conflict—and we are doing all of this without final regard for our own ability to carry the burden. While at the same time it is becoming increasingly evident, if we believe some of the leaders, that we are in this war in theory and not in fact and that every one of our allies have only one purpose in view and that is to fight and win our battle for us. If we recognize the fact that we are probably putting much more into this war than we will ever get out of it, and getting less out of it than any other nation, we will immediately reach the opposite conclusion.

Are we doing nothing for China now, Mr. Chairman? Irrespective of what our past record toward China may have been, we are now making atonement in a very positive and material way. We have American boys by the tens of thousands scattered all over the Pacific islands and Far East areas, with only one objective in mind—to crush the military might of Japan, and the day that Japan is crushed China will be free. She will be free to take her proper place with all other free nations of the world. Is that not doing something for China in a very material way? Consider also the immediate postwar period. Will we not be called upon to play some part of giving China some assistance in her problem of rehabilitation? Will we not be called upon to join with other nations to help feed the starving people of China? These things are real. They are constructive. These are the things that will convince China of our sincere regard for them. Is it necessary then to tear apart our immigration system to cement our friendship with China? It is acts and deeds, Mr. Chairman, and not mere words that lay solid groundwork for sincere friendships between nations as well as men.

In conclusion, I want to make it clear that I profess to be no expert in the broad field of immigration. My opposition to this measure is basic and fundamental. I have endeavored to approach the problem as an average American trying to be realistic in my judgment and fair and just in my attitude toward a friendly neighbor. But I have concluded that what is being attempted here today is essentially an idle thing and will put us in the position of being constantly embarrassed in our relationships with other friendly nations. This problem is economic. It is social and domestic and we should look to its solution, if it needs solution, in the post-war period, when the hysteria of war with its sympathies and prejudices cannot warp our judgment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman indicates that this bill would not be a treatment of equality which we all desire. Would it be a better treatment of equality if we should abolish all quotas on foreign immigration? How does the gentleman feel about that?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I think we ought not to tamper with our immigration system and make it a diplomatic proposition in time of war. This whole problem of immigration is going to be very perplexing and difficult after the war. We have already had demands from people all over the universe who want to make the United States their haven when this war is over. I say we ought to consider this whole problem of revision of our immigration policy in the post-war period, as a post-war problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I hoped to be brief today, but inasmuch as the question before us deals with fundamental international problems, I think the record should be as complete as possible. First of all, let me point out to Members of the House that this bill, H. R. 3070, is a comprehensive, well-drawn bill, embracing the basic principle of several bills introduced in the Committee on Immigration. The pride of authorship lies with no one individual. The bill embodies the thought of a great many Members who have been thinking about the matter for several months. It is a subject to which the Immigration Committee has given ample consideration. I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] will agree that no bill before the Immigration Committee has received more consideration, about which more witnesses have been heard, and which has been more deeply studied than has been this particular bill. It is comprehensive. It is somewhat technical in its nature, and I know that many Members in reading the bill will be somewhat confused by some of its technical provisions, but I can say to the Members of the House that it has been approved by the Attorney General of the United States, and is well written to cover the subject desired. It repeals some 15 laws dating clear back from 1882 to 1913, and therefore it is, of necessity, comprehensive in its nature. I hope that when the bill is open for amendment we will not have technical amendments offered, because you could technically get this bill into such a mess because of previous actions of many Congresses that the membership would be confused so far as the language of the bill is concerned. After all, this debate is on basic principles involved. To clutter it up otherwise would be unfair.

A great deal has been said here today, and ably said, regarding the reasons for the bill. I merely point out that the Chinese exclusion acts, in my opinion, have been a great source of misunderstanding between China and the United States for over 60 years. I cannot say as some of the speakers have said today that the Chinese exclusion acts have caused widespread resentment in China. I cannot use that word "resentment," because I know the Chinese people too well. They are a proud and a tolerant race, but I can say that the Chinese exclusion acts for 60 years have been a source of humiliation to a great nation and a great people. The Chinese do not resent anything. They are an understanding, tolerant people, and may I say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] far over and beyond that, they are a spiritual people and there are some things, and I know my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] will agree with me, that the Chinese people value away over and beyond material things. These Chinese exclusion acts are a source of humiliation to a people of great character. Let me say another thing to clear the record. I do not think the Chinese think for one minute that the origin of the exclusion laws in this Congress was due to ill will toward the Chinese people.

Intelligent Chinese know that the reasons for them were economic. The able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] pointed out today that, at that time, the laws were well taken, not only to protect us against contract labor, but to protect our country from groups that exploited labor in those times. After all, the Chinese were brought to California for one thing, cheap labor.

That time and the economic reasons for the exclusion acts have passed. We have ample laws on the books to protect us against contract labor. We have ample laws to protect us against the influx of cheap labor. The economic reason was gone years ago. This House today

should consider this bill only upon the problem that it presents for today and the future.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I also want to call attention to the fact that even the 105 who would come in under that quota would come in under the immigration laws, which require proof of the moral and physical fitness of the immigrant, and that they are not coming in here for labor at all.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is right. But, take the number 105, for instance. I have a deep appreciation for the sincere apprehension on the part of some that this might be a wedge to let in more than that number of Chinese. But no intelligent person in this House can say that our quota system and our present strict immigration laws have not controlled all such cheap labor threats since the laws were enacted.

There is no reason why the same laws should not control 105 Chinese. Do you know how many that will mean per State? Two. I am sure the great State of Michigan will not be bothered by any two poor Chinese in any one year.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Of course, that is not the point I made. I do not have any objection to 105 Chinese. My objection is a basic objection to repealing fundamental law, and doing it now and doing it piecemeal.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me follow the gentleman's argument. The gentleman says we should not do this now; that we are repealing basic law. I do not think we are touching the basic immigration law at all. Do you know what we are really doing here today and tomorrow? We are putting the Chinese in under the basic law. They have been on the outside all the time. We are not touching the basic law.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. The gentleman will admit that what you are doing today does not put the Chinese on the same basis as the European nations, for example?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Well, I do not know. I did listen to the gentleman with great interest. Perhaps he would go further than we would go in this bill. I was inclined to believe that we had not done enough, and even maybe the gentleman from Michigan was not opposed to this bill, but if he was it was because we had not granted greater privileges.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Then I would be honest about it. I would not try to fool them as this bill does.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Well, I do not think the Chinese people believe that the Members of Congress, the proponents of this bill, are trying to fool them at all. As a matter of fact, the Chinese are pretty hard to fool.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In some respects, I will say that they are much more intelligent than some of us. I would like to model my own life after many Chinese precepts.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Then why should we try to fool them by the sop that this bill pretends to give them?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The gentleman may call it a sop, but I think I can point out that it is not anywhere near that.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I just wish to state in answer to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] that the bill is exactly as the leaders of the Chinese Nation asked and wanted, and are perfectly satisfied with.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And are wholly in accord with?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I wonder if the committee examined what the increase in the Chinese population due to natural causes of birth to 450,000,000 would amount to, and to possibly the informal or illegal causes, such as informal or illegal increases would be? Would that not probably be more than 105?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have not consulted experts on that question, and all I can say to the gentleman is that we had a hundred thousand Chinese in the country, I believe, in 1900, and that number has dropped now to 77,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not think it is fair to call legislation, the purpose of which is merely, as I understand it, to place our ally, China, on the same footing as occupied by an enemy, a sop.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the gentleman is exactly correct.

Now let me say this, and I need not address myself to the older legislators in this body than I, but we all know the practice of legislative stall. It is like one time when I was prosecuting attorney and I asked an old judge how to try the case. I told him that the evidence was against me, the witnesses were against me, and everything else, and he said, "Well, you then raise hell with the judge," he said, "divert the issue."

And, so it is as legislators, when we are against something, if there are no valid arguments we can advance to merit attention, the answer is to say, "Now is not the time to do it."

Let me say to this House that the status quo is the plague to all progress; it has always been so to legislative progress.

But, let me continue. I think we have covered the so-called basic immigration proposition. I think an adequate answer to that has been given. This is merely a segment, and the same underlying policies as to immigration exist as are embodied in the omnibus bill which was passed in 1935.

It has been said here today, and I notice in the minority report which the gentleman from Michigan signed, and from which I quote, it says:

> It would be desirable, we think, to await the return of our soldiers from all the battle fronts before embarking on a radical change in our immigration laws.

I wonder if it is unreasonable to assume that our soldiers and sailors and marines returning from the Pacific war front, fighting side by side, maybe literally side by side, with Chinese as brothers in arms, would not rather say to us that we, the Congress of the United States, have been derelict in our duty in wartime in not putting our brothers in arms on an equal basis with all the other allies. I have talked with servicemen and I think if this question were put to a poll of the armed forces of the United States whether we should repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act, the vote would be 99.44 for the repeal of the act. That expresses their opinion.

Mr. Chairman, I think the record ought to be clear here as to veterans' organizations. There was the statement by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] that the American Legion is on record against this bill. Let me say to the gentleman from Kentucky the only test vote that has been had by the American Legion on the repeal of the Chinese exclusion acts was taken in the home town of our able friend from San Francisco. The California Department of the American Legion, the home of the exclusion acts, on a vote on the floor, an open vote, of 4 to 1, endorsed this bill to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act. That action was taken to the national convention and the national convention took no action, but referred it to an executive committee which will act on it in November. That is the stand of the American Legion.

The minority report says that this will be one of our greatest post-war problems. That is correct as to Asiatic peoples.

Mr. Chairman, I merely want to have China in on those discussions. I think she is entitled to be in; I want to put China in the same category as Italy, Germany, the Rumanians, the Bulgarians, or the others, who incidentally are fighting against us. I think that is the least we can do for them, and by bringing them under the provisions of our immigration laws, any discussions we might have as to quotas regarding immigration, whether they are revised upward or downward, the Chinese, who are our allies, ought to be on the same footing as the other peoples of the world, and that is all this legislation does.

There has been a great deal said here about what the other Asiatics will demand. It has been pointed out that India is not an independent nation; that Korea is not an independent nation.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. India has a quota.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does India have a quota?

Mr. JENKINS. India has a quota.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wonder if the gentleman is not mistaken about that. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. JENKINS. Korea has a quota; Afghanistan has a quota; Japan has a quota.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Do you know how many come under that quota?

Mr. JENKINS. They have a hundred.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A hundred?

Mr. JENKINS. The minimum quota is a hundred.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana, a member of the committee.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. All countries have a minimum quota of 100.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; they have a quota, but we do not let them in, so they have no quota.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Asiatics are excluded from admission.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is right.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. But there is a minimum quota for all countries of 100.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It means nothing.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. Just for information, I was interested in what the gentleman from Illinois said regarding the officials of the Chinese Government being in favor of this particular legislation. I thought I had gone through the hearings in quite considerable detail, but I did not see any reference to that in the hearings. Will the gentleman enlighten me on that, please?

Mr. MAGNUSON. As far as I know, no representative of the Chinese Government appeared. I think I can explain to the gentleman why they did not appear. The Chinese have a very peculiar habit of asking for nothing.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Insofar as I know, no representative of the Chinese Government appeared officially at the hearings.

Mr. BUSBEY. Then, I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois the basis of his statement, just to enlighten me so I will have the information.

Mr. MASON. The basis of that statement was the fact that leaders of the Chinese Nation told me personally that this was exactly what they wanted.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I said, and the record is clear, the Chinese Government has not officially appeared at the hearings. Sure, the Chinese people, friends of mine, have talked to me about this bill. Why should they not talk about it? It is a thing of the utmost importance to them; but they are not going to come to us with their hat in their hand and their hands out asking for equality; they expect us to give them equality of our own volition and our own initiative, and we should.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. If the Chinese did do any lobbying before the gentleman's committee, undoubtedly they learned it from us Americans.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They probably thought it all right to privately express their views on this. The cold fact remains, however, that the statement in the minority report that we shall be placed in the position of discriminating against other Asiatic nations pretty much begs the question, because other Asiatic nations are not in the same position as China.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Chinese, Mr. Chairman, are not in the same position as the other Asiatic nations. It is amazing to read the history of our foreign policy for the past 150 years. In that time we have been pro-British and anti-British; we have been pro-Italian and anti-Italian; we have been pro-German and anti-German; and the same has been true with these and other countries toward us. But may I say to this House over a period since the dawn of the American Republic there has been one friend of America all the time and every time, and that has been the Chinese; they have never wavered, and that includes the Boxer Rebellion, because in that instance they were only protecting themselves. Paradoxically—and this is indicative of the great character of the Chinese—out of the Boxer Rebellion grew the indemnity that allowed Chinese students to come to this country. Those Chinese students who were educated in this country have gone back to their own country and are now many of the leaders in new China.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion let me say that this is the most simple thing in the world we can do, and this is the first time this Congress has had an opportunity not only to practice what we preach, but to do something concrete and practical, and something right and fair about our foreign policy right now. This is our first opportunity. I know we are going to do it. It is the easiest task before us.

And let me say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] that this is one thing that is not going to cost us anything but is going to repay us a million times over.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, let me ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] if it is his purpose to finish debate today and read the first paragraph of the bill, letting consideration under the 5-minute rule go over until tomorrow?

Mr. GOSSETT. We have had no particular understanding but if general debate is concluded today it will be rather late and I think that would be the proper procedure.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made heretofore today.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7½ minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ELLIS].

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Immigration Committee I believe it would be helpful to the Members of the House to give a brief history of this legislation.

First, I want to state emphatically that there is not a Member of this body who has a greater respect and admiration for the Chinese people than I. Through their courage, their industry, and their loyalty, they have won the respect of all civilized people.

This spring a bill was before the committee designed to grant citizenship to the wives of Chinese citizens of this country who have returned to China, married and many of them have reared families there. This bill was introduced in spite of the fact that if it became law it would be impossible for any woman or child to come here from China until many months after the end of the war in the Pacific. This is an example of the constant pressure to break down our immigration laws.

The witnesses in favor of this legislation consisted principally of representatives of the church who had worked in China in behalf of their denominations, statements made lovingly, not critically, and from persons who had served in China in other capacities. One of the witnesses was our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. He was the first to bring forth the moral issue that the existing exclusion law was a stigma on the Chinese people. He stated that the legislation under consideration was of little importance and would mean nothing to the people of China. He further stated that the proper thing to do was to repeal the exclusion law. This, so far as I know, was the first time this proposal had been placed before the committee. Then and there the germ was born to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act and the great moral question was injected.

The Chinese Exclusion Acts have been on the statute books for approximately

60 years. During this period the most friendly relations have existed between China and the United States. Over 6 years ago Japan began her undeclared war on China. The Chinese people have fought magnificently with very little to fight with. It has been almost 2 years since Pearl Harbor when China became our ally in this great undertaking and still she fights courageously. China knows that her best friend is the United States and that her only hope is in continued friendship. If this question has been so vital, where have the proponents of this measure been for the last 2 years or since China was attacked by Japan? China has been subjected to Japanese propaganda for the past 25 years and it will continue, and still she fights. Has General MacArthur asked for this legislation? Not to my knowledge. Has Admiral King asked for it? If so, I have heard nothing about it. So far as I know the President has only become interested since the question was injected before our committee. I am firm in the belief that the time has come for a complete overhauling of our immigration laws to the end that quotas will be materially reduced or completely stopped, at least for the period of readjustment following the end of the war. Our readjustment problem following the war is going to be of such magnitude it will tax the genius of America to solve it satisfactorily.

We have been told by high Army commanders that the morale of the soldier on the front was of the utmost importance and the responsibility of the maintenance of that morale is largely in our hands. I do not believe that our soldiers would be pleased to learn that we were relaxing in our immigration restrictions. We are not going to need a single immigrant in this country for many years following the war.

At this moment I want to pay my respects to the great number of immigrants who have come to this country and who have made excellent American citizens. The best service we can render to our allies is to make sure that we preserve a strong America. Then we can truly be a good neighbor.

You will be told that China's war activities are saving American lives. I am sure there are some of you who agree with me that our participation in the Pacific war is saving Chinese lives. Are not there some that will agree with me that our participation in Africa and Europe is saving Russian and English lives? If there are some who think that this legislation is necessary to keep China in the war we are certainly on thin ice in the Pacific. If you think that this legislation will be the means of keeping China fighting, you hold the Chinese people much cheaper than I do.

It is unfortunate that this bill was introduced. It is untimely and unnecessary. It is one of a succession of attempts to punch the first hole in the immigration dike.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, when gold was discovered in California in 1848 and white men flocked to the West to get rich quick and become gentlemen of leisure, it soon became clear that someone would have to do some hard work building railroads and bringing the soil under cultivation. Agents of the railroads and shipping companies recruited laborers in China and brought them here in large numbers, until by 1876 there were about 110,000 on the Pacific coast.

Inevitably some economic and social problems developed. The American population was still small and there were fears of being overwhelmed by a flood of Chinese laborers. We had not yet evolved the quota formula for controlling and regulating immigration. So we did the natural thing, and in a series of 15 laws or parts of laws passed between 1882 and 1913 we first "regulated and limited," then "suspended" temporarily, and finally "prohibited" Chinese immigration to the United States.

Then in our comprehensive Immigration Act of 1924, the quota system was devised. Aliens who were eligible for citizenship, that is, "white persons, persons of African nativity or descent, and descendants of races indigenous to the Western Hemisphere," were put on a quota basis.

A quota from a given country, according to the present formula, is "a number which bears the same ratio to 150,000 as the number of inhabitants in continental United States in 1920 having that national origin bears to the number of inhabitants in continental United States in 1920." All aliens not included in the above groups and therefore ineligible for citizenship were totally excluded, with certain limited exceptions such as government officials, students, professors, ministers, merchants, temporary visitors for business or pleasure, and so forth.

Since the Chinese are thus excluded by the general law, surely there was and is no need to continue on our statute books the 15 outmoded laws which single out the Chinese by name for special humiliating discriminations.

But is that where Americans want to leave the matter? Do we still want officially to stigmatize as congenitally inferior because their skins happen to be yellow instead of white, black, or red, the Chinese people who recognized the nature of this world struggle and held the line single-handed for 4½ years before we woke up?

Should we not now extend our quota formula to include the Chinese and put them on a plane of equality with our other allies? The Chinese have put more into this war to date than any other people. They have proved their friendship with their lives. Is it not time for us to prove our friendship by bringing our laws into harmony with what our attitude toward China really is?

A simple act of Congress, providing three things, will prove more to the Chinese than endless professions of our good will, or even than fleets of airplanes.

First. Repeal the old exclusion acts.

Second. Amend our nationality laws to make Chinese persons or persons of Chinese descent eligible for naturalization by the same procedures other immigrants follow.

Third. Allot an annual immigration quota to the Chinese. The established formula which admits a quota of over 65,000 a year from England and 17,000 from Ireland and 27,000 in normal times from Germany would give the Chinese a total of only 105 persons a year.

Just to state that simple fact should be enough, it seems to me, to answer the question whether we should not in our own country's interests take such action now.

The Chinese to be admitted under the quota would, of course, have to meet all the regular qualifications required of immigrants from whatever country, such as literacy, freedom from disease, good moral character, and financial responsibility, so that none would be likely to become a public charge.

There are no loopholes whereby persons of the Chinese race who were born in Hong Kong, for example, and therefore are British citizens, could come in under the British quota; or whereby Chinese persons born in Mexico could come try they are citizens.

The one quota of 105 would cover all persons of the Chinese race desiring to migrate to the United States, regardless of where they were born or of what country they are citizens.

Any fears of unfair competition arising from Chinese labor are completely unfounded, because few, if any, of the immigrants would be laborers. Even if all of them were, the number would amount to only three a year for Chicago. one a year for Washington, D. C., and one every 2 years for San Francisco. Can anyone seriously maintain that would be a threat to American labor standards, or deprive returning soldiers of jobs?

How about the Chinese aliens now in this country? Could they all, as well as the maximum of 105 entering each year, start taking out their citizenship papers? No; because an applicant for citizenship under existing law must have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. For many years only an insignificant number of Chinese has been admitted for permanent residence. Therefore, of the 40,000 Chinese aliens now in the United States, only comparatively few could successfully apply for citizenship.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Did I understand the gentleman to say, and I agree with him, a Chinaman in this country now who cannot show that he is here legally may not avail himself of this 105 quota?

Mr. JUDD. That is correct.

Mr. JENKINS. No. Whoever avails himself of the 105 quota must come from China.

Mr. JUDD. No Chinese person under present law may apply for citizenship, but when this bill is passed, he can if legally admitted for permanent residence. The bill amends the nationality laws and makes eligible for citizenship, in addition to persons of the red, white, and black races, "Chinese persons or persons of Chinese descent."

Mr. JENKINS. I think both of us are wrong. He could not be here legally unless he was born here or unless he is the descendant of someone who was here before the treaty.

Mr. JUDD. There were certain limited classifications who were admitted lawfully for permanent residence, like ministers and professors.

Mr. JENKINS. But they could not stay and become citizens. They could never become citizens.

Mr. JUDD. Not under the present law.

Mr. JENKINS. So, then, I think we must come to the conclusion that a law-abiding Chinaman who was born out of this country cannot be naturalized under this law because he must come in under that 105 quota and, furthermore, anybody coming in under this quota has got to expatriate himself, he has got to get permission from China before he can make application for citizenship here, else he will have dual citizenship.

Mr. JUDD. Those who are here would be eligible to take out citizenship papers if they can show they were lawfully admitted for permanent residence, and that would be in addition to the quota of 105.

Mr. JENKINS. I do not want to leave the impression, and I do not think the gentleman does, that any Chinaman born in this country is not a citizen. He is a citizen.

Mr. JUDD. Certainly.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I know the able gentleman from Minnesota spent part of his life in China and knows this subject. I rise, however, to ask this question. The claim has been made here this afternoon that if a member of the Chinese race came here from South America, he would be charged against the quota of China proper. What is the answer to that?

Mr. JUDD. No; he would not be charged to the quota of China proper, because you will notice that this bill does not give a quota to China, the quota is of Chinese persons or persons of Chinese descent.

Mr. DONDERO. I notice that is in the last line of this bill.

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. DONDERO. If that is so, and a person came here from South America who is of Chinese descent, would he not be charged against the quota of the Chinese Government proper?

Mr. JUDD. The quota would not be limited to the Chinese Government proper. If the gentleman will look on page 3 of the bill, line 17, he will see that it states "all Chinese persons entering the United States annually as immigrants." The Chinese would be a Chinese person even though he was born in Mexico or Brazil and is a citizen of Mexico or Brazil.

Mr. DONDERO. That is the point I am making.

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. DONDERO. But he would not be chargeable against China proper?

Mr. JUDD. He would be charged against this quota of 105 a year. The quota includes "Chinese persons and persons of Chinese descent," even though they are not citizens of China proper.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. I think that is not strictly correct, if I understand the bill. The bill gives 75 percent of the 105 to the nationals of China.

Mr. JUDD. That is right. Those who come from South America, and so forth, would be limited to 25 percent of the quota if the other 75 percent were taken up by persons from China proper.

Mr. GEARHART. That leads me to the other question. Does the gentleman think we are going to win the friendship of a nation of 375,000,000 people by telling them that 75 of their people can come into this country once a year?

Mr. JUDD. The issue, I should like to say, is not primarily winning their friendship; it is more retaining their friendship and their full respect. The issue is not how many are to be admitted. The fact that it figures out to be 105 is relatively unimportant. The important fact is that by our present laws they are excluded because of their color. It is not red, white, or black. This bill would remove that stigma of biological inferiority. If the same formula used for other peoples figured out to admit only 2 Chinese a year, it would still do the job. It would start treating them as equals racially instead of as inferiors. It would be justice. That is what they want, just as we would want it if we were in their place.

Mr. GEARHART. Are we not being a little supersensitive to this supposed insult?

Mr. JUDD. No, indeed.

Mr. GEARHART. We have a situation here where we have had the statute on the books for 50 years, and during that entire 50 years we have had the respect, the admiration, the friendship, and the high regard of the Chinese people.

Mr. JUDD. I wish I could agree with that statement in toto.

Mr. GEARHART. How are you going to protect that friendship by opening the doors to 75 of their number a year out of a nation of 375,000,000?

Mr. JUDD. Because people live by roses as well as by bread. No one is suggesting that roses will do what bread can do. But surely no one believes that bread will do what roses can do. There is such a thing as self-respect. We who are the descendants of 1776 ought to know of people who fought in the snow with bare, bleeding feet for such things as equality. That is the principle involved here. It is more important than just guns or even food. The actual numbers to be admitted do not count. The chief thing is the principle of being treated as equals. That is what I was going to discuss next, to try to show how this is of enormous importance from the standpoint of retaining for our country the confidence and good will of our associates in the Pacific.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman has spoken of the red, white, and yellow.

Mr. JUDD. The red, white, black, and yellow.

Mr. GEARHART. The red, white, black, and yellow, if you include the Chinese. There is another race called the brown, the Filipinos. Under our law relating to Philippine independence we limit the immigration to 50 until independence develops, and thereafter no Filipino is permitted to enter this country. If Japan is able to make propaganda out of the fact that we exclude the Chinese, what is Japan going to do to us in the Philippines when we admit Chinese and continue to exclude Filipinos?

Mr. JUDD. The Filipinos are not now excluded, they have a quota. I think without any question, I certainly hope, and I believe the gentleman will agree with me, that the day the Filipinos get their independence we should make their present quota of 50 a year permanent. They have been fighting with us as allies, as have the Chinese. It would seem to me incredibly unworthy of them and of ourselves for us not to give them a permanent quota of 50 when they gain their independence.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Do I correctly understand the gentleman to say now that the principal thing here is the matter of equality of treatment and not the number of Chinese who may be admitted each year?

Mr. JUDD. That is exactly right.

Mr. MURDOCK. Whether that number be 2 or 105?

Mr. JUDD. Yes. The quota formula that gives the English 65,000 a year gives the Chinese only 105. But that solves the problem. It treats them as equals.

The first time I had the privilege of speaking in this Chamber, last February, I said that we have to deal with our enemies and our allies on the basis not of what we think they ought to think, or of how they ought to feel, or of how we think we would feel if we were in their shoes, but solely on the basis of how we think we would feel if were were in their shoes, but solely on the basis of how they do feel. Most of our mistakes in the Far East, so tragic and costly

in lives and money, were made because we were inclined to assume that if we knew how many coal mines a nation had, and how many oil wells, and how many inhabitants per square mile, and how many bushels of rice they had per year per capita, and how many tons of steel they could manufacture, and how many ships and guns and planes, and how many miles it was from this port to that—then we knew all there was to know that was important. We thought we could predict what that nation could or would do in a given situation and make our plans accordingly. The theory was comfortable but unsound because it ignored the human factor, and it was therefore blown sky high.

Four and a half years ago, in April 1939, in testimony before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House on this very subject, I said, "Coequal in value with any set of facts is a knowledge of the psychology of the people who are going to use those facts." I was trying then to get us to understand Japan's psychology, and what her militarists intended to do, no matter how impossibly absurd it seemed to us. I wanted us to prevent this war. Now we must try to understand the Chinese and their psychology.

We were too little and too late with Japan. Are we going to be too little and too late with China, too? Are we going to insist stubbornly, against the testimony of every single witness who has lived in China and knows the Chinese well, that just because we cannot imagine that granting an insignificant immigration quota would mean much to us, therefore it cannot really mean much to them? Must a lot of American boys die needlessly before we realize that there still are some peoples in the world who care more about the things of the spirit than about the things that can be counted, measured, and weighed?

Tanks and planes and food are important; but equally important is the heart of the man who uses them. Men with guns but without hope of their own freedom do not fight very well, as has been demonstrated, for example, in the case of the Burmese, Malayans, Javanese, and the Italians when they realized that fighting would not win them their own independence but would only preserve a foreign rule over them. In contrast, all through history men without adequate guns but with hope of ultimately achieving from their struggle their own freedom and equality have fought unconquerably—witness the Norwegians, Greeks, and Chinese.

I am not for a moment suggesting that unless we pass this bill the Chinese are likely to fold up and end their resistance against Japan. I am saying they will fight many times as hard and more unitedly and with renewed offensive spirit if they are reassured that winning the war will not mean a continuation of discriminations against them by the West, but rather their full independence among the nations of the world.

If we were Chinese and had been fighting for over 6 years, much of it on the verge of starvation, without drugs or anesthetics, without weapons or industrial plants to make them, with increasing inflation and growing discontent, and therefore divisions among the people, would we not begin to ask, "Why are we going through all this? If by enduring and struggling till victory is ultimately won we are still going to be just a sort of subcolony, treated as inferiors by 'master' races, the white men, then why do we not make peace now and get the best terms that we can with Japan? Why not stop this slaughter of our people, why not stop this rape of our women, why not stop this taking away of our children, why not stop this complete disruption of all our lives? Why not get the best peace that we can and then let the Japanese fight it out with America? We held the line for long years while America made the money. Why not let her do the fighting a little while? Let us be realistic and practical and think of China first."

I regret to say that that sort of propaganda is inevitably increasing, especially from those Chinese in the Japanese puppet governments. They do not consider themselves as traitors. They think they are the true patriots and that Chiang Kai-shek is the traitor, because he has gambled his nation's very existence on his faith that the great democracies of the West, and particularly America, will stay true to their professed principles of justice and fairness and equality. Surely hard-headed concern for America's best interests requires that we hold up the hands of those who are our best friends and loyal supporters among the Chinese, rather than prove correctness of the criticisms of those disaffected Chinese, fortunately still astonishingly few.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. JUDD. I am sorry that I have not yet gotten to the main point of my statement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the gentleman's modesty. However, I think we should show the gentleman's knowledge of the conditions in China. The gentleman spent some years in China as a missionary, did he not?

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman state for the RECORD the number of years that he spent as a missionary in China, working among those fine people?

Mr. JUDD. I was privileged to work there for 10 years. I do not know whether I will ever be able to do my country much good as a Member of Congress; but I know that I did do a lot of good for my country by the 10 years that I spent in China as a medical missionary. I know that China has already repaid a hundredfold, in saved American lives and dollars, all the investments of life and money and goodwill we have made there in 125 years of missionary work. Let us not regard lightly that gratitude and faith in us.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. O'HARA. I assure the gentleman that I share the same admiration for the Chinese that the gentleman does, but I am very sure that they must appreciate that we are sending our boys out there to fight for the same interest that China has.

Mr. JUDD. That does not necessarily follow. They know that we could send our boys out there for no other purpose than to reestablish ourselves, or the white men, as rulers in Asia. They do not want to believe it, but they know that we could send them money and airplanes and men solely for selfish reasons and without the slightest intention of treating them as equals after the war. Granting them an immigration quota and making them eligible for citizenship is a totally different matter. It is understood instantly as a revelation of our basic attitudes and war aims.

Now, if I may proceed, I should like to examine the importance for our own country of this bill, from the standpoint of winning the war and of our long-term economic and political interests in the Pacific.

No one will dispute that this Nation is in the most critical hour in its whole history. The feeling of self-sufficiency and self-confidence with which we have always approached our problems is not wholly justified under the present circumstances.

The hard experience of a year and a half of war against Japan indicates all too clearly that we cannot win alone in the Pacific, or at least not without almost prohibitive costs. We can succeed only if our allies, and particularly if China, can hold against Japan until we can defeat Germany and get our full strength into the Pacific.

I do not think anyone today will dispute that conclusion; but if anyone should have a doubt as to how crucial it is to our own war effort that China continue to resist actively, the definitive answer was given 2 months ago by Admiral Ernest J. King, Commander in Chief of our American Navy. He said in a public interview that the key to winning our war with Japan was China, and emphasized it by asking us to imagine what our situation would be if China were to drop out of the war. He knows how many tens of thousands of additional American lives and billions of American dollars it would cost us if we had to fight Japan without China's wholehearted cooperation.

The question before us, therefore, is not just 105 Chinese immigrants a year. It is also our taxes. More important, it is thousands of American boys, perhaps even victory or defeat in Asia.

Japan's basic strategy, beginning in 1937, was to knock China out or to force her to give up in exhaustion or in disillusionment regarding her western allies. With China as a base on the continent, Japan would be impregnable, or so nearly so that it would require 4 or 5 or even 10 years to defeat her, and Japan gambles we will not be willing to pay such a price.

I had daily contact with Japanese officers and men for months after they seized the city in which I was working. They would say even then, and far more confidently since Pearl Harbor, "You Americans have lots of money and territory and resources, but we Japanese have spirit. We will win in a war with America. Or if we do not win, at least you will lose. Well, maybe we will not win this time. But if not this time, then we will win next time; and if not the next time, then the next time. Some day we will win."

We in America are up against something in this war quite different from anything we have ever faced before. Cocksureness regarding our own abilities is not enough. We must have complete understanding and confidence and teamwork with our allies.

Fortunately for us, Japan could not defeat China by direct assault the first 4 years of the war, so she had to turn elsewhere. She found that it was easier to defeat the French, the Americans, the British, and the Dutch, and make the long detour around Malaya into Burma to try to force China out of the war by blockade, than to knock her out by direct assault.

China has been able to hold out in the center against the fiercest frontal attacks Japan has been able to carry out.

Russia has held the northern flank, tying up over a half million of Japan's best troops there. The Japanese have never sent anything against us except their "second team." The "first team" has always been in Manchuria and Korea, neutralized by the Russians.

But we, the great, proud boastful white nations, could not hold the southern flank. That is the hard, painful fact. And the Chinese have no reason yet to believe that anything more than a token attempt will be made during this present dry season to break the blockade in Burma and reopen lines of communication to China by land or by sea.

The Chinese have endured over 6 years of bombings and invasion, famine, disease, dislocation of all normal life, uncontrolled inflation, enforced migration of over 50,000,000 people, and a year and a half of almost complete blockade. All of these physical disasters have not caused them to waver. Only one thing could cause them to waver, a loss of expectation that they will eventually get full independence and equal treatment by other nations of the world, a loss of confidence in the real and ultimate motives of us, their allies.

Unfortunately, there have been some things that could legitimately cause thoughtful Chinese to be disturbed about their western allies. You and I may be sure that their fears are unfounded, but just what would we think if we were in their place and observed such things as the following:

First, that the western nations never made a single move against Japan's aggression until she began to interfere with the white men's empires. We all protested, denounced, and condemned, but we never made a real move until Japan went into Indochina. She could loot, murder, burn, slaughter, and destroy at will in China, but we began to take real steps against her only when she started interfering with the white man's colonial system. Could that mean that the western nations never had any intention of helping or even of letting China become independent and strong, but were concerned only in maintaining their own supremacy?

Second, our failure to make good, thus far, on our promises. You will remember that on March 15, 1941, just after the passage of the Lend-Lease Act, the President promised that because China wanted and needed help in her gallant struggle, we were going to see that she would get, along with our other allies, "unqualified, immediate, all-out aid." More than 31 months have now passed. When you are hungry and besieged and discouraged, 31 months is a long, long time to wait for "unqualified, immediate, all-out aid."

I do not think we should have made any such promise. The logistics problems were as apparent then as now. China knew far better than we how difficult it is to get supplies to her. She did not see how it could be done, but when we promised it, we who have so often talked about our ability to do the impossible, naturally she thought that we must have methods and means for delivering the goods. The net result is not to increase her confidence in us, but to make some Chinese begin to wonder whether we really intended to get adequate help to them until after we finished in Europe so that we could then come in to give the final blow ourselves and thus be in a position to dictate how things are to be in Asia after the war.

Third, our joint failure, after 4 years of watching Japan move steadily southward, to be ready for her in the Philippines, Malaya, Dutch East Indies, and Burma.

Fourth, the speeches of Mr. Churchill declaring his intention to reestablish the British and French Empires. I have hesitated long about bringing this matter up. I do not want to be misunderstood as trying to create disunity between America and England. Nobody can accuse me of being anti-British. I was begging that we help England, out of concern for the safety of our country, 2 years before most people in America would realize that these aggressions around the world were of any real danger to us. But one cannot keep silent when the stones are crying out. We owe it to our own men to evaluate frankly anything which has a deteriorating effect on the morale and loyalty of 450,000,000 people on whose will and ability to keep on holding Japan our own hopes for an early victory so largely depend.

You will remember that last November, within 10 days of the time we landed in north Africa, and for the first time it seemed clear that we were reasonably certain of winning the war, Mr. Churchill very skillfully declared his war aims. That was clearly his right. No one can have anything but the highest admiration for his toughness in looking after the interests of his country as he sees them. He is a giant on the battlefield, and we in America should be, and will be eternally grateful to him for the courage and valiance of his inspired leadership and indomitable will in the last 3 years.

He intends to win the peace for Britain as well as the war. He drives down his stake first, gets his goals out in the open first, and then if we, or China, or anybody else should not agree with some different objectives we are told we must not declare our own aims or ideas because we would be "creating disunity."

As a matter of fact, if we believe in the Atlantic Charter, about which we have talked so much, then he was the one who was creating disunity when he declared war aims quite at variance with its noble ideals.

I am all for unity, but if to get it America must surrender the historic position and principles from which have come all her greatness—that is too high a price to pay.

And I do not admit it is a necessary price. He was not ashamed to state what his war aims are. Why should we hesitate to be equally frank and aboveboard about ours?

He said:

> Let me make this clear, in case there should be any mistake about it in any quarter: We mean to hold our own. I have not become His Majesty's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire.

Less than a month later he said in a broadcast that it might be a good thing if the war in the Pacific did not end until after the defeat of Germany. The necessity for still fighting together against Japan might enable the Allies to hold together in Europe instead of quarreling over the settlement there. That could only mean to the Chinese that prolongation of their sufferings was considered of no consequence. The Chinese were just so many million of flies. The thing that was important was that the Allies get agreement in Europe. The white man and his civilization must be saved no matter what happened to anybody else.

Then, this last spring, in a message to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, Mr. Churchill assured him that when the job in Europe was done we western nations would come over and "rescue" China.

Now may I suggest that the Chinese do not care to be "rescued" by the British or by us, or by anybody else, any more

than George Washington and the colonists wanted to be rescued by the French. What they wanted was to be free. They wanted France to help them win their independence. They did not want France to rescue them and then establish herself in control.

Fifth. The thing that shook Chinese confidence most of all was not what Mr. Churchill said; it was what we have not said; our failure to give any clear indication that we have any war aims other than his. The Chinese are a wise, patient, and understanding people. They know that Mr. Churchill was brought up in India in Kipling's day. They know that it would be asking too much to expect the Tories who built the British Empire to change their ideas now. They know that only time takes care of some things. They know that another England is coming along in which they have confidence, as have I.

That is, they did not expect a man with Mr. Churchill's background to come over to our side and our views; but on the other hand, they did not expect people with our background to go over to his side, his views; did not expect that America, after standing for 167 years, as no other nation in history, for human freedom and equality above all else, would appear, by her silence, to be approving white men's empires in Asia. That is the dagger in China's heart. That is what drives some Chinese to wonder, almost in despair, whether we in the west really want China ever to be independent and strong in her own right.

The Japanese propaganda ceaselessly hammers, "Why are you Chinese pulling America's and England's chestnuts out of the fire? Do they treat you as equals?"

Surely it is understandable why many tired, starving, and sick Chinese might begin to wonder whether help to them is being deliberately delayed until after Hitler's defeat, so that the white man can then come in to make the kill and thus be left sitting on top in Asia, the old status quo restored.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JUDD. Thank you very much. What I am trying to say is that it is absolutely imperative that we correct any such impression quickly.

Fortunately, we do not have to have a head-on collision with any of our allies in order to make clear our own war aims as far as China is concerned. We can prove, by passing this bill giving the Chinese an immigration quota on the same basis as other countries, that America stands for freedom and equality today as always. It would not create disunity among the United Nations or be critical of any other nation's policy. It would merely establish our own. Our action would be tangent to England's, not directly opposed. Mr. Churchill drives down his stake there; we drive down ours here. He makes clear what he stands for; we make clear what we stand for "in case there should be any mistake about it in any quarter."

Such an act would rekindle the fires of hope in the hearts of millions who want to be with us, if they are sure that this war is for their freedom, too. It would invigorate and galvanize them into redoubled effort and offensive spirit as no amount of pronouncements or even of planes and guns can do. It would be a deed—not just another word.

Where else can we get so much for so little?

When America was a little group of 13 struggling colonies with a population of only a million, she was strong. She knew what she believed in and stood for it unashamedly and unflinchingly before the world. She did not hesitate, in Washington's challenging words, to "raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair."

Now that we have become the most powerful Nation in the world, why should we be so timid and fearful, so half apologetic about our beliefs? We are inclined always to ask, Well, what will Mr. Stalin think or what will England or some other country do? Why do we not decide what we ourselves think and believe? Why do we not have confidence in ourselves and in the rightness of the great principles on which the Nation was founded? We are the only people in the world who do not begin to appreciate our own country's strength. Eighty-five percent of the peoples of the world will give their unqualified loyalty and confidence to America as to no other nation if only we will remain true to our noble heritage and conduct our affairs not by attempts at clever outguessing and outmaneuvering others but by steadfast adherence to our basic belief in human liberty and equality.

With regard to China, then, it seems to me it is imperative that we do two things: We must get more material help to China, more guns, planes, medicines, munitions at the earliest possible moment; and we must get more political help, more encouragement, more to justify and strengthen China's confidence in us and our purposes.

We have all seen the necessity of taking the military offensive just as soon as possible; we have not seen how necessary it is that we take and win the political offensive even more quickly.

The less that we are able to get to them in military assistance, the more important it is that we get to them more spiritual assistance during these times of greatest testing.

The most dramatic and helpful thing imaginable would be for us to put the Chinese on the same quota basis as our other allies and thereby begin treating them as equals now. It may seem to us only a trivial gesture, but to them it means very much, indeed.

Time and again in this debate it has been said that we should not do anything about this matter until the boys get back; but is it not far more important for us to make sure that they do get back, alive and sound? Chinese soldiers can fight on little more than two bowls of rice or millet gruel a day. They are partially immune to many of the tropical diseases which caused many more casualties among our soldiers in New Guinea than did Japanese bayonets and bullets. During the first years of the war, before physical and mental exhaustion began to develop, they made as good a record in fighting the Japanese, with no weapons save small arms, wits, and sheer courage, as we were able to make in our first year with all our mechanical and other advantages.

We are sacrificing American lives insofar as we fail to mobilize fully the will and the confidence of so indispensable an ally. I do not want on my hands the blood of a single additional American soldier who had to die in China because we failed here to show our purpose to treat the Chinese as equals, and thereby weakened China's morale and will to fight offensively.

So, Mr. Chairman, I repeat, this bill involves more than 105 Chinese immigrants a year. It involves the lives of American boys. It involves the financial solvency of our country. It is difficult enough to get military supplies to China for China's forces. If they have to be replaced by American men it will require far more materials, and the men in addition. How many years do we think we can stand our present rate of expenditures for war?

I said in the beginning that most of our errors in the Pacific have been the result of our failures to understand the peoples who live there. Fortunately for us, Japan has thus far been even less astute than we in dealing with the Chinese. She could have had the Chinese on her side. She could have led Asia. Instead, she tried to drive it, and she cannot drive it any more than we can.

But we cannot gamble our future in the Pacific on the assumption that no matter how many mistakes we make, the Japanese will make even more and worse ones. There is a lot of evidence that they are beginning to be smart enough to try to win the political offensive before we wake up. All they need to do is to start treating the Chinese and other Asiatics better than we treat them. Where their airplanes used to drop bombs on Chinese cities, they now frequently fly over, dip their wings, and drop food.

Therefore, it is too precarious to wait until after the war to deal with this issue, because without China we have absolutely no assurance we will win it. The risk in waiting is too great.

To make this change in our immigration laws is as important for our economic interests in the post-war world as for our military interests now. I understand the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] plans to discuss this matter in detail. However, at the risk of boring you, I want to repeat some arguments I have presented on this point previously, because I believe they are so very important.

In order to supply ourselves, our allies, and hungry millions being liberated from

the Axis, we are building up in America productive capacity far in excess of what we at home can consume, or at least more than we can buy and pay for. After the war we will be left with an enormously overbuilt plant, agricultural and industrial. We must then either drastically reduce our plant to what we can consume, which would mean putting millions of men and women out of work at the very time soldiers are being demobilized, and we need several million more, not fewer, jobs; or we must find new markets for our surplus productive capacity. There are only two places—at home and abroad.

We need to be planning now to multiply jobs by building up in every possible way new industries here at home; but, with all the expansion conceivable, the American market alone simply cannot be enough to keep the American farmer and manufacturer and laborer at full employment.

China, if friendly, will present tremendous opportunities for our products, our technical assistance, machinery, and equipment in developing new industries there, railways, highways, and so forth. Furthermore, she will not have to borrow from us to pay for her purchases as did Europe last time. She produces many things which we need and with which she can pay for what she buys from us.

Expanding trade with a friendly China will make a great many more jobs for Americans both here at home and in China than admitting 105 Chinese a year could possibly take away.

To prove our intention to treat China as an equal is not starry-eyed idealism or sentimental generosity. It is good, hard business sense.

It is also strongly in our political interests, our hope for security in the Pacific. Much as we need China now to help win the war, we will need her as much or even more to help establish and maintain a stable peace.

We have learned the hard way that we cannot get security by ignoring the rest of the world, because the rest of the world simply will not ignore us.

On the other hand it is clear that it would be suicidal for us to try to get security by just building up a gigantic Army and Navy and Air Force to try to rule the world. Other nations would unite against us just as surely as we now unite against those who would control us. We simply do not have enough resources or money or manpower to sustain such an attempt. It would mean permanent militarization of our country, one to three million men permanently in uniform, constantly increasing taxes and debts, steadily falling standard of living. Would we Americans accept permanently such restrictions?

The peoples of the world are on the move. We cannot hold them back. We cannot drive them. What, then, can we do? We can lead them—if it be not on a basis of superior and inferior but working together for the security of all as the true way to promote the security of each.

In short, America after this war is going to need friends and need them badly. Therefore we dare not trifle with the friendship of that nation which will inevitably be the strongest in Asia. The burning question is not whether we will help China; but whether she will help us, now in the war, and afterward in the peace.

Those who think we can continue to leave as it is a statute which is an insult to our friends and not eventually suffer for it are, I believe, grievously mistaken.

In addition to the disservice which our exclusion of the Chinese does to our own military, economic, and political interests it violates the finest traditions and the moral sense of the American people. Under our present laws Hitler is admissible to our country and eligible for citizenship; Mme. Chiang Kai-shek is not.

In the last analysis it all comes down, I suppose, to what we really believe. Perhaps we have few more important things to do today than to think that through.

Do we really believe in 1943, as our forefathers did in 1776, that all men are created equal in worth and in the right to be treated justly on the basis of what they are as individual human beings, not on the basis of the race to which they happen to belong? Do we really believe that there are certain inalienable human rights, such as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness? If so, then let us make it unmistakably clear by our words and our deeds, and quickly.

This bill does not remove our immigration barriers; it merely removes discrimination from them. It does not tear down our immigration laws; it improves them. It does not abandon the principles on which they are based; it merely extends them.

The alleged risks in taking such action are microscopic compared to the benefits to be gained. The risks in not taking such action are I believe genuine and serious. If there are risks either way, then why not base the decision on principle rather than expediency? It might turn out, as it has rather consistently in history, that what was right would prove in the long run to have been also expedient.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ELMER].

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Chairman, repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws is based on two principal premises.

First. The United States has done an injustice to China, which should be rectified.

Second. It will help China and us to win the war.

The first premise confesses our Government, Congresses, Presidents and people have been wrong for 60 years. I deny it. If it had not been for these legal restrictions our country would have been filled with Europeans and Asiatics and our problems vastly increased as to alien influences and dangers. No injustice is done to China, greater or above that to other Asiatics, and any country has a right to protect itself; that is what these laws did. To elevate China now above the other Asiatics is a discrimination against them and lays the foundation for future disputes with them. We may ignore them now in our enthusiasm to correct our alleged mistakes to help an ally, but these questions have a way of flapping back in our faces. Also it will raise new problems along other fronts. Most of this move is based on sympathy and shame-facedness along other lines, not because we have erred on the exclusion question. A few years ago when the Boxer Rebellion was on and for years afterward our pet name for them was "Chinese devils." They were fighting then for their country just as much as they are doing so now. They were trying to defeat a partition of China. The exclusion acts were heartily approved then. We just did not like the Chinese. But now we want to show our sympathy so we repeal the exclusion laws because some Americans want to ease their consciences over more recent treatments and others want to arouse our sympathy to a high pitch for other motives, ulterior to our safety and well being. The sympathy so lately aroused and the compunctions of conscience so lately developed, to me have somewhat of a "phoney" ring. When did the Chinese devils become Chinese saints? Personally I never had any particular feeling for them and nothing against them. They did not fit into our system of things. To us they are aliens in China; they are aliens in this country. They did not assimilate. All were pretty well satisfied with the present situation, even the Chinese, for I have read some 1,000 pages of recent Chinese historical books since January 1, 1943, and not one of them mentioned the Exclusion Act as a matter of consequence, much less a controlling factor in Chinese life, as now urged. So far as I am aware the Chinese authorities here never sent a witness to our committee, nor asked for any favor. All the witnesses were of our own choosing. The Chinese felt it was an American question to be discussed and settled by us. Why then this agitation? Why this self-incrimination over a policy of 60 years ago? Why this sudden face about? You will have to dig deeper than the Exclusion Act to find it.

China has been in war 7 years. The evidence before our committee shows that at least one-fifth of her territory—the very best she has—her coast lines, rivers, harbors, big cities, rich farm lands, most of her industrial area are in Japanese hands and over 200,000,000 people in these areas are under Japanese control, with many of them openly espousing the Japanese cause. Some of the witnesses were Chinese, notably a fine young woman, intelligent, beautiful, and fascinating, so much so, she nearly broke up the committee—and like the sirens of antiquity singing to the tied sailors—lured every member under 70, from safe and sane anchors, into the realm of visions and dreams. Testimony and other information revealed that even a greater percentage of the territory and population of China was

under enemy domination; and that Chinese applauded when the English colonials were taken from the Hill in Hong Kong by the Japs and jailed. They could not restrain their happy feeling. This was on the basis of "Asia for the Asiatics," and the foreign domination by occidental nations was so bad any change was welcome I do not blame them. No nation has the right to boss, control, and govern another nation or people. And I will welcome the day, and millions of people will applaud, when the baneful influence of Great Britain is removed from the United States of America, and American Senators, reporting their honest findings to their people, are not compared to monkeys, with approval of high officials of our own country.

All of these things came about in China while we still thought of them as "Chinese devils"; before our consciences were awakened; before the sere wore off. During all this time we thought so much of the Chinese, and their struggle for self-preservation, we sold Japan billions of dollars worth of oil, iron, guns, ships, powder, shells, food, and all other implements, to use against China in the war. On December 5, 1941, ships cleared from Pacific United States' ports loaded with such stuff for Japan. Friends of China protested to the Government and commercial interests, but the answers were, in substance: "This is business—world commerce." Perhaps we were aiding our exclusion laws by making sure a lot of Chinese would not apply for entry and citizenship.

Then came Pearl Harbor, December 7. All at once we discovered the saintly qualities of the Chinese people. If it had not been for December 7, I do not know if we would have ever found out how good they were. Since then we have been extending a lot of sympathy, at least, and some material help. But after these years of wholesome neglect, even active aid to their robber enemy, and when it serves our own national interests, we apply the Unguentine to our seared, sympathetic consciences and offer to them the strictly "American made" soothing sirup, with plenty of opium, the repeal of the Exclusion Act, and admit to citizenship 107 of the unkilled Chinese, from China, and all other parts of world. Then we rejoice, even sing it from the throne: "We have brought forth fruits, meet for repentance."

It is a wonderful thing. We have killed two birds with one stone. We have cemented Chinese friendship forever, and dealt Japan a deadly blow. All these years we had just been coddling Japan along so as to give us time to prepare for this terrific assault on her morale. We have saved the face of the Chinese by elevating him above the Jap. The Jap has lost face and will now commit suicide. Our good friend and fellow Congressman, Dr. JUDD, of Minnesota, can now rank as a statesman of two continents. For if it had not been for the distinguished doctor our knowledge of China would still be in the embryonic stage.

But I am constrained to pull the curtain back a little. We had before our committee H. R. 2076—applicable, in reality, only to China—sent out over my vote and passed this House without it, providing that seamen deserting any Allied ship in our country could be immediately arrested and deported to the country from which they enlisted as seamen. This bill was due to a decision of a Federal district court, which ruled such seamen had to be deported to their homeland. Over 1,000 Chinese seamen were then at Ellis Island, detained as prisoners, because they refused to return on British ships to British ports, on account of low wages, brutal treatment, and sending them to the most dangerous war zones. We wanted to make them serve our ally so we passed this bill to amend the judgment of the court. It did not look right to me. But national interest must come first. In the Senate it passed, but later when attention was called to the injustice done to an ally by an ally for an ally, the Senate recalled and amended the bill July 6, 1943, by attaching a provision "deporting might be to a country proximate to the country of which alien was a citizen or subject, or to any other country with the consent of the alien's country." This was agreed to by this House July 7, 1943. This House bill brought a vigorous protest from the Chinese Government, resulting in the amendment, which was accepted by China. We had an ax to grind and we were willing to make China turn the grindstone. The enactment of such legislation at this late date does not show our national conscience was aroused to that high pitch of international brotherhood we have heard so much about in the discussion of this bill. Do you think the Chinese will be fooled by this cheap gesture of international comity? Will it help win the war? If so, small matters decide wars. China cannot quit. She must fight to live. With most of her valuable territory gone, dissension within her own ranks, contending rebels, selfish interests, international commerce, her new President has almost an unattainable task. We sympathize with him and his great wife in their supreme struggle and may they succeed. But I would not insult their intelligence and patriotism by voting to impress their seamen, for self-interest, and then offer them citizenship for 107 of their nationals, for self-interest, to help us win the war. If we have to rely on China to win the war, we have already lost it. We are the one to help China.

Behind and beyond all this manufactured sentiment to help China and "save our face" is a determined and well-financed movement for another purpose. The copious tears shed for the Chinese are only a few drops compared to the dramatic climax of The Rains Came that is to follow. Already bills have been introduced here to admit all the oppressed, Hitler-persecuted people of Germany and other European countries into our country for the duration of the war and 6 months after peace is restored. Are you in favor of that? If you are, we might as well repeal all our immigration and naturalization laws and let foreigners take over the United States of America before the "one world" is established. You can prepare for a blitzkreig of sympathetic eloquence over the plight of Jews, Gentiles, church people, and Masons in Europe and Africa. Plights which are real. For nearly every nation of Continental Europe has chased out Jews, abolished Masonry, and closed churches. They have done this by laws and decrees. It has been so widespread, there must have been compelling reasons for their actions. It is not altogether based on racial and religious, or antireligious, grounds.

We in this country, with our Constitution, free institutions, love of liberty, and freedom from persecution cannot approve such legislation or action. But it is not of our making. We cannot afford to open our doors of hospitality to them. In such a horde there are bound to be many "isms" contrary to our aims and Government. It is idle to say they will be returned to their native countries. They will be here to stay. Any attempt to deport them after peace is restored would only bring a new flood of immigration and naturalization bills before Congress, and so many tears the seas themselves would overflow.

We have enough problems at home now, even racial ones, which require statesmanship and Christian consideration. We are sitting on powder kegs in many areas. There is a tendency of some to ignore, others to coddle, and still others to use intimidation and force to solve these problems. There is something to the Negro question besides getting his labor and his vote, and the white man owes it to himself and the colored man to solve it. It can be solved on a just and abiding basis. The Negro is an American by birth, environment, teaching, education, and nature. He lives among us, accepts our manners, language, religion, songs, and civilization; works for us, learns our trades and professions, and is indispensable to our industrial life. He gets most of his training from his white friends. When the time comes he fights with us and knows it is his fight. In his 80 years of freedom he has made more general progress than any other race ever held in slavery. His advancement is one of the marvels of human history. His civilization is not ancient. It is young. He is not tied to precedents that bar progress. He is a part of our great body politic. We can, and do, trust him. He has an affectionate regard for the white man who treats him right. The great Negro knows his position in his country, is not and never will be, due to social equality with white people. It is the white who thinks color and the black who thinks force is supreme that cause trouble and miss the synchronizing of the two races.

Without prejudice, ill will, disrespect, or contempt for any nationality, I would prefer the millions of colored people now in this country to be our citizens than a like number from any of the Asiatic countries.

There is one safe course for us to pursue. Keep America for Americans. Treat all people fairly and friendly. Intercourse and commercial relations with all, entangling alliances with none. Never place our stamp of approval on the oppression or enslavement of any people. Clean our own skirts at home in racial matters. Tighten instead of loosening our immigration laws. Other countries, England and Canada, will not admit Chinese. Even Americans cannot work in England. Why then should we be the dumping ground for world population? This country needs a new birth of Americanism. It is almost a disgrace now to prefer our own country over other nations. For me there is one country, one people, one flag. I know no other and will not bow down my knee to any political Baal.

You enact this law and you have taken off the stakes and riders of the immigration fence. It will be easy to push down the rest of it. Raise it higher, strengthen it more, close the gaps. Make it like the Missouri lawful fence: Horse high, bull-strong, and pig-tight.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri who just preceded me cites various incidents in our past relations with the Chinese in which it is quite possible that we have made mistakes. Nations, like individuals, make mistakes, yet again like an individual, if a nation makes a mistake it is only the part of intelligence to recognize it and correct it. I do not know whether the bills excluding the Chinese were a mistake at the time they were passed. There is at least some reasonable opinion to the effect they were necessary in order to keep up the standard of living of American workers; but it is quite evident that any usefulness, if such there was, no longer exists. When the reason for discrimination no longer exists it is unfair if we retain the discrimination. The desire to sustain our living standards was what undoubtedly animated the American Federation of Labor, for instance, in their past opposition to the repeal of the Chinese exclusion acts. I happen to have a friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCANLON], who is not only a member of the A. F. of L., but I believe is an official of that group. He has a son in the service. He told me that the controlling motive in his determination that this discrimination be removed was the fact that the Japanese radio was sending radio messages to China repeating the testimony before the committee which was considering this bill.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield briefly.

Mr. GEARHART. What kind of propaganda message will the Japanese radio to the Filipinos when they remain the only excluded race after we remove the disqualification of the Chinese?

Mr. WRIGHT. I certainly am not in favor of discrimination against the brave Filipinos, nor do I think the gentleman is, but there is no reason why we have to be unfair to the Chinese merely because we might be unfair to the Filipinos at the present time.

Mr. GEARHART. Why not include both in one bill?

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman knows I did not draft the bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. For the information of the gentleman from California I may say there is a quota of 50 for the Philippines at the present time.

Mr. GEARHART. But only until independence is granted, and after that automatically they are absolutely excluded.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not true that this country has demonstrated its friendship during the years with the Filipinos so that they have a right to expect justice and equality from this Nation, whereas the Chinese have little ground for worry?

Mr. WRIGHT. I think that is undoubtedly true. I do not think we should feel shame at our record in the Philippines. It was demonstrated in this war that the Filipinos trust us, but an entirely different situation prevailed in some of the Asiatic regions which were owned by some of our allies.

Mr. Chairman, there seems to be considerable doubt expressed by various Members talking on this bill as to whether it is important to repeal these laws as a gesture of friendship for the Chinese. I think the best way we can determine that is to point out what the Chinese themselves say about it. With your permission I should like to read a few excerpts from some Chinese newspapers and read some comments made on the Chinese radio. On October 9, 1943, a radio message from Dr. Hollington K. Tong was made from Chungking as follows:

Coming on the eve of the Double Tenth, the approval of the bill for the repeal of the 60-year Chinese Exclusion Act by the United States House Immigration Committee and House Rules Committee has been extremely well received in China's wartime capital. The Central Daily News promptly came out with an editorial describing the move not only as sagacious following the abolition of the unequal treaties between China and the United States but also as a necessary step toward a new world order based upon mutual respect. The journal adds that as soon as the bill becomes law a source of misunderstanding which has existed for 60 years between the two countries will be completely removed. There is no doubt that the coming debate in the House will be followed by the Chinese people with the keenest interest.

I call attention also to a Government statement from Dr. K. C. Wu, Vice Minister in charge of Ministerial Affairs:

Although it is a domestic issue, the repeal of the act as recommended by President Roosevelt will be exceedingly welcomed here and will be considered as further cementing the traditional friendship between the United States and China.

There are several more to the same effect:

CHUNGKING, October 12.—President Roosevelt's message to Congress endorsing the pending bill for the repeal of the Exclusion Act and the granting of naturalization rights to the Chinese in the United States has evoked widespread interest among the people here in Chungking who consider it to be of especial significance both during and after the present war. The Chinese particularly take heart at what the President said: "By the repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws, we can correct a historic mistake and silence the distorted Japanese propaganda."

It is generally believed that the American people will share with their President the same sentiments and spare no efforts to abolish the discriminatory laws which have stood as an obstacle to friendly Chinese-American relations in the past.

Dr. P. C. Chang, counselor of the Executive Yuan, said: "President Roosevelt's message to Congress urging the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act to remove the discriminatory legislation is really a magnificent one. The spirit and the principle for which it stands counts most. Details about the quota are of second importance. China never hoped to solve her population problem by large-scale immigration from China into the United States."

Asked whether the views expressed by Dr. Sun Fo, President of the Legislative Yuan, in his recent article to the American press that the Mikado must go, represented the views of the Chinese Government. Dr. Wu said that there is no doubt that Dr. Sun's opinion represents the views of a large number of people in China. There is also no doubt, Dr. Wu added, that a democratic Japan after the war will be a benefit to the world as well as to herself, but the conditions and requirements to be imposed on a defeated Japan can only be made known after consultations with the United Nations engaged in the war against Japan.

CHUNGKING, October 13.—Several Chungking dailies today urge the American Congress to adopt legislation discarding the Chinese Exclusion Act and giving naturalization rights to Chinese immigrants to the United States. The China Times predicts a new law will be passed as the relations between China and the United States have become more and more friendly and the American people realize that any unequal treatment in international relations will hinder the construction of a new world. "We hope that the new law not only will be passed by the United States Congress but will be passed by an overwhelming vote so as to manifest the American people's sense of justice and to produce favorable effects on the future relations between the two nations," the paper declares.

Sao Tang Pao particularly takes note of President Roosevelt's remark: "By the repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws, we can correct a historic mistake and silence the distorted Japanese propaganda." The Japanese have been persistently insinuating that strong racial prejudices prevail between the white and colored races. This propaganda is, of course, ridiculous to the Chinese, the paper says. The signing of the new Sino-American and Sino-British treaties strongly prove the fallacy of such distortion. To eradicate thoroughly such ill-attempted propaganda, however, the United Nations must further show equality among themselves. It will serve as a strong proof of such equality

if America discards the Chinese Exclusion Act, Sao Tang Pao believes.

As the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] pointed out, the question is not one of bread alone. Self-respect is necessary and the respect of one's associates. One of the things that makes us so angry with the Germans is not the fact that they are good fighters; it is a fact that twice in one generation they have shown us that they believe that they are by God destined to rule the other peoples of the earth. The Japanese also believe that they are heaven-ordained to rule the world. Do you think America, with the traditional respect it has for human rights—America, the traditional champion of liberty—should imitate the Germans and Japs—should put herself in the position of saying to a proud civilized people, the Chinese, "You are not fit to come here and live"?

I think our respect for the Chinese people is extremely important. The only person who does not think things like that are important is the person who has no respect for moral principles. America was built upon moral principles, and it is because we have followed those principles that we have the respect of the world. If we show now that we do not care about them, we can very easily lose that respect.

One gentleman who spoke said that Admiral King and General MacArthur had not asked for this bill. Obviously, their job is to fight a war. The Congress of the United States is the policy-making branch of the United States Government, not the United States Army or the United States Navy. I may say, however, that Admiral Yarnell, with his long experience in Asia, testified in favor of this bill before the committee and said its passage would be very important in cementing Chinese and American feeling.

Several other statements have been made in opposition to the bill. It seems there is a fear on the part of some that we are opening a door here, that we are going to admit millions of homeless people from Europe to the United States. Mr. Chairman, we are voting to repeal Chinese exclusion. The words of the bill mean what they say and no more. That is all we are doing. There is no door which the Congress opens that the Congress does not have the power to shut when it wants to. Any attempt to appeal to this Congress by arousing fear of having our country overrun by foreign people, when all we are doing at this moment is correcting an injustice and a mistake and discrimination against an ally, is not particularly statesmanlike.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCANLON].

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Chairman, it has been said that it is a woman's privilege to change her mind. I trust that none of my colleagues on the distaff side will feel that I encroach on their private territory because I stand before you a man who has changed his mind.

When hearings opened on the bill now under consideration, H. R. 3070, providing for the repeal of the so-called Chinese Exclusion Act, I was opposed to it. I was opposed at that time to any relaxation of our immigration laws. But, Mr. Chairman, as a parade of witnesses unfolded their story before our committee and after being privileged to read transcripts of propaganda broadcasts which are spewing from Tokyo into the ears of listeners in China and all the area which Japan has conquered, I became convinced that, if for no other reason, we should repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act for the purely realistic reason it will lessen the task faced by our fighting men.

Psychological warfare—whose chief weapon is propaganda—has shown itself since this great war began to be a potent factor in victory. In terms dear to the American heart, psychological warfare is nothing more nor less than high powered salesmanship. It takes several forms. When the Nazis marched through Poland, Denmark, and Norway, the Low Countries, and France they softened up their next objectives by selling the idea they were invincible. When they made moves toward the Balkans some countries had accepted this premise, looking only to the record of Nazi conquest, and not to the record of valiant resistance put up by the British who had not been conquered. This made the job of the Nazis much easier. There was comparatively little German blood spilled there. We have done a bit of psychological softening up ourselves. We sold most of the French in north Africa on the idea we were coming in there to release them from Nazi bondage. Algeria, Morocco, and the bulk of French West Africa became ours at a very small cost in blood.

The Japanese have been playing the psychological game for all it is worth. We cannot stop their propaganda broadcasts here in Washington. That will only be accomplished when our bombing planes blast their radio stations and power plants sky high and our troops gag the lying Nipponese tongues.

We in Congress have it within our power, however, to give them one less truth upon which to base their propaganda. Propaganda based on truth cannot be stopped. Our own history shows that. But propaganda based on lies will not be believed all the time. "You can fool some of the people all of the time and all of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time." That is a pretty sound statement upon which we all agree.

The Chinese Exclusion Act has given the Japanese propaganda machine a truth from which to grind seeds of distrust and dissension among people we look upon as our allies. Adequate proof of this is contained in the transcripts of a few broadcasts included in the printed copies of the hearings. You are all familiar with them, so I will not take the time to read them here. They appear on page 81 and the next few following pages.

As we read those transcripts we are apt to think, "Just imagine those chattering monkeys dishing out this drivel. Why the Chinese are our good allies. We love the Chinese. We will do anything in the world to help them," and so on.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is not drivel to the Chinese and other peoples of Asia under the yoke of Japan. These people know that when the Japs build a propaganda argument around the fact that we have told the Chinese we like them all right in their place, that propaganda is based on truth.

These Chinese have been fighting since 1937. Since that time we have been cheering them on. For many years we were just grandstand spectators, chanting "Hold that line." Furthermore we were selling Japan the things she needed to make war on the Chinese. But all this the Chinese could understand. After all, we were neutral.

Then came Pearl Harbor and we hurled into the same war with the Chinese. At first our forces were hurled back. This came as somewhat of a surprise to the Chinese, as well as to us, but this they could understand.

They probably also understand the difficulties facing us in our effort to get the guns, tanks, planes, ammunition, and other implements of war in to them. Those things they probably can understand as long as we give them some obvious, positive proof of our friendship. This we can do by repealing the Chinese Exclusion Act. This one gesture of friendship is not attendant with vast, unsurmountable problems of logistics. It merely requires a vote in this Chamber, a concurrent vote in the other Chamber, and a squiggle of a pen in the hand of our President.

I would not say forthrightly that failure to pass the bill now under consideration would mean that China would quit and accept the grandiose separate peace offers which Japan has offered, but I do say this:

In the words of Admiral King, of our Navy, our whole over-all strategy has been to keep Russia and China in the war. It is up to us to do all we can to keep them in the war, and so far as Russia is concerned, we have succeeded. But in the case of Russia we have given some concrete evidence of our good faith—vast quantities of war weapons and food. In China's case the evidence has been very, very meager. We can go on record here in the House of Representatives with a concrete action. The Chinese are a patient people, but all patience comes to an end. Let us not keep on asking the Chinese to have blind faith in us. We should show them we are deserving of that faith.

I am a member of the American Legion, which has gone on record opposing this measure. I do not like to stand here and oppose those buddies of mine from the First World War, but I think that if they had had the opportunity to hear the evidence they would be wholeheartedly in favor of this repealer.

I am a member in good standing of a labor union affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. I have a record here of supporting every measure designed to aid the workingman and of opposing every measure aimed at depriving the workingman of his hard-won rights. But I see nothing in this bill which will be harmful to a single, solitary American worker.

I do see this bill saving the lives of our fighting men recruited from all walks in life. I am the father of a soldier. I want the job for him and his buddies to be as easy as possible. We need the help of the Chinese to defeat the Japanese. We need the support and friendship of all the peoples in Asia and the Far East which have come under the dominion of Japan. If we have that friendship the bloodshed in beating the Jap down will be less. Some of our colleagues know what it is to have a fine son cut down in the fight for our country. Let us pass this repealer and save countless other mothers and fathers the heartbreak of lost sons.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, after the excellent speech of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], I really do not see much need for me to try to add anything. He has presented the case for this bill as ably as it could be done. I think it is important, however, that the House bear clearly in mind exactly what it is doing in this bill and what it is not doing. If this bill is passed the basic immigration laws of the United States will still stand subject to such amendment as the Congress may in the future choose to make. By the passage of this legislation the Congress will in no way whatsoever reduce its power to cut down further on immigration as a whole should it seem wise to do so in the future.

In my judgment, emigration out of a nation has never proven the answer to the problem of the people within that nation. As a matter of actual fact, even large-scale emigration out of many of the nations of the world has left them with substantially the same problems and even the same population pressure as they had before. By and large the problems of the various peoples have got to be solved internally within their nation if they are to be solved at all.

But the issue that we have before us today is to my mind an issue that goes to the very root of the problems of peace in the world tomorrow. This war could be won, the military power of Japan could be swept from the seas and from the land and still our children and their children might be faced with a greater danger than that which is now facing us unless America conducts herself in a statesmanlike manner on some of these questions. I do not think there is a shadow of doubt but that the basic Japanese purpose throughout this whole long struggle has been to convince the rest of the peoples of the Far East that their only hope of achieving a place of equality and justice among the nations of the world lay in the success of the Japanese Army. There is nothing more fundamentally important for America to do by means of her policy, and this is something we can do, than to give the lie to that Japanese claim and that Japanese propaganda. The passage of this bill will go a long way in helping to give the lie to that Japanese claim.

Over the years it is true, as many Members have said in the course of this debate, that American relations with China have been most cordial and most friendly, but American relations with China continuing on that plane is the road to peace in the Orient, to peace in the Pacific, and to the defeat of the long-range objective of the Japanese military power. To that extent it is possible for America by her policy to build a strong China, strong not only from a military standpoint but strong in spirit, strong economically and strong in the unity of her national life; to that degree we will have built the best of all foundations for the peace and hope of the peoples of the Pacific world. America's relationship with China is the key to the defeat of Japan's long-range objectives.

All we are asked to do in this bill is to place the people of our Allied Nation, China, the one nation that has fought against the aggression of the Axis longer than any other nation in the world, on the same plane relative to our own laws as are the other peoples of the world. It seems to me it is little enough for us to do. It is well for us to remember and face the fact that what might be termed the colonial period in China is over, that the years when what happened in China was determined by the presence or absence of the gunboats of other powers in her water is gone. The age for self-determination of that great people is here.

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly hope the Congress will practically recognize that fact by enacting this bill into law. I want to pay sincere tribute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] for the constructive leadership they have given us here today in guiding this bill toward passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, my reason for favoring the repeal of the Chinese exclusion law and to grant them a quota of 105 per year is a selfish one. I take this position because I think that it is the best thing for America. Many able military men, such as Admiral Yarnell, believe that this alone will save countless lives. If that is the case, I want to vote for it.

I have served on the Committee of Immigration and Naturalization for 4 years. My record on that committee will show that I am not for unrestricted and unlimited immigration. You find here today battling for this bill the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]. All are for restricting immigration generally. Two of those gentlemen have pending before our committee bills to restrict over-all immigration into this country. I, too, will support such legislation.

I would vote today to cut down all quotas for the post-war period, but this Chinese problem must not be confused with that problem. The Chinese recognize our right to limit immigration to prevent unemployment or for any other like reason. They grant to the United States the right to shut off all immigration, if we so desire, but they do object to a policy that permits the immigration into this country of hundreds of thousands and not one Chinese.

At the present time, the Chinese are prohibited from coming into the United States. This is one of the most forceful arguments that the Japanese have in their drive to break down the resistance of the Chinese. For 6 years, the Chinese have withstood bombings, executions, hunger, disease, and all the terrible ravages of war. They have been attacked by a savage enemy, who possesses the mechanized monsters of war.

The Japanese radio and propaganda agencies keep telling the Chinese, "China, wake up. America wants to exploit you, not to protect you. The United States is just like all other white men. They do not love the Chinese. Why, it is unlawful for one Chinaman to immigrate into the United States." After years and years of war and hunger and famine, some day such an argument may fall on receptive ears. By repealing the Chinese exclusion law and granting them a quota, which is limited to 105 persons per year, we take away from Japan the greatest weapon of propaganda that she has to use against the Chinese.

I think that it is of utmost importance that we retain the frendship of the Chinese. Suppose the Chinese do capitulate and join Japan, then all Asia is apt to go with her. Then you will have a race struggle in which we are hopelessly outnumbered that will last, not for 1 year or 5 years, but throughout the generations to come. It will mean much not only in our day, but to our children and grandchildren to have a strong, powerful China that is a friend to the United States and with whom we can have a working cooperation.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, over in Europe a great struggle for liberty and civilization is going on. We are allied with Great Britain in that struggle with the German Government headed by a madman. The struggle goes well. In Asia, a great struggle goes on between the bloody

Hirohito dynasty of Japan and the Republic of China, headed by its President, General Chiang Kai-shek. The battle is a severe and cruel one and has lasted a long time. We have been thrown in alliance with the Republic of China and General Chiang Kai-shek, and today we are allied with him in every way that a great and honorable people can be allied with another great people to fight for the principles of government we hold so dear.

The battle has been an unequal one for a long time. The Japanese Imperial Government battles with a slogan of "Asia for the Asiatics," and they are teaching the Chinese and other eastern peoples that we and Great Britain are their enemies and that they should have a government of Asiatics, which the Japanese will furnish. The situation is critical.

The leaders of our country and the leaders of the Republic of China, those who conduct our foreign affairs, advise us that this ancient law discriminating against the Chinese people is an irritating matter, to speak mildly; that it is helping Hirohito and his damnable dynasty; that in the struggle for the heart and judgment of the Chinese themselves this act which we seek to repeal is being used more effectively than anything else to win the Asiatics, even the Chinese, to the standard of Hirohito. We are asked to repeal it by those who lead us in both countries.

I say this Congress ought not to hesitate for a minute to repeal it, because it may do the great cause in which our boys are dying and into which we are pouring our treasure great good. It certainly cannot do labor or anybody else in the United States any harm worth mentioning.

A small number of Chinese admitted on an equality under the quota law with other countries can do but little if any harm, but we are advised by those who know the Chinese mind and understand the struggle there that the repeal of this law will be a mighty contribution to Chiang Kai-shek and the great Republic hé represents. I think it will help win this war. If we are to have peace on earth, General Chiang Kai-shek and his Republic, and his brilliant wife, who addressed us sometime ago, are as important in organizing this world for peace and against war as Winston Churchill and Franklin D. Roosevelt are.

We must cooperate. We must act together, and to act together we must wipe out every vestige, whatever the cause may have been for its enactment, which speaks contempt and disrespect for the great Chinese people. There is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that that law was enacted with a conception of the Chinese character which does not now abide in the hearts and brains of the American people. We have more respect for the Chinese today than we had when that law was enacted. I am not going to strike back and reflect upon our great fathers who enacted those ancient laws, but today Gen. Chiang Kai-shek and his lady are crowned with glory and honor in the heart of every true patriot in the United States. Why should we keep upon the books an insulting and irritating discrimination whose repeal will do us no harm, when Gen. Chiang Kai-shek and his lady and the great Republic of China and our own great Government, guided and directed by President Roosevelt and Cordell Hull, tell us that it ought to be repealed? I earnestly urge that we repeal it and lock hands with Gen. Chiang Kai-shek, Churchill, Stalin, and all who stand for liberty on earth.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the courtesy of the gentleman from Illinois in extending me this time.

It shall be my purpose to clarify and make positive some matters that were discussed by me and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] during the course of his address. I took the position that if this proposed legislation were enacted that China would then enjoy two separate quotas. There is no question but that I was right in my position and as proof of it I cite the report of the Immigration Committee of which the gentleman is a member. On page 2 of this report, the following language appears:

> While a quota of 100 per annum has been allotted to China it has been available only to persons of races eligible to citizenship born in that country.

Further in that same report and on the same page it appears clearly that the enactment of this proposed legislation would grant to China another quota of 105 which would be filled as prescribed in the bill and as set forth in the report as above referred to. Further in support of what I have said I will quote a statement which I have from a very eminent authority in the Government. This authority is supposed to have been asked the following question:

> If the Magnuson bill were enacted, would China have two quotas?

The answer to that question was:

> Yes. In addition to the regular quota of 100 annually the Magnuson bill provides a special racial quota of approximately 107.

This authority was also asked the following question:

> Is this an innovation in our immigration laws?

And his answer was "Yes." He elaborated and explained his answer.

The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the majority leader, in his address, stressed our responsibility to show proper consideration to one of our allies. He overlooks the fact that under this legislation the Chinese would be given two quotas of 100 each while the Filipinos are only given a quota of 60, which quota will be lost to the Philippines just as soon as they are given their independence. How they will feel about this discrimination against them we can guess. They surely are our allies. He also lost sight of the fact that India is one of our allies and that she is given no consideration under this proposed legislation.

The distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, Doctor JUDD, paints a very interesting picture drawn from his experiences in China. I can recall 6 or 8 years ago hearing many people make the statement as to how unfair we were toward the cultured, refined and intelligent Japanese. They were people who felt affronted because back in the days of Theodore Roosevelt our Nation had made a gentleman's agreement with Japan with reference to the movement of her people into this country. Japan has no complaint to make against what she has had from the United States of America. Neither has China. We have done much more for both of these countries than they have done, or probably ever will do, for us. We should not be swayed to change an organic law which represents a well-studied and well-accepted policy of the Nation because of sentimentality. China is in dire circumstances. We need to do much more for China than to offer a gesture, as so many of the speakers have called this proposed piece of legislation. What we need to do for China is to give her material support from the standpoint of war supplies of all kinds. I would yield to no one in the wish to do everything possible to reestablish China and to drive every Jap off of Chinese soil. Japan has stolen millions of acres from the Chinese. Japanese aggression, which they began 7 years ago against the Chinese, is responsible for this great war in which the whole world is involved. I repeat that we should be sensible and should fight the war as we come to it and as it presents itself but that we should not be so soft as to feel and think that we can win the war by legislation passed simply as a gesture. The war is bigger than that and the Chinese people are bigger than that and the interest of our own country is bigger than that and this Congress ought to be bigger than that.

Immigration is a very human question. Tariffs and taxes and so forth are intangible and unseen issues but immigration, the moving about of people, is altogether a human question and consequently is very interesting. It permits sympathies and prejudices to have play very easily.

When I came to Congress I was assigned to service on the Immigration Committee where I served for many years. I served during the time that the immigration policy of this Nation was made effective. I know something of the work and the thought that the statesmen of 20 or 25 years ago gave to the solving of this very important question. Our country has probably been the foremost nation of the world in matters of immigration. We established the principle that it is an inherent right of every nation to control the immigration into its territory. It is a very essential element of sovereignty. We took the position, and still maintain it, that we have

full right to determine who shall come into our borders and who shall not come. In other words, we maintain that aliens do not have any rights that our Nation must respect by way of permitting them to enter our land. If we permit them to come we do so as a privilege and not recognizing that they have any inherent right. Until they are accepted into our country they have no rights except those which we accord them by law. We established that policy and we have gotten along with it in fine shape. We are now asked to deviate from that policy and to grant a favor to a very deserving people simply as a gesture. There are no gestures in the immigration law. The immigration law is stern and it should be recognized as such. It has proven a great boon to millions of people who have been seeking liberty and freedom. We still want to do the best we can by the whole world but we must also remember that we owe an obligation to our own people. That is the reason why the American Federation of Labor and all the patriotic societies of the land are opposed to this legislation.

When I first became interested in immigration matters, we had much to do with smugglers. Fifteen and 18 years ago most of the complaint was against the Chinese who were being smuggled into the United States from Mexico. I have never felt especially hard toward the poor Chinese or any other man who wanted to come to our shores and to enjoy the benefits of our great country. However, I cite this simply to show to you that while there are many good Chinese and while they deserve all the credit we can possibly give them for the fight they have been putting up against the unwarranted attacks from Japan, still the Chinese question has not been an easy question in this country.

What is really the purpose of this legislation? The real purpose is to make amends for what many people now think was an injustice that we showed toward China. I do not think it was an injustice because everything we did was under and in line with a treaty to which they agreed. However, I do agree that since we reformed and reestablished our immigration policy in 1921 and 1924, and since by virtue of that law and that policy we have rendered obsolete the old statutes known as the Chinese exclusion acts, then there is no reason why we should not repeal them now. In fact I think we should do so, and I am enthusiastically in favor of passing a law to that effect.

But to change our immigration policy as laid down in the laws of 1921 and 1924—that is an entirely different proposition and I am opposed to it because it is not necessary to do that in order to do what we claim we are trying to do.

I find that there are many people who are badly confused over certain very general terms that are used with reference to immigration matters. Many of them fail to appreciate the importance of the term "eligible for citizenship." Likewise they fail to understand just what a quota means. Let me develop these for just a minute. Section 303 of the present immigration laws is as follows:

SEC. 303. The right to become a naturalized citizen under the provision of this act shall extend only to white persons, persons of African nativity or descent, and decendants of races indigenous to the Western Hemisphere.

That section of the law was prepared carefully and it is as concise as it can possibly be made. Under this section it can clearly be seen that we do not extend the right of naturalization to anyone except white persons or persons of African descent and descendants of races indigenous to the Western Hemisphere. In this language we do not mention any nationality or any religion or any race. We do not mention England or Ireland or France or Sweden. We make no reference to any special country. Now this proposed legislation changes this whole set-up by adding the following words:

And Chinese persons or persons of Chinese descent.

This grants to the Chinese a privilege which has not been granted to the Germans as such nor to the French nor to the Irish nor to any other nationality. Can it be expected that this great departure which the proponents of this bill seem to think is only a gesture will not bring repercussions that will be heard all around the world? We are in a gesture changing the most important section in the whole immigration law. It is the basic section.

After taking this gigantic step and trying to do what I am afraid will destroy our whole immigration structure they then proceed to prepare another section which is to the effect that after we grant this great distinction to these Chinese that we provide that only 105 may come by reason of this enactment and that only 75 of these need come from China.

In other words, the proponents of this legislation ask us to risk the very life of the important immigration laws that have done so much for the working people of the country in saving their jobs against the cheap labor of the world just simply to make a little flag-waving gesture that will only mean that 75 out of 350,000,000 Chinese would be eligible for admission to the United States. I do not rate the Chinese as being so ignorant and so easy as not to notice how they are being fooled and discriminated against. There is no degree of eligibility. If a Chinese is made eligible to citizenship, he is just as much eligible as the Englishman, or the Irishman, or the Frenchman. To make him eligible and then say he is not eligible, and we will tolerate only 75 of them per year, is not putting them on a par with other peoples and other countries.

The reason they were declared ineligible is due to the fact that they were considered as unassimilable and it was necessary for our country to do something to restrict immigration. For many years in the early nineties a million immigrants came to our shores annually. In 1907 before we had restricted immigration, there came to our shores approximately 1,265,000 persons for permanent residence. This number came legally. It is safe to say that an equal number, at least, came illegally. Our country could not absorb and assimilate these great hordes. It was necessary for us to put up the bars, and we did so by the adoption of quotas. We made a very complicated study and determined the national origins of many of our people. It took the best scientists of the country who were familiar with the census and with the movement of people several years to evolve a safe and fair formula to determine the nationality of the people then in the country. The idea was to find out the proportionate number of our people who were the descendants of the nationalities that built up the country. It was only natural and fair that they would find that the nations of northern Europe should have larger quotas than the countries who had not contributed toward the founding and building of our country. Who built up this country? It was the English, the Scotch, the Welsh, the Irish, the Scandinavians, the Germans, the French, and the Spanish, and the Dutch, and the Italians, and other nations of that kind. The Japs or the Chinese were not here in any numbers when the country was built up. They did not contribute toward the building of the country as other nations. Consequently when Congress passed the quota laws they provided that the principal quotas should go to those countries whose people predominated in the country. But to be fair and courteous the Congress provided that every country should have a minimum quota of 100. China has had a quota of 100 from the time the law was first passed. Several of the European countries only have a quota of 100. But this proposed law takes a nationality who under the present law are not even eligible to citizenship and gives them two quotas and makes them eligible to citizenship. Even the English or the Irish are not honored by being especially named, yet we name China especially and give her a signal honor not accorded to any other country just because we allow ourselves to be carried away by a maudlin sentimentality. We Americans have always been easily carried away by sentiment even when our judgment dictates a different course. As for me, I refuse to undo what our previous Congresses have done faithfully and patriotically.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk for a moment or two about the statements that have been made in this debate that the witnesses before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization consisted mostly of ministers, missionaries, and idealists, and also about the insinuation that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] belongs to this list of professional "do-gooders," and so forth, and is not practical-minded.

I heard General Marshall this morning discuss the situation concerning the World War. If there was any impression I got from General Marshall it was

that he is a "hard-boiled" professional soldier up at the top of his profession. Admiral Yarnell testified before our committee and gave exactly the same impression of himself. He is a "hard-boiled" seadog of some 50 years' experience, who was Commander in Chief of the Asiatic Squadron from 1936 to 1940, and who knows something about the situation in the Orient concerning the war. I wish to quote from his testimony to show you that that "hard-boiled" gentleman, the opposite to any idealist or missionary or minister, has this to say. Admiral Yarnell said:

> In conclusion, it is my conviction that the repeal of these laws will have far-reaching effects as a war and as a post-war measure. It will also be a partial recognition of the bravery of a great people who for 6 years have been fighting America's most dangerous enemy.

The further testimony of Admiral Yarnell went to show that he considered the repeal of this measure as one of the most effective means of saving lives, American lives, in the Asiatic combat zone, and I do not believe that any Member of this House would accuse Admiral Yarnell, seadog that he is, with the long experience and the responsibilities that he had on his shoulders, of being an idealist of any kind. He considers first, last, and all the time the material, practical welfare of this Nation, and, according to his testimony and other testimony, there is only one nation in the Orient that can preserve the peace after this global war is over, and that is China, and we will have to look to China to do it, and all we can do to help China and build up a strong China between now and then will be to our own future good.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the preeminent importance of this proposal before us. I have listened with great interest to the persuasive arguments of those who advocate the passage of this bill. I sympathize with them in their desire to do the right thing by the Chinese. I, too, want to remove the stigma that now hinders proper relations between us and our great ally on the other side of the Pacific. I, too, have a deep appreciation for the Chinese.

However, I would feel a little more pleased about it if we did not regard this measure entirely separate and apart from our general immigration policy. In my own mind I cannot divorce the two. I have heard it said that there are Members who propose to introduce amendments when the time comes, amendments in respect to all quotas. This bill will put China on a quota equality basis and on terms of equality with other nations. At the same time the amendment to which I refer would propose to cut all quotas of all nations 50 percent or more.

I asked the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] a moment ago what was desired by our Asiatic allies. He said the chief thing needed is equality. What the Chinese want is a feeling that we regard them on terms of equality, and I do so regard them and want our Nation to so regard them. As I see it, it is not so much a matter of whether we will open our doors to 105 Chinese annually or to only 2. Putting them on exactly the same plane as all others is exactly the way I feel about this matter.

Thomas Jefferson threw out something we all give lip service to, when he said in the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal. There has been much discussion as to just what he meant but whatever he meant, he was thinking of individuals. In the Illinois senatorial campaign of 1858 Stephen A. Douglas tried to make a large audience believe that Abraham Lincoln understood the Declaration of Independence to mean by "all men are created equal" that that meant social equality for Americans. Now that is not what Abraham Lincoln really understood the Declaration to mean and he made apt reply, "Because I do not want a Negro woman for my slave it doesn't necessarily follow that I do want her for my wife. I don't want her for either." Undoubtedly Lincoln thought our Declaration means all men are equal in rights and he favored a practice based on such equality.

If it is true doctrine that all nations are created equal, that can only mean equal in rights. If we attempt to practice equality and democracy in our attitude toward all nations it should be on a recognition of equality in rights. Such practice of equality involves much more than merely admitting to residence and citizenship a handful of individuals here of any particular nation or race of people. In my high regard for the Chinese people I want to practice democracy and equality toward them in many other respects in addition to putting them on a quota basis and thus on terms of equality with other nations.

How may an attitude of equality toward China be shown? It may be shown in all our dealings and relationships—in diplomacy, in business, in respecting her sovereignty, and in giving aid. If we admit to our shores the people of various nations on terms of equality, obviously that is just one way of recognizing equality, and perhaps not the best way.

I am instantly on the alert when it is suggested that somebody from abroad be admitted or permitted to stay here. I feel that now is the time for us to safeguard our gates. I am persuaded by the friends of China who say we ought to deal fairly in this case with our friends and allies in Asia. I agree with that, but when this great war is over there will be a longing on the part of people of every nation on earth to come to this haven. I think we ought to begin now to raise those bars, rather than lower them. Of course, it is said that that is another matter, and Congress should leave that until a later time. I presume we are going to have to do it under the parliamentary situation, but I am not leaving it to another time in my own thinking, and I hope the Congress of the United States will not relegate it to too late a time. I do feel that America has flourished because our doors have been open somewhat to people of other lands, but I do not look at this melting pot quite so enthusiastically as others have done. I find that this so-called melting pot at critical times has had a good deal of slag in it.

Heretofore when we have dealt with immigration laws we have done it with the thought of how the influx will affect labor conditions or the economic situation. Apparently all too often we have forgotten that when we open our doors to immigrants, we are admitting ancestors of future citizens, and not only laborers.

Very few Americans who have not resided in China have a higher regard for the Chinese people than I have myself. I heartily approve of inviting Chinese students to attend our colleges and universities. I certainly endorse our abolition of extraterritorial rights in China, which our Nation with other western nations have heretofore exercised. I want to treat the Chinese, not only while we are at war but for long years of peace, on terms of mutual respect and equality. My vote on this measure, however, is not to be construed as indicating my stand on our general immigration policy. It may be impossible under the rules of the House to attach an amendment to this bill extending equality of quota treatment to China and at the same time reducing the quota of immigration from all countries, which I should very much like to do.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MASON. I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCOWEN].

Mr. MCCOWEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to express my opposition to this bill which would put the Chinese on a quota basis.

If the present immigration law that excludes the Chinese on the basis of color is regarded by the Chinese as classing them as an inferior race and if the Japanese are really using that fact as propaganda against the white race in order to win the Chinese to their side, I should be willing to strike that condition out of the present law. I believe that every Member of the House would be perfectly willing also to make that change. This could easily be done without reference to a quota for the Chinese and it would not make a basic change in our immigration laws. But when we undertake to establish a quota we are proposing a basic change which is the real point that is the greatest cause of differences of opinion among the Members of the House on the question of repealing the Chinese exclusion law.

The point most emphasized in the hearings before our committee was that the Chinese regarded their exclusion on account of color as being a stigma and that same point has been made in the debate on the floor of this House today.

Those who have contended for the repeal of the Chinese exclusion law primarily for that particular reason show themselves to be quite inconsistent, in my opinion, when they go on to another unrelated point and ask for a basic change in the law by insisting on a quota.

The immigration laws should not be changed to admit an increase of immigrants from any other part of the world during this war. For emotions and not logic and war hysteria would be the real cause of such a change. If the immigration laws should be changed at all now, it should be to further restrict all present quotas and not to increase them.

A quota of 105 Chinese per year is provided for in this bill. Those who claim that Japanese propaganda to the Chinese would be overcome by establishing such a small quota are woefully mistaken. The Japanese can and will continue to try to win the Chinese by making such a small quota look very unreasonable. The Japs can still say to the Chinese, "The smallness of the number is only a gesture of no value." In fact, to remove the part of the exclusion law based on color and establish no quota at all would accomplish far more than the passage of this entire bill with such a small quota.

On page 2835, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the following paragraph is quoted from the extension of remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, May 9, 1940:

> During the same 6-year period, Japan has sold us directly $580,000,000 in gold and we paid them a profit of approximately $230,000,000 on the transaction. The Japanese Government used the money they received from the Treasury largely for the purchase of war supplies and raw materials to carry on the aggression against friendly China and in the building of a large navy which some American admirals claim will some day be used against our country.

If the United States provided the money as is indicated in the above quotation to purchase vast quantities of war supplies and raw materials to carry on the aggression against friendly China, is it reasonable to suppose that the passage of a law which even its supporters call only a token gesture will remove the hard feeling from the minds of the Chinese for our actions in that respect? Certainly not.

China was at war with Japan several years before the United States declared war on Japan. Were we the ally of China at that time or were we permitting assistance to go to her enemy? Any unprejudiced person can see that the war between China and Japan before we got into it was China's war and the fact that we are now in it does not do away with the further fact that it is still China's war even though it is now our own war as well as China's. The impression given by some that there is danger in our losing China as an ally, if this legislation is not passed, is not a sound idea because China must fight for her very existence and she must have help from the United States. The furnishing of planes and other weapons and munitions of war is of far greater importance to the Chinese people than a mere quibble as to whether we should permit 105 per year to come in, particularly at a time when, on account of this war, none could get here to come in. Personally, I think it would be of far greater value to China if we were debating on the floor of this House how to get more aid rapidly to China.

It has been said that this law should be passed because of its psychological effect on the Chinese. The question of the kind of a psychological effect that would be produced is strictly a matter of opinion, therefore entirely debatable and cannot be stated correctly to be an effect. The person who says that it is a fact should very properly say that it is his opinion. It would be impossible for anyone to determine the reactions of enough individuals among the Chinese people to prove such a statement. Even if the statement should be accepted as true, we, in my opinion, would have a mixed psychological effect. It probably might be favorable if the so-called stigma alone were removed but the opposite, or unfavorable effect likewise, in my opinion, would be produced by the small quota basis. As a matter of fact, China is our ally and we are hers. It is well for both that such is the case. All of us have high praise for the Chinese people. But that does not mean that we have to change our domestic policies to suit the Chinese any more than China has to change her own domestic policies to suit us.

Let us quit quibbling over conjectural things, remove the so-called stigma, not give a quota, and do all that we can to help China win her own freedom while we, at the same time, are fighting this terrible war with Japan.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, I am tremendously interested in this vital topic, because as many of the Members will recall, I was very active in a crusade to interdict the sale of war materials to Japan, in the period preceding Pearl Harbor. Many Members will recall that my bill was given hearings before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and we received 3 votes out of 25 in its favor 2 years before Pearl Harbor. Six months before Pearl Harbor I introduced House Joint Resolution 30, designed to stop the sale of war materials to the Axis Powers and their affiliates, including Japan. We had 3 days of executive hearings before the Rules Committee and then my latest measure was turned down due to the opposition of certain gentlemen in the State Department.

This reform, embodied in the instant bill, in my judgment, is long overdue. This is a condign recognition of the rights due the great, proud, and yet humble people of China. They are entitled to their place in the sun.

Some years ago there lived a famous English Catholic cardinal, John Cardinal Newman. He wrote a book which was entitled "Apologia Pro Vita Sua"—an apology for his own life—which explained his change in religious views. I think this bill is an apology for certain mistakes we have made in the past. Let us recollect that we have been culpable of many blunders in the treatment of our neighbors across the Pacific. We are fighting today a sanguinary war against Hitler, against his doctrine of Aryan superiority. Here in this House some Members advocate and espouse ratifying the same dubious philosophy in another form, only to apply this strange sanctior quam te doctrine to neighbors whose pigments are different from that of the white race. When we talk about the "four freedoms" I can understand some Chinese who might mumble to themselves, although they are too gentlemanly to speak it out loud "Physician, heal thyself. Physician, apply this doctrine to your own country. Apply it there and then we will listen to you when you make the argument that you are fighting for noble idealism." We made a mistake in aiding Japan in its aggression against the Chinese. The Chinese people for many years fought this formidable enemy with little help from the outside. We gave them lip service. We gave them sympathy. But when my bill was pending in Congress I received as high as 5,000 letters a week from citizens throughout the United States prayerfully urging the adoption of the bill by Congress. The Gallup Poll said that 72 percent of the American people were in favor of stopping the sale of war materials to Japan.

The current proposal is a gesture—a beau geste. This does not open the door. Some people think it is the camel putting its nose under the tent. But this assures the people of China that we recognize them as equals.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, will agree with me that the most puissant propaganda is being disseminated by the Japanese throughout China to the effect that the Americans and British do not believe in an orient for the orientals. They charge that we believe in the doctrine that the white race is superior to the orientals. They say that the white men forced upon China the opium trade; that the white men seized Hong Kong and took it away from the Chinese in 1840–41; that they forced extraterritoriality upon the Chinese; that they forced trade ports and a strange open-door policy upon the Chinese.

I cannot help but admire the Chinese for their forbearance and patience in face of a great many offenses. This is an opportunity to demonstrate to the world that we recognize the Chinese as brothers, insofar as we are willing to exemplify the Declaration of Independence where it states, "All men are created equal." The French, too, adopted a slogan—"liberté—egalité—fraternité." We are telling the Chinese people, "We are going to let you people come in in limited number to the United States. We are placing you under the immigration laws and putting you on a parity with the other countries of the world."

This is our chance to demonstrate to our Chinese friends that we are with them in this fight. This is not something just for the Chinese; this is something for the long pull; this is something for our own people—our own men; this is a contribution to a stable, just, post-war world.

From 1905, when the treaty of Portsmouth was signed in the United States with the help of Theodore Roosevelt, the Japanese have preached to the orientals, "Now, you see that a colored race can win over a white race because we, a colored race, won victory over a white race, Russia." From 1905 to 1943 this propaganda has been assiduously sown throughout the Orient, namely, "If you join with us and rally together as one coprosperity sphere and entity, we can combine together and defeat the white race."

That pronunciamento has been more productive of results than anything else.

It left its mark in Burma; it had its effect in Malay; it helped weaken resistance to invasion in the Dutch East Indies; it is making inroads in the Philippine Islands. This bill will do more to counteract that propaganda than any other bill that we can enact. I hope we will pass this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, the American people are the most generous people in the world. We have always been friendly to the people of China. We were friendly in the Boxer Rebellion. We have been and are their friends in this war. We were their friends when Japan moved into Manchuria, but in our proposal to stop Japan we could get no help from Great Britain, and Japan seized and now occupies that rich portion of China.

We are giving the Chinese material aid now, giving them money, planes, munitions, and men, doing all possible for them. Notwithstanding the financial and military aid this country has extended to China, certain well-meaning people assume an apologetic attitude and cry out that the American people must make atonement for all the sins other nations have committed against China.

They go about in sackcloth and ashes, cutting themselves among the tombs. And we are told that unless we repeal the Chinese exclusion laws we are guilty of a great sin against ourselves and against the Chinese. The proponents of this measure say its enactment will help win the war and make the Chinese our friends.

If what we have already done for the Chinese has not made them our friends, I do not know what we could do to make friends of them.

This measure, innocuous as it seems, is an attempt to put the camel's nose under the tent of our immigration laws, because in the offing we know that there is a bill pending to bring into this country millions of aliens from foreign countries under the pretext that they are to be here just for the duration and 6 months longer. But once you get them in you will never get them out. We have not been able to get rid of Harry Bridges. He has taken root and neither the Congress nor any other Federal agency has been able to get rid of him. Now, let us be practical. I am for China as well as for our other allies, but I believe that the future of China must be worked out on the soil of China, within China itself; and I think that the future of this country is rightfully in the hands of the people of America. As their representatives we have no right to flood this land with aliens from all over the earth. The American people and the people of China, magnificent people that they are, are not homogeneous peoples. Each should work out their own destinies within their own lands. To the end that China may be free this Government is giving her all possible material aid and what is more precious than all of that—the help and the lives of American boys.

Now just stop and think for one moment about the status of the Chinese nation with respect to this proposal. There are 400,000,000 Chinese, 200,000,000 of them now under the domination of Japan, and other millions who are under the domination of Russia. In China there are two armies—one commanded by the Chinese Generalissimo, and a so-called Red army, equipped by Russia and largely under her control. And now it is said that if we can do this and let this infinitesimally small number of 105 Chinese come into this country from all over the world, it will win the war. One would think that the passage of this bill would level the Himalayas, would open the Burma Road. It will do neither of these things. It will give no material aid whatever to China. She needs her citizens to help fight her war for liberation and to restore her economy, her manufacturing concerns, and her agriculture when the invaders have been driven from her shores.

Our first duty is to America. In the midst of this war, when men's minds are moved by their emotions, let us keep cool. When the war is won, when the boys come home, will be soon enough to consider how many aliens we will admit. We will continue to give to China the things she needs—guns, planes, munitions—material aid that will help them win the war. This we can do and take care of the United States and our own people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, in the Appendix of the RECORD, on page A4408, in an extension of remarks, I inserted a group of editorials from various States of the Union asking for the repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws. I have also given the ranking minority member of my committee an additional number of editorials from every State in the Union, I believe, urging that the Chinese exclusion laws be repealed. I have yet to find any opposition to it in any great newspaper, or by any great organization representing a large number of the people of this country.

I heard the statement made that we should cut the quota. If you want to help China and do the right thing by this bill, then you had better not attempt to offer any amendments, because you are going to destroy the whole purpose of this legislation. If there is a problem concerning quotas we can deal with it when considering bills that are pending before the committee dealing specifically with the quota system. There is no reason why this clear-cut issue of repealing the Chinese exclusion acts should be complicated by encumbering this bill with a lot of amendments not germane to this legislation.

To come back to the bill before us—it has been stated several times today that we do not really know how the Chinese people feel about the exclusion acts.

Let me call your attention to a statement made before the committee by the Most Reverend Bishop Yu Pin, the Catholic bishop of China. His statement appears on page 13 of the hearings, and I shall quote only a little portion of it—appearing on page 14 of the hearing. Time does not permit the quoting of his whole statement, but I commend it all to your very careful reading:

> Should thousands of tanks and airplanes from America to China not be forthcoming immediately, the Chinese people and soldiers perhaps will understand that Allied strategy of global warfare dictates otherwise for the time.
>
> But should your honorable committee look unfavorably upon these bills before you today, then I assure you that my country and my people will not be able to understand. It would be a great blow to our morale in China, irreparable harm to the Allied cause.

Here is a responsible representative of the Chinese people who can be relied upon to know exactly what the Chinese soldiers and civilians think about our exclusion laws. His testimony alone should be sufficient to convince us that our great ally is deeply concerned with the grave injustice done to her people. They are a proud people who consider it below their dignity to come asking for something which is rightfully due them. Let us respect their dignity as a people and live up to our reputation as a fair and just nation. I want to call your attention to the testimony of a number of Americans who had been prisoners of the Japanese at Hong Kong. About 300 Americans were detained in Hong Kong as prisoners of the Japs. They were starving; there was a severe lack of food. It was the poor Chinese people who, risking their own lives, smuggled food into that concentration camp to feed the Americans. This testimony has been corroborated by that of other witnesses. The Chinese people did not hesitate to

endanger their own safety when this became necessary to come to the aid of their American ally. The least we can do is to show them—to prove to them by concrete action that we consider them on an equal basis with our other allies. The claim made here that the passage of this bill would break down our immigration laws is nothing but a smoke screen to becloud the issue. It does not change the basic immigration policy at all; it simply extends its provisions to our Chinese friends. It will be up to Congress, at some future date, to determine whether they want to change our basic immigration laws and that will be the time to discuss many of the issues raised here today. But these issues certainly have no connection with the legislation before us now. As to the proponents of this measure, every religious organization in this country, representing almost every denomination, have been urging the passage of this bill; 40 or 50 witnesses, from groups which represented approximately 80,000,000 people, have gone on record appealing to the committee and the Congress to pass this bill at the earliest possible moment for the good of this country. The wide range of the people interested in the repeal is astonishing. Missionaries acquainted with the reaction of the Chinese people to exclusion; most of the chambers of commerce of the west coast interested in post-war trade; labor organizations eager to see an old wrong, for which they were partly responsible, corrected; social and welfare organizations anxious to show their sympathy and understanding of the problems facing our ally; military experts thinking of the best strategy to defeat our enemies; in short, the American people as a whole, eager to show by action that we mean what we so proudly proclaim to be our war aims and our blueprints for a brighter and happier future—equality and justice for all human beings.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I have read the minority and majority committee reports. I have listened carefully to the general debate, participated in largely by members of the Immigration Committee and those who have given special attention to immigration and foreign affairs. I have come to the conclusion that I shall support this resolution.

It would seem from the views expressed in the debate that the opposition to this proposal at this time is cogently summed up in the Minority Committee Report. In short, those members of the committee opposing the resolution feel, first, that our basic immigration policies should not be changed in time of war; second, that to repeal the part of existing law, granting privileges to the Chinese not granted to other Asiatics, would be discriminatory and prejudicial to Koreans, Hindus, Indians, and other Asiatics.

There is much logic in the position taken in the minority report, yet, on the other hand, we must not lose sight of the fact that we are fighting a great war, that China is our ally, and that, as a practical matter, the enactment of this legislation will have an infinitesimal effect on immigration into this country.

I am sure that this is but a gesture so far as immediate results are concerned. Nevertheless, it is a gesture, the effect of which will be to strengthen the unity and the confidence between China and the United States. If this move will not be injurious, and will be helpful in the war effort, then I am willing to resolve the doubt in favor of affirmative action.

I was interested in the statement of the preceding speaker, the chairman of the Immigration Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]. Now, it is no secret that I have often disagreed with the distinguished chairman on immigration policy. By some, I might be called a restrictionist, and I am sure that by no stretch of the imagination could the gentleman from New York be placed in such a category. He always has been, and undoubtedly always will be, very liberal when it comes to opening the ports of our country to immigration from abroad. Maybe I have been a little selfish, but I still believe that our country cannot be of the most assistance to the rest of the world by reducing our own standards of living, by relaxing immigration laws to the extent that when the war is over we will have many more people than we have American jobs for those people. If I judge rightly, the principal opposition to this bill is because it is feared that this is but the forerunner of legislation that is to come from the Immigration Committee at a later date letting down the bars, throwing open the gates, and creating a condition after the war that will make it utterly impossible to go back to American standards of living. I am opposed to any legislation that even remotely endangers our own people in this regard.

Speaker after speaker, in opposing this resolution, has pointed out that "this is but the nose of the camel under the tent," and that later the real camel will appear and attempt to push its way into the tent, carrying with it legislation that will destroy existing restrictive law.

The distinguished chairman of the Immigration Committee has made it clear that he at least has in mind the changing of present immigration quotas, and that his committee will give consideration to bills now pending before it aiming directly at that objective. If I thought this bill were a pilot for the bills to which he has referred, then I should oppose it most strenuously. Regardless of the views of the chairman, I have such faith in his committee that I do not believe it will agree with him in this effort.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Does the gentleman want an answer on that?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; I should like that assurance.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes; and in this matter I am just going to exercise my rights as a Member of this House and advocate what I believe is proper, and human, and just on behalf of the persecuted people of the world. If I can convince the committee and the Congress that it is the proper thing to do for this country, all right; if not, at least I shall have tried.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman for that candid statement.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Immigration has removed all doubt and placed the House on notice that he contemplates urging the enactment of legislation on behalf of the persecuted people of the world. The gentleman is well within his rights in endeavoring to put his views into law and, by the same token, we who do not entirely agree with this general philosophy are only exercising our rights when we scrutinize these proposals most carefully.

While I shall support this resolution for the reasons which I have given, at the same time I want it distinctly understood that I shall oppose any effort to break down our immigration quota law. Indeed, I possibly will go further and support legislation to further restrict all immigration for the duration of the war and for such period thereafter as may be necessary to thoroughly demonstrate that additional immigrants will be beneficial to our economy and our form of government. In taking this position, I cannot be accused of being too much of a nationalist. We must put our own house in order, and post-war jobs must be provided for our own before we give a thought to importing more labor and more people from other lands. This is not a selfish attitude. Our country can perform a more important mission in the world by being virile, strong, well governed, adequately fed, clothed, and cared for. Certain it is that we cannot help others to attain our standard of living by reducing that standard or, by lax immigration laws, destroying the very principle that has made our country and our way of life the envy of civilized man.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, it is seldom that I take the floor and especially on an occasion of this kind. However, I am deeply interested in this bill, and I shall support it.

When the 4 o'clock mail came in this afternoon I was agreeably surprised to receive a letter from one of my old friends back in Fort Wayne, Ind., who is now stationed as an officer in the United States Army in Hawaii. I wish to read it to the House. It is as follows:

Hon. GEORGE W. GILLIE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DOC: It is seldom that I write to my Congressman with reference to pending legislation as I believe that if a man is highly enough considered to be elected to the Congress that he should be capable enough to be left alone to exercise his own discretion.

However, I do feel compelled to say something with reference to the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act. I am stationed in Hawaii and have had a fine opportunity to observe the American Chinese here in large

numbers and I am much impressed with them.

Twelve Chinese officers were detailed to this air base a year and a half ago and were accepted with some trepidation, but they have become a very highly regarded group of people, readily amenable—an able and intelligent group of people.

I earnestly favor repeal of this act.

With kindest personal regards to you and your staff and family, I am,

First Lt. JAMES O. BALLOU,
San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURLEY].

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Chairman, the adoption of the pending measure will serve to give expression by the United States of our friendship for the people of China. It is a belated acknowledgment of an obligation that should have been discharged, if not prior to, at least upon the announcement of the attack upon Pearl Harbor by Japan. The sad spectacle of China, whom we declared an equal ally with Great Britain and Russia at the time of the Atlantic Charter, is difficult of explanation. The opportunity for the saving of the lives of 500,000 or more American boys through the arming of the Chinese forces represents a proposition that it is extremely difficult for America to either explain or justify. It is clearly evident that our ally, Great Britain, recognizes that an offensive by China and the ultimate establishment of a Chinese Republic means the loss of former possession of Hong Kong and Shanghai in China and that the establishment of a Chinese Republic with its huge army of veteran soldiers equipped must ultimately mean an independent India and the permanent loss of prestige and profits in the Far East to the British Empire.

It is more important to the United States that the lives of our boys be preserved than it is that England either acquire possessions in China or continue to control India. It must be apparent to every thinking person that the sacrifice of the lives of 500,000 American boys means nothing to Great Britain provided as a consequence of the sacrifice of these lives she retains India and reacquires Hong Kong and Shanghai. It must be apparent to everyone that the Atlantic Charter is meaningless when British possessions are at stake. The possibility of a war at some future date between the Orientals and the Occidentals at a time when the Occidentals have been bled white as a consequence of the present war apparently does not disturb the equanimity of the British Empire.

These two great storehouses of manpower, China with its population of 450,000,000 and India with its population of 400,000,000 and the adjoining territories with another 150,000,000, makes a total of 1,000,000,000 people, who, unless treated justly and in conformity with the Atlantic Charter, must some day be reckoned with. Uncle Dudley, of the Boston Globe, under date of Tuesday, October 19, presents an astounding summary of the situation in the Far East that is worthy of study and consideration by all Americans desirous of a permanent peace with justice and morality as a basis.

The gratifying progress of the Allied attack on the Axis in Europe offers sharp contrast to the status of their fortunes in the Pacific conflict. In Europe, the Germans have been shorn of their major ally, thrown out of Africa, pushed more than one-third of the way up the Italian peninsula, blasted by mass air raids and hammered into retreat, with staggering losses, from more than 500,000 square miles of territory they had overrun in Russia. Simultaneously, the political consequences of Allied success emphasize growth of Allied prestige.

What of Asia?

Japan, after nearly 2 full years of war, remains secure, and relatively untouched, within the 15,000,000 square miles area over which she has extended her rule. She has been contained within that area. But since it includes most of what she set out to take, while the remainder lies mainly in China (which she has isolated), the present situation by no means operates to her disadvantage.

The brilliant fighting of General MacArthur's forces in the southwestern Pacific, the superiority of American air power whenever tested, the proven striking power of our Navy—all this by no means cancels out the discomforting facts which are:

1. Twenty-two months after the beginning of this war we are still gnawing at the outer rim of Japanese defenses all the way from Burma to the North Pacific.

2. Having strengthened their Burma garrisons 100 percent, the Japanese are presently striving to conquer a land link over the Burma road toward Kumming, widening the buffer between India and China, and opening a threat of a new interior supply line direct from Indochina. This scheme, if successful, would enormously lengthen the process of Burma reconquest.

3. The Japanese, employing vast hordes of native labor drawn from the 400,000,000 people now under their thumbs, have made serious progress in winning native political support.

4. The huge industrial base in Manchukuo (50-percent completed when the war with China began in earnest) has now been expanded. Into it Japan is moving quantities of her industries from home.

5. The fabulous coal, iron, timber, oil, tin, rubber, and other mineral and metallurgical resources fallen into Japanese hands through conquest are being exploited effectively by the conquerors.

6. Not one of Japan's industrial centers, at home or in China, has been effectively raided by air thus far.

7. Not one of her vital communications lines has been broken or crippled.

8. China, our great Asiatic ally, is weaker today than at any time since the war began, because of the Japanese blockade, persisting internal disputes, disastrous inflation, war weariness, persisting "peace" pressures from Japan, and growth of "appeasement factions."

True, China has lately launched a new offensive in the middle of Yangtze, and her ragged troops are striving valiantly to thwart Japan's drive from Burma. True, also, the British have sped an attack down the Burma coast some 60 miles above Akyab. True, also, from Washington and in London, statements have issued to the effect that nothing on a real scale can be expected this winter in Burma. If true, that would mean granting Japan another 12 months to strengthen her position.

Japan will not be defeated for years unless the "massive" blows demanded by General MacArthur are delivered against her vitals soon. The problem is not one of hitting her here or there; but of crippling her power to make war. That power is concentrated in Japan proper and on the Asiatic mainland. Japan is not a naval power in the sense in which Britain and this Nation weigh naval power. Japan is a land power. She will continue to fight until her armies are defeated. She must be beaten at home and on the continent of Asia.

The first task implies major assault by sea and air power from the eastern Pacific. The second entails powerful drives into Burma, to reopen a real supply line to China and facilitate reequipment of China's manpower.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

LET'S FIGHT THE AXIS INSTEAD OF OUR ALLIES

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, in the past few months our armies have made tremendous progress toward the winning of the war. We have won Italy over to our side. German cities have been severely damaged. The Japanese are beginning to get theirs in the south Pacific.

But here at home, folks have been spending their time condemning our allies. If we spent half the energy trying to resolve our differences which we are spending in magnifying them, they would disappear.

Right now is the time for us to stop criticizing the British, the Russians, and the Chinese and to start working together. Right now is the time for us to quit the subtle process of backbiting and faultfinding directed against England, Russia, and China in favor of a real effort to understand and sympathize with our allies.

The thousands of words attacking British imperialism, Russian communism, and so-called Chinese reactionaries are neither winning the war nor contributing to peace. The sly propaganda which tends to undermine our united front may cost thousands of lives by driving us apart.

In one word, this is the time for us to fight the enemy and stop fighting our friends. The sooner our intellectuals and our hatemongers stop their private war, the sooner we shall win the real war and begin to build a worth-while lasting peace.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, China is the only one of our major allies with whom we all sympathize but about whom we do nothing. I am only sorry that the entire membership of the House was not here this afternoon when the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, gave his splendid and outstanding talk on the Chinese situation. It is something that not only everyone in Congress should hear but everyone in the country as well. I feel that we are extremely fortunate to have as one of our distinguished colleagues the gentleman from Minnesota, who can give us the benefit of his wisdom and

knowledge, especially with respect to Far Eastern affairs.

I listened with a great deal of interest to many of the comments this afternoon and specifically to the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ELMER], who told us about the Boxer Rebellion. He stated that at that time we called the Chinese "devils." Well, I would not be surprised. We have probably called the Chinese everything else including that. But I think if he will go back into his history he will find that the devils were on the other side, that the Americans, the British, the Russians, the Austrians, the Germans, and all the others who comprised the International Legion which went up from Taku to Peking, at the time of the Boxer Rebellion, were known collectively by the Chinese as foreign devils.

If the gentleman from Missouri will again go back into history he will also find that the Empress at that time, the Old Dowager, so-called, was a rather conservative but at the same time a rather remarkable woman. What she tried to do was to play ball with some of her Manchu princes and friends. She picked the wrong horse on that particular occasion. But there were some outstanding, statesmanlike Chinese such as Li Hung Chang, who saw to it that relations were kept on as good a basis as possible with the foreigners, and because of that, better relations came about in the long run.

We should keep in mind also that a German commander was sent out to take charge of the International Legion which marched on Peking, and that this commander was given a testimonial dinner by the Kaiser at which he was told to march into China as the Huns did into western Europe in centuries gone by. He was also told to use the mailed fist wherever possible.

We did not do China any real good at the time of the Boxer Rebellion. Our nationals as well as the nationals of other countries put in exorbitant claims which were later scaled down. We stole everything we possibly could of real value and transported a great deal of it back to this country. Some of it is still in the Capital City of the United States today, where it does not belong.

We ought to wake up and realize that of all people the Chinese are the most tolerant. Every religion—Catholic, Jewish and Protestant—has been welcomed in China. Every people has been welcomed in China. It is the occidental who is intolerant, not the Chinese.

When we think of our superiority, we ought to keep in mind the fact that Chinese culture is approximately 4,000 years old, and maybe it will prove to be longer before we get through with our research in that particular field. China was a great and a powerful nation long before there was such a thing as a Greece or a Rome. Those are the places which we consider as the foundation of our civilization, but, believe me, they cannot compare with China in antiquity, and we must not forget that fact.

Do we by any chance have the idea that we have treated China fairly, that our policy has been for the best? Do we favor the idea of extraterritoriality? Do we realize it was formally incorporated in a treaty—the Treaty of Wanghia—first by America? Do we derive any satisfaction out of the results of the opium war—the so-called First Anglo-Chinese War—which preceded that treaty? Do we uphold the idea of treaty ports? Do we uphold the idea of foreign concessions and compounds? Do we uphold the idea of having American consular courts in China, and a district court at Shanghai dispensing justice to American nationals on Chinese soil? No. We have a good many things to answer for, and this is one way that we can make good some of the things we owe to our Chinese friends.

We must awaken from our lethargy about the Orient and put the manifest sympathy of the American people to a practical use. We must realize just how much we need China; not how much China needs us. We must never forget that we will have full need of all our energies, abilities, and real friends in our barbaric struggle with Japan. We must not forget our future lies, in large part, in the Pacific. A friendly and strong China will be a safeguard for us in that area. Let us recognize the situation as it really exists and do our share to keep China going so that American lives will be spared and the war shortened considerably. Not by words—which mean everything and anything—but by action now.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I am for this resolution. I am sorry that my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has gone. I dislike very much to disagree with him. I wish he were here.

I do not feel that America has been criticizing Great Britain, or China, or Russia unjustly, or otherwise. We have not been criticizing them as the gentleman from Ohio has said. We have been criticizing our own administration for some of their own faults, their own incompetence in the past few years.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURLEY] said that when he was speaking in New York a year or two back members of the audience rose and hissed and sneered at him because he said we should stop sending cotton and scrap iron to Japan to throw against China.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] said that he had a bill, H. R. 30, pending here a year or two ago to correct this condition, but the State Department by their influence had defeated the bill.

Therefore I disagree with my colleague from Ohio. America is not criticizing Great Britain, America is not criticizing China, America is not criticizing Russia. I glory in their loyalty in being for their own country first and always, but never last. The criticism which America has to offer is against our administration for the past 10 or 12 years on their foreign policy, which was nonexistent, and which so far as the American people know is still nonexistent. The five Senators in their report are not criticizing our allies, but rather offering constructive criticism to our present administration in an effort to show our past faults, and if possible, to profit by those mistakes. The sooner England realizes this and stays out of our personal quarrels the better it will be for the war effort.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I have no more requests for time, and therefore I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following acts or parts of acts relating to the exclusion or deportation of persons of the Chinese race are hereby repealed: May 6, 1832 (22 Stat. L. 58); July 5, 1884 (23 Stat. L. 115); September 13, 1888 (25 Stat. L. 476); October 1, 1888 (25 Stat. L. 504); May 5, 1892 (27 Stat. L. 25); November 3, 1893 (28 Stat. L. 7); that portion of section 1 of the act of July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. L. 750, 751), which reads as follows: "There shall be no further immigration of Chinese into the Hawaiian Islands except upon such conditions as are now or may hereafter be allowed by the laws of the United States; and no Chinese, by reason of anything herein contained, shall be allowed to enter the United States from the Hawaiian Islands."; section 101 of the act of April 30, 1900 (31 Stat. L. 141, 161); those portions of section 1 of the act of June 6, 1930 (31 Stat. L. 588, 611), which read as follows: "And nothing in section 4 of the act of August 5, 1882 (22 Stat. L. 225), shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of the Treasury from hereafter detailing one officer employed in the enforcement of the Chinese exclusion acts for duty at the Treasury Department at Washington. * * * and hereafter the Commissioner-General of Immigration, in addition to his other duties, shall have charge of the administration of the Chinese exclusion law * * *, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Treasury."; March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. L. 1093); April 29, 1902 (32 Stat. L. 176); April 27, 1904 (33 Stat. L. 428); section 25 of the act of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. L. 1087, 1094); that portion of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. L. 417, 476), which reads as follows: *"Provided*, That all charges for maintenance or return of Chinese persons applying for admission to the United States shall hereafter be paid or reimbursed to the United States by the person, company, partnership, or corporation, bringing such Chinese to a port of the United States as applicants for admission."; that portion of the act of June 23, 1913 (38 Stat. L. 4, 65), which reads as follows: *"Provided*, That from and after July 1, 1913, all Chinese persons ordered deported under judicial writs shall be delivered by the marshal of the district or his deputy into the custody of any officer designated for that purpose by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, for conveyance to the frontier or seaboard for deportation in the same manner as aliens deported under the immigration laws."

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'NEAL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration H. R. 3070, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THF HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time that I have today I may have on Tuesday next, after the disposition of the legislative business and any other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a report from my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an address made by the Vice President of the United States, Mr. WALLACE, who spoke on the occasion of a meeting of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped at the National Press Club, July 9, 1943. Also to include an address at the same meeting made by Mr. Millard W. Rice, national service director of the Disabled American Veterans, and a resolution passed by the meeting.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a talk by my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] as opposed to a sales tax.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCANLON. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] be permitted to extend his remarks on Monday, October 18, on the increase to dependents of soldiers bill, and also to include remarks respecting the so-called fathers' bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, by previous order I was granted 30 minutes this afternoon. I ask unanimous consent to yield back that time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HOSPITALIZATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for half a minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And in that time, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a resolution that I am introducing today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The resolution requests certain information from the President with regard to Government hospitals, and the necessary number of beds. I think the House should know all about hospital construction, and the number of beds available and the number and type of patients now hospitalized, and the anticipated load. The least we can do for our disabled veterans is to see that they are properly and promptly hospitalized:

Resolution requesting certain information from the President with respect to Government hospitals

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is hereby requested to furnish the House of Representatives with the following information:

(1) The number of beds now available in all hospitals under the jurisdiction of the United States or the District of Columbia, or in private institutions under contract with the United States, and the number and type of patients in such hospitals;

(2) The number of beds to be available in hospitals now under construction by the United States, together with the approximate dates on which such hospitals will be placed in service;

(3) Plans for future construction of Government hospitals; and

(4) The maximum number of war casualties which it is estimated must be hospitalized at any one time.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] may address the House for 30 minutes after any special orders on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], be permitted to extend his remarks in two particulars.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a series of editorials on the Chinese exclusion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday of next week following the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk, I may address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of subsidies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter I have received today from Dr. Van Kirk, executive secretary of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America and include a petition signed by more than 800 of the most prominent educational and religious leaders in America, asking Congress to pass H. R. 3070, granting immigration quota to the Chinese. I will not ask that all the names be printed but just the petition and certain names.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement by Mr. Edward A. O'Neal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HARE, for 1 day, on account of important business.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after any other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a radio address delivered by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, representatives of the three religions of the United States have issued an identical seven-point plan for peace, accompanied by a separate preamble for each of the groups.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on Army and Navy E awards in Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3223. An act to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others, in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service;

H. R. 3225. An act to amend the act of May 27, 1908, as amended, authorizing settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps; and

H. R. 3230. An act to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942.

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 964. An act to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation.

S. 1113. An act to amend Section 11 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942;

S. 1132. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 so as to provide for the pay-

ment of a uniform gratuity to certain officers recalled to active duty;

S. 1170. An act authorizing the conveyance to the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, of a portion of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, Va.;

S. 1279. An act to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes; and

S. 1350. An act to establish the grades of commissioned warrant officer and warrant officer in the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 533. An act for the relief of John P. von Rosenberg;

H. R. 2888. An act relating to the application of the excess-profits tax to certain production bonus payments;

H. R. 3029. An act to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damages on the Illinois River, Ill.;

H. R. 3208. An act to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 3223. An act to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others, in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service;

H. R. 3225. An act to amend the Act of May 27, 1908, as amended, authorizing settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps; and

H. R. 3230. An act to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 21, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the petroleum subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Thursday, October 21, 1943.

Business to be considered: To begin hearings on the petroleum situation.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The hearing which was scheduled for Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 10 a. m., on the bill, H. R. 3334, relating to certain benefits to trainees in the Maritime Service, has been postponed until Tuesday, October 26, 1943, at 10 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 786, a bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (to include chiropractic practitioners), at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, November 3, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications, were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

865. A letter from the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, Office for Emergency Management, transmitting a copy of the estimate of the number of employees required for the operation of this Office during the period ending December 31, 1943, as submitted to the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

866. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a copy of amendment No. 2 covering the personnel requirements of The National Archives for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

867. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements, prescribed for the purpose of determining the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of this agency during the quarter beginning October 1, 1943, and ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

868. A letter from the National Service Director, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, transmitting the proceedings of the Eleventh National Convention of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, held at Duluth, Minn., August 5 to August 8, 1943, to be published under authority of House Joint Resolution 196, Public Law 249, of the Seventy-seventh Congress (H. Doc. No. 340); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1336. An act to authorize the transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 782). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SASSCER: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1354. An act to amend the act approved January 16, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United States Naval Academy"; without amendment (Rept. No. 783). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 3420. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 784). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 3500. A bill to reduce immigration quotas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 3501. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to enroll on the tribal rolls of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations all Choctaw and Chickasaw claimants whose names appear in the citizenship cases hereinafter mentioned and who were duly and legally enrolled by the Federal court, and the heirs now living of all such claimants, born prior to the closing of said tribal rolls by an act of Congress; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3502. A bill to amend the provision of the act authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of officers, enlisted men, or nurses of the Navy or Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3503. A bill to return the receipts in excess of lawful payments of a public-housing agency to the authority and to the political subdivision in which the project of such agency is situated in the same proportion to their respective contributions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JEFFREY:

H. J. Res. 175. Joint resolution commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 328. Resolution requesting certain information from the President with respect to Government hospitals; to the Committee on Military Affairs

---

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 3504. A bill for the relief of Wade Bros., a partnership composed of M. J., G. W., and Ovid Wade; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H. R. 3505. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to present a Congressional Medal of Honor to Jennings Jack Bennett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3506. A bill to authorize the appointment of Gregory Boyington a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3093. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of sundry citizens of Knox County, presented by Olga Cochran, of Mount Vernon, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3094. Also, resolution, adopted at Plymouth Grange, Richland County, Plymouth, Ohio, Friday, October 15, 1943, that Plymouth Grange No. 2632 support the National Grange master, Albert Goss, in his opposition to subsidies and roll-back of prices for farm produce, and instead of this ask the State and National Grange to support cost-of-production bill to farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3095. Also, petition of the wheat farmers of the Seventeenth Ohio District, requesting their Representative in Congress to sign petition No. 10, which relates to the cancelation of wheat penalty assessed against farmers of

the Seventeenth District of Ohio and refund of all penalties paid by said farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3096. By Mr. WELCH: Petition of the board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco to the Congress of the United States, sponsoring Federal legislation to permit of reduction in income taxes by an amount not to exceed $7,500 for construction or reconstruction of buildings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3097. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Mrs. E. A. Lee and 19 other citizens of Salem, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3098. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mrs. E. E. Calton and others of West Plains, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3099. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of the Hill Tavern of Washington, D. C., and signed by 18 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3100. Also, petition of Chester Christie, of Washington, D. C., and 29 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3101. Petition of the Certified Holsum Bakery, of Washington, D. C., and signed by 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3102. Also, petition of Columbia Lodge, No. 85, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, and 116 other Washington citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3103. Also, petition of Mrs. T. Krehbeil and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3104. Also, petition of Mrs. B. Zimmerman and 60 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3105. Also, petition of Andrew Reiser and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3106. Also, petition of Joseph Kristof and 24 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3107. Also, petition of Michael Eccardt, Sr., and 41 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3108. Also, petition of Cyril Ludwig and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3109. Also, petition of Arthur F. Doenmer and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3110. Also, petition of Joseph Sulmer and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3111. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Buma and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3112. Also, petition of Frank J. Florence and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3113. Also, petition of the Stanford brothers, of Washington, D. C., and signed by 68 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3114. By Mr. IZAC: Petition of various citizens of San Diego, Calif., and drawn up by Oscar L. Holt, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3115. Also, petition of various citizens of San Diego, Calif., and drawn up by Arizona Cafe, of San Diego, Calif., protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3116. Also, petition of Henry B. Cramer, of San Diego, Calif., and sundry citizens, protesting against the enactment of any legislation which would return the alcoholic beverage traffic to the underworld; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3117. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of May H. Baker and 13 other citizens of Riley County, Manhattan, Kans., urging the passage of House Resolution 3070 to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3118. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication from W. G. McCracken, farmer and businessman of Fairfield, Ill., urging a reduction in Government expenditures instead of an increase in taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3119. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Automobile Association, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to an investigation of petroleum and petroleum products; to the Committee on Rules.